

# OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

## DEBATES

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

## DOMINION OF CANADA

---

FOURTH SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

---

62-63 VICTORIA, 1899

---

VOL. L.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF MAY TO THE  
SIXTH DAY OF JULY, INCLUSIVE

8



OTTAWA

PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE QUEEN'S MOST  
EXCELLENT MAJESTY

1899

# House of Commons Debates.

FOURTH SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 7th July, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### BROCKVILLE AND WEST HURON ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that in obedience to the Order of the House of yesterday, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is in attendance at the Table with all poll-books, voters' lists, and all other letters, documents and memoranda which have been transmitted to him by the respective returning officers, or which may otherwise be in his possession relating to the last election for the electoral district of Brockville, and to the last election for the electoral district of the West Riding of the County of Huron, respectively.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I desire to move, seconded by Mr. Haggart:

That the poll-books, voters' lists and all other papers, letters, documents and memoranda relating to the last election for the electoral district of Brockville and the last election for the electoral district of the west riding of the county of Huron, respectively, which have been produced by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections for the purpose of inquiring into and investigating the conduct of the respective returning officers and of the several deputy returning officers at and in connection with each of the said elections respectively; with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to report thereon with all convenient speed.

As I understood from the right hon. leader of the Government yesterday that the motion would not be opposed by the Government, I presume that it is not necessary for me to say anything further in support of it. If I might be allowed a word of personal reference to something that was said by the right hon. gentleman yesterday with regard to my warmth, I certainly did not intend to exhibit any unbecoming warmth, and I do not think I did exhibit any. In the remarks I made as to the evidence, I carefully guarded myself from suggesting what I could not presume to suggest until the facts were brought out, that any of these gentlemen were guilty. I have looked over the records of the past when certain charges were made, and I think I brought myself very much within the rule of temper in language which has been observed by

hon. gentlemen in the past. I might refer to the language of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) in connection with certain charges against Sir Adolphe Caron in 1892,—language in which that hon. gentleman did not exhibit quite the judicial temper which he was so desirous to inculcate upon me. On that occasion he said:

We have not sat in this House so long without understanding thoroughly that the hon. Postmaster General has been for many years one of the inner ring, and thoroughly familiar with all the machinery by which fields were fought and won in electoral campaigns. We have not been here for so many years, Sir, without knowing enough of the character of that hon. gentleman to know that being thus familiar with all the inner details of these campaigns, he is not, and I do not blame him for it, disposed to be made the scapegoat and to pay the whole cost of any little delinquencies that may come to light. Mr. Speaker, what my hon. friend has brought to light, and what I know well he will prove, if the opportunity is given him,—

He was not a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, but he was a member of this House, which had to consider the report of that committee—

—is after all, only part and parcel of that colossal scheme of corruption by which and under which Canada has been governed for the last fourteen years.

Well, I am willing to submit the temper of my language in connection with this matter in contrast with that. He continued as follows:—

I know well, Sir, and the Ministers of the Crown know well, how the elections of 1882 were won, how the elections of 1887 were won, how the elections of 1891 were won, and how the recent by-elections, if they will have it, were bought and sold likewise. Sir, we know that the merest corner of the veil was lifted by the disclosures of last session; and I say to this House that if this investigation and the others demanded by the Opposition, be had, we shall see, and all Canada will see, with regard to the mode in which Canada has been governed for these many years past, that not on this continent, Teutomania Hall itself not excepted, has there ever been such a system of organized corruption as that investigation and others like it would expose.

Now, I think probably the right hon. gentleman will agree with me that I did not exceed the calm, judicial temperance of language which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce displayed on that occasion. I did also intend to refer, Sir, to some remarks made by yourself in debate on that occasion, and which exhibited a certain amount of warmth which I do not, however, consider at all inconsistent with the personal characteristics that justified the Liberal party in rais-

ing you to the very honourable position you fill so well. If it were desired, I think I could refer to some pretty strong language of which very likely you, Sir, have a recollection on that occasion. Perhaps it would not be inopportune for me just to mention a sentence or two; and you will understand, Sir, that I am not citing this in any invidious spirit, but because my right hon. friend saw fit to criticise me more or less for the manner in which I dealt with this question yesterday. I have quite a long reference, but I will just read a sentence or two:

And what is the glorious end that is accomplished by this boodling? Why, Sir, it is to maintain the loyalty and unity of Canada to the British Empire, to maintain the old flag and the old monopolists, and surely that end justifies a great deal. The means to that end are the votes of public money, and what object could be more patriotic than to allow a reasonable and sufficient proportion of those public moneys to filter into the pockets of the Minister and then be disseminated among the electors for the good of the old flag?

And then, further on:

Besides, a man who can raise the wind for election purposes so well as the Postmaster General, is invaluable to that party; he cannot be spared; they will have more elections, and they will want him again.

I did not make any exhaustive research into any of the other precedents, but simply took the "Hansard" of 1882, which I happened to have in my hand, for the purpose of reference, and I do not make these references with any idea of reproaching hon. gentlemen opposite, but merely with a view of showing why I thought they should not consider me as having too warmly supported the resolution I submitted. I may say to the right hon. gentleman that I am always very glad to accept any suggestion from him as to the mode in which business ought to be conducted in this House. He has great parliamentary experience, and I do not take any suggestion of this kind from him in bad part at all, but am very glad to receive it. And what I have said with regard to the matter is only an attempt to justify any warmth I may have exhibited.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am quite willing to meet the hon. gentleman on the ground he has taken, and since he has been kind enough to refer to the little experience I have had in Parliament, I may be permitted to tell him that I do not think the examples he quoted are at all apposite to the criticism he offered. I may say at once that the language he used yesterday would have been quite in order, if the Government had taken the same attitude on the question which the late Government did on similar occasions, and which brought forth the replies of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce and my hon. friend who oc-

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

cupies the Chair (Mr. Edgar). If my hon. friend had consulted the authorities, he would have perhaps found a more apposite authority in the opening speech of the hon. gentleman who moved the motion against Sir Adolphe Caron, rather than the speeches in reply to the refusal of the late Government to grant an inquiry. Unless I am greatly mistaken—and upon this point I am quite ready to stand corrected by the hon. gentleman—I think he quoted from the speech made by the mover of the resolution, not when he made the motion, but in reply to the attitude of the late Government in refusing an investigation on that occasion. My hon. friend quoted the remarks of my hon. colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce, also made in reply, but he no doubt did so because he assumes that this Government would do as the late Government did. That was his mistake.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And as this Government has been doing.

#### THE RESTIGOUCHE BOOM COMPANY.

Mr. McALISTER moved that Bill (No. 65) to incorporate the Restigouche Boom Company, be referred back to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills for further consideration. He said: I may say, by way of explanation, that this Bill was before committee yesterday morning, and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) requested that it be merely discussed, and not passed. A great deal of discussion took place on the Bill, but while a great many objections were made to the details, none was made to the principle of the Bill itself. Mr. Busted, who was the only one appearing to take objections, took the ground that the structure should be placed at the foot of the islands, some two or three miles above the point indicated in the Bill. In reply, I gave the opinion of experts who had examined the locality, that this could not be done, and the objection of Mr. Busted was the only one to the merits of the Bill. There was no objection to its principle. The hon. member for North Simcoe took objection to a great many of its details, and I admitted my willingness to accept an amendment covering the objections which he took. It was then suggested by the committee that the Bill should be referred to a special committee of three, and reported back to the committee. After that was agreed upon, the chairman said that the proper course would be to pass the preamble, and then refer the Bill to this special committee, on the distinct understanding that the passing of the preamble was not to be accepted as an indication that the Bill would be passed by the committee. On that understanding, the preamble was submitted, but quite a large number of members in the committee who were prepared to support the principle of the measure, had

then left, under the impression that nothing more would be done with regard to it, except to refer it to a special committee. The preamble was rejected, but rejected, as I have said in the absence of these members who, if present, would have supported it, and who had left when it was agreed not to go on with the Bill.

I may say that the lumber industry is the most important on that river, and in order to carry on lumbering operations successfully, a Bill should pass empowering the company to build proper protection. I do not wish at all to override the will of the committee—but I am satisfied—and I think the majority of the committee who were present in the beginning, will bear me out in this—that the rejection of the preamble was irregular and due to a misunderstanding.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know that this motion is absolutely unprecedented, though I do not remember any such motion having ever been made. Accepting, however, the statement of the hon. gentleman, that the vote taken in committee was a snap vote, the whole committee not being present, I have no objection to allowing the motion to carry.

Motion agreed to.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg to refer to a report which I see in a newspaper to-day regarding something that I said in committee yesterday, and which is a very unfair and incorrect version of what I really did say.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the paper?

Mr. SPROULE. I have here the Toronto "World," but I see that several other papers evidently misunderstood what I said, and reported me somewhat on the same line as this correspondent has done. The report says:

Dr. Sproule characterized the average system of lending of Canada "a swindling system," and held that no more charters of Bills should be sanctioned by Parliament that did not protect borrowers from a higher interest than was fair, and he understood that under the present system it was stated a loan was to be repaid, say with 6 per cent interest on the principal; whereas the interest was in reality on the full amount originally borrowed, irrespective of repayment.

Then it goes on to say that Mr. McCarthy said:

That unless such assertions were founded on fact they should not be made; but, if founded on fact, the sooner an investigation was commenced the better.

The report also contains the following:—

E. F. Clarke said all the expectations of the company might not have been realized, but it could not be pretended that there had been any sharp practice or operations in the remotest de-

gree justifying the use of the term "swindling" or anything of that sort.

In the first place, I may say that I never made such a statement as is attributed to me here when it says that I "characterized the average system of lending in Canada as 'a swindling system'." I said, with reference to the company that was before us, that they sent out literature offering to lend say \$1,000 or any other amount upon such terms that the borrower must take so much stock and would pay back \$1.50 per \$100 every month until he had made ninety-six payments, when his mortgage would be paid off and he would be entitled to have the mortgage cancelled and returned to him. But after he has made his ninety-six payments, he is told by the company that it will be necessary to make fifteen or sixteen payments more before he can get a discharge of his mortgage. I said that such conduct, taken in connection with such representations in their literature, might fairly be regarded as a swindling system. I said that several of these companies had been organized and were doing business in the country, and I knew of their operations. I characterized that operation as rather of a swindling character. I think the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), in answer, said that every company did the same. My reply was that, in my experience, no such thing was done, and I gave as my reason—

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I dislike to interrupt my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), but I would ask your ruling on a point of order—

Mr. SPROULE. I had nearly finished what I have to say.

The PRIME MINISTER. I suppose that my hon. friend has fair cause to complain of the report, and I did not wish to interrupt him. But I would ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to whether it is in order for the hon. gentleman to make an explanation concerning what passed in a committee of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a personal explanation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I may tell my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) that the Bill is still to come before the House, and he will have ample opportunity to set himself right.

Mr. SPEAKER. As to the point of order, my impression is that under the rules of the House, an hon. gentleman cannot, as a matter of personal explanation, refer to what has taken place in a committee of the House until that committee shall have reported.

Mr. SPROULE. The committee has reported.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then, I think the point is not well taken.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going on to say that, in answer to the statement that all companies did the same, I said that, so far as my knowledge extended, no respectable companies in Canada did it. I named the Canada Permanent and the Western Canada, the Farmers' Loan and Savings, the British Canadian, as companies that did not do it, and I said that I was confident that the same might be said of others. But I find a class of companies that have sprung up lately and are carrying on operations in this line. It will be seen that the report does not represent fairly what I said. I do not attribute to this correspondent any desire to misreport me, but it is evident that his summary is based on imperfect information or upon a misunderstanding of what I said.

#### THE PRINTING OF THE VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). May I ask the leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if anything has been done or any arrangement made to carry out the provision of the Franchise List Act. I find, on inquiry, that the lists of the county of Pictou for last year have been sent and that those for this year are here or are ready to be sent. I desire to know if we are to receive the lists in printed form?

The PRIME MINISTER. We have an appropriation in the supplementary Estimates for that very purpose.

Mr. BERGERON. We understood that the point was to be considered and decided, and either Parliament was to be asked to vote the money to print the voters' list or else a Bill would be introduced to change the law. Has that been done?

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no change in the law. The lists are to be printed.

Mr. BERGERON. But they were to be printed last year, and they were not printed. Mine were not.

The PRIME MINISTER. It may be that the appropriation proved insufficient.

Mr. McDUGALL. May I ask if the department have called upon the different county clerks to send in the lists? The reason why I put the question is that, as I understand it, unless within the last few days, the lists from the county of Cape Breton have not reached the Printing Bureau. Where they are, I cannot say. I am aware that some members have received copies of their lists printed from the Print-

Mr. SPEAKER.

ing Bureau. When I asked at the Printing Bureau for mine, I was informed that they had not received the lists.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot inform my hon. friend (Mr. McDougall). The only information I have is a report received yesterday or the day before from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery that the officers have been very negligent in sending in the lists, and very few lists have been received up to this moment.

Mr. BERGERON. How will it be in the future?

The PRIME MINISTER. My intention is to instruct the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to write a circular letter to all the officers to send in the lists.

Mr. BERGERON. The other day the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) explained that there was a flaw in the law, and that the officers cannot be forced to send in their lists, as they are not paid any fee. According to the hon. Minister (Sir Louis Davies) the law was to be amended one way or the other—either we would vote money to provide fees for these people and then compel them to send the lists, or it would be provided that the lists should not be printed except when absolutely necessary. If there is to be no amendment of the law, I do not know how my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is going to be sure of having the lists sent.

The PRIME MINISTER. To pay a fee to the officers would certainly be a good way to force them.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I know that, in some cases, the lists have been paid for by the Government. The officer who supplied the lists for my county was paid, though he claims he was not paid as much as he was entitled to. I did not understand that there was any question of the payment of the county clerk. I am surprised also to learn that some of the lists have been printed.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is the intention to have the lists printed, and we are having an appropriation for that purpose.

#### FOREIGN IMMIGRATION.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to speak upon a matter that I consider of great importance, and, to put myself right, Mr. Speaker, as my remarks will be somewhat lengthy, I will conclude with a motion. I was present when the right hon. leader of the Government saw fit to castigate my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) for bringing forward a matter, before the Orders of the Day were called, which he, with his knowledge of parlia-

mentary procedure, thought was not of sufficient importance. But I hope the hon. gentleman will not accuse me of doing the same when he has heard the subject I am bringing up. On the 26th of last month I asked the question in this House :

1. Is the Government aware that fourteen statutes, viz., chapters 39, 44, 46, 73, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88 and 89 passed by the local legislature of British Columbia on the 27th February last, and received by the hon. the Secretary of State on the 27th April last, contain a clause prohibiting the employment of Chinese and Japanese in connection with the undertakings referred to in said statutes ?

2. What is the policy of the Government in regard to the disallowance or otherwise of said Acts ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Government is aware that a number of statutes of British Columbia passed in the present year contain clauses prohibiting the employment of Chinese and Japanese. These statutes are now under the consideration of the Department of Justice, but no report has yet been made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to impress upon the right hon. gentleman the necessity that exists for an early opinion on that question of disallowance. The uncertainty that is engendered by Acts being passed and left in suspense, neither allowed or disallowed by the Dominion, is of great consequence to a large number of employers of labour in British Columbia. The fact that under some of their charters they were not allowed to employ Japanese and Chinese, makes it impossible for them to get capital in the old country until this matter is settled. I should like the right hon. gentleman to get from the Minister of Justice as soon as possible his opinion, or the opinion of the Council of his own Government, as to the advisability of allowing or disallowing these Bills. I will say that I myself am strongly in favour of restricting this immigration of Japanese. Now, the Japanese are, I may say at the outset, very much superior to the Chinaman in many ways. They are better men to come into the country, if there is any better about it, because they are a superior class. They use more of our eastern goods, they dress more in our way, they assimilate with our people a great deal better than the Chinese. But the trouble is that they come into the country as paupers, if not as serfs and slaves, and they are willing to work for a mere pittance in competing with white workmen in all sorts of labour. Now, in my opinion, and in the opinion of seven-eighths, at least, of the people of British Columbia, that is a great menace to the welfare and the well-being of, at all events, the working classes in the Dominion of Canada. Of course, I am aware that the Imperial Government has seen fit to put its foot down on any restrictive measures, and I suppose their action precludes the possibility of excluding these Japanese. I am sorry myself to see that the Government were obliged to veto these Acts. I know, as

good British subjects, as members of the British Empire, we should bow to the superior authority of Great Britain ; and I suppose that the Imperial authorities know what is best for the Empire in doing as they have done. But I must say that I sincerely hope that means will still be found whereby the tide of these men, a tide that is bound, I believe, to increase very largely and very rapidly with the means of communication we have across the Pacific—I say I hope means will still be found to keep that tide back. Not only do I believe that the workmen of the Dominion are menaced by this kind of immigration, but the manufacturers and merchants of this country are also menaced. The two Asiatic races across the Pacific, China, and especially Japan, have, in the last two or three years, awakened fully to the necessity there is for them to compete with the older countries ; and with their ability, for there is no doubt these men have ability, with the cheap wages, the starvation wages they are willing to work for, they will certainly become dreadful competitors of the white race on this continent, unless some means are taken to offset that competition.

But, Sir, there is another, and, to my mind, a still greater danger than from the Japanese, that is from the "yellow spectre," as it has been called, or the Chinese race, of which there are over 400,000,000 living across the Pacific from our coast. For years a cloud of them have been coming across to our country. They come here and take the places that, in my estimation, should be held by men of our own flesh and blood. Now, perhaps, the House is tired of hearing about this Chinese question.

Mr. GIBSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. PRIOR. I think hon. gentlemen who say "hear, hear," do not know as much about it as I do myself, or as other members who come from British Columbia.

An hon. MEMBER. We are tired of hearing it.

Mr. PRIOR. The fact that you are tired will not stop the British Columbia members from bringing this matter up year after year.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. You were not so active when you were in the Government.

Mr. PRIOR. I beg your pardon. If the hon. gentleman will look up "Hansard" he will find that I have spoken exactly as I am going to speak now, not, perhaps, in the same words, but to the same intent, when our party was on the other side of the House, and as I have spoken on every hustings in British Columbia where I have spoken at all. Now, Sir, this subject has been before the House for at least twenty-five years. It has been brought up by every member of Parliament that British Columbia has sent to represent her in this House. Mr. DeCosmos, Mr. Roscoe, Mr. Bunster, Mr. Gordon, Mr. Shakespeare, Mr. Baker—every one of us

have got up in this House and given utterance to the same opinions that I am going to express to-day. In 1878, Mr. Bunster, the hon. member for Nanaimo, caused some amusement by moving a resolution in this House, which I will read, as I dare say there are many members of the House who have never heard it. It was on March 18th, 1878 :

That the Government insert a clause in each and every contract let for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that no man wearing his hair longer than five and one-half inches shall be deemed eligible for employment on said work, and that no person wearing his hair longer shall be eligible to any contract on said railroad, either by the engineers, employees, or any other person or persons so engaged on the said railroad, under penalty for the first offence of \$100, and not to exceed \$1,000 for the second offence, or imprisonment for the first offence for three months, and not more than twelve months for the second offence.

Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman did that because, I know, he was sincere in the wish to keep out the Chinese from British Columbia. It caused also a little amusement in this House when Mr. Mackenzie, in answering the hon. mover of that resolution, called attention to the fact that the mover of the resolution, and also the hon. member for Cariboo, would both be precluded, he thought, from taking contracts on the railroad, because their hair was not cut in the shortest fashion. But, seriously, this subject of Chinese and Japanese immigration is one that overshadows all other subjects that can be brought before Parliament, so far as the people of British Columbia are concerned. It affects mostly, of course, the poor labouring men, also the miners. I will not say of them, as it has been said about the Indians, that the only good Indian is a dead Indian, but it almost applies to the Chinese race. There are, I must say, some good, honest, clean Chinamen, well educated, smart business men, and money makers, but they are few in number. It is not of these that I speak to-day, but it is of the labourers, the men who are nothing more than serfs and slaves, who are brought over in droves, owned by Chinese firms, let out to contractors at certain sums of money, of the value of which they have no idea and never see a penny of it. I am aware that a large number of people in British Columbia employ Chinese servants, myself amongst the number. I employ a Chinaman as a cook, and it has been said: If you object to Chinese so much, why do you employ them? The fact of the matter is that it is impossible to get anything else in British Columbia.

Mr. GIBSON. Do you do your own cooking?

Mr. PRIOR. If the hon. gentleman wants to ask me a question, I will be very glad to answer it.

Mr. COWAN. You look as if you fared pretty well by that cook.

Mr. PRIOR.

Mr. PRIOR. Yes, I think I do as I do everywhere. The servant girl question of British Columbia is such that it is impossible to get white girls. As the Victoria "Times" pointed out a few weeks ago, in an editorial, it is necessary that we should try and get some society in England, or elsewhere, to send out girls to Canada and to the Pacific coast particularly, to go into domestic service in houses. There seems to be an idea amongst girls that it is far better to go into millinery shops and factories than into household service.

Mr. TALBOT. It is the same all over Canada.

Mr. PRIOR. I believe it is the same all over Canada, and that is the trouble that has to be met. If there were sufficient girls to perform household service very few people in British Columbia would employ Chinese. But the summing up of the trouble is that these Chinamen are a lower class of human beings than white people are. They are able to live in a manner such as no white man can, and the wages that they would accept would be such as would really mean starvation for the white man. Senator Jones, of Nevada, once gave a reason why the white man could not compete with the Chinaman, and he did it in so succinct a manner that I will read what he said to the House. He said that he had been talking to a labourer, and this labourer had spoken to him as follows:—

"While my work is very arduous," says the labourer, "I go to it with a light heart and perform it cheerfully, because it enables me to support my wife and children. I am in a position to bring up my daughters to be good wives and faithful mothers, and to offer my sons better opportunities in life than I had myself. I cheerfully support the churches, charitable institutions and other objects that enter into our daily life; but, after I have maintained my family and performed these duties, not much is left of my wages when the week is ended.

"How is it with the Chinaman? The Chinaman can do as much work underground as I can. He has no wife and family. He performs none of these duties. Forty or fifty of his kind can live in a house no larger than mine. He craves no variety of food. He has inherited no taste for comfort or for social enjoyment. Conditions that satisfy and make him contented would make my life not worth living."

That is exactly the pith of the matter. It is impossible for white men to compete with Chinamen at the wages that the Chinamen are willing to work for. These Chinamen are now beginning to learn trades. We have them working in British Columbia as carpenters, building houses, making shoes, making clothes, and in fact, entering into every industry almost that you can find. They are very apt scholars; they are very imitative and industrious, but they have no wives and there are no children. All the women are of a certain class; you cannot call them wives—there may be children.

The Chinamen sends every cent he makes and saves to China. Anything that he spends in British Columbia is for Chinese goods imported by Chinese merchants. I clipped from a paper, a few days ago, a little interview with the Inspector of the Merchants' Bank, of Halifax, who had been out on the coast. It says:

#### CHINESE BUSINESS.

The inspector here displayed a fly-sheet covered with Chinese characters, indicating the steps that the Vancouver banks take to secure the business of the industrious Celestial. Every sailing day of the "Empresses," streams of Chinese are seen going from bank to bank to get the best rates for a draft on Hong Kong. Many of these people have good deposits; but as soon as their savings amount to \$1,000 or upwards they get a draft, and off goes the hard-earned Canadian money to China.

Perhaps some hon. gentlemen say: If these Chinamen are hardworking and industrious people you ought to allow them to come into the country. Men who make money in the country and do not spend one cent of it here are a detriment to the country. They never assimilate with the white people. A woman has to descend very low before she would think of marrying a Chinaman. Not only this, but the Chinese despise us. Although we think that they are a lower class of human beings they think themselves that they belong to a higher civilization; they despise us and they are becoming more and more disposed to break our laws. I do not think that anything can be done to keep these people out of the country unless it is by legislation passed by Parliament. It is the belief of nearly everybody in British Columbia that the only way to keep them out is to pass some strict legislation which would prevent them from coming across. I believe that the best way to do is to materially raise the head tax that is now placed upon them. I would urge on the Government, as I believe it has been urged by other British Columbia members, and will still be urged if it is not done, that they increase very materially the head tax as has been done in Australia.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). The expression of opinion which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) is giving, I presume, refers only to the Chinese?

Mr. **PRIOR**. That is what I intended to refer to.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. Speaking of the capitation tax?

Mr. **PRIOR**. Yes, to the Chinese. I would ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether he cannot, before many days are over, tell us what the policy of the Government is in regard to this? I understood the right hon. gentleman to say, if I am not very much mistaken, that in a little time he would tell us what is his policy

in regard to this question, and if there is still time I would like to urge upon him that, if the Government have decided not to raise it, to reconsider the decision and raise the tax which is the only way to keep these Chinese out. The point that employers of labour cannot get cheap labour enough to compete is, I think, not well taken because there are now enough Chinamen in British Columbia to do all the work, that only they themselves can do. I think that these men who are in British Columbia should be properly treated, but there are enough there now and others should be stopped from coming. I find by looking at "Hansard" of the session of 1882, what the late Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald thought about these people. He said, when the matter of Chinese immigration was brought up by Mr. DeCosmos:

The Chinese bring no women to British Columbia with them, and are not likely, therefore, to be permanent settlers.

We know they do not bring in women. Still, the Chinese are there, and they are taking the place of white people, and this just shows that a very clever gentleman, such as that hon. gentleman (Sir John Macdonald) was, is not always right in his prophecies. He said:

Whenever a practical difficulty arises, it is quite in the hands of the legislature to deal with it in the manner in which it has been dealt with, after a great many years' experience, in the United States, and as it has been dealt with in the Australian provinces. At present every white man can be employed in British Columbia at good wages.

That is what has been done. The local legislature has seen fit to insert a number of anti-Chinese and anti-Japanese clauses in several Acts, but as we know, these have been disallowed. The right hon. gentleman, Sir John A. Macdonald, further on in the same speech, in order to show that he did not believe in Chinese labour, except to build a railway and then get rid of them, said:

If the temporary necessity had been overcome, and the railway constructed across the continent, with the means of sending the European settlers of labourers in British Columbia, then it would be quite right to join to a reasonable extent in preventing the permanent settlement in this country of Mongolian, Chinese or Japanese immigrants.

Although Sir John Macdonald wanted to allow them to be employed on the railway because they were not able to get enough white people in British Columbia to build the road, he held that as soon as that was done they should not have any permanent occupation in the country, and should be got rid of. Mr. Rochester, another gentleman, spoke on the question, and he said:

I do not know what the difficulty is with regard to Chinese labour in British Columbia, but I do know the people of Ontario would be glad if they had Chinese or other labour.

The opinion given expression to by Mr. Rochester then, is not, I believe, the opinion of the people of Ontario to-day, if we are to judge by the numerous petitions which have been presented to this House by trades and labour unions and other associations in Ontario, in regard to this Chinese question. The Hon. Alexander Mackenzie speaking, in 1878, in regard to the resolution of Mr. Bunker, said :

He hoped the hon. gentleman did not really expect such a resolution to obtain any support in the House. It was one unprecedented in its character, and altogether unprecedented in its spirit, and at variance with those tolerant laws which afforded employment and an asylum to all who came into our country, irrespective of colour, hair or anything else.

Now, Sir, I do not wish to say that we should not afford an asylum to people in distress, but I do say that our first duty is to ourselves and to our children. I do not think we are doing our duty to our own people if we allow the Chinese and Japanese to come in and compete with Canadian labourers. There is no excuse for seeking such cheap labour now, when we have seen recently that good, honest able-bodied Canadians can be got to work for 98 cents a day, as railway trackmen. I do not think any one in Canada should wish for cheaper labour than that. It has been argued also that labouring men cannot be adverse to Chinese as they employ them themselves, but if a man takes a contract and cheap labour is close at hand, and he can get men to work for 75 cents or \$1 a day, it is only human nature that 99 men out of a hundred should avail themselves of that, and, therefore, the only way to do justice to the ordinary labourer is to keep these cheap workers out of the country. I believe that the Chinese are like a malignant cancer eating in the very vitals of the workingmen of Canada, but with this difference : that while up to the present time, no cure is known for cancer in the human frame, there is a cure for this Chinese cancer, and that is by the Government providing a sufficient poll-tax to keep them out of the country. Let me say that it is not only British Columbia that is interested in this matter. The gentlemen sitting in this House from all parts of Canada should take an interest in the question, because as sure as fate the Chinese will spread over the face of this country. We see the advance guard in Toronto, Montreal, and other cities, setting up their wash houses, and as to them not being civilized, why it was only yesterday I saw a Chinaman careening down Rideau Street on a bicycle.

Mr. DAVIS. He must have bought the bicycle.

Mr. PRIOR. He may have stolen it for all I know. I believe that if the Chinese and Japanese are not stopped somehow, they will ultimately swamp the artisans and work-

Mr. PRIOR.

ingmen of Canada. Let me therefore impress upon the Government the urgent necessity that exists for immediate restrictive legislation, and I can tell the Government also that unless they take some action this Chinese question will be brought up in Parliament year after year by all the British Columbia members. There is another class of emigrants coming to Canada at present, which I believe is as great a menace to our well-being and prosperity as are the Chinamen and Japanese. The worst of it is, that these men are not coming in solely of their own accord, but they are coming in with the assistance of the Government of the day. I refer to the Galicians and the Doukhobors.

Mr. DAVIS. He never saw a Doukhobor in his life.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) is just a little too previous. I was going to say that I have never been in company with either a Galician or a Doukhobor that I know of, but I have heard a great deal about them from men who live amongst them and from men who have lived with them in Russia, and who can speak their language. It is not my intention to do an injustice to any man be he ever so poor or humble, but I must believe my own senses and the opinions of my friends who know these people intimately. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) thought he would make a point by saying that I had never seen a Doukhobor. Well, I believe his colleague the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has hundreds of them living near him, and I am sure he will endorse everything that I say this afternoon. Some of the information I have obtained is from a gentleman known in the Press Gallery, Capt. Clyde Phillips Wolley, a gentleman who has lived in Russia for many years, who has been amongst the Galicians and Doukhobors, who can speak their language and has written about them many times. Capt. Wolley is a gentleman well known in the literary world, one of the most patriotic writers we have in the British Empire to-day, and we can rely upon what he says of these people. I have information from others on this matter as well as from Capt. Wolley. Now, Sir, I presume that the aim of this Government is, as it ought to be the aim of every man who has the welfare of Canada at heart, to see Canada populated with the best, and the bravest, and the most intelligent people that can be got under the sun. From the very beginning of the colonization of Canada she has been peopled by a brave and intelligent race. The first settlers, the French Canadians, opened up our country under the greatest dangers and the greatest difficulties, and they are still willing to go to the uttermost part of the earth for the sake of the Empire. The French Canadians have shown the greatest loyalty and fealty to the British Crown, and let me ask the Govern-

ment, why cannot we have more of the French people in this country instead of bringing in these Galicians and Doukhobors. I see in a paper to-day that some one—I forget the name—asks why should not France colonize in Canada as well as anywhere else. We would be glad to see some of those French colonists amongst us, rather than many who are coming at present. The aim should be to people Canada with those who have the courage and the wish to build up the British Empire and perpetuate British institutions. We want men who have been brought up to respect and obey the laws in their own country, so that they will respect and obey the laws in Canada; and we also want people with whom our young folks can associate and assimilate. Do we find these qualities in the Galicians and Doukhobors? In my opinion, both of these races are very far indeed from coming within that category. They are physically strong, I believe; but is that all that is expected of them? We want a little more than that. We heard from the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Roddick) the other day, that they were more liable to tuberculosis than almost any other race of people he knew. If I understood him aright, he said that something like 10 per cent of them suffered from tuberculosis in their own country. As for physical strength, we know that some of the lowest types of humanity are physically strong.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). That is not an argument against these people.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. gentleman says that is not an argument against them; but if the only thing the Government looks to is to get people who are physically strong, I think they ought to look for a little something else as well. Let us see what the newspapers published in the district to which these people have been brought, say about them. At the late session of the Edmonton district meeting of the Methodist Church, composed of all ministers and preachers of that denomination resident within its bounds, together with an equal number of laymen, the following was adopted and ordered to be forwarded as a memorial to the Manitoba and North-west Conference of the Methodist Church, now sitting in Winnipeg. This is the resolution:

That in the opinion of the district of Edmonton, the immigration of such a foreign element as represented by the Galicians is to be deplored. They are by no means a desirable class of settlers, and, coming in such numbers, they threaten our social, political and religious interests. We feel this the more strongly on account of the rapid development of the country by a much more desirable class; and be it resolved that Conference be memorialized to bring this matter before the Government as a strong protest against such immigration.

The same opinion was expressed by the Rev. Dr. Robertson, the Presbyterian Sup-

erintendent of North-west Missions, in recent utterances in his travels through Ontario. I may say that at the meeting at which that resolution was passed, there was present a gentleman who was a strong partisan of the present Government, and who tried to have it laid on the Table for six months; but he was overruled, and the memorial was sent forward. We find also the following letter in the Neepawa "Press," a Liberal paper:—

The Galicians are being put on the lists whether they are qualified to be there or not. It must be a pleasant reflection for those British and Canadian-born citizens who, by the Greenway registration clerks, have been disfranchised by wholesale, and prevented from exercising their natural right of having a voice in the government of their country, to find the right of which they are deprived being widely and illegally accorded to these ignorant aliens. It must be almost equally galling to those free and independent subjects of native birth who have succeeded in getting on the lists, to find that their votes can be cancelled by the wholesale stuffing of the lists with these unqualified foreigners, who, besides owing allegiance to a foreign state, know nothing of the constitution and laws of this country, and will record their votes at the dictation of the officials of the Administration by whom they have been imported and fed, and from whom they are securing special privileges which are denied to Britons and Canadians.

According to that, the people in that country seem to feel that there is a danger of having these men put on the lists without knowing anything of our constitution or laws. At election time they might be able to carry anything they wished for people who would fulfil their desires. A paper called the "West," of Regina, of the 15th of June, said:

Surely the Government has received enough evidence to demonstrate that the immigration policy now being pursued is a very objectionable one to the people of the North-west. If enough evidence has not been submitted to convince them, then we must despair of ever succeeding, because it would be almost impossible to have greater unanimity than that presented by the North-west in its opposition to the Galician and Doukhobor immigration. The Liberals in the North-west—that is, all except paid servants and that portion of the press which is Liberal because there is money in it—are as strongly opposed to this wholesale foreign importation as are the Conservatives. It is almost impossible to find a rank-and-file Liberal who does not condemn the Government for what they are doing. Even Liberal M.P.'s speak strongly against the policy. The Methodists of Northern Alberta are the latest to condemn Sifton's methods. The resolutions they passed were very pointed, and lacked entirely any partisan flavour. It was a pure condemnation of the course being pursued by the Government, because that course they considered wrong. On the head of this comes word that people in Saskatchewan are petitioning the Government to remove the Galicians from there because they are a curse to that district, and are retarding the progress of the English-speaking settlements. Everywhere it is the same thing. The English-speaking people have become alarmed, and well they might. They see

the greatest danger to the future welfare of the state, and have protested, and are persisting in their protests; in fact, instead of subsiding with acquaintance, the opposition to these people seems to be increasing the more we see and know of them.

Now, Sir, I turn to a paper published, I believe, by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), a gentleman who supports the present Government in almost everything, but certainly not in regard to this class of immigration. On the contrary, he has been a consistent opponent of it, and, living, as he does, amongst those people, he knows whereof he speaks. On February 2nd I find in his paper a letter signed "Saxon," which reads as follows:—

Sir,—Northern Alberta certainly cannot be congratulated upon last year's immigration statistics. So large a proportion of Galicians and others who know nothing of the blessings of free institutions like ours, may one day constitute a serious menace to society. In the rebound from the state of semi-serfdom, in which they have always lived, liberty is apt to degenerate into license. If our population is to maintain its high standard of Anglo-Saxon civilization, with all that it implies in case of law and order, and capacity for self-government, it is absolutely necessary we should have a larger immigration from the United Kingdom.

On the 30th of March, I find also an editorial, under the head of "Immigration," which says:

The "Bulletin" has from time to time attempted to put the case of the citizen settler forward. Mr. Oliver has done the same in the House of Commons and elsewhere, and because he has done so the western newspaper organ of eastern monopoly, masquerading in the guise of Liberalism, attacks him in season and out of season, whether he supports or opposes the Government of which it has constituted itself the special champion.

The flooding of western Canada with people who are not used to the duties of citizenship is a serious question for the west and for all Canada. It is said that these strange peoples will assimilate with the English-speaking settlers, possibly, to some extent and at great length of time. But the work of their assimilation is that much of a drag and burden upon those with whom they are expected to assimilate. They have withstood assimilation in the country from which they come for many generations. What reason have we to expect their ready assimilation here, when settled in bodies large enough to insure all the machinery for the perpetuation of their whole system? This is a question concerning the very life of the nation—the very foundation of its life; and it is with an appreciation of its importance from every point of view that the "Bulletin" has hitherto dealt with it, and proposes to continue so to do.

Mr. CLARKE. To what does that refer?

Mr. PRIOR. It refers to the Galicians and the Doukhobors who are settled in the neighbourhood of Edmonton. Then, on the 8th of June, another article, headed "Immigration," appears. It is rather long, but I shall read it to the House, because I think it is very important. It is as follows:—

Mr. PRIOR.

Readers of the "Bulletin" will remember that from time to time this paper has felt it to be its duty to call attention to the undesirable as well as the desirable feature of the immigration policy of the Government, as viewed from the standpoint of this district and the settlers in it. For doing this it was fiercely attacked by alleged Government newspaper organs, and discredited as far as possible by Government officials' reports. But what the "Bulletin" saw clearly a year ago, because of its opportunities of close observation, which others at a distance did not see, and therefore did not believe, now that the immigration objected to has become large enough to attract their notice, is seen by them to be exactly as stated by the "Bulletin," much as they evidently dislike to acknowledge it. The fact that some two or three thousand Galicians had started from Hamburg to Canada, and that there were 50,000 more to follow, was of such importance that it could not be ignored.

It has, therefore, been dealt with by some of the party organs in a very gingerly way. The Toronto "Globe" and Montreal "Witness" may be particularly mentioned. The "Globe" says:

"The arrival of Galician and Doukhobor immigrants in considerable numbers in this country has given rise to some discussion as to whether we are in danger of experiencing some of the troubles from which our neighbours have suffered in the attempt to assimilate foreign populations. In some cases in the United States the objection has been made to the low standard of living among the incoming foreigners, the lack of that desire for improvements and comforts and refinement, which is one of the great civilizing forces. If, it is argued, a large number of people are content to live in squalor and ignorance, they tend to lower the standard of the whole population, especially by depressing the rates of wages in various occupations. If, it is objected, that some of the arrivals are not likely to make good citizens, but they form colonies, cling to their language and habits, and in some cases, return to their own country as soon as they have scraped a little money together. It is said in a recent work on city government in the United States that the naturalization of foreigners for immediate use as voters has been a source of great political corruption in the cities. \* \* \* There is, however, no doubt of the wisdom of being careful in the selection of immigrants, and of taking every means of assimilating them with the rest of the population, and making them good citizens. The question of the period at which they should be allowed to exercise the franchise is one for careful consideration. To confer the franchise upon them before they understand the institutions of the country would be to inflict an injury upon them and upon the community at large."

It is only fair to the "Globe" to say that having delivered itself of this much truth, it proceeds to live up to its record by saying that the objections at first recited only apply to immigrants who settle in cities, and that the present naturalization laws, requiring three years' residence before voting, are a sufficient protection to the public interest.

The Montreal "Witness," being more honest than the "Globe," is more outspoken. It heads its article "The Hordes of Europe," and says:

"Talk of foreign missions! Canada seems likely before a year more is gone by to have upon her own domain a foreign mission work a hundred-fold greater than any she has ever done, in the task of Canadianizing the masses

of continentals now being poured on her shores at a rate that must sensibly affect the abundance of her public domain and very seriously influence her future. We should give thanks to God that now that this long-impending flood has broken loose it has come in so mitigated a form. \* \* \* But those who are coming are not all either Doukhobors or Finns, and there is every reason to expect, possibly to dread, a wholesale migration of the semi-civilized peasantries of Poland, Hungary and Russia. \* \* \* The various railways are prepared to handle the traffic, and will convey these people to the west, where, if permitted, they will settle together in large communities. It is of the utmost importance that this last should not occur, as only those who have travelled in the country they come from can tell what it would mean to have a new Galicia in Canada. A railway management, whose talk is being rapidly appreciated by the profits of this traffic, and still more by the increased value it gives to railway lands in the North-west, looks, of course, with the most cheerful optimism of this movement, and assures us that the conditions of life in America will in time turn these people into citizens like ourselves."

That shows that even the papers supporting the present Government see a danger in this tide of immigration which is being induced to flow into this country. I am told by men whom I can trust that these people are wanting in all the principles of loyalty, patriotism, cleanliness—in fact, all the principles that go to fit them for good citizenship. I would ask, have they ever been trained so that we can expect them to accept our laws and usages? Were their ancestors law-abiding people? Have they been loyal to their own king and country? I am afraid that no one can say that they have. Have they been willing to fight for their country and religion? I am told that these Doukhobors maintain, as a principle of their religion, that they will not fight under any consideration, and I am also told, whether true or not—and if not true I know that I shall be set right by hon. gentlemen opposite—that before these men could be induced to come in, the Government had to pass an Order in Council exempting them from military duty. If that was done, it is a disgrace to the Parliament of Canada. I will not say so much of the Doukhobors, but the Galicians live under circumstances that, I think, can hardly be found to exist even among the Chinese. Their manners—so I am told by men who lived close to them for some time—are very little removed from the habits of animals. Again, the Doukhobors have religious scruples against bearing children. They neither bear arms nor children. That is considered to be the highest virtue they can have. They have no idea of what we consider the decencies of home life. The other day, there was an account in the press of one of them in Winnipeg selling his wife to another and thinking nothing of it, not having the slightest notion that it was wrong at all. Then, there have been several brutal murders committed by these Galicians under the most revolting circumstances. Only the other day I read that a woman was tied up

by the hands and feet and almost beaten to death by her husband. I am aware that brutal assaults are sometimes made by white people, but these are exceedingly brutal. These people have never shown themselves in their native country, Russia, to be thrifty and able to make a good living on the lands on which they were established. The lands on which many of them who have come here were settled, are, I am told, even finer than the lands in the North-west Territories, and the climate as good, if not better. Yet with all these advantages, they have been found going off to the cities and turning out anything but desirable citizens. That is my information, whether true or not, but, no doubt, the hon. Minister of the Interior will be able to inform us on this point, as he must have secured a great deal of information concerning them before he allowed them to come into the country. How can we expect Canadians to welcome these people? We have nothing in common with them. They cannot assimilate with us in any way, and the settlers around them say they do not wish their young people to have any communication with them whatever. Are such people likely to make good citizens and contribute to building up the British Empire? If it be true that they will not fight, are they men who, if the time should ever come, as I hope it will not, would be willing to go forth as citizen soldiers and face the enemies of the Empire, as every Anglo-Saxon will be found to do, should the occasion arise. I do not think it is good policy for this Government to fill up the country with these people, simply for the sake of developing it. It would be far better to be less in a hurry, and restrict the influx of indifferent classes of immigration. It would be better in the long run to adopt such a policy than bring in people of a kind detrimental to the welfare of the country at large. I do not think that the Government is doing its duty in bringing in such people. I do not think it is right for them to pay \$5 a head for men and women of this description, and only pay \$1.75 per head for immigrants from the British Isles? The United States has had a good deal of experience in this class of immigration, and I think any man who is well posted on that subject in the neighbouring republic will say, that they want no more of them, because they are a menace to their institutions at present. The Chinese, to my mind, are bad enough, and they should be taxed, as I said before; but I do not think they are one bit worse than the Galicians who are going into the North-west to-day. It is all very well for the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) to point with pride to the large number of immigrants he has brought in since he took office and to the way he is filling up the North-west and Manitoba. It is all very well for the large railway companies and steamboat companies that carry these people and make so much out of them, to wish

to see them come into this country. But I do not think that the Canadian farmers and artisans will look upon it with the same eyes. This immigration is bound, in time, and with the large number of these people brought into this country, to lower the tone of Canadians who are brought into contact with them. We are to-day educating our young people in a way that our fathers and grandfathers would never have dreamed of; we are giving every boy and girl, whether his or her parents can afford to pay for it or not, a school training which carries education to a high standard. Now, the education given to these young people will not allow them to live on next to nothing, to live in the way these immigrants are living. We are endeavouring to elevate the standard of living, so, I say, do not let us lower it by bringing to our country men who will work for 25 or 50 cents a day and think they are well off. In the cities of the United States there are large numbers of Poles, Hungarians and others of the same class as these, who are living under the most wretched conditions. You hear of these in all the commissions appointed to look into the sweating system—poor wretched people, living in cellars, working for a pittance barely sufficient to keep their wretched hearts beating. They have no pleasure, no hope, nothing to look forward to. I ask if we want this sort of immigration to compete with our own people. If the Government does not hold its hand and stop this class of immigrants now coming in, I think the end will be disastrous to the prosperity of the North-west and Manitoba, at all events. The Galicians and Doukhobors, we learn by these papers, extracts of which I have read, are allowed to live in communities. If they do that, they are bound to perpetuate their religion and their habits—and I must say that some of those habits are very filthy—and will not, in any reasonable length of time, assimilate with the rest of the population. If these people must be brought in, for heaven's sake, let us have them distributed here and there so that they may learn in a short time a different way of living. Another thing that will be found, I think, is that these people will gradually drift into the cities, competing with the men there and lowering the wage of the artisans and labourers. I am glad to say that in British Columbia we see our good Canadian Anglo-Saxons, generally, in very prosperous circumstances—men with nice homes for themselves and their families, well dressed and with a little money in their pockets. But if this tide of Chinese, Japanese, Galician, Doukhobors and others of the kind are allowed to come into the country, how long will this state of affairs last?

I have very little more to say on this subject. I have put the matter forward

Mr. PRIOR.

in as good a light as I possibly could. I think that if the Government have money enough to spend on bringing immigrants into this country—and I believe they should assist immigrants—let them pay \$5 a head or \$10 a head to good Anglo-Saxon men and women. Let them bring immigrants from the old sod. There must be plenty of them to be got if a little inducement is held out to them. For they have congested districts over there, and from those congested districts the people are going into the States, going into Africa, going all over the world, except, as we are told, to Canada. Surely the Government can help them. But if the Government wish to pay \$1.75 a head to somebody, let them get good Swedes and Norwegians, who make good settlers, as I know. But for heaven's sake, let us have no more Galicians and Doukhobors. Why not assist some of the young men in the eastern provinces to move west. There must be many young men who find but limited chances on their fathers' farms in Quebec and Ontario and the maritime provinces, and who are now drifting to the United States. Surely, if the Government will assist them with money and with land to start farming in the North-west, you could get the North-west filled up with this class instead of with Galicians. If the Government would pursue that policy, in a few years they would find that Canada, instead of being overrun with a horde of foreigners will have a population of our own flesh and blood and will be a happy, contented, prosperous country, the envy of the civilized world. Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, if I were to follow my own inclinations at this moment, I would simply agree to this motion for adjournment and let the House adjourn and everybody go to his business. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) has committed nothing less, though he deprecated it at the outset, than another unwarranted abuse of the privileges of this House. He has taken advantage of the present opportunity to make an appeal to some of the worst passions that may be in our population, an appeal which, however, I am sure, will not be responded to. But, not only is it a breach of the well-known rule of the House that a motion to adjourn, at this stage, should not be made except for an urgent matter of public business—

Mr. PRIOR. I say it is urgent.

The PRIME MINISTER. There can be no urgency in a question that has been before the country for twenty-five years and more. We are in the fourth month of the session. The hon. gentleman has had opportunity after opportunity, when the House was moved into Committee of Supply, to bring forward the matter which he

has now called to the attention of the House. He has refrained, for reasons of his own, from doing so. And now, when another order of public business has been agreed upon between the two sides, he brings this question forward. It is not only a breach of the privileges of the House, but a breach of faith on the part of the hon. gentleman. Yesterday, before we adjourned, my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), who acted in the absence of the leader of the Opposition, asked me what would be the order of business for to-day, and I told him we would take up again the Redistribution Bill. Now, there was an implied agreement between the two sides of the House that this business should be gone on with to-day. And, though that was understood, and everybody had made his preparations accordingly, the hon. gentleman springs upon us a question in which there is not the slightest urgency, which was brought before the House by my hon. friend from Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) several weeks ago in the shape of a Bill. But, in order to gain some kudos for himself, my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) brings this motion forward and gives his views not only upon the Chinese and Japanese questions, but upon the Doukhobors and Galicians as well. I say this is abuse of the privileges of the House. I put it to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that there must be some respect for word pledged between one side and the other, and when the Government is asked what business it will bring before the House announces that it will bring forward certain business, if any hon. gentleman intends to bring forward other business, he should give notice of it, so that we may—

**Mr. PRIOR.** I did give notice of it to one of the hon. gentleman's Ministers.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** Perhaps the hon. gentleman gave notice to one of the Ministers, but it was not brought up, at all events.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton).** I may explain that my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior) sent me a note some days ago—I think it was on Tuesday—that he would bring this question up. I am bound to say that I was aware that he was going to bring it up at the first available opportunity.

**Mr. PRIOR.** I said I would bring it up on the Orders of the Day.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** It is always within the right of any member of this House, when the House is moved into Committee of Supply, to bring up any grievance which he chooses. That is the constitutional rule, and, if that rule is obeyed, we have nothing to say. When we announce to the House that we shall move it into Committee of Supply the following day, we are pre-

pared then to meet every motion which is brought up, and to discuss every grievance that may be brought up. But to move the adjournment of the House every day, as has been done, I think is interfering altogether too much with the business of the House, and I appeal to the good sense of the members of this House to discourage that practice, and to follow the true constitutional rule of ventilating grievances when the Government ask for Supply.

The hon. gentleman brings up this motion to-day upon the Orders of the Day being called, to discuss—what? A question of urgency? The question has been before the public, as he said himself, for twenty-five years or more. He has discussed once more the question of Chinese and Japanese immigration. Well, I have no intention at this time to discuss the Galician and Doukhobor immigration. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who has charge of that department, will deal with that question later on. But the hon. member has brought up the whole question of Chinese and Japanese immigration again before the House. I may say at once to my hon. friend that I sympathize largely with him, and I sympathize largely with the members from British Columbia in the attitude they have taken in regard to the undesirability of allowing a Mongolian immigration amongst us. It is a fact for which there must be some strong ethical reason that the Anglo-Saxon race, which has proved itself to be one of the most tolerant of all races that ever appeared on the earth, shows an invincible repugnance to people of the Mongolian races. We have seen this fact in Australia and in California, as well as in British Columbia; we find the same feeling exists in the Straits Settlement; we find it wherever the Mongolian race has penetrated. It might be easy to discover the cause of that feeling, though I do not care at this moment to go into that question. I simply recognize the fact that, though the English race is one of the most tolerant of all races on earth, and is always ready to open its doors, its institutions, its liberties, to all other races that come to its shores, whenever the Mongolian race presents itself, the English race immediately shows a strong repugnance. That is the fact, and though perhaps it is a sentiment to be deplored, still it exists, and we have to reckon with it. I say at once that it will not do for this Government, or for any Government, to ignore it; on the contrary, the Government is quite prepared to recognize it and to deal with it accordingly. The hon. gentleman is not the first who has brought this question to the attention of the Government. Long before this, the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) brought in a Bill to increase the head tax with which every Chinaman is met when he comes to our shore. It was found at the time that this Bill was unconstitutional, because it implied a money tax,

legislation concerning which must originate from the Crown. The members from British Columbia who support the Government in this House, have interviewed myself and some of my colleagues repeatedly on this subject, and have asked us to increase the head tax from \$50, as it is now, to \$500. Well, to increase a tax of that kind, admitting the object to be very praiseworthy, is always a serious consideration. In fact, it is always a serious consideration when the government of any country has to impose a tax, not only on its own subjects, but on those of other nations who come to its shores. However, we took some time to look into the subject; we wanted to inform ourselves as to the other side of the question, because upon this, as upon all other questions, there are two sides. If we increased the tax to such a degree as to make it absolutely prohibitory of immigration, we had to inquire what the consequences would be. We know that we have done our best to establish a trade with China and Japan. Now, it may look a little inconsistent that whilst we have done our best to develop trade between Canada and China and Japan, by granting heavy subsidies to steamship companies, we should, on the other hand, adopt measures that will restrict that trade. But we have to look at the major fact, the dominant fact, that the people of British Columbia, as well as the people of all the other places I have named, belonging to the Anglo-Saxon race, have evinced the greatest repugnance to the Chinese and Japanese settling amongst them. I may say at once, without committing any breach of secrecy, that the Government will be prepared at an early date to inform the House as to what policy they will adopt upon this question. Further than this I will not say at present, but I will repeat, that we have given due consideration to the representations which have been made to us upon this subject by the members for British Columbia.

I may say, however, that in our treatment of this subject, the Government has made a distinction between Chinese immigration and Japanese immigration. Whilst we are prepared to deal with Chinese immigration in the way I have indicated, and to do our best to meet the views of the people of British Columbia, I am sorry to have to say that, so far as Japanese immigration is concerned, though it is the same in all its salient and important features, the question is governed by other considerations, considerations of Imperial policy, which must appeal to every gentleman of this House who is a British subject. As a part of the British Empire, we have duties to discharge to the Empire which we cannot ignore. Our attention was called last year to the legislation of British Columbia placing restrictions upon the employment of Chinese and Japanese labour. We appealed to the Government of British Columbia to revise their legislation in so far only as the Japanese were concerned; we

were not at all disposed to interfere with that legislation in so far as Chinese labour was concerned. We also communicated with the Imperial authorities upon this subject, and we transferred to the Government of British Columbia the representations which had been made to us by the British authorities. The British Columbia authorities replied, giving us their reasons for not complying with the wishes of the Imperial authorities. Then, as the limit within which to disallow was drawing near, with the authority of the Council, I sent the following telegram to Mr. Semlin, Premier of British Columbia, on the 2nd of June last:

The Federal Government has only four days in which to disallow your Acts relating to Japanese as urged by Imperial Government, which fears prejudice to Imperial relations with Japan if Act referring to Japanese is allowed to go into effect. Have you any suggestion to make as to this legislation, so far as it relates to the Japanese? Immediate reply necessary.

On the following day, I received this answer from Mr. Semlin:

Telegram received. Regret that in justice to the interests of labour in British Columbia, can only refer you to minute of Council of February last, copy of which you have no doubt received.

In that minute of Council which the members of the House have in their hands, the British Columbia Government squarely refused to modify their legislation, not only with regard to Chinese, but with regard to the Japanese labour as well. Under those circumstances, we were in this position: either we had to let these Acts go into force and to sanction the restriction against Japanese labour, as well as against Chinese labour, or we were under the necessity of disallowing the Acts concerning both Japanese and Chinese labour. If it had been in our power to disallow only those Acts relating to Chinese labour, we would have done so, but it was not in our power. We had to take these acts as a whole, and, therefore, we were brought to the absolute necessity of disallowing them in toto. Now, I may say, if the British Columbia legislature were to re-enact these Acts, but separating the Chinese labourers from Japanese labourers and simply restraining Chinese labourers, we would not interfere with these Acts, but so long as the British Columbia legislature choose to restrain Chinese and Japanese labour together I must appeal to hon. gentlemen in this House to support the Imperial policy of not dealing harshly with Japanese subjects. Sir, as I said a moment ago, we are proud of our British Empire, and I would say to hon. gentlemen from British Columbia, however strongly they may feel upon this question, they must upon this occasion, allow their strong feeling against Japanese labourers to give way in favour of maintaining the policy of the Imperial Government in these matters. At the present time, as we know, the question of

the Orient is one which may become very acute at any moment, and the moment the question becomes acute, Great Britain will be involved in these complications and she may be precipitated into war. If she is precipitated into war it is to her of the greatest and mightiest importance to have the support of the Empire of Japan. For these reasons, I hope the hon. gentleman who addressed the House a moment ago, upon the question of Japanese labour and upon the action of the Government, so far as we disallowed the Acts of the British Columbia legislature, will reconsider his determination, and will give his support in this matter to the Government which has acted in obedience to reasons of wide Imperial policy, and upon the conviction that we should do our best to maintain the alliance of Great Britain with the Empire of Japan. These are the reasons which actuated us. It is not a pleasant thing to have to come to this decision, but we thought we owed it to ourselves and our position as British subjects that every other consideration should give way before that reason of Imperial necessity. It will not do for us as British subjects only to sing "God Save the Queen" and to boast of our British connection at banquets and at demonstrations and celebrations. We must also be prepared to make some sacrifices because our obligations may claim sacrifices. I suppose I do not utter my own sentiment alone, but that I utter the sentiment of every hon. gentleman on this occasion, when I say, that we should be prepared and be ready for every sacrifice which our Imperial connection may demand at our hands. If we take the glory and the advantages we must also take the duties; we must be ready for them and abide by them. There are the reasons which have actuated the Government in relation to this question. There are other statutes which were passed by the legislature of British Columbia last session. In reply to the hon. gentleman some few days ago, I stated that these statutes had been submitted to the hon. Minister of Justice who is reporting upon them. He is considering whether or not they are legal and constitutional, and if they are legal and constitutional he has to report to the Government and the Government will have to consider whether the same reasons of Imperial policy are involved. The duty which may be incumbent upon us as to these statutes we must discharge in the light of the considerations that actuated us in dealing with the statutes passed by the British Columbia legislature the session before last. With the other question raised by my hon. friend, as to Galician and Doukhobor immigration, I shall not attempt at this moment to deal. I will leave it to my hon. colleague, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), but I must deprecate the tone of the remarks of the hon. gentleman upon this subject. We

cannot in this, our Canada, allow this policy of the dog-in-the-manger to prevail. We have lands in the North-west, what do we want to do with them? Of course we must have desirable immigrants. As to the Galicians I know nothing, but as to the Doukhobors I know a little, not that I know them personally, but all accounts agree that they are a noble race. Let me call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) to this fact, and I think it ought be sufficient to make him recall his remarks with regard to Doukhobors. They belong to the Caucasian race; they do not belong to the Galician race. They are very peculiar in their habits; they will not fight, but I am sorry to have heard the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) on this subject. The Doukhobors will not bear arms, it is true, but has it ever come into the mind of a British subject, in any part of the British Empire, to ostracize the Quakers or people of similar religious thought, because they will not bear arms? Why, Sir, some of these Quakers are amongst the best men that the British Empire has ever known. In conclusion let me say that, for my part, I am not prepared to favour the immigration of these Mongolian races which do not assimilate with us, but as to the Caucasian races and European races—not all of them, but all those who readily assimilate with us—it is our duty to open our doors to them and follow the example of the mother country in that respect.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The reference which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) has made to immigration outside of the Chinese and Japanese, makes it desirable that I should say a few words. The House will be in committee upon the immigration estimates in a short while, when every possible information will be given to the members of this House, and they will necessarily be in a much better position to discuss intelligently the subject than it is possible for them to do at the present time. To a very considerable extent I sympathize with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) in regard to the Chinese and Japanese. The same views have been expressed in this House by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell), and these views have been pressed very strongly upon the Government by the different members from British Columbia. As I understand it, this is largely a question in British Columbia between the white labouring man and the Chinese and Japanese; and, as in most cases where the labouring man comes in contact with a competitor who deals with him unfairly, I am bound to say that my sympathies are altogether with the Canadian labouring man. I feel that the labouring man of British Columbia has a right to protect himself against this unhealthy rivalry; a rivalry which does not tend to develop the highest type of citizens. It was with very

great regret that I joined my colleagues in the conclusion that we were bound to disallow these Acts, for the reasons which have been stated so well by the First Minister. I am not without very strong hope that means may be found to take effectual measures for the purpose of protecting the labouring men of British Columbia from the competition to which they are subject, and the danger they are in of being reduced in their style of living. It is a question, as the hon. gentleman said, which did not only affect British Columbia, but affects the labouring men all over the Dominion—although I do not share the belief that the Mongolian race will spread very much from the Pacific coast. I am not, however, surprised to know that the labouring men of the eastern cities have in a very emphatic way in some instances expressed their sympathies with the labouring men of the Pacific coast.

Now, as to the other question. The familiarity of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) with the Chinese and Japanese question, has enabled him to deal with it in a manner which entitles his opinion to the respect of the House; but he is apparently not so fully acquainted with the question of immigration into the North-west Territories. I desire to correct the evident misapprehension he labours under in regard to the attitude of the Government as to foreign immigration. If we believe what appears in the newspapers, or, indeed, if what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) said were correct, one would think that the attitude of the Government upon this question was that of encouraging foreign immigration and discouraging immigration from the British Isles and the United States, from which we might naturally expect to get immigrants of British lineage. That is an entire mistake. As to the question of the bonus, I shall refer to it later on, but I would point out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) that the change which he suggests would make no difference at all in the actual results. It is necessary to know somewhat of the history of the immigration question to understand what the particular effect of any particularly suggested course would be. During the last year, we received from ocean ports, 11,608 English, Irish and Scotch immigrants, and we received from the United States 9,119—I am speaking now of agricultural settlers who actually settled in the North-west. With reference to the United States immigrants, it is impossible to say that all of them were of British lineage, but, of course, with slight exceptions they would be. We, therefore, received last year 20,727 immigrants of British lineage, and the total number of Gallician immigrants last year was 2,509. Therefore, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) will see that the supposed preponderance of Gallician immigrants over British immigrants is an entire mistake. Of course, that does not include the entire immigration, because you will see we received of Germans 563, Scandinavians 724, French

Mr. SIFTON.

and Belgians, 545; and miscellaneous nationalities, 3,832. They were kept separate last year because we desired to know what class of people were coming in. Those figures fully dispose of the idea that we are encouraging this particular class of people as against people of British nationality. The encouragement is all the other way. The efforts that we are making and the money we are spending for the purpose of getting British settlers, is altogether away and beyond the money we are spending in connection with Gallician immigration, or, in fact, immigration from any foreign country. An enormous amount of our immigration expenditure takes place in the western States, and a very considerable portion of it in the British Isles. The money we spend for getting Gallicians and Doukhobors, is almost entirely confined to the simple payment of the bonus of so much per head, but the very large amount of money which we are spending in carrying on a propaganda for the purpose of inducing people to come to Canada, is expended in other directions, and we have spent but a small amount in Austria, and none at all in Russia. Therefore, when the hon. gentleman asks us to direct our efforts to getting settlers of British nationality as against foreigners, that is exactly what we have been doing all the time. We have never changed our intention, or policy, or practice in that respect. When I took charge of the immigration branch, the work which had been begun some years before in the United States had practically died out altogether, and we were getting practically no settlers from the United States at that time. As the result of the large amount of money we spent in the United States last year, we secured nearly 10,000 actual agricultural settlers to settle on land in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and every one will admit, who knows these settlers, that they are the very best people for our western prairies. Nearly 10,000 of these settlers were the result of our work last year, and I understand from the best sources of information, that we will, perhaps, get from 10,000 to 14,000 of the same class this year. These are people of our own lineage, most of them children of men who came originally from the British Isles, and a great many of them are Canadians who formerly left the province of Ontario and settled in Michigan and other states. They are practically, therefore, of the same class as the farming population of Ontario. I may say that these people come from the States of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Dakota, Colorado, and a few from Kansas, Iowa and Illinois. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) that in the immediate neighbourhood of Winnipeg, for fifty or sixty miles around, large tracts of land, which have for many years been lying idle in the hands of speculators and have been absolutely unsaleable, have been purchased by these very people from the western states, and the face of the

country there is assuming a very great change and undergoing a rapid improvement. I state this to show my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) the mistake under which he is labouring, when he says that we are spending our money for the purpose of getting Galicians and Doukhobors, as against British settlers. The efforts, and the energy, and the ingenuity of our officers are all devoted in the direction of securing immigrants of British lineage.

Mr. SPROULE. What commission per capita is the Minister paying for the immigrants?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will deal with that in a moment. As to the question of these foreigners coming, we have to face the matter in this way. Are we to make restrictive laws? If we do not feel disposed to go that far, are we to make distinctions against these people for the purpose of preventing them coming? That resolves itself into this question: Whether these people are desirable agricultural settlers or not? My hon. friend asked me a question about bonusing.

Mr. McNEILL. Before my hon. friend goes into that question, I have a slip in my hand, and I would like to ask him if he can tell us whether the information in it is correct or not. This is from Halifax:

The Hamburg-American steamer "Phoenicia" arrived to-day from Hamburg, and sailed this afternoon for New York. She brought 350 German immigrants, who landed. Eighty proceeded with the steamer to New York. The Hamburg steamers have landed more than 50,000 Galicians at this port this season, under contract with the Government, for settlement in the North-west. All who are expected this year have now arrived.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I should think the hon. gentleman would know that was not correct without asking me.

Mr. GIBSON. What paper is that?

Mr. PRIOR. The "Mail and Empire."

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is reports of this kind which have given rise to many of the false ideas that are prevalent with regard to the work of the Government in this connection. In the first place, the Government has no contract with the Hamburg-American Steamship Company. In the second place, the Government is not paying any bonus at the present time for Galicians. In the third place, we have not 50,000 Galicians in the country altogether, nor anything like that number, counting all who have come to the country from 1894, when that immigration started, until the present time. I think I can give the hon. gentleman the total number before I get through. The statement the hon. gentleman has read is so incorrect as to be absurd.

Mr. McNEILL. Could the hon. gentleman give me any idea of how many Galicians and Doukhobors have come in this year?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, I will give the hon. gentleman the figures in a few minutes. Of course, our returns are made up to the end of 1898, and consequently it would be impossible for me to give official figures for this year; but I will give the hon. gentleman the figures before six o'clock, if possible. I desire to explain the bonus system in a word or two, so that there may be no misapprehension on that subject. In 1882, when the late Mr. J. H. Pope was Minister of Agriculture, the question of bonuses was first considered, and it was then decided to pay bonuses for the purpose of assisting to induce immigration. It was decided to pay the same bonuses that were being paid by other countries, and this is a point to which I desire to direct the attention of the House. The bonus we pay in England is as high a bonus as is paid by other British colonies and other countries which are competing for immigration, with the exception of one or two countries which pay a higher amount. Queensland is a case in point. We pay a higher bonus on the continent, not because we desire to get more immigrants from the continent, but because the bonus paid by other countries for immigrants from the continent is higher. We have simply to pay that in order to meet them, and to get the booking agents to book the immigrants. If we raised the bonus to the booking agent in Liverpool, the effect would be not to secure for us more British immigrants, but that other colonies would raise their bonuses too. That is known to everybody who is familiar with the case. We would be paying out more money simply for the benefit of the steamship agents. I will prove that the Government of which my hon. friend afterwards became a member recognized that fact. Some years ago, when they decided to increase the inducements for the purpose of getting British immigrants, they did not increase the bonus to the booking agent in the way of paying a larger bonus for each man who came, but they changed it into another kind of bonus. They changed it into a bonus that would be paid only for each man who was shown to have settled in Canada, and in addition to that they gave a bonus to the immigrant himself. Let me tell my hon. friend what the policy of the late Government was; because, if I understand his main contention, it is this, that if we cut off or reduced the bonus to continental immigrants, and increased the bonus to British immigrants, we would get fewer continental settlers and be likely to get a larger number of British settlers. Now, the late Government tried that plan, and gave it up, because they found that it was a failure. On the 23rd of September, 1890, they

passed an Order in Council, by which they agreed :

To pay a bonus to steamship agents in the United Kingdom of \$5 for each adult settler on land, of 18 years and over, on certificate of "booking" and shipping such settler to Manitoba, the North-west Territories or British Columbia, and on a certificate of a Dominion Lands agent, to be furnished as proof of such settlement.

To pay a bonus of \$10 to each homesteader, the head of a family, and \$5 for each member of such family at the ocean adult age of 12 years and over, with an additional \$5 to any such member of a family who may within six months after arrival in Canada become a homesteader, on settlement on land in Manitoba, the North-west Territories or British Columbia, on proof being furnished of such settlement by the certificate of a Dominion Lands agent.

There was \$5 for the booking agent, \$10 for the homesteader, and \$5 for each member of his family. The House will see at once that that was a very liberal encouragement which the Government were seeking to give for the purpose of getting these settlers. After five years' experience of the plan, which the hon. gentleman suggests that we should follow, the Minister, in an Order in Council of the 26th of February, 1895, recommended :

That the provisions of the respective Orders in Council above quoted, in so far as they relate to the payment of money bonuses to settlers in Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia, be repealed as from and after the first day of March, 1894, since which date no bonus certificates have been issued by Canadian immigration agents in Europe.

The late Government first inaugurated the bonus system which we have now ; then they changed it on the exact lines which the hon. gentleman now suggests ; after trying it for five years, they gave it up because they found that it was a dead failure ; and we are carrying on the work on the system which the late Government adopted in the first place, but our work is more successful and we are getting a larger number of settlers. I need not discuss the reasons for that. I am discussing the suggestion that we should adopt the bonus system which is recommended by the hon. gentleman and by the press which supports hon. gentlemen opposite, and the statement of the hon. gentleman that we are following a special line of policy for encouraging foreign settlers, which was not followed by the late Government, and to which he has directed his censure.

**Mr. CLARKE.** Do the other British colonies pay the same bonus for foreign immigrants as the Canadian Government does ?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** When I discuss the Estimates, I will give the hon. gentleman a detailed statement ; but I can say now, speaking from my recollection, that the bonus to the

**Mr. SIFTON.**

booking agent is the same ; but there are British colonies which offer special inducements. Queensland gives a bonus to the immigrant, just as Canada did some years ago. I believe my information to be correct, when I say that the other British colonies that go into it at all, give the same or no higher bonuses than we do—practically, the bonuses are all the same. Queensland is giving very special inducements at present, and as to whether these have any effect in diverting British immigrants to that country, who otherwise would have come to Canada, I am bound to say that I do not think they have had a pronounced effect. I believe that we are getting a larger proportion from the British Isles than formerly, and that the special inducements I have referred to have not greatly affected the question. What does affect the question is, what you do with the booking agent. Every man who buys a ticket has to do with a booking agent, and a clever, experienced agent can divert quite a large percentage from one country to another, if he so desires.

Speaking on the question of bonuses, I may say that some time ago I gave orders that the payments of bonuses to Galician immigration should be discontinued from the 1st of June of this year, and from that date we pay no bonuses whatever in respect of these immigrants. I have not inaugurated that policy as a permanent one, but that will be a matter for consideration and decision later on. Nor did I decide on it because I considered the Galicians to be undesirable settlers, but because I thought we were likely to get as many this year, without the bonus, as our immigration staff could conveniently handle. These immigrants, especially those from foreign countries, necessitate a great deal of work on the part of the immigration staff. As they do not know the conditions of the country, it takes much more labour to get them settled than people from the United States, who simply hunt up the land, make a few inquiries, and take care of themselves. That goes without saying. I thought we would get as many of these foreigners as we could satisfactorily handle without paying any bonus after the 1st June, and I gave orders to cease the payment of bonuses. After I did so, I received a remonstrance from the High Commissioner who was of the opinion that the policy of paying bonuses should be adhered to until the 1st September. I maintained, however, the position I took, and the order went that no bonuses should be paid after the 1st June.

I think I have given all the information which would be of any use on the question of bonuses, and I think I have made myself clear that, so far from increasing and accelerating the policy of encouraging immigration from Galicia and other continental countries, our policy was, until we stopped the payment of bonuses on the 1st June,

precisely the same as that of the late Government.

**Mr. CLARKE.** Does the stoppage of the bonuses apply only to the Galicians ?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Yes, for the present. We are, I may say, getting no very great number of other people from the continent, but we do get some people from Germany who are very desirable settlers indeed, and I have no desire that the encouragement given to the immigration of those people by the payment of bonuses should be withdrawn. The stoppage only applies to the Galicians, who were coming in considerable numbers, and whom we expect to come in as large numbers as we can handle.

As to the question of the desirability of these settlers generally, I will take up just for a few minutes two or three objections that have been raised. In the first place, I desire to say that the hon. member for Victoria, B.C., (Mr. Prior) is not correct when he says there is any disposition on the part of the continental settlers, the Galicians and Doukhobors, to come to the towns. That is not correct. These people have no disposition for an urban life. Once they get into such a position on land that they have enough to eat and a house to live in, they have no disposition to go to the cities. Their habits are altogether the other way, and that is one of the prime reasons why I thought it desirable not to discourage unduly their immigration. If these people were people not accustomed to agricultural life, with any disposition at all to abandon agricultural life and come to the towns, I would unhesitatingly use every power that the Government would place in my hands for the purpose of preventing their going to the North-west, for nothing but disaster would result from such a course ; but it is because these people are agriculturists and have been for generations, because they have no idea of following any life except that of agriculturists, because their one idea is to go on land and stay there, that I consider them unquestionably good agricultural settlers and an acquisition to the country. These people came in at first under rather unfortunate auspices. While I do not wish to make a party discussion out of this I am bound to say the late Government was somewhat to blame for those unfortunate auspices. The movement began under the late Government. Professor Oleskow came out here and interviewed the Minister of the Interior of that day and the officers of that department. Having had a special authority from the Austrian Government in connection with the matter, he was desirous of making an arrangement whereby he would be authorized, for a certain payment, to supervise the immigration of the Galicians. The Government of that day did not see fit to make any arrangement with him, but

these people came in just the same. The result was, that no supervision and no care was exercised in their selection, and the people who did come in at first were the least desirable of all the Galicians that have come to the country. Professor Oleskow informs us that if he had been employed to exercise any degree of supervision, the people who first came, and who were the people that went to Edmonton, and who first gave rise to the unalterable hostility which the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has against the Galicians, would probably not have come at all. They were just such people as can be picked up in any country—paupers where they came from, and, of course, paupers when they got here. Since arriving, however, they have done fairly well. That does not, however, at all apply to the Galicians generally that have been coming in since. I may say to my hon. friend that one of the first matters called to my attention, on assuming office, was, that there were a couple of Galician settlements not doing well, for the reason that they had been given no direction or assistance in the way of advice as to the methods of conducting operations in this country, and consequently some of them had got discouraged and gone into the town, just as my hon. friend suggested they had a disposition to do. But they did not go into the town because they had a disposition to do so, but because they had been turned loose on the country, without any instructions being given them as to the methods to be followed, so that they did not know what to do, and became totally discouraged. But what I did in connection with these people was this. I consulted my chief officers of immigration ; we went over the whole case, and the result was, that, of the 115 Galicians who were in Winnipeg when I took office, at the end of six months after my immigration commissioner took charge of the work, there were not five. All had moved out to the Stuartburn settlement, where they are prosperous to-day, and under no obligations to anybody. The difficulty in their case at first was simply because they were dumped into the country and no attention whatever paid to them. But those people are now upon their feet in the Stuartburn settlement, not far south-east of Winnipeg. The settlement is a prosperous one, and the people there are doing quite as well as a lot of people coming from a foreign country, under similar circumstances, could possibly be expected to do. There is no movement of these people to the towns in the slightest degree. On the contrary, they manifest the strongest disinclination to the town, and a determination to stay on their land and make homes for themselves, if possible.

So far as the Galicians are concerned, the attacks that have been made upon them, in my judgment, are most unfair and most ungenerous. If we are ever going to have the North-west populated, we shall not succeed

in doing it by standing on our boundary with a club or putting the microscope on every man who wishes to come into the country. We have had these prairies for a good many years now. I have seen the towns and cities in the North-west with business stagnant, and business people leaving them, and everybody in the North-west getting discouraged, because the urban population had nothing to do. And why? Simply because there were no people to trade with. The only solution of our problem there, is to get people on the land who will till it. And I am prepared to say this: That I do not care what language a man speaks, or what religion he professes, if he is honest and law-abiding, if he will go on the land and make a living for himself and family, he is a desirable settler for the Dominion of Canada; and the people of Canada will never succeed in populating Manitoba and the North-west until we act practically upon that idea. And upon the development of Manitoba and the North-west, in my judgment, the future greatness and prosperity of this Dominion of Canada very largely depends. In so saying, I do not wish to minimize the importance of other parts of the country, but I think the House will agree with me that the place to which our merchants and manufacturers of eastern Canada must look for enlarged markets is Manitoba and the North-west Territories; and there will be no markets there unless we have the population. So far as I have been able to observe the Galicians—and I have taken the trouble to drive out and go through the settlements, and even to go from house to house, for the purpose of seeing them; and I have interviewed many people of sound judgment who have taken the trouble to ascertain the fact, who have gone out there to inquire and form a fair opinion without prejudice and without desire to make political capital either for or against the Government—as a whole, they are most desirable settlers. So far as we have had them coming into the country up to the present time, we have no cause to find fault. I do not say that it would be desirable to get 50,000 or 100,000 of these people in one year. I do not think it would. But I do say we can well assimilate five or six thousand of them every year for the next twenty years. And there would be no danger to the institutions of Canada from the fact that, at the end of ten years, we may have fifty thousand Galicians in the North-west. Our experience of these people teaches us that they are industrious, careful and law-abiding, and their strongest desire is to assimilate with Canadians. Dr. Robertson, the general superintendent of the Presbyterian Church in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, has spoken in the highest terms of these people and has expressed the warmest commendation of the policy the Government has followed in bringing them in. He entertains the same opinion that I do, that it

Mr. SIFTON.

would be proper for us to encourage them to come and to make agriculturists of them; and it would be no menace to the future of the country, but, on the contrary, they will assist in the developing of the country and become good citizens. So far as their general habits are concerned, I may say that they are people who have lived in poverty. That is no crime on their part. I do not think that we as members of the House of Commons are prepared to say that we would not allow people to come into Canada because they have been unfortunate enough to live in poverty in the countries from which they come. I venture to say that the ancestors of many prominent citizens of Canada were poor in the country whence they came, and nobody thinks less of them on that account. They are people, as my hon. friend said, of good physique, and they are people of good intellectual capacity; and they are moral and well-living people. I desire to call special attention to that—to their moral habits of life. I venture to say there is no part of the population of Canada—and I am not seeking to disparage my own countrymen for the sake of making an argument—more law-abiding or more moral in their habits, one with the other, than the Galicians.

Mr. PRIOR. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) to say that the Galicians are of good physique?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Very good, indeed. And I was going to say they manifest a wonderful aptitude for improvement in their habits. When they come here, by reason of the manner in which they have been compelled to live, they do not present a very cleanly appearance. In that respect, they differ from the Doukhobors. The Doukhobors are said to be the cleanest people that ever landed in Halifax; and the railway conductors say, without hesitation, that they never had as clean a lot of immigrants on their trains as the Doukhobors were. That, I am bound to say, does not apply to the Galicians. But it is not less true that the Galicians show great aptitude for improvement. I could point my hon. friend to some most remarkable cases showing the improvements that have come under my notice. My hon. friend mentioned the servant problem. It will be found that the large number of Galicians and Doukhobors coming into that country will, to a great extent, overcome the difficulty that has existed in procuring persons who were willing to enter service. It is no disparagement of our Canadian boys and girls to say that they do not wish to go out to service. If they have a higher ambition, we desire that they should gratify that ambition. But what are these sons and daughters of farmers, who desire to leave the farm and follow professional or mercantile occupations, who would do what has been done in the province of Ontario, where the sons and daughters of the farmers

have gone into the cities and have, in many cases, taken leading places—what are they going to do if there are no towns? And what will become of the towns if the farming population does not increase? We have had the question of populating these prairies on our hands for a good many years. From 1881, when the Canadian Pacific Railway contract was let, to 1896, it was surprising and extremely disappointing to see how slow had been the increase of the farming population. Everybody knows that we almost began to believe that we were never to have the growth of the farming population in the North-west that we anticipated in former years. And we never shall have it if we follow a policy of keeping people from coming in. If we can find people of fairly good character who desire to live an agricultural life, and who say they want to come to Canada and build up homes for themselves and are willing to obey the laws and pay taxes for the support of our institutions, we must open our doors to these people and give them such encouragement as will overcome the initial difficulties of their change of situation. For my part, I have not the slightest fear of the results. I call my hon. friend's attention and the attention of the House, to this point, that in all the experience of the United States—and they have had a great deal of experience upon these lines—none of the difficulties that they have had has been with an agricultural population. The foreign people who have gone there and concerning whom difficulties have arisen, are people who live in the towns and cities—mechanics and labourers. There has never been a difficulty with an agricultural population. I could show my hon. friend places in the United States where large stretches of country are settled with a foreign population—and not as good a class of people or as well circumstanced as the people who are settling our North-west—and they are as prosperous and as respectable and as highly respected as any rural population in the United States. There has been no trouble with them. We need not apprehend any trouble from those who come out to till the soil and make a livelihood for themselves and their families. Let me say another word to my hon. friend. These people take up a class of land that will not be taken up by Canadian or that English settlers will not take up. Galicians went upon a tract of land that we could not possibly get anybody else to look at, and they have settled down there, and cleared the scrub and brush away, and I venture to say that if the hon. gentleman will go up there in ten years from to-day he will see as prosperous, as contented, as law-abiding and peaceful a population as he will find anywhere else in Canada.

In so far as the Doukhobors are concerned, I have only this to say. I am altogether at one with my right hon. friend the Prime Minister when he suggests that it is not a reason why we should keep people out of

Canada because they have a conscientious objection to bearing arms. I think the House will not agree with the suggestion that because a man may have conscientious objections to bearing arms, therefore he has not courage, therefore he has not those qualities which go to make up a good citizen. Sir, there is many a man who is ready to fight and who has no courage at all, he has nothing in the sense of true courage. While I think I would be quite prepared to put on a uniform, if it became necessary, and to go out in defence of the country, I do not believe that either I myself or my hon. friend would go through what these Doukhobors have gone through for the sake of their convictions. I doubt if there are five men in this House who would show the moral courage, who would show the tenacity, who would show the fortitude which these people have shown for the purpose of preserving the faith which they believe to be the true faith. They have this idea about military service, but so long as they are willing to till our land, so long as they are prepared to raise wheat and cattle and pay taxes, I think we will be able to use their money for the purpose of paying and equipping men who are perfectly willing to go out and do the fighting. These people have gone out on a tract of land passed over by all other people, not occupied by other people, lying there year after year, travelled over by the English and Canadian settlers that the hon. gentleman talks about, but who would not look at that land, we could not get them to settle there at all. These men went on a square block, they took up one section after another, regardless of the quality of the land, and they have taken their chances as to whether they would be successful or not. I have not the slightest doubt that if my hon. friend will go up to that settlement ten years from to-day he will see a population that will be a credit to the Dominion of Canada.

Now, my hon. friend says they have habits that are repulsive, which are to some extent contrary to the ideas we have as to what the habits of well-regulated people should be. Well, that is perfectly true. It was also true of the Mennonites; and all that has been said here about the Doukhobors and Galicians was said much more strongly in regard to the Mennonites, and I think it was said with much better ground, that is to say, that the argument which is used applied more strongly to the Mennonites than it does to the Doukhobors and the Galicians. We all know what the social habits of the Mennonites were when they came here. They have improved very much since then; but there was this difference between the Mennonites and these later settlers. The Galician is anxious to assimilate, the Galician is anxious to be independent, the Galician wants to be a Canadian, he wants his children to go to a public school. We have had the strongest evidence that these Galicians

are desirous that schools should be established among them. We have their children going to the schools in large numbers now. We actually have two young men from the Galician settlement at Dauphin down in Manitoba College studying Presbyterian theology for the purpose of going out and acting as missionaries amongst their people. The Doukhobors are also quite willing to assimilate and become Canadians, that is to say, they have no prejudice against it. The Mennonites are altogether different. The Mennonites are exclusive, the Mennonites are opposed, and always have been to some extent by their mental attitude, to becoming Canadians. And yet, Mr. Speaker, although the Mennonites were not looked upon so favourably as the Galicians and the Doukhobors, they have been among the most valuable citizens we have had in Manitoba and the North-west. Why, Sir, there is no more prosperous portion of the province to-day than the Mennonite reserve. I venture to think that if the hon. gentleman will ask the leading merchants of the city of Winnipeg where, in the last ten years, they have made the most money, where they have had the fewest bad debts, and therefore have lost the least money, they will say that it has been upon the Mennonite reserve; and that of all the population of the province of Manitoba there is no portion that contributes more to its commercial prosperity than does the Mennonite reserve. I venture to think that we have just as good grounds for expecting that the Galicians and Doukhobors will be equally successful, and that they will be a credit to the country as the Mennonites have become, and with this added advantage, that they have a desire to assimilate whereas the Mennonites have not.

Now, I desire to point out in reply to my hon. friend that I think he is entirely astray when he speaks of the Doukhobors and the Galicians in the same way that he speaks of the Mongolian populations which menace our people upon the Pacific coast. Let me add that the settlement of our plains of the North-west by such people as we have been able to get there, not only settlers from the United States, but other settlers from continental Europe such as the Galicians and the Doukhobors, will fill up those prairies and create a trade, and thus benefit the urban population. That is not only in the interest of the country at large, it is in the interest of the population of the city of Winnipeg and of the various towns and villages in the North-west, because the increase of the rural population is the only possible means by which the urban population can be increased, or a trade built up for the purpose of sustaining it. It is also in the interest of the artisan and of the labouring man of Quebec and Ontario. Where is the artisan of the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario to look for an increased market, to what place is he

Mr. SIFTON.

going to look for the purpose of selling the goods which he has produced by his labour, if it is not to our North-west, to these markets built up by settlements upon our prairies? There is no man more interested in immigration, that is more interested in the successful development of the North-west, than the mechanic, than the man who has skilled labour to sell in the eastern portion of the Dominion of Canada. And it is with that view that I appeal with the greatest confidence to my colleagues in the Government, and appeal to the public wherever I have spoken upon this question, to support a vigorous immigration policy, knowing as I do that not only does the prosperity of the North-west depend upon it, but also the prosperity of the towns and cities of eastern Canada.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question? What does he say as to the allegations which are constantly being made that special privileges are being accorded to Galician settlers in Manitoba that are not and have not been accorded to Canadian settlers up there?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. So far as the department has any knowledge, the statement is absolutely untrue. I have given the most positive and special instructions that that should not be done, that no distinction should be made between the settlers of any class. I may add, as touching the hon. gentleman's suggestion, that at this moment I have despatched the chief officer of the Dominion Lands Branch to the North-west for the purpose of investigating the question as to whether any officers of the department have disobeyed their instructions.

Mr. CLARKE. I will take the opportunity, later on, if an opportunity offers, of reading a clipping from a paper friendly to hon. gentlemen opposite, in respect to this matter of discrimination in regard to which I have asked for information. I will send the clipping to the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I apprehend that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), when he speaks of special privileges, is referring to a statement that was made that they were given entries for land which had been refused to other settlers.

Mr. CLARKE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. All I have to say is that, when that statement was brought to my attention, I brought it before the officers of the Dominion lands branch, and pointed out to them that the express instructions I had given them were not to permit that. I demanded an explanation of the officers of the branch, and information was given that they had no knowledge that such had been done, and they did not believe it had been

done. Upon that I sent the Commissioner of Dominion Lands to the North-west with the special object of making a report upon that, and ascertaining if any officers had violated their instructions.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, in reference to the question that was raised by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), I rather think that the conduct of the hon. Minister of the Interior has entirely vindicated my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior), because, with the reproof of my right hon. friend ringing in his ears, the hon. Minister of the Interior rises and makes a carefully prepared speech on a motion to adjourn the House. In reference to the doctrine as laid down yesterday or the day before yesterday, I forget which, by the right hon. gentleman, I must say that, in my opinion, it would limit, to a great extent, the liberty of action of private members of this House, because, if you speak upon a question on going into Supply, you will, on a question like this, deprive the mover of a substantive motion, of the right of a reply, which he might wish to avail himself of. The right hon. gentleman, when laying down that doctrine, I think it was the day before yesterday, quoted from May the practice of the English House of Commons, but Bourinot, as quoted by the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), says that the practice in our House is entirely different from the practice in the English Chamber, and he supports the contrary doctrine by the high example of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I consider that by far the most important question that has been brought before this House to-day is the question of Mongolian immigration. Something like fourteen years ago a great deal of attention was given to this subject, and an elaborate inquiry was instituted by the Government of Sir John Macdonald. That inquiry established that Mongolian immigration was a menace to the prosperity and progress of British Columbia, and that it would be a danger even to Canada. The report that was made at that time, after going into the evidence taken at San Francisco, after going into the evidence taken by the Government of the United States, after going into the evidence taken at Portland, Oregon, and evidence taken in British Columbia, advised legislation, and legislation took place in 1885, as my right hon. friend will remember, when a tax of \$50 a head was imposed on Chinese immigration. The person who wrote this report was the same person that prepared the Act, and any one who turns to the recommendations that were made, will see that it was recommended that the Government should legislate tentatively, and that they should look forward to further action, that in legislating

no course should be taken that would give a severe shock to great interests on the Pacific coast, and that when \$50 a head was imposed they should look forward to the time when \$100 a head would be imposed, nay, when probably \$200 a head would be imposed. The opinion that was put forward by that commission, need I add, was emphasized here to-day, because I find that the hon. Minister of the Interior takes precisely the same view of Mongolian immigration that of the hon. member for Victoria. The hon. Minister of the Interior not only reprovved the doctrine laid down by the Prime Minister, but, by the sentiments that he uttered, he actually condemned the Government of which he is a distinguished member. The Prime Minister will have, I believe, the sympathy of everybody on this side of the House in deferring to the Imperial instinct of every free citizen of Canada. But, what should have been done when these Acts were disallowed? If the hon. Minister of the Interior is correct in saying that Mongolian immigration is a menace to the workingman, what should have been done when the Acts passed by British Columbia were disallowed, when the protection to the workman supplied by the legislation of British Columbia was taken away by the disallowance of this Government? Taking the opinion of the Minister of the Interior as a just opinion, and as an opinion that we all share, what should have been done by this Government, because the power is with them, is this: We should have had an Act brought in by the right hon. gentleman or one of his colleagues, adding to the duty that is now imposed on the Chinese. This report points out that there is a great difference between Japanese and Chinese immigration. Every person who knows the character of the Chinaman and the character of the Japanese, who has followed the immigration of each race in the United States or in Canada, knows that there is not as much danger from numbers, from immoral practices, or from secret societies, involved in Japanese immigration as in Chinese. The Chinese are demoralizing, in the most—

The PRIME MINISTER. The Japanese?

Mr. DAVIN. No, what I say is that there is not as much danger from the Japanese as from the Chinese, because Chinese immigration is a menace to labour by contributing cheap but most effective labour. It is most effective, but it is cheap, and taking the form that has been described as celibate immigration, it is, of course, a very serious menace to the workingman who has a wife and three or four children to support. But it is not merely that. I am speaking now of the regular immigration, where immigrants come to make money, not, of course, referring to

high officials visiting the country, either for pleasure or business, and I say that I believe no exception can be found either in San Francisco or British Columbia, to the rule that every woman that comes is a prostitute, and every woman is a more dangerous prostitute by far than those to be found amongst white people, even the most abandoned, because the practices of these women are indescribable. They strike not merely at the morality of the adult population, but at the morality of very young male children, and that, of course, is a thing that you must expect residents of a place like Victoria or the residents of any town—I suppose there is the same thing now in Vancouver, although I do not know anything by direct information about it—to look with dread upon such immigration as that.

I say that, when the legislature of British Columbia passed that legislation, and when it made the error, as error I consider it, of including the Japanese in the same class as the Chinese, when the Government felt bound to disallow that, we should have an Act brought into this House which would increase the poll-tax on Chinese coming into the country, as the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) implied should have been done. I believe every man will entirely sympathize with the view put forward by the Prime Minister, that where we have to deal with an issue in which the Imperial Government is concerned, respecting the Japanese, who have shown themselves as possessing some of the very highest qualities which have distinguished the Anglo-Saxon race, whom my right hon. friend loves to eulogize—when you have this nation showing themselves to be the England of the eastern seas, I think it was perfectly right for the Government to disallow these Acts. But, at the same time, I say that the Minister of the Interior, holding the views he has expressed, is guilty towards the province of British Columbia, in not having insisted on a Bill being brought in to deal with Chinese immigration.

Mr. MORRISON. Can the hon. gentleman tell me why it was, that the Conservative Government did not take any steps to increase the Chinese tax, or do something to restrict the immigration of the Chinese into British Columbia?

Mr. DAVIN. I was not, unfortunately, a member of that Government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But a very strong supporter.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know that. I found it necessary on many occasions to differ from the Government, and, whenever I did, I found I was supported by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) and by the Prime Minister; and on those occasions I was able to do what will be found in "Hansard," and what will be found on the statute-books—I was able to accomplish

Mr. DAVIN.

a great many things for the North-west Territory that could not otherwise have been accomplished. I mention that for the behoof of my hon. friend (Mr. Morrison). He asked me, why did not the Conservative Government do this, and I tell him that I was very busy at that time getting the Government to do a great many things that came right home to the people I represented in the North-west Territories. I could mention them by the dozen; and, if the dealing with Chinese immigration is so dear to my hon. friend (Mr. Morrison) as it certainly is to his constituents, let him come forward and do as I did—let him make his motions, and press them, and divide the House.

Mr. MCGREGOR. And vote against them.

Mr. DAVIN. No, and vote for them. I squelched completely that intellectual insect of hon. gentlemen opposite on another occasion, and I hope the hon. hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) will not force me to bring "Hansard" in and ram something I will not name down the throat of such persons as my hon. friend (Mr. McGregor).

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

#### After Recess.

#### DOMINION PERMANENT LOAN COMPANY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 104) respecting the Dominion Permanent Loan Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. W. W. B. McINNES (Vancouver). Mr. Chairman, before the Bill is reported, I beg to move that the following be added to the Bill as section 4:

Any shareholder who has obtained or hereafter obtains a loan from the company, shall be relieved of all liability arising therefrom, and shall be entitled to a release and a reconveyance of any property charged therewith, upon his paying to the company the amount required to repay such loan, as represented by the agent of the company who effected the loan, or by the literature of the company circulated at the time the loan was made.

When this Bill was before the Committee on Banking and Commerce, I took occasion to move an additional clause very similar to the one I propose to-night. Although the motion received substantial support in the committee, a majority did not concur in the view that the proposed clause should be made part of the Bill. But I am confident the majority came to that conclusion on account of certain statements which were made in defence of certain practices of the company by certain members of the company who were present, and by members of the committee. For that reason, as well as because I am firmly convinced of the im-

portance of the motion which I propose, I feel justified to-night in again bringing it to the attention of hon. members. As the committee is aware, there are quite a number of loan companies in Canada which loan out money on what is known as the instalment plan. They represent to intending borrowers that they will loan them say \$1,000, and that the borrower shall have the privilege of paying that money back in a certain number of instalments of so much per month. It has been found, unfortunately for those who have borrowed money in this way and for those who have subscribed for stock in most of these companies, that when the time came for settlement with the company, the company has not been prepared to carry out its promises, its representations or its obligations. Now, the company which is asking for additional powers from this Parliament at this time, and which was formerly known as the Dominion Building and Loan Association, has acted in a way towards its borrowers which I think justifies this Parliament in taking cognizance of its conduct. Those who have borrowed from this company have had experiences which to them appear to be most unjustifiable. This matter was brought to my attention two or three months ago, when I received a petition from some prominent constituents of mine which set out in clear terms the grievances which they had against the company; and for brevity's sake, I will read this petition which is dated Nanaimo, May 8th, and is addressed to me:

We, the undersigned, borrowers from and subscribers to the Dominion Building and Loan Association (now the Dominion Permanent Loan Association) head office, Toronto, hereby appeal to Parliament through you for redress and relief from a very unfair, unjust and, we believe, dishonest condition which the association are trying to exact under the mortgage given by us.

When we obtained the loans from the association, the printed by-laws were handed to us, and the agents of the association stated clearly and explicitly that the by-laws contained all the conditions governing the contract between the association and the borrowers.

The clause in the by-laws most important to the borrowers is the repayment clause, which stated plainly that the money would be repaid and the debt discharged by the borrower making ninety-six equal monthly payments. We have faithfully complied with this clause, and when we made application for a release of our securities and a discharge of our mortgages, we were informed by the association that we had an additional sum of \$225 on each \$1,000 borrowed to pay before the release would be granted, the association claiming the right to change the by-laws and eliminate the clause specifying the number of payments to be made.

As this is a question affecting a large number of Canadians all over the Dominion, petitioners respectfully request that you bring the matter to the notice of the Dominion Parliament for the purpose of causing a Government investigation to be made.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

You will see that it is specifically stated in

this petition that these borrowers—and they number 29—borrowed money from this company on a specific understanding that upon making 96 repayments they would be entitled to a full discharge of all the securities they gave the company—that, on payment of these 96 payments, they would be absolutely released from all liability connected with the loan. It is further stated that having complied with these conditions, and having done everything they thought they were under an obligation to do, the company, instead of giving them a release and discharge, wishes to extort from them an additional sum of \$225, or 15 additional payments on every \$1,000 which was borrowed. Now, I know the gentlemen who have signed this petition, and they are gentlemen of the very highest standing; and the fact that they have subscribed to that statement is sufficient to convince me that the facts stated in it are true. I know that the members of this committee have not the pleasure of knowing those gentlemen, and I have accordingly fortified myself with a few facts to show the committee that the statements contained in this petition are absolutely true. In the first place, I shall read section 3 of Article 3 of the by-laws of the company which were in force at the time these loans were made. This section, which bears upon this point, reads as follows:—

Loans on stock, with real estate mortgage as collateral security, shall be payable in ninety-six monthly payments of one dollar and fifty cents for each share assigned to the association, sixty cents out of each payment of one dollar and fifty cents being credited to the shares assigned, fifty cents to the interest account, and forty cents to the premium account; provided, however, that if the shares assigned mature before the expiration of ninety-six months from the date of issue thereof, the said payments of one dollar and fifty cents for each share assigned shall thereafter cease, the shares cancelled and the mortgage released.

You will see that in that section it is provided that, upon making 96 payments to the company, the securities which have been given to the company by the borrowers, shall be discharged and released. Furthermore, the additional inducement is held out to the intending borrower, that there is a possibility that these shares will mature inside of 96 payments, and consequently a borrower may be allowed to repay his loan by really making less than 96 payments. There is not the slightest suggestion to the borrower of the loans not terminating with that number of payments. The declaration is specific that 96 payments, and no more, will be all that will be required in order to secure the borrower a release. That same representation is repeated in all the literature of the company circulated to intending borrowers. I have here a copy of some of the literature which was issued at the time these parties who are now petitioning took out their loans, and I will read a portion which

is set forth in large letters in one of their circulars, and styled an illustration. It is put in this shape so as to show intending borrowers the great advantage of borrowing \$1,000 on this plan :

#### ILLUSTRATION

Showing the Cost of \$1,000 Loan on Ten Shares of Stock for Eight Years.

The borrower pays \$15 per month for 96 months.

In other words, in return for \$1,000.00 he pays \$1,440, with entrance fee of \$10. The total cost of the loan, therefore, is \$1,450. Deduct the amount of the loan, \$1,000, and it will be seen that the whole cost of the loan has been only \$450.

The literature continues :

Thus, the borrower has had the use of \$1,000 for eight years, which cost him only \$450. Had he borrowed from a banker or broker, at 6 per cent interest, he would have paid for the same amount during that period, \$480.

That, again, shows clearly that the company represent to the public that, upon paying 96 payments, and no more, the borrower shall receive a full quittance. But further on, in the same piece of literature, I find, in great double capital letters, this paragraph :

#### STOCK GUARANTEED.

The stock of the association is guaranteed to mature in eight years, thus limiting the number of payments, and assuring a handsome profit to investors.

In view of that literature and the section I have read from the by-laws, there can be no doubt that the company is representing, in the clearest possible language that, upon paying 96 payments, and no more, the borrowers will be entitled to a full release. As stated in the petition that I read to the committee, a number of subscribers for loans have complied with all the terms, and have made their payments regularly ; but, when they applied for a release, they were coolly told that they would have to pay the company some 15 more payments before the company would give them a full discharge. I have in my hand a letter written by the manager of the company to one of the petitioners, William Woodman, dated Toronto, September 19th, 1898. Towards the close of the letter this sentence occurs :

It will take considerably more than 96 payments to repay your loan, probably fifteen more. You will see that even here they do not specifically state when this contract will come to an end. After making 96 payments, the company exact 15 more, but they say, "probably 15 more will be required," so that perhaps 20 or 25 more will have to be made. In other words, according to the agreement as interpreted by the company, there is no definiteness at all as to its finality. It may be asked, what is the excuse the company put forward for exacting these additional payments. There was only one excuse ven-

Mr. McINNES.

tured before the Banking and Commerce Committee, and that was, that this company, when a new company, some ten years ago, estimated that the profits would be very large. They went into business when the rates of interest were high, and they thought they would be able to make such profits as would warrant their declaring that the stock would mature in eight years, and consequently that a person who took out a mortgage then would be able to obtain a release on making 96 payments. But I think I am in a position to show that that statement clearly cannot be true, or, if it be true, the company is persisting in continuing to swindle the public, because, not only eight or ten years ago did they represent to the public that if the borrower made 96 payments, he would get a release, but continuously since then up to the present they have made that same representation to the public. In fact, at present this company are representing to the public that they will lend \$1,000, and that if the borrower pays back only 93 payments of \$15 per month, making a total of \$1,395, he will obtain a full discharge. Clearly, if the company can do that to-day with regard to persons who mortgage their property now to the company, they can do that to those who took out mortgages some eight or ten years ago. On the other hand, if they cannot do it to-day, in the light of their past experience, they are acting dishonestly towards the public in continuing to make the same representation. In either case they should be brought to book, and, when they are asking for further privileges, this House has a perfect right to insist that they shall deal fairly with their clients. They are offering at present to give \$1,000 to the borrower and promise him a full release on his paying back, not 96 payments, but 93 payments, of \$15 each. I have here some literature I obtained from their office in this city only a few days ago, in which they make the specific statement, without any suggestion at all that it depends upon contingencies as to expenses or profits, that they will lend \$1,000 and that the borrower will only be required to pay back 93 payments of \$15 each.

Mr. WALLACE. Has the hon. gentleman made an estimate of the actual rate of interest that would have to be paid ?

Mr. McINNES. No, I have not.

Mr. DAVIS. Sixteen per cent.

Mr. McINNES. I am merely dealing with the literature of the company and the representations they have made to the public, and it is on those representations alone the public are induced to take loans from the company. It was suggested in the committee, that really this was not a matter Parliament should deal with, but I submit that, inasmuch as this company is entirely the creation of this Parliament, inasmuch as it

has no rights whatever to deal with the public outside those given by this Parliament, and inasmuch as it can be shown that they are dealing unfairly with the public, it is competent for this Parliament to compel them to deal fairly and honourably with their clients. It was also suggested that the proper place to fight out the disputes between the borrowers and the company is the courts. But while it is perfectly true that the courts are open to every one, still, as a matter of fact, it is not every one who can afford to go to the courts, and if the borrowers, who, in the very nature of the case, are men of small means, who have been forced to borrow money, are forced to go to the courts, it is manifest very few of them will receive their just deserts. Because, Sir, it is an unequal fight between a large company and a poor borrower. There are vexations about lawsuits, there are expenses attending litigation, which make it practically impossible for the great majority of these borrowers to secure their rights at the hands of the courts.

There is another reason why borrowers under the present condition should not be compelled to go into the courts to secure their rights in this matter, and it is this—if the borrower starts a suit to secure what he considers his just rights from this company and the case is brought on for trial, the rights of the borrower will be decided upon the exact wording of the mortgage. I take it that these previous representations as made by the agent of the company and as contained in the literature of the company would not be taken notice of; at all events, they certainly would not be taken full notice of by the courts; but, on the other hand, the mortgage would be held to contain the whole agreement, and the courts would not go behind or back of the mortgage. Consequently, though the agents and the literature of the company induced the borrower to believe that he was entering into a certain bargain, yet, if the strict language of the mortgage did not bear out that understanding, the borrower, as the law stands at the present time, would not succeed in the case, and, as I think, would not succeed in getting justice. Now, I would like to point out, furthermore, the process which takes place when these loans are effected. We all know that the agents are very anxious to secure these loans. They get a handsome commission for securing the loans, and it is clearly in their interest to get as much of the company's money loaned as possible. That has the effect, necessarily, of not making the agents over-scrupulous as to the statements they make to intending borrowers. I know quite a number of these agents, even the agents of this company, and I know men whom they have approached, and I know it to be the invariable practice of the agents to represent to the borrowers—and, so far as I know, they do it honestly, because

they think the company will fulfil its obligations—that on making a specific number of payments, they will receive a complete discharge. Now, the literature of the company clearly shows that the same representation is placed before the public—it backs up what the agent says. The great majority of intending borrowers will look at the literature and listen to what the agent says, but when the crucial point comes of signing the mortgage, not one man in a hundred would read the mortgage—and, if they did, not one man in a thousand (I have seen the document) would understand it. I venture to say that there are not five men in this House who could read this mortgage over and understand it. We had a copy of the mortgage before the Banking and Commerce Committee the other day, and the language was seen to be tricky, ambiguous and uncertain, and the whole document was apparently drawn up with a view to confuse the mind of the reader and cover up the real intent of the mortgage. So I say the contract as between man and man which was entered into was the contract entered into on the representation of the agent of the company and of the literature of the company, and not as contained in the mortgage. Inasmuch, therefore, as the law now stands, the mortgage will be taken as conclusive of the justice of the thing in court and not these preliminary representations, I submit that this motion, which has for its object to make the representations of the agent the basis of the decision of the action and not the mortgage, should be adopted by the House.

I have only one other thing to point out, and that is the general importance of this matter. This is not a matter which is confined to my district or to the province of British Columbia; it is a thing in which people all over the Dominion are concerned, so far as this Dominion Permanent Loan Company has done business over the Dominion. Since this matter has been before the House, I have had letters from different parts of the country showing that people in widely separated sections are interested in it. The importance of it can be gathered in another way. You will observe that the manager of the company in writing to one of these parties stated that the company would exact fifteen more payments or a total of \$225, more for every \$1,000 he has borrowed. I think it quite fair to assume that, up to 1896, that company had loaned out in this country 4,000 such loans. If that is a fair estimate, and if \$225 is exacted from each of these 4,000 borrowers, you will see that the enormous sum of nearly a million dollars is attempted to be extorted from these innocent borrowers by this company. You will observe, from that line of argument, that this question is of no limited importance, but is one of very widespread concern in the country. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee

further ; but I submit that, in view of these considerations, the committee would be well advised and would be doing right by those who are not at present exactly in a position to protect themselves, if they incorporate the section I propose in the Bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think it is only right to say that when this matter was before the Banking and Commerce Committee there was a very full representation of the members there. All the facts that have been stated by my hon. friend (Mr. McInnes) were fully brought out and fully discussed before that committee. Everything was considered for several hours and the committee decided, by a very large majority indeed, that this clause should not be added to the Bill. I need not go into the reasons for that conclusion now, as the time is limited and there are other Bills to be dealt with. But I think it is fair that this committee should understand that the Committee on Banking and Commerce had considered all these points, and had decided against adding this clause to the Bill. Therefore, I think this committee would be well advised in rejecting this motion made by my hon. friend.

Mr. DAVIS. This is a question I happen to know something about, not in connection with this loan company, but another. We had one of these companies working on much the same lines in the town of Prince Albert, where I live. They came in some years ago, and made representations in the same way as has been stated, and got a lot of people to go in and take stock on the strength of statements they made and the literature they produced, telling the people that they would be able to pay back the loan in seven years if they went into the company. They circulated this literature and got up some local companies to take control of the thing. People went into it in good faith ; and I do not suppose there was one in twenty-five who read the mortgage ; and even if they had, it was so full of covenants that no layman could understand it—even lawyers could hardly understand it. These people understood by the agreement they had with the agent and by the literature that the agent circulated in the town that in so many payments they would pay up the whole amount they borrowed in seven years. Other parties who went in for the purpose of investing money in the same way were supposed to draw \$1,000 when the seven-year period was up. Now, that was more than seven years ago. These people in good faith made their payments year by year, they never missed a payment, and when the time was up they asked to be released. They said : We have been paying for seven years, we have made our payments according to the agreement. But they were told that they would have to

Mr. McINNES.

pay for three years more. When they showed their agreement and said : Well, here is the literature that was used by your agent, this is the agreement. Oh, they said, you had better read the mortgage, under that mortgage we can hold you as long as we please. The reason they gave, as my hon. friend says, was that they expected bigger dividends than they got. There was a case decided in Minnesota by the Supreme Court in which it was held that they were bound to release these parties ; that if their agent went into a certain place and made representations, this company were bound by those representations, and that they would have to release them. I think there is a case in Canada to the same effect. But I submit that if this Bill is going through now, and if there is any way this House can protect the public, it should be done. Everybody cannot go to law with a loan company like one of these ; there is no doubt that if they did, they would go to the wall. If a labouring man, who has been induced to go in and borrow this money on the understanding that he could pay it back in seven years, and if he found out at the end of the seven years that he could not get justice, has he got to go to law with this company ? It is impossible for him to do it. If he succeeded in a local court, it would be carried to the Supreme Court ; and the people recognize that, and, therefore, they submit to be plucked before they will go to law. I hope this will be taken into consideration by the House, because I know that it is not only in the places mentioned by my hon. friend that these cases occur. There is not a town in the North-west Territories where the same thing has not taken place, and I assume that the same thing has taken place in Ontario, and I think something should be done to make these companies do what is right.

Mr. HENDERSON. I agree with the hon. gentleman who has moved this amendment to a very large extent, inasmuch as I have had a prejudice against this class of business for possibly thirty years. But I hold to the opinion that it is unfair to this company at this time to add a special clause which does not apply to other companies doing business in exactly the same way. If the clause now proposed is to be enacted, it should be made general. Now, let me state in a few words the nature of this whole transaction. The borrower goes to the company and buys stock, he agrees to take his chance on the payment of this stock. If the company has a profitable business and the profits will enable him to pay his stock in eight years, then he will be entitled to the discharge of the mortgage given in security for the money which was advanced, or the money which he is to pay for the stock. If, on the other hand, the company was fortunate enough to make sufficient money to enable that stock to be paid for in six years, then the borrower would get the advantage,

and I have no doubt in the world that he would take that advantage, and if such had been the case, he would not be in the position of these people in British Columbia, who have been unfortunate enough not to get their discharge. Now, what do these people contract to do? It is written plainly in the mortgage that they have agreed to pay 16 per cent on \$1,000. This would amount to \$160 a year, and in eight years, to \$1,280. Then, principal and interest, would amount to \$2,280. Now, that is written in plain words; it says what the borrower contracts to pay, there is no mistake about that. He contracts to pay \$1,000, and to pay interest at 16 per cent thereon for eight years, as he alleges, making in all \$2,280. Now, suppose it was paid off in eight years, by instalments of \$15 per month, the borrower would simply pay \$1,440, or \$840 less than he contracted for in plain words written on the face of his mortgage that he should pay. It is said that the company asks him to pay fifteen monthly payments more than the ninety-six. Suppose he would do that, it would be \$225. Still \$615 less than he contracted to pay in the face of his mortgage. My impression is that we should not pass legislation that will be retroactive at all. These men go into this business with their eyes open, they are intelligent men. I saw a mortgage signed the other day, written in plain and distinct language, evidently the man who signed that mortgage was an intelligent man and knew what he was doing; yet he signed that mortgage with a clause in it that he was to pay 16 per cent for the money that he was getting. I do not think this Parliament has any right to step in between these two contracting parties and say that because a man made a foolish bargain with his eyes open, somebody else should suffer for it, because the other shareholders of the company would have to suffer if this man is relieved. But for the future I would say that it is the duty of this Parliament to prevent a recurrence of what is complained of at the present time, and I have no doubt that the Minister of Finance will before long do something in that direction. I myself would approve of there being used in all these charters for loan companies a form of mortgage, to be the only form of mortgage that would be used by the company; then there could possibly be no mistake made, no matter what kind of literature was circulated amongst the people. People go into these things because they think that they are going to make money by it, and I know for a fact that men do it with their eyes open. I remember one instance where a gentleman came to me and asked my advice with respect to one of these schemes. I asked him if he thought it was a reasonable thing, if he thought it could be done. After explaining it to him he thought it was unreasonable, and he did not go into it. He came back the second

time, and a second explanation was given him, and still he agreed that it was impossible that he could make that amount of money in eight years. Notwithstanding all that, so terribly greedy was he to make money that he entered into a contract and bought some of these certificates. Now, it is impossible to legislate so as to prevent men going into these schemes when they will do so with their eyes open for the purpose of making money. I cannot believe that the people on the western coast are any less intelligent than those in this part of the country, and I know that people here go into it as a speculation, and when they do it voluntarily they must take their chances. I cannot say that I sympathize much with them. But I hope that if there is a possibility of avoiding a recurrence of what has taken place here, some principle will be introduced that will be made applicable to all companies.

Amendment negatived.

Bill read the third time and passed.

#### BILL FOR RELIEF OF PENBERTHY INJECTOR COMPANY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 141) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Penberthy Injector Company.—(Mr. McGregor.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. HAGGART. What department has charge of this matter? The Bill is to allow the Commissioner of Patents, notwithstanding the expiry of a patent to extend the duration of letters patent on behalf of this company. We have refused always in this House to do it no matter what the circumstances have been, or through whose neglect it was. Even where the parties have sent down the money for the purpose of renewing patent and through the neglect of the officers of the department it was not renewed we have refused such legislation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The practice before the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills has been to require evidence on oath in order to prove the specific facts alleged in the preamble. Bills have been passed by the committee, reported and adopted by the House where the committee were thoroughly satisfied that it was owing to a mere accident that the money had not been paid on the proper day. It was held by the committee that in this case the party having the patent should not be prejudiced, and a clause was put in expressly reserving any rights which any third party had acquired in the meantime. There are some cases of great hardship, and there would be great hardship in this case if, after the facts, as alleged in the preamble, have been proved,

the House did not grant relief. Very great care was taken; the department was communicated with and the officer in charge of the branch came before the committee and certified that, so far as the department was concerned there was no objection to the Bill, provided the rights of any parties who had acquired rights in the meantime were protected. That was done.

Mr. McALISTER. When the matter came before the committee two or three days ago, action on the Bill was postponed in order to ascertain if the Bill would prejudice the rights of any third parties. Evidence was submitted yesterday that no such rights would be prejudiced, and the committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 140) respecting the Canadian Railway Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to the Dominion Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 158) respecting the Edmonton District Railway Company, and to change its name to the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)

Bill (No. 166) respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. McAlister.)

Bill (No. 71) to incorporate the Algoma Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Dymont.)

#### FOREIGN IMMIGRATION.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assinibola). Mr. Speaker, when the recess arrived I was dealing with the question of Chinese immigration into British Columbia, and I referred to the Report of the Royal Commission on Chinese Immigration in 1885, in the resume of which we read as follows :

Everywhere the railway man and the mine-owners, the manufacturers and the housekeepers, the merchants and the shop-keepers, are against absolute exclusion, but the very best friends of the Chinamen think their immigration should be regulated.

The writer of the report, evidently looking at the state of things then existing in British Columbia, and in looking forward to what has actually taken place since, wrote as follows :—

That now (if here a speculative thought may enter) British Columbia has a great opportunity, by welcoming Chinamen, and thus securing not only cheaper labour than California, but conciliating the good-will and fixing the attention of a people, from the vast resources and inchoate wealth of whose country the veil is only just being drawn aside, whose commerce is of great value, and on the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway may be of incalculable value. British Columbia has many features in common with California. It is a country which needs local railways; it is a mining country; it is

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

a fruit-growing country. It possesses, besides, enormous resources in timber, lands and fisheries. If, therefore, British Columbia were to decide that the undoubted evils of Chinese immigration were largely counterbalanced by other considerations, what would happen is this: she would by vigorous legislation secure that her mines would be worked on a large scale, the riches of the country being thus enormously increased and her treasury swelled; she would engross nearly all the coal and timber trade and much of the fruit trade of the Pacific coast, while her fish would largely supply the markets of the eastern and central parts of the continent, and even with Europe no insignificant commerce would be within her grasp; her wealth positively, possibly and, above all, relatively to California, would develop at a ratio not short of mathematical; she would literally shoot ahead as one of the great seats of commerce and industrial activity; and, her position achieved, she could then apply herself to the political and social problem, and by the aid of the Dominion Parliament, deal with that.

It is quite clear that the writer of this report saw what was the great danger that was attaching to Chinese labour in British Columbia at that time, and that he looked forward with a steady eye to the time coming when to deal with that immigration would be an absolute necessity.

Mr. MORRISON. Whose report is that?

Mr. DAVIN. It is the Report of the Royal Commission on Chinese Immigration.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who wrote the report?

Mr. DAVIN. It is signed by Mr. Chapleau.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Was it written by him?

Mr. DAVIN. His name is to it.

Mr. MAXWELL. It was the hon. gentleman himself who wrote it.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Chapleau's name is to it.

Mr. MAXWELL. You wrote it yourself.

Mr. DAVIN. When this report was written the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maxwell) was, I suppose, making his studies, to use a French idiom. How can he know anything about it? The report continues:

That assuming Chinese immigrants of the labouring class will persist in retaining their present characteristics of Asiatic life, where these are strikingly peculiar and distinct from western, and that the influx will continue to increase, this immigration should be dealt with by Parliament; but no legislation should be such as would give a shock to great interests and enterprises established before any probability that Parliament would interfere with that immigration arose. Questions of vested rights might come up, and those ought to be carefully considered before action is taken.

That, therefore, if restrictive legislation were considered opportune it should aim at gradually-achieved results, and the history of the questions, as well as the evidence, shows that by legislation regulating, not excluding, Chinese labourers, every purpose can be effected which those who apprehend evils from Chinese immigration could and actually do desire.

What I want to point out is, that the commission reporting in 1885 looked forward to this Parliament legislating in the premises. The same year the chairman of that commission, as will be seen by looking at "Hansard," introduced a Bill and it was passed into law, in which clause 4 provides for a duty on each Chinese coming into Canada of \$50. Reading that report which, as I say, was signed by my late lamented friend Mr. Chapleau, who was then the Secretary of State, and taking section 4 of the Act passed at the instance of that hon. gentleman, it is perfectly clear that the idea at that time was that a fine of \$50 was only a commencement, and that that minimum fine was put in the Act in order to give British Columbia at that time a certain advantage which undoubtedly she received from Chinese immigration restricted in that way, and to prevent the shock to important interests that would have been greatly damaged if there had been anything like prohibitive legislation. That legislation was passed in that form, looking forward to this Parliament at some future time adopting still more restrictive legislation.

Now, Sir, these Acts which have been disallowed at the instance of the present Minister of Justice were perfectly competent to the legislature of British Columbia, and I say—and I strongly urge it upon the Government—that now that they have disallowed that legislation, which British Columbia was perfectly competent to pass, they are bound to introduce this session legislation that will give to the labour interests in British Columbia and the labour interests all over Canada—because labour has a solidarity that binds the interests of the workmen on the Pacific coast with the interests of the workmen of the Atlantic—that relief in the premises that was pointed to by the report of the Chinese commission of 1885 and by the legislation of 1885 interpreted by that report.

With regard to the immigration of Doukhobors and Galicians, both in and out of this House, I have stood aside, and I stand aside, from most of my friends in the west who take an interest in this matter. I never could say a word against any class of men, any poor men, come from whence they may, who can assimilate with our population, and who come into the country to make their way; and I have never made any criticism on that immigration further than to regret the grouping of them together into colonies. I think it would be better for themselves, for the North-west and for Canada, if they were not put together in blocks, but were mixed with the people, so that assimilation would be more rapid. While not saying one word against the Doukhobor or Galician, I do regret, and I must persistently regret, that we get, comparatively speaking, so few immigrants from England, Ireland and Scotland. Let me direct your attention to the report on immigration in the Blue-book of

the Department of the Interior for the year ending 1898. We find that there were 22,781 coming from ocean ports. How many of these were English, how many were Irish, and how many were Scotch? My friend, Mr. Devlin, only presents us with 733 from Ireland; we got only 1,400 from Scotland, and only 9,473 from England, making altogether 11,608. Taking that from 22,781, you have 11,173 foreigners, as compared with the numbers that I have given of Englishmen, Irishmen and Scotchmen. I think that is regrettable, and I cannot but think that with more effort and more inducement, and a more abiding sense of the importance of having those Anglo-Saxons who always excite admiration in the breast of the Prime Minister, we might have more from the Imperial isles. Now, having expressed my own individual view in thus welcoming the Doukhobor and the Galician to Canada—and I have no authority to speak for any one else—it is my duty to give expression, in their own language, to fears on the part of my constituents in this regard; and I have a letter here from Kinbrae which thus refers to the condition of the Galicians:

I write you in haste. What about the Galicians? They are dying north of Saltcoats like sheep—three and four a day. Two police and several special constables are sworn in to keep them rounded in and quarantined, and the doctor is constantly with them at the expense of the Dominion treasury. This is a nice state of affairs—that we are to be subject to all kinds of diseases, and also have to contribute by taxes to keep a doctor.

There is some very strong language used here which I will quote:

Is it not going to stop, or is Sifton to be allowed for all time to bring in such miserable paupers and call them settlers?

That is a letter which, of course, I am bound to read to the House. I would rather the language were not so strong; but I think we ought to know what the Minister of the Interior is doing with those Galicians, and this man is a responsible farmer. Some time ago I called the attention of the Minister of the Interior to a paragraph that appeared in the newspapers with regard to the condition of the Galicians north of Saltcoats. I did so in the interests of the Galicians themselves. If these people were suffering, and if they needed help, it was the duty of the Minister of the Interior, who is responsible for bringing them in, to attend to them and to see that they had this doctor that my friend and correspondent deprecates, and the expense of whom he seems unwilling to pay—a feeling in which I do not at all sympathize with him; but what I want to point out is this. Here is a letter coming to me from a respectable farmer, and saying positively that a state of things exists as to which the Minister of the Interior a week or two ago assured me, I think by letter, across the House, that there was nothing whatever in it.

R

Mr. DAVIS. There might not be.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course, I cannot guard my correspondent; but I do not see how he could invent this out of the whole cloth. Since the 1st of July, 1896, to the 31st of December, 1898, we received 17,287 foreigners; and I have only to say that I myself have no inclination to shut the door in the face of any kind of immigrants who can assimilate with our people; but I repeat, what I have just said, that more energy should be devoted to bringing in immigrants from England, Ireland and Scotland, and in that way we would be not only fulfilling a duty to Canada and a duty to the mother country, but we should be supplying the very best material to mix with the foreign element, and to maintain the position of our country as a British colony.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I shall not take up much of the time of the House in discussing this question. As far as the Chinese are concerned, I must say that I am not interested in them and know very little about them. The hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior), however, appears to know very considerable about them, and he has told us that he has a Chinese cook. One thing, however surprises me, and that is if the state of affairs is such as he represents, how is it that although that hon. gentleman's party were in power about eighteen years, and although that hon. gentleman was a member of the late Government a short time ago, they did not do something towards doing away with this state of affairs in British Columbia, which he has so pitifully described this afternoon. Conditions certainly could not have changed so much in the last five years as to warrant radical measures now which were not required then. If the state of affairs he describes exists to-day, it must also have existed when he was a member of the Cabinet, and I should think that a gentleman of his pronounced views would have seen that that question was dealt with then. But it all depends, evidently, on whose ox is gored.

With reference to the Doukhobors and the Galicians, the hon. gentleman frankly told us he did not know anything about them. If he did not, he should have left the discussion and the bringing up of this question to some one else. He acknowledged that he did not know anything about them, and before the hon. gentleman got through he proved that admission very successfully. But he made some statements in which I cannot agree. One was that the people of Saskatchewan sent a petition to this House to have the Galicians withdrawn. I think he will do me the credit of saying that I should know a little more what the people of the Saskatchewan want than he. And for my part, I have never heard anything about such a petition, and if any such had been sent down here, I certainly

Mr. DAVIN.

would have heard of it. In place of the people of the Saskatchewan petitioning to have the Galicians withdrawn, we are getting in some more, so that we are evidently perfectly satisfied with them, and I can assure the hon. member for West Assinibolia that they are not dying off like sheep.

I was glad to see the stand taken by the hon. member for West Assinibolia (Mr. Davin). He did not agree with the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior). He had nothing to say against the Galicians and Doukhobors—not a word—but he made one remark which I regretted to hear in his speech, and that was his description of his own countrymen as a beggarly lot.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not say that. I quoted the well-known phrase of Shakspeare, "A beggarly array of empty benches." What I meant was that we had just got 733, and it was in reference to that small number that I made the quotation from Shakspeare.

Mr. DAVIS. I do not know what the hon. member meant, but he certainly made use of the expression that they were a beggarly lot.

Mr. DAVIN. No, I did not.

Mr. DAVIS. Of course, I accept his statement. The hon. member for Victoria alluded further to Prof. Robertson, who is the gentleman in charge of the Presbyterian missions in the North-west Territories and Manitoba, and he told us that Prof. Robertson had said something down here against the Galicians. I wish to draw his attention to the fact that I have here a letter from Prof. Robertson, who, I acknowledge, is an authority on immigration, because, owing to his connection with the mission in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, he has to travel a great deal over the country, it is part of his business to meet these people, and therefore an opinion from him must certainly have great value. I wish to read what Prof. Robertson has said of these same Galicians:

Dear Sir,—Mr. Knowles, of this city, whom I knew several years ago as a resident of Prince Albert, called to see me to-day on your behalf, asking for a copy of one of the papers in which an interview of mine, in reference to the Galicians, was published. I was sorry I could not oblige him, as I had no copy with me. The substance of the "interview" can, however, be given in a few sentences. Some of these people I saw at Dominion City, and a large number in the Dauphin district. Their young women I saw in private houses in Manitoba as servants. They impressed me as people of good physique, clean-blooded and energetic. From cap to clog their dress was peculiar, but a change here is easy. The dress of the Mennonites was and is peculiar, but they are proving themselves fair settlers. The Galicians, I was informed by those who knew them better than I, are industrious, frugal, thrifty, ready to do any kind of work at pre-

valling wages. A number of their young women go out to service, they learn our language rapidly, and seem anxious to know what is required to be done, and know how to do it to please. They are going to help to solve the "servant girl" problem.

If the hon. member for Victoria is troubled about the servant girl question, as he appears to be, since he told us he could not get a servant girl, and had to employ a Chinaman, although he does not seem to have much love for that class, let him come to the district of Saskatchewan and he will get there a very nice Galician girl.

At several places I was informed that these girls, after getting some needed clothes for themselves, sent regularly the most of their wages to help their fathers and mothers to make a home. Seeing some of their children playing at Dauphin, I said to them: "Are you not Galicians?" "No," they replied, "we Canadians; we not Galicians now." These children will grow up with the country. A deputation waited on the Rev. Dr. King, principal of Manitoba College, and myself, to ascertain whether something could be done to supply some of their people with missionaries. The interview was so satisfactory that we promised to do all in our power to help them. Two of their young men are now studying in Manitoba College with a view to the ministry; they are making satisfactory progress in their studies, and they are well thought of by their fellow students, and students in such cases are good judges.

These people may not be civilized up to our standard, they may not be so familiar with representative institutions as we are, they may be ignorant of our traditions, aspirations, ideas, but they seem to have in them the stuff of which good settlers are made. \* \* \* It might be added that it has come to my knowledge that several Canadians and "Britishers" have married Galician women, and that more of this work of assimilation is likely to go on. Canadian women seem to dislike the west, and necessity is laid on some men to seek foreign alliances. Let Galician girls become familiar with English, and promotions from kitchen to parlour, in present social conditions, will neither be few nor undesirable. Since the substance of this letter has already appeared in print, I cannot reasonably offer any objections to your showing it to any of your friends.

This is a letter from Prof. Robertson himself, who gives in it a very good account of the Galicians, and I take it he ought to know more about them than the hon. member for Victoria. With reference to the Doukhobors, the hon. gentleman did not seem to be any more pleased with them than with the Galicians. Well, I might tell the hon. gentleman that there are more bores in this country than the Doukhobors. He quoted from a newspaper out west called the "West," and also from the Edmonton "Bulletin." As far as the newspaper "West" is concerned, it is well known in the North-west as a terribly strong partisan organ, without any kind of love for the Minister of the Interior, and for that reason keeps slashing away at that hon. gentleman and his department. As regards the Edmonton "Bulletin," the hon. gentle-

man says that is a paper published by a gentleman who sits on this side and which ought, therefore, to have some weight. Well, all I have to say on that point is this. I have only to say that if we take into consideration the articles written in the same paper about the Edmonton route, it would seem that we cannot always credit what that paper says. The editor seems to take very strong objections to things that do not exactly suit him. I have here a clipping from a Conservative paper, the Stratford "Herald." This shows the opinion of a Conservative editor on the Doukhobors and the Galicians as well. This is quoted from an editorial:

Why should not the Galicians and Doukhobors in time make good citizens? How much better than they were the ancestors of many of those who are now glib in the utterance of gibes at the new immigrants? The great need of Canada is population, and the time has not come to be over-particular and dainty, and to insist that all new settlers must wear gloves and part their hair in the middle, and be experts as to when it is good table manners to use a knife, a fork or a spoon. It is more material to inquire whether they are fitted to coax into activity some of our millions of acres of idle lands and make them multiply business for our factories, our railways and merchants, and thus help to feed others besides themselves. Those who do not like the Doukhobors do not have to live with them; goodness knows Canada is big enough, and the vacant lots numerous enough, to keep them hundreds of miles apart. It is time to stop the nonsensical abuse of people who with a proper chance under good Canadian laws and language and institutions will, with little doubt, develop into useful and creditable Canadians. Who knows but we may have a Doukhobor for Premier some day, and why not?

This gentleman seems to have risen above partyism, and is willing to give the facts of the case. Now, here is another small clipping from the Montreal "Gazette" of yesterday. Talking about the idea of planting a colony of Doukhobors, which has been mooted for some time, the "Gazette" says:

The idea of planting a colony of Doukhobors in the Lake St. John district came too late to be taken advantage of, but their friends will be glad to know that the new immigrants made such a favourable impression on the French Canadians, who are evidently disposed to give the Doukhobors a warm welcome if they could have stayed in the province of Quebec.

There is a clipping from a paper that every hon. gentleman on the other side will say is a paper with a reputation for fairness—and I think I can say the same myself. A short time ago the people of Ontario were trying to get a colony of these same Doukhobors into the Rainy River district. There is not a province of the Dominion but would be glad to settle within its bounds; and, if my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior) knew them as well as he knows the Chinese, he would be trying to get a colony of them into British Columbia. Now, in a country like the North-west Territories, we cannot be so very particular about the immigrants we

get in as the hon. member for Victoria would like. He wants to know why we do not get Canadians into the North-west. We like to see Canadians coming in there; they are the very best settlers we get. But if the hon. gentleman takes a dollar from one pocket and puts it into another, he does not find himself any richer. To take people from one part of the country and plant them in another does not increase our population. We need the people from outside, who will take up land and increase the production of the country, for, with the increase of production, there will be an increase of consumption, and everybody will get a share of the prosperity thus caused. In the meantime, we cannot be too particular. I submit that the people coming from northern Europe are first-class people to get into the North-west Territories—Swedes, Norwegians and others of that class. Their climate is much the same as ours; they are accustomed to farming under the same conditions as they find in the North-west Territories. Any man who goes to the North-west, and is prepared to work hard and live cheap, as these people are, will succeed. These are the best class of settlers we can get. I travelled through the Galician settlement in my district last winter. I went through their buildings and stables, and I never found cattle—and I pretend to know something about stock—in better shape than the Galicians kept theirs. Their cattle were fat and looked well. The people were getting ready implements for the seeding in the spring. They were nice, clean-looking people, and were all working. I have never heard complaints of them, except from a few people who are scared and do not know what they are scared about. I had a letter, something the same as the one that has been read, wanting to know if these foreigners were going to have privileges that were not given to Canadians. Evidently, the writer had read in some paper—probably a Conservative paper—that privileges were being granted to foreigners that were not given to Canadians. I wrote to the gentleman, and asked him to explain what privileges they were getting. But he has not explained. I tried to get from the Minister of the Interior some privileges for three or four hundred families of Hungarians coming into my district. But he would not give any privileges, and said all people were treated alike. I think that if the gentlemen who are interested in this matter will look into it, they will find that people are treated the same, no matter what country they come from.

Now, the Mennonites have been mentioned. These people were brought in by the Mackenzie Government. They were abused, just as the Galicians and the Doukhobors are abused to-day. The country rang from end to end with complaints about these people who were being brought in and given the best land in the North-west Territories. As a matter of fact, the land

Mr. DAVIS.

they were given was a swamp, and that swamp at Gretna they have turned into a perfect garden. Their land to-day is worth \$40 an acre, and they are selling it out and coming up to the district of Saskatchewan. They have turned out among the best settlers that ever came into the North-west Territories. Since they have come into our district of Saskatchewan, we find that they are energetic and progressive. They are strong supporters of our public school system; they establish school districts, and send their children to the schools. Of course, these people are of the second generation. They live much the same as other Canadians—build the same kind of houses, buy the same sort of things: it is nothing to see them riding about on bicycles. My hon. friend from Victoria talks a great deal about getting in Anglo-Saxons. I suppose he alludes to Englishmen. We had a class in the North-west Territories and Manitoba in the early days—Englishmen—who did not assist much in the development of the country. We had a lot of gentlemen farmers around Calgary, and some in my own district. They are known in the North-west Territories as "remittance men," and I suppose my hon. friend from Victoria also knows something about them. They wanted to farm on horseback, or in a buggy, to wear top-boots, knee-breeches and eye-glasses. Of course, they went to the dogs. When their money was gone, they went out and abused the country, not only from end to end of Canada, but all over the old country as well. They said the country was no good.

Now, I claim these people are an injury. What we want in that country are farmers, men who understand agriculture. We do not care whether they are poor or not, men with good strong arms are the capital that we want in the North-west Territories. Another class of people was brought in there a short time ago, and I will give hon. gentlemen opposite credit for them. They brought in farmers from France. Those people have done remarkably well since they came in. There were about 150 families of them who settled in my district, and without exception they are about the best settlers that we have there. They are thrifty, and get along well. Of course the hon. gentlemen brought in a few notaries, and lawyers, and fellows like that, who had broken down in business. Those were soon starved out, and had to go back. But the men who knew anything about agriculture have all succeeded. I hope that the Minister of the Interior, in looking after immigrants, will bring in a few more of the same kind. The member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) gave us a list of the different nationalities that came in. I have here a statement of the number of immigrants of various nationalities coming in, and also the number of homestead entries, and these figures show the progress that is being made under the conduct of this business by the Minister of

the Interior. In 1897 there were 2,383 homestead entries made in the North-west Territories; in 1898 there were 4,528, just about double. In 1896, the last year that hon. gentlemen opposite were conducting the immigration policy of this country, there were only 456 homestead entries. I think that progress speaks well for the hon. Minister of the Interior. Now, here is a statement of the countries sending immigrants for 1897 and 1898. In 1897 there were: England, 1,519; Ireland, 69, and these, I may say, were all good immigrants. Scotland, 205; Germany, 520; Scandinavia, 474; French and Belgians, 383; United States, 712; Canadians, 2,373; Galicians, 4,363; Russians, 28; other countries, 218. In 1898 we find a remarkable increase. From England we received 3,203; Ireland, 266; Scotland, 701; Germans, 998; Scandinavians, 532; French and Belgians, 368; United States, 2,643. In 1897 we only had 712 from the United States, showing that we are making good progress in that respect. The totals are: 1897, 10,867; 1898, 27,856.

Now, I thought it strange at first that the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior) should bring this matter up, but after he had proceeded a little while and commenced to talk about these men getting on to the voters' list in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, he gave the whole situation away. He said that these people would get on to the voters' list, and that they would be an injury to the existing settlers up there. I do not know who he meant they would injure, but I suppose it would be his political friends. When he talked about their being dragged up by the official to votes he gave the whole thing away.

Mr. PRIOR. The quotation I read in regard to their being put on the voters' list was from a Liberal paper.

Mr. DAVIS. I accept the statement; I did not hear the hon. gentleman give the name of the paper. But I know he laid great stress about these people getting on the voters' list. He evidently believed what he read in that paper. He said they were going to be led to the polls like lambs to the slaughter by officials of this Government. I will tell the hon. gentleman that he need not be afraid. He must not underrate the ingenuity of his political friends in the west, because they will manage to get some of them. I read in a newspaper the other day where one of these men the hon. gentleman says are going to be dragged up to vote, and who had only been two years and a half in the country; some of the political friends of the hon. gentleman dragged him up, and got out some kind of papers for him, and got him put on to the voters' list in Winnipeg, but the affidavits were objected to and the scheme didn't work. The hon. gentleman's political friends are up to all kinds of tricks. They will get their share of the immigrants

coming into the country, or I am very much mistaken.

I may say that so far as my own district is concerned we are quite satisfied with the Doukhobors. We are getting a lot of them up there. Prince Hillkoff has picked out a place for them on the Saskatchewan where they are going to settle. I hope the Minister will send us some more of them. So far as the Galicians are concerned, we have lots of room for them. The hon. member for Victoria says it would be better to go slow in bringing out these people. Well, we have been going slow for the last 18 years. When the hon. gentlemen opposite took office in 1878, they found that country with some 25,000 or 30,000 people in it, and when they went out of office there were only some 75,000 people. As the result of their labours for 18 years, only 40,000 people were brought in. And yet the hon. gentleman advises us to go slow. I think we have been going very slow for the last 18 years, and it is time we got a move on to build up the country. They prophesied great things of what they were going to do for that country. The leader of the Opposition said that 400,000,000 bushels of wheat, I think it was, was going to come out of that country in a short time as the result of the immigrants they were going to bring in there. But their anticipations did not materialize, and one of the reasons was because they did not put people in there to grow this grain. We cannot raise grain without having somebody to work the soil. At the rate hon. gentlemen opposite were going, it would take 500 or 600 years before that amount of wheat could be produced. The Minister of the Interior has put as many people in that country in one year as they did in eighteen years, and still they are not satisfied. They object to these people because they are afraid they are going to be good voters, that is about the strength of it. I hope the Minister of the Interior will go on and bring in plenty more of the same class of people.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). The right hon. the First Minister referred to the fact that the Government had disallowed the British Columbia Bill making further restrictions upon the importation of Chinese and Japanese. In reference to Japanese immigration into this country, we, on this side of the House, can very easily come to the assistance of the Government, because, to my mind, there is a very wide distinction between the Chinese and the Japanese. As the Prime Minister has pointed out, the Japanese are the allies of Great Britain to-day and they have been in the past. It would properly be considered an unfriendly act for any portion of the British Empire, recognizing the responsibility we have assumed as a part of that Empire, and knowing the close and cordial relations which exist between the two powers, to do anything, such as is contemplated by the

legislation of British Columbia, against the Japanese. They are widely different from the Chinese in that they are more rapidly, than any people of whom we have any knowledge, acquiring European civilization. They are more anxious, perhaps, than any other people to adopt the English language, and to adapt themselves to British ways, British laws and the habits of civilized nations. The strong objection which is properly taken to the importation of large numbers of Chinese into this country does not apply with equal force, or perhaps with any force, to the importation of Japanese. In regard to the importation of these other classes of people, to whom reference was made this afternoon, I look with a good deal of apprehension, as I believe the people of this country will, on the efforts of the Government in bringing in these Galicians and Doukhobors and other peoples from the southern parts of Europe. Nearly thirty years ago, during the early settlement of Manitoba, the very best portion of that province was given up to the Mennonites. It was thought that they would be most admirable settlers, because they had many of the qualities which make good settlers. They had those qualities which we are told to-day characterize the Galicians and Doukhobors—industry, the desire to live on the farm, perseverance in their pursuits, and economy in living. For my part, I think the results of the settlement of the Mennonites are, in a great many respects, disappointing to the people of Canada, because they have not assimilated with the rest of the population in the country where they are living as it was expected they would and as it was desired. They have kept largely to themselves; they have continued their former habits of living, their forms of settlement and their system of education. There are many other things that we do not object to, because, although we have our system of Government, we know that it is not perfect, and, if there are other systems which experience has proved to be good, there is no reason why we should not profit by them. But after the lapse almost of a generation, we are told that these people are continuing to this day to keep themselves apart from the rest of the population and that they are not becoming Canadian citizens in the true and proper sense of the term. The Doukhobors are like them in many respects, I assume, having the qualities which the Mennonites have and which we thought would recommend them as admirable settlers in our North-west. The hon. Minister of the Interior told us what an admirable lot the Galicians were, how they had all the qualities that go to make good settlers, how they should be encouraged to come to this country and that the Government were doing what they could in that direction. In one breath he told us that, and, in another, he said: We are not going to discourage unduly their immigration, but we are going to discourage their immigration to

Mr. WALLACE.

a limited extent. Fifty thousand of them coming in one year would swamp us and would be injurious to Canada, but 5,000 would be an admirable number of Doukhobors to bring in each year, and we should encourage the immigration of that number. If the statements which the hon. Minister has made are correct as to the admirable qualities of these people, we could not have too many of them in a year, but the very fact that the hon. gentleman himself is discouraging their immigration to a larger extent than 5,000 people per annum, shows that he recognizes that the statements that he is making about these people must be taken at a discount. I am disposed to look with a great deal of apprehension upon the importation of Doukhobors and Galicians, and people of that stamp. Their traditions and history have been such as not to encourage us to have too many of them in our midst. My own observation and experience are that people from the north of Europe are the most desirable class of settlers that we can have in Canada outside of those from the British islands, or those who have been of British extraction, who have gone to the United States and are returning to Canada. They would not only be of assistance to Canada, but they would be assisting in that great Imperial work of building up the British Empire. If a British subject from the British islands goes to the United States he assists in building up that country, his children grow up to be American citizens, and may become hostile to Great Britain in a few years, but if he comes to Canada, he assists in building up the British power and influence on this half of the North American continent, and while he is assisting to build up the British Empire, he is helping us in Canada. This is the most desirable class of settlers we can get. After this class I think the best settlers we can get are these from the nations of the north of Europe. Many of the Icelanders have gone into Manitoba; they are an educated people; they have those qualities that characterize the men of the northern zone; they are industrious; they become good settlers and British citizens with British instincts and ideas. They rapidly acquire our habits and they assimilate themselves with our population. The same may be said of the inhabitants of Norway and Sweden. These people have gone, in considerable numbers, into the North-west Territories and Manitoba; they have scattered over the country and they have gone and settled among the Canadian people. They become Canadians themselves; they are anxious to adopt our language, to obey our laws and to be regarded as Canadians. That is not a theory, but it is the experience of the North-west Territories. They have scattered themselves among the English-speaking people up there. These are the classes that we should devote ourselves, I submit, to getting into this Dominion of Canada, and, from what I hear, these are

the classes to whom the least attention has been paid for by the immigration department of this country. I regret that, because the department of immigration has been proceeding on entirely wrong lines. I would sooner see 10,000 immigrants from the British Isles come to Canada than 20,000 or 30,000 of those Doukhobors, the immigration of whom the Minister himself admits we have to restrict. The English are a migratory and adventurous race; no matter how well off they may be at home, there instinct is to spread out to all parts of the earth, and it is men of our blood, men like those who have made Canada what she is to-day, whom we should encourage to come here to assist us in building up a great British nation on this half of the North American continent.

**Mr. HEWITT BOSTOCK** (Yale and Cariboo). Mr. Speaker, I was greatly pleased to-day to find the members from British Columbia, on both sides of the House, in accord on this question of Chinese immigration. I was not before aware that my hon. friend from Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior), took such a strong stand on this question, for I do not remember having heard that he brought forward the subject with any great force as a supporter of the late Conservative Government, or even as a member of that Government. The Act under which Chinese immigration is now regulated was passed in 1885, and as the Conservative Government was in power until 1896, they had considerable time to deal with this matter in a more stringent manner than they did. The stand taken to-day by the hon. member (Mr. Prior) is a good deal stronger than he has ever taken before.

**Mr. PRIOR.** Really, I am glad to hear that.

**Mr. BOSTOCK.** This Chinese question, of course, affects British Columbia a great deal more than it does any other portion of the Dominion, and in view of the vast extent of Canada, the difficulty we have is to impress the people all through the country with a correct idea on this, which is to some extent a local matter. There are many who think that the Act of 1885 applies to all Chinamen, but that Act is specially worded so as to deal with the objectionable class of Chinamen who are taken over here in herds, as slaves, to compete unfairly with the workmen of this country. These Chinamen have been accustomed to living in such a state of misery in their own country that they can afford to work for cheap wages here, and the ultimate result of such competition by them must be that our own workmen will be forced down to the same miserable level of life, a thing which we do not want in Canada. Any one who has been on the Canton River, as I have been, will see the

Chinamen swarming all over the river, practically covering the water with their boats, so that you can hardly see the river at all. They are born in these boats, live in them, are married in them and die in them, and practically they have no opportunity of availing of the advantages of civilization, such as we understand it on this continent. It is these Canton Chinamen, and the coolies from the rice fields who are brought over here by the Chinese companies and turned loose on the labour market of British Columbia. It is these that we desire to see kept out of Canada. The first section of the Act of 1885 expressly provides that the expression "Chinese immigrant" means,

Any person of Chinese origin entering Canada and not entitled to the privilege of exemption provided for by section 4 of this Act.

Section 4 of the Act specially exempts

The members of the diplomatic corps or other representatives and their suite and servants, as well as all consular agents, merchants, men of science and students, who are bearers of certificates of identity specifying their occupation and their object in coming to Canada, or other similar documents issued by the Chinese Government.

I point this out because I have reason to know that many gentlemen in this part of the country think that this law applies to all Chinamen entering Canada. As a matter of fact, the law does not apply to the better class of Chinese who have capital and who propose to go into business on their own account. Another strong objection to Chinese immigrants is that they do not settle on the land, or add to its productiveness. The only agricultural work they do is market gardening outside the cities, and they may be classed in the category of parasites, who live on the people of this country. They work for a number of years without spending much money in Canada, and when they accumulate sufficient money to go back to China, they do so and others come and take their place. I do not myself think that at the present time there is any danger of the people of British Columbia being placed at any disadvantage through, I might almost say, the Chinese being absolutely prohibited from entering this country. We have quite a number of them in there now, and all the time we have a large number of other immigrants who are ready to take their places, as soon as they know that these Chinamen are prohibited from coming into competition with them. I think it is very much more desirable, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), that we should have all through this country people such as these Galicians and others of that stamp to act as servants in our houses rather than these Chinamen. I do not class the Japanese in the same category as the

Chinese at all. I think the Japanese are a more amenable class of people, and are much more easily assimilated with the European population than the Chinese can ever be. The Chinaman is much too conservative in his ideas and opinions ever to adopt the customs and habits of European people. They will not take the trouble to study our institutions, and they are quite content to come to this country and make a living without trying to improve their condition further than they are naturally obliged to do by the work in which they engage. In regard to mining in British Columbia, in which they have shown themselves to be apt pupils, they came over in large numbers in the first rush, when mining was started in British Columbia. I find in some of the British Columbia reports that in the early sixties they had as many as three thousand Chinamen at Yale, and a large number of those were reported to have gone back to China, carrying sums varying from \$2,000 to \$4,000. These Chinamen never go out into the country, and find new ground for themselves, but we always find them following up the white man, and working over again the ground which he has already worked. They do not help forward the opening up and development of the country. I was very pleased to hear the statement made by the right hon. leader of the Government on this question this afternoon. The members from British Columbia on this side of the House, who have been pressing this matter on the attention of the Government for some time past, were very pleased to hear the leader of the Government express the view that he expressed in the House to-day, and I hope it will result in our obtaining the legislation which we desire.

With regard to the immigration into the North-west, I cannot say that I know very much about the people referred to. On coming down here at the commencement of the session, I saw a number of Doukhobors in Winnipeg and at other points along the line of the railway, and they certainly impressed me as being an exceedingly good stamp of settlers. They gave one the impression that they were a strong, healthy people who would be able to do a great deal in opening up and developing the uncultivated districts of our prairie country. I might almost say that it is an insult to people of that kind that the question of their coming into this country should be discussed with the question of the Chinese. What we want, as was said this afternoon by the hon. Minister of the Interior, is a class of people who will go out into the country and live on the land, and so create a market for the merchants and traders of this country who have goods to sell. The great tendency in every country at the present day, especially in the older countries, is for people to leave the land and crowd into the cities; and if we can secure for this country a class of settlers

Mr. BOSTOCK.

who will go on to the land, and build up communities in that way, it will help the merchant and the trader of the country. These people will form a nucleus, and they will also in time, I think, become imbued with the desire to become like the people among whom they live, and to adopt the manners and customs of the country.

Mr. A. McNEILL (North Bruce). I do not intend to detain the House more than a moment or two on this subject. In the first place, I was very sorry this afternoon, when my right hon. friend the leader of the Government rose to reply to my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior), that he adopted the tone of reply which he thought right to adopt. I am not complaining of his complaint about moving the adjournment of the House. That I think was a fair criticism; but I was very sorry that the right hon. gentleman thought it right to cast across the House a charge of breach of faith. I do think that is a thing which should only be done in case of most absolute proof. In this case there was really no excuse for it; and I think that we on this side of the House have reasonable ground for complaint that no withdrawal of that charge was made after the statement that was made by the Minister of the Interior. It is a very grave thing, for the leaders of one party to charge a breach of faith against the leaders of the other party in this House, because if we cannot trust one another in matters of that kind, we are in a very bad condition to carry on the business of Parliament.

With regard to the statement of the right hon. gentleman on the subject of Mongolian immigration into this country, I was very much gratified to hear it. I thought his utterance on that subject was broad, and strong, and statesmanlike, if I may venture to say so, and I was very much gratified indeed to hear him adopt the tone he did adopt in reference to it.

With regard to the other question, the question of the filling up of our North-west Territories by Galicians and other European peoples, I must say I cannot follow altogether what was laid down by the Minister of the Interior. I was very glad to hear him say that he was using great exertion to get British people into the North-west Territories, and also to hear him make the statement that he was successful in getting a number of British people to come from the United States to settle there. But when he spoke as he did about not being in favour of standing at the borders with a microscope and a bludgeon to keep out intending immigrants, and implied, if he did not state definitely—and I am almost inclined to think that he went so far as to make the definite statement—that he thought we ought to receive almost any one who came to this country from Europe in order that we might fill up our lands as quickly as possible. I must say, I wish to enter my protest. I

understood the hon. gentleman to say that he did not wish these people to come in in great numbers at once, but wished to see a flood of these people coming to the North-west Territory gradually. I venture to think that that is a very doubtful policy to pursue. With reference especially to foreign immigrants coming into our country, we ought to be exceedingly careful. I think it is very much better to move slowly and get immigration of the right kind, rather than to encourage in any way the immigration of people who will not prove to be, on the whole, suited to us in the long run. We know perfectly well that one of the great evils which is facing the republic to the south is this question of foreign immigration, and the fact that it has been overrun so much by that kind of immigration. For my part, I believe it is a dangerous doctrine to lay down, that we should encourage any considerable rush of these people into this country from the continent of Europe. I do not speak of Scandinavians; they are all right. But so far as these Galicians are concerned, from the information I have been able to gather about them—and I have information from one gentleman at least who is specially able to give an opinion on the subject, because he has been among them, and has seen them in their own country, and knows all about them—his assurance is, that they are a most undesirable class of immigrants. I venture to enter my protest against any policy which would subject us to the risk of being flooded by these undesirable foreign immigrants, men who will overcome, perhaps, if allowed to come in in numbers, the British element of this country—overcome it, I mean, in numbers. My idea is, that it would be very much better for us to move slowly and get in the right kind of people. I cannot agree with my right hon. friend that it is all right to bring in men who refuse to perform the first duty of citizens, namely, to take up arms in defence of the state. I do not think that is a good policy. I think it is a very great evil with regard to any class of immigrants, and a very serious objection, that they are not prepared to take up arms in defence of the country that protects them. So far as the Galicians are concerned, I understand they are a most undesirable class. What we ought to do is to try and build up a British country and not have our own people overrun and swamped by a number of undesirable foreigners from the centre of Europe.

Mr. J. V. ELLIS (St. John). I desire to say a word or two on this question. I do not very often trouble the House, and am in sympathy with the right hon. First Minister in his desire that we should endeavour to shorten in some way, if possible, the debates. I think that at this period of the session there ought to be an understanding, or agreement, or some rule, or method, arrived at by which the debates could be curtailed to the

necessary limits required by the business of the country. I am not going to make any criticism on the hon. gentleman, in this respect, who brought up this subject, but I think that we might, one and all, endeavour to facilitate business and get home. I followed the hon. gentleman with a great deal of attention, and I observed that, in endeavouring to make out a case, he quoted a number of newspaper blood and thunder articles about these people selling their wives; but he knows very well that that is a thing which occasionally occurs in England. He could take a file of English papers to-morrow, and, no doubt, cut out some paragraphs about Englishmen selling their wives. I read the other day an account of a Frenchman selling his wife, and must say that I was shocked by it, because that is very rare with Frenchmen, but I would not have been shocked, had it been an account of an Englishman doing the same thing, for hon. gentlemen who know English customs, know that we occasionally read of such a thing taking place among certain classes in that country. The courts do not authorize it, and no one would think of judging the English people by it. No one would think of quoting any paragraph giving an account of such a transaction, against the habits and customs of the English people.

The main impression left on my mind with regard to the North-west is the great extent of that country. When I dream of it by night or think of it by day, I see a great space of land that ought to be settled, and, therefore, I agree in the idea that it should be settled. I am not going to speak with regard to Chinese or Japanese, but with reference to the Galicians and Doukhobors. I saw quite a number of Galicians on different occasions, and they appeared certainly to be a tractable people, well subject to control, and to have come to this country with a sincere desire to eke out an honest living. They bring with them, of course, their national customs, and to a certain extent a national existence that may be more difficult to overcome than the customs of the Doukhobors, but if the civilization of this country is not equal to cope with the comparatively small number of people who will come in from Europe, if it is not capable of holding its own, it is a civilization that is not worth maintaining at all. I am satisfied there can be no people, at any rate from Europe, brought into Canada who will injure Canadian institutions or in any way crowd Canadian life, because the conditions in which we live, material as well as mental and moral, are of themselves sufficiently strong to overcome any difficulties that might present themselves in the character of a people who come from Galicia or any other part of Europe. With regard to the Doukhobors, I cannot speak of people whom I saw only for three or four hours, with any authority, but I was a witness of the landing of them

at St. John, when the first batch came across. I went over the ship, talked with the officers, talked with such of the men as I could find to talk with me through the interpreters of the Department of the Interior, and conversed with those who accompanied them, and who spoke the English language, and the impression I formed was, that they are a most desirable people to have in this country. I do not say that we should bring them in by the thousands, or tens of thousands, at one moment, but I think the ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace) rather misquoted the hon. Minister of the Interior with reference to what he said as regards numbers. I understood the hon. Minister to say that he desired only to bring them in in limited numbers, because he thought 5,000 were as many as could be controlled and managed by the officers of the department in one year. But, as regards the greater number, he was willing to spread it over a greater number of years. Now, the Doukhoborts are not a race, they are a sect. They leave their own country because they are driven out by the oppression and aggression of the dominant power there. They are driven along the same lines as English Quakers and dissenters were, some of whom were among the very best men in English history, men like George Fox and John Bunyan, men who were driven to the positions which they took by the tyranny of the magistrate, the injustice of the judge and the hardships of English prisons. And so the Doukhoborts were driven along the line of religious sentiment which has made them what they are by the national oppression of Russia. With these feelings or sentiments which they take up—I do not try to convert the House to Doukhobor sentiment—it was the most natural thing in the world that they should refuse to carry arms for a country which, if they did carry arms for it, would neither tolerate their opinions nor protect their property. The best thing they could do was to refuse to offer their lives to a country that refused to do anything for them. The forms of dissent from Russian orthodoxy which they have assumed must disappear in this country, because there is no ground for maintaining them—just as the Quakers have, to a large extent, disappeared, in the United States, and exist as a matter of sentiment rather than as a religious organization. So these sentiments of the Doukhoborts with regard to religion will, I believe, disappear in this country, and the Doukhobors will become a people like ourselves, not retaining their national habits, but under our institutions, with their industry and other good qualities, they will prove of great advantage to Canada. I found that on board the ship in which they came out they submitted themselves readily to the organization of the ship and to the officers of the ship. They assisted the officers by making an organization

Mr. ELLIS.

among themselves, and the men who were put to the front by them, they obeyed readily, doing all that was required of them. And when the landing took place and they were called upon to discharge their household goods and luggage, they laboured just as hard as any men possibly could to assist in that work. They were under perfect control. And the women of the party showed that they would readily take up with Canadian customs, because they esconced themselves at once in the comfortable cars provided by the Canadian Pacific Railway, quite as though they were used to those comforts, and at once began to make preparations to continue their journey. Many ladies of St. John came into contact with them in many ways during their short stay. The impression these people left was most favourable; and we all felt that it was a good augury for their future in Canada. Now, of course, I do not pretend to say what may happen in the future; but I am sure that these people have come here with the sincere desire to make good homes in Canada. I talked with their leaders, and that was the idea expressed throughout their conversation. Of course, everybody must be in sympathy with the suggestion made that we should have the best class of English, Irish or Scotch immigrants that we can get. But the day has gone by when we can take our pick. The British Empire has extended so wide that there are fields in every part of the world to which the British people can go. We must do the best we can under the circumstances, trusting to the power of our own civilization to make for these people comfortable homes here and to make them excellent citizens.

I dislike to detain the House, but I would like to mention that the sight of this ship-load of immigrants coming in and the incidents connected with it reminded an hon. gentleman who is a member of this Parliament, but not of this House, of an incident of sixty or seventy years ago. At that time, up one of the main rivers of New Brunswick, the Miramichi, a vessel came up the river laden with immigrants from Ireland. They were driven out of the ship, and upon the land, like sheep. The small group of English who lived there had not known that they were coming, and no preparation had been made for them. But something had to be done. The people who lived there thought they would be flooded by these newcomers, and the whole civilization of the place, such as it was, overturned. But natural sympathy asserted itself, and they made a place for the newcomers as well as they could. The third generation of those people are living to-day along the northern shores of New Brunswick and throughout the province. They have seats in the legislature, they have professorships and scholarships in the institutions of learning, and they are teachers of religion. They are as good citizens as it is possible to be. So, I believe,

the Doukhobors will set aside their peculiarities, having no need for them here, and they will be ready to discharge every duty of citizenship as other citizens do. Their coming will be a great advantage to the country. I believe that men who come here a generation from this will be satisfied with the policy that brought into the country a people who are so well disposed as I believe these people to be to advance the interests of Canada.

**Mr. McNEILL.** What nationality were the immigrants to whom the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ellis) referred to?

**Mr. ELLIS.** Irish.

**Mr. McNEILL.** I suppose they would make good settlers.

**Mr. WM. MCGREGOR (North Essex).** I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ellis), who has just taken his seat. In 1867, I had the pleasure of going to this North-west country, and I have had the pleasure of going there year after year since. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that to-day the great question for this Government to solve is the question how best to fill the western country, and how best to bring in there the things that the settlers require and to carry away to markets the products which are more than they can use. In 1867, we travelled 300 miles between St. Paul and Fort Garry, and there was not a single foot of that land occupied except at the Hudson's Bay posts. I had the pleasure of going over the same district last year, and I found every part of it occupied. In 1867 they did not grow a single bushel of grain in the larger portion of that district; last year they shipped from there one hundred millions of bushels of good Red Fife wheat. At that time the population of St. Paul was 19,000, and of Minneapolis 8,000. The population to-day of those cities is about 400,000. We should take advantage of the example which that country has shown us. We have a vast country to fill in the North-west. It is 800 miles from Winnipeg to Calgary, and the larger proportion of that country is fitted for settlement. We have 123 miles between Winnipeg and Rat Portage, and a very large proportion of that district is fitted for settlement. Then, when you take from Macleod to Edmonton and north, you find you have between four and five hundred miles from north to south of good country. The great question for this House to help this Government to settle is how to fill that country with the best people. It is true that we would be glad to ask England, Ireland and Scotland, Germany and France to send us the best they have. But those countries have been so employed with the demands of other countries that it is almost impossible to get a settler from them. We have to take

what is offered us. I had the pleasure of being in this House twenty-five years ago, when the bringing in of the Mennonites was discussed. Then, as the Premier has said, there was more trouble with regard to the Mennonites than there has been about the Doukhobors and Galicians. Then we had another little wrangle with regard to the Icelanders. To-day we know there is no better settler coming from a foreign country than the Iclander. We all desire to send as many Canadians as possible to the North-west, because they have been trained here and know our ways, and they are nearer and dearer to us. We would like to get as many Americans as we can, because they understand our institutions. Now, not being able to get the number and the class we want, we must take what we can get and make the best of them. I have seen the Galicians, and to my mind they will make good settlers. They have come here for the purpose of making homes for themselves, and have brought their all with them. As to the Doukhobors, I feel satisfied that they will be all right. As for the Mennonites, they have proved themselves to be all that we could desire. It is true they have ways of their own, but nevertheless they eat, drink and sleep as we do, and they consume goods as we do, and I think they will become useful citizens. We have no greater question to solve in this country than that of filling up our North-west Territories with good settlers, and giving them transportation facilities in and out. I well remember the immigration from Ireland that took place 50 years ago after the severe famine in that country. A large number came and settled in our district. They were very poor, and worked in the stone quarries and at any other hard labour that was required of them. But their sons and their daughters are now an honour to any country that they belong to. They hold high positions in our district. The daughters have married sons of some of our best men, and their sons have married into some of our best families. I have no doubt that these people who are coming from Europe to this country will give a good account of themselves. I hope the Government will pursue their immigration policy with energy, because the great need of our western country is immigrants, in fact that country is almost valueless without settlers.

**Mr. PRIOR.** The right hon. leader of the Government saw fit to call me to account for bringing this matter before the House before the Orders of the Day were called. The reason that he gave was that he did not consider it of sufficient importance to be brought forward at that period. Now, I think the right hon. gentleman, if he will cast his memory back a few years when he sat at the left of the Speaker, will remember several occasions when he brought for-

ward matters before the Orders of the Day were called, and when he was called to account for it by Sir John Thompson. So I do not think I am much to blame in view of these precedents. The right hon. gentleman saw fit also to charge me with a breach of faith in bringing it forward to-day, as he expected to take up some other business. Well, I can say this, that on Tuesday last I sent a letter to the Minister of the Interior telling him that next day, on the first opportunity, I would bring this forward before the Orders of the Day are called—I used those very words. The hon. gentleman came to me and asked if I would kindly take a seat on the front row of benches immediately before him, as he desired to be able to hear me clearly. Accordingly, on Wednesday I took my seat there, but the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) happened to catch the Speaker's eye before I did, and made a motion, so that I had to wait until to-day. The Minister of the Interior saw me before him with my books and papers and must have known that I was going to speak; so I do not know how I can be charged with a breach of faith. Besides that, the leader of the Government has cut off any chance there was for myself or any person else to speak on the Chinese question, by taking the only private members' day there was left. More than, that, when the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) brought up his motion it was declared to be out of order, which was tantamount to saying that there was nothing more to be said about it. The right hon. gentleman seems to think this matter is not urgent because it has been brought before the House for the last 25 years. Why, Sir, I think that fact shows that it is all the more urgent, it having been left in suspense for so long a time. Another thing the right hon. gentleman said was that I was appealing to the worst passions in a portion of the people. Now, if one of the worst passions of a man is a desire to save himself from fearful competition with a miserable rate of wages on which he cannot live decently and keep his wife and family, I say that is a singular expression of one of the worst passions. I am glad that I have noticed in this discussion a great change in the feeling of the members in regard to the Chinese question. Hitherto when this matter has been brought up there have been several members on both sides of the House to protest emphatically against any restriction being placed upon the Chinese. I remember distinctly the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) being very emphatic in his protest. I have only to say in conclusion that I must again urge upon the right hon. gentleman the desirability of putting a higher tax on the Chinese than exists at present, in order to try and keep them out of the country.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

Mr. PRIOR.

## REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 126) respecting Representation in the House of Commons.—(Mr. Mulock.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), in moving the second reading of this Bill, and in speaking upon it yesterday, stated that any suggestion which he thought was perfectly fair, he would be willing to embody in the Bill.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I hardly went as far as that, did I?

Mr. HAGGART. You went as far as that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Did I say any suggestion that one side thought fair?

Mr. HAGGART. Not at all. The hon. gentleman said that if he thought the suggestion a fair one, he would embody it in the Bill. I will draw his attention to a statement made by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) the other day. The principle which the hon. Postmaster General introduces in the Bill is one of county boundaries. The hon. member for Welland has a strong claim that his constituency should not be interfered with. This constituency, as he stated, was a constituency returning a member of Parliament before confederation. By the Imperial Act, making the electoral districts of the country, Welland was set apart in precisely the same state that it is found at the present day. There has been no change from that time down to the present, and all the reasons which apply to municipal or county boundaries apply more strongly to Welland, because the people have been accustomed, within that district, to return members for that particular portion of it. It is sanctioned by a higher authority than even municipal or county boundaries. The district was set apart by the Imperial Act at the time of confederation. Surely that is a stronger reason for no interference with it than the application of the principle of county boundaries. On the one hand, you have the electoral district set apart by the Imperial Act, at the suggestion of the parties to confederation, while on the other hand you have the argument of judicial or county boundaries which may be altered from time to time by provincial authority. There has been another strong reason advanced on the very ground taken by the hon. Postmaster General as to the setting aside of electoral districts within county boundaries, and it is the claim put forward by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). He states that the three ridings

of Bruce are within the county boundaries. According to the directions which are to be given to the judges the division shall be made as nearly as possible according to the numbers in the constituency. But as the hon. member has pointed out, the county is now divided as perfectly as it possibly could be. That argument has not been challenged in this House, and the only claim that was made was that of the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), who said that, in 1882, a grievous wrong had been done in that constituency, and that it was proposed to remedy it. My hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) stated that he has complied with every condition that is required under the present Bill. When the riding, as at present constituted, in 1898, according to the census of 1891, complies with all necessary conditions, is it an argument to say that in 1882 an injustice was perpetrated. There are two cases, the fairness of which I commend to the hon. Postmaster General, and provision for which he should make in his Bill.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Mr. Chairman, without now giving a final reply to the suggestions of my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart), I may, at least, be able to make some observations in reference to this proposal. The hon. gentleman claims that the electoral county of Welland should be retained because it was one of the electoral districts named in the Confederation Act. The same might be said of the electoral county of Monck, which was also an electoral county provided for in the Confederation Act. Yet, the late Government, in 1882, saw fit to abolish the electoral constituency of Monck, created by that same constitution. It was not abolished on account of a lack of population, because, at the time of its abolition in 1892, it had a population of 15,940. There were other constituencies at that time with a less population which were retained. If, because its population was not quite up to the unit, it was abolished, one would have thought that the first change, on that ground, would have been in a constituency which had a smaller population. For instance, Brockville had a population of 15,107. Leeds and Grenville had a population of 12,443, yet Leeds and Grenville was not interfered with.

Mr. Haggart. Yes, it was.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. It was not wiped out.

Mr. Haggart. No.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. It was retained. While the late Government abolished Monck, with a population of 15,900, they did not put the pruning-knife, apparently, where it ought to have first been placed if the question of population determined them on that occasion. More-

over, I can point out that the same Confederation Act created a large number of constituencies, naming the component parts of each of them, and yet the late Administration, and all previous Administrations since that day, have felt it to be perfectly in harmony with the spirit of confederation to change electoral districts that for the moment had a place in the Confederation Act. The Confederation Act itself contemplates changes from time to time, in all the constituencies. It provides for taking a census with the view of making changes, and these changes have not been limited at all, but sometimes have resulted in the detachment of parts of one riding, and their being transferred to another; in other cases the abolition of ridings, and in other cases the union of ridings. I might remind my hon. friend that there is a more glaring case, if it is wrong to interfere with Welland as it existed under the Confederation Act. Let me remind my hon. friend that, in 1882, the late Government abolished a county that had a statutory existence. They took the county of Stormont and Cornwall, that by the Confederation Act formed two separate constituencies, and returned two separate members, and they wiped out one of them altogether. They united these two counties.

Mr. Haggart. Are you not finding fault with all this?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I am only pointing out to my hon. friend that he is estopped from taking exception.

Mr. Clancy. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) permit me to ask him a question? The hon. gentleman has stated, over and over again, that the single and one reason, above all others, was to undo what hon. gentlemen alleged was wrongly done in 1882. The hon. gentleman has pointed out that nothing of this kind was done in 1882 and it is to that question—

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Will the hon. gentleman state his question, and let me proceed? The question I will be pleased to hear, not an argument. I could illustrate in many ways wherein the scheme of representation set forth in the Confederation Act was departed from from time to time, and, therefore, I can hardly think that my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) is very sincere in his criticism, for if he be, he is condemning his own conduct in the past. The county of Wentworth, and the county of Niagara, and others, disappeared by legislation of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, I will say why it is necessary to deal with Welland.

Mr. Haggart. You dealt with that yesterday.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I did not allude to Welland, except to say that it was a county which had not sufficient population to give it two members, and could,

therefore, only have one ; but in all cases in this Bill, where we are affecting any municipal portion of a county, then that county is brought wholly under the provisions of the measure. We are giving back to the county of Lincoln what belongs to the county of Lincoln municipally, and we are detaching from Lincoln what belongs to other counties municipally, and that means that we have to take from Haldimand in order to give to the counties entitled to them their municipal portions which are in Haldimand. That involves giving to Welland what belongs to Welland. You cannot adopt the principle of county boundaries in any of the counties that are the subject of this Bill, without having to do what the whole Bill does. You cannot do less than undo the gerrymander which set up these eight hives. I know of no way in which you can do this, if we are to undo the wrong of 1882 and 1892. In 1892 you made these changes in Lincoln, in Welland and in Haldimand, and we are only undoing these changes. You abolished Monck that time, and now we are only straightening out the county lines. My hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) says that at present the county of Bruce is as fairly divided as possible. I shall not controvert that proposition, but no one will deny that in 1882 that county was improperly divided.

Mr. McNEILL. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) allow me to make a remark, as it may save him some trouble ? I wish to explain to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) that I do not ask any favours from him whatever. Let the county of Bruce go to the judges. That is all I want.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The representative of North Bruce is perfectly content with the measure so far as it affects the county of Bruce, and so that is the best answer I could give to my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy).

Mr. McNEILL. I do not want my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) to misunderstand me ; I will put it in that way. I did not say that I was satisfied with the measure so far as the county of Bruce is concerned. I think it is a villainous measure so far as the county of Bruce is concerned. I will explain what I mean by saying there is no possible reason why the county of Bruce should be interfered with at all. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has not been able to show the shred of a thread of a filament of a reason for interfering with Bruce. He and those beside him have been challenged for a reason, but they have not been able to show a shadow, or the ghost of a shadow, of a reason.

Section 2 of the Bill agreed to.

Section 3 of the Bill agreed to.

Mr. MULOCK.

On section 4,

Mr. HAGGART. Before this clause of the Bill is passed, I would like the fulfilment of a promise that was given by the Postmaster General and by the Prime Minister, that before the passage of the Bill, he would include, if necessary, in the Bill itself the names of the judges to whom he intended to refer the division of the counties.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not aware that it was ever stated by any Minister that the names of the judges would be mentioned in the Bill. What the First Minister stated was, that, before the Bill became law, he would announce to the House the names of the judges whom it was proposed to invite to work it out.

Mr. HAGGART. Before the Bill passes this House ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, before it leaves this House. I think it was promised for the third reading.

Mr. HAGGART. You can do that tonight, if we hear that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know whether my right hon. friend has selected the judges.

Mr. CLANCY. I asked the Postmaster General and the First Minister if they proposed to attach, as a schedule to this Bill, the instructions to be given to the judges. It is well that the committee should have these instructions before them, and I suppose the hon. gentleman will not ask that the Bill should go further until he at least announces the instructions which will be given to the judges.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Shall this clause be adopted ?

Mr. CLANCY. Not yet.

Mr. McNEILL. It is very important that some information should be given the committee on that point. It is important that we should know whether the judges shall hear any evidence on the subject. In the mother country the commissioners there did hear evidence. One of the commissioners held a sitting in each constituency, and they advertised in the local papers their provisional scheme which they had prepared beforehand, and also advertised a day on which they would hear evidence for discussion, so that the people had an opportunity to go and present their views before the commissioners, and the commissioners in their report say that they were able, by the valuable information they obtained, to modify their provisional scheme on several occasions to very great advantage. I would like to know whether any system of that kind is to be adopted in Canada, or whether the judges are to be precluded from hearing evidence, as they are to be precluded from tak-

ing notice of the change of population which have taken place since 1891.

The **PRIME MINISTER** I am quite sure my hon. friend ought to approve of the disposition of the Bill which precludes the judges from entering into an investigation as to increase or decrease of population. The subject of population can be considered only after a decennial census. We have to take the population, not as it is now, because we do not know it. We have to rely upon the census of 1891, and as to that I think my hon. friend ought to be satisfied. With regard to the other point which he has raised, whether the judges are to hold a court, the Bill does not contemplate that. I refer my hon. friend to subsection 2 of section 2, which gives the instructions to the judges. I am aware that in England the commissioners who were appointed to divide counties and boroughs and cities into ridings, and who were called boundary commissioners, were required to look into old marks and charts and records to find out the true boundaries of the different divisions with which they had to deal. I doubt if there is any such necessity in Canada. Our maps in that regard are different to those of England. Our country is a new country. It was first laid out into townships and the townships are well known by numbers, by concessions, and so on. The divisions that have taken place in the municipalities are also well known. The judges will have the map before them, and having that, they will have all the divisions on which they are to proceed. It may be that the judges will require some more information for their own sake; and if so, I suppose they will decide how they shall obtain it. But it is not contemplated by the Bill that they should hold a court.

Mr. **CLANCY**. The hon. gentleman has not yet stated what the instructions to the judges will be, or whether they are embodied in the Bill, in subsection 2 of section 2, or whether they are to go further than that, because the instructions there are only stated in a general way. Therefore, I shall have to repeat my question and ask the right hon. gentleman if the instructions to be given to the judges based on that subsection, are to become a schedule of this Bill?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. No, it is not so contemplated.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Then, surely the right hon. gentleman does not propose that the Government shall have conferred on them such powers of legislation? If the right hon. gentleman thinks the instructions given in this subsection are sufficient, then perhaps the committee might be content; but this committee ought to know whether that is the case, or whether, this subsection is simply the basis of the instructions to be given.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. There will be no variation from what the Bill contains.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Then the hon. gentleman is at variance with his leader, who does not assent to the proposition that this is the only instruction. I should like to have that made clear.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. This contains all the instructions, I understand. There cannot be any other understanding of this clause than that all the instructions to be given to the judges are contained in subsection 2 of section 2.

Mr. **WILSON**. The Prime Minister also explained that if the judges could not get what information they required from the maps, they were to get other instructions.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. No; other information.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Have you fixed on the time limit within which the judges are to send their report?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. The time has been left, I believe, to the discretion of the judges. I have no objection to the time being limited to a very narrow period.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The time is to be limited by the letters patent.

Mr. **HAGGART**. That time would be fixed by the Government. Have they fixed any time?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I do not know that it would be possible to limit the time absolutely; but I can say to my hon. friend that the intention of the Government is to make the time as short as possible.

Mr. **McNEILL**. I would like to call my right hon. friend's attention to one matter. Of course, as we all understand there is a very formidable objection, which was brought forward in this House in 1892, when some of us were urging that a step of this kind should be taken and a commission of judges appointed. That objection is that it is bringing judges too closely into contact with party issues. I want to ask my right hon. friend what steps the Government are taking to see that the right course in this respect shall be properly safeguarded, so that the judges will understand that they are to deal with this matter as the commissioners in England dealt with it—simply on the lines of geography, population, and convenience—and that the party issue shall be excluded; because, if not, then I should say that it is a very serious blunder that is being made.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I do not think my hon. friend has really any cause to put to me such a question as that. The character of the work to be done by the judges is well defined in the language of section 2,

which I shall quote again for the benefit of the hon. gentleman :

2. The letters patent appointing the commissioners shall direct them, in making the divisions, to consider the distribution of population according to the latest census of Canada, the public convenience, and such divisions as appear to them best calculated to do substantial justice.

Mr. McNEILL. These are very wide words.

The PRIME MINISTER. So they are. What is substantial justice? It is not to look after the interests of the one or the other party, but of all the electors, so that an honest expression of their opinion may be obtained. That is the only instruction, I believe, the judges ought to have, and that is the only view which judges of the high character we intend to appoint would admit themselves warranted in accepting. It will be the endeavour of the Government to select men who, I hope, will be satisfactory to all parties in this House, and if it were possible that this division of counties should be separated from political considerations, I would much prefer it. I may say that three years ago I made a motion that a Bill of this kind should be referred to a committee of this House, selected by both parties. This motion was not accepted. I do not know that I have changed my views. I would prefer that this question should be dealt with by a committee of both parties, but I know very well, from the attitude taken by the leaders of the Conservative party at that time, that such a proposition would not meet with their acceptance. They did not give any reason for their opposition, but simply refused to entertain the views I held. I considered then that the best thing to be done was to refer the matter to judges whose public character and position and the confidence which they enjoy, not only because of their high office, but because of the ability and impartiality which they have acquired as judges, would be the best guarantee of a proper and just settlement of this question. For my own part my desire is that the judges should deal with this matter, apart altogether from political considerations.

Mr. McNEILL. I am very glad to have the very satisfactory statement of the right hon. gentleman in that regard. That was the only danger I thought of with reference to the appointing of the judges. With regard to the proposition of the right hon. gentleman in 1892, when the Act of that year was being discussed, I remember that I myself opposed it and did so on the ground that it would not be satisfactory to the party which would be in the minority upon the committee. At that time a committee of this House had just held a very laborious investigation, and the result of its report was not satisfactory. Many members on that committee, on both sides, had worked with

the greatest possible conscientiousness, but when the report was brought down it was not possible to deal with it in any other way than on party lines, and I felt that if we accepted the hon. gentleman's proposition to have the redistribution of seats—a question which touches most closely many members of this House—referred to a committee, the result of a report of such committee would not be satisfactory, but would be regarded, to some extent, at all events, as a party report.

Mr. SPROULE. It cannot be expected that the judges will be so familiar with every locality that they will be able at once to come to a conclusion as to how it would be best to divide counties, so as not to interfere with the commercial and social relations of the people. I therefore assume that they must have information from some source so as to enable them to come to a conclusion, and if they do not hold an open court, how will such information reach them? It must be by private representation of some kind, and in that case are we not justified in supposing that representations may reach the judges from sources that might, to some extent, be politically biassed. It seems to me it would be much better for the judges to hold open court and obtain what information they desire in open court than in a private manner.

The PRIME MINISTER. If that mode of procedure were adopted, I am afraid you would have the two political parties wrangling before the judges. It is true, the judges cannot have at this moment complete information regarding every part of Ontario, but with the information at their hand, by means of the dissemination of local literature and the public press and the well known geographical works we have of the country, it will be easy for the judges to obtain all the information they desire in order to come to a proper decision.

Mr. SPROULE. The same difference arises in mapping out districts for the division courts, and the judges in that case apply to people in the localities for information. I have seen them do so several times. The judges living in the county themselves do not pretend to know the locality as well as people living there, and have frequently appealed to public men in those localities for their advice and information as to where the lines should be drawn.

Mr. HAGGART. It appears to me that by the Bill the Government have no power to limit the proceedings of the judges under the letters patent :

2. The letters patent appointing the commissioners shall direct them in making the divisions to consider the distribution of population according to the latest census of Canada, the public convenience, and such divisions as appear to them best calculated to do substantial justice.

You cannot give the judges any more or limit them to anything less than what the Act provides. I think that, under this clause, the judges can do just as they please.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** In the lines of the clause.

**Mr. HAGGART.** In the lines of the clause.

**Mr. CLANCY.** It is a matter of sincere regret that the right hon. gentleman sacrificed his principles, and what he believes his conscientious duty, to a party triumph. He says that his own view was, and now is, that the better way would be to refer this to the party leaders, and by a conference settle the question amicably and fairly. But he was afraid to approach the leader of the Opposition, because he thought the leader of the Opposition might not accept the proposition to deal with the question in that way. It does seem to me that the remedy was in the right hon. gentleman's hands. He must feel that if he could not reasonably approach the leader of the Opposition, it was because he was entering upon the course he has taken at an improper time, when no hon. gentleman on this side could well consent to it. Whatever he might think of the hon. gentleman's proposition, he would feel that it was almost impossible to accede to it at this moment. We now have a statement from the right hon. gentleman that he has adopted a view entirely at variance with what he thought to be the proper thing. He says this for the purpose of carrying out what the country must know to be a rather worthless pledge, a pledge for the neglect of which I am pretty sure the country would absolve him. But, if now the party leaders could not get together the reason seems apparent. The right hon. gentleman has given it plainly, and the country will understand.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is rather too smart. The pledge we took was to have the Gerry-mender Act dealt with and reformed.

**Mr. McNEILL.** Which Gerry-mender—this one?

**The PRIME MINISTER.** The Gerry-mender Act with which the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) is very familiar, and with which he had something to do. I must say that I would prefer, and I suggested in 1892, that the party leaders should meet in committee and try to come to an understanding. But the proposition I made was spurned; and, it having been spurned once, I did not care to propose it a second time.

On section 5,

**Mr. A. MARTIN (East Queen's, P.E.I.)** Before this Bill was introduced, we were

told that we were going to have a fair Bill, a consistent Bill, and one which would be just to every part of the country. We were told that it would follow closely certain principles. But we find that in the Bill one principle is followed for one part of the country, and another for another part of the country. When they deal with western Ontario, they make a fetish of county boundaries. But when they come to eastern Ontario their zeal for county boundaries dies out. Even in the county next to the city of Ottawa we find that their zeal for county boundaries vanishes away. They go down a little further, and when they come to New Brunswick, there their love for the maintenance of county boundaries breaks out afresh. And when they come to Prince Edward Island, they pretend that county lines are sacred in their eyes and must be maintained. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) told us the Bill was intended to correct some mistakes in Ontario made by the Bill of 1882. Why, then, should he deal with Prince Edward Island. No change was made in the representation of Prince Edward Island in 1882, nor was any made at any time under Conservative rule until there was a change in the proportion of population and the number of representatives from that province reduced from six to five. Then, I ask the Minister of Customs why touch Prince Edward Island at all. The hon. gentleman told the House they had another reason—that they were pledged to do it by the Ottawa platform of 1893. But if the Minister would think it over he will remember that there are many things this Government were pledged to do that they have not done. Will he rise in his place and say they have fulfilled all their pledges? After all, what are these pledges? They were not all made in the interest of the country. I believe that every pledge they made in the interest of their party they are going to fulfil, and every pledge they made in the interest of the country they are going to break. The Franchise Act and this Gerry-mender are plainly in the interest of the Liberal party. If they had the confidence of the country, they would have no reason to introduce the latter. Did they fairly and equitably carry out their pledge with regard to prohibition? Was it a fair thing for three or four Ministers of the Government to go down to Quebec and speak against a measure that, they said was in their platform? Again, have they fulfilled their pledges with regard to expenditure?

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Question! We are not dealing with the expenditure now.

**Mr. MARTIN.** The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) is getting a little impatient. Perhaps I may be able to give him something that will interest him before I sit

down. As the hon. Minister does not want me to refer to the pledges of the Government which are unfulfilled, those which were in the interest of the country, perhaps I may turn my attention to something bearing very directly on the question at issue. The population of King's County is 26,633; of Queen's County, 45,975; of Prince County, 36,470. Now, you give two members to Prince County. We will say that one of them will represent the same population as the member for King's. Then, the other will represent only about 9,000 people. And that I suppose is what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries thinks is fair-play. Now, let us look at the voting power of these three counties. The voting power of King's County is far greater, according to population, than the voting power of either Prince or Queen's. The voting power of King's County is 7,120, the voting power of Prince County is only 8,198. That is, Prince County has only a little over 1,000 votes more than King's County. Prince County will have two members for a voting population of 8,198, and King's County will only have one member for a voting population of 7,120. Can the hon. member justify that? I think the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is the man who is responsible for this proposed change, and I think he must have misled his colleagues in making it. In 1892 Prince Edward Island was divided into five ridings, and the population of those ridings was equalized as nearly as possible. Under the existing distribution, King's has a population of 21,694, East Queen's 23,464, West Queen's 22,210, East Prince 20,723, and West Prince 20,978. That was, in my opinion, a fair and equitable distribution of the province and was accepted in Prince Edward Island as such. Evidently the reason for this new change is political, the object is to gain a political advantage. The hon. gentleman, when this Bill was discussed in 1892, misrepresented the state of facts—I do not say he did it willingly—but whether willingly or not, he misrepresented the state of facts in regard to the distribution that was made at that time. He said at that time that his riding was East Queen's. He assured this House, I have an extract of his speech in my hand, that East Queen's was his riding. He also assured the House that they were going to dump 300 of a majority into East Queen's in order to swamp him. Now, Mr. Chairman, instead of there being a majority of 300 in East Queen's that he had to overcome, the actual majority he had to overcome was only 40 votes. Surely the leader of the maritime Liberals, as he was styled at that time, could go into East Queen's and overcome the majority of 40 votes. I will give the House the position as it stood after the election of 1891. In the part of King's that was attached to East Queen's, that is

Mr. MARTIN.

lots 61, 63 and 64, there was a majority for McLean, who was running against Dr. Robertson, of 33 votes; in Queen's County, at Fort Augustus, there was a majority for Mr. Ferguson of 18 votes; in lot 24 there was a majority for Ferguson of 149; that is Ferguson's majority, including Mr. McLean's, in lots 61, 63 and 64, in the whole of East Queen's would be 201. Davies's majority at Belfast, which was the only place taking East Queen's only where he had a majority at that time, would be 161. Take 161 from 201, and you will have the exact majority that he had to overcome, only 40 votes. When the election day came round the hon. gentleman did not run for East Queen's at all, he ran for West Queen's. Now, these hon. gentlemen do not pretend to respect representation by population. They pretend to have great regard for county lines. They have introduced this Bill out of season. I have here what the present Prime Minister in 1892 said on this question, as found on "Hansard," page 3115:

Mr. LAURIER. Apart from the dispositions of this Bill, to which it must be my unpleasant duty to allude presently, the very fact that this measure has been postponed and put off until, I may say, the dying hours of the session, is in itself sufficient to deserve the most severe censure of this House.

Now, I do not think that you can find any where anything more applicable to the present position than these words of the present leader of this Government in 1892. The present Bill is introduced out of due season, and I could quote from the present Prime Minister in 1892 to prove it. They were already quoted. But we also had some prophetic words from the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries in 1892. What did he say on that occasion in regard to what might be done if his party came into power? Turn to page 3241 of the debates of 1892, and you will find that hon. gentleman saying:

And when the party which is excluded for the time being happens by a combination of accidents to be returned to power,—

That combination of accidents took place, and they were returned to power.

—that party will be, perforce driven to adopt the same unjust and unfair system, and will introduce a Redistribution Bill not founded on justice or on the lines of the constitution,—

Well, I think that is a prophecy that has been fulfilled in this Bill.

—and intended to give the people a fair means of representation, but intended to promote the interests of the party alone.

Has not every word of that been fulfilled? His party having been returned to power, by a combination of accidents, they have introduced a redistribution Bill which is not founded on justice and which is not upon the lines of the constitution.

The hon. gentleman, when discussing that Bill at that time, took the hon. members of

this House to England for an example of what a redistribution Bill should be, and he stated what Gladstone had done :

Certain principles on which the Redistribution Bill should be based were proposed by Mr. Gladstone. He invited his great opponent to a conference, they sat in conference from day to day with their lieutenants on both sides. Lord Salisbury broadened the measure to suit the interests of his party, and what he conceived to be the wants and requirements of the country, and eventually the Bill, which threatened at one time to involve a dead-lock, was presented to the House as the joint product of both political parties of the state, and passed into law.

When the hon. gentleman was on this side of the House he told us that he had high ideals, and this was what the party then in power should do. Then, take example from England, What did they do to-day? They introduced this Bill, as he prophetically said they would introduce a Bill, which was not founded on justice or the lines of the constitution. Further on the hon. gentleman says :

I invite the attention of the House to that Act.

That is, to the British North America Act.

On reading the section to which I refer, it will be seen that the framers of the Act never intended that the redistribution of seats should be entrusted to the dominant party for the time being.

What is he doing now? Is it not entrusted to the dominant party? Is not this Bill to be forced through the House by the party vote? Certainly it is. Further on he says, and it bears on the constitutional question whether or not it is in the power of this Government to introduce this Bill at all :

I ask the House to take a higher view of their responsibilities,—

That was a very nice thing to say then, but he will not say it to-day.

—and I say that the Imperial Parliament determined in passing the law, that not only should the lines and principles be laid down, but that at every decennial census you should make a change in these lines and principles to suit the changed conditions of the country.

He was evidently under the impression, and I believe in his heart that he is under the impression yet, that all this should be done after a decennial census. He has repeated that in his speech three times. Again, the hon. gentleman says :

The Act does not say that the Parliament shall lay down what for all time shall be the lines and principles to be followed,—

While they must lay down certain lines, he says that these lines may not continue for ever. The next Parliament might change them. One Parliament might come in and say: We believe in county lines. Another Parliament might come in and say: We do not believe in county lines; we believe in representation by population; but in this

Bill one or the other is adopted as it suits their party. He says :

The Act does not say that the Parliament shall lay down what for all time shall be the lines and principles to be followed, but that Parliament, after every decennial census, shall lay down those lines and principles.

Further on he says :

You have no authority arbitrarily to cut and carve as you please.

That is what they are doing in this Bill.

The law does not give it to you. A limitation has been placed upon your power. It does not say that you "may" do so and so, but you "shall." The imperative is used, and you "shall" do so, not once for all, but from time to time, after each decennial census you shall readjust.

If time would permit I could quote further from what the hon. gentleman said in giving his opinion on this question. I wonder that hon. gentlemen, who occupy the Treasury benches, could so far forget the traditions of the Liberal party as to forsake the policy of representation by population. I have here extracts from speeches of hon. members which bear on this point. For Prince Edward Island we should have the province divided according to population, which is a tradition that has been held sacred by the Liberal party from time immemorial. I have here the debates of the Parliament of Canada on confederation. I have expressions of opinion from the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, George Brown, Sir John Macdonald and others, every one of them advocating representation by population, but you cannot find one word about county lines. The idea was when they arranged this confederation that representation by population was to be the basis of the House of Commons. We find Sir John Macdonald using these words :

In settling the constitution of the Lower House, that which peculiarly represents the people, it was agreed that the principle of representation, based on population should be adopted, and the mode of applying that principle is fully developed in these resolutions.

And then you have the Hon. A. A. Dorion : quoted by Solicitor-General Langevin, speaking as follows :—

At the same time, I said that if these views were not accepted, I should certainly be in favour of representation based on population, with conditions and guarantees which would secure the interests of Lower Canada, and preserve to Lower Canada the institutions which are so dear to her.

Mr. Mackenzie said, speaking in regard to representation by population :

In the first speech I ever made in this House I used the following language :—

"I am not myself bound down to representation by population as the only possible measure. If the opponents of that measure can suggest any other remedy I am quite willing to give it a candid consideration; and I am quite sure that

the large constituency I represent will support me in considering any measure which will place it out of the power of the Government of the day to perpetrate sectional injustice.

Further on, the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie says :

Up to the beginning of 1862 the agitation for a redress of this grievance had been carried on throughout the whole of western Canada ; and I am convinced that at that time there was not an individual who could appear in public in Canada West, and take any share in the public discussions of the day, with any chance of getting a favourable hearing, unless he asserted that he was in favour of representation by population.

Again, on page 422, he says :

There is, or there was then, a popular opinion that the Lower Canadians were only afraid of representation by population because they dreaded that the people of Canada West would use the larger power they would thereby obtain for the injury, if not the destruction, of their religious institutions. That is entirely an error. I am convinced that the people of Lower Canada have no such opinion and no such fear.

Here is a quotation from the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie which bears directly on the matter :

In the scheme, as propounded, we have all that we could possibly demand in the way of representation in the Lower House. And, besides that we have provision made for extending the representation east or west, as occasion may require, according to the increase of our population shown at the decennial periods for taking the census.

Alexander Mackenzie, therefore, had some respect for decennial census, and it was clearly his belief that it was only after a decennial census that this could be done.

Anything fairer than that could not possibly be demanded. And if Lower Canada increases more rapidly in population than Canada West, she will obtain representation accordingly, for, although the number of her members cannot be changed from 65, the proportion of that number to the whole will be changed relatively to the progress of the various colonies. On the other hand, if we extend, as I have no doubt we will do, westward, towards the centre of the continent, we will obtain a large population for our confederation in the west.

At page 434 he says :

It is quite clear that we must have a settlement of our difficulties in some way, and I think the scheme proposed is a very favourable settlement of them. I think it is more than perhaps some of us expected at the time when the present Government was formed to bring about a settlement ; and I do think, Sir, that it would be the greatest act of madness that western members of this House could perpetrate to vote against it. (Hear, hear.) I am not, however, afraid that it will be voted against by them. I believe that under it we have obtained representation by population, that we have obtained what we have long contended was justly due to us.

That is what Mr. Mackenzie said at that time, and we did not hear him say anything about county boundaries, and we find that

Mr. MARTIN.

when you go to England, there is not always much respect for county lines. I shall make one or two more quotations, which are still more emphatic with regard to representation by population. The Hon. George Brown, page 994, "Confederation Debates," said :

I think the hon. gentleman has risen for a very poor purpose. And in place of accepting his explanation as correct, I dissent from it in toto. The position of the matter is quite the opposite of what he states. He says this is a different thing altogether. I totally deny that it is. I say this is simply what we asked for, only in another form. The measure we asked for was representation by population. We got that. (Hear, hear.) And the hon. gentleman is the last man to object to this, which is the very basis on which he agreed to go into the Brown-Dorion Administration—representation by population being the basis, accompanied by such checks and guarantees as might be shown to be necessary.

Again, at page 995, he said :

The hon. gentleman will admit that we have been wonderfully, unexpectedly successful in the policy we initiated in July last ; and I am prepared to say, as I have always been prepared to say, that, if practicable, this measure is a better one than the smaller scheme. But so far from its being a different remedy from ours, I say it is but an extension of our plan—that we who have contended for representation by population for so many years are getting all that we asked and something more.

These are the views of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and of the Hon. George Brown, the great leaders of the Liberal party in Ontario at that date. I presume that the present Liberal party intend to depart from the wholesome rule in regard to representation by population, and that they are to bow down and worship the boundaries as established by county lines, at least when it suits them, which are in themselves sometimes very arbitrary indeed. Mr. Gladstone, when introducing Redistribution Bill of 1885, very often departed from county lines, and I point to this because in Prince Edward we have no municipalities and municipal associations are broken up. There are county courts, and there are petty sittings of those county courts all over the province, but there are no municipalities, and when you divide the county lines, you break up no associations whatever. In 1884, when Mr. Gladstone was introducing his Bill, he used some very pertinent words in regard to the division of the city of London. I will quote his language for more than one purpose. When we were discussing the representation that Toronto should have, it was laid down that Toronto, being a large city, was not entitled to as large a population as a rural riding, but the very converse of that is what Mr. Gladstone sets forth, as applied to London, England. At page 376 of the English "Hansard," Mr. Gladstone said:

The metropolis it is proposed in a great degree to recast. The boroughs in the metropolis are generally suited for being so dealt with. Being

parliamentary boroughs only and not having also established municipalities, they have no common historic life attached to them.

I see, the Premier laughs ; but the next part of Mr. Gladstone's speech which I will read, will turn that laugh the other way.

The PRIME MINISTER. I may be allowed to laugh now, when I have the chance.

Mr. MARTIN. At page 381, English parliamentary debates of 1884, Mr. Gladstone said :

The city of London, I am afraid, all circumstances considered, cannot equitably be exempted from some change. Its population is a population of 50,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is nearer five millions.

Mr. MARTIN. No ; Mr. Gladstone was referring to the city of London proper.

With a population of 50,000 odd, its electorate is remarkably large.

Now, you remember that Mr. Gladstone deemed that one reason why London should be made an exception to the general rule. Now, if you apply the same thing to my province, you will find that King's County, as I have already shown, to which this Bill gives only one member, has a larger electorate according to its population than any of the other counties in Prince Edward Island. I have shown you that though King's County has a population of only 26,000, and Prince County has a population of 36,000, there is only a difference of about 1,000 in the voting power of the two counties. When Mr. Gladstone introduced his Bill, he said that was one fact which should be taken into consideration in giving the city of London a large representation, and he gave a larger representation on that account. He said :

With a population of 50,000 odd, its electorate is remarkably large ; and its largeness of electorate, combined with its history, marks it out for some exemption from the application of the rigid rule of population.

Here are two things which we have to take into consideration. The first, as I have said, is that the city of London was entitled according to Mr. Gladstone to a larger representation on account of its larger electorate, compared with other parts of the country ; the second is that he was departing from the rigid rule of population, though representation by population was the basic principle of his Bill. The unit of population in England at that time was 52,700 ; yet Mr. Gladstone gave London two members representing only 50,000 people. That is a reason which cannot be overcome to prove that in dealing with Prince Edward Island you have done an injustice to King's County in giving it only one member, while you give the other county two members. What did

you do it for ? Did the province want it ? The hon. member (Sir Louis H. Davies) was down in that province running the election of 1896 ; and though he stood up in the House in 1892 and made the statement which I have read, when he went down to Prince Edward Island, he had not a word to say about the redistribution that was made at that time. It was all right. The hon. gentleman made another statement at that time to which, before I sit down, I will refer. He said that it was enough that they were to load him with three townships from King's County in which he said there was a large Conservative majority ; but I may tell you that the large majority which he said was dumped on him from King's County amounted to only 33 voters. There was also a township called Township 24 added to East Queen's, against which the hon. gentleman fought long and laboriously in this House. With regard to that, he said : " You are going to add one township, lot 24, with 200 majority of Conservatives, and dump it into my riding." That was not the fact. The majority which he had to overcome there was 149 ; but he had a majority of 161 in his favour, and when the whole thing was toted up, all he had to overcome was 40 votes ; and yet I am told on good authority that he went privately to Conservative members, and represented, or rather misrepresented, that he was to be slaughtered by dumping 300 Catholic votes into his riding. If the hon. gentleman turns to page 4188 of " Hansard " of the year 1892, he will find that he said this :

Of course, I do not like the complexion of the electorate of that township.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) What was wrong with it ?

Mr. MARTIN. I do not know. I do not know whether it was the political complexion or the physical complexion.

Mr. DAVIN. Or the religious.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, they are a very religious class of people. They are French Acadians, and are true to their religious principles. I was astonished to find the hon. gentleman saying that he did not like their complexion. I presume their religious complexion, because I see it reported that at a meeting at Sorel the hon. gentleman said that French blood flowed in his veins ; and I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, what did he see in the complexion of the electorate of lot 24, which is almost exclusively French that he detested so much ? Was it the colour question or the religious question ?

The PRIME MINISTER. They were too " bleu."

Mr. MARTIN. It is late, and I do not wish to tire hon. members. Though I have been

stricted in the debate, I think I have made a pretty good case, and I think the hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill, when he comes to his second thought, will strike this clause out of the Bill altogether. When the Minister of Marine and Fisheries goes to Prince Edward Island, I think he will find that very few will give him any support for the change he is making, because they know in their heart of hearts, as the hon. gentleman knows in his heart of hearts, what he is doing it for. He is not doing it for any advantage of the people of Prince Edward Island; he is doing it for the advantage of himself and his party. If he stands up in this House and tells us what is in his mind, that is what he will say.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman has fired off his speech at the wrong time, and although he was out of order almost from the moment he rose I did not interrupt him, but let him go on discussing the principle of the Bill, which was agreed to long ago, while carefully avoiding going into details. He did not tell the committee why he objects to the reinstatement of the county lines in Prince Edward Island, and did not dare to say that any injustice was being done. One hundred and twenty-five years ago the county lines of Prince Edward Island were established and have never been altered since. They have been observed by the legislature ever since that island has been a province and ever since it came into confederation, in the establishment of counties as the electoral divisions. The counties of Prince and Queen's had two members each. King's has one member now, and nobody, Liberal or Conservative, has questioned the decision and propriety of that. In process of time Prince Edward Island lost one member by diminution of population as compared with the other provinces, and when the readjustment of seats was effected, instead of retaining the county boundaries, as they should have and giving to the one county that had only 3,000 beyond the unit, the county of King's, one member, as they should have done, and allowing each of the other counties to have two, the late Government cut and carved the island up into the divisions which they thought were going to give them wonderful party advantage, but which were a gross injustice to the people and the Liberal party. They took the whole townships of 29, 30 and 67 out of Queen's County and added them to East Prince. Prince, Queen's and King's each has had its county towns and boundaries for 125 years. The jury are summoned two or three times a year to the assizes; they never had any relation with the other counties at all. The judicial and political divisions were marked by the county lines, yet the late Government took three whole townships, with a population of 5,240, and dumped them into East Prince,

Mr. MARTIN.

and then they came to King's County and took three townships, 61, 63 and 64, and dumped these into East Queen's. For fear the hon. gentleman could not get any constituency that would possibly return him, they put three townships from King's and put them into East Queen's, and they took township 24 out of West Queen's, giving him a majority of 300 in East Queen's. Now he wants to maintain these anomalies which nobody can defend. The fact is the gerrymander of 1891 was intended to put certain gentlemen out of the House, but it most egregiously failed.

Mr. WALLACE. What are you doing here?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. We are asking to reinstate the county boundaries, which were in existence 125 years ago, which have never been disturbed, which have been the basis on all the provincial representation, and which were made into law when the province came into confederation and remained so until 1891. What are the facts, speaking from a population stand-point? The county of King's only has 26,633 of a population, or 3,000 above the electoral unit, and it gets one member. That is all right, is it not? The county of Queen's has nearly 47,000 of a population, and it gets two. Does anybody object to that? Is there anything wrong there, either from the county boundary or the population stand-point. Prince has 37,000, which is a little short in the electoral unit, but that could not be helped. So the hon. gentleman will see that what we are proposing here is to re-establish boundaries which have been in existence 125 years, and are well recognized by the people, and there is no party advantage in it. The population of King's county is 26,633, and that gets one member. Queen's County has very nearly 46,000, and that gets two members. I say there can be no mistake about King's getting one member and Queen's getting two. The other two members are given to Prince County, which has 36,470. Is there anything wrong in that? The hon. gentleman said something about the voting power of the present district. King's County has only 5,900, whereas Prince County, east and west, has 9,600, and Queen's County 9,600. These two counties, with nearly 10,000 voters each, have two members given them, and the other has one member. This is just an attempt to remedy the great injustice done in 1891, and to remedy it on the lines of establishing the county boundaries. It does injustice to nobody, and is carrying on the traditions which prevailed in that province long before the hon. gentleman or myself entered political life.

Mr. A. C. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.)  
When I see the hon. member for Queen's get

up and say that there was gross injustice done by the laying out of the present districts in Prince Edward Island, I must emphatically deny his statement. We have heard the hon. gentleman talk very strongly of the great injustice being done and his friends behind echoed his words, but after they left the four walls of this House we never heard a word about the injustice in Prince Edward Island from them or their party. The fact of the matter is that when that redistribution was made, we commenced at the east end of Prince Edward Island and went along taking township after township until we got up to the unit of population without breaking up the townships. Then, we began with the next riding and went on until we got sufficient territory without breaking township lines, and we divided fairly so that no man could say truthfully that there was any advantage taken over anybody, and the fact was that if any injustice was done to anybody it was done to myself. If anybody had any reason to complain, I would, because they took some of my majorities off. But I thought it was done on a fair and square basis and never said a word about it. These county lines, which they prize so highly, do not amount to anything at all but are merely arbitrary. There are no bad results from the way the boundaries of the constituencies have been drawn, without regard to county lines—because these lines do not make a bit of difference. There is no good reason at all why there is any necessity for taking the county lines into consideration. If they are determined to give two members to one county, King's county and not Prince should have the two members. Apart from that, I maintain that the existing distribution is fair, fairer than any other distribution they can possibly make. And it does not break any township lines, as that has not been done heretofore.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). And is not done by this Bill.

Mr. **MACDONALD** (King, P.E.I.) That may be. But the hon. gentleman gives a reason which holds good for one place and does not hold good for another. The population for the five ridings, as given at the last distribution, was: King's 21,694; East Prince, 20,723; West Prince, 20,987; Queen's, 23,464; and West Queen's, 22,210. That is as close as could be got at that time without breaking township lines, and I believe is the best way to divide the province to do justice to all concerned.

Mr. **MARTIN**. The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) says that a great injury was done to Prince Edward Island by breaking the county boundaries. You would think the hon. gentleman bowed down to county boundaries and worshipped them—for Prince Edward Island. But how did he do in the county immediately adjoining Ottawa? Are

not county boundaries as sacred in Eastern Ontario as they are in Prince Edward Island? No injury was done either to the hon. gentleman or to any constituency in the province of Prince Edward Island by the distribution that was made in 1892—and the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) knows it. There is another point in this Bill. In Ontario the division of the counties is to be made by judges. Are you going to do that in Prince Edward Island?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. We are not dividing the counties in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. **MARTIN**. But are not you going to divide the ridings and counties with two or more members in Ontario? Are you not going to divide Toronto?

Mr. **DEPUTY SPEAKER**. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) will please address the Chair.

Mr. **MARTIN**. I am addressing the hon. gentleman through you, Mr. Chairman. Judges are to be appointed to divide the ridings in Ontario, and I ask the hon. Minister is that to be done in Prince Edward Island? In 1892, these gentlemen declared that a Redistribution Bill should be fair, that justice should be its dominating principle. But when they introduce a Bill of their own, the thin veil which covered their hypocrisy is torn away. Judges are not appointed to lay out the constituencies in Prince Edward Island for reasons that the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) knows very well. But his expectations will not be realized. When he goes to Prince Edward Island the question will be asked him why judges should do this work for Ontario and not for Prince Edward Island. I call upon hon. gentlemen to give us a Bill based upon principle, and not one like this—which, I hope, will never become law—in which one principle is applied to one part of the country and another to another part of the country, as suits the convenience and advantage of the Government. No amount of talking on the part of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will make the people of Prince Edward Island believe that he has any respect for county lines. The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) said King's County had only 5,900 voters and Prince had 9,600. The hon. gentleman ought to know that he is totally wrong. King's has 7,120. Prince only 8,198. When he repeats that 300 of a Conservative majority was given East Queen's, he repeats what is very wide of the truth. I can show what the hon. gentleman and his party did with regard to county lines in Prince Edward Island. This map which I now show to the House will show what his friends did in the way of gerrymandering Prince Edward Island.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman said that I did it.

Mr. MARTIN. I said the hon. gentleman's friends did it. And the gentleman who was the leader of the Government at the time when this redistribution was made was rewarded by this Government. This was Mr. Frederick Peters, who was appointed by the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) counsel before the Behring Sea Commissions, for which he has drawn, perhaps, about \$20,000 in hard cash of the money of the people of Canada.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's P.E.I.) The red on that map represents one riding.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It should have on it a photograph of the man who drew it.

Mr. MARTIN. It certainly is not a photograph of the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies), for his features are a little more regular than this. This is what I presume the hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Bell) would call a good gerrymander—one that would class A1 at Lloyds. The hon. gentleman had a seat in the legislature and was a supporter of the party that carried out this gerrymander.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Who is the hon. gentleman speaking of?

Mr. MARTIN. Of the hon. gentleman from East Prince (Mr. Bell). This small spot on this map is a district called Georgetown, and that town of Georgetown—

The PRIME MINISTER. Order. It is now half-past twelve.

Mr. MARTIN. If you turn to the debates of 1892, you will see that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries consumed about half an hour in talking of this same matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I may remind the hon. gentleman that, in Committee of the Whole on the Bill, discussion is confined to the clause which has been submitted to the committee.

Mr. MARTIN. Perhaps I can get a chance to explain it on the third reading.

The PRIME MINISTER. When section 3 was adopted, my attention was drawn in another direction, and I did not notice that you had put the question. I have an amendment to suggest to subsection "d." That subsection now reads as follows:—

(d) The parishes of Notre Dame de Stanbridge and Notre Dame des Anges de Stanbridge, together with the islands situated in the river Richelieu opposite thereto, are transferred from the electoral district of St. John's and Iberville to the electoral district of Missisquoi.

I move to strike out, in line 53, the following words:—"together with the islands situated in the River Richelieu opposite thereto."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN.

The PRIME MINISTER. I wish now to make an alteration in subsection "k" of the same section, which reads as follows:—

(k) All that part of the township of Stanfold, to wit: the first twelve lots in the first three ranges of the said township, which forms part of the parish of Notre Dame de Lourdes, is transferred from the electoral district of Drummond and Arthabaska to the electoral district of Megantic.

I move to alter that so it shall read as follows:—

All that part of the township of Stanfold, to wit: the first twelve lots in the first three ranges the first ten lots in the fourth and in the fifth ranges, the first four lots in the sixth range, the first two lots in the seventh range of the said township are transferred from the electoral district of Drummond and Arthabaska to the electoral district of Megantic.

The reason is, that the township of Arthabaskaville belongs to the electoral district of Drummond and Arthabaska. But there are some settlements nearer the township of Somerset South which have been incorporated in the municipal township of Somerset South, and which have been annexed by the legislature of the province and by resolution of the county council, to form part of the county of Megantic, by a statute of the province of Quebec passed in 1895, chapter 12, 58 Victoria, of the legislature of the province of Quebec.

Mr. HAGGART. I know nothing about these changes, and I see there are no members present from the province of Quebec.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not propose to move the third reading to-night.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.40 a.m. (Saturday).

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 10th July, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have received the following communication from Major Drummond, the Governor General's Secretary:—

Ottawa, 8th July, 1899.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber on the 10th instant, at 3 o'clock, for the purpose of giving assent to the Bills which have passed the House of Commons during the present session.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

L. G. DRUMMOND.

### SAFETY OF SHIPS.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 170) respecting the safety of ships. He said: This relates to the deck cargoes carried by ships from Canada to Europe alone. A very serious blow was struck at our shipping interests by the insurance underwriters in the last year, when they raised the rate of insurance to a very high and, we think, very unjustifiable rate. Among the reasons alleged for this unfortunate course was the manner in which our ships carry their deck loads, chiefly from St. Lawrence ports to the European markets. The English law provides that no ships arriving there after the 1st of November and before the 1st April shall carry any deck load higher than three feet from the deck. Our law provides that no vessel shall leave our ports after the 1st October carrying a deck load more than three feet from the deck. If it had not been for the British Act, which prohibits the entry of a deck load higher than three feet from the deck in the winter, I should be prepared to recommend, in conformity with the advice of the shipping interests, that we should permit the ships to load their deck loads flush with the bulwark rails. But as ships are not allowed to enter English ports with deck loads higher than three feet from the deck in winter we must conform to the English law. In this Bill, we extend the time up to the 12th October when steamers may load in summer a deck load more than three feet. This concession does not extend to sailing ships. Last year I was instructed that steamers would not come to the St. Lawrence ports at all, as under our restrictions with regard to deck loads, they were not able to make sufficient freight, and consequently they went to the Baltic ports instead. After consulting the shipping and insurance interests, I am advised that we can with great safety extend the time during which steamers may load their summer deck loads to the 12th October, which will enable them to arrive in England before the prohibited date of the 1st November. But this extension of time cannot be granted sailing vessels. In winter, under the new law, a steamship can load any deck load approved by the port warden up to the 12th October. At present there is no such requirement, and my hon. colleague (Mr. Do-

bell) informs me that one of the ships left the port of Quebec, and when she got out in the stream she keeled right over, so high was her deck load. This provision requiring the deck loads to be inspected by the port warden and approved by him will prevent any vessel ever leaving port with any deck load which is not consistent with safety. The law also provides that no clearance shall be given by the customs officers to any vessel carrying a deck load unless and until she has complied with this requirement, that is, obtained the approval of the port warden. I do not propose that the second reading be taken in a hurry, but would specially recommend gentlemen representing the commercial and mercantile interests to have copies of the Bill forwarded to their constituents in the shipping interest for the benefit of their advice. I have taken the advice of the Montreal, Quebec and other shipping interests in the lower provinces, and think that this Bill meets with their wishes.

Motion agreed to ; Bill read the first time.

### ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS:

A Message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:—

Mr. Speaker,

His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of Your Honourable House in the Chamber of the Honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

And having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Governor General had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act for the relief of David Stock.

An Act to amend the Act respecting certain works constructed in or over navigable waters.

An Act to incorporate the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.

An Act to confirm an agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Hull Electric Company.

An Act respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Welland Power and Supply Canal Company, Limited, and to change its name to the Niagara Welland Power Company, Limited.

An Act respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Bronsons and Weston Lumber Company, and to change its name to the Bronson Company.

An Act respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Alberta Irrigation Company, and to change its name to the Canadian North-west Irrigation Company.

An Act respecting the Brandon and South-western Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Atlantic and North-west Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.

An Act respecting the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Pontiac, and to change its name to the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Pembroke.

An Act respecting the Canadian Railway Accident Insurance Company.

An Act respecting the Quebec Steamship Company.

An Act respecting the Eastern Trust Company.

An Act respecting the Hamilton Powder Company.

An Act respecting the Home Life Association of Canada.

An Act respecting the Canada Life Assurance Company.

An Act further to amend the Adulteration Act.

An Act to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

An Act respecting the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.

An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the James Bay Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Guarantee and Pension Fund Society of the Dominion Bank, and to change its name to the Pension Fund Society of the Dominion Bank.

An Act respecting the Dominion of Canada Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company.

An Act to amend the Bank Act.

An Act respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.

An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Thomas Robertson.

An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George L. Williams.

An Act to incorporate La Compagnie du chemin de Fer de Colonisation du Nord.

An Act to incorporate the Russell, Dundas and Grenville Counties Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Arthabaska Railway Company.

An Act to authorize the amalgamation of the Erie and Huron Railway Company and the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Ottawa Electric Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canadian Power Company, and to change its name to the Ontario Power Company of Niagara Falls.

An Act respecting the London Mutual Fire Insurance Company of Canada.

An Act respecting the Hudson's Bay and Yukon Railways and Navigation Company, and to change its name to the Hudson's Bay and North-west Railways Company.

Mr. SPEAKER.

An Act to incorporate the Edmonton and Saskatchewan Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Klondike Mines Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canada Accident Assurance Company.

An Act respecting the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company.

An Act respecting the Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert.

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Inland Transportation Company.

An Act for the relief of Annie Inkson Dowding.

An Act respecting the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company, Limited.

An Act respecting the Bedlington and Nelson Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Corporation.

An Act to incorporate the Canada Plate Glass Assurance Company.

An Act to amend the Winding-up Act.

An Act to incorporate the Sudbury and Wahnapeitae Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company, and to change its name to the Quebec Railway, Light and Power Company.

An Act to incorporate the Rutland and Noyan Railway Company.

An Act respecting the inspection of petroleum and naphtha.

An Act to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.

An Act respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.

An Act to incorporate the Canada Mining and Metallurgical Company, Limited.

An Act respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to railway debts.

Then the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General as follows :—

May it please Your Excellency :

The Commons of Canada have voted certain Supplies required to enable the Government to defray certain expenses of the public service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency the following Bill :—

An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required or defraying certain expenses of the public service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1899, and the 30th June, 1900, and for other purposes relating to the public service,—to which Bill I humbly request Your Excellency's assent.

To this Bill the Royal Assent was signified in the following words :—

In Her Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks Her loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill.

CLOTHING FOR THE ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

Mr. FOSTER (by Mr. Bergeron) asked :

Who supplied the clothing for the Royal Military College at Kingston previously to the present firm, and was it by tender and contract, and for what length of time ?

Who now supplies the clothing for this institution; were tenders called for, and if so, was the contract given to the lowest tenderer?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE** (Mr. Borden). I have the following information in answer to this question:—A communication from Lieutenant-Colonel Vidal, for Chief Staff Officer, addressed to the Commandant Royal Military College, sending this question and asking for an answer; then, answer to it of S. C. McGill, Lieutenant-Colonel, for the Commandant, addressed to the Chief Staff Officer, as follows:—

(1) George Creegan, of Kingston, from 1876 to June, 1898. At different times during these years other persons tendered for this work, but Mr. Creegan's price being lowest, his contract with the Commandant was renewed. (2) Messrs. Livingstone & Bros., of Kingston. The old contractor's work having been found very unsatisfactory for some time, and this firm being highly recommended, the change was recommended by the Commandant to the department and approved of. Tenders were not called for.

(Sgd.) S. C. MCGILL, Lt.-Col.,  
Staff Adjutant,  
for Commandant.

#### SALARIES OF POSTMASTERS.

Mr. MONK (by Mr. Bergeron) asked:

1. What is the postmaster's salary at the following places:—(a) Isle Bizard, P.Q.; (b) Ste. Geneviève, Jacques Cartier county, P.Q.; (c) Pointe Claire, P.Q.; (d) Beaconsfield, P.Q.; (e) Valois, P.Q.?

2. How many mails are delivered daily at Pointe Claire, Beaconsfield and Valois?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to establish a post office at Saraguay, Jacques Cartier county, P.Q.?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mullock). 1. (a) Isle Bizard, salary \$20; (b) Ste. Geneviève, salary, \$100, and an additional allowance of \$6 for forward duty; (c) Pointe Claire, salary, \$120; (d) there is no post office called Beaconsfield in the province of Quebec; (e) Valois, salary, \$24. 2. Mails are delivered at Pointe Claire twice per day, and at Valois, once per day. 3. A post office called Saraguayville was opened in the county of Jacques Cartier on the 1st October, 1898.

#### CONVEYANCE OF MAILS, JACQUES CARTIER COUNTY.

Mr. MONK (by Mr. Bergeron) asked:

1. How many mails per day are there from Montreal to Isle Bizard, P.Q.?

2. At what o'clock is the Montreal mail due to be distributed each day in the parish of Isle Bizard, in the county of Jacques Cartier?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. 1. There are two mails per day from Montreal to Isle Bizard. 2. Mails are due at Isle Bizard post office about 9.30 a.m. and 7.30 p.m.

Mr. MONK (by Mr. Bergeron) asked:

1. Did the Government call for tenders for the conveyance of mails from Beaconsfield, P.Q., to Ste. Geneviève and Isle Bizard?

2. How many tenders were received?

3. Who was the lowest tenderer?

4. To whom was the contract for the conveyance of the said mails awarded, and at what price?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. 1. Yes. 2. Three. 3. F. Lauzon. 4. To F. Lauzon, the lowest tenderer, but the inspector reports Mr. Lauzon as refusing to accept the contract, and, accordingly, up to the present no contract has been made.

#### FLOODING OF LANDS, STE. GENEVIÈVE.

Mr. MONK (by Mr. Bergeron) asked:

1. Did E. Lafontaine, appointed to examine the cause of flooding of lands at Ste. Geneviève, Jacques Cartier county, make a written report?

2. What was, according to said report, if any, the cause of floods in said locality?

3. What does the Government intend doing to prevent said floods?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). 1. Yes. 2. The following is an extract from Mr. Lafontaine's report:—

The owners of the water lots at Ste. Geneviève have not to suffer by the rising of the waters at Rivière des Prairies, caused by the melting of snow in the spring. The level of that river rises but little at such time, and when there is an inundation it is but slight, and causes but very little damage.

It is only towards the 15th of June, when the waters of the Ottawa River rise, a portion of which empty into Rivière des Prairies, that damages occur. The waters, not finding sufficient outlet in the rapids at Ste. Geneviève, rise and overflow the lands there, and spoil the farming of some 300 acres.

3. The matter is under consideration.

#### TENDERS FOR BINDER TWINE.

Mr. TAYLOR (by Mr. Mills) asked:

1. In what newspapers were tenders called for by advertisements calling for tenders for the binder twine manufactured in the Kingston Penitentiary between the 1st of July, 1898, and the 30th of June, 1899?

2. What was the date of the advertisement calling for said tenders?

3. On what date were the tenders to be received?

4. How many tenders were received?

5. What were the names of the persons or firms who tendered?

6. What were the prices offered by the unsuccessful tenderers?

7. At what price was the said twine sold to the Hobbs Hardware Company?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. 1. Toronto "Globe," Hamilton "Times," London "Advertiser," Windsor "Record," Chatham "Banner," Ottawa "Free Press," Brantford "Expositor," Kingston "Whig," Montreal

"Witness," "La Patrie," Montreal "Herald," Quebec "Le Soleil," Quebec "Telegraph," Halifax "Chronicle," Acadian "Recorder," St. John "Globe," St. John "Telegraph," Moncton "Transcript," Charlottetown "Patriot," Winnipeg "Free Press," Winnipeg "Tribune," Regina "Leader," Vancouver "World," Victoria "Province," Victoria "Times," London "Record," Kingston "Freeman," Ottawa "Le Temps," "The Canada Baptist," "Christian Guardian," "The Westminster," "Hardware and Metal," Essex "Free Press," Ottawa "Danebrog," "Dominion Presbyterian," Sherbrooke "Progrès de l'Est," Paris "Transcript," Belleville "Sun," Belleville "Ontario," Beeton "World," Ridgeway "Standard," Leamington "News," Peterborough "Examiner," Stratford "Beacon," "United Canada." 2. 12th January, 1899. 3. 15th February, 1899. 4. Four tenders. 5. H. N. Bate & Sons, Hobbs Hardware Co., Call Bros., Martin P. Connolly. 6. This information has always been considered confidential until such time as the twine is marketed. 7. See answer to No. 6.

#### POSTMASTER OF SYDENHAM, ONT.

Mr. BELL (Addington)—(by Mr. Davin) asked :

Has the postmaster of Sydenham, Ont., been discovered with a shortage in his cash during the last three months? If so, what is the amount of his shortage, and when was it made good to the department?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. To state that the postmaster of Sydenham had been discovered with a shortage in his cash, is to give an entirely erroneous idea as to what occurred, which simply was, that, instead of keeping the whole cash in the official till, the same, to the extent of \$12.18 became mixed with funds of his own. When the inspector was making the regular inspection of the office, he called the postmaster's attention to the matter, and whilst the inspector was present, the postmaster immediately separated the amount by putting into the official till the \$12.18. This occurred on the 19th May, 1899.

#### THE GALICIAN SETTLEMENT, SALT-COATS.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to ask the Minister of the Interior whether Mr. Turreff, the land commissioner sent some three weeks ago to Manitoba, has returned; if not, what is he doing there?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Mr. Turreff, the commissioner for Dominion lands, was sent up to Manitoba; he had also instructions to go to the Galician settlement near Edmonton, and to

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

make a report to the department in regard to departmental work. He has not returned, and I am under the impression, speaking from recollection, that he telegraphed, asking if he might have leave of absence to go to the coast for a few days, while he was away. I have not yet any information as to what has happened since then.

Mr. DAVIN. The Minister will remember that some weeks ago I called his attention to the rumour in the newspapers that a considerable number of the Galicians near Saltcoats were dying, and the Minister was courteous enough to send me a note about that. Has the hon. gentleman since heard of the condition of the Galicians north of Saltcoats?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I gave it my attention at once. The immigration commissioner had the matter in charge at the time and attended to it. The physician was in charge at the place mentioned and everything was done that could possibly be done.

#### INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION—ALASKAN BOUNDARY.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right. hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether his attention has been called to an article which appeared in the Ottawa "Citizen" of this day, 10th of July. It is as follows:—

#### NEGOTIATIONS ARE OFF.

Story that Britain and the United States Could Not Agree to a Provisional Boundary.

New York, July 8.—The "Journal's" Washington correspondent says:

"Following are the British-Canadian propositions which have been rejected by the State Department:—

"First, the cession of Pyramid Harbour at the head of the Lynn Canal; second, the cession of any other port on the Lynn Canal; third, the cession of a strip of territory which would give access to tide-water; fourth, a free right of way across Alaska to any United States port; fifth, the variation of Hay's provisional boundary line so as to include Kluckwau, an Indian village, at the head of canoe navigation, leading into the Lynn Canal; sixth, the inclusion of the Porcupine district, with a near approach to navigable waters on the British side of the provisional boundary line; seventh, the proposition to arbitrate the provisional line precedent to the formulation of a modus vivendi pending a permanent settlement of the question.

"This statement was made by a high official of the State Department, describing the status of negotiations on the Alaskan boundary:—'The negotiations have been indefinitely postponed, or, to put it otherwise, they have practically been declared off.'

"These developments leave the boundary line in dispute where it was when the Joint High Commission adjourned on February 18th, with the situation not improved.

"Sir Julian Pauncefote, Ambassador Choate and Lord Salisbury went as far as to agree that a provisional boundary line, to be followed by a modus vivendi, was the first step. England proposed several lines, which were objected to, and eventually Secretary Hay delimited the territory with a line which was apparently agreeable to England. Canada then suddenly was revealed again as the really important factor, and made propositions at various times which were sustained by England. England's last diplomatic resort, which developed yesterday, is the astounding suggestion that the provisional line itself be submitted to arbitration. This was promptly refused by this government by cable.

"The United States is not unwilling to submit the true and permanent boundary line to arbitration, and has officially said so. The State Department officials here regard the proposal to arbitrate the provisional line as only another scheme for delay, profitless to this country and capable of being made advantageous to Canada. The State Department makes this point: 'It is a matter which two sensible and great governments could easily agree upon without the intervention of any other nation. Great Britain's refusal to accept our provisional line, precedent to the formation of a modus vivendi, is regarded as distinctly disingenuous and intended to secure, through the favour of an arbitrator, probably a European monarch or a South American despot, an advantage, to be utilized when the temporary line is arbitrated, as a basis for some preposterous claim.'"

I would ask the right hon. gentleman whether he can give the House any information as to whether this article, or any portion of it, is true.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I am called upon to give any information upon this piece of journalism. We have had such articles up time and again in this session, and every time that these sensational despatches have been given as coming from such sources, the probabilities have been that they have not been true. I do not believe there is any more truth in this than there has been in preceding despatches of the same character. I am very glad to know, if there is any truth in this despatch, that there is a probability of the permanent boundary being referred to arbitration. One thing is true in that statement, and it is that the matter is pretty much where it was when we returned in February last in regard to the permanent boundary. In regard to the provisional boundary, we have been negotiating in the endeavour to have it fixed in a manner which would suit both parties, but, I am sorry to say, that, up to the present time, our propositions have not been agreeable to the United States, and the American propositions have not been agreeable to us. I am not without hope that we may reach a settlement upon this question, in fact, I have great hope that we shall do so, but the House will readily understand, that it is very difficult to settle a boundary so far distant as we are from the place where it is to be fixed, and with the limited information we have upon the subject.

#### EMPLOYMENT OF MR. W. T. R. PRESTON.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) whether Mr. W. T. R. Preston is in the Government employ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). He is.

#### REGULATIONS OF NEWFOUNDLAND GOVERNMENT RESPECTING EXPORT OF BAIT.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), whether he has any further information in respect to the regulations of the Newfoundland Government respecting the export of bait. I may mention that since I last had the matter up, I have seen some of the captains myself and have taken statements from them which I would be very glad to furnish the hon. gentleman for his information. I thought possibly that he might have some further information.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Mr. Speaker, I am not able to make any definite statement to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) to-day. The Government has been in communication with the Government of Newfoundland since the hon. gentleman last brought the matter up in the House. I am not aware whether, in the last day or two, any communication has been received from the Newfoundland Government, but we have entered a very strong protest against the action of the Newfoundland Government in respect to our fishermen. I will look, when I go to the department, and see whether any communication has been received within the last few days.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, before the House proceeds with Government Orders, I think that an arrangement was made across the floor some days ago that unopposed notices of motions should go through to-day.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace), that I have looked over the paper, and I find that all the motions have been gone through once before, with the exception of the last four, that of Mr. Gillies, those of Mr. McCarthy, and that of Mr. Wallace. All the others have been gone through and must stand, because they are on debatable subjects. As to these four there can be no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER. By the unanimous consent of the House, I will call the four last motions on the Order paper.

### TRADE AND OTHER RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. McCARTHY (by Mr. McMullen), moved for :

Copy of the draft treaty respecting Canadian trade and other relations with the United States entered into and settled in 1874 by Sir Edward Thornton and the Hon. George Brown on behalf of the Imperial Government, with the Government of the United States, and for copies of the protocols and correspondence relating thereto, and the non-ratification of the said treaty by the United States.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I do not see much use in moving this, because this information is now in the sessional papers of 1874 and 1875.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, it is all there.

Mr. SPEAKER. Dropped.

### RETURNS ORDERED.

Return showing : 1. The number of wharfs and piers that have been constructed at the public expense by the Government of Canada, or the construction of which has been assisted by the Government of Canada, in the province of Ontario since 1867, and the total amount paid out of the public exchequer of Canada towards the construction, repairs and maintenance of these wharfs and piers from the 1st of July, 1867, up to the present date.

2. The number of wharfs and piers constructed in the province of Quebec during the said period, and the amount paid towards their construction, repairs and maintenance by the Government of Canada.

3. The number of wharfs and piers constructed in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and the aggregate amount expended in each of these provinces from the 1st of July, 1867, to the present date in the construction, maintenance and repairs of the said wharfs and piers.—(Mr. Gillies.)

Copy of the Treaty of 1825 between Great Britain and Russia, respecting Alaska, and for copies of the projects, protocols and correspondence between the Imperial Government and the Government of Russia respecting the said treaty, and subsequent thereto, and copies of correspondence between the Imperial Government and the British Ambassador at St. Petersburg during the negotiations for the said treaty.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Return of all papers in connection with the applications made for, and the consideration of the commutation of the sentence of death on Marion Brown for murder.—(Mr. Wallace.)

### THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 154) further to amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. Paterson.)

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

### REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock) moved :

That Bill (No. 126) respecting representation in the House of Commons, be now read a third time.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I would move :

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amending section 4.

This is in regard to the city of St. John simply to make it clearer as to what should be the boundaries of the electoral districts of the city and county of St. John.

I may say at this stage, Mr. Speaker, that the Government have considered the question of the selection of commissioners who are to act under this law. I made a promise early in this debate that before the Bill was put through this House I would give the names of the commissioners whom we intended to ask to act on this commission. The gentlemen we intend to ask to sit on this commission are all judges of the High Court of Justice of Ontario. They are :

The Honourable Sir John Burton, Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal of Ontario.

The Honourable Sir John Alexander Boyd, Chancellor of the province of Ontario, president of the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice of Ontario.

The Honourable Mr. Justice Falconbridge, one of Her Majesty's judges of the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice of Ontario.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BERGERON. I, unfortunately, was not here on Friday afternoon, as I did not expect that the clause relating to the province of Quebec would be passed. I would ask the right hon. the Premier to be kind enough to answer me some questions with regard to clause 3, so that the House may understand the change that is made in the province of Quebec.

The PRIME MINISTER. After we dispose of the electoral district of St. John, N.B., I have no objection to answer the question of my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron).

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The existing Bill, in paragraph 4, provides that the city of St. John shall return one member, and that the county of St. John shall return one member, the object being to constitute the city into an electoral district and vote for one member, and the county of St. John to constitute an electoral district for one member and vote for one member. There is some doubt

as to whether that is clearly expressed in the Bill. By the Act of 1891, of the legislature of New Brunswick, the boundaries of the electoral districts of both the city and the county were defined for electoral purposes. We propose to follow the lines of the provincial Act and the paragraph which we move to insert in lieu of the one now in the Bill, reads as follows:—

Parts (a) and (b) of subsection 5 of section 2 of chapter 11 of the Statutes of 1892 is hereby repealed and the following is substituted therefor:—

“(a) The electoral district of St. John shall consist of the city of St. John, as now existing under provincial legislation, and shall return one member.

“(b) The county of St. John shall consist of the county of St. John, as now existing under provincial legislation, and shall return one member.”

This in no way alters what was proposed to be carried out by the Bill, but it makes it more clear and definite.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the population of the city, and what is the population of the county?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not got the population before me now, but this amendment does not alter the meaning of the Bill as originally passed.

Mr. WALLACE. Surely the hon. member can tell us what the population of each of these electoral districts is? I would like also to inquire whether the city of Portland is in the city of St. John or in the county of St. John for electoral purposes under this Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Portland is now in the city of St. John.

Mr. WALLACE. We know that, but in what electoral district is it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The town of Portland is now part of the city of St. John, and my impression is that for electoral purposes it will form part of the city of St. John.

Mr. WALLACE. We do not want the Minister's impression, we want facts about a thing like this.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the difference between the provincial electoral district of St. John and the electoral district of St. John as constituted under this Bill now?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The Bill as now before the committee makes the federal electoral division identically the same as they are in the provincial elections.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the distinction between them and the Dominion electoral districts?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In the case of a member for this Parliament the electors of the city of St. John and of the county of St. John voted together for one member and the electors of the city of St. John alone voted for another member.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the difference as the Bill proposes now between the electoral district of St. John City as it was and as it is under your Bill?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Under the present Bill the electors of the city of St. John will elect one representative for this House.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it the same area?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The same area as affects one of the members at present. As to the other member, the electors of the county of St. John, the parishes outside of the city, will elect one member.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the population of the county?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Eleven thousand, as I understand it.

Mr. WALLACE. And what is the population of the city?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Between 30,000 and 40,000.

Mr. WALLACE. What does the House think of that?

Mr. McNEILL. How long has the existing condition of things prevailed before the introduction of this Bill?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has varied from time to time. There is an anomalous condition of things existing in the city of St. John which has no parallel in any other constituency in the Dominion. There have been times when the city and the county together elected two members. There have been times when the county and city voted together and the city voted alone. At the present time the city votes for its own members and the county for its own members in provincial matters.

Mr. McNEILL. So far as the election of members for this House is concerned, I understand that the city of St. John and the county of St. John have together elected a member to this House—at all events, since confederation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They do not now in the province. They have altered that.

Mr. McNEILL. I am not speaking of the province; I am speaking of this House. I do not consider that we have a right to hand

over all our prerogatives to the provinces. I understand that this is an arrangement that has existed for many years. There has been no gerrymander here, and it seems to me strange that hon. gentlemen should interfere in this way, and pounce down on this one particular place in the province.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is the only one where this extraordinary condition prevails.

Mr. McNEILL. I understand that one of the constituencies has a population of between 10,000 and \$11,000, and the other a population of nearly 40,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. McNEILL. That seems a very strange arrangement to make.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are a good many similar cases.

Mr. McNEILL. It is another illustration of the manner in which the Liberal party, so far as this Bill is concerned, set the principle of representation by population utterly at defiance.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. My right hon. friend says "hear, hear," but I think there is no question at all about it. If my right hon. friend will forgive me, I say that the very root principle of this Bill sets the principle of representation by population at defiance, because you ask the judges to decide what the constituencies shall be without knowing what the population is. The very foundation of the constitution in this regard is that the constituencies shall be readjusted from time to time on the basis of population, as between province and province; and whatever reason we can adduce for giving a greater representation to the more populous province, you can adduce for giving a greater representation to the more populous county, and in so far as this Bill calls on the commissioners to readjust the constituencies in the dark, as to the change of population which has taken place in the last eight or nine years, to that extent the principle of representation by population is set utterly at defiance.

The PRIME MINISTER. The principle of representation by population cannot in any way come into this question. My hon. friend is aware that the principle of representation by population entered into the Representation Act of 1882, so far as the province of New Brunswick was concerned. That province did not increase in population under the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite, I am sorry to say, and therefore lost one member. But now we find this unique condition of things in the city and

Mr. McNEILL.

county of St. John, probably not to be found anywhere else on the face of the earth, that the electors of the city of St. John elect one member, and then the same men vote with the electors of the county to elect a second member. Nothing could be more anomalous than that.

Mr. McNEILL. They are well content with it, are they not?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know whether they are or not; but my hon. friend ought not to be content with such an anomalous condition of things. If this Bill passes, the electors of the city of St. John will elect one member and the electors of the county of St. John will elect one member. The hon. member tells me that there is a great disparity in the populations. The city of St. John will have about 30,000.

Mr. McNEILL. Nearer 40,000—I think 39,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, let us say 40,000. The county of St. John has a population of 11,000.

Mr. McNEILL. Over 10,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. One is a rural population and the other a city population. How can my hon. friend defend the present system, by which the men of the city of St. John elect one member, and then go and vote for another member in conjunction with the 11,000 of the county of St. John? My hon. friend will agree with me that the same purpose will be served, and in a way more regular and more convenient for the members, by having one to sit for the city and one for the county, and no injustice will be done to any one.

Mr. BERGERON. Oh, yes.

The PRIME MINISTER. To whom is the injustice done? Certainly, the present half-and-half arrangement is not suitable to anyone, while the arrangement proposed in the Bill cannot work the slightest injustice to any person on earth.

Mr. McNEILL. My right hon. friend will forgive me if I remind him that this is a Bill introduced with one excuse—that is, to redress an injustice that was committed in 1882 and to fulfil a pledge. Surely my right hon. friend does not pretend to say that there was an injustice committed in 1882 in the city and county of St. John. So far as the anomaly is concerned, since the arrangement is working satisfactorily to the people of the two constituencies, I do not think we need to trouble ourselves about the anomaly. Our constitution is full of anomalies, and so long as they work well, we are all satisfied. I do not think it necessary that we should set about having everything cut and carved in accordance with some theoretical principle, provided always that

the present arrangement is a satisfactory one to those whom it affects.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. My hon. friend is not a reformer.

**Mr. McNEILL**. I belong to the great reform party of Canada, the Liberal-Conservative party; and I think it hardly lies in the mouth of my right hon. friend, who has adopted our policy, to say a word of that kind across the floor of the House. This amendment does not come within the four corners of the reason given for the introduction of this measure, and when there must be another readjustment of the constituencies in 1902, I think it would be reasonable to allow the present arrangement, by which no injustice is done, and with which every one is satisfied, to remain at least until that time.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. My hon. friend will see that the committee has already agreed to this clause in the Bill:

The electoral district of the county of St. John shall consist of the county of St. John only.

In the amendment we are not altering that.

**Mr. HAGGART**. Yes, you are.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. We are making that more clear which was somewhat doubtful. The county of St. John is expressly defined as one electoral district, but we should have gone on to say that the electoral district of the city of St. John shall consist of the city of St. John only. The amendment does not alter the Bill, but makes it more clear.

**Mr. HAGGART**. I was led to the same belief as the hon. gentleman by the remarks of the Minister of Railways and the Premier. I asked if the electoral district of the city of St. John was as it had been fixed by the law; but it is entirely different. There is 16,000 or 18,000 of a difference. I find by the census that the population of the city of St. John is 24,000 and that of the county 25,000 under the old Act, and now you intend to alter that entirely.

**Mr. WALLACE**. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries tells us that this was passed on Friday, and there is to be no further discussion on it, and that it is only making some verbal alterations. But we did not do our duty on Friday night, and since hon. gentlemen have opened up the question we propose to have it ventilated now, and it is in order to do so. What are the facts? The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has told us that his impression was that the city of St. John had 24,000 and the county 25,000. That is the case probably by the census returns, but a different state of affairs exists to-day. The city of Portland has been taken from the county and added to the city. I asked

the question a while ago, where the city of Portland was in this redistribution—whether in the city or county. The hon. Minister of Marine could not tell, the Minister of Finance said his impression was it was in the city, but nobody could give a definite answer. I appealed to the hon. Postmaster General, who had the Bill in charge, but he was silent. What are the facts, so far as we can glean them? They are that the city of St. John, under this Bill, will have 39,000 people, and the county 10,000, so that the city has four to one of an interest in the question. This is a gerrymander, and the right hon. First Minister tells us that he wished to avoid gerrymandering. Oh, he says, representation by population cannot come in, in any way, on this question. I should think not, where you make a division of city and county, and give the city four times the population of the county. Such a preposterous division I never heard of. The right hon. First Minister thought it was an anomaly to have the city sending one member and the county sending another. Perhaps so. I believe there is not a parallel case throughout the whole Dominion, but we are told that it is something with which the people there are quite satisfied, and if it was an anomaly, it was a fair and proper division. The total population gave about the unit for two members, or a little over. I assume that the people of New Brunswick thought it was a pretty fair distribution for I am not aware that they have disturbed that arrangement in the local legislature.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is just what they have done.

**Mr. WALLACE**. For many years they had that arrangement in the local legislature, and presumably where they have four members for the city and two for the county, it will be more convenient to divide it up in some fair way, by giving the city twice the representation given in the county, if that is a fair division—four and two.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is the division.

**Mr. WALLACE**. That recognizes in a certain way, at any rate, the principle of representation by population. But this Bill totally ignores that principle, by providing that 40,000 people shall elect one member and 10,000 the other. Surely there is nothing to justify that. The principle of representation by population should guide us in a rough and ready way, at any rate. We recognize it in the distribution of members for the various provinces. Quebec sends sixty-five, and every other province sends its proportion according to population—one member for about every 22,700, or whatever the unit of population is, according to the census. The same justice should

be done, so far as conveniently, each electoral district; but here you have the two, the city and the county, which for these thirty-two years have been represented by two members on the principle of representation by population, approximately if not exactly. Now we have a proposal iniquitous in character, because it ignores every idea of fair-play, by allowing 40,000 citizens of St. John to send one member and 10,000 in the county to send another member. When you have adopted, as we have in Ontario, the system of one man one vote, you must, to be honest and logical, carry out the law fairly and approximate, at any rate, by giving one vote one value, a thing which you totally ignore in this case and all through the Act in the province of Ontario as well.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is surely not serious. If he will reason a little he will see the absurdity of his argument. The anomaly he complains of is one that he is responsible for. How does the thing work to-day? There are 5,000 electors in the city of St. John for every 1,000 in the county, and the city electors vote also for the county member, so that the same disproportion exists now as will under this Bill, only we follow the principle of recognizing county boundaries. There is no occasion at all for my hon. friend to get so angry.

Mr. BERGERON. If my right hon. friend wanted to reform this way of voting in St. John, which does look anomalous at first sight, there is a way of doing it without completely reversing the principle which the right hon. gentleman said he was desirous of establishing when introducing the Bill, of having representation according to population as much as possible. He admits that the city of St. John, with a population of 39,000, will elect a member, and that the suburbs in the county of St. John, with a population of 11,000, will also elect a member. Until now it was considered that the county gave such a small vote that it had to be tempered by the larger vote of the city, and then it could not be called a hive, which it may be now, prepared for the benefit of somebody. We do not know. It came so late that we cannot judge very well of the reasons for it. If my right hon. friend wanted to do the proper thing, why does he not take part of the city of St. John and annex it to the county and make a constituency. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) need not laugh. We have the same thing in the city of Montreal, and the same thing is being done in the city of Toronto.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. BERGERON. Why, 35,000 people are being taken from the county of York and put into the city of Toronto.

Mr. WALLACE.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). They are part of the city municipality and not of the county.

Mr. BERGERON. But if you do it in one way, why can you not do it the other? It would equalize population better, giving about 25,000 to each constituency. Otherwise the people will naturally suppose—of course, I do not know whether it is true or not—that, instead of doing right, you are trying to make a hive of a very small county with about 1,800 votes. It will be nothing but a pleasure for a man to run in such a county, and will offer an excellent chance for a gentleman who desires to get into the House in an easy way.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) said that he did not do as I state, that he had divided the city and county of St. John into electoral districts, giving each a representative and fairly dividing them, because one has a population of 25,000 and the other 24,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes. I can interpret the Bill as well as anybody—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not object to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) interpreting the Bill, but what I object to is this misquoting what I said.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman denied my statement that it was so. I stated that under the Bill as introduced by the hon. gentleman he has divided the county and city of St. John in two electoral districts, giving each a representative; in one district a population of 25,000 and in the other of 24,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) is falling into an error. The municipal boundaries have been altered by provincial legislation since the time of which he speaks.

Mr. HAGGART. I am looking at the returns for the electoral districts.

Mr. POWELL. Perhaps I can throw a little light on this matter. What was originally the city of Portland and included in the census returns under five wards originally, was a distinct city, and before 1890 it was incorporated into the city of St. John and made part and parcel of that city. But the time-honoured state of affairs was continued by the redistribution of 1882 and the redistribution of 1892. It stands to-day as it always was, and the change is this carving out of a little constituency of 10,000 inhabitants.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In conformity with the municipal boundaries.

Mr. POWELL. They are not coterminous with the municipal boundaries.

Mr. ELLIS. I do not know exactly the terms of the amendment, as I was not in my place at the moment when it was proposed. But I feel it my duty to refer to the representation of St. John, as it is under discussion. I would have to answer to my constituents in case any discussion arose about the reasons for the settlement of the matter. Now, I represent a city of 39,000 people; and the effect of the legislation is to take away from these 39,000 people the right to have a vote for two members of Parliament. The main idea of the settlement of the question is that the city and county of St. John, which is the title of the county of St. John—there is no county of St. John under the law—should be made one constituency, and that two men should be chosen for it, the same as in the case of Halifax and Pictou. The division on the ground of population is not a good one. In the last election 7,200 votes were cast in the city of St. John, and 1,900 in the county and outside of the city. The total vote on the list is about 11,000 in the city of St. John, and 14,000 in the city and county, leaving 3,000 for the county outside the city. So the new constituency would have 3,000 and the city and county 11,000. I would press upon the Government that on principle and on grounds of greatest fairness, no alteration is necessary now, but that if change is made two members should be elected for the city and county of St. John.

Mr. POWELL. It is true, as the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said, that there is an anomaly in this matter, but it is no more an anomaly than giving the universities of Oxford and Cambridge representations in the English House of Commons.

The PRIME MINISTER. Oh, yes.

Mr. POWELL. It is precisely the same thing. The city of St. John, on account of its position in the province of New Brunswick, and, I think, by virtue of its charter—the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) will correct me if I am wrong—had a right to distinct representation in the House of Assembly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). As long as the charter was not altered.

Mr. POWELL. It has not been altered.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, it has; over and over again.

Mr. POWELL. Only so far as the incorporation of Portland is concerned. The leading principles remain the same.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) means by leading principles.

Mr. POWELL. From the time the province of New Brunswick was set apart as a separate province in 1784 down to 1892, that is, for a period of 108 years, this anomaly existed. Now, Sir, what dissipated the anomaly so far as representation in the provincial assembly is concerned? Well, Sir, in 1890, in the general election, the city and county of St. John returned six members in opposition to the then Administration, headed by the present Minister of Railways and Canals. One year after that election, the hon. gentleman caused to be introduced and put through the House a Bill by which two members were given to the outside parishes of St. Simonds, Lancaster, Musquash and St. Martins, with a population of about nine or ten thousand people. I question very much if they did, at that time, number so many as they do at the present time, because the county of St. John has been depopulated somewhat. But in this way the city of St. John and these parishes were dissevered. Previous to the incorporation of Portland in the city, had Portland been incorporated with the parish in which it stands—St. Simonds or Lancaster I think—and a division made on that basis, the population of the two ridings would have been nearly even. But Portland was overwhelmingly in opposition to the then Government, and if Portland had been put in, as part of one constituency, there would have been no hive for the supporters of the Government, and so that anomaly was created of giving two members to what were originally four parishes, with a population of 10,000, and giving four members for the city of St. John, with 38,000 or 39,000. Now, what is sought to be done is the violation of the most sacred principle as laid down by the leader of the Government, that respect should be paid to historic associations and to the traditions of localities. To-day we have the whole arrangement broken up. Why not adopt the division which has so long existed, and which was perpetuated in 1882, and still further in 1892, by which there was no destruction of the old order of things. Or, if they must divide, why not divide in the perfectly obvious way suggested so as to give two constituencies, one with a population of 24,184 and the other a population of about 25,000—as equal a division of population as is practicable? What should have been done was to have given one member to the old city of St. John, that was recognized as having some peculiar privileges for over a century—giving one member to the old city of St. John, then one member to Portland and the balance of the county. I think the fair principle was enunciated by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) when he said that it would be better to give two members generally to the city and county, the same as is done in Halifax, in Pictou, in Hamilton, and in this city of Ottawa. Now, what objection could there be to that? There could

be no objection urged, although I myself am a strong believer in representation on the basis of population so far as it can be worked out. That is unquestionably the true principle.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. POWELL. I do not know whether the right hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." ironically, or as an expression of his genuine sentiment. So far as New Brunswick is concerned, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) pointed to Westmoreland as an anomaly. Well, it is an anomaly. To-day, I suppose, I represent nearly 50,000 souls, the largest constituency in our province, by all odds, with the exception of St. John. Westmoreland contains as large a population as the constituency represented by the Minister of Railways and Canals, the county of Restigouche and the county of Victoria put together. So that one county has the same representation as three other counties in the province of New Brunswick. The principle of ridings sending individual members is doubtless the correct principle, and it is what all parties should have in view. But this is moving the sun back on the dial, it is going back to a state of affairs that every political party in every civilized country is endeavouring to get clear of as rapidly as practicable. There should be no different principle applied to New Brunswick than is applied in other provinces. The Government laid down the principle that they did not intend to meddle with affairs in the provinces any more than was necessary in order to restore the state of affairs before 1882. This is going further; it is creating an anomaly; as I said before, it is creating a state of affairs that is deprecated in every enlightened county with representative institutions. I think they would do well to act on the suggestion of the hon. member for St. John, that the county and city should be put together with two members, or else divide it on the lines of the old constituency, giving to Portland and the parishes of the county outside of Portland one member, and one to the city of St. John.

Mr. TUCKER. I have only to say that the statistics quoted by my colleague from St. John (Mr. Ellis) are quite correct. There are 11,000 voters in one division, and 3,000 in the other. The hon. gentleman quotes what was done years and years ago by our grandfathers; but I say that does not apply to us at all at this moment. What we have to deal with is the future. Now, as being interested in the general welfare of the city and county of St. John, I have written to a large number of my friends asking their opinions of the change proposed by the Government. So far, I have not received from any of those gentlemen to whom I wrote a single word against the proposed change. I consider that I was sent here for the purpose

Mr. POWELL.

of serving both the county and the city, at least it is my desire to do so, and that is what I am endeavouring to do. For that reason I raise no question in regard to the population, or in regard to what was done years and years ago. Every one here knows that the city and county of St. John returned three members some eight or ten years ago, if my memory serves me right. Now they return only two members, but we have no reason to complain, I suppose, according to the principle which prevails elsewhere.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It may appear a little strange that I should insist upon saying a word with regard to this feature now under debate as affecting the province from which I come. My opinion is that the representatives from the different provinces affected ought to be the best judges of how their province is affected by this Bill. While I am sorry to differ with the two gentlemen who have spoken on the Bill, the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis), still it is a legitimate difference. They have given their views with regard to the effect that this Bill is to have upon those particular constituencies now under discussion, the city of St. John and the city and county of St. John. I want to start out by stating that the question of representation by population has about as much to do with this discussion as it would have to do on a discussion of the tariff. The principle of representation by population was fought out in this country before confederation; it was so thoroughly fought out and established that it forms part of our constitution to-day. Representation by population was honestly carried out at the formation of confederation, and the representation of every province was based upon that principle. The advocates of that principle have adhered to it ever since, and it has remained and been acted upon ever since confederation, and will remain for all time while we have our present constitution. Quebec being taken as the pivotal province, every other province has a proportionate representation as compared with Quebec. That same clause provides for the readjustment of representation after each census, in order to carry out that principle. If the rate of population is changed so as to entitle one province to a larger representation on that basis, then provision was made for a redistribution so that the equilibrium could be kept up, that the proportion could be kept up. But so far as representation by population within each province is concerned, this Parliament never had anything to do with that, and should never occupy itself with such a discussion at all. How do I prove that? I prove it by consulting the very promoters of that principle, the men who fought it out and established the principle of representation by

population. When confederation was formed that principle prevailed with regard to the provinces. Take the large city of Montreal, that was given credit for its large population in fixing the representation for Quebec. That province received a representation based upon the whole population, including that of the large city of Montreal. In like manner Ontario obtained a representation upon its whole population including the large city of Toronto. But did the men who framed the constitution and who adopted the principle of representation by population, turn round and give Montreal a representation by population in this Parliament? Not at all. The large city of Montreal did not get representation by population as between the provinces. Then it is fair to state that having fixed that principle as it is fixed by the constitution, as between the provinces, that principle does not apply within a province when we are legislating here. Therefore, it makes no difference to Quebec, if she has her 65 members here, how the 80 or 90 members from Ontario are distributed in Ontario; nor does it make any difference to Ontario, so long as she has her quota of members here, how the 65 members of Quebec are distributed in that province. That is a question that we have nothing to do with in this Parliament, we are only concerned in maintaining the proper provincial representation.

Mr. POWELL. Might I ask a question? Was it not entirely with regard to the principle of representation by population that the counties of Queen's and Sunbury, with such a small population, were united into one constituency when New Brunswick was deprived of one member under the census of 1891?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Was that entirely the cause? We find that Restigouche, with only 8,000 or 9,000 of a population was still left with one member. No matter how you handle it, there will be inequalities of population.

Mr. POWELL. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) wants a complete answer, I will give it to him. These two counties, Queen's and Sunbury, lie contiguous to each other, but there was no way of taking from any other county on the north to make up the population of Restigouche. There was no way of doing it without creating great disturbance and dissatisfaction. These two counties lie contiguous; they were very small counties, and, as they came so near the unit of population, constituting an average electoral constituency, they were united.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will answer the question that my hon. friend (Mr. Powell) put to me, if he has not answered it himself already. That bears out the argument I was making. The union of these two counties was caused by that condition of the consti-

tution that insists upon the principle of uniform representation, based upon the population as between the provinces.

Mr. POWELL. Oh, no.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. POWELL. How did that affect it?

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to go on.

Mr. POWELL. Certainly.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I say, yes. When the census was taken, the change of population showed that New Brunswick must lose some of its representatives. It had more than it was entitled to on the basis of representation by population. I am correct in that, I suppose. The representation of New Brunswick had to be reduced in order to comply with the principle of representation by population embodied in the constitution. We had to reduce our representation by two members. Then the question arose: How can we so drop out two members as to disturb least the representation and the constituencies of our province? One member was dropped from St. John, but the city, I think, had two members then, and the county one.

Mr. ELLIS. No, that was not it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Was it the reverse?

Mr. ELLIS. Yes.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Well, the constituency that had two seats was reduced to one representative. The city and county, included together, had three representatives, and their representation was reduced to two members. We had to make a reduction of one more member. We found Queen's and Sunbury lying side by side, and it was concluded, and wisely concluded, that there was no other way of proceeding than to take away the two representatives, and give one member to these two counties. There were no other two counties that could be so easily dealt with as these two.

Mr. POWELL. Oh, yes, there were. You had Albert and King's, King's and Queen's, and Albert and Westmoreland.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The population not having made the same increase in New Brunswick as in some other provinces to maintain its representation, it had to lose two of its members, and, in making the change, the committee will agree that it was made with the least possible disturbance to the representation of the province. The only way in which this Bill interferes with New Brunswick is as to the manner in which the two representatives coming from the city and county of St. John shall be elected. It does not propose to reduce or increase that representation, but it proposes to declare that the county and the city shall each elect a member. The hon. member for Westmoreland

(Mr. Powell) says that it would not have been objectionable, if the Government had taken Portland and left it with the county, and let the old city of St. John elect one member, and the county and what is now a portion of the city of St. John elect another. The Bill itself lays down the principle that it is advisable to avoid, as far as possible, altering well-established boundaries. The representation that is fixed here will not be changed. The two representatives who will be elected are not proposed to be elected by constituencies created and defined by this Parliament. These constituencies are created and defined by the local legislature. The city of St. John is one constituency, and the county of St. John is another constituency. The Government say that they will take the constituencies of the city of St. John and of the county of St. John as they are made by the local parliament. They say to the city, which has a larger population than the county: Elect your representative. And to the county: Elect your representative. The city of St. John has a larger population, but what has been said before as to city and rural representation in regard to other cities, applies to St. John. Cities do not always suffer, although they have a larger population than rural constituencies. It is only a few years ago that the cities had over one-third of the representation in the other Chamber, and men living in St. John find constituencies in other parts of the province of New Brunswick. I hope that the section which provides for the change and for the removal of the anomaly which exists in regard to St. John, will be carried, so that the city will elect its member and the county will elect its member.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) if there is a county council, made up of representatives of the city and county of St. John.

Mr. ELLIS. There is.

Mr. HUGHES. Very well; the Government are violating county boundaries, because the county and city form one municipal organization. I want to point out to the right hon. First Minister that in North Victoria he is overlooking the sacred principle of county boundaries.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). That does not enter into the discussion here.

Mr. HUGHES. I am bringing this up as an illustration—if the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals will kindly keep quiet—to show that there is no principle in the Bill. I have the honour of representing a part of three counties—North Victoria proper, a part of the district of Haliburton, and the township of Peterborough. I draw the attention of the right hon. First Minister to this to show that the principle of county boundaries is seriously shattered in connec-

Mr. COSTIGAN.

tion with North Victoria. If the hon. gentleman would adopt the principle of county boundaries, restore Peterborough where it properly belongs to-day, and give to North Victoria the district of Haliburton, which belongs to North Victoria for judicial purposes, I think he would be acting in harmony with the principle of the Bill. They have done me all the harm they could by letting me seriously alone in that riding. I can tell the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan), who thinks that members from other provinces have no right to interfere in regard to New Brunswick, that we have as much right in this Parliament to discuss a question pertaining to New Brunswick as he has, and we shall not hesitate to do it either. If the principle of county boundaries is to be carried out in this Bill, then the suggestion of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) should be adopted. There is a county council for the city and county of St. John, so that it is just as much an integral municipality as any other municipality in the Dominion. They talk about county boundaries in the province of Ontario, but under this Bill they have violated county boundaries in many respects. Do these gentlemen opposite know of the recent County Councils Act in the province of Ontario, under which municipal boundaries just as sacred as any mentioned in this Bill, have been violated. I presume there are not half a dozen townships or local municipalities in the province of Ontario that are not cut in pieces under this new County Councils Act. We find part of the town of Lindsay voting with part of the township of Ops to elect a municipal councillor and part of another section of Ops voting with Emly. They have divided farms in some cases under this Act, and the Liberals in Ontario claim it works well, although I think to the contrary. There is not the same necessity for maintaining county boundaries in the representation for this Parliament as there is for the local legislature or the county councils, but, on the contrary, I adhere to the old principle that the province should be divided up as nearly as possible into equal units of population for federal purposes. A county like Restigouche, with a large territory and a scattered population, I think a district such as that, though small in population, should have a member. I maintain that the Government should adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis).

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) has stated that this clause violates the principle upon which the present Bill is alleged to be based. Any one who understands the law with regard to the existing conditions in the city and county of St. John, would not make that statement. It is true, as stated by the

hon. member (Mr. Hughes), that there is a general municipal organization, including both the city and county of St. John, but that organization is only for certain limited purposes, such as the maintenance of the poor, which can, no doubt, be better managed by a combination of the two municipalities. But while there is a county or municipal council for the city and county combined, there is a distinct municipal organization for the city of St. John, and the city, under provincial legislation, is distinct from the county for electoral purposes.

Mr. HUGHES. Is there a separate and distinct county council for the county, outside of the city?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is not, but all the same, by law in the province of New Brunswick, there is a distinct county called the county of St. John.

Mr. POWELL. The city and county.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, called the county of St. John, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) does not seem to be familiar with the law on that any more than he is familiar with the facts, when he stated that this change was made in consequence of the result of an election which took place in the city of St. John.

Mr. POWELL. I did not say that. I said that it was two years after your candidates were defeated in the city of St. John that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) went to work and carved out a constituency, by taking parts of four parishes and giving 10,000 people two members, contrary to what had been prevailing in the city almost from time immemorial.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) only stated part of the fact. He could not have misrepresented the situation more clearly if he designed to do so, than he did when he stated that the division took place in consequence of an election some two or three years previously. In the year 1889 there was a consolidation of certain of the parishes of the county, which constituted the city of Portland prior to that date, and it was united with the city of St. John. The city of St. John, from that period, and at the time of the legislature referred to, comprised all the territory previously included within the two cities of Portland and St. John. Subsequent to that combination, a feeling arose in the county of St. John that they were not in as good a position in the legislature from the point of view of representation as they were entitled to be, and not only did the councillors representing the county of St. John, but the councillors representing the whole municipal organization of the city and county petitioned the Government to make

this division, and to set up the four parishes which constitute the county to-day, as an electoral district, and to make the combined cities of St. John and Portland, known as the city of St. John and Portland, electoral district, and give them separate representation in the provincial legislature.

Mr. POWELL. That petition was never presented to the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg your pardon, that petition was presented to the Government and read to the House.

Mr. POWELL. And submitted to the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by "submitted." I stated that the municipal council of the city and county of St. John presented that petition, and that the Government considered that petition and acted upon it. There was some trouble from the Opposition upon that, as there usually is against anything that a government may propose, but I believe the change was entirely satisfactory to the people both of the city and the county; it was unquestionably satisfactory to the people of the county. The legislature declared in specific terms that there should be a county of St. John, not a city and county, but a county, and it declared that the county should be composed of that part of the city and county of St. John, outside of the city, and should consist of the parishes of Simonds, Lancaster, St. Martins and Musquash, and that they should hereafter be called the county of St. John.

Mr. HUGHES. For what purpose?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does not say for what purpose, but it says it shall be called the county of St. John, and it declares it shall be a separate electoral district and return two members.

Mr. HUGHES. Merely for electoral purposes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not care for what purpose. It answers my purpose perfectly well if it is for electoral purposes, because it is for electoral purposes we are dealing with it now.

Mr. HUGHES. Is there any such thing as a municipal council of the county of St. John? There is not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) is, I suppose, perfectly satisfied on that subject, as he has answered his own question—

Mr. HUGHES. There is an electoral county of St. John, but there is no municipal

county of St. John, as I understand it. If I am wrong, let the hon. gentleman set me right.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a distinct county constituted by the provincial legislature, and known as the county of St. John. I do not care whether it is limited to electoral purposes or whether it is municipal; that is entirely beside the question. The legislature of that province having the right to deal with the question, and having a better knowledge of the situation, I think, than any member on the other side of the House, who has been recently addressing himself to this question, has made this provision; and I think we are proceeding on lines entirely in harmony with the principle of this Bill when we say that the county of St. John shall have one member and the city of St. John shall have one member. I cannot see, for the life of me, how there can be any objection grounded on principle to this arrangement. I could understand that there might be a feeling in regard to it among certain people in the city of St. John, though I have not learned that there is any such feeling. I have, in common with my hon. friend representing the city and county (Mr. Tucker), taken every means to ascertain what the feeling in the city of St. John has been in reference to this change; and I have not yet ascertained that there is any objection to it in that constituency. I think I would be safe in saying that if there had been much objection, we would have heard of it. My hon. friend would certainly have heard of it; it would not have been necessary for him to write to people, for they would have made known to him their objection, as I think they would have done to me; for I have been a resident of the city for a number of years, and have been in close communication with the people there. So that, so far as the general principle on which the legislation before the committee has been framed, I cannot see how objection can be taken from any quarter, because we are following the lines which the provincial legislature has laid down governing its electoral powers. I do not know how we could appeal to a safer authority or ask a better guide than the people of the province; and I fully approve of the argument made by my hon. friend from the county of Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan), when he so lucidly pointed out that after all it must be a question resting largely with the people of the province, how they should desire to have their electoral divisions made up, and is not so much a question for the other provinces of the Dominion. There might very well be some objection among the people of the city of St. John, based upon the ground that, whereas under the existing law they have a right to vote for two members, if this becomes law they will only have a right to vote for one;

Mr. HUGHES.

and to that extent it becomes a fair matter for consideration, and has received a great deal of consideration. But we had to deal with an anomaly so grave that there is no parallel to it in respect to the representation of any of the counties or ridings throughout the whole Dominion. We say to the people who are living on one side of the boundary line between the city and the county: "You shall have two votes," and we say to the people on the other side of the boundary, "You shall have only one vote." That is to say, we say to the people of the city of St. John: "You shall have the right to elect a member for yourselves and solely by your own votes, and you shall have the right to overrun and swamp the votes in the county when a member is being elected for the county portion of the city and county." That is an anomalous condition, and it required to be dealt with in some way or other. It might have been dealt with in the form in which my hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Ellis) preferred, that there should be a combination of the city and county, and two members chosen by the city and county combined, each elector voting for the two. For that view there is very much to be said. But there can be nothing said for a continuation of the existing condition of things. Now, when it became necessary for us to consider the question as between the city and the county, and when I conferred with my hon. friends who directly represent that district in this House, and when there was no strong opposition to this proposition on the part of either, but a very decided opinion in its favour on the part of one, and when we came to take into account the fact that the city, having it is true a larger population, still had all the influence which naturally radiates from a large city and the principal city of the province, and when we considered that the county with its separate and divided interest might very well claim to have a voice in the election of one member for itself, it seemed to be fair and reasonable and entirely in harmony with the principle on which this Bill is founded that the constituencies should be divided in the manner in which we have proposed to Parliament. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) seemed to have a confused idea with regard to what the Bill, as first introduced, proposed, and what this amendment proposes. He is entirely in error. I admit that the hon. gentleman has a perfect right to interpret any Bill as he pleases; but both he and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) cannot be right; one or the other must be wrong. Well, I think the general sense of the House would be that my hon. friend from South Lanark is astray in his interpretation. The Bill is founded upon the 5th section of the Act of 1892, which declares:

That in the province of New Brunswick, the electoral district of the city of St. John shall consist of the city of St. John as now existing under provincial legislation.

The electoral district of the city of St. John is and was, at the passing of this Act, declared to be a separate electoral division, and entitled to elect one member.

The Dominion adopted the bounds and limits of the city of St. John, as defined by provincial legislation; that is all it did. The Act of 1892 declared that that division should have the right to send one member to Parliament. That stands; we do not propose to interfere with that. The Bill as it first came in did not interfere with that. There is where my hon. friend is wrong. He supposes that the Bill does interfere with that, and that we are proposing to alter what we first presented to Parliament. In that he is in error, because the amendment we are now submitting, and the amendment originally submitted, do not interfere with subsection "a" of section 5. We leave subsection "a," and repeat it exactly as it is found in the Act of 1892. It is repeated for greater clearness, not because there is any doubt in our minds in regard to what would be necessary legal interpretation; but we thought it better, as a matter of prudence, and out of the abundance of caution, which my hon. friend as a lawyer will understand, to put both of these sub-clauses together in the new Act, so that everybody could see at a glance what alterations have been made in reference to this constituency without turning up the previous Act. That is the sole object of the amendment now proposed.

Mr. HAGGART. I was not aware of the clause in the Act of 1892, but took the divisions in the British North America Act, under the impression that they were the same at present. I took the electoral districts as they were made by the census of 1891, and I found that a part of St. John county consists of Dufferin, Mason, Lorne, Stanley and Victoria wards, and I was just going to ask the hon. member for St. John whether these wards have the right to vote for him as representative of the city of St. John?

Mr. ELLIS. They did at the last election.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, they are part of the city now.

Mr. HAGGART. If the Act of 1892, which I was not aware of, making the electoral districts of St. John city and St. John county the same as they were made by the provincial government, were not in force, then my argument was perfectly correct, but I was not aware of the change made in 1892, and I see that hon. gentlemen opposite are only correcting what is really a doubtful description by their amendment.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to enter my protest—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You have done that already.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend, I am sure, has no intention to interrupt me improperly in any way. I wish to enter my protest very strongly against the doctrine laid down by the Minister of Railways. We are going further and further away from the old views held in this House, and interfering more and more apparently, under the present Administration, with the rights and privileges of this House. During last session we had our right to settle the basis of our own franchise taken from us, and now the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals tells us that we ought to hand over to the provinces the right to define the constituencies for the election of members to this House. That is what I desire to enter my protest against, and what I had not protested against before, because the hon. Minister was the first person to advance such a monstrous proposal. We are to-day face to face with this condition of things, that a member of the Administration tells us that, in his judgment, we ought to hand over to the provincial legislatures the formation of constituencies for members of this House. I should like to know from the hon. Minister of Marine whether that is his view or not. I should like to know whether he approves of handing over to the provincial authorities the right to settle the bounds of constituencies for the election of members to this House? That is a new doctrine, and one which will not commend itself to the Parliament of Canada nor to the people. The privileges of this House were sufficiently encroached upon last session without a further inroad being effected, as suggested by the hon. gentleman. However, the view he propounds is fortunately not embodied in this measure, because hon. gentlemen opposite have not in this measure dealt with the constituencies in that way but have formed the constituencies to suit themselves. The hon. gentleman talks again about an anomaly, and I challenge again hon. gentlemen opposite to give some reason why they are so anxious to interfere with this anomaly, as they call it, at present. It is doing no harm to any one, there is no protest against it from any quarter, it is not suggested that any of the people in these constituencies in any way disapprove of the present conditions. Why then should it be interfered with now? It is not within the four corners of this measure. The only excuse given for the introduction of this measure at all is the excuse that it is necessary to redress some grievance which was brought about by the Act of 1882. But no one pretends that the Act of 1882 in any way interferes with these constituencies. Why cannot the anomaly which has stood for a hundred years remain until the census is taken? I understand that for a hundred years the city and the county of St. John have been voting together. If I am wrong in that statement, my hon. friend opposite

(Mr. Ellis) will correct me. What is the reason for interfering with that condition of things now? None so far has been assigned. Hon. gentlemen opposite must either assign some reason for this extraordinary course or admit that the one they have put forward on behalf of this Bill is not a valid one. I should like very much if my hon. friend the Minister of Marine, would tell me if he can suggest any reason why it is improper to allow this condition of things to remain as it has existed for so many years until we take the next census, especially in view of the fact that no one has complained, and that there is no evidence at all before the House that the change may not be undesirable to the people who are to be interfered with.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I do not see much benefit in repeating time and again the arguments that have been urged so forcibly by my hon. friend behind me. The Minister of Railways has already explained that the province of New Brunswick thought it was time this anomaly should cease, and they did away with it as regards the provincial electoral districts. With regard to those districts, they determined that the county should have a representation of its own and not to be swamped by the city vote, and that the city should have a representation of its own. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways says that that decision, reached by the province and approved by the people of the city and county, is a just one, and should be applied by us to the electoral districts of the Dominion by giving the county a representation of its own and not allowing it to be swamped by the city vote, and giving the city a representation of its own. That is the principle of the Bill, following on the lines of the provincial legislature on the subject. The only ground for this amendment is to remove the possibility of any doubt which might arise and make more clear what I think is sufficiently clear in the Bill itself, namely, that the intention of Parliament is to give one member to the city and one to the county.

Mr. HUGHES. Does not the provincial legislature give twice as much representation to the city as to the county?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. Why does not the hon. gentleman do the same?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We would if we could, but unfortunately we are not entitled to another member.

Mr. BERGERON. If we pursue the investigation a little further, we shall have from hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches a certificate from the city of St. John

Mr. McNEILL.

asking for this division. The hon. member for the city and county said he had written many of his friends and never got an answer. A little while afterwards my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals said about the same thing—that he had consulted people down there and had received no answer. In fact, nobody asked for it and nobody spoke against it. I do not wonder at it, because nobody down there knows the measure that was presented to the House to-day. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries goes further. He said that they are only doing what the people desire—that the people of New Brunswick asked for this.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I stated that the provincial legislature had already legislated to divide the county from the city of St. John.

Mr. BERGERON. This has been brought into the matter by the speech of my hon. friend from Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan), because nobody ever thought of it before. If we are to revert to the divisions made by local legislatures, this Parliament will have an immense amount of work to do before we prorogue. You will have to go through the province of Ontario, and the province of Quebec also, because it has not been divided in the same way for the Dominion as for the local legislatures. The hon. member for Victoria found this legislation perfectly good in 1892, and was one of those responsible for passing it. But to-day he finds it is better to divide the counties according as the local legislatures do. But he has to answer the pertinent question put to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It is true, that the local legislature divided the county from the city of St. John, but then they gave four members to the city and two members to the county.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. How would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) cut up two representatives in such a way as would give to the city twice the representation that is given to the county?

Mr. BERGERON. I am not saying what I would do just now. I stated it a few minutes ago. I am now answering the argument of my hon. friend who says they have adopted the same course as taken by the local legislature. But I am showing that they do nothing of the kind, for the local legislature give four members to the city and two to the county. But here it is proposed to give one member to the city with 40,000 population, and one to the county outside the city with 10,000 population. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a few moments ago read, in answer to my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), the statute of 1892, but he did not read the whole of it. He said that he thought

they might as well come down here and ask to go into committee again and put this through. They did well, for they would not have been able to have put this into operation, if they had not come back and made the change they now propose. How does the present law read ?

The electoral district of the city of St. John shall consist of the city of St. John as now existing under provincial legislation.

That was all right, had the Government left the Bill as it was ; but it goes on to say :

The city of St. John, as now existing under provincial legislation, shall also form part of the electoral district of the city and county of St. John.

The Government would not be able to put the Bill into operation without coming here and proposing what they are now proposing. The hon. member for Victoria a few moments ago, when he spoke of dividing the counties on the same lines as those for the local legislature, spoke of Montreal. Montreal is given six members. It has been divided in the same way for the federal as for the local House. But this is not acting in accordance with that one question, because in the local legislature the city of St. John has twice as many members as the county. The question we are discussing now is, whether we shall adopt the principle laid down by my right hon. friend, when he first introduced the Bill, to divide the counties according to population, or whether he shall follow the other principle on which he now insists, of following the divisions for provincial purposes. So many principles have been appealed to since this Bill came before us, that it would be difficult to know which one the Government is really acting upon. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is perfectly satisfied to accept the changes made by the local legislature. But how does he stand in his own province with respect to that ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All right.

Mr. BERGERON. Not at all ; if he were to follow the local lines in his province, he would have to change his position altogether. This shows the absurdity of the whole thing. I would suggest that the proposal made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) should be accepted, and that the city and county of St. John should be united, and two members elected, as you have in Hamilton, Ottawa, Pictou and Halifax. This would give two members to a population of about 50,000. As I said a few moments ago, if this is not done, the people will believe that there is some special object to be served, and that that is not a good object. The division is not being made according to any principle hitherto laid down. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Cus-

toms said that it was evident this was a good Bill, because we did not propose any amendments to it. But the reason for this was given by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), when he said we did not recognize the constitutionality of the Bill. I hope that somebody will move to have the city and county of St. John united, with power to elect two members for the Dominion Parliament, and I should be glad to vote for that.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I must say that I fail altogether to understand the opposition that is given to this proposal. It alters nothing at all, but simply defines the boundaries. So far as the representation is concerned, it leaves things just as they are at present.

Mr. BERGERON. No.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, I will leave it to the judgment of the House. I have endeavoured to make myself understood, and I will try once more. It is so plain to me that I cannot understand why there should be any debate about it. At the present time the elector of the city of St. John votes for one member.

Mr. BERGERON. He votes twice.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, having given one vote for member for the city of St. John, he gives another vote for member for the city and county of St. John. Now, let us suppose that if in the city of St. John there are 5,000 electors. Of these, 4,000 vote for one candidate, and 1,000 vote for the other candidate. The same men then give another vote for the second candidate, 4,000 for one, and 1,000 for the other. But for the second vote they vote with, let us say, 900 electors in the county of St. John, of whom 500 vote for one candidate and 400 vote for the other. So, you have absolutely the same result. The second vote is altogether lost. Whether the vote is cast or is not cast, the second man is always elected by the county of St. John, because in the city of St. John, though the same electors have given the same vote, it is clear that, so far as the electors in the county of St. John are concerned, they are not affected by the vote in the city.

Mr. BERGERON. Why give them the vote, then ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not see why, and that is the reason why we propose to do away with this anomaly and separate them. They get only one vote each under the arrangement we propose. At the present time the second vote is lost.

An hon. MEMBER. I do not see that. Suppose there are 900 electors in the county of St. John, and 500 vote for one candidate and 400 for the other, that leaves 100 majority.

Mr. BERGERON. There is a reverse side to that medal.

The PRIME MINISTER. Suppose that in the city of St. John 4,000 voted one way and 3,000 voted the other way, you have 1,000 of a majority in favour of one candidate. In the county of St. John you have 4,500 voting for one and 1,400 for the other, leaving a majority of 3,100. Take it as you please, the second vote does not count, therefore it is simply making the matter clear if you compel the people to vote separately.

Mr. WALLACE. I have followed closely the figures given by the First Minister and I must say that I could not understand his argument.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is no fault of mine.

Mr. WALLACE. He says that it is no fault of his, but I contend that it is his fault. I say that there is not one member on this side of the House, and not one member on that side of the House, that can go over the figures that he gave us and understand them. There is only one thing about it that I did find clear. He said that they first vote for a member in the city, then they vote for a member in the city and county, and that will give the same result. Well, turn up the record of the last election and see. In the last election the member for the city of St. John (Mr. Ellis) had a majority over the next highest candidate of 722. Then, we come to the city and county, and we find that Col. Tucker was in a minority in the city in that same district of 1,892. Then, how does that tally with the statement made by the First Minister that the result is the same in both cases? In his county we are now discussing, in the last election, Mr. Ellis had a majority in the city, and Col. Tucker was in a minority of ninety-two in the city, but was elected by a majority of 191 in the county.

The PRIME MINISTER. I went so far as to say that the proportion was the same, giving so many votes to one person and so many to the other.

Mr. WALLACE. But the thing does not work out on any definite plan. In the election before that, the result was different, because there were two Conservatives elected, and each of them had a majority in the city of St. John. I am reminded that Sir Leonard Tilley was elected in 1878 in St. John by a majority of eight, whilst his colleague in the city, Mr. Burpee, a Liberal, was elected for the city and county by an overwhelming majority. So that the rule laid down by the First Minister did not apply in 1896, and it did not apply in 1878. Now, the member for the city and county of St. John (Mr. Tucker) says

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

that he is quite satisfied. Well, I suppose he would be. He gets a five constituency of 10,000 people, or less. In the last election 1,948 votes were polled in this constituency. There were three candidates, there was the liveliest opposition, and every man had an opportunity of voting pretty well for a candidate expressing his views. But in spite of that 1,948 votes polled at the last election in the county of St. John, and 7,204 votes polled in the city of St. John, each of these constituencies is to have a member.

The member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan), says that this is the right thing, that he is satisfied. He says, moreover, that this is a principle that has prevailed ever since confederation except as regards the distribution of representation between the provinces. Sir, I repudiate any such statement. Go over the redistribution of 1882. Surely the member for Victoria must have been sleeping in this House ever since to have made such a statement as that. Go to the county of Cornwall. It had 9,904 population, Stormont had 13,294; these were added together, making 23,198, a little more than the unit of population. But it was in accordance with the principle of representation by population. We had four new members and had to create four new constituencies in the province of Ontario. But that was done in accordance with the principle of representation by population, nothing more or less. Yet the member for Victoria does not appear to have known that. Take the county of North Simcoe. It had a population of 49,000, a redistribution took place, and it had a population of 26,000 closely in accordance with the principle of representation by population. Take the constituency of Niagara, comprising the town of Niagara and the township of Niagara. It had a population of 3,445. The county of Lincoln, alongside, had 22,000, in round figures. These were joined together, making a constituency of 23,000, because there were some other changes. Yet we find one of the men responsible for that legislation, one of those who had been a member of the Government for fourteen years after that legislation was passed, getting up in this House and telling us that there was no principle of representation by population in the Redistribution Bill of 1882 nor in any previous or subsequent Bill. Why, Sir go over the whole list. Take the county of Norfolk, take the county of Brant. In North Brant there were 11,800; under the redistribution there were 17,600, in accordance with the principle of representation by population. In North Perth there were 34,000, redistributed there were 26,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Take Leeds and Grenville.

Mr. WALLACE. Very well; we find no change made in it.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Yes, there was.

Mr. **WALLACE**. A slight change.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. They left it with 12,000.

Mr. **WALLACE**. North Leeds and Grenville, I suppose, the Minister meant. Is that what he meant?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Leeds and Grenville.

Mr. **WALLACE**. There is no such constituency. North Leeds and Grenville is the constituency. There were 12,924, and it is true that under the redistribution there were 12,423, or a decrease of 500. I do not say that in every constituency they were brought up or brought down to the exact unit of population, but I do say, that, running through the whole of that Act and taking every constituency, there was a measurable and successful effort made to bring them closely to the unit of population. I have a column showing the population previous to the redistribution and those afterwards, and if hon. gentlemen will look over it they will find that there was a fair and successful effort made to bring about this result wherever changes took place. In many places changes were not made, because the principle of county boundaries might have been applied with injury to the principle of representation by population. East of Toronto, there is no doubt that the unit of population was smaller than it was west of Toronto, where the counties were larger and more populous than in the eastern part of Ontario. When the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan) gets up and tells us that representation by population has not been a question since confederation as to the number of representatives that each province would send to Parliament, he totally disregards the history of legislation and the history of this Parliament in those years.

Mr. **McMULLEN**. No.

Mr. **WALLACE**. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), as usual, blunders and says, no.

Mr. **McMULLEN**. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) has blundered all the time.

Mr. **WALLACE**. I can read twenty or thirty more counties where changes have been made on the principle of representation by population.

Mr. **McMULLEN**. Where it suited you, that principle was adopted, and where it did not suit you it was not.

Mr. **WALLACE**. It would have suited the Conservative party to have kept Cornwall and Stormont as two separate constituencies, because each of them had sent a Conservative to Parliament. The four constituencies that were joined together, when

two constituencies were abolished, were represented by Conservatives, and we might fairly assume would be represented at the next election by Conservatives. Parliament under Conservative rule voluntarily abolished these two constituencies and deprived them of these two members. That cannot be denied, even by the hon. member for North Wellington, or the hon. Postmaster General. They cannot deny that Niagara and Lincoln were represented by Conservatives, and that they each gave Conservative majorities in the next general election. The same thing can be said in regard to Cornwall and Stormont. They gave Conservative majorities in 1878, and again in 1882, if taken separately. Therefore, they would have returned Conservatives, but the Conservative party voluntarily abandoned the political advantage that they had for the purpose of giving effect to the principle of representation by population.

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

### After Recess.

#### GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 118) respecting the Great Northern Railway Company, and to change its name to the Great Northern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Savard.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 9 (b),

Mr. **HAGGART**. What is the meaning of this?

Mr. **SUTHERLAND**. This is practically the clause recommended by the sub-committee to whom the Bill was referred. Dr. Russell was chairman of the sub-committee and drafted the amendment, and I added the words "ownership by purchase or by lease," to make it consistent with the latter part of the clause; as I was informed that the company might have a great deal of difficulty in purchasing the right, but they would have no difficulty if they had an undertaking from the present company to lease it to them for a long period of years.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. There is nothing serious in the change?

Mr. **SUTHERLAND**. No. It was threshed out by the sub-committee and they thought in view of all the circumstances that this company should adopt the obligations of the old company, and this is the means of carrying it out.

Mr. **HAGGART**. I do not understand the explanation. What is the obligation imposed upon this company?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Either to pay back the bonus they got from the parish of St. Andrews, or to procure the ownership of the road by lease or purchase and operate it as by the agreement under the subsidy clause. There is a clause in the subsidy agreement, under which they undertake to operate the road, but they failed to do so and transferred it to another company. It is a long story, but this clause was drafted by the sub-committee and passed almost unanimously by the Railway Committee after a long discussion.

Mr. HAGGART. Was the obligation transferred to another company by Act of Parliament?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It was confirmed by Act of Parliament.

Mr. HAGGART. Why do you impose on this company an obligation which was transferred to another company by Act of Parliament.

Mr. BERGERON. It is a long story, and if my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) were present at the Railway Committee he would understand it. It was very seriously considered by the sub-committee and its recommendation was endorsed unanimously by the Railway Committee. There were seven miles of railway between Lachute and St. Andrews, and it belonged to the Great Northern Railway Company. The gentleman who was representing the whole company obtained subsidies from Quebec, and municipal subsidies amounting to \$59,000, and he got \$10,000 from the municipality of St. Andrews on condition that he should operate the line between Lachute and St. Andrews. After a few years it was found the road did not pay, and a charter was obtained here by what was called the Ottawa Valley Railway Company, and a transfer of that seven miles was made from the Great Northern to the Ottawa Valley Railway Company, the latter company being simply on paper. Later on the proprietor of that company—if I may call him so, for there was only one gentleman in it—transferred that piece of road from the Ottawa Valley Railway Company, which actually never had been in existence, to the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway, but without the obligation of operating the line. This was never sanctioned by Parliament or by Order in Council. The new company, the Great Northern comes in and their line is in that part of the country, and when they apply for a charter the municipality of St. Andrews intervenes and asks that that line for which they have paid a bonus should be operated, or that they be reimbursed their \$10,000. This amendment declares that the Great Northern shall acquire, either by lease or purchase, that road between St. Andrews and Lachute and operate it, or that

Mr. HAGGART.

they pay back to the parish of St. Andrews the \$10,000 that was voted by it.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not understand that. The obligation was transferred to another company, and as I understand the transfer of the obligation was sanctioned by Act of Parliament. Is that so?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is a disputed point. The one point my hon. friend left out was that this branch and the part now under this company were all originally the Great Northern, that is, under the ownership of Armstrong; and when he wanted to transfer the road to the present company, they did not want to take this branch, with the obligation resting upon it; and, as the sub-committee put it, they got up this scheme to transfer to this paper company these nine miles and the rest of this branch. The committee do not consider that that was legally done, and they think the obligation should now be placed on the original company. They hold that the original company were aware of all the facts, and have no right to claim that they should be relieved.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

#### REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 126) respecting representation in the House of Commons.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. D. HENDERSON. It seems to me, after listening carefully to several hours' discussion of this amendment, that the whole thing narrows itself down to a very small point. From all the information I could obtain, both in the House and elsewhere, with regard to the city of St. John and the county of St. John, I am led to believe that there is a municipality known by the name of the city and county of St. John. If that is the case, and it is the intention of the Government to give that municipality two representatives, I fail to see why the division between the two portions of this municipality should be made in a different way from what is done in the province of Ontario, where the judges are to decide as to the particular portions of each municipality that will form the respective electoral divisions. Section 2 of the Bill reads thus:

Where, under the foregoing provisions, any county or city is to be divided into more than one electoral district, such division shall be made by a board of commissioners.

Now, instead of the House determining that one portion of this municipality of the city and county of St. John shall send one representative and another portion shall send another representative, it seems to me that the same rule should be applied to St. John that applies to other municipalities in the Do-

minion. If not, what is the use of a principle at all? We are told that one of the leading principles of this Bill is that the judges should decide; but here, in the case of the municipality of the city and county of St. John, there seems to be a complete evasion of that principle; for the division, instead of being made by the judges, is proposed to be made by this Parliament, and in a way that seems to me to be extremely unfair, when we take the population into consideration. As I understand, one of the ridings shall have a population of nearly 40,000 and the other a population of only 10,000. I fail to see why the general principle of the Bill should not apply to this case.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan) stated that in the case of the city and county of St. John, there was an evil that should be remedied. The hon. gentleman is not in the House; but as nothing I have to say is of a personal nature, I will refer to his argument and will refer to it very briefly. That hon. gentleman was in this House in 1872; he was in the House in 1882; he was in this House in 1892; he was a member of this Government in both years, 1882 and 1892; in each of those years there was a Bill passed relating to the redistribution of seats in the House of Commons consequent upon the completion of the decennial census; yet it is a most remarkable fact that the hon. gentleman, who had the opportunity of remedying any evil that existed in respect to the representation of the city and county of St. John, should have allowed the matter to go unheeded in 1872, especially in 1882, when he was a member of the Cabinet, and had an opportunity to rectify it, and again in 1892, when he was still a member of the Cabinet, and had another opportunity to rectify it. Then, as respects the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), he says that at the time the Bill of the New Brunswick legislature of 1891 was passed through the New Brunswick House of Assembly, he was acting in pursuance of a petition from the council of the city of St. John, or the municipality of the county and city of St. John. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. In the first place, he had no such petition, and no petition was presented to the House of Assembly in 1891. In the year 1891, in which a Bill in relation to the Act of 1891 was passed, there was a petition presented to the House from the municipal council of the city and county of St. John; but it was not for the purpose of favouring the Bill of the session of 1891, nor curing the evil that the Minister says required remedying, because the Bill had then been passed. The hon. gentleman took the reins of power in the province of New Brunswick in February or March, 1883, and led the House from that time down to 1891, when this Act was passed. And it was a remarkably strange thing that although the hon. gentleman and his Government had

petitions, not from the municipal council of the city and county of St. John, but from the town council of the town of Portland, he had, if my recollection is right—and I think the hon. gentleman will not contradict me—petition after petition from the municipal or town council of the town of Portland asking that this anomaly be rectified, and that the city and county of St. John, outside the city, be allowed representation entirely distinct from the city, yet he did not act until the session of 1891. If this was right in the year 1891, when he passed the Act, it was right in 1883, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1888, 1889, 1890, but that gentleman did not seem to be seized with any earnest desire to rectify what he, in a peculiar state of affairs in 1891, considered was wrong. I have in my hand a stenographic report of the speech made by the hon. gentleman on the floor of the legislature of New Brunswick when he introduced this Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman says he has a stenographic report?

Mr. POWELL. I do.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We never had a stenographic report, nothing but a synoptical report.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman scarcely ever made a speech on the floor of the legislature of New Brunswick which was not reported by a stenographer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are entirely in error.

Mr. POWELL. I am not. It may have been epitomized afterwards, but the speech was reported by a stenographer, and the hon. gentleman had Mr. Risteen on the floor of the House, a most competent reporter, whose function was to report the speeches of the hon. gentleman, as he must remember distinctly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are the most reckless individual I ever came across in my life.

Mr. POWELL. I am very much astonished that you should say I am reckless in that respect. All that I have to say is that the impression made on the hon. gentleman's mind is made on cerebral material so incapable of receiving a lasting impression, that he is to be commiserated instead of being found fault with on this occasion. In that speech the hon. gentleman said:

He was credibly informed that on no less than four occasions had petitions strenuously urging this reform been presented, emanating from outside parishes of St. John.

He then proceeded to give his reason for pressing the Bill; and I again call the attention of the House to the fact that there never was a petition from the municipality of the city and county of St. John:

He had one before him which emanated from the corporation of Portland, in 1885, and was signed by Shadrach Holly, mayor, asking for an exclusive representation for Portland, the same as that enjoyed by the city of St. John. That petition did not get very far, the reason being—

I would call attention of hon. gentlemen to this, because the representation in the city of St. John, at the time this petition was presented was entirely a Government representation, and each and every member thereof was an ardent supporter of the hon. gentleman's government.

He had one before him which emanated from the corporation of Portland, in 1885, and was signed by Shadrach Holly, mayor, asking for an exclusive representation for Portland, the same as that enjoyed by the city of St. John. That petition did not get very far, the reason being that the then representatives from St. John were opposed to any change in the representation, not knowing how it would affect their friends and supporters in all parts of the country. They opposed it then just as the present members from St. John oppose it, because they are doubtful of its results on themselves. They had no alternative but to oppose it—they were not here as free agents. The Government in 1885, supported as it was by a united representation of St. John, did not feel like antagonizing their supporters in this House. But as the matter now stood, the Government did not look to the present representatives from St. John for advice or support. The Government would thus be in a position to remedy any injustice which existed, and which, generations ago, should have been remedied. He quoted a petition (accompanying a Bill) read in the House in 1886, asking for separate representation for Portland and the parishes.

The hon. gentleman made that speech, and it is very good reading from beginning to end, and he will find no mention in it whatever of a petition emanating from the council of the city and county of St. John. To convince the hon. gentleman, I may mention that at that time, as he will remember distinctly, the council of the city and county was entirely opposed to his government, on account of a question that agitated the minds of those people, in respect of which I may say I had very little sympathy with the then members of the city and county. The constituency was so agitated that they could carry it for any purpose they saw fit. The warden at that time was opposed to the hon. gentleman and was a member of the House of Assembly, and a member of the Opposition, and the Opposition were in an overwhelming majority at that time in the city council, so that nothing favourable to the Bill of 1891 would spring from them. I find, on consulting the journals of the House, and referring to the vote on that occasion, there was not a solitary representative from the city who voted for that Bill. There was a motion to read the Bill, section by section, the House voted on this motion, and each and every member from the city voted against the Bill by voting against the resolution to have it considered section

Mr. POWELL.

by section. Among the nays were Messrs, Hannington, Melanson, Turner, D. Lewis, Rourke, another member for the city of St. John, who at that time was the warden of the city and county of St. John, who resided in Carleton, and Mr. Shaw, another member for St. John. All the members of the House were not present. Afterwards, when the committee had gone into further consideration, it was moved that the chairman should leave the chair and report the Bill as agreed to, and the House divided, and the following voted against the motion, being the six new members of the city and county of St. John:—Dr. Stockton, Alward, Rourke, Shaw, McEwen, a present supporter of the hon. gentleman, and Mr. Smith.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They were all in opposition.

Mr. POWELL. Certainly. The hon. gentleman at that time did not introduce a Bill for the purpose of remedying an injustice. Was the hon. gentleman true to his position, as leader of the Government, when he allowed a gross injustice, as he puts it in his speech, to continue in respect of the city and county for no less a period than eight or nine years? He put forward this as a pretext; it is not his reason. When I seek for his reason I find it elsewhere. I deduce it as an inference from the facts. The hon. gentleman, in 1891, introduced this Bill that I have spoken about. The object, I have no hesitation in saying, was to gain political supporters in the city and county of St. John. He thought that though there was a fair prospect of his carrying the two seats in the county, it was utterly useless for him to think of carrying the seats in the city, where this unreasonable sentiment prevailed. What did he do? He passed this Bill of 1891. It would have been too flagrant a violation of every principle of justice for the government to have gone further at that stage, but this was only the precursor of one of the worst Bills ever sought to be put on the statute-books.

In the year 1890 a Bill had been introduced and passed in the House and become law in amendment to the Controverted Elections Act of the province of New Brunswick; and under that law, it was necessary for an election petition to proceed to trial within six months after the time it was presented, the provision of the Dominion law being copied in this respect. The six months has run by in the case of election petitions of 1890. In order to get support from the city and county of St. John, the Government after their election petitioners were dead as Julius Cæsar and all that was required was a formal motion to wipe them off the records of the courts, the Government introduced a Bill, notwithstanding the law that he himself had put through the House—a fair Act—in effect repealing this law so far

as the petitions relating to St. John were concerned. The only two petitions left hanging were those of the city and county of St. John, the Government introduced a Bill which passed into a second reading—and I have forgotten whether it passed into law or not—declaring that, notwithstanding the words limiting the time to six months, it should be assumed in respect of any election held in 1890 that this Act should not apply, and putting a construction upon the language entirely opposed to the interpretation of every lawyer who I heard express an opinion upon it. In order to prevent this outrage to be brought about, we applied to the Chief Justice, Sir John C. Allen, for an order—an order and a summons in fact—because we had to deal with it immediately, and the ex-parte order striking the petitions off then was to be used in case a hearing could not be had in time. The summons was served on the petitioner, and the hearing came on before the Chief Justice and the petitions were struck off the files of the court. This was the last we heard of this Act, so far as I recollect. It is evident that, as I have said, the Bill now before us is a moving of the sun back upon the dial. There cannot be any justification for it. The absurdity of giving ten thousand people one representative and the forty thousand people next them only one cannot be defended or excused. Anomalies do grow up, we may regret their existence yet refrain from meddling with them. Who ever heard of a legislature in the name of justice and sound legislation and advanced liberalism attempting to perpetrate such an outrage as this. The present Minister of Railways and Canals, in the legislature of New Brunswick, introduced a Bill in 1894 to give to certain counties additional members. These members were given from Carleton, Kent and Gloucester, so they should be on the basis of population in the same position of the majorities of the counties in the province. On that occasion the county of Westmoreland had not the honour to receive, although entitled to two, an additional member. But we were in the position of Opposition in the city of St. John at the time. There is a parliamentary majority behind hon. gentlemen opposite and they can put the Act through, doubtless, if they see fit. In respect to these matters, however, that touch our constituencies some sound, plain principle should be adopted. There is no principle underlying this Bill. The Government do not claim there is. The great thing in the country is to have the people believe the principles of fair-play govern and underlie the legislation, the contrary leads to anarchy. Suppose that at the next general election—a consummation devoutly to be wished—the present Government are driven from power. Well, there are men in the Conservative ranks who are governed by the same feelings as are many

Liberals to-day, and they will attempt retaliation for this measure. See the evil precedent the Government have established. In the county of St. John, 10,000 people who, for some time past, have cast a Liberal majority are to have one member, and alongside of them, 50,000 people, the majority of whom under ordinary circumstances are Conservatives are to have one representative. If political gain is to dictate the line of procedure, our constituencies will be divided not on any well-grounded principle, but according to the whims and desires—and baser desires, I have no hesitation in saying of the rank and file of the parties of this country.

I have one remark to make with respect to the hon. member for the city and county of St. John (Mr. Tucker), no wonder that he is very anxious that this Bill should pass. He is the gentleman who is said and believed to have largely footed the bills in the city and county of St. John in the last election. We all know what that means. It is unfortunate that we all have to be charged generally, in partial truth at least, with such things. The less number of constituents he has, the less will be the election bill. It is all very well for him to clamour that he may have a constituency of three or four parishes, a little pocket borough, and then throw upon his co-representatives in this House the work of carrying the large remaining portion of the constituency with an electorate of 50,000 people; but let the House understand his opinion is not disinterested.

Mr. McALISTER. Reference has been made on two or three occasions during this debate to the county of Restigouche which I have the honour to represent. It has been referred to as a county of small population. I admit the population is not very large. But there are two things to be said. In the first place this county was given a representation with the rest of the province and it has not been changed up to the present time. In the next place the county is one of very large area. Again, there is no county in the province of New Brunswick that has increased so fast in population in the last twenty years as the county of Restigouche. I find on referring to the census of 1891 that it showed a larger percentage of gain in population from 1871 to 1881 than any other county in the province. On referring to the census of 1891, I find that Restigouche leads in the same way for the decade between 1881 and 1891. The counties that increased in population between 1881 and 1891 were seven in number, and the other counties decreased in population. The increase in the county of Gloucester was 15.42 per cent; Kent, 5.4 per cent; Northumberland, 2.4 per cent; Victoria and Madawaska (one electoral district) 16.1 per cent; Westmoreland,

9.9 per cent; York, 1.9 per cent. And Restigouche showed an increase of 17.7 per cent, a larger percentage, as I have said, than any other county in the province. I may say that this increase still continues, and I think I am safe in saying that the next census will show a much larger increase than has been going on hitherto. The town of Campbellton, in which I live, in 1881 had a population of a little less than 1,500. To-day it has a population of between 3,000 and 4,000, showing that it has a little more than doubled since 1881. If the rate of increase since 1891 continues, the next census will probably show a population of between 4,000 and 5,000. Now, as I said before, while the population of the county is not large, I think that under the circumstances the Government would not be justified in interfering with it. It has a large area, and it is also increasing rapidly in population, in fact more so than any of the other counties. I make these remarks in view of the fact that reference has been made to the county of Restigouche as containing a small population, and, therefore, as being overrepresented by having one member.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). I alluded to the county of Restigouche to-day, as my hon. friend mentions, in a question I put across the floor of the House, but I did not do so for the purpose of claiming that undue representation was given to Restigouche, but only to show that there were inequalities of population, that they were inevitable, and that in the case of Restigouche there was a greater inequality of population than that which would be established, in the amendment of the Bill with respect to the city and county of St. John. My hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) has entered into this question from a point of view which is entirely new to us on this side; he has discussed the political consequences of it. I am bound to say that his explanations are quite a revelation to me. He says that, if I followed his observations intelligently, we have at present a condition of affairs which gives the Liberal party two members from the city and county of St. John, and that we have deliberately chosen to say that hereafter we shall only get one.

**Mr. POWELL.** Does the hon. gentleman not know that the Conservative party was split up by an independent candidate at the last election?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I have a pretty good knowledge of the affairs of St. John, and if I venture to make the prediction—though one should never prophesy unless he knows—you cannot by any system, not even by the ingenuity of my hon. friends opposite in their Act of 1882, cut and carve the city and county of St. John in such a manner as that it would fall to

**Mr. McALISTER.**

send two Liberals to Ottawa. That is my belief, and the prediction I venture to offer. But I may take advantage of this opportunity—as hitherto it has been largely an Ontario question that I did not care to enter into—to make a remark about Nova Scotia. Frequent reference has been made, at earlier stages of this debate, to the importance of the principle of representation by population. My hon. friend from Victoria, N.B., (Mr. Costigan) emphasized the fact that in the lower provinces we never understood that representation by population was of the great consequence which seems to have been attached to it here. As a question between the provinces, we all recognize the fact that population has to be considered. But I say, from the point of view of the province of Nova Scotia, there was never any regard paid to the principle of representation by population in the arrangement of constituencies within the limits of the number assigned to the province. Now, at the beginning of confederation we had 19 members for Nova Scotia. Every county, regardless of its size, received one member and some of those counties with small populations received the same representation as the large counties of Cumberland, Pictou and Cape Breton. As there were eighteen counties and nineteen members, the city and county of Halifax received a second member. Later on, when there was a readjustment and an additional member was assigned to Nova Scotia, even then the principle of representation by population was not recognized as the one of chief consequence, but the principle of county boundaries, which is recognized in this Bill, was regarded as the one of paramount importance, and an additional member was given to the county of Pictou—I think Pictou received a member at that time. Later on, another member was assigned to Nova Scotia, and again the question of county boundaries was regarded as the paramount question, and a second member was assigned to the county of Cape Breton. The result has been that from the beginning there were great inequalities of population, and these inequalities have been carried down to the present time. I allude to that briefly to show that this principle of representation by population, neither at the beginning of the union nor down to the present time, has ever been regarded as the paramount question in distributing the representation. The county of Cumberland contains 34,500 people, according to the last census; it is much larger to-day. But we are dealing with the census of 1891. But it has no greater representation in this House than the county of Richmond with 14,000, or Victoria, in the Island of Cape Breton, with 14,000. In each of these cases these small counties receive the same representation as the larger counties, and only in one or two exceptional cases, where the surplus members over and above the number of counties

enabled it to be done, that the counties receive two members. Looking into the case of New Brunswick, we find to-day that there are great and striking inequalities, greater than any that are proposed in this Bill. For example, the hon. member for Westmoreland states that he represents a constituency containing 50,000 people. He is probably not far from correct, but, according to the census of 1891, the population was only 41,477, though it has doubtless grown since. Yet my hon. friend from Restigouche (Mr. McAlister), representing only 8,308 people, comes from a county having the same representation that is given to the great county of Westmoreland. Right alongside Westmoreland is the county of Albert, with 10,000 people, yet Albert has the same representation in this House as the great county of Westmoreland. And so, you may go through all those counties, and you will find these inequalities existing. They have existed from the beginning, they must continue to exist, and they exist because in the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia the principle of representation by population was not recognized within the province, but the first and great question was, that each county should, if possible, have a representative. County boundaries was the paramount principle then, and not the question of representation by population. In the cases of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick more recently, there was a redistribution whereby two small counties were united. Perhaps this was the most convenient way, though the arrangement is open to strong objections. There again the principle of county boundaries was recognized; and it will be found in every case in the lower provinces that the principle of county boundaries has been regarded of greater importance than the principle of representation by population.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I do not know what meaning my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) gives to the term "always." I can assure him that he is very much mistaken in saying that the question of representation by population has never been considered in the province of Nova Scotia.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Not of so much importance as county boundaries.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** When I had the honour of first obtaining a seat in the House of Assembly in Nova Scotia, as my hon. friend knows, Falmouth, with 146 electors, I think, returned a member.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I was speaking of representation in the Federal Parliament.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** In fact, there was a regular system of small boroughs in the shape of townships with very small populations and a very small number of electors. My hon. friend knows that the

government of which I first had the honour of being a member, brought in a Bill for the purpose of dealing with this very question and equalizing the population according to representation. I am afraid that he did not take as much interest in those matters at that time as I did, and consequently may not remember the circumstances. But we were unable to carry the Bill which we introduced in the legislature of Nova Scotia, and were obliged to withdraw it and fall back upon county representation, which, as he says, has prevailed up to this time. But he is well aware that a great change was made in equalizing the representation in the province of Nova Scotia, and that while county boundaries were maintained to a large extent, and from the difficulty there is in completely carrying out the principle of representation by population, still we have always had that in view, and the moment we had another member added to the province, we at once gave that second member to the county next largest to Halifax, the county of Pictou. Subsequently, when we obtained another member—I think it was subsequently—we extended the same thing to the county of Cape Breton, because those two counties, Pictou and Cape Breton, each had a larger population than any other county in that province. While it is true that county boundaries have been observed to a very large extent, the question of representation by population has always been kept in view, and, consequently, when we lost a member we had to carry out that principle as nearly as we could by putting the two smallest counties together. It has been frankly admitted that it has been attended with great difficulty, but as far as it could be done, both of these principles, county boundaries and representation by population, have been respected in the province of Nova Scotia. I only rose for the purpose of reminding my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) that since I entered public life a great deal of attention has been paid to equalizing representation according to population.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** There is not much difference between my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) and myself in this matter. I confined my observations from the time of confederation onward, because I did not suppose that what occurred before confederation would have any bearing on the question. I did not argue that population has no value in this matter at all. I do not propose to say that in arranging representation anybody can be absolutely indifferent to population, but my point was that representation by population was never considered to be of the chief importance and was not regarded at all as of equal importance to the principle of county boundaries, because in no case in the province of Nova Scotia have county boundary lines been disturbed. If the true principle be that there

should be a unit of representation based on population, the breaking of county boundary lines in Nova Scotia, as was done in Ontario, might have secured what might have been a more equitable representation, so far as the unit of representation is concerned, but in Nova Scotia county boundary lines were always regarded as being more important than the securing of absolute equality in the unit of population.

**Mr. McALISTER.** The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) made a comparison between the county of Restigouche and that part of the county of St. John intended to be created into a separate riding by this Bill. The census, I think, shows that the latter has a larger population than Restigouche, but, unless it has had a very rapid increase in population since 1891, I have no hesitation in saying that the population of Restigouche is much larger than that part of that county of St. John, and when the census of 1901 is taken, I think it will bear me out in this statement.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Mr. Chairman, when you took the Chair it was understood with the right hon. the Prime Minister that we would be allowed to ask a few questions about section 3, which was passed on Friday night. I want to be very brief, because I am almost afraid to open a new subject, as there is so much discussion upon it, and it may be carried too far. I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister upon what principle he has taken the parish of Lavaltrie from L'Assomption and put it back in Berthier?

**The PRIME MINISTER.** Upon the principle that it broke county lines.

**Mr. BERGERON.** It does not show upon the map that it is better because it is reversed. The map which we have, and I suppose it is correct, shows that the parish of Lavaltrie is entirely out of the county of Berthier. It shows that, by the topography of the country it belongs to L'Assomption, but, when we come to the population, which, I think, is more important, we find that there is a great deal of difference. The right hon. gentleman knows that Berthier has a population of 19,065, and that L'Assomption has a population of 13,674, making a difference of nearly 6,000. When the Government, in 1892, took the parish of Lavaltrie from Berthier and added it to L'Assomption, they were equalizing the population by within about 1,000 souls. After the parish of Lavaltrie had been transferred to L'Assomption the population stood: Berthier, 18,836; L'Assomption, 14,667. There was already over 4,000 of a difference, and my right hon. friend, by putting back the parish of Lavaltrie into Berthier, brings it to over 6,000 of a difference. Surely the principle invoked by my right hon. friend has no place here. There must be another reason. As far as county lines are concerned, the parish of

Lavaltrie belongs, for all purposes, to L'Assomption. It already makes a straight line, and this change takes it out of the straight line and it also makes a difference in the population of over 6,000. Of course, my right hon. friend is not obliged to give me all the reasons which he may have had, but I want to put before the committee the fact that it cannot be justified on the ground of the equalization of population. I see also that the Bill transfers the Caughnawaga reserve from Chateauguay to Laprairie, Napierville. My right hon. friend will remember that when he introduced this Bill I remarked to him that the Indians on the Caughnawaga reserve would be entirely out of the voting as they have been deprived of the vote by the repealing of the Franchise Act, and I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman what his object is in making this change. Surely it is not a question of population, because Chateauguay had a population of 15,800, and when the Caughnawaga reserve was attached to it there was added a population of 1,936. Laprairie and Napierville has a population of 19,065, and the right hon. gentleman is taking 1,936, which was added to 15,800, from this population, making it still smaller, and adding it to 19,065, which will make it over 21,000. Will the right hon. gentleman explain the reason why this change as to the Caughnawaga reserve has been made?

**The PRIME MINISTER.** I will explain the two changes. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) has asked me, first, the reason why we have taken the parish of Lavaltrie and put it back into the district of Berthier. The reason is that the parish of Lavaltrie, from 1852, when the last division of counties took place in Lower Canada, has been part of the county of Berthier. I do not dispute that if the legislature of that date had looked only to geometrical symmetry, they would have placed the parish of Lavaltrie in the county of L'Assomption, but the legislature of 1852 put Lavaltrie in Berthier, and about 1852 Canada was endowed with her municipal system. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) knows that in Quebec, as in Ontario, the counties are divided into local municipalities, either townships, villages or parishes, and the mayors of the local municipalities constitute the county council. Although Lavaltrie has been in L'Assomption for Dominion elections since 1892, it is still part of the county of Berthier, and the mayor of Lavaltrie attends the municipal council of Berthier. The registry office of Lavaltrie is in the county of Berthier. For judicial purposes L'Assomption belongs to the district of Joliette, and if I remember aright the county of Berthier belongs to the district of Richelieu. For all purposes, except the purpose of Dominion elections, the parish of Lavaltrie belongs to the county of Berthier, and the lists upon which the electors of Lavaltrie would vote would be

**Mr. FIELDING.**

prepared and revised under the judicial authority of the county of Berthier. That is the reason, and the sole reason, why we have made the change. The population of Lavaltrie is 987, and the majority last time in favour of the Conservative candidate was thirty-one, so it does not affect the result one way or the other.

Mr. BERGERON. I did not say that. The right hon. gentleman is always looking at the political complexion of the change.

The PRIME MINISTER. I did not look at the population so much as at the county boundaries, and I say it is far better that the people of Lavaltrie should vote with Berthier in federal elections, as they do in all other matters. These, I think, are cogent reasons why Lavaltrie should be put back in the county of Berthier.

Mr. BERGERON. Both counties belong to the judicial district of Joliette.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think so. Perhaps by a recent Act of the legislature it may be changed, but I believe even now they have concurrent jurisdiction in Richelleu and Joliette. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) asks why we took Caughnawaga from Chateauguay, and put it back in Laprairie. Well, it does not affect the result one way or the other, because the Indians do not vote. But suppose that 100 of the Indians left the tribal system and could vote, all their interests would be in the county of Laprairie, and they would have no interest for any purpose whatever in the county of Chateauguay. Caughnawaga naturally belongs to Laprairie, and for that reason we put it back.

Mr. BERGERON. If the local legislature gave the Indians the right to vote, it would put 2,000 of a population on to Laprairie county which has 19,000 already, and take it away from Chateauguay county which has only 15,000. Is that the whole explanation the right hon. gentleman has to give.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, if we had plenty of time, I think I could give some other reasons, but where is the use. Now, why was the parish of Lacolle taken from Iberville and put into Missisquoi? St. John and Iberville county has a population of 23,868, and Missisquoi has a population of only 19,256. In 1892, when Lacolle was put into Missisquoi, it was done to equalize the population between the two counties.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not at all, because they took Notre Dame de St. Stanbridge and Notre Dame des Anges from Missisquoi and put it in Iberville. What they take away with one hand they put back with another.

Mr. BERGERON. But my right hon. friend is increasing the more populous county by 1,621 population and decreasing the less populous county by the same number. My right hon. friend has spoken about the political complexion of these changes, but what has he to say to this? He is back putting a large Conservative parish into St. John county because he does not fear it there, and he is taking it away from Missisquoi where it might be dangerous to his candidate, and by taking Notre Dame des Anges and Notre Dame de Stanbridge into Missisquoi, he helps his political friend in that county.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then, if I am to follow the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron), the reason why Lacolle was put into Missisquoi in 1892 was because that Conservative parish was to help the Conservative candidate in Missisquoi, and the reason why they took Notre Dame des Anges and Notre Dame de Stanbridge away from Missisquoi was because Iberville was already strongly Liberal.

Mr. BERGERON. Not at all.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is the reason he attributed to us, and why should not I attribute it to him?

Mr. BERGERON. I have shown that it was done to equalize the population.

The PRIME MINISTER. But that was not the reason we did it. I will tell my hon. friend what the reason was. We took the parish of Lacolle from Missisquoi and put it back into the county of St. John for the reason that I have stated in regard to the parish of Lavaltrie. In 1852, by the Redistribution Act of that year, the parish of Lacolle was put into the parish of St. John, and it has remained there ever since. To-day it is part and parcel of the county of St. John's for all purposes except for Dominion elections. In the local elections, it votes in St. John's, for municipal purposes it is part of St. John's, its jurors belong to the county of St. John's, the mayor of the parish of Lacolle sits in the municipal council of the county of St. John's, and can be elected warden of the county. For district purposes it has to go to court to Iberville. On the other hand, the Act of 1892 took from the county of Missisquoi the parishes of Notre Dame de Stanbridge and Notre Dame des Anges de Stanbridge, and put them into the county of St. John's. But these parishes are part of the county of Missisquoi except for Dominion electoral purposes. The mayors of these two parishes sit in the municipal council of Missisquoi, the jurors from them are required to go, not to St. John's, but to Sweetsburgh in the district of Bedford; and, therefore, there is no reason whatever why these two parishes should not be transferred to the county of

Missisquoi where they properly belong. I stated when introducing the Bill that the main object we had in view with regard to the province of Quebec was to return to county lines, and that is the reason of these changes.

Mr. BERGERON. To go back to the divisions of 1852 is quite a reactionary step.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry you are not as conservative as you ought to be.

Mr. BERGERON. We must be the reformers, for we have lost them on the other side of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. You will make a mess of it.

Mr. BERGERON. Not worse than my hon. friend. Notwithstanding what the right hon. gentleman says, the fact remains that by the last census the population of St. John's and Iberville was 23,268, and the population of Missisquoi 19,456, a difference of nearly 4,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When the Redistribution Act of 1892 was passed, you never bothered with figures.

Mr. BERGERON. What was done by the Act of 1892 was to equalize the population by taking the parish of Lacolle, which has over 2,500 and putting it into the county of Missisquoi, and by transferring to the county of St. John's the parishes of Notre Dame de Stanbridge and Notre Dame des Anges de Stanbridge 1,625, which left a difference of about 900 to equalize the population. My hon. friend to-day is changing that altogether and giving more to the county which has more and less to the county which has less. I suppose I need not ask my hon. friend the reason for taking the parish of St. Pie from Rouville and putting it into Bagot.

The PRIME MINISTER. The same explanation.

Mr. BERGERON. The county of Bagot has a population of 21,625 and the county of Rouville a population of 16,012, a difference of over 5,000; so that the transfer of the parish of St. Pie from the county of Bagot to the county of Rouville made a difference of about 4,000, and the addition of some other parishes brought the population of Rouville up to about 20,000, or pretty near the unit. This was done, not for political purposes but purely to equalize the population. My right hon. friend now brings by this change the population of Rouville to 16,000 and leaves the county of Bagot with about 21,000. I suppose I need not speak about the transfer of the parish of St. Marcel from the county of Bagot to the county of Richelieu. I suppose there is the same explanation for that?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the reason of speaking of the parish of St. Eugène de Grantham as being transferred from the county of Bagot?

Mr. J. E. MAROIL (Bagot). I may explain to the hon. member for Beauharnois the reason, but I am obliged to explain in French, as I am not very familiar with the English language.

(Translation.) I draw the attention of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) to the fact that the wording of the Bill is not correct, when it speaks of the parish of St. Eugène de Grantham, formerly in the county of Bagot, as being transferred to the county of Drummond. Here are the reasons why this change was made. In 1867, the county of Bagot was formed from the different parishes referred to in this Bill, and from the parish of St. Hugues, which included the concession Brodeur. Later on, they created the parish of St. Eugène of Grantham, which belongs now to the county of Drummond; but, in order to form this parish, they had to dismember the parish of St. Hugues, by detaching from it the concession Brodeur, as also a part of St. Germain and a part of Drummondville. In 1892, when the census of those counties was taken, the parish of St. Pie was taken from the county of Bagot and put into that of Rouville. If, as they say, this was done in order to equalize as much as possible the population of those different counties, I submit that they should have detached the whole parish of St. Nazaire d'Acton and annexed it to the county of Bagot. At any rate, by the gerrymander of 1892, the concession Brodeur was entirely overlooked and, as a result, at the election that took place last year in the county of Bagot, there were 63 electors, belonging to that concession, who did not vote at all, having no right to vote.

I do not speak as a party man, because I do not know what the political complexion of these people is, but I think a crying injustice was done these people by depriving them of their right of vote.

The reason why we ask that St. Nazaire be put into the county of Bagot, is because that is where it properly belongs; while the parish of St. Eugène, which now belongs to the county of Drummond, and which was formerly part and parcel of the county of Bagot, will go back under this Bill, to the county of Drummond. So, you see, those people who rank among the electors of Bagot, according to the census of 1891, are not entitled to vote as such. Now, in order to avoid confusion in the preparation of the lists of voters which are now under the control of the municipalities, we have come to the conclusion that it would be preferable to annex the whole parish of St. Eugène to the county of Drummond, and to take the parish of St. Nazaire and put it into the county of Bagot.

Mr. BERGERON. The explanation of my hon. friend is very clear to me ; but I cannot understand how the wording of this can make it effective. As a matter of fact, the parish of St. Eugène de Grantham is not in the county of Bagot, and I call my hon. friend's attention to that, because the wording of the Bill cannot remain as it is, as it would not be true. I will pass now to another change that has surprised me. The Bill says that the parishes of St. Nazaire and Ste. Christine, as municipally constituted, shall be included in the electoral district of Bagot. We had a meeting there, and they voted in the election at Bagot.

Mr. MARCIL. A part of it.

Mr. BERGERON. I am speaking of the parishes. They may be badly divided, and it would be very important to see about it now. The parishes of St. Nazaire and Ste. Christine are to-day in the county of Bagot.

Mr. MARCIL. Not all of them.

Mr. BERGERON. It is important to find out which are in and which are not. The wording of this Bill, at first sight, is not correct. It is said here : "The parishes of St. Nazaire and Ste. Christine, as municipally constituted, shall be included in the electoral district of Bagot." There might be a concession or two not included, I do not know.

The PRIME MINISTER. The parish of St. Nazaire is in the county of Bagot, as an ecclesiastically constituted parish.

Mr. BERGERON. They voted the last time in the county of Bagot.

The PRIME MINISTER. They vote in the county of Bagot, but there is a part of the parish which forms part of the municipality of St. Nazaire, which is still in the county of Drummond, and it is to include that part, which is for all municipal purposes part of the parish of St. Nazaire, in the electoral district of Bagot, that we insert this clause.

Mr. MARCIL. I might explain that there is no change at all about Ste. Christine. That is just the same as before.

Mr. BERGERON. Why do you mention it then ?

Mr. MARCIL. It is only St. Nazaire in which there is a change. A part of St. Nazaire belongs to the county of Bagot, and a part to the county of Drummond, and the intention is to have the whole parish of St. Nazaire in the county of Bagot, in exchange for the sixty-three electors who used to belong to the county of Bagot and now belong to the parish of St. Eugène de Grantham, which parish belongs to Drummond county.

Mr. BERGERON. Ste. Christine belongs to the county of Bagot.

Mr. MARCIL. Yes, because a part of the parish of Ely, which belongs to the parish

of Ste. Christine does not belong to the parish of Ste. Christine for municipal purposes, but only for church purposes. They do not pay taxes to Ste. Christine or go to the council meetings.

Mr. BERGERON. Where did these people belong before ?

The PRIME MINISTER. These two parishes have been formed from two townships, part of the township of Ely and part of the township of Drummond. This is to make it absolutely sure that they will all go into the same place—that the municipal parishes of Ste. Christine and St. Nazaire shall all go to the county of Bagot.

Mr. BERGERON. The parish of St. Guillaume is transferred to the electoral district of Yamaska ?

The PRIME MINISTER. In 1871, the parishes of St. Guillaume and Bonaventure were detached from the county of Arthabaska for all purposes covered by the local legislature—registration purposes, municipal purposes, judicial purposes. Since 1871, the parishes of St. Guillaume and Bonaventure have voted for local purposes in the county of Yamaska. They form part of the municipal council of Yamaska and belong to the judicial district of Richelieu. Therefore, this is to complete the change that was made and has been now in existence for almost thirty years, that is to say, to put the parishes where they belong in the county of Yamaska.

Mr. BERGERON. And they are two Liberal parishes ?

The PRIME MINISTER. They are.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose the right hon. gentleman will give the reason also for putting in the electoral district of Nicolet, St. Eulalie and St. Samuel. I think they belong to that county already.

The PRIME MINISTER. The parishes of St. Eulalie and St. Samuel are part of the Township of Horton, which originally belonged to the county of Arthabaska. They have nothing whatever to do with the county of Arthabaska, but are part of the county of Nicolet for municipal, registration and judicial purposes as well. This is only to make it doubly sure that they do not form part of Arthabaska.

Mr. HAGGART. What electoral district do they vote in now in Dominion elections ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Partly in Nicolet and partly in Arthabaska.

Mr. HAGGART. They may have the right to vote in both places under this Bill, because it does not say that they shall be transferred to the electoral district of Nicolet.

The PRIME MINISTER. At present I believe there is only a concession which ought

to vote in Drummond and Arthabaska. At the last election there was a contest between the two revising officers, and they did not vote at all, and this is to make it absolutely sure that they will vote in Nicolet.

Mr. BERGERON. What about the township of Stanfold? The hon. gentleman is splitting the township in two. It is a good Grit place and gives a large majority.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is a good Grit place, and I am sorry for my hon. friend from Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) that he is to lose them.

Mr. BERGERON. He has 1,200 besides.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is a reason for this. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) is familiar with the township of Stanfold, which is a very fine one, he knows that the part which is on the River Becan-cour is separated from the rest of the township by a swamp, and is not connected with Stanfold proper, but new parishes have been established on the river, including Notre Dame de Lourdes; and that this part has annexed for all municipal purposes with the township of Somerset South, in the county of Megantic. That has been done under a resolution of the county of Drummond and Arthabaska, and also a resolution of the county of Megantic, confirmed by Act of the legislature. I will find the statute for my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) if he will give me a moment.

Mr. BERGERON. While the hon. gentleman is looking for the statute, I may say that I have found what I was looking for. The hon. gentleman will find that the townships of Ste. Eulalie and St. Samuel are in the county of Nicolet already.

The PRIME MINISTER. For the local?

Mr. BERGERON. No, for the federal.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is to make it sure.

Mr. BERGERON. Too much law is as bad as none.

The PRIME MINISTER. In the last election the electors of the parish of St. Samuel did not vote at all. Mr. Methot, the returning officer for Drummond and Arthabaska, would not recognize them as within his territory, nor would the returning officer for Megantic County count their votes. This is to make it sure that they shall have the opportunity to vote some place the next time.

Mr. BERGERON. While my hon. friend is looking for that statute, I may say how it strikes me. When this Bill was introduced it was said to be for the undoing of the redistribution of 1882. And every one must be struck with the thought that the Bill was really prepared for Ontario, and that, so far as it applies to other pro-

vinces, the work has been done in a hurry and without due consideration. We have had proof of that in the case of St. John this afternoon. Hardly anybody on the Treasury benches could explain the section to us. So far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, I read in "Hansard" today that they were at loggerheads how it was to be done. When we come to Quebec, I do not see any reason in it at all, unless I read between the lines. The reason given by the Premier are very clever, but it is quite evident that they were not intended to be given when the Bill was prepared. All these parishes except St. Pie, which, of course, my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur), who presides over this committee, would not have because there is 200 of a majority, had been put back into Bagot to help my hon. friend (Mr. Marcell). And for Lacolle and Caughnawaga and Lavaltrie, it can be understood. But, when we reach Yamaska, Drummond and Arthabaska, and Nicolet, there is something the committee does not know, and it might be worth while to explain. Some subsidies were promised in Nicolet and Yamaska, and promised under very solemn circumstances, and by the leader of the Government himself, when he went there, and letters were put in the hands of the member for Yamaska (Mr. Mignault). But when it was decided to complete the Drummond County Railway and pass far away from these parishes, the Government naturally felt that they could hardly go back before these people and hope to win their support without granting subsidies. As I have no doubt that my hon. friend (Mr. Mignault), with the persistency which characterizes him, though he looks quiet enough, must have gone to the Government and asked: How can I get out of this fix? He was told, like the hon. member for Nicolet: Never mind, the failure of our promise will be made up with a number of Grit townships from Arthabaska put into your county. This is the reason for the gerrymander in Quebec. Drummond and Arthabaska has a majority of 1,200. In putting in two or three of these parishes, with large Grit majorities in Yamaska and Nicolet, and one or two in the county of Megantic, the hon. gentleman is trying to assure himself of all three of these counties. All of this has not been explained by the right hon. gentleman himself, but this is what I read between the lines of the Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER. I must say that I admire the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Bergeron's) imagination. His idea that the promise of a railway can be made good with voters is one which it requires some imagination to conceive. The hon. gentleman has answered his own statement with regard to Nicolet. He said that the railway was promised to Nicolet, and because it was not given two Grit parishes

were put into the county. But, he has said that these parishes, Ste. Eulalie and St. Samuel were put into Nicolet in 1892. Then, we are merely confirming the legislation of 1892. So far as Yamaska is concerned, we simply make the constituency, for Dominion purposes, coincide with the constituency for local purposes. Now, with regard to the township of Stanfold, I refer my hon. friend to the Act of 1895, 58 Vic., chap. 12. It provides that lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, &c., are detached from the township of Stanfold in the county of Arthabaska, and annexed to the township of Somerset South, in the county of Megantic, for all purposes except registration purposes.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that the local Act?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Where do these people go to church?

The PRIME MINISTER. In a new small mission they have at Notre Dame de Lourdes.

Mr. BERGERON. What does it belong to?

The PRIME MINISTER. It belongs to Somerset South. Municipally, these people are in the township of Somerset South, which is in Megantic. They vote in Megantic for municipal purposes, and they are a part of it for all purposes except registration, with respect to which they have been retained for some time to come in the county of Arthabaska. That is the reason for the change.

Bill reported.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have a slight amendment to offer in section 3, subsection (g), which now reads:

The parish of St. Engène de Grantham, now in the electoral district of Bagot, is transferred therefrom to the electoral district of Drummond and Arthabaska.

It should read this way:

The part of the parish of St. Eugène de Grantham now in the electoral district of Bagot, &c.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before this Bill passes from this House I desire to enter my final protest against what I regard, and what hon. gentlemen on this side of the House regard, as an uncalled for measure. The fact that the county of Halton, which I have the honour to represent, is not interfered with by the Bill, is a good reason why I should be able to speak of this measure without any prejudice. I have no pent up indignation of 18 years standing, as the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) had, and which he gave vent to a few days ago in the most unmeasured terms. Nor do I share the con-

clusion to which he arrived after the leader of the Opposition made his statement that he would not take the responsibility of moving an amendment to a Bill which he regarded as unconstitutional. I say that I do not share the conclusion at which the Minister of Customs arrived when he said that we on this side of the House regarded the measure as being so fair that we would not even move an amendment to it. The reason given by the leader of the Opposition for not moving an amendment is the one which he stated, namely, that he had an objection to moving an amendment to a Bill which he regarded as beyond the power of this House to pass. Personally the members on this side of the House seek no preferences from the Government, nor do we think that it is fair that hon. gentlemen on that side of the House who are more numerous, should insist upon having preferences. The question of two representatives for the county of Brant, which has received so much attention, is one I think that deserves even more consideration. To my mind, to make two Liberal hives out of the small county of Brant with a voting population of only some 33,000, is something that cannot be characterized by any hon. member on that side of the House as being fair, when in the same Bill the hon. gentlemen propose to take the large county of Welland, with nearly as much of a population as the two ridings of Brant will have, and convert that from a Conservative county, as it is now, into a Liberal hive. The county of Welland as it exists at this time—because this Bill has not yet passed—is the same as it has been for some 32 years, it is the same for the Dominion as for the local. No change in the long period of 32 years with the representation either in the House of Commons or in the local legislature. As we are all aware, the boundaries of this riding were fixed by the British North America Act, by such men as the Hon. Geo. Brown, Sir Oliver Mowat, and others, the fathers of confederation, regarding it as a fair limitation for the size of the riding, and a proper thing that that old historical county should be represented in this House as well as in the legislature at Toronto in the form in which it was described in the British North America Act. Her Majesty the Queen approved of that measure, but notwithstanding that fact we find that hon. gentlemen are now proposing to interfere with this old historic county, and change it from what it was determined upon by the fathers of confederation in 1867.

Now, what are hon. gentlemen seeking to do? What is their object in changing the various constituencies throughout western Ontario? Men have been accustomed for years and years to vote together, they know just exactly where they are to go to poll their votes when election time comes on. But under the new arrangement all things

will be new. They tell us their desire is to repeal the iniquities of 1882; and the Prime Minister, in introducing this Bill to the House, declared in the most solemn manner, with his hand raised toward heaven, that this Bill would be a fair Bill, fair alike to Liberals and Conservatives. They claim that they have grievances, they think that there are iniquities. I believe these iniquities are more imaginary than real, and I am quite sure that any hon. gentleman who listened to the able speech of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) a few evenings ago, would have no hesitation in saying that these grievances were more imaginary than real, that as a matter of fact the Liberals lost nothing by the redistribution of 1882, but on the contrary they were gainers, and consequently they have no real grievance.

With reference to the county of Welland to which I desire more particularly to refer, they now propose to add the township of Pelham and the township of Wainfleet. The township of Pelham contains a population of 2,554, and the township of Wainfleet, 2,803. These added to Welland as it now exists, and as it has existed for the past 32 years without and change, either for the local or the Dominion, will make a riding of 30,489. Now, let us bear in mind that the township of Pelham originally was a part of the county of Lincoln, and it is now a portion of the county of Lincoln. Why, then, tear it away from Lincoln again and put it into another county? I think we have heard to-night statements made that a parish ought to be put back where it was many years ago. The township of Pelham, away back at the union, was in the county of Lincoln. It was put into the county of Welland for good reasons, I have no doubt, by such men as the Hon. George Brown, Sir Oliver Mowat, and other good Liberals who at that time helped to frame the British North America Act. Now it is proposed, for the first time in thirty-two years, to change the boundaries of this old historic riding. We think it hardly fair; we think it is one of the instances in which unfairness is exhibited in this Bill, and, as I said before, men like the Hon. George Brown and Sir Oliver Mowat agreed that there was fairness in the arrangement made in 1867. Her Majesty the Queen assented to the Bill, and, as Mr. Speaker says, signed it by her own hand, declaring that it was considered fair and proper, and that no injustice was done as between one side and the other. The township of Pelham in 1896 gave a Liberal majority of 230, but with a good strong candidate it is presumed that it would give a majority of 300, and that is one of the townships that it is proposed to add to the riding of Welland. For what purpose? I can see no other purpose than that of legislating out of this House an hon. mem-

Mr. HENDERSON.

ber (Mr. McCleary) who has been an honour to the county that he represents. Under the Bill, as constituted, the riding of Welland will have 30,489 of a population, and the county of Brant will have about 33,000 of a voting population. Brant is to have two representatives, who will, presumably, support hon. gentlemen on your right Mr. Speaker, but, not satisfied with two Liberal hives within the small county of Brant, they are prepared to do something that, I believe, from one end of the province of Ontario to the other, and from one end of the Dominion to the other, when the circumstances are fairly known, will be declared unfair and unworthy of a large majority for the purpose of legislating an hon. member out of this House. They will add two townships to the riding of Welland, which will give it a large Liberal majority, and make it a Liberal hive. Now, hon. gentlemen tell us that the reason for this is, that they have adopted the principle of county boundaries. Why adopt a principle if the principle is going to work an injustice? I confess I have listened to the arguments, day by day, in favour of the principle of county boundaries, but I have not yet heard one argument that convinces me that county boundaries alone should guide in apportioning the constituencies of Ontario or Quebec. I fail to see that a principle that works an injustice should be absolutely adhered to. At best, it is a game of chance. We simply apply the principle, and take our chance as to what kind of constituency will be hewed out. It may be a small one; it may be a large one; it may be a proper one or an improper one. But there is one thing sure in adopting a plan of this kind, and it is, that this House absolves itself from its prerogative of determining how the constituencies shall be formed which are to be represented in this Parliament. Last year we had the spectacle of taking away from this House the power of dealing with the franchise, and handing it over to the local legislatures. With what result? We have the extraordinary spectacle during the whole session of Parliament of one of the chief cities in Canada being unrepresented on account of that special measure, or of that new franchise law, which was imposed on us by the action of the Government and their supporters last session. Surely, the lesson for this House to learn is, that it ought to be careful not to hand over to the different provinces the power to deal with the constituencies, when so great an injustice has been inflicted upon the city of Winnipeg by handing over to the province of Manitoba the making of the franchise for that province.

The legislature of Ontario does not observe county boundaries. They make no pretense of doing it. They only show respect for county boundaries when it suits their convenience, but when it does not suit

them, they adopt some other system. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to-night made an extraordinary statement. He said that the matter of arranging constituencies should be left to the guidance of the people of the provinces; they knew best. Now, he proposes to leave the arrangement of the constituencies in the province of Ontario to the guidance of the provincial legislature at Toronto. If we do so, we can only assume that the legislature at Toronto will do very much the same as they did with the representation in the legislature. They pay no attention to county boundaries when it suits their convenience to do otherwise. We have frequent illustrations of that fact, and, besides, as Ontario will from time to time no doubt change the county boundaries, create new counties and change the old counties, the fact is, that we simply hand over to Ontario for all time to come the making of the constituencies, which is the basis of representation in this Parliament. We give that power over wholly and solely to the legislature of the province. We have that exemplified in the case of the formation of the county of Dufferin. In establishing a new county they changed the formation of different counties, and, every time they choose to establish a new county, they will interfere with the present arrangement. As a matter of fact, the moment they establish a new county, new boundaries will be created for various constituencies represented in this Parliament. We have that point exemplified in regard to the city of London and the city of Toronto. The western part of Ontario, the large territory known as new Ontario, will no doubt very soon, perhaps before another decade, be divided into ridings for representation in the local legislature and into counties for municipal purposes. The Ontario legislature will have the cutting, or carving, of an immense tract of country, and thus we shall have shown to us that we have entirely given up the power and right to say one word as to what the formation of the constituencies in new Ontario will be, because we have handed the whole matter over to the provincial legislature, which deals with the matter, not as we propose to deal with it here, but deals with it irrespective of county boundaries. In the province of Ontario we have county lines which are not respected. In the county of Simcoe and in Peel, the county adjoining the one which I have the honour to represent, this is illustrated. Only about ten years ago a township was taken from the county of Peel and added to a portion of another county for the purpose of strengthening a gentleman in the county of Peel, making a riding of unshapely appearance, extending from about 10 miles north of the town of Brampton to near the town of Barrie. Not only in Simcoe and Peel are county lines avoided, but in Welland, Lincoln, Haldimand, Monck, and Cardwell is the

same thing to be seen. In how many other places county lines have been avoided, I am unable to say, as I have not gone to the trouble of investigating the province from one end of it to the other, but we have this assurance, at any rate, that when we lay it down as a principle here, that ridings ought to be carved out along the line of county boundaries, the provincial legislature, which has to deal much more closely with municipal matters than we have, pays no attention to that principle, but cuts out their ridings for legislative purposes in such a manner as appears best to themselves. I desire to say one word with regard to the county of Middlesex, for apart from the unfairness in connection with Welland, another injustice is done Middlesex. Welland has been for thirty-two years in a state of quiet repose without interference by the local legislature or by the Dominion. Its boundaries received the approbation of the fathers of confederation, and I think we might well have left that county as a relic of what the framers of our constitution conceived to be right and just. The Government should not change the boundaries of Welland, simply for the purpose of legislating an hon. member out of this House, or any Conservative out of this House. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite to be fair, and in the case of Welland to make an exception to the rule, as Sir Oliver Mowat does. I appeal to them not to be bound by a principle which is simply a piece of gambling, a principle which is shown to be unsound, a principle which the late Prime Minister of Ontario shows is not sound, because he has departed from it in forming and continuing ridings without considering it. In the case of the county of Middlesex another principle has been set aside by this Bill. The county of Brant brought forth much warmth from the Minister of Customs in defending the proposition to make two Liberal hives out of that small county with a population of 33,000; and in that county the town of Brantford is thrown in with the rest of the county, and the judges are asked to divide the whole into two ridings. How different with the county of Middlesex, in which the city of London is situated. Parliament proposes by this Bill to tie the hands of the judges in reference to that. It says: We will allow you to deal with Brantford and the county of Brant, but we will not allow you to deal with London and the county of Middlesex on the same principle; we will first say that the city of London, with a population, under the census of 1891, of over 31,000—and now probably 40,000—shall have but one representative, and then the balance of the county shall be divided into three ridings. Why not be as fair in this case as you were in the case of Brant? Why not say to the judges: The county of Middlesex shall have four representatives and we will allow you to divide this county into four divisions, each of which shall send a member to this Parliament. Let

there be fairness all around. I ask that the principle applied in one instance shall be applied in the other. I shall conclude my remarks by saying, that I hope the Prime Minister, before this Bill finally passes off the scene—if he cannot do it in this Chamber I hope he will intercept it in the Senate Chamber before it becomes law—will do himself the honour—and I believe he will be doing himself an honour—of fulfilling the pledge he gave to this House early in the session, when he declared, with uplifted hands, that this Bill should be as fair to Conservatives as to Liberals.

Mr. GILMOUR. Mr. Speaker, before this Bill is disposed of, and so that I may not be misunderstood, I desire to put myself on record in regard to the county which I represent, and the city of London, of which a portion is in my county of East Middlesex, and which is affected by this Bill. I have listened with much attention to this debate, and particularly to the arguments as to the constitutional rights of this Parliament to pass such a Bill at this time. Not being a lawyer, I have listened as a jurymen would, to the learned and able minds of the House explaining the constitution, and I must say that I have been disappointed. I have seen legal gentlemen, in endeavouring to make their explanations, get into deep water and flounder to an extent that it made my heart feel for them, and I earnestly desired to see them relieve themselves. I saw some of them make painful attempts to twist and turn the constitution in order to suit the exigencies of the case. It reminded me of Nelson of old, who, when he did not want to see, put his glass to the blind eye. The arguments of the legal gentlemen so disappointed me that I have had to fall back on my own resources, and take my own counsel as to the situation. Now, if it really be the case that under the constitution this Parliament can change its constituencies at its whim, it is a most unfortunate thing, because I have no doubt in my mind that Parliament may do it for party purposes, and at any time it suits—to the extent even of fixing a constituency for a by-election. I would rather it had been that the constituencies could only be changed after each decennial census, so that we might know where we are during the succeeding ten years. During this debate I have heard many quotations made from learned men, both dead and living, with regard to the constitution and the powers of Parliament under it, but I have never heard any quotation which asserted that Parliament had the right to act, after it had once distributed the seats, before another decennial census had been taken. I have not a great deal of fault to find with regard to my own county; indeed, if the Government and Parliament had a right to pass this measure, I would not complain even if they cut

Mr. HENDERSON.

my political head off. But I submit to the House, that in all fairness, since this Bill takes away one member from the county of Middlesex, the Government might have proposed to give another member to the city of London. The three representatives left in the county will, by the present Bill, represent a population of 58,000, according to the last census, and the member for London will represent a population of 40,000. I have heard the principle laid down here: That the city population does not require the same representation as a rural population requires. I beg leave to differ from that argument entirely, for in my opinion the city population requires more representation than the rural population, their wants are more, and in any legislation you may give to the city population you cannot help but legislate for the rural population. A great deal of credit has been taken for the fairness of this Bill, in remitting so much of it to the judges. I think myself that much more might have been left to the judges and less said about the fairness of the measure, because, in my opinion, we might have trusted the judges even more, and said less about the trust placed in them. I think, however, that the judges will not be flattered with the trust you repose in them, inasmuch as you only trust them a little with the province of Ontario, and you forget altogether to trust them in the province of Prince Edward Island. Had this been a proper Bill to pass, I think you ought to have made it apply not only to the portion of Ontario to which it is confined, but over the whole country from ocean to ocean. It has been said that this is a necessary Bill in order to do away with an iniquity that was perpetrated some time ago with regard to Ontario in former redistributions. Well, all I can say is this, that I notice that at the last general elections a minority of the votes of the province of Ontario were cast in favour of the Liberal party, and yet they secured a majority of members; so that the arrangement of the constituencies could not have been so very bad after all. The Liberal party ought to try to return to power again by the same road by which they came in. I think they ought to tell to the country again the same story which they told before in 1896. I intend to tell the same story in my county, if again a candidate, that I told then; but I do not believe the Liberal party will do so. Mr. Speaker, I declare myself against the passage of this Bill.

Motion agreed to, on division, and Bill read the third time and passed.

#### CONDITIONAL LIBERATION OF CONVICTS.

Bill (No. 171)—from the Senate—to provide for the conditional liberation of penitentiary convicts.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

### INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 86) to further amend the Insurance Act.—(Mr. Fielding.)

(In the Committee.)

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). When this Bill was last in committee it was disposed of with the exception of one point, which was reserved at the request of my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Foster). In the investment clause it is provided that the companies may invest in the debentures or bonds of any steam railway company. It was suggested that that was rather a broad provision, and that we ought to try to limit in some way the class of securities in connection with that special class of companies. I suggested an amendment, which I showed to the hon. gentleman before he left the city, and which he agreed to. It will read as follows:—

The debentures or bonds of any steam railway company which has earned and paid regular dividends upon its ordinary, preferred or guaranteed stocks for the two years next preceding the purchase of such bonds or debentures.

That is to say, they must be steam railway companies, with dividend-earning powers. The same words will require to be inserted twice in the Bill. I move that the clause be amended accordingly.

Motion agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, amendments concurred in, Bill read the third time and passed.

### WINDING-UP ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 163)—from the Senate—further to amend the Winding-up Act (Mr. Fielding), read the second time, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

### SUPPLY.

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

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Charges of management..... \$145,119 42

Mr. **DAVIN**. What is the explanation of this increase of \$10,000 in the printing of Dominion notes?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The only explanation is the exceptional increase in the circulation of notes, which, during the past year, has been much larger than in previous years.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. This is simply to meet the increased circulation?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes, rendered necessary by the expansion of trade.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. I understand that the item has reference to the cost of printing Dominion notes. I would draw attention to the fact that the paper on which these notes are printed is not sufficiently strong in texture. These notes go to pieces very easily. They are handled very frequently, much more so than any other denomination of money, and my experience is they tear very easily indeed. It is worth while considering whether the paper cannot be improved.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I shall be happy to accept the hon. gentleman's suggestion and look into the matter. This is the first complaint I have heard. I think it will be found that the paper is up to the standard, though possibly the standard is not high enough, and I will look into it.

Militia—

Pay, allowances, &c..... \$352,896

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) tell us what is the policy of the Government, as he promised to do on this vote?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. Since the present Government has been in power we have drilled annually more than three-quarters of the militia each year, and this year, that is the year 1899, we propose to drill all the militia that are properly officered and able to go out to camp. Our main object is to secure efficiency. I think the country will agree with me that if we are spending a large sum, as we have been ever since confederation, from \$800,000 to \$1,500,000, and sometimes even beyond that, it would be good economy to add a sufficient amount to make our militia system as perfect as possible, so that in time of necessity, whether on account of internal trouble or an attack from the outside, if any such misfortune should happen us, we shall have a militia force which in a few days can be put in the field. As to whether we can every year call out the whole militia for annual drill, will depend, of course, upon the revenue of the country. It is the policy of this Government to have the whole of the present force annually drilled, or, failing that, should funds not be available, I would recommend that any economy practised should be in the direction of reducing the numerical strength of the force and maintaining the principle of annual drill of the whole available force at all hazards. With reference to this vote, I stated, when I asked for a supplementary vote of, I think, \$125,000 for the last fiscal year, that I would propose a reduction of this vote by a similar amount. The hon. member for York then criticised that proposition because, he said,

I would want this year probably the money voted over again. I have considered that question, and am of the opinion that the criticism is not a fair one. The amount to be voted is for paying the men who may be called out for the present financial year, that is, prior to the 1st July next, and the number to be called out at given dates is a matter which is left largely to the discretion of the General Officer Commanding. It so happens that this year the whole force was called out prior to the 1st July, and therefore we required the \$125,000, but next year it may happen that a much smaller force will be called out before the 1st July, and therefore we may reduce the amount by \$125,000, as compared with that which has been expended during the fiscal year just closed. With reference to some changes being made in the organization of the militia, I have already said that we consider efficiency of prime importance. With a view to that, some new departments are being created. An exceedingly important one is an army medical staff. That has practically been created and established now under the very able direction of Surgeon Lt.-Col. Neilson. I believe the system which has been adopted here is a very good one. It combines our old regimental system, which has been in existence here, and which was the system in England for many years, with the medical staff system, which is the one now adopted in the Imperial army. Surgeon Neilson, after a very careful examination of the whole subject, has, with the approval of the General Officer Commanding and my own, adopted the system, and I believe it will be found to work advantageously. I may say also that, differently from most changes of this kind, it will result in a slight saving to the country, instead of an increase of expenditure. Any military man can see the importance of this establishment, and my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), as a medical man, will recognize at once the very great importance of having a medical staff of this kind. In case our men have to take the field, it is our bounden duty to provide every possible means known to science and to skill to take care of the men who may have the misfortune to become ill or to be wounded. We are establishing in this connection four bearer companies, a new thing in this country. One was organized in Halifax about a year ago, and is being uniformed and furnished with the necessary equipment. These companies are being organized at four different places.

Another important improvement is about to be carried into effect in the establishment of an army service corps, in addition to the army medical corps. That will mean the establishment here at headquarters of an officer who shall have charge of all questions of transport in the field, and who will organize throughout the country means to provide transportation of stores and supplies, in case of our being suddenly called

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

upon to do so, and who will arrange his plans for securing the necessary stores and supplies at short notice in different parts of the country. This is an exceedingly important branch of the service, the need of which has been felt in the past, when on two or three occasions we have, unfortunately, found it necessary to use our militia force in the field. I may say, in a word, the object is to make our militia force a perfectly self-reliant and perfectly self-contained force, so that we shall have every branch of every service represented by a skilled man, a man who is able at once, at a moment's notice, to take the field and discharge the important duties which would devolve upon him. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, having made this general statement, it would be better now to take up the individual items. I shall be very glad to answer, so far as I can, any question that may be put to me on these items.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If I remember well, when the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) brought up the votes in the first instance and proposed to enter into some of the details, it was suggested then, and arranged, that we should have the policy of the Government stated on the present occasion, and I may say one of the reasons I was anxious that it should be done was, that when the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) asked what was the intention of the Government with regard to the annual drill, the hon. Minister said, as far as he was personally concerned, he was of opinion that the entire force should be called out for the full period of drill every year, but it was a question that had not been finally settled by the Government. One of the reasons why I suggested that it would be desirable that we should have the general explanation on the regular item being brought forward was, that we might know the conclusion at which the Government had arrived on that very important point. I do not quite understand from my hon. friend that the subject has received the consideration of the Government in the meantime, or that they are in a position to state what is their intention, whether to have the entire militia force called out for the full term of drill—

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I stated that that was the intention.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad to hear that. I entirely agree with the Minister of Militia that it would be true economy to spend a larger sum of money and accomplish the object in view by having the work thoroughly and efficiently done, than it would be, for the purpose of making a small saving to impair the whole efficiency of the militia organization for the want of a thorough drill. I may remind the House that

the importance of having the militia service of this country put on the best possible footing was presented to the House by the Government, when they asked an increase of the vote to provide for the services of the General Officer Commanding. And the House very cheerfully met that position by giving an increased allowance; and, so far as I am able to form any opinion, I have no hesitation in saying—I do not pretend to be an expert in such matters, as I am entirely a man of peace—that we can congratulate the Government of having obtained the services of a very able and efficient officer in that high and very important position. I notice, in the report of a speech made, I think, in the province of Quebec, the General Officer Commanding attached the very greatest importance, not only to the full period of drill, but he appeared to indicate that it was scarcely possible to bring the militia force of Canada up to the state of thorough efficiency, from every point of view desirable, without an extended term.

He was speaking, perhaps, especially in reference to Quebec, but I am inclined to think his views apply to the general question. If that be the case, it would be very much better to extend the term of the drill a few days, even at some increased cost, provided that step is absolutely necessary in order to obtain that thorough efficiency that we all admit is so desirable. I desire to say in reference to the remarks made by the Minister of Militia and Defence, that there was a point of very great importance brought up in the report made by the General Officer Commanding, to which I wish to draw his attention, and that is with reference to the permanent force. It may not be included in the item immediately before the committee, but as I am on my feet I wish to draw the attention of the Government to a fact which strikes me as of vital importance in reference to the defence of the country. We have a small permanent force, and as that force has been organized for specific objects, it would be a most undesirable thing for the Government to adopt such a course as would to a large extent destroy the utility of that force. As I understand it, the General Officer Commanding, in his report, states that the removal of a large portion of that force to the Yukon has completely disorganized the force, that it has in fact rendered it impossible to carry out the objects of Parliament in providing for that permanent force, that is in connection with the various schools. He says it would be absolutely necessary, and if Parliament expected that force to perform the duties for which it was organized, to recall that large portion of the permanent force from the Yukon, or to organize an additional force under the Act. Now, I entertained no doubt whatever that immediately upon that state-

ment coming from such a high authority, the Government would at once recall that military force from the Yukon district. So far as I am able to form a judgment, I think the Mounted Police are better qualified for service in the Yukon than any military force. We all know that the Mounted Police has proved itself a most admirable and efficient militia force in this country. But the military force now in the Yukon are simply useless, they are completely paralyzed, they are not in a position to perform any of the duties devolving upon the Mounted Police, such duties as are required in the Yukon district. You have only to read Major Walsh's report to see that they did not know what to do with this large military force sent up there at an enormous expense, and having said that some 70 or 80 men might be brought down to Dawson in the meantime, you have a force of over 200 men and officers in the Yukon district at great cost and absolutely useless, only useful for the purpose of putting up military barracks in a section of the country where there are only a few Indians and a mere handful of white people. Experience has shown that the Government have made a great mistake. I do not see how any person can read either the report of the General Officer Commanding or the report of Major Walsh without finding that an utter waste of public money was made, and the usefulness of the permanent force has been destroyed by that act. Not one hour's service has ever been demanded, nor in an emergency could they move a finger until the Riot Act has been read in Dawson, and then you have to send up a long distance to Fort Selkirk where the main body of this force is, in order to obtain their services. Why the Government should have sent a military force into such a country as the Yukon, where the Mounted Police were so admirably adapted to do the work, passes my comprehension. Experience has shown that the Mounted Police are a thousand times more efficient than a military force for any service that might be required in that region. I cannot understand why, when it is ascertained that there was no possible utility in keeping them there, they should not have been brought back at once as the General Officer Commanding said it was absolutely necessary to do if the Government desired to maintain the permanent force in efficiency. I should be glad to hear from the Minister of Militia and Defence why it is that, having obtained the services of an eminently capable General Officer Commanding, his views should be utterly disregarded on that subject, in view of Major Walsh's evidence that there was no necessity for them, that in fact so far as any one could learn from his report, they are rather in the way instead of performing any useful service. I may say that so far as my voice and influence go in this country, I am ready to support any

expenditure necessary in order to maintain our militia force in a state of efficiency. We owe that to the country, we owe it to ourselves, and we owe it to our self-respect as a nation. I shall most cheerfully give my hearty support to every object such as the maintenance of an efficient force for the defence of this country, and I am certain that such measures will meet with the general support of the people irrespective of politics.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** Mr. Chairman, I may say, first, that I feel very much gratified indeed at the way the hon. leader of the Opposition has received the statement I have made in reference to the somewhat increased estimate, and to know, that so far as he is concerned, speaking, I suppose, for the party which he leads, he will co-operate in any reasonable measure designed to perfect our military system. I may say that that is the view I expected the hon. gentleman would take, because I know that he is accustomed to take broad and statesmanlike views on questions of this kind. But, at the same time, I must confess that I am somewhat disappointed at the somewhat narrow view he put forward, and I think, the very unfair statement he made in reference to the action of the Government in sending the force to the Yukon. Of course, that is a matter for which I myself and the Militia Department are not specially responsible. It was the policy deliberately decided upon by the Government after being requested from the Yukon to send a force in there in case that it might unhappily be needed. The hon. gentleman has divided his observations on this point into two parts. First, he says that as a result of sending a permanent force into the Yukon territory, we have marred its usefulness, in fact, to use his own language, disorganized it as a teaching body for the militia of this country.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I wish the hon. Minister (Mr. Borden) to understand that I am not offering my personal opinion upon this subject. I am simply quoting from the report of the General Officer Commanding.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** I will come to that point. I think the statement made by the General Officer Commanding does not bear out the strong language which the hon. gentleman has used. I may say that the permanent force of this country has done as good work, and I think more work, during the past year than has ever been done by this force before. The General does not discuss the question of policy. He says:

It is satisfactory to know that the services of the troops have proved valuable, but in the event of its being considered advisable to retain the whole or any portion of the force, I request that

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.**

a corresponding increase in the establishment of the permanent corps may be approved. With the reduced number of permanent troops now available, it is found to be impossible to satisfactorily carry out the instructional system for officers and non-commissioned officers of the active militia at the various schools of instruction.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Will my hon. friend read that a little louder? He has dropped his voice at the important point.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.**—

It is even difficult to carry out the ordinary routine duties.

It is true that the Major General has made that statement, but he has not said that the permanent force has become completely disorganized.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I said that the duties for which they were intended were rendered impossible of performance, and that the whole *raison d'être* of the organization of the force, according to the General Officer Commanding, cannot be carried out.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** There is a good deal of difference between what the Major General says which is that the work cannot be satisfactorily carried out, and the statement made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, which is that as a result of sending 200 men to the Yukon, the whole permanent force of the country has been disorganized. In answer to his statement, I repeat again that there has never been a year, I believe, in the whole history of the permanent force when such good work has been done as during last year, or since the time that the troops were sent into the Yukon. The question of sending the troops there was discussed in the House last session. Last session the hon. gentleman, I think, was present in the House when the vote was taken and the matter was discussed over and over again. The necessity then, I think, it was agreed by both sides of the House, was urgent, and, if the necessity was urgent then, there was no other force which could be sent into that country except a portion of the permanent force. The hon. gentleman suggests that because they had not been called upon to use their arms there was no necessity to utilize this force, but will the hon. gentleman say that their presence in the Yukon might not have prevented serious trouble? He cannot say that. He should know the contrary. We had in Dawson City a collection of 30,000 miners or more. Immediately after the force was sent to Selkirk a request was made to have fifty of them sent to Dawson, and later on a request was made for thirty more, so that we had stationed at Dawson seventy or eighty members of the permanent force. I venture to say that

their presence there has had a salutary effect upon the condition of society in Dawson. If the hon. leader of the Opposition has read the papers to-day he will have seen what took place in London only a few hours ago. The permanent force was called out, and what threatened to be a most serious riot was immediately put an end to. Some thirty or forty of these men were called out and immediately all the trouble that was threatened was ended. Now, the hon. gentleman has asked me what our policy is in reference to the Yukon force. That is a very fair question. While his criticisms, I think are exceedingly unfair, Parliament has a right to know what our proposal is in reference to the future in connection with the matter. I may say at once that it is the intention of the Government to withdraw one-half of the force from the Yukon at the earliest possible moment, and I think, with the slight increases which have been made to the permanent force and when these 100 men are brought back here, the General Officer Commanding will have no cause to complain of the lack of men in order to make his schools perfectly satisfactory. The permanent force is restricted by the Militia Act to 1,000 men. When I came to office, I found that the number of men had gone down below 800. We were authorized by our establishment list to keep it at 800, but it so happened that the force had run down to about 750. After the force of 200 men were despatched to the Yukon, we increased the force to its full strength of 800, perhaps a little more. So that readily we have lost by no means 200 men, and when 100 men return we shall have the force fully as strong here as it was prior to the contingent being sent to the Yukon. I may tell the leader of the Opposition that the force sent to the Yukon has been performing patrol duty there continually, and that it has been of the greatest assistance to the North-west Mounted Police. They have not simply lived in garrison and waited for something to happen, but they have been utilized in various ways.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have shown that Major Walsh had not reported that there was any necessity for a military force there. He tells us in that report that the North-west Mounted Police were thoroughly efficient, and that when the troops got to the Yukon he did not know what to do with them, so that they could not have gone up on his recommendation. If there was any necessity for them in the country at all it was at Dawson, but after months of weary journeying at an enormous cost to the country, these two hundred officers and men took up a position a long distance from Dawson, and Major Walsh intimated that he could possibly provide for the taking care of some seventy of them, but after a few days he intimated that it was

not necessary for them to go to Dawson at all. Major Walsh who was in charge of the whole district did not know what to do with them, and their time was occupied in building expensive barracks at a place where there were only a few white men and Indians, and no insurrection could take place. The evidence from first to last points to the fact that a more law abiding or a more peaceably disposed community never existed in any part of the world than in that territory. Even ladies wrote that they felt as secure and more secure in Dawson than they did in large cities in more civilized communities. I do not at all doubt the accuracy of the report of the General Officer Commanding in reference to the excellent conduct of the men; but that is not the question. He reported:

The small field force under Lt.-Col. Evans is now divided between Dawson City and Fort Selkirk,—

Why divided? There were no duties for it to perform at Fort Selkirk.

—but happily its services in the cause of public order and security have not hitherto been called into request.

Here the General Officer Commanding says: That they were able to perform no services for the simple reason that there was nothing for them to do. As I pointed out, if any duties were required the Mounted Police were a thousand times better qualified than a force of that character; and if more men were required you could have recruited into the Mounted Police, and have avoided the destruction of the whole object for which the Canadian permanent force was established. The General Officer Commanding further reports:

I trust that the detachment of permanent troops now on duty in the Yukon district may be permitted to return to duty in their respective corps in the early summer.

If they had duties to perform I have not the least doubt that the force would perform them well, but there were no duties to perform.

The General also reports:

But in the event of its being considered advisable to retain the whole or any portions of the force,—

THE MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENSE. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Of course the Minister of Militia having sent them there could keep them there if he wished, but the General Officer Commanding first tells him that there is no necessity for being in that country at all and then he says:

But in the event of its being considered advisable to retain the whole or any portion of the force, I request that a corresponding increase in the establishment of the permanent force would be approved.

Would the General Officer recommend such an addition to the permanent force of this country at an enormous cost, unless he found that sending these men to the Yukon disorganized the whole system as contemplated by the organization of that force? He says further:

With the reduced number of permanent troops now available, it has been found impossible to satisfactorily carry out the instructional system for officers and non-commissioned officers of the active militia at the various schools of instruction.

There the General states that the very object for which the permanent force was established was destroyed. We can take that statement with the statement of Major Walsh that he never asked for them, and that they did not know what to do with them when they got there. I cannot understand the objection to bringing them back, except that the Minister of Militia, having made a blunder, is afraid that he would expose himself to the danger of being charged with having blundered by bringing them back; and so he says that that can only be done piece-meal. Do the Government intend to do that which the General Officer Commanding declares is absolutely necessary to carry out the object of that permanent force? If they only bring back half the force, they will have to increase the permanent force by the half of the force that is left there, or else they will be wasting a large amount of money which this country pays for a permanent force, by having the object for which that force was established interfered with. If you want a larger force in the Yukon, why should you not temporarily increase the Mounted Police force, and bring back this permanent force which the General Officer Commanding says are required here? It strikes me as a matter of grave importance, that the public money which Parliament is ready to give, and which the country will support them in giving, for having an effective and thoroughly well-equipped permanent force, should not be diverted from the purpose for which it is intended.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am far from admitting that the Government committed a blunder last year when we sent to the Yukon 200 men of our permanent force. If there was a blunder committed at that time, my hon. friend must take his share of it, because I do not recollect that he offered the slightest opposition to it. If my memory serves me rightly, he supported it, at all events by his silence, if not otherwise. At that time we were all of opinion that it was a wise move, in view of the great influx of population into that region, and in view of the rather turbulent character of the population, to send a body of our permanent force there to protect law and order. There was no difference of opinion in the House on that subject. But it is easy to be

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

wise after the event. The hon. gentleman says, that the Major General says, that these men have not been called upon in a single instance, and that the population are orderly and well-behaved; but my hon. friend knows that it has been said, be prepared for war if you want to have peace, and no one can say that the preparations which were made last year have not contributed largely to the peace and order of the Yukon country. There are sections of this country where we have a military corps, which is only used for the purposes of instruction, and has never been called out. But after the event my hon. friend suggests that we should withdraw the force from the Yukon. Now that the country is settled and that we know the character of the population there, we think we can safely withdraw half the force. Perhaps we can withdraw the whole of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. But I want to put this question to my hon. friends opposite who say "hear, hear," even in the face of the report of the Major General, for whose opinion I have great respect: Since we have a military force, not a very large one, but the nucleus of a permanent force, probably to be increased as the population increases, are these gentlemen prepared to condemn the Government for having taken the position that it would be a wise policy to have a military force in the Yukon? In this respect I think we can take a leaf out of the book of our neighbours, who, from the time California was discovered, have had a force on the Pacific Ocean. We have a fortification at Esquimalt, so as to be prepared for emergencies; and I put it to the patriotism and the intelligence of hon. gentlemen opposite, I put it to the intelligence of the Major General himself, whether he thinks it would be a wise thing on our part not to have a force in the Yukon. Before the Minister of Militia withdraws the force altogether, for my part I intend to think seriously on this matter. If I were to follow my own inclination at this moment—I do not know that it is my deliberate or last judgment on the subject—I think it is a wise policy to have a military force in that distant country. We know as a matter of fact that to-day the Americans are sending a military force to Skagway, that they intend to send one to Pyramid Harbour, and that they have one in Alaska. If the Americans find that to be a wise course, I appeal to the hon. gentleman's better judgment whether it is unwise and unpatriotic for us to have a military force in the Yukon? I am not prepared to express that opinion. I ask my hon. friend and other hon. gentlemen opposite whether they seriously advise the Minister of Militia to withdraw his force altogether from the Yukon. I can only say we will think twice before we take that step; and when the hon. leader of the Opposition gives more at-

tention to this question, I think he too will come to the conclusion that it would not be wise to withdraw the whole force, but to leave a military nucleus in the country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not intend to prolong this discussion ; but the First Minister was not in when I made my first remarks. I take the ground that the Mounted Police are infinitely better qualified to perform such services as may be required in the Yukon than a military force. We have uniform testimony as to the good conduct of the miners, so that I look upon the presence of a military force there as rather offensive than otherwise ; and when it is presented so strongly to us by the General Officer Commanding that the absence of that force was seriously affecting the object for which the permanent force was established, and that it should be withdrawn, I think we should give weight to that opinion. Besides, I regard the Mounted Police as infinitely better adapted to preserve law and order among that class of population than a military force, for many reasons, some of which my hon. friend has touched upon, and others which I could not very well touch upon, regarding the action of the United States Government officials. We are in a stronger and better position with a sufficient body of Mounted Police than we would be with the very small body which we would necessarily have there, supposing the right hon. gentleman would carry out his plan of having a portion of the permanent force organized in that district. That would necessarily be a very small force, and for defensive purposes, I am inclined to think that the work would be more efficiently done and at a smaller cost to the country by allowing the Mounted Police to remain there than by removing them from there, where they are absolutely necessary.

Mr. MORRISON. I think the action taken by the United States Government at the juncture when it was desirable to send troops to the Yukon will be within the recollection of every hon. gentleman. They undertook to send troops there in very much larger numbers than those sent by Canada, but they never carried out their design, not because of lack of necessity, but apparently owing to lack of that efficiency which has distinguished the action of this Government. This Government set to work, moved by the same reason that actuated the United States, but carried out its plan. I do not think that the hon. leader of the Opposition would care to see this Government follow the example set by the proverbial king of France who marched his troops up the hill and then marched them down again. Any impartial person will admit the necessity that existed at the time, and which induced the Government to send troops out there. Whether it is necessary to keep them

there is another question. The point to which the Government decided it advisable to send the troops was Fort Selkirk, for the good reason that it was not then known nor is yet, that a large number of people would not resort to the vicinity of Pelly River, which joins the Yukon at Fort Selkirk. Fort Selkirk was settled years ago by the Hudson Bay Company as being the point of all points in that district which was the most convenient for centralization in the case of trouble. A large influx of people was expected into the Pelly district. It was hoped that that district would turn out as the Yukon has developed since, and it was expected that Fort Selkirk would be the capital of that territory, as it may yet become, and I think it was the most central distributing point to that country. It has turned out, however, that the greatest congestion has been some 180 miles down the river. But the river is apparently navigable, and the troops could be conveniently transferred in a short time to the district of the Yukon, if necessary. Having a police force there, I suppose it has not been necessary to transfer all the troops, after building the barracks at Selkirk, to the Yukon district. The police force is not very large, but, at the same time, it can do efficient work indeed ; but if dire necessity should occur, I do not think that the Northwest Mounted Police force would, with its other various duties, be able to cope with the difficulties that might arise, particularly in the case of a population of 40,000 or 50,000 people. The police force is not primarily and solely military, but has various duties, whereas the militia force is purely military. When I was in Dawson City, in October, it was expected that the services of both the police force and the militia would be called on. A very serious fire, the largest, I believe, that ever occurred in Dawson, broke out, and there was every probability of the warehouses of the North American British Transportation Company and the Alaska Commercial Company being burnt, as well as some of the other large provision buildings. If that had happened, clearly great hardship would have resulted in the town of Dawson, especially as these companies, being mercenary and without any sentiment, would drive a pretty hard bargain for their goods, and refuse to render that assistance which humanity would demand under ordinary circumstances. Fortunately, the fire did not go that far, but an incident occurred which shows, to a small extent, what a small thing might cause a riot and disturbance. When the fire was going on, the Alaska Commercial Company, we are informed—but of this we have no official statement—refused to furnish buckets to the troops, who came to the scene and formed a bucket brigade. Commissioner Ogilvie was obliged to declare that if these people did not open their ware-

houses and allow the soldiers to take what material they required to quench the fire, he would order the soldiers to help themselves. The manager saw that he had a determined man to deal with, backed by our militia and Mounted Police, and at once gave in and let them take what they required. Had the police and soldiers not been there, these people would have defied the populace, and no doubt would have set at defiance a small corps of Mounted Police. Occurrences of that kind might take place at any moment. But whether, because of the presence of these forces or the inherent law-abiding character of the people, there was splendid order preserved; and I do not think it too much to attribute the preservation of law and order to the presence of the Mounted Police in that vicinity. Fortunately there were no riots, but all the elements of a riot were there. The people going in there are bound to increase, and there will be quite a large population in the vicinity of Fort Selkirk. But going out further, we have the Atlin district. According to the reports circulated now, by whom I do not know, there is said to be a great deal of ill-will in that district, owing to the way matters are conducted, but whether there is any more foundation for these reports against officialdom there than in the reports against the same class in the Yukon, I do not pretend to say. There are a great many people going in there. Its proximity to American territory—Skagway—and the facilities for getting in there being greater than for getting into the Yukon, it is expected that a large population will flow in, mainly from the United States. The few mounted police at the border, at Bennett and along Tagish will in no way be sufficient to cope with an uprising in case there should be one. A few miles away they have a post, they have the soldiers at Selkirk. These, supplemented by any that might be sent in would be sufficient to cope with any emergency that might arise. And these are emergencies that are not by any means remote. Human nature in mining communities is very much the same the world over. There is not such great difference between the camp on the Yukon, at Cripple Creek, at Coolgardie or elsewhere. When we recall the history of any of the districts in other parts of the world there is certainly a justification for the maintenance of some force other than the Mounted Police in that district. I have said that the Mounted Police cannot be excelled; but they have other duties that can only be performed with thorough efficiency by themselves, and they perform those duties remarkably well. In fairness to them their force should be increased to a number equal to their own force and the militia added, or a number of militia should be maintained. There should be no conflict between Mounted Police and Militia. I

Mr. MORRISON.

would not support any Act that I thought would lead to superseding the police by the militia or any other body. They should be independent, and should have full sway of jurisdiction where they are, and should not be superseded by the militia. There may be a little element of that in considering the question on the part of the officers of these different bodies. The remarks of Major Walsh cannot have had reference to the initiatory steps to send the militia there, because he was not in Dawson, or in the Yukon when the troops were despatched from Ottawa. As to his saying that there is absolutely no apparent necessity for their being there, that might be true. But, following out the argument of the leader of the Opposition, on the same ground the city of Ottawa would be quite justified in discharging its policemen because there is no fear of disturbance in the city. It is a compliment to the militia and the mounted police that there has been no apparent reason for their presence in that country. I think if the militia are to be supported and maintained in Canada, it is just as well for us to have a portion of them maintained there, where there is more apt to be a necessity for their services than in any of the older provinces. As to their suffering for lack of instructional facilities, it seems to me that troops in their position should have a better opportunity for drill and instruction that would prepare them for an emergency than they would have in the school at Kingston, Quebec or elsewhere. There is no argument that I can see against the course taken by the Minister and the Government in sending these troops up. And, having sent them up there, we should give them a fair trial, and should not be too hasty in withdrawing what I think we can say is the cause of having peace and order maintained in that country.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) has found admirable reason for keeping the militia out there. What for? As a fire brigade. If a certain fire having taken place, had gone as far as—

Mr. MORRISON. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will pardon me for a moment, I will say that only for the presence of the troops and the mounted police there, the whole city would have been obliterated, and the hon. gentleman knows what that means.

Mr. SPROULE. While the hon. gentleman was telling us what awful catastrophe might have occurred but for the presence of these seventy men, I was wondering if it was possible that the Government, after taking so much money out of that country—thousands and thousands of dollars—they did not even provide the common necessity of a fire brigade out there.

Mr. MORRISON. There was a fire brigade.

Mr. SPROULE. But it seems that the Government did not do this, and the people were dependent on the militia to make an improvised fire brigade in case of necessity. If the hon. gentleman could give us no better justification for the Government keeping the troops out there, it would be quite as creditable to him and to the party he endeavours to defend, if he gave no answer at all. But what struck me as indicating the unwisdom of this course is the fact that the Minister of the Interior has told us over and over again, and so has the Prime Minister that the management of that country under their care was so perfect that life and property were as safe there as in the city of New York or London. If that be the case, what necessity was there for keeping the troops out there? It was said by the Minister of Militia that when the proposal was made to the House to send these men out, it was not opposed. Why, we were told by the Government: We have information in our possession, private information, that justifies the action we are about to take. These men were sent away at very great cost to the country surely, then we know that everything quieted down long before they ever reached the country and that from that time to this there has not been the slightest information of disturbance amongst the people and there never was. The people were quiet all through the winter, the spring, and summer. But yet the troops are retained there, and we are told that we may withdraw half of them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison), who has just sat down, says: You would not have the Government do like the celebrated general who first marched his troops up the hill and then marched them down again. Of course, that would be an acknowledgment that there was no need for sending them. That was too much for the hon. gentleman to candidly confess; and having unwisely sent them there, he must unwisely keep them there. I think I am perfectly safe in saying that if we believe all the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has told us about that country, the quietness, the maintenance of law and order and everything else, and the little need there, was even for the Mounted Police, we cannot come to any other conclusion than that it was an unwise step to send the militia out there, and it is doubly unwise to keep them there, that it is a useless expenditure of public money every day they are kept in that country. It is not only doing that, but it tends to disorganize the force at home. If we believe what the General Commanding has said, and we are bound to believe it, because he is a very able man, he is unable to get the efficiency out of the force that he ought to be able to get, on

account of a portion of the force being out there, and a small number being at home, with whom he cannot work to advantage. If there is no need for that force out there, then why not bring them home? The Minister has given us no reason for incurring the expense of keeping them there. The hon. gentleman who has come to his defence says practically that we require them as a fire brigade out there. The Government have not even taken the ordinary precaution of organizing some kind of fire brigade, and we must use the very expensive body of a militia force for that purpose. The Government might organize a fire brigade out there for one-tenth part of the cost of maintaining the militia force.

Mr. DAVIN. I have listened without surprise to the speech of the Minister of Militia and Defence and to the speech of the hon. gentleman who supported him. I was not surprised, because I cannot conceal from myself that the Government, in every department in regard to the Yukon, has blundered hopelessly. The Minister of the Interior blundered, and we need not be surprised that the Minister of Militia and Defence blundered. Now, what was the chief reason given by the Minister of the Interior for the Teslin Lake Railway? It was, not that we might have a commercial road, but that we might have a military road. He said it was absolutely impossible to look forward to maintaining peace and order in that country, unless we had that Teslin Lake Railway built. We remember that the Minister of Justice told the Senate that if they had the information he was in possession of, hinting at information that indicated turbulent possibilities in the Yukon, they would not dare to take the responsibility of refusing to pass that Bill. The policy of the Government in the Yukon has been one of reckless extravagance, and now it is a policy of bugaboo: You do not know what danger there is, what tumults will arise in Dawson. These were the arguments given from the Treasury benches. But the hon. gentleman from British Columbia, who addressed the House in support of the Minister of Militia and Defence, gives another excuse for taking the force there and keeping it there: it is, that the Government should put its establishment on a war footing in the Yukon in order that it might be always ready to put out a fire. Why, Sir, that is the 'reduction ad absurdum' of an imbecile Administration. Now, the Minister of the Interior asks us to look at the miners. Why, a man of his experience should know that there is no analogy between miners and the employees of a railway or a factory. Everybody knows that the history of mining in every country proves that all a mining population wants is security, and, when that is assured, the miner is one of the most peaceable of men. He may go out at night into a saloon and

drink up his earnings, but banded turbulence, such as the Minister of Militia and Defence refers to, does not belong to miners. We had a mining population in Kootenay, and what was the military force that kept that population in the most perfect order? One policeman. I have talked with these miners, I have talked with American miners. They had their implements for mining, and I said: Where is your bowie knife? Where is your revolver? The answer was: We are going to mine in a British territory; we have mined in British territory, and we have mined in the United States. In the United States we carry revolvers, because our own Government, we are ashamed to say—these were Americans—don't protect the miner in his rights, as your Government does.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Now you have struck the key-note.

Mr. DAVIN. Protect him, not with the gun of the soldier, but with the strict and fair administration of the law. But I will take a more turbulent population than the miners. When the North-west was opened up, we had in the small towns a rowdy population, coming from the United States. They opened saloons, they had their bowie knives and their revolvers. They thought they were about to carry out the same kind of life they had been accustomed to in the Western States. They did not stop three days, and it did not require any military establishment at all. It only required a policeman to go and say to them: What are you going to do with that revolver? Where is your license? We do not allow you to carry a revolver. You do not need to protect yourself here; we will protect your life and property. And that rowdy element disappeared, but the well-conditioned element was glad to remain. Now, in the Kootenay you have an illustration of how completely peace and order can be kept in a mining camp without having a regiment of soldiers. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence has laid down a doctrine of the responsibility of the Opposition and I do not know where he finds it. I do not think he will find it in the speeches of the great financiers, either in this country or in England. The hon. gentleman speaks as if, when an item passes through committee, not adversely assailed by the Opposition, the Opposition is as much responsible as the Government for that expenditure. Gladstone never laid down such a doctrine as that. The Government makes the proposal, but you cannot suppose for a moment that even if all things were equal, the responsibility of the man whose duty it is to criticise, is as great as that of the man who makes the proposal, and who, by the theory of his position, is in possession of all the information that ought to guide him in the premises.

Mr. DAVIN.

Not only that, but the conditions are not equal. The hon. gentlemen are surrounded by a large majority, and when they propose any given policy, involving an expenditure they can carry it out. You cannot, for one moment, suppose that responsibility, where there is no power to carry out your opinions, would be as great, as for instance if the conditions were even and if you act under such a state of things that, should the Opposition be determined to fight it out under all circumstances, they would be able to carry their point. The responsibility of the Opposition is great and important, but no Government can take a course which is one not in consonance with sound financial views and not in consonance with the rule bearing on the responsibility of Government. No Government can shelter itself from public odium, or from the attacks of the Opposition, by saying: When we proposed this you did not assail it, and you are, therefore, as responsible as we are. I think you will find in one of Mr. Gladstone's speeches that he dealt with that question when he was in Opposition. He repudiated entirely and denounced as cowardly the conduct of a Government that, when its policy is assailed turns around and says: You are as responsible as we are. You voted the money, or what is more likely to have taken place, you did not vote at all; there was no vote and you allowed it to go. I repudiate that doctrine. It is not parliamentarily sound and it is not for the best interests of the people. It would not be useful to the people if we should accept such a doctrine as that. It is palpable that a mistake has been made, and a far greater mistake would have been made on the same theory, though we could not help ourselves, in regard to the Teslin Lake Railway, but the Senate happily threw out the proposition. Now, we know from the evidence of leading Reformers, from the evidence of a leader of the Reformers in the North-west Territories, Mr. Bulyea, who told me that the water in which vessels were to ply in order to implement that railway was not a foot deep. It is known that that policy was an unwise, an absurd, and, therefore, a preposterously extravagant policy; nevertheless, hon. gentlemen supported it upon the same kind of argument that is now put forward as an excuse for sending an army of 200 men to the Yukon when a police force sufficient was sent up previously. I should like to ask the hon. the Minister if my memory is correct, that Major Walsn was in Dawson, or on his way to Dawson, a considerable length of time before the force went up.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Many months before.

Mr. DAVIN. That is my recollection. They say their position is one unassailable and impregnable. With this man who was vaunted by the hon. Minister of the Interior

(Mr. Sifton) as an experienced North-west man, as an ideal man for that position, surely that militia force should not have been sent up and this vast expense connected with it incurred without learning from Major Walsh what his opinion was. We know now what his opinion was, because the moment that he expressed his opinion he said that it was a foolish thing to send them up. One of the hon. members from British Columbia, who was up there, and who gave evidence as an expert, tells us that these 200 men helped to put out a fire and to get a few buckets out. We can hardly accept that as a sufficient excuse for this mistake. What is the proper course to take in the face of the report of the Major General, which my hon. friend from British Columbia (Mr. Morrison) entirely misunderstood? The Major General is not speaking of the instruction of the 200 men in the Yukon. He is speaking of the instructional system of the whole force. Now that it is acknowledged that these 200 men are not needed the hon. Minister should say: It is acknowledged that there was a mistake and we are going to bring back these 200 men. What is the use of this piecemeal policy, merely for the cowardly purpose of shrinking from a frank acknowledgment of the failure of the policy that was adopted? A Minister of Militia should be a man of gallantry and dash, and I would urge upon the hon. Minister that, when he knows that his policy has failed, knowing as he knows that it was a piece of useless extravagance to bring back his force and let the people be saved this useless expenditure.

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is a mistake.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend (Mr. McGregor), who falls into these discussions with a kind of refrain does not agree with me. My hon. friend would not agree with me under any circumstances unless I agreed with the Government. His normal position is that of agreement with the Government, so that we need not mind what he may say upon the subject.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The rebellion of 1855 cost several millions of dollars which might have been saved if there had been a few soldiers in that country to check it.

Mr. DAVIN. There is about as much analogy between the half-breeds and the condition of things that led to that rebellion and the miners of the Yukon and what is going on there as there is between two things totally dissimilar. Can it be possible that my hon. friend (Mr. McGregor) means to suggest that the administration of the Yukon is of such a character at the present time as to create a rebellion?

Mr. MCGREGOR. The Administration is all right.

Mr. DAVIN. If the Administration is all right, why should there be a rebellion?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With the permission of the committee I want to say a few words in reference to the Royal Military College. I expressed very strong dissent, when proposals for changes were made in relation to that college, but I may repeat here what I had an opportunity of saying in Kingston a short time ago, that the Royal Military College of Canada is a proud monument to the memory of every able and distinguished Canadian Premier, Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, and with it, his name will be long connected. It is well known that the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie when he obtained an Act from this Parliament to found that college, bestowed a great deal of personal attention on the matter, and had the good fortune to secure the services of Major Hewitt, subsequently General Hewitt, an eminent soldier, under whose management the college rose to a high position. I think Major Hewitt was Commandant of the Royal Military College for about ten years. No better evidence could be afforded of the high position which the Royal Military College attained in the estimation of distinguished military authorities, than the fact that Major General Sir Andrew Clarke has recorded in an official document: That the Royal Military College of Kingston, Canada, was second to no military school in the world, not only as to its curriculum, but also as to the character of the men it had sent out. When Major General Sir A. Clarke wrote that, there were some seventy Kingston cadets in the British army, and I believe there are now over eighty. I am not one of those who regrets to see the Canadian cadets in the British army. I believe it is an opportunity to Canadians to show the high position they can attain, and that it is also calculated to form a link between the heart of the Empire and this portion of Her Majesty's Dominions. The Royal Military College having attained such a high position under the system organized by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and Major Hewitt, I look with no little apprehension upon one change made by the present Government when it came into power. Let me say here, that one change made by the Government was an admirable one, the reduction in the fees. The late Government I believe made a mistake in largely increasing the fees of the students, for that was followed by the natural consequence of largely reducing the attendance. I believe that if the country goes to the expense of having a Military College, it is desirable that as many persons as possible ought to be able to avail themselves of the advantages such an institution affords.

However, I regard it as a very great misfortune that the present Government reduced the term of service in order to graduate, from four years to three, because I fear it will greatly lower the standard of education. Of course, it must be impossible, to crowd all the knowledge obtained in a

four years course into a three years course, and I can hardly believe that the three years course will enable the students of the Royal Military College to take such a high position in the future in the British army. We are not surprised to learn that several of the graduates of that college have died gloriously on the field of battle in many parts of the world, and that they have shown that valour which might be expected from the children of the Anglo-Saxon race which people Canada. I shall not confine my reference to the Anglo-Saxon race, because at this moment we have a most illustrious instance of one of our French Canadian graduates of that college, commanding the attention of the first minds in Great Britain on account of the ability he has shown. Lord Salisbury, the present Prime Minister of England, has passed a high eulogium indeed—not too high because it was richly deserved—upon Major Girouard, for the wonderful ability which that brave soldier has exhibited in carrying out one of the most important enterprises in which the British army has ever been engaged, and to which the success of Lord Kitchener in the Egyptian campaign is in no small measure due. The services rendered by Major Girouard in providing rapidly and promptly for the transport of supplies and troops in the Soudan, by railway, are at present receiving the highest commendation from the military authorities and the Government of Great Britain. I say, we rejoice to know that the cadets graduates of the Royal Military College have obtained such distinction, and we also are gratified to know that a very large proportion of them, are now occupying important positions in their own country, both in our engineering and military service. One of the first objects of the College is to qualify men to strengthen our own Canadian military force, and I trust that in the future that object shall be served to a greater extent than ever before. Now, as to the reduction of the college course, I hope the Government will carefully watch the results of that. I had the pleasure of visiting the Royal Military College a short time ago, and so far as I could form an opinion, the drill, the athletic exercises, the surroundings, and everything connected with the institution merited my sincere admiration. I was delighted to find evidences of efficiency and vigour that were exhibited on all sides. I hope the Government will watch carefully the effect of shortening the curriculum. The graduates this year are four-year men, and, therefore, we have not yet had an opportunity of seeing what kind of graduates a three-years curriculum will turn out. But there are two points to be considered—one with reference to the military education, and the other with reference to that general and scientific education which will practically finish the education of those who attend the college so far as this country is concerned.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.**

and who do not go into the British army. Therefore, it is important that the graduates should come out of the college thoroughly equipped as scientific engineers, and qualified for important business either as military or civil engineers. I was anxious to draw the attention of the Government to that question, with the view of ascertaining whether the Royal Military College is likely to maintain the high reputation it attained previous to the coming of the present Government into power, by substituting a three years term for the four-years term. I will not detain the committee further. I am obliged to hon. members for allowing me to interpose these few remarks at this time, as I cannot remain very much longer to-night.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** Perhaps it would be convenient for me to say now the few words I have to say. I am sure every one must feel gratified at the tone in which the hon. leader of the Opposition has criticised the present Administration of the Royal Military College. I quite admit that the criticism which he has suggested with reference to the shortening of the course is one worthy of a great deal of consideration. I am bound to admit that when the proposition was first made to me, I was inclined to take a view similar to his own; but, after discussing the matter very fully with Col. Kittson, who, I think, the hon. leader of the Opposition will bear me out in saying has given evidence of great capacity and ability in the administration of the college—

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Hear, hear.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** After discussing the matter with him, I felt that under all the circumstances we might venture to try the experiment. The hon. leader of the Opposition will notice that some changes have been made which modify the teaching which was given outside of the purely military education. So far as the military training is concerned, I do not think the college has suffered or will suffer by the change. But so far as the scientific, mathematical and other branches which are taught in the chartered colleges of Canada, are concerned, I think it will be found that the course is not as full as it was formerly. But I may point out to the hon. gentleman that now the age at which students shall be admitted to the college has been raised. That I may say in justice to Col. Kittson, was contemplated at the time the modification to which I am now referring was made. Further than that, it was contemplated to raise the standard of matriculation somewhat, so that we shall have, as a result, as nearly as possible at any rate, a condition of efficiency at the end of the three years equal to what it was under the former arrangement at the end of the four years. Whether or not it will turn out as we hope it will I cannot say.

**Mr. HUGHES.** Does the hon. Minister know how the students who have taken the

three-years course have turned out in comparison with those who took the four-years course? I am told they beat them.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am told by the commandant that the comparison is very favourable to the three-years men. I may point out to the leader of the Opposition that in England in similar schools is a two-years course, though the teaching there is almost exclusively military. The hon. gentleman has referred to the character of the young men who have been sent out from that college. That college has undoubtedly been a credit to this country, and is, as the hon. gentleman said, an honourable monument to the sagacity of the statesman who founded it, Alexander Mackenzie. It has, perhaps, done more than anything else to make the mother country acquainted with Canada and with the kind of young men we have in this country. I believe it has been the means throughout the Empire of strengthening materially the position of Canada. The hon. leader of the Opposition has referred by name to Major Girouard, who has so greatly distinguished himself, and whose name is now known from one end of the British Empire to the other. There are many others. Indeed, it is surprising that such a large percentage of the men who have entered the Imperial service, Canadians from this college, should have distinguished themselves as has been the case. I have before me a list of names. Some of them are well-known names: Straubenzie has recently been brought back, and is now a professor in the college. The other day when I was present at the closing exercises of the college, it was rather an impressive and striking thing to observe that four out of the five military teachers in the college were Canadians, and graduates of the college. Twining is another; Stairs, a man who distinguished himself and gave his life for the Empire; Robinson, of Toronto; Campbell, Dobell, McKay, Ridout, Carey, and Lieut. Joly de Lotbinière. I thought it might be of interest in discussing this item to ascertain where the young men whom we have educated at that college have gone. The hon. leader of the Opposition has said that it was no great cause for regret, but on the contrary a cause for satisfaction that so many of the graduates of that college should have accepted commissions in the Imperial army. I quite agree with him in that view, particularly as we find them coming back, as I hope we shall find still more in the future coming back, to occupy permanent military positions in the Dominion. I have here a list of the number of men who have graduated. I find that on the 30th of June, 1898, there have been 261 graduates from the Royal Military College, of whom eighty-eight were commissioned in Her Majesty's Imperial service; 21 have commissions in the Canadian permanent force and the North-west Mounted

Police, 20 are employed in the civil service of Canada, 55 are railway engineers and civil surveyors and architects in Canada, and 35 engaged in commercial business and other occupations in Canada. Four are civil engineers in other British possessions, 12 are civil engineers in the United States, 7 are dead, and the occupation of 24 is not known. It seems to me that, after all that has been said about our educating young men to go out of the country, when only 5 per cent have gone out of the British Empire, the money expended on this college is not wasted.

Mr. HUGHES. Major Burgess, a graduate of the Royal Military College, is in command at Sidney, Australia.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The discussion has hitherto been almost entirely confined to the military side of the question. Without undertaking to lay down any policy for the Government, I would suggest that we do not go far enough to recognize the Military College in the Civil Service.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We ought to be able to devise some scheme whereby we could utilize year after year in the various departments of our civil service a number of the young men who have had the benefit of the training at that college. In the Railway, Public Works, Interior and Marine and Fisheries Departments we have occasion to employ gentlemen of scientific attainments, and I hope we shall be able to devise some means of competitive examination by which, year after year, a number of the young gentlemen in the Military College will find some inducement to remain in this country and take positions in the civil service.

Mr. SPROULE. I have always thought that it would be well to provide as many places as possible for the graduates of the Military College in the civil service, but I have also thought it would be largely unfair not to give other young men who have acquired education in other institutions, an equal chance for admission to the service. Some years ago we passed a law providing for examinations for entry into the service, and those young men who pass those examinations ought to be treated also with consideration; but, while saying that, I recognize the fact that when these young men of the Royal Military College have finished their education, we ought to keep them in the country, as much as possible, without giving them any advantage over others educated in our other educational institutions. I have never had any serious objection to the Royal Military College that many of its graduates should go to any portion of the Empire, because they could there acquire practical information which they would not by remaining at home, and in case of need,

no doubt, many would come back. As long as these young men are engaged in any colony of the British Empire, they are giving the assistances we are bound to give, as one of the colonies of that empire.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not see any statement in the Auditor General's Report that corresponds exactly with this item.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Look at the next page to that you are looking at in the Estimates—page 41.

Mr. SPROULE. I asked the hon. Minister some time ago how that increase was distributed, but the hon. gentleman's answer was interrupted.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The pay of headquarters' staff was \$7,800 last year and is \$13,800 this year. In the first place, we have engaged a chief artillery officer at \$3,200. This officer has been appointed at the urgent request of the General Officer Commanding, for a term of eighteen months. If the committee will read the report of the General Officer Commanding, they will observe that he makes very strong statements with regard to the condition of the artillery and the absolute necessity of having an up-to-date Imperial officer here for a time. He wanted him here for three years, but we compromised the matter by bringing him here for eighteen months. I think likely that was a prudent thing to do. The other new appointment is that of director general of the medical staff, which I referred to in my opening remarks. The salary of the director general is \$2,800. These items constitute the increase.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the Canadian rank of Colonel Stone?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Lieut.-Colonel, I think.

Mr. HUGHES. It does not carry with it seniority over those of the same rank?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think not. He is a major, I believe, in the Imperial army. I may say, with reference to the director general of the medical staff, that the increase is not really what it appears to be. Col. Nelson has been in the permanent force for years, in fact, he was the senior medical officer, and has been a long time on the force and has been with the battery at Quebec and Kingston and also in the Royal Military College at Kingston. All his pay and allowances amount to \$2,263 before he was appointed—\$100 a month, I think, and a house and allowances at Kingston. He drew \$2,100 in cash. His place at Kingston will be filled by a medical officer at \$2 a day. So that this apparent increase of \$2,800 is really an increase of \$1,267.

Mr. PRIOR. Before proceeding to the next item, I should like to ask a question with regard to Col. Stone. I have the great-

Mr. SPROULE.

est faith in the General Officer Commanding. I think Canada is to be congratulated on being so fortunate as to secure his services. But it does seem to me that some of our artillery officers who have been taking special courses in England, to learn about the new guns and so on, and with their experience here, should be competent to take that position. Of course, if the General Officer Commanding says that they are not, that is the end of it, I suppose. But it seems curious that none of them should be fit to take such a position. Another thing is the pay of the district staff, which, I think, is one of the items making up the amount now under consideration. I see by the Auditor General's Report that the district officers commanding get different pay and different allowances. It seems to me that if an officer is appointed to a similar position, it does not matter whether in Manitoba, Quebec, British Columbia or Ontario, being called upon to fill the duties of that position, the fact that he has 500 men or 5,000 men under him makes no difference—he has the same responsibility. An officer in the English army, if he gets to be colonel in any branch gets the same pay as other officers of similar rank. If he becomes a major general he gets the same pay as other officers of his rank. If he becomes assistant adjutant general or officer commanding a district, he gets a certain rate of pay. Why should not that apply in Canada? We find that one man in one district gets \$1,700 and \$500 allowance, and another man, because he has more troops under him gets \$2,200 or \$2,300 and allowance of \$700 or \$800. This, it seems to me, is not fair, and I think there should be some reform in the scale of pay.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. So far as the pay is concerned, that is, of necessity, uniform.

Mr. PRIOR. No.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I mean the pay proper. So far as the allowances are concerned, there is undoubtedly a difference. Col. Lake, late Quarter Master General, went into that matter very carefully the second year I was in office. I am sorry I have not his statement here, but I should be glad to show it to my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) if he will come to my office. Col. Lake went into the thing very carefully, bringing to bear upon it his perfect knowledge of the whole requirements of the force in Canada, and made a table, which I thought was a fair one, in which he gave allowances at different rates to officers in different places. For instance, when I came into office I found the district officer commanding at Montreal had a salary and allowances of \$1,700, while the men who occupied a similar position at Kingston and Toronto, and, I think, Quebec, were receiving close upon \$3,000. We have changed that, my hon. friend will be glad to know. We have given the officer at Montreal a house, and, I

think, light and fuel, allowances, at any rate of \$500 in addition to the \$1,700. In Halifax, in the same way, the officer was receiving only \$1,700, with no allowances of any kind. He has been given, I think, \$300. We have been trying to equalize it with a view to the calls that would be made on the officer at the place at which he was stationed, and I do think that is the correct principle. We do not keep the same officer at the same place always. You must not forget the responsibilities thrown upon a man, say in Halifax, where there is a garrison and where there are so many calls upon him and he has to entertain more or less.

Mr. PRIOR. The officer in British Columbia is in the same position as the one in Halifax in that respect.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think the British Columbia officer has his quarters; the officer at Halifax has not even that.

Mr. HUGHES. The very interesting discussion which has taken place on these Estimates to-night, has been pleasant to all of us. Now, the custom for years past, both with this Government and with the late Government, was to let the militia items rush through without any discussion. I do not think it is the desire of the Minister of Militia and Defence, and it is not the desire of any members of this House, that these items should pass through without further suggestions. There are suggestions in the mind of many of us, and, therefore, as the hour has gone pretty well on and as the evening has been pleasantly spent, I will respectfully suggest an adjournment.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is magnificent, but it is not war. We have had lots of interesting discussion, but we have not passed a single item. I would suggest that we dispose of all these items and reserve one, because we have been wandering over the whole of them now.

Mr. HUGHES. I am willing to let these items pass, reserving one, on the understanding that all the others may be discussed at any other time.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister proposes that we pass all the items but one to-night. But surely, with important items like these, with the enormous increases, and with all the explanations that seem to be necessary—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We might sit another hour.

Mr. WALLACE. So far as I am concerned, I do not object, but there are other members who have to meet their committees in the morning. The rule has been, that when half-past twelve has been reached, the House should adjourn.

Mr. BRITTON. I have some remarks that I would like to make, and I think it

would be well to pass all the items except one, upon which we may have an opportunity to speak on another occasion.

Mr. SPROULE. We are asked to-night to deal with items of millions, to leave one item, and then hurriedly try to review the whole on that one item. It is quite unreasonable to propose to vote away so much money, where so many items require explanation.

Mr. HUGHES. I am perfectly satisfied there will be no time lost whatever, because the same discussion will go on. It has been the custom of all Governments to rush the militia estimate through. But to my mind they are as important as any other estimate here.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend knows that, so far as I am concerned, I am anxious to have a full discussion. The discussion this evening has been instructive and useful. I have no desire to press the estimates through at all, but it occurred to me that we might pass some of these estimates, and, as we have been discussing the whole question of the militia upon the first one, we might pass some items, with the understanding that the whole question shall be discussed on every branch of the militia upon some one item to be left over.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is an old member of this House, and I think his past experience has pointed out that to pass all the items but one means that there is no discussion upon the balance. That has been the practice in this House. I do not think there has been any undue time taken up in discussing these matters. There are vast increases here which need to be explained. I think the manner in which the militia estimates have been passed through in the past is not creditable to the Opposition. I am wholly uninformed about many of the increases, and I think that the committee should be in possession of such information as will enable them to judge of the grounds upon which we are asked to pass them.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was understood the other night, when the supplementary Estimates were going through, that when we took up these items, the Minister of Militia and Defence should give us explanations in reference to freight paid on the Yukon supplies. Now, we would like to have that statement to-night, before these estimates come up again. I think we might pass items 104 and 105, and then we could reasonably ask the Minister to adjourn.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think hon. gentlemen opposite are a little unfair. The leader of the Opposition, before he went away, asked the privilege of discussing all these items. He went from one to the other, and stated as his reason for doing so, that he did not

consider, at his advanced age, that he should be asked to stay to a late hour.

Mr. SPROULE. No, that is not the case. The hon. leader of the Opposition asked to be allowed to go to the Military College vote, and that a general discussion be permitted. The hon. Minister of Militia acceded to his request that a general discussion should take place upon the militia policy of the Government. After the discussion, the hon. leader of the Opposition left with the expectation that these items would be passed. After discussing these items for about three hours without passing one, to suggest, as the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) does, that we should rise without doing anything at all, is to make a suggestion that I cannot believe is sincere. I think the suggestion that the hon. Minister has made that the item should be passed with the exception of one, which should be left with the understanding that every item would be open for discussion at a later stage, is a fair proposition.

Mr. HUGHES. What common sense is there in any such statement. If we are going to discuss all of these items, we will not save any time by passing them and reserving one. This is simply going to stir up a little bad blood, and I am satisfied that the best plan will be to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for West York.

Mr. McMULLEN. Let us have the bad blood; let us begin now. The generosity of the hon. Minister is receiving the treatment that it deserves from the Opposition. He has been too generous to-night. He has allowed hon. gentlemen to discuss every item, and because he allowed them to wander all through the list it is proposed to rise without passing a single item. Let us have the bad blood; we are here.

Mr. HUGHES. Because the hon. leader of the Opposition discussed these items that is no reason why the rest of us are not to discuss them.

Mr. McMULLEN. You do not admit that you are led by the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman must have been out to-night or he is expecting a Senatorship, or something of that kind. Because only one or two of these items have been discussed, and he is asking the committee to pass all the items without any discussion at all.

Mr. SPROULE. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) should get up and make the absolutely reckless statement that he has made when he was present and heard the discussion that took place. He surely could not help knowing that there were only a few of these items touched. Military properties and rifle ranges, warlike and other stores, clothing and neces-

Mr. McMULLEN.

saries, provisions and supplies, transport and freight, rifle association grants, miscellaneous and unforeseen, Government cartridge factory, defence of Esquimalt, monuments for battle-fields, have not been touched. The items of pay and allowances, salaries and wages, civil employees and annual drill, were merely incidentally mentioned in the discussion. In the face of that why should the hon. member for North Wellington make such a statement?

Mr. McMULLEN. Sit down and I will tell you.

Mr. SPROULE. I asked the question of hon. members who have been sitting in this House listening to the discussion. There is no justification for it, in my judgment, and there is no fair-play in it, because it cannot be assumed that, upon the discussion which took place upon one, two or three items, we are going to allow items to pass involving nearly \$2,000,000, especially when all the information given to the House was given within two or three hours. The Opposition would not be doing their duty, and no hon. member knows that better than the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), because I have seen him consuming, or wasting, five hours of time on a vote of less than \$500,000, instead of \$2,000,000. In regard to the wisdom of adjourning, it does not seem to me that it makes much difference whether we reserve that one item and go over the other items again and pass one item and reserve the rest. I have always observed that the Government, and it is excusable in a Government, desire to get their Estimates through with as little discussion as possible. They are always willing to reserve one item and to promise a general discussion afterwards, but they do it in the hope that the discussion will not be reached until a late period in the session, when the members are anxious to get home. When we reserve one item, it is probable that the others will not be gone into as carefully as if they were gone into item by item in their regular order. Their desire is to have any discussion upon a reserved item take place at as late a period in the session as may be. This may be desirable from their stand-point, but it is not desirable from the stand-point of the Opposition. The Opposition desire the opportunity of discussing these items at the earliest possible moment, and in their regular order, and in this way they are doing nothing more than their duty.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I want to know what the item is that is before the committee, and if the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is in order in discussing every item on the list.

Mr. SPROULE. I presume it is in order to speak to the point of order.

Mr. McMULLEN. I claim the hon. gentleman is out of order, because we are on the first item and he is discussing all the items on the list.

Mr. SPROULE. It is in order for me to discuss the point of order. In doing that, I was answering the statement made by the hon. member for North Wellington that the leader of the Opposition had discussed all these items, and that we wanted to go over them again. We have not, up to the present, been confined to any one item, and when the hon. member for North Wellington, on the question of the adjournment, made the statement he did, am I not in order in referring to that statement and giving reasons why I think it is time to adjourn?

Mr. WALLACE. In discussing the point of order which has been raised by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), we are almost tempted to analyse the motives of that hon. member in proposing this point of order. Whence comes this new-born zeal? We know that the hon. member has been, on many occasions, quite zealous. It has been of intermittent character—one time bubbling over, another time down below zero.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) is discussing the point of order. He is not keeping to the point.

Mr. WALLACE. If I have wandered away from the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I will be obliged to you to call my attention to it. I was referring to the point of order and to the course of the hon. gentleman who has raised the point of order. What is the reason of all this new-born zeal? Is it because there is a Senatorship in view?

The CHAIRMAN. I understand the item under discussion is Item 104. The suggestion has been made by some hon. members of the committee to adjourn. Some discussion has taken place on the suggestion, but nothing has been done. I would ask the members of the committee to resume the discussion on the item.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood we were discussing the question of adjournment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no motion before the Chair, and as the suggestion made by some members of the committee has not been acted upon, we had better resume the discussion of the item.

Mr. SPROULE. We should get the information with regard to the increase in this first item and then adjourn.

Mr. TAYLOR. I insist on the Minister carrying out the promise he made the other night to supply information as to the freight on Yukon supplies furnished by

Bate & Co. That question is before the House to-night.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The fifth item refers to that.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is in order on any item according to the Minister's own statement.

Mr. WALLACE. We were promised full information as regards past expenditures, and we should have all that information before we allow a single item for a new expenditure to pass.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The understanding certainly was that when we came on the main Estimates to an item of a like character, the information would be given. There is an item for "supplies" here, and the Minister can give all the information he can on that. We did not understand that the moment we reached Militia estimates the information should be given.

Mr. WALLACE. We should have all the information with regard to the previous year before we pass one of these items.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I certainly stated I would give the information on the main Estimates, and I am prepared to give it when we reach the item a little lower down to which it applies.

Mr. SPROULE. My recollection of the statement made by the Minister of Militia and Defence—

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think this is a proper way to discuss the question under consideration.

Mr. WALLACE. I think it is.

The CHAIRMAN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is referring to a past debate and as there seems to be some misunderstanding in relation to that, the best course is to discuss the item under consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you mean to lay down the rule that we cannot refer to a previous debate on a question of estimates such as this?

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to me there is an item in the main Estimates which bears on the information the hon. gentleman is seeking for, and I think it would be more desirable to wait.

Mr. SPROULE. That may be your opinion, but I want to have a definite ruling on it; because if that be your ruling it is the most extraordinary ruling I have ever heard in this House.

The CHAIRMAN. I have perhaps permitted too much latitude so far, but I thought it was the understanding of the committee that we should discuss the Militia estimates generally. It now seems to be the opinion of the committee that the

discussion should be confined to Item No. 104, and I may ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) to confine his discussion to that.

Mr. SPROULE. Allow me to refer to facts which took place in this House. We were asked to allow the supplementary Estimates to go through as a matter of urgency, and that on the plea, that when the main Estimates were reached the information would be given.

The CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. He is in order.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the Postmaster General rule this House?

The CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. The Chairman should not allow the Postmaster General—

The CHAIRMAN. Order. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) does not want to break the rules of the House.

Mr. WALLACE. I am breaking no rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) knows that when the Chairman is making a ruling no one has a right to interrupt him. I understand that there is some misapprehension as to what occurred some days ago and so the safe rule is to confine ourselves to the item under discussion.

Mr. SPROULE. If that be your ruling I shall be obliged to move that you leave the Chair. If the distinct pledge of a Minister is regarded so slightly in this House, then I for one will not be bound by it in future. It was a distinct understanding that we could discuss this subject when we reached these estimates.

The CHAIRMAN. I have nothing to say in regard to that.

Mr. SPROULE. We passed the supplementary Estimates, not as a matter of wisdom but on the solemn pledge of the Minister, and that question ought to be settled before we go further. If we are stopped from discussing these items, which we passed as a matter of grace and on the solemn pledge from the Minister that when we reached a certain stage we would be allowed to review them at our pleasure, we want to know it, and we will take our own means of having them discussed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no breach of faith. It was certainly understood when these items were passed that the information would be given at a later stage, that there would be ample opportunity to discuss it on the main Estimates. But to say that the Minister was bound to bring down the information on a particular item of the main

The CHAIRMAN.

Estimates, is not a correct statement of what occurred. I was willing that we should not be too technical in regard to confining the discussion to a particular item, but hon. gentlemen opposite did not favour that, and were not prepared to go beyond the first item. There is certainly no breach of faith. All the information which was promised to hon. gentlemen will be brought down, and brought down on a corresponding item of the Estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not aware that we were to reach a corresponding item of the Estimates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is the difference?

Mr. SPROULE. There is this difference that we recognize the rights of the Opposition, and the ruling of the Chair is that we cannot discuss anything but the item before the committee.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. As I understand, there is in these Estimates before us an item corresponding exactly to every item that was under discussion in the supplementary Estimates. I promised when the supplementary Estimates were going through, that when we reached the main Estimates—of course, it was presumed on the correct item—I would be prepared to give all the information I could ascertain. I am prepared to do that; but I think it would be more logical to give that information when we reach the particular item to which it belongs—the item relating to provisions and supplies.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister promised to make the statement, not simply when the main Estimates came up, but on the Monday or Tuesday following that discussion on the 30th of June, without reference to the Estimates. My hon. friend from Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Earle) objected to allowing the item to go through; but the Minister begged for the vote, saying that he wanted it on the 30th of June, and here is his language:

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will make a statement to the House at the very earliest moment on Monday or Tuesday, of everything connected with the matter.

That is on page 6530 of "Hansard." It was to correct his statement made last year that the freight was paid by Bate & Sons to Victoria; and when the hon. member for Victoria produced the accounts showing that freight was to be paid to or was charged by Bate & Sons to the amount of about \$2,000, the Minister went on to explain that it was the first time the matter had been brought to his notice, and that he would speak to Mr. Bate about it, and give the explanation to the House on Monday or Tuesday. He certainly made that statement, and we want

him to implement his promise to the House. Now, we are on the main Estimates, and he promised that when they came up this whole Yukon matter would be threshed out. There was not one word said about coming to a corresponding item, because there is no item in these Estimates for the Yukon.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not believe there is an hon. member of this House who had any expectation that this information would be given otherwise than in Committee of Supply, and under the proper item for militia.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Did you ever hear of an Opposition controlling the House?

Mr. TAYLOR. The Opposition of this House is going to make the Government keep their promises.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, start right along.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the Government do not think their promise is worth anything, a promise which was as solemnly made as any promise ever was, then we want to know it. The Minister did not say that we would be in Supply, but he was to bring to the House on Monday or Tuesday an explanation of how this thing happened. There is a big steal of \$2,000 by Bate & Sons in this matter, and we want to have it explained. I have the account here which I moved for in the Public Accounts Committee, and after we get the explanation, I purpose going into the prices.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think it was the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Earle) who had this matter up, and who is more directly concerned with it, and if he expressed a willingness to let it go down to this item, I think it might go. If he feels that an explanation ought to be given now, it might be given, as he is the one most concerned.

Mr. EARLE. I would like to state right here that the position of the matter is this. I objected strongly to the item passing, and the Minister of Finance got up and asked that the item be allowed to pass, as it was a matter of importance that the supplementary Estimates should go through, and the Minister of Militia and Defence stated that if that were done, he would obtain the information in the morning, and at the earliest opportunity on the Monday or Tuesday following he would give the information we desired. However, that has not been done, and I presumed that as soon as we got into the militia estimates, the first thing we would get would be the information which he was not in a position to give when we allowed that item to pass. Therefore, I think the information should be given at once.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What page?

Mr. EARLE. 6355.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. As my hon. friend takes a very reasonable and moderate view, and he is not indulging in threats and charges, I shall at once comply with his request. If I did not give this information earlier, it is because we did not go into the Estimates when I expected at the time I made this promise, and I have not had an opportunity to-night of making this explanation sooner. On the very first item, the hon. leader of the Opposition asked me to state the general policy of the Government, and since then every moment has been taken in replying to the various requests for information from the Opposition. When this item was last up, it was contended that the goods should have been delivered free at the coast, and one microscopic gentleman took serious objection to a charge for 50c. for marking. It is true that I said, last year, when the item of supplies for the Yukon was under discussion, that the goods were to be delivered free of freight at the coast; but I also said, at another point in the debate, that 45 or 50 tons we would pay freight upon. The fact is, we had delivered on the coast free of freight about two-thirds of all the supplies which were purchased, and that we paid freight upon about one-third. It was originally intended, as the memorandum indicates, that all the supplies should be furnished at the coast, freight paid, but subsequently, by arrangement between Bate & Sons and the Quartermaster General, exceptions were made, and Bate & Sons tendered for certain supplies delivered in Ottawa. But the larger portion, the meat, flour and oil, was delivered freight free at the coast. I have taken the trouble to ascertain whether the country has lost any money by what has been done, and I am advised that the prices compare favourably with those obtainable at the coast. I find that we had delivered free of freight charges practically 400,000 pounds of freight, and that Bate & Sons delivered here, upon which we paid freight, 189,124 pounds. The stipulation was made, that the freight should not exceed \$20 per ton. They paid the freight, and were recouped by the Government, and among the goods were 11,586 pounds, or 5½ tons, belonging to the department, which were packed in the cars that were only partly filled by Bate & Sons. So that the actual freight we paid to them on their goods was \$1,984 altogether. I have here the prices of the goods, and I think that even the hon. member for Victoria will admit that, so far as the prices of the goods delivered at the coast are concerned—meat, flour and oil—they are cheaper, or as cheap, as similar goods could have been procured at the coast. The only question is as to the goods deliv-

ered at Ottawa and upon which the Government pay freight—whether the Government, after paying the freight, received as good value as if they had purchased the goods on the coast. In the article of biscuits the price was 5½ cents per pound. Let us apply that price for the coast, deducting package and freight. The cost of package was 1 cent, and freight 1 cent, which leaves 3½ cents for the biscuits at the coast.

Mr. EARLE. Where did you get the reduction of 3½ cents per box? Biscuits are charged at 5½ cents, and you pay the freight upon them besides. All you have to do is to turn up the Auditor General's Report, and you will find similar goods charged against the Mounted Police in the Yukon. Take corn-beef; we have only 2-pound cans on the coast, and they are charged \$2.75. Four-pound cans would cost less in proportion, because they are made up cheaper and cost double the price of the 2-pound cans. But you pay \$6.22. There is a difference of between \$600 and \$700 in the prices paid Bates and that paid in Victoria.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. What is the quality?

Mr. EARLE. It is Armour's and Libby's beef. There is no difference in the quality. In the whole list there is scarcely an article bought as cheaply as on the coast, and on top of this there is the charge of freight. Last year, when this matter was being discussed, as an excuse for purchasing the goods here instead of purchasing them on the coast, the hon. Minister stated that the prices here were better than on the coast, and at that time it was distinctly stated by the Minister that they were to be delivered on the coast. It does not make any difference what statements have been made, the country is out the freight and the excessive charges for packing, and so on, amounting to about \$3,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to finish my statement. I have a list of goods here showing prices that we paid to the Messrs. Bate and the prices paid on the coast for goods for the North-west Mounted Police.

For instance, tea was bought here at 23 3-5ths cents a pound, while on the coast it costs 23½ cents. I am told that the grade of tea which was purchased here was a little better grade than that bought for the North-west Mounted Police, while the price is practically the same:

	Ottawa.	Van-couver.
	cts.	cts.
Peaches .....	8.58	9
Sugar (granulated) .....	9.33	10½
Bacon .....	4½	5½
	9	10
	10½	13½

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

	Ottawa.	Van-couver.
	cts.	cts.
Flour .....	5.65	5.85
	6.10	6.50
These prices are for flour delivered on the coast:		
Rolled oats .....	2 7-16	3½
Lard .....	8½	9½
		10
Coffee .....	18	25
		30
Rice .....	3.63	4½
		5½
Corn beef (less duty).....	10½	11½

The prices are delivered on the coast compared with the price charged on the coast by the merchants there.

Mr. PRIOR. Was it duty paid?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE: Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. What was the freight?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There was no freight; it was delivered free. The beef and flour and the oil were all delivered on the coast.

Mr. WALLACE. The beef and flour could not have been delivered free, because the freight was charged.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, it was not.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, the hon. gentleman—

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No freight was charged on these goods. I flatly contradict the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace).

Potatoes (evaporated) .....	15½	12½
		25
Onions (evaporated) .....	30	45
		55
Baking powder .....	13½	40
		75
Currants ....	9	6½

The currants bought here were a special brand. The prices there are considerably less, but the explanation is that it was considered better to pay the higher price, because the freight was high and we wanted goods that were clean and such as would give us the greatest value for the amount of freight and expenses.

Biscuits .....	5½	6½
		8

Now, that is the comparison made up most carefully by the assistance of Messrs. Bate and the officers of my department. Now, I would like to apply the rule laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite respecting freight. Take, for instance, the item of pease, we paid 1½, the freight was 1 cent. That would leave one-third of a cent a pound as the price on the coast. Sal soda we paid one cent. Take the freight of one cent per eleven pounds,

and the price on the coast would be nothing. Salt, we paid one cent per pound, so that the price on the coast on this also should have been nothing. Sugar, we paid four and a half cents; allow one cent for the freight and the price that should have been charged on the coast would be three and a half cents.

Mr. TAYLOR. You paid freight on this?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have given the hon. gentleman a list on which I have prepared the prices here and the prices there, and there is ample between these prices to pay for the freight. I am simply looking at it the other way and deducting the freight for the price paid to show what would be the price at the coast on that basis to bring the price of hon. gentlemen opposite to a reductio ad absurdum.

Mr. PRIOR. Where did the hon. gentleman get his coast prices?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I take the prices of supplies purchased for the North-west Mounted Police.

Mr. PRIOR. Purchased in Vancouver or Victoria?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE: Yes, I got the prices from Mr. White's office. We paid for rolled oats, 2 7.16. Take off the freight of one cent, and you have practically one and a half cents as the price on the coast. It seems to me that I have amply proved that, although I stated in the House or gave the impression that all the goods we purchased were delivered free of freight on the coast, so far as two-thirds of them was concerned that was literally true, and, so far as the others were concerned, the goods, though bought and delivered here, the Government made as good a bargain and even a better bargain than if they had been delivered on the coast at prices ruling on the coast at that time.

Mr. EARLE. Are the prices those of this year or last year?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They are the prices at the time. I did not prepare this statement myself, but I instructed my officers to find out the prices that were being paid as nearly as possible at that moment, and these were the prices which were given to me.

Mr. CLANCY. I think we should have the accounts before the committee from which the comparisons were made. It is not a fair thing to make a statement of that kind without the committee being in possession of the accounts.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman can have an opportunity of seeing the accounts in the proper place—before the Public Accounts Committee. I would be prepared to have my officers go there—the officer who furnished me this statement. He knows that his

very position depends on the accuracy of his statement, so he would hardly venture to furnish me with figures that were not practically correct. Now, I cannot deal with the other serious charge which is brought against this account of Bate's. It is the most serious of all, and was brought forward, I think, by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor). That charge was that this country had paid fifty cents for marking goods, this item being charged in Messrs. Bate's account. I have investigated that serious charge. I find that Messrs. Bate were required by their contract with us to mark goods in a certain way. They provided themselves with a proper stencil for this work. We had in the department 121 boxes belonging to the department with which Messrs. Bate had nothing whatever to do. We asked them to send a man over with their stencil plate and mark these 121 boxes. They did so, and they charged fifty cents for doing it. That is the explanation of the fifty cents.

Mr. EARLE. You shipped your own goods under Bate's mark?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Bate's mark was simply addressed to the commanding officer at Fort Selkirk to show where they were going.

An hon. MEMBER. Fifty cents a box?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, 50 cents for the whole of the boxes, less than half a cent a box. Now, with regard to the packing. There seems to have been \$180.75 paid. 1,250½ hours were occupied in the work of specially packing these goods.

Memorandum.—Re packing the supplies sent to the Yukon for the Militia Department by Messrs. H. N. Bate & Sons, Ottawa.

Time—1,250½ hrs. charged for.....\$180.75

When Bate & Sons were asked to tender for the supplies, they were not informed that these would have to be specially packed. It was found subsequently this would have to be done, and Bate & Sons were directed to pack the whole very securely, and to so fasten the boxes that they would not open through rough handling, or through efforts to abstract the contents in transit. Besides, the cost of transport was so very expensive, it was necessary to reduce the weight to the lowest point possible; therefore, cases lighter than ordinary ones were used wherever possible, and strengthened by bands to make them secure. (It may be remarked here that on account of the high freight charges the clothing, blankets and socks were unpacked from the wooden cases and sent forward in bales.) Messrs. Bate & Sons were informed that for doing the additional work in packing they would be paid only the actual cost.

The time to pack was so limited—less than four weeks—that the department thought it necessary to request Messrs. Bate & Sons to employ help from outside, if necessary, to assist those of their own staff in the packing, and from four to six outsiders, including a tinsmith, as well as four of their own men, were kept continuously employed at this work from about

the 10th April until the last shipment was made on the 5th May.

To our knowledge Messrs. Bate & Sons, contrary to their regular practice, kept their men at work on the Saturday afternoons, and, during a part of the time, their men worked at night also.

Every one of the boxes and cases sent to the coast was firmly strapped at each end with flat iron bands (or wire)  $\frac{1}{2}$  inch wide, and most of them were fastened in the middle, on each of the four sides, with sheet-iron clutches nearly an inch wide. In some instances two sets of clutches has to be used on the longest cases and boxes.

Notwithstanding that Messrs. Bate & Sons' own men, and those employed by them from outside, worked thus continuously, the delivery was not completed until three days after the time specified, 2nd May.

In all there were 4,200 cases and boxes strapped; computing the time charged for—1,205 hours—at 10 working hours per day, there would be 120 $\frac{1}{2}$  days.

Were one man employed at the work of strapping alone, he would have to do 35 cases per day—carry them to where his wire was, strap them, remove them out of his way, &c.

But of the first lot of tea a tin plate was soldered over the hinged top of each chest; of the second lot the ends were strengthened diagonally with iron bands.

Then the lard had to be hermetically sealed in tin pails of 5 lbs. each.

The jam (in bottles) was all sealed with a special composition, for which no charge was made.

It will be seen, therefore, that even within the time charged for, a very great deal of work was done. Under ordinary circumstances, that is, if the time were not limited, it would have taken considerably longer to do the same work, as the men would not have worked so hard.

Material ..... \$243.08.

Besides their own supplies, Bate & Sons strapped over 200 cases of supplies purchased by the department from other firms at a distance and delivered at Ottawa, without being securely fastened in some cases, as was necessary, and some of which had to be repacked. They were requested to do this work because their men had become accustomed to it, and could do it rapidly, and also because they had the iron banding already mounted for the purpose.

Out of say 4,455 packages shipped by Messrs. Bate & Sons, including 165 belonging to the department, there were 4,200 which were strapped.

Estimating that on an average about 10 feet of iron banding was used on each case, the quantity required for this service reached fully 42,000 feet, while about 16,000 clutches were used.

At 30 cents per 100 feet for this banding, the cost for it would be \$126; for the clutches, at \$5 per thousand, the cost would be \$80; add for two kegs small wire nails, at \$7. So, for material for strapping, the cost would be \$213.

In addition to this would be the cost of the material for putting crating on a number of the small cases, two of which were, in many instances, crated together for convenience in transporting them overland, and to have the small ones put into lots of two or three each that were going round by the Yukon. For this latter material the charge was estimated as being only about 30, which was considered reasonable.

The department had to pay the Hudson's Bay Company \$514 for boxes, for extra labour, &c., at the coast, and had also to pay for the sacks (15 cents each) and gunny sacks (10 cents each), in which the beans were put up.

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

Now, it seems to me that ought to be considered a fairly satisfactory answer to these two sets of charges. I understand the goods are all delivered now, and delivered in excellent order, and largely as a result of the extraordinary precautions which were taken. I believe the small sum of money which was taken here in exercising due precaution to preserve the property of the country from loss was well expended, and was more than justified by the result.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to inform the Minister, in the first place, that I was not here when the discussion took place the other night, so I could not have made any reference to the 50 cents for marking.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I withdraw that.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman has read a statement of prices that he has had cooked-up somewhere as to what prices were paid. I could tell him where he got it, but let him go to the Auditor General's Report and refer to some items purchased there, and compare them with the prices given to the Bates.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the expression "cooked" is a little too strong for the circumstances of the case.

Mr. CLANCY. It seems to be an extraordinary thing if the word cooked cannot be used. What does it mean?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Perhaps I am not sufficiently familiar with the English language, but according to my understanding it means that the Minister has done something wrong with these accounts. It seems to me it is not a proper expression to be used in Parliament. Cannot the hon. gentleman find some other expression?

Mr. TAYLOR. I can find no other expression in the English language to convey the idea that I intended to convey, that is, that the statement read by the Minister is not in accordance with the Auditor General's Report for prices. I do not know who has cooked up the statement he has read here.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman did not impute the cooking process to the Minister?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, somebody cooked the accounts for him, I do not know who, but it is a cooked account as compared with the Auditor General's Report. Turn to page M-38, to the account of McMillan & Hamilton, and to M-39 for Templeton's account. In Bate & Sons' account there are 5,980 pounds of evaporated apples, charged at \$9.75. Add a cent a pound to that, and it makes the price at the coast \$10.75. At Vancouver, there is an item of 100 pounds of evaporated apples charged in one account at 10 cents a pound for 450 pounds, and in another at 9 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents a pound.

So there is nearly one and a quarter of a cent a pound less for apples purchased at Vancouver than you paid Bate & Sons.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There may have been a difference in the quality.

Mr. TAYLOR. No difference in the quality, the same goods, and I am quoting articles—

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Put up by the same house?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know whether done by the Brantford concern or not.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. How can you tell, then, that they are the same quality?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am quoting the prices that the Government paid Bate & Sons at Ottawa, and the prices they paid at Vancouver, and no doubt they ask for the same class of goods in either case.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Ask the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Earle) if they are the same?

Mr. EARLE. I would say to the hon. Minister of Customs that evaporated apples are a standard article and differ very little.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What is the standard?

Mr. EARLE. You will find that goods sold on the coast are of a higher standard than goods sold in eastern Canada. You know that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I know that. The hon. gentleman will admit that there are differences in the qualities of these articles.

Mr. EARLE. There is a little, but there is no doubt that the apples sold on the coast are a No. 1 article.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Victoria will have something to say in regard to this matter, and I will have something more to say if the hon. Minister of Customs will allow me to proceed.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You must say what is correct.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am saying what is correct. This is taken from the Auditor General's Report. The department bought from Bate & Sons 3,000 pounds of apricots at \$10.95, and with a cent a pound added for freight it will bring it up to \$11.95 at Vancouver. They bought from Templeton at Vancouver 350 pounds at 10 cents, and 550 pounds at 8 cents. The price paid Bate & Sons was equal to \$11.95. They bought 718 dozens of corned beef from Bate & Sons at \$2.19, and at Vancouver, with freight added, \$3.19. They bought at Vancouver 42 dozens of canned corn beef, which was charged by

Templeton at the rate of \$2.75 per case. \$3.19 in one case and \$2.75 in the other. Bate & Sons charged \$6.10 per barrel for flour, which with freight added, cost at the rate of \$6.10, while 200 barrels were furnished at \$5.80 by Templeton at the coast. Bate & Sons furnished 6,500 pounds of prunes at \$6.93, and with one cent a pound added, it made \$7.93 at the coast.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman would not give us the benefit of the lower price that we paid for flour. A large part of it was bought for \$5.65, and the other part of it was bought for \$6.50.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am taking the invoice as it reads—510½ barrels at \$6.10. That is the only item of flour in the invoice.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Then there is another invoice, because there were two lots of flour. There were 3,800 pounds of flour at \$5.65.

Mr. TAYLOR. That would be another invoice.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is the invoice you have.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will read every item in the invoice from start to finish and give correct prices. Every one can see the reason why Bate & Sons figure on every page of the Auditor General's Report. Why are Bate & Sons selected?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Somebody had to be selected.

Mr. TAYLOR. They were selected because, when the Liberal party held a convention in Ottawa, I read from that little red bible, which I have in my hand, that after Mr. Longley had moved that famous resolution Mr. H. A. Bate, Secretary of the Ottawa Liberal Association came forward and hung upon the platform a banner in which was inscribed "Laurier expects every man to do his duty." That is why Bate & Sons have been selected. They live in Ottawa; they are merchants; they are strong Liberals, and they are shrewd business men. When the Government came into power they thought it would be a first-rate thing to pay this Government that compliment and receive all the patronage. They purchased a house and presented it to the right hon. Prime Minister of this country, and, therefore, this Government are under obligations to repay Bate & Sons.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Where did you get the information that a house was presented to the right hon. Prime Minister?

Mr. TAYLOR. It was common rumour in Ottawa, and I believe the facts are as stated.

Mr. SUTHERLAN. I think that is a very improper statement. I may say it is not a fact.

Mr. TAYLOR. I make the statement, and I will let the right hon. Prime Minister contradict it. I say that they bought and furnished a house, and that the right hon. Prime Minister lives in it. There may have been some others who contributed towards it, but Bate & Sons, being shrewd business men, knew that it would place this Government under an obligation by paying this compliment to the Prime Minister as they have done. They were allowed to purchase 600,000 pounds of binder twine from the penitentiary, without tender, last year at 4½ cents per pound, and through the ring they sold it at 13½ cents a pound to the farmers throughout this country. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said that the cause of high binder twine last year was the war in Manilla. Yet this firm purchased binder twine from this Government at 4½ cents a pound and sold it to the farmers at 13½ cents a pound.

Mr. SPROULE. And as high as 16 cents a pound.

Mr. MCGREGOR. They got it at the same price as others, but binder twine went up.

Mr. TAYLOR. No one else got binder twine. They got the whole output, and they controlled the Brantford factory. They were all in the ring, as I will show, when the item comes up.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I bought binder twine which I used on my farm at 6 cents a pound.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I have known Bate & Sons for 25 years or more. I know that they are a firm of a higher character, and I will say that their character is higher than that of the hon. gentleman who is speaking.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Livingston), got it at 6 cents a pound he must have got it from the ring.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. I did not get it from any ring, but I bought it from a dealer in twine. I know as much about twine as the hon. gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR. The farmers know what they paid for binder twine last year, and we will allow the farmers to settle that question. I was discussing the prices paid Bate & Sons in Ottawa as compared with the prices paid in Vancouver for a similar article. The Government purchased 6,500 pounds of prunes from Bate & Sons at \$6.93. A cent a pound added for freight would make the price \$7.93 at the coast. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Earle) knows that the price that Templeton furnished them for there 6½ cents a pound of the best quality is about

Mr. TAYLOR.

right. Templeton furnished them to this same Government at Vancouver—

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The same quality?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes. The Minister is very critical.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. How do you know?

Mr. TAYLOR. I sold more of them than the Minister did.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You know there are different kinds, then?

Mr. SPROULE. There are different kinds of biscuits, too.

Mr. TAYLOR. There were 3,500 pounds of evaporated peaches at \$10.33 per 100 pounds added for freight 1 cent, making 10½ cents a pound; and they were furnished up there for 6½ cents and 7½ cents by Templeton, and McMillan, and Hamilton. There was a nice little profit of 3 cents a pound on that for Bate & Sons over and above the ordinary price. There were 469 pounds of currants furnished by Bate at 9 cents a pound, and 1 cent a pound added for freight, making 10 cents, and any person knows that you can go into any country store, and buy at retail, and get 4 pounds for 25 cents.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What kind?

Mr. TAYLOR. The very best quality of currants. Templeton furnished 100 pounds at 6½ cents at Vancouver, and my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Earle) knows that 6½ cents a pound is the outside price for the very best quality of currants. This Government pays to Bate & Sons, to give them a chance to make money, 9 cents a pound, and 1 cent a pound extra for freight.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am told that this Venosta Excelsior currant is the very best, and it is worth a great deal more than the currant supplied to the North-west Mounted Police.

Mr. TAYLOR. They are that good that you can buy them in any retail store for 25 cents for four pounds. Last year the Minister told us that the goods had to be supplied in a hurry, that he made some inquiries about prices, and found Bate could supply them as cheap as they they could supply them anywhere else. They got the contract without tender.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They were asked for tenders, and they did not know but that twenty people might compete. A tender was put in.

Mr. TAYLOR. I sent this account to one of the largest concerns in our town, and asked them to put the prices opposite each line of goods.

Mr. TALBOT. The prices this year ?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, but the prices last year, when these goods were supplied.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Would you mind stating who this concern was ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes ; when I get through, I will tell you all about it.

Mr. MORRISON. The goods obtained from Templeton could not be obtained last year, because Templeton is dead a few years.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Auditor General's Report, page M-39, he will find that the Templeton firm was doing business last year. These are the goods to supply the Yukon contingent, and the Auditor General brought down these figures to the Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) knows how Templeton was killed; that is the trouble.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Militia told us salt was 1 cent a pound, and that if you took the cost of the freight there, it would be delivered for nothing. That is a nice sort of argument. Bate & Sons charged a cent a pound for the salt, and they charged a cent a pound for freight, that is, 2 cents a pound, when they get it to Vancouver. Here is their account. Seventy bags of salt, 50 pounds each, 3,500 pounds at 1 cent a pound, \$35. Seventy bags at 10 cents each, \$7. My information is, that the very best dairy salt is worth 28 cents for 50 pounds, and no charge for the bags. But Bate & Sons charge 50 cents for the salt, and 10 cents for the bag, making 60 cents. Taking all the charges together, by the time this salt got to Vancouver, it cost the Government \$1.10 for the 50-pound bag. Here is another item of their bill. Seventy bags of rice, 100 pounds, 7,000 pounds, \$3.65. The quotation I have here is \$3.35. Evaporated potatoes : charged by Bate, 15½ cents per pound ; real price, 8 cents a pound. Evaporated vegetables, charged by Bate 22 cents a pound, and I have it here that the current price is 18 cents. Here is another item in Bate's bill. Twenty-five bags of pease, 41½ bushels at 80 cents a bushel. They had 33½ per cent profit on pease at that price. Sixty cents a bushel is all any one paid for them at that time—a year ago last fall. Bate & Sons charged bags : 25 bags at 10 cents each and 50 bags at 10 cents each to hold the pease. Bate & Sons charged for evaporated apples 9·75 ; I am informed the real price is 8 cents. They charge for evaporated apricots, 10·95, when the actual price is 9 cents. They charge for evaporated peaches 9·33 cents, when the actual price is 8 cents. Then, here is another item in their account. Ninety

cases of lard, 50 pounds each, 5,400 pounds at 8·75 cents a pound, and \$1 per case for each case, making 9·75. That is a high price for lard.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I suppose the hon. gentleman knows there are various qualities of lard.

Mr. HENDERSON. How many qualities of lard does the Minister of Customs say there are on the market ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If you look at any trade paper, you will see.

Mr. HENDERSON. I will undertake to say that the lard throughout this country is sold as one quality. The Minister is only trying to humbug the committee.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Look at any trade paper, or ask your neighbour (Mr. Earle).

Mr. EARLE. His neighbour can tell you. There is only one quality of lard. Fairbanks' people in Montreal are making a compound they call lard, but there is only one quality of pure lard.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister knows what lard is worth. Ingersolls are turning out pure lard, and it is good lard, and at the time these goods were bought, there was no difficulty in buying lard at 6½ cents a pound.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. How was this lard put up ?

Mr. TAYLOR. In tins.

Mr. HENDERSON. You can put it up in tins as cheaply as in pails. If I mistake not, the tin would be the cheaper package. The Ingersoll Packing Co. are selling lard at 6½ cents a pound. I am speaking of something I know of.

Mr. MORRISON. In regard to this question, I quote from the "Star" of to-day—

Mr. TAYLOR. Give that in your speech. Mr. Chairman, call him to order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) will not give way. I would ask the members of the committee to address the Chair.

Mr. MORRISON. With the hon. gentlemen's permission, I want to make an explanation.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You dare not hear that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I dare hear the Minister of Customs or any other gentleman in this House when he treats me gentlemanly.

Mr. MORRISON. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will show him that there are different qualities of lard.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Customs knows there are different qualities of lard.

He is a manufacturer of biscuits, and he knows how cheap he can buy the poorest quality.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. How dear I can buy the best quality.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Halton was talking about the price of the best qualities.

Mr. MORRISON. The best quality is 9½ cents. It runs from 5½ cents to 9½ cents. You are ignorant of it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know more about the market and about all groceries than my hon. friend does about law, because I have put in thirty years at the business. The next item I will refer to is 2,000 gallons of coal oil at 26 cents a gallon. The Minister of Customs says the oil was delivered at the coast and he says that is a fair price. I say it is an outrageous price for coal oil, even delivered at the coast.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What quality is that?

Mr. TAYLOR. It is the best American oil, I presume. It may have been Canadian for anything I know.

Mr. EARLE. It was Canadian.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, so much the worse.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It was not Canadian.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Earle) says it was, and I think he is in a position to know. A case of blacking, 36 dozens, at 27 cents. The proper price should be 25 cents. A case of blacking, D & M, 12 dozen, 75 cents—it should be 60 cents. 4 cases of black pepper, 200 pounds, at 12½ cents. 10 cents is the proper price. Granulated sugar, at 4½ cents a pound. That price is correct. 24 cases matches at \$3.00, and 12 outside cases at \$1. The price is all right, but there should be no charge for the cases. 48 boxes of Sunlight soap, at \$4.30. The proper price is \$4. 16 barrels of Lazenby's pickles, 92 dozen, at \$3.25. The proper price should be \$1.50. 16 barrels of vinegar, 49,730 gallons, at 27½ cents a gallon. The proper price for XX is 20 cents, and the proper price for XXX is 24 cents. 11 cases Reindeer milk, at \$5.85 here in Ottawa, although it is sold at Victoria \$4.50, and they had to pay the freight on it to the coast. 10 cases of tomatoes, 20 dozen at \$1.25 a dozen. \$1 is the proper price. 80 boxes of Sperm candles, 2,000 pounds, at \$10.92. The proper price is 7½ cents a pound. 120 tins of marmalade at 75 cents per tin. The proper price is 65 cents. 16 boxes of raisins, 448 pounds, at 6½ cents. The proper price is 4½ cents for the very best raisins you can buy—layers. Then we come to the time for strengthening packages, etc., and repacking, \$118; mate-

Mr. TAYLOR.

rial used in strapping, nails, &c., \$174. Then there are two kegs of nails, wire nails, \$7, or \$3.50 a keg. All the nails are charged at 4 cents a pound, though every person knows that last year the right price was 2 cents a pound, or \$1.85 by the keg. Then, we have 12,500 pounds more nails at 4 cents a pound. I do not see why the Minister paid freight on six carloads of goods. When you take out the flour, corn-beef and coal oil, in my opinion six cars would not be required for the whole invoice. The corn-beef, I expect, was shipped direct from Chicago. If freight was paid on six carloads of goods, taking the flour out, they were very small carloads. \$26,699 was paid for the goods on that first invoice. We have another small invoice for \$8,563, with \$519 deducted for canned beef, leaving \$8,044.76. There is charged 2½ cars freight—\$209, \$216 and \$55. There is also the item, time strengthening packages, &c., \$61 and \$69. these goods that ought to have been packed and would have been packed by any wholesale merchant supplying the goods and charging the prices charged in this invoice. We have the same class of goods, candles, 11½ cents per pound, twelve pounds; 7½ cents per pound is the proper price. Ten pails of lard—this is not in tins at all, but right from the factory, fifty pounds in a pail, at 9½ cents, which the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) told us is furnished by the pork packers at 6½ cents per pound. Three hundred and eighty-eight bags of South Dakota flour at \$5.85 per bag. It does not say what quantity is in the bag. In barrels it is charged at \$6.10 per barrel. There are 5,000 bags of biscuits—the Minister of Customs will know whether the prices are right and who furnished them. Perhaps they were biscuits made at Brantford, but they are charged at 5½ cents per pound, 500 boxes. The boxes are charged at 25 cents a piece, which hold the biscuits. Then we come to matches, which were charged in the other invoice at \$3. Here they are charged at \$3.75, and they were not parlour matches, for on the other invoice there is a case of parlour matches at \$2.50, and here there is one charged at \$2.50. In the other case there was \$3 charged, but they evidently forgot the price that they charged, and invoiced them at \$3.75 in this instance. At any grocery you could buy them at \$3 a box. Five boxes of baking powder, ten dozen, at \$1.75; \$1.20 is the proper price. Twenty boxes sperm candles at \$10.92; \$7.50 is the proper price. Two cases pepper, 100 pounds, at 12½ cents; 10 cents is the proper price. This invoice runs on a par with the other one, all retail prices charged in every case, and then the freight added to Vancouver, and my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Earle), who is in the business, will tell you these are high prices for goods of the same quality sold out there. There can be no other conclusion than that the

Government wanted to repay Bate & Sons, and allow them to charge their own prices. They were paid in all \$36,302.59 for goods they supplied the departments, which appear in the Auditor General's Report. The Indian Department and every other that required goods simply sent to Bate & Sons, and Bate & Sons charged what prices they liked. Here are the various amounts taken from the Auditor General's Report :

Bate & Son—		
G—19, Indian Affairs	.....	\$ 17 52
G—20	do	118 59
G—20	do	27 57
G—21	do	21 42
G—22	do	150 32
G—22	do	27 76
G—23	do	7 00
G—24	do	23 02
G—25	do	26 12
G—25	do	20 98
G—26	do	32 60
G—27	do	35 12
G—28	do	118 26
G—28	do	43 32
G—29	do	18 82
G—29	do	51 49
G—29	do	67 54
G—30	do	102 93
G—31	do	12 58
G—32	do	51 62
G—33	do	20 76
G—33	do	17 47
G—34	do	62 36
G—34	do	44 31
G—36	do	21 66
G—37	do	66 39
G—38	do	2 10
G—39	do	59 54
G—40	do	39 41
G—40	do	77 60
J—18, Legislation	.....	136 48
J—19	do	35 68
L—76 and 77, Militia	.....	34,744 25
Total		..... \$36,302 59

A favoured and petted firm Bate & Sons evidently are.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman seems sometimes to quote coast prices and sometimes prices delivered here. He said he would give us the name of the firm.

Mr. TAYLOR. The name of the firm that said they would retail goods in the retail line at the prices on the list all through is the departmental store in Gananoque.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They were not the prices at the coast, but at Gananoque ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, just as the prices charged by Bate & Sons are the prices at Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, but sometimes the hon. gentleman quoted so much at the coast and so much here backward and forward, and it was hard to tell what he meant.

Mr. TAYLOR. When I was quoting salt the Minister said it cost one cent a pound, and that if you deducted the freight you would have it at Vancouver for nothing, but the salt was 2 cents a pound and 10 cents a bag. At the coast they charge 50 cents per bag. Here they charged \$1 per bag and 10 cents freight, making \$1.10 per bag.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Are these first-class ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, they offer the highest class of goods in every case, and they only put on this list the prices of such goods as they know. They have not put prices on tea and coffee, because they say you cannot draw comparisons in the case of tea or coffee. The hon. Minister selected tea and coffee as illustrations of what he paid here and out there.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The tea was against me, because the price was lower.

Mr. TAYLOR. You can buy tea or coffee at any price, and a great many other articles, but the articles I have named are staple articles, the same as pure lard, that my hon. friend referred to.

Mr. HUGHES. Do not let it go on record that the Minister of Customs uses pure lard.

Mr. TAYLOR. As a rule, bakers buy as cheap lard as they can to manufacture their biscuits with.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do they do much business at the departmental store in Gananoque ?

Mr. TAYLOR. If my hon. friend will write for particulars, they will tell him.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You are astray in your currants.

Mr. TAYLOR. You can go to any retail store and buy from three to four pounds as good currants as can be purchased for 25 cents, and you pay equal to 10 cents per pound, delivered at the coast.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman cannot buy this particular kind at 25 cents for four pounds.

Mr. TAYLOR. I can buy the best currants—I do not say that these are the best brand, you may have a better brand—at 25 cents for three pounds, by retail, and I can buy four pounds for 25 cents.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You will find it difficult to convince anybody that a firm like Bate & Sons would overcharge.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Government have no right to go to Bate & Sons in preference to

any other firm and pay them 25 per cent larger prices than they would have to pay if they would call for tenders. They promised they would run the Government on economical lines. Are they doing it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Militia asks an increase on every vote but one—the grant to rifle associations is reduced.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If the hon. gentleman wants to know why that is, I may explain that last year there was a special vote for the Bisley building. We do not have to make a vote like that every year.

Mr. TAYLOR. He has increased by \$10,000 the item for salaries for civil employees. He has brought a man from Goderich to be inspector of military stores, notwithstanding that he had as good a staff as he required. But he had to find a place for this political heeler, and this man was in Goderich during the West Huron election, canvassing from house to house, and yet drawing his pay as storekeeper.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is not correct. If any officer of the department was engaged in any electioneering—I do not know that there was any—he was not paid by the Militia Department.

Mr. TAYLOR. He was playing the part of an offensive partisan and doing it on the bounty of this Government. He was sent out specially to do stumping and canvassing work with the "brigade." On account of such appointments, the Minister has to ask for an increase of \$10,000 a year. I am as willing as any member of this House to vote all that is necessary for the militia. But the trouble is that the militia force are getting very little of this increase. The extra money goes to pay a larger staff and to pay three or four prices for supplies. I have here a memorandum of supplies bought from another political friend of the Government—Aikenhead of Toronto.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose you never did that when in power?

Mr. TAYLOR. The late Government purchased everything by tender that could be purchased in that way. This Government, not only do not purchase goods by tender, but they do not sell the people's property by tender, but give it away for half price, as I shall show when we come to discuss the Estimates for the Department of Justice. They gave away to a ring the binder twine belonging to the people of this country, and the farmers are paying three or four prices for it. At page L-30 of the Auditor General's Report will be found the account of the Aikenhead Hard-

Mr. TAYLOR.

ware Company. From an invoice of \$2,026.27, I take a few items. For instance, there is ninety-one pounds of putty at 4 cents—the proper price is 1½ cents—nineteen gallons of boiled oil at 60 cents, and so on. At page L-44, there is another invoice of the same firm for \$694.13. Among the items in it are the following: Thirty pounds of soft soap at 20 cents—who ever heard of such a thing! It is worth 2 cents. There is two gallons of boiled oil at 95 cents—the proper price is 45 cents; 120 pounds twine at 30 cents; 1,000 pounds of hard soap at 12 cents; thirty pounds cut nails at 4 cents, and 300 pounds cut nails at 4 cents. At L-53, the same company have an invoice for \$2,152.43. Among the items here we find 200 bathbrick at 5 cents. You can go to any grocery store on a side street and buy a single bathbrick for 5 cents—the wholesale price is about 1½ cents. Then there is a lawn mower, \$145. It does not say whether it was a horse mower or hand mower. You can buy the very best steel horse lawn mower for \$85. And there is one lawn mower at \$17—a hand lawn mower, I suppose. You can buy the best hand lawn mower at \$8 or \$9. Then there are nine stable buckets at \$2.50 a piece, and 47 curry-combs at 48 cents each—the price of the best quality is 25 cents each. Then we find fourteen kegs of horseshoes at \$6.50 per keg—and you can buy them in any hardware store for \$4.50. Six boxes of horseshoe nails, \$4.75 a box—and the retail price is \$2.25; fifty bushels of lime at 30 cents—you can buy the best quality at 15 cents. The Opposition would not be doing its duty if it did not challenge increases in the staff, and almost every other item except that for the annual drill and such others as go directly to the militia force. I find that Messrs. Chestnut & Sons, of Fredericton, receive such prices as twenty pounds flour at 5 cents; thirty pounds of putty at 5 cents—proper price 1½ cents; twenty-six pounds of nails at 7 cents—proper price 3 cents; 243 pounds whiting at 5 cents—proper price 1½ cents. Then we find at page L-38: Larose et Fils, 25 barrels of cement at \$2.50, and they get 20 per cent commission on everything they supply, labour and everything else. 25 barrels of cement at \$2.50, with 20 per cent added, \$3; 1,350 white brick, \$2.80 per 100, \$28 per 1,000 equals \$33.60; 22½ pounds of nails, 4 cents a pound, add cartage, \$16.70; 102 days at \$2, add 20 per cent, \$2.40; 119 days at \$1, add 20 per cent, \$1.20. Their account figures up \$986.06, made up in this way: The first items I have read amount to \$456.15. They run up 20 per cent, \$91.23; then 20 per cent on \$560.98, \$112.16; 20 per cent on \$932.44, \$186.49. Then they charge for five barrels of cement at \$3, 20 per cent added, \$3.60. 3½ bushels of cement at \$1.50, add 20 per cent, \$1.80. Sand, 7 bushels at 6 cents, add 20 per cent, 7½ cents a bushel. Every person knows that sand is not worth 7 cents a bushel. This is the way the Minister is shovelling out the people's money,

asking for votes \$10,000 and \$50,000 over last year, simply to give it away to political friends for goods they are supplying at two or three prices. In the whole of these purchases by the Minister of Militia and Defence by his staff, for supplies either for the Yukon contingent or for military purposes, he has paid on the average 25 to 50 per cent more than he would have paid had he advertized for tenders.

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** The hon. gentleman is just where he was the other night when he gave us to understand that we were paying for ordinary brick 4 cents, when they were fire brick.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** They were not firebrick. The hon. gentleman cannot produce an account showing these are firebrick, they are white brick.

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** The hon. gentleman told me at that time it was ridiculous to talk about firebrick being that price, firebrick were worth 12 cents a piece. The hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Earle) knows something about these things, he is a large wholesale dealer and he knows the value of goods. The Minister has told him that part of those articles were freight paid, and part were not, and he has submitted the prices at which he has paid for these articles on which freight was not paid. According to the figures furnished by the Minister for corresponding prices for the Mounted Police, the member for Victoria would admit that these articles had been fairly bought. To submit prices and goods from a departmental store that may have been a job lot bought at auction, and putting them on "Hansard" as a quotation of first-class goods bought from a first-class house, is not the way to do. The hon. member for Victoria will have an opportunity now of comparing the figures the Minister has given here, and if this item is not passed to-night, he will have an opportunity of pointing it out on another occasion.

**Mr. EARLE.** As regards the figures here in the account of Bate & Sons, I have stated here before, and I state again, that they are fair prices take them all through for these goods delivered on the coast. In confirmation of that I will not take up your time to read the items here from three or four merchants on the coast who have supplied similar goods last year to the Yukon police force. The prices compare with those favourably in every instance. Wilson & Bros., large grocers on the coast, have supplied a large amount of goods to the Yukon force, and you will also see in their bills that the charges for packing are nil. Where they have furnished extra sacks they have charged for extra sacks. That is the only extra charge. Where they have strapped their goods and put them up for the northern trade, they have made no extra charge.

You will find charges for packing in none of these bills except in a few instances where extra cotton duck sacks have been specially furnished to go over their bean sacks. Who would think of buying salt in eastern Canada for the Pacific coast, salt that is delivered by sailing vessels from England to our merchants at \$10 or \$12 a ton? Take washing soda; here it is 1 cent a pound, over there it is 1 cent a pound; but no one would think of buying it here for the Pacific coast who had any idea of trade. In fact, if it is inquired into it will be found that the goods supplied by Wilson Bros. in Victoria and in Vancouver have given entire satisfaction, not only as to quality but as to the manner in which they are packed. These prices, take them all through, are good fair prices for goods delivered on the coast. I have not compared them item for item, but I know the price of all the staple articles thoroughly well. Some of them are a little above the prices of goods sold at any time during the last year. The prices quoted by the Minister of Customs to-night, I dare say, were supplied by Mr. White. Well, he calls for goods to be put up in a special manner, and the prices include packing and everything else. Most of his goods were in tins, and even then the prices compare very favourably with these.

**Mr. CLANCY.** Can the Minister give us separately the weight of the flour, the pork and the oil?

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** Meats, 114,520 pounds; flour, 140,900 pounds; coal oil, 17,200 gallons. Nineteen thousand two hundred pounds of pork and 71,163 pounds of bacon.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** That is not in Bate & Sons' bill.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** No. Do you just want to know Bate & Sons' bill?

**Mr. CLANCY.** I only want to know the class of goods upon which freight is supposed to be paid.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** Two hundred and twenty-seven thousand six hundred and twenty pounds.

**Mr. CLANCY.** That is goods upon which freight is paid?

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** Yes.

**Mr. CLANCY.** Is that the whole of it?

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** Yes, but the Hudson's Bay Company's order, which formed a part of these goods, was to be delivered. When I refer to two-thirds of the Yukon supplies, of course, I refer to two-thirds of all the supplies. When I made the statement as to the goods we were buying, I supposed that all the goods were to be delivered on the

coast, but it turned out that a portion of the goods were delivered here—179,000, as against 272,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. I hope that the hon. Minister of Customs is satisfied, having appealed to the hon. member for Victoria, when he finds that the Government paid \$3,000 more in freight, besides a higher price than the goods could have been purchased for at the coast.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I would like the hon. gentleman to sit down with Bate & Sons and establish what he says.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will, certainly.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Oh, not you. I mean the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Earle).

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. Minister of Militia gave the impression that on one-third of the goods only was the freight paid. In dealing with this apparent overcharge on the part of Bate & Sons, the statement of the hon. Minister gave us the impression that it was in relation to one-third and two-thirds. The hon. gentleman's statement, as revised, now excludes the goods purchased from the Hudson Bay Company. It does not stand in the proportion of one-third and two-thirds, and the question does not stand in the same position as the hon. gentleman put it a short time ago. The hon. gentleman says that it was 272,000, as against 189,000 pounds, regarding Bate & Sons. Will the hon. gentleman tell us what was the class of goods purchased and the prices of these goods which Bate & Sons repacked with such care, putting iron hoops around the special boxes of light weights? The hon. gentleman seemed to have a brief, so great was the detail into which he went as to the kind of boxes they were.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have shipped a great many goods to the coast, and the hon. gentleman will understand that, where freight is 1 cent a pound, great care would be taken to have the cases as tight as possible, and, going on to the Yukon, they will have to be strengthened all the more on that account.

Mr. CLANCY. It has been stated over and over again by the hon. member for Victoria that the packing of these goods is not usually charged for, although it is charged for in this case. I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Militia as to the class of goods that were repacked by Bate & Sons.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I can give the hon. gentleman the number of packages in each car and what the packages were, but I am afraid I cannot give him the class of goods. Some of them were desiccated vegetables. I remember that, but I cannot tell the hon.

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

gentleman, from memory, what the classes of goods were.

Mr. CLANCY. It is very important that we should know. There are 250 boxes, according to the statement of the hon. Minister.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think I said 121 boxes.

Mr. CLANCY. It is very important that we should know what classes of goods these cases contained, because the prices paid might have been prices which ought not to have been paid on the cases and for this repacking, and all this extra expense which has been put in on a class of goods bought at a price that could not be justified.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Meat, flour and oil were the only three articles to be delivered free on the coast.

Mr. CLANCY. The person who sold these goods should have packed them and had them ready for shipment. That is what I am speaking about now and not about the freight.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The goods were forty cases of evaporated vegetables, fourteen cases of onions, twenty-five cases potatoes, thirty-three boxes of evaporated vegetables mixed, forty cases of lard, one case of tallow, twenty-five cases of evaporated potatoes. I am not quite certain, but I think these are the goods.

Mr. EARLE. These are not the goods referred to, because all these would come in the original package.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think they had to be re-packed in stronger packages.

Mr. CLANCY. It was obviously the duty of the firm selling those goods to have them prepared for shipment. Who gave the instructions about re-strapping and re-packing these 4,200 cases?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They were given by the Quartermaster General, who had this done under his personal supervision.

Mr. CLANCY. And he arranged the prices with Bate & Co.?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Bate & Co. sent in a tender.

Mr. CLANCY. To whom?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. To the department.

Mr. PRIOR. Nobody else was asked.

Mr. CLANCY. Surely it was not the Quartermaster General who settled on the price?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. The Quartermaster General recommended the prices to be accepted, and of course I approved of them.

**Mr. CLANCY**. Now we have it. The Quartermaster General ordered Bate & Co. to do the work, but the Minister is responsible, and the whole transaction is utterly unjustifiable.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. The Minister is not trying to get out of his responsibility.

**Mr. CLANCY**. But he should find some defence for his conduct.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. Oh, pshaw!

**Mr. CLANCY**. The Minister says: Oh, pshaw! but when the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) proved that this was an extravagant bargain, he said the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) quoted as authority a third-rate house, who had a job lot. What does he (Mr. Paterson) know about it. The firm quoted by my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) may be a house of as good standing as H. N. Bate & Son.

**Mr. TAYLOR**. Just as good.

**Mr. CLANCY**. And that is no way for the Minister of Customs to cast reflections on a first-class house, and try to get into "Hansard" that that is a third-rate house. Now, I want the Minister to name the goods that were re-packed, or else he should let the item stand.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. They are the goods I stated. Forty cases of evaporated vegetables mixed, fourteen cases of evaporated onions, twenty-five cases of evaporated potatoes, forty-two cases of compressed beef, fourteen cases of clothing, twenty-nine bales of clothing, one trunk.

**Mr. CLANCY**. Now, what was in that trunk?

**Mr. TAYLOR**. Will the Minister say that he bought compressed beef without its being ready for shipment?

The **CHAIRMAN**. Shall this resolution No. 104 be carried?

**Mr. CLANCY**. Not a bit of it.

**Mr. SPROULE**. Might I suggest, at this hour in the morning—

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. We are going on with the Estimates.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Item 105.

Annual drill ..... \$400,000

**Mr. SPROULE**. I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that while I am on my feet you should not take up another item. This was a valuable discussion we had; we are not obstructing, and we have now reach-

ed an hour in the morning when it is fair that we should be allowed to go to bed so as to be able to attend to committee work to-morrow.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Shall this resolution be adopted?

**Mr. HENDERSON**. Having obtained the large vote in item 104 the committee should rise. As the Government wishes to continue, I notice there is an increase of \$100,000 in this item.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. Excuse me, I want to reduce it by about \$125,000.

**Mr. HENDERSON**. If we are going to put in the time till 5 o'clock, the Chairman will get enough of it.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The item will be reduced.

**Mr. HENDERSON**. That is what I object to, and I will tell you why. I am one of those who favour an increase in pay of the non-commissioned officers and men of the volunteer force throughout this country. We are told that this is the growing time, and that the revenue is buoyant. Then, I do not see any reason why these young men should be asked to go out and drill in the warm days of June, leaving their employment and their homes, losing their wages and living on humble fare, when the Government has plenty of money to pay them and to provide for them properly. I think the Government should take this matter into consideration. My opinion is that men who go out to camp ought to be paid a day's wage equal to what they can earn at home. They should not be asked to lose a cent by enlisting in the service of the country. Nor should they be asked to live on humbler fare than they get at home. Notwithstanding the reduction of this item, I still hope the Minister is asking for a sufficient sum to increase the pay of the non-commissioned officers and men of the volunteer force throughout the entire country.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. I beg now to move that this vote be reduced by \$100,000, for this reason. We have already voted in the supplementary Estimates for the financial year which has just closed a sum of money which, with what it had on hand, has paid for probably two-thirds of the drilling for the present calendar year, and I think that after making this deduction we shall have perhaps more than sufficient. It depends on the date at which the militia is called out. With regard to what my hon. friend says, I always listen to him, because when he speaks, he speaks to the point. No one would be more glad than I, as an old member of the militia force, to be able to vote a larger sum of money for the non-com-

missioned officers and men. It is a question well worth considering; but I think the young men of Canada, officers as well as non-commissioned officers and men, are prepared to make some sacrifices in order to defend this country, and I think they would be disappointed if they were not permitted to do so. I think my hon. friend mistakes the feeling of loyalty and patriotism of the young men who join our battalions and go into camp, if he supposes that they are led to do so by any mercenary motive. All they want is to get enough to repay them for any direct expense or loss that may occur. At present I think it is not necessary to make any provision of that kind. On the contrary, I think our young men would rather resent it.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to say a word or two on the matter which has been brought up by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). I agree with the Minister that the officers and men do not require any better pay per day than they are receiving. But what they do require, and what I think they should have, is a proper system of messing. I know that the proposition is before the Minister, as in the case of the battalion from the county of Halton, to have it properly messed at Niagara. I am satisfied that the men would prefer to have 10 cents per day for that purpose rather than an increase to that extent in pay. In time of active service, they would not object to eating in the tents; but they do object to doing so in camp; and if the Minister would provide sufficient to enable them to have marquees where they could sit down at table, I am satisfied that many young fellows who do not now go to camp would go.

I am satisfied that 10 cents a day given for this specific purpose would do it. They would appreciate 10 cents for that purpose better than 25 cents a day added to their pay. Not only should the marquee and these tables be provided, and they could be provided very cheaply, but there should be a little improvement in the rations. We find, by reference to this Yukon business, that prepared vegetables could be issued easily to the men, so that they might have some vegetables other than potatoes. There is no reason in the world why there should not be some improvement in the rations. Speaking of the reduction in this item, if a battalion does not drill before the 1st of July, it may not drill at all. I would draw the hon. Minister's attention to the fact that this year some corps were nearly omitted, and unless a special vote be brought up again to give a corps the right to drill twice in a year, it will lose its annual drill. I trust the hon. Minister will let the item stand as it is, and not ask for a revote for any corps which is unable to perform its drill in September instead of June. September, in the province of Ontario, is a very unsuitable month, and

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

June is the most suitable month. I wish to draw attention also to this fact. Many of our young officers are induced to join the force before they have that enthusiasm which comes from long years of training. They have to lose their time attending military school. Of course they get paid, but still it is a hardship to many of them, and in addition they are called on to purchase a very expensive outfit at a period in their career when they do not feel that enthusiasm that they will later on, and when they are probably not flushed with money. An ordinary drill uniform with sword and belt cost \$75 to \$80 at the least, which is too much for these young men and has a tendency to make them hesitate; and when that expense is added to the inconvenience of getting these things, it makes them feel like leaving the force entirely. This year, before going into camp, I was informed by a number of officers that there was not a sword to be purchased in the Dominion of Canada, and, besides, the prices are just graded according to the whim of these gentlemen who have them for sale. The department should keep not only swords and belts, but cheap drill uniforms for the officers, so that an officer should get his uniform at a reasonable price. These are matters that I know affect the corps seriously. I think the helmet should be paid for by the department. Unless the young officer puts his hands into his pocket and buys a helmet he cannot get one, and when he goes to the school, without his helmet, he is brought up with double turn by his superior officer with the question: Where is your helmet? He has not enough gall to face it out and is broken down at the beginning of his career, because he has not a helmet or the latest type of sword or the little fandangoes that change according to the whim of those who change the regulations every two or three months, according to the changes of the moon. All these things should be taken hold of by the department. The Government should supply the men with helmets. There is no reason why any one going to a military school should be called on to pay for his helmet. Not only should the helmets be provided by the department, but the swords and uniforms should be furnished to each officer as soon as he completes his qualification and should be kept in stock. We are told the English system of volunteering is purely voluntary, but I am informed that there is a considerable grant given to officers and men in the way of uniforms and all these extras. This matter might very properly receive the attention of the hon. Minister. Another suggestion in connection with the annual drill is this. The bands and staff undoubtedly should be over and above the strength of the company. No one will gainsay the proposition that the band and staff should be over and above the company establishment, and there should always be a separate pay-sheet for the band and staff as for each company. If that were the

case, each captain would know exactly how many men he could count on, and he would have no trouble in sending uniforms to each company for the band, and a great deal of the interior economy of a company or battalion would be minimized. There are a great many other matters that we will have an opportunity of discussing again, probably before the Minister rushes these items all through. I would make this other suggestion. Thanksgiving Day is observed all through the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and on that day the city and rural corps meet for manoeuvres. These are of great practical service, and I would suggest the advisability of bringing these under the control of the department, and also the furnishing of transport and making some allowance to corps from a distance that will take part in these manoeuvres.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am very much obliged to my hon. friend for his suggestion. From his long connection with the militia and the active interest he takes in it, anything he has to say is always of value and well received. With regard to what he has said about the improved plan of messing, I noticed that battalion to which he refers in my short visit to Niagara, and I certainly think the scheme is a great improvement and am favourably inclined to it, and would like to help it along as far as possible. The question of assisting the officers to uniform themselves in some way by providing at our stores for the sale of uniforms at cost is certainly worth considering. We do that now in the matter of saddlery. The difficulty about providing uniforms would be to make them fit, and we could hardly undertake the work at present of making the clothing, but might, perhaps, do something in the way of getting uniforms and having them altered to suit.

Mr. HUGHES. I may say that through the courtesy of the hon. gentleman's officers, I know that a number of men sent their measurements to his department, and these were sent on to the Government tailor at Hamilton, who sent the uniforms, cash on delivery, to the officers, and they were very satisfactory.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am grateful to the hon. Minister for the manner in which he has received my suggestion. I do not doubt the loyalty of young Canadians and their willingness to join the volunteer force and fit themselves for the defence of the country. I have never been connected with the service, but I have been a careful on-looker, and the conclusion I have come to is, that we must not allow the young men to feel that they are treated by the Government in such a way as to cause them loss. The Government must deal fairly with them, and, when they go to camp, make them as comfortable as they can, and, so far as rations are concerned, to give them as good as they are accustomed to at

home. And, in a pecuniary way they must not be called upon to suffer the loss of wages—because most of these young men are wage-earners. If they realize that the Government will give them fair compensation, the young men will go into the force with spirit. I think that the Government, in these growing times, might be a little more liberal to these young men who so willingly offer their services to the country.

Mr. SPROULE. I took it for granted that this increase in the item was to pay an increased amount to those who drill every year, and regret that there is no intention to increase the pay. The fact that our county councils are often asked to supplement the pay with 25 cents a day, is evidence that the young men of the country think the pay too small. Some county councils grant it, and some do not; some grant it one year and refuse it another year. This year, and others, I have known this matter to be discussed among themselves; and, when the proposition is made to them to enlist and fill up the companies, many of them would willingly go, if the county council would pay the additional 25 cents. But, otherwise, they seem to think they are putting in time largely for nothing. It is true, that there is an attraction in having a holiday and going out with the military corps, and there is the loyal question as well. But I think the loyalty question does not appeal so much to their hearts as having a holiday, and having some drill, and being out with the boys. But, with it all, they would like to have some money as well. When the county council is importuned for this vote of an extra 25 cents a day, the question always comes up: Why does not the Government pay this: why should not the whole country bear the burden? If the county of Grey sends out a battalion of full strength, and another county does not send out half the number, why should the county of Grey pay that amount extra for helping to keep up the militia, when other counties, equally as able, perhaps better able, do not pay a cent? It would be fairer for the Government to pay it. I am sure the country would willingly bear the increased expenditure. For one, I would be prepared to go on any platform and justify the Minister of Militia in giving more in this way. My hon. friend from North Victoria said: If you give the young men 10 cents a day extra and a marquee, that would satisfy them. I do not think so. I have often heard complaint of the small sum given, and think it should be increased.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not pretend to criticize what has been said by the hon. member for Victoria. I have no doubt he is well qualified to give valuable information and a weighty opinion. But if his proposition should be carried out, there would have to be an additional sum voted. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) raised the ques-

tion, when discussing the supplementary estimate of \$125,000 for this same purpose. The Minister explained he would reduce the main estimate by \$100,000, leaving it at \$300,000. The hon. Minister has since stated very explicitly the policy of the Government to be, that there shall be an annual drill. If that is the case, it will require every cent for that purpose alone. Last year \$300,000 was voted for the annual drill, and he spent that and \$125,000 besides. And when it was pointed out that it would take every dollar of \$400,000 for the annual drill, the hon. gentleman complains that that is not a fair criticism. But, in seeking to show that it is not, he can only say that there will not be an annual drill every year—that is, that he will not carry out the policy that it is his intention to carry out. This means that he will come, at the end of this fiscal year, asking for another \$100,000 to make up what he has actually spent. The hon. gentleman might as well face the country first as last. If his policy is to be an annual drill, he had better ask for enough money to pay for it, rather than, later on, to be obliged to put in the Estimates an amount that he is leaving out now, though he knows that it will be needed. The hon. gentleman proposes to reduce this vote to \$300,000. I would like him to give the committee information showing how much he intends to expend on the city corps at local headquarters, also the pay that is to be given to the men and horses for supplies and transport, each separately.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The question which the hon. gentleman asks is a very fair one, but I have stated twice since 10 o'clock this evening that it depends upon the time of the year when the militia is called out whether the vote which I propose to take, \$300,000, will be sufficient. I said that such a large proportion had been called out and paid prior to the 1st day of July this present year, that I believed the \$300,000 asked for will be sufficient. Last year nearly the whole of the militia was drilled, and the total expenditure was \$302,241 for the financial year. Nearly the whole of the militia was drilled during the calendar year of 1898. We voted last year \$300,000. Out of that, \$122,759 was incurred in the previous year, and paid, so that we had to come down this year and ask for \$125,000. But as a matter of fact, if we had not paid \$122,000 the previous year, we would have had within \$2,241 enough in our \$300,000 vote to pay for the annual training of the militia during the fiscal year just closed. So I say that while I do not guarantee that the \$300,000 will be sufficient, I believe it will come pretty near it; and as we have got \$25,000 extra which I take on the vote of last year, I think it is only fair to reduce this estimate by this \$100,000. I will then have \$25,000 more than

Mr. CLANCY.

I have originally estimated. The militia drills within the calendar year, and our Estimates are taken for the fiscal year. So it depends upon the date when the camps are called out, but I believe this will be adequate. The hon. gentleman wants to know how many city battalions there are.

Mr. CLANCY. How much of that \$300,000 is to be paid for drilling the city corps at the local headquarters?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They get \$6 for 12 days.

Mr. CLANCY. How is that \$300,000 divided among each branch of the service?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The annual training of the city corps is going on all through the year at the convenience of the men and officers. They drill at night in the drill sheds, and they are paid \$6 for 12 days annual drill within the year, just the same as the rural battalions.

Mr. CLANCY. What portion of this whole sum goes for that purpose?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It depends upon the number of men.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman must have known how many men there were; therefore, I ask how much of this \$300,000 goes to these branches of the same service?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will give the hon. gentleman some information here which may satisfy him. This is the way in which the estimate is made up:

PAY.

One day's pay for the whole of the militia, including the horses (vide statement "A" attached).....	\$ 27,636 78
Deduct from this 8 per cent, on account of men not turning out to drill .....	2,210 90
	\$ 25,425 88
Required for one day's pay.....	\$ 25,425 88
Required for twelve days' pay....	305,110 00

ESTABLISHMENT.

	Men.	Horses.
Total strength of the Militia.	30,072	3,511
Deduct strength of the city corps and garrison artillery, which drill at local headquarters (vide statement "B").....	11,516	508
	23,556	3,003
Balance .....	23,556	3,003
Deduct 8 per cent, to allow for men not turning out..	1,885	240
	21,671	2,763
Balance, which represents the number of men and horses to be provided for in camp.	21,671	2,763

## RATIONS.

1½ lbs. bread .....	03	
1 lb. meat .....	06	
1 lb. potatoes .....	01	
1 ration groceries ..	03	
<hr/>		
Total.....	13 for 1 day 1 man.	
	\$1 43 for 11 days 1 man.	
Required for 21,671 officers and men—		
11 days .....	\$30,989 00	
First day in camp, at 25c. each..	5,418 00	

## FORAGE.

Each horse—		
10lbs. oats per day.		
12 lbs. hay per day.		
8 lbs. straw per day.		
2,763 horses for 11 days—		
8,939 bush. oats at 40c.....	\$3,575	
166 tons hay at \$12.....	1,992	
122 tons straw at \$8.....	976	
Add 35c. each horse first day in camp.	967	
<hr/>		
Total required for forage.....	\$7,510	

## FUEL.

1½ rations to each officer per day.		
¼ ration to each non-commissioned officer and man per day.		
There are 96 rations in one cord wood.		
	Rations.	
2,000 officers, 12 days .....	36,000	
19,201 non-commissioned officers and men, 12 days.....	57,603	
<hr/>		
	93,603	
93,603 rations equals 975 cords, which, at \$5 per cord, amount to.....	\$4,875 00	

## MARCHING ALLOWANCE.

This may be estimated at..... \$8,500 00

## BAGGAGE TRANSPORT.

Say 1,000 officers at 50c.....	\$ 500 00
Say 10,000 N.C.O. and men at 10c....	1,000 00
<hr/>	
	\$1,500 00

## CAMP TINS.

467 companies or troops at \$6.....	\$2,802 00
17 batteries at \$10.....	170 00
<hr/>	
	\$2,972 00

## FIELD ALLOWANCE TO PERMANENT CORPS.

\$2.50 per diem to each officer ; 10c. per diem to each N.C.O. and man.	
50 officers, 15 days.....	\$1,875 00
600 N.C.O. and men, 15 days.....	900 00
<hr/>	
	\$2,775 00

## EXTRA PAY TO BRIGADE STAFF.

This may be estimated at..... \$10,000 00  
It was over \$11,000 in 1896-97 ; but there were 16 camps.

## TRANSPORT.

It is difficult to arrive at any exact calculation for transport.

In 1896-97 it cost \$47,000 ; but that was previous to the reduction of one-third the regular rates, at which the railway companies do the carrying now.

Reduce \$47,000 one-third, and it leaves.	\$31,000 00
Add to this \$9,000 for extra transport to large camps.....	9,000 00
<hr/>	
	40,000 00

And the result is..... 40,000 00

## SUNDRY EXPENSES.

For Artillery practice—	
Erecting latrines, cartage, targets and other items.....	\$10,000 00
<hr/>	
Total amount required.....	\$429,649 00

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will see that while that gives part of the information, it is based on an expenditure of \$429,000. The hon. gentleman proposes to reduce that estimate by \$129,000, so that, I am afraid, we are about as far from definite information as before. What I asked for were the relative proportions of the \$300,000, and not \$429,000 that he proposes to expend on these services. In regard to transport, 40,000 is put in the Estimates, but that is based on the expenditure of \$429,000. If the service is carried out as estimated then at least \$29,000 more will be required to carry it out, and since it is to be reduced practically by \$129,000, I think we should have the information on which the hon. gentleman is proceeding to reduce it by that sum.

Mr. HUGHES. I can remember the time when Victoria County gave \$5 per man every year the corps went to drill. It had no tendency to increase the efficiency of the corps in comparison with those from other counties that did not give any \$5. Five cents a day with food and rations had a greater effect than \$5 given to the corps. Young fellows from the best homes all through the Dominion of Canada will not sit down on the floor of a tent with a plate of hot soup between their knees and eat their meals. While they might do it in active service they will not do it in camp. Forty-two thousand dollars will give 10 cents a day to every man for his extra rations, and \$10,000 will more than pay for marquees necessary to feed them. I suggest that the hon. Minister should consider this matter, and instead of reducing this \$100,000 item, let the item stay at \$400,000, so that he will have money at his disposal. I make this suggestion to the hon. Minister in reference to the pay of horses. A man gets 50 cents a day and a horse \$1 a day. People sometimes bring horses to camp and they go back with \$12 in their pocket, which is about the value of one of these horses. I would suggest that 50 cents a day be allowed for horses the first year, 75 cents the next year and \$1 the third year. They can easily be branded on the hoof so that they will be known the next year. The hon. Minister did not make any reply to the suggestion I made about helmets.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We are considering that matter. We are making purchases of helmets now. I cannot say how they will be distributed, as to whether we will charge the whole or a part of the price.

Mr. PRIOR. Mr. Chairman, I am very much delighted to hear what has been agreed upon by the Government, as stated by the hon. Minister of Militia. That is in regard to what the Minister said about the wish of the Government to make the militia thoroughly efficient, even though the number be smaller. That would be brought about by having all the militia trained every year, and it is most essential. I call the Minister's attention to the statement of the General Officer Commanding, that it is impossible to get the militia into an efficient state with 12 days' drill. Why not leave the \$100,000 in this vote, and give the men 16 days' drill instead of 12. It is only a question of dollars and cents, and I think Canada can stand it in these prosperous times.

Mr. CLANCY. If it cost \$429,000 to drill the militia and the Minister only asks for \$300,000, that is deceiving the country as to the actual cost. He will have to get the vote in the supplementaries to get the balance.

Mr. MCGREGOR. You find fault when he reduces it, and you find fault when he increases it.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) is asleep half the time, and interrupting the other half.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Talk about something you know something about.

Mr. McMULLEN. He does not want to know what he is discussing.

Mr. CLANCY. I will never discuss the evidence of good breeding from these two hon. gentlemen who are interrupting. I was not discussing the wisdom of the policy of the Government as to whether they should have an annual drill or not.

Mr. McMULLEN. Sit down, and go asleep.

Mr. CLANCY. If you slept longer you would accomplish more good for the country. Since it requires \$429,000 according to the statement of the Minister—

An hon. MEMBER. What do you know about it?

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I appeal for your protection.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) has the floor and I ask hon. gentlemen not to interrupt.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not think such unseemingly interruptions—

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order, the hon. gentleman should discuss the question before the Chair.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, now, Mr. Chairman,—

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have called for order, and understand hon. gentlemen are willing to obey the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

Mr. CLANCY. I will not pass judgment on the ruling of the Chair, but his friends on the other side of the House are certainly not obeying him. I say that the Minister of Militia and Defence puts what is practically a false statement into the public accounts of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, the Minister states that it will take \$429,000 and when he only asks for \$300,000 it amounts to a false statement of the actual cost.

Mr. MCGREGOR. You told us that one hundred times before.

Mr. CLANCY. I shall not answer those interruptions. I am addressing myself to the hon. Minister who presides so ably, and under the circumstances so amiably over his department. We should have a clear statement from the Minister as to the amount he requires for this service for the year?

Mr. SPROULE. If the Minister's own statement is that we require \$428,000 to drill the whole force for one year, he ought to take that much at once in the main Estimates, instead of calling for supplementary Estimates afterwards.

Mr. HENDERSON. I fully concur in what the hon. member for East Grey has said. There is no money granted to the Government with more pleasure by this House than the money expended for militia purposes, and I think the Minister should accept this money which the House is willing to grant, and then he will be the more willing to accede to my request for additional payment to the non-commissioned officers and men throughout the whole service.

Mr. TYRWHITT. We are in the habit of boasting of our loyalty, and at the present time we have a practical opportunity of showing how loyal we are by placing a sufficient sum in the Estimates to drill the entire militia force next year. With regard to cutting down the allowance for horses, I object to that reduction too. The saddlery alone is worth at least \$50 on a horse, and nine officers out of every ten are not the owners of horses, but job their horses, and it would be utterly impossible to get a horse fit to go on the field for \$40 or less as described by an honourable member.

Mr. MOORE. I think this is about the best opportunity the Conservative party have had to congratulate the Government on an endeavour to be economical, and I shall have to separate myself from my associates on this side of the House in that respect. I am not entirely in sympathy with the demand for a large expenditure for militia purposes. In my opinion, if we cut down our militia expenditure one-half, and devoted the money for agricultural purposes, it would be better for this country. Some people may call this disloyalty, but I claim to be as loyal as

any man in the Dominion of Canada. When we hear the Premier and the leader of the Opposition both stating that there is no prospect of war between Canada and any other country, the spending of so much of the country's money in this direction, when one-half of it would be more advantageously devoted to other purposes, I look upon as a farce.

Mr. CLANCY. It is just as well to get this matter right. I have not advocated an increase of expenditure. I advocate simply the Minister telling us what expenditure he requires, and letting the country know that we are going to spend \$400,000 for the annual drill of the country.

Mr. HENDERSON. I wish to be perfectly candid in this matter. I am not ashamed to say that I am advocating an increase in the expenditure, and I have a warrant from my constituents to make this demand. I believe that is their sentiment, and it has been made clear to me in such a way that I have the utmost confidence in asking the Minister to do what a short time ago I asked him to do. If this money is required to carry through the department to the 1st July next, let the item remain as it is, and not call for a supplementary vote next session.

Mr. HUGHES. I just wish to say a word with regard to this expenditure.

Mr. McMULLEN. Obstruction.

Mr. HENDERSON. I rise to a point of order. Has an hon. member the right to charge another with obstruction?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think it is proper to charge anybody with obstruction, and neither is it proper to make interruptions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. McMULLEN. On the ruling of the Chairman, I withdraw the charge of miserable obstruction.

Mr. HUGHES. I have heard an hon. gentleman say something about rubbing an asses head with soap, and I think the remark would apply to the hon. member for North Wellington very well.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. HUGHES. If the Chairman will keep himself in order—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will be kind enough to withdraw the expression concerning the Chairman which he has just used.

Mr. HUGHES. What expression have I used?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. He has just said that the Chairman of the Commons should obey the rules of the House himself, and I do not think that is a proper expres-

sion to use with regard to the Chair, and he should withdraw.

Mr. HUGHES. If I have charged the Chairman with anything I had not the right to charge him with, I withdraw the expression, but at the same time—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must withdraw the expression without any restriction.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is no point of order, the question has been decided, and I ask the hon. member to withdraw the expression without restriction.

Mr. HUGHES. I have withdrawn it and will do no more.

Mr. SPROULE. The expression I understood the hon. member to make is this—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The expression that was used has been withdrawn, and I would ask the members of the committee to get down to business. I want to be fair to everybody, and I think I have acted as fairly as possible. I would ask the members of the committee to discuss the question.

Mr. HUGHES. I claim privilege. I have been charged with being an obstructionist. No man can say that in the ten or twelve sessions I have sat here I have ever obstructed business.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. I have given my ruling, and the question is disposed of; and I would beg members of the committee to confine themselves to a discussion of questions before the Chair.

Mr. HUGHES. If the Chairman will rule instead of making speeches it will please me much. One hon. gentleman wanted this expenditure cut down. I say that no money spent by the Government so readily finds its way back to the pockets of the people as that spent on the militia, and especially for the annual drill. This training does great good also in fostering a loyal spirit among the young men and developing them physically, mentally and morally.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Item 106—

Mr. SPROULE. I think we might now fairly ask an adjournment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order, the hon. gentleman will give me an opportunity to read the item.

Militia salaries and wages of civil employees ..... \$63,000

Mr. SPROULE. I think I may fairly appeal to the Minister of Finance to agree to an adjournment now. This is the first day we have been on the main Estimates, and

we do not generally do so much the first day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. I have sat in this House for twenty-one years, and I think no one has observed more closely what has been done in the House year by year. There has been no attempt to delay business, and we have done a fair day's work. On many occasions we have been here all night, on many occasions not passing more than two or three items, and those not nearly as large as any of the items we have passed to-night. I can appeal to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to verify what I say, for he has seen it himself. This session we put through the supplementary Estimates rapidly, knowing that the exigencies of the time demanded that the Government should be furnished with the money; but it was with the understanding that when we reached the main Estimates there should be no attempt to curtail discussion. Having reached the main Estimates we have endeavoured to discuss the matter fairly. I appeal to the House that we have not taken a moment that we did not fairly think necessary to bring out information that should be made public. We have sat here all night, and now it is twenty minutes to five in the morning. We must have our time for rest as well as for work. And I say it is not fair that we should be called upon to sit here any longer. I move, therefore, that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. CLANCY. Before you put that motion. I have only to say that I hope the Minister of Finance will consider it. We commenced in Supply at 11 o'clock. Since then we have voted over \$650,000. That is a pretty fair proportion of the main Estimates to vote in the time. Yet, hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches propose to keep us here longer. I do not think the country will view their conduct with very much favour. I do not think it is fair treatment. So far as I am concerned, I do not ask any favours; I am willing to sit here until to-morrow, if hon. gentlemen opposite desire it. But I appeal to the Minister of Finance, in view of the late hour and of the very considerable progress that we have made, to allow an adjournment now.

Mr. MORRISON. I have been here all evening, and I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) who has just taken his seat has displayed a great deal of assurance, after taking up all the time he has taken up, now to attempt to dictate to the House as to an adjournment.

Mr. SPROULE. He is not dictating to the House, only asking respectfully.

Mr. MORRISON. For my part, I would like to see some work done.

Mr. SPROULE.

Motion that the committee rise and report progress (Mr. Sproule) negatived.

Mr. HUGHES. The Chairman has not read that 106th resolution right.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We took one-tenth of the previous vote, and we are now voting nine-tenths. The votes are being read all through correctly.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister is asking for \$10,000 extra. To whom is the increase to be paid?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. When the supplementary estimates for last year were under consideration, this item was discussed. I asked for a supplementary estimate for a similar vote to this on the ground that we had used the money voted for the last year in a previous year, that is, that a portion of the then vote had been expended in a previous year, and I promised then that I would in the future endeavour to arrange my estimates so that they would cover the whole expenditure. As a matter of fact the expenditure has been about \$67,000 or \$68,000 a year. This year we propose to take enough money to cover the whole vote, and not take any supplementary vote at the end of the present year. There has been a slight increase owing to the new rifle. The new rifle being a very delicate arm, we have had to employ armourers, and also the Oliver equipment being in store has to be looked after. So we have had slightly to increase the number of employees.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the Minister kindly inform the House to whom this money is to be paid?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. To the superintendent of stores and the stores staff.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who are the superintendent of stores and the stores staff, and what salaries do they get? The same with the armourers, the caretakers of the drill sheds, and the inspectors of clothing. I want a full detail of the total expenditure of this \$70,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There are 12 districts. In district No. 1, London, the superintendent of stores receives \$800. There are three employees, one of whom gets \$1.50 a day, one \$1.25 and the other \$1. They do the work in connection with the stores, taking charge of the rifles and keeping everything in order. The superintendent of stores at district No. 2, Toronto, gets \$1,000, his name is Gravely. There is a foreman who gets \$547; district clerk, \$600. There is an armourer, two caretakers and three employees. The whole expenditure is \$7,738.85. One caretaker gets \$1.65, another \$1.50. The ordinary employee gets \$1.25 a day and \$1. The superintendent of stores in district No. 3, Kingston, gets

\$1,000. There are two armourers, two foremen, and two other employees. Total expenditure, \$9,792. There has been practically no increase in this vote. The annual expenditure has been \$65,000 and \$67,000. Then in district No. 4, Toronto, there is an armourer, four store clerks, 12 labourers, 6 other labourers and a charwoman. Then in military district No. 5, the armourer has \$2.25 and the caretaker \$1.75.

Mr. PRIOR. Where do these armourers come from ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This one who gets \$2.25, I think his name is Smallwood, is a New Brunswicker, a very good man. Several of them come from England, and were brought here to look after the new rifles. District No. 5 is Montreal. The superintendent of stores gets \$1,200, that is Colonel Mattice. There is an armourer at \$1.63½, two employees at \$1.50, one at \$1.25, 15 at \$1, one at 75 cents, and one at \$5 a month.

Mr. CLANCY. Who is the superintendent at Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Lieutenant-Col. Mattice.

Mr. PRIOR. Can the hon. gentleman say what these fifteen men are employed at ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They work in connection with the stores on St. Helen Island and in connection with the drill hall and armoury in Montreal.

Mr. PRIOR. How many regiments are there ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There are five or six, including the artillery. The total for that district is not excessive. We have combined for all purposes in connection with arms and stores military districts Nos. 5 and 6. There was a superintendent of stores in No. 6, but that office has been abolished and there is only, for the two districts, one set of stores and one set of employees, except that three men are employed in No. 6 district.

Mr. PRIOR. Which is No. 6 ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is south of Montreal with headquarters at St. Johns. We abolished the superintendent of stores there and we have the whole thing in Montreal. We have only three men employed in No. 6 district, one \$1.50 a day, two at \$1 a day, so that the two districts together cost us only \$9,800. No. 7, Quebec, is a very important district, as there are more stores there than anywhere else. We have a superintendent of stores, Lieut.-Col. Forrest, receiving \$1,400.

Mr. PRIOR. On the subject of stores I would call the attention of the Minister of

Militia to the fact that there is a tremendous amount of stores in Canada which are perfectly worthless. Would it not be well to have boards appointed to go around and condemn these stores at once ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is a great deal of truth in what my hon. friend has said. In every district there is a large quantity of stores that are perfectly useless. A considerable quantity has been sold. We give old cannon away to those applying for them for the decoration of public parks. In No. 7 military district besides the superintendent of stores who gets \$1,400, there are two armourers at \$1.95 a day, and twenty-three employees. The total expenditure is \$12,000.

Mr. HUGHES. What are these twenty-three employed at ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is an immense quantity of rifles. The larger proportion of the new rifles are there.

Mr. PRIOR. In store ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, we have not been able to issue the rifles permanently to the rural corps until we can get the armour for it. No. 8 Military District, New Brunswick. The superintendent of stores gets a salary of \$1,000. There are three employees at \$1.25 and five at \$1. The total expenditure is \$4,000.

Mr. PRIOR. Who is the superintendent ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Major Armstrong, a very efficient man, is the superintendent of stores at St. John. No. 9, Nova Scotia, a man by the name of Curran is the superintendent, and he gets only \$800.

Mr. HUGHES. Are the stores in Halifax separate from the regular stores ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes ; we have our own store-room there. There is an armourer, and there are seven employees, getting \$1.50 a day down to \$16 a month. In No. 10 Military District there is a foreman of stores getting \$2, one storeman and caretaker at \$750.

Mr. PRIOR. Does the foreman of stores get a living allowance ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I rather think he does, but I am not sure. Now the superintendent of stores has \$730 and the caretaker \$619.

Mr. PRIOR. He is the caretaker and sergeant-major of the regiment. It is not right that the foreman of stores should get more than the caretaker, and I called the attention of the Minister to that disparity at the beginning of the session. The caretaker of the drill hall, at Victoria, was for years sergeant-

major in "C" Battery, and came with the battery from Quebec to Victoria, and was afterwards appointed caretaker of the new drill hall. He is a splendid instructor, and yet, he is getting less than the foreman of stores. The foreman of stores is a good man, and I would not like to see his salary cut down because he is well worth what he gets. He is an old Blue Jacket and has been a long time there. It seems absurd that the man who is responsible for the drill hall and the sergeant-major of the regiment should get such a small remuneration. It is wrong and against discipline that he should get less than the foreman of the stores, and I hope the Minister will look into the matter.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) called my attention to it I referred the matter to the chief superintendent here, but I have not heard about it yet. I shall look into the matter.

Mr. PRIOR. I would be the last man to ask that the pay of the foreman of the stores should be reduced.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It does not follow.

Mr. PRIOR. I hope you will give the caretaker an equal amount.

Mr. HENDERSON. In the 20th Battalion, Lorne Rifles, in the county of Halton, we have perhaps one of the most efficient battalions in western Ontario, and I am sure the Minister who is always ready to assist the Militia in any way he possibly can and in whose administration I have a great deal of confidence—except perhaps when he takes the liberty of promoting a junior major over the senior major—

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They are all happy now.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to draw the Minister's attention to the fact that in the village of Acton we have an ancient drill hall, the roof of which is leaking. It contains the armoury of No. 6 Company, which is in charge of Captain Langton, a very efficient officer, and a gentleman whose ability the hon. gentleman no doubt recognized when he met him at the Niagara Camp recently. I would like if the Minister, out of this large vote, would devote a small sum to improve the armoury so as to protect the military property there which belongs to the Dominion.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My attention has not been called to the matter before, but I will inquire into it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have not called the Minister's attention to it before, but as it is a somewhat important matter I will take the

Mr. PRIOR.

liberty of addressing him a letter upon the subject.

Mr. TAYLOR. Have you appointed any new inspectors of clothing?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There have been different inspectors and they have been paid by the day for each day they work. Mr. Robertson is the chief inspector, and we have employed the inspectors who were there at the time I came in. Mr. Watson is another. There is a man named McCormack.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is the man from Goderich?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Then there is a man named O'Leary and a man named Caldwell.

Mr. TAYLOR. What salary did McCormack get?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. \$5 for the time he worked. He is not and never has been permanently employed.

Mr. PRIOR. Is he a tradesman?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, he was a tailor. I do not think he has been employed by the department for some months.

Mr. PRIOR. Does he inspect all new clothing?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, everything is inspected.

Mr. HUGHES. Is much clothing kept in store?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is not an opportunity to keep a great deal, because we have to issue it rapidly on account of the camps. We have had no difficulty in getting clothing enough to supply the men.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was the vote asked for in 1895-96 for this service?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. \$63,000. The vote for 1897-98 was \$65,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman has increased this by \$7,000 since 1896. Will he give the details of that increase?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is owing to the increased number of men who had to be brought out to take special care of the new rifles, and some extra men who had to be employed to take care of the Oliver equipment which is being supplied to the force.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that the Minister gave all the men employed in the several districts; but from the Auditor General's Report, I do not think he did.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. I gave the list that was given to me.

**Mr. SPROULE**. The hon. gentleman did not give their names and salaries.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. I said I gave the number of men and the character of their employment and the amount paid in each district. I could only give the names so far as I remembered them.

**Mr. SPROULE**. By the Auditor General's Report it appears that the men doing the same class of work do not get the same pay.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. There is a difference according to the importance of the place. This matter has been very carefully looked into, and it is consequently being reviewed by the chief superintendent of stores on the advice of the different superintendents under him in the respective districts. The greatest care is taken to pay these men what they really earn and not more. Length of service has also something to do with the rate of pay.

**Mr. HUGHES**. I move that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

**Mr. FLINT**. I do not think it is fair to ask that the committee rise before this item is passed. The Minister has given all the information, we have had a thorough discussion of it, and there is no reason why it should not be assented to.

**Mr. TAYLOR**. If the Minister of Militia had had control of his own Estimates and spoken for himself at half-past twelve, instead of allowing the hon. member for North Wellington and the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Railways and Canals to attempt to bulldoze the House, there would have been no necessity for this long sitting. They insisted on our going on and passing all the items.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER**. Even on a motion to adjourn it is not permitted to refer to a previous debate or to circumstances which have occurred in the debate on the previous item. The discussion must be confined to the item before the Chair.

**Mr. SPROULE**. In speaking on an item in the Estimates, is a reference to what occurred on a previous item a reference to a previous debate?

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER**. The same rule applies as in discussing a motion before the House. Hon. members have no right to refer to a debate on a previous item.

**Mr. CLANCY**. I understand that it is not proper to discuss an item already passed, but in my experience—which may have been

wrong—I have not known it to be held that one could not refer to a debate on a previous item.

**Mr. PRIOR**. There was a general discussion at first, concerning this and all the items. In that case, under the ruling, there can be no discussion of the item.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER**. I understand consent was given that there should be a general discussion at the beginning. But afterwards, it was agreed that the discussion should be kept close within the rules of the House.

**Mr. TYRWHITT**. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) in his eagerness to reach his resolution on Prohibition has lost the sense of fairness that usually characterizes him in this House. He speaks of the Opposition obstructing—

**Mr. FLINT**. No. I have not spoken of obstruction.

**Mr. TYRWHITT**. I withdraw it. Now, it must be remembered that the Ministers, except the Minister of Militia and Defence have slept, while the members of the Opposition have been awake, bearing the heat and burden of the day. This is a matter which the Minister of Finance should take into consideration.

**Mr. CLANCY**. The member for Yarmouth said that the Minister had given full information. Now, I wish to cite the fact that the Minister has stated that in the case of this item there is an increase because he has to pay off a debt of last year of the supplementary Estimates of \$9,000. I have asked many times for an explanation of an item of \$100,000 which is on precisely the same footing, and yet the hon. Minister will not explain.

**Mr. SPROULE**. The hon. member for Yarmouth says it is not courteous for the members of the Opposition to act as they have done.

**Mr. FLINT**. I did not say that. I said it was not fair to ask us to rise and report progress, after the long and patient hearing which hon. members on both sides had given to the Minister, without passing the item. I did not refer to courtesy.

**Mr. SPROULE**. I took down the hon. gentleman (Mr. Flint's) statement, but if the hon. gentleman withdraws it, I will not press the point. But the hon. member said we had been unduly delaying the business of the House.

**Mr. MORRISON**. Hear, hear.

**Mr. SPROULE**. I would ask the hon. member what is the duty of an Opposition?

**Mr. MORRISON**. I have never been in Opposition to learn.

**Mr. SPROULE**. Well, those in Opposition could probably instruct the hon. gen-

tleman (Mr. Morrison). The members supporting the Government rarely rise in Committee of Supply except to support what the Government proposes. If there is to be criticism, it must be by a member of the Opposition. I think I can appeal to this House that we have not made long speeches, and while we are not complaining of the disposition of the Minister to withhold information, I can fairly appeal to this House that we have not been in any way endeavouring to delay business which engaged the attention of the House during the night.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I may remind the hon. member that in the discussion on a motion to adjourn, it is not allowed to review what has taken place in the House. According to the parliamentary procedure of Sir John Bourinot :

Nor, on a motion for the adjournment of the debate, can a member refer to a vote just previously given, nor review what has taken place in the House.

So the hon. gentleman has no right to review what has taken place during the night, he must confine himself to the item under discussion, and to the motion for adjournment.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I not within my rights in giving reasons why the House should adjourn? and one of the reasons is that we have done a good night's work, and that we have not delayed the business of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule is that the hon. gentleman has no right to review what has taken place in the House, so he must confine himself to the motion to adjourn.

Mr. SPROULE. I think I am safe in saying that I have seen this done hundreds of times, and I have never yet heard a member called to order for referring to what took place during the night. I am endeavouring to give the reasons why at this hour, six o'clock in the morning, after having done a good night's work, the Committee should rise, and why the Government should not force us to work any longer. We have not endeavoured to do anything like obstruction to-night. We have allowed a fair amount of business to go through. There has been fair and legitimate discussion on the Estimates.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have to recall the hon. gentleman's attention to the rule that he must not review what has been said during the night.

Mr. SPROULE. Then what reasons can I give for desiring to adjourn.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like you, Mr. Chairman, to read the whole rule you have quoted. As I read it, it does not apply to

Mr. SPROULE.

a motion only when a Speaker is in the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is no difference, the rules are the same when in committee as when the Speaker is in the Chair :

When there is a question before the House, and a member moves the adjournment, he must confine himself to the question. Nor, on a motion for the adjournment of the debate can a member refer to a vote just previously given, nor review what has taken place in the House.

The motion now before the Chair is that the Committee do rise and report progress.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a distinction between a motion to adjourn a debate and that the committee rise.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. When a motion that the committee rise is made, it is like a motion for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a motion that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again. Therefore it is a wider motion than one that the committee rise.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who is the caretaker of the Gananoque drill shed, and what salary is he paid?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In all my experience of parliamentary life I have never heard anything like this tornado of questions being put to any previous Minister of Militia. I have brought with me all the information that any reasonable man could desire in reference to the policy of the Government, and the details of this expenditure. That information I have given to the House, but surely I cannot carry in my head the name of every caretaker in the Dominion and the salary paid him. It has been said that there has been no obstruction, and I have not charged it, but although the explanations are repeated over and over again, the fact remains that we have been here for eight mortal hours over two items. That may not be obstruction but it certainly is no desire to expedite public business.

Mr. HUGHES. I sympathize with the Minister of Militia, but the fault rests with the Minister of Finance who, with a little jaunty side-line air, refused to adjourn when the suggestion was made early to-night.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) is not permitted to discuss anything that has been said during the night. The authority for this is quoted at page 551 of Bourinot.

Mr. HUGHES. Then the Minister of Militia was out of order?

Mr. CLANCY. The proposal that we should vote these millions of dollars of militia esti-

mates at one sitting of the committee is, I submit, without reason.

**Mr. McCLURE.** I should like to ask if any one of the hon. gentlemen opposite has given the faintest reason why this item should not pass?

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** That is a poser for them.

**Mr. McCLURE.** The only time I heard them discuss the questions under consideration—

**Mr. CLANCY.** Order; reviewing the debate.

**Mr. McCLURE.** I cannot review a debate because I heard no debate to-night. I have heard any quantity of talk, but not on the subject before the House. With reference to this particular item, the reason we have given why it should not pass, is that the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) cannot vote for it until he knows who has charge of the drill-shed in Gananoque. I suggest that the Minister might try and find out the name for him and let the vote pass.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** When the Minister asks for a vote of money to pay any official he should be ready to answer the questions put.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** Don't you know the name of the Gananoque caretaker?

**Mr. TAYLOR.** I do not.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** There is no such official of that kind so far as I know.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** Will you say positively there is not. I think there is a late appointee as caretaker, and I want to know his name and the salary he gets.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** Will the hon. gentleman give me his name and when he was appointed?

**Mr. TAYLOR.** I do not know that. I think it is a late appointment.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** There has been no one appointed by me. It may be in the Public Works department, but I have appointed no one.

**Mr. MARCOTTE.** (Translation.) I have listened very attentively to the debate now going on, and I think it my duty to rise and insist upon the Government giving us all the desirable information on the matter under consideration in the interest of the country in general. The whip of the Conservative party (Mr. Taylor) has asked the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden) to give us the names of the caretakers of the

Gananoque drill shed, and the hon. gentleman has not yet thought fit to answer the question put.

**Mr. DECHENE.** (Translation.) What was the question put?

**Mr. MARCOTTE.** (Translation.) The hon. gentleman wanted to know the name of the caretaker of the drill shed at Gananoque and what salary he is paid.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.** (Translation.) I have to recall the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the salary that caretaker is paid is not provided for by the vote now under consideration.

**Mr. MARCOTTE.** (Translation.) I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the pertinent answer you have just given; it shows that if you occupied the position now filled by the Minister of Militia and Defence, all the information we have been asking for since yesterday would have been brought down.

**Mr. CHAIRMAN.** (Translation.) I would beg the hon. gentleman to confine himself to a discussion of the question before the Chair.

**Mr. MARCOTTE.** (Translation.) I only wished, Mr. Chairman, to congratulate you on your ruling.

**Mr. TALBOT.** The member for Belchasse, interrupts me—

**Mr. CHAIRMAN.** (Translation.) The hon. gentleman is not allowed to address an hon. member by name; he should use the name of the constituency he represents.

**Mr. MARCOTTE.** (Translation.) The hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) is well and favourably known in this House.

When you interrupted me, Mr. Chairman, I was congratulating you about the intelligent way in which you had given us information. It would greatly conduce to the expediting of public business, if the Minister of Militia and Defence acted in that way.

We find that the sum provided for the payment of that salary and for salaries for civil employees has been increased by \$10,000 over last year. It cannot be said that this increase of \$10,000 in the expenditure of the country is an insignificant item, especially when one remembers that they promised they would run the Government on economical lines and cut down the expenditure. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Dechene) seems to be amused at my remarks, but did he not pledge himself before his electors to a policy of retrenchment in the public expenditure? Is that what they are doing? No, the Government have falsified their pledges in that respect.

It is not only about that increased expenditure of \$10,000 that I would like to get information, but also on many other items of

these estimates. It is all very well to laugh about penny-wise economy, but we ought to bear in mind that it is only by small savings that nations grow rich as well as private individuals. It is by avoiding all needless expenses that one accumulates a fortune.

It is astonishing to see how the present conduct of the Government contrasts with their past pledges. It is no doubt desirable that those who are called upon to defend the country or who are entrusted with the care of our armouries should be well paid as they constitute, as it were, our national guard. To them is intrusted the duty of restoring order in the country, should it ever be disturbed. All we want is to see peace prevailing in the country, so that we may develop our natural resources and improve our position, by fostering the agricultural, manufacturing and commercial interests of the country. I do not object to the salaries paid to the caretakers of our drill sheds.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman should confine himself to the item under consideration and should not refer to the salaries of public employees.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I am now referring, Mr. Chairman, to the salaries of the caretakers of our drill sheds. Suppose for one moment that some of those officials proved unfaithful and that our arms were stolen from our arsenals, does any one pretend to say that there would be no connection between the conduct of those employees and the defence of the country? Should we prove unable to defend the country under such circumstances; we might lay ourselves open to the reproach of cowardice and be charged with unmanly conduct, while it would all depend upon the lack of arms. This shows how important is the matter under consideration. I do not object to this item, as I am in favour of paying proper salaries to those who are called upon to defend the country, but I say that we want more circumstantial information about that increase of \$10,000. The Government should not come down and propose such an expenditure after having pledged themselves to a policy of retrenchment. The Government should not come down and ask us to vote that item, without giving us some good and sound reason for it. The Minister of Militia should give us some explanations. I am waiting for an answer.

The hon. gentleman does not condescend to answer me. Such a large vote calls for minute explanations, especially when one remembers that it is asked by a Government pledged to economy.

I ask for details, and when the hon. Minister will have supplied us with information as to that increase of \$10,000, I may then be able to tell him whether it is desirable to give it to them. Should his explanations prove satisfactory, then I will be ready to vote in favour of that item with my hon. friends on this side of the House.

Mr. MARCOTTE.

Mr. Chairman, would you kindly convey my request to the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence? Shall I have to speak English to get an answer? No reply is vouchsafed, and yet we are entitled to obtain some information. Why have they increased this vote? I call upon the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Dechene) and upon the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot).

Mr. TALBOT. (Translation.) What about that expenditure of \$2,000,000 incurred by the old Government for the purchase of rifles?

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) And you have sold the old rifles for 25 cents apiece without any tender.

We are hungering for a little information, the smallest quantity of which would satisfy us, and the hon. Minister does not vouchsafe a reply. The hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Angers) seems amused at my remarks. Could he tell me the reason of this increased expenditure?

I think it is high time the mode of procedure followed in this House were reformed, when it comes to this pass that we are unable to get the least scrap of information from the Ministers. The hon. gentlemen opposite laugh, instead of supplying us with the desired information.

I say again, Mr. Chairman, that I am not opposed to this vote; all I want is to know the reason of this increased expenditure. As a member of this House, as a voter, as the representative of an honest and intelligent class of voters, I, with all my colleagues on this side of the House, ask for full information as to this vote.

Military properties and rifle ranges..... \$147,000

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That item is made up as follows:—Rents of ranges, armouries and buildings, \$10,000; fuel for armouries and buildings, \$8,000; gas and electric lights, \$9,500; water rates, \$1,500; clearing snow, \$1,000; telephones and general expenses, \$5,000; making a total of \$35,000, an increase as compared with last year of \$3,000. The increase is partly in the rents of ranges, armouries and buildings. I have here a full list of all the buildings and properties for which we are paying rent, a pretty long list.

Mr. TAYLOR. Read them.

(The Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden) read the list.)

Mr. HUGHES. Did I hear Lindsay mentioned there?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. HUGHES. Then I must inform the Minister that we made application over a

year and a half ago for a grant to our range.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. So far as I know, I have not heard anything of it. It has not come to my notice.

Mr. **HUGHES**. I made personal application to the Minister, and I made official application to the D. O. C.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. I may say in reference to a question asked me by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt) that there is here an item of \$7,000 being voted to fit up drill sheds and armouries suitable to receive the new rifle. In addition to this vote I am taking a further vote in the supplementaries so that we will be able to make a fair showing during the next year towards getting the new rifles distributed among the rural battalions. It is proposed in this vote of \$30,000 for rifle ranges, to secure a rifle range at Montreal, and to improve the range at Bedford in Nova Scotia. I may say to the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) that there will be a revote of the amount voted last year, \$6,000, for that purpose.

Mr. **PRIOR**. I asked a question twice of the hon. Minister as to whether the contract had been let for the Vancouver drill hall, and I was informed on both occasions that it had not. It seems a most curious thing that a Liberal paper in British Columbia, owned by a gentleman who has a seat in another place, had information in that place that the contract had been let to a firm in Ottawa and Hull, Viau & Lachance. The editor stated in his paper that they had a statement from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) that the contract was let. I know that these men believed they had got the contract, and one of them went to British Columbia to find out the prices of labour and material.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The explanation is that the Minister of Public Works had made a report to Council on the subject, but it had not passed Council when I gave the hon. gentleman the answer. Therefore the statement in the newspaper was not quite correct.

Mr. **PRIOR**. I suppose the two contractors had been notified that they would get the contract, because, as I say, one of them started off to British Columbia to make arrangements. Would the hon. gentleman tell me whether the contract has been let yet?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. My impression is that the Order in Council did not pass, but I will ascertain. It is possible that an intimation was given to him in an informal way, but practically the contract was not officially awarded.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I understand the Minister to say that he paid rent for drill-hall in Brockville.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. Yes, \$300. That building has been rented, I think, for a long time.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Is the hon. gentleman negotiating with people there to build a drill hall?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. Yes, I think there will be a vote in the estimates, if there is not in the main estimates. The city of Brockville is giving a site free upon which a drill hall will be constructed; then this \$300 will be saved to the country annually. I understand there are three or four sites for a drill hall under consideration, but up to this time no decision has been come to. The local military authorities have certain views and the city council has certain views.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I am told that the town are being forced into the position of purchasing a site, and that Brockville has the assurance of the Minister of Public Works that the site will be purchased and that he has put the money in the supplementary Estimates for the commencement of the work.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. This is the first intimation that I have had of anything of this kind. I can scarcely think my hon. friend is well informed. I do not think the Minister of Public Works would have anything to do with selecting a site for the construction of a drill hall.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Has not the Minister told Mr. Graham, the local member for Brockville, that there would be an item in the Estimates for this particular work, and that that is the only site he will consent to take?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. Do you mean the Minister of Public Works?

Mr. **SPROULE**. No, the Minister of Militia.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. No. I could not say that, because the matter as to the site has not come to me for a decision.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I understand that Mr. Graham interviewed the Minister at Ottawa and telegraphed back that he had secured his permission for this site, and there would be an item in the Estimates for the building.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was not an officer of your department in Brockville selecting a site, just prior to the election ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I cannot say.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see in the Auditor General's Report that there are large sums paid to Liberal firms here for goods supplied and labour done, and they were supplied without tender. Is it the intention of the Minister to pay out this money we are voting to his Liberal friends without tender and at exorbitant prices ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. These men were asked to put in tenders in conjunction with others, and the lowest tender was taken. We have in the department an engineer, a Royal Military College graduate of great ability, who takes the greatest care to see that everything is done properly and at the lowest figure. The work at Quebec is under the direction of a gentleman who has been in the service for a long time, and who, I believe, is one of the best employees of the department. In the main, I believe that the work has been well and economically done.

Mr. PRIOR. Do you mean to say that these tenders were advertised for ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. PRIOR. Just three or four Liberal firms were asked to tender.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There may be some Conservatives, but at all events, we are paying gentlemen opposite a compliment by continuing the same system which we found in existence when we came in.

Mr. TAYLOR. They go to Aikenhead & Co., a political supporter, and pay 4 cents a pound for putty that they could buy at a cent and a half a pound. All through the Auditor General's Report I find that the Minister is paying exorbitant prices for political supplies.

Warlike and other stores..... \$45,000

Mr. TAYLOR. What do you want with this increase of \$6,000 ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The vote is required for the following purposes:—Camp equipments, \$12,000; harness and saddlery, \$10,000; medical supplies, \$3,000; barrack and miscellaneous stores, \$10,000; maintenance of stores, \$7,500; small arm material, \$2,500. Camp equipment; 3,000 gray blankets, \$4,800; 2,000 waterproof sheets, \$2,200; 200 tents, \$3,500; 10 marquees, \$800; 4,000 mess tins, \$700. Harness and saddlery: 200 sets sad-

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

dlery, complete, \$7,500; 30 sets officer's saddlery, \$1,500; parts of harness and material for harness and saddlery, \$1,000; medical supplies for camps, \$3,000. Barrack stores, including shirts, palliasses, horse-blankets, bed-straps, mops, brushes, pails, brooms, &c., \$6,500; miscellaneous stores, \$3,500; maintenance of stores, replacing deficiencies, repairs, &c., \$7,500; small arm material; this includes the purchase of such supplies as may be required for the armourers, and of articles required to replace losses by the men in the force, \$2,500.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to ask the hon. Minister about an item in the Auditor General's Report. Mr. W. C. Caldwell, of Lanark, supplied 2,380 blankets, weighing 9,855½ lbs., at 40 cents a pound. I want to ask the Minister when Mr. Caldwell tendered for these blankets. Did he tender for them at all ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, he was the only tenderer.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then he put in a written tender saying that he supplied them at his price.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Therefore there was no public tender called for ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will explain the case to the hon. gentleman. We had a contractor who was supplying blankets at a figure lower than these, and when we came to inspect the blankets we found they were not up to the standard. They were stated by the inspector and by experts to be shoddy. When we required him to supply a different blanket we found that he could not do it at the price, and he withdrew and asked to be relieved, and we paid him for what he had put in at a price which was recommended—I forget exactly what it was—and allowed him to withdraw. We required the blankets, and Mr. Caldwell had been a tenderer, and we corresponded with him and asked him what he would supply a good lot of woollen blankets for, and he made us an offer and we accepted his offer. I venture to think the Department of Militia or any other department never got better value for the money paid than that contract.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am informed by a gentleman who is well conversant with the quality of blankets, and who is also a large manufacturer, that had he been asked to supply these blankets, he would have supplied them at a great deal less price and of better quality than these, because 40 cents would purchase the best quality of all wool blankets, leaving a big profit on it besides. Therefore it is no wonder that the

Minister, with the money that he over-ex-  
pended last year, bought these blankets at  
these prices, from Mr. Caldwell, paying for  
them \$3,973.70.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DE-  
FENCE. It is only fair to Mr. Caldwell  
to read to the committee a letter which I  
received from him a day or two after the  
discussion of this subject which took place  
some time ago :

June 21, 1899.

Dear Sir,—On my way up to Toronto to-day  
I noticed in the "Mail and Empire" that the  
Opposition were criticising the blanket contract,  
and making some very absurd statements. I pre-  
sume you are thoroughly well posted regarding  
the matter and yet there can be no harm in my  
explaining a few things in the manufacturing.  
We bought no wool last year, 1898, at less than  
18 cents per lb. for Canadian wool, and we paid  
from 18 cts. to 20 cts. for the clip, and for some  
used to make the blankets for the Yukon we paid  
as high as 22 cents. But suppose we put the price  
paid at an average of 19 cents per pound, and add  
the cost of manufacturing each pound of wool,  
which we put at 12 cents, including dyeing, freight,  
&c., then 19 cents + 12 cents = 31 cents per  
pound for stock and manufacturing into the  
blankets. It takes 5 pounds of wool to make a 4-  
pound blanket, so that we get at 40 cents per  
pound for the blankets, \$1.60, for what costs us  
\$1.55. When rushed with the blankets for the  
Yukon we could not manufacture as low as the  
above, because we had to rush the work, and it  
cost more in consequence. The blankets re-  
quired for the militia camps this spring were re-  
quired to be finished by the 1st June, and having  
to be pushed cost more on that account. We  
had the 6,000 ordered shipped before that date,  
and the additional 2,000 ordered were shipped be-  
fore the 17th, so there was no delay on our ac-  
count.

These blankets were made out of last year's  
wool and were not affected by the lower price of  
this year's clip which did not go into these. We  
are paying now for this year's clip 14 cents to 18  
cents per pound, and have bought no wool at less  
than 14 cents per pound. We buy it from the  
farmers, washed by them, but no matter how  
clean they make it we calculate to lose in shrink-  
age, after scouring and putting through air ma-  
chines at least an average of 20 per cent, so  
that 5 pounds of wool will not make more than  
a 4-pound blanket. I arrive at the cost of 12  
cents per pound for manufacture, as follows :—

	Cents.
Cost of labour, per pound of wool manufactured.....	8.00
Oil .....	.60
Soap .....	.75
Dyes .....	.75
Fuel .....	.70
Interest on investment and tear and wear (and freight to Ot- tawa) .....	1.20
Total.....	12.00

These figures may vary a trifle as I am giving  
them from memory not having expected this mat-  
ter to come up. Canadian wool has dropped since  
the new clip came in this year, but in the early  
part of the spring foreign wool had advanced  
from (25 p.c. to 40 p.c.), twenty-five per cent to

forty per cent, and still maintains its increased  
price. We are not dealing though with this sea-  
sons lower prices but with stock manufactured  
out of last year's clip of wool bought at last  
year's prices, and the very lowest we paid was  
18 cents per pound.

Now, as to the blankets, you may have them  
subjected to any test freely, we guarantee them  
to be made from pure stock only, and invite in-  
spection.

I hope I have not wearied you, but I felt so  
annoyed at the absurdity of figuring out last  
year's contract on this season's cost of wool  
that I could not keep quiet.

That is the statement of Mr. Caldwell who,  
I think, my hon. friends on the other side  
of the House will agree to be an upright,  
straightforward and honest manufacturer,  
a man who would not put his name to a  
statement which was not true.

Mr. WALLACE. It is a very interesting  
letter the Minister has read. But I wish  
to point out to the hon. Minister of Militia  
and Defence that Mr. Caldwell says in his  
letter that you, the Minister, are familiar  
with this whole question. Why, Mr. Chair-  
man, not a member in this House who was  
present when this subject first came up,  
but will remember how the Minister flound-  
ered, how he ran from post to pillar and  
from pillar to post and back again, not  
knowing the first thing about it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gen-  
tleman has no right to refer to a previous  
debate.

(Mr. Bennett and Mr. Bergeron) addressed  
the committee at some length.)

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I am  
sorry I was not able to stay here later  
than midnight, which I thought was a pro-  
per hour for every respectable person to  
retire. I had thought of asking for informa-  
tion upon certain items that were a mystery  
to me, and on which I would like to have  
got information, but rather than continue  
the discussion at that late hour, I retired.  
I find now that a great many of these items  
to which I wished to refer, have been passed  
over and I am denied that privilege. I think  
that the accounts of the Militia Depart-  
ment require very stringent criticism, for  
I find that in most cases the prices are  
extravagant, and the accounts are kept in  
such a way that it is impossible for this  
committee to know what the items are,  
and what they represent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I cannot under-  
stand the present condition of the com-  
mittee. I left here at 12.30, and, Mr. Chair-  
man, you will perhaps allow me to refer,  
in connection with the present condition of  
the committee, to what was the then posi-  
tion of affairs. The Minister of Militia  
had introduced his resolution, and when we  
went into Committee of Supply we asked

him to give the committee a general statement of the position of affairs and the policy of the Government, which, I am bound to say, he did in a very efficient manner and everything was very satisfactory.

The Committee were good enough to indulge me with going, perhaps, a little outside the regular order, because it has been customary, ever since I have been a member of this House, on a subject of such importance as the militia estimates, that the Minister should give a general review, as he did, of the whole subject. That was the condition of the debate about the time I left. There is no doubt that in dealing with the Militia Department, it is especially necessary, in order to command public confidence, that the fullest information should be given to the committee in reference to the expenditure of such large sums of money. I find that progress has been made during the night, and that a number of important estimates have been passed, aggregating nearly \$1,000,000. It appears to me that having made such substantial progress in a single sitting, there can be no objection to the committee rising now. I am informed by my friends on this side of the House that the Minister of Militia and Defence was quite willing, after two or three o'clock in the morning, to adjourn the House. There is no member of this House more anxious to promote public business than I am, but I must say that the responsibility for wasting the time of the committee falls upon the Government when they take an unreasonable position, and say that after a large amount of estimates have been passed at a very late hour, they will refuse to adjourn the House. I put it to the hon. gentlemen to say whether this condition of things ought not to terminate, so that the committee may rise. It is now noon, and if my hon. friends will consent to an adjournment I think we should make much more rapid progress with public business.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** My hon. friend's description of what occurred up to the time of his departure from the House last night, was entirely correct; and I am satisfied that if he had remained in the House the unpleasantness would not have occurred. For, while we differ in many things, I am pleased to say that the hon. gentleman has always manifested a desire to advance the business of the House, and has been above resorting to small and petty acts of obstruction. At an early stage of the discussion I suggested that we should carry out what seemed to be the view of my hon. friend, that instead of confining ourselves to particular items we should deal with the militia estimates in a general way. After we had made considerable progress on those lines, I suggested that we should go on and pass the various items with the understand-

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.**

ing that in any case where information was defective, and there was a desire to have further discussion, we should reserve one item with full liberty to discuss the whole subject at a later stage. Unfortunately my hon. friends opposite did not see it their duty to accept that suggestion, but preferred to adopt other measures. When we saw that the time of the House was being wasted and that public business was not being advanced, the provocation was exceedingly great to the Government and the members supporting the Government, to sit here long enough to do a reasonable amount of business. I can assure my hon. friend that the information which has been given to him as to the cause of the whole difficulty is inaccurate.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I would like to remind my hon. friend the Minister of Finance that a ruling you, Mr. Chairman, I think have made, rather unfortunately, although technically it may be correct, conflicts altogether with the views which have just been given by my hon. friend who is leading the House.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.** I may say that the ruling was given very late in the evening, at a time when nearly every one desired that the discussion should be limited to the special item before the committee.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** The Minister of Finance proposed that all the items should be passed except one, and that on that item there should be a free range to go over the whole of the previous items. That is entirely contrary to your ruling. You have just ruled that not a word can be said in reference to any item that has been passed.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The ruling of the Chair came in at a later stage. We were proceeding, as it were, by common consent on the lines which my hon. friend himself had suggested. It was at a later stage when the difficulty occurred, and then the exception was taken, and the Chairman ruled that unless there was unanimous consent, he must follow the strict rules of the House.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** It is evident that neither side are in a condition, under these circumstances, to look at matters in a dispassionate manner. I propose that we meet at three o'clock with a determination to get on vigorously with the business, and I can assure my hon. friends opposite that they will find me ready to do anything in my power, and to exert my influence with my friends to promote the business of the House.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I sat here through the whole night, and therefore I am quite cognizant of what occurred during the progress of this discussion. I want to say that I entirely sub-

scribe to the proposition of the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition that it would be quite useless for the majority of the House to endeavour to coerce even a small minority to any particular course of action. But while doing so, I would ask my hon. friends on the other side to accept the converse of that proposition that gentlemen must not expect, because they are in a minority to compel action on the part of the majority to which the majority do not feel that they are in fairness and in justice called upon to accede. No Government that at all respects itself can submit to threats on the part of the gentlemen of the Opposition. A Government, as it commands a majority of the House, must surely be taken to have a right to direct and to guide the course of action and procedure in the House. They may call attention to improprieties on the part of the Government, but I maintain that it is utterly subversive of all principles of Government to undertake to say how public business should be carried on, and that such and such a thing should not be done. We owe a duty to hon. gentlemen opposite, but they also owe a duty to us as the majority in this House for the time being.

Mr. SPROULE. I appealed to the House that it would be unreasonable to pass \$2,000,000 at that hour of the night. I may say also that the discussion was not irrelevant for the Chairman always kept us very closely to the question.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will admit that he stated that he was doing this for his own amusement.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) did the same thing.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) is the most guilty of the whole lot for what occurred. I said we had learned from hon. gentlemen opposite—the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) was not present, and does not know anything about it—I said we had learned from my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) how to discuss these items, and from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) who I thought would compliment me. We were here one night for thirty-six hours discussing one item of \$16,000 for the Laprairie post office, and as last night we voted nearly \$1,000,000 we wanted to adjourn.

Mr. SPROULE. It was after six o'clock this morning when I took up the Auditor General's Report, and as I stated I did not discuss any item under \$200. There was

no disposition whatever to obstruct business.

Mr. HUGHES. There was a suggestion of the hon. Minister of Finance that we should hold over one item, but we all know what that means, as it would be passed over altogether, and then the Minister of Railways like a jumping-jack following the dictation of the hon. member for North Wellington, said that we would have to pass all the items. There is a strong suspicion abroad that the Finance Minister and the Minister of Railways are jealous of the success of the Minister of Militia and that that is the reason they did not want to get these items through.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I subscribe to the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, that public business can only be conducted with mutual respect to each others rights and privileges, and I think the hon. Minister of Finance made a serious mistake when he suggested that one item should be held over.

Mr. WALLACE. And in addition to that there was the strict ruling of the Chair.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, the very severe ruling of the Chair which I shall not discuss now, because the Chair quoted a very high authority for it. I would suggest that this vote be passed and that this House either adjourn until three o'clock, or that the committee rise until three, so that the Ministers may be in a better frame of mind to continue this discussion.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No object can be achieved by that, because the committees do not meet this morning, and we might as well continue discussing these items.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You will get a little fresh air and lunch.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no reason why we should lose any time now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think that expression is most unfortunate.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hesitation with which the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries accepts a suggestion from this side of the House indicates a desire on the part of the Government to bull these items through without proper explanation. I should think if this suggestion is accepted, better progress would be made.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) not being in the House all night, is not a judge of what has happened. I realize we all ought to be reasonable, and I will assent to the sug-

gestion of the leader of the Opposition, on the condition that we proceed in the ordinary way with the discussion of the estimates until one o'clock.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is all right.

Militia clothing and necessaries..... \$150,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish to ask the hon. Minister if he answered Mr. Foster's question yesterday with reference to the clothing for the Royal Military College.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I answered the question and it will be found on "Hansard." I would point out that the Government has no direct charge of this matter except to see that the general appearance of the cadets is maintained, and I might mention that the cost of clothing of the cadets is provided by the parents.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The answer is most unsatisfactory. The fact that the parents have to pay for the clothing ought to make the Government more anxious to see that justice is done, and, that, by no petty patronage the clothing of the cadets is interfered with. I have information which leads me to think that the absence of tender and contract in this clothing is extremely objectionable, and that the results of the present system are far from satisfactory. I think it is very improper that the Government, who have charge of that college, should try to shoulder the responsibility of this matter on to the college. I had the pleasure of making the acquaintance of the Commandant of the Royal Military College, and I must say that I was most favourably impressed by him, and that I believe he is a gentleman who is most anxious to do the very best in his power for that institution. But he is a young military officer from England, and he cannot possibly know anything about clothing contracts. It is entirely out of his department, and the Government should not seek to throw a responsibility upon him that never should rest upon him. This clothing should have been let out to public tender instead of private contract, and irrespective of all considerations the contract should be awarded to parties who would do their work well, and supply good material and good fit to the young gentlemen who are students in the Royal Military College. The Commandant might be a very good judge, after the clothes are on, as to whether they fitted properly or not, but he necessarily cannot have the information to enable him to judge the quality of the article that business men would have. I do not intend to say more about this. I hope this will be changed, and that the clothing required by the cadets will be provided by contract, after tenders have been called, in the way in which all these

Mr. FIELDING.

supplies in all the departments ought to be provided.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I beg to differ from the hon. leader of the Opposition when he says that the commandant is not a good judge of military clothing. It seems to me that a man who has worn the uniform practically all his life and who must know the cost of military clothing and how it ought to fit, is the very best judge we could possibly have. There has not been to my knowledge a single complaint, and I was surprised at the question of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). This is a matter which is not now for the first time under the control of the commandant, but has always been and I think very properly. Since my attention has been called to the matter, I will ask for further information, and if the work can be done as well by contract and the same supervision exercised over it, I should be very glad to have it done in that way.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not know the details in connection with the contract for the clothing, but I do know that if any article of clothing is not considered up to the mark by the cadet on receipt, he has the option of referring it to some authority in the college. I know that the contractors' work is kept up to the standard by this constant supervision.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What are the prices?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have not the prices.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That surely is information we ought to have.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I was not aware that there was any complaint with regard to the clothing as I never heard the slightest complaint.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has told us that he had to dismiss the man who had it in hand.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I had nothing to do with that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Here is an item of \$150,000 for clothing and necessaries.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That has nothing to do with this vote.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What has it to do with?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is the clothing for the permanent force and the active militia purchased from the W. E. Sanford Co. cheaply, and a firm in Montreal.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Was the contract originally given these people?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, last year.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman has made no contract with others?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. HUGHES. I may say that this year, on going into camp, many of the corps did not get their new uniforms until just before they started and the reason was they were not manufactured. Would it not be well for the hon. Minister to take a sufficient sum to his credit now, so that he could have the clothing manufactured and ready for next year. I would take the liberty of drawing his attention to another fact. The new serge which fits very nicely and is good material, becomes very dark in colour, in some instances, when it gets wet. While some of it holds up very nicely, others seem to have a different dye and become darker, and in other instances I have seen them quite faded and bleached. The hon. Minister would do well to carry out the suggestion made by the General to supply a Kharki drill uniform for rough purposes. It is a very cheap and serviceable uniform. I have worn a similar uniform for upwards of eight months constantly during the day and sometimes during the night, and found it very serviceable.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend's suggestions are very valuable indeed. I only wish that we were able to vote more money in order to provide a reserve of clothing. I do hope in the near future we may be able to do so. This year a very large number of militia went into camp somewhat hurriedly, and we had a great deal of difficulty getting clothing ready. My hon. friend will agree that the department did very well under the circumstances, and that although many of the men only got their clothing at the last moment they looked fairly smart as they went into camp. With regard to the colour of the clothing, I think that the manufacturers in Canada had some difficulty in learning the way to make firm colours, but I believe they are able now to make as good cloth here as anywhere. Of course the committee know that all the cloth used in the manufacture of clothing for the militia is made in Canada.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to call attention to contracts given, I think, in 1898. There used to be given to a house in Montreal, which had been the lowest tenderer and had all the plant necessary to do the work cheaply and well, but in 1898 the contracts were given to some political friends of the Government, amongst whom a house in Montreal got a contract at a higher price than the old contractors submitted. Afterwards these people had to get the work done by the old contractors.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. What is the name?

Mr. BERGERON. Louis Boisseau & Co.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They never made an article of clothing.

Mr. BERGERON. They got the contract.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That was in 1897.

Mr. BERGERON. I may be wrong in the year. Formerly the work used to be done by Shorey & Co., and when the Minister of Militia called for tenders in 1897, this firm tendered at the lowest possible figure expecting to get the work. Mr. Boisseau, however, a retail merchant, through political influence, obtained the contract at a higher price.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. BERGERON. We want to thrash that out. Afterwards Boisseau had to go to Shorey & Co. to get the work done.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Boisseau never did a dollar's worth of work for the department.

Mr. BERGERON. Who did the work for him?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Nobody did it for him. We cancelled the contract, and the work was done by the Sanford Co. and other people. Boisseau failed absolutely to do the work.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That was the question I asked some time ago, and the hon. Minister said that no contract had been cancelled. I asked whether the contractors had been changed, and he said not.

Mr. BERGERON. There is another Boisseau & Co., who belong to Toronto and who furnished cavalry clothing and pantaloons.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is another firm.

Mr. BERGERON. I am putting the question which I desire the hon. gentleman to answer later on when he makes his explanation. To show how political favour was the ruling motive in giving these contracts in Montreal, the great coats, D. C., 4000, were tendered for by Shorey & Co. at \$6.25. They were not given to Shorey & Co., but to a friend of a great politician in Montreal at 49 cents higher, namely, Workman & Co. There was a clear profit on that of \$2,500, which has gone I do not know where. More than that, it was understood that whoever tendered for that work would have to buy the cloth from a friend of the party. Mr. Willet, cloth manufacturer at Chambly.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes. These great coats were made of cloth bought from Willet & Co., and the Government paid 49 cents per coat more than the tender of Shorey & Co.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. BERGERON. The very same thing happened up in Ontario where the work used to be done by the firm of Sanford & Co. in Hamilton for \$26,000—that is one part of it. The contract with Boisseau was for 4,519 coats. In the Auditor General's Report I do not find the name of Louis Boisseau, of Montreal, but I know he got the contract, because he told me so himself. It may be that he transferred it immediately to another. I know he went to Shorey & Co. to have the work done because he could not do it himself. In calling for tenders the Government always stipulated, in fulfilment of a promise made by them when in opposition, that the firm tendering should not have recourse to the sweating system. This was carried so far that the contract was not given to the lowest tenderer under the pretext that that firm followed the sweating system, but that pretext was not always carried out in the matter of the clothing of the militia, because Workman & Co. do not do their work in any other way. I am told that the Sanford Manufacturing Company also do their work in the same way.

Mr. GIBSON. I would like to say that Mr. Sanford, while alive, asked all his men voluntarily in his pay to join the union and comply with the requirements of the Government, and his work is not done under the sweating system.

Mr. BERGERON. I accept the statement of my hon. friend. But the information I have is that it would be impossible for either the Sanford Manufacturing Company or Workman & Co. to do their work otherwise than under the sweating system. Under the sweating system that exists in Montreal, instead of doing their work in an immense building under one roof, they give it to women and girls in the parishes around Montreal who do the work and bring it back.

Mr. GIBSON. I can state that the men of the Sanford Manufacturing Company in Hamilton are all union men, and there is no sweating system.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to ask the Minister of Militia and Defence to explain how it is that the people of this country pay 49 cents more per coat to have the work done by political friends of the Government, instead of having it done by the old firm.

Mr. BERGERON.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I wish to say to the committee, that so far as Boisseau & Co., in Montreal, are concerned, in every single case in which a contract was made in 1897, their tender was the lowest. There was no sweating clause nor anything else, and I am prepared to bring down the papers and prove it. In every single item of the contract which was entered into with Boisseau at Montreal, he was the lowest tenderer.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is the contract? I have had an order of the House passed for it, and I cannot get it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will see that it is brought down. We entered into a contract with Boisseau; in fact, his prices were too low, and he was never able to fulfil his contract. He had to give it up after humbugging us for weeks and weeks, and then we gave his contract to Doull & Gibson, of Montreal, and the Sanford Co., of Hamilton, the next highest tenderers; and the records will prove that what I say is absolutely true. These tenders were advertised for in the public press of this country. As to the tenders asked for in 1898, in the meantime, the Postmaster General had introduced his Bill with reference to a sweating clause in every contract. The Department of Militia and Defence had adopted that as the proper thing to do in the interests of the workmen of this country, and then gave notice to all parties whom we asked to tender that they must tender with the understanding that their contracts were to be based upon the sweating clause. Shorey & Co. tendered, but they distinctly stated in their tender that they would not be bound by the sweating clause, and they wrote me a letter asking me to overlook it, because they said they had a contract with the North-west Mounted Police which committed them to do their work without that sweating clause being included. Now, the sweating clause means this: that the employers of labour shall do all their work within their own factory, and shall not have any of it given to outside parties or to sub-contractors. They must have rooms of a certain size, of a certain number of cubic feet of air for every operator, and the work should be done on the premises. The Sanford Company tendered also. They put in two tenders. They said, as I have stated, in an answer which I gave on the floor of this House recently, that if they secured \$67,000 of this contract, they were prepared to come under the sweating clause, promising to construct a factory with larger rooms, and that the work would be done in that way. It turned out that their contract amounted to more than the sum, and we gave the Sanford Co. the largest part of the contract, and so far as I know and believe, they are doing their work in accordance with

their contract. With regard to Workman, he was the lowest with regard to certain articles, and he got the contract. Shorey was lower than Workman; he was lower than Sanford; but he absolutely refused to be bound by the sweating clause, and he was out of the race. The same thing happened with regard to one or two others. The hon. gentleman says that the clause of the contract has not been carried out. I want to tell him that if he will give me information to that effect, I promise to make full inquiry into the matter. The hon. gentleman has stated that I have forced contractors to buy cloth from certain people. There is not the shadow of foundation in that, and I challenged him to prove it. Mr. Sanford came to me and spoke to me and I explained to him all these things. So far as Willett is concerned, he is a good manufacturer, but he complained that under the late Government, being a Liberal, he was never able to get a dollar's worth of work; and I said that if Mr. Willett could make his cloth as good and as cheap as anybody else, I should be very glad to see him get a part of the work.

But to say that I used any improper influence, or asked anybody to buy cloth from Mr. Willett at any price, is to say that which is absolutely unfounded; I never did anything of the kind. Now so far as any of these contracts are concerned, if the hon. gentleman wants to investigate them he is at liberty to do so, I am prepared to meet him anywhere and at any time with reference to them. I can assure him, and I can assure this committee that we have accepted the lowest tender under the conditions upon which we asked for tenders, and offered to enter into contracts. But Shorey, by his own action, was out of the race, and I made out contracts with Sanford & Company, of Hamilton, for a part of our goods, and with Workman & Company, of Montreal, for the rest, and at prices which were the lowest available.

Mr. BERGERON. With regard to that sweating system, I think the house of Shorey & Company were more honest than those who got the contract, because they declared that they would not do their work in any other way than by that system, that is, of having it done by their employees in their own houses. Workman & Company have been doing their work in the same way, but they didn't say anything about it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Will the hon. gentleman make that statement?

Mr. BERGERON. Certainly, I make that statement. I have asked for the papers, and would have proved it before the committee, but I could not get any meeting of the committee. Workman & Company got

the contract, and they are doing it in the same way that Shorey is doing his work.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There have been two or three meetings of the Public Accounts Committee, but we could not get any gentlemen to bring forward any work at all.

Mr. BERGERON. Did not my hon. friend try to prevent me from bringing any witnesses before the Public Accounts Committee on these very facts? Now, about the Willett business, this is the information I have.

At one o'clock the Committee rose for recess.

TUESDAY, 11th July, 1899.

At Three o'clock the Committee resumed.

Mr. TAYLOR. There seems to be an increase here. Will the hon. Minister please explain how this money is expended?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I did give an explanation, but I suppose the hon. gentleman would like to have it repeated.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was not here at the time.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Of this amount there is for clothing \$125,000, necessaries \$15,000, and allowance in lieu of clothing \$5,000. The last item means that certain of the regiments, as the 48th Highlanders, of Toronto, take a cash allowance and provide their own uniforms. This is the ordinary vote for clothing, the same as we have had for many years.

Mr. WALLACE. I understood the hon. Minister to say that all the cloth was bought in Canada. I would like then to hear an explanation of the item at page L-48 of the Auditor General's Report of \$2,094 paid to H. M. Accountant General for cloth caps, shoes and other similar articles.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There were a small number of purchases made in the old country. It was represented to me that it was necessary to obtain these articles in order to show the manufacturers here what was required. As far as possible we purchase everything in Canada and the quantity of goods purchased in the old country is very trifling, as a whole.

Mr. WALLACE. With an expenditure of \$150,000 a year a large quantity of clothing must go out of use every year. I have been informed that the instructions are to destroy all old clothing. This seems to me like

a waste of good material which many people in the country would probably like to have. Of course we know it would not do to have Her Majesty's uniform used by men driving wagons, and so on, but surely with some slight change, dyeing cloth or taking the military buttons off the tunic or coat, it would be possible to make use of these discarded articles with advantage.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The instructions are not to destroy the clothing. It is left with the corps for fatigue duty to save the new issue of uniforms.

Mr. WALLACE. I know in one case the instructions were given to destroy the clothes, and I said I would speak to the Minister about it. Another point to which I would call attention is this: A battalion in the county of Renfrew, whose number I cannot recall at the moment, went to camp at Niagara. Going part of the distance by boat, as they did, they arrived at camp on Wednesday night. There is supposed to be 12 days' drill. But in the case of this battalion they would have only three days the first week, and as it would be necessary for them to leave on Friday in order to reach their homes on Saturday, there would be only four days the second week, or a total of 10 days' drill. That seems to me a disadvantage in the training of the men, besides being an improvident use of money in moving a battalion so far.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman mentioned the matter to me privately, but I think he did not give me the number of the battalion.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, I gave the hon. Minister the number.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Then I overlooked it. I am not able to give the explanation; but perhaps before this discussion is through I shall be able to inform the hon. gentleman. Of course, the day going and the day coming are necessarily lost. If the drill was reduced to 10 days, that is certainly wrong and should be inquired into.

Mr. BRITTON. When I was out this afternoon, the question arose with reference to Livingston & Bros., whose account appears at L-71 of the Auditor General's Report. This is one of the most respectable firms in the Dominion, and is in a large enough way of business to undertake the most extensive contract for militia clothing. They have always tendered when tenders have been called for by the Dominion Government for the militia clothing, but, unfortunately, they

Mr. WALLACE.

have not been successful. This account is not for clothing paid for by the Government but for clothing paid for by the cadets themselves. Up to 1897-98 the work was done by a person named Creegan whose name appears in the accounts of work done for the battery. But there was some dissatisfaction with the clothing and the change was desired by the cadets themselves, which change was brought about by Col. Kitson and Col. McGill, the adjutant of the R. M. C. This work was done by Livingston & Bros. There are two items on the page. One is work actually paid for by the cadets and the other will be paid for by them. The rules of the Royal Military College require that a deposit be made by the cadet to cover his expenses, including his clothing. Most of their clothing, dress and undress is paid for by the cadets themselves. At page L-49 there is a small item to Livingston & Bros. of \$17.50. I suppose that was because the goods were required in a hurry or because they could not be furnished by Mr. Creegan. The items to which I first referred show that goods have been purchased from Messrs. Livingston & Bros. to the extent, at least of giving them a trial. This is not necessarily to reflect on a man who was in the employ of the Government and doing the work prior to that time. He is still doing some work, I believe, in connection with the battery.

Mr. TAYLOR. How is it that the Minister asks for \$150,000, when the actual expenditure last year under this head, as shown by the Auditor General's Report was \$87,343.46?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am told that the item for 1897-98 was lower than the present, that it was only \$90,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the annual expenditure for clothing and necessaries \$150,000?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think it has not been as high as that always. When there is a drill of the whole force, more clothing is required. If we have an annual drill, we cannot get along with less than \$150,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How do the prices paid for clothing compare with those paid in 1892-93-94-95?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have a price list here, showing the prices paid for clothing and necessaries each fiscal year since the 1st July, 1891. The first item is ankle boots, and the prices are as follows:—1890-91, \$3.10; 1891-92,

\$3.37; 1892-93. \$3.37; 1893-94. \$1.74; 1894-95. \$2.50; 1895-96. \$2.50; 1896-97, \$1.95; 1897-98. \$2.45; 1898-99, \$2.25.

Mr. WALLACE. Is that of the same kind?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am told that the standard of goods is very much higher now than it was a few years ago.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who has the contract for boots?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. A gentleman named Hodgson, in Vankleek Hill, in Prescott County.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How was the contract let?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. By tender, after advertisement.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Was that the lowest tender?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes. I will read the statement, which is as follows:—

PRICES PAID FOR CLOTHING AND NECESSARIES, EACH FISCAL YEAR SINCE  
1ST JULY, 1899.

Description.	1890-1.	1891-2.	1892-3.	1893-4.	1894-5.	1895-6.	1896-7.	1897-8.	1898-9.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Clothing—									
Boots, ankle.....	3 10	{ 2 50 3 37	{ 2 50 3 37	1 74	2 50	2 50	1 95	2 45	2 25
" knee.....		6 37	6 37	6 37	4 75	.....	3 50	3 75	3 75
" Wellington.....		3 50	3 50	{ 5 00 3 50	4 00	4 00	3 95	3 85	3 85
" winter.....	4 87	4 75	4 75	2 98	3 25	3 25	3 20	3 15	3 25
Caps, forage, Cav., R.C.D.				0 33½	0 33½	0 33½	0 33½	0 33½	0 33½
" " A. M.					0 44		0 55	0 47½	
" " Artillery.....		0 36½	0 36½	0 36½	0 36½	0 36½	0 36½		0 36½
" " Infantry.....		0 30½	0 30½	0 30½	0 30½	0 30½	0 30½	0 29½	
" " Rifle.....		0 32½	0 32½	0 32½	0 32½	0 32½	0 32½	0 31½	
" fur, winter.....	1 20	1 10	1 15	1 15	1 25	.....	1 45	.....	1 45
Cloaks, Cav., D.C., P.F.	10 30	10 55	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	8 90
" " Act. Mil..	7 47	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	7 70	.....	.....
" Art., D.C.D., P.F.	11 55	.....	.....	11 25	{ 11 25 11 55	.....	.....	.....	.....
Great coats, Art., D.C.G., Per. Force.	7 69	7 69	7 69	7 69	7 69	.....	8 30	.....	7 24
" Arty., A. C., Act. Mil..	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
" Infy., D. C., Per. Force.	6 59	7 00	7 00	7 00	6 98	6 98	8 30	.....	7 24
" Infy., A. C., Act. Mil..	5 73	5 73	5 73	5 73	.....	5 73	5 59	.....	.....
Helmets.....	.....	1 11½	.....	1 11½	.....	1 11½	.....	1 10	1 11
Frocks, Cavy., R.C.D.	.....	.....	3 20	3 20	3 20	3 85	3 57	3 48	3 45
" (scarlet) Cav., 3rd Dragoons.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3 57	3 48	.....
" (scarlet) Mani'ba Dragoons.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3 62	.....	.....
" (scarlet) Cav., G. G.B.G.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3 45
" (blue) Cav., Drg.	.....	.....	3 50	{ 3 85 3 50	.....	3 85	3 72	3 55	3 45
" " Huss	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3 72	3 55	3 45
" Artillery.....	3 50	3 50	.....	{ 3 85 3 50	3 85	3 85	3 72	3 50	3 45
" Infy., Per. Force	3 00	3 00	3 00	3 00	3 15	3 15	3 62	3 50	3 45
" " G.G.B.G..	.....	3 75	3 75	3 75	.....	.....	.....	3 62	.....
" " Fusiliers..	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3 60
" " Act. Mil..	.....	.....	.....	.....	3 15	3 15	3 62	3 50	3 45
" Rifles.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3 72	3 25	3 45
" blue duck, fatigue	.....	.....	1 46	1 46	1 46	.....	.....	.....	.....

## PRICES PAID FOR CLOTHING AND NECESSARIES, &amp;c.—Continued.

Description.	1890-1.	1891-2.	1892-3.	1893-4.	1894-5.	1895-6.	1896-7.	1897-8.	1898-9.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Clothing—									
Tunics, Cavy., R.C.Drg.				5 89½	5 89	5 89	5 78		5 89
" (scarlet) Cav., 3rd									
Dragoons				5 70					
" (scarlet) Cav., M.									
Dragoons.				4 75			4 75		
" (scarlet) Cav., G.									
G.B.G.									
" (blue) Cav., Drg.	5 89½	5 89½				5 89			
" " Huss		7 64		7 64		7 64	7 35		
" Arty., Per. Force.	6 04	6 04	6 04	6 04	5 72	5 72	5 70	5 70	5 60
" " Act. Mil.	6 04	6 04	6 04	6 04	5 72	5 72	5 60	5 60	
" Infy., Per. Force	5 00	5 00	5 00	5 00	5 25	5 25	5 19	5 17	
" " Fusiliers.						5 50			5 50
" " Act. Mil.	5 00	5 00	5 00	{ 5 25 5 00 }	5 25	5 25	5 19	5 17	
" Rifles.	5 58½	5 58½	5 58½	{ 5 55½ 5 56 }	5 40	5 40	5 40	5 30	
Pantaloon, Cav., R.C.D				{ 5 55 5 56 }		5 55	4 60	4 15	4 30
" " cloth, A				{ 6 05 6 06 }	5 68	5 68	4 75	4 75	
" " Mil.	6 06	6 06							
" " serge "									3 20
" Arty., cloth.	5 56	5 56	5 56	5 55		5 55	4 75	4 15	4 35
" " serge.								3 20	3 20
Trousers, Cav., cloth, R.									
C. Dragoons.				4 78		4 78	4 36	4 40	4 25
" " " A.M	5 13								
" Arty., cloth.	4 30	4 30	4 30						4 36
" " serge.	2 79	2 85	2 85	2 78½	2 78½	2 78½	2 53	2 50	2 48
" Infy., cloth.	4 18	4 18	4 18	4 18					4 12
" " serge.	2 82½	2 82½	2 82½	2 82	2 82	2 82	2 59	2 37	2 46
" Rifles, serge.	2 82½	2 82½	2 82½		2 80	2 80	2 80	2 42	2 46
" blue d k, fatigue			0 95	0 95	0 95	0 95			0 82
Leggings, blk. leather, lg		1 25						0 85	0 90
" " short	0 80							0 68	0 70
Band wings, Infantry	0 33	0 33	0 33			0 33		0 33	
" Rifle.	0 33	0 33	0 33			0 33		0 33	
Necessaries—									
Blacking, waterproof	0 14½								
" English army						0 05			
Braces, web.		0 34	0 34	0 37	0 34½	0 34½	0 34½	0 28	0 25
Brushes, blacking.	0 09½	0 10		0 10	0 09		0 10	0 06½	0 07
" brass	0 11		0 12½	0 14½	0 11½	0 10½	0 11	0 10½	0 08½
" clothes	0 15		0 18		0 17	0 15	0 17	0 16½	0 14½
" hair							0 23	0 25	0 25
" polishing	0 12	0 12½	0 12½	0 13			0 13	0 08½	0 10
" shaving	0 17	0 15	0 19	0 15			0 13	0 09½	0 11
Combs, hair	0 05½	0 05	0 05		0 05½			0 05	
Drawers, woollen.				0 65	{ 0 73½ 0 65 }		0 71½	0 74½	0 82
Fork and knife.	0 14	0 13½	0 13½					0 09	0 14½
Gauntlets, hair seal and									
fur	2 50								
Gauntlets, hair seal, black							3 00	2 64	3 25
Gloves, buck, white.	1 24½	1 24½	1 25	1 25	1 15				
" brown leather,									
summer.							0 75	0 90	0 90
" brown leather,									
winter.	0 69½	0 69½							1 12
" caribou		1 50	1 50		1 70	1 70			
Hold-alls.					0 13	0 13	0 12		0 11
Mitts.	0 48½	0 51½			{ 0 66½ 0 55 }	0 66½			
Razor and case.	0 17½	0 17½	0 18½	0 18½		0 18½	0 18½	0 15	0 18
Shirt, flannel, gray		1 06		1 05	0 94½		0 91½	0 87	0 84½
" under, knitted					0 69½		0 67½	0 74½	0 73
Socks, knitted, wool.	0 18½	0 17½	0 18½		0 17		0 18	0 15	0 15
Sponges, pipe clay.	0 14	0 14			0 14				

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

PRICES PAID FOR CLOTHING AND NECESSARIES, &c.—*Concluded.*

Description.	1890-1.	1891-2.	1892-3.	1893-4.	1894-5.	1895-6.	1896-7.	1897-8.	1898-9.
	\$ cts.								
Necessaries—									
Spoons, table .....	0 01½	0 01½			0 05½	0 05½	0 05	0 05	0 02½
Towels .....	0 17½				0 16½		0 14½	0 14½	0 14½
Straps, great coat, brown.	0 17								
Mufflers .....	0 67½	0 67½	0 60	0 49½	0 48½		0 46	0 52½	
Moccasins, moose.....		1 10	1 00		1 00			0 83½	1 16½
Stockings, black, long..		0 65	0 50	0 29	0 35				0 37½
Snow shoes.....					1 40				

PRICES PAID FOR BARRACK STORES AND EQUIPMENTS, EACH FISCAL YEAR  
SINCE 1ST JULY, 1890.

Barrack stores—									
Blankets, horse.....		4 50		3 10					3 75
Brooms, corn.....	0 18	0 27½	0 23			0 18	0 18	0 18	0 16½
" stable .....	0 45	0 30	0 50	0 30		0 42½	0 42½	0 38	0 37½
Brushes, scrub, hand .....	0 14	0 14					0 14	0 11	0 11
" with handles .....	0 21½	0 21					0 19		0 18
" whitewash.....		0 68					0 48		0 43
" carriage.....	0 34		0 30						0 25
" horse .....	0 57	0 62½					0 60		
" " water.....	0 41½								
" dandruff.....	0 22	0 22							
Bedsteads, iron.....		6 50							
Counterpanes .....		1 99					2 20		1 75
Cases, pillow.....		0 24	0 23						
Mops, with handles.....	{ 0 41½ } { 0 47 }	0 40	{ 0 37½ } { 0 40 }				0 39	0 37	0 35
" without handles .....	0 36½								
Palliasses.....		1 05	{ 1 11 } { 1 05 }				1 10		1 09
Sheets, cotton.....						0 47½	0 47½		0 46½
Shovels, snow.....		0 27	0 27						
Slips, pillow.....									
Straps, bed.....				0 33	0 25		0 24		0 25
Combs, curry.....						0 13			0 14
Equipment—									
Blankets, gray, wool .....	1 47½	1 34½	1 34½				1 30		
Bags, nose .....	0 59	0 60	0 55	0 55	0 50		0 48		0 50
Haversacks, black. ....	0 49	{ 0 45 } { 0 49 }	0 44						
" white .....	0 37	{ 0 35 } { 0 37 }	0 34	0 34					
Marquees.....	84 00	83 00	83 00	82 00			80 50		77 50
Tents.....	{ 17 00 } { 18 00 }	18 00 17 00	16 80 17 95	16 80				16 00	17 00
Numnahs.....	2 40	2 40		2 50	{ 2 50 } { 2 25 }	2 50	2 20		
Pins, tent, large.....									
" medium.....				0 02½					
" small .....				0 01½	0 01½		0 01½	0 01½	0 01½
Straps, mess tin, black..	0 07				0 08				
" " brown.....	0 08				0 08				
Saddlery, complete.....	20 00	20 00			{ 35 25 } { 37 75 }		35 00	37 50	36 75
Tins, mess.....	0 33	0 32	{ 0 31 } { 0 32 }				0 31	0 33	
Valises, blanket.....	2 35	2 35	2 25						
" artillery.....	1 80	1 80							2 25
Sheets, waterproof.....		1 10	0 89½				0 87½	1 05	1 05

**Mr. BERGERON.** Is the price paid for great-coats not 49 cents higher than the Shorey tender?

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** This is the lowest contract that was ever made. I will explain to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) that Mr. Shorey did not tender, because he would not include in his tender what we required, sweating cloth. I have the clause of the contract here, and, if the hon. gentleman cares to have it read, I will read it.

**Mr. BERGERON.** The hon. gentleman promised to bring down all these tenders. Where is the cloth for the cavalry frocks made?

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** In Canada. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Rosamond) who sits upon that side of the House, has made some of it, and he makes some very good cloth.

**Mr. TISDALE.** How long do these contracts for clothing run?

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** One year now.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Where does the cloth come from?

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) seems a great deal worried over the cloth. My hon. friend who sits behind (Mr. Rosamond), or his mill, makes a considerable portion of it, and it is very excellent cloth. Willett & Co. make a portion of it.

**Mr. HENDERSON.** What is the difference in the quality of these brooms that were purchased?

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** That is a question I was asking the hon. gentleman last night, and I know as much about the quality as the hon. gentleman did then.

**Mr. HENDERSON.** Brooms may be bought anywhere from 10 cents to 30 cents each.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** The hon. gentleman did not know that last night.

**Mr. HENDERSON.** I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, because I am quite sure the question of brooms did not come up last night.

**Mr. BERGERON.** What did the hon. Minister say about mufflers a moment ago?

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** The hon. gentleman's friends paid 67½ cents, and we pay 52½ cents.

**Mr. HENDERSON.** I think that it is scarcely fair of the hon. Minister of Militia that he should buy such a poor article. I

**Mr. BORDEN (King's).**

am sure the former Government were more considerate of the comfort of the men.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** I have been informed by my officers, who have been in the department for many years, that the goods we purchase now are very much better than they were three or four years ago.

**Mr. BERGERON.** That is the result of the National Policy, I suppose.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** Stable brushes, hand brushes—

**Mr. TISDALE.** A fair criticism on the whole question, to make it worth anything, is, of course, as to the question of quality. I take it for granted that the hon. Minister has consulted with and acted through the officers delegated by the department. They settle the quality, and I do not understand how the same gentleman can say that these goods are so much better than goods purchased formerly, when they passed them. I do not go with the hon. Minister on that point, and he will permit me to express my doubt upon it. I think the department, under both Administrations, has endeavoured to get a standard of quality to see whether goods are cheap at a certain price ten years ago and now, and that in order to tell this, it would require a very considerable mass of information. At the same time, I congratulate the hon. Minister that, as a rule, the prices have not been increased, yet during the short time that he has been buying goods there were very material variations. We find that the prices in 1899, as a rule, though not always, were higher than in 1897-98. The great point in the whole question is, that as to clothing and shoes. In all these small things there is no end of people dealing in them, and, therefore, as long as there is not a material increase, it would seem as if the hon. Minister and his officers had endeavoured to properly discharge their duty. There is a material difference in the price of the boots and shoes.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** I have been comparing the same classes.

**Mr. TISDALE.** There is no such difference that one would be nearly \$3 and the other \$1. I congratulate the Minister on being able to show that he has not in all cases made increases, but in some cases has made increases. The policy which the late Government adopted and persevered in for several years was to get these articles made in Canada, if we could get them as cheaply and of as high a quality as the imported articles; and in order to encourage manufacturers, we let the contract for a term of years, not always by public advertisement, but by a system of circular to those who appeared competent to do the work. I am

glad to learn from the Minister that the policy which we fought for and for which we were severely criticised has been adopted by himself and is working satisfactorily. Among those who supply the materials, I venture to say are the same people who supplied them to us.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** Yes, they are largely from Sanford's.

Mr. **TISDALE.** It is a great satisfaction to me to know that our policy in this respect, which was really based on the principle of the National Policy, has been justified at the hands of the hon. gentleman.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I desire to call the attention of the House for a moment to an incident which took place last night in which I am personally interested. This morning, when I looked at the morning papers to see what took place in this House, I read that the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) had stated that the Messrs. Bate "had bought and furnished the house in which the Premier lives." Hardly believing that the hon. gentleman could have been guilty of making such a statement, for which there is not the slightest shadow of foundation I got an advance copy of "Hansard" to ascertain exactly what were the words which the hon. gentleman had made use of; and this is the way he spoke:

Why are Bate & Sons selected?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Somebody had to be selected.

Mr. **TAYLOR.** They were selected because, when the Liberal party held a convention in Ottawa, I read from that little red bible, which I have in my hand, that after Mr. Longley had moved that famous resolution Mr. H. A. Bate, secretary of the Ottawa Liberal Association, came forward and hung upon the platform a banner in which was inscribed: "Laurier expects every man to do his duty." That is why Bate & Sons have been selected. They live in Ottawa; they are merchants; they are strong Liberals, and they are shrewd business men. When the Government came into power they thought it would be a first-rate thing to pay this Government that compliment and receive all the patronage. They purchased a house and presented it to the right hon. Prime Minister of this country, and, therefore, this Government are under obligations to repay Bate & Sons.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Where did you get the information that a house was presented to the right hon. Prime Minister?

Mr. **TAYLOR.** It was common rumour in Ottawa, and I believe the facts are as stated.

Mr. **SUTHERLAND.** I think that is a very improper statement. I may say it is not a fact.

Mr. **TAYLOR.** I make the statement, and I will let the right hon. Prime Minister contradict it. I say that they bought and furnished a house, and that the right hon. Prime Minister lives in it. There may have been some others who contributed towards it, but Bate & Sons, being shrewd business men, knew that it would place this Government under an obligation by

paying this compliment to the Prime Minister as they have done.

Now, I may say at once that I do not feel called upon to contradict anything that has been said by the hon. gentleman; but in order to show to what levity gentlemen on the other side of the House can descend, and how they can utter absolutely foundationless accusations, the House will pardon me if I ask them to follow me into my private affairs. In the spring of 1897, I bought a House in the city of Ottawa. I bought it from the Leslie Estate. The price agreed upon, if I remember rightly, was \$9,500. I paid down \$5,000 cash, and gave a mortgage on the balance for \$4,500. I bought the house in the name of my wife, because, being poor, and well knowing that if I died, I would have hardly anything to leave to her, I thought it would be right to give her a home. The amount paid cash I myself raised upon a note, which has not yet been altogether extinguished. That is all there is about it. The house has been furnished by myself, with the exception of a few gifts which were given to my wife by some of her lady friends. That is all there is to this transaction. For the accusation of the hon. gentleman there is not a shadow of foundation. The Messrs. Bate have never furnished nor bought a house for me.

Mr. **TAYLOR.** I accept the hon. gentleman's statement; but I am sure he has not lived in Ottawa without having heard, as I have heard from friends of his own, sitting on that side of the House, and from many other responsible men in Ottawa, whose word for truth and veracity I would take as soon as I would that of any gentleman in this country, that what I stated last night was the fact. The statement being common rumour, I heard it time and time again, particularly since the contract for these Yukon supplies was given to Messrs. Bate & Sons without tender, and at these extraordinary prices, and also since that firm were given the binder twine, belonging to the people of this country, at about one-third of what it was sold for. This is the statement that is prevalent in Ottawa, and I think the hon. gentleman ought to be under a compliment to me for having brought it to his attention publicly, so that he might give it a flat denial, as he has done to-day.

Some hon. **MEMBERS.** Oh, oh.

Mr. **TAYLOR.** Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but you cannot go down street and ask any merchant in town without hearing him make the same statement that I made here last night. When the hon. leader of the Government sat on this side of the House, he and his friends behind him charged the late lamented Sir John A. Macdonald with having, through his wife, accepted a trinket from the then Sir Donald Smith, who was at that time, as he is to-day, connected with the

Canadian Pacific Railway, and who saw fit to make Lady Macdonald a present of a gold necklace. Not only was that charge hurled against Sir John A. Macdonald, but when the people of this country made Sir Hector Langevin a present, the Prime Minister stood in his place and declared that no public man occupying the position of a Minister of the Crown should receive a gift from his friends without having their names made public and laid on the Table of the House. What do we see to-day? Sir Donald Smith, now Lord Strathcona, is a civil servant of this Government, representing Canada in England, and is more closely associated with the Canadian Pacific Railway than he was then; and what does he telegraph to this country? "I will head the subscription list for a present to the Prime Minister with \$10,000, and, if necessary, I will make it \$20,000." Will the hon. gentleman take the same stand now that he took when he charged in this House that the testimonial to Sir Hector Langevin was made up by contractors and others who had favours to get from the Government? The hon. Prime Minister has now contradicted the rumour that is prevalent. I thought I could look into the gallery and see one gentleman who told me that Bate & Sons were interested in getting up a house completely furnished for the Prime Minister of this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. TAYLOR. I could name a dozen. The hon. gentleman says there is no truth in the rumour, and I accept his statement.

The PRIME MINISTER. I beg to say one word more. The rumour that has been current in the streets of Ottawa was that the house has been offered to me, but the truth is that I would not accept it.

Mr. BERGERON. Now that this matter is over, and I accept fully the statement of the Prime Minister—I am sorry the matter has occurred—I want to say one word about the clothing. The hon. Minister of Militia seemed to be annoyed a few minutes ago when I asked him if the clothing was all of Canadian produce and made in Canada. I believe my hon. friend was a member of the House some years ago when an investigation was held by the Public Accounts Committee into the clothing made for the militia, and when every possible effort was made by hon. gentlemen opposite, who were then in Opposition, to prevent the Department of Militia and Defence using any clothing made in Canada. They brought cloth from England, and from every manufacturer in this country, to show the difference; but it was proven to the satisfaction of the inspectors of the department and others that the cloth made in Canada was as good, if not better, than the cloth imported from Great Britain. Even though it has cost power to the Lib-

Mr. TAYLOR.

eral-Conservative party, there is a satisfaction in knowing that at last hon. gentlemen opposite have changed their views, and that they now admit, by giving the contract in this country, that the cloth made here is as good, if not better, than what we imported, and just as cheap. I want to ask my hon. friend if he has fulfilled his promise made to me this morning to bring down the different tenders of 1897 and 1898?

I may explain, in order to show why we ask these questions. I made a motion for papers, and the return in answer is an illustration of how we are treated. What I asked for and what the House ordered was the tenders for the Department of Militia and Defence since 1896. I have accounts of Boisseau, Laliberté, Paquet, Shorey & Co., and others. I would like to know, by the way, if the Paquet mentioned here is the Senator of that name. But the tenders I asked for are not here, and I am reduced to ask the Minister as a favour—which I hope he will grant, but which perhaps he will refuse—to have these papers brought down. A member of Parliament is reduced to ask as a favour from a Minister papers which the House has ordered to have laid on the Table. If I get the papers, I shall be able to show that the lowest tenders were not accepted in every case. The hon. Minister may plead that the lowest tenderer worked under the sweating system. There is not one of these concerns, the Sanford Company or the Workman Company, or any of these having contracts that do not do their work under what my hon. friend calls the sweating system. It is the ordinary system and they have no other; it would be almost impossible for them to have another. Instead of the work being done in the factory, those who do the work for Workman & Co. in Montreal are doing it in their own homes. Why does not the hon. Minister agree with the right hon. Premier, who has given a contract to this firm, Shorey & Co., for clothing for the North-west Mounted Police. Messrs. Shorey having stated openly that if the department insisted on the work being done in any other way than the regular way they could not take the contract.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) is a very anxious inquirer; I hope to be able to satisfy him. First, I may refer to what was said by my predecessor in office, the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). It is a satisfaction in a debate of this kind to have an hon. gentleman who is fair and at the same time knows something of what he is talking about. Though he was at the head of the department for but a short time, the hon. gentleman has left his impression on the department in the work he did in establishing standards for the cloth and the character of the clothing—standards which, possibly, were too

high, but the establishment of them has been of great advantage to the department. I may tell the hon. gentleman, and also my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), that they take too much credit to their political friends for having inaugurated the system of purchasing as much as possible the militia clothing in Canada. Alexander Mackenzie, as far back as 1876, began to work on that line. It is the Liberal policy that has since been carried out by succeeding Administrations to such a large extent. As to the character of the clothing, I have great pleasure in telling the hon. member for South Norfolk and I give him credit to a considerable extent for it—that the character of the clothing is improved and is improving, so that to-day, I believe we can manufacture in Canada as good clothing as can be made in England, and certainly, if the duty were added, as cheap as it can be imported from England. We discussed the question of the three-year contracts in 1896. I have no hesitation in saying, after three years' experience, that there was a great deal of force in the statement the hon. gentleman made at that time, that when you have secured the services of a reliable contractor and that contractor has become familiar with the work. It is best, wherever it can be properly done in the public interest, to continue the work with that contractor. But I think that object may be gained without entering into three-years contracts.

Now, as to the observations of my hon. friend from Beauharnois, who still persists, notwithstanding what I said before recess, in saying that I did not give the contract to the lowest tenderer. I repeat that we called for tenders upon certain known conditions. Among those who responded were Messrs. Shorey & Company. But they distinctly said that, if the department insisted upon enforcing what is known as the sweating clause, their tender was not to be considered. So they were not tenderers, and I insist that we gave the contract to the lowest tenderer. I do not see how I can make my statement plainer.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not deny what the hon. Minister said; but I want to tell him that the parties to whom he gave the contract are doing the same as Shorey declared they would do. But the other parties did not say they would do it. That is all the difference and the hon. Minister should be aware of it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman is misinformed. The W. E. Sanford Manufacturing Company are doing this work literally under the provisions of the sweating clause. They are not farming out the work, but are doing it in their own factory with members of the union, and under their own direct supervision. The officers of my de-

partment have inspected their building and they inform me that that is the fact. Moreover, the contractors cannot draw a dollar until they have made an affidavit that the work has been done in accordance with the provisions of the sweating clause of the contract. Now, after this statement made by me upon the floor of Parliament, will the hon. gentleman say that the Sanford Company are doing the work in the same way as the Shorey Company said they would do it. He knows that the Sanford firm is a reputable firm.

Mr. BERGERON. If the hon. Minister had said before what he is saying now, I probably would not have said what I did say. The information the hon. Minister gave this morning was that there was a question of the Sanford firm's contract being over \$65,000, and if it did not exceed that amount they could not undertake to do it under the provisions of the sweating clause.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend did not follow me. I did say that there was a question as to the amount of the contract; but it is ascertained that, at the prices offered, their contract would run considerably over \$70,000. So we gave them the contract, and they took it under the sweating clause. I know my hon. friend did not catch that part of the explanation or he would not have made the statement he did. Now, with reference to the other firm, which, no doubt, is more obnoxious to my hon. friend—

Mr. BERGERON. I am not talking politics. I am talking for the good of the department.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The other firm is that of Workman & Company, and I am informed by my officers that that firm comply literally with the provisions of the contract. I have not been there myself, and the statement I make is made upon the faith of the report made by the officers of the department.

Mr. BERGERON. I will not detain the hon. gentleman another moment. His words are on "Hansard" and before the Supply Bill is passed, we shall know whether his officers have posted him correctly or not. I have information one way from parties whom I have reason to trust, and he has information the other way from his officers.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron), I am sure, would not wish to injure any man in this House or out of it. But I venture to point out to him how careful he should be in making such statements about firms of this character. No greater blow could be struck at the credit of these firms than to make such a statement on the floor of Parliament. He has already said if

he had understood me in the sense he now understands me, he would not have made the statements which he has made since we resumed this sitting. It is only fair to make this statement in justice to my hon. friend: The W. E. Sanford Company has done work outside of their contract. We wanted clothing in a hurry to get ready for the annual drill, and the Sanford Company said they were prepared to furnish it if we would allow them to do as they had been accustomed to do their work in the past. The amount was not a large one, and this concession was made. My hon. friend may have heard of that being done.

Mr. BERGERON. That may be.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. But I do not think that would apply to the Workman Company, because I think they have had no work—certainly very little, if any—outside of their regular contract.

Now, my hon. friend has asked me for tenders. If I said I would bring down tenders, what I meant was that I would bring down a statement of tenders. I never saw the tenders in my life. This is the system adopted: There is an independent board of officers over whom I have no control, who open the tenders. The clerk writes down the name of each tenderer and fills in the amount of each article for which he tenders. The lowest tender is then marked with a red line and the whole schedule is brought to me. I invariably approve of the lowest tender, unless there is some good reason—failure in former work or something of that kind. I have here the schedule showing the tenders for clothing for 1897-98. I am very much surprised, if my hon. friend moved for papers, that this was not brought down. I will make inquiry and ascertain the facts. The names of the tenderers are as follows:—Mark Workman, Montreal; Gillespie, Ainsley & Dixon, Toronto; W. G. Reid, the Tunstead Hat Company, Hamilton; W. E. Sanford Manufacturing Company, Hamilton; Zepherin Paquet, Quebec; G. Marsonais, O. J. Monday & Co., Montreal; Wm. Vincent, Quebec; Chalcroft, Simpson & Co., Toronto; L. H. Boisseau, Montreal; H. Shorey & Co., Montreal; W. R. Johnston & Co., Toronto; John Calder & Co., Hamilton; George Blanche, Montreal; P. E. Caron & frères, Hull; Doull & Gibson, Montreal; A. S. Campbell & Co., Montreal; J. B. Laliberté, Quebec; that is for furs, I suppose. Now, I find that last year the tenders for clothing were the following:—L. H. Boisseau was the lowest for artillery tunics at \$5.03. There is the original paper, initialled by me, and I will send it to my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron). The next tender was that of the Sanford Co., Hamilton, \$5.60; the next that of John Calder & Co., Hamilton, \$5.65; Mark Workman, \$5.70, and

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

Vincent, \$7.25. Boisseau tendered for engineers' tunics at \$5.03. There are the tenders of Mark Workman, Sanford and Paquet. For infantry tunics Boisseau was the lowest tenderer at \$4.97; the next is that of the Sanford Company at \$5.17. For rifle tunics Boisseau was the lowest at \$4.97, and the Sanford Company came next at \$5.30. Boisseau failed to fulfil his contract, and I went to Sanford, and Doull & Gibson, the next highest. Boisseau never made a dollar's worth of goods, and gave us a great deal of trouble. I repeat what I said before, that in every single case the contract was made with the lowest tenderer, and, when he failed, we gave it to the next lowest tenderer. That has been the invariable rule followed by the department since I came into it.

Mr. BERGERON. These statements, I am sure, are satisfactory to the hon. Minister as much as to us. I want to ask how the department has failed to comply with an Order of the House in not putting in all these tenders.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am very sorry, and I shall inquire into it.

Mr. DOMVILLE. How long have tenders been in the hands of the board of officers? When was that instituted?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It has been the system ever since I have been in the department. I am not sure how long it has been in existence, but it has been the practice for some time.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it Senator Paquet who has tendered and who has sold a great deal of goods to the department?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not able to tell my hon. friend that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to a statement he made here last night in connection with the supplies furnished by Bate & Sons. He made the statement, if I understood him correctly, that flour, corned beef and oil were bought at a price delivered at Vancouver. I hold in my hand the original bills of lading for goods shipped by Bate & Sons on the 5th of May: Way-bill 6239, car No. 23760, 70 cases of corned beef—freight on corned beef, Montreal to Ottawa, \$10.04, making a total freight charge on that car of \$315.26. On the second invoice there is a charge for freight on 42 cases more of corned beef, \$209.17. This is charged for in the invoice, so that the Minister has misled the House, and he has made a statement that requires looking into.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman will be great-

ly relieved in his mind to know that we bought, outside of Bate & Sons, 42 cases of compressed beef in Montreal. That is the explanation.

Mr. TAYLOR. There are 42 cases, and there are 70 cases in the invoices, which appear as having been shipped by Bate & Sons. The 42 cases are on the bill of lading. The department had shipped some cases of goods in H. N. Bate & Sons' car, and this memorandum appears upon one of the bills of lading :

Shipped in H. N. Bate & Sons' car. No requisition given for freight paid by the department to the railway.

These goods were bought by the department outside, but they were shipped with Bate & Sons' goods. Bate & Sons paid the freight on them, and charged it in their bill, the account making \$226.69. There is a reduction made of \$188.98, it is proper to say, but the invoice gives \$226.64 as the gross sum.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am informed by my officers that 70 cases of beef were bought at the last moment to replace a similar quantity of pork which had been ordered from the Hudson's Bay Company, and which order was cancelled. This was bought to replace

the pork, and was sent from here. That is the only portion of the meat upon which we paid freight.

Mr. BRITTON. If Bate & Sons paid the freight, why should they not charge the Government with it ?

Provisions and supplies..... \$112,500

Mr. BERGERON. There is an increase of about \$15,000. What is the explanation ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The explanation is, that we found the amount voted last year rather insufficient. It is possible that this vote may not be all used, but it was thought better to take the vote, as we are bringing back a portion of the Yukon force. As I explained to the committee yesterday, the number of the permanent force had fallen below 800 eighteen months ago, and it has been slightly increased in order to keep up the strength of the schools and make them thoroughly efficient. The object is to provide for remounts, forage and forage allowances, fuel, light, hospital, vegetables, water rates, postage rates, barrack-room furniture, and so forth. I have a detailed statement, if the hon. gentleman would like to hear it. This vote was expended last year as follows :—

PROVISIONS AND SUPPLIES TO PERMANENT CORPS, 1897-98.

	Quebec.	Kingston.	Toronto.	Winnipeg.	London.	St. Johns.	Fredericton.	Yukon.	Provincial Schools.	General.	Total.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Barrack stores, repairs, stoves, pipes and necessary articles, artificers' supplies, &c.....	3,037 11	1,242 33	2,370 95	1,049 69	494 40	798 18	1,436 82	.....	.....	.....	10,435 39
Fuel.....	6,076 77	4,454 41	3,491 90	5,061 95	3,568 41	3,304 46	4,818 84	.....	.....	.....	31,376 83
Light.....	186 17	188 42	226 80	998 41	176 82	264 72	976 10	.....	.....	.....	3,017 44
Meat.....	4,277 05	2,036 81	3,060 10	2,696 27	998 95	2,478 60	1,959 49	.....	.....	.....	17,507 27
Bread.....	1,589 58	855 05	1,519 78	1,411 32	1,388 59	826 45	926 29	.....	.....	.....	8,517 06
Groceries and potatoes.....	2,530 97	1,332 45	1,875 96	1,084 03	1,233 83	1,392 77	1,093 90	.....	.....	.....	10,543 91
Forage and straw.....	3,339 98	3,043 20	3,450 02	3,498 04	160 80	234 08	200 10	.....	.....	.....	13,926 82
Drugs.....	1,148 89	306 39	374 47	692 13	199 11	332 01	231 99	.....	.....	.....	3,284 99
Water.....	2,758 00	268 44	1,042 40	1,000 00	382 80	375 00	300 00	.....	.....	.....	6,726 64
Washing.....	272 76	147 61	294 62	149 68	300 19	225 38	171 04	.....	.....	.....	1,561 28
Cleaning closets and cart- eag.....	1,009 50	235 10	450 90	403 00	68 00	121 00	444 45	.....	.....	.....	2,731 95
Postage and telephones.....	145 10	137 29	120 87	81 08	147 75	29 75	57 68	.....	.....	.....	719 52
Remounts.....	600 00	513 35	450 00	1,000 00	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,563 35
Miscellaneous.....	937 90	90 65	32 50	625 70	128 90	153 15	129 61	3,193 00	28 21	1,084 49	6,820 50
Allowance for rations.....	.....	.....	.....	416 39	.....	.....	.....	.....	194 81	.....	194 81
	28,509 78	14,851 50	19,307 36	20,168 20	9,248 55	10,535 55	12,746 31	3,193 00	223 02	1,084 49	119,927 76
Average number drawing rations (including attached Co.) .....	No. 197	No. 134	No. 172	No. 80	No. 90	No. 88	No. 94	No.	No.	No.	
Cost of maintenance per man—Forage and re- mounts not included.....	\$ cts. 125 00	\$ cts. 84 00	\$ cts. 80 00	\$ cts. 194 00	\$ cts. 103 00	\$ cts. 120 00	\$ cts. 136 00				

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister took a considerable time a few moments ago to explain to the House the effect the National Policy was having in making a reduction in the price of goods. Notwithstanding the fact that the militia does not require a larger amount of supplies, the amount of money that the hon. gentleman is spending is increased by \$15,000 this year. I find by the Auditor General's Report, L-53, that the Aikenhead Hardware Co., of Toronto, supplied goods to the value of \$2,152.43, amongst which was a lawn-mower for the squadron of cavalry at Toronto, for which \$145 was charged. There is another lawn-mower at \$17. I would like the hon. Minister to explain why \$145 should be paid for a lawn-mower.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I suppose it is a mowing machine.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, I am prepared to say that you can purchase the best horse-power mower for \$80. The hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior) made inquiries as to the value of that article, and he says that you can purchase a hand-mower for from \$7 to \$8, if these goods had been purchased by tender. This firm also charged for nine stable buckets \$22.50, or \$2.50 for each stable bucket. Curry-combs were charged for at 48 cents apiece.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I can only say that those purchases, which are made without tender, and a large number are made by tender, are made upon the requisition of the officer in charge of the depot to the head officer here, if the prices are, in his opinion, fair and just. I never see these papers; they come here, and go through the office in due form; authority is given, and they are returned. The system we have now is precisely the system that has been in operation since confederation, except that there has been a change in the parties who supplied the goods. The prices will be found to be quite as good, if not better, than those formerly paid. I shall go carefully into the whole system, however, and if improper charges have been made, I shall take steps to have the money refunded, if there is any way to have that done. I say that candidly and frankly. I know nothing of these people; I never saw them. They were recommended to me as reputable, honest, decent tradespeople, and I believe they are such; but I shall take some trouble to inquire more particularly as to these people and the prices.

Mr. TAYLOR. The fact that the Minister is asking for a very much larger sum for the same supplies proves that he is paying exorbitant prices for them. I presume the practice is for him to give his officer a list of names of people from whom he is to buy supplies, and the officer simply goes to them and pays

them their prices. Aikenhead & Co. furnished fourteen kegs of horseshoes for \$90, and six boxes of horseshoe nails for \$28.35; whereas anybody knows that you can buy horseshoes at \$2.25 a keg, and horseshoe nails at \$4. The hon. gentleman must be paying extravagant prices when he is asking \$15,000 more than was asked last year, and probably \$25,000 more than the Conservative Government administered this department for. The fact is that this Government is giving away the public money to political favourites by purchasing supplies from them and allowing them to charge what prices they see fit.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is a standing order that officers shall obtain two or more tenders for all goods, and in addition to that they are required to certify that the prices are fair and just before the purchase is authorized.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see that on the invoice. It is a rubber stamp.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not know that a rubber stamp makes it any less binding.

Mr. HUGHES. I wish to call the Minister's attention to the fact that the terms used in item 109 are not correct military language, because the permanent corps are a part of the militia. I also wish to call his attention to the unsanitary condition of some of the barracks; in fact, the whole system of buildings is antediluvian. In regard to the horses, in the recent staff ride of three days through the Niagara peninsula, a large number of the troopers' horses gave out, whereas the private horses taken from livery stables stood the ride a great deal better. The horses of the permanent corps do not appear able to stand these hard rides as well as the ordinary horses of the country. I hope the Minister will inquire into that.

Mr. TYRWHITT. My experience with regard to the horses has been the very reverse. I have bought and sold hundreds of horses, and my experience is that the horses of the permanent corps are in first-class condition.

Mr. HUGHES. That may be true, so long as they are prancing around in their own little menage; but I am stating what actually occurred.

Militia Department—

Transport and freight..... \$36,000

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The details are as follows: Transport at headquarters, district staff officers, and officers of the permanent corps on inspection and other duties, annual drill excepted, \$12,000; militia attending schools of instruction, \$10,000; freight charges on military stores, \$18,000. The total expenditure in 1895-96 was \$37,483. In 1896-97, \$43,997; and in 1897-98, \$39,927. I may say that the work in this branch is increasing.

but we are not asking for an increased vote because under an arrangement made a couple of years ago, we have reduced the cost of transport 33 per cent ; so that we are able to do one-third more work with the same amount of money.

Mr. HUGHES. I wish to protest against the staff college course at Kingston being continued as it is at present conducted. While the men from the civil service are as a rule thoroughly capable men, many of them are not by any means superior to the rest of the officers of the militia force ; and while an officer in the civil service of Canada may be able to spend four months at Kingston, it is out of the question for an ordinary volunteer officer to give up his time and business for that length of time.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Might I suggest whether in the opinion of the hon. gentleman the staff course could not be divided ?

Mr. HUGHES. The suggestion I was going to make was that the department should furnish to the militia officers of the country the books that would enable them to read up the course instead of being compelled to attend the college for four months ; and they could wind up with a week or two at Kingston. The history of the British army and of all campaigns the world over proves that unless a man has actual genius in him, no amount of staff work will make him a soldier.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. When the suggestion was made that a staff course should be given in connection with the Royal Military College, it seemed to me a desirable move in the way of putting the college to practical use. There is a great deal of force in what my hon. friend says ; but, at the same time, I would be hardly justified in calling the course a failure without seeing whether some modification could not be made by which it could be continued.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the Minister give us some explanation of the large items on page L-64 of the Auditor General's Report. For instance, what is the meaning of the payment of \$7,560 to the Grand Trunk Railway ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is the transport of stores from one point to another, and also the transport of troops for their annual drill.

Mr. WALLACE. I suppose that the cost of the transport of troops would come under the head either of annual drill or pay and allowances ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, there is an item of \$12,000 for the transport of the headquarters and district staff officers and officers of the

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

permanent corps at inspection and other duties, annual drill excepted. We pay their transport both ways.

Mr. WALLACE. But here are a number of items, Canadian Pacific Railway, \$2,716 ; Canadian Pacific Navigation Company, \$578 ; Grand Trunk Railway, \$7,560 ; Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, \$289 ; Intercolonial Railway, \$1,540, and so on.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have already given the item \$12,000. There is also militia attending schools of instruction, \$10,000—that would be partly paid to the railways ; freight charges, military school, \$18,000—that also would be partly paid to the railways.

Mr. WALLACE. At page L-61-62-63, Auditor General's Report, we have charges of thousands of dollars attending schools of instruction. But you have there the names of the persons who are paid, so these can hardly be included in the items the hon. Minister has given.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is an item, "Attending schools of instruction," \$10,000.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I see the right hon. First Minister in his place, and I desire to ask him a question with regard to this item No. 111. But before asking the question, I may say that I sometimes get an opportunity of agreeing with the Government and with the First Minister—and this is one of the opportunities. I fully agree with the First Minister's views, as expressed last night, with regard to the withdrawal of troops from the Yukon. I am sure that public sentiment will support the Government even if they determine to keep the whole force now in the Yukon in that territory. The Minister of Militia stated that half the force would be withdrawn. I think that before such action is taken there should be the grave consideration, and I am quite in accord on this point with the views of the right hon. First Minister. If it were a question of sending the troops into the Yukon at the present time, the number might be considered, but the troops are there, and they should be kept in that country until the various centres are furnished with local or municipal police, and with the equipment for municipal government the same as in eastern cities. The presence of a permanent force in that country has, to my mind, done a world of good. As to the Mounted Police, we all know that they are an efficient body. But Major Walsh is a Mounted Police man, and, very possibly, he would like to have the credit of all the kudos accruing in connection with the government of that country for the Mounted Police. Notwithstanding his opinion, I think the Government are acting wisely in

deliberating before they withdraw the permanent force as a protective force from that country. The Americans have troops along the international boundary. I am told that they are sending troops there to-day; and I think it would be wise to keep the permanent force there, for unpleasant circumstances may arise that may require the co-operation of the forces of Canada and the United States in the preservation of order.

Now I desire to ask the right hon. the First Minister a question with regard to a statement made to-day in Washington in connection with the Mounted Police. If he will give me a reply, I think it will be appreciated by the public of this country. I have received the following telegram:—

(Washington special to New York.)

New York, July 11.—The "World" says an unofficial intimation has reached the State Department that the Canadian Government intends to send to the Porcupine region, in Alaska, a body of mounted police to maintain order. If this proves correct the administration will meet the situation by ordering troops to Pyramid Harbour.

I have also a despatch from Washington saying that the British Embassy does not credit the story. I do not know whether the First Minister can give me a full reply from the fact that this refers to a removal of the Mounted Police under the direction of the Yukon officials, and he may not yet be aware of such a movement. But I find on the map that this Porcupine River and region, no doubt the part of country alluded to, is about 300 miles north of Dawson. It is probable that such a move might have been made by the officials in the Yukon, and I would like to ask the First Minister whether his department, which, as I understand, has charge of the Mounted Police, has any information as to this proposed movement. I cannot, I may say, understand why a movement of troops or police away north of Dawson should cause the Americans to send troops to Pyramid Harbour, which is in another direction. Perhaps my right hon. friend can explain.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I think I can give my hon. friend the information he asks for. There is in that part of the country the Porcupine River and also Porcupine Creek. Porcupine Creek is a tributary of the Klabeela, which discharges in Chilcat River, at about five miles from Pyramid Harbour. We have had that post for about two years. Porcupine Creek is in that direction, at a short distance from the post. We have no intention, at the present time, of fortifying the post we have already there. I believe we have ten men at that point. There are some mining camps on the Porcupine Creek. There are two creeks, the junction of which form Porcupine Creek. Our American friends have called one Bryan and the other

McKinley. We believe, so far as we have information, that the force we have in that vicinity is quite sufficient to maintain law and order at that place. Our force is on the Dalton Trail at a place known as Dalton's Cache, only a few miles—it may be one or two miles—from Dalton's Cache. We have been told that the American authorities intend to send a force to Pyramid Harbour. If it were not breaking a state secret, I would say that, for my part, I would strongly object that the Americans should send any force into that disputed territory under existing circumstances, so long as the question of permanent boundary has not been settled.

Mr. WALLACE. We have not yet had the explanation from the Minister of Militia as to these items. If the hon. gentleman will give us some detail, for instance, this item of \$7,560 for the Grand Trunk Railway, that will be sufficient.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am informed that that includes about 10,000 items—clothing, military stores, boots and shoes, blacking brushes, blacking—I can hardly go through the list; I think my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) can hardly be serious in asking me to give information of that kind.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think the hon. Minister heard my question.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have already told the hon. gentleman what the vote was for.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman told me before that he did not know.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I told him nothing of the kind.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not mean to be rude—

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will read if the hon. gentleman will permit me—

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister does not understand—

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. All right, the hon. gentleman does not want to have his question answered.

Mr. WALLACE. If it were parliamentary, I would say that that was an impertinence. I should be quite in order in saying it is another of those ebullitions of courtesy in which the hon. gentleman sometimes indulges. I do not think I am asking too much in asking for the information I have suggested—some details as to this item of \$7,560 to the Grand Trunk Railway. The facts will be an indication as to what services are rendered by the railway companies and other transportation

companies, and will be, so far as I am concerned, satisfactory. But the hon. Minister goes to his secretary and comes back with a reply, which, to say the least, is not very polite. But everybody has his own opinion of politeness, and we must let the Minister judge for himself. He said that this item was for blacking brushes and other things. That makes it still worse, in my opinion. I understood him to say that these items were for transporting the permanent corps from one headquarters to another. I presume that where there is an exchange of the corps at Quebec and Toronto, each would not take its own supplies, but would leave the supplies where they had been tendered for and delivered. So, there could be no charge for freight. Then we know that the railways carry the personal baggage of passengers free.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have no desire to appear impatient; but I think the hon. gentleman and the committee will overlook anything of that kind when they recollect that I have been here since ten o'clock last night, that I have not had a wink of sleep and have been listening, or trying to listen, to the questions that the hon. gentlemen have plied me with.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman was absent many times.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) does not accept my statement, I cannot help it. I have told the hon. gentleman that \$12,000 of this vote is for the transport of headquarters and district staff officers and officers of the permanent corps on inspection and other duties, annual drill excepted. Does the hon. gentleman accept that?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Another statement which I make for the third time is that \$10,000 of this vote is for the active militia officers, non-commissioned officers and men going to the headquarters to their respective battalions, to the respective schools and depots and back home again. Thus the hon. gentleman has got \$22,000. \$18,000 of it is for freight charges on military stores. Military stores are made up of camp equipment of various kinds which are used by the military, and it is to pay freight charges.

Mr. WALLACE. Do not the contractors supplying goods deliver them where they are required free of charge?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In nearly all cases they do.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. Minister to explain an item that appears on page L-59 and 60 of the Auditor

Mr. WALLACE.

General's Report. I find that there is a charge of \$10,012.58 for travelling expenses of officers, made up in part of hotel bills at \$5 per day. I see the following account:—

Major Robert Cartwright, two months' pay on removal to headquarters, \$466.66; travelling expenses, \$125.40..... \$592 06

Who is Major Cartwright, and where was he removed from? Is he the son of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright)?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes. I think he was stationed at London before he was appointed to his present position as Assistant Adjutant General.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is not the sum of \$10,000 of the money of the people a great deal to have been paid for the travelling expenses and removal of officers? No wonder the hon. Minister is asking for an increased vote.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have not asked for it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, there is an increase of \$10,000 this year. You asked for \$30,000 last year, and you are asking for \$40,000 this year.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I had to take a vote in the supplementary Estimates.

Mr. TAYLOR. Here is one account:

Travelling expenses, \$87.10; hotel allowance at Montreal, 10 days, \$50; cab-hire at Ottawa, \$18.50; travelling expenses of man servant, \$85.20; board of horses at Montreal, \$6.50; board of groom, \$7.50; on account of expenses of trip to England, \$500..... \$954 80

There is \$10,000 of the people's money asked for militia purposes that does not reach the militia at all, but is simply given to officials to travel around the country.

Mr. WALLACE. Is that account of expenses to which the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has referred for a trip coming from as well as going to England?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. WALLACE. Who is the money for?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. General Gascoigne. This is for his return to England.

Mr. WALLACE. Can the hon. Minister tell us how an eight or ten-day trip across the Atlantic would cost \$500?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. These gentlemen travel in state, you know. He took his family and servants.

Mr. WALLACE. Is that usually allowed?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think this is usual.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is it usual, when you remove an officer and give him a promotion, to pay him \$466 ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This thing is provided for by the regulations. It is based upon a scale, and I suppose it includes the moving of his family and all the expenses connected with his transfer to Ottawa.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was his salary before he was removed to Ottawa ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. He was paid by the day ; I could not tell the hon. gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is his salary now ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. \$2,800.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was his salary previous to the appointment ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I told the hon. gentleman that I cannot say. He was an officer of the permanent force receiving so much per day according to his rank. I suppose he would get a captain's pay of about \$3-a day and allowance.

Mr. TYRWHITT. The answer of the hon. Minister is perfectly correct. He receives the pay of his rank and allowance.

Mr. TAYLOR. Three dollars a day would amount to about \$1,128 a year. Assuming that it is \$1,128 a year, you gave him a bonus of \$466 besides that on coming to Ottawa, and allowed him \$125 travelling expenses.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. He simply got what any other officer in the militia receives.

Mr. HUGHES. This \$466 was two months' pay, and not a bonus.

Mr. WALLACE. We have not had a satisfactory statement of these expenses which are increasing. The vote is increased from \$30,000 to \$40,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I explained to the hon. gentleman that I had a vote in the supplementary Estimates. The expenses this year have been about the same. In fact, they are rather less than they were three or four years ago.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister last year asked for \$30,000, but he did not find it sufficient, as it is one of those items under which we may spend a lot of money. The hon. Minister came in with a supplementary estimate for 1899 and asked for \$10,000, making \$40,000. He considers this year that \$40,000 will be sufficient. Presum-

ably in another year we will have him coming down and asking for an increase of that amount. This is one of those items that the hon. Minister would have very largely under his control and would be, to that extent, more responsible than for some other items.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Not to the extent of one dollar.

Mr. WALLACE. Then the hon. Minister has no control over his department. We would expect that the Minister of Militia and Defence, who has charge of a department in which the officers are more amenable to discipline than officials in departments, would have the orders carried out that he gives. Yet he tells us that he has no control, to the amount of a single dollar, over these travelling expenses. I think that where moneys are voted in this way Parliament is abrogating its functions.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. What I meant to say was that I did not have anything to do with the details of these expenditures. The officers in the military branch arrange what officers shall go from the permanent force to the schools, and they arrange the question of transport of stores. Of course, I am responsible for the expenditure of every dollar of money that is expended in my department. What I meant to say was that, so far as these items are concerned, I assume that my officers know their business and act on the regulations. My Deputy Minister checks these expenditures and sees that the money is properly expended. As a matter of fact the military branch controls this expenditure and the Auditor General looks into it to see that no improper use is made of the money voted.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think it will be satisfactory for the hon. Minister to tell us that his officers, in the performance of their duties, act on the regulations. I assume that the officers of the Militia Department in that regard are very much like officers of other departments, and that if you give a large amount of money to them to spend, so that they can go where they please to have a good time, no doubt they will have a good time. The country votes \$92,000 over the \$2,000,000 mark for the purposes of defence. We vote that money willingly if we know that it will be wisely expended. While we know that the private soldier performs his duties and gets very small pay, while the martial and soldierly spirit of the volunteers are matters of admiration, while we act in a niggardly way in dealing with our volunteer service, we are proceeding with a lavish hand so far as these officers are concerned.

Mr. BERGERON. The nabobs.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister should exercise a restraining hand and keep a control of this expenditure. The Minister is apparently as much in dark as to these expenditures as we are, but he undertakes to give an explanation which is not very much of an explanation after all. We know that the Minister has had a long siege. We know that he has been here from ten o'clock last night until six o'clock this evening and that he has not had a wink of sleep. I regret that, but I repel any insinuation that any one on this side of the House is in any degree responsible for that state of affairs. We were willing that the House should adjourn at a reasonable hour and that the business of Parliament should go on. All that the hon. Minister has to do is to look straight in front of him and he will see the cause of all his troubles. He must not blame us, but he had better blame his colleague sitting directly in front of him. The very idea of obstruction is obnoxious to us.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does not seem to hurt you.

Mr. WALLACE. There is another insinuation that we have been obstructing, but if the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair), by that means that obstruction does not seem to hurt us, he is quite right. I think that the hon. Minister of Militia who is wearied might appeal to his colleagues to let up, but so far as we are concerned, we are here doing our duty criticising, in a feeble way, it may be, the Estimates that are before the House, but anxious to get full information about all these expenditures for which we will be held responsible by the country.

Mr. TYRWHITT. In regard to the expenses connected with the transfer of officers from one headquarters to another and in discussing the relative pay, as between an officer and a private, hon. members forget occasionally that there is a great deal of capital invested in the education of an officer of the permanent force. Before he becomes fit to hold a position in the permanent corps he should, strictly speaking, have taken a course at the Royal Military College or elsewhere. After expending all this money, he receives in return less than any ordinary bricklayer or skilled mechanic. At first sight this appears to be a large sum, but we seldom find soldiers become rich, and the officers have to live in a certain social state, and to keep up appearances. All these expenses connected with the transfer can easily be explained to show that the officers reap no advantage from it themselves. The rule in regard to appointing to the permanent corps men who have been fitted by education for their positions, is not always strictly adhered to. I know personally a great many officers of that corps who have not been at the Royal

Mr. WALLACE.

Military College and who learned their profession after their appointment at the expense of the country. I hope, however, that future appointments will be given to men who have qualified at the schools provided by the country for their education, instead of to men who happen to be friends of the party in power.

Royal Military College..... \$63,000

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase here of \$15,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is only an apparent increase; it is not real. This is due to the fact that the number of cadets has largely increased, and it is necessary to estimate for a larger amount, but the net expenses of the college are less than before. The fees paid by the cadets, amounting to about \$25,000, go to the Receiver General, and the department does not get the credit for them. But, as a matter of fact, the expenditure will be \$10,000 or \$15,000 less than last year.

Mr. SPROULE. What are the fees at the college?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. \$300 the first year, and \$250 per year afterwards. These fees pay all the expenses, including books, board and clothing.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Have any pupils been admitted without having passed the matriculation examination?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister is positive?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Quite sure.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be in order for the Minister to give us some idea of the working and success of the institution.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. A year ago 34 or 36 new students were admitted; the year before that about the same number. This year there are places for 30, so that during the next year there will be an attendance of something like 90. In 1896 the number in attendance was 56. I think 11 went up for graduation this year. I may say in general terms that the college seems to be exceedingly prosperous and is doing excellent work—quite as good as it has ever done.

Mr. HUGHES. Both before and since Col. Kitson took charge of the college I have taken an interest in it, and I may say that the universal opinion is that a finer institution has never existed in any country. Col. Kitson is a man of thorough judgment

and tact, and he manages the boys in excellent shape.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have no doubt that the school is prosperous and is doing a good work; and yet I think it might, so far as Canadian interests are concerned, do a better work still. Has the Minister considered the question of giving positions in the civil service to graduates of the school?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, and I have thought that while we ought to do something at Ottawa, the provincial governments might also be asked to co-operate to some extent, and I have written to the premiers of some of the provinces on the subject. I think it would be hardly fair to take all the appointments to the permanent force away from the militia, but I have made up my mind to give the artillery appointments, which are technical, exclusively to the college, and as many as possible of the others. I would ask the committee to let the rest of these items go through with the understanding that any further discussion on any of the remaining items may be had on one item, which is allowed to stand at the request of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague). I would be very glad if the committee would agree to that.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member can hardly ask that.

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

After Recess.

Royal Military College..... \$70,000

Mr. BRITTON. I do not intend to detain the committee very long, but there are two or three things I want to call attention to. The first thing the committee ought to notice is the smallness of the amount asked for the maintenance of this institution. The amount hitherto has been in the neighbourhood of \$50,000 to \$55,000, but owing to the increase in the staff and other improvements, the amount is now \$70,000 out of a total of \$1,700,000 odd for military purposes in the Dominion. No one who has ever attended or visited the Military College or taken pains to read anything about it, can fail to admit that for so small an expenditure a very large result has been obtained, if there is any advantage at all in having money expended for military purposes in Canada. It is a first-class institution in every respect, and growing in the public estimation every year. The present year the students number 74, or very nearly up to the capacity of the institution at present, and the number of applicants this year is in excess of the capacity of the institution, and very much in excess of any previous year. That in itself speaks well for

its management and the interest that the public are taking in it. As was said the other night, in reply to the leader of the Opposition, the reduction in the term from four to three years and the reduction in the fees have proved most beneficial. Complaint was made, while the four years course obtained, that the college was in competition with the other educational institutions of the Dominion. It was complained that here was a Dominion fed institution in direct competition with these colleges, such as the University of Toronto, Victoria College at Toronto, the Queen's College at Kingston, McGill of Montreal, and the other Canadian institutions, but this shortening of the term removes to some extent that objection. And by increasing the age and requiring a higher standard—

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is it now?

Mr. BRITTON. It is increased from 15 to 16. These improvements are likely to be of lasting benefit for the purposes intended. There have been 261 graduates from the institution since its establishment. That does not seem a very large number for the length of time it has been in existence, but when we consider its capacity and the limited number that necessarily can take advantage of its educational course, the number is quite a large one. Over and above the 261 graduates, there are students who, for various causes, were obliged to leave before their term was finished—change of circumstances, ill-health and other causes. In addition to the graduates who are holding positions of responsibility and trust and showing to advantage in different parts of Canada, in different walks of life, I have a list here of those who have served with distinction in the cause of the Empire outside of Canada, and which I desire to read and put on record:

J. Irvine Lang, C.M.G., R.E.  
Captain J. Irvine Lang, R.E., was appointed an ordinary member of the third class or Companion of the Order of St. Michael and St. George for services in connection with the railway survey and the delimitation of the western boundary of the Gold Coast Colony.  
Graduated in 1883.

W. E. Cooke.  
Captain W. E. Cooke, late Royal Canadian Artillery, was seconded for service under the Imperial Government, in the Uganda Protectorate. He was shot by a brother officer, who was suffering from temporary insanity at the time.  
Graduated in 1890.

E. V. O. Hewett.  
E. V. O. Hewett, Royal West Kent Regiment, took part in the operations on the North-west frontier of India, and rendered excellent services, being mentioned in despatches. He was first appointed superintendent army signalling to the 1st Brigade, Malakand field force, and with that force took part in the operations in Upper Swat and Bajour. Was then appointed divisional superintendent to the same force for the operations against the "Utman Khel," and filled the same appointment with the "Buner field force."

Obtained a commission after two years' attendance at the Royal Military College.

H. C. Smith.

Captain H. C. Smith, Royal Dublin Fusiliers, served in the operations in the Soudan, attached to the Egyptian Army. He was twice mentioned in despatches for services rendered, by Major-General Lord Kitchener of Khartoum.

Obtained a commission after three years' attendance at the Royal Military College.

D. S. MacInnes and C. C. Van Straubenzee.

Lieut. D. S. MacInnes and Captain C. C. Van Straubenzee, the former of the Royal Engineers and the latter of the Royal Artillery, rendered good services in connection with the late expedition to Ashanti.

Lieut. D. S. MacInnes graduated in 1891.

Captain C. C. Van Straubenzee obtained a commission after two years' attendance at the Royal Military College.

P. G. Twining.

Captain P. G. Twining, Royal Engineers, served on the first Uganda survey, under Colonel Macdonald.

Graduated in 1883.

Huntley Brodie Mackay.

Captain, Royal Engineers. Served with distinction in Bechuanaland (1884-5), and as commanding Royal Engineers on the west coast of Africa (1887-9). In recognition of his services in expeditions against the tribes near Sierra Leone he received the Distinguished Service Order. Died of fever at Mombasa, 16th April, 1891, whilst acting administrator to the Imperial British East Africa Company.

Graduated in 1881.

William Grant Stairs.

Captain, the Welsh Regiment; Lieutenant, the Royal Engineers, 1885-91. Served on the staff of the Emin Pasha relief expedition, 1887-90, under the leadership of H. M. Stanley, and exhibited great courage and devotion to duty. Died of fever on the 9th of June, 1892, at Chinde, on the Zambesi, whilst in command of the Katanga expedition, sent out by the King of the Belgians.

Graduated in 1882.

William Henry Robinson.

Captain, Royal Engineers. Rendered valuable services as commanding Royal Engineers, west coast of Africa, 1889-92. Killed in action on the 14th March, 1892, whilst with conspicuous bravery blowing in the gate of the stockaded village of Tambi, near Sierra Leone.

Graduated in 1882.

K. J. R. Campbell, D.S.O.

Captain Campbell, late of the Suffolk Regiment, was made a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order for services in the operations against the Chief Nanna of Benin, during the period August to October, 1894. He was then employed with the forces of the Niger Coast Protectorate.

Discharged from College at his own request after two years' attendance at the Royal Military College.

E. P. C. Girouard, D.S.O., C.E.

Major Girouard, of the Royal Engineers, was made a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order in recognition of services during the operations in the Soudan (the Dongola expedition). He was appointed President of the Egyptian Railway Administration in June, 1898, at a salary of £2,000 per annum.

Graduated in 1886.

G. M. Duff and H. C. Nanton.

Captains G. M. Duff and H. C. Nanton, of the Royal Engineers, rendered good services in the

Mr. BRITTON.

Chitral district. They were selected and placed in charge of the operations at Malakand and Chakdara. They laid out and superintended the erections of the fortifications at these points. Captain Duff at Chakdara and Captain Nanton at Malakand.

Captain Duff graduated in 1882.

Captain Nanton graduated in 1883.

C. M. Dobell.

Lieutenant, Royal Welsh Fusiliers. Has been noted for consideration for the brevet rank of major on promotion to the rank of Captain, in recognition of services during the occupation of Crete.

Captains D. H. Ridout, H. C. Carey and Lieut.

H. G. Joly de Lotbinière.

All of the Corps of Royal Engineers.

Are employed at the War Office, in the office of the Inspector General of Fortifications, and are doing good work.

That is the honour roll of this institution, but is by no means embraces all the graduates who have earned distinction for valuable services at home and abroad. The officers I have mentioned are not only popular with their own regiments, but have had their services recognized by the highest authorities in Great Britain. Two of them have been loaned to us, and are now on the staff of the college at Kingston—Captain Twining, whose time has now expired and who is returning to his regiment, and Lieut.-Col. Leslie, the son of a distinguished citizen of the city I represent. These men are not only popular and distinguished for their ability in their regiments, but have proved most capable teachers in the college to which they have been loaned. No more popular professor than Lieut. Leslie is on the staff. Certain improvements are absolutely necessary, and I hope the hon. Minister will bear this in mind, when preparing his supplementary estimates. A hospital and new gymnasium are necessary, and both will be appreciated, not only by the present students, but by those who come after. I hope people in this country will take increasing pride in the Royal Military College. There is nothing that has done more to advertise Canada abroad. If we decide that we cannot afford, or for any good reason we do not desire, to continue to spend our money for militia purposes, the Royal Military College may go by the board with the rest; but, so long as we expend money for these purposes, then this institution, as a centre, at a site unrivalled in the world—and I do not think I am putting that too strongly—is an institution in which we should take a growing pride, and which should not be starved.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I have listened with pride to the list of names read by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) of graduates of the Royal Military College who have done honour to themselves, to their alma mater and to the country. I am a friend of the college at Kingston, and, if I had twenty sons, I would send them all

to that institution. In my election in 1896, I regret to say, one of the subjects discussed on almost every stump was the college at Kingston, and I found it necessary to post myself in order to defend that institution. Although the college was attacked to my detriment at that time, I shall always bear kindly feelings toward that institution. It may be possible that the high grade of the institution may not be kept up to the standard, owing to the shortening of the term of service, and—I was going to say—the lowering of the fees. I hope the lowering of the fees and shortening the term will have the desired result of causing an increase in the attendance, and I hope that the high standard that has characterized the college, will continue.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt) has touched upon a point it was my intention to bring forward. I cannot refrain, however, from saying to the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) that the ardent appeal he made for sympathy with and pride in the Royal Military College need not be addressed to this side of the House. If he had been a member of the last Parliament, he would have addressed his appeals for sympathy to those sitting about him. If there was one subject more than another for which the late Government were bitterly criticised, both in this House and by the candidates of the Liberal party in the country, it was upon the Royal Military College.

Mr. BRITTON. They could not have understood it.

Mr. TYRWHITT. Like many other things.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As my hon. friend (Mr. Tyrwhitt) remarks, like many other things. They spoke of that which they did not understand. The statements they made were known to be absolutely ridiculous by the members of the Government and supporters of the Government, but it was one of the strong points of attack made on the Conservative candidate, especially in the country constituencies. But now the same thing has come to pass that we find in reference to other subjects in which the Conservative party were attacked. We are called upon now to listen to praises loud and long of this institution, for maintaining which we were attacked, when in power. It seems that the great Patron party has dropped from its platform one of its strongest planks. I do not see the members who were elected upon the Patron platform, except the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Lang). But, if I recollect correctly, the Patron party made all sorts of attacks upon the college at Kingston. It was said to be an institution maintained by the Family Compact, the old Tory Government, upon Tory lines, and for the education of gentle-

men's sons at the expense of the country. There was not a platform upon which the Patron speakers did not indulge in the most bitter criticism of the late Government because they maintained this very college of which the present Government and its supporters speak with such pride to-night. And here we are passing an increased sum for the maintenance of this college. And the gentlemen who were elected specially to protect the agricultural interests, of which interests the two old parties were said to be neglectful, are absent from the House, or are sitting absolutely silent while this increased vote is going through for this college which was maintained, according to them, for the purpose of educating the sons of gentlemen at the public expense. We join heartily in the pride which has been expressed by the hon. member for Kingston—whose pride, I am sure, is not local, or, if in part it is local, it is mainly national. We join heartily in the expression of pride at the success of that college. We are also pleased to note the evidence of the abandonment of one of their planks by the candidates who were talking and canvassing against the members supporting the late Government in connection with this question. It is only another evidence that the late Government were right in maintaining this institution, and that the candidates supporting the hon. gentlemen were wrong, when they appealed to the country against the expenditure.

Mr. HUGHES. In regard to the present curriculum of the Royal Military College, I have given the matter considerable attention and have conversed with those who have given it much more. The age of admission to the college and the standard of admission are both increased. A cadet cannot join at as early an age as formerly, and he must have a higher degree of education before he joins. I understand that considerable of what may be called ordinary literary work which is usually regarded as being part of a high school and minor college course, has to be acquired before he enters now. Formerly much time was taken up in the study of non-essential branches. At the present time the course, I am assured, is as difficult as ever, in all the essentials of a military education and in the higher mathematics. I understand that the third-year men who have gone in under the new regime have graduated with as high honours as the fourth-year men.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have not heard the Minister explain why he has increased the vote this year from \$55,000 to \$70,000.

THE MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have explained that the increased number of students made it necessary to increase the vote, but that the real net cost to the country would be less. The receipts will be considerably larger, and it is merely

a matter of book-keeping, because the amount of money received is paid into the Receiver General, and the college does not get direct credit for it. But as a matter of fact, the cost to the country will be less this year than it has been last year.

Mr. CLANCY. What were the receipts last year?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman will find it in the Auditor General's Report, L-94. Last year, they were \$15,883. It is estimated this year they will be near \$10,000 more.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I notice there are certain advertisements in connection with this college. In what papers are they published?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They have been published chiefly in serial almanacs, the Montreal "Gazette," the "Globe," and, I think, the "Herald," and the "Canadian Monthly."

Mr. MONTAGUE. Chiefly Liberal papers.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The Montreal "Gazette," I think, is not a Liberal paper.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the Montreal "Gazette" is the only Conservative paper which gets an advertisement in this connection.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It may be so, but I remember giving it to every one who has applied for advertisement. I may say that we have discontinued these advertisements now, because we feel that the college is sufficiently well known. We have spent a good deal of money in that way, and we do not intend in years to come to spend any more.

Mr. TAYLOR. How many cadets were admitted last year?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think thirty-six. There are seventy-four students there now, in the three classes. The first year they pay \$300, and the second and third year, \$250. This year we give six commissions. I think recently the commandant told me that he had been asked to send an extra cadet, making seven.

Miscellaneous and unforeseen..... \$20,000

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I would like to ask the Minister a question in connection with item 112, that is, the rifle association grants. The Minister is aware that every year we send over to Bisley twenty men to compete at the National Rifle Association meeting. I am informed that up to two years ago the entrance fees of the competitors from Canada were paid by the Dominion Rifle Association. I am informed, however, that during the past two years these entrance fees have to be paid by the men. I would ask the Minister to inform me of

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

the reason for this change, and why the twenty men who enter for these prizes at Bisley are now compelled to pay their own entrance fees instead of the fees being paid by the Dominion Rifle Association, as formerly.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I may say to my hon. friend that these men are sent forward under the auspices of the Dominion Rifle Association. I was not aware of the fact which the hon. gentleman mentions, but it is not a matter over which the Government has any direct control, although as we subsidize the Dominion Rifle Association, I suppose we might be able to exert some influence in the matter. Since my hon. friend has called my attention to the matter, I will ask for an explanation.

Mr. HUGHES. I may say that the team is sent over entirely under the auspices of the Dominion of Canada Rifle Association. Since the erection of the Bisley building the association found themselves a little out of pocket. Owing to the liberality of the Minister of Militia and Defence last year, as you will see by the grant to the Dominion Rifle Association, the additional \$5,000 was given to the association, which greatly relieved us of the debt which the association incurred by the erection of that very fine building on Bisley Common. I may say concerning these fees that it was a measure which was reluctantly adopted by the association in order to keep the expenses of the team down as low as possible. The expenses of the team are all borne from the time they leave home until they return. They have a very nice time, and all their earnings in the matches are pooled and divided up amongst themselves. While we were reluctantly obliged to ask these men to pay their own entrance fee, I hope, and it is the intention, that as soon as the association is financially strong enough, these fees will be again paid to the men, that is the intention of the association. There is really no great hardship. It is a matter the Government has no control over.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would the Minister explain why he asks for an increase of \$5,000? I think the hon. Minister and the Government promised to economize. On every vote save and except one—grants to rifle associations—the hon. Minister has made an increase of from \$5,000 to \$40,000 and \$50,000. I wonder where the economy is going to come in. In his small vote of unforeseen expenses last year he asked for \$15,000, and this year he is asking for an extra \$5,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. When the supplementary Estimates for last year were before the committee there was a full discussion between the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), and myself in reference to this item, and several others in which the annual vote

for years has been too small, and we have been borrowing from the next year to pay the previous year's expenditures. This is precisely one of those votes, and I read to the committee, item by item, every dollar of the expenditure which now amounts to about the sum that we are asking for in this estimate. I said to the House then, that in the main Estimates, for this year, we had taken a sum which would be sufficient for our requirements and we would not ask for a supplementary vote at the end of the present year. In regard to the reduction of the vote for rifle associations I explained before that that is due to the fact that last year we gave a special vote, as the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior) has stated, in aid of the construction of the Bisley building. That is ended, the money is not required and we are coming back to the normal condition of the vote.

Mr. MORIN. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence to a practice which has become too prevalent in some parts of the country in regard to the militia. It has been pursued in my county and probably elsewhere. A number of young men give their names in for enlistment in the volunteer force, but when the time comes to go to drill they do not go. They send young men, ranging in age from 16 to 17 years, in their places. The one whose name is entered on the rolls draws his full pay, and gives the boy who acts as his substitute 20 or 25 cents or 30 cents a day to take his place. These men are doing nothing more or less than speculating at the expense of the Government. Of course when these men go down to drill it should not be merely for their pleasure. If they do not attend drill they will not get that instruction which they require. I would be sorry to see them punished for not attending, but I would suggest to the hon. Minister, that substitutes should not be permitted to take their places and that a stop be put to this practice. It will save the Government a considerable amount of money.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I may say that I am very much obliged to my hon. friend (Mr. Morin) for calling my attention to this matter. I had no idea that anything of the kind was possible, and I will see that the matter is inquired into. These young men must assume false names, I suppose?

Mr. MORIN. I cannot say.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They must do that, and it would seem to me to be very easy to trace them. The matter, having been called to my notice, I will have it inquired into and followed up.

Mr. MORIN. I have seen that done right at my door in the county of Dorchester. Last Saturday I was at Lévis. There was a

whole lot of them going up and down, breaking up camp, and I heard them talking about it. I remarked to some young men, and they were saying: Whose place did you take? and the reply was: The place of such and such a man. I do not say this from hearsay, but I say that I can prove it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If the hon. gentleman does not care to make the statement publicly, I would be very glad if he would give me any information he has privately.

Mr. HUGHES. The captain of the company is the man who is responsible for such a fraud as this, if such a fraud has been committed, and he is the man to get after.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the hon. Minister intend to increase the ammunition for the practice of country battalions?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is great demand for it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We have had a great deal of trouble, on account of the long carrying power of the new rifle, in getting rifle ranges, and the general has adopted the expedient which, I think, has been employed with some success in the camps, of having practice with the Morris tube at aiming and shooting. It is a fairly good substitute for practice with the rifle, but as soon as we can get adequate rifle ranges, of course, we shall give all the ammunition that is necessary for the militia to practice with.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How many rounds do you give now?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Twenty. Of course we supply them with ammunition at cost if they wish to practice to a further extent than that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They are not able to purchase it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is this new instrument?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The Morris tube, it is called. I must confess that I have never seen it and cannot explain it.

Mr. HUGHES. It is an ordinary rifle with a tube and shoots a small cartridge. It is a tube inside of the old barrel, and the cartridge is much cheaper.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. Minister supply this tube?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We do it now in the camps.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. Minister knows that the chief value from practice is to have it at home, and as this tube is not so costly, you might supply it to the battalions.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think that it will be done, but I cannot say positively at present.

Mr. HUGHES. In addition to the Morris tube practice at the camps, each man has to fire volleys with his company, a certain number of rounds, starting at 30 yards advancing to 100 yards and returning to 500 yards again, firing as he advances and retires.

Government Cartridge Factory..... \$97,861 60

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the net result of the operation of this factory?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is the statement I have. For wages, the estimate this year is \$38,820; material, \$12,730; new machinery, \$14,074; making \$95,000, as against \$65,000 the previous year; recapping defective .303 ammunition, revote \$13,000. The money is to be repaid by the Imperial Government. The total cost was \$87,000 and we turned out 1,500,000 ball cordite .303, and 1,000,000 blank and 4,000 shells. We also turned out a quantity of nine-pounder R. M. L. and recapped a number of the defective .303. They cost \$25 a thousand in England, and I think we produced them at the same figure. We supplied some to the Imperial authorities at Halifax and they did us the honour of saying they preferred them to their own shells. We laid them down at Halifax for about the same price as the Imperial Government did.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Is the Minister aware that some of the ammunition used by the artillery has not given satisfaction? I understand that at some of the western camps there was a complaint as to the quality of the ammunition turned out by the Dominion Cartridge Factory.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am aware that some of the .303 cartridges were defective on account of a defect in the shells which were imported. Yes, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross Robertson) is right. I find, on inquiry, that some of the B.L. practice shells were found to be defective, but only a very small number.

Defence at Esquimalt..... \$109,000

Mr. TISDALE. What is this vote?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Tisdale) will remember that there was an arrangement entered into some years ago with the Imperial Government, by which we co-operated with the Imperial authorities for the defence of Esquimalt, and under that arrange-

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

ment we paid \$76,500 a year. A new arrangement involves us in a somewhat greater expenditure. The following proposition has been made to the War Department, to take effect on October 1st, 1899. The Dominion of Canada to pay: (a) half the annual cost of the Imperial garrison, 320 officers and men, say £21,000 sterling; (b) half the prime charges for the barrack accommodation of the force, £12,500 sterling; (c) to continue to pay, as at present, the whole cost of maintenance of the local regiment, the strength to be maintained at the establishment fixed, and the militia to be subject to an annual inspection by the Imperial officer in command at Esquimalt, or the Lieutenant-General Commanding in North America, say £9,345 sterling. The total cost of the first year is \$208,512, but of that amount £12,500 sterling is only chargeable for one year. The annual charge will be \$140,000. This is a detail of the militia we propose to keep in British Columbia: Military officers, 5; submarine mining engineers, 3; infantry, 15; total, 23. Non-commissioned officers and men: 150 artillery, 50 submarine engineers, 400 infantry; total, 623 officers and men. The militia charge to the public will be simply the same as with regard to any other regiment in Canada. The only charge to us is the £21,000 sterling a year, which is half the cost of the garrison, and the initial charge of £12,500, which goes to capital account for barracks. I may say that this has been agreed to by the Government.

Monuments to battlefields ..... \$3,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where will this be?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There are \$2,500 for monuments to the memory of the battle of Stoney Creek, and \$500 for a tablet at Burlington Heights.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Historical Society is doing good work, and have recently purchased a property there, and I suppose the Minister will co-operate with them.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. GIESON. I would like to point out to the Minister that there is some trouble as to where this monument at Stony Creek should be placed, and the matter should be settled by the Historical Society before the Government pay over the money.

Militia—

Artillery, fortress armament, &c..... \$347,400

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. With reference to this vote, there was an understanding, in 1895 or 1896, that the Dominion would undertake to appropriate about \$3,000,000 on capital account, although it was not actually voted, towards the defences of the country. Up to that date there had not been a dollar voted on

capital account since confederation for the defence of Canada. That vote has not been exhausted. I think about \$500,000 in addition to this vote is still on hand. This vote is to be used as follows:—Two batteries, 12-pr. B. L. Q. F. field guns, with harness, wagons and stores complete, \$148,000; additional expenditure for quick-firing pattern upon four batteries, 12-pr. B. L. guns, already ordered, \$25,000; two B. L. guns and emplacements in No. 1 fort, Lévis, \$82,000; two B. L. howitzers on siege carriages for St. Helen's Island, \$15,000; four Q. F. guns for Kingston, \$55,000; to pay Imperial Government half the prime cost of the barrack accommodation at Esquimaux, per new agreement beginning October 1st, 1899, \$61,000; making in all \$383,000.

Mr. TISDALE. Where are these four batteries for?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They are field artillery.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask the hon. Minister what steps, if any, the Government have taken in relation to placing at the disposal of the Imperial Government a corps or brigade in case of service abroad?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I cannot say that we have taken any formal or official steps in that direction.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not see very well how, without a radical departure from the principle of the volunteer force, any steps could be taken in that direction. It is a matter that would require a great deal of consideration before any steps should be taken that would entail what would practically become a part of the regular army.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It would probably require a special enlistment.

Railways—Canadian Pacific Railway—  
Land damages, &c..... \$2,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where are these land damages now?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. At Fort Moody.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who are the claimants?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mrs. James Cooper, I think. We made an offer of a small amount, and the claimant has refused to accept it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is this the only claim?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are a few others, but this is apparently the only one that is looming up.

Intercolonial Railway—

Land damages, Oxford and New Glasgow  
and Cape Breton divisions..... \$2,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. What are these?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have asked for a vote as a residue to cover claims which are always cropping up. This is the usual appropriation. We expended \$289.87 under this head last year.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is usual when these sums are voted, to say what the claims are.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must demur to that statement.

Mr. MONTAGUE. These are not for damages in the future, but in the past, and are not unforeseen.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are to cover claims which arose out of the original construction. My deputy says he is quite sure this claim was settled out of court. These claims are passed on in various ways. A person makes a claim and we send an officer to examine into it, and if it has a sound basis he reports to us what is a reasonable amount to offer. If that is not accepted, the party is left to his remedy in the court.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Was there an agreement in this case?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The party accepted this amount.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who made the valuation?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could not tell. We have not one particular officer for this purpose.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When were these claims put in?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could not tell.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This is probably a claim that was passed by the late Government and refused.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know. It may possibly have been passed upon.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not think that a claim for damages in 1888 would lie in abeyance absolutely for ten years and not be pressed and passed upon.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, yes, they lie in abeyance sometimes longer than that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The chances are that such claims are put in and passed on. We ought to have the particulars of when put in, what the claim was, and who made the

valuation. All we want is the information, and will pass the item at once.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I would suggest that a good time to get the information would be on concurrence.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. A very bland suggestion, and one which in our time, have made very often; but it has not been accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). Oh, come; I have accepted it frequently.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Yes, that is true. Very often hon. gentlemen opposite got information on concurrence and very often they pressed very strongly for it. This is a very small amount, but the point is one of principle. If this claim was rejected by the late Government, there should be very special reasons why it is allowed now without going to court. In the case where a man has the decision of the Exchequer Court there can be no question of favouritism. I do not charge that there is favouritism in this case, but such a consideration might arise. If we knew the name of the valuator, that might show us the nature of the decision. But not having any information—

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. But seeing the amount is so inconsiderable—

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. But for that very reason surely the hon. Minister will allow it to stand until he gets the information.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Surely the hon. gentleman will not ask that.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Will the hon. Minister promise faithfully to bring the information down?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes.

Intercolonial Railway—

Original construction ..... \$1,800

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. This is to cover possible claims on the Intercolonial Railway arising out of the original construction of the road. None were paid last year, and it may be that none may mature this year, but it is always safe to have the vote.

Increased accommodation at St. John.. \$400,500

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The committee may remember that we obtained a vote of \$250,000 last year for the purpose of enabling us to put up a wharf and lay down tracks and provide necessary accommodation in the harbour of St. John at the Intercolonial Railway terminus there. Of that sum, we have expended \$200,000 and we shall require a supple-

Mr. **MONTAGUE**.

mentary vote of \$49,000 for this year. The amount we are now asking for, we hope will cover the whole amount. We are acquiring various small properties at the head of the harbour, and immediately adjoining our present station, and are constructing a pier capable of accommodating two large steamers and one small one, with freight shed and other appliances and with our tracks laid for the accommodation of traffic.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. What are the items of the expenditure hitherto?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We had spent \$201,000 up to the 30th June. Of this \$100,000 has been paid upon what is called the Long Wharf property which was expropriated. There was a contract entered into for the wharf and trestle, included in one bulk sum of \$328,173. Then, as part of the same contract and in addition thereto, there was a price per cubic yard for rock excavation, for ballasting, for pile dredging and other items of that character and also for a warehouse on the wharf, which would bring the cost of the wharf construction up to \$410,000. The rock excavation was estimated to cost \$41,600; the stone ballasting, \$12,900; tie rods, \$1,304; planking on inner face, \$1,320. That makes a total of \$385,297. The warehouse on the wharf will cost \$22,795. Other items include pile dredging, \$3,330; pile foundations for iron bridging, \$1,700; iron bridging removed and re-erected, \$2,030; new iron bridging, contract, \$1,640; floor for iron bridging, 800 lineal feet at \$2.70, \$2,160; fencing and fender piles, \$1,194; removing track, flooring, fencing and fender piles of present main line, \$120. These items amount to \$12,444. Then, \$6,120 would represent the cost of a temporary pile trestle for sidings to wharfs; 1,400 lineal feet at \$10, \$14,000; platform on piles at north end of wharf, 9,000 lineal feet at 60 cents, \$5,400. Then, track-laying on wharf, trestle and bridges, one and one-half miles, \$300; on balance of main line and sidings, including ties and ballast, \$3,400; rails and fastenings, \$6,250; fifteen switches, \$1,750; excavations for sidings back of elevator, \$1,500, and removal of solid rock, \$16,500, or a total of \$18,000. Engineering, legal valuations, office and stationery expenses, \$10,000. There are also a number of other items, making up a total of \$685,756. That is the estimate of the total cost of the erection of the wharf and all that is appurtenant thereto.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. How has the \$200,000 been spent this year?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I told my hon. friend that \$100,000 of that amount had been paid for what is called the Long Wharf property. Then, there are other properties in connection with it. There is the Hazen Estate slip,

which has been expropriated at a cost of \$500. There is the property belonging to Mr. Lightly, which cost \$8,000, and which has been expropriated.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that the work of erecting an elevator is still proceeding at Halifax. Is there any provision made for the work that is still to be done there?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are going to ask in the supplementaries for the sum which will suffice to complete that work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman stated some time ago that it was expected the elevator would be completed about the 1st of October. Has he any further information in regard to that? There has been some apprehension expressed that the expectations of the Minister will not be realized, there is some fear existing in the minds of some persons in Halifax that the elevator will not be ready for this winter's operations, which would be very disastrous, as they felt the disadvantage of not having it ready for the past winter's work.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The contractor has not been proceeding very satisfactorily with that work. I do not like to say that he is going to be unable to complete it by the date mentioned, because he assured me personally, and assures my officers positively, that he will be able to complete it. He ought to be, there is no reason in the world why he should not, if his machinery has been contracted for, as he says, and it is specially admitted. I am informed that information is received to-day that there will be no delay whatever in the delivery of the machinery to the contractors. If the machinery comes, the other work could, without any doubt, be completed. There is no reason for any anxiety.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The people of Halifax will be very glad if the hon. gentleman's explanations are realized; I know they will be greatly disappointed, and justifiably so, if these expectations are not realized. It has been stated, I do not know with what degree of truth—I am not conversant with these matters—that an elevator of that kind can be built in the United States in about six weeks. I suppose we can hardly expect to equal their expedition.

Mr. GILSON. It cannot be done anywhere in six weeks.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am simply repeating a statement that has been publicly made in the city council of Halifax by Mr. Ald. Gildert, a strong supporter of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. He is not a bulder, but he has had much to do with these works. There is one other

matter I would like to mention to the Minister, that is, the depth of water on the south side of No. 4 pier, Deep Water Terminal. The hon. gentleman doubtless recollects that a committee of the Halifax Board of Trade investigated the depth of water at that place, and they made this report:

After careful inquiry, we find there is only 23 feet 6 inches of water at low tide, and that this pier contains the only two coal chutes available for the coaling of steamers. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary that there should be a sufficient depth of water to admit of steamers of the largest tonnage which may require to make use of said pier, to lie always afloat. We would therefore recommend that prompt steps be taken for the dredging and deepening of this dock to the necessary depth. Unless this is promptly done, it will not only seriously reflect against the facilities of the port, but will be a serious blow to the coal business over the Intercolonial Railway.

The hon. gentleman is aware that Halifax is largely a port of call for steamers in want of coal. During the past winter an enormous number of steamers have come in for their coal, and the Board of Trade seem to regard this matter as important. Some of these gentlemen are interested in this coal business. The hon. gentleman is aware that it is of importance to the port of Halifax for the reason that one large line of steamers has decided to coal altogether at Halifax instead of in the United States; they came to that conclusion within the past year. It is therefore of the utmost importance that every facility should be given to them. This report continues as follows:—

We would further recommend that on the capstans of each and all the piers, marks showing the depth of water at every 20 feet be placed in such a way as to be in full view of the masters when docking their ship, so that they may know exactly whether there is sufficient water in the berth assigned to them to admit of their lying always afloat.

Then, they say further:

We would further draw your attention to the fact that on the new pier no capstan nor stringer-piece has been provided on the upper edge of said pier, and upon inquiry we are informed that nothing of this kind has been provided for in the specifications for building. This, we think, every person at all conversant with the docking of ships will admit to be absolutely necessary, especially in winter time, as it would be almost impossible for the men running the lines when docking ships to do so with any degree of safety unless this very necessary protection was provided.

That came to my attention last month, and I did not then have any opportunity to mention it to the hon. gentleman in the House. I understood that a copy of this same representation had been mailed to him as well as to myself and my colleague. I would be glad if the hon. gentleman could tell me whether the matter has received the attention of his department.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have no doubt it is receiving the attention of the department. The engineer, Mr. Mackenzie, has been giving a great deal of personal attention to this work. I get a good many communications from Halifax in respect of the work itself there, and in respect to the elevator, and I usually forward these, with what instructions I think it is proper to give, to the engineer. I have no doubt this matter which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) has mentioned, is receiving his very careful attention.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the hon. Minister said that he is spending \$100,000 in purchasing this property.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. In purchasing a portion of it—the long wharf property.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the total cost of that property?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. One hundred thousand dollars is the amount we have paid to the owners of the property. There is a further sum of \$18,000 which the owners of the property have claimed from us, but which claim is now under consideration.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It was purchased by an expropriation, was it not?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes, the property was expropriated, but there is quite a history connected with it, and if the hon. gentleman would care to hear it I will explain the circumstances, so that he will see how the additional claim for \$18,000 has arisen. There was an offer made to the Government, prior to the expropriation, to sell the property for \$100,000. We thought that, to avoid any possible question, it would be well that we should put on valuers and have the necessary steps taken to begin expropriation proceedings. The expropriation taking place, the valuers went on and placed a value of \$118,000 upon the property. We had received, previously from the owners, an offer to sell the property for \$100,000, and so we considered it rather as an engagement on their part to accept \$100,000 as the purchase price. When the valuers had put this additional sum of \$18,000 on the property the owners asked us to pay \$118,000 for the property. We said: You agreed to accept \$100,000. They said, true, but you went on and expropriated it, and having done that we think we ought to get the sum that the valuers say the property is worth. That is the point in controversy.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How does the hon. gentleman propose to settle it? Does he propose to allow it to go to court?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We have not done that, although we cannot refuse to allow them to go to court

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

if the parties desire. We have only paid \$100,000, and it was only paid since Parliament has been in session, so that we have not had time to deal fully with it.

Mr. DAVIN. Who were the valuers?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. They were gentlemen resident in St. John. Mr. McGregor Grant was one and Mr. George Robinson was the other.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You have a regular board of valuers?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Not now under the law.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is not customary to appoint local individuals.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes, it is customary always. You could not very well take strangers, put them into a town, particularly in respect to a property of this kind, and expect them to make a value that would be reliable and satisfactory.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who are these gentlemen? What is their business?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Mr. McGregor Grant is the manager of an insurance company in St. John, a gentleman of many years' experience, and, I think, one who would be admirably qualified for a duty of this kind. Mr. George Robinson was mayor of St. John for many years. He is a wholesale merchant.

Mr. DAVIN. Were these valuers judges?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, they were business men. Mr. Edwards was an insurance valuator. These gentlemen have had a good deal of experience in valuing real estate for the purpose of insurance, and they were chosen. I think it would be difficult to find gentlemen who would be better qualified to perform a duty of this kind. There is no mistake in regard to the valuation of the property, because the owners were receiving a rental of over \$5,000 for a few years past.

Mr. DAVIN. How much did the owners expend in keeping it in order from year to year?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think not very much. They had the advantage of being free from taxation, although not entirely free. There was an outside limit of \$300 of taxation to which they were subject. I do not think very much was required to keep the property in order. For the purposes for which it was being used it was in a fairly good condition.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What was the area of it?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have not that in my mind at the moment, and I have not the memorandum before me. The property was quite a

long wharf running out very nearly to the border line of the harbour. The wharf itself was eighty-five feet in width and there was 100 or 200 feet of a slip available for public uses.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the hon. gentleman no information as to the size of the land?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not have before me the number of square feet.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The price of \$100,000 is pretty large and it is a matter of speculation as to whether you are not paying too much for it. I know of one case in Halifax where the value of a wharf property was being adjudicated upon in the Exchequer Court. There were from fifteen to twenty men who gave evidence as to value and the valuations ran from \$15,000 to \$90,000 in respect to the same property. The court eventually awarded about \$60,000, and the Court of Appeal reduced this award to about \$40,000. If you had happened to buy that property on the valuation of the people who thought it was worth \$90,000 you would have paid \$50,000 more than would have been a fair price for it. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman should be very sure about it before he would agree to pay this price of \$100,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am absolutely sure. We have made no mistake as to the amount. We did not pay too much.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We are not in a position to form any judgment as we do not know what is the size of it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You would not be in a position to form a judgment if you did know the exact size.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps we would not, but we would be able to form some idea.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The property is more than 1,200 feet long.

Mr. DAVIN. I should like to ask the hon. Minister what is the business of Mr. McGregor Grant.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As I said before, Mr. McGregor Grant has been for many years in the insurance business, acting as manager or agent for an insurance company. He has also been representing one very large estate in the city. Any one who knows the citizens of St. John would say that Mr. Grant would be a suitable person for this.

Mr. DAVIN. What estate was in his hands?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The John W. Nicholson estate.

Mr. DAVIN. Was it left in his hands?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He was left an executor under the will, and a trustee, I think.

Mr. DAVIN. When did the idea occur to the Minister of Railways to purchase this property?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As soon as I began to consider the question of obtaining the necessary terminal facilities at that point. It is in every way suited, and the most desirable situation that could be selected.

Mr. DAVIN. Did the Minister discuss the price with any one?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, with many people, and before taking any step for expropriation.

Mr. DAVIN. Did the Minister arrive at a price before it was referred to arbitration?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Having had conversation with gentlemen from the city, I had in my mind a sum which I felt the property was worth, and which we could afford to pay for it. I had a conversation with the mayor, Mr. Robertson—I had no idea then he would be one of the valuers—and the members of the board of trade, and the consensus of opinion on both sides of politics was, that this property would be very well purchased, if we could get it for \$100,000.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the arbitration the Minister thought about \$100,000 would be about the price?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. Who was the third arbitrator?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. M. D. Edwards.

Mr. DAVIN. It would look as if it were referred to these gentlemen to confirm the price agreed on by the Minister and those he discussed the particulars with.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I happen to have some knowledge of the matter, as part of the transaction occurred when my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) was absent in England, and I was acting Minister of Railways. I was aware that the owners of this property had offered, or suggested, its purchase at \$100,000. At first I thought that this was a large sum, but subsequently the matter came before me, as Acting Minister of Railways, and it became my duty to look into it. The formal proposal to buy the property was made to me, and not to the Minister of Railways, because it occurred when he was in England, although I am aware that, before he left, it was the subject of conversation. Subsequently, when

it came before me, in my capacity as Acting Minister, I gave it considerable attention. I tried to ascertain from trustworthy and reliable gentlemen, who were in no way concerned in the property, what its fair value was, and the general impression I received was, that \$100,000 was not an excessive price. During the absence of the Minister, the owners of the property—

Mr. DAVIN. Who were the owners ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The owners were the St. John Terminal Company. The president of the company was Mr. A. A. Stockton, the leader of the Opposition in New Brunswick, and prominently associated with him was Mr. Justice McLeod. These were the gentlemen who manifested the most interest in the matter. They approached me and wished me, in the absence of the Minister, to take possession of the property, as there was a feeling in the city of St. John that the improvement should go forward. After carefully considering the matter, and inquiring from various trustworthy people, I formed the impression that \$100,000 was not extravagant. Still, I preferred that the matter should be settled by expropriation, and we took proceedings under the Expropriation Act. Although I formed the idea that \$100,000 was a reasonable price, I was not surprised to learn that the valuers—each one of them I happen to know, and they are gentlemen of the highest standing—gave their opinion that the property was worth something more.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman has established my contention, that local men interested in the value of property in a city, and anxious that city property should be as valuable as possible, were not the best parties to protect the treasury in the purchase of a property like this. Did the Minister of Finance ever know an individual, or a set of individuals, who did not put the full value on their property when they offered it to the Government for sale ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Most people ask what they think is the value.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Most people ask a good deal more than that, when they know the Government is to be the purchaser. I quote from "Hannard," of 1893, where the Minister stated that the property had been offered to him for \$100,000. I venture to say that the people who made that offer did not expect to get over \$80,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are mistaken about that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then, they are a class of people in St. John that do not exist in any other part of the Dominion. There is not a gentleman on the other side of the House who can cite an instance where less than the value of property was asked from

Mr. FIELDING.

the Government who desired to purchase. The hon. gentleman appointed valuers, who say that the owners of the property asked \$18,000 too little. I can fancy these gentlemen who owned the property, blushing up to the ears at their meekness in asking \$18,000 too little of the Government of Canada. It shows that these gentlemen who were appointed to value it—while they were anxious to be right, no doubt, judging from the character given them—were anxious to see property in that city attain its highest value, and, having an honest sympathy, no doubt, with the people who owned the property, they placed a higher value on it than even the owners did. I think the hon. Minister has made out a very weak case.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think I made out a strong case.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No doubt, you do.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And the citizens of St. John think so, too.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There can be no question but that the citizens of St. John were anxious to have this money spent there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They would not be anxious to have it paid for this property.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman knows that when an amount of property is being sold to the Government there is not such a keen desire on the part of the owner's neighbours to see that the last cent in value is got for the money paid by the Government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a good deal of jealousy in my experience.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In the judgment of the neighbours of this property it seems to have been worth \$118,000, while it was only valued at \$100,000 by themselves.

Mr. ELLIS. They were a company who were anxious to sell.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister says they were not anxious to sell. They were earning about 5½ per cent on the property.

Mr. DAVIN. The Finance Minister spoke of two gentlemen with whom he had discussed the value of this property. One he mentioned; who is the other ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not mention the name of any gentleman with whom I had discussed the matter. I did discuss it with some gentlemen in the city of St. John, but I did not mention their names. The names of the gentlemen mentioned were those who acted as valuers. I never discussed the subject with them at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Whatever may be the experience of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) as to the value of land, my experience is that if you wanted to have a just and fair valuation of a property of that description, you would not be safe in selecting persons who did not know anything of the value of the property in the city to make the valuation. These gentlemen, all three of them, were entirely independent of the owners of this property, had no interest in them or connection with them, in business or otherwise. I think it would be difficult to select three gentlemen in the city of St. John whose appointment would have been approved more heartily than was the appointment of these gentlemen. In reaching a valuation of the property, the valutors held a court before which witnesses were summoned, who gave evidence, I think, under oath; and among the men who gave evidence were leading business men, bankers and others, in the city.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman has that report, I presume.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The report is on file, with the evidence. The manager of the Bank of Montreal and the manager of the Halifax Banking Company, and others, placed a higher value upon this property than the valutors finally concluded to award to the owners. So that we made no mistake with respect to the amount at which we acquired the property. I felt that in all human probability there would be a great deal of feeling over the matter, and it might be used to make political capital, unless we surrounded ourselves with every possible safeguard; and therefore we took a course which would protect us from any possible ground of criticism or complaint on the part of anybody.

Mr. ELLIS. With regard to the valutors, and particularly with regard to Mr. Grant, I have great confidence in him as one of the most conservative estimators of property in the city—a man entirely uninfluenced by the sentiments and fads which some men have about growth, and so forth. I am satisfied that his influence on the valuation was of the best kind, and that he could be trusted. The other valutors are also citizens of great knowledge and worth. The only objection I had to the valuation was that it took too much time; but that was owing to the giving of evidence by persons who could throw any light on the subject. I think the whole thing was managed very fairly indeed.

Mr. MONTAGUE. By whom were these valutors recommended?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I appointed them and selected them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. From personal knowledge?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. From actual personal knowledge. I knew the gentlemen myself, and if I had gone over the list of citizens of St. John, I do not think I could have selected three men who would have been more likely to reach a safe conclusion, or whose decisions would be more generally accepted by the community.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose the owners of the property know the value of property in St. John?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose they would have an idea.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It seems strange that a man would get \$18,000 more for a piece of property than he asked for the property. This will stand out as a bright instance in the history of Canada.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They were very anxious to sell.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago they were not anxious to sell.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Why should they be anxious to sell when they were getting an income from the property of 5½ per cent?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They really were anxious to sell. There may be times when men are anxious to sell a property, even when it is yielding them a fair return.

Mr. DAVIN. Who were the arbitrators for the Government?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There were three, all chosen by the Government. The company were not permitted to name any.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How much would the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis), if purchasing that property, consider that it would be worth? Does he not consider that he would get it for \$70,000?

Mr. ELLIS. It is not a matter on which I would express an opinion, because I am not in that kind of business. These gentlemen formed a company some years ago, expecting to carry on a very large business. It is true, they were getting 5 per cent on their investment, but it was rather an incongruous business. Mr. McLeod having become a judge, it is easily understood why he would be anxious to get out of the business. Then the business might fall at any time, because if the large lines of steamers

which came to that wharf and paid a rental were transferred to another wharf, that rental might cease.

Mr. MONTAGUE. All of which decreased the value of the property.

Mr. ELLIS. It did not occur, but it might, and that is the reason why the company appeared anxious to dispose of the property. \$100,000 was an assumed value. When the valuator was put on, they thought it was worth something more.

Mr. DAVIN. Who were the other proprietors besides Judge McLeod?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Pugsley owned an interest in the property, a small interest, I believe.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We are gradually getting the names.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know any more owners than those.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) has not told us what he considers the property worth. I would take his opinion just as well as that of the manager of the Bank of Montreal. The hon. member is a property owner, I believe.

Mr. ELLIS. In a very small way.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is the hon. gentleman's modesty, as my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden) suggests. He is just as keen a business man as there is in the city, and if asked to-morrow to sell some property to the Government, I venture to say that, for all his kind looks, he would not offer it to the Government for one-fifth less its value. I do not think he believes in his heart that this was a good bargain. How much is the property assessed for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know. That is really no guide.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is a pretty good guide, because we can find out exactly, on what basis they assess.

Mr. ELLIS. I do not know what the assessed value is. My property is assessed at more than its value.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We ought to have the assessed value. My property in Hamilton is assessed at more than its value, and that is not an uncommon case in town lots.

Mr. ELLIS. I do not think that would apply to wharf property.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My recollection is that there was an arrangement between the city corporation and this company, that the company should not be subject to taxation beyond \$300 a year. The question of valuation for

Mr. ELLIS.

assessment purposes would not, in that case, arise.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Was that by way of bonus, because we can easily figure it out. The party considered \$300 was a fair taxation on it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. By whom was the offer made?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Stockwell made a formal offer to me. \$100,000 had previously been spoken of as the value of the property. I received a formal offer from Mr. Stockwell and had conversations with Mr. Pugsley, Judge McLeod and Mr. Stockwell, chiefly with Mr. Justice McLeod.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They were anxious to sell at \$100,000?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The property, at any rate, in their minds, under the hammer would not bring nearly \$100,000?

Mr. DOMVILLE. Oh, yes, it would.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is pretty difficult to say what it would bring under the hammer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This was expropriated property, and there was no question of what it would bring under the hammer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You do not expropriate usually in that way?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no other way than to have valutors proceed under the Expropriation Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The usual way is to have the value determined by a judge, and then you can appeal from him to the Supreme Court.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We do not know that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know it, but the Minister of Finance speaks of this as the usual way. I am pointing out the usual way. The disadvantage of the course pursued in this case is that you have no appeal, and the Government are perhaps morally bound by the \$118,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Do not assume that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If you had had the value determined in the ordinary way, you would have had it determined by the judge of the Exchequer Court and you could appeal from his decision to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court has been known to decrease the value fixed in the first in-

stance by the judge of the Exchequer Court.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Is there a case where the Crown is involved in which the Supreme Court reduced the valuation?

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). In a case relating to certain property in the city of Halifax, the Supreme Court reduced the award of the judge by \$20,000. That is the only case I know of. The Minister of Railways and Canals says that witnesses were called and examined on oath. How could that be if these gentlemen were mere valutors appointed by the Crown?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I understood that they called Mr. Jones of the Bank of Montreal, and Mr. Taylor of the Halifax Bank, to give evidence.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). My hon. friend will surely recollect that a valuator would have no power to take evidence under oath under the common law. It must be given by statute, and I am not aware of any statute that would apply.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. They may have made statutory declarations, but I know that in a very formal way they made statements.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). Did the Government have counsel present to cross-examine?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes, we had a counsel looking after our interests.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Who represented the Government?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Mr. McLean.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Does the hon. member for St. John know how the witnesses in this case were examined?

Mr. **ELLIS**. I think they were sufficiently examined. They are citizens whose word is as good as their oath.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. The hon. gentleman knows that there is a vast difference in having men give their ideas of the value of a piece of property in an informal way for the benefit of their friends. The hon. Minister ought to let this stand.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. There never was a transaction that went through this House in which the owners of property asked less than its value. The property was offered at \$100,000, but after valutors were appointed they reported it was worth \$118,000. Possibly the Minister of Railways will know about it.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. There never was a transaction that will bear closer scrutiny. Right alongside you have the property known as the Harris property, and I would like to put the two transactions side by side.

Mr. **BENNETT**. Was Mr. Robinson the defeated Liberal candidate in the general elections of 1896, or was he a candidate at all in these elections?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, he was not a defeated candidate in 1896.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Mr. Robinson had been a candidate before, and had been defeated.

Mr. **BENNETT**. Were the names of these valutors suggested by those who owned the property, or did they make any demur at their appointment?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. They were not consulted.

Mr. **BENNETT**. It seems strange that in the case of a property they valued at \$100,000 they were willing to submit to the arbitrament of three gentlemen appointed by the Government.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. They were not consulted at all.

Mr. **BENNETT**. That seems all the more strange. It seems strange that they should go into an arbitration—

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. It was not an arbitration.

Mr. **BENNETT**. Yes, it seems to me that it savoured of an arbitration. Did the vendors of the property agree to stand by such valuation as might be placed upon it by the Government?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, I think not. They were not asked to.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The vendors agreed with me that they were only to demand \$100,000.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. In any event?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes, that was the understanding I had.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. But there is a claim.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes; when the owners found that these three gentlemen had valued the property at \$118,000, they made what they called an equitable claim upon the Government. That claim is lying there. When I was negotiating with them, they valued the property at \$100,000, and I had the option of accepting it or taking the matter into court. I decided to put it under the Expropriation

Act, having, however, an assurance that the sum of \$100,000 was what they would claim.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But the Minister of Railways and Canals had an option upon it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is most extraordinary, because the hon. Minister in 1898 said: "I have an option from the present owners."

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Before I went away, the parties said they would be willing to take \$100,000, if I would take that sum.

Mr. DAVIN. How much did these people pay for the property?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think they paid this amount, but I know that, after having purchased it, they spent a very considerable amount of money on it, improving it and putting it into shape for use.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Ordinary repairs?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all. They spent thousands of dollars.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose that is all in the evidence.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I presume so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose the Minister can get that for us.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My Deputy tells me that the evidence is in hand.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like the Minister to tell us, after all, if there was any arbitration.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. DAVIN. Really, what has happened is this, that the department agreed to pay a certain price for this property, and then they named three of their friends to buttress their opinion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If these three gentlemen had decided it was worth less than \$100,000, and the usual proceedings of expropriation had determined it, they would have been obliged to accept it. What was referred to the valuers was, whether the property was worth the \$100,000 claimed. I was surprised to hear that the valuers placed so high a figure on it. But when I was told that \$100,000 was not an extravagant price, I understood that the valuers might fix the price anywhere

Mr. FIELDING.

about that amount. But, after it was known that they had offered the property for \$100,000, I thought they should have been content with that.

Mr. CLANCY. Did the Government feel bound to abide by the decision of the gentlemen who were appointed to value the property?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is directing the question to me, I may say, expressing my own opinion on a matter on which the Government has not yet decided, we were not bound by the offer of the gentlemen to sell for \$100,000, but they were bound not to demand more than \$100,000. If they had estimated the value of the property at a less sum than this, the Government would have been entitled to the benefit. But the owners say that, in fairness and equity, the Government ought not to take that \$18,000. That claim has not come before the Government, and I do not express any opinion upon it. But I do know that I had no intention that they should receive more than \$100,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Does not this appointment of valuers seem a strange proceeding? I understand that arbitrators were not appointed, because we are told that the parties were not consulted at all. I suppose that the Government thought the property not worth \$100,000—there could be no other ground for the appointment of valuers. That opinion as to the value of the property was probably reached after careful inquiry, because people living in that city would have a pretty fair idea of the value of the property, and anybody to whom property is offered is not without means of gaining some information as to the value. It must have been present to the mind of those who were dealing with the property, that \$100,000 was too much. If not too much, it is clear that those who were empowered to act, would accept the property at \$100,000 as a fair price. That would be the end of it. But it must be plain that the Government did not believe it was worth that, and they asked the valuers to go on, perhaps in the hope that they would make the value considerably less, because they had an option under which they were not to pay more than \$100,000 in any case. The valuers come back and say the property is worth \$118,000. The owners then say: You were not satisfied to give us \$100,000, and now your own valuers, with whose appointment we had nothing to do, say that the property is worth more. Does it not appear a very strange transaction from beginning to end? It seems a strange transaction to take place on a property of the value of \$100,000. It is a new case, as it has been put here tonight, that a set of gentlemen offer a property for any set sum, and those who want to purchase it are not satisfied with the

price, and appoint men to value it, gentlemen, perhaps, of good standing, but who know nothing of the value of property.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. If these gentlemen could not form a judgment, then you could not find anybody who could.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Gentlemen who had ideas of the value of property entirely adverse to those of the owners.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. These gentlemen considered the property worth more, and they were willing to sell it to us for \$100,000, they were anxious to part with the property.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Was it stated to the gentlemen who made the valuation, that the Government had a standing offer of \$100,000?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not think I could state whether they knew that or not. I did not make any communication to them on the subject at all, I do not know whether my hon. friend did. But I must say that what the hon. member has said just now surprises me, because the course which was taken here was the course which is taken every day. I had occasion to expropriate a property, and there is nothing surprising that these gentlemen desired to find a market for the property. It is not every day of the week that parties come along wishing to buy a property valued at \$100,000 in the city of St. John. They felt that here was an opportunity of finding a market for this property, and desiring to sell for their own business reasons, they made this offer, and I believe they considered that \$100,000 represented the value of the property. I think they considered they were making a fair offer. It happened, fortunately for them that the Government desired to acquire a property on the harbour of St. John, and this was very favourably situated, and, perhaps, as some inducement to the Government to locate at that point rather than at some other point, they made this offer.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Nobody else thought it was worth that for any other purpose?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. My hon. friend must not think that, because I myself had many conversations with persons in the city able to form a judgment as to what the property was worth, and I mentioned to them that these people were willing to sell at this price, and I invited their judgment as to whether the sum was reasonable. I am bound to say that in no instance do I recall an opinion expressed to me to the effect that the price was excessive or unreasonable.

Mr. **CLANCY**. It seems odd that the hon. gentleman did not take it.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It was not taken not because I did not think it was a good purchase, but because I knew that unless the purchase was made in a way in which it could stand scrutiny, there would be politicians on the other side from one end of the country to the other howling against it as a job; you cannot make a transaction in which the Government is a party without people who are opposed to the Government making attacks on it without rhyme or reason.

Mr. **DAVIN**. Why was it not put in to the Exchequer Court?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The same course was pursued here as in all other cases where property is expropriated. We filed our plans, we took the property, and we put on, not arbitrators, but valuers for the purpose of advising us as to what they considered a fair sum to offer to the owners. We would have been quite free, and it would have been our duty, in case we had not had an offer from them at a less sum, to tender to these people \$118,000, according to the valuation fixed. We would then have been in a position to say to the owners: Now, go ahead, if you are not satisfied with this price, go to the Exchequer Court and we will produce the evidence of these valuers, and we will rely upon that. The report of the valuers was made in writing, fixing the value of \$118,000.

Mr. **BENNETT**. Then, how did the vendors become possessed of the information that the valuers had placed a sum on the property in excess of \$100,000? And when the Minister ought to know that the vendors were willing to accept \$100,000, why did he disclose the fact to the vendors that the valuers had fixed \$118,000, and not hold them to their original offer?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Why does the hon. gentleman assume that the Minister did disclose the fact?

Mr. **BENNETT**. Then, how did the vendors know? There must have been a good deal of friendliness between the valuers and the vendors.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. You cannot get three valuers to examine a property and come to a decision without its leaking out.

Mr. **MCNEILL**. Were the owners consulted as to these gentlemen who were appointed?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, they never are.

Mr. **MCNEILL**. It strikes me as curious that the Minister of Finance has said that this was an ordinary transaction, that the owners of a property worth \$100,000 should be prepared to leave the valuation of that property to any body of men at all.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. They were not asked to. The hon. gentleman, perhaps, is not familiar with the procedure in such a case. If we desired to run a canal through the hon. gentleman's land, we would make our plans as to the quantity of land that we would require for the purpose of our canal, and we would file our plans and expropriate the property. We would then put our valuers upon that land and make a valuation of the damages that he ought to get for our forcibly taking his property. We would not ask him what valuers we should select, we would not consult him on the subject, the department never does. All we have to do is to be careful to make such a selection of valuers, men of judgment, whose valuation, when made, can be relied upon as likely to convince a court. There was no arbitration, no consultation with the owners, there never is in these cases. We have to do it repeatedly, and the same procedure was adopted in this case as we are adopting in respect to canals every month of the year.

**Mr. BENNETT.** Was the property encumbered?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes, there was a mortgage, I think, of \$26,000.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** And that is as much as could be raised upon it.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Does the hon. gentleman think it is fair to jump to a conclusion of that kind? Is it fair for him as a member of Parliament to say that the owners of this property could only borrow upon it \$26,000?

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** That is the amount that could be raised on it.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. My hon. friend is not very often so unreasonable as that.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** I do not desire to be unfair or unkind, but the fact is, here is a property encumbered to the extent of \$26,000. To whom was it encumbered?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. To a gentleman named Fawcett, of Sackville, N.B.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** The banks were not interested in it?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, they had nothing to do with it. Mr. Fawcett is a man of large means.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** I think the hon. Minister will find, and it is no discredit to the gentleman who owned it, that the property was encumbered for just about all that could be raised upon it.

**Mr. McNEILL.**

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Does the hon. gentleman know the property?

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** No, but I am judging from the circumstances, and from the statement of the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), which statement was that these gentlemen were anxious, for reasons which he did not desire to mention to the committee, and which reasons I do not wish to probe at all, that they were desirous to dispose of it. These are undoubtedly financial reasons, as the property was mortgaged to the extent of \$26,000. If the hon. gentleman had got the property at its proper value he would have got it at \$50,000 or \$60,000 at the very outside. There are ways of proving it. May I ask the hon. gentleman how much these gentlemen paid for that property?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I cannot say.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** The gentlemen are in the city, and some of them could easily tell us. It is a matter of public importance. You paid \$100,000, and you are liable, perhaps, to pay \$18,000 more.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not think that we are.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** Have you a conveyance of the property?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We have the property.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** Have you a conveyance of it?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Certainly we have.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** I think that is an important point. These gentleman bought the property and spent so much upon it. Let these gentlemen state to the hon. Minister, that he might give it to the committee, how much they paid for this property. The hon. Minister says that they have spent quite a sum on it. I would ask the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Tucker) if this property is worth \$100,000. I mean the gallant colonel from St. John. Here is a property encumbered to the extent of \$26,000, and that is about all that can be raised upon it. I am asking the gallant colonel from St. John.

**Mr. DOMVILLE.** He does not hear you; he is not paying any attention.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** Neither does the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville), but that does not make any difference. I am asking the gallant colonel whether this wharf is worth \$100,000.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The hon. member (Mr. Tucker) did not hear you, I am sure.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Hon. gentlemen around him will certainly give him the information.

Mr. TUCKER. Being a little deaf, I was unable to answer the hon. gentleman as promptly as I should like to have done. But I should think that the best judges of a matter of that kind would be those who had spent two or three weeks in making a personal examination of the property, and who have pronounced judgment.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman is diplomatic.

Mr. TUCKER. I was unable to place a value on the property.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was a little misled by what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals said as to these men being valuers, when I supposed that there might be some moral obligation on the part of the Government to pay \$18,000. What I understand to be the fact is that the Government appointed these gentlemen for the information of the Government, and not under any agreement between the Government and the owners of the property, that the valuation would be adopted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They are in exactly the same position as if the Government had a regular officer for the purpose of examining the property and reporting. Under these circumstances, I say that not only was it not an arbitration, but it was not even a technical valuation, because a valuation means something that both parties are bound by after it is made.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would be an arbitration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). A valuation is where two men are appointed to settle a difference which has not already arisen. They are called arbitrators if appointed after the difference has arisen. I am impressed with the idea that this is a very high value for this wharf property, as far as we have been able to get any information about it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am afraid the hon. gentleman would be inclined to that view, anyway.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have seen valuations made before which have been corrected by subsequent valuations. I have known of circumstances very much like this in my own practice. There was a case where a value of \$40,000 was placed on a number of properties by expert valuers, men who were as well acquainted with that property, as these men were acquainted with the property in St. John. The Government were proposing to buy the property; they

had a further valuation made, and the first valuation was reduced by more than one-quarter. The property was acquired by the Government for a considerable amount less than this first valuation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think there would be the slightest probability of any valuation less than this being made by anybody.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, the hon. gentleman knows more about the property than I do.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is very favourably situated.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have some little idea of the value of wharf property in Halifax, and if this property is worth \$100,000, such property must be worth a great deal more in St. John than in Halifax.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Our harbour does not freeze, but the Halifax harbour does.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend (Mr. Domville) has referred to the Halifax harbour freezing. I think that not within his recollection has an event of that kind occurred. Moreover, we have very good depth of water all the time, which you do not always have at St. John.

Mr. CLANCY. It seems to me that a case might very well be supposed that would have two sides to it. We will suppose that the gentlemen owning a property were anxious to sell that property, as well as they could, and we will suppose that the Government were anxious to buy it as cheaply as they could. We will suppose another case, that they were disposed to favour a friend as well. There would be two alternative courses. One would be to call in valuers in order that too much would not be paid; another would be that if too much was paid, they could stand behind the valuers and say, if they were charged with paying too much for the property: We had the valuers there and that is sufficient justification. That is not an extreme supposition. I do not say that this is the case, but I say that if the Government were trying to defend themselves against an unfair attack, the appointment of valuers would be a very good way of doing it. If they were paying too much they would be able to shield themselves by appointing valuers.

Mr. McMULLEN. After listening to this debate I must confess that I am of the opinion that the valuers of this property appear to be very kind to the owners. I know nothing about the property, but, from the fact that the owners offered it for \$100,000, I do not think we should pay them one cent more, and I object to going into the Exchequer Court and having an exhaustive examination by sworn evidence.

Mr. BENNETT. The two hon. gentlemen representing the city of St. John, N.B., ought to know something of the value of this property, if any member of the House does, and yet the junior member (Mr. Tucker) has refrained from expressing any opinion at all. I believe he is an extensive property owner in the city and having been engaged in the marine business he must have a knowledge of the value of wharf property. And yet he has not favoured Parliament with an opinion as to the value of this property. Neither has the other member (Mr. Ellis) ventured an opinion as to the value.

Mr. ELLIS. Perhaps I may not have conveyed my idea to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett). My own judgment is that the property is worth the \$100,000 which the Government agreed to pay for it, and which the owners themselves offered to sell it for.

Mr. BENNETT. Not more.

Mr. ELLIS. I accept the view which is generally held in the city, that the \$100,000 is the fair value of this property.

Mr. BENNETT. Was the Government represented by counsel before the valuers?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. McLean represented the Government, but I was not there, and I do not know whether the other parties were represented by counsel.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I agree with what the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has said, that if the Government eventually decide to pay the \$100,000—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The \$100,000 has been paid.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Have the parties accepted it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought you said there was a further claim for \$18,000?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is true.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is merely a claim upon the benevolence of the Government?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose so. They say they offered the property to us for \$100,000, but that we would not accept it and took our chance of getting it at a lower price by expropriation. They contend that if the award had been lower than the \$100,000 they would have to accept it, and that the Government is bound by the converse of that. They have made a claim on the grace and bounty of the Crown to be paid the excess, but they have received no encouragement in any

Mr. McMULLEN.

shape or form from me, or none from the Minister of Finance, I believe.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Why was not a decision arrived at by the Government when this offer of the property was made for \$100,000?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At that stage the matter was not fully considered by the Government at all, and it was not dealt with by Council at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can easily understand that if the Government had accepted a property for \$100,000 without taking any steps to ascertain its value by arbitration, they would have been subject to the same criticism that they are now. I have heard Sir Charles Tupper state in this House that in expropriating property on the St. Charles Branch, he got sick and tired of valuations, because the Government were called upon to pay exorbitant prices. I believe that when a man starts to sell a property to the Government, he will try to beat the country out of every cent he can possibly get. That is, I believe, the rule from the Atlantic to the Pacific. These people offered the property to the Government for \$100,000, and it appears that the valuers, whether they intended it or not, have played into the hands of the sellers. But I do not think the Government should pay over \$100,000, and I think they should be prepared to fight it out to the bitter end, even to the extent of giving up the property rather than pay any more.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We contend that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) does not go far enough. That hon. gentleman admitted my argument. These gentlemen offered the property for \$100,000, and I claim that that was an exorbitant demand. The property at the outside was worth probably \$30,000.

Mr. GIBSON. They could not raise \$26,000 or \$30,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not see why they could not on \$30,000 or \$35,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why do you not say \$5,000 while you are at it?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister of Railways should not get facetious. His wit is elephantine, and does not go in the House of Commons.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are elephantine in your figures.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My figures are better than those of the Minister of Railways. I would like to know what these men got the property for.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that has the slightest relation to the subject.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Oh, no, not a bit. It would help us to judge what the property is worth. The men are here, and they can be asked to give this information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would have no objection at all to asking them, but I have not got the information.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend proposes to settle the value of this property by what was originally paid for it. I remember a case somewhat similar in connection with the St. Charles Branch. Additional accommodation was required at Point Lévis, and there was a property there for which the owner a short time before had paid a dollar a foot, and it was actually turned over to the Government at \$4 a foot by expropriation; and that is what the Government had to pay, because that was the value put upon it. It just shows what I stated, that property-owners will try to get out of the country all they can get. You really cannot fix the exact value by finding out what was originally paid for the property.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is some guide.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is not a sure guide. The city of St. John is a growing city, and I presume that there, as in other places, property may have risen considerably in value. Some years ago when the Harris property in St. John was bought by the then Minister of Railways for \$200,000, we had a discussion for a whole night, thinking there was something wrong with the purchase. I do not find fault with hon. gentlemen opposite for their criticism. They are perfectly within their rights, and, perhaps, the course they are taking is in the interests of the country; I believe it is. It appears to me rather singular that the valuers valued the property at \$18,000 more than the owners offered it for, and I think the Government would not be justified in paying a dollar more than \$100,000 for it.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the proposition of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) is a most reasonable one. The vendors of the property are in the city. Between now and to-morrow the Minister can see the title papers, which are, no doubt, in the department; and if the item is permitted to stand until to-morrow or a subsequent day, we could proceed with another item in the Estimates. As to the question of mortgage, that is a question also in doubt. I draw the attention of the hon. member for North Wellington to this fact, that the Minister does not know whether or not the sum was for principal alone or principal and interest together. If there was a large arrears of interest, that would make a considerable difference.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think there are large arrears of interest.

Mr. BENNETT. Another point, the amount at which the city assessed the property for municipal purposes would be an indication of its value.

Mr. McNEILL. The observations of the hon. member for North Wellington were very fair and in very good spirit, but I must confess that, assuming that these gentlemen, who were appointed by the Government, were competent and honourable men, I am not quite clear that the Government are not under some moral obligation to give \$118,000. The Government had the option to buy at \$100,000 and did not accept it, but said they would ask certain gentlemen to make a true valuation, and these men told the Government that the property was worth \$118,000. Under these circumstances, I do not feel clear that the Government are not bound to give the \$118,000, but I do not express an absolute opinion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was not exactly a case of option. When the proposal was made to me to sell this property, I was anxious to protect the Government at all points. I had received the impression from my communication with others that \$100,000 was probably not an unfair sum. But when they were anxious to close the transaction, for reasons they explained to me, I said: Are you willing that we should take this property at \$100,000 with the option of putting it into expropriation proceedings, in which case you are not to claim more than \$100,000? They agreed to this, and I took the precaution to get this from them in writing. I have their telegram, in which they agreed that this property might at once be taken by the Government. They asked \$100,000, and were willing to take that at once, but they were also content that we should take expropriation proceedings, in which case their claim would still be only \$100,000. My hon. friend from Halifax took exception to my remark that these were ordinary proceedings in expropriation, but my remark was substantially correct. When the Government proceed to expropriate lands for a canal they file their plans and thus acquire the title, and then they appoint one or more valuers, and if the figures arrived at by the valuers are satisfactory to the Government, they tender that sum to the owner, and if the owner sees fit to reject their tender he may take his suit in the Exchequer Court. The owners of this land wanted to sell and they offered it for \$100,000. Acting on behalf of the Government, I said: We will take the land on condition that we shall pay no more than \$100,000, and if we proceed to expropriation you are not to claim more. Men of the highest character and experience were appointed valuers, and after spending several weeks on the matter, they came to the conclusion that the property was worth \$118,550. That is ample vindication of the Government buying it at \$100,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is simply proof that the gentlemen appointed were not good valuers. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) screwed his courage up to the point of saying that he thinks it is worth \$100,000, in the opinion of the people around, but will not say that there is a shadow of foundation for making it worth \$118,000.

Mr. ELLIS. These valuers heard the evidence, and that was their judgment after hearing all the facts.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Was the hon. gentleman present?

Mr. ELLIS. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The fact remains that these men put a very outside value on this property when they offered it to the Government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think they did.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman says they did not, and yet they were willing, if a board of arbitration allowed them more, not to claim more. They were dead certain that the valuers would not allow them more.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They committed themselves to accept \$100,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not believe the property was worth that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of course you know best.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not pretend to know. I venture to say that a good many hon. gentlemen opposite do not believe that the property is worth \$100,000. I venture to say that the hon. Minister still has grave doubts as to its being worth \$100,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not the least doubt.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then the hon. gentleman differs with a good many of his followers. If it is such an absolute certainty that the property is worth \$100,000, in a very few minutes he can get the price paid by these gentlemen who sold to the Government. The hon. gentleman must have the deeds, as no doubt he had a search made as to the title.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, a full search.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then it all will appear in the deeds?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It might not.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I venture to say that it does. I would ask that this vote stand until we get that evidence.

Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What evidence?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Just what these gentlemen paid for the property.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How does that affect the question? Suppose they had obtained the property as a gift.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is an entirely different thing. They bought it as a business transaction, and they sold it as a business transaction. How much did they pay for it? How long did they own it? How much did they spend on it? What was the income of it? What was it assessed for by the city? These are the questions that we want answered, and I submit they are not unreasonable questions. Surely, we are not here to pass these things without information. I am not impugning the motives to the hon. gentleman, and I never do impugn the motives of any member of this House. I am not saying that there is anything wrong. If it is shown that these gentlemen paid anything like the sum of money for this property that the Government is paying, I will acknowledge that I was wrong. I can only say that so far as I am concerned, we have got to get that information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know what these gentlemen spent, nor do I know what price they paid.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But the people are here.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But I cannot very well bring them into this Chamber to state what they paid, nor can I go away and inquire of them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) is not reasonable, nor is not fair, in suggesting that this item should stand for this reason. It is a matter of indifference to this House—

Mr. MONTAGUE. How the money is spent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman will find that, so far as the Department of Railways and Canals is concerned, there is just as much anxiety to get value for every dollar that is paid as there was when the department was under the direction of his hon. friends.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not questioning that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In my opinion it is a matter of indifference to this committee and to the country what these gentlemen paid for the property, or what they have spent upon it. There is only one way in which the Government can proceed in cases where it has

to acquire property. We have to depend, in order to ascertain the value, upon the judgment and experience of men whom we select to advise us. Proceedings are constantly being taken for expropriation in my department. There are not tens, not hundreds, but thousands of cases? What principle would the hon. gentleman have us proceed upon? No Minister can give his personal attention to these matters or ascertain the value of these properties. This only he can do, and this he is bound to do—to select as careful, competent and reliable men as he can find, to advise him as to the value of the property. I venture to say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) will not find among his political friends in St. John one individual of credit who will say that the valuers chosen by the Government are not as competent and as reliable men as can be chosen in the city of St. John. And what would these men do? They would ask honourable and well-informed men, who have no interest in anything except what is fair, what the value of this property is. They would not invite before them people of no experience, people of no standing, people who have no characters to maintain. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the gentlemen who conducted this valuation have just as much regard for their own characters as any member of this House. They have put their names and pledged their characters and respectability to the statement that this property has a value of \$118,000. Now, what can the hon. gentleman say I did that I ought not to have done; what can he say that I left undone that I ought to have done? What other means could I have taken to assure the public that this transaction was fair and square, open and above board? These gentlemen having decided this to be the value, the hon. gentleman says the property is not worth more than \$40,000 or \$50,000. What does he mean? Has he any authority for such a statement? Ought he, as a member of this House, to suggest that these men of character and respectability have entered upon a scheme to rob the Government to put money into the pockets of certain property owners, regardless of their honour and their duty? It is a cheap way to make a point for the hon. gentleman to say that he does not believe that the property is worth this amount. But he has not a single circumstance to support his opinion. He does not know the property, never saw it, and, I dare say, never heard of it until to-night. Are statements made by an hon. member under such circumstances of the slightest value? Does he wish to have his judgment and opinion, as a member of Parliament, treated with respect, that he makes such a statement in this House? I say that to defer the further consideration of this item in order to find out what these gentlemen paid for the pro-

perty, is simply to make a farce of the whole business. We have done everything to make sure that we are not paying more than the property is worth. These gentlemen have given the deeds of the property, and, the transaction being closed, there is no reason why this item should not pass.

Mr. DAVIN. I will give the hon. Minister the reason why this item should be closely canvassed. Both the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden) have laid down the doctrine that the Opposition are as responsible for an item passed in Committee as the Government. I contested that view last night, and I did so on the authority of Mr. Gladstone. But we have these two prominent members of the Government declaring that if we pass an item, whether we criticise it or not, we are responsible for it. The hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Earle) I could call as a witness that, in regard to the proposal to send the militia to the Yukon, he and I discussed and disapproved of it. But, on looking at "Hansard," I find that I did not express my opinion in the House as perhaps I should have done. And last night I ventured to criticise the appropriation under that head, and the Minister of Militia said: You are as responsible as we are. Now, in regard to this large item—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The item was passed last year.

Mr. DAVIN. It is evident that if we do not canvass this item, we shall be told that we are responsible for it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am a little astonished at the warmth of the Minister of Railways and Canals. That is, in my judgment, not an evidence of the strength of his case. Now, if a Minister has made what he is able to show is a good bargain for the country, he will be willing at every stage to answer every question, and to give every tittle of evidence he can to show the value of that bargain to the country. If this was a good bargain, we would have the Minister of Railways and Canals down here with all these figures, just as we had the Minister of Militia and Defence this afternoon reading a whole list of figures.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He had plenty of time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And so have we plenty of time to deal with a \$100,000 bargain made by the Minister of Railways and Canals. Why does he not give us the information in this regard?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have given you all the information I have.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I say the information the hon. gentleman has given us wholly dis-

credits the transaction. Has one gentleman spoken on the other side of the House tonight who has not discredited those valuers? The hon. gentleman asks me why I have the audacity to rise and asperse these gentlemen? I have not aspersed these gentlemen. It is the Minister of Finance who has discredited them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I said that inasmuch as the company had bound themselves to sell the property for \$100,000, that was all I was willing to admit they had a right to. But I said that after the valuers had placed it at a higher figure, there was room for a difference of opinion to the extent of \$18,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I must accept the statement, but I believe the hon. gentleman will be found in the "Hansard" to have said that he was astonished, or surprised, at the report of these gentlemen.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was surprised that any question could be raised as against the Government for more than \$100,000. I say that now. The company had bound themselves by their communication simply to accept the \$100,000, and my surprise was that they should want anything more. The first intimation I had of the valuation from the owners of the land, who came to me for the other \$18,000, and I was surprised that they should ask for anything more than \$100,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) himself say that that property is worth \$118,000? Not at all. Take the junior member for St. John (Mr. Tucker), will he say the property is worth \$118,000?

Mr. TUCKER. I said that these men, the valuers, were respectable men, in whom we have confidence in our city, and when they arrived at this conclusion we placed some value upon it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman is too good a business man not to have an opinion of his own on this question. He will not say that the property is worth \$100,000.

Mr. TUCKER. I will tell you this much. I have been on the property before it was spoken of for Government purposes, several times, but I never looked at it with an eye as to its value. Since the Government have purchased it I made it my business to go down on one occasion to see it. Not knowing the relative value of land on either side, I did not know, nor do I know anything about it, and to arrive at a conclusion worth anything as to the actual valuation of that property, was on my part utterly impossible. Therefore, I could not stand here as you do and value land that I never saw. I would not pretend to do it. But I must say that I have some little faith in the report of respectable people.

Mr. MONTAGUE.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If these gentlemen had placed a valuation at \$218,000, he will endorse their opinion, because they are respectable men.

Mr. TUCKER. I have sufficient faith in the gentlemen who form that commission to know that they would not make a wild report with the opportunity they had of examining the relative value of the land in the vicinity.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have shown that the friends of the Government have discredited their own commission. Now, what possible reason is there that this cannot stand over?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Surely the hon. gentleman does not want the impression created that he simply wants to block the thing for the purpose of blocking it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does it not look like that. Supposing that upon inquiry I find that the property was bought for \$20,000—

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then, I say that you paid three times too much for it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS—supposing that, after it was bought, \$10,000 was spent upon it how does that bear upon the question before us. And upon what ground can the hon. gentleman ask that this appropriation should not be made when I, as the head of the department, and when my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who was acting in my absence, so far as our conduct is concerned, have done everything that it was our duty to have done in this connection and on the strength of which we paid the money?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that I agree with him to a certain extent in what he says. I agree that the amount that these gentlemen paid for the property is not conclusive as to its value. If these gentlemen had bought this property in the open market three months before and had spent no money upon it, it would be a most important thing for the House or for the judge of the Exchequer Court to know what they paid for it. But, if they paid a certain amount fifteen years ago, when conditions were different and business was not booming as it is now, it would have nothing to do with it at all. A recent purchase under circumstances similar to the present, would be a most relevant fact for the court or the House to know; otherwise it might not have any relevancy at all, and in any case it is not conclusive. Even if the owners only paid \$50,000 for it, the Government might be perfectly right in paying \$100,000, because these gentlemen might have got a

good bargain. I know of a case, as I said before, where the valuations of property ranged from \$15,000 to \$80,000, according to the opinions of the witnesses. Because the House does not agree with the opinion of the valuator in this case, I do not think there is any aspersion cast upon them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. How should the value have been determined?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not say that the value was not properly determined. I think it was a prudent measure for the Government to ask three men to value this property. The only thing that the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) proposes is that the hon. Minister should ascertain the price that the parties paid for this property, and lay it before the House before the item passes.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. member for Haldimand has thrown the taunt across the floor of the House that there was not an hon. gentleman on this side who was prepared to stand up and defend a transaction of this kind. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the discussion in reference to this matter, and I must say that in it the Government deserve the support not only of the members on this side, but of the members on the other side of the House as well. Here we find these gentlemen owning a piece of property. I understand that they held that property for some years, and not for a month or two, as the hon. member for Haldimand suggests. They went into this transaction with the bona fide intention of establishing a steamship line. The hon. member for Haldimand says that the deeds will show what they paid for that property. Every lawyer and every hon. gentleman in this House who has had any experience in purchasing property knows that the price to be found in a deed is no criterion of the value of property. It is simply a conveyance of the land to the parties purchasing the property. There may have been \$10,000, or \$15,000, or \$75,000 put on the property after these gentlemen purchased it. Did the Government make reasonable inquiries as to the value of the property? The hon. Minister of Finance, who was acting in the absence of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in England, took the trouble to go down to St. John and make personal inquiry as to the value of the property, and I am informed, on reliable authority, that gentlemen who are well acquainted with the value of properties in St. John, gave it as their honest opinion, that this property was worth \$100,000. The gentlemen owning the property offered it to the Government for \$100,000, and the hon. Minister of Finance said that \$100,000 would be the maximum, in any case, that they would give to the owners of the

property, with the right to cut it down if they could. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals returned to the country. He was not satisfied about the value of this property, and he asked three independent gentlemen in St. John, occupying the highest position in the country, to act as arbitrators and as advisers of the Government as to the value of the property. These gentlemen, whose integrity cannot be questioned and whose reputation is at stake, and I would here remark that the reputation of the hon. members supporting the Government is as much at stake as that of hon. gentlemen opposite, gave it as their opinion that the property was worth \$118,000. The Government expropriated the property and paid \$100,000 for it, and they were justified in paying \$100,000. I am glad to know that the Government did not see their way clear to paying this \$18,000, because the bargain was made on the basis of \$100,000. All that troubles the hon. member for Haldimand is that the Government went out of their way to take this ordinary precaution, because, if the transaction had been carried through when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power they would have expropriated the property and paid \$118,000 without any question at all. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) asks the Government to allow this item to stand in order to give the Conservative papers an opportunity of saying to-morrow that the Government had been caught paying more than it was worth for this property.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman must not impute motives.

Mr. GIBSON. I do not want to impute motives, and I withdraw. We know that from the moment the Mackenzie Government took power until they went out of office it was constantly and repeatedly assailed and attacked, and since the present Liberal Government came into power there has been a combination to try and discredit it in the House and out of the House and everywhere. I am proud to say that up to the present moment the Opposition have been unable to find anything against this Government, and in this particular transaction the Government are to be congratulated upon its businesslike disposal of it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) says that there was \$26,000 loaned on this property and that the entire value was only \$30,000. How does he know that the \$26,000 covered the whole property, and it certainly is not likely that any company would lend \$26,000 on a property only worth \$30,000? How does he know but that that loan was obtained to rebuild the wharf or to make improvements? Neither would the transfer of the property be any value in fixing the price, because it is quite possible that between the time it came into the hands of the late owners and its sale to the Government many improvements may have been made. No

transaction that has been brought forward in the House for a long time so commends itself to the good judgment of Parliament as this one.

Mr. McNEILL. I would suggest to the Minister that as it is now 12 o'clock, he might grant the reasonable request made by the member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), and I believe if he does so more progress will be made. I have been here a good many sessions, and I hope the Minister will pardon me for saying, that I have a little more experience of the working of the committees of this House than has my hon. friend, and I have never found any good come of keeping the House sitting when we reach a crisis of this kind. In view of the fact that we have had such a long session, I think the Minister had better let the item stand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I concede that it is desirable that we should make an early adjournment to-night, and if the committee pass this resolution I would be willing to adjourn. If this item were allowed to stand I cannot help thinking that such a course would involve an acknowledgment that there was something needed in the way of further information to justify the committee passing this resolution.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the report of the evidence was here, I suppose it would contain the very information we want.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That may or may not be found in the report. If there was anything suggested in the way of doubt as to the bona fides of the Government in this transaction, or that sufficient information has not been furnished I would at once consent to let the item stand. I, for one, will not admit that every document in connection with all the items in supply should be piled up here in the lobby in expectation that some hon. gentleman would ask for information contained in some of them. If any gentleman thinks this transaction has an unpleasant odour, for any reason at all, let him move for the papers, and they will be brought down.

Mr. DAVIN. It is too late in the session now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not by any means. You have the Public Accounts doing nothing, and they can investigate it any time. Let that committee take this subject up, and investigate it root and branch; but do not ask us to keep Parliament waiting, and stop the granting of the supplies while you are getting something that has no real business connection with the Estimates which are going through.

Mr. DAVIN. If this item passes, will the hon. gentleman say that he will bring down the papers?

Mr. GIBSON.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Unquestionably I will. The hon. member for Halifax suggested that we might furnish the report and all the evidence and papers that we received from the commission, and I will do so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman, it appears to me, has shown the weakness of his own case by his refusal to give us the information we ask. If this is a splendid bargain for the Government, why should not the hon. gentleman pile up evidence to show that it is? I have not suggested that the transaction is fishy or dishonest. I am only suggesting that too much was paid for the property. I am not suggesting that it was intentionally paid; it may have been paid in ignorance; and the hon. gentleman has no right to assume that he was being attacked or to allow his anger to rise against gentlemen on this side of the House, who are quite within their right in making this criticism. The hon. gentleman says that the information which I ask for has nothing whatever to do with the question, and that we have no right to question him as to the expenditure of \$100,000 out of last year's vote, when he is asking for a vote which has no connection with that at all. But he is asking for a vote in continuation of that work, and we are entitled to ask for every detail of the expenditure that has already taken place in connection with the same work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. Minister of Finance admits that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I admit that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When he is in his seat the hon. gentleman admits that, but when he is on his feet he scolds me for my attempt to get the particulars of that expenditure. Now, I will make what I think is a fair proposition. Let us pass that page of items, and let us reserve this one on the understanding that we shall have the full privilege of discussing the others. I am sure that is evidence that I do not desire to block the hon. gentleman's estimates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no objection to that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. On this understanding, that the hon. gentleman will bring down the evidence on the purchase, and every information he has.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That proposition is not an unreasonable one, and I accede to that. It will not be understood at all as involving any question of or reflection upon this particular transaction.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not see how it could in any way.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). I want to say this to the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), who is always fair in discussing items in Supply, that, whatever may have been the price paid for this property by these gentlemen, that ought not to be introduced as an element in considering the present value of the property. I do not know what amount these gentlemen paid for it; I have never felt that I was justified in asking them; I thought that was a matter of their own private concern, which they were not called upon to disclose. The question which I, as a member of the Government, had to concern myself with was, what is the present value of the property? A great deal has taken place in the city of St. John since these gentlemen acquired this property. Its importance as an ocean port has enormously increased. In fact, it has only been recognized as an ocean port since then. Large and important wharfs involving a cost of \$750,000, have been constructed by the municipality of St. John near this property, and it has been enhanced in value accordingly. As St. John was growing as an ocean port, it was evident that the time was not far distant when this property would come into demand for the purposes for which the neighbouring properties were being used. Moreover, I want hon. members to consider this further fact, that this property was returning to its owners a rental of over \$5,000 a year. Now, how can any hon. gentleman with a business thought on this subject, suggest any less value than \$100,000 in respect of a property which was bringing to its owners that annual return?

Committee rose, and reported progress.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Wednesday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 12th July, 1899.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. **FORTIN** moved that the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be empowered to employ a shorthand writer

to take down such evidence as they may deem necessary.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. **FORTIN** moved that all the proceedings of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, and all the evidence which may be taken before it, be printed from day to day for the use of the members of the committee, and that rule 94 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

### MR. MARTIN JEROME.

Mr. **ROCHE** asked:

1. Is Mr. Martin Jerome an employee of the Interior Department in the province of Manitoba as forest ranger or in any other capacity?

2. If so, is he the same gentleman who is the Liberal candidate for the constituency of Carillon in the ensuing elections in that province?

3. Will his services be continued by the Government while he is engaged in party politics?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). 1. Mr. Martin Jerome is an employee of the Interior Department in the province of Manitoba as forest ranger. 2. Inquiry has elicited the fact that Mr. Jerome has been tendered but has not accepted a nomination for the legislature. 3. Should Mr. Jerome accept the nomination his employment in his present capacity will cease.

### I. C. R.—APPOINTMENT OF MR. BRUCE McDOUGALL.

Mr. **McDOUGALL** (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

1. Has Bruce McDougall, of Moncton, received an appointment as an official on the Intercolonial Railway, in the general offices there, and if so, what appointment?

2. Has the Government any information that the said Bruce McDougall published a paper in Moncton called the "Plain Dealer"?

3. Was said paper excluded from the mails, and if so, on what ground? Was it on the ground of its scurrility and indecency?

4. Has the Government any information to the effect that the said Bruce McDougall while publishing said "Plain Dealer" referred therein to the present manager of the Intercolonial Railway and other leading officials thereof in a manner reflecting upon their personal character, and also upon their conduct in official matters?

5. Upon whose recommendation was said Bruce McDougall employed as such official?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). 1. C. Bruce McDougall has been appointed as clerk in the audit office at Moncton. 2. The Government is aware that the said C. Bruce McDougall published a paper in Moncton called the "Plain Dealer." 3. The department have no knowledge of the said paper being excluded from the mails. 4. The Government has no information as regards question number four. 5. Mr. C. B. McDougall was appointed upon the usual recommendation.

## THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. HUGHES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say, as a member of the Public Accounts Committee, that some days ago certain witnesses were ordered to come here to give evidence in a certain subject before that committee. The witnesses were summoned for last Tuesday, and were present, but no meeting of the committee has yet been summoned, and the witnesses are kept here at public expense. The delay also necessitates my remaining here on this glorious 12th of July, in the city of Ottawa, instead of being out in my own riding commemorating the event which brought civil and religious liberty into the world. I regret exceedingly that the chairman of the committee has so neglected his duty in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. HUGHES. Perhaps I am out of order. I would like to ask and to find out, if possible, when this committee will meet, so that these witnesses may not be kept here away from their homes at public expense?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I beg leave to say in reply to the hon. gentleman that the committee met on various days and there was no business done. Yesterday it could not meet on account of the hon. member and others with him who kept the House in session all the time. I was going to call a meeting the night before last, but I saw from the temper of the hon. gentleman and others associated with him, that it was no use to do so. As to the hon. gentleman being prevented from promulgating those noble principles he refers to, I beg leave to say, as an individual member, that whatever may be my attachment to any order, the performance of my duty as a member of the House is of more importance than anything else. We are here to attend to public business, and we must do so.

Mr. HUGHES. I resent the personal aspersions cast upon me by the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. The hon. gentleman was not in the city, and was, therefore, not in this House. He was not here, and that is the reason he did not call a meeting of the committee.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I was here yesterday morning, and would have called a meeting if there was any gentlemen to attend it.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman was absent from the city. His statement is entirely erroneous in saying that he could not call this committee.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). That is not true, and he knows it.

Mr. BLAIR.

## SCRIP FOR THE HALF-BREEDS.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to a very important statement which is made in the "Daily Herald" of Calgary, of July 8th. It will be remembered that when we had a very important Bill before this committee, one clause of which provides for giving scrip to the half-breeds of the North-west, the Minister of the Interior said:

Notwithstanding all the years I have lived in the North-west, I never saw one of these original certificates until I came to the department.

When I came to examine the certificate, I found that it simply said: "This certificate entitles John Smith or the bearer to \$240 worth of scrip," setting out the particulars. So that when a certificate was issued, all that a broker had to do was to get possession of it without making himself liable for stealing it, and he would be entitled to come here and make a demand for the scrip.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is quoting from a previous debate.

Mr. DAVIN. I am going to refer to—

Mr. SPEAKER. But the hon. gentleman must not quote. An indirect reference might be made to a debate, but certainly not a quotation.

Mr. DAVIN. It will be remembered that the hon. Minister of the Interior said that the scrip that will be issued by the commission will not be payable to bearer as previous scrip was, but that it could not be alienated without an assignment, and that assignment would have to be lodged in the Department of the Interior. He made a point by saying that the half-breeds who got the scrip would thus be protected, as they were not protected previously. In the paper to which I have referred, the Calgary "Herald," July 8th, I find the following:—

Some peculiar stories are in circulation in reference to the half-breed scrip issued by the treaty commissioners and now offered for sale by speculators. Notwithstanding Mr. Sifton's declaration to the contrary, the scrip is made payable to bearer, a portion of the printed matter having been struck out by the commissioners.

I think the hon. Minister of the Interior will thank me for bringing this before him and giving him an opportunity of making an explanation in regard to the matter.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The statement which I made to the House the other day is absolutely correct. I would only say in regard to the hon. gentleman's statement, that I cannot enter into a full explanation of the matter at the present stage, because we are not at a stage of the proceedings of the House that would permit me to go into it. I have received a number of official papers, letters of recommendation and of advice from the commissioners, and

so soon as my estimates are reached, or at any other convenient stage of the proceedings, I will lay the papers before the House and give a full explanation of the whole matter.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION—SALE OF BINDER TWINE.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I have something to say very important to myself as well as important to the country, and, to put myself right, I will conclude with a motion. In the Ottawa "Evening Journal" of yesterday, the following statement is made by the writer in the gallery, I have no doubt, who reported the proceedings of this House :

Proceeding, Mr. Taylor said, that as shrewd business men, Bate & Sons knew that their action would put the Government under an obligation to them. They bought the Government binder twine the next year at 4 cents, and sold it at an average of 13 cents, thus making enough to pay for two or three houses.

The enterprising editor or proprietor of the "Journal" sent one of the reporters of that paper to see Messrs. Bate & Sons :

A "Journal" reporter to-day called at H. N. Bate & Sons regarding Mr. Taylor's statements.

The "Journal" says that I made a statement that Bate & Sons purchased binder twine at four cents a pound. I made no such statement. After having made reference to the question of the house, to which I need not refer again, as that matter was discussed yesterday, the statement in the "Journal" proceeds :

"Another lie," said Mr. H. A. Bate, in the interview with him, "was the assertion that the firm had bought the Government's binder twine at 4 cents and sold it at 13 cents."

The statement I made in the House, as reported in "Hansard," is as follows :—

They were allowed to purchase 100,000 lbs. of binder twine from the penitentiary, without tender, last year, at 4½ cents per pound,—

At 4½ cents a pound. Who told that lie? Certainly it was not me. It was the "Journal" reporter in this House, who published the false statement that I had stated that 4 cents was paid for binder twine, when the statement I made was that 4½ cents was the price which Bate & Sons paid. The next statement they make is, that the statement that they sold at an average of 13 cents is false. I did not make the statement that they sold at all, because I believe the fact is that they did not sell it to the farmers of this country. The statement I made was this :

—and through the ring they sold it at 13½ cents a pound to the farmers throughout this country.

I said that it was sold through the ring, and I will prove, before I sit down, that there is a ring, and every hon. member of this House from Ontario, or from any other province where binder twine is used, knows that the farmers of this country had to pay from 13 to 16 cents a pound for their binder twine. The average was about 13½ cents that the farmers had to pay for this article. I did not say that Bate & Sons sold it to the farmers; the statement I made was that it was sold through the ring. Another statement that Messrs. Bate & Sons gave to the reporter is :

If we had bought at 4 and sold at 13 it would have been perfectly legitimate, provided we tendered in open market for the twine, which we did. The Government advertised for tenders.

There they make a statement, and I will leave it between them and the right hon. Prime Minister to say who tells the lie, because, if my right hon. friend will refer to "Hansard," page 1873, he will see that I put this question to the Government :

2. To whom and at what price was the binder twine manufactured at the Kingston Penitentiary between the first day of July, 1897, and the 30th June, 1898, sold? Were tenders called for, and in what papers were they advertised?

The Prime Minister replied to me as follows :—

To H. N. Bate & Sons, Ottawa, at the following prices :—Sisaf, \$4.15 per cwt.; Beaver, \$4.45 per cwt.; Maple Leaf, \$4.95 per cwt. These were the exact figures that I quoted the other night when I said the average was about 4½ cents a pound.

Tenders were called for by circular addressed to the leading dealers throughout the Dominion.

Bate & Sons say that tenders were advertised for. The Prime Minister says that a private circular was sent out to the leading dealers throughout the Dominion. At a later date, I asked the right hon. Prime Minister this question :

What are the names and post office addresses of the leading dealers throughout the Dominion to whom circulars were sent inviting them to tender for the output of the binder twine manufactured at the Kingston Penitentiary between the 1st day of July, 1897, and the 30th June, 1898?

The hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), answering for the Department of Justice, said :

The following are the firms to whom circulars were sent :—

Remember that the right hon. Prime Minister said that they were sent to the leading dealers throughout the Dominion, and Bate & Sons say that, in response to a public advertisement, they tendered in open market. I will prove, before I sit down, that there

was no tender at all, but that the twine was sold before the circular was passed. Who were the leading dealers throughout the Dominion to whom this circular was sent? The gentlemen who composed the ring that has controlled the article of binder twine for the last year or two were the parties, with one or two exceptions, to whom I will refer, to whom this circular was sent :

Wood, Wallace & Co., Hamilton ; Hobbs Hardware Co., London, Ont.; John Hallam, Toronto.

Everybody knows who John Hallam is. A party heeler, not in that line at all.

Rice, Lewis & Co., Toronto ; H. Mooers, Kingston.

The gentleman there who handles the funds of the party when there is an election on, and who is not a merchant at all.

J. H. Ashdown & Co., Winnipeg.

The gentleman who handled the twine for all that part of the country for the ring, and a defeated candidate at the last election.

Coll Bros., of St. John, N.B.

To whom, as I shall prove, this Government sold the output of binder twine as soon as it was made in 1896, without tender, and who handed it over to the Hobbs Hardware Company. Coll Bros. bought it one year, the Hobbs Hardware Company the next, and Bate & Sons the next. This is the ring that controlled it.

The Farmers' Binder Twine and Agricultural Manufacturing Co., Brantford.

Which I shall prove by Mr. Bate's statement are also in the ring.

Charles Braithwaite, Portage la Prairie, and Jas. Elder, Virden, Man.

Both farmers, one a defeated candidate in the last election who opposed my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche), and neither of whom is in that line of business at all ; and H. N. Bate & Sons of Ottawa. These are the names given by the Solicitor General as the leading business firms to whom the Prime Minister said this circular was sent. Not a circular was sent to Halifax, not one to Montreal, not one to Quebec, not one to Victoria, or to any other place. Not a circular was sent to the Massey Manufacturing Company, the largest binder twine handlers in Ontario or in the Dominion. The Government wanted to hand it over to their friends, and they did so, as I will prove before I sit down.

Mr. BERGERON. To help a combine.

Mr. TAYLOR. Not only to help but to form a combine, with their knowledge. Mr. Bate says :

The Government advertised for tenders. We replied. We do not know whether there were other tenderers or not. We got the contract in March, 1898, at an average of about 4.50. That

Mr. TAYLOR.

this was a reasonable price was proved by a purchase we made later, when prices had risen. In March, on the rising market, we bought from a private firm in Brantford 307,000 pounds of binder twine at 4.80 cents per 100 lbs.

That is the output of the Farmers' Binder Twine Company, of Brantford, which is handed over to the ring in order to gull the farmers of this country and make them pay from 13 to 16 cents a pound. He says further :

The pure manilla, bought at 4.95 from the Government went at 6.05 to 6.20.

The sisal, bought at 4.15, went at 4.90 to 5.25.

He does not say to whom. It went into the pool at these prices.

" Mr. Taylor's false statement that we sold at an average of 13 cents," said Mr. Bate, " was doubtless a guess based on the fact that the market made an extraordinary advance last year, and the highest price for the best twine towards the end of the year did touch 13 cents, which we did not get."

They practically admit my price, saying that it was got at the end of the year, after the pool was completed. But they do not sell to the retail trade of this country at all ; they do not handle binder twine. It is sold by the Hobbs Company and their branches throughout the country. He repeats again :

" We got the contract by tender in open competition, paid a fair price and sold at ordinary profits. I take the trouble to explain this, not because we would not have had a right to sell at the most exorbitant profit if we could have got it, but because when a man will make the recklessly false assertions Mr. Taylor has done about the binder twine, it can be judged how much reliance can be placed on his vile slander upon Sir Wilfrid Laurier."

Now, I want to ask who told the lies ? I did not make the statement that Bate & Sons bought the twine for 4 cents. The statement I made was that they had bought at 4½ cents. Who told that lie ? I did not say that they sold to the farmers of this country at 13½ cents. Who made that false statement ? " Hansard " proves that I said it was sold to the farmers by the ring who handled the twine. What is wrong about that ? They say tenders were called for by advertisement. The Prime Minister said : " No, there was a private circular sent to the leading dealers." Who told the falsehood there ? What else is there for me to prove ? I have told no lies in connection with the matter. I made the statement, which they admit, that they bought it from the Government without tender at 4½ cents a pound, and that it was sold to the farmers at 13½ cents. Now, I will prove that they bought it without tender. I moved in the Public Accounts Committee for all the correspondence in reference to this deal. After fighting pretty hard, I got it by piecemeal ; and what is the first document ? On the 19th of February, 1899, the Minister of Justice writes a letter to Messrs. Bate & Sons with whom

he had previously had an interview in regard to the matter. In that letter, he says :

Referring to the interview between the Minister of Justice and your Mr. H. Allen Bate, I am directed by the Minister to state that he is prepared to consider any definite proposal which you may submit in connection with the manufacture of binder twine at the Kingston Penitentiary.

I may also inform you that we have on hand at Kingston Penitentiary a quantity of three different grades of twine, and the Minister will be glad to receive any offer which you may make in that connection, such offer to be treated confidentially pending a definite decision in reference thereto.

Whatever was said and done, in dealing with the property of the people of this country, must be confidential—

The twine referred to is the produce of the manufacture of the current fiscal year.

This document I only got by seeing that the next letter proved that one of that date had been written. On the 28th of February, Messrs. Bate & Sons wrote to the Minister of Justice, as follows :—

Ottawa, February 28th, 1898.

To the Hon. David Mills,  
Minister of Justice, Ottawa.

Sir,—Referring to the request contained in yours of the 19th instant, relative to making you an offer for the binder twine on hand, we beg to submit the following :—

For about 60 tons of sisal..... \$4 50 per 100

For about 120 tons mixed manilla ..... 4 45 do

For about 100 tons pure manilla 4 95 do

Subject to cash settlements on dates of deliveries at our option, f.o.b. Kingston, providing of course that the manufacturing is well done and in perfect condition.

We are, awaiting the favour of an early reply,

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) H. N. BATE & SONS.

Remember, the hon. Minister of Justice got that offer on the 28th of February, and no doubt at once decided that he would hand the twine over to these people. I have no doubt that he went to Council with that proposition, but Council had to give some impression of honesty, and they issued a circular dated the 5th of March, calling for tenders. The Prime Minister said this was sent to all the leading dealers throughout the country. It was sent to the parties I have named, and what time was left for a reply? It had to be typewritten and addressed, so that I suppose it would leave the office about the 10th of March, and the tenders had to be returned by the 19th. There was not time for a letter to go to Virden and back, nor to Victoria and back. This is the circular :

Ottawa, 5th March, 1898.

Sealed tenders, endorsed "Tender for Twine," and addressed "Inspector of Penitentiaries, Ottawa," will be received until Saturday, the 19th instant, inclusive, for the prospective output of the twine factory at the Kingston Penitentiary for the current year. The lot consists approxi-

mately of 500 tons of "Maple Leaf," "Beaver" and "Pure Sisal" brands, and includes the twine on hand and manufactured since the 1st of August last, as well as that which may be manufactured before the 1st of August next. The twine will be delivered f.o.b. cars, Kingston, in quantities to suit the purchases. The Penitentiary warehouse to be cleared of all twine on the 1st of August next, at which date the contract will terminate.

Terms, cash on delivery.

The quality of the twine may be ascertained by inspection at the Penitentiary warehouse.

Tenders should state the price per pound for each grade, and must be accompanied by accepted cheque of \$2,000, payable to the order of the Minister of Justice, which, in the event of the tender being accepted, will be retained by the department as a guarantee of the faithful performance of the contract and accounted for in the final settlement.

That was the circular calling for tenders, which the Prime Minister said was sent to all the leading dealers throughout this country, but which was sent to the five or six gentlemen who composed this ring which bled the farmers white last year. The next is the document I read in reply to the answer of the hon. Minister to my inquiry, which I put to the House some time ago, giving a list of the parties to whom tenders were sent. The next document on the file is dated 28th February, a copy of the one I read from Bate & Sons to the Minister of Justice. But on the 19th March, the day that tenders were to be called for, and which were to be received up to the 19th, the department got a document from Bate & Sons, which was not a tender at all, but simply a letter to the Minister, and which reads as follows :—

Ottawa, March 19th, 1898.

To Douglas Stewart,  
Inspector of Penitentiaries.

Dear Sir,—Referring to your circular of the 5th instant, calling for sealed tenders for the prospective output of binder twine at the Kingston Penitentiary for the current year, we beg to say you may consider our offer made on the 28th ult., and addressed to the Hon. David Mills, Minister of Justice, for certain quantities of twine, as applying to the output for the current year.

In regard to the deposit of \$2,000 asked for in your circular, and referring to our conversation over the 'phone this morning,—

Letters were not sufficient; they had a private conversation over the telephone.

—we will be pleased to send you our accepted cheque on Tuesday next, if desired. Kindly advise us on this point, and oblige,

Yours truly,

BATE & SONS.

There is the open competition. In reply to the circular, there was not a tender put in at all, because the ring had control, the ring knew to whom invitations had been sent, and the Minister of Justice handed over to Bate & Sons the entire output, on the condition of their letter of February 28th, without requiring them to deposit any

cheque or to put up anything. No tender came in, and the Government deliberately and wilfully handed over the output of binder twine to Bate & Sons at a price far below its true value, judging by the prices paid for it by the people of this country. I want to ask who told the lie, and who told the truth. I say that no tender was put in, and there was no advertisement in the papers, as Bate & Sons say. And to prove my other statement, let me refer to the return which has come down and show the House to whom the output of binder twine was shipped in 1897 and 1898. To whom was it shipped last year, when manufactured. In July, August and September everything went to the Hobbs Hardware Co., and also in November. That was in 1897. In 1898 they commenced shipping in April, and shipped to Bate & Sons some small quantities. Then in May and through May they shipped to the Hobbs Hardware Co. How was it, if Bate & Sons were the purchasers, that the shipments were made to the Hobbs Hardware Co.? Every dealer in this country who handles binder twine, knows that he did not purchase from Bate & Sons at all. Hobbs Hardware Co. were the parties who had control, and who sold to the retail merchants, and the retail merchants sold to the farmers at from 13 to 16 cents per pound, which gave them the small profit of 1 cent per pound.

This binder twine belongs to the people, who entrusted the Government with its manufacture and sale, as their trustees. Just imagine any incorporated company appointing its president to handle its business, and that president sacrificing the property of that company, as this Government has done the property of the people, by handing it over to a clique and letting that clique squeeze the farmers by making them pay 13 cents to 16 cents for goods that this clique obtained from the Government at 4½ cents, on an average.

I intend to deal with this question more fully when the estimates of the Minister of Justice in reference to the penitentiary are going through.

Here we have a contract that was made with Coll Bros. in 1896 for the purchase of the binder twine, and the assignment of that by Coll Bros. to the Hobbs Hardware Co. in the fall of 1896. We have also a sale by the Government of the binder twine manufactured in 1897, to the Hobbs Hardware Co., and in 1898 the Government sold it to Bate & Sons, but the Hobbs handled it. This year it is sold again to Bate, and handled by Hobbs, and twice I asked the right hon. Prime Minister what rates he got for the property of the people entrusted to his management, and he said: I cannot give the price until the property is disposed of. He knows that if he had told the people that he had sold this binder twine at from 5 cents to 6 cents, for which the peo-

Mr. TAYLOR.

ple have to pay 13 cents to 16 cents, there would be a little rebellion in the country. Therefore, on two occasions he refused to tell. I put the question in another form, by asking what prices had been offered by the unsuccessful tenderers, and the hon. gentleman again refused. Why did he refuse? I now ask him again to state what he got for the output of the penitentiary this year. I can see no possible reason for his declining to give the information. Every staple article is quoted in the newspapers, and there is no concealment of price. Nails, cotton, sugar, every staple article, has its prices quoted in the press every day, and our farmers are willing to give the merchants a fair profit. But can you call that a fair profit, namely, the difference between 4½ cents per pound, which the Government received, and 13½ cents per pound, on an average, which these merchants made the farmers pay? And they are compelling the farmers to pay the same prices this year. This ring, composed of the Hobbs Hardware Co. and the Brantford Binder Twine Co. control the output. The Hobbs Co. are the agents for the American trust; no binder twine can come into this country from the States except through that trust, so that this ring I have mentioned are enabled, with the assistance of this Government and the Ontario Government, to control the market and bleed the farmers of this country. They can snap their fingers at the farmers, when the latter ask for better prices, and say to them: You have to pay our prices.

Now, everybody knows that this industry was established by the Conservative Government in order to regulate the prices of binder twine. The late Sir John Thompson said that the prisoners would be put to work in the penitentiaries at the manufacture of binder twine, so that under no circumstances could our farmers be compelled to pay exorbitant prices. But to-day we have this Liberal Government, in collusion with the Ontario Liberal Government and the Binder Twine Co. of Brantford, controlling the output and making our farmers pay two or three times the value of the goods. This they have been doing for the last two or three years, and the right hon. Prime Minister refuses to tell the House what the Government is getting from this ring for the property of the people. Such a refusal is unheard of and utterly unjustifiable, because binder twine is a staple article, the true value of which should be quoted in the daily papers. Our farmers are willing to pay the retail men a reasonable profit, but not willing to pay the difference between 4½ cents, the price charged by the Government, and 13½ cents, the price charged by the merchants. How prophetic were the words of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, when he said when in Opposition, that for every

dollar that went into the treasury, two dollars were taken out of the pockets of the people and went into the pockets of some speculators. This Government gets 4½ cents per pound for its binder twine, and the farmers have to pay 13½ cents, so that for every dollar that goes into the treasury, two dollars go into the pockets of the ring to which this Government has given the control of this staple commodity, so largely consumed by the farmers of this country. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The hon. gentleman moved the adjournment of the House for the purpose, as I understood him at the outset, of fortifying his own position, or his own veracity, which he said had been impugned by Mr. H. A. Bate.

Mr. TAYLOR. And the public press.

The PRIME MINISTER. And the public press, if he chooses to put it so. As to that, I have nothing to say at this moment—that is between the hon. gentleman and those he accuses. But, starting from this text, the hon. gentleman went on to discuss the policy of the Government with regard to the selling of the binder twine manufactured in the penitentiary, and he brought forward certain statements on which he accuses the Government. It is impossible for me or any member of the Government, at this time, to answer, because the Minister who is at the head of this department does not sit in this House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) stated that he intended to bring this matter up again when the estimates for the Department of Justice come before the House. That will be the time to discuss it. In the meantime, I will confer with my colleague the Minister of Justice and bring to his attention the statements made by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CRAIG. Although I am very anxious to have the business of this House proceeded with and to have the session ended, I wish to say a few words on this question. I think we all agree that the object of establishing the manufacture of binder twine in the penitentiary was that the prices might be kept down for the farmers, so that the Consumers Cordage Company, especially, which was the great manufacturer of binder twine at that time, might not be able to charge an exorbitant price. I imagine that this plan has not been successfully carried out. I think the farmers would not agree to the proposition that they have received full benefit from this manufacture. I take the ground that unless the farmers are to be benefited by the manufacture of binder twine in the penitentiary, the twine should not be manufactured there at all. As a rule, I am opposed to manufacturing in the penitentiaries by prisoners in competition with

goods manufactured by parties outside. This binder twine was said to be a particular and exceptional case; and if the Government could show that by manufacturing binder twine there, the price had been kept down for the farmers, there would be some excuse for carrying on the manufacture in the penitentiary. The statements made by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) are most important and are rather startling, if we accept all that has been said—and I am quite disposed to accept it, as I know something about it—that the twine was sold to a dealer at 4½ cents and was resold to the farmers at 12 cents or 14 cents a pound. I think the Government should take care that nothing of this kind can happen again. I know that the circumstances last year were exceptional, that the prices of raw stock advanced very rapidly, and that is the reason that such prices were obtained from the farmers. But I think that the Government should lay down the rule and should make it one of the conditions of sale that those who purchase of binder twine—and there should be public advertisement for tenders and the highest tenderer should get the twine—should not be able to charge the farmers more than so much advance on the goods. I hold that this twine belongs to the country—in fact, we all agree to that—and especially to the farmers of the country; and they should not be at the mercy of speculators or combines—for it has been stated that a ring or combine really have controlled the price of binder twine to the farmer.

Mr. DAVIN. Although my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor), who brought this question before the House says that he intends to discuss it again when the estimates of the Minister of Justice come up, I think the House should warn the Government that we shall expect on that occasion very full and complete information of the unfortunate circumstances that the hon. gentleman has brought to the attention of the House. It will be remembered that as a consequence of the action of certain members of this House the late Government reduced the duty on binder twine some fifty per cent—from twenty-five per cent to twelve and a half per cent—and the result was that there was at once a reduction in the price of binder twine to the farmers. When the present Government came into power they said they were going to give a boon to the farmers greater than the old Government gave, and they took away the duty altogether. I was exceedingly glad they did that, because I had always contended that it should be done. At the same time, some persons warned the House and the country that, after all, twelve and a half per cent would be as effective for securing competition and low prices as would a complete sweeping away of the duty. And what occurred? As the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and my hon. friend (Mr. Craig), who have just sat down have told us,

the object in having this twine made in the penitentiary was to make sure that the farmers should not be at the mercy of a monopoly. Now, we find that this very remedy for monopoly is sold right out to a ring. Last year we had a very remarkable state of affairs in the North-west Territories. Binder twine was higher than it had ever been before, and mirabile dictu, but for the Massey-Harris Company, the farmers would have had to pay even more than they did. Whether it was their policy elsewhere or not, I am not able to say, but I suppose it was, Mr. Michaels, who represents the Massey-Harris Company in Regina, actually sold binder twine lower than the merchants were asking, because they considered that the price that was being demanded was beyond what should be charged to the farmer. I think they sold it at two or three cents a pound less than was being charged by the merchants—and it was greatly to their credit—in order to prevent the farmer being made the victim of this very ring that my hon. friend from Leeds has exposed. Mr. Speaker, it is really discouraging, it is a very unfortunate state of affairs, that when this House takes away the duty from binder twine altogether to help the farmers, affairs are so managed that the farmer gets it in the neck from the very source from which he might have expected relief. That is a very serious and a very lamentable state of things.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) who has just taken his seat is quite aware—or, if not, as a reader of the public press, he ought to be aware—that the cause of the rise in the price of binder twine last year was altogether the rise in the price of raw material. Every farmer knows that the rise of the raw material entering into the production of binder twine completely explains the increased price of the finished article. Yet, in the face of facts, and knowing these things, the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), rise in this House and boil over with indignation, declaring that the farmers of this country have been robbed by the Government handing over to a certain firm or person the sale of the binder twine manufactured in the Kingston Penitentiary. I quite agree that this twine should be sold by open competition, and that every man in Canada should have an opportunity of buying it, and I believe it is the desire of the Government that should be the case. I am amazed to find hon. gentlemen opposite attempting to take such petty advantage of a condition of things which existed last year, and which never existed before. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) yells out on behalf of the farmers, and he says that the late Government reduced the duty to twelve and a half per cent, but

Mr. DAVIN.

does he not know that this Government took the duty off altogether.

Mr. DAVIN. And then they handed it over to a ring.

Mr. McMULLEN. They gave binder twine free, and if, as the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) says, a combine has been formed in Canada, binder twine can be imported from any country free of duty to compete with that combine. When the vote for penitentiaries comes up, a full explanation will be given, and I have no doubt it will be proven that as high a price as was possible was secured for this twine.

Mr. TAYLOR. Pshaw!

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) knows that at the time this twine was sold it was sold for the highest possible price.

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, and he knows that. The manufacturers of binder twine in Brantford, one of whom is here, can prove that the Brantford Company held their twine and they realized more on it than in any other year.

Mr. TAYLOR. Seventy per cent, because they were in the ring.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, but because the raw material advanced to a high price on account of the war, and the price ran up from one point to another until it reached 13 cents. Hon. gentlemen opposite will fail to make any impression upon the farmers of this country because the farmers know that the reason the price of twine advanced was because the raw material could not be obtained.

Mr. BERGERON. That won't take.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is the truth, and these gentlemen opposite will get their answer from the people of the country.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). I would not at this time advert to the question raised by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) had it not been for the statement made by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). An attempt has been made year after year by the Liberals of this country to assign causes that did not exist for the high price for binder twine, and agents selling binder twine took advantage of the arguments used by hon. gentlemen opposite and the arguments used by the same gentlemen when they sat on this side of the House. In that way these agents were enabled to extort from the farmers a higher price for twine than the farmers ought to pay. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is at the old game that was practiced by him years ago, and he is preparing the way for binder twine agents in North Wellington.

to sell to the farmers in that riding at 3 or 4 cents a pound more than it ought to be sold for. He (Mr. McMullen) tells us that the high price of the binder twine was due to the advance in the cost of the raw material last year. That is not so. Every hon. member in this House knows that the war, to which he attributes the advance in raw material, did not take place until every pound of raw material which was required for last year's output was landed on the continent of America. He leads us to understand that binder twine is made entirely from manilla from the Phillipine Islands.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not say so.

Mr. HENDERSON. Let me tell him that only a small portion of the raw material comes from the Phillipine Islands, and that a large portion of the raw material is not produced in the Phillipine Islands at all. I refer to sisal, which is grown on the American continent, and which was in no way affected by the war. We produce in Canada one-fifth of the raw material from which binder twine is made. Every one who has studied the question knows that 400 pounds out of every 1000 of binder twine consists of coarse coal oil. We produce that in our own country, and as the Government tell us they have reduced the duty on coal oil, there should be no increase in the price of that part of the raw material for binder twine. The argument of the hon. gentleman seems to amount to this: The less you make the duty the higher the price of the article. Well, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) did not intend to state that. I say that the high price of binder twine was not on account of the advance in raw material, but was, on account of the combine amongst those who held the twine. The sisal, which enters largely into the manufacture of binder twine, comes from the southern United States and from Mexico, and, as I have said, 20 per cent of the raw material is produced in our own country and pays no duty. He tells us that the present Government took the whole duty off binder twine. That is where this Government made a grand mistake. The result of that was that large factories had to close down, because they saw the American twine could come into this country, and I am not sure but that some have ceased to manufacture altogether. It is a fact that only a smaller quantity of binder twine was produced last year in Canada, and the result was that when the farmers wanted the twine it was all in the hands of a few monopolists, like the Ontario Binder Twine Company, the Hobbs Company, and the Bate Company, who cornered it. It is a well-known fact that they instructed their agents in the earlier part of the year, to sell twine at about 7½ cents a pound, but

when the time for delivery came they refused to deliver it to some of these agents. Some of them only got half the quantity they ordered, and some of them none at all. In one instance in my own neighbourhood, the agent only secured a portion of the twine he had ordered, when he threatened the Brantford Company with a writ, and went there with his lawyer and forced them, as it were, at the point of bayonet to deliver his twine. The farmers unable to get their twine at the price they bought it for earlier in the season, were obliged to pay 14 or 15 cents instead of 7½ cents a pound, and that was caused by the mischievous policy of the Government in taking the duty off twine, and destroying the industry in this country.

Mr. McMULLEN. If it had not been for the increased cost of the raw material, the price of twine would not be so high.

Mr. BERGERON. That will not take with the farmers.

Mr. HENDERSON. Even after I have informed the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen), and he should have known it before, that only a small portion of the raw material is produced in the Phillipine Islands, he still insists that the advanced cost of the raw material caused the increase in the price of twine. I tell him again that the war had nothing to do with it whatever, but that it was the mischievous policy of the Government—who did not understand the trade of this country—when they took the duty off twine, closed up the Canadian factories, destroyed competition, and compelled the farmers to deal with the combinesters in order to get their supplies. That is a positive fact. We know that the Farmers' Binder Twine Company last year were selling twine elsewhere when their agents to whom they had sold that same twine, were urgently demanding it. The fact is they were taking it to the other side, they were shipping their twine out of the country, they had cornered it in Canada, forcing the farmers to pay two prices for what they ought to have got at 7½ cents. With such a policy as this, I wonder at hon. gentlemen standing up here and giving expression to the utterances we have heard to-day, attempting to justify a policy which the farmers of this country from one end to the other condemn. Just another point. The hon. gentleman from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) stated that raw material could not be got. Now, let me answer that in this way. If raw material could not be got to make twine for Canadian farmers, how in the world did they get raw material to make twine to ship across the lines? Their factories were running in Brantford and other places, they were shipping twine out of the country, plenty of raw material to make twine with

for the other side of the line, but no raw material to make twine for the poor farmers of Canada. The fact is, they had plenty of twine, and they knew that by unloading on the United States the supply in this country, they could extort an extra 7½ cents out of the pockets of the farmers of this country, which they did too. I hope the day is not far distant when the policy of hon. gentlemen will be reversed, when the duty that was taken off binder twine will be restored, when the Canadian factories will be reopened, and then the farmers of this country will get binder twine at 6 and 7 cents, as they did before. Another question. Why should twine that is made in Toronto and Kingston be handed over in bulk to one man or to one firm? The intention originally was that the twine should be sold direct to the farmers. But no, no, some friend has to be accommodated, some man has to make a little profit out of it, and it is handed over to one man. It is true they say that that man was the highest tenderer. But an ordinary farmer cannot tender for 500 tons of twine; he does not want that quantity, and he does not wish to be put to the expense of disposing of what he does not require, and has no use for. The result is that only a few people are in the twine business, and one of those lucky men got hold of a large quantity at 4½ cents; he turns it over to somebody else at probably 5½ cents, and then it is turned over to somebody else at a higher price. But before it gets into the farmer's hands, there are half a dozen nice little profits made out of it. This is the way, I say, that the farmers of Ontario have been fleeced year after year by the abominable policy of hon. gentlemen to your right, Mr. Speaker, a policy which never should have been inaugurated in this country. I hope, as I said before, that the day is not far distant when that policy will be reversed, and when the farmers of this country will get an article that is an absolute requisite, something they must have, and that they will get it at a reasonable price, and not be forced to pay toll to the Bates, to the Ontario Binding Twine Company, to the Farmers' Twine Company, who, as I was credibly informed the other day, paid a dividend of 60 per cent last year. I say the time has come that the farmers of this country ought to have a little protection, and I believe that when they have an opportunity they will rise in their might and tell the Government of this country that they must have protection, or else they will order them to turn right-about face.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am a little astonished at the position the hon. gentlemen opposite have taken this session. At the second session they were sympathizing with the Cordage Company, telling us that the

Mr. HENDERSON.

action of the Government had caused a good many of these cordage companies to shut up. The leader of the Opposition told us it was the Government that had shut up and ruined many of those companies. The hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) stated there was a little cordage company in the town of Port Hope that had been shut up, and the machinery had been taken away to Montreal, simply because it belonged to the cordage company that was in that combine. I was glad to hear my hon. friend say that the Cordage Company of Brantford made 60 per cent of a dividend this last year, besides a rest. The Consumers' Cordage Company also had a dividend of 40 per cent, besides making a very large rest for future uses. Will the hon. gentleman tell me that they put a duty upon binder twine to relieve the farmers of this country? Not at all; it only made the burden heavier upon them. Hon. gentlemen opposite must learn that this is one result of the system that they inaugurated. But when this Government took the duty off binder twine the cordage companies shut down. Why did they shut down? In order to make the Government believe that they were not able to run. But just as soon as it was fully settled, the cordage companies began to run, and run extra time, in order to make up the time they had lost by shutting down, there is no doubt about that. I ask the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) if he can stand up and state in this House that the raw material of which binder twine is manufactured did not go up. I heard a binder twine manufacturer state that he could make 3 cents per pound on the raw material that he had purchased without ever touching it or taking it out of the railway station, it became so scarce in Canada. But he did not make the statement that the raw material did not go up, but it did go up, and that was one of the causes. In western Ontario I have bought binder twine at 11 cents a pound. But I did not purchase early enough. Many farmers in my locality that were a little wider awake, purchased at 7 and 8 cents, because they bought early, while I was one that purchased late. I say that a greater falsehood never was stated than to say that it is the removal of the duty that put up binder twine. Why, the whole argument is against them. The farmers of this country know that it is one of the results of the protective system that has been in existence, and the manufacturers will always—

Mr. MONTAGUE. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman from Halton (Mr. Henderson) stated that taking off the duty on binder twine had caused a rise in the price, and the member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) declares that no greater falsehood was ever stated.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). That is very true.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not happen to hear the language. If the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) refers to a member of the House, of course he must not use that language, he must take it back.

Mr. McMILLAN. I made a general statement, I referred to no single individual. But my hon. friend always was very quick to take up anything. He is just like another hon. gentleman, who stated that the butter that he shipped to the old country had returned every cent to the treasury, when in reality he purchased it at 21 cents and sold it at 13 cents. Mr. Speaker, what the farmers suffered from during the last year was only the dregs of protection. When binder twine is left in a free market and without a duty, there is no doubt in my mind that the farmers will get cheap binder twine. However, I will just make one statement. I understand that in the state of Michigan, where I have friends living, binder twine is manufactured by the government of that state. The first thing they do is to advertise, and they allow the farmers to send in for a certain quantity and send the money with their order. Allow me to say to hon. gentlemen opposite that they have forgotten entirely what the loss was to the treasury of this country in manufacturing binder twine at Kingston. When an investigation took place in this House, it was ascertained that \$20,000 had been lost to the treasury, and it was found that it was the heelers of the Government of that day that had got that twine and had sold it out for large sums of money, and I doubt very much if that money is returned to the treasury yet. I believe the Government should advertise and allow the farmers to send in their orders, taking at least 500 pounds of binder twine, and sending the money along with the order, and that would assist in keeping down the combine in the country in the manufacture of binder twine.

Mr. McNEILL. With regard to the question of order, I would like to ask a question now, as I did not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman while he was speaking, and I do it now for our guidance hereafter. When an hon. member describes a statement made just before by another member of this House, as an absolutely false statement, is it sufficient excuse for him to say that he was making a general statement?

Mr. SPEAKER. The point of order is passed, and should not properly be raised now, but, as it happened that I was talking to an hon. member here, I did not hear the expression. I can only accept the statement of the hon. member, when he said that it was a general statement that he made

and that it did not refer to any hon. member of the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. I will accept the statement of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) freely, that he did not intend to give a point-blank contradiction, personally. I am perfectly willing to leave it to the country to say whether I am right or whether the hon. gentleman is right.

Mr. CLANCY. I have no disposition to prolong this debate, but there have been statements made this afternoon by hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, I believe, unwittingly, and I would like the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to remain, if he will kindly do so—

Mr. McMULLEN. Speak up, so that I can hear you.

Mr. SPEAKER. May I appeal to hon. members on both sides of the House to be good enough, whenever they have to address an hon. member on either side of the House, to do so through the Chair. I may say that some distinguished public men from a distance had seats on the floor of the House a few weeks ago, and, in a general conversation as to the conduct of the House, I asked them what they thought of it, and they said that it must be difficult to preserve order in the House, inasmuch as members are in the habit of addressing one another across the floor. I could not deny it, but I said that it was contrary to the rules. I do hope that hon. members will assist in observing the amenities of debate, and they could not do it better, in my judgment, than by referring to one another in the third person and through the Speaker, no matter whether it is a mere interruption or interjection.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I am not at all conscious of being guilty of that on this or any other occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not refer to the hon. member (Mr. Clancy).

Mr. CLANCY. I thought perhaps that you were under the impression that I had done so to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not wish to refer to anybody in particular, but I took this occasion to make the suggestion, and I am sure that it will be for the good of the House, if it is adopted.

Mr. BERGERON. You look over here more than upon the other side.

Mr. CLANCY. I was very anxious that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) should remain in the Chamber. He made a statement—I would say, unwittingly—which I do not think he would have made, had he called to his mind for a single moment the fact that he was chairman of the Public Accounts Committee when this

question was very thoroughly threshed out, and when it was shown that when the material had been purchased for this 500 tons, and a great deal more, of binder twine, the price was very much under 4 cents. Yet the hon. gentleman has made the statement this afternoon that the rise in the price of binder twine in this country was entirely owing to the advance in the price of the raw material. I think it is due to himself to state to the House that he was mistaken when he made that statement. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman, for the momentary purpose of gaining a little victory, to make a statement that is not consonant with the truth. I do not charge the hon. gentleman with telling an untruth, but I say that he has made a statement that he must know is utterly wanting in any foundation as regards truth. I was astonished at my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan). Of all the men in this House, he is the last man, I thought, who would have risen in his place to defend a great wrong. Every farmer knows perfectly well that the farmers of Ontario were fleeced. I do not apologize for using that term; I ought perhaps to apologize for using so mild a term as to say that they were fleeced. The binder twine that was sold by the Government to Bate & Sons at an average of 4½ cents a pound, was sold, even to the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) himself, at 11 cents a pound. He knows perfectly well how great the disparity in prices was, and he was a fortunate one, because the farmers generally paid 11, 12, 13 and 14 cents a pound for their twine. It was in the power of the Government—and I would call the attention of hon. gentlemen particularly to this—to have come to the assistance of the farmers. They were manufacturing binder twine to the extent of about 500 tons a year, which is about the capacity of Kingston Penitentiary, and they could have held that as a safeguard against any combine in Canada. They could have prevented the rise in binder twine, because they were not forced to sell. How did they sell it? That binder twine was sold practically without tender. Who were the parties bidding? I do not care to use the names in this House, but the gentleman to whom the hon. member for South Huron referred as a heeler, was one of the parties who manipulated this sale at 4½ cents a pound. Mr. Connor was the man who was charged, on that side of the House, in no mild terms, and I thought then, in harsh and unwarranted terms, of defrauding the Government out of \$20,000. The hon. gentleman repeated that. Was he in his place when the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) declared that there was nothing owing to the Government, and that the whole thing had been settled; and did the hon. gentleman repeat that statement to have a fling at a Conservative Government, as it will be shown here in answer to a

Mr. CLANCY.

question put on the Notice paper? I do not know why my hon. friend is calling me to order for having referred to the Notice paper.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Nobody called you to order.

Mr. CLANCY. I understood you did. The transaction was wholly inexcusable. The twine was sold under circumstances which were perfectly plain. The evidence is, that Connor, on the one hand, Coll Bros. and the Hobbs Co. co-operated in this matter, that they came to the Justice Department and arranged, side by side, that one would call off, and the other would take the twine at his own price. What was the conduct of the Government? It is inexcusable, because it is the duty of the Government—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What evidence has the hon. gentleman to prove any such disreputable transaction as this?

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) will go to the department, he can get the evidence and read it for himself.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. gentleman has stated that these men, who are well known to be respectable merchants in this country, were guilty of a most disreputable and dishonest action. That is the way the hon. gentleman put it. I would ask him if he has any evidence of the fact.

Mr. CLANCY. I am not charging the merchants at all; I am charging the party of the hon. gentleman and his leaders.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. gentleman made a general attack upon these gentlemen.

Mr. CLANCY. I did not say "dishonest" Government. I say that the transaction on the part of the Government was disgraceful and the farmers were the ones who, after all, had to bear the burden.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. gentleman cannot produce the evidence in support of such a charge as that.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman will go to the department, he will get the evidence. It was before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There was no such evidence taken by the Public Accounts Committee. There was evidence taken, but no such evidence as the hon. gentleman speaks of, as to any fraudulent manipulation taking place.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has taken leave of his memory, and that he has not paid strict attention to the question. I do not know that the hon. gentleman was there all the time; however, that can be easily settled, and I will take

another opportunity of making good the statement I made this afternoon. A strife of words here is unprofitable, and I shall not indulge in it. But I repeat that all the evidence shows the transaction either to be lacking in business capacity or to be perpetrated with design, and either way the farmers of this country have suffered on account of it. The Government were not compelled to sell that twine; they practically could have thrown it on the market at their own price, and they could have protected the farmers of the country. The evidence given by Mr. Stewart was, that they sold that twine because they feared a fall in the market, rather than a rise; and I venture to say that evidence can be produced. If hon. gentlemen will turn to the Trade and Navigation Returns, they will find that American twine was entered here at a value of \$5.81 per 100 pounds, so that it is perfectly plain that this transaction cannot be justified on any ground whatever, and that the farmers of Canada were the prime sufferers by it. Hon. gentlemen opposite may apologize and try to find excuses, but the fact remains that the farmers paid from 12 to 15 cents per pound, and that the Government sold the twine to the manipulators at an average of about  $4\frac{1}{2}$  cents a pound.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. member from Halton (Mr. Henderson) told us that the fact of the duty being taken off twine had increased the price to the farmers, but in that he does not agree with the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who stated in the House a short time ago, that the farmers of the North-west Territories paid \$400,000 more for binder twine than they ought to pay, because there was a duty on twine. Let these two gentlemen reconcile their statements. For my part, I cannot understand the argument that competition will raise the price of any commodity. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) told us that all of the twine factories in this country had been closed by reason of the duty being taken off, and in the next breath he said that binder twine was dearer in the United States than in Canada. If that be the case, let him tell me how comes it that the Canadian manufacturers had to close their factories when they could have kept them going, and exported their twine to the United States where the price was higher. The hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) tells us that because one or two merchants in Canada got a corner on a small quantity of binder twine, that raised the price all over the continent. He then said that this twine was sold for  $4\frac{1}{2}$  cents a pound, but the newspaper article read, shows that the parties who got it for that price sold it at a reasonable price to the retailers, so that I do not see how he can contend that the selling of the binder twine by the Government had anything to do with the price at which it was sold to the farmers. If the

hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) ever did any business, he must know that the price of twine increased on account of the advance in the price of the raw material. Twine, like wheat and every other commodity rises and falls in price, and as soon as the raw material lowers in price the price of twine will also lower.

Mr. GILMOUR. I think the circumstances of the case might have been explained with less heat than has been shown by certain gentlemen.

An hon. MEMBER. On the other side.

Mr. GILMOUR. I do not know but that I may say that. The Government has been blamed for allowing this binder twine to get into the hands of a few individuals, and I think they have been justly blamed. In the first place they took off the duty. This had the effect of shutting up some Canadian factories, and in the second place, at an early date in the year, they sold the whole of two years' output that the Government had on hand and allowed it to get into the hands of a few men. The whole make of twine was then manipulated by these men who took advantage of the situation. I believe the Government have also sold their output this year at too early a date, and I think that is a great mistake. I think it would be better to hold it until nearer the harvest time. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) that the advance in the price of the raw material had nothing whatever to do with the increased price of twine to the farmers a year ago.

Motion to adjourn the House, negatived.

#### DISMISSAL OF JAMES DEVLIN.

Mr. HUGHES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to draw the attention of the First Minister to the report of the Minister of Justice, in which it is stated that a man named James Devlin, late engineer of the Kingston Penitentiary, has been found guilty of forgery and dishonesty, and I would like to ask the First Minister if he is going to prosecute this man?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am unable to give an answer to my hon. friend at this time, but now that he has called my attention to it, I will answer in a day or two.

#### ELECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. INGRAM. I wish to draw the attention of the right hon. gentleman to a certain request made by the Methodist Conference of the province of Nova Scotia, and by the clergy of Ottawa, Toronto and other cities in the Dominion, with respect to certain proposed legislation in reference to the Election Act. I would ask the right hon. gentleman if he will consent to allow a certain Bill, now on Public Orders, to be placed on Government Orders, so that it may be considered this session? If the right hon. gentleman

does not feel like answering now, I would consent to this remaining over until tomorrow, so that he may have an opportunity of consulting his colleagues.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** What Bill?

**Mr. INGRAM.** Bill (No. 142) with respect to amendments to the Election Act as proposed by me.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** What is the nature of the Bill?

**Mr. INGRAM.** The Bill is intended to meet certain corrupt acts committed by persons taking part in elections, and by amending the Act I think it would be an advantage to hon. gentlemen on both sides. It would do away with the necessity of having the Privileges and Elections Committee dealing with such cases as they are now called on to consider.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** The Bill has not been called to my attention before, but I will be able to give an answer at an early date of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram).

#### DISMISSAL OF LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER QUICK.

**Mr. M. K. COWAN** (South Essex). **Mr. Speaker,** before you leave the Chair, I desire to call attention to an article appearing in the editorial columns of the Windsor "World," under date June 27th, which I believe has been mentioned before in this House by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett):

A letter from an Amherstburg correspondent recalls an incident in the experience of Mr. James Quick, who has been lighthouse keeper at Pelee. He was well known as a brave man, and it is one of the outrages of the present Grit aggregation has been guilty of. It is, indeed, shameful on the part of Mr. Cowan to reward honest services with this sort of treatment.

Mr. Cowan will have this to answer for. He will suffer in three ways, namely: from the friends of Mr. Quick, by means of those Liberals who despise a mean trick, and by the men who were disappointed by failure to get his job.

The letter referred to appears on the first page of the paper of that date, and a portion of it is as follows:—

On the 5th of December last there was a terrific gale blowing on Lake Erie.

The wind registered 80 miles per hour, the thermometer showed the mercury below zero, a heavy storm was raging. It was a critical time for mariners. On the middle ground on Pelee Island Reef a large vessel was stranded and flying a flag of distress, and in danger of breaking up. Both her life-boats had been launched and capsized, and she was covered with ice.

Mr. James Quick, then lighthouse keeper on Pelee Island, telephoned for assistance, and a tug left Amherstburg at 3 o'clock in the morning. On arrival at Pelee, the tug could not get nearer than 2,000 feet of the distressed vessel on account of the ice, the shoal water and the terrific gale.

**Mr. INGRAM.**

An appeal for help was made to the life-saving station, but the boat had not been launched for two years, and was not seaworthy, and, moreover, the captain was not there. An appeal was then made to Mr. James Quick, who came in his little boat through the blinding gale with provisions, clothing, necessaries as the crew required, and courageously brought relief to over a hundred persons in a dangerous situation. The tug remained by the vessel, and later on succeeded in releasing her.

Mr. Quick was dismissed from the Government service, and I am informed that the charge against him was that he did on this occasion absent himself from his station. He was dismissed without warning and without an investigation.

I would not have drawn your attention to this article, Mr. Speaker, nor taken up the time of the House in discussing the matter, if it had remained there; but the clear inference from the article was that a vessel had been stranded near him on Lake Erie, with the thermometer below zero and the wind blowing at the rate of eighty miles an hour, that the lighthouse keeper had gone to her assistance, and that because he had left his post on that errand of mercy and was absent for three hours, I had asked the Government, as a representative of the constituency, to have him dismissed. I would not have drawn your attention to the matter nor taken up the time of the House in regard to that charge in a local paper concerning myself had it not been that certain other papers had taken the matter seriously, and that I find this article copied and comments made upon it in rather a reputable journal, which says:

Mr. James Quick, the lighthouse keeper on Pelee Island, was dismissed by the Dominion Government for being absent on an errand of mercy to a shipwrecked crew, a large vessel being stranded in the neighbourhood during a heavy December gale. For rendering aid to a Nova Scotia fisherman under similar circumstances, Capt. Frank Carroll, of the Gloucester schooner "Polar Wave," has been presented with a gold watch. This is poor encouragement to a Canadian Government official to do the good Samaritan act. But, then, Mr. Quick was a Conservative, and was accordingly objectionable to Mr. Mahlon Cowan.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Hear, hear.

**Mr. COWAN.** I just desire to say for the information of my good friend the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), who generally says "hear, hear" with that knowledge of affairs which I have no doubt he has of this particular case, that, instead of Mr. Quick being objectionable to me, quite the contrary is the case. I had been the solicitor of his family for some years. Although Mr. Quick was a Conservative, and although he took part in the last election against me, going so far as to call me vile names on the Island of Pelee, as he admitted afterwards, I never asked for his dismissal; but when I heard that he was in trouble, I went to the Department of Marine and Fish-

eries, and I asked, for the sake of his wife and family, that he should not be dismissed from office. I was informed that he was dismissed on the recommendation of Mr. Stupart, director of the Meteorological service in Toronto. I was told that Mr. Stupart was in the city, and I saw him, and went with him to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). I found that this man from 1893 had never kept up his reports on the meteorological service; that, when written to, he still failed to send them in; that over twenty letters had been written to him during the five years asking for an explanation of his dereliction of duty; that every one of those twenty odd letters had remained unanswered; that his salary had been kept back from the 1st of April, and that he was told that it would not be paid until these reports were brought up; that he still failed to bring them up. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries absolutely refused to retain in the service a man who would allow twenty odd letters sent to him to remain unanswered in five years. I simply say that I never asked for his dismissal, that although I had frequent letters requesting me, on account of the offensive part he took in the last election, to ask for his dismissal, I went to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and asked that he be kept in office. I, therefore, wish to give the statement that he was dismissed from office for being absent on a mission of mercy for two or three hours on his coast, an absolute denial. I might further state that I find, after the most minute inquiry, that his alleged absence on the occasion referred to was something that existed in the imagination of the correspondent and nobody else, and that no such incident ever occurred.

Mr. CLANCY. I intended to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to this matter before the session closed. Mr. Quick complains that he has been dismissed without a trial or an investigation into his case. The very statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) that Mr. Quick had been more or less derelict in his duty for five years, that he had sent in no meteorological reports, that the inspector reported to that effect, for the first time, I presume, and that that was the reason he was at last dismissed, shows pretty clearly that Mr. Quick was singled out for dismissal. If the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) did not recommend his dismissal, I can tell him that he pays a poor compliment to his influence with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he could not induce him to save his wife and family from starvation. I am told that this man has occupied that position for a long time, and has become somewhat helpless.

Mr. COWAN. He is a perfectly able-bodied man and one of the best sailors on Lake Erie—a man about 35 years of age.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. member is more able to describe the man's qualifications for work than to obtain the work for him. If there was any sincerity in the hon. gentleman's conduct, he could have told the Minister of Marine and Fisheries what he knows, that of late there is not one lighthouse keeper in twenty who sends in these weather reports, because the Meteorological Office has refused to pay for them; and the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that that was not a fair ground on which to base a charge against any lighthouse keeper in the province of Ontario. I do not know whether or not their instructions require them to send in these reports to the Meteorological Office at Toronto. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries will know. At any rate, Mr. Quick complains that he was dismissed on the plea set forth by the hon. member for South Essex, but without real reason, but the real reason is that there were other parties who wished to get his position. The hon. gentleman went to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and implored him not to dismiss Mr. Quick, but the Minister insisted and Mr. Quick was dismissed on a paltry ground. No complaint was ever made against him as regards his duties as lightkeeper. I intend to take the matter up later, and am very glad it has come up in this way, so that the Minister will be in a position to give the information I shall ask for on a future occasion.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am happy to be able to give now all the information the hon. gentleman can possibly want in respect to the dismissal of this lightkeeper. There were no politics in it from beginning to end, and nobody ever applied for his place. The hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) never spoke to me on the subject at all. But after my departmental officers had reported to me that this lightkeeper absolutely refused to obey any orders and after I had examined into the case, I went to the hon. gentleman and told him there was a lighthouse keeper whom I could no longer retain in the service because of neglect and flagrant disobedience to orders. My hon. friend asked me who he was and I told him it was this man, Mr. Quick. The hon. gentleman then told me he was very sorry that Quick should be dismissed as he thought he was a good lightkeeper, and urged me not to dismiss him. I replied that in the face of the official reports, I could not retain the man. The hon. gentleman pressed me all he could not to dismiss him, but I said it was impossible to retain him any longer. Here is the report which I have from my Deputy Minister:

Mr. James Quick was the lighthouse keeper and the meteorological observer at Pelee Island, and his services were dispensed with altogether on the ground of neglect of duty.

Since 1892 Mr. Quick was continually in arrears with his returns, and although requests were repeatedly made to bring these reports up to date, they were invariably disregarded, nor would he reply or give any explanations whatever.

Since 1893 he was requested at least twenty times to forward his returns, and his quarterly salary was withheld on several occasions, but even that had no effect in securing his attention, and the Superintendent of the Meteorological Service strongly urged, several times, that another appointment should be made at once, as the wind observations were very much needed from Pelee Island, and every effort was made by the department to keep him on, before the extreme step of dismissing him from the service had to be resorted to.

To-day a report has been received from the Superintendent of the Meteorological Service, stating that he had given instructions to Mr. Weber to instal the new lighthouse keeper and to report on the station as well, and he has reported that he found everything dirty, and the instruments on the platform loose and shaking. The rain-gauge was rusted out and the thermometers covered with cobwebs. The signal-mast was rotten, and must be at once replaced; there were no halliards, one stay had torn away, and the drum and cone were both rotten.

Mr. Quick, the late keeper, must have got very careless for the last two years, for the officer in 1897 reported that everything was in the very best order, and one of the finest stations in the lake region.

In the face of these reports it was impossible for me to continue this man in office an hour longer. Politics had nothing whatever to do with his dismissal, and the statement which the hon. gentleman read from a newspaper is absolutely unfounded. I see that the Montreal newspapers allege that he was dismissed for political reasons, but so far from that being the case, he was dismissed against the advice of the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan).

Mr. BENNETT. It is charming to see the hon. Minister reward neglect of duties, but if a lighthouse keeper displays a great deal of activity he keeps him in his position. The Minister has in his department to-day a lighthouse keeper, who harboured three or four men in his lighthouse during the winter, who indulged in illegal fishing, and who were fined by the Fishery Inspector.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Who is that?

Mr. BENNETT. Surely it cannot have escaped the hon. gentleman's recollection. I asked him early in the session and he replied that he did not intend to dispense with this man's services. Baxter is the name of the lighthouse keeper and he keeps the lighthouse at Gin Rock light. Although the records show that he was fined \$50 for harbouring persons who were guilty of illegal fishing, the Minister retains him in office, and it is a laughing farce in the community that this man is kept in his position, who harbours people engaged in illegal fishing, while other men, who may perhaps be guilty of some petty infraction of the law are punished to the bitter end.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

## JUDGES FOR DISTRICT OF MONTREAL.

Mr. J. A. C. MADORE (Hochelaga). There is a subject which I desire to bring to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, and which I think is of sufficient importance to warrant my doing so at this moment. The Quebec legislature, Mr. Speaker, passed an Act last session creating three new judges for the district of Montreal, and as I find nothing in the Estimates providing for their indemnity I deem it my duty, as a representative of the Montreal bar, to bring this matter before the House in case it might have been overlooked. That the legal business of the district of Montreal is in a congested state any one cognizant of the circumstances will readily admit. That such congestion is principally due to the fact that there are not sufficient judges residing in the district of Montreal is another circumstance which no one will deny. The legal business done in the Montreal district in the Superior Court is more than equal to half of the legal business of the whole province of Quebec. I have gathered from the "Official Gazette," of Quebec, for the year ending 31st December last, data in proof of the statement I have just made.

During the year ending 31st December, 1898, there were issued by the Superior Court of the province of Quebec 8,254 writs and summons, out of which number 4,925 were issued by the Superior Court in Montreal. In the whole province of Quebec 7,283 writs were returned into court, whilst in the district of Montreal 3,918 were returned. There were 3,276 judgments delivered by default, out of which 2,000 were delivered in the district of Montreal. 2,109 cases were contested before the Superior Court in the whole province of Quebec, of which 1,257 were contested in the Superior Court of the District of Montreal. These figures show that more than half of the legal business of the whole province is transacted in the district of Montreal. Besides we have a Court of Review, which is presided over by three judges of the Superior Court. The Court of Review sits for the revising of judgments only in Quebec and Montreal, and the province of Quebec, for that purpose, is divided into two. We find that in the section of Montreal, 266 cases were inscribed in review and had to be dealt with by the judges of that district, while only 87 were inscribed in the section of Quebec.

Let us see what is the number of judges appointed for the whole province of Quebec to transact the business before the Superior Court, and let us ascertain whether the district of Montreal has a fair share of the number of judges so appointed. There are thirty-two judges appointed for the whole province of Quebec. Of these thirty-two, only ten are resident judges for the district of Montreal, and one of these ten takes charge of the district of Terrebonne. You can readily see that, even with the appoint-

ment of three new judges the district of Montreal will not have its proportionate share of the number of judges appointed to handle the legal business of the province of Quebec, since, as I have established, I think, more than half the business is done in the district of Montreal.

It has been suggested that, instead of increasing the number of judges for Montreal, and thereby increasing the expense for the administration of justice, some other means might be found by which we could do away with the congestion of legal business in the district of Montreal. The province of Quebec is divided into judicial districts, and one of the suggestions was that two of these districts could be united, and that one of the two judges of the districts so united could be transferred to Montreal. I am ready to admit that there are some judicial districts in the province where the judges have little to do, the legal business being very small. But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot change that state of affairs, for this Dominion Parliament has no jurisdiction to change the bounds of the legal districts of the province. The only authority to do so is the local legislature of the province. If the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) were here to-day, he would certainly bear me out in the statement that it is an impossibility in the province of Quebec to change the judicial districts, at least, for the time being. The hon. member for Montmorency was at one time the Attorney General of the province; and, while occupying that high position, he undertook to centralize the legal business of the province in the large centres. He framed a measure which commended itself to the bench and bar of the province; but, though there were surely many good things in his Bill, he never could induce his colleagues to accept it, because they all knew—and the hon. gentleman acknowledged it himself—that no Government in the province of Quebec would be strong enough to carry a Bill to re-establish the old system of centralization and do away with the present system of decentralization. There is no doubt that it can be argued that decentralization of the administration of justice would, perhaps, bear some good results. But, as I have stated, the jurisdiction is with the province of Quebec, and the local government will not dare to introduce such a measure, because they know that the province is not ripe for such a change. As an illustration of this, I may say that, a couple of years ago, the local government of the province, seeing the bad state of legal business in the district of Montreal, tried to help. They proposed a measure by which the county of Verchères was cut off from the district of Montreal and transferred to the district of Richelieu. The thing was done on the quiet and very few people noticed it; but as soon as it was known in the county of Verchères, there was an out-

cry amongst the people, and such was the public indignation there that at the next session the Government had to bring in another measure to restore the county of Verchères to the district of Montreal. That shows that the mass of the people in Quebec are not only unwilling to go back to the old system of centralization, but they are unwilling even that the bounds of the judicial districts should be touched. So, it must be admitted that the first suggestion made to remedy the bad state of legal business in the district of Montreal must be discarded. We cannot afford to wait until the province of Quebec is ripe for a change in its system of judicature. The evil must be remedied and remedied at once. I do not know of any other remedy than the appointment of additional judges.

Another suggestion was made, and that was to have all the judges of the province of Quebec reside in Quebec and Montreal, and to send them into the rural districts only when they should be needed. When the system of decentralization was established in the province of Quebec, it was deemed necessary to have a resident judge in each judicial district. And I think, for very good reasons. The administration of justice would, to my mind, be jeopardized if all the judges were to reside in Montreal and none could be found in a rural judicial district except when specially called for. There are many procedures that require speed, so that surely rights would often be imperilled if there were no judges at hand. Lately this Parliament has passed a law compelling each judge to reside in his own judicial district, showing that this House believes that no such change has occurred in the province of Quebec since the establishment of the system of decentralization to warrant such a change as the one that is proposed. Moreover, the proposition, to my mind, amounts to the system of centralization. It would not be, perhaps, centralization in law, but it would amount, in fact, to a re-establishment of the old system. It would not be more popular in the province of Quebec, and it is subject to as many objections as the re-establishment of the old system. Another objection to this proposition is that the travelling expenses of the judges would be enormous. The judges of the province would be travelling all the year around, and their expenses would surely be greater than the indemnity of the three new judges we are asking the Government to appoint.

A third suggestion was made by those who opposed the creation of three new judges. They said: Let the judges reside in their own districts, but let them come in greater number to the city of Montreal whenever they are needed and whenever they have not much to do in their own districts. The words "whenever they are needed," if we consider the state of legal business in the city of Montreal now, means the whole year around.

This proposition is equal to the second one, because these judges will all reside in Montreal and will spend the whole time hearing the cases that are accumulating there awaiting their turn. And the districts would be deprived of their resident judges. So, the only way to help the city of Montreal in this predicament, I think, is what the legislators of the province think—the appointment for Montreal of three new judges.

After all, Mr. Speaker, the expense will not be so heavy, and the increase will not be so great. The travelling expenses of the judges from the rural districts to Montreal, as the system now exists, would be sufficient to meet the indemnity of one of the three judges. But even if the increase is to be \$15,000, when such an expense is admitted by all to be a necessity, certainly this small amount added to our budget cannot be an objection. Now, at this time, when the country at large is willing to spend millions to improve the harbour of Montreal in order to enable that great metropolis of Canada to compete advantageously with the large cities of the United States, what is the weight of \$15,000 in the scale when that sum is needed to enable the city of Montreal to protect the great commercial interests which centre there? And is it not equally necessary to expend this latter sum in order to enable the Government to dispense to the citizens of Montreal sound and speedy justice, which is one of the indispensable conditions of commercial progress?

Mr. T. FORTIN (Laval). I wish to say only a few words on this subject. I am a practising lawyer in the district of Montreal, and having been so for nearly eighteen years, I am in a position to know the state of legal affairs in that district. The conditions are such now that I think no other part of the country would tolerate. Cases are accumulating in all the divisions of the Superior Court and in the Court of Review to such an extent that when a writ is issued it is impossible for the solicitor even to give any idea of the time when the case will be heard. Various expedients for improving that state of affairs have been tried, and they have all failed. It was thought that by extending the jurisdiction of the Court of Review we would relieve the accumulation of cases before the Superior Court. To a certain extent, that did relieve the situation in the Court of Appeals, but did not in any way improve the state of affairs in the Superior Court. On the contrary, the list of arrears is now almost as large before the Court of Review as it is before the Superior Court. Now, Mr. Speaker, no one can form any idea as to the expense that is caused to litigants and the trouble to the lawyers and all those connected with the administration of justice that result from such a state of affairs. It is a matter of daily occurrence for thirty,

Mr. MADORE.

fifty or sixty lawyers to flock into the court where the cases are to be heard. Thousands, I may say, of witnesses and of litigants are seen there waiting for their turn. If the cases are called, there is frequently no judge to hear them, and the parties with their witnesses must remain, sometimes a day, sometimes a week, and even as long as ten days. Every one knows that it is a hardship to compel witnesses, frequently business men, bankers, traders, wholesale merchants, to whom time is very precious—to compel these men to wait day after day, and at the end of five or six days to be told that the case is put off to the end of the list, or continued to the next term. I say it is impossible to form any idea of the trouble and expense involved in such a state of affairs, and all will admit the imperious necessity for some remedy. Various suggestions have been made, as was stated by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Madore), to relieve this congestion of legal business. To my mind, there is only one thing that can improve the situation, and that is the appointment of additional judges. I may say, however, that it is by no means certain that the appointment of additional judges will do all the good that is expected. Something more than that is required, at least in the district of Montreal, and that is an increase in the salary of the judges. The judges in the district of Montreal receive the same salary to-day that they received some thirty years ago, and everybody knows that the cost of living in large cities has greatly increased during the last twenty or thirty years. It seems to me that if the judges received a better salary than they receive to-day, possibly they would perform a greater amount of work; at all events, it would be an inducement to them. We have been told, and it is a matter of notoriety, that some of the legal gentlemen who have accepted positions on the bench have done so at great personal sacrifice. It is notorious that eminent members of the profession in the district of Montreal, and I may say in all the large centres of population, will not accept a position on the bench for the salary at present attached to that position. The consequence is that the best men cannot be secured, and second-class men, although very good men usually, have to be appointed to these positions. On the whole, Mr. Speaker, I think it is the duty of Parliament to do something to relieve that state of affairs in the district of Montreal. Times are prosperous, we have a large surplus. I see on the Order paper that the Government is willing to contribute a large sum of money in order to improve the appearance of the Washington of the North, the city of Ottawa. Now, \$15,000, or even \$20,000, given to relieve the congestion of legal business in Montreal, would be well spent, and that end would be cheaply attained by that sum.

Mr. R. LEMIEUX (Gaspé). I wish to endorse the statements just made by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Madore) and the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin). Being a practising lawyer in the district of Montreal, I can speak from experience. During the last judicial year I have seen, several times, as many as 100 or 200 witnesses in room No. 23 of the court-house at Montreal, witnesses who had been subpoenaed, and who had been waiting there day after day, perhaps week after week, in order to be heard in the cases for which they had been summoned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member representing Hochelaga (Mr. Madore) said a moment ago, that a system had been proposed in the Quebec legislature some years ago by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), who, I see is not in his seat to-day. The then Attorney General, now the hon. member for Montmorency, prepared a very great measure, and a very able measure too, by which he proposed to change the system now existing in Quebec; that is to say, he wanted to replace the actual decentralization by a concentration of judges in the district of Quebec and in the district of Montreal. I have heard myself the hon. member for Montmorency state that if his measure had been presented before the Assembly of Quebec to be read the third time, the Government of which he was a member, would surely have been defeated because the rural members would not allow the change that he proposed to be made. Now, Mr. Speaker, as was stated by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin), and the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Madore), we all know in the district of Montreal that the only change that can be made and that will meet the difficulties with which we are surrounded, is the appointment of three additional judges. The bar of Montreal, of which the hon. member for Hochelaga is bâtonnier, has passed resolution upon resolution for several years past. The legislature of Quebec at last came to the rescue, and during last session, a law was passed favouring the appointment of three new judges. It is true that the law is not enforced because the proclamation has not yet been issued, for reasons unknown to us, but I am sure that if the Federal Government would show any disposition towards the appointment of the new judges, the proclamation would soon be issued. At any rate, this is the only way of settling the actual state of affairs. Such an eminent gentleman as Sir Melbourne Tait, the Assistant Chief Justice of Quebec, told me that during the last term of the Superior Court in the district of Montreal, he was obliged to adjourn the court two weeks before the time to allow himself and his colleagues an opportunity to consider the old *délibérés* that had been pending for months and months. The judges in Montreal are simply overworked,

and that is a fact known to every member of the bar. Sir Melbourne Tait said to some of the members of the bar in my presence that he was doing the work not of one man but of three or four men every day. He was working without taking any rest from the first day of the month until the last day of the month, and still, as he added smilingly: We are paid less than some bank cashiers are paid. I am not speaking of the salaries of judges; I think that they are very well paid, but I am speaking of their actual number. I say that, in the district of Montreal, the accumulation of work has been so great that the Government of this country must come to our rescue and give the judges a chance to deliberate upon the cases which have been pleaded before them. As the hon. member for Laval said a moment ago, the Government of this country, whether Liberal or Conservative, has been spending millions and millions of dollars for the commercial interests. Well, it is time that something should be done for the professional classes, that something should be done for the judiciary in the district of Montreal. This is the largest district in the Dominion of Canada, and we are obliged to call in judges from the country every day and every week to help their colleagues on the bench in Montreal. Some of the rural districts are complaining of this system. They say that they have their judges and that they want to keep them. It is true that in the rural districts the judges do not sit on every calendar day, but there are some matters which are settled *en chambre*, as we say in legal language, and at which judges are required every day. It is not fair that these rural districts should be deprived of the services of their judges. Therefore, I conclude by saying that the suggestion that is made by the hon. member for Hochelaga, the bâtonnier of the Montreal bar, and by the hon. member for Laval, is a proper one and that the Government should give us three additional judges.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, this is a question which is not altogether new to this House. On several occasions in former sessions the same subject has attracted its attention. I have had occasion to point, in former debates, to the anomalous position in which the British North America Act places this question. Under the terms of the British North America Act the organization of the courts has been vested in the provincial legislatures. On the other hand the nomination of judges has been vested in the Federal Government and the appointment of the same in the Federal Parliament. We are in this position, therefore, that the local legislature can organize courts, and if they do so, they incur no responsibility whatever, but they throw upon the Federal Government and Parliament the duty of seeing that the judges

whose appointment they have ordered, should be paid. It is not a satisfactory condition of things, but such as it is, we have to deal with it. It would be more consonant for us, since we have to pay the judges, to say that we should exercise our own discretion and judgment as to whether these judges are required in any particular locality. We have not that discretion and we are constrained to follow the resolution of the local legislatures. Such being the case, I have often expressed my opinion that the Federal Parliament in this matter has very little, if any control, to exercise over these appointments after they have been ordered by the legislature. In former years I took that position, and I have to take the same position to-day. At the same time, though this position seems perfectly beyond dispute, it has been very often combatted by gentlemen on the other side of the House, and the position has been taken by several hon. members of the House that in these matters, as in all others, Parliament is able to exercise its own judgment, and that, even if the legislature has put upon it the duty of appointing more judges and providing for their payment, we should refuse to do so if we see fit to comply with their wishes. I prefer on this occasion not to revert to that debate, but to take a position upon the merits of the case which has been presented by hon. members of this House. It is beyond dispute, it cannot be controverted that the judicial district of Montreal is not at all organized as it should be and that the judicial business, owing to the fact that there are not sufficient judges to administer justice, is in a very sad condition. The matter has been brought again and again to the attention of this Parliament and to the attention of the legislature of Quebec, by the very highest authorities. To-day we have it on the authority of the bâtonnier of the district of Montreal, a gentleman who is appointed as their head by the lawyers themselves, we have it on the authority of eminent lawyers practising in Montreal, and in former years we had it on the authority of the Chief Justice and several puisne judges of the courts of Montreal. The attention of the local legislature has been frequently called to this condition of things, and at the last session they provided for the appointment of three new judges to sit in the district of Montreal. It was stated in former sessions on the floor of this House that the judicial business was unequally divided, and that whilst the district of Montreal had not enough judges to perform the duties entrusted to them, many of the rural judges had not enough duties to keep them busy. It has also been stated here that the law should be altered, and that all the judges of the province of Quebec should be compelled to reside in the district of Montreal, as in Ontario all the Superior Court judges

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

are compelled to reside in Toronto. It has been contended that if all the judges in the province of Quebec, who under the law have to reside in particular districts scattered over the province, were compelled to live in the city of Montreal or in the city of Quebec, the evil would be obviated. There are two objections to this. First, there is the objection which has been pointed out by my hon. friend from Hochelaga (Mr. Madore), that the legislature of Quebec has been unwilling, up to the present to change the judicial organization with regard to judges living in specified judicial districts. The legislature is supreme in that respect, and we cannot compel it to change the system. But the legislature has not been following a caprice in this matter, for it has good and substantial reasons for refusing to depart from the system which prevails. It would be impossible for us in Quebec to adopt in its entirety the system which has given satisfaction in Ontario. The hon. gentleman who represents Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) and who at one time was Attorney General of the province of Quebec, some years ago introduced a Bill to change the system, but he utterly failed, and last session he told us frankly that the government of which he was a member would have been defeated on this measure if they attempted to carry it through. They therefore had to withdraw it in the face of the opposition which came from all parts of the province. This is a free country, and we are represented by parliamentary institutions, and, after all, the best way for all governments is to try and comply with public opinion. Public opinion may sometimes be wrong, but in that case it only remains for us to try and educate public opinion, while for the time being we have to submit to it, such as it is. The government of which Mr. Casgrain was the Attorney General had to submit to the will of the people, and they were compelled to withdraw that measure. There are good reasons to sustain the public opinion of the province of Quebec in this regard. The system of Ontario compels all the Superior Court judges to reside in Toronto, and it would be impossible for us to compel the Superior Court judges in Quebec to reside either in the city of Montreal or in the city of Quebec, even though we should appoint county court judges in Quebec as they do in Ontario. No Government could undertake to propose that system in the province of Quebec with any hope of having it passed by Parliament or approved of by the people of that province. If we adopted the Ontario system in Quebec, we would have to organize a class of courts in that province which are not in existence now. We would have to have county court judges residing in the country districts and Superior Court judges residing in the cities of Montreal and Quebec. Under the present system in Quebec

the Superior Court judges perform all the duties which in Ontario are assigned to the Superior Court judges and the county court judges as well. We would have to recast the whole system if we made it similar to the Ontario system, and I doubt very much that if we did so, we would effect any economy whatever. A sentiment has frequently been given expression to on the floor of this House that the administration of justice in the province of Quebec costs, in proportion, far more than the administration of justice in the province of Ontario. The systems of the two provinces differ, but I maintain, without any hesitation at all, that the Quebec system is not more expensive than the Ontario system.

Mr. BERGERON. It does not cost so much.

The PRIME MINISTER. Indeed, our judicial system in Quebec is not so expensive as the system in Ontario. If hon. gentlemen will look at the estimates of the Department of Justice, estimates which have not varied for twenty years or more, they will find that in the province of Ontario we have to provide for the salary of the Chief Justice of Appeal, at \$6,000, and the salary of four puisne justices at \$5,000 each; the salary of the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench at \$6,000, and the salary of two judges at \$5,000 each; the salary of the Chief Justice of Common Pleas, at \$6,000, and the salary of two judges at \$5,000 each; the salary of the Chancellor of Ontario, at \$6,000, and the salary of three judges at \$5,000 each. Then, you have to provide for the salary of forty-three county court judges, varying from \$2,000 to \$2,600 each, and the salary of twenty-three junior judges, varying from \$2,000 to \$2,400 each. In all, if I mistake not, you have to provide for the salaries of eighty-three judges in the province of Ontario. Now, take the judges of the province of Quebec. You have to provide for the salary of the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench of the province of Quebec, at a salary of \$6,000, and the salary of five puisne judges at \$5,000 each; you have to provide for the salary of the Chief Justice of the Superior Court at \$6,000, the senior puisne judge at Montreal at \$6,000, fourteen judges at \$6,000 each, fourteen judges at \$4,000 each, two judges at \$3,500 each, and three judges of the Circuit Court of Montreal at \$3,000 each. In all, you have forty-one judges to provide for in the province of Quebec, whereas in the province of Ontario you have to provide for eighty judges, or, if I mistake not, eighty-three judges. That difference in the number of judges is not all accounted for by the disparity in population between the two provinces. It is accounted for by the fact that our organization is different. In the province of Quebec there are duties performed by the

Superior Court judges which in the province of Ontario are performed by the county court judges. In the province of Ontario the Superior Court judges have jurisdiction only over a certain category of cases, whereas with us, in the province of Quebec, the Superior Court judges have jurisdiction over all cases that come before the courts. In the province of Ontario the expenditure for the salaries of judges, in round numbers, is \$290,000, with about \$15,000 for travelling allowances. In the province of Quebec the salaries amount to a trifle over \$200,000—

Mr. BERGERON. Two hundred and one thousand dollars.

The PRIME MINISTER—and the travelling allowances about \$16,000. In salaries there is a discrepancy of \$90,000 in favour of the province of Ontario against the province of Quebec. We are told that the system of Ontario is a cheaper and a more effective system than our system, a proposition which I do not admit at all. I think our system is as effective, while it is more suited to our wants and habits, and is less expensive than the other system. These are the general considerations which apply to the present matter. At the last session of the legislature of Quebec an Act was passed providing for the appointment of three new judges for the district of Montreal. This Act has not yet come into force. It must come into force by proclamation. I may say that before Parliament was summoned, I myself wrote to Attorney General Archambault, asking him to come and meet the Minister of Justice and myself, in order to discuss the question. He told us very frankly that the people and bar of Montreal wanted these judges appointed, and that to refuse this request would be to deny them the justice they were entitled to. I pointed out that, while some of the judges in the district of Montreal were overworked, some of those in other parts of the province had very little to do. He frankly admitted to me that there was something in that, but he represented with great force that it was impossible by legislation to overcome that condition of things, as it is part of the geographical condition in which we are placed. He instanced the district of Gaspé, in which there is a judge who by law has to reside in the district, and it is impossible to conceive of the district of Gaspé being without a resident judge. That district is almost a province by itself. It has not a large population, but rather a small population, scattered over a large extent of territory. The cases there are not many; the litigation is not very great. But still the people have some wants, and Parliament must provide for them. Though a judge in the district of Gaspé has far less work than a judge who resides in Quebec or Montreal, still it is impossible to obviate that condition of things.

Mr. BERGERON. He has a smaller salary.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is true, but that does not militate against the difficulty. So I represented to the Attorney General of the province that the Government would take this question into their consideration and give it their best attention. I am very glad to have this expression of opinion on this occasion. It will, no doubt, assist the Government to come to a conclusion on the question. So far as my personal views are concerned, I have already expressed them. We have no discretion in the matter: we must give to the people and to the great city of Montreal, not only the satisfaction, but the justice, to which they are entitled in this matter. I believe the Parliament of Canada and the country are rich enough and fair enough to do that. Still, I would like to convince the House that this is a question on which there is a great deal to be said in favour of the proposition that has been maintained by the bâtonnier and the other hon. gentlemen who reside in Montreal—the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Madore), the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin), and the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux).

Mr. BERGERON. There is not much to be said, after what has fallen from the right hon. Prime Minister, and what has been said by my hon. friends opposite, except that, from the last sentence of my right hon. friend, it struck me that it might have been arranged by him that the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Madore) should bring the matter before Parliament, so as to help the Premier in Council to have the salaries voted for the three judges. There is no doubt, as has been said, that there is a congestion of business in the courts of Montreal. It is an inconvenience for pleaders, witnesses and lawyers. This question, as my right hon. friend has said, has been before Parliament before. It seems to be acknowledged that there is something wrong, but how to remedy that condition of things is what we ought to study. It is true, as my hon. friends opposite have said, that the local legislature of Quebec, which has charge of the administration of justice, has passed a law to create three new judgeships for the district of Montreal; and, although my right hon. friend the Premier says we have no discretion here, I differ from him as to that. The local legislature may pass as many laws creating judgeships as they please, and, so long as we are called upon to pay them, we have discretion to say whether we shall do it or not. I believe my right hon. friend the Premier has already found that out, because I have no doubt in my own mind that the case was discussed with his colleagues, and that they did not agree upon it, at which I am not surprised. It has been said that the district of Mont-

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

real suffers. For the information of members of this House who would be called upon to vote the salaries of these three new judges, I want to say in what condition the matter stands in the district of Montreal. The right hon. gentleman says that there are some judges in the province of Quebec who have not as much work as they might have. We have the proof of this in a return that was brought down a few days ago at the request of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) on the 26th of June, and I will read this return to the House to show whether we could give relief to the district of Montreal by appointing three judges. There is nothing to prevent the legislature of Quebec, at its next session, passing a law asking for the appointment of two or three more judges; but my impression is, that the appointment of three new judges will not afford the remedy we desire.

I find in this return that some judges in the rural districts, who have not enough to do at home, are at liberty to give their services to the Chief Justice in Montreal, who calls on them when he finds it necessary. They are Superior Court judges and their names are: Judge De Lorimier, of the judicial district of Joliette, who gave his services from the 1st January, 1898, down to the 1st March, 1899, 84 days to the district of Montreal. Judge Lynch, of the judicial district of Bedford, who gave 29 days to the judicial district of Montreal. Judge Tellier, of St. Hyacinthe, who served 263 days in the judicial district of Montreal during 14 months. Judge Caron, of the city of Quebec, who put in 33 days of his time in the district of Montreal. It seems that there is not enough work in the city of Quebec to keep the judges there busy all the time. Judge Cimon, of the judicial district of Kamouraska, who sat six days in Montreal; Judge Ouimet, of the district of Richelieu, who sat 64 days in Montreal; Judge Bourgeois, of Three Rivers, who sat 10 days in the judicial district of Montreal; Judge Lavergne, who has a very large district under his jurisdiction. Even if the local government of Quebec would accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Hochelaga, which was repeated by the right hon. First Minister, they would still have to leave a judge in the district of Pontiac, because that is a very large and busy district. But still Judge Lavergne has been able to give nine days of his time to the district of Montreal. Judge Lemieux, of Sherbrooke, who gave 43 days to the judicial district of Montreal; Judge Bélanger, of Beauharnois, who gave three days to Montreal, and Judge Pelletier also, who sat three days in that district; Judge Charland, of St. Johns, who sat 126 days in the district of Montreal; Judge Choquette, who gave 40 days to the judicial district of Montreal, and Judge White, of Sherbrooke, eight days. In all, those fourteen

judges put in 667 days in the judicial district of Montreal during 14 months. Three judges could not accomplish all this work, so that as far as the expense is concerned I do not suppose that by appointing these three judges we could effect any economy because we would still have to utilize the others.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** The hon. gentleman must remember that though all the judges he mentions have put in this extra time in the judicial district of Montreal, that district is still in arrears.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Then the nomination of three additional judges would not prevent these other judges from going into Montreal again?

**Mr. FORTIN.** Probably not.

**Mr. BERGERON.** When the Act was passed at Quebec, the Attorney General gave as the reason for it that the expense of paying these judges I have named for sitting in Montreal would be saved, because the three new judges would replace them. But it is evident now that even if we name the three judges, those other fourteen would still have to sit in Montreal.

**Mr. FORTIN.** Very probably.

**Mr. BERGERON.** If we vote a salary for these three judges, I may mention in passing that there are ten or fifteen Quebec Liberals clamouring to be elevated to the bench, and consequently, even with these three additional appointments this year, next year we may still have a pressure for the appointment of three others. Unless you propose something which will put an end to this, you do not know where it will stop, and you will still have in the province of Quebec not sufficient judges for the Montreal district and too many for the rest of the province. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), when Attorney General for the province of Quebec, introduced a Bill in the local legislature to reform the judicial system of the province, but that Bill was never discussed for causes known. When the present condition of affairs was created by Sir George E. Cartier in 1852 or 1854, which was called a system of decentralization, the means of travel in the province were difficult, and it was considered the best policy to appoint judges in the different districts. The means of locomotion, however, have since greatly improved so that it is possible for a judge to leave the judicial district of Montreal or of Quebec in the morning and get to any of the rural districts in these divisions the same day. What was the cause of the non-acceptance of the Bill introduced in the Quebec legislature by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), who I regret to see is absent? The local members said that if they supported such a Bill they would forfeit their seats, because in the shire town of each county there are a number of lawyers who are inter-

ested in having the legal business centralized in that place. They do not want to see the shire town disappear and lose the court-house.

**Mr. BELCOURT.** That would not remove the court-house. The judge would sit there just the same.

**Mr. BERGERON.** But they want a judge to be continually there. They have motions to make, and if the judges were all resident in Montreal they would have to wait several days and make only one motion when now they can make several, which means something to the lawyers. I am simply giving the reasons stated by the hon. member for Montmorency as those which prevented the passage of this Bill. My right hon. friend said we must follow public opinion. That may be true to a certain degree, but we must sometimes create public opinion. We have great examples in the history of our country of public opinion being created by our predecessors, and if they had simply followed public opinion, I do not know where we would be to-day. One of the best ways to create public opinion is to bring the matter so close to the people that they will understand it themselves. I was quite satisfied when I heard the rumour that my right hon. friend was not disposed to put an amount in the Estimates to pay these judges, for my impression is that if you want the people to instruct their local members to change the present system of judicature, the best way would be not to grant what hon. gentlemen are asking to-day.

**Mr. LEMIEUX.** Will the hon. gentleman be satisfied if the judge in the district of Beauharnois were transferred to Montreal?

**Mr. BERGERON.** That is not the point at all. So far as I am concerned, I simply look to the public interest, and I say there are some districts where there is no necessity to have a judge at all. For instance, one judge would be sufficient for the districts of St. Hyacinthe and St. Johns, and one for the districts of Richelieu and Joliette.

**Mr. BRUNEAU.** No.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Yes, we have the fruits of this statement in the return. I was looking for the report of the Department of Justice to find out how many cases were tried in those districts but cannot find it. Of course I have no personal interest in urging this reform, because it is not I who am going to pay for the judges but it is the people, and it is in their interest that I speak. The hon. member for Hochelaga has complained and suggested two or three plans, and the right hon. First Minister has complained and suggested some improvements, but neither has suggested a reform which could be put into practical effect, and that is the one I am suggesting. One judge

would be enough for two districts in which there is not much to do.

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

### After Recess.

Mr. BERGERON. When the House took recess at six o'clock, I was answering some remarks of the right hon. Premier, in which he emphasized what had been said by my hon. friend from Hochelaga (Mr. Madore)—that the three means that had been proposed for an arrangement of the judicature of Quebec were not workable, because the people of the province were not agreeable to any of them. And I was suggesting a means, which, I think, had not been mentioned by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Madore)—that some of the judicial districts might be united by the local legislature and the judges thus set free might be transferred to the judicial district of Montreal. If I remember well, I was just mentioning that the districts of St. Hyacinthe and St. Johns be united, as also could the districts of Richelieu and Joliette. My hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) asked me if I was in favour of uniting the district of Beauharnois with that of Montreal. I have no objection to answering that immediately. I believe that a judge from Montreal could perfectly well administer the business in Beauharnois. Still, that district is in a different position from the others. It is the south-westerly part of the province. Among the suggestions which might be made to the local government by my right hon. friend when he meets the Attorney General of Quebec is this, that the counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil, which are to-day in the judicial district of Montreal could easily be put into the judicial district of Beauharnois. They belong, in fact, to that district. The diocese of Valleyfield, my right hon. friend remembers, comprises five counties, the territory covered by the judicial district of Beauharnois and the counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil, and I think it is a very good division. If Soulanges and Vaudreuil were put into the judicial district of Beauharnois there would be so much less work for the judicial district of Montreal. I think we ought to take every possible means, as long as we do not impair the efficiency of the administration of justice in Quebec, to avoid increasing the expenditure on this service. My right hon. friend has said, with a great deal of truth, that the administration of justice in Quebec costs a great deal less than does the administration of justice in Ontario. I have made up the figures hurriedly, and I think the cost in Quebec is \$201,000 and in Ontario \$262,400. So much the better. I think that in a question of this sort, we here ought to strive as much as possible to keep down expenses. My hon. friend from Gaspé said that we have been doing everything to encourage the

Mr. BERGERON.

manufacturing industries of the country, and every day there is some suggestion for encouraging the farming interests, and that the professional interests should be encouraged. This is not the way we should discuss things here. As a professional man, I say we do not want any encouragement from anybody—professional men can take care of themselves. The point for us to consider is how we can secure the greatest efficiency at the least possible cost to the public. It should be remembered that this request for additional judges comes, not from the farmers nor from the people of the province, but from the local government. What the purpose is, except, as I have said, to secure the appointment of gentlemen who want to go on the bench, I do not know. If my right hon. friend does not grant the demand of the local legislature for the appointment of judges, but has a kind of interview with the Attorney General of the province, and comes to some understanding by which the judges in Montreal may be appointed without increasing the expenditure for the administration of justice in Quebec, the object in view will be entirely achieved, so far as the administration of justice is concerned. I repeat that my impression is, from the speech of my right hon. friend, that he would like to grant this request but he cannot get quite his own way; and the question was brought up in the House—I will not say as the result of an understanding, but it looked like that—so as to show the recalcitrant Ministers in the Cabinet that the thing is wanted in Quebec. But the administration of justice can be carried on perfectly with the judges we have in Quebec, if they are properly distributed.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the right hon. gentleman how many counties there are in each of these judicial divisions in Quebec?

The PRIME MINISTER. Three.

Mr. BERGERON. I should say three on the average.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not rise for the purpose of prolonging this very interesting discussion on the judiciary of Quebec, which has given us all a very great deal of information, but simply to say one word in favour of the British North America Act, with which my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) seems to find some fault on the ground that while the organization and the administration of the courts is left to the provinces, the appointment of the judges and the provisions for their salaries is left to this Parliament. I have no doubt that one of the causes from which my right hon. friend, like any other occupying his high and distinguished position, has a great deal of trouble, is from the question of patronage, especially in reference to filling these high and important judicial positions. I am inclined to think that my right hon. friend has altogether underrated the protec-

tion which the British North America Act gives him. If the organization of the courts and the appointment of judges were with this Parliament, all any aspirant would have to do would be to make a request to my right hon. friend, and say: I want to go on the bench. I think the time has come when you ought to make a provision for me; all you have to do is to introduce a Bill to provide an additional judge, and give me the office, and vote my salary. My right hon. friend has now this protection, that he can say: We cannot create judgeships, we cannot make vacancies; I should be delighted to consider your claims, if there was a vacancy, but there is no vacancy. That rests with the provincial legislature, and until they provide for a place, it is impossible for us to fill it. I am inclined to think that the same thing would apply to provincial legislatures, if whoever has the creation of these places could make the appointments. I think the pressure upon them would be much greater. At present it is divided, and my right hon. friend, I think, has weakened his position by not holding strongly to the ground that, while the organization of the courts depends upon the local legislatures, the Government of the Dominion has to provide the salary, and whoever is responsible for making the appointment must exercise judgment as to whether it is absolutely necessary in the interests of the country that these places should be created and filled.

Mr. INGRAM. In view of the discussion which has just taken place, I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman with respect to a Bill relating to judges moved by the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), whether he intends to proceed with that this session, and if so, is it a Bill similar to that moved by the Solicitor General last session affecting the age of judges.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, it is not.

#### PRESERVATION OF HEALTH ON PUBLIC WORKS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think there was an understanding that an important Bill regarding public health was to be taken up to-day. That has been changed, and, as I understand there are some parties who will be here to-morrow, and who are anxious to speak upon that subject, I would ask the right hon. gentleman whether that question will be taken up to-morrow.

The PRIME MINISTER. Several gentlemen have intimated to me their intention of taking part in that debate. As this is a very thin House, I do not intend moving it to-day, nor yet to-morrow, if the House is not any more full than it is to-day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask a question which is not on the paper, but to which I presume the Government will have no objection. I want to ask the Minister of the Interior whether Mr. Wade, Q.C., is now in the employment of the Government, and if so, at what salary?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Mr. Wade is the Crown prosecutor in the employment of the Department of Justice for the Yukon district. I am not personally aware of the terms of his engagement, and therefore, cannot answer the question without consulting the Minister of Justice.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very much obliged to my hon. friend, and perhaps to-morrow he would be kind enough to let me know.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance—I think the time has come when it is proper to press that question—how soon we may hope to have the supplementary Estimates.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I hesitate to name a definite day, for fear of not being able to keep my promise. We are pushing them forward with all possible speed, and at a very early day they will be laid on the Table.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is a very late period of the session to bring down large supplementary Estimates, and it has leaked out from a very authentic source that these are very large. If so, my hon. friend will see how absolutely necessary it is that we should have them at the earliest moment.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman. Perhaps, in fairness, I ought to say that, owing to the illness and the subsequent absence of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), some delay occurred which otherwise would not have happened.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Intercolonial Railway—

Increased accommodation at St. John. \$445,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understood, from the hon. gentleman's statement last night, that this \$100,000 has been paid.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, and the property has passed into the hands of the Crown, and the transfer has been executed.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Of course, if the sum has been paid, there is no necessity for discussing it, except to state my views a little more fully than I did last night. I may ask the hon. gentleman whether he has gone over the evidence since we discussed this last night.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I have not.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I confess that the hon. gentleman could not have gone over it, otherwise he would not have made some statements which he made last night. Now, with regard to this purchase, I wish to make a brief statement and then to say that I think it is a matter which might very properly be discussed and investigated by the Public Accounts Committee. That is the only place where it can be investigated fully, and I think there are facts in connection with it, without insinuating anything unpleasant, that ought to be investigated before the Public Accounts Committee; and if I have the honour of a seat here next year, I shall, with the consent of the committee, ask for witnesses and papers in connection with it. This year the expenditure is not in the Auditor General's Report, and consequently that would not come regularly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The amount was not paid until February. The hon. gentleman will see, from the reference to the report, that it was early in February before we had a report from them. So, it must have been later than the 1st of February when the transaction was closed. But I may say to the hon. gentleman that there would be no objection, so far as I am concerned, to the matter being taken up by the Public Accounts Committee at any moment that he pleases, although the item does not appear in the accounts of the present year; and I will facilitate that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It will come in the regular way. This is a purchase of a piece of property from practically three gentlemen, Messrs. Pugsley, McLeod and Stockton. The property was offered to the hon. Minister for \$100,000. The hon. Minister then appointed three gentlemen to investigate as to the value of the property, not being satisfied at the moment that it was worth the sum named.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not the reason. It was not because I was not satisfied the property was worth \$100,000, and that it was a reasonable price to offer. In any transaction of this kind the Government is certain to be criticised whether there is really any foundation for it or not, and, with a view of avoiding criticism and showing that there was every desire on the part of the Government that the matter should

Mr. BLAIR.

go through in a straightforward and proper way, we concluded that we would have competent valuers appointed. We asked them to value the property so that we might have their report, for whatever amount they might advise that the property might be purchased for safely, to depend upon in justification of our action in the purchase. That was the reason I gave the hon. gentleman last night.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not know that it is a stronger reason than the reason I have suggested. I think it is a weaker one.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The statement that the hon. gentleman made is not accurate.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the hon. Minister had felt assured that no criticism could lie against him he would not have bothered with a commission of gentlemen that he named to inquire into the value of the property.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did bother.

Mr. MONTAGUE. At any rate, he appointed three gentlemen. These gentlemen met and took evidence in a very informal way. There was no sworn testimony at all. I am bound to say, and I do it very freely, that the evidence bears out the contention which the hon. gentleman has made. The statement of the people who were called before the commission goes to show that the property was exceedingly valuable, and the only difficulty I have in coming to a conclusion upon the question as to its being worth \$100,000, or as to the sale of the property by these individuals, is to wonder why three gentlemen, resident in the city of St. John, would offer to the Government a property for \$100,000 which all their neighbours whom they called upon to give evidence say was worth a good deal more than \$100,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They wanted to sell it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is true, and I am told that they are still very anxious that this matter shall not be obstructed. I was warned that one individual would be ruined if this was stopped, but I cannot, for the life of me, understand how a man would be ruined by having the sale, for \$100,000 stopped, of a property which was worth \$140,000 or \$150,000, or to take the valuation placed upon it by these men, \$118,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has stated that somebody has approached him on the subject. I do not understand him to say that any person with whom I am connected approached him, or that it was at my in-

stance or suggestion that he was approached.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** Oh, certainly not. The hon. gentleman may make mistakes, but he would not make that mistake. We find that this commission took evidence in an exceedingly informal way, and the hon. Minister of Railways exhibited a great deal of ignorance in regard to the commission last night. For instance, he said: Well, yes, I believe the Government were represented by counsel, but he did not know whether the owners of the property were represented by counsel or not. I find that the owners of the property were represented by counsel, and that counsel's name is Mr. Blair. I do not know who that gentleman is, but I am told that he is the son of the hon. Minister. The hon. gentleman has a son a lawyer; he represented the owners of this property when the question was up as to what the value of it was, and the hon. gentleman does not follow his son's professional career very closely or he would have known that he did do a certain amount of business.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I did not know that my son was connected with it in any way.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. I am told, too, that the gentleman who represented the Government, though not directly interested in any way, was in a position to be anxious that the property should be purchased by the Government, that the deal should be concluded, and that the sum of \$100,000, at least, should be paid. Now, you have these two facts, together with the fact that the hearing was conducted in a very informal way, and it appears to me, on the face of it, to be an exceedingly funny commission for the purpose of making a valuation of a property which is being purchased by the Government of Canada.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding).** The hon. gentleman alluded to a gentleman who acted professionally in this matter, as if he might be interested, or concerned, in the sale of the property. Let me say at once that the gentleman who was acting professionally was Mr. Hugh H. McLean, of St. John, who was employed by me. If that gentleman had any, even the remotest, interest in the property, I learn it for the first time, and I think it is not correct, because he is a gentleman of the highest standing, and I am sure he would not have accepted the position if he were interested in the property.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** I do not know the gentleman at all, and I am not going to make any specific charge.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I am responsible for employing him.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** If so, that responsibility will be assumed, I suppose, at the proper time, and the facts will come out. This property was purchased by the gentlemen who sold it to the Government in 1891. It was purchased under the hammer for \$25,000. It was sold at Chubb's Corners under a mortgage sale, and the sum it brought was the mortgage and the added interest and expenses. It does seem to me a remarkable thing that prominent residents of St. John, having money to spare, should let a property, in 1889, be taken at the sum of \$25,000 under the hammer and not bid on it, and then step up in 1899 and say that the property is worth \$130,000 or \$140,000.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** They said \$118,000.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** There are statements that it is worth \$140,000.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The hon. gentleman is referring to the statements of witnesses.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** I am referring to the statements of witnesses who gave evidence, and who are residents of St. John.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Under oath?

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** Not under oath, and who made the statement that the property was worth \$130,000, \$140,000, \$145,000, and yet these gentlemen allowed this property to go under the hammer at \$25,000.

**Mr. BRITTON.** Had there not been valuable improvements made in the meantime?

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** I am coming to that. The property was sold for \$25,000, and was purchased by six individuals. I am told by the evidence here. Afterwards three individuals bought the other three out, and when the property came to be sold to the Government of Canada there were only three individuals interested in it. According to the evidence, \$40,000 had been spent in improvements in addition to the \$25,000 paid. That is the statement of the owners of the property, not under oath; no bills shown that were paid, no accounts laid before the valutors as to how the \$40,000 was spent—I think I am correct in the sum \$40,000, but it may be a few thousand one way or the other. According to the evidence, what they paid for it was \$25,000 and what they spent on it was \$40,000 or \$43,000.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) say there was no statement as to how that \$40,000 was made up?

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** I said there was no account presented. There are some details. There are statements made: We spent so much on this and so much on that; but that is a mere statement. There is no evidence

to show that money was spent at all, except the statement of the owners who desired to sell it to the Government and who desired to get the largest price for it. Now, taking the evidence of these gentlemen: \$25,000 is paid for the property, and \$40,000 or \$43,000 was spent upon it, so that we will say this property cost these gentlemen \$67,000 at the outside.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). What about interest and taxes?

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. My hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) says "interest and taxes," but surely if the property is worth \$100,000, the interest and taxes would be paid by the income.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Did it always bear an income?

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. It did not, but the Postmaster General is giving away his case in that.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I know nothing about it.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Oh, very well. The bare fact is this: The Minister of Railways said he made a splendid bargain when he bought that property for \$100,000—and may possibly have to pay \$118,000—a property which had been bought by these individuals ten years ago for \$25,000, and on which has been spent \$42,000 according to their own estimates, so that \$67,000 was the purchase price of this property which has been sold to the Government for \$100,000.

An hon. **MEMBER**. The increase in value.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Some one says "increase in value." There is not a gentleman on the other side of the House who will tell me that property in St. John has increased in value at that rate in the last nine or ten years.

Mr. **MORIN**. Increase in politics.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Some one says "increase in politics," but I am not suggesting that now. I am only giving the facts as they appear in that evidence, and the Minister (Mr. Blair) will correct me if I am wrong.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I would prefer not to interrupt the hon. gentleman, and I will take occasion to make my statement later on. At the same time I do not wish it to be inferred from my not interrupting him, that I accept the hon. gentleman's statements as facts.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Now, as to the income from the property; this property was sold under mortgage. It was bought by these gentlemen, and for a number of years, so far as I can glean from the evidence, there was no income from it at all—at least if there was an income it was a very small income. After a while they seem to have made an arrangement with the Dominion

Mr. **MONTAGUE**.

Atlantic Railway, and after they made that arrangement the property gave an income of something like \$5,400, but that was only for a couple of years.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The last two years.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. It did not go any further than the last two years to which the Minister has referred. Now, I am told—my information may be wrong—that the property was not considered good security for \$30,000.

Mr. **BERGERON**. That is a matter for investigation.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Quite so. I am told, and I may be wrong in my information, that not more than \$27,000 could be raised on that property by way of a loan.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Would the hon. gentleman mind stating his authority for that?

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. I will give my authority at the time when it is necessary; the hon. gentleman can dispute it if he wishes. I am told that it was not considered good security for a greater loan than \$27,000. I am told too, that that property is assessed in the city of St. John for \$35,000. That appears in the evidence, but it is not quite clear whether that is subject to a special arrangement they made with the council or not. According to the evidence the assessment is \$35,000, though the witness says that \$10,000 has been reduced, and I am not aware whether or not that \$10,000 is the complete reduction coming out of the special arrangement which they made with the council. However that may be, it appears from the evidence that the property is assessed in the city of St. John for \$35,000. I submit that all these things tend to show the property not to be so valuable as the price which has been paid for it by the Minister of Railways would indicate. That is about all the facts that appear upon the surface. The Minister (Mr. Blair) has closed the deal, and of course there is no necessity so far as I am concerned, of going into it any more fully, even if we had the fuller information. I do not think, upon the surface, that a good bargain has been made. I think it shows that a bad bargain has been made, and for my part I shall feel justified at the proper time in asking that the subject be investigated before the Committee on Public Accounts.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). I want to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Montague) that so far as the statement is concerned that he will take action hereafter to have the matter investigated before the Public Accounts Committee, he will find no member of this House more ready to facilitate this investigation than I am. I am entirely prepared to have the hon. gentleman produce all the witnesses, and if it suits his convenience, I assure him it will

suit mine to have the investigation proceed at once. Whatever may be the hon. gentleman's information with regard to this, I make no doubt that I will be able to show that his information is unreliable, that his statements are not capable of being supported by worthy testimony, and I can satisfy—if not him—I can satisfy the Public Accounts Committee and this Parliament that the transaction is a good one for the Government, that it has been honestly and fairly conducted, and that it is defensible from every point of view. The statement of the hon. gentleman therefore does not alarm me, and he can rest confident that I will be available while I am here, at all time, to facilitate such investigation. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has taken occasion to read the evidence given before these valuers, because I am informed that the hon. gentleman has not availed himself of what are the leading facts which were made to appear before these valuers, and which are to be found, as I am advised, in the evidence which was taken on that occasion. I agree in the statement of the hon. gentleman that this property was sold at a forced sale, I think a foreclosure of mortgage, and that it only brought \$25,000 at that sale. The facts behind that are, that this was a property owned by a firm in St. John, of the name of Kirk & Daniel. These gentlemen held that property in their books for many years as having cost them and as being of the value of \$160,000. There was unquestionably a depreciation in value, particularly in wharf property, in the city of St. John. I do not know how far it would be proper to attribute that depreciation to the policy which our hon. friends opposite had introduced, and which did its most deadly work in the maritime provinces; but it is unquestionable that during the period that policy prevailed, property in the city of St. John did decline in value, and at the time this sale took place it had reached very nearly its lowest point.

Mr. McMULLEN. When was that property sold?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The sale took place ten years ago. Any gentleman who knows the contingencies which affect the value of property will not assume that at a forced sale a property would be certain to realize all its value. Up to that time it was used as a mill property and for the purposes of a public wharf; but unfortunately at that period there was no way of having access to it from the main street of the city in a business way; and there were a variety of other circumstances which tended to somewhat reduce its value. It did, however, sell for \$25,000, interest, and expenses. Instead of being bought by three persons, it was bought by six. I am told that besides the gentlemen named there were three others originally interested in the purchase. After some time elapsed some of them

desired to dispose of the interest which they had acquired in the property; and the hon. gentleman will see from the documents which he has in his hands whether or not what I am now stating is correct. At the time these people desired to part with their interest, the three remaining bought out the other three, which they were obliged to do, not on the basis of \$25,000, interest and costs, but at a value of \$50,000. Does that appear?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No papers whatever appear in connection with that. I do not know where the hon. gentleman gets his information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am told that it does appear. I have not read this evidence, but I am told that that fact does appear. But whether it appears or not, I am told that is the fact.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What year was that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was before any improvements were made upon it by the owners. At that time the total amount of the rentals which were being received in respect of the property was only \$1,200. The owners made some arrangement with the city corporation, and acquired certain rights by which they were able to make satisfactory connection between the main street and the wharf. They followed that by laying down a highway, building a bridge, and laying tracks, thus providing a railway connection between the Intercolonial Railway on the one hand and the end of this pier on the other. In consequence of the expenditure they made, which the hon. gentleman has correctly stated as somewhat between \$40,000 and \$43,000, they were able to induce persons to rent portions of the property which they had not been able to rent before; so that, as a result of their improvements, their rentals went up, from \$1,200 to \$5,400. As a consequence, the property has enormously increased in value. Now, we have the basis of \$50,000 two or three years after the property was originally purchased and before these expenditures were made, and we have \$40,000 added to the value by these improvements, making \$90,000. Amongst those who were contributing the rentals was the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company, which owns one or two steamships plying between St. John and Digby, and which paid for a wharf privilege \$2,400 a year; and they had an understanding with the owners of the property that if their business turned out as they expected, they would give an increased rental after the lapse of one or two years. The various rentals are as follows:—The Dominion Atlantic Railway Company, who had a lease of the end of the wharf and the right to use the warehouse for their business, although not the exclusive right, \$2,400; Gibbon & Co., who leased the large

building at the upper part of the wharf, and the western side of the wharf, \$900; J. A. Likely, \$240; four tenants on Main street, paying a total of \$303; another, Mr. Brown, paying \$36; Mr. Elliott paying \$45; nine tenants of a large tenement building on Long Wharf street, paying \$318; making a total of rentals of \$4,242. The average of the wharfage from vessels coming to the wharf has been about \$1,200 a year. The present year the wharfage has been less; and just immediately before the Government expropriated the property there was a certain and insured income of about \$5,400. The hon. gentleman seemed to suggest that because these rentals had not been received during the whole period of the ownership of this property by this company, that was an element which ought to make its value less than the price we paid. But is there any reason or force in an argument like that? During the last two years before the Government took over the property they were in receipt of rentals amounting to \$5,400 a year. Would not that be a controlling fact? My hon. friend has said that the property is only assessed by the corporation at \$35,000, and that this ought to be taken as nearer its value than the sum paid by the Government, but he had in his hand the evidence, and, if I am correctly informed of the contents of these papers—which I did not read, but handed over to the hon. gentleman the very moment I received them from the Deputy Minister—the evidence discloses these facts, that in New Brunswick railway companies are free from taxation for a period of years; and this company, having laid down its line of railway and run it in connection with the Intercolonial Railway over its property to the end of this pier, was exempt from taxation, so far as the railway portion was concerned, which was by far the larger portion of the value, and was subject to taxation only on that part occupied by these tenants.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is a reduction on that part.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not care, if there was. Possibly, \$35,000 might have been claimed by the owners as an excessive valuation of that portion of the property.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is not very clear, but it looks as though the ordinary assessment were \$35,000, and that, in view of the special arrangement these gentlemen had with the council, there was a reduction of \$10,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No doubt, these gentlemen endeavoured to reduce the estimate of value for taxation purposes to as low a figure as possible. That is not an uncommon thing in such cases.

Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You will find that in Mr. Pugsley's statement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This fact remains, that the city of St. John, not having authority under the law to assess them in respect of any portion of the property which was a railway portion, where their tracks were laid down, would not have the right to assess on the wharf portion, but only that occupied by these tenants.

Now, we have the fact that this property cost these gentlemen something over \$90,000 three years before the Government took possession of it. We have, in addition, the fact that during the last three or four years property has been much enhanced in value in the city of St. John, particularly property which lies in the neighbourhood of the wharfs recently constructed by the city corporation. This property lies in the very heart of the city, and, when the value and the importance of the port of St. John came to be recognized, when steamships sought that port, and business came into it, this property necessarily became much enhanced in value. Its prospective value was also much increased. You could imagine how great would be the prospect of increase in value in respect of this property, if you were not a resident there and did not know how it was situated and how it lies in respect of the other wharf properties which have been erected by the city. It lies at the very head of the harbour, is splendidly situated, and is the best site possible for the purposes for which the Government acquired it, and, in addition, it lies adjacent to the Government railway, and can be reached immediately from our general depot at a very little cost in the way of construction of line. This property, I want the committee to understand, contains over seven acres on the whole. I have ascertained the exact acreage to be 7.08, which would be 280,000 square feet. I want to know whether any one will say that in a city like St. John, with its harbour coming into prominence as a favourable harbour for business, and the prospects which are opening before it, 50 cents a square foot would be an unreasonable price for such a property. If you only paid 50 cents a foot for the 280,000 feet, that would amount to \$140,000. From my own experience on points along the Intercolonial Railway where we have had occasion to buy property, that would be a very moderate price. I am in treaty now for the purchase of property at Lévis, and taking every possible means to get it at the lowest figure, the lowest price is 40 cents per foot, and for some portions, on which there are improvements, we have to pay 80 cents per foot. Putting the lowest value, 50 cents per foot, on this property, you will have \$140,000. From any point of view from which the property may be examined, it will be found

that the Government have made a very fair agreement. I do not say to my hon. friend, although he has quoted me as saying so, that it is a splendid purchase, but I do say that we acquired it at a moderate, reasonable price, and I do not think the hon. gentleman will find any one in the city of St. John who has any idea of the value of property, who will say that we have paid more than we should for it.

I just want to read, for the information of this committee, the names of the persons who went before these valuers and made their statements as to the value of the property. Any one acquainted at all with the leading citizens of St. John will agree that we could not have made a selection of persons more likely to give an honest opinion, and whose opinion would be more reliable. We have, first, Mr. Pugsley himself, one of the owners. Then Mr. W. B. McKenzie, chief engineer of the Government railways.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. McKenzie does not put any valuation on it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These are the persons whose evidence was secured.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the hon. gentleman will read Mr. McKenzie's evidence, he will not regard the property as being quite so valuable as he says it is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had many conversations with Mr. McKenzie, and he was of opinion that there was no site in the city as favourable as this. Any gentleman who knows the city of St. John will say that if we were to put down terminal facilities in that city, this place, above all others, should be the choice. Then, there is Mr. Daniel Clark, an old citizen of great responsibility and the highest character, and who is an authority on the value of real estate. Also, Mr. Samuel S. Mayes, Mr. Herbert Mayes, Mr. John Collins, Mr. Robert Lee, Mr. A. O. Crookshank, Mr. W. H. Thorne, a very respectable gentleman and large merchant in the city of St. John, who is not a Liberal, but belongs to the Conservative party, and of whom, no doubt, my hon. friend has heard in times past, and has had communication with. Mr. Geo. F. Baird, who was a large owner of shipping property and other property. The hon. gentleman will remember whether he put a value on the property, but I understand he did, and that his estimate was in excess of that made by the arbitrators. Mr. E. C. Jones, manager of the Bank of Montreal; Mr. J. E. Cowan, Mr. Jas. Knox, Mr. T. B. Robinson, Mr. Hurd Peters, Mr. H. D. Troop, Mr. W. W. Turnbull, Mr. James Kirk, Mr. A. Chapman Smith, for many years mayor of the city; Dr. W. Christie, Mr. Edward Sears, the pre-

sent mayor, and Capt. Taylor. I do not know that all of these gave evidence as to the value, but I think that nearly all did. Possibly Mr. McKenzie might be an exception.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Some of the others did not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The great body of them, I think, it will be found, did, because I do not see for what purpose they would be likely to be called by the valuers except to get their judgment as to the value of this property. The hon. gentleman has implied that an unusual course was taken in this case, that there were no formalities such as it is usual to observe. I know of no other course it would have been possible for us to take. It is true that evidence was not taken under oath; but I suppose none could be so taken unless the matter reached the Exchequer Court by the refusal of either party to carry out the arrangement.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I notice that some claims in connection with this were referred to the Exchequer Court—cases of parties owning property at or near this point.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not aware of any. There have been properties expropriated in the immediate neighbourhood, but the valuers have not yet made any report in respect of them. I do not know whether, when they make their report, the amount reported will be accepted or not. If they are willing to accept it, I should feel, for one, like being guided by that report.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I can give the hon. Minister the information. I notice here, at page R—35, there has been some claim referred to the Exchequer Court—Charles W. Drury.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The estate of Charles W. Drury is not an estate in St. John of which I have any knowledge.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then, the Auditor General must be wrong. I find it under the heading: "Intercolonial Railway, St. John: increased accommodation; Exchequer Court award."

Mr. DOMVILLE. It is part of the Harris land that you gave \$200,000 for.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And that you are now using.

Mr. DOMVILLE. It is no good.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But the Minister of Railways and Canals is using it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has not been any good for railway purposes. It lay unused all these years and was never worth—

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is not the hon. gentleman building an elevator upon it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. And why? Not because it is the site that would have been chosen, but because we have the property and we are trying to put it to some account. That is the reason and the only reason. No use has been made of the property from the moment it was bought, and I have never been able to see what object the purchasers had in acquiring that property in the first instance.

An hon. MEMBER. What did they get for it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Something over \$200,000; I do not remember the exact amount.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When was it bought?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Before 1891, I cannot state exactly what year. Mr. Drury does not own any property in this locality. The only persons whose property has been expropriated are the Hazen estate, Jos. A. Likely, F. E. Sayre, the estates of Edward Ironsides Simons and Edward Simons.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then, to what does this entry in the Auditor General's Report refer?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It refers to property in some other part of the city.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is under the heading: "St. John, increased accommodation."

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has no connection with this matter.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Perhaps it is the rifle range.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is no part of this property now under discussion, which is the material point.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What other property has the hon. Minister had to acquire there outside of the property bought from this company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Some few lots in the immediate neighbourhood. Immediately between the wharf property and the Intercolonial Railway station are a few lots we have had to get. We are changing the present railway track, which runs from the Intercolonial station to the bridge and we had to get

Mr. MONTAGUE.

some additional property to put the railway track upon so as to give us the uninterrupted use of the whole of the wharf.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As I read the evidence—I have not consulted the plan—on either side of the wharf is a slip, spoken of as the East Slip and the West Slip. Has the hon. Minister had to pay anything extra in connection with the West Slip?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not had to pay anything yet. When we came to dredge the West Slip, as the dredging has to be carried down pretty deep in order to give us the necessary depth for the ships, we found the effect would be probably to weaken the foundation of a portion of the adjoining property. It is anticipated that we may have to acquire a portion of that property; and this, I believe, is allowed for in our calculation and taken into the estimate of cost. I was saying that the proceedings that have been taken are usual and customary proceedings, and attended with all the formalities and surrounded with all the protection usual in such cases. After all, the valuers whom you appoint to make a valuation are required to satisfy their own judgment and to inform themselves fully what the value of the property is; and after selecting gentlemen in whose judgment capacity we have confidence, it is not a matter of concern to the department how they satisfy themselves, so long as they do satisfy themselves. In this case, they met and brought these gentlemen before them. They did not content themselves with that; they made a personal inspection of the property, as they naturally would. After having made this careful examination and having had the information and judgment of these citizens on the question, they came to this decision. And I do not see that the Government could have done anything else than accept their judgment, having appointed these gentlemen for the purpose.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But you are not accepting it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are accepting it, to all intents and purposes. We are accepting it as an assurance that the property was worth the sum which these gentlemen offered to sell it for, which they declared their willingness to accept.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You don't propose to accept it for \$118,000?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have never felt as a member of the Council and as head of the department that I would be justified in recommending that a larger sum should be paid for it than the sum which these gentlemen declared to us they would be willing to take.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has that subject been considered ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it has not. /

Mr. MONTAGUE. There are some memos. on the papers which would indicate that it had been considered to a certain extent. For instance, there is this memo. on one of the papers : Is Mr. Schreiber willing to recommend the extra payment ?—or something of that kind.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has never come before Council in that form, and that question has not been dealt with. Judge McLeod came up to Ottawa during the present session with these gentlemen, and desired to be heard upon the subject. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) and myself had an interview with him, and we stated to him that the pressure upon Council was such that it was impossible to afford him a hearing. But we said that if he chose to defer the matter to a later period, a hearing would be accorded him. But until the matter does come before Council I have not felt like stating whether we should or should not pay any more than these gentlemen have all along declared their willingness to accept.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I see the hon. gentleman from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) over there he has said nothing upon this subject. He knows the city of St. John very well, and he is also a friend of Judge McLeod, and I do not think he would concur in the view taken by some gentlemen opposite that Judge McLeod of the Supreme Court would attempt to extract from the public coffers any more than the property was worth. I think the hon. member for Westmoreland ought to speak, in justice to New Brunswick and in justice to his friend the judge. Perhaps he has some late information on the subject which he will give to the House. I know this property very well ; I certainly know it better than the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), and I certainly have a more intelligent idea of the value of property in New Brunswick. It does not look very well to find fault with our city. It is struggling to do the best it can. It had a very hard time for a great many years after the fire. To-day the Government are endeavouring to make a port of it. In the last year or two we have succeeded in inducing vessels to come there, which have loaded, and have given a great deal of encouragement to the city, and in the last few years property is increasing in value. Now if any hon. members of this House were to go down and look at that property they would come to the conclusion that, placed as it is, it is an absolute necessity for the western traffic coming there, an absolute necessity to the Intercolonial Railway, and they would say that it was cheap at a quarter of a million dollars. My hon.

friend laughs. I do not know what property in his place is worth, but we think our property is pretty good.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am laughing to think how foolish these gentlemen were to offer it for \$100,000.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I have seen a good many foolish men in my time, and I have known people to do a great many foolish things. My hon. friend no doubt feels it was a very foolish thing for these gentlemen to sell the property in the first instance. They were helpless. They were immense operators down there. They had an immense property, a valuable property, and after the fire when everything was paralysed, people took their money to build up the town, it went into bricks and mortar, and money was so scarce that properties almost went for nothing. These gentlemen were old, and I think one died. You know how prudent bankers are. They felt it was necessary to do something about this property, and as these gentlemen were not in a financial position to get along, it was brought to the hammer, and had to be sold as best it could be. The property was so large, so valuable for a large operator, that in the depressed times, there was nobody to take it, and like many other properties it went almost for a song. These gentlemen went along, they improved the property. There was not a proper approach from the railway. They spent a great deal of money on it, and they were working up a magnificent business. I know it was hard work to get wharf room there. Two or three steamboat companies were negotiating for it at various times, and it bid fair to be a most valuable property, one of the most valuable properties in the city of St. John. At this time the Government needed it for this improvement to the railway. It could not be said that these gentlemen bought that property to sell to the Government. They may say if they like that they expected to sell it to the Government of the day. They were not friends of this Government. Mr. A. A. Stockton, the leader of the Opposition, and Judge McLeod were friends of the late Government. Those gentlemen could expect nothing from the Liberal party, they were not our friends. But I do not suppose for a moment that they had any such intention in view. But they saw as shrewd men that when they got over the first difficulties, when business began to right itself and times improved, that would be one of the finest properties in New Brunswick, or at any rate in the city of St. John, and it had an immense future. If my hon. friend from Haldimand had ever seen it I am sure he would regret imputing to Judge McLeod or these other gentlemen any intention to get more for it than it is worth. I do believe that they made a great mistake in allowing the Government to take it for \$100,000. I am satis-

fied that if they had gone to the Exchequer Court they would have got \$150,000 at least; and I am satisfied that if they had gone to a jury of their own people who know the place, they would have got that sum. I suppose my view of it, being perfectly disinterested, is as good before this House and before the country as the view of my hon. friend opposite who knows little or nothing about it. But it does seem as though it would be a little hard for these hon. gentlemen from the west to come to St. John, when there is an election, and ask the people to vote for them, and to vote for their candidates for this House. What kind of a position will they be in when they have stated in this House that property in St. John is of little or no value? They are placing themselves in a very awkward position. I think my hon. friend from Westmoreland should say something. He does not wish to sit in this House and hear his friend the judge spoken of unfavourably; if he does, I am afraid he will realize that there is little gratitude between politicians. The Harris property right alongside of it was thought cheap at \$200,000 or \$220,000. I think I am right in stating that when the late Government bought it it was assessed by the city on a valuation of \$8,000, at any rate it was not over \$12,000. Yet with undue haste, without anybody wanting it, a perfectly derelict property, played out, they got that sum of money for it, and the owners were allowed to take all the machinery there was on it and sell it in Nova Scotia or somewhere else. The land was a swamp, a literal swamp, one which no one would think of purchasing. Every hon. gentleman who knows anything about our city knows that, if the land had been applied for the purpose of the city, such as building, it would not, under the most favourable circumstances, have brought \$20,000. This land, which is to be purchased, is a most valuable property; there is no question about it. I am satisfied that if the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) could see it, he would say that he regretted ever having said so much as he has about this property, and having occupied so much of the time of the House about a matter as to which he is entirely incorrect. I state that in deference to the city of St. John. I hope that the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), who often visits St. John, who knows the property very well, and who knows Judge McLeod, and these other gentlemen, will say a few words to remove them from the odium of having endeavoured to swindle this Government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). At the risk of repeating some things that are already before the House, I would like to make a statement of the facts of this case, so far as I have had anything to do with them, and to give the House, perhaps, a little more information upon the subject.

Mr. DOMVILLE.

At the last session of Parliament a large sum of money was appropriated for the improvement of the Intercolonial Railway facilities at the city of St. John. It was well understood that the chief purpose of the appropriation was the construction of a deep water wharf and the general improvement of the terminal facilities in that city. Soon after that appropriation was made and immediately after the session, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals left for England. In the meantime he had had some conversations, or informal negotiations with the owners of this property in St. John.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He had an option.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know that you could call it an option.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know whether it had reached that stage or not.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In "Hansard" the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is reported:

We had an option upon the property from the present owners.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We had an offer of it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I quite understood that the owners desired to sell it for \$100,000. That had been stated before I had any direct communication with the parties myself. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals having gone to England, I was assigned to the charge of his department during his absence. Soon after that I paid a visit to the city of St. John. While I was there I met at different times a number of citizens, and they were naturally anxious to see some progress made in regard to these improvements for which an appropriation had been made. A number of these gentlemen, some of them in official positions and other citizens, mentioned to me the desire of the city that some progress should be made and expressed the hope that I might be able to make a move in that direction. About the same time I was brought in contact with the gentlemen who were the owners of the property, Dr. A. A. Stockton, Judge McLeod and Dr. William Pugsley. It will be well understood that when the appropriation of an amount is made and the season is passing away without anything being done, there is naturally a great deal of unrest and a desire to see something done. I was pressed by the citizens of St. John, who urged that the Government should at once do something to establish these terminal facilities. I said to the gentlemen who owned the property that I was not prepared to take any action in the matter immediately, but that I would consider their proposal. I happened to be spending a few days with my family in the village of Rothesay, where two of these gentlemen resided, and I saw them

more frequently and had more frequent conversations with them on this matter than one would ordinarily have. They desired to sell the property; they did not conceal the fact that they were anxious to sell it. They gave me their reasons why it would be a great inconvenience to them to have to hold the property, and they had been building of uncertainty. They assumed that the hon. Minister of Railways intended to purchase the property, and they had been building upon that belief to some extent. They informed me that the leases of some of their tenants were about to expire; they did not know whether to renew the leases or not, and they desired that the uncertainty should be removed. They wished me, in the name of the Government, to take possession of the property and leave the question of the price to be settled later on. I was not willing to deal with the matter in that way, and I told them so frankly. I remember one morning meeting on the train, between St. John and Moncton, Mr. Pugsley, who was on his way to Campbellton. I had a conversation with him in connection with the matter, although most of the negotiations had taken place with Mr. McLeod, and some of them with Mr. Stockton. Mr. Pugsley again referred to the desire of his associates to have the uncertainty removed, and asked me to take possession of the property, leaving the price to be determined by any arrangement which might be made on the return of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. Again I said that I was not satisfied to deal with the matter in that way, and that the Government could not enter upon the property without knowing the limit of their liability. He then said that he was willing to have the Government take possession of the property by either paying the money or taking expropriation proceedings, the company limiting their claim to \$100,000. I obtained that offer from him in the course of our conversation in answer to my statement that I would not ask the Government to incur an unlimited liability. I then said to Mr. Pugsley that if that was the offer I wished him to give it to me from the proper officer of his company and in writing. He informed me that he was proceeding to Campbellton to take part in an arbitration there, that Mr. Stockton, the president of the company, was in Campbellton, and that I would hear from him. On that day, or the day following, I received a telegram from Mr. Stockton, which I shall now read:

Campbellton, N.B., August 15, 1898.

To Hon. W. S. Fielding, St. John.

In order to expedite matters, our company agree that if you file plan taking over Long Wharf property, we will allow price to stand until the return of the Minister of Railways, and will then either execute deed giving clear title on being paid \$100,000, or will consent to valuation, we undertaking to put in our claim for that amount.

(Sgd.) A. A. STOCKTON,

Pres. St. John Terminal Ry. Co.

I thought that statement was tolerably clear, but I wanted to make assurance doubly sure, and I then sent to Mr. Stockton the following telegram:—

Rothsay, N.B., Aug. 16, 1898.

To A. A. Stockton, Campbellton, N.B.

I understand your telegram to mean that the Government have the option of buying the Long Wharf property for \$100,000, or of taking it by the established practice of expropriation, and that if the latter course be preferred the claim of the owners will be \$100,000. Is this correct?

(Sgd.) W. S. FIELDING.

In reply I received the following:—

Campbellton, N.B., Aug. 16, 1898.

To Hon. W. S. Fielding, St. John.

Yes, your interpretation is correct.

(Sgd.) A. A. STOCKTON.

On August 18th, I received from Mr. Stockton the following:

Campbellton, N.B., Aug. 18, 1898.

To Hon. W. S. Fielding, St. John.

Kindly inform me conclusion arrived at. Our tenants anxious to know.

(Sgd.) A. A. STOCKTON.

On the 19th of August, I wired to Mr. Stockton as follows:—

St. John, Aug. 19, 1898.

To A. A. Stockton, Campbellton, N.B.

Will file plan this afternoon or to-morrow. Please notify your tenants that they will be subject to the authority of the Government, and that in any matter relating to the occupation of the property they can communicate with Mr. W. B. Mackenzie, chief engineer of the Intercolonial Railway.

(Sgd.) W. S. FIELDING.

That is the story of how the property came to be purchased, or rather, of how we came to take possession of it. At that time we did not purchase the property, but we filed a plan under the Expropriation Act, which vested the title in the Crown. Then, the matter was placed in the hands of Mr. H. H. McLean, a gentleman of the legal profession in St. John, well known to any one who knows that city as a gentleman occupying the highest professional position. Mr. McLean was employed to conduct the legal business in connection with the expropriation. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) made some reference to some possible connection which Mr. McLean had with the business, which would make him not anxious to serve the Government. I asked my hon. friend if he would be kind enough to give me his authority for that statement, but he passed over my question. I can assure him that any one who has intimated that Mr. McLean would act otherwise than as a faithful adviser of the Government has been misinformed, and I would say that, his professional position places him above suspicion in the matter. The hon. Minister of Railways soon afterwards returned. I ceased to have anything further to do with the mat-

ter, and what occurred subsequently I know only from the information as it was reported from time to time by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to his colleagues as to what had occurred. Three valuers were appointed, Mr. James McGregor Grant, insurance agent, a gentleman who has had to deal largely and in a very conservative way with the valuation of properties in the city of St. John.

Another gentleman was Mr. George Robertson, a merchant of long standing, a man who was mayor of St. John for years, and who is respected and esteemed. The third valuator was Mr. M. B. Edwards, an insurance agent of St. John, and a gentleman universally respected and esteemed in that city. There can be no question that the three gentlemen chosen as valuers were eminently qualified. They proceeded to make a valuation, and shortly after their decision was arrived at, I had a call from Judge McLeod, and then for the first time I heard that they were likely to report a higher valuation than the \$100,000. The desire of Judge McLeod was that I should take what he called an equitable view of their claim, and help them to get the full amount awarded. I told Judge McLeod at once that I was not disposed to consider the claim for the extra sum as an open question, because, in my judgment, they had settled the limit of their claim at \$100,000, and were bound by their agreement to take it. I told him I could not see how they could legitimately ask the Government to pay one cent more than the \$100,000. I do not know whether Judge McLeod told me the award was actually \$118,500, but at all events he told me that it was considerably above the \$100,000, and I afterwards learned that the valuation was \$118,550.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** One hundred and seventeen thousand five hundred and fifty dollars.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** No, I think I am correct in saying \$118,550. The exact sum I have learned from the papers during the last day or two. A short time ago Judge McLeod again called on me in company with Dr. Pugsley—

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Was it not Dr. Stockton?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Yes; I mentioned Mr. Pugsley, but that was a mistake. Dr. Stockton, the president of the company, and Judge McLeod called again, and, when I told them my own view was averse to the claim, they expressed a wish to be heard before the Government. I met them, in company with the Minister of Railways, and we both told them that the Ministers were so busy that it would be utterly impossible to give them a hearing at once.

**Mr. FIELDING.**

I suppose that they have not given up the idea; I have no doubt they will be heard from again in some form, and in that sense only the question of the \$18,000 may be considered to be an open matter. But in no sense is it true that the Government have assented to their proposal. In fact they have stated by Order in Council that \$100,000 was the proper sum to be paid. I shall read that Order in Council, which is as follows:—

Extract from a Report of the Committee of the Honourable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency on 27th April, 1899.

On a memorandum dated 26th April, 1899, from the Minister of Railways and Canals, representing that, for the purposes of the increased deep-water accommodation for the Intercolonial Railway in the city of St. John, now being carried out, it has been necessary to acquire certain property owned by the St. John Terminal Railway Company, and, by an Order in Council dated the 13th day of December, 1898, valuers were appointed to determine the value of the said property; under date the 7th February, 1899, they have reported that, after personal examination, they consider the sum of \$118,550 to be fair and reasonable compensation.

The Minister submits, however, that he has had an undertaking from the company to accept a lower figure, namely, \$100,000, and he (the Minister) recommends that authority be given for payment of that amount, with interest at the rate of 4 per cent from 20th August, 1898, the date of filing the plan of the property in the Registrar's office; such payment to cover all the wharf, land and premises comprised in the acreage, 7.08 acres, taken, and all damages in that connection, and to be paid only on receipt of a proper deed of conveyance and release to be obtained, as usual, through the Department of Justice.

The Committee submit the above recommendation for Your Excellency's approval.

(Sgd.) JOHN J. MCGEE,

Clerk of the Privy Council.

Therefore, in accordance with this Order in Council, the sum of \$100,000 was paid to the company, they in return giving a deed for the property free from all claim whatever. As I have said, these gentlemen have stated that they have what they call an equitable claim for \$18,000. They asked, and I suppose they will ask again, to be heard on that, and I presume it will only be courtesy to give them a hearing, but I have no hesitation in saying that from the circumstances connected with the transaction, from the agreement I made with them, and from the terms of the Order in Council, I consider the matter is settled, that we have paid these people all they are entitled to for that property, and, so far as I am concerned, I have no desire that they shall receive a penny more.

My hon. friend opposite (Mr. Montague) may say he did not mean it, but I am sure in this practical world we all know that the inference to be drawn from certain criticisms on this transaction would be, that the Government had endeavoured to

serve some friends unfairly and unduly. I think the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) put a supposed case, that the valuers of the Government might desire to deal generously, and so forth, with the friends of the Government. Well, if we are to consider that aspect of the question, let me ask: Who are these gentlemen who owned the property? First, Dr. Alfred Stockton, a gentleman I have had the pleasure of knowing for many years, and a gentleman who has been known for the last ten or twelve years as perhaps the most determined opponent that the Minister of Railways and Canals had in the province of New Brunswick. Dr. Stockton opposed the Minister (Mr. Blair) in his local elections. He was the leader of the Opposition for years while my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) was Prime Minister of that province. He is a gentleman who has taken a very active part for a number of years in the interests of the Conservative party, and against the Liberal party. The second gentleman is Dr. Wm. Pugsley, who is personally and professionally a friend of the Minister of Railways and Canals. The third is Mr. Justice McLeod. Was Judge McLeod a friend of the Minister of Railways or of this Government? Mr. Justice McLeod sat in this House for years as a Conservative member; he was appointed to the bench by the Conservative Government, and he has the honour and pleasure of being a cousin of the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster), my predecessor in the office of Minister of Finance. Put it on the ordinary low level which sometime wicked people will suspect—we know suspicion haunts the guilty mind—put it on that low level, and suppose for a moment this Government were disposed to view things in that way: is it reasonable to think that the Minister of Railways and his colleagues were going to break their necks to do some great favour for two at least of the gentlemen I have named? It is hardly possible that any one would for a moment adhere to that view. But after all, the great question is: Have we paid a fair price for this property, or have we not? I have stated that when I first heard the matter mentioned, I rather thought \$100,000 was too much. I knew that property had been depressed in the Lower Provinces. Perhaps I did not look carefully enough into the great change that had been brought about in the condition of this country by certain events which it is not necessary to dwell upon, and with the usual modesty which characterizes this Government, we probably were not thinking of that fact. At all events, I did not think of the advance which ought take place, and which doubtless did take place, in the value of real estate from various causes. But, on later inquiry, from gentlemen who were in no way interested, gentlemen who perhaps might be assumed to be biassed against the owners of

this property, I received the impression that \$100,000 was not after all an excessive sum. I approached the negotiations from that point of view, and I came to the conclusion that \$100,000 was a fair price. The valuation of property is a matter of opinion. You cannot determine its value by any precise mathematics. One man may say a property is worth \$100,000, and another man may say it is worth \$200,000, and both may be honest men, conscientiously giving their conviction. We find, however, that these valuers called some witnesses, and I shall quote the evidence of some of them. I never saw these papers until I got them to-night, after my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) had an opportunity of reading them, but I will read the evidence of two or three witnesses who are well known in this House, and who are well known throughout the political and commercial world.

Let me give first the testimony of Mr. George F. Baird. He was well known as a leading merchant of St. John and a large ship owner; he had a good knowledge of the value of property, especially property having a shipping side to it, and he would be accepted as a very excellent authority. He was also a member of Parliament, having been elected under circumstances which provoked considerable strife, and he was never expected of being a strong friend of the Liberal party. He no longer lives in St. John, having passed away last year. According to the summary which I find among the documents, Mr. Baird said:

That he is a shipping merchant; has been in active business for fifteen or twenty years. Knows the Long Wharf property; has become acquainted with it from mooring vessels at that wharf largely in this shipping business. He had always used the wharf as much as possible, whenever he could get accommodation at it for vessels loading for West Indies and South American markets; liked the locality for that purpose in preference to any others in the harbour. It was ample in its proportions, had good slips at the sides of it where vessels could get their moorings and bring cargo alongside in scows and lighters, and find smooth, safe waters without disturbance from tide such as would be found in wharfs down at the lower end of the harbour. The action of the tide is not so strong at that part of the harbour as it is down at Reed's Point; there it is smooth, and you can move your scows and lighters about just as you like, to the bow or sides of the vessels. If your scows are filled with water, there is a slip that becomes dry, and you can drain the scows and go on with loading. Then cargo can come by rail right down to them. He feels that this wharf is superior to any other in the harbour; it is convenient and central, and a vessel can lie there with more quiet than at any other place. In the days when Kirk & Daniel had it they asked about \$110,000 for it. There had been some quite expensive improvements put on it since then. He should think it would be worth more now, but would not say just what.

The harbour is crowded for accommodation, and will be congested in a very short time, so that property of that kind is becoming more valuable.

He would measure the property by the revenue. A property bringing in \$5,400 a year, with a prospect of increasing the revenue to about \$6,400, he would capitalize at anywhere between 4 and 5 per cent, and mark that down as the price—would capitalize it at 4 as a gilt-edged investment.

If you take the lower sum mentioned as the revenue derived from the property, \$5,400, and capitalize it at 4 per cent, which Mr. Baird said would make it a gilt-edged investment, on that basis the property would be worth \$135,000. The Government paid \$100,000, and the valuers state that they think it was worth \$118,000. We have also the testimony of Mr. E. C. Jones, the manager of the Bank of Montreal. It was very lucky for the Government that we did not have to buy the property at Mr. Jones' valuation, but a gentleman who holds the responsible position of Manager of the Bank of Montreal in one of the large cities of Canada, is a gentleman whose opinion on a business matter is entitled to very great consideration :

Mr. Jones states : That he is the manager of the Bank of Montreal in St. John. He knows the Long Wharf property very well. He looks upon the property as the most valuable wharf property in St. John for two or three reasons : 1st, its extent ; 2nd, its position and its availability for the purpose for which it is now being purchased. Its position is unique ; it is just what is wanted ; there is no other wharf property that would answer the purpose. If sufficient capital were put in it to develop it thoroughly, it would bring in a revenue which would mean a good rate of interest on a very much larger sum than \$250,000. He would look upon the property from the extent of its position, as a very fair value for \$200,000 as it is, and a very cheap property at \$150,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I cannot help expressing my awful regret that these gentlemen offered this property for \$100,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think in the light of all these documents they did act somewhat foolishly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does not the hon. gentleman think that these witnesses are going too far ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A witness whose honesty is not suspected can never be thought to go too far.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the hon. gentleman think that \$250,000 is the valuation of an absolutely disinterested party ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no right to think anything about a gentleman being improperly interested in any matter unless I have some evidence to show that he is interested, and I am bound to assume that a gentleman worthy of holding the high position of Manager of the Bank of Montreal in one of the large cities of Can-

Mr. FIELDING.

ada is one who dare not be improperly interested in any transaction of the kind. Mr. Jones's evidence continues :

The condition of the wharf, he should think, is only fair at present ; it answers very well for the business which has been transacted at it. Wharf property is becoming more limited, and, therefore, will be more valuable.

He should think the Government would consider interest at 3 per cent a good investment ; that would mean \$150,000. With the fact that the revenue is \$5,400 now, and might easily be made \$7,000 a year, he should think \$250,000 a fair price for it. If he had that property, and could hold it, he would not sell it for a dollar less than \$150,000. That statement is not based upon the fact that the Government wants it at all.

Now, I want to read one other bit of testimony, and I think it is one which hon. gentlemen opposite will regard as important—that of Mr. W. H. Thorne. Hon. gentlemen from the maritime provinces do not need to be told who Mr. Thorne is ; but for the information of others, I may say that Mr. Thorne is a leading merchant of the city of St. John, a gentleman of high standing in the commercial world, and he is, if I may use the expression, a worthy man though a Conservative. I remember a man who described one of his neighbours as a worthy man, though an Episcopalian ; and so I say that Mr. Thorne is a worthy man, though a Conservative. He is recognized as a leading light in the Conservative party in the province of New Brunswick. I am informed and believe, and have always understood, that he is the chief owner of the St. John "Sun," which is regarded generally as the organ of the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster). I do not think there is any reason to suspect that Mr. Thorne was anxious to have this Government arrange a job for any one on the Government side :

Mr. Thorne states : That he is the senior partner of W. H. Thorne & Co. ; has been in the business over fourteen years. Knows the property called the Long Wharf property. Judging from the revenue he understands it has been bringing in the last few years, from his knowledge of the property, if he were the owner of it, he would place it a low price at \$100,000, taking into consideration the revenues and also the amount of land that is not utilized, but is capable of being utilized, and believing that the value of property is increasing, and believing that the value of water fronts in the city of St. John must be of very much increased value. He would not care, if he owned it, to sell it for that amount at the present moment. It is one of the best positions in the harbour, and very great improvements have been made there in the last eight or ten years. He believes wharf property to be increasing in value ; wharf accommodation is limited. Thinks the general condition of the wharf very good for the accommodations that are there now ; should think it good for a good many years. He should say the whole property is worth from \$120,000 to \$125,000. If he had it, would feel that \$100,000 is a moderate valuation for it. If we were able to do so, would rather hold it than sell for \$100,000.

That is the testimony of Mr. W. H. Thorne, and I am sure that hon. gentlemen opposite must, after this discussion, be satisfied that the price which the Government have paid is moderate, fair and reasonable. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) has repeatedly asked were these men so foolish as to offer the property for \$100,000. Looking back at the whole transaction, I am free to admit that they offered it too low. If they had waited five or six months and allowed the thing to go into expropriation proceedings, under the evidence, I believe they would have got much more than \$100,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. \$250,000?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I believe they would have struck a happy meeting between \$100,000 and \$250,000, which is the valuation of the manager of the Bank of Montreal. But the desire of these gentlemen to settle the matter, led them to name a price somewhere less than the valuation. However, they were satisfied to limit their demand to \$100,000, and if they have found that they sold their property too low, that is the risk they took, and the Government should not be obliged to pay any more than the amount agreed upon.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have made my statement and the Government have made theirs, and we will again examine into the matter later. So far as I am concerned, I made no statement that does not appear on the record, and have no hesitation in saying that I think there are circumstances which will show that this was not a profitable bargain on the part of the Government. I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals how the other portion of the money was spent, which was spent last year?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have stated already that the balance between the \$100,000 paid for this property and the \$200,000 was spent transferring the track and progressing with the works which are included in this contract.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the wharf been extended?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The contractor is now proceeding to carry out his contract. It is being rebuilt.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What was the contract price?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. \$328,000 was the lump sum.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What does that contract consist of?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are two features of the contract which I explained to the hon. gentleman yesterday. One was that the con-

tract, so far as the building of the pier and the approaches are concerned, was for a lump sum.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The old wharf had to be rebuilt.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A portion had to be taken off each side—about eighteen feet.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It was in pretty bad repair.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, but we were dredging so deep that we had to take that much and build a new foundation.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The engineer reports that a very large portion of the work had served its day.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No doubt, included in that contract will be a great deal of new work.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How much extension is given to the pier?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not more than sixty feet, between the present end of the pier and the harbour line.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the whole work supposed to cost?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. \$695,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is very much larger than the hon. gentleman promised last year. Last year he said that, according to the estimates of his officers, it would take to build the work all of half a million dollars. There is a considerable difference between half a million and \$695,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In one particular they did not estimate for a sufficient amount. There is an additional sum required to pay for the additional lands taken, which have been valued by our engineer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What land?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These additional lots I have spoken of. The land altogether will cost us \$100,000 more than we anticipated.

Mr. MONTAGUE. So that really the site for this increased accommodation will cost \$200,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not the site alone, but all that is connected with it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. So that the site is not sufficient, although boasted of as a very great site.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not going to build any structure except upon this property. This

property is large enough for the piers. It will be used for our sheds and the laying of our tracks, but we have to get some other property in the neighbourhood.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That leaves \$95,000 yet to be accounted for.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not bind myself down to any figure last year.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, the hon. gentleman said: "According to the estimate of my officers, it will take to build the work all of half a million dollars." The hon. gentleman must have had an estimate last year upon which he based his statement. Now he is \$195,000 out and he says that \$100,000 is for additional land. But what has become of the other \$95,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have all the details here, showing how we make up the \$695,000. The wharf and trestle, including the lump sum of \$328,000, which I have mentioned, I estimate at \$364,000; the warehouse on the wharf, \$74,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Were tenders called for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And given to the lowest tenderer?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who is the tenderer?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. M. P. and N. K. Connolly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Surely not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is that really the fact?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You can take my statement as accurate.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I move that we expunge a large number of the speeches from "Hansard."

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am sure a great many speeches might be expunged. Warehouse and wharf, \$34,000; new main line, \$11,130; temporary trestles, \$6,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Have you contracts for all these?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not included in the contract I have spoken of.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How is that being built?

Mr. BLAIR.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Some of them necessarily have to be built by day's work and some by contract.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What amount is to be done by day's work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Anything that could be done by contract has been so done.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How much is it proposed to spend on this work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That must depend very much on circumstances. We lay down the rails ourselves. We furnish the rails and put them down. We do the track-laying ourselves in transferring the line of track from its present location to its new location. You cannot do that work by contract.

Mr. BERGERON. Were there many tenders for this contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Three altogether.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who were they?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Besides the Connollys, there were Mr. Mayes and Mr. John Heney, of Ottawa.

Mr. BERGERON. Were tenders called for publicly?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. There was one difficulty which caused Mr. Mayes, whose tender was less than that of the Connollys, to withdraw his tender. He coupled his tender—not at the moment of tendering, but before we notified him, and in fact, before we opened the tenders—with a condition that the Government should give him permission to bring in a dredge from the United States free of duty and allow him to work in the harbour. We refused to allow the dredge to be brought in without duty. He declined to sign the contract, and forfeited his deposit.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the amount?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Five per cent of the contract—speaking from memory, about \$14,000 or \$15,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Is Mr. Mayes a Canadian?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, he is a resident of St. John. He had no dredge and said he had tendered in the expectation of being allowed to bring in a dredge from outside. We did not feel that it would be fair to persons who had dredges here to allow that, and we said: You took your own risk in making your tender, and in putting up your deposit, and your deposit will be forfeited.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is Mr. Mayes in the contracting business? Has he had any contracts before this?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think he is in the business. I believe he had a contract from the Government before for building a bridge.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose this is Mr. G. S. Mayes. He built the bridge across Picton harbour.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How soon after the tenders were in did he find his mistake?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He did not find any mistake. We notified him to execute a contract within a given date or he would forfeit his deposit.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When did the question of a dredge come up?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We were aware before the contract was drawn that Mr. Mayes would not enter into it. He notified us to that effect.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Did he own a dredge in the States?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No; he wanted to hire a dredge and bring it in.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Why could he not hire a dredge here? Is he any relation to Mr. Bancroft who tendered on the Kingston graving dock? The hon. Minister will remember there was a gentleman named Bancroft who tendered on that work.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a Mr. Mayes. He is not a mere name.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is an extraordinary thing that he should tender and then be willing to lose \$15,000 because he could not bring in a dredge free of duty from the United States.

Mr. BERGERON. Was he reimbursed by the Connollys?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister would not know that. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) must see that it is an extraordinary looking case. Mr. Mayes tenders at figures at which he supposes he can make money, thinking he can bring in a dredge from the United States, and when he is not allowed to bring in a dredge, he forfeits \$15,000 rather than get a dredge here.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My information is that he could not find another dredge in Canada to suit his purposes. I do not think there are dredges available suited for that work in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think there must be.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am informed, whether cor-

rectly or not, I cannot say, that there are not.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is an extraordinary statement. There are large contractors in Canada having splendid dredges. The Government also has good dredges.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not hiring dredges.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But if you could get a lower tender, surely you would make an arrangement to let the contractor have a dredge.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think all the dredges are pretty well occupied.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Did it not occur to the Minister as a funny thing that a man should be willing to forfeit \$15,000?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I only know that we did take the deposit.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And Mr. Mayes made no objection?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He made a good deal of objection, but his objection did not prevail.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When were his objections made?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. At the time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In what form?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He wrote and protested.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Perhaps the hon. Minister will be able to tell us the difference between the Connollys' tender and Mr. Mayes'?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had expected to give the hon. gentleman the figures, but my deputy informs me that he did not bring them tonight. I will be able to give him the information at some other time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, this is like the continued stories in the magazines—we are compelled to stop just at the most interesting point. And it is interesting to find that a man drops \$15,000 and slides out of a contract because he is not allowed to bring in a dredge which he knew he could not bring in.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose Mr. Mayes may have thought that he would be allowed to bring it in.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What would be the duty on a dredge?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose it would be in the neighbourhood of \$30,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What would a dredge cost ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I fancy between \$120,000 or \$150,000.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend has got his idea from the Minister of Public Works. You can get them cheaper than that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I never bought a dredge, and never built one. You need a very heavy dredge there. At St. John the tide rises twenty-six or twenty-eight feet, and you need a dredge that will work in a high and rising tide.

Mr. BERGERON. I am glad to see that the work is being done by the Connollys. I think they are the best contractors the hon. gentleman could get. I am glad, not only because they will do good work, but because it is a vindication of them of all the abuse and insults which have been heaped upon them by the friends of the hon. gentlemen when they were on this side of the House. It is an extraordinary spectacle to find the Minister of Public Works, who was instrumental in dragging one of these men to jail, and in publishing them all over the world as scoundrels and thieves—to find him now a colleague of my hon. friend, who has granted them a large contract, which shows that he has confidence in their honesty and ability.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are the Connollys doing all this work themselves ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not been in the city since they commenced their work.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Would the Minister be surprised to know that Mr. Mayes has a sub-contract under the Connollys ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not be surprised. Very likely they will find Mr. Mayes a good man to do the work.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My information is that he has a sub-contract. Now, here is Mr. Mayes, who tendered for the job, and gets it. His price is a good deal lower than that of the man next above him. He retires from it on the flimsy excuse that he cannot get his dredge in from the United States. He loses his \$15,000, and he takes a sub-contract from the man who gets the job at a higher figure. What does the Minister think of that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think if he could get Mr. Mayes to build that wharf, he would get a very good man.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where were the Connollys' dredges at the time this contract was let ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know. I know they were not in St. John.

Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am informed they were in the United States. Did they get permission ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They would not require any permission. They were their own dredges, and they have a right to take them into St. John wherever they chose.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Did they pay duty on them coming in ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think not. The fact of their going from Canada to the United States would not oblige the Government to exact a duty from them when they returned.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Could they work them in bond ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know, I never heard anything about that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman ought to know that Mr. Mayes is a sub-contractor under Connolly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He did not require to make any arrangement with us.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Quite so, the only arrangement he had to make was to get out of the way, that arrangement would not be made with the Minister. Could the Minister tell us what price is being paid for the dredging per yard ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the dredging is included in a lump sum. We asked for tenders for a certain portion of the work at a lump sum. The special prices that were given were more for the rock and the ballasting. My recollection is that the dredging was included in the general contract.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman give us the estimate made by his department ? How much rock, how much dredging, and how much masonry work.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I gave the figures to my hon. friend last night, and I appear to have mislaid them since.

Mr. BERGERON. Since we are on the Intercolonial Railway, would my hon. friend be kind enough to relate to us the case of Mr. A. R. McDonald, who was superintendent of the Rivière du Loup branch of the Intercolonial Railway. He was suspended and afterwards dismissed, after having promises from the hon. gentleman and from the Premier that he would be reinstated, or something to that effect. Would the hon. gentleman tell us why he was suspended and dismissed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think the hon. gentleman has any statement from me saying that he would be reinstated.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, I have it here, in your best writing, and I intend to put it on the "Hansard" later on.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The history of Mr. McDonald's case is not a very lengthy one. He was complained against by the gentleman who was then the member for the district, Mr. Pouliot. The charges were serious, and at his urgent solicitation an inquiry was held into Mr. McDonald's conduct. The inquiry lasted for a length of time, during which he remained under suspension. The result of the inquiry was that Mr. Pouliot's charges were not sustained. He had charged him with active intervention in the elections, with offensive partisanship, and a variety of other things. I do not recollect just now the charges in detail, but after what had transpired it was deemed advisable not to reappoint Mr. McDonald, and his services were dispensed with.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that the charges that were brought against Mr. McDonald were of a political character, that he was an active political partisan, and that they were made by Mr. Pouliot. An investigation was granted, was it not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the hon. gentleman remember the instructions given to the commissioner?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. If the hon. gentleman had mentioned that he was going to bring the matter up, I would have had the papers so that we could have gone into it.

Mr. BERGERON. It might be worth while doing that, because we will not get away from this resolution for some time. Will my hon. friend bring all the papers he has concerning the A. R. McDonald case?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will be very glad to do so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It appears to me that the hon. Minister gave a very good reason for retaining Mr. McDonald. As I understood the very brief and curt statement with which he has been good enough to favour the committee, Mr. McDonald, who, as the hon. Minister is perfectly well aware, long held the position of district superintendent on the Intercolonial Railway, discharged his duties with great ability and success. I think, so far as I am able to form an opinion, that all parties were highly satisfied with Mr. McDonald's discharge of his duties. I had myself a great deal of intercourse with him, when I held the position of Minister of Railways and Canals, I may say that, of all the officials on the Intercolonial Railway, none appeared to me to be more devoted to the conscientious and

painstaking discharge of his duties. It is right that I should say that under the circumstances. A change of Government took place, and a political opponent, a supporter of the present Government, brought, as I understand from the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, serious charges against Mr. McDonald, mainly connected with political partisanship and with having acted too strongly in favour of the party to which he belonged and to whom he owed his position and his advancement. The hon. Minister says that these charges were investigated. Mr. McDonald was suspended, and a full and lengthy investigation took place. The hon. Minister has been frank enough to admit that Mr. Pouliot's charges against Mr. McDonald fell to the ground, and that he was unable to sustain them. It appears to me that the hon. gentleman should have said that, having investigated these charges against this official, and finding that they were not well founded, it was considered a matter of justice to pay him for the time during which he was suspended. That is what Mr. McDonald was entitled to, but for some strange reason, instead of being reinstated and remunerated for the trouble to which he had been put improperly, he was dismissed. I cannot understand that. I think the committee would naturally have expected that the hon. Minister would have concluded his statement by saying that, finding that these charges which had been brought against Mr. McDonald by a political opponent and a person who was probably annoyed that Mr. McDonald would not take an active part in his favour, had failed in their entirety, and that there was nothing to be alleged against Mr. McDonald, he had been reinstated in his office. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) says that his salary was paid for the whole period during which he was suspended. I am also advised by my hon. friend that the Government properly felt that the case was so strong, that Mr. McDonald's vindication of his conduct was so good, that it was only right that they should pay the charges that he had incurred in securing his defence, by paying the lawyer who had defended him against these charges. I think the committee would naturally have expected, under these circumstances, that the matter had resulted in the complete reinstatement and restoration of Mr. McDonald to an office which, as I say, I had an opportunity for many years of knowing that he had discharged the duties of with fidelity and success.

Mr. BERGERON. The right hon. Prime Minister is here, and probably knows about this case. We might as well have as much discussion as we can to-night upon it. My impression is, that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has not very many papers that he could bring down. He has probably forgotten the circumstances of the

case, and I may be able to refresh his memory. As a matter of fact, Mr. McDonald has always been looked upon as a good and faithful employee of the Intercolonial. Charges were brought against him, by Mr. Pouliot, of offensive partisanship. The members of the Liberal party in that part of the province were not all of the same opinion. A great many of the Liberals stood by Mr. McDonald, and said that he was not guilty of the charge. During the course of his service as superintendent, he treated members of one party as well as those of the other, and always tried to be as agreeable and courteous to everybody as he could. Mr. Pouliot insisted, and the Government, I imagine, wanted to be pleasant to him. They instituted an investigation into the conduct of Mr. McDonald. The Government paid two lawyers to defend Mr. McDonald. I find that in an answer made by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals the other day to a question asked by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain). We find here that

An official investigation was held into the conduct of Mr. A. R. McDonald, late superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway, before his dismissal. 2. It was held by J. E. Bedard, Esq., Q.C. 3. The investigation lasted sixteen and one-half days. 4. The Government paid counsel representing Mr. McDonald. 5. He was represented by Mr. Charles Langellier, who was paid \$120, and by M. L. B. Dionne, who was paid \$40. 6. Ninety witnesses were heard. 7. The total amount paid to witnesses was \$310.28. 8. The total amount paid J. E. Bedard, Esq., Q.C., was \$408.36. 9. The Department of Railways, or Government, were not represented by counsel at such investigation. 10. Therefore, nothing was paid. 11. The total amount paid for stenographer's fees was \$82.50.

I have added them up, and I find that the expense came to \$961.14. When the investigation was made, nothing was found against Mr. McDonald. At this investigation as many Liberals as Conservatives testified in Mr. McDonald's favour, and he had no stronger friend than Mr. Pacaud, proprietor of "Le Soleil," Quebec, and Mr. Langellier, member of the provincial legislature for Lévis, two of the most devoted supporters of the right hon. the Prime Minister in the district of Quebec. It was well understood that nothing was to happen to Mr. McDonald, and as a matter of fact, although he was suspended in January, 1897, he was not dismissed until December, 1897. He was paid during the whole year for doing nothing, and, besides that, Mr. Belleau, who replaced him at Rivière du Loup, was paid, and Mr. Ouellette was also paid a salary for the same position; so that it is no wonder the Intercolonial Railway does not pay.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend is wrong in that.

Mr. BERGERON. No, he will discover that these three men were paid at the same

Mr. BERGERON.

time. Nobody did more to support Mr. McDonald's claim than did the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), and it was expected that when Mr. Pouliot was dead nobody would then clamour for the head of Mr. McDonald. The present member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) was at loggerheads with the Minister of Public Works because the Minister of Public Works wanted to support a member of the Pouliot family as a candidate in Temiscouata. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gauvreau) said to the Conservatives: "Do not be afraid, for if I am elected, the axe will not be applied to any more Conservative heads in Temiscouata." Here is a letter from the Minister of Railways and Canals written on the 20th May, 1897, but the name of the man to whom it is written is in blank here, although the Minister, no doubt, can find the letter or a copy of it in his department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Have you got the name?

Mr. BERGERON. It is not given in the letter, but it does not seem to be a private letter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Have you got the original letter?

Mr. BERGERON. This is a copy.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How can you tell whether it is a private letter or not?

Mr. BERGERON. If it was private it ought to be marked "private."

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It ought also to be addressed to some one.

Mr. BERGERON. I imagine to whom it was addressed, but it is not stated here.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is that letter taken from any record of the House of Commons?

Mr. BERGERON. I do not know. So far as I am concerned, these papers were left me by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain). I think I know the gentleman to whom that letter was addressed, but I will read the letter and the Minister can say whether it is true or not:

20th May, 1897.

Dear Mr. So and So,—I think that ultimately your friend Mr. McDonald will have no reason to feel that the department has used him harshly. I believe that is so in some respects, because his lawyers were paid, and he had the greatest encomiums that could be given on his conduct as a public servant:

I am not at liberty to say anything more just now, but I have no desire to be severe on him, nor do I know that the circumstances of the case would warrant it.

Yours faithfully,

ANDREW G. BLAIR.

**SIR CHARLES TUPPER.** That is a very good letter.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Yes, and Mr. McDonald's salary was paid, and he was brought up to Ottawa 'en attendant,' and promised that something would happen.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I suppose you saw him here?

**Mr. BERGERON.** Yes, what was he doing?

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I suppose he was busy in the office of the department.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Did you see him doing any work?

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I think he must have been engaged.

**Mr. BERGERON.** I have seen Mr. McDonald here often, and he did not seem to be hard at work. On the contrary, he expected every day to be put back in his position, as he had been promised by the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Public Works, and the Prime Minister.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** He had no such statement from me.

**Mr. BERGERON.** When Mr. Poullot died, there was to be an election in the county of Temiscouata, and my information is that the Prime Minister told the friends of Mr. McDonald that he would be reinstated.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** I never told anything of the kind.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Well, I will read some letters. The Prime Minister was telling other people, too, that Mr. McDonald would not be reinstated. Several prominent Liberals were working for Mr. McDonald, among others Mr. Pacaud, whom I know personally did everything in his power for him. Mr. Charles Langeller not only had been his lawyer, but he was working for him politically speaking, and both had the greatest assurances possible from the Prime Minister that Mr. McDonald would be reinstated. There was an election in Nicolet, and I never saw parties doing everything in their power to carry a by-election as these hon. gentlemen opposite do.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Is that an unusual thing?

**Mr. BERGERON.** In former by-elections both sides would place their case as eloquently as possible before the electors, but I have never seen a party work as the Liberals do now, and carry on such practices as will be revealed, no doubt, before this session is over. In spite of the promises made by the right hon. gentleman

and by the Minister of Railways, and by the Minister of Public Works, verbally and by writing, to reinstate Mr. McDonald, during the election at Nicolet, Messrs. Leduc and Bernier—I presume the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe—insisted on the Prime Minister appointing Ouellette, whose name must have been very often unpleasantly before the Minister of Railways when he was superintendent.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** Mr. Leduc never spoke to me about it.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Do you say that Mr. Ouellette was not appointed before the election? It had nothing to do with the Nicolet election.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Yes, it had a great deal to do with the Nicolet election. When Mr. Ouellette was appointed he went down to Quebec and for a fortnight he was going from bar-room to bar-room at Point Lévis with the men of the Intercolonial Railway, and he was not in a condition to do good work. Even friends of the Prime Minister said that a man like that could not hold the position after a man like McDonald, who had discharged the duties of his office well, and to the satisfaction even of his enemies.

It was during that time that the election in Nicolet took place; and my right hon. friend, while passing through the city of Montreal, told two gentlemen with whom he was talking after lunch that after he came to Ottawa he would see that Mr. McDonald would be reinstated. He then went to Arthabaska-ville, where some gentlemen went to see him about the matter. I may say that there were accusations made that Mr. Ouellette went along the line in his car, and while he was stopping at a station, he would not let the ordinary train draw up at the station because it would stop his promenade. And it was said that he had something besides ginger ale on his car, and that during the time he was under the influence of ginger ale an accident happened on the Intercolonial involving the loss of \$20,000 and the loss of one life. Now, the right hon. gentleman promised those two gentlemen in Montreal that Mr. McDonald would be reinstated.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** I never promised anything of the kind.

**Mr. BERGERON.** How could they boast of having a French Premier if Mr. Ouellette was dismissed and replaced by Mr. McDonald?

**The PRIME MINISTER.** What has that to do with the Nicolet election?

**Mr. BERGERON.** I am making my case. I said a moment ago that it was during the Nicolet election that these gentlemen saw my right hon. friend, and they insisted so

much that although he had promised a day or two before to reinstate McDonald, he telegraphed to Ottawa to the Railway Department.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is mixed in his facts. The Nicolet election took place in the fall of 1897, and the incident to which he refers was in June or July, 1898.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend is mixed in his dates.

Mr. SCRIVER. Read the letters.

Mr. BERGERON. I will when I come to that point. Who is making this speech? If my hon. friend (Mr. Scriver) is sleepy, let him go home and to-morrow he will read this in "Hansard." My right hon. friend knows that he promised, not only once, but twenty times to Mr. McDonald himself that he would be reinstated.

The PRIME MINISTER. I never did anything of the kind.

Mr. BERGERON. I am very glad the hon. gentleman denies it, because it will bring matters to a climax. This is what I want to know from the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, whether it is not true that Mr. Belleau, Mr. McDonald and Mr. Ouellette were all at the same time receiving a salary as superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway. The Minister of Railways must have received some complaints at the time, and he will be kind enough to bring them down. We will see whether it is true that Mr. Ouellette, after his nomination, went to Rivière du Loup, and that for 15 days he spent his time in the bars with employees of the Intercolonial Railway, and that during that time there was an accident on the railway resulting in the loss of \$20,000 and the loss of one life. That surely can be ascertained. In January, 1898, my hon. friend promised to Mr. Pacaud that Mr. McDonald would have full satisfaction—"pleine satisfaction." The same day two gentlemen, Messrs. Carroll and Choquette, met Mr. McDonald's son and told him to ask Mr. McDonald to come to the Hotel Frontenac in the evening. Mr. McDonald went there, and they met him and assured him that as soon as the right hon. Premier got back to Ottawa, he would give Mr. McDonald satisfaction. That was in January, 1898. I have another letter of the Minister of Railways and Canals of the 3rd of November, 1897, addressed to Mr. Langeller. That was after the investigation, I imagine. This is the letter:

Dear Mr. Langeller,—I quite agree with you that the McDonald matter has remained unsettled long enough—in fact, very much longer than I could have wished. It was my purpose to bring it to an end without further delay in one form or the other. Until I have had the opportunity of considering the subject, I am not able to give you any information as to what course will be taken; but you may say to Mr. McDonald that

Mr. BERGERON.

this uncertainty will be relieved at a very early day.

Yours faithfully,  
ANDREW G. BLAIR.

My right hon. friend, who lacks memory I am afraid, was very anxious about this, and on the 27th of April, 1898, he had a letter sent to Mr. McDonald by his private secretary. It is in French, but I will read it in English:

Dear Sir,—I have received instructions from the Prime Minister to inform you that he will be happy to give you an interview on Monday next, in the course of the forenoon.

Your very devoted,  
(Sgd.) RODOLPHE BOUDREAU.  
P. S.

A. R. McDonald, Esq.

Mr. BRITTON. Is that the promise to reinstate him?

Mr. BERGERON. Surely from a man like my hon. friend, who expects to go on the bench, we should not have a question like that. This is the letter of the private secretary asking Mr. McDonald to come up, as the Premier would be glad to see him on Monday morning. The Minister of Railways and Canals dismissed Mr. McDonald on the 13th December, 1898, by this letter:

Sir,—I am, by direction, to give you notice that your term of service as district superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway, will cease on the 31st inst., up to which date you will draw your salary through the head office of the railway at Moncton, N.B.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
L. K. JONES,  
Secretary.

I have no doubt that the notes which I have must come from Mr. McDonald, as they have been put into my hand by my hon. friend the member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain). I find that when Mr. McDonald met the Premier in Ottawa, the latter said to him that the Government never had the intention of dismissing him, and that after the session he would arrange matters.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is not my memory of the interview.

Mr. BERGERON. More than that, during the time the Intercolonial was in the hands of Ouellette, he, Ouellette, got on a spree and woke up one day in San Francisco.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is the hon. gentleman reading from—from a letter?

Mr. BERGERON. I have lots of letters here. These are the notes left me by Mr. Casgrain. In July, the Minister of Public Works told Mr. McDonald that the Government would reinstate him, and advised him to sell his properties in Montreal and go to Rivière du Loup and prepare for work. This is a letter which the Minister of Public Works wrote Mr. McDonald on the 23rd of June, 1898:

Dear Mr. McDonald,—Before reading your letter of the 21st, I had written to the Minister of Railways and Canals, Mr. Fielding,—

Mr. Fielding was then, I suppose, acting for the Minister of Railways and Canals.

—and also seen Mr. Schreiber. I shall see the First Minister this afternoon, and be in a position to give you an answer more direct in a few days at Quebec.

Yours truly,  
J. ISRAEL TARTE.

The word "Que." is struck out in the letter. At that time the Minister of Public Works had assured Mr. McDonald that beyond doubt he would be reinstated, and I believe that the Minister of Public Works has always been a friend of Mr. McDonald, and did everything in his power to prevent his dismissal and have him reinstated. I said a moment ago that at a restaurant in Montreal, the right hon. gentleman met two of his friends to whom he said he would not leave Ottawa before reinstating Mac, and that he had authorized Mr. Tarte to so state. That was told to Mr. Dansereau and Mr. David at the Duperrouzel restaurant about this time last year. I have given the names to my right hon. friend so that he may easily refresh his memory, and I take the word of these two gentlemen. The next Sunday Ouellette went down to Arthabaskaville and promised the First Minister in writing never to drink again, and then the First Minister promised he would not be dismissed. After that Ouellette went to Rivière du Loup and got on a terrible spree. He went around the hotel and then went to Montreal in a sleeping car and probably took the freak afterwards of going to San Francisco, but that I do not know. At last he was dismissed and replaced by Mr. Dubé. When it was perfectly decided, I suppose, that Mr. McDonald would not be reinstated, the Minister of Public Works wrote, on the 12th of July, 1898, to Mr. Dansereau, as follows:—

Ottawa, 12th July, 1898.

My dear Dansereau,—On my return to Ottawa, I found that most powerful influences had been worked in favour of Ouellette, in fact, Mr. Schreiber told me that the department had received orders to keep him. I do not know where to find McDonald, and as you are probably aware of his whereabouts I charge you to announce the news to him. It is against all my habits to deceive people by giving them hopes which can never be realized. It had been practically decided the other day to reinstate McDonald, but another decision has been adopted, and I want to have McDonald acquainted with it as soon as possible.

Yours truly,  
J. ISRAEL TARTE.

All this was done on account of Mr. Poullot, who had started the investigation against Mr. McDonald. I have said that Mr. Gauvreau, the present member for the county, when canvassing for his election, had declared to his friends that there would be no political dismissals in the county so far as

he was concerned. This was probably after it was found out that McDonald was irretrievably dismissed. Mr. Gauvreau, the member for Temiscouata, tells Mr. McDonald that he always stood by him:

Stanford, 24th Nov., 1898.

A. R. McDonald, Esq., Montreal.

Dear Sir,—You are aware of the accusations brought against me in regard to yourself, accusations which have recently been revealed to me by your friend, Mr. Pacaud. He must have informed you of what I asserted at his office. I have since met Sir Wilfrid, who authorized me to give the most positive denial to all such slander; he even promised to speak of the same to Mr. Pacaud. I do not know if he has done so, nevertheless, I am not ashamed of my deeds, and if I had in any way withheld your appointment I would have assumed all responsibilities over the same. I consider it most cowardly of those who wish to make me the scapegoat of their own turpitudes. I still heartily feel what you have done for mine, and this alone would have prevented me from injuring you in any way. I have nothing to reproach myself against you, either in word or deed, and if the Government had wished to employ you I would not have been against it, leaving them full liberty to do so.

Hoping these few lines will be sufficient to dissipate all your doubts, I remain, dear sir,

Very truly yours,  
CHAS. A. GAUVREAU, M.P.

Of course, it is not denied, not only that Mr. McDonald's salary was paid, but that his travelling expenses were paid when he was here. He received \$71.25 for travelling expenses and board. The vouchers are here. There is also a letter from Mr. Pottinger, asking Mr. McDonald for some vouchers, which, I suppose, were sent, because the amount was paid. There is another letter from Mr. Pottinger on the subject of an item of \$60 for board.

There is the case, and it will help my hon. friend to find all the papers in his department either to establish his case, or to explain, if it is not properly presented to the committee.

Mr. BOURASSA. Where are the promises?

Mr. BERGERON. It is very clear, from what has been read and from the facts, that this man was kept there with the promise that he would be reinstated. Nothing was proved against him. There are letters here showing that the hope was held out to Mr. Langelier that the matter would be settled. If hon. gentlemen opposite were to state the case openly, they would admit that they intended to replace Mr. McDonald. For a whole year he received his salary. Here is this letter of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), in which he says: "It had been practically decided the other day to reinstate Mr. McDonald." Well, that is a funny Government. But he goes on: "Another decision having been arrived at, I want to notify Mr. McDonald as soon as possible." That seems to be the work of a friend, and says in effect: I have kept him in hope of

reinstatement, but it has been decided not to reinstate him, and I want to let him know as soon as possible, so that he may do something else. If the colleague of the Minister of Public Works says the contrary, surely this shows that this is a most extraordinary Government. I have given the case, so far as the notes I have here show it. It is a most extraordinary case. Mr. McDonald did his work to the satisfaction of his superiors and the department. The only thing against him, as was said by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, was active partisanship.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That was one of the charges.

Mr. BERGERON. It is the only charge that justified the investigation, and nothing else was tried to be proved against him. And, the Government will not dare to say that they had anything else against him. They were not—I was going to use an unparliamentary word, but I will not—they were not brave enough to bring any other accusation against him. As to the charges that were made against him, he came out of the examination clearly exonerated, so much so that his lawyers were paid and he was paid his salary for the whole year. At that time a man named Boileau was receiving a salary, as will be seen when the papers are brought down. Then, Mr. Ouellette was employed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not doing the same duties.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Ouellette was employed to do Mr. McDonald's work. Mr. McDonald was superintendent of that division.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Belleau ceased to act as soon as Mr. Ouellette was appointed.

Mr. BERGERON. But Mr. McDonald was paid for the whole year. Mr. Belleau was paid for all the time he served, and Mr. Ouellette for the time he served. There were at least two salaries paid for 1898. And Mr. McDonald was kept like that until the month of December. Political influence was used against him; but political influence was not all against him, for a great many Liberals in Quebec were for Mr. McDonald, and are still. The right arm of my right hon. friend in Quebec, Mr. Pacaud, also Mr. Langelier, and, I believe, some of the gentlemen on the other side in this House were in favour of Mr. McDonald. This Government has done many bad things in the way of dismissals, some of them in my constituency, but I do not know of a worse case than this. Here was a public employee who had been in the service of the Government for nearly twenty-five years, an honest man, a man against whom no one has a word to say. They did not

Mr. BERGERON.

dismiss him outright; they played with him. They have treated many employees in a brutal way, but this is the worst case of all. This is what we call in French, 'tuer à petit feu'—taking his lifeblood drop by drop. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) will bring down the papers before the Intercolonial Railway estimates are passed.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman chose to bring my name in in connection with this case. He started with a great flourish of trumpets, declaring that he would be able to show letters of mine in which I had promised Mr. McDonald and his friends that he would be reinstated. I did not hesitate to tell him that he had no such promise from me. Upon an interjection of mine, he reaffirmed the statement. Then he produced a letter from my secretary to Mr. McDonald to the effect that I would give him an interview at a certain time. I am sure my secretary did not write that letter without some reason for it. If my secretary wrote the letter to Mr. McDonald that I would give him an interview on a certain day, it must have been because somebody, either Mr. McDonald or his friends, asked for such an interview. If Mr. McDonald asked an interview to bring to my attention something connected with the public business, it was my duty to give it to him; and no doubt, he had written asking that I should see him. I remember the interview as distinctly as if it had taken place yesterday. But I will not commit the indiscretion of repeating what took place at a private interview. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) proposes to bring into this certain statements which he says were made in a restaurant. I must say I do not charge my memory with such matters. I transact my business in my office—

Mr. BERGERON. But does the hon. gentleman deny it?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not deny it or affirm it. I do not transact the public business in a restaurant; when I go to a restaurant, it is generally for something else. I am ready to be answerable for anything I say or write in my office, and in my capacity as a public man, but I decline to be held responsible for what I may have been understood to say in a casual conversation. It is purely childish to ask me whether I had a certain conversation in a restaurant. I decline to answer that. Now, the hon. gentleman brought in the Nicolet election, and talked of Mr. Ouellette. The course of the moon is just as relevant to this question as is the Nicolet election. The election for Nicolet took place in the month of December, 1897. Ouellette was appointed superintendent of the division of the Intercolonial Railway from St. Flavie to Lévis and afterwards of the division from the latter point to Montreal, if I remember right,

in the winter of 1897-98. In the summer of 1898, it is true, an unfortunate accident took place with regard to Mr. Ouellette. I sent for him to come to my office, and he came. I need not say what took place there, but he has since been dismissed from the service.

Mr. BERGERON. That is going off at a tangent. It may not be true as regards the election of Nicolet. Does my hon. friend remember that a deputation of his friends went to him at Arthabaskaville and asked him to reinstate Mr. Ouellette after he had been suspended for conduct which was not becoming in his position?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is all wrong. This is simply what took place. I was in Arthabaskaville, and I heard something about Ouellette, and wrote for information. A charge had been made against him, and in order to investigate it I wrote for him to come to me. I need not say what took place, at all events, I asked the department to continue him in office. What connection had that with the Nicolet election? Ouellette has since been dismissed from office. I now come to Mr. McDonald's matter, which, however, has nothing to do with the case of Ouellette. I think in the latter part of 1896, charges were made against McDonald. He had been for some twenty years superintendent of the division on the Intercolonial Railway between Ste. Flavie and Lévis. The charges were brought by Mr. Pouliot, who at that time represented the county of Temiscouata. Unfortunately, he has since departed this life, but my hon. friend knows that if there ever was a respectable man, of high character, it was Mr. Pouliot. We thought it advisable to bring Mr. McDonald face to face with those who had made charges against him, and have the charges either proved or disproved. The gentleman who was entrusted with conducting the investigation was Mr. Bedard, a leading lawyer from Quebec, a very able man, most impartial and anxious to do justice to both parties. After the investigation, a report was made. I looked over the record and came to the conclusion that the investigation had to a large extent substantiated the charges. The charges were those of offensive partisanship and misconduct in office. So far as political partisanship was concerned, I am free to absolve Mr. McDonald absolutely on that head. The investigation showed that he had not been free from that, but I became convinced that if he had infringed his duty in that respect, he had done it by order of a superior authority, and I would not hold him responsible for it. As for the charge of misconduct in office, I am free to say that the offences proved against him were not of a very grave character.

Mr. BERGERON. What were they?

The PRIME MINISTER. I forget at the moment. I did not charge my memory with the details, but that is the impression left upon my mind. It is eighteen months since I read the evidence. But the impression left upon my mind by the evidence and the report of Mr. Bedard, was that the offences proved against Mr. McDonald were not of a serious character. But one thing was proved to my satisfaction, namely, that the usefulness of Mr. McDonald as superintendent of that division was altogether gone, and that he could not be retained in that office. I may say at once that for some time I had contemplated recommending the Minister to give Mr. McDonald a position somewhere else. Against that gentleman personally, I have nothing to say, but I have no hesitation in saying that I came to the conclusion that his usefulness as superintendent on that division was gone. The fact was notorious, and it was proved in that investigation, and well known all over the line, that Mr. McDonald had taken an active part in all the municipal contests that took place on the line in his division. I would not call him an offensive partisan, but he was a person who gave a great deal of his time and attention to municipal contests, taking part on one side or the other, canvassing, assisting at the polls, conspiring in caucuses and giving the better part of his time to these contests. The result was that a large portion of the population, whom it was his duty to serve, lost confidence in him. But there is something more. It was a matter of notoriety that Mr. McDonald for a long time had been engaged in speculations as a railway promoter, and as a railway builder, and as a railway broker. He was engaged in law suits which members of this House have doubtless heard about.

Mr. BERGERON. He has been dealing in other places than Quebec.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no answer to give to that remark. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by his veiled threats, but they do not affect me in any way.

Mr. BERGERON. No, they do not affect you personally.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am telling the committee why we came to the conclusion that his usefulness was gone. Surely hon. gentlemen in this House will understand that an employee of the Intercolonial Railway should not be allowed to take an active part in municipal contests as a canvasser, and thus render himself offensive to a portion of the people. Take a little town like Rivière du Loup, where he was stationed, with a population of 2,000 or 3,000 souls, and, perhaps, 300 or 400 voters. We know with what bitterness municipal elections are fought in those small towns. Mr. McDonald was allied with one side or the other. Day after day he had to meet in his office men on business belonging to the railway, whom he

had made deadly enemies by his conduct in these municipal matters. I have no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that he no longer could be retained in that position, and I communicated my opinion to my colleague the Minister of Railways and Canals. While I am not going into private conversations. I took that ground and maintained it. At the same time I recognize that Mr. McDonald had sinned more through indiscretion than otherwise. I remembered that he was highly recommended by some of my political friends. There are members of this House who are friends of Mr. McDonald, and who would have been happy to see him retained in the service, and who would have been glad if the Minister of Railways and Canals could have found a position for him in some other capacity where we could utilize his services. I would be glad if the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals would try to find a position for Mr. McDonald where he could utilize his services in some other capacity. I am sorry to speak in this way; I would prefer to have left this matter where it was, but if the hon. gentleman chooses to bring it up he will have to take the consequences. If we have erred, it has been in that we have been too lenient towards Mr. McDonald. We paid him his salary perhaps when we should not have done so. It is not correct to say that we paid the salary of Mr. McDonald and Mr. Ouellette at the same time. I believe that the records will not show anything of the kind. If it is that we have been too lenient with Mr. McDonald, it was that he should not have reason to believe that we wanted to treat him unfairly. We wanted to treat him as fairly as possible, believing that he had been more indiscreet than guilty. We have to bear the penalty to-day of being too lenient with those with whom we have at some time to deal. We would not be subjected to criticism by the hon. gentleman if we had treated Mr. McDonald harshly. He offers the criticism that we have not been severe enough with Mr. McDonald. Perhaps that may teach us a lesson for our guidance in future. I leave the case in the judgment of both sides of the House.

Mr. BERGERON. I have seen the right hon. Prime Minister defending a bad case very often, and he generally does it well. But this is too strong for him. I never yet heard such a lame defence. The hon. gentleman commenced by saying that he does not repeat private conversations. He does not say anything about the conversation he had in the Restaurant Duperrouzel with Messrs. Dansereau and David, two respected gentlemen and friends of the Prime Minister. It would have been better for the right hon. gentleman to say whether the statement of these gentlemen is true or not. He does not say yes or no;

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

he simply hides himself behind this noble phrase: I do not repeat private conversations. But it was not a private matter; Mr. McDonald is a public man to a certain extent, and the conversation has been well remembered by the others, that when these two friends were asking him what would be done in this case, he said that Mr. McDonald, if not reinstated in the same position, would at least be given something else. The hon. gentleman has just now given out the case himself, confirming the promise he made of putting McDonald somewhere else. The interview in his office my right hon. friend has passed over in a quiet way. He says: If my secretary has answered, it was the answer that he would give to persons who had come to my office to get an interview with me. The fact is that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte had spoken to the right hon. gentleman very often about McDonald who was here for many days, and of whom he knew not only by letter but by word of mouth. He himself wanted to see McDonald; he felt that there was something due to McDonald, who occupied an anomalous and unjust position. The right hon. gentleman, who is just and fair sometimes, felt that it was due to McDonald to give him some explanation, and he ordered his secretary to write to McDonald as follows:—

(Translation.)

Ottawa, April 27th, 1898.

Dear Sir,—I have received instruction from the Prime Minister to inform you that he will be happy to grant you an interview on next Monday in the forenoon.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) RODOLPHE BOUDREAU.

A. R. McDonald, Esq.,

P. S.

Mr. McDonald came here. The right hon. gentleman says that he does not want to speak about a private conversation. I would not have mentioned it, but I cannot help doing so. Mr. McDonald went into the right hon. gentleman's office and the right hon. gentleman said to him: My dear McDonald, as the late Sir John Macdonald said to Mr. Letellier de St. Just, your usefulness is gone. These were the very words that the right hon. gentleman used. Mr. McDonald said: Sir Wilfrid, have you brought me here simply to tell me that. You might have allowed me to remain at home and sent word to me. The right hon. gentleman said to him: McDonald, I do not want to be hard on you; we want to do something for you, and I am in hopes that you shall remain in the employ of the Government in a position better than the one that you had before. Mr. McDonald was kept here for a month in the department waiting for that good position. He mentioned what he thought it was to be to me, but I forget what position it was. The Prime Minister may remember it, and if not the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals must remember

the position which was to be given to McDonald. Now, if the hon. Prime Minister remembers his conversation with McDonald in his office, and his conversation in the Restaurant Duperrouzel, he will remember that the promise that he made to McDonald was to reinstate him or to give him something better. The hon. gentleman required an investigation into the case of Ouellette, whom he had summoned to Arthabaska-ville, and after he had investigated the case he ordered the department to keep Ouellette. That is in "Hansard." All of the case except that portion bearing on the Nicolet election—and that is immaterial—is proven. My right hon. friend defends his action in this case by saying that there was political partisanship, but when he can keep a gentleman in office like Mr. Preston, surely he must not be very touchy on the subject of political partisanship, although to-day we are hearing of some of the most infamous political actions on the part of public employees that we have ever heard of, and if they were Conservatives they would be dismissed. In my county they have been thrown out of their houses, built on Government ground, because they were appointed by me, and because it is supposed that they would vote for me if they were allowed to remain there. Men appointed by the Liberal Government and paid by public money are not disturbed. Then, the right hon. gentleman says that McDonald took part in municipal affairs at Rivière du Loup. The old Government permitted public employees to mix in municipal affairs. Are you going to make slaves of public employees? Mr. McDonald has about twenty-five houses at Rivière du Loup and he is deeply interested in municipal affairs, but the right hon. gentleman takes the ground, as it will be found in "Hansard," and as it will go down to posterity, that a man who is a public employee and a Conservative cannot mix in public affairs. This is a most preposterous proposition, and one that this House should not approve. The right hon. gentleman attaches little importance to the charge of political partisanship against Mr. McDonald. It must indeed have been a very slight offence when the report of the commission is entirely in favour of Mr. McDonald on that point. The commissioner was Mr. Bedard, one of the best friends of the right hon. gentleman and a staunch Grit in Quebec. Mr. Langelier, another Liberal, was defending him, with Mr. Dionne, and the report of Mr. Bedard is that there was nothing against Mr. McDonald at all. It is unjust and unfair for the Prime Minister to say that Mr. McDonald was not only charged with being a partisan but that there was something else against him. The Prime Minister will have to answer for that, if not to McDonald, then to others. My right hon. friend has tried for a year to do something for Mr.

McDonald, and he was so convinced that there was nothing against McDonald political or otherwise, that for a whole year he has been trying to get something better for him. The right hon. gentleman promised Mr. Dansereau and Mr. David and he promised it to McDonald himself and he promised it to Mr. Pacaud and other political friends. He intended to do it, but he has not been able to succeed, probably the Minister of Railways would not do it for him, and now he insinuates that there were other charges against McDonald. When I ask him what the other charges were, he says he does not remember. Well, when a man has been twenty years in the employ of the Government and when he is put out of office without any possible reason, it is important enough for the Minister to remember what other charges were brought against McDonald, and upon which there was an investigation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman intimated to me that he would want those papers I would have brought them down.

Mr. BERGERON. I believe the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) was promised these papers long ago.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think so.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, I ask for them now. I ask the Minister to bring down the report of Mr. Bedard and the charges, so that we may know what the accusations are, and which the Prime Minister says he has not seen.

The PRIME MINISTER. I did not say I had not seen them.

Mr. BERGERON. Then what were the other charges besides political partisanship against Mr. McDonald?

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman will see what are in the papers when they are brought down.

Mr. BERGERON. All right; we will have another shot at them, and if the matter is not brought up this session it will be brought up next session. In order to show that McDonald was just as fair to one political party as the other, in the way of doing favours, and I know that as matter of fact myself, I see in this note that a Mr. Talbot—I suppose it is the member for Bellechasse—once telegraphed to McDonald that he was going to St. Michel with some friends, and he asked that a train passing by Chaudière should pass by the St. Charles Branch, or something like that, and this request was granted. My hon. friend (Mr. Talbot) is not a political friend of Mr. McDonald in any sense.

Mr. TALBOT. What the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) is now stating is altogether

unfounded. There is not a word of truth in it.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, it does not say it was Mr. Talbot, M.P., and it may be some other Talbot.

Mr. TALBOT. There is not a word of truth in it. If the hon. gentleman allows me I will tell him what did happen. My wife was ill in town at the time, it was in winter and I telegraphed to Mr. McDonald to allow the express train to stop at St. Michel, my station, giving the reasons why I asked the permission. Mr. McDonald refused it, and at the time I knew perfectly well that he had often permitted Conservative friends of his to stop at any part of the road they wished to stop. He refused to do it, although I mentioned in my telegram that my wife was ill.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, it is another Talbot; it is not the one we have here. I understand this item will not pass until we get the papers down.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will let this item stand and bring down the papers.

Soulanges Canal, construction..... \$1,610,000

Mr. BERGERON. When will this canal be ready for navigation?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One has to speak with a great deal of reserve in naming a date for the completion of works under contract. I feel a little hesitation because I have already intimated to Parliament that I thought these works would be completed somewhat earlier. I have the strongest possible assurance from the contractors that they will be in a position so that we will be able to let the water in on the first week in September.

Mr. BERGERON. Were there not some landslides there?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There have been three or four slides, but I think they will be all cleared up by the date I mention.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who are the contractors?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Sections 1 and 2, Ryan and McDonnell; section 3 is practically finished; sections 4, 5, 6 and 7, are being completed by Mr. Onderdonk; section 8, Charles Raynor; section 9, Macdonnell; section 10, Rogers and Taylor, practically completed. Section 11 is practically completed. Section 12—M. J. Hogan is the present contractor. Section 13, Messrs. Manning and McDonald. These are all.

Mr. BERGERON. Are the locks finished?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think they are.

Mr. TALBOT.

Mr. BERGERON. I think you have five locks instead of four.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have three, each with a lift of 23 feet 6 inches, one with a lift of 17 feet 6 inches, and one guard lock—five altogether. In addition to that, there is a guard gate.

Mr. BERGERON. What do you call a guard lock?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has no lift. It is for protection.

Mr. BERGERON. At Valleyfield the first lock, which is a guard lock, is like the others. Does the hon. gentleman know how the case with Mr. Stewart stands?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That matter is before the court.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the matter of the quarry still before the court?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Sault Ste. Marie Canal, construction.... \$18,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is this for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is for dredging in the channel and levelling the ground.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What was the cost of removing the pier?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The estimated cost was \$5,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You took a vote of \$75,000 last year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That was for the new bridge. The whole work will probably cost the sum estimated.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Did the Canadian Pacific Railway pay any share of the cost?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understand not.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Were they asked to?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was some correspondence on the subject, but it did not eventuate in anything. We had to do the work in order to get the use of the canal.

Mr. BERGERON. I am very glad the Government did it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I visited the place a year ago and the pier was an eyesore.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who did the work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Dominion Bridge Company have the contract for the bridge.

Lachine Canal, enlargement..... \$113,400

Mr. BERGERON. I thought that was finished twenty years ago under the Mackenzie Administration. What is going on there now ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are dredging fifteen feet between Locks 2 and 3, which we estimate is costing us \$18,200; we propose to build a lock at the lower entrance to replace two others, costing \$15,000; widening the old wier at Lachine, \$30,000; building two sloping walls, \$21,000; and to complete the MacNamee & Mann's contract, \$18,000.

Mr. BERGERON. A very small part of this is for enlarging the canal proper.

Mr. TAYLOR. If I understand the Minister correctly, in making his speech last session, he promised the people of this country that they would have the canal deepened to the full depth at the opening of navigation of 1899. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman when the promise he made is going to be fulfilled. The opening of navigation has gone by for some months and I have not heard that the canal is yet enlarged to its full depth.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not many months have passed by since the opening of navigation. I had hoped, and had reason to hope from the assurances of the officers of my department, and the statements of the contractors, that we would be in a position to let the water in and provide a channel at the opening of navigation; but we did not expect to have the canals finished. I do not wish to imply that we are going to have the canals fully finished, but we are going to be able to let vessels drawing fourteen feet of water pass through.

Mr. TAYLOR. When ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am now strongly hoping that we shall be able to do it by the first week in September. Contingencies occur in all these great works, and it was found utterly impossible to have the work finished by the 1st of May.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend must not be too sanguine. Even if the Soulanges Canal were completely finished, vessels drawing more than nine feet of water could not pass through, because the deepening of the lakes to fourteen feet is not finished. Lake St. Louis is not deepened.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understand that the work has progressed further than I thought and that nearly 300 feet of channel in Lake St. Louis is completed to a depth of 15 or 16 feet. We felt confident that we would have channel enough for the fall business, but we will have the full 300 feet ready by September.

Mr. BERGERON. I am very much surprised if there is a channel on Lake St. Louis of 14 feet.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. More than that.

Mr. BERGERON. How is it that vessels are using the old channel instead of the new one ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not yet formally announced that the channel is ready and shipmasters are not going to run any risk. They will not use the new channel until they have assurance that it is completed.

Mr. BERGERON. At the foot of the Soulanges Canal has any deepening been done ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The intention is to have the channel at the foot of the canal dug to a depth of 20 feet clear, for a distance of 13,000 feet, from the head of the canal up. There is no dredging at the lower end.

Mr. BERGERON. I am talking of the lower end. You cannot pass there with a steam yacht drawing three feet of water.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Monroe very recently made a careful test of the channel there and said that no dredging was required.

Lake St. Louis Channel, deepening and straightening ..... \$65,000

Mr. BERGERON. When will that be finished ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is almost finished now.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who is doing that work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Weddell Dredging Company are the contractors.

Cornwall Canal, enlargement..... \$150,000

Mr. BERGERON. Have all the damages been paid for landslides that have taken place there ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I never heard of any landslides on the Cornwall Canal.

Mr. BERGERON. Some vessels went through an embankment and caused some damage.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have vessels running into our gates and banks on all the canals.

Mr. BERGERON. This was on a level between two locks. It happened during three summers, one after the other.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It must have been before my date. We have had three or four on the Welland, but none on the Cornwall.

Rapide Plat Canal, enlargement..... \$83,250

Mr. BERGERON. I see the hon. gentleman is asking for \$35,000 also.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes; that was a revote.

Mr. BERGERON. What is being done, and when will the work be finished?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A great deal of work has been done there. The contractors are Messrs. Poupore & Fraser on section 1, and the Welland Dredging Company on section 2. The work is done, and we are now awaiting the making up of the final estimates.

Galops Canal, enlargement..... \$688,400  
North Channel, deepening and straightening ..... \$55,000  
Galops Rapids, removing obstructions... \$50,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would ask the hon. Minister to allow these items to stand, as some gentlemen desire to speak upon them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would probalby suit the hon. gentleman as well, if we allow the first to stand, and pass the other two. Any discussion that is desired can take place on the one item.

Mr. MONTAGUE. All right.

Trent Canal, construction..... \$845,000

Mr. HUGHES. I do not wish to take up time, but would the hon. Minister be good enough to tell us what is to be done this year? Is he going to build the section between Lake Simcoe and Balsam Lake?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are going to make an effort in that direction.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the contract be let?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I hope so. We have it in contemplation.

Mr. PETTET. How much will it cost to complete this canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman mean to the Bay of Quinté? It will cost a good deal of money. We have not intended to take up any extensive work below Peterborough this year. The appropriation we are asking for will be sufficient to complete existing contracts and leave us \$300,000 or perhaps \$350,000, to start upon fresh work. It is in contemplation to let a portion of the work between Lake Simcoe and Balsam Lake, and possibly a portion of the work on the lower stretches, but we have not decided.

Mr. PETTET. Have the engineers gone over the canal? I do not wish to oppose the grant, but we know the Liberal party, when in Opposition, condemned this work,

Mr. BLAIR.

and, while Prince Edward will be benefited by it more than any other county, and I do not think there is a single person in the county would support the construction of the canal, I am not in a position to know anything about it. I would like to know of the hon. Minister if the canal would be of use to the country, when constructed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should be very sorry to say that it would not be of any use to the country. We did not initiate the enterprise; we inherited it. I think it would be rather a reproach to us, if we left the canal unfinished half way between Lake Simcoe and Balsam Lake. It occurred to me that we should complete the work, a portion of it at any event. I do not see that there is any alternative.

Mr. PETTET. What is the depth of water in the canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It will not be more than 6 feet on the mitre sills.

Mr. HUGHES. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pettet) who has the distinguished honour of representing Prince Edward County, and who is candid enough to come here and say he knows nothing about it—and he is supposed to be one of the most intelligent men in his county—that he should go into the Library and read over the "Hansard" reports of discussions upon this subject, or procure the report from the Department of Railways and Canals of the commission that was appointed to take evidence on this subject. If he will do this before he undertakes to take up the time of the House, I am satisfied he will have a different opinion of the canal.

Mr. BENNETT. I understood the Minister to say that he expected to make a contract of the section between Balsam Lake and Lake Simcoe.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The new portion of it. I am asking a vote for that purpose. The hon. member (Mr. Bennett) understands the situation, and he knows that we have already under contract a very considerable portion between these two lakes.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the hon. Minister expect to have this section under contract this fall?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know what course I shall take with regard to that; but I am certainly contemplating having it under way at as early a date as I possibly can. I think this section between the two lakes must be completed. That is my judgment about it. I am not going to say whether it ought to have been taken up in preference to other work, but I am just going to deal

with it as I find it. I find it under way, and I think we will have to complete the section between Simcoe and Balsam.

Mr. BENNETT. I think any gentleman, whether in this House or outside, who has taken the trouble to post himself on this work, instead of contenting himself with crying out against it, will commend the action of the Minister in placing under construction the link between Lake Simcoe and Balsam Lake. When does the hon. gentleman hope to have the lock completed and in running order at Peterborough?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The contract does not call for the completion of that lock—at all events, it is not likely to be done before next season. It is a pretty large undertaking, and it is something new. I think that when completed it will be a creditable work. There is nothing at all like it on the continent, and I think it is in pretty good hands. I hope it will be done by the opening of next season.

Mr. GIBSON. What is the estimated cost of the canal when completed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can tell the hon. gentleman that up to the end of April, 1899, there has been expended altogether \$2,500,000 upon the canal.

Mr. GIBSON. Has it been used for any purposes of navigation yet?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not to any appreciable extent. Until we have the locks completed at the lower end it will not be possible to utilize it except as a local line.

Mr. GIBSON. It is for the purpose of carrying counties, and not for carrying the trade of the country. I remember distinctly a large deputation coming down here when Sir John Thompson was Prime Minister, and when the question was pressed upon him for the construction and completion of this canal, there was a promise made by the delegation to give the Government their moral support, and I remember Sir John Thompson saying to them that he wanted something more than their moral support. I believe it was gone on with for the purpose of carrying the counties through which it passes.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not think the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) is hardly fair to this project. Practically speaking, this is not a canal at all, because there are miles and miles of lakes, some of which vary from ten to twenty-five miles in length and width, that are practically part and parcel of this canal system. It is true, as the Minister says, that a great deal of money has been spent on it, so much money that the consummation of it must be

brought about. But I have always understood that this work has been undertaken, not so much as a local work as a part of a line from Lake Ontario to the Georgian Bay. When that is completed, and when there is a depth of six feet of water over the sills, and the large water stretches are utilized along the system, there will then be a water carrying route far in advance of the Erie Canal.

Mr. PETTET. When was it commenced?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I believe it was commenced before confederation. I think considerable money must have been spent before 1867.

Mr. BENNETT. The Imperial Government started it in 1837.

Mr. GIBSON. It would not do a great deal of harm if the estimate was cut down one-half. If a canal started before confederation is not completed yet, there cannot be a great necessity for the work. It is only a ditch at the very best. I have no fault to find with the class of work that has been done, it has been very well done, but as for its utility, it is one of the greatest farces that was ever perpetrated by the Government. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) spoke a few moments ago about the Soo Canal. I remember when he was sitting on this side of the House, and then I condemned it as an engineering monstrosity. That pier that was put in the canal was done at the instigation of the Canadian Pacific Railway in order to save them the expense of building a bridge.

Mr. HUGHES. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is referring to a previous debate. The item to which he has referred has already been carried.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is true I declared the item carried, but we are in the habit, when a member gets up immediately and wishes to continue the debate, of allowing him to do so.

Mr. GIBSON. I am obliged to you for your ruling, because I am touching the hon. gentleman on a very sore spot, because all this blundering was done by a Conservative Government. I pointed out to them from my place in the House the absurdity of placing that pier in the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, and I think the member for Beauharnois will remember my criticism at that time. I called the pier then an engineering monstrosity, constructed for no other purpose than to save the Canadian Pacific Railway from building a new bridge. But I am glad to know that the present Minister of Railways and Canals was far-seeing enough to remove that objectionable feature from the Sault Ste. Marie Canal after the Government had spent so much money upon it.

Mr. BERGERON. I spoke in the same sense.

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, after the hon. gentleman had gone and seen it for himself. He then confessed frankly to me that if he had seen it before he would have assisted me in the criticism I offered at that time. Now, in respect to the canal under discussion, and which the member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) is so touchy about, we know that if this canal had not been put through the hon. gentleman would not be sitting in this House. That is the trouble with the hon. gentleman. The canal was built practically for the purpose of carrying the county in his behalf. A large sum of money was spent in completing that canal, and I say from my seat in this House that it is a useless expenditure of money. It will never pay the interest of the money that has been spent upon it. All you want to do is to have the public work carried on in your riding during election time so that you may have some control of the men as you had in the past

Mr. HUGHES. I rise to a point of order, and insist on a ruling. The hon. member for Lincoln is imputing improper motives to me. He stated that my whole desire was to get work done on this canal for political purposes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think it is attributing an improper motive to say that some hon. gentleman has advocated a public work for the purpose of getting elected.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not want to interfere between the hon. gentleman, but I think we ought to have serious rulings, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that such a ruling is not worthy of being put in "Hansard."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think there is no improper motive imputed in saying that an hon. gentleman is advocating a project or political idea for the purpose of getting elected. I do not think there is an improper motive in that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman seriously rules that?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes; certainly.

Mr. GIBSON. I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that I am within the rules of the House. We all know the purpose for which this canal was contemplated. This canal has been under consideration for eighty years, but there was not a great deal of work done upon it until a Conservative Government took it up in a serious form. The idea of going to the enormous expense of \$845,000 for the continuation and completion of a work which is of no practical utility to the

Mr. GIBSON.

Dominion is one that has little to support it, and in view of the fact that the work has remained in a stationary condition for eighty years, I do not think the people desire that the Government shall rush it through. There is no doubt about it, that the work should never have been started, but the Government are committed to some of the acts of folly of their predecessors, and I suppose this is one of them. We have many illustrations of the fact that the other canals were only constructed and the work pushed forward as the exigencies of the general elections required. We know very well that, if the predecessors of the present Government had displayed ability, energy and foresight, as the present Minister of Railways and Canals has done during his short term of office, the whole canal system of Canada could have been completed ten years ago. The Welland Canal was commenced in 1870 or 1871, and it did not reach the summit level of Lake Erie until Mr. Mackenzie's Government came into power. Prior to that time the canal was constructed for 12 feet of water. Lock 25 had to be built, and Mr. Mackenzie, foreseeing the future demands of inland navigation, completed lock 25, under his own supervision as Minister of Railways and Canals, to a depth of 14 feet. The canal remained in that condition until a general election was coming on, when the Government of that day saw fit to increase the depth of the canal to 14 feet. The whole of our canal system was carried on in that way during the last twenty years. The Government which was so long in power and of which we hear so many praises coming from hon. gentlemen opposite, simply dilly dallied until a general election was coming on when a lot of contracts were made. The hon. Minister would be perfectly justified were he to cut the item under consideration, in two. There are many other things of more moment required in connection with the improvement of our inland navigation. I am glad to see that he has placed something in the Estimates for Port Colborne. But if this large sum of money were appropriated for Port Colborne instead of the Trent Valley Canal the people of Canada would realize a greater return for the expenditure than they will ever receive from the money that will be spent in building the Trent Valley Canal.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the hon. gentleman intend to make a motion to that effect?

Mr. GIBSON. I would be glad to do it if I had the power.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman has the power.

Mr. GIBSON. If the hon. Minister will take my opinion of the matter he will stop the work entirely. The Government are doing what I consider wrong when they are finishing the Trent Valley Canal.

Mr. HUGHES. I have never seen the old adage that wealth gives to an ignoramus the privilege of being insolent and arrogant without being subject to the censure that rightly should fall to him, better illustrated than in the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) who has just taken his seat. The hon. gentleman has intimated here to-night that my election to this House was due to the Trent Valley Canal. No one to my knowledge ever charged that hon. gentleman with having any ability. He has no end of assurance and impudence, but I have never known that the hon. gentleman was charged with any innate ability, and certainly with none acquired. If he had had any acquired ability he would have been able to look up the records and ascertain that the Trent Canal, in my locality, was not started until two years after I was elected to this House, and that it was owing to the fact that, after I was elected, I brought to the attention of the Government the benefit that this canal would be to the locality, that they took the matter up and voted the money for it. In the election I distinctly refused to say whether I would support the canal or not. I refused to take a stand upon that question inasmuch as the commission which had been appointed to inquire into the project had not reported as to whether the water supply would be sufficient. A number of the croakers—the hon. gentleman was not in the House then, and I have the assurance that he will not be in the next Parliament—but a number of gentlemen in former Parliaments found fault with the proposition on the ground that there was not a sufficient water supply. That was the only argument I ever heard advanced against the canal by any gentleman of intelligence. That argument has been completely refuted by the reports of engineers who were originally adverse to the work, but who, after giving serious consideration to the question, have stated in their reports that there is an ample supply of water for the canal. I shall not take up the time of this House in discussing the merits of this question. Every person except some of those hon. gentlemen who belong to dark age intellectually, knows that the work is necessary in the interest of Canada. It is a work which has been discussed again and again in this House and in the country. I wish to tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) that I took the stand along the canal route, that I would not support the canal if the engineer's report did not show that there was a water supply. I said, if there was a sufficient water supply I would support the canal. I do not require any fat contracts; I do not require to be a bloated monopolist to be elected to the Parliament of Canada. I have the confidence of the people of my county, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson), or any other gentleman of his stripe, comes along there—and I had the pleasure of disposing of a large number of them last election, single-handed—they will

find that I do not require any assistance from public works to elect me.

Mr. GIBSON. I am glad to have a lecture read to me by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes), because if any one in this House requires a lecture it is himself. He need not speak about arrogance or impudence, for in the words of the Scotchman he might "let that flea stick to the w'a." If there is any one in this House who has a superabundance of that it is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes). He need not refer to my want of intelligence, for my electors are a better judge of that than he is, and he has no more than he requires to be here. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) has a certain amount of cunning, although not enough to conceal his hand, for he let the cat out of the bag when he said he was careful in his remarks as to whether he would advocate the canal or not. He wanted to see on what side the cat would jump, and when he found the canal was popular in his county he supported it. He now stands up and tries to dress me down for having the courage of my convictions in stating that that work should never have been commenced. We have now the supreme assurance of the hon. member (Mr. Hughes) that he was the prime mover in this canal matter, so that hereafter when any criticism of the Trent Valley Canal is being made hon. gentlemen will know that it is not the late Conservative Government that are to blame, but the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), who is responsible for the whole business. It shows his influence with the Government of that day, when they were prepared to spend \$6,000,000, and perhaps \$10,000,000, in order to secure his return to the House. Let me correct a wrong impression of the hon. gentleman when he says that he is longer in this House than I am. I came in in 1891, and he came in on a by-election in 1892, and I have just as good a recollection of all the circumstances of the case as he has. I remember the large delegation that came down from his county and from the section to urge on the Government the building of the Trent Valley Canal. But the time of that delegation was apparently wasted, for we find now from the hon. gentleman himself, that he above all others was the man who got the canal built. It will remain as a lasting monument to the importance of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) that he got the Conservative Government to spend \$6,000,000 to return him to Parliament.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) has opened up a large field for discussion, and when we were making such progress with the estimates, it was uncalled for that he should launch out in the direction. Notwithstanding the claimed tenacity of his memory and exactness of his knowledge, in order to show that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) knew little of what he was talking about, I will quote from the last

report of the Department of Canals. He charged that the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) had secured his election by reason of the great expenditure on the Trent Valley Canal, but it may be news to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) when I quote what the facts are, and before he makes such sweeping charges again, he should take pains to fortify that very defective memory of his. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) came into the House in 1892, and from confederation up to that date, about \$700,000 had been expended by the Dominion Government on the Trent Valley Canal. After he came into the House, the Conservative Government only expended in 1892, \$4,457; in 1893, \$5,900; in 1894, \$3,400; in 1895, \$53,000. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) owes to the House an apology for such an arrant misrepresentation of statistics. In 1896, the first year the Liberal party came into power, I find a capital expenditure of \$392,000, no less than six times the amount that was expended under the Conservative Government in previous years, after the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) gained his seat in this House.

Mr. GIBSON. That is what I said. They kept dodging along.

Mr. POWELL. It was not the Conservative party kept dodging along.

Mr. GIBSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. POWELL. The Liberals dodged along at a tremendously rapid rate, for in 1897 they spent \$496,000, in 1898, \$351,000, and the estimates for the coming year will be about \$800,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It is only fair I should state that the contracts under which this expenditure increased were entered into within a few months prior to the change of Government.

Mr. GIBSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. POWELL. Now, as to the Welland Canal. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) knows anything he should know about that, for it is under his nose in his own constituency. When the Conservative Government went to the country in the general elections of 1882, the expenditure on the Welland Canal that year was \$600,000 less than the previous year; \$650,000 less than the year previous to that; and \$1,500,000 less than in the year 1878, when the Liberal Government called a general election. The election of 1887 took place in the month of February, and the Estimates for that year were not passed by the House until the month of April. I find that in 1886, the Estimates before the election, showed an expenditure on capital account of \$250,000 less than the year previous; \$220,000 less than the year previous to that; \$344,000 less than the year previous to that, and \$400,000 less than the

Mr. POWELL.

year previous to that. The next general election was held in 1891, and in that year the total expenditure on capital account on Welland Canal was the small sum of \$36,371. Yet, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) stands up here, and charges the Conservative party, especially in connection with the Welland Canal, with making extraordinary capital expenditure on the eve of a general election.

Mr. GIBSON. Is the hon. gentleman aware that in all the years he speaks about the Welland Canal was under construction and under enlargement?

Mr. POWELL. I think it would be a fair inference from my remarks that I was aware of that. It is certainly a very sapient question to ask me whether I was aware of the capital expenditure, when I was going over the capital expenditures that had been made. I will pass to the St. Anne's Lock and Canal. In 1882, \$193,154 were spent; the next year, \$21,000 less; the next year, \$31,000 less. In 1891, at the time of the next general election, there was no expenditure whatever. Now I come to the Grenville Canal. In 1882 the capital expenditure was \$433,000; in the next year it was the same amount; in the next year it was \$400,000, and in 1886, the year immediately previous to the general election, it was \$104,000, or \$53,000 less than the year previous. If I pass next to the Culbute lock and dam, I find in 1882 a capital expenditure of \$29,000, about \$25,000 in excess of the previous year. In 1886 it was \$26,000. On the Murray Canal the capital expenditure in 1882 was only \$7,000; in 1886 it was \$179,000, which was only \$30,000 more the preceding or succeeding year. I might go on and exhaust the whole subject to show that there is not a single instance, the facts of which were such as the hon. gentleman could base his assertion. Taking the Sault Ste. Marie Canal I find that in 1891 there was an expenditure of \$325,000; in the next year it was larger; in 1895 it was \$446,000, or about \$900,000 less than that of the previous year. When the hon. gentleman scolds the Conservative party, and claims to be the embodiment of wisdom and knowledge with respect to these matters, he should place himself in a position to satisfy the House that he does understand a little about that matter, to which his whole energies have been applied.

Mr. GIBSON. I am sure that the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), who poses as one of the wisest men in this House, will take my statement, when I say that I had a contract on the Welland Canal for the enlargement of section "J," when the general election was going on.

Mr. RICHARDSON. This discussion on the Trent Valley Canal reminds me a good deal of an incident that occurred in this House some years ago, when the Tay Canal

was under discussion. Sir Richard Cartwright, when criticising the estimate, made the remark that he understood that this Tay Canal was calculated to drain the county of Lanark. Sir John Macdonald, who was then Prime Minister, said: "Well, Mr. Chairman, if it does not drain the county of Lanark, I think the House will agree that it will at least drain the public treasury pretty well." The committee will see the application of that remark to the present case. We have gone on practically since confederation fooling with this Trent Valley Canal, and spending hundreds of thousands of dollars every year upon it. According to the statement of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), the Liberal party were opposed to the Trent Valley Canal and the expenditures in regard to it. I was particularly delighted to hear the hon. gentleman get up and denounce the whole thing, and say that, as far as he was concerned, he felt that the time had come to stop expending money on this canal. It showed an amount of courage and consistency that at least appealed to me. Because of that I felt somewhat disturbed over the remarks of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) in censuring the hon. member for Lincoln for what he said. Now, I am not an engineer, and I am not in a position to criticise this Trent Valley Canal with the technical intelligence that I should like to possess, but it has always appeared to me as a huge joke and an electioneering canal: I may be entirely wrong. If the Government are in a position to say that it is an excellent undertaking, and just the thing the country wants, I shall be prepared to support it. But it is as well for this committee to remember that this country has expended some \$83,000,000 in constructing its canal system; yet, notwithstanding that fact, at least four-fifths of the products of the North-west do not go through the Canadian canal system, but through the American system. If that is the case, is it not the duty of this House to take stock of its canal system, and to determine that we shall not spend one dollar more on our canal system until we know that it is going to be of some value to the country? My hon. friend from Prince Edward County (Mr. Pettet), who should be considerably interested in this work, tells me that, so far as his county is concerned, it is of no value, in his estimation, and he believes that his people would be opposed to the expenditure. If this is merely a political canal, and has run along since confederation merely for the purpose of carrying constituencies, does it not strike the committee that it is about time that stopped? As I have said, I am not prepared to offer an opinion as to whether or not this canal is going to be of some value to the country. I am prepared to accept the opinion of the hon. Minister of

Railways, if he states that it is valuable and is essential to this country; but if it is not so, I am prepared to vote against the expenditure of another dollar upon it.

Mr. BERGERON. What about the St. Andrew's Rapids?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I believe the improvement of the St. Andrew's Rapids would be of some value to an important section of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. McHUGH. I do not rise to continue this discussion. I do not think it has taken a course which is calculated to enlighten the House much as to the benefits of the scheme in question. I would rather the debate took a different course and have a discussion on the merits or demerits of the canal. Living close by the canal, I am in a position to form a judgment, and believe it is one which is going to be of great benefit to this country. If constructed, it will be one of the great transportation highways of this country. What money has been spent on it has been well spent. This canal, as far as it has gone, has opened the land stretches between waterways and given the people their only means of transportation for the products of the farm and forest along that line, and enabled them to bring these products to market much more cheaply than they otherwise could. In fact, they could not bring them to market at all were it not for the money spent on the construction of this canal. Now that so much money has been spent, the Government will be acting wisely to go on and push the work to completion at the earliest date possible. I know that in the past it has been discredited to some extent because it was used for political purposes, but I am satisfied that the men now at the head of affairs are not going to use it for such an object, and I trust that men on both sides who are interested in seeing it pushed to completion will bend their energies in the one direction, and that is to get rid of these political differences and serve the best interests of their country by having the canal completed at as early a date as the resources of the country will permit. And that policy will have my support. So far as the canal has gone all the money that has been expended on it has been wisely expended, because it has given the people means of transportation for their products. I do not like to see hon. members quarrelling over this matter, and instead of cutting this grant in two and only spending one-half, the Government ought to spend one-half on the Balsam division and the other half at the mouth of the lake. You would then begin to see the advantage of the Trent Valley Canal for a through route, and I trust that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals will see that this work is completed at as early a date as possible.

Mr. BENNETT. Since some gentlemen on the other side seem determined to prevent this estimate passing, I am going to appeal to some hon. gentlemen over there, who have not made up their minds in advance, not to accept statements that cannot be proved. A couple of hon. gentlemen have described the canal as a ditch. Well, we cannot be responsible for the ignorance of any gentlemen of the geography of the country. They do not seem to be aware of the fact that there is a large lake known as Lake Simcoe, situated in the county of Simcoe, a magnificent stretch of water, some twenty miles in size—

Mr. RICHARDSON. Is it salt or fresh?

Mr. BENNETT. To suit the hon. gentleman, it is freshness itself.

Mr. RICHARDSON. You live there.

Mr. BENNETT. Passing out of that large lake, when the connection is made that the hon. Minister has projected, there will be a connection of about nine miles in length with Balsam Lake. This Trent Valley Canal system is a connection of a number of very large lakes, and when completed there will be a canal having on the sills a depth of six feet of water, which will accommodate barges constructed to carry 15,000 to 20,000 bushels of grain and will therefore be a very large carrier, and cut a considerable figure in the transportation question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. This House is to be congratulated on having among its number an hon. member who knows everything. I was not discussing the geography of the country, but merely wished to have from the hon. Minister the assurance that this scheme will be valuable in a commercial sense, and I would be prepared to accept his statement. It is due to the House that he should inform the committee exactly what this undertaking is going to cost. I understand that we have already expended over \$2,000,000 on it, and it may cost \$5,000,000 or \$10,000,000 more. It was on that point that I was speaking. I would like to know exactly what the undertaking is to cost.

Mr. McHUGH. I may mention that boats from Lake Skugog are using this canal almost every day. Large steamers that carry 500 passengers go through that lake every day.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I intended making a very brief statement to the committee with respect to the judgment I formed of the enterprise on the occasion of my visit to that section of the country. I went there to see the works and passed over the route of the canal some two years ago. I am free to confess that

Mr. McHUGH.

having heard a great deal to the detriment of the undertaking I had rather conceived a prejudice against it myself. The result of my visit to the country along the canal, to the various towns situated in that section led me to form a much more favourable opinion than I had entertained in regard to it, and led me to this conclusion—that while if the work had not been initiated, if nothing had been done, probably I could not have strongly recommended it to Parliament, yet, seeing the work had been commenced, we are fully justified in carrying it to completion, at least so far as the upper stretches and the connection of the two lakes, Simcoe and Balsam, are concerned. The canal certainly traverses a most beautiful country, and a country that is not only beautiful but has great agricultural resources and is a good business-producing country. As some hon. gentlemen have said, these various works we are constructing connect a chain of very beautiful lakes studded by lovely islands—and a altogether charming section as well as a productive section. I am bound to say that I cannot and do not agree with those who are looking forward with confidence to this canal doing a considerable amount of through business. I do not think it is going to present advantages such as are claimed by many of its friends as a medium for carrying western produce to the ocean. But I do believe that it will be a great convenience from a local point of view as affording cheap and easy communication for the people who are doing business along and about these stretches of water. I am satisfied also that the canal, when constructed and in operation, will have much to do with reducing the cost of transport over the railways, and will keep railway rates down to reasonable figures. It is estimated that it will cost \$900,000 to complete the work which we have already commenced between lake Simcoe and Balsam lake.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Is that included in this estimate?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This item of \$845,000 includes \$300,000 of the \$900,000 which will be necessary to complete the work.

Mr. RICHARDSON. How much has been expended?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The total amount expended is about two and a half millions. On the 13th February, 1895, a contract was made for section 1 of the Simcoe-Balsam lake division. On the 27th August, 1895, contracts were entered into for one section of the Peterborough-Lakefield division, and on the 17th May, 1896, a contract was made for section 2 of that division. These works are in process of construction under these contracts. As I say, it will take probably half a million besides this estimate to complete this work

between Lake Simcoe and Balsam Lake. My strong opinion is that we could not leave that work uncompleted. A Government cannot take up such a work and leave it half way between two such important bodies of water as these two lakes. It would be discreditable to do it. Even if you had the strongest possible opinion against the utility of the work, you ought to finish it. I have no hesitation in saying that I think we are justified in asking for the appropriation we have placed in the Estimates in order that we may make some progress towards completing the cut from the present terminus towards the lake.

Mr. BERTRAM. A good deal has been said with regard to the geography of the country through which the Trent Valley Canal passes, including not a little that rather indicates that the hon. gentlemen who speak are not well acquainted with that section of the country. I was a resident of that section for many years before moving to the city of Toronto. There is no part of the province of Ontario with which I am better acquainted than this. I remember very well when I was on the steamer at the time it passed up through one of these back lakes, when the present leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) was aboard, and speeches were made about the advantages of the Trent Valley Canal. This was before any expenditure of importance had taken place. I held the opinion then and I hold it now that the commencement of the Trent Valley Canal and the involving of the country in that immense expenditure was a great mistake. The Toronto Board of Trade takes the same view. But I quite agree with what the hon. Minister has said on the other hand. We are not discussing whether it is advisable to undertake a work of this kind or not. The work has been undertaken and a large amount of money spent. I am not going to say which Government is responsible. The late Government took the initiative at all events. I believe the present Government, when they came into power, had a very serious question to consider in connection with this canal. There is no doubt it will be a great benefit to the country through which it passes. As to whether it will bring down grain from the North-west to Montreal that is another question. A large amount of money has been spent on the canal, and though I certainly consider it a mistake to have spent it, I think we could get better value for the money by spending it in other directions, I do not believe it would be wise or prudent for the Government to say: We will abandon the whole thing and lose the money we have put into it. Let us try to make the money we have put into it of some value, and let us make the work as successful as possible. I held that there was nothing left for the Government but to proceed with the work begun by their predecessors. I admit the amount is large, but still, all

things considered, I think the policy of the Government in continuing the building of the Trent Canal, is the best that can be adopted. The large amount of money spent would be entirely wasted if we abandoned that work now, whereas we can make it of some value by going on and completing the work. As I said a moment ago, the wisdom of beginning the construction of this canal in the first place is not under discussion now. While I hold a strong opinion on that point, taking everything into consideration, I think the action of the Government probably the best under the circumstances.

Mr. HENDERSON. I rather think the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Bertram) is more anxious to make a point against the late Government than, perhaps, to advocate what is best for the country. He tells us that the Board of Trade of Toronto had expressed themselves opposed to this scheme. I think the Minister of Railways and Canals understands why the Toronto Board of Trade is opposed to this scheme: it certainly will bring no grist to their mill. As a rule, Toronto is very selfish, and if an expenditure of public money is not going to do something for Toronto you can almost rest assured that Toronto is going to give it some opposition. Now the hon. gentleman stated that the late Government initiated the construction of this canal. He may be well acquainted with the geography of the country, but I must tell him that he does not know much about the history of that part of the country. The Trent navigation improvement was begun in 1837, long before the late Government came into power, in fact, before many of the members of the late Government were born. So, I think it is unfair for the hon. gentleman, if a mistake was made in bygone years in respect to this canal, that he should charge it on the late Government, when, as a matter of fact, it is over sixty years since the improvement of the Trent navigation was commenced. But I certainly must say that I think this work ought to go on. I am quite willing to take the responsibility of saying that this is a proper course for the Government to pursue. The member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) says it will never pay. I ask the hon. gentleman if the St. Lawrence Canals will ever pay. I question if they ever will. All the money we have expended on the St. Lawrence Canals certainly never will come back into the public chest. All the money we have expended on the Welland Canal will never come back. Nobody expects that public works are going to pay a revenue to the Government to indemnify it for their construction. But the public good is obtained, transportation is cheapened, and in one way or another the public is indemnified for the outlay.

Mr. BERTRAM. I think the hon. gentleman's reference to the city of Toronto was

rather uncalled for, and I do not see that there was any particular reason why he should have made the observation. He gives this House to understand that the city of Toronto is never interested in any project that will not directly benefit that city. He did not give any proof of that statement, and I am surprised at a gentleman of his intelligence making a statement of that kind. I always supposed that any public work that would benefit Ontario or the Dominion would benefit the city of Toronto. I represent one of the divisions of Toronto, and I am not opposed to this undertaking being completed. I am supporting the Government. Then, the hon. gentleman says that I do not understand the history of the country because I did not go back to the beginning of the enterprise. I did not need to do so. What I said was that the work was not commenced in earnest until the late Administration committed the country to this expenditure.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I entirely dissent from the view of my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), even though he is an excellent business man. He tells us with perfect frankness that he visited that district and made up his mind that the work would be of no special value, or words to that effect, as a national undertaking. Now, let us analyse his frank confession with regard to that. We have already spent some \$2,500,000 on this undertaking, and the Minister of Railways and Canals, for whom we all have the greatest respect, tells us that in addition to the estimate which we have before us there will be another estimate of \$600,000 to complete any one section of the enterprise. Now, let us take the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals, that it will cost \$1,500,000, or probably \$2,000,000. The probability is, from all past experience, that this work will cost the country four or five millions. Now, the hon. member for Centre Toronto tells us that inasmuch as a mistake has been committed by the previous Government, this Government must go on and spend a lot more of money, throwing good money after bad. Now, notwithstanding that the Liberal party opposed this vigorously, are we to go on and spend unlimited sums of money on an enterprise that is to be of no national value to the Dominion of Canada? There is not a business man in the House that will not say that such a proposition is most absurd. If we have already squandered \$2,500,000 upon it, is that any reason why we should go on squandering still more. Take the Tay Canal, for instance. We were told it was to cost \$50,000 to \$100,000, and before we got through with that undertaking we spent some \$400,000 or \$500,000 on it.

I think I am correct in saying that one year the revenue from that canal did not exceed \$3. Are we going to go on and pursue this

Mr. BERTRAM.

policy in regard to this undertaking? I am convinced, and I think it has been abundantly demonstrated, that we should not spend these sums of money on this undertaking. The hon. Minister himself admits that, so far as his judgment goes, if it were to rest with him as to whether such an undertaking should be instituted, he would decide the question in the negative. He tells us that this is a beautiful country, that there are islands in the lakes, and that the scenery is charming, but he admits that this undertaking will not be of any permanent national value to the country. It may carry some local freights; but I fear the chief design of the enterprise has been to carry elections. I do not believe that the farmers and the great mass of the taxpaying people of this country desire that the country shall be loaded with a debt of from \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000 in order that this work shall be completed. The time has come to stop spending money on such undertakings. It would give me the greatest pleasure to see the Government drop the estimate, that they might consider it during the year and make an investigation, so that they will be able to come before this Parliament with such a statement of the case as will, if they intend to carry out the work, satisfy this committee—because I am sure it needs to be satisfied—that this is an expenditure warranted by the circumstances.

Mr. ROGERS. I have listened attentively to the discussion of this question, as I do to all discussions in connection with this celebrated canal. It was evident all through the country when the Patron movement was active, that one of the most foolish expenditures that could be undertaken was that upon the Trent Valley Canal. Not only the constituencies in the western part of the province, but the very constituencies that might be directly benefited, and that might have been supposed would support it, condemned the project and say that it is a farce and a humbug to spend more money on it. We know very well why some hon. gentlemen are supporting it. They feel that they are doing it for votes. That has been the consideration actuating some hon. gentlemen in this House, and, I am sorry to say, it is not very much to their credit. As the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has said, a certain amount of money has been expended, and it appears necessary to him to carry to completion the work that has been undertaken. If we had the assurance of the Government that they had no intention of finishing the work, there would be some consolation in the matter. I can only hope that they do not purpose doing so, although they may not care to say so. The time of these one-horse canals, or ditches, I think, is past. When there was an agitation going on all through the country about this pro-

ject, a gentleman in Kingston, in discussing the matter, said that the canal could be of no practical use to this country. He said that by increasing the depth of the natural waterway from 3½ to 7 feet, thousands and thousands of acres of land would be drowned. I believe there will be more land drowned in that part of the country than would pay for building a railway through it. The Rideau Canal has been built for sixty years, and we are not yet done paying for land damages. We have estimates passed in this House every year for land damages along the line of that canal. The Trent Valley Canal is only in its infancy, and in a lifetime we will not be done paying damages resulting to the land from its construction. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), in discussing the Welland Canal, says that the days of one-horse canals are done. I thought he would never have said any more in favour of these little ditches after having made that statement. It is true, that the days of these small canals are done. A railway could be built and operated at a much less cost.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rogers) in favour of this vote?

Mr. ROGERS. I will just give you my views in reference to the matter, and you can do as you like, and I will do as I like. I think, after the discussion which has taken place, that the Government will know that they cannot in the future propose an expenditure of this kind without meeting with opposition, and they will know that there will be a more serious discussion another year.

Mr. HUGHES. It strikes me that a year or two ago, when this large and influential deputation came to wait upon the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and when this array of beauty and talent from all the different districts between Frontenac and the Georgian Bay stood up in front of this building to be photographed, one of the prominent features of that picture was the countenance of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers). I am sorry to see the desertions from the ranks of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to-night. I cannot understand why the hon. gentleman's followers have turned tail, as they have in opposing this canal. I am not going to say any more upon the subject in reply to these hon. gentlemen who have spoken, because any school boy knows that this must be a valuable work to the country.

Mr. ROGERS. I will just say, in regard to the deputation, that Mr. Young, the editor of the Trenton "Courier," asked me if I would come in and hear what they had to offer in favour of the project. I did go, and I would go again. If I could get any information in any way, I would do so. I would go to a Conservative caucus, if I

thought I could learn anything, but I know that I could not learn anything in such a place. I went in with the deputation, but when they came out, I thought that they had made such a poor case of it that I could not see how they could expect the hon. Minister to have any faith in their proposition.

New scow, St. Ours Locks..... \$1,600

Mr. BERGERON. We want some information about this scow.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The item can pass, and I will get the information to-morrow.

Mr. BERGERON. Oh, no. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) is having some money spent at Sorel for scows, and we want to know how these are built. I will consent to the passage of the item if my hon. friend will give the information to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. All right.

Trent Canal—

Rosedale Bridge, two concrete piers.... \$600

Mr. HUGHES. The Government enlarged the swing bridge at this place, necessitating the township increasing the height of the piers and raising the superstructure. I maintain that the township is entitled to the cost of the piers above the old level, and to the cost of removing and replacing the superstructure. I trust that the Minister will give his attention to that. I do not object to the \$10,000 towards rebuilding the bridge over Chemong Lake, but I ask the Minister to make this expenditure a precedent for others of a similar nature there. I am sorry to see there is nothing in the Estimates for a swing bridge in the township of Emily, over Pigeon River. This Government controls Pigeon Lake and Pigeon Lake controls Pigeon River, and the answer cannot be well given that this is not under the control of the Government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) must not conclude there will be no provision for this.

Mr. HUGHES. I asked the Minister before and he said he would not do it. He claimed the Federal Government had not the control.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That was at that time.

Mr. HUGHES. I thought the Minister was wrongly advised then, and I knew he would change his mind. Another matter, the dam at Bobcaygeon flooded the mouth of McLaren Creek, necessitating a diversion of two miles in the main road. I have always maintained that this Government was

responsible for this diversion of the road, and that they should compensate for the new road that had been built. It will take only \$1,500 to do that, and it will take less than \$1,000 for the Emily bridge, and I trust that the Minister will give his careful attention to it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That item will stand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, pass it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If we are allowed an opportunity for free discussion at another sitting there is no reason why it should not pass.

The committee rose and reported progress.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What will be the business for to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Estimates, and perhaps a Bill respecting public health and public works.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.40 a.m. (Thursday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 13th July, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER AT ENTRANCE ISLAND.

Mr. McINNES (by Mr. Maxwell) asked :

1. How long was Robert Gray, Esq., lighthouse keeper at Entrance Island ?
2. When did he resign ?
3. While in the Government employ did he contribute to the superannuation fund ?
4. What amount would he be entitled to if superannuated ?
5. Has he applied for superannuation ?
6. If so, has he submitted, in support of his application medical certificates from Drs. Davis and Walkem, of Nanaimo City, to the effect that he became physically incapacitated while discharging his duties, and that he is unable to resume work ?
7. Has his application been granted ? If not, why not ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. Twenty years. 2. On April 26th, 1897. Resignation to take effect 1st July, 1897. 3. Yes. 4. \$160. 5. Yes. 6. Yes ; he submitted certifi-

Mr. HUGHES.

cates from these gentlemen, but they were not entirely satisfactory. 7. No ; Professor Prince reported that on the 7th July, 1897, he found Mr. Gray living on Gabriola Island, and that he seemed to him to be in a fairly active and healthy condition. This was seven days after he was reported as lying dangerously ill in Nanaimo hospital.

### REGULATIONS RESPECTING ISSUE OF LONG SERVICE MEDAL.

Mr. KLOEPFER asked :

1. Have the regulations been issued yet regarding the issue of the proposed Long Service Medal ?
2. What are those regulations ?
3. Will an officer who has served upwards of thirty-five years and who has just been placed on the retired list, be eligible for a medal ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). No Canadian regulations have yet been issued, but a Royal Warrant was published on June 2nd last in the London "Gazette" granting to the volunteers and militia in the colonies the Long Service Medal. It is expected that, at an early date, regulations will be promulgated in Canada under the provisions of the warrant. In regard to the third question I can give no answer except to say that I suppose that an officer who has served continuously for thirty-five years and is on the retired list would be entitled to the Long Service Medal.

### POLL BOOKS AND VOTERS' LISTS USED AT PLEBISCITE VOTE.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has laid on the Table a partial return made by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to an order of the House dated the 10th May, 1899, calling for copies of the poll books and voters' lists of the counties of Beauce, Lévis, Montmagny and Kamouraska as used at the plebiscite vote.

### ADMINISTRATION OF THE YUKON - SALARY AND APPOINTMENT OF MR. F. C. WADE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. While questions are being answered I might perhaps be permitted to take the opportunity of reminding the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) that he was good enough to say that he would inform me to-day what salary was paid to Mr. Wade, the Crown Prosecutor, as I think he described him, and I would be greatly obliged if he would also say whether he was appointed by Order in Council.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In compliance with the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) made yesterday, I asked my col-

league the hon. Minister of Justice to give me a memorandum of the facts. He was to send it to me to-day, but I have not yet received it. It is probable that I will receive it some time this afternoon or evening, and I will communicate it to the House. As to the latter portion of the hon. gentleman's question I may say that Mr. Wade was appointed by Order in Council. That I remember distinctly.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), whether he, as I would almost be inclined to assume, has abandoned the intention of bringing forward the resolution in regard to the Senate during the present session. I can hardly believe that the right hon. gentleman would leave to the 120th day of the session, and of a summer session, the introduction of a resolution raising so important a question as that. I am in hopes that he will be able to say that the matter will be deferred to another session.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No, I am sorry to say I cannot gratify the wish as expressed just now by my hon. friend. My hon. friend is familiar with what is to be the tenor of the resolution which we intend to bring in. If we did not bring it in earlier it would have served no purpose to do so, because there has been no occasion, the whole of the time of the House having been fully occupied, as my hon. friend knows, up to this moment. It is not the intention of the Government to give up this resolution.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I may ask my right hon. friend when we may hope to have the resolution laid before us. I have no idea myself as to what the tenor of this resolution is. I have not the slightest idea, and I think my right hon. friend will agree with me that the House is entitled, at this period of the session, without further delay, to have laid before it the express terms of the resolution.

The **PRIME MINISTER.** The request of my hon. friend is certainly most reasonable and I must ask his pardon. I thought he was familiar with the tenor of the resolution, judging from the length of the remarks that he made upon the idea and the way that he discussed it on a former occasion. If the hon. gentleman says that he discussed it without knowing what it was I shall have to accept his statement. I shall probably be able to inform him of its terms next week.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I was not discussing the proposed measure. I was discussing what I supposed were the crude and ill-considered proposals made by the

right hon. gentleman at a banquet in the city of Montreal.

#### DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

**Mr. INGRAM.** Would the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) answer the question I asked him yesterday as to my Bill to amend the Dominion Elections Act?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry to say that I cannot give the hon. gentleman an answer to-day, and I do not think I will be able to do so before next Monday.

#### SUPPLY—SALE OF LIQUOR IN MILITARY CANTEENS.

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

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE** (Mr. Borden). Before the House is moved into Committee of Supply, I desire to bring up a matter which I find referred to in the Ottawa "Citizen" of this morning. In the proceedings of the Ontario Alliance which has been meeting recently in Toronto I find in the report, the following reference made to my department and myself:—

At the evening session resolutions were passed against military canteens.

And later on :

In the course of a lengthy discussion upon the military canteen, Major Campbell, of Orillia, took the Minister of Militia, Dr. Borden, very thoroughly to task, concluding that it was time the Minister was retired. He told how the Minister had given permission to the various camps for the violation of the order prohibiting the sale of liquor in canteens, and when the results were called to his attention, by a "miserable subterfuge," he had tried to make it appear that he was unaware of the violation, and promised stringent enforcement. This promise, Major Campbell urged, he had not kept.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is only fair to myself and to the officers of my department, that I should make a very brief statement of the facts. When I assumed office, I found a regulation in existence which had been passed in December, 1893, forbidding the sale of intoxicating liquors in military canteens at camps of instruction. The language of that regulation is as follows:—

48. Nothing in the Queen's Regulations and Orders for the Army, so far as they relate to the establishment of canteens, is to be understood as permitting the sale within the limits of camp-grounds during the annual training of the militia of Canada, of spirituous (to include wine) or malt liquors of any kind; their sale within such limits being strictly prohibited.

49. Officers commanding camps of instruction will be held responsible that the above order is carried out, and they, together with officers commanding units of active militia, will in those dis-

tricts where the law so directs be liable to prosecution in respect of any liquor sold in tents or other premises subject to their control, in addition to such penalty as may be inflicted for a breach of military discipline.

My attention has been called to the fact that this regulation was not being enforced. Knowing that in my own province that regulation had been strictly enforced, I was surprised, but I thought it proper, so long ago as the 18th of October last, to call the attention of the General Officer Commanding to this alleged inequality of the enforcement of the order as between the camps in Ontario and Quebec and the camps in Nova Scotia. This memorandum was sent to the General Officer Commanding, through the Deputy Minister of the department :

Ottawa, 18th October, 1898.

Memo. for the Deputy Minister.

Representation having been made to the Minister from different sources, that General Order 78, of 1st December, 1893, prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in camps of instruction, is not being enforced, the Minister requests that the attention of the General Officer Commanding be called to the matter, and that steps be taken to have the order strictly enforced hereafter.

(Sgd.) E. F. JARVIS,  
for Private Secretary.

Referred to the General Officer Commanding for necessary action.

(Sgd.) C. EUG. PANET, Col.,  
D. M. M. & D.

When the camps were being organized in the present year I again thought it my duty to call attention of the General specially to this matter, and on the 25th of April last I wrote the following letter to him :

Ottawa, 25th April, 1899.

My dear General,—My attention has been called by clergymen of several denominations, and recently by the Rev. G. E. Lloyd, editor of the "Evangelical Churchman," of Toronto, to the question of canteens in our camps of instruction. Some years ago an order was promulgated, forbidding the sale of liquor in canteens. In my own province this order has been carefully observed, but I am informed that in the other provinces it has not. In view of the strong temperance feeling in this country and the agitation which is being constantly carried on, and also in the interests of the soldiers themselves and of the department, I hope you will endeavour to have this order strictly enforced at the approaching camps.

Yours very truly,  
(Sgd.) F. W. BORDEN.

Major General Hutton, Ottawa.

In reply to that letter, I received the following from the General :—

Ottawa, 26th April, 1899.

My dear Dr. Borden,—You may rest assured that whatever regulations exist shall be strictly enforced in our camps.

The regulations as regards the sale of intoxicating drinks within the limits of our camps are explicitly and clearly laid down in our regu-

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

lations and orders recently passed by an Order in Council.

I have no wish to recommend at present any change to existing regulations which have been approved as regards the sale of liquor in camps.

Yours very sincerely,  
(Sgd.) EDW. T. H. HUTTON,  
M. G.

Surgeon Lt.-Col.  
The Hon. F. W. Borden,  
Minister of Militia and Defence,  
Ottawa.

After the London camp had been concluded, I received a letter from a representative of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of London. It is quite a long letter, and I shall not trouble the House by reading it. This letter alleged that drunkenness had existed in the camp to a greater extent than ever before in any camp in Canada, but the writer carefully abstained from giving the name of any person or the name of any authority ; simply saying that this was current rumour. I at once forwarded that letter to the General, and received from the General the following reply :—

Laprairie Camp, June 23rd, 1899.

Dear Dr. Borden,—In reply to your note of the 21st, forwarding a letter from Mrs. May R. Thornley, dated the 19th, I can only say as follows :—

I should be much indebted to the lady in question if she would give me directly or indirectly, through you, any corroboration of her statement that liquor was sold in the camp at London, or that any canteen existed in the camp for the sale of liquor.

I was personally in command of the 1st Division encamped at London, as you are aware, and, as is my habit, I was frequently in the lines. If any irregularity such as that described by Mrs. Thornley had existed it would have been brought to my notice. Mrs. Thornley is entirely in error in her statement that there was irregular drinking and dissipation in the camp. I authoritatively contradict the statement, and during the whole period of my command there I never saw a drunken man, nor have I ever seen a camp of young men and inexperienced soldiers conducted with better regularity and with better discipline under the circumstances.

If any irregularity took place on the first night of arrival, it was due to the fact that men either brought liquor with them or obtained it in the town.

The only canteens which existed in the camp were canteens at which the sale of liquor was excluded, and the regulations and orders upon that subject, as well as my own directions, were, so far as I know, and am informed by my brigadiers, carried out.

I shall be glad if you will convey the foregoing to Mrs. Thornley in any form which you may deem best.

Mr. WALLACE. Who wrote that letter ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. General Hutton.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I thought the hon. gentleman said that it was from the

gentleman in command of the 1st Division ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. General Hutton was himself in command of the 1st Division, and therefore the letter is all the stronger.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I may say that on receipt of this letter I forwarded a copy of it to the lady who had made the complaint and asked her either to withdraw the charges or to state what evidence she had. I have as yet received no reply whatever to my letter.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the date of the last letter ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The last letter is dated the 23rd June, immediately after the camps. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out one thing with reference to this. There seems to be a popular misunderstanding as to the meaning of the word "canteen," and a great many letters which I have received in reference to this matter were apparently due to that fact. A military canteen is a shop where everything is sold which a soldier may require, and in England it includes the sale of beer, and perhaps stronger liquors. In Canada the canteen has been continued, and it must be continued, because soldiers must have the opportunity of buying such things as they may require; but the sale of intoxicating liquors has been prohibited in our canteens. There are still canteens, but under the regulation no liquors of any kind can be sold. I think there has been a misunderstanding through not knowing the significance of the word canteen, as applied to military matters; and from the fact that there are so-called canteens or shops where articles are sold, not including intoxicating liquors, the impression has gone abroad to the public that the sale of intoxicating liquors is still permitted. One word more with reference to the charge made at this meeting of the Ontario Alliance by Major Campbell. I can only say that if the words which I have read are a correct report of what that gentleman said, it would be impossible for any man to condense into so short a space a greater number of inaccuracies or a more unjust attack or aspersion upon myself and the gentlemen who are administering the Militia Department.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few observations; but before I do so, I would like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Militia if he knows what Major Campbell means by the statement that by a miserable subterfuge the regulations prohibiting the use of liquor in the canteens have been evaded.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have not the slightest idea.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very glad indeed that the hon. Minister of Militia has felt it due to himself to deal with this subject promptly. Nothing more disastrous to the whole militia organization could go abroad throughout Canada than the impression that, notwithstanding the stringent regulations which the Government have continued, prohibiting the sale of liquor in canteens, the effect of these regulations could by any means be evaded. Nothing could place the public mind in a more unfavourable position towards that important organization than the impression that the bringing together of great numbers of young men in military camps was to result in dissipation and in the use of intoxicating liquors. It is impossible for the Government to attach too much importance to the matter, or to take too rigid means for absolutely preventing these numerous gatherings of young men in camp being abused by any means whatever, by individual members of the force being permitted to bring into the camp surreptitiously even moderately small quantities of liquor, and thus evading the regulations. I am very glad that the hon. Minister of Militia has felt it his duty promptly to lay before the House, as he has done, the evidence of the determination of the Government and of himself, as Minister of Militia, to do everything in their power to prevent anything like intemperance at these important gatherings of the young men of the country.

Mr. HUGHES. As this matter has been brought up, and the statement made has been so sweeping as to include all the camps, I wish to say, with regard to the second Niagara camp, which I had the privilege of attending, that I heartily bear out the statement made by the hon. Minister of Militia. The ordinary regulations were in force; there were canteens for the sale of pipe-clay and various other commodities which soldiers require; but I have no knowledge of the sale, directly or indirectly, of intoxicating liquors on the ground, and there was very little intoxication in the camp. I do not think you could get a large organization of men together with less intoxication than there was at that camp.

Mr. PETTET. From my experience as paymaster of the 2nd Battalion during camp, I can say that I never saw an officer or a private under the influence of liquor. If there was any liquor on the ground, it was not abused.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a matter which

I think of sufficient importance to justify me in trespassing for a few moments upon the attention of the House, and making a remark or two in respect of it. The Montreal "Star" of last evening contained an editorial article having reference to a subject of debate yesterday, that is, the purchase of the Long Wharf property; and this morning the Ottawa "Citizen" contained an editorial article of a like character. These two statements are identical in many particulars. They are identical in the important and essential particular to which I will refer; and the fact that these statements have so appeared in these two different newspapers simultaneously, and in their editorial columns, justified me in suspecting that they are the outcome of either an organized bureau of misrepresentation or of a conspiracy to misstate and misrepresent to the public the facts which were stated to Parliament yesterday. The editorial of the Montreal "Star" contains this statement, which I will read:

Another instance of the benevolence of the Government alluded to last night was the purchase of the Long Wharf property at St. John. The owners only wanted \$100,000 for it, but the Government was not to be outdone in generosity, and as a valuation (what a beautiful thing is a valuation) showed the property to be worth \$118,000, the Government stumped up the other \$18,000.

The Ottawa "Citizen" of this morning contains this statement:

That was an interesting fact brought out by Dr. Montague, M.P., in connection with the purchase by the Government of the Long Wharf property at Halifax. The owners of the wharf offered it to the Government for \$100,000, but the Government insisted on paying them \$118,000 because the valuers placed it at that figure!

I need not say to any member of this House who was present during that debate, that a more perverse, unauthorized and unwarranted misrepresentation of the facts could not possibly be made. No person who sits in the Gallery—and I presume this must have emanated from the Press Gallery—could labour honestly under any misapprehension with regard to those facts. The fact is, that \$100,000 was the amount the Government paid, and the only amount the Government agreed to pay; and no member of the Government held out any hope or expectation to the owners of the property that any more than \$100,000 would be paid. I say it does afford a justification for the inference that there is a determination on the part of the newspaper press published in the interest of hon. gentlemen opposite, to distort and misrepresent the actions and the conduct of the Government, feeling, I believe, well assured that if the facts in respect of these matters are known, the impression created by them must be favourable, and it is necessary, therefore, to mislead the public by distorting and misrepresenting the facts.

Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman is rather insinuating in his language—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not as to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MONTAGUE—that some one had asked the papers to make such a statement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, no; I did not do that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. So far as any hon. gentleman on this side is concerned, the hon. Minister's attack is quite gratuitous. The transaction was bad enough in its true light and need not be misrepresented, as no doubt the papers have misrepresented it. It is bad enough without giving the other \$18,000, but we are not sure that the hon. gentleman may not still pay the \$18,000. So far as I am concerned, I neither saw the item nor knew anything of it.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman had better await the investigation with which he threatened us before making further comment. He said yesterday he would have the matter investigated. We are quite prepared for an investigation. He has no reason to say now that the Government has not acted properly in the matter.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The item is still under discussion, and we have a perfect right to discuss it.

The PRIME MINISTER. The more it is discussed the better.

#### CANADIAN TROOPS FOR THE TRANSVAAL.

Mr. HUGHES. I beg to draw attention to a paragraph in this morning's "Citizen," stating that the colony of Queensland has offered to the mother country 250 men in case of trouble in the Transvaal.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken on the motion to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. HUGHES. I thought that I had spoken on the Orders of the Day being called.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the House does not object, and the hon. gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HUGHES. The colony of Queensland has offered 250 men for service in the Transvaal if required. I take this opportunity of again pressing upon the Canadian Government the necessity of our taking some action in the premises, also to fulfil our part as the senior colony of all the British colonies. I know it for a positive fact that there would be no trouble in enrolling, not merely 250 men, but, if necessary, thousands of men in Canada to go to the assistance of the motherland in a war with the Transvaal, where more than in any other part of the world, the

necessity arises to vindicate the honour of the old flag. I am satisfied that a brigade of 5,000 men could be enrolled at a very short notice, and I know hundreds of officers who would be only too glad to take part in leading such an expedition. In the House of Commons there are a number of gentlemen who would be only too pleased to give their services to the mother country. I have before offered to raise a corps and have no hesitation in offering to raise a corps again for service on any such expedition.

The PRIME MINISTER. I sincerely hope that no opportunity will arise for Queensland or any other part of the British Empire to send troops to the mother country to meet difficulties in South Africa. We are all of the opinion, I believe, in this House, that the troubles which are brewing there will be appeased before the sword is unsheathed. We all sympathize with that portion of our fellow-countrymen in Africa, and it is not too much to hope and believe that the Transvaal will recognize that since that country is under the suzerainty of Her Majesty they must see that the same measure of justice is given to all classes. And if these principles prevail, as I hope they will, we can further entertain the wish and thought and hope that there will no occasion for the troops offered by Queensland to leave that country and for Canada to follow her example.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I quite agree with my right hon. friend that every person in Canada most sincerely desires that no possible necessity will require that Queensland or any other portion of Her Majesty's dominions should come to the aid of her Government in connection with the difficulty now threatened in South Africa, but I would say to my right hon. friend that if those difficulties are avoided, that avoidance will be largely due, we have every reason to believe, to the outspoken support that the press of Great Britain has given to Her Majesty's Government in exhibiting a determination firmly to maintain the rights of British supremacy in South Africa, and that nothing will contribute more to a complete avoidance of anything like war between the Boers and Great Britain than the knowledge on their part that not only the great heart of the Empire, the British Islands, are united in a determination to maintain British authority and not to lose one jot or tittle of the rights Great Britain possesses as a suzerain power in regard to that country, than the impression that the action of Queensland will have created that England would not have to depend upon the British Islands alone but that the outlying portions of the Empire would be ready, in case of necessity, to strengthen the arms of the mother country.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Post Office Department ..... \$203,055

Mr. MONTAGUE. Might I ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if he can give us the explanation with regard to tenders put in for the work at St. John?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I am getting the information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). My colleague has occasion to be absent, and we will take up the Post Office estimates until he returns.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the reason for the increase of \$5,000?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Macklock). The various increases are set forth on page 18, and are made up as follows:— There are four increases of \$50 each in the chief clerks and eight increases of \$50 each in the first-class clerks. Mr. Bennett has been transferred to the inspector's office and the inside service at \$1,600. In the second class there are five increases and a vacancy has to be filled. That makes an increase of \$1,250. In the third class there are forty increases, and there are several transfers from the outside to the inside service. Six packers were recommended for increases, making \$320. Mr. Birch was transferred from the Ottawa post office at \$510, and Mr. Jeffrey the same, \$480. From that is to be deducted one clerk, Mr. Watson, died, and one, Mr. Taylor, was transferred to the Ottawa post office, making a deduction of \$840. This makes a net increase of \$320. These items together makes up the \$5,180 of a change.

Mr. DAVIN. Are these all statutory increases?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have not recognized the statutory increases in the sense of increases that move automatically by virtue of the statute. But they are increases within the range of those contemplated by the Civil Service Act. They are all lawful within the provisions of the Act.

Mr. DAVIN. What is the average salary for letter carriers in Canada?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) will find it all in a schedule of the Civil Service Act, page 197. The maximum salary is \$600.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that there is a branch of the department that has grown very much within the last few years, the stationery or distribution office. Would the hon. gentleman give some information in regard to this? How many

officers are there and what are their salaries ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Would it suit the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) to wait until we come to item 39, to which this properly belongs ?

Mr. BERGERON. That will do. I hope my hon. friend will be able to give us some information when we come to the item.

Mr. HUGHES. I presume that this is a proper item under which to bring up the question that I mentioned to the Minister last year. He will remember my speaking about mail clerks who are in temporary employ, but whom the department may wish to make permanent. As I understand it, a temporary clerk may have been on the staff five or even ten years, and become a very efficient officer, yet, under the law, if he becomes a permanent officer, he must spend six months in apprenticeship at a salary of \$300 a year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the law is as stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes). He probably has in mind the case of a mail clerk in his own county ?

Mr. HUGHES. Yes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are only so many permanencies provided for by the statute. When one of these positions become vacant, it is for the Government to fill it either by promotion from among the temporaries or by appointment from some other available source. One thus appointed to a permanency is called a probationer. The Act does not recognize the status of a temporary mail clerk, so, when one is appointed to a permanency, he can only come in as a probationer.

Mr. PRIOR. There are one or two points I want to call attention to with regard to temporary clerks generally, not temporary mail clerks alone. Permanent clerks are allowed holidays, but the temporary clerks are not. In fact, when these permanent clerks are absent, these temporary clerks have to do their work without any extra pay. Some of these temporary employees are men who have been for years and years in the service, because there is no place for them to be appointed to as permanent officers. If the temporary clerk is sick, even though he brings a doctor's certificate to show that he has not been shamming, the Government does not pay him for the time he has been off. This may be all in accordance with the Civil Service Act, in fact, I believe it is ; but it appears to me that, if that is so, the Act should be amended. The hon. Minister knows that my colleague (Mr. Earle) and I have spoken to him of these matters in his office. He was good enough to give us as much information as he could about them.

Mr. BERGERON.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That matter would be more properly discussed under the item of the outside service. Of course, I do not object to discussing it now, but if it is desired to keep the discussion in order, it should come up on another item.

Mr. PRIOR. In that case, I shall bring it up later on.

Mr. INGRAM. I suppose that this is hardly the item on which to discuss mail contracts ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not wish to prevent anybody discussing anything, but, if it is desired to keep the discussion in order, I may point out that this item has to do with the staff here at Ottawa. Mail contracts will properly come up under item 269 probably.

Mr. INGRAM. In the meantime, I would like the hon. gentleman to refresh his memory with regard to certain contracts between Aymer and St. Thomas.

Mr. PRIOR. On looking at this vote, 21, it seems to me that it relates to what I want to discuss, as it covers the whole service.

Mr. BERGERON. No, this is only for civil government.

Mr. PRIOR. If there is no objection I would sooner finish what I have to say ; it is only a few words. Now, in regard to the letter carriers. Those men are given to understand when they join, whether in writing or not, I do not know, that they will have a statutory increase. But such has not been the case since the present Government came into power. They used to get that increase up to 1896, then, I am informed, it was stopped for 1896 and 1897. Now, does not the Postmaster General think that it would be an honourable and a fair thing for the Government to pay those men the statutory increase that has been stopped from them ? I hear they have begun to pay it again, so there can be no good reason why it should have been stopped. Some of those men got into debt, expecting they would get the larger salary, and they ran up expenses that they have not been able to overtake so far. That is the case in Victoria, B.C., and I think the Government should pay those men the statutory increases that were docked from them in those years. The same remark applies to the letter carriers and the temporary letter carriers, that apply to the temporary clerks. When they happen to fall sick their pay is stopped ; also they are not allowed any holidays, so far as I understand. Then again the staff is not sufficient to afford an extra man to take the place of any that are sick, or off from any other cause. Therefore, the men have to do extra work in such a case without getting extra pay. I hope the hon. gentleman will look into the matter and set

it right. I know he will do what he considers fair, and I hope he will accept my suggestions as fair.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). With reference to the first point raised by my hon. friend, the temporary clerks generally, either in the inside or outside service, are not allowed pay when absent. That is the law, I understand. It is not a new thing, it is the law as we find it, and there has been no change in it. It is competent for Parliament to change the law if it sees proper, and it is competent for my hon. friend to move Parliament in that direction. At present I can only administer the law as I find it. With reference to the increase of the salaries of letter carriers, I think myself that every man whose maximum possible salary does not exceed \$600, might fairly be assumed to be entitled to an increase unless there is cause to the contrary. In regard to that class of officials in the department, I have proceeded upon that principle, and have recommended for an increase every person who is not at the maximum of a salary of \$600, thereby shifting the onus, as it were, on the officer to show cause why he should receive the increase. As to the past, there is no vote in the Estimates to pay any arrears. There is nothing in the law, as we are advised, entitling the staff to the increase, therefore, it is sufficient at present to deal with what is recommended. As to the suggestion that the staff in any place is insufficient, I hardly think a case of that kind can be made out. I think the general complaint on the part of the taxpayers is in an opposite direction. It may occasionally happen that a staff temporarily runs down from some unexpected cause, but that is not a permanent condition of affairs, I think, in the Post Office of Canada.

Mr. **PRIOR**. The hon. gentleman said that it was quite competent for me to bring in an amendment to the Act in regard to the pay. I think anything that has to do with an increase of salary must emanate from the Government; a private member has no power to do that.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. He cannot propose an Act, but the hon. gentleman could easily invoke Parliament to give an expression of opinion, and on that opinion the Government would have to act.

Mr. **INGRAM**. This question of temporary clerks comes up every session. While I believe the hon. gentleman desires to do what is fair in respect to temporary clerks, it seems to me that some of the objections now urged by the hon. gentleman to giving them better treatment can not be overlooked. Take, for instance, a man appointed four or five years ago, and who still remains a temporary clerk. It is unfair to that man, who is still performing his duty

every day the same as a regular clerk, that if he is obliged to lose a day his pay should be docked. That is the objection I have to dealing with temporary clerks in the way in which they are dealt with. I know of instances where temporary clerks have become permanent appointees, while others that were appointed before them still remain temporary clerks. That, I think, is unfair, and I hope the hon. gentleman will look into it and remedy that injustice.

Mr. **N. CLARKE WALLACE** (West York). I think the matter referred to by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) is well worthy the consideration of the Government. A temporary clerk is at a great disadvantage. He may be performing his duties, and we will assume that he does equally as well as the permanent clerk. But he has less pay, he has no superannuation allowance to look forward to, he has not that permanency that is assured to a permanent officer. Then he is at a continual disadvantage in regard to the treatment the Government accords him. A temporary clerk gets no holidays, as has been pointed out, and he very seldom gets promotion. If illness overtakes him his pay stops, while in the case of the permanent officer he gets leave of absence and his pay goes on. Now, why should there be such a disparity in the treatment of these two classes of officers? The permanent officer has a superannuation, the Government takes a paternal interest in him, and after he leaves the service he is still paid for the services he had rendered. I think the Government could fairly reconsider the case of those temporary clerks. Now, with reference to the other point raised by the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior) as to the letter carriers. The Minister has replied that it is not the rule in Canada that the civil service are overworked.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I did not refer to the question of work at all. My hon. friend from Victoria was complaining that some of the staff could not get holidays, owing to the staff being too limited. I said it might occasionally happen that the staff in any locality might run down, but that was not a normal condition of affairs in the service.

Mr. **WALLACE**. That is in substance what I said, and I am not going to quarrel with the Postmaster General over that. I agree with his statement in a general way. Of course, we know there are exceptional cases, but as a rule, I think, the Postmaster General is quite right. But while that may be so, I think we should take care that no class of officers should undergo a hardship. Take the case of letter carriers in cities. I think an official of the Government is a much better man, serves the Government much better, and satisfies his own conscience by doing a good day's work, and I am

not going to complain when the hon. Postmaster General, or any other hon. Minister, imposes a good, solid day's work on any official. I think it is quite right that he should do so, and I think it makes a better man of the official to be given a good day's work. The consciousness of having performed his duty well gives an incentive to the officer to continue in the performance of his duty, and it is a justification for the Minister to give him promotion and an increase of his salary, when it is required. The letter carriers commence at \$30 per month in cities. For men performing responsible duties, entailing a good deal of physical work and a good deal of intelligence, if these duties are properly performed, I think \$30 a month is a low remuneration. They are told: It is very low, but you have to acquire a knowledge of the service, to go through your training, after which the Government will give you an increase of \$30 per year. You have to pass your examination and to demonstrate your fitness by experience to do the work. It is three years ago yesterday since the hon. Postmaster General assumed office. Am I right in making the statement that the letter carriers have received none of their statutory increases?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). I do not think that any year has passed without any of them having received increases.

Mr. DAVIN. Do they receive them as a right, if they do their work properly?

Mr. WALLACE. That is quite an indefinite answer.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not want to give an indefinite answer.

Mr. WALLACE. I assume so. What I want to know is, how many letter carriers there are in Toronto. There must be between one hundred and two hundred.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. About one hundred in active service.

Mr. WALLACE. How many of these in Toronto have received the statutory increase each year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We will have to get the Estimates of last year to deal with that.

Mr. WALLACE. I am told that not 5 or 10 per cent got the statutory increase.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think that last year every letter carrier whose salary was under \$540, received an increase of \$30. That is what I recollect.

Mr. WALLACE. That is, in three years.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think in the first year they got it. I think that

Mr. WALLACE.

in the Estimates we passed in August, or September, 1896, there was provision for the increases on the old principle. I think these increases were all awarded. We adopted the Estimates that we found prepared for us.

Mr. WALLACE. There were no Estimates, as I understand it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Oh, yes; they were laid on the Table of the House in the spring of 1896, and partly proceeded with, and they contained all the increases that the Government considered these officers were entitled to. I think we carried out that vote.

Mr. WALLACE. I am trusting to my memory, to my recollection, and the Minister's recollection does not seem to be much stronger than my own. He says his impression is so and so; but the hon. Minister ought to give us something more reliable than impressions. I know that the letter carriers have addressed a petition to the hon. Postmaster General, asking that they receive their statutory increases, which have been kept back from them. I think that in the case of the letter carriers the complaint is a stronger one than complaints coming from almost any department under the Government that I could name. They start with small salaries, they have arduous duties to perform, and they are given a good day's work. The hon. Minister says that they should do a good day's work, and I quite agree with him. I believe that every officer in the Government service should be given a good day's work, and that there should be a removal of those unnecessary officers from any department, if there are such. These men perform laborious duties; they do intelligent work, and I believe they do it well. Although I am not brought in contact very much with them, I hear that they perform their duties satisfactorily and courteously. Though commencing with low salaries, the Government have retained their statutory allowances for some time, and I would ask the hon. Minister to make a statement to the House as to what statutory allowances that might have been granted, have not been granted by the Government.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not carrying in my memory a financial statement.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not ask it from the hon. gentleman's memory. I supposed he would have a record of it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have it neither in my memory nor on record here. I have a record for these estimates, but I cannot tell what increases have been given A, B and C each year that has gone by. This is a matter for each year's considera-

tion. There may be some possibly who have not received increases in days gone by.

Mr. DAVIN. How many letter carriers are there in Montreal and Toronto who are working for less than \$35 a month?

Mr. WALLACE. While the hon. Minister is getting that information, I may call his attention to a petition of the letter carriers addressed to the Postmaster General, which, I am afraid, contradicts the statement, or the impression, that the hon. gentleman made. They say in this petition that

On joining the civil service we were informed that statutory increases would be made in our salaries each year.

That is a correct statement of the case, no doubt. The invariable practice was, and the law provided, that statutory increases of \$30 should be given each year. The practice conformed with the law. You may say that the law is permissive, that it did not make it obligatory, but custom and practice and law made it universal, and these officials might fairly expect that it would be continued. The next statement they make is, that

The statutory increase was regularly granted until 1896, when the same was stopped without notice.

That statement of the letter carriers does not agree with the statement of the hon. Postmaster General to the committee a few moments ago. It was stopped in 1896. The hon. Postmaster General tells us that they continued the increases in 1896, just as they had been made formerly. This statement was made to the hon. Postmaster General himself by the parties interested, and we must assume that it is exactly correct. There is no disputing that. When the Postmaster General told the House that in 1896 he continued the condition of affairs previously existing, he was in error. He said it was his impression, but I told him we wanted the actual facts of the case, and not impressions. The letter carriers, in support of their application, say in this statement:

A majority of us are married and have families to support,—

Well, that is our own case.

—and the discontinuance of the annual increase, which we were led to expect when joining the service, has caused great hardship amongst us.

That is quite true. While in the country, men do live at less cost than in the city, the letter carrier is essentially a resident of the large cities, and the loss of the \$30 a year annual increase to a man with a salary of \$30 a month in a city must be severely felt. I believe myself that the salaries paid to letter carriers was at the very lowest notch before this increase was stopped by the Min-

ister, and when we are told that the revenues of the Government are increasing, and that the country is prosperous, there is no excuse for this Government economizing in this petty way. The Government apparently has millions to spend in various directions, and it was ill-advised economy to curtail the statutory increases of these letter carriers, who deserved better treatment from the Government. The next statement in their petition is:

That the cost of living in cities is very great, and even had we received the expected increase it would be necessary for us to have exercised the strictest economy. That men who are thus insufficiently paid are compelled, against their will, to contract debts which place the civil servants in an unfavourable position with the business community. That the carriers entitled to their annual increase be placed on the same footing as they would have been had the same not been discontinued, and that back-pay be paid to them from the time it was stopped, so as to enable them to liquidate the debts that had to be incurred.

While I think that every one should live within his income if he has health, and unless he meets with some of those misfortunes which come to high and low alike, yet it must be said that when men receive these low salaries and are compelled to live right up to their salary, then when the increase they expected is suddenly stopped, they are put at a great loss, and so these letter carriers can fairly make the request that their back pay be given to them. The only justification for the refusal of an increase of salary is one of two things: Either the officer is sufficiently well paid already, and that occurs very often in the civil service, or, that the times are not prosperous and every citizen having to curtail his expenditure and economize, the civil servants will be asked to practice the same economy. Now, these two reasons do not apply in the case of the letter carriers. It is universally admitted that the letter carriers of Canada are not overpaid, and it is equally true that in these prosperous times they should not be asked to economize when no other class in the community is so asked. There has undoubtedly been an era of prosperity during these three years. The general revenues of the Government have been increasing, and the Post Office revenues have been so abundant that the Postmaster General has felt justified in reducing the postage from 3 cents to 2 cents. If the general public of Canada thought that this reduction was obtained at the cost of depriving letter carriers of their legitimate salaries, I do not think they would willingly accept the boon under such conditions. The request of the petition that back pay should be granted from the time it was stopped, is one that the Postmaster General should grant. He made a mistake when he stopped the annual increase to these deserving officers, and if any economy had to be practised by the Government, in my opinion these were the last men in the Government

service who ought to have been touched. If a man was getting \$360 a year and he came to the service three years ago, he would have been entitled under the old rule to \$390 in 1897; to \$420 in 1898, to \$450 in 1899. But under the ruling of the Postmaster General he has lost \$30 the first year, \$60 the second year, and \$90 the third year. Even if the Postmaster General gives the \$30 increase this year, the letter carriers will in future lose \$90 per year to which they are fairly entitled under the contract they made with the Government.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. I say that the Postmaster General has deprived each of the letter carriers of \$90 a year to which he is fairly entitled under the law. Surely with the Postmaster General himself sitting in luxury getting his \$7,000 a year, and his ordinary expenses in addition, surely he is not going to say that nineteen letter carriers at \$360 a year for their services are only worth as much as the Postmaster General alone. These letter carriers are intelligent men. They are good citizens. They have passed the qualifying examination. They discharge their duties well, and yet their salaries are curtailed, and the conditions under which they entered the service are ignored by the Postmaster General. This is doing them a great injustice. I do not know whether this statement will move the heart of the Postmaster General or not, but I know that it is only a modest and moderate presentation of the actual facts of the case. Hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to make a great showing of economy in the Post Office Department, but as a matter of fact they have administered that department extravagantly. They have ignored the legitimate and proper wants of the public service in that department without increasing the expenses; but in this case, in trying to economize they have done an injustice to a deserving class of officials. The Postmaster General himself recognizes that fact by giving the statutory increase for the year ending the 30th June next. Is that what I understand the Minister to do?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Estimates provide for increases for all the staff in my department whose salaries are under \$600.

Mr. WALLACE. Statutory increases?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. An increase; you can call it what you like.

Mr. WALLACE. We will not dispute that point. By that very fact the hon. Minister acknowledges that he has been doing wrong in the past. On what principle of fair-play or justice can the Minister this year give an increase, which he may say is not statutory or obligatory in any sense, but permissive, and not give it in other

Mr. WALLACE.

years? By that fact he acknowledges that he has done wrong to these men in the past. If they had got the increase last year they would have \$60 this year, and they would have that for all time. You drop \$90 from their salaries for the three years, so that it is not \$90 for one year only, but \$90 for every year you are defrauding these men, who have responsible duties, such as the handling of large sums of money in registered letters. Though cases have occurred in which men have gone astray, as men go astray in every walk of life, the letter carriers, as a class, have performed their duties faithfully, honestly and with courtesy and attention to the public wants. This loss of \$90 to one of these men amounts to a loss of one-fourth of his salary. How would the Postmaster General and the other Ministers like to have one-fourth of their salaries cut off? They would not accept the conditions with good grace. I would like to see their salaries brought down to some extent, except in the case of the Premier of the country, whose salary, for many reasons, I would say should be kept up at a good figure. The other Ministers could very well have their salaries cut 25 per cent, as they have cut those of the letter carriers, and then they could come before the country with better grace than they can now, to cut down the salaries of such a very deserving class as the letter carriers.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Am I correct in understanding that the letter carriers all over Canada receive the increase this year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Estimates provide for an increase to any letter carrier whose salary is under \$600.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). To how many letter carriers in Halifax would that apply? The total increases last year appear to have been \$210, which would give an increase to only seven.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think that will probably be all on the staff who are not at the maximum.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The salaries of twenty-one letter carriers this year amount to \$12,050. I entirely concur in what has been said by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) with regard to these men. I know that in the city of Halifax they are a very hardworking and deserving class of men, and they have felt very much the loss of the increase which they had been led to expect, and were certainly entitled to receive, on a fair understanding of the contract under which they entered the service. They were men who gave up other occupations, and who, if they gave up their present positions could not very well get a means of livelihood. It may be that they have no legal right to exact the increase from the Government; but on every

principle of fair-play, it seems to me they were entitled to receive it. I am very glad the hon. gentleman sees his way clear to giving them the increase this year, and I only regret very much on their behalf that they have not received it during the past two or three years. I would be very glad if the hon. gentleman would, before the Estimates pass, give me more definite information on the matter which I do not now understand.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** If the hon. gentleman refers to page 84 of the Estimates, he will find that there are 21 letter carriers at Halifax, including one temporary employee, showing an increase of \$210. That provides for an increase of seven, one being temporary. If he will turn to the civil service list, he will find that there are six letter carriers at Halifax at less than \$600, and the others over \$600.

**Mr. DAVIN.** Look at Winnipeg, there is a decrease there of \$60. I entirely sympathize with the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) in the position he takes, that if we are to reduce salaries, we should reduce the larger salaries and not the small ones, for in the one case you would only cut off luxuries, whereas in the other you cut off the necessities of life. There was a spirit manifested in this Chamber yesterday, which obtained expression in the speech of the hon. member for Gaspé, who declared that since we have a surplus we ought to appoint three more judges at \$5,000 a year. Of course I cannot discuss that question now, but I may say that I have no sympathy in the argument to add unnecessarily to a plethoric expenditure on a bloated judiciary, but I would have sympathized in an argument to raise the salaries of poor men. I know of no more deserving class than the letter carriers, and I am not now speaking in the interests of my constituents, because in my constituency we have none, but in the interests of justice to men, who, in all sorts of weather, have to perform their very severe task. I may say that it is not with respect to these men alone that the Postmaster General has shown himself a hard taskmaster. He has put a griping hand upon the poor employees in the Post Office Department everywhere throughout the Dominion, but I do not see that he has touched the men with large salaries. I have been told by postmasters in Ontario and the lower provinces, in fact everywhere, whose salaries are being cramped to such an extent, by pairings off here and there, that their positions are hardly worth keeping. There is no economy more ill-advised than that which works injustice to deserving labour. I would like very much, since the Postmaster General has taken it into his head to give these letter carriers the increase they are this year entitled to, that the same just sentiment would govern him

with regard to other ill-paid officials in the department. I do not know what his motives are, I cannot penetrate the secrets of his bosom, I cannot tell why this year he feels he must give the increase that these men were entitled to last year as well as this, but it is much better that right should be done in any case even though the motive at best be somewhat obscure. If the protests of the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in past sessions be the reason for his change of heart and for his doing this tardy justice—for all that he is doing now is what he should have done in previous years—he is to be commended for his repentance, even though that will not alleviate the sufferings caused by the self-denial which he imposed on deserving men throughout the cities of Canada by his determination to earn a spurious reputation for economy at their expense. But I do not think that these men will feel that because my hon. friend has been constrained to take the course he is taking now, it is to him their gratitude must be directed. The only position in which he can stand before them now is not that of a benefactor but of an absolved departmental penitent.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** In reply to the first question, as to whether there has been a decrease in the salaries of the letter carriers of Winnipeg, I find that there is an increase in the salaries of eleven at \$30 each.

**Mr. DAVIN.** Look at the Estimates, page 85.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** One letter carrier having a salary of \$390, has resigned. Deduct \$330 from \$390 and you will get \$60. With reference to the salaries of postmasters, I would say to my hon. friend that I have never yet had anything whatever to do with the reduction of salary of any postmaster in Canada. They are remunerated according to fixed rule. I have not interfered with or reduced the salaries of these officers. The other classes of postmasters are remunerated on a different basis—with reference to the revenues of their post office. The existing scale of remuneration I think has obtained in Canada ever since there was a post office, even prior to confederation. I have not interfered to reduce any postmaster's salary, so my hon. friend is in error in attributing the amount of their salaries, whatever it may be, to any decision or order of mine. Before concluding I may say that I am in error in one thing. I recall now that in one case I did reduce the salary of a postmaster who was receiving \$2,000 a year. That was a special case. There may have been other isolated cases, so I qualify what I have said in that way.

**Mr. ROGERS.** A great deal has been said in this House about the principle of statu-

tory increases. I have never been able to see any good reason for those statutory increases. It seems to me to go without saying that the Government should do their business on the same principle as any other institution, mercantile, manufacturing or agricultural. In all these lines employees are dealt with according to merit; the worthy ones find their pay increased and their positions improved. I find that at the time of election, all those who address the public at meetings or otherwise are very much in favour of this idea, that the Government should run its business on business lines. Especially is this the case when gentlemen are addressing agricultural audiences. when they tell the people that the Government should run its business on the same lines of care and economy as a farmer runs his farm. Since I entered this House my observation teaches me that the Government business is not run always upon these lines. It is true that the salaries of letter carriers are small as compared with others. But it is also true that there is no compulsion upon any man to take such a position, or to keep it if he finds it does not pay him. We all know that when such a position is vacant there is great pressure brought to bear by many applicants to secure it. If the Government's business was run on the same principle of supply and demand as other lines of business are, surely there would be no need for the shedding of so many tears over the hiring of letter carriers at salaries of from \$300 to \$400 a year, and as high as \$600. There are plenty of young men in the country, farmers' sons—I am very sorry that it is so—who would be glad to leave their farms and take positions in the cities at this pay. We know very well that the great agricultural community, which has to foot all these bills, cannot afford to pay its labourers anything like the wages paid in the service. Of course, I know that the answer will be, in accordance with the feeling which used to exist, that it does not require any intelligence to be a farmer. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) spoke of the privations and hardships suffered by these letter carriers, of the weather they had to face in the performance of their duties. I wonder if he has considered the privations and hardships and exposure that the great agricultural masses have to go through for much less pay. Such arguments as those of the hon. gentleman would have little weight at the time of election before an agricultural audience, when used to decry the Government for attempting to economize. And hon. gentlemen would not care to have it repeated against them just before election, when they appeal to an agricultural audience, that they had spoken against the economy and in favour of the payment of salaries better than the agricultural interests can afford to pay for service calling for equal labour, sacrifice and intelligence. That sort of argument may do well enough in the city

Mr. ROGERS.

where many people argue only that the more that is paid to the civil servant the more money they will have to spend. The city people do not need to care very much for economy in these matters, for they know where the money comes from—the farmer has to pay it all. I will admit that there is a disparity between the salaries paid to letter carriers and the salaries paid to some others. I think that the pruning knife might be applied to those receiving higher salaries much better than to the letter carriers. Speaking of the intelligence and ability required for the business of the letter carriers, I would like hon. gentleman to compare that with the intelligence and ability required for a farm servant. I would not like to say that these gentlemen who speak about these matters are talking through their hats, but it does seem to me that that is about the way they talk. If they had had the experience I have had for the last twenty years as an agriculturist, doing my share to make this country and hold it where it is, they would change their tune, I am sure. Their arguments, as I say, would have little weight before an agricultural audience, and I think they will have less weight even in the cities than formerly, because the city people have more sense than they used to have.

But I do feel that the postmasters in the country are the most miserably paid of any class of public servants. It is really a shame that a man should be paid only \$10 or \$12 a year for taking care of a country post office. They often write to me and ask if there is no possible way of getting an increase of salary.

Mr. BERGERON. There is the Patron principle.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, and it is all right, As the people say, it does not pay for sweeping their floors. I would like to see some of these gentlemen who respond with their superior "ha ha," try it for a while. I know that it is replied that these salaries are paid on a certain principle. But that principle should not be pressed so closely when you have to deal with cases like these. The post office is the only thing that the Government gives these people. To get their mail at some fairly convenient place is the only luxury these people have, and the city people should not insist upon remunerating so poorly the man who throws his doors open to accommodate his neighbours and the public. In some instances in my county, we can hardly get people to take the post offices, and in some cases the neighbours actually subscribe \$15 or \$20 a year to induce some person to perform this service. If the Postmaster General could see his way clear to grant country postmasters a little more pay for the trouble and inconvenience of keeping these little post offices, I think he would be doing a just thing and one advantageous to the people at large; I am sure that no person would object.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) I am glad to hear the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rogers), who has just taken his seat. As I understand it, the postmasters in the country are paid on the basis of 40 per cent of the receipts of their offices. I have no fault to find with the principle. It is well to have a principle and to stick to it. But circumstances arise where you have to sacrifice the principle or sacrifice the interests of the people. The suggestion of my hon. friend brings to my mind a condition of things in my own riding, something like that he mentioned. I refer to the post office in Hamilton, lot 18, concerning which there has been some correspondence with the Postmaster General. The receipts of the post office only justify an expenditure, I think, of \$4 a quarter, or \$16 a year. Now, it is impossible to get any person to take the position of postmaster at that figure. The people have offered to build an addition to the post office at a cost of about \$10, and they have offered to buy all their postage at that office in order to swell the receipts.

Mr. WALLACE. In justice to the post office where they deal, they should do that.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) They are not obliged to do that; they frequently go to the county town, and buy their postage there. But I say they have offered to do this in order to increase the receipts of the post office, and still they cannot induce any one to take charge of the office. The consequence is, that at the present time the people are deprived of a post office. The rule laid down by the Department is, no doubt, a very salutary one, but I think there ought to be some exceptions made that would meet a condition of this kind. Usually, persons are found willing to take a post office in country places; in fact, there is a competition to get it; but here is a place where no one wants it. Under these circumstances, I think there ought to be some departure from the general principle in order to meet the necessities of a particular case. Then, I want to ask the Postmaster General what is the rule with regard to the extension of the service to country post offices where they only receive a mail say—twice a week. I have in mind an office in my riding, Sea Cow Head, where the people are very intelligent, and have a large amount of business to transact, yet they receive the mails only twice a week. Now, upon what principle is the Government guided in extending facilities so as to give three mails a week, instead of two? Circumstances often arise where the frequency of receiving the mails ought to be extended.

While on my feet, I wish to refer to a remark of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) in regard to the judiciary of Canada. He referred to the

judges in terms which I do not think should be employed by a member of this House. He applied to them the epithet of a "bloated" judiciary. That offensive term is applied sometimes to certain of the aristocracy to show how puffed up they are with their hasty and ill-gotten wealth, and how offensive are their manners and morals. But the term is utterly misapplied when used with regard to our judiciary. They are neither wealthy or puffed up, nor offensive in manners or morals. They earn every dollar of their salary. They are an honour and credit to Canada. The hon. gentleman should withdraw and apologize for his insult to the judiciary.

Mr. DAVIN. I am glad to have the weighty support of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) in regard to the salaries of postmasters throughout the country, and I am also glad to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Prince, P.E.I., (Mr. Bell) on that subject. It is quite clear that there is a general opinion that country postmasters suffer an injustice at the hands of the department. I want to give just one instance. There is a small post office lately established, called Condie, on the line between Regina and Prince Albert. I had the honour of bringing the case before the department, and I thank the Postmaster General for having a post office established there. It was quite necessary, and a postmaster has been appointed. The postmaster offered to carry the mails from the train to the post office for \$50 a year, for four trips a week in summer and winter. The distance is not very far, but it entails going out four times a week and watching for the mail. Now, \$50 is a very small sum. When I called at the department and gave cogent reasons to the Deputy Postmaster General why that post office should be established, he seemed impressed by the reasons I laid before him. A petition had been sent to the same effect before I left Regina for my parliamentary duties. But when I went, early in the session, to inquire why it was that no arrangement had been made for carrying the mail, I was told that the department could not afford to pay \$50 for carrying the mails from the station to the post office, a distance of probably a couple of hundred yards, but which still entailed 208 trips a year. With reference to what my hon. friend said about the judiciary, it is quite clear that he misunderstood my remarks. I did not at all compare them to a bloated aristocracy. But I do not want to go into the discussion of this subject now. I will be able to discuss it when the proposal under the estimates of the hon. Minister of Justice comes up. I can assure my hon. friend that he quite misunderstood my remark, if he thought that it indicated any want of respect on my part for the judiciary of Canada. I do not yield to him, or anybody, in

my esteem for the character and learning of the bench.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. In reply to the hon. gentleman as to the principle upon which post offices are established, or the service increased, I would say that it is upon the principle of having regard to the public interest solely. We cannot give an over-frequent service if the community and revenue are small. There must be some regard had to the revenue of the office; that being the justification, to a large extent, for increasing the service. In great cities you have greater frequency of service, because there is a greater public need for it. In regard to the salaries of postmasters, we had that question up in the House some time ago. Many people act as postmasters merely to oblige their neighbours, not for the sake of the revenue at all, and post offices are dotted here and there—I will not say with over-liberality, but they are numerous in order to meet the convenience of rural districts. A mere increase of \$50 a head to all these postmasters in Canada would probably involve an expenditure of half a million of dollars.

Mr. **WALLACE**. How many post offices are there?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I think there must be 10,000 or more.

Mr. **WALLACE**. Are there not only 7,000?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I think there are nearly 10,000.

Mr. **INGRAM**. The usual practice of this House, in criticising the expenditures of the different departments, is to find fault with the extravagance of the Ministers, but we find to-day, instead of finding fault with the extravagance of the Postmaster General, the complaint is that he is studying economy too much in his department. I am sure he must feel highly honoured when he finds the self-constituted leader of the Patron organization complaining of the economy practised by the hon. Minister in his department. I did not rise to discuss that matter, but I wish to ask the hon. Postmaster General three questions affecting his department. First, I would like to know how the special delivery system is working, and, in the next place, I would like some information from him respecting the postal note system. I wish to draw his attention to what I think is a fault in the postal note system. It has been organized for the purpose of sending small amounts through the country. If you send \$5 you pay perhaps 2 cents, while if you send 25 cents, you pay an equal sum for it. I think a change should be made in the system, providing that the charge for transmission should be on a pro rata basis. I believe

Mr. **DAVIN**.

that would be a more reasonable method. I understand that there has been a change in the registered letter system of the country. Under the present system, persons sending registered letters containing money through the mails have, in case of their loss, found great difficulty in securing the return of the money posted in a registered letter. I understand the department is making a change, whereby, in the event of a registered letter being lost, the amount of money contained in it shall be made good.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. My hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) has asked a question in regard to the special delivery system, which is somewhat vague, but if he desires to know whether the public is availing itself of the privilege, I may say that I understand the public is. I understand that, in Toronto, it is used to a considerable extent, and that while at first one person was sufficient to deliver all the special letters, the number has been increased to two, and I think that shortly three will be required. I think the number of special delivery letters in Toronto is about 600 a month. In reference to the postal note charges, we must have a minimum. I think the minimum charge for a postal note is 1 cent.

Mr. **INGRAM**. I thought it was 2 cents.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. No. I think it is 1 cent. I do not think we could have a lower charge than that. The highest charge is 3 cents for \$5. I think it is 1 cent up to a certain amount, 2 cents up to \$2 or \$3, and 3 cents for the balance up to \$5. That is the very principle that the hon. gentleman suggests. There is not much margin left for a greater division, as we have no centimes in this country. In regard to the question as to whether there is a change in the registered letter system, I suppose the hon. gentleman refers to the legislation that is now going through the House. I explained the proposal to the House upon that measure. Of course, it is not law yet, although the Bill has received the sanction of the Senate as well as of this House.

Mr. **BEATTIE**. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General a question. The letter carriers of London have received no statutory increases for the past three years, although they consider they are justly entitled to them. I would like to know if the Government have any intention of paying these back statutory increases.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The Government have no intention of paying anything except what the Estimates indicate. The Government do not consider the law as creating a liability in regard to increases.

Mr. **McMILLAN**. Mr. Chairman, I cannot allow this item to pass without saying

a word or two upon it. A good deal has been said about the small remuneration that letter carriers receive throughout the country. I have been looking up the question, and I find that in Winnipeg letter carriers get \$530 a year, and in Toronto \$546 a year. That statement is based on the Estimates placed before us to-day. Gentlemen from the city do not estimate the remuneration for labour in the same way that we farmers in the country do. The average wage paid to farm labourers for a number of years is very small indeed. The report of the Ontario Bureau of Industries for 1897 is the last we have, but I have an advance report for 1898, which gives the wages of farm labourers, without board, for the year at \$244. In 1897 the average wage in the country without board was \$236, and in 1896 it was \$243. The average from 1888 to 1897 was \$251. I think that statement is correct. I know whereof I speak when I speak of farm labourers. It is a very small remuneration, and I am sorry to say that the condition of the farmers of Ontario has not been such that they have not been enabled to pay a higher salary. The salaries that letter carriers in cities are receiving to-day are more than double that which farm labourers are getting throughout the country. The occupation of letter carriers does not require a great amount of education. They must be able to read the addresses on newspapers and letters, and I suppose they have to be respectable, decent individuals, and keep themselves properly dressed. But, I would say that if these places were put up to competition, for every one that could be engaged you would have ten ready to take their places. We must see that men in the employ of the Government get fair remuneration for their services, but in this case the employment is steady, and although they have to go out in all weathers, letter carriers are not exposed to the inclemency of winter weather in the country, where a snowstorm is more serious in its effects than in the city. There is a class of post offices in the country where the remuneration is very small, such as post offices where there is no place of business or little store. In the cities the letters are delivered free at the expense of the whole country, and where a farmer throws his house open to accommodate the community with their mail matter, I think he should receive better compensation. As has been stated, there is often competition for the post offices in the small towns and villages, because people have an idea that it brings them incidental trade, but that does not apply to the small post offices in country districts. As to the letter carriers, taking into consideration the services they render, and the qualifications required from them, I think they get a fair remuneration.

Mr. OSLER. Personally I congratulate the Postmaster General on the reduction in the postal letter rates which he has effected. I wish to give him full credit for that. I believe that the present loss of revenue on account of it will soon be made up by the increased business, but I hope that he will not economize at the expense of the officers of the department. The city letter carriers are quite differently placed from officials in the country. Their rent is high, their living expenses are higher, and they consequently deserve more recognition from the Government. I agree that the remuneration to country postmasters is entirely inadequate, for I do not think it is proper that important correspondence should be sent to a post office where the person in charge only receives \$10 or \$12 a year. I do not believe these officials should be unduly paid, but I for one would not object to seeing them better paid. If the letter carriers entered the service expecting this annual increase, or if it was morally certain they should get it, then the Government should pay it to them. I notice in going over the salaries that the letter carriers in Toronto are paid smaller salaries than the letter carriers in almost any of the other cities. In Toronto post office the salaries average \$546 a year, in Ottawa \$600, in London \$550, in Hamilton \$550. The difference is very small, but nevertheless the Toronto letter carriers are entitled to the highest pay given to any letter carriers, and specially in view of the fact that there are only four temporary clerks in that office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I appreciate the reference of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) to whatever action I may have taken in the department, and I am glad that it meets with his approval. Whatever may have been the case in the past, these Estimates at all events provide for the increase of salaries to letter carriers, and are to that extent, on the line which the hon. gentleman approved of. I would say generally, that I have had under consideration the adoption of a scheme which would be some incentive to letter carriers who faithfully discharge their duties, even after they attain their maximum. If the prospect of an increase to \$600 serves the useful purpose of stimulating them to efficient service, as I presume it does, I would be glad to go a step further and provide some prize for efficiency after the maximum salary has been attained. If a scheme like that can be evolved, it would probably quite compensate for any temporary disappointment which these officials have experienced. I may say, that this scheme is not yet sufficiently ready for submission to my colleagues in the Government or to Parliament, but I have had it in contemplation. As to those postmasters who receive \$10 a year it will be found that the quantity of

business attended to is nominal and that these offices are established on the routes of couriers where a bag is deposited for the convenience of a few neighbours, and the income of the office is not more than perhaps \$10 a year, representing about one letter each day. They can in no sense be called regular post offices.

Mr. MARTIN. In how many cities in Canada is there free distribution by letter carriers ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston, Toronto, Hamilton, London, Brantford, Winnipeg, Vancouver, Victoria.

Mr. MARTIN. What is the smallest city in which there is free distribution ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Fredericton, the capital of New Brunswick, has in a sense a delivery, but it is rather unique. There is a letter carrier there who has been on duty since ante-confederation days, and who has some peculiar privileges and perquisites. The population is about 8,000, but it is not a fair sample of a city with free distribution. The next lowest in population is probably the city of Brantford, with a population of 18,000.

Mr. MARTIN. Some years ago it was proposed to extend that privilege to Charlottetown, the capital of Prince Edward Island. Charlottetown, has a population of probably 16,000, double the population of Fredericton. There is not a province in the Dominion without one city at least having this accommodation, and Charlottetown being rapidly growing, and the Postmaster General having shown himself progressive in other ways, he ought to see his way to extend the free letter delivery to the capital of the island province.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will take the matter into consideration.

Mr. MARTIN. The population is up to the limit of other cities to which accommodation has been given.

Mr. SEMPLE. I think there is no department of the Government that has received more attention than the Post Office Department, and I believe this fact is appreciated through the length and breadth of Ontario. I know some who carry the mails for too little, because the contracts are let by competition. Whoever is the lowest, and furnishes the proper security, gets the contract, whether he is a Conservative or a Reformer. It is gratifying to find hon. gentlemen opposite complaining of too much economy in some respects, and wanting the expenditure increased. I think the people of Ontario appreciate the economy that has been practised by the Postmaster General; yet I

Mr. MULOCK.

think he might very well consider the cases of some of these small post offices in Ontario where the postmaster receives only \$10 or \$15 a year, and see if he cannot give them some increase. Many of the salaries paid in the cities are too large, and might be reduced, while some of these country postmasters who are receiving a very small pittance, ought to be paid more.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not quite understand the answer given by the Postmaster General to the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) as to whether he has definitely decided not to pay the back allowance to these letter carriers. Has the Minister got an answer as to that ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What I stated to the hon. member for London was, that the Estimates set forth all that the Government have decided to recommend to the House. I added that the Government did not recognize the law as creating a legal liability on the part of the Crown for increases of salary.

Mr. WALLACE. I suppose that, stripped of all verbiage, that means that the Minister is not going to give the letter carriers this back pay. I regret that, because I think they had fairly earned it. The Minister has not reduced the expenditure in his department, but has increased it; and if he desired to practice economy, he could have applied it somewhere else. Can he give us approximately the amount of the expenditure of his department for the year just closed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The accounts have not been made up yet; but I think the expenditure will be within the appropriation.

Mr. WALLACE. While the revenues of the Post Office Department are increasing, the employees, especially those to whom I have referred, are fairly entitled to consideration; but the Minister has decided, as I judge from his language, not to recognize any legal liability, and not to give any further increase. I think his economies might be applied in other directions. For instance, I understand that the Government in their contracts with the railway companies for the carrying of the mails, are paying about the same as they did when the railways of Canada came into existence. Is that correct ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The remuneration to the railways is not uniform. Some are paid so much per train mile, and some are paid so much per mile of railway per annum, the remuneration, I suppose, varying according to the service rendered. Although the rate per train mile may be the same as it was many years ago, yet the volume of mail matter carried is in

many instances greater than it was many years ago.

**Mr. WALLACE.** In many instances I have no doubt it is ; but as the number of trains carrying mails is much larger, I assume that there would be no very material increase in that respect. The amounts that are paid to the railway companies are so very large that I think it is time the Postmaster General, who is studying what can be saved in his department, should devote some attention to that subject. I would like to ask him if he has made special inquiry into that subject, or whether he proposes to make reductions or to make new contracts with the railway companies for carrying mails.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I do not think I have disturbed any of the railway contracts that my predecessors left to me, or reduced the allowances they had contracted to make. I suppose my hon. friend would scarcely approve of my recommending the doing away of any allowances which his Government assented to.

**Mr. WALLACE.** Why ?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** Because my hon. friend's Government, no doubt, did what he thought was right in this respect.

**Mr. WALLACE.** Surely, you are not going to stand still ?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I have not as yet declared any want of confidence in the good judgment of my hon. friend or his colleagues in regard to the rates allowed to the railways. Perhaps they might properly be revised. For the benefit of my hon. friend's Government, of course, I would rather assume them to be correct than otherwise, but if my hon. friend will point out to me any railway mail contracts which he thinks should be revised, I shall be extremely pleased to give them my attention.

**Mr. WALLACE.** I would then ask the hon. member to resign and have me appointed as Postmaster General to do the work at \$7,000 a year, without political responsibility for the policy of the Government otherwise, and I might be able to give him some pointers, but I admire the remarkable coolness with which the hon. Minister assumes it is all right because he says it was done by a former Government, when it was really not done by them.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** Yes.

**Mr. WALLACE.** No. The state of affairs, according to him, was allowed to go on because the present Government allowed it to go—

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** It was passed on from Government to Government.

**Mr. WALLACE.** His statement that the previous Government were responsible for

it because he continued it, is not quite correct. Surely he is not going to ask us to do the work of his department. He coolly asks us to demonstrate how his department can be improved and public money saved, and promises that then he will adopt our programme. What we want to have is further particulars as to the enormous expenditure for carrying the mails by the railways. There is a growing feeling that we are paying them an enormous amount. While at the time those railways began operations and when everything was in a crude state, these figures may have been approximately correct, we were then but trying an experiment, and after that experiment has been tried all these years, it looks to me as if the Postmaster General, with all his courage, was afraid to tackle the railways, though he has no hesitation in tackling the poor mail contractors who carry the mails at from \$50 to \$300 a year.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** My hon. friend is giving away his secrets. He has been behind the scenes evidently.

**Mr. WALLACE.** I do not know what the hon. Minister means, and would ask him to explain.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** If these contracts were bad, why did you not correct them ?

**Mr. WALLACE.** I am not saying they were bad, but that while the Minister can courageously attack the mail carriers, who are performing services for twice the money value they received, who are doing work for the Government at less pay than they will do it for a private individual—and in this I am not speaking about the larger contracts, some of which may be quite high enough or even too high, but of the ordinary mail carriers throughout the country—he is afraid to devote his attention to the railway rates for carrying the mails, involving millions of dollars in expenditure. I would invite the Postmaster General to open up that question if he has the courage to do it. It will not do for him to say that he is simply continuing the contracts which existed previously to his coming into office. That will hardly be accepted as a satisfactory answer. We want him to say that this state of affairs is satisfactory to him, or if not that he will have it investigated and make it satisfactory. We would like to know whether he proposes to have an investigation and revise the prices paid these railway companies, and whether he is prepared to tell us what other countries pay for similar and corresponding services ?

**Mr. HAGGART.** Let me supplement some of the remarks my hon. friend has just made. If I remember rightly, it is only about a year or two ago when the hon. gentleman was talking in the same vein as my hon. friend from York, and wanted the appointment of a commission for the purpose

of regulating the railway rates. I knew at the time that he was treading on very dangerous ground. I do not think he ever applied for a commission, because he knew that its report would be such that he would not dare to come down and ask for a vote to carry it out. The Government has given the power into his own hands to fix the remuneration for the railway companies. We did it when in power, and in justice to the department I must say that I think the railway companies are not getting a larger amount than they are entitled to. I think that if the hon. gentleman had a commission appointed for the purpose of investigating this question, the result would be that he would find himself in a pretty bad hole. I do not see a vote in the Estimates for this commission, and I am glad to see that the Postmaster General has taken the power into his own hands, which the statute gives him, to pay what rates he thinks proper. If we were to follow the plan of the United States, I can assure the Postmaster General that he would have to pay a far greater rate to the railway companies for the carriage of the mails than he does at present. While on this subject, I would ask the hon. gentleman if, in all his improvements, he has ever considered the question of a personal delivery of the mails, the same as they have in Great Britain. I inquired into that system thoroughly when I was in the department, and I came to the conclusion that by adopting that system you could dispense with a number of mail carriage contracts in the well-settled sections of the country. Instead of having a number of contracts for carrying the mails, you could adopt this system of personal delivery, which would be as cheap and, perhaps, cheaper than the present system. The hon. gentleman might try it in some part of the country where it could be properly tested namely, parts of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. I think that he will find that, by a thorough change, doing away with these little offices throughout the country and with the numerous contracts for carrying the mails, he could adopt a system of delivery, such as they have in the United Kingdom, which would be as cheap as the present system and far more efficient.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I can take no exception to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart)—quite the contrary. As to the adoption of a rural delivery, that is a question that is at present engaging the attention of the people of the United States. Whether they will be able to make it a success remains to be seen. It is a very different matter having a rural delivery in a country like England, small and with compact population, and having a rural delivery in a country like Canada of vast area and with only a few millions of people. With reference to the remuneration of the railways, there is no item in the Estimates for a commission.

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. HAGGART. There was such an item at one time. We supposed that the commission had sat and had given the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) the benefit of its inquiry.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I received some advice after Parliament prorogued which I thought was well intended and entitled to great weight; and, in consequence, I did not recommend the appointment of a commission.

Mr. WALLACE. What was the amount voted?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Five thousand dollars. That has been saved to the country.

Mr. HENDERSON. What has been the result of the postal note system? Is it generally used, or is it used to as great an extent as the Postmaster General expected? I have rather thought, or have been led to believe, that it has not met with the approval of the general public to the extent the department had hoped.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The postal note system began with one or two denominations of notes in August last. There are now, I think, seventeen different denominations of postal notes. The issue of these extended over many months, and I think the last was not ready for use until December last, or thereabouts. The number used has grown steadily—perhaps fluctuating a little—and I think it is between 60,000 and 70,000 a month at the present time. It seems to be filling a public want.

Mr. WALLACE. The Postmaster General has admitted what we had, perhaps, forgotten in the rush of business—that he had obtained an appropriation of \$5,000 about three years ago for the expenses of a commission to inquire into this matter of the money paid to railways. In his early experience in the department he also had conceived the idea that this question required some examination. Now he tells us that this \$5,000 was saved to this country, and he claims credit for another economy in his department. He investigated the matter sufficiently to feel justified in asking Parliament for this vote to investigate the question of the rates paid to railways for carrying the mail. He says that some sagacious man said: Don't; and he accepted the advice. Well, could not the Postmaster General take us a little further into his confidence and tell us why his friend advised him not to spend this \$5,000 and why he did not have this investigation that, in an earlier stage of his official life he thought was necessary, and why this information is not given to Parliament as to the payment by other countries for similar service rendered by the railway?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I should think that my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace).

with his usual astuteness, would not have asked an answer to the question, after the answer he received from one of his colleagues.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) has no responsibility.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He has been Postmaster General.

Mr. WALLACE. Many years ago. But I want the responsible Minister to give his statement now. The hon. member for Lanark was not responsible for that vote of \$5,000, and cannot tell us why it has not been thought proper to hold that investigation into this question of the millions that are paid to the railways.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have already answered the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WALLACE. No, that will not do. That is not an answer.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What do you want answered?

Mr. WALLACE. I want to know why the Postmaster General, after asking \$5,000 for this purpose, has not gone on with that investigation. He would not have asked Parliament for this \$5,000 if he had not made any inquiries whether these enormous sums that are paid to the railways year after year should be paid. Has the hon. gentleman investigated this matter? He cannot say; he has not had sufficient time, for he has been in office three years. If he has investigated it, we want to know if he is prepared to come before Parliament and say: I asked Parliament for an appropriation to appoint a commission to investigate this matter, and I proposed to give Parliament the results of that investigation. He has not told us that. Has he done so? Has he done all this work himself, and saved that \$5,000? Because he said he saved the \$5,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not say I saved it; I said it was not spent.

Mr. WALLACE. There is not much difference, anyway. But a saving is not made unless the work is done at a less expense, or at no expense. He said the money was not spent. Well, that is no information at all. We know it was not spent. But we want to know why it was not spent, after he had asked Parliament to vote it for that purpose. He has excited our curiosity, and after he has said to us: Now, the money is paid to these railroads—

Mr. MCGREGOR. You have got mixed up.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not aware of any mixing up. If the member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) is not mixed up, I do not know who is, unless it be our Postmaster General here, who asks for \$5,000, and tells us the money was not spent, and

when we ask why it was not spent, he says the member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has given the reason. But that will not do for us. We want to know from the responsible Minister the reason.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Have you no faith in the member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart)?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think that is the question before the House. The question is whether we have sufficient faith in the Postmaster General, but the Postmaster General is not giving us an opportunity to see whether we have faith in him or not. He asked Parliament for \$5,000 for a certain purpose. Then he says he has not spent it, and we ask him the reason why and he does not give us an answer. That may satisfy the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), but it is not sufficient for me. The people will want to know why he has not expended this money, what new light he got that enabled him to refrain from spending that \$5,000, to desist from making this investigation where he expected to save hundreds of thousands of dollars per year, because I assume that the railway companies are being paid too large an amount. I assume that from the fact that the Postmaster General, after he had investigated the matter, came to the conclusion that he wanted a further investigation, so as to revise all these bargains and make new contracts, after the inauguration of the new state of affairs. But he has not given the information to the House, though usually willing to express himself fully in regard to his department. I think we can fairly ask for a further and more satisfactory explanation from the Postmaster General.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

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

### After Recess.

Post Office Department—

Contingencies ..... \$49,435

Mr. BERGERON. I wanted to say a word or two in regard to the printing and stationery branch of the Post Office Department, but as the hon. Postmaster General very properly said, this is the item upon which I may bring the matter up. My hon. friend was taunted this afternoon with his economy. In fact, I think that even some hon. gentlemen sitting behind him informed him that he was too economical. He may not be entirely au courant of this part of his department, which is altogether too expensive. I do not blame him personally, because I think our friends have their share of guilt for having incurred this expenditure in this little branch of the service. It

commenced with a very small expenditure of about \$2,000 a year, and to-day the expenditure for printing and stationery amounts to \$20,000. I believe that one clerk with a salary of \$1,800 a year, and an assistant at probably \$400 or \$500 a year, would be amply sufficient to administer that part of the department. I am told, and this is the point I want to make, that there are six or seven clerks now employed in that branch.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The superintendent of that branch is Mr. Sydney Smith. He was in attendance at six o'clock, and I asked him to be back here at eight o'clock. I do not see him in the Gallery, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) wants to go into the details, I would suggest to him that he allow the matter to stand until Mr. Smith returns.

Mr. BERGERON. I might make an arrangement with the hon. gentleman, that if I should not happen to be here at the moment, that he will keep the item for me.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will do so. Or we may pass it, and take the subject up on another item.

Mr. BERGERON. I have no objection, if the hon. gentleman will see that I have a chance to go into the matter. It is a matter that the hon. gentleman will be glad to know about.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As soon as Mr. Smith arrives, I will get the hon. gentleman the information that he desires.

Yukon Provisional District—

Amount required for mail service.... \$103,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will explain this item. We had this up in committee on the supplementary Estimates for the year closed 30th June last. The committee will perhaps remember that we reduced the item. Part of this item includes the carriage of the mails in winter by the Mounted Police, and there is an item in the Mounted Police vote for their service generally. As it is impossible to separate the services, it is thought advisable to allow the mails to be continued to be carried by the Mounted Police, and then, at the end of the fiscal year, the vote will be apportioned between the two departments. I, therefore, wish this item reduced by \$64,130, because the services will be performed by the Mounted Police, and when at the end of the fiscal year it is ascertained what proportion to charge to this department it will be charged to the Post Office. There is no necessity for taking the vote twice, because the Mounted Police vote will cover the service between Dawson and Bennett, and we will append a note if necessary, that when we come to the Mounted Police vote, and when the fiscal year is closed, there will

Mr. BERGERON.

be charged from that vote the proper proportion to the Post Office Department.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose the Minister cannot say what will be the proportion for his department?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No one can tell that now; it will have to be apportioned by the officers of the department. I have not charge of the Mounted Police, but nevertheless, they perform the service when instructed to do so. I move to reduce the vote of \$103,000 by the sum of \$64,130, leaving a balance of \$38,870.

Mr. WALLACE. On what basis do you get that figure?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Of course it is a service that is in its infancy, and whilst I am giving these figures at present as to the expenditure in sight, as the season advances there may be some other expenses which will be provided for in the Supplementaries of next year. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) reminds me that 10 per cent has been taken off this vote, but I am now giving the full face value, and not considering that. The full amount my department requires is \$38,870, made up as follows: Salary, postmaster at Dawson, \$3,200; clerks at Dawson, \$7,200; board about \$9,000; Mr. James's salary, \$2,000.

Mr. WALLACE. Who is Mr. James?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is a first-class railway mail clerk that I transferred to Skagway to take charge of this service. His salary, including mileage, in the railway mail service, would amount to about \$1,500 a year, and I undertook, in consideration of his going to Skagway, to make his salary equal to \$2,000 a year and his board. I explained all this in the supplementary Estimates. I have to come to Parliament for this, as under the Act I could not pay more than the statutory allowance for his office. I thought it unreasonable to transfer him from the service in older Canada without making it worth his while, and he has proved himself an excellent officer. The total expenditure for Mr. James is estimated, salary, \$2,000 and board, \$720. We give the postmaster at Bennett, Mr. Kane, \$1,750, which includes his board, we thinking that if we allow him \$720 for his living expenses, his salary would be about \$1,000. For the mail service between Bennett and Dawson and Bennett and Atlin and Bennett and Skagway, we estimate \$10,000, and incidental expenses, \$5,000. The contract made with Mr. Irvine, or with the Canadian Pacific Navigation Company, of which he is manager, is about \$250 a round trip between Dawson and Bennett, and \$50 between Atlin and Bennett, and if the season lasts the usual length, it would take \$10,000 to provide for that contract.

Mr. BERGERON. It is not my intention to propose any increase in that expenditure,

but we have heard lately that living at Dawson and at other places in that part of the country is very expensive, and if the employees are paid too small a salary, it will take all their salary for them to live. This would leave them open to temptation to make money in other ways, something which I am sure the Government would not tolerate. Under these circumstances, would it not be better to pay the employees higher salaries? The hon. Minister said that the salary of the postmaster at Dawson was \$3,200. What does he think that salary would be equivalent to here? It is said that the population of Dawson is about 40,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not so much as that.

Mr. BERGERON. It may soon reach that, as it is a place where population may increase very rapidly. A postmaster in a city of 40,000 population in this part of the country would have as much salary as that. I speak purely in the interest of the service when I say that it is better that the employees should be well paid, so that they will be encouraged to attend to their duties, and will not attempt to make money in other ways. I am perfectly satisfied to leave the matter with the hon. the Postmaster General.

Mr. WALLACE. I am forced to disagree with the suggestion of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), and to agree with the Postmaster General in the course he has adopted. Once you fix a salary at a certain figure, it is difficult if not impossible to reduce it when the expenses of living have been reduced; whereas by fixing the salary at the right figure, and giving in addition a living allowance which is fair and reasonable, when the cost of living falls, you can reduce the living allowance without reducing the salary. In that regard I think the Postmaster General has taken the right course. I would like to have further particulars in regard to the expense of conducting the mail service, and with regard to what the Minister proposes. I understood him to say a few weeks ago in the House that up to the time navigation opened, he would utilize the North-west Mounted Police, and after that he would have the mails carried by contract. Am I correct in that understanding?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the method of utilizing the North-west Mounted Police for such a service is not a good one. While it might have been useful in the early days of the country, it should not be made permanent. If it were, the Minister should give us some sort of statement or calculation which could be revised afterwards as to the cost. It is not quite satisfactory to have the whole of these expenses charged to the North-west Mounted Police, and then to have

a readjustment of the accounts in a year or so hence. We should know approximately, at any rate, what these additional expenses are, so that we can charge each department with the amount which properly belongs to it. The Minister does not propose to do that, but he proposes to ask the House for a definite sum of \$38,870. He proposes to pay the postmaster at Dawson \$3,200, and ten clerks each \$60 a month, amount to \$7,200, and then, he makes an allowance for the board of the ten clerks, and I presume the postmaster as well.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, the postmaster's board is included in the \$3,200.

Mr. WALLACE. Then it looks to me as if \$9,000 for board would be a most extraordinary sum to pay—about \$3 a day for each. I remember some years ago, when the facilities for getting into Dawson were not so good as they are to-day, the manager of one of the transportation companies told me that he would furnish all the provisions necessary for a man's sustenance for one day for one dollar. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Earle) informs me that the railroad is now built to the head waters of the Yukon River, so that there is no difficulty in taking in provisions and supplies, and \$900 a year for the board of each of these officials would be a pretty large amount. Mr. James gets a salary of \$960 and \$540, which would be the salary he would receive here as a first-class mail clerk.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am estimating \$75 a month for the living expenses of these clerks at Dawson City. I do not think they can live respectably for less.

Mr. WALLACE. Where is Mr. Cane located?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At Lake Bennett. He had once the distinguished honour of being a resident at Newmarket, in North York.

Mr. WALLACE. That is not in North York. It is in West Ontario.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It soon will be in North York.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, I see the hon. gentleman is preparing for that contingency. The expenses of this section of the Post Office Department for the last fiscal year were \$103,000. That is a very large expenditure for a very unsatisfactory service; and although the Government have not made adequate provision for an effective service, the Postmaster General evidently does not anticipate that there will be any less expense, because he has put that \$103,000 in the Estimates for the current fiscal year. It is not the duty of the Mounted Police, as a permanent work, to carry the mails. That work does not comport with the status of men who are required to act

as peace-makers, and who have the task of preserving the peace and dignity of the country. If they are not required for that duty, they should be taken out of the country and sent where they are required or their services dispensed with. I think the Postmaster General made a mistake in not providing for an efficient service, and is persisting in that mistake in continuing to use the North-west Mounted Police as mail carriers. How often does he propose, during the present year, to carry the mails in and out of Dawson?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is in error in assuming that the employment of the Mounted Police, in carrying the mails, is to be a permanent affair. The maintenance of the mail service in the winter involves considerable outlay in supplies and equipments of various kinds—dogs, as well as huts and provisions for the men.

Mr. WALLACE. Dogs are cheap.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not dogs fit for this service, and I think it would not be safe to take this work away from the police and put in the hands of private contractors altogether. It is the policy of the department to transfer, as rapidly as is consistent with safety, this service from the Mounted Police to contractors, and I have an advertisement in the press calling for tenders to be received up to the 24th July for the carrying of the mails, in order to see whether we can get parties who will tender for the service and put up sufficient security to warrant our entrusting them with it. I would prefer not dispensing with the Mounted Police all at once, but to work gradually into the hands of the contractors as we become satisfied that we have contractors competent to do the work. In the coming winter, we propose, if possible, to have a weekly service, but intend having a fortnightly service by the Mounted Police and a fortnightly service by a private contractor. Then, if after the year's operation, we find that the private contractors are able successfully to perform the service, the department might feel justified in wholly dispensing with the Mounted Police and having the whole work done by contractors. But you cannot tell what private contractors might do. They may give security that they will perform their contracts and then fail in the performance. We have an organization there now, and I am not willing to risk the whole mail service on one chance, but propose to gradually divorce it from the Mounted Police, as we find the contractors competent to carry on the work. The summer contract begins with the opening of navigation, and continues during the period of navigation, and that was awarded to Captain Irving, of Victoria. Speaking from memory, the contract is \$250 for the round trip between

Mr. WALLACE.

Bennett and Dawson, and \$50 for the round trip between Atlin and Bennett. It is estimated that the payments for the services will cost about \$300 a week for a weekly mail. It starts from each end every week. I would like to give a weekly mail service in the winter, but that is a question of ways and means. I am in hopes that we will be able this winter to perform part of the services by horses instead of dogs. When the ice is well formed on Lake Bennett horses can go from Bennett to the head of Lake Labarge, which is, I think, 130 miles. They could not start on the ice as soon as dogs, but there will only be a few days' difference. By using horses we will reduce the expenditure and improve the efficiency, because horses will be able to carry bigger loads and get more quickly over the ground. Two horses may be used, in tandem. If we can succeed in the summer in making a good trail, we may be able to extend the horse service a considerable distance by getting round the points where there is rapidly running water that now interrupts the winter service.

Mr. WALLACE. I can only express my dissatisfaction with the very crude system adopted after three years' experience, during which the necessity of having an efficient mail service was evident to everybody. And even now he tells us that he does not want to give a contract, because the contractors may not fulfil their duties, and he wants to leave it with the Mounted Police until they may by degrees work into a system of contracts. I think that is a very unsatisfactory statement. He tells us that to Atlin and Dawson City from Lake Bennett it will cost him about \$300 a week. If that service continued the year around, the cost would be \$15,600 a year. But he is asking between six and seven times that amount. He was voted between six and seven times that amount last year for a fortnightly service, presumably—but not a fortnightly service actually. It may have been a fortnightly service in the sense that mails were despatched every two weeks, but, so far as delivery is concerned, a point which was of vital importance not only to the country, but to the Government, it was not fortnightly at all. Hon. gentlemen opposite were inaugurating a system of government and appointing officials for that territory, upon whom they should have had a firm grip. But they make the excuse now, that they could not properly govern the territory because it was so far away and so difficult of access. But they made it twice as far away by having a mail service only half as frequently as was necessary. The very first thing that the Government should have done in that territory was to provide an efficient mail service, so as to have complete control over the officials there, the

Mounted Police, the manager, or commissioner, and all the others. This they neglected. The Postmaster General, I assume, was looking after other matters in his department, and neglected this branch of the public service. An enormous sum of money was voted last year, and he proposes that a practically similar amount shall be voted this year. The Minister cuts it down to \$38,800 now, but he said that this matter of the Mounted Police will have to be settled at a later date. I think he might have given us an estimate at any rate, so that we might make a comparison of the expenditure of the department for the various years, which we cannot do with from \$60,000 to \$100,000 unsettled. The most important part the Postmaster General has not given attention in a way the country had a right to expect. He has spent the money, \$103,000, apparently, and he proposes to spend the same amount this year, but he has not provided efficient mail service to that district. It is true that, now that others have made arrangements, now that the railway has been completed from the Pacific to the head waters of the Yukon, thus forming one chain of communication, and now that there are numerous, almost innumerable, steamboats on the river, he will probably do better. I think that the importance of the work and the large expenditure made there will justify the adoption of a system under which the mails will be carried down by almost every reliable steamer, affording the people the best facilities, even if they charge a higher price for carrying the letters to that country. At any rate, to afford the most prompt facilities for doing business in that country—a business that is constantly spreading out and becoming of enormous magnitude—the Government should have done these things. In the first instance, the Post Office Department should have been alive to its duty in this matter, which, I am afraid, it has not been—and I am afraid it does not realize even to-day its responsibility in this matter.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not find that the hon. Minister has given any explanation of the defectiveness of the postal service in the Yukon. He is, of course, aware that the people have been complaining everywhere, and the newspapers have been flooded with complaints that letters have been delayed for months and months—not one or two letters, but letters delayed by the wholesale. I remember one of my brother members showing me a letter that had taken a very long time—I have forgotten just how long—to come down from the Yukon. It has struck the public, and it has certainly struck me, that if a contract were given to a private firm, to one of the efficient firms transacting large business there and showing great executive power, the service would have been pretty well attended to.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think so.

Mr. DAVIN. I shall be very glad, if the Minister can show here to Parliament, and through Parliament to the country, why it was that that defective postal system from here to the Yukon prevailed. Probably, he can give us a satisfactory explanation, but that satisfactory explanation has not yet been given. It seems to me that now is the time for it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I had to choose between a private contractor for carrying the mails and the Mounted Police. My own judgment suggested the Mounted Police. If they could not perform the service efficiently, I doubt if there is another company in the world that could have done it. They performed the service as well as human beings could perform it. I intend to adhere to the police until I have proof that the service can be as efficiently performed otherwise. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) will have an opportunity of judging who is right in the case during the present season, because I intend to test the system of contractor or Mounted Police. It may be found that, with improved facilities for transport—for example, the construction of the railway now completed to Bennett—that the contractors can be depended upon. I am satisfied that, in the work they have done, the Mounted Police were as efficient as any force could have been, and they had all the abundant means and the best facilities that could be afforded at that time.

Post Office—

Mail service ..... \$2,207,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. On this item the hon. gentleman can speak upon the subject mentioned a moment ago.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to get some explanation of item 39, on page 20: Printing and stationery, \$21,000. Last year it was \$18,500. I would like the Minister to explain why this increase is necessary. I may say that my impression is that this branch is costing altogether too much. It has increased from year to year, until to-day it has attained altogether too great proportions.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Post Office Department is an expanding department, and you cannot expand the Post Office Department without feeling the consequence in printing and stationery. Every time you open a new post office it means new supplies, new forms. Every time there is a change in a post office, it means new forms, and whenever there is an expansion, as, for example, when we established the postal note system, it involves new forms, new books and new printing. Now, this is the explanation offered to me by Mr. Smith, who has charge of that branch, the postal stores. Last year the main Estimates contained \$18,500 for printing and stationery, and the

supplementaries, \$3,808.33, making a total for 1898-99, of \$22,308.33. The expenditure for the fiscal year closing on 30th June last, was \$22,292.02, leaving an unexpended balance of \$16.31. The vote in the present Estimates for the current year is \$21,000, as against an actual expenditure last year of \$22,292.02. If that \$21,000 sees us through this year, it will mean that the expenditure on these items will be \$1,292.03 less. But if it does not see us through, and there is a small increase for printing and stationery, it will be simply because of the normal growth of the Post Office Department. This branch of the service is in the hands of an officer who has not his superior in the service, I am satisfied, in fidelity and in efficiency, than Mr. Sydney Smith. He has been in the service for many years, is the son of an old Postmaster General himself, and he has enjoyed, and deservedly so, the confidence of every Postmaster General.

Mr. BERGERON. How many years has he been in this branch?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Twenty-five years. I have found him to sympathize with my efforts to conduct the service efficiently, but without any cheese-paring, and with a due regard to the taxpayers as well as to the service itself. I am satisfied you could not have it conducted more efficiently than it is.

Mr. BERGERON. I am not criticising the administration of my hon. friend, because this expenditure commenced long ago. I think it is one of those matters that it is well for us to discuss, because we might learn something from each other. Now, when Mr. Smith commenced, how many employees were there in that branch? I want to know how we have reached that expenditure.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If you mean the clerks in the stores branch, that is one branch of my department in which there has been a very considerable reduction in the staff. The stores branch, as it is called, contains the supplies that have to be distributed all through the country to the postmasters, such as mail bags, locks, office equipments, obliterating stamps, &c. There are certain men in that branch who receive requisitions and who make up parcels and send them off by mail. Now, the number at present engaged in that work is considerably less than it was when I took office, and the staff is, I am sure, well employed.

Mr. BERGERON. How many are there?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There were over forty-five in that branch when I took office, there are thirty-eight now. The salaries amount to about \$5,000 less per annum than when I took office.

Mr. BERGERON. And when Mr. Smith took hold of that branch, how many were there?

Mr. MULOCK.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At one time the distribution of stores took place from Ottawa for Ontario and Quebec, while the distribution for the maritime provinces, and Manitoba and the Territories took place from those districts; there was a scattered staff to attend to it. The service has now been gathered in and operated from a central point, Ottawa, and that has involved a concentration of the staff here to carry on the service instead of in a divided way, as heretofore. But that was before confederation. After confederation the distribution for those provinces and the Territories took place from Ottawa, and the staff grew from half a dozen before confederation to some forty-five three years ago, and now it is thirty-eight.

Mr. BERGERON. Then, if I understand my hon. friend, when he took charge of the department, there were 45 employees?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is as I am informed.

Mr. BERGERON. And there are 38 now, seven less, making a saving of about \$5,000 a year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. About that.

Mr. BERGERON. Yet we are asked to vote more money.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will explain to my hon. friend that I do not consider that this vote is put in the right way. It has always been put in that way, and I do not think it ought to be. There is in the service generally a class of expenditure for what is called "clerical and other assistance."

Mr. BERGERON. I am speaking of the second item, printing and stationery.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, then there is nothing in that item for wages or salaries.

Mr. BERGERON. That is only for forms and printing?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, forms and printing drawn on the Department of the Secretary of State.

Mr. BERGERON. Does clerical and other assistance come in conjunction with that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, it is scattered through the department generally. It is an extra item.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General if the clerical and other assistance has increased in his department in the last few years?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A number of employees may change. There may be a reduction in a certain class and an increase in a certain other class.

Mr. INGRAM. Speaking generally, has the number been increased ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Speaking generally, since I have been in the department, there has been a reduction of six or seven.

Mr. INGRAM. I see that in respect to printing and stationery, the hon. gentleman says that there is an increase. He also says that the staff in the department has been decreased. I wish to draw his attention to the fact, that within the past few years, the officers in the post offices throughout the country, have had their duties increased by reason of the additional forms being issued by the department here which compels the officers in the different post offices to put additional work upon their clerks. I do not think the department have increased the number of their employees in the post offices sufficiently to keep up with that extra work and, there being a decrease in the number of clerks here, I see no reason why the number of clerks in the outside post offices should not be increased in view of the extra work imposed upon them. I know that the St. Thomas post office has always been short-handed, and that about a year ago one of the clerks resigned. I mentioned this matter last session and asked the hon. Postmaster General if he would be kind enough to look into the matter and see whether the office was short-handed or not. The staff are overworked. They frequently have to remain to a late hour to overtake the duties imposed upon them. They go to work at six in the morning and in some cases are compelled to work on Sunday to keep up with their work. I trust that the hon. Postmaster General will give this matter his consideration.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) did call my attention to this matter last session, and I did look into it. I sent an officer to St. Thomas and he did not report a shortage, but he reported a defect in the administration of the office, and I think, he, to some extent, corrected it. There was only one wicket and only one person serving the public at the wicket. The result was that there was generally a congested state of affairs in the post office. There being but one wicket, the other clerks, who might not be otherwise occupied, were unable to serve the public and the public were kept waiting. Mr. Bennett directed that there should be two wickets and two clerks attending to the public. He reported that as an entire solution of the difficulty. My hon. friend, of course, will know the facts better than I.

Mr. INGRAM. There have been two wickets in the post office since the building was erected, but the difficulty is that at the noon hour, when the principal mail trains come into the city and at four o'clock, when the children come from the schools and naturally

crowd the post office, with the changing of the mails, the making up and distributing of mail matter taking place in the post office, it is impossible for the clerks to have both the wickets open. The public complaint was due to the fact of the young man resigning his position and his place not being filled. I am sure if the hon. Postmaster General will look carefully into the facts and into the report he will find that to be an actual fact. There has been no fault found, as far as I know, in respect to the administration of the post office, the cause of the trouble being simply that they are short-handed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A lack of good management.

Mr. INGRAM. I think you will find that Mr. Bennett's report will bear out the statements I am making.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am quite as solicitous as the hon. gentleman is to see that the office is sufficiently administered. I shall be pleased if the hon. gentleman will come to my department and look over Mr. Bennett's report. If he takes exception to it, from his local knowledge I will attach much weight to what he advises. My own impression is that Mr. Bennett has reported that the arrangement which has been made meets all the requirements.

Mr. INGRAM. I shall be glad to avail myself of the opportunity of reading the report.

Mr. BERGERON. I imagine that this would be the proper time to ask my hon. friend if anything has been done in regard to the appointment of a postmaster at Montreal ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Nothing has been done yet. I found that the post office at Montreal had been managed on somewhat ancient lines and I thought it advisable, before installing a new postmaster, to a large extent, to modernize the system of management so that he would start with a fair chance. I have had two of the most experienced officers of my department take charge of the office, Mr. Bennett and Mr. Armstrong. They are not my appointees, but are experienced men, none better in the service, and they have made great changes and improvements, and I think they have put the office in a satisfactory condition. They are working at it quietly, not being always in attendance now. They were in constant attendance for a while, but one was taken off and the other remained in constant attendance. Now, the other goes back and one will take it for a week at a time. In this way we are getting the office running on proper lines. I am in hopes that, in the course of the summer, we will get it in good working order.

Mr. BERGERON. And then the postmaster will be appointed ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I am looking forward to making the appointment when the office is in good shape. I want to put it in such shape that there will be no excuse for it deteriorating. Montreal is almost, if not the most important post office in Canada. It is not only important to Montreal, but to Canada, that the mail service shall be equal to all the possibilities, and I intend to bring it up to that state of efficiency.

Mr. **BERGERON**. A difficulty arose there last summer, or fall, about the letter carriers riding on the street cars and then being deprived of that privilege. They sent a petition to the hon. Postmaster General. What has been the result?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The Street Railway Company were paid a contract price for some years for the transportation of letter carriers.

Mr. **BERGERON**. How much was it?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I think \$2,400. They demanded that it should be increased about \$10,000—I think \$800 a month. It was thought not to be in the public interest that mail clerks should be riding on the cars with too great freedom, because it would perhaps induce them to slip off from their beats. Moreover, it was impossible to accede to the demands of the railway company, but a satisfactory arrangement with the company was made by which the company issue a special letter carriers' ticket and we pay for the service that is rendered. The post office purchases a lot of letter carriers' tickets at a considerable reduction, because the letter carriers make short trips. I think everything is satisfactory now.

Mr. **WALLACE**. What is the estimated cost under that arrangement?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I think a little less than the contract price. I think it is a shade less.

Mr. **BERGERON**. What is the arrangement in Toronto?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. It is a contract for a lump sum.

Mr. **BERGERON**. The same as in Montreal?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I think a little more than Montreal.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I wish to bring to the notice of the Minister a communication I have received from a gentleman in the parish of St. Victoire, in the county of Richelieu. They had a mail service there three times a week, and a request was made of Mr. Bruneau, member for the county, to secure a daily mail. Probably Mr. Bruneau brought the matter to the attention of the Minister, because, if I am

Mr. **BERGERON**.

rightly informed, the post office inspector visited the place in December last, and tenders were asked for the daily carriage of the mails between St. Victoire and Sorel from the 1st of April, 1899. The tenders were opened on the 10th February, but when the 1st of April arrived there was no daily mail. Mr. Bruneau, probably expecting the thing would be done, authorized the postmaster, Mr. Paulhus, to carry the mail every day from the 1st of April, but there was no contract. This was done from the 1st of April to the 27th of April, and this gentleman, writing to me on the 29th of May, says that the three days a week service has been resumed as formerly. It seems that the post office there is kept in a very bad way, and that the mail does not arrive and depart at a proper time, it being a kind of go-as-you-please matter. The gentleman who writes to me, and I suppose you must take it as coming from a gentleman who is a politician, says that if Mr. Paulhus was not a good Grit, he would not remain postmaster very long, because he does not give satisfaction. My correspondent wants to know why the parish of St. Victoire is treated in that way. I would be glad if the Postmaster General would give me some information about it, so that my informant may know what the particulars are.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I cannot be expected to give all the details of eight thousand mail contracts, but I will give my recollection of it. The village of St. Victoire is, I think, seven miles from Sorel.

Mr. **BERGERON**. About that.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The mail service was tri-weekly, beginning at Sorel, which was the only post office connected with St. Victoire, and the member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) pressed me on many occasions with great earnestness to establish a daily mail system, pointing out that there was no telegraphic system to St. Victoire and no railway facilities. The revenue of the post office is about \$150, I think, so far as my recollection goes. I told the member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) that I would see what this daily mail service would cost, and so we called for tenders, but the cost was, I believe, more than the gross revenue from the post office, and we would have nothing left to pay the postmaster and other expenses. I did not let the contract, and the matter has remained in that state up to the present time.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I will send the "Hansard" to the gentleman who wrote to me, and he will get the answer.

Mr. **INGRAM**. Would the postmaster say whether a contract has been let for carrying the mail by stage from Aylmer to St.

Thomas, and whether the old contract has been cancelled on the air line of the Grand Trunk Railway, connecting those two points ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was represented to me last winter that it would serve the public convenience better if the mails between St. Thomas and Aylmer were sent by stage, and I directed the calling for tenders for that service. Tenders were received, and before the contract was awarded there was one tender that was lowest, but it appeared to have come in too late. There was a contention about it, and I refused to accede to the view that the tender was in time, and yet I did not like to award the contract to a higher tenderer, and so I solved the problem by directing that the matter should be put up to tender again. I do not remember whether the time for the reception of these tenders has elapsed, or whether the contract has been awarded.

Mr. INGRAM. The department issued orders to those who carry the mails between the station and post office, that that would be discontinued on the 1st of May, but they were again ordered to continue it. I understand that the contract of Mr. Winder had been accepted, that the bonds had been sent to him and accepted, and that afterwards a telephone message asking that the bonds be returned was sent to the postmaster at Aylmer. Mr. Winder has the contract between the Aylmer station and the post office. He is a responsible man, and his tender, as I am informed, is considerably lower than the next one.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Do you mean under the re-advertising ?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not heard anything about it.

Mr. INGRAM. I am informed by letter that Mr. Winder's tender was \$199, and that the next lowest tender was \$250, and his second tender \$99.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The contract will be awarded to the lowest tenderer, whoever he is, if there is nothing against him.

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Winder has at present a contract with the department, and he seems to be a very good man.

Mr. GANONG. Can the Postmaster General give me any information with regard to the Grand Manan mail service, to which I called his attention last Friday ? The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) is here, and perhaps he may know about it. I met a gentleman on the street to-night who had recently come from there, and he complained that as yet no arrangement had been made for this mail service. The island is six

or seven miles from the mainland, has a population of about 3,000 people, and, as a large amount of business is done there, it is important that this service should be attended to. It is in the interest of the people there that some arrangement should be made at once.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The service is in the charge of the Department of Trade and Commerce. I think the steamer was subsidized under the head of mail subsidies, and when the steamer was taken off the line she was sold. But I understand from the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce that some arrangement had been made.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I believe the service as heretofore performed will be renewed. The parties who were negotiating with the department were unfortunately demanding a sum for services they proposed to render which would have exhausted the entire sum at my disposal in a period of about two months and a half. It was impossible to accede to that proposition, as it would deprive the inhabitants of all services for the balance of the year. I understand that negotiations are going on by telegraph at this moment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not know whether it is pertinent to this item, but, perhaps, the committee will allow me to inquire whether the Government propose to do anything for a very important service which has a strong claim upon Canada, both from its usefulness and its importance as a large contributor to the Intercolonial Railway. I mean the steamship service between Newfoundland and Cape Breton. It is an admirable service, and has maintained a weekly connection between the island of Newfoundland and North Sydney for every week in the year but one. Last winter it was much obstructed by ice, and did not accomplish quite as valuable a service. The steamer "Bruce," which has been put on that line, furnishes a more rapid communication between every part of Canada and Newfoundland than any other means of communicating with the island. If the Government have at all considered the matter, I can hardly think they would hesitate to show their appreciation of the enterprise of the Messrs. Reid in establishing such an admirable means of communication, and bringing such a large amount of travel and traffic over the Intercolonial and through Canada.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I may say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that negotiations are pending at this very moment between the Government and Mr. Reid on that subject ; but they are hardly in a state as yet to communicate to the House.

Mr. BERGERON. Would this be a proper time to ask my hon. friend about the con-

tract for the ocean mail service of which we have seen something in the papers ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think we had better wait until the items come up.

Mr. WALLACE. This afternoon I made a few remarks on the question of the mail service, and I propose to refer further to that question. I said that the Postmaster General was quite ready to cut down the payments to those who had mail contracts throughout the country, but that the payments made to the railroads formed a much larger item. The hon. Postmaster General admitted that when he came into office he had asked Parliament to appropriate the sum of \$5,000 to investigate the question of the payments to the railway companies for the services they performed; but some good angel whispered into his ear that he had better not do that, and he told us innocently that he had not expended the \$5,000, and had, therefore, saved that much to the country. Now, I would like to know who it was whispered this into the Postmaster General's ear. Who was this great benefactor who told him that he had better not investigate these matters? Was it the railroad companies who were anxious that no investigation should take place, because, as the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) told us, if an investigation did take place, the railroad companies would be entitled to a much larger amount for the services they performed. If that be the case, the railroad companies are a very innocent and unsophisticated lot of corporations; but they have not that name. They do not know that they are not paid half or three-fourths what they should be for the services they render; they are quite oblivious to the fact that they are entitled to much more money; and the Postmaster General, by simply shutting up his book and not expending that \$5,000, has kept these innocent railway companies in the dark, as to the further amount they would be entitled to if an investigation were held. I assume that the railroad companies would proceed with that investigation if they had the strong case intimated by the present Postmaster General and by a past Postmaster General. These companies carry the mails on their regular trains. It is not on record that they carry a single mail at a time that suits the convenience of the Government unless it suits their own convenience. The service forms part of their regular passenger train equipment; and the Government pays for the officer on board who performs the work. All that the railway companies do is to give a certain space required in a railroad car. I assume that the fair way to do would be to do as the express companies do. The railroad companies are common carriers. They are bound to carry Her Majesty's mails. They are bound to carry the merchandise of anybody who goes to them and pays them

Mr. BERGERON.

a fair tariff for the work performed. Now, we have some thousands of men who are day by day carrying the mails from the railroad stations and from the towns and centres of business all over this country. These men, you would suppose, should be paid a good deal more money than the railroad companies, which simply give a portion of a car for the letters and newspapers to be carried; but when we come to investigate, we find that for the ordinary convenience of mails, apart from the railroads, by horses, by foot, by wagons and other conveyances, all over the country, there is paid the sum of \$754,000, or, adding the cost of transferring at the stations, \$765,000.

While the railways receive \$1,352,000, it looks to me as if the payment to the railways was out of all proportion to what is paid to the ordinary mail contractors. In one case \$754,000, and in the other \$1,352,000, without tender, and without investigation, although the Postmaster General asked for and received from Parliament an appropriation of \$5,000 to make an investigation, which he never made. If you take up the payments to each individual railway company, you will find large sums paid for services, where the railway company is simply running its trains, not for the accommodation of the Post Office Department, but for its own purposes, and as we have had occasion to know, in several instances, when conflicts arose between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canada Atlantic Railway in the Parry Sound district, at Scotia Junction, the mails were delayed twenty-three or twenty-three and a half hours every day. The community was put to great inconvenience, and apparently the Post Office Department was not strong enough to assert that authority which the laws of the country have given it in order to correct this condition of affairs. We are paying these railway companies enormous amounts. Take, as an example, the Kingston district, which is a fair average district, because there are in it some long stretches not very thickly settled, and other portions well settled. In that district the department pays the ordinary land conveyances \$37,300, and the railways \$68,000 per year, in round figures. The Kingston and Pembroke road receive \$7,200 a year, the Bay of Quinté \$7,125 a year, and other railways make up an appropriation for that district of the enormous amount of \$68,000. The Postmaster General is not doing his duty, when he permits such a state of affairs to continue without investigation and without comparing this expenditure with what other countries pay for similar services. He does not undertake to make a single comparison or statement to this House to show whether we are paying too much or too little. He does not tell us how the scale paid in this country compares with the scale paid in other countries for similar services. We are left completely in the dark as regards

this expenditure of \$1,352,000. When he is asked what justification there is for that expenditure, what return we receive on what basis it is made, he has to confess that he really does not know. I would like the hon. gentleman to take the House fully into his confidence and tell us why he did not spend that \$5,000 in order to make an investigation. It is not at all likely that we are paying too little to these companies, for, if we were, we would find them clamouring for more, as they are not noted for their bashfulness or lack of assertedness in pushing their claims to anything they consider they are entitled to. The hon. gentleman is not doing his duty to this House if he does not tell us to-night on what basis, or for what reason, he is paying these railway companies one and one-third million dollars for carrying the mails, when he is giving very little more than half of that to private contractors, who are day by day, and night by night, carrying the mails over land routes all over the country, and serving every part of the community, cities and towns, as well as districts, hamlets and villages.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Of course, I reply to the hon. gentleman, as he desires a reply, but I can only repeat what I have already said. The Government of which my hon. friend was a member, when in office, followed the example of its predecessors, and left the condition of affairs which I found awaiting me.

Mr. WALLACE. And found satisfactory?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I found that condition of affairs existing, which had received the endorsement of long years of acquiescence by previous Governments, and I do not know that my opinion, whether favourable or otherwise, to the existing arrangements, would determine the question altogether. Still, I attach so much weight to precedent handed down to me by those who have had greater experience, that I carried on the system bequeathed to me by my hon. friend and his associates, and their predecessors, and no doubt he will approve of the respect I had for the legacy left me by the Administration of which he was a member. As regards what is paid in other countries, no doubt the most appropriate country for the purpose of comparison would be the United States, and I understand that the United States pay very much more for the like service than we do. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway are the chief railways engaged in carrying Canadian mails, and they continually complain that they are underpaid. In like manner, the Michigan Central, which carries the mails between Fort Erie and the Detroit River, makes the same complaint, and is continually applying for an increase. So that my hon. friend will under-

stand that these innocent, unsophisticated orphans of railway companies are not resting upon their rights, but are continually clamouring for more pay. I have not acceded to their demand; but to relieve my hon. friend's anxiety, I would inform him that I did not change my policy of holding an investigation at the instance of the railway companies, but I thought he would have understood, from what I said before six o'clock, that the suggestion made to me, to which I then alluded, did not emanate from the railway companies, but rather from a member of this House who has had considerable experience in the Post Office Department as one of my predecessors, and who was a colleague of the hon. gentleman. Inasmuch as he gave expression to the same view on the floor of the House, I think it is not necessary for me to name him. My hon. friend can judge who it was who, in the public interest, advised me not to proceed by way of a commission.

Mr. CARGILL. A very important matter has been brought to the attention of the Postmaster General by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). It is a revelation to me, at least, that the Government is paying twice as much to the railways of this country for carrying the mails as they are paying for all the other mail service combined throughout the country. That is a matter worthy of the most serious consideration of the Government. As the hon. member for West York has stated, the railways merely supply a car for the purpose of transporting the mail.—

Mr. WALLACE. A quarter of a car.

Mr. CARGILL. They only furnish the space, and the Government pays the employees to take charge of the mail and distribute it. The only expense that the railways are put to is for sufficient steam to carry the mails from one point to another. Very serious complaint is made throughout the country about the very small remuneration that the letter carriers get. These contracts are let by public tender. A number of parties who are anxious to find employment, put in their tenders, and, in many cases, they carry the mails for a good deal less than the work is worth. Of course, that is their fault. At the same time, I think it would be more in the interest of the country if these poor mail carriers in the country got a fair remuneration for the service they render and make the railways carry the mails at a much less price than they are receiving to-day. In the case of the mail carriers, the department dictates terms, making them leave a given point at a certain hour and deliver mails along the route at certain hours during the day. These mail carriers have to comply with the conditions of the Post Office Department or forfeit their job. But, apparently, the department has no control over the

railways in this mail service. The railway will not put on additional cars to accommodate the Post Office Department or supply any extra mail service without receiving extra pay. They will carry the mails only on such trains as they run over the road and no others. It seems to me that when they are so well paid they should render the service that is required in the different portions of the country. In the locality where I live they had, at one time, a very good mail service. But the railway came to the conclusion that there was not enough business being done to enable them to run two trains a day. The consequence was that one train was taken off, and we in that section had to be content with one mail a day. Of course, we murmured and complained, and referred the matter to the Post Office Department; but we could not obtain any redress. I believe the Postmaster General is administering this department to the best of his ability and with a desire to do what is best in the interest of the country. I feel satisfied that if he gives careful consideration to this matter which the hon. member for West York has brought very intelligently before him, he will come to the conclusion that the railways are being paid much more liberally for the services rendered than the letter or mail carriers of the country.

Mr. POWELL. I would like to ask the Postmaster General what is the ordinary allowance per mile to railways for the carriage of mail?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The lowest allowance is 2 cents a mile. I think. In 1864 a commission was issued, and they adopted a scale of remuneration—4 cents for what is called baggage car service, the baggagemen employed by the railways handling the bags, receiving and delivering, and 8 cents a mile for a postal car, that is, furnishing a postal car or a portion of the car and carrying the mails and mail clerks. There is another system of remuneration. On the Intercolonial Railway main line we make an allowance of so much per annum per mile. I desire to say 't nas nothing to do with my hon. friend's question—that in referring to Mr. James on a former item, I spoke of him as a first-class mail clerk. I made a mistake. He was a second-class clerk.

Mr. POWELL. What is that allowance on the Intercolonial Railway?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think about \$130 per year per mile. On the leading lines of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway the same system prevails. I endeavour, where the service is only limited, to pay on the train mile or baggage-car basis, but when there are a great many services between two points, as between Hamilton and Toronto, Toronto

Mr. CARGILL.

and Ottawa, and Toronto and Montreal, where the services are frequent, the other system is adopted. I have never, myself, changed a service to so much per mile, but my predecessors have converted many of the ordinary services of so much per train mile to so much per railway mile. I have had to establish mails on certain lines since taking office, and I think in all cases we have paid on the scale adopted in 1864, except sometimes where I have had it at 2 cents a mile.

Mr. POWELL. That is a great deal lower than in the United States, is it not?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The railway men say so. They complain that I treat them very hardly and very unfairly.

Mr. POWELL. Whatever railway men think, the people of the United States think that the railways treat them very hardly over there. Another question I would like to ask the Postmaster General is the amount that we pay in case of special trains for the service. There are some cases of that on the Intercolonial Railway.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The scale is a dollar per train mile. My hon. friend refers to the United States. I may say that a year ago this question came up in Congress, and a special committee was appointed to consider the whole question of the basis of remunerating railway companies for the carriage of the United States mails. That commission met in Chicago in June and in July last, but I think they did not accomplish much.

Mr. POWELL. Do you pay more than \$1 per mile for special trains anywhere in Canada?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think not.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). What is the total cost per annum for the carriage of the mails by the railways?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The total contracts as set forth in the Postmaster General's report are \$1,350,000, in round numbers.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to bring up a question which I will ask permission to do on this item, as I want to leave by the train. I want to ask the Minister to do an act of justice to a constituent of mine whom I am sure, after hearing the report that has been brought down, he will admit has been harshly treated by him, that is Mr. J. R. Leake, postmaster at Morton. He had been postmaster for some 23 years, and he was dismissed in 1899 on a charge of political partisanship. I moved for a return which I hold in my hand. The first letter of that return is dated Westport, 23rd November, 1897. The elections were held in June, 1896. This letter is addressed to the Hon. Mr.

Mulock, Postmaster General. It is written by Mr. W. H. Fredenburgh, who was the Liberal candidate in that election. It reads as follows :—

Your letter of the 10th instant, re certain complaints made against Postmaster Leake, of Morton, duly received and noted, and in reply beg to say that I have been very credibly informed that Mr. Leake took a very offensive political part in the election of June, 1896, which, according to the policy as stated on the floor of the House at the first session, would be quite sufficient to cause Mr. Leake's dismissal. I have been informed that for several days before the election he kept a document in the post office, the object of which was to pledge electors who would sign it to support George Taylor, the Conservative candidate at the then coming election. He also, it is said, went out on the street with the document in hand, and used his influence to get all he could to sign or pledge their support to Mr. Taylor, attended Conservative conventions, and in other ways took a very active part in the interest of Mr. Taylor and against me. If any man is liable to be dismissed for political interference, I think Mr. Leake is one.

I am, hon. Sir,  
Yours truly,  
W. H. FREDENBURGH.

The next letter is dated the 1st December, 1897, and is addressed to Mr. Leake, and signed by Mr. W. D. LeSueur, secretary. It is as follows :—

Sir,—I am directed to inclose to you herewith an extract from a communication which has been received at this department charging you with specific acts of partisanship during the Dominion election of last year. The Postmaster General would be glad to receive any reply you may desire to make in regard to the charges in question, and I am to request that your reply may take the form of a statutory declaration.

Mr. Leake replies to that by a statutory declaration, the last clause of which reads as follows :—

I have not allowed the discussion of politics around my store for years. On the day of said election an agent came to me in my store and said that a certain person upon whose farm I had a mortgage would vote for Mr. Taylor if I would ask him. My reply was : "No, emphatically." I was in my office all day, except about 15 minutes, while voting. And I make this solemn declaration, and so on.

(Sgd.) J. R. LEAKE.

Declared before me at Morton, in the county of Leeds, this 6th day of December, A.D. 1897.

(Sgd.) J. C. JUDD,

A Commissioner in and for Leeds and Grenville.

The next letter is from Mr. Sliter, inclosing two declarations charging Mr. Leake, the postmaster, with offensive partisanship. They are lengthy, and I won't read them, because it is not necessary. One is from Mr. Sly, and one from Mr. Robert Wood. There was no attention paid to them. The matter apparently dropped there until the 12th of March, 1898, when this document was presented to the department through Mr. Fredenburgh, the defeated candidate, and it shows that the axe came down on Mr. Leake through the influence of the exe-

cutive of the Reform party of that township. This was sent to Mr. Fredenburgh, the defeated candidate :

We, the undersigned executive of the township of South Crosby, do hereby recommend the appointment of A. E. Sliter as postmaster at Morton, and request that you will urge the Postmaster General to make the appointment as soon as possible.

(Sgd.) CHARLES E. JOHNSON,  
HENRY HALLIDAY,  
C. B. HALLIDAY,  
A. D. DeLONG,  
R. G. MURPHY,  
L. W. BROWN,  
H. S. DAVISON,  
D. A. COON.

The next is a letter dated Morton, January 2nd, 1899, addressed to the Postmaster General :

Hon. Sir,—I beg to call your attention to the application and material before you of long-standing for the removal of our postmaster. The management of our office here is simply unendurable, and it is too much to ask the public for a continuance. If he cannot be removed upon the material before you, kindly let us have an investigation.

I am, your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) J. JUDD.

Then Mr. Hawken, Post Office Inspector from Ottawa, was sent up, not to hold an investigation, but to go round and see, first, Mr. Fredenburgh, and then these parties who had sent in these complaints. He made private inquiries, and made a report on which Mr. Leake was removed, and Mr. Sliter was appointed in his place. Mr. Leake writes me this letter, dated the 26th of April, 1899 :

Morton, 26th April, 1899.

George Taylor, Esq., M.P.

Dear Sir,—In reference to my dismissal from the postmastership of Morton, I beg to say, that last fall I received a letter from Mr. Mulock, containing charges against me of being partisan in political matters. In reply thereto I made a statutory declaration, and sent it to the Postmaster General. It should be on file in his office.

Some time between 10th and 15th of March last, I noticed a stir around Mr. Sliter's—a stranger was there, and I supposed it was the electrician from Rathbun, changing the telephone office from Mr. Sly, who moved to Taylor next day. Afterwards a gentleman came into my store, and announced himself as Mr. Hawkin, post office inspector, from Ottawa, and that he had come on a painful errand. He showed me a list of charges against me as postmaster, that is, partisanship, &c. I never had a paper here and asked voters to sign it for Mr. Taylor and against Mr. Fredenburgh. There was a paper left here, but it was solely for Conservative convention purposes, and before either Mr. Fredenburgh or Mr. Taylor was in the field. And after the Conservative convention was over, I took it up from the counter and gave it to Mr. Taylor first opportunity. The paper, anyway, was like a chip in porridge, neither good nor hurt. I have not talked politics, nor allowed it to be discussed in my office these years past. On election day, 1896, I was in my store and post office all day, excepting one half-hour, whilst voting. An

agent came in, in the afternoon, and asked me to influence a man largely under obligation to me—a Liberal—to vote for Mr. Taylor. I said emphatically: "No, let every man vote as he chooses, untrammelled. All the people here, of both parties, said, "Most decidedly we want to stay with Mr. Leake," excepting two men, and am astonished that Mr. Mulock would allow himself to be hoodwinked by such a quantity and quality.

Respectfully,

J. B. LEAKE.

P.S.—If Mr. Hawkin held an investigation here I was not notified of it, or to attend it. And Mr. Mulock was misinformed when he said I was. There certainly was no public investigation. I only wish there would be one—I would be there.

These are the facts of the case. Mr. Leake is one of the most respectable men in the county, a merchant of many years' standing, and postmaster for twenty-seven years. By the advice of the executive of the Reform Association there he was, in March or April of 1899, dismissed for political partisanship, two or three years after the election was held, without a sufficient investigation. Mr. Hawkins went there and saw Mr. Sly, Mr. Sliter, the gentleman who was appointed, Mr. Fredenburg, and some others, and made his report upon that. This old servant has been dismissed in this way, and I claim that he should either be reinstated or that a public investigation should be held so that he would have an opportunity of presenting his side of the case. He knew nothing about it until he got a notice saying that he was dismissed, further than that Mr. Hawkins came into his store and had a conversation with him. He was not present at an investigation. I think that a great injustice has been done to him and I appeal to the hon. Postmaster General to order a public investigation. I am satisfied that the declaration made by Mr. Leake is true and that it will be found so, in every particular. I know myself that he was a faithful officer and that he took no part in the election further than to go himself and vote.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought this matter to my attention, because I would like to undeceive him and to remove any erroneous impression that may exist. I have a copy of the report before me, and as this may be the only occasion upon which the matter will come up, I might say what it contains. I may say that long ago complaints were made against Mr. Leake, my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) says, of political partisanship. I have not, at least recently, read the correspondence upon that point, but I did not take any action upon the complaints. However, this spring complaints were made against the postmaster in regard to the management of the office and these complaints were referred to the inspector for his report. The inspector finds these complaints proved. What steps he took as to the form of the investigation I do not know. He is an old and experienced officer,

Mr. TAYLOR.

and I presume that he would make a proper investigation. He found the following charges proved.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. Postmaster General, before he makes his statement of the charges proved, make a statement of the nature of the investigation the inspector made?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I know nothing about the investigation.

Mr. WALLACE. Does he not state that in the report?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will read the report.

Mr. WALLACE. Does he not state it in the report?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman will permit me to read the report he will see what he says. I do not want to quote from memory, because I do not know whether I might be right or not. I know nothing as to the form of the investigation.

Mr. WALLACE. I asked the hon. Minister that because I thought before he reported the finding of the investigation he would report the form of the investigation.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He would do nothing of the kind. This would be the only thing that he would report. When complaint is made touching the administration of an office, if it comes to me and I consider it a proper subject for investigation, I endorse upon it a memorandum referring the complaint to the inspector for report. It goes to the officer and the next thing I hear of it is when he makes his report. It is his duty to make a proper investigation. I do not interfere at all. These officers are constantly making investigations under the direction of their superior officers, all over Canada. Some people write direct to me, and others to the officers of the department, and anything that touches the conduct of an officer, if sufficiently serious, becomes the subject of an investigation.

Mr. WALLACE. I only mentioned it in view of the fact that the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) made the statement to the hon. Postmaster General that there was no investigation made in the sense that the postmaster was not notified and did not know that an investigation was being held. I would like to have that point cleared up.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I can hardly believe that Mr. Hawkins would come to an ex parte finding. He is an experienced officer, a fair and just man, and I am satisfied that he never made a report without giving the postmaster a fair opportunity to defend himself.

Mr. WALLACE. That is the statement of the hon. member for Leeds.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am sure he never did it. It would be impossible for him to do such a thing. I may say that he refers to the following charges as proved: However, I think, in fairness I will not put these things on record. I will discuss it with the hon. member for Leeds, who is not now in his place.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Postmaster General has deemed it better to defer the statement, and I have no objection to make as to that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It may be made at some other time.

Mr. WALLACE. The statement made by the hon. member for Leeds is a serious one.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Either discuss it or drop it.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not intend to discuss it; it is a serious statement made by the hon. member for Leeds, but, as the hon. Postmaster General prefers to defer it to another occasion, I have no objection. I was going to make a reference, before that matter was brought up, to the former item, because I think it requires further investigation. We are paying the Intercolonial Railway for carrying the mails, \$145,000 a year. Take that road as a specimen: it is a Government road. They do not run a mile on that road, I presume, for the accommodation of the Post Office Department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are some special trains run in connection with the ocean mails.

Mr. WALLACE. Presumably, there will be some few items of that kind. I do not see any here in the list of payments made, but it may be that there are some. On the main line and branches at \$130 per mile per annum the payments amounted to \$87,750; Moncton and St. John, 89 miles, \$11,500; Dalhousie and Dalhousie Junction, 7 miles, \$910; Truro, Pictou and Mulgrave, 137 miles, \$17,800; Oxford Junction and Brown's Point, 5 miles, \$8,700; Sydney and Point Tupper, \$11,800; Ferriage Straits of Canso, \$1,800; Ste. Rosalie Junction and Nicolet from 20th February, \$1,084; Ste. Rosalie and Chaudière, \$872; British mails, \$111. We pay the Intercolonial Railway therefore about \$500 a day for 313 days in the year. You pay the Grand Trunk Railway Company for carrying mails on their roads the total sum of \$373,248, which amounts to \$1,190 a day. You give to the Canadian Pacific Railway \$614,000 a year or \$1,960 for every working day, nearly \$2,000 a day. The services rendered are no doubt large, but these are enormous sums, and you cannot say that the service entails any additional expense on the railway companies further than furnishing a portion of a car or a whole car if it is required, for the carriage of the mail. Now, take Prince Edward Island, where you can

make an exact estimate of the business, and you find that while we are paying for the ordinary land conveyance all over the Island \$16,000, we are paying \$18,900 to the Prince Edward Island Railway for the service. You pay that, notwithstanding the fact that the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Martin) is continually complaining to this House that the greater portion of the Island is not served by the railway, and that branch lines are required all over the Island. We must assume that the land mail service in Prince Edward Island is, therefore, very extensive. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) thinks this is a very moderate allowance that is paid to the railways for this service.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you say to the railways generally or to the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. WALLACE. I am criticising the sums paid to the railways generally.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You said that I stated that the railways generally were not paid enough. I merely complained that the Intercolonial Railway is not paid enough.

Mr. WALLACE. I beg pardon of the Minister of Railways if I attributed that remark to him. He is too cautious to make such a statement, but it was the Postmaster General who made the statement.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What the Postmaster General said was that the railways claimed they were not paid enough.

Mr. WALLACE. The Postmaster General went further than the words which the Minister of Finance puts in his mouth. The claim of the railway companies would not be a justification for him paying this enormous sum, unless he endorsed that claim. He must either approve or disapprove of their claim, and when he gets to that point, he tells us that one of his predecessors, for whose judgment he has the greatest respect, paid the same amount to the railway companies. He is so conservative in his instincts that he does not like to change any regulation made by a Conservative predecessor in office. That is a curious doctrine to be preached by a Liberal who denounced a Conservative Government for extravagance, for wild expenditure, for not taking due care to preserve the public moneys, and denounced them too, because, as they asserted, the Conservative Government was under the control of the railway companies. It is a curious doctrine to be preached by a Government that proclaimed that when they got into power there would be a revolution in all these matters. We know that the present Postmaster General is making claims in every direction that he has made improvements, and that he has cut down expenditure, but when he comes to the most important expenditure in his whole depart-

ment, he balks at that and gets frightened. He started for the ditch, but when he came close to it he pulled up, and refused to attempt to cross it. We are not satisfied with the course of the Postmaster General in this matter. We are not satisfied with his reasoning; that because the Conservative Administration permitted that state of affairs to go on, that that is a complete justification for him, and that we are estopped from complaining or criticising. Even admitting that the Conservatives were lax, or indifferent, or that we did not realize fully this enormous expenditure, is that a sufficient reason for the Postmaster General to allow that state of affairs to continue for all time? I do not think so. Every member of every Government must be always ready to justify his administration of affairs, and the expenditure of public money which he asks Parliament to vote and the people to pay. In this case the Postmaster General is not treating the House with that candour which we have a right to expect from him. He has given us no reason for demanding this enormous sum of \$1,350,000 for the railway companies. He started out to investigate that, but he tells us that a former Postmaster General told him to keep his hands off, and that he was guided in the course he took by the advice given him then, and made no investigation. That is a confession that I did not expect the Postmaster General would make to this House. When he started out to make this investigation to inquire why \$1,350,000 was voted to the railway companies for this service, he should have gone through with his investigation, and found out what the services rendered are worth. He tells us that the railway companies are not satisfied, and that the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway and the Michigan Central are demanding larger sums for this service, and now we hear from the Minister of Railways that the Intercolonial Railway is not satisfied with the \$500 a day which the Post Office Department pays that railway for the mail service. Yet, the Intercolonial does not incur a dollar of expenditure that I know of, further than to furnish the necessary room on a car for the performance of the duties of the post office officials.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I have fallen out with the Postmaster General because of his treatment of us.

**Mr. WALLACE.** The Minister of Railways say the Postmaster General has not paid sufficient for the service he performs, and that he has fallen out with him on that account. I do not believe the falling out is of as serious a character as the Minister of Railways would have us believe. They can be easily reconciled; but the safety of the Minister of Railways lies in this, that the Postmaster General cannot pull down the

**Mr. WALLACE.**

amount paid the Intercolonial without doing the same with the other railways, and then he would have a hornets' nest about him. At any rate, I think it is the duty of the Minister to tell us that, before he pays that money any longer, he will inquire and tell Parliament why he has paid these hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial for services which are very easily and cheaply performed by these railroads, and which, when compared with the services rendered by other parties for the Post Office Department, seem to be very expensive.

Post Office—

Miscellaneous expenses..... \$190,953

**Mr. WALLACE.** Before that item is voted, I have a word to say about a matter with regard to which I have had some correspondence with the Post Office Department and also with the Postmaster General direct. A manufacturer in the city of Quebec, Mr. Mark Frankenberg, of the Globe Rubber Works, has a magnificent factory, perhaps the only one in Canada where both rubber goods and rubber cloth are manufactured. He achieved a great reputation in Manchester, England, where he carried on a large business; and some years ago, while I had the honour of being Controller of Customs, he decided to start a business in Canada. He came over and started business in the city of Quebec, investing a large amount of capital in buildings, machinery and the necessary plant to carry on a large manufacturing enterprise, and being a man of great energy and industry, and having capacity and experience, he built up a large business. Seeing that the Government were importing for the Post Office Department a very large quantity of rubber goods, he made application to the department for an opportunity of supplying those goods. He got very unsatisfactory answers from the department. When I was in Quebec last autumn, I met Mr. Frankenberg; I saw the extent and importance of his establishment, which employed many skilled hands. All he wanted was the opportunity to tender for the supplies for the Post Office Department, but that opportunity has been denied to him. The department say: Oh, we purchase our supplies from parties in England or elsewhere. I contend that is treating our Canadian manufacturers very unfairly.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** How long has he been there?

**Mr. WALLACE.** He came there before I ceased to be Controller of Customs, which was in the latter part of 1895. It took him a year to get properly going, but his establishment has been, I am sure, three full years in working order. He is selling his goods all over this country, and is doing a

large business. He is a skilled and competent manufacturer, and all he wants is an even chance with others to supply these goods. If he supplies them at the same price that the Government pay the English, the French or the German manufacturers, then the Government should buy from the Canadian manufacturer. That is all that Mr. Frankenberg asks, but that privilege has been denied to him. I wrote to the department, and also to the Postmaster General, asking why he was not allowed that privilege, and the matter stands just where it was before. Mr. Frankenberg brought many skilled workmen with him from the old country, the business being new and of a technical nature, and he has educated large numbers of Canadians, who, he says, acquire a knowledge of that business very rapidly. I now bring the matter to the attention of the Postmaster General.

Prince Edward Island Railway—

To shorten main line by removal of curves .....	\$10,000
Rolling stock .....	8,000

Mr. MARTIN. Will the hon. gentleman explain this vote?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The appropriation last year was \$15,000, of which \$13,923 was expended, and a further sum of \$10,000 will be required to complete it.

Mr. MARTIN. Is there any other new work to be done?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not included in this vote. Any further work would require to be provided for in the supplementary Estimates. This is to complete what had already been begun. It is to straighten out the line, where there was a very sharp curve, and out of 5,100 feet, it will save 3,281 feet.

Mr. MARTIN. Although this large expenditure is to be made, the curve proposed to be made will not be much better than the curve which existed before.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am surprised to hear that.

Mr. MARTIN. The curvature before the straightening began was nine degrees and thirty minutes, and since the straightening it is nine degrees and nine minutes. There is only a difference of twenty-one minutes in the straightening of the road secured by this expenditure which, I think, was made by day's work and not by contract. I understand also that the grade is much more to-day than it was before the work began. I would like to ask what was the estimate at first for straightening this curve?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Let me first refer to the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Martin's) statement, made earlier, with regard to the curve. The hon.

gentleman has overlooked the fact that it was not a case of one curve only, but in a distance of 5,100 feet there were no less than three curves, each one of which was of 9·30 degrees radius. It was quite impossible to do away with the curves altogether, but two out of the three had been I may say, extinguished. One curve remains, but it is a curve of 9 degrees, as against 9·30 degrees, as it was before. There has been a saving of 3,281 feet out of the 5,100 feet. That is the condition of affairs, as I am advised by the officers of the department.

Mr. MARTIN. I understood the Minister, in replying to a question of mine, earlier in the session, to say that the curve now is one of 9·9 minutes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think that must have been an error in printing.

Mr. MARTIN. The Minister has not given the estimate for the straightening of this curve.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. True, I omitted that. I am not in a position to give the estimate; but I am informed that the work has cost \$25,000 to date.

Mr. POWELL. What is the increase of the grade?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Eight feet. There was already a grade of 58 feet.

Mr. MARTIN. The object in spending this money may have been a very good one, but I think the results obtained are not commensurate with the sum expended. It must be remembered that this road originally only cost \$14,000 or \$15,000 a mile. It is shortened by only 3,281 feet, at an expense of \$25,000. I think there are many ways of spending the money on that road which would have yielded better results than in dealing with these curves. I believe that on this road there is 50 per cent of curvature. On the line between Charlottetown and Summerside, there is only 49 miles of straight road, and 24·40 of curvature.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would not be 50 per cent—the whole road is over 200 miles long.

Mr. MARTIN. I am speaking of the road between Summerside and Charlottetown. On the whole road the straight line aggregates 132·51 miles, and the curves 65·99 miles, or almost exactly 33 per cent of curves. I think there has been no demand for the straightening of these curves. In fact, if there was work to be done in the way of straightening curves there were worse curves than these requiring attention. I do not wish to impute motives, but the work was done in the riding of the

hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), and I fear that the work was undertaken and the money spent largely in the interest of his political friends. I think the outlay is altogether too large for the results.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I understood from the hon. Minister that the road was shortened 3,281 feet, and there was an increase in the grade?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) About \$25,000 has been spent, and about \$10,000 more is required. To shorten the road by 3,281 feet, we shall expend \$35,000, and this on a road the construction and equipment of which, from end to end, cost about \$14,000 or \$15,000 a mile. This is perfectly ridiculous. I think I must, from my own standpoint, try to give the Minister a little friendly advice, and that is, when he comes to straighten the other curves, to let the work be by contract. If he does, I guarantee that he will get it done for one-third the amount that it cost in this case. I must say that I am very much afraid that this is done for special purposes. That is the opinion of people who understand these things. This expenditure of \$35,000 has been spread over two or three years. The work has been kept going to give employment to party friends. That is the general impression, and I believe there is a good deal of ground for it. When this work was started it was expected that \$8,000 or \$10,000 would be all that would be required. We could not get any satisfactory information at the time. But it is going on year after year and the amount expended is increasing. Now we are asked to vote \$10,000 to keep it going for another year. I think it time the matter was brought to a close; and if the Government study the interest of the people in the case of future work, they will have it done by tender and contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am sorry I had not anticipated that we would be asked to repeat the arguments already advanced in this House, I think, on more than one occasion, or I would have suggested to my hon. colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) to remain in the House to hear what his colleagues from the island were going to say on this subject. I had no personal knowledge with reference to the necessity or importance of this work itself, until the matter was brought to my attention by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and thereupon inquiries were made by the officers in the service. The engineer was sent there with the view of making an examination of the road, and of advising as to the wisdom or necessity of having the work done. I did assume that as regards the im-

Mr. MARTIN.

portance of this work there was no difference of opinion among the gentlemen representing the Island. Any one who has travelled over the island road must have been impressed with the rather dangerous condition, or the unsatisfactory condition, of its curves, for the curves which it has been proposed to straighten are particularly severe, and I should think more than ordinarily dangerous. A small piece of the road, less than a mile in length, which has three curves within that distance of the character I have stated, would seem to indicate that some improvement was necessary. It was, as I have stated, on the representations which were made of the necessity of doing this that the appropriation was asked for in the first instance, and I do not recollect that on that occasion it was vigorously opposed. When the subject came up for discussion, I do not recollect that one or other of the gentlemen opposite criticised the manner in which the work was being done, and complained that it was not being done under contract, and I explained to the House why it had been determined that it was better to do the work otherwise than to call for tenders. It was on account of these things that the general superintendent for one, and the chief engineer for another, advised that it would be quite impracticable to invite tenders for doing this work, since the tenderers would not be able to make an estimate; at all events, if they did make an estimate, they would likely include an item for a considerable time that would be lost in consequence of the passing of trains over the portion of the road where the work was going on. I explained that fully to the House on a former occasion, and my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is familiar with the nature of the ground, took part in the discussion. I do not think it is likely to be of any general advantage that we should discuss it again. The House was made fully aware of the fact that it was deemed advisable to do the work in this way. I am sorry my hon. friends opposite have had so little appreciation of the efforts which I have been making to meet what I believed was the desire of the people of the island who used the road between these two points.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) The Minister tells us that it was impracticable to let that work by contract. Anybody who knows anything about railroad building would know that it is just like making a new piece of road outside an old piece, or inside an old piece, as the case may be. Now, we are not objecting to straightening the curves on the Prince Edward Island Railway. In fact, there are some curves even greater than those that are being straightened, and we would be only too glad to see them all straightened. We think we are entitled to that from the way we have been used by the Dominion of Canada. In the first place, we have a road that cost \$16,-

000 per mile as against the \$48,000 per mile that the Intercolonial Railway cost, and you make us pay just as high rates on the Island road as you do on a road that cost \$48,000 a mile. It is a most ridiculous, absurd and dishonest transaction, not only on the part of this Government, but on the part of preceding Governments. The people of Prince Edward Island object to this course. We have got to pay one-third more for both freight and passengers in comparison with other roads on account of increased length of about one-third by reason of the curves, and you charge us just as much as you do on a straight road that cost three times as much. Now, I believe that the Government would be consulting the interests of the country if they put the rates on that road very much lower than they are now. In the first place, we have no long hauls, and people only travel a short distance and send freight a short distance. Besides that, nearly all the people have their own horses and rigs, which they use when they want to go a short distance. If the rates on that road were put down to a reasonable figure in comparison with the cost, I believe the travel would be greatly increased, and the revenues would be greatly increased. As I said before, we do not object to these curves being straightened, but they should be straightened in a businesslike way. In the future you should let the work by tender, and then there would be no occasion for fault finding. Would the Minister tell me where these curves are to be straightened?

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** There are three distinct localities where it is proposed to straighten these curves, at North Wiltshire, Royalist and Caldwell.

**Mr. MARTIN.** I think the Minister should give some consideration to the proposition that was made by my hon. friend in regard to reducing the rates on the Prince Edward Island Railway. I think the Minister is anxious to do something for the province, although, if he has not accomplished much, I suppose we should not blame him because his intentions were very likely good. The question of reducing the rates deserves to be taken into consideration. You are scarcely justified in charging as great rates on a road that cost \$16,000 a mile as you are on the Intercolonial Railway, which cost three times as much. If, on the Prince Edward Island Railway, you have to travel three miles in order to accomplish two miles of your journey, it is plain that you are not only paying at the rate of 3 cents a mile but that you are paying at the rate of 4½ cents a mile. You travel over a mile and a half of the road in order to accomplish a mile. I referred to this some time ago in speaking on another question, and I think the proposal is worthy of the attention of the hon. Minister of Rail-

ways and Canals. I sincerely believe that, if the rates on that road were reduced to the capacity of the road, the hon. gentleman would have more revenue from its operation than he has to-day. There is a prejudice in the minds of the people who travel over that road because they have to pay more than when they travel on the Intercolonial. When these curves are taken into consideration it is not 3 cents a mile that they are paying, but they are paying at the rate of 4½ cents a mile, and, in order to equalize the rates of travel on the two roads, it will be necessary to reduce the rates on the Prince Edward Island branch about 50 per cent. Then the people of Prince Edward Island will be paying the same rate as is charged on the Intercolonial. I find that the working expenses of the Intercolonial are \$2,711 per mile, and the working expenses of the Prince Edward Island Railway only \$1,101.99. The working expenses of one road are more than double those of the other, and when you consider what I have already said, I think the question is plain to any person who will give it consideration. If the hon. Minister will give it his consideration he will find that his receipts will not be diminished, but that they will be increased by reducing the rates. The exact cost of the Prince Edward Island Railway, including rolling stock and everything, was \$3,768,107.25 up to the 30th June, or at the rate of \$17,610 per mile. The cost of the Intercolonial Railway, according to the latest statement I can get in the report of the Railway Department, was \$55,668,913.95, or at the rate of \$46,352 per mile. It is, in my opinion, unreasonable that the rate on a road which only cost about one-third of the other road should be the same as the rate upon the other road. It is not business that these rates should be left unequalized, and no company would think of running the road on the present basis; and I would ask the hon. Minister to give his consideration to this question. I am sure, if the Minister wants to wipe out the deficit on that branch of the Intercolonial, one thing that will conduce to it is to reduce the rates so that the people of Prince Edward Island will not be paying as they are to-day, at the rate of 4½ cents a mile on that section of the road.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** When my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) states that the working expenses on the Intercolonial are \$2,700 a mile and upon the Prince Edward Island road \$1,100 per mile and draws the inference which he does from that fact, I think he loses sight of considerations which do not really support his general conclusion. The fact that the working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway are so much larger is due to the greatly increased amount of business that is done upon the Intercolonial Railway and not, either to the condition of the road, or to the

character of its structure, as compared with the Island road. I may say that the point of view from which my hon. friend has presented his claim, that the department might fairly consider this subject of making some reduction in the general passenger rate and the way in which he brings it forward are quite new to me. I am bound to say that I think it has some force in it and is entitled to consideration. The fact that the railway was made so much longer than it need have been made, that the mileage is so much greater than it need have been, and that the rates are based upon the same rate per mile as on the Intercolonial Railway is quite a new and reasonably strong point of view from which to present the case. Should I, yielding to the force of his strong presentation of the case, make a reduction and it should not turn out quite as he anticipates, or that there should be some increase in the deficit in the working of the road, I think I would have to count upon the assistance of my hon. friend to justify me in my course and to meet the very strong adverse criticism that my action in that regard would have provoked. I will say this to my hon. friend, that I am willing to give the subject a very fair and full consideration. If it is possible to see my way clear to meet his views, without detriment to the public interest, I should be very much pleased to be able to do so, and I would hope that, if the experiment were tried, the hon. gentleman's anticipations, as to the results would be more than realized.

Mr. MARTIN. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) will find that there is a prejudice in the minds of the people of Prince Edward Island due to the fact that they believe they are paying too much for travelling on that road. The hon. gentleman might follow the example of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), in reducing the rates of postage. He might not for the first year have the anticipated results, but I believe that he would eventually find that the receipts from the road would be increased rather than decreased.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Quite an agitation is springing up in this country in favour of the adoption of the 2 cents a mile rate on railways generally.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I hope that agitation will not strike the Intercolonial.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I hope not; I must agree with the hon. gentleman there, but I think this would be a very good opportunity to illustrate the matter and see if any such results can be obtained from the adoption of that experiment as are anticipated by its advocates. I am very much pleased to find that the hon. Minister of Railways looks favourably on the suggestions that have been thrown out by the

Mr. BLAIR.

hon. member for East Queen's (Mr. Martin) and myself on this occasion in a matter that to my mind appears so reasonable. I think the request is a reasonable one, in fact, I think the present state of affairs in Prince Edward Island is very unreasonable for the reasons that have already been set forth. The cost of the road was very small, and the expenses are also small, in comparison with the larger roads. I think myself that under these circumstances, while the road only cost one-third of the Intercolonial Railway, it would not be prudent to give us a rate at one-third of what is charged on the Intercolonial Railway. I am not so unreasonable as that, but it is worth while considering a very substantial reduction with the strong hope of increasing the travel there very materially, as I am sure it would. From a personal stand-point, I can hardly favour that, as it might bring trade past myself. But all the same, in the interest of the public generally, it would be a good thing, and if the Minister (Mr. Blair) should come to Parliament with an increased deficit on account of giving this advantage to Prince Edward Island. I would not feel disposed to blame him. I honestly believe that if this suggestion got a fair trial in Prince Edward Island, it would not increase the deficit to any extent, if at all.

Mr. BERGERON. The Minister expressed the hope that a 2-cent rate would not strike the Intercolonial Railway, and, of course, I understand his anxiety that the Intercolonial Railway should pay. Let me ask him if there has not been a cut rate on the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal to the seaside resorts on the lower St. Lawrence, by which people can travel for less than a cent a mile. Has not the Minister received a communication recently with reference to this from those who are interested in making traffic arrangements between railway and navigation companies, and has my hon. friend not refused the request made to him? I understand he has cut down the rate to less than 1 cent a mile between Montreal and the watering places on the St. Lawrence.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) must have been misinformed, when he states such a rate has been made, even under the special circumstances which he has alleged. I have not yet been informed as to what the exact tourist rate is for the season, but I did receive a complaint—not, however, from the travelling public who are using the road, but from those who are interested in a competitive line of steamships—against the rate that the officers of the Intercolonial Railway had fixed for excursion parties of tourists upon certain sections of the road. I have written to the General Superintendent to know definitely just what these rates are. I can believe

that, in accordance with the general custom that obtains on the Intercolonial Railway, as upon all other roads, they found it necessary, in order to induce traffic and to maintain their own traffic against competition, to make a rate which will enable them to hold their business. I presume a rate has been made in this case for parties of perhaps five or ten, or it may be a family rate. If that were done, I think it would be in accordance with the general usage upon railways, but I would not think the rate would have been as low as the hon. gentleman has mentioned. However, I will obtain information upon that subject.

Mr. BERGERON. Could not my hon. friend the Minister get from his chief engineer the last rate issued on the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal to Rivière du Loup or Cacouna?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have written for that information already, and shall let the hon. gentleman know when it arrives.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the Minister know if these tickets are so issued that any group of persons can travel on them as if they belonged to the one family, and that the rate is cheaper than on any other railway, or even upon the steamers?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman must understand that I am not speaking with respect to the particular circumstances which he has called to my attention, because I do not know, and I have not been advised, of any such special rate as he has mentioned. The usual course, I believe, is, that excursion rates are made to cover a party of ten or upwards. If ten persons combine to go, and get these tickets, only the parties who buy them can use them, and they cannot divide up, and one go to-day, and another to-morrow, and another the next day. They must go in parties.

Mr. BERGERON. And they need not be members of the same family.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Speaking from general knowledge, and not with reference to this particular case, there is a difference between family tickets and tickets usually issued to excursion parties consisting of a specified number. There are some points on the line to which family tickets are issued, and these persons who get the tickets must belong to the family, and their names are mentioned, and it is only the persons who are actually members of the family who can use these tickets. They are liable to be taken up, if they are found in possession of any other person.

Mr. BERGERON. I can tell my hon. friend the Minister. They are liable to be taken up. Can the Minister ascertain now whether

the rates on the Intercolonial Railway to the St. Lawrence seaside resorts are not cheaper this year than ever before.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My deputy says he has no knowledge whatever on the subject, but, speaking from my own belief, I can very well understand that the officers of the Intercolonial Railway have made special rates for tourists from Montreal to points along the St. Lawrence in direct competition with the steamship lines. The officers, no doubt, have felt that in order to retain the business which they think legitimately belongs to them, and to secure other business, they should make a rate under these special circumstances, limited to a certain time and so arranged as to comprise a certain number of people within one group. I can well understand that such tickets are reasonably low, but under no other circumstances, I presume, could this class of business have been secured in competition with the steamers. The object of the Intercolonial Railway is to get all the business it can get which is remunerative.

Mr. BERGERON. The Minister knows that in summer special arrangements are made between navigation companies and the railways running to the same points. I suppose he knows better than anybody else that he has refused to go into any such arrangement. Does he remember that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That question has not been submitted to me.

Mr. BERGERON. I may be wrongly informed, but the information I have is that the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway have gone into an arrangement with the steamship companies, and that my hon. friend through the Intercolonial has refused to go into that arrangement. As a matter of fact, the Intercolonial Railway carries people more cheaply than any other conveyance down there. It carries them at the low rate of one cent per mile. Until we have the information from Montreal, there is no use of discussing this.

Mr. POWELL. I would like the Minister to give us the exact length of the new railway that was constructed in order to effect this saving of 3,000 feet on the Prince Edward Island, between the point at which the divergence occurred and the point it came in contact with the old line again.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The length of the old line was 5,100 feet, and that of the new line is 3,281 less than that.

Mr. HAGGART. Can the hon. gentleman give the grades and curves of the new line and those of the old line?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There were three curves on the

old line of 9 degrees 30 seconds and there is one curve on the new line of 9 degrees. The grade is 8 feet heavier.

Mr. POWELL. The change is certainly a good one. Would the hon. gentleman please tell me the exact cost of the change?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. \$24,410 complete.

Mr. POWELL. What is the depth of the cutting that was made?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was there and saw that it was a deep cutting, but I cannot state to-night what the depth was.

Mr. POWELL. There must have been a very heavy cutting or filling, because the work cost about \$70,000 a mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A very heavy cutting and a correspondingly very heavy filling.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman must have given a wrong statement the other day, when he stated that the curvature on the new line was a great deal sharper than the old.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is confusing the grade with the curvature.

Mr. MARTIN. I think there must be some mistake with regard to the curvature. I have here Vol. IX, No. 8 of the Sessional Papers of 1876, which contains a report on the gradients and the curvatures of the Prince Edward Island Road. I find on page 16 of sessional paper No. 66 that there is only one curve on that road of 9 degrees 30 seconds. The next is 9 degrees, the next 8 degrees, and the next 7 degrees, and there is a curve of 10 degrees, which I understand had been straightened years ago; and that is not either of the curves the Minister referred to. The curve of  $9\frac{1}{2}$  degrees has a radius of 604 feet, and is 5.14 miles in length. So that I cannot understand the Minister of Railways saying that there were three curves, when this is the report of the engineer who examined the road at that time. I was a little astonished to find the Minister saying that there were three curves of  $9\frac{1}{2}$  degrees. According to the statement of the Minister to me, which you will find on page 1854 of "Hansard," the curvature at present is 9 degrees and 9 minutes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of course, I would not be able to state from personal knowledge, but I have stated the information just as I have received it from my officer.

Mr. BERGERON. That answer was given by the department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There must be some mistake in the printing. The line will be shortened

Mr. BLAIR.

by this change 328 feet, and the length of the new bed will be 5,100 feet. The original curve was  $9\cdot30$ . There were three long curves, and the sharpest curve, after the work of straightening is made, will be 9 degrees.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) I have been over this road many times. There is one long or main curve, which is about the shape of a horse-shoe. The large curve is made up of smaller ones. There is no question as to the absolute necessity of this work. It is one that has been agitated for during many years—ever since the railway was first constructed. There is no doubt, also, that the work which has been done, although it does not shorten the distance much between Charlottetown and Summerside, is of great benefit to the railway, and will be of great advantage to the people. The reason why this work was done by day labour and not by contract and tender, is mainly because the Government, running the road, could more conveniently do the work, and at the same time not interrupt traffic. While this work was being done, the traffic was continued without interruption. The work may have cost more than was originally anticipated—most of these works do. It certainly, however, was done well and economically. In fact, the great complaint urged by the labourers employed was that they were paid too little for their services. So far as the work is concerned generally, there is a main ditch or dump of about thirty feet to be filled in and a cutting of about from ten to fifteen feet. Although the work was done by day's labour, it was done as efficiently and as economically as it possibly could have been under contract, and more satisfactorily to the general public, because the traffic was not interrupted.

I am quite in accord with my hon. friend from King's as to the advisability of the Government reducing the freight and passenger rates on the Island railway. The people there are fairly well off; each farmer has his horse and buggy; the roads are fairly good, and it is a very easy matter to travel from one place to another. Under these conditions, very few people travel on the railway, because of the high passenger rates charged, but if the Government should reduce the rates, the passenger traffic would be largely increased. The same difficulty obtains with regard to freight. On account of the high rates charged, and the facility with which people can move around with horses and carriages, they prefer to draw their freight by horses rather than pay the high rates of freight on the railway. If the Government would reap any profit from the operations of the road, they must reduce the freight and passenger rates. A petition has been presented from people in the vicinity of Summerside to reduce the freight rates on manure.

From Bedeque Bay, there is a large quantity of mussel mud hauled to various parts of the island, and it is very clear that reduced rates on that kind of freight would be advantageous to the Government as well as to the people. It would be advantageous to the people, because it would enable them to manure their farms to better advantage. It would also be in the interest of the Government in two ways. First, because the farms, being better manured, better crops would be raised, which would have to be carried by the railways; and, second, if the farmers raised better crops they would buy more dutiable goods, so that in both respects this would inure to the benefit of the Government. I am, therefore, quite in accord with my hon. friend from King's, and hope the Government will favourably consider the proposed reduction of freight and passenger rates.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the hon. gentleman an Order in Council to allow him to do this work by day's labour?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not recollect.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose that the hon. gentleman is aware that he is obliged by statute to let the work by contract unless, under the interpretation of the Prime Minister, he shows reason and gets an Order in Council allowing him to do it by day's labour. Here is an expenditure of \$25,000, and I suppose he has an Order in Council setting forth the reasons for doing the work by day's labour.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No doubt, the usual course was pursued, but I cannot say it now.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister has his deputy there, and surely his deputy can inform him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have just asked him, and he cannot give me positive information.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister ought not to ask us to pass this item until he gives us this information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will get the information, but it is not worth while to let the item stand.

Mr. BERGERON. I think we ought now to get all the information that the hon. gentleman said he would bring down.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). As the committee may remember, when this item for improvements at St. John was under consideration, it was removed for the purpose of enabling me to secure the actual figures and an abstract of tenders for the work to be done in this connection. I have the abstract here

before me, and, with the permission of the committee will read it. First, we had a tender for the freight warehouse contract. These are the names of the tenderers:

George W. Appleby.....	\$24,600
Rhodes, Curry & Co.....	22,795
Daniel W. & Daniel C. Clark...	25,945
J. B. McManus .....	24,950
G. S. Mayes .....	39,860

The contract was given to Messrs. Rhodes, Curry & Co., of Amherst, the lowest tenderers, at the amount of their tender. I have here also an abstract of the tenders received for the wharf and dredging at St. John. Tenders were asked for by newspaper advertisement, dated October 6th, 1898, and tenders were to be received up to the 26th of October, 1898. The first tender was John Heney, Ottawa, whose tender amounted to \$298,193. His second tender, which I will explain later, by reference to some correspondence, asked to be allowed to add \$33,000, making a total of \$332,193. The next tender was received from Mr. G. S. Mayes, the amount being \$219,990. I omitted to mention, when referring to Mr. Heney's tender, one point; perhaps I had better go back to that. In addition to the items of work we required, there were certain items that were not to be included in the bulk sum of the contract—rock blasting and stone ballast to be placed in the crib. The tenderers all gave prices. In the first place, in the bulk, and in the next, the price at which they were prepared to do this special work. The next tender was Mr. John F. Morrison, for \$335,569. The last was Messrs. M. K. and N. Connolly, \$328,173.

Mr. BERGERON. That was advertised all over Canada?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes; the advertising was pretty thoroughly distributed at all events. These tenders, you will observe, were received on the 26th of October, 1898, at Moncton. At the time the tenders came to hand at Moncton, Mr. Pottinger, the general manager, was not there; he was up the line. So the tenders were not received by him until two or three days afterwards. They were received at Moncton, of course, according to the time specified in the notice. The tenders were opened by Mr. Pottinger and myself at Montreal on the 31st October. He had the tenders sent to him from Moncton. They were received by him at Montreal, and I, being there, they were opened jointly by himself and myself, on the 31st October. Prior to the opening of the tenders, some correspondence took place with Mr. Heney, one of the tenderers. He called at my office on the 27th of October, as I see from the date of a memorandum which I made at the time. He said he had sent in a tender for the St. John work, but had omitted to state that he had based his figures on the expectation of being able to obtain a dredge in the

United States, there being none available in the maritime provinces.

Mr. BERGERON. You are speaking of Mr. Heney?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. There were no dredges in the maritime provinces that would answer the purpose, and he had counted on being able to hire a dredge in one of the adjacent ports, Portland or Boston, and having it imported duty free into the Dominion, and having it work during the period required, and re-export it on the completion of the contract. He asked me whether or not the Government would give permission for the admission of the dredge, under the circumstances, free of duty. I stated that the question of the free admission of dredges for the purpose of doing work in Canada had been before the Government and application had been made in one, if not more, cases recently. The subject had come up before the Minister of Customs, and he had referred it to the Treasury Board, and the Treasury Board had decided that it was not fair to the owners of Canadian dredges to allow the admission free of American dredges, and I told Mr. Heney I would have great doubt of the application being favourably entertained. I gave Mr. Heney to understand that there would be very little doubt of an unfavourable result to his application. He went home and addressed to me a letter, which was received that evening at my office, and which was in the following terms:—

Ottawa, October 27th, 1898.

Hon. A. G. Blair,  
Minister of Railways and Canals,  
Ottawa.

Sir,—Since my conversation with you this morning in relation to the importation of dredging plant, in bond, to do the dredging in connection with the proposed improvements in the harbour of St. John, N.B., I learned that the duty on the plant I proposed importing will be about \$33,000; I, therefore, most respectfully request that this amount be added to my tender; or, if this is contrary to the practice of the department, I beg leave to withdraw my tender, and trust you will kindly return my cheque.

I intended presenting this letter to you in person; but owing to your absence could not do so; but as tenders will not be opened until your return, I hasten to make this explanation before the relative position of the different tenderers can be known.

I have the honour to be, sir,  
Your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) JOHN HENEY,  
Ottawa.

Mr. BERGERON. The letter says Mr. Heney had seen him during the day. The letter would imply that the hon. gentleman was away.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is quite true. He had seen me in the morning. I had left by the early afternoon train and was not at home when

Mr. BLAIR.

he came to the office in the afternoon. He wrote a letter and left it there for me. The first words used in his letter are: "Since my conversation with you this morning in relation to the importation" he ascertained what the duty would be. I have no doubt that he had gone to the Department of Customs, or to some other place, and had ascertained that it was going to cost him \$33,000 to pay the duty on the dredge, and he asked that this amount might be added to his tender. It appears further in this connection that Mr. Heney—I do not know that I have a copy of that letter, but I am in a position to state that Mr. Heney, while writing to me—and the letter was left at my office here at Ottawa—also mailed a letter to Mr. Pottinger which he addressed to Moncton, and which reached Moncton in due course, and which Mr. Pottinger showed to me later when we were going over these tenders, and it was quite to the same purport, that he wanted to be permitted to add \$33,000 to his tender price.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman gives us the total amount of Mr. Mayes' tender, \$219,900. The Connolly's' tender was \$328,173; John F. Morrison's tender was \$335,366. What is the amount of Mr. Heney's tender?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. \$298,193, to which he asked permission to add \$33,000, which would be \$331,193. Mr. Mayes' tender, you will observe, was the lowest, that was \$10 less than \$220,000. The contract was awarded to Mr. Mayes. He had notice in due course, and shortly afterwards wrote a letter to me, dated 9th of November, after he had been notified that his tender was accepted. He says this:

Sir,—Referring to my tender for the work in connection with the terminal improvements at the Long Wharf, St. John, I beg to say that in making the estimate of the cost of the work, I assumed that the Government would permit an American dredge to be brought into Canada free of duty, the same as was done for the city of St. John in connection with the improvements recently made on the west side of the harbour. I felt the more sure that this would be done, because there is no dredge in the maritime provinces suitable for deep-water dredging. My intention was to build a new dredge, which, however, will take about four months, and to use an American dredge in the meantime. Being now informed that this concession cannot be granted to a private individual, I feel constrained to ask permission to withdraw my tender, and that you will be pleased to direct that my cheque be returned.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the deposit required?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Up to \$250,000 a fixed sum was required, and then 5 per cent upon the tender price. \$14,000 was the amount of deposit by Mr. Mayes, \$20,000 was the amount deposited by Mr. Heney. These are the

only two that are really important, of which I have the exact amount.

Mr. BERGERON. In this letter of Mr. Mayes, does he say by whom he was informed that he could not bring an American dredge into Canada?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, Mr. Mayes came up here to get permission.

Mr. BERGERON. By whom was he informed? He says: "I am informed."

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (reading):

Being now informed that this concession cannot be granted to a private individual, I feel constrained to ask permission to withdraw my tender, and that you will be pleased to direct that my cheque be returned. I am sure that an examination of the specifications will convince you that even if the expected concession were allowed me, my tender would be very low, and there having been a not unreasonable assumption on my part that the law would permit the introduction of an American dredge temporarily, you will, I feel sure, see the justice of this application.

That was a request to withdraw his tender and to have his cheque returned.

Mr. BERGERON. Was that complied with?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. I see that I have the memo. here with regard to the deposit, which I may as well read. With Mr. Heney's tender there was an accepted cheque, dated Ottawa, 24th October, 1898, the Banque Nationale in favour of the Minister for \$20,000. That was an accepted cheque. G. S. Mayes's cheque was dated 26th October, 1898, on the Bank of Montreal in favour of the Minister, \$14,000. This was accepted. But as it was marked good for two days only, and certified by the General Manager, this fact created some doubt in the minds both of Mr. Pottinger and myself at the time, as to whether it would be proper to treat it as a sufficient accepted cheque. In order to make sure, before finally notifying the tenderer that the contract had been awarded to him, we communicated with the Bank of Montreal. I thought I had a copy here of the letter received from the bank on the subject, but I am not quite sure about that. At all events, we received from the Bank of Montreal at St. John an assurance that the cheque would be good, that, although limited on its face to two days only, it would be regarded as an accepted cheque by the bank for an indefinite period. Having that assurance from the manager of the bank, we thought there was no longer any doubt as to the sufficiency of the deposit, and it was following that, that notice was sent to Mr. Mayes. We had a visit from him in Ottawa, and received from him the letter which I have just read. Mr. Mayes was notified.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the answer of the department to his letter?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The answer of the department to Mr. Mayes's letter was the following:—

Department of Railways and Canals,  
Ottawa, 23rd Nov., 1898.

Sir,—Having reference to your communication of the 9th instant, on that day received by the Minister, with respect to your tender for work in connection with the terminal improvements at the Long Wharf, St. John, I am directed to say that the department cannot see its way clear to comply with your request to be allowed to withdraw your deposit cheque, and to be relieved from entering into a contract in accordance with your tender.

I am to say that it is open to you, and you are hereby required, at once to intimate whether it is your purpose, in the view which the department is completed to take of your application respecting the deposit cheque, to enter into a contract for the execution of the proposed works, or not. As so much time has been lost already, and the season is becoming so far advanced, I am to request you to advise us by return mail of your decision in this matter.

I have the honour to be, sir,  
Your obedient servant,  
L. K. JONES,  
Secretary.

G. S. Mayes, Esq.,  
St. John, N.B.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the date of that letter?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The 23rd November.

Mr. BERGERON. And he had written on the 9th?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. On the 28th of November the following letter was received from Mr. Mayes, addressed to myself:—

St. John, N.B., Nov. 28th, 1898.

Hon. A. G. Blair,  
Minister of Railways and Canals,  
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I write to say that I adhere to the statements contained in my letter of the 9th inst., and must decline to enter into contract for the work in connection with the improvements at the Long Wharf.

With reference to my deposit, I sincerely trust you will see your way clear to return it (as expressed in my previous letter), which I think is only just and fair, under the circumstances.

I remain,  
Yours most respectfully,  
G. S. MAYES.

Following this refusal on Mr. Mayes's part to enter into a contract, the officers of the department were directed to notify Mr. Heney that it was open to him to accept the contract, treating it as a tender in itself of \$298,193, and not treating it as a tender for \$33,000 added. There was some doubt in our minds as to whether or not, under the circumstances, it would be proper for us to allow Mr. Heney to amend his tender.

We had not a fixed view upon that subject, and therefore notified him that he, being the next lowest tenderer, the contract was open to his acceptance.

Mr. BERGERON. He was \$70,000 above Mr. Mayes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He was \$70,000 above Mr. Mayes. On December 5 the following letter was sent to Mr. Heney:—

Department of Railways and Canals,  
Ottawa, December 5, 1898.

Sir,—With reference to your communication of the 27th October last, received by the Minister, with respect to your tender for work in connection with the terminal improvements at the Long Wharf, St. John, I am directed to say that the department cannot see its way clear to comply with your request to be allowed to withdraw your deposit cheque, and to be relieved from entering into a contract in accordance with your tender.

I am to say that it is open to you, and your are hereby required to at once intimate whether it is your purpose, in the view which the department is compelled to take of your application respecting the deposit cheque, to enter into a contract for the execution of the proposed works or not. As so much time has been lost already, and the season is becoming so far advanced, I am to request you to advise us by return mail of your decision in this matter.

I have the honour to be, sir,  
Your obedient servant,  
L. K. JONES,  
Secretary.

John Heney, Esq., Contractor, Ottawa.

On the 7th of December Mr. Jones received the following letter from Mr. Heney:—

Ottawa, Dec. 7th, 1898.

L. K. Jones, Esq.,  
Secretary, Railways and Canals.

Dear Sir,—Referring to our conversation, I do not wish to send any communication until I see the Minister.

I am, yours truly,  
JOHN HENEY.

On the 7th of December, which was the same day as that upon which the last communication of Mr. Heney was written, the following letter was written by Mr. Jones to Mr. Heney:—

Department of Railways and Canals,  
Ottawa, Dec. 7th, 1898.

Sir,—Your letter of to-day's date cannot be considered as a direct reply to my communication of the 5th instant. If you will kindly again peruse it, you will observe that the case is put plainly to you—that your request for the return of your deposit cheque could not be entertained—and you are requested to intimate whether you are prepared to enter into a contract on the terms of your tender.

I have the honour to be, sir,  
Your obedient servant,  
L. K. JONES,  
Secretary.

John Heney, Esq., Contractor, Ottawa.

On the same day, the 7th of December, the following letter was received by Mr. Jones in the department from Mr. John Heney:—

Mr. BLAIR.

Ottawa, Dec, 7th, 1898.

Sir,—In reply to your favour of the 5th inst., permit me to say that my communication of the 27th October, addressed to the Hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals, requested the permission to amend my tender in the work referred to, by adding thereto the approximate amount of the duty on the necessary dredging plant and appliances for the St. John work; or, if such permission was not in conformity with the rules of the department, that my cheque be returned.

My tender was prepared on the assumption that the same privilege would be accorded me that was, a couple of years ago, allowed the city of St. John, the importation of dredging plant in bond. But immediately on the hon. the Minister declining to entertain such a request, I made application to have my tender amended in the manner mentioned. This request was made immediately after my tender was put in, and long before the bids were opened or could be considered; and, permit me to say, the right to alter or amend a bid is conceded to intending contractors by all countries up to the time the same are opened.

Now, it being the depth of winter, I fear it will be a difficult matter to take the necessary dredging plant from the United States to commence dredging operations before spring; still, if an extension of time for completion equal to three months is granted me, and my tender is amended in the manner suggested by my letter of October 27th, I am quite prepared to enter into a contract.

I am, sir,  
Very respectfully yours,  
JOHN HENEY.

L. K. Jones, Esq.,  
Secretary, Railways and Canals,  
Ottawa.

That closed the correspondence between the department and these gentlemen tendering.

Mr. BERGERON. Was his deposit returned to him?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has not been returned.

Mr. BERGERON. And it has remained like that since?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The deposit has remained in the possession of the Government. Following this correspondence, and the question seeming to be one of considerable importance, and one upon which it was proper for me to lay a statement of the facts before my colleagues in Council, I did so, with the result that an Order in Council was passed, authorizing the contract to be awarded to Mr. Connolly for the amount of his tender, \$328,173, for the bulk sum portion of the work also at the prices which he had offered to do the other work at, \$8 for rock blasting, and \$1 for stone ballast in cribs. The Council decided, as I have said, that the contract should be awarded to Mr. Connolly. The circumstances which had occurred justified the Council in its opinion in forfeiting the amount of Mayes's deposit; and unquestionably as it was clear,—I do not say it was clear,—but as it was possible that there might have been something

which had led Mr. Mayes, after the tenders had been in and the situation was well understood by him, to come to an understanding with one or other of the tenderers, we considered it our duty to forfeit the amount of the deposit which he had made. With regard to Mr. Heney, it seemed as possible to the Government, that there might have been an understanding also with Mr. Heney and the next highest tender to him, and if there was, it was a proper case in which Mr. Heney's deposit should also be forfeited. With these two deposits amounting in the whole to \$34,000, there would be a diminution by that amount in the cost of the work, assuming that the contract being awarded to Messrs. Connolly, they were prepared to enter into it for this sum. In addition to the reduction upon the cost of the work which would ensue from the forfeiture of these two deposits, there was also the difference in the Connollys's favour in the item of this special work for the rock ballasting, of \$1.40 per cubic yard, as between their tender and Mr. Mayes's; and 30 cents a yard for the stone ballasting in the cribs. Taking the difference between the amount which we would have to pay the Connollys under their tender for that special work, and the amount of the deposits, there would be in the neighbourhood of from \$45,000 to \$50,000—I will not say over \$45,000 but about that sum,—of a saving in the amount, or rather of an advantage to the Government below the amount of the Connolly tender.

Mr. HAGGART. Would you get from the deputy an estimate of the amount of the rock and the number of yards of filling?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There were 5,200 yards of rock blasting and the Connolly price was \$8 per yard, and Mayes's price \$9.40. \$1.40 per yard for 5,200 yards, is \$7,280. There is according to the estimate of the engineer 15,000 cubic yards of stone ballast which at the difference of 30 cents per yard would be \$4,500, which would make \$11,780 of a difference in favour of the Connollys upon the special items in the contract. If you add to these sums the forfeit of \$34,000, you have \$45,780 which would be taken off the amount of the Connolly tender, and the residue would be the cost to the Government.

Mr. POWELL. I suppose your advertisement calling for tenders said that the Government was not bound to accept the lowest or any tender?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. POWELL. In view of this fact do the hon. gentleman consider the law would allow him to retain the cheque of Heney?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I confess I do not want to make any statement to the committee on the subject which might prejudice the Crown.

Mr. POWELL. Your expression of opinion would not prejudice you.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not necessary for me to express an opinion. The inference may be drawn from the fact that this course has been taken, as to what the Government felt would be its strict legal rights in the matter, and I do not think if I had a doubt as to that I would be justified in expressing it?

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose no legal proceedings have yet been taken by Mr. Heney or Mr. Mayes to get back their deposit?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. Mr. Mayes has been informed most positively that his deposit would be forfeited. Mr. Heney has been in communication with us, and the matter has remained just in that position down to the present moment.

Mr. BERGERON. Nothing has been done since.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Nothing has been done since.

Mr. BERGERON. My impression is that the Minister will not hear from them again, or they would have done it before this.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I hope I shall not. I want to point out to the committee in this connection that while I cannot say that it did enter largely into the judgment, or lead the Government to a conclusion in the matter, I had in my own mind, as also had the general manager of the Intercolonial Railway, grave doubts as to whether it would be possible for Mr. Mayes if he had accepted the contract, to have carried it out. The dredging portion of the work at least, was work of which he had no experience, and of which he had not done any previously so far as we could ascertain. Judging from the letter which we received from Mr. Mackenzie, the amount of the tender was much below what he considered the work would actually cost. In order to be perfectly sure in regard to the matter, Mr. Pottinger wrote, when he was up here at Ottawa, I think while this matter was under consideration, and before the 12th of November, to his chief engineer Mr. McKenzie a confidential communication stating that the tenders had been opened, that Mr. Mayes tender was the lowest at \$220,000, and asking him whether in his opinion the work could be done at the price. Mr. McKenzie replied under date the 12th November to the following effect:

D. Pottinger, Esq.,  
General Manager.

Dear Sir,—Replying to your letter of the 1st instant, and received on the 7th instant,—

According to that, Mr. Pottinger must have written from Montreal immediately after the opening of the tenders. The tenders were opened by Mr. Pottinger and myself at the Windsor Hotel, in Montreal, on the 31st October, so that Mr. Pottinger must have written the very next day. I understand that Mr. Mackenzie was away at the time that letter reached Moncton, and this is the letter written by him on the 12th of November:

Replying to your letter of the 1st instant, and received on the 7th instant, I have to say that from the best information at present obtainable by me, it does not appear to me that the bulk sum part of the St. John work can be carried on or completed satisfactorily, according to the true intent and meaning of the plans and specifications for so small a sum of money as \$220,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Was there an estimate by the Government? If so, what was the amount?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was an estimate of \$322,050.

Mr. BERGERON. By whom were the plans and specifications prepared?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. By Mr. Mackenzie.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the cost of the dredging and the cost of the timber for the cribwork?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The dredging was put at 45 cents per cubic yard.

Mr. HAGGART. That is the most extraordinary price I ever heard of. If the Minister inquires, he will find that dredging in New York is done for from 7 to 8 cents per cubic yard, and that it was done on the Manchester Canal for less than 3 cents per cubic yard.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman does not really know the conditions under which this dredging requires to be done.

Mr. HAGGART. They must be extraordinary conditions.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is exploding rather precipitately. Dredging in the harbour of St. John is not capable of being done under conditions anything like as favourable as at a place like New York. The engineer who made these figures made them, so far as this particular item is concerned, as I happen to know personally, in concert with the engineer of the city of St. John, Hurd Peters, Esq., who had had, within a year or two preceding this date.

Mr. BLAIR.

actual means of forming a judgment as to what it would cost to dredge in that harbour. The harbour is a difficult one to dredge in, not only owing to the force of the tides, but also owing to the extraordinary depth, and the difficulties attending the disposal of the dredged material. Mr. Hurd Peters agreed with Mr. Mackenzie—it was from him that Mr. Mackenzie got the rate of 45 cents—and Mr. Peters spoke from actual personal knowledge. He had charge of the work done by the city corporation of St. John; he supervised the doing of it, and he paid the bills. So that my hon. friend must not jump to such a hasty conclusion, against the opinion of men who have means of knowledge, and have characters to sustain.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to remind my hon. friend that on the Princess Louise graving dock, which is in tidal water, the price paid for dredging was 39 cents, and that sent one of the Connollys to jail, and created a terrible row in this country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There will be no one sent to jail on account of the Government or the city corporation paying 45 cents a yard for dredging in the harbour of St. John. I know something of the difficulties attending dredging there, because I was engaged as counsel in a lawsuit connected with work of this kind. The dumping of the material is very difficult. It has to be dumped outside of the harbour, and the scows can be taken out only at certain periods; and while these scows with the dredging materials are being delayed, the dredges themselves have to remain idle.

Mr. BERGERON. When I was there some time ago, I saw the material dumped on the west side of the harbour, near the Canadian Pacific Railway elevator, and I was told that it came from the harbour.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You have to take the scows a mile and a half or two miles outside of the harbour to dump the dredged material. We had reason to believe, from the opinion received from Mr. Mackenzie—a well-grounded opinion—that it would be rather difficult to say whether the work could be completed at this price; that is to say, the price offered by Mr. Mayes; but the question did not turn on that. It was decided on other grounds and after the whole question had been submitted to Council.

Mr. HAGGART. As I understand, they are building a wharf with cribwork, and I would like to know what is the timber, the size and everything about it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The engineer estimated that the cribwork and stone would be 138,950 cubic yards at \$1.50, \$208,425.

Mr. HAGGART. We have that already. What we want to know is the price paid for the timber work to the successful tenderers?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As far as the timber work in the pier is concerned that is all included in the lump sum of \$328,000.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentlemen need not tell me that. There is a schedule of prices for every individual article for which you pay out every month, and that is moneyed out every month. What are the quantities on which they have moneyed out?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I give you the items just as I received them from the engineer at the time. The cribwork is included in the \$208,425. I received a general estimate. The engineer does not send me, when I ask him for an idea of what the work will cost, a statement containing the elaborated details. He gives me in a general way the figures of what this work is going to cost, and taking all the items together, taking the construction of the work together with the cost of the land, he made his estimate, and figured that the work would cost \$559,769.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman has a detailed estimate or tenders from each of these different parties that contracted for this work. Every bit of it is given in detail, and every detail is moneyed out. Every tender shows so much for wood work, so much for dredging, so much for spikes, so much for stone excavation, so much for stone filling. I want to know what the timber work was? I want to know what the price was per lineal foot and the quantity?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is thinking of canal construction. No doubt, when inviting tenders for canal work, you will have your schedule and you figure out your quantities to the tenderers, and they fill in opposite each particular item how much they will charge—how much for earth work, how much for rock work, how much for masonry, &c., and the only way to ascertain how much any particular tenderer proposes to do the work for is to money out all the quantities. But that was not this kind of contract at all. We asked each tenderer to say: For how much will you build this particular pier? How much will you do this dredging for? We stated in a specification to what depth we wanted the dredging done, and over what particular area they must make that depth. The tenderers did not put in a schedule of prices except for the rock blasting and the stone ballast. They gave a lump sum for all the rest of the work, which was the chief part of the work. Is it necessary that I should repeat that several times over. That was the character of this contract—not an ordinary canal structure at all. There was no moneying out ne-

cessary except with regard to the smaller items of rock blasting and stone ballasting.

Mr. WILSON. Have you a copy of the tender?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. WILSON. Did not the engineer make a detailed statement showing how much timber and how much dredging?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No doubt he must have made out the items in detail to come to a conclusion, but I have not got that here.

Mr. WILSON. You might bring it here.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can get it, but have not got it now.

Mr. BERGERON. Did the hon. Minister ever see that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think I ever did.

Mr. BERGERON. Before incurring an expenditure of about \$500,000, was it not the hon. Minister's duty to see that everything made up by the engineer was put before him and examined by himself. The hon. gentleman now says he never saw it. How can he say, then, whether the tender made by the Connollys was a proper tender or not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My engineer gave me the figures, which showed that \$322,000 was his estimate.

Mr. BERGERON. How could the hon. gentleman have ascertained whether that was correct or not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman expect me to sit in judgment upon my engineer's statement as to what quality of wood or stone, or dredging or rock ballasting is required to complete any given work?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is talking of a matter he does not understand.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Mackenzie may be a very good man for taking measurements in the harbour of St. John, and Mr. Peters is no doubt the best man that St. John can produce as an engineer, but when those figures arrive at the department, should not the hon. Minister have submitted them to his chief engineer and got his opinion? Should he not have said to his chief engineer: According to your estimate of the work, when they say they want so much for the stone, &c., is that correct? But the hon. gentleman pretends that it is not his duty to go through all that, but that when Mr. Mackenzie says the amount will be \$322,-

000, he is to accept that as perfectly satisfactory.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If I had not men in my employ in whom I can have confidence, it would be my duty to put them out and get others on whom I could depend, and my duty would not go beyond that. I would be making a show of myself if I were to undertake to pass upon the correctness of Mr. Mackenzie's calculation as to the number of cubic yards of timber there would be in that pier or the cubic yards of rock blasting which would require to be done. Is it the business of the chief engineer to go down to St. John himself and measure what quantity of rock blasting there was to be done, or go with a tape line and pass across this pier and measure what quantity of cribwork requires to be done?

Mr. COCHRANE. If he had any brains, he would know it without going down. It seems to me that the Minister is fooling with the committee when he tells us—he, the Minister who is responsible for the expenditure of this enormous sum of money—that he did not know what he was going to do before he undertook the job, and that he had nothing to do with it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Who told the hon. gentleman—

Mr. COCHRANE. I have been listening to you—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) will please address the Chair.

Mr. COCHRANE. I desire to be courteous to the Chair, and beg your pardon. But the country knows whom I am addressing. We want to know, before we pass this amount, Did not the Minister know from his engineer the amount of money involved in this job, and did he not have a detailed statement in his office before he gave the contract? The Minister told us that he supposed he had, but he did not think it worth while to bring it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then I must have been dreaming. But I think the committee understood it just as I did—that the Minister supposed he had this in his office but did not think to bring it.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the Minister will tell us whether the plans or specifications were exhibited to the different tenderers at the office here.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, they were seen at Moncton.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. Minister said a moment ago that if he had taken the precaution of having the figures of the engineer

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. Mackenzie, and having them examined by the chief engineer, he would have made an exhibition of himself.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. BERGERON. A show of himself, then. The hon. gentleman used one word or the other.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I used the last word but not the preceding words.

Mr. BERGERON. In my way of interpreting English, when I see a show, it is generally an exhibition. The hon. gentleman said "show" then, if it pleases him. From what we have heard and from what we have known of contracts of this sort before, this seems to me to have been a combination, and the best combination I have heard of yet. We have got the figures here in parts and have not got what we were promised—the figures of the engineer and those of the different tenderers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg pardon; I said I would bring an abstract of the tenders and I have brought it.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman has not brought what I understood he promised.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What the hon. gentleman understood I promised is another thing.

Mr. BERGERON. "Hansard" is there, and we can see what the hon. Minister promised. I certainly asked the hon. gentleman the other day for the figures of his engineer and of the different tenderers so that we could compare them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman can compare the figures.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, I can compare the lump sums. I know Mr. Mackenzie said the work would cost \$320,000, and the Connollys got the work at \$328,000. But how can one reach a conclusion until he has the detailed figures of the engineer and those of the successful tenderer?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Suppose that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) had plans for building a house and asked persons to tender for the building of that house. And suppose that a man tendered at \$10,000. Does the hon. gentleman imagine that he would have a statement from that tenderer showing how much he calculated for the foundation, the walls, the roof, the plastering, the windows and so on?

Mr. WILSON. That would depend on how the tender was asked for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have said that the tender asked for was to build a pier of a certain length at a certain spot, upon piles, and to dredge around that pier for a certain distance to a certain depth. The tenderer was asked to say how much he would do that work for in a lump sum. He gave us a lump sum, and I gave the contract at that figure.

Mr. BERGERON. I am more convinced than ever that it is a combination.

Mr. DOMVILLE. What does the hon. gentleman mean by a combination?

Mr. BERGERON. I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Domville) understands that.

Mr. DOMVILLE. No.

Mr. BERGERON. Here are three men tendering for a work.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Four.

Mr. BERGERON. There were only three considered; there is no use talking about the one who was so high that he was not considered. One of these is Mr. Mayes. He sends in a tender of \$220,000. I need not state it, I suppose my hon. friend heard before the figures of the engineer of the department, but this is \$100,000 less than the figures of the engineer. I asked if Mayes was a contractor; my hon. friend, a few moments ago, said he had had no experience. That fits in with the idea of a combination. There has been a tender from an Ottawa contractor who is a good contractor, and who has the money to complete the work. He tendered for \$298,000, but he finds out afterwards that he has no dredge. That dredge question plays a great role in this combination. Mr. Mayes says: I cannot do the work unless I am allowed to bring in a dredge from the States. So he takes it for granted that there is no dredge in Canada to do that work. He says that if he is allowed to bring in a dredge from the States he will take the contract. Of course, he is told that that cannot be done. So there is one man put aside, and his deposit of \$18,000 is retained. He does not try very hard to get it back. He says if the Minister will be kind enough to give it to him, he will be glad to take it, but he makes no earnest effort to get that \$18,000 back. Then the second tenderer, Mr. Heney, finds out that he has not got a dredge, and unless he can buy a dredge in the States, unless he can get three months' delay and bring a dredge into Canada without paying duty, he also cannot go into the contract. He offers to do the work for \$298,000, plus \$30,000 for a dredge. The Minister also refuses to accept his offer, and then he (Heney) asks to be relieved of his contract. The Government say: All right, but they keep his deposit of \$18,000. Then they have two deposits, making \$34,

000. Mr. Heney does not try very hard to get back his deposit. Then we come to the third tenderer, the Connolly Bros., whose tender is \$328,000. Now, Mr. Mackenzie is a good engineer, I am told, but we have had good engineers in the past who were in partnership with contractors, and what happened five or six years ago may happen again.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I ask the hon. gentleman to have a little mercy on our officers. These gentlemen are in the public service, and they have a right to be treated as gentlemen.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. Minister will not prevent me from saying what I wish. I am here to perform a public duty, and I will do it. I do not care whether I offend the pets of the Government or not. They are in the hands of the Minister, who can do with them anything that he likes. Their salaries can be increased if they are Grits, but if they are Conservatives they are hounded like slaves. I only ask why these things are done. I do not say that Mr. Mackenzie has done anything improperly. It is a fact that we cannot get his figures. The engineer says it will cost \$322,000, a lump sum. Connolly, without giving his figures in detail, makes a tender for \$328,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He was not asked.

Mr. BERGERON. He should have been asked. The hon. gentleman will not squander public money like that without asking the contractor to come down to minor details. Mr. Connolly is an intelligent man, a good contractor, who knows what he is doing. Has my hon. friend never heard of the Kingston graving dock? Why could not the same thing be repeated? We are not going to hound the Connollys, as my hon. friends opposite have done, we are not going to treat them like thieves, as they have been treated by the Government party when in Opposition. The Connollys made a combination with Bancroft, and why could not the same thing be done again? Mr. Heney gets off, and Mayes gets off, that leaves Connolly with a contract at a price of \$328,000. Mr. Mayes does not clamour for his money, and I do not think Mr. Heney will ask for his money any more. It is my impression that both these gentlemen have been reimbursed by Connolly, and why should they not be reimbursed? In what position would Connolly be by giving \$34,000 to get a contract of \$328,000? Subtract \$34,000 from \$328,000, and you still have \$294,000 for a work that Heney was ready to do for \$298,000, leaving the dredges out of the question. Now, is there not prima facie evidence here of a combination? My hon. friend may laugh, but the people who will hear of this will not laugh. What dredges has Connolly got? How can Con-

nolly have dredges here in Canada when Mayes and Heney could not have any. Mr. Connolly got his own dredges from the States; he was doing some work at Philadelphia; he was more clever than the others. The combination is as clear as daylight. He says to the others: You pretend that you cannot bring in dredges without paying customs. He had his own dredges, and I believe they were the dredges that he took into the States, giving some bond to the United States authorities, which money was to be reimbursed when these dredges came back.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They were Canadian dredges, then?

Mr. BERGERON. I am not sure, I believe they were.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then, you think we ought to have exacted duty from them?

Mr. BERGERON. I am not talking about duty at all. I am saying that Connolly either was more intelligent than the others, or else they all understood one another. More than that, I think the hon. gentleman told us last night that Mr. Mayes was a sub-contractor, working for Connolly. Is that not the case?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know that he is; I dare say he is.

Mr. BERGERON. Now, there is a combination. Mr. Mayes leaves his \$16,000 there, and he is reimbursed by Connolly; Heney leaves his \$18,000 there, and he is reimbursed by Connolly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is a good reason why we should keep the deposits.

Mr. BERGERON. You can keep them, but that is like the white horse story, which I have not time to relate. The hon. gentleman has got the \$34,000, but the Connollys will take that out of him without his knowing anything about it. Now, Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, it seems to me as clear as can be that here is a combination. My hon. friend may not know anything about it, and if he does not know anything about it, at least he has taken no means to prevent it. He has not shown all the zeal that he ought to have shown over the expenditure of the people's money. If he had been spending his own money on this work, he would have looked into it a great deal more carefully. When his own engineer estimated 45 cents per cubic yard he would have gone to see how much the Connollys were doing it for. If Connolly was doing it for 35 or 40 cents—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How could I tell?

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. BERGERON. By asking his own engineer to make his own schedule, and by asking Connolly to make his own schedule, and compare them.

Mr. HAGGART. We ought to have in possession of the committee the memorandum from the Minister of Railways and Canals to the Council, in which he set forth the facts and reasons for dropping this lowest tenderer, and whether he recommends that the sum of \$20,000 which Heney has deposited should be forfeited, and the same in regard to the \$14,000 deposited by Mr. Mayes. The minute of Council has either been approved or not, it has either been altered or amended in Council, and the Minister ought to be in a position to speak positively as to what has been done in Council.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say that Council passed an Order approving of the letting of the contract to the Connollys on the statement of facts, as I have presented them.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the hon. Minister, further in his memorandum to Council, recommended some action in reference to the deposits of the other two lowest tenderers. The hon. Minister speaks, in his calculations, as if this \$34,000 forfeited in effect lessened the difference between Mayes' contract and the Connolly contract, which difference was in the neighbourhood of \$94,000. He says that the difference is further lessened by the sum which Connolly is lower than Mayes in reference to rock excavation, and also lower in regard to the sum of money which is required for filling the crib. That amounts to \$11,000 difference, as he pretends, and he leads the committee to believe that he intends to forfeit \$34,000; and this makes \$45,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How much?

Mr. HAGGART. Thirty-four thousand dollars and \$11,000 make \$45,000. Then, I presume, from the remarks of the hon. Minister, that he looks upon that \$20,000 as forfeiture. What we ought to know is exactly what he recommended to Council in his memorandum, whether Council has approved of it or not, or whether he has recommended anything in regard to the forfeiture of the \$20,000 and the \$14,000. The hon. Minister ought to be required to speak distinctly upon that point. Taking these two amounts, making \$45,000, it will be seen that Connolly's contract is in the neighbourhood of \$50,000 over and above Mayes', deducting \$16,000 from the amounts which are forfeited to the Government, and the \$11,000 difference. The hon. gentleman states that he has no details in his department or at Moncton in reference to this work. It is the most extraordinary statement that I ever heard from a Minister. I

will venture to say that the engineer in charge of the department has a detailed statement of every piece of timber that goes into the work. I will venture to say, further—and it is not merely my belief, but the statement of a positive fact—that there is a schedule price attached to every item in the tender of Connolly for such work, and his deputy will not tell him that it is not so.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I know it is not so. I do not require to ask my deputy that. It is absurd to make such a suggestion.

Mr. **HAGGART**. How is he to be paid for the timber on the ground; how is he to be paid for the amount of excavation that he does? This is the first lump-sum contract I ever heard of. The hon. Minister says: How are you going to ask for details of everything in reference to building a House? How are you to ask how much paint is in it, how many yards of mortar, how many bushels of lime, how many feet of timber? Every contract that is let by the British Government gives every detail as to even every paint brush that is used. There is a separate statement and a separate tender for every pound of nails, mortar, lime, sand, timber, and everything that enters into the building. The hon. gentleman received tenders for a lump sum, but there is a schedule of prices attached to each. How is the Government going to pay on the monthly estimate, unless there is a schedule carefully made out. If it is as the hon. Minister says, it is the first time I ever heard of a contract being let in such a manner as that. The hon. gentleman says that he has a statement which shows that the cost of the excavation of earth in the harbour of St. John will amount to 45 cents a yard, and he refers to me and talks at me in a manner as if I were interrupting him with some foolish remark. I will tell the hon. Minister that, within two or three months, there has been let for the excavation, in the harbour of New York, of 8,000,000 yards of earth, and the parties have to take the earth 6 miles away, a contract in which the highest price is 8 cents per cubic yard. I will also show him that the Liverpool Harbour Commission paid for excavation, where the parties had to take the earth 3 or 4 miles away, less than 3 cents per cubic yard. There may be extraordinary circumstances with which I am not acquainted, in reference to the harbour of St. John. There may be some peculiarities about the work which may justify the Government in paying 45 cents a yard, but what the committee ought to have in their possession, when an expenditure of that kind is proposed, is a schedule of the amounts. The hon. Minister may not be required to have a personal knowledge of all the details, but the Deputy Head of his depart-

ment ought to have all that information in his hands, when an extraordinary expenditure, such as is proposed to be made upon the harbour of St. John, is under consideration. I have been at the head of the department, and I have seen details of every piece of work published again and again in the reports in reference to every contract, every canal and every piece of railway work done by the Government from one end of the country to the other. There is a schedule of every item. It is absolutely necessary that there should be a schedule, in order that the monthly payments may be made.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. How would you pay a man, as the work is progressing on the building of a house which is not under a schedule contract?

Mr. **HAGGART**. I tried to explain to the hon. gentleman. There is a schedule of every item of material that goes into the building. If you will get one of the tenders of the Imperial Government, you will see that there is a schedule for every item.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. In the case of a straight lump-sum contract for the building of a house there would not be a schedule contract.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Not at all, as ordinary contracts are let for the building of a house.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Let me ask the hon. gentleman one more question. The hon. gentleman has asked: How is it possible to pay a man as the work progresses, unless you have in the contract a schedule of prices? How would you pay a man who was building a house under a contract for a lump sum, which is not, as the hon. gentleman admits, a schedule contract?

Mr. **HAGGART**. The architect in charge of the building pays him according to what, under his estimate, would be a correct amount.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Exactly.

Mr. **HAGGART**. But that is not the way that Government works are let, which I am trying to impress upon the hon. gentleman. There is not an expenditure of \$5,000 in the whole of the Empire by the Imperial authorities for which there is not a schedule showing every pound of paint, every bit of glass, putty or anything else that enters into the details of the work.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Did the hon. gentleman never hear of a wharf being put up to tender and contract, and the tenderer being asked to offer a lump sum for the construction of such work, according to specifications?

Mr. **HAGGART**. Not according to specifications. The specifications give the depth

to which the timber is to be placed, the amount of the timber that is in the wharf, the amount of dredging and rock filling, but nothing else.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Did you do so when you were Minister of Railways and Canals?

Mr. BERGERON. Speak to the Chair.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), if he did so when he was Minister of Railways?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Then why were you \$300,000 out on the Curran bridge and \$300,000 out on the Tay Canal, between the estimates and the real cost, if you were so very careful about it?

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) is talking of something entirely foreign to the subject. On the Tay Canal there was a schedule of quantities. The quantities may be far in excess of the estimate of the engineer. This lump sum contract is on the quantities which are furnished by the Government engineer, and the different materials which enter into the building of the dock, so much per lineal foot for timber, so much for excavation, so much for dredging, so much a yard for rock excavation must be ascertained. There must be details of that, and yet the Minister says there are no details.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said nothing of the kind. I said the contract contains no details of the kind.

Mr. HUGHES. That is just what he stated.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, the hon. gentleman said that I stated there are no details of the kind. That is different from stating the contract contains no details of the kind. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) cannot see the difference his mind is not working.

Mr. HAGGART. Then if there are details of this contract we want them. The Minister says a lump sum is required to put the wharf in a particular place. That is an extraordinary statement for him to make. The engineer must have measured carefully the depth of the water in which this pier is to be built, he must know exactly the quantity of timber and all the details on which he estimated the cost of the work. He could not jump at the cost. Now, we know what the Minister pays per yard for dredging, we know what he pays for rock excavation, we know what he pays for filling the piers, and what we want to know is how much he pays for building the cribwork which is put up upon piles in that harbour. When we know that we will know approximately whether this contract has been let in an economical

Mr. HAGGART.

manner or not. Let me tell the Minister that when he saw that Mr. Heney had dropped his tender and that Mr. Mayes was getting out of it, why did he give the contract to Mr. Connolly? Why did he not forfeit the deposits of these two gentlemen, and then ask for further tenders?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could not do that.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, it has been done thousands of times in the department, and the moment there was a suspicion of collusion between the tenderers he should have advertised again. The time allowed for tendering was not sufficient to allow contractors to inquire into it. It was not a work that was urgently necessary, in fact I do not think it is a work that is necessary at all. The Minister is doing it for the purpose of building an elevator to come in competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway, who are perfectly competent to do all the business, and who have an elevator on the opposite side of the bay. Where he thinks he is going to get his grain from astonishes me. He intends to haul the grain a couple of hundred miles further than the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to enter into competition with a railroad which we have induced to build to St. John.

Mr. BERGERON. And the grain can go to Portland too.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, grain that can go to Portland by the Grand Trunk Railway, and grain that can go to St. John by the Canadian Pacific Railway at a couple of hundred miles less haul, than over the Intercolonial Railway. It will be like the elevator at Halifax. By hauling the grain for nothing down there he may get some of it, but as to entering into competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, who will take the grain to Portland and St. John by a shorter route, it is perfectly absurd and ridiculous.

Mr. POWELL. There is one thing I would like to have the Minister make clear. I have no doubt he is able to do so, but although I followed him closely I do not think he has done so yet. If I understand him correctly, all the stone ballast is going into the cribwork of the wharf, and the cribwork of the wharf is in the lump contract with Connolly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The contract provided for an additional sum for rock blasting under water and removal per cubic yard, and for stone ballast in accordance with wherever it should come from.

Mr. POWELL. But that is in the lump contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, the stone ballast to put in

the cribs is not in the lump contract. That is outside the lump contract altogether.

Mr. POWELL. That certainly cannot be.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Wherever the stone ballast was taken from there was a certain amount to be allowed. There were only two tenders. Mr. Mayes who tendered for 60 cents for stone ballast from the old wharf—there did not come much from that as it so happened—\$1.30 from the Harris property—a good deal was taken from there—and 80 cents from other sources. There does not appear to have been any taken from other sources. Connolly's tender was 75 cents from the old wharf, \$1 from the Harris property, and 86 cents from other sources.

Mr. POWELL. What I fail to see is where the Minister is going to get his wharf to come in at all. If the dredging is all per cubic yard, and neither of these is to the lump contract, what in thunder is the lump contract for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The dredging is in the lump contract.

Mr. POWELL. You told us that was so much per cubic yard.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I tell the hon. gentleman that the estimate of cost which I received from the engineer was, that the dredging would cost 45 cents a yard, but it is in the lump contract. Mr. Connolly undertook to say that he would build that wharf.

Mr. POWELL. As long as the hon. gentleman says that it is in the lump contract, we all understand that. We have reached this stage, that all the dredging is in the lump contract, and is it not a fact that all the ballasting is in the lump contract?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. POWELL. I think my hon. friend is right in that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. POWELL. That must follow, because I understand that the lump contract is for the construction of the wharf and the dredging around the wharf.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a separate tender for the loading of the wharf. In the tenders each man was invited to say how much he would charge for the stone ballast in the cribs taken from these different places.

Mr. POWELL. What was included in the lump contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It included all the work of building this pier and doing this dredging complete, except so far as the rock ballasting,

if there was any, and the removal of the stone ballast from those points were concerned.

Mr. POWELL. We have got that. There is another question I would like to have cleared up. The hon. gentleman has informed the House that he has before him no details of the work that entered into this lump contract. I am correct in that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will tell the hon. gentleman what I have. I have the engineer's estimate of what in his judgment it would cost for building the new wharf and docks, tearing down part of the old wharf, and dredging to 30 feet below tide, which he said would amount to 252,000 cubic yards. That work he estimates to cost \$113,625.

Mr. POWELL. That is outside of the lump contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is part of the lump contract. Then, he estimates that building the cribwork filled with stone will cost \$208,425. That is all the information which I have in my hand. Now, it has been stated by the hon. gentleman dozens of times over that I said there are no other details, that there are no calculations nor figures showing how the engineer arrived at that estimate of the total cost. I did not say anything of the kind. I said quite the contrary. I said that the engineer must have made a careful calculation as to every square foot of timber that would be put in, every cubic yard of dredging that would be required, and all the necessary work to go to make up this structure; and I dare say that when the tenderers were at Moncton the engineer would show them, not his prices, but the quantities, with the plans and specifications, the size and location of the work. But I have not those figures; they are at Moncton.

Mr. POWELL. Where I was astray was that the Minister told the ex-Minister of Railways that it was arrant nonsense for him to have the details of this lump contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is it possible that any gentleman sitting within the sound of my voice could misapprehend what I said as the hon. gentleman states? I have told the hon. gentleman again and again that these details were not in the contract. There is no reason why they should be. It is absurd that they should be.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman went beyond the contract, and said it was folly to suppose that these details should be here—that they would be at Moncton. He said it was absurd to have them here.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say that. I used the word absurd with reference to the contract containing the details of prices and quan-

tities, as to how the lump sum should be made up.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to ask the hon. Minister how much it will cost in addition to \$328,000 to finish that work. How much rock blasting will there be, and what will it amount to ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The estimated quantity of rock blasting is 5,200 yards, which, at \$8, the contract price, will cost \$41,600.

Mr. BERGERON. The engineer's estimate for the whole work was \$363,000, and the Connolly tender was \$369,000. It seems that the Connollys were most intelligent gentlemen to come so near the estimate of the engineer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of course, that is intended as an insinuation.

Mr. BERGERON. No, that is not my way. I am generally too blunt. If I had an idea such as my hon. friend seems to have, I would say it openly. But when the hon. gentleman has not given us all the details of the calculations made by his engineer, when he has not taken the trouble to see the figures and the details of the successful tenderers, the Messrs. Connolly, and when in a work involving over \$300,000 which the engineer estimates in a lump sum, would cost about \$363,000, and when the Messrs. Connolly, in reply to the invitation for tender, say they will do it for \$369,000, that confirms me in my opinion that the whole scheme was a combination to the detriment of the public interest.

Mr. HAGGART. I asked the hon. gentleman for the details and he said he had not got them. He has a very short memory. I find that last night, when I was not present he gave the full details to the committee. I have been asking him for the details, and he said it was a lump sum contract, that he was not in possession of the details, that the engineer might have the details in Moncton, and no doubt he had for the purpose of arriving at a lump sum. But now I find that the hon. gentleman was in possession of the details the whole time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken.

Mr. HAGGART. Let me give the hon. gentleman's own words as reported in "Hansard" :

There was a contract entered into for the wharf and trestle, included in one sum of \$328,173. Then, as part of the same contract and in addition thereto, there was a price per cubic yard for rock excavation, for ballasting, for pile dredging and other items of that character, and also for a warehouse on the wharf, which would bring the cost of the wharf construction up to \$410,000. The rock excavation was estimated to cost \$41,

Mr. BLAIR.

600 ; the stone ballasting, \$12,900 ; tie rods, \$1,304 ; planking on inner face, \$1,320. That makes a total of \$385,297. The warehouse on the wharf will cost \$22,795. Other items include pile dredging, \$3,330 ; pile foundations for iron bridging, \$1,700 ; iron bridging removed and re-erected, \$2,030 ; new iron bridging, contract \$1,640 ; floor for iron bridging, 600 lineal feet at \$2.70, \$2,430 ; fencing and fender piles, \$1,194 ; removing track, flooring, fencing and fender piles of present main line, \$120. These items amount to \$12,444. Then, \$6,120 would represent the cost of a temporary pile trestle for sidings to wharfs ; 1,400 lineal feet at \$10, \$14,000 ; platform on piles at north end of wharf, 9,000 lineal feet at 60 cents, \$5,400. Then, track-laying on wharf, trestle and bridges, one and one-half miles, \$300 ; on balance of main line and sidings, including ties and ballast, \$3,400 ; rails and fastenings, \$6,250 ; fifteen switches, \$1,750 ; excavations for sidings back of elevator, \$1,500, and removal of solid rock, \$16,500, or a total of \$18,000. Then engineering, legal valuations, office and stationery expenses, \$10,000. Then, there are a number of other items, making up a total of \$685,756. That is the estimate of the total cost of the erection of the wharf and all that is appurtenant thereto.

Why did not the hon. gentleman give me the details at once ? I was not here the night before last, but the hon. gentleman evidently is in possession of every detail, and might as well have given them at once.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This just shows how the hon. gentleman fell into error. I have been asked all this evening, and what I have been doing is to furnish this committee, fully and fairly, to the best of my knowledge and ability, what information the engineer furnished me and on what facts I acted in awarding this contract. I produced the document which I received from Mr. Mackenzie, the engineer, addressed to me personally, in answer to the request for this information, in which he showed me, as I have read to this committee, how he made up the amount which he estimated this work was going to cost. What the hon. gentleman refers to is a totally different thing. It is a statement, not made over a year ago, but made now, and which shows what the cost will be of this work now, under present circumstances. The engineer shows that there were some work added he did not include in his original specification, and included them in this statement. His original estimate of the cost of the work was \$559,769. His present estimate is, with all these necessary additions, all of which I read last night, \$698,156. There are additional items in that which were not contemplated at the time the contract was first entered into. The committee will understand clearly the difference in the two statements. I could have produced this, but the committee would not have accepted it, because it was not an answer to the request for the estimates that the engineer gave me before the contract was entered into. This is an estimate I have only just received, and is the basis of the vote before the committee.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. Minister promised to bring down some papers concerning the Macdonald affair.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have had the report of Mr. Bedard looked up and it is being copied with all possible despatch. To-morrow I shall have the pleasure of giving it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot understand the hon. Minister's explanation. He says that he could not give the information because the contract was entirely different from the subsequent information he got from his engineer. And the engineer was giving him the details of the contract, \$328,173, exactly the amount which the Minister states to-night that he let the contract for. Well, he goes on and gives the details of the same contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, no.

Mr. HAGGART. He says: "Then as part of the same contract and in addition thereto, there was a price per cubic yard for rock excavation," and then he goes on and gives the details of the warehouses on the wharf, the size of the pier it was to be erected on, and sums up the whole amount that the engineer has furnished as the total cost at \$685,756. Then I see there is to be some 5,000 yards of excavation. Does the hon. Minister give \$1.30 a yard for putting that in the pier?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There were 5,200 yards of rock excavation at \$8 a yard.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose he takes that rock and puts it into the pier. Does he get \$1.30 besides for that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The rock blasting under water and the removal of the rock into the pier is all included in the \$8 a yard.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). And he does not get \$1.30 extra for putting it into the crib?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Can the hon. gentleman quote a case where so much as \$8 a yard has been paid for rock excavation, and without tender?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What does the hon. gentleman mean "without tender"?

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry); I want to know if the hon. gentleman can point out any case in this country where \$8 a yard was paid for excavating rock?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Under water—sometimes under 40 feet of water.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). But can the hon. gentleman point to an instance?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My deputy tells me that more than that was paid in the harbour of Victoria, B.C. I do not know of any case myself; I never excavated any rock under water.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I can hardly believe that such an amount was paid even there. But if so, there may have been special reasons for it. We know that wages there are twice as high as they are in St. John, N.B., and that everything is more expensive. Concrete has been put in here for \$5 a yard, but it costs \$17 or \$20 in British Columbia or the North-west, as in the case of the bridge at Edmonton.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The man who put in the lowest tender on the rest of the work wanted \$9.40 for this rock excavation that the Connollys do for \$8.

Mr. BERGERON. I have understood then the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to bring down the papers about Macdonald.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will do so with pleasure.

Mr. BERGERON. Now, will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to give me the facts with regard to the dismissal of Mr. Bernier, of Rivière du Loup?

Mr. INGRAM. Before we leave the point now under discussion, may I ask the question whether there are two separate contracts, one for \$8 for taking out the rock, and one of \$1.30 for putting it in the pier?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it specifically stated in the contract that this rock is to be placed in the piers?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no doubt it is. All that these parties get for blasting out that rock and putting it in the piers is \$8 a cubic yard.

Mr. INGRAM. The reason I ask is because we have had experience in this Parliament of contractors taking advantage of the Government in this way: They have a contract to take out material, which they must dispose of in some way so as not to interfere with navigation; then they have another contract to fill in a certain space, getting so much a yard for it; and by the shrewdness of contractors, the material taken out which would have cost them money to dump somewhere out in the lake away from the harbour, they have used to

fill in thus saving them money and at the same time getting paid for it. I want to know, was it stated in the contract that that material would be put in the piers?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is under the one contract. The engineer, in the statement read by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) estimated for so much solid rock excavating under water and putting material in the wharf as ballast.

Mr. INGRAM. What is this \$1.30 per yard for?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That may be taken from the Harris property. The department has been blasting a great deal of rock to make room for some additional tracks, and this rock would be included in that schedule and for taking that stone ballast and putting it in the crib, the contractor would be entitled to \$1.30 per yard.

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to have this clearly understood—

Mr. MCGREGOR. It has been made clear.

Mr. INGRAM. This is an important matter to the country, though my hon. friend from North Essex (Mr. McGregor) may care little about it. The Government would not be justified in paying \$1.30 per yard to the contractor for putting the material they take out of the harbour in the crib, which would be more convenient for them than dumping it outside the harbour.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have already assured my hon. friend that the contractor is not entitled to and will not receive under his contract anything above \$8 for the ballast, the rock excavation and the removal of and placing it in the crib. \$8 covers the whole.

Mr. INGRAM. Therefore, there is no \$1.30 at all?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Not for that rock, nor for that ballast, only for the material that is taken from the Harris property.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Would the hon. gentleman say where this work was let in British Columbia that cost \$9 per yard?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The Deputy Minister says it was in 1880, according to his recollection. I may say to my hon. friend that the difference between the highest and lowest of these tenderers is only \$1.60. Connolly's tender was \$8, Heney's \$7.80, and Mayes's \$9.40.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Is it the case that some of these contractors are now sub-contractors of the man who got the contract?

Mr. INGRAM.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That has been stated. I have no personal knowledge on that subject.

Mr. HAGGART. Before concurrence, I would ask the Minister to bring down the specifications on which this work was let, and a copy of the tender, or one of the tenders, and lay them upon the Table.

Mr. HUGHES. Could the Minister tell us in general terms what the cubic contents of the pier may be? In other words, will the cubic contents of the pier exceed the number of cubic yards of rock to be excavated in the harbour?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. There will be room in the pier for all the rock that will be taken out of the harbour?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes, and more too.

Mr. POWELL. Would the hon. gentleman tell me what portion of these seven acres is covered with water at high tide, and what portion of that basin is going to be excavated?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. All that is going to be excavated further will be the east and west side of the pier for a distance of 525 feet. In front of the pier, some few feet after you get out, you will probably reach a depth of water which will be sufficient without any dredging. There is some dredging, I understand, at the end of the pier, but a considerable part of it is on the two sides.

Mr. POWELL. What is to be done on the Portland side? There is a large portion on the Portland side. What does the Government contemplate doing with that?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We have not had occasion to consider that question yet. It is fairly well situated, I think, for business purposes. Part of it, of course, is under water in the neighbourhood of the tracks, but as you near the main street there are dwelling-houses and tenement houses upon the property.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood that we are at liberty to discuss some of the items other than the bridge on this particular item. I see there is an expenditure of \$600,000 for rolling stock for 1898-99; was that expended?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That has all been expended.

Mr. HAGGART. You are asking a further appropriation of \$343,000. What are you going to do with it?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The rolling stock was all pur-

chased by tender. The \$343,000 we are asking for is for five locomotives, two first-class sleepers, three dining cars, 100 box cars, three first-class cars, six second-class sleepers two baggage and express, one postal, one flanger, two heavy platform cars, 30 refrigerator cars, air brakes, draw-bars and swings. The rolling equipment mentioned here is well within the average over the whole line to which the road is entitled under the additional mileage. For instance, there are still seven or eight locomotives which we will be entitled to ask from Parliament because of our added mileage. But we have not yet thought it well to ask for any more than the present business of the road will justify. I have approached it as moderately and as cautiously as I could, and I am justified in saying that the business of the road requires fully all the equipment we are here asking for, and absolutely more. Last year we were obliged to pay out of our income no less a sum than \$60,000 and over, for the use of cars and car mileage to other roads, so that as compared with the highest amount my hon. friend had to pay, we have to pay \$50,000 more in the last twelve months in that one direction alone. Our locomotives are in full demand, we require all we have, and more. The same thing may be said about the rolling stock.

Mr. INGRAM. I suppose the hon. Minister has fitted his engines with the latest appliances and air-brakes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. I notice an item of \$20,000 for air-brakes. What is the amount paid for these appliances? In the meantime, may I ask if it is the Westinghouse Company that is furnishing them?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These cost \$70, and we are asking for a sufficient amount to equip 285 cars.

Mr. INGRAM. I am willing to compliment the hon. gentleman. I very much approve of these latest improvements being put on the cars. I am glad to compliment the hon. gentleman on taking such a step on the Government railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I trust my hon. friend will make himself heard on this side of the House, if he is complimenting me.

Mr. INGRAM. I was attempting to compliment the Government, and the hon. gentleman especially, for expending this sum of money in improving the rolling stock of the Government railway. I think, if there is one thing more than another that the railways should do, it is to adopt the latest appliances for the purpose of saving life

and limb of those engaged in the dangerous occupation of railroading, and that the Government railway should set a good example to other railways throughout the country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BERGERON. What engines had the hon. gentleman built in the United States?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had twenty locomotives built in the United States. They were built by the Baldwin Company, of Philadelphia; they cost \$9,800 each, and they are the cheapest locomotives that were ever put on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BERGERON. Are they good?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are good.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the tonnage?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Seventy-seven tons.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the size of the cylinders?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think, 18 x 24.

Mr. POWELL. Some of them are compound, are they not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, some compounds, and some others.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the hon. gentleman tried Kingston engines on the Intercolonial Railway at all?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, we are keeping the Kingston company as busy as, I think, they are capable of being kept. At all events, they are turning out for us locomotives as fast as they can turn them out.

Mr. INGRAM. The impression throughout the country amongst railroad men is, that the Government do not want to patronise the Kingston Engine Works.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is a mistake.

Mr. INGRAM. I am glad to hear that the Government is keeping them so busy that they cannot supply them fast enough and I think no fault will attach to the Government for having applied to the Baldwin Company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think the Kingston people will find any fault with us. We required to have a number of engines last fall for our winter business. We applied to the Baldwin Company, and ascertained from them the best they could do in the

way of furnishing twenty locomotives. We had these furnished in thirty days from the time the order was given, and paid \$9,800 each for them.

Mr. BERGERON. Were they new, or had they been used before?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Absolutely new. I think the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) will tell you that they poured into his county at Moncton with a good deal of rapidity. We had to pay the Kingston people last year, to get them to build the same size of engines, \$14,600 each.

Mr. BERGERON. What cars were built—parlour cars?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No parlour cars. We had some sleepers, dining-cars and first-class cars.

Mr. BERGERON. By the Wagner Company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Were tenders asked for these cars and engines?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. We asked for tenders for engines from perhaps half a dozen of the American firms.

Mr. BERGERON. May we have the names of the firms?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I shall be happy to furnish hon. gentlemen with the names of the firms.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the hon. gentleman do it before we get through with the supplementary Estimates?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. I notice that in some of the sleeping-cars that were here the space was small from berth to berth, and it may be that the cars were built low to go through some of the lower tunnels. There was not as much space between the upper and lower berth as in the ordinary sleeping-car, in which the passenger can sit in the lower berth without bending the head. I wondered if the car was built low for the lower tunnels.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The cars were made standard size. I had the same impression as the hon. gentleman has, when I first examined one of the new cars, but I found that the impression was not well founded. It was due rather to the fact that the springs were new and the cushions were all out to their full extent. After a little wear they will

Mr. BLAIR.

fall, and there will not be any difference in that respect.

Mr. INGRAM. In respect to the duties on the Baldwin engines, was any reduction made to the Government, or did they pay the full duty.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am afraid that I will have to acknowledge that we smuggled these engines in. That is the only justification we have for paying the Kingston people the price I have mentioned. When we bring anything in for the purposes of the Government, it is not subject to duty. Cars or locomotives, coming in from outside, pay no duty, and, therefore, we have felt that in getting work done at home, we might fairly add to the cost outside the amount of the duty.

Mr. BERGERON. How does my hon. friend fix that with the hon. Minister of Customs? How does the Customs Department keep its books straight?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not let him know anything about it.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to bring the attention of the hon. Minister to a case that occurred on the Wabash. It is reported—and the hon. gentleman, I understand, has the report in his department—by the Grand Trunk employees employed at Stratford, London and St. Thomas that one of the Wabash engines which had been used by the company in Canada was sent to Stratford. It was not repaired there, but was sent to the other side of the river where the repairs were made, and it was brought back into Canada without paying duty, while certain employees engaged in Canada, on the Grand Trunk, were laid off owing to scarcity of work. They are complaining now because the Wabash Company send engines to the other side of the river for repairs and bring them back into Canada without duty being paid on the repairs.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not like to speak with confidence on that point, but I think the hon. Minister of Customs would feel justified in having the duty levied on repairs and improvements made on the other side of the line.

Mr. INGRAM. The impression is that the department gave instructions that there should be no duty placed on these repairs.

Mr. MCGREGOR. When a vessel goes over the river for repairs the owners have to pay duty on these repairs when the vessel comes to this side again. I am quite satisfied that locomotives would be in the same position. When a vessel goes to Detroit for repairs it has to pay duty when it comes back to Windsor.

**Mr. HAGGART.** The Minister does not intend to apply any of this money to purchasing rolling stock there is no provision for ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Not a cent.

**Mr. HAGGART.** You have made no provision for the purchase of it ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I am under no obligation for it.

**Mr. POWELL.** Who has the contract for strengthening these bridges ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The contract is not let yet.

**Mr. POWELL.** Who had the contract for similar work last year ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The Dominion Bridge Company.

**Mr. POWELL.** Has the Hamilton Bridge Company any contracts ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** They have a good deal of work with us.

**Mr. POWELL.** What is that \$100,000 for ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** That is not for repairing, but to add additional spans to a number of bridges.

**Mr. POWELL.** Are the contracts let for these yet ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** No.

**Mr. POWELL.** What price do you pay the Hamilton Bridge Company f.o.b. at Hamilton ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Two and a half, or two and three-quarter cents ; less than 3 cents in recent years, just now prices are going up.

**Mr. POWELL.** Two and a half cents, of course, would be low, and I am glad to hear the Government are getting it for that. Are they subject to careful inspection, so that you may get good work ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Yes.

**Mr. POWELL.** Who is your inspector at Hamilton ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I think a man named John Starr at Hamilton, and he is reported to be a very competent man.

**Mr. POWELL.** John Forbes or John Starr ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** John Forbes of the Star Company.

**Mr. INGRAM.** Do the bridge companies do their own erecting or is it a separate work ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Sometimes they do it and sometimes we do it.

**Mr. INGRAM.** Has the Government any bridge erectors in their employ ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Yes.

**Mr. POWELL.** Is not this charging of strengthening bridges to capital, instead of to revenue, a departure from the practice that has prevailed on the Intercolonial Railway for the last ten or fifteen years ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I do not know that it can be said to be a departure, because the conditions under which this is to be done are conditions different from any existing heretofore. If one or more of these bridges became defective and required to be replaced, I quite recognize that in conformity with past custom we should charge that work out of revenue, against maintenance for the year. But when these bridges are good, and if the conditions had not changed, would last, perhaps, half a century, but are not strong enough, and we must double up their strength, it would be rather an extreme view to say that that would be a fair charge upon income. It is not so regarded in railway accounting as a rule, and I do not think it would be proper for us to do it. We ought really to do more of this than we are doing ; and if we were to make all these expenditures chargeable against income there would be no means of paying them at all without creating a considerable deficit.

**Mr. POWELL.** There have been circumstances in times past very similar to the present circumstances. The increase in weight of the engines some ten years ago led to the strengthening of the bridges. \$15,000 or \$16,000 was spent in strengthening one bridge, and \$100,000 was spent in strengthening the north-west and south-west bridges over the Miramichi.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** My engineer says that cost \$65,000.

**Mr. POWELL.** He may be right. I have no recollection about it myself ; but these charges were all against revenue, increasing the deficit. By a mere stroke of bookkeeping the hon. gentleman reduces the deficit or shows a surplus, and makes an unfair showing on the operation of the road by his predecessor. Instead of charging these bridges in full to capital account, he should simply charge the betterment.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** That is all I am doing. I am adding new spans or strengtheners.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman a few moments ago said he was not only strengthening, but was providing absolutely new spans. In this case I think he is charging the full cost of the new spans to capital.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly.

Mr. POWELL. That is unfair. Now, I notice another item: "Rolling stock to apply air brake to freight cars." In times past, the work of putting air brakes on cars was paid out of revenue?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not in recent years.

Mr. POWELL. However, at this early hour of the morning there is no use of detaining the House. Any remarks I have to make on this subject had better be made on concurrence.

Mr. HAGGART. I see it stated in the newspapers that the Government have decided to close the capital account on the Intercolonial Railway after all the immense improvements now being made are completed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not made any such statement or authorized any such statement to be made. I think you can count with some confidence on the capital account of the Intercolonial being closed when the road is closed. I want to say a word to the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Powell) with regard to the spans. I think he is under an erroneous impression. What we did last year with respect to some of these bridges was not simply to strengthen them in the ordinary way by putting in an extra brace, but we took a whole structure from one locality and planted it alongside of another structure at another locality, giving to the bridge to which we made the transfer the double weight and strength caused by the combination of the two. You have exactly the same bridges that you had before, but they are differently placed, and you have on the old foundations from which the span had been removed a new structure. We are doing that in the cases to which I have called attention. The hon. gentleman says that this plan not having been formerly pursued, the Government are at an advantage over their predecessors as a result of adopting this different method of making improvements. That remark would have some force as applied to a period anterior to the last eight or nine years, when the Intercolonial had a deficit ranging from \$350,000 to \$650,000 a year. During those years I have no doubt that some, perhaps all, of that class of charges found their way into the maintenance account and went to add to the deficit. But during the years of the administration of my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Hag-

Mr. BLAIR.

gart), with which I can most fairly compare the results under the present Administration, he has done nothing of that kind. I am prepared to show that we are expending year by year an equal if not a greater sum in maintenance and works than has been expended by the hon. gentleman, outside and beyond the cost of these iron structures and the other items found in the capital expenditure. I would be prepared to go over the details which go to make up the money expended on the Intercolonial in the way of maintenance and repairs year by year, and compare the totals with the hon. gentleman's totals: and when that is done, I think no one will say that it is an unfair mode of making a comparison, or that the present Administration is not entitled to confine its comparisons to a period within which the system has obtained which I am now continuing.

Mr. POWELL. This new movement for the extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal will have led, when these expenditures are made, to about \$2,000,000 additional capital expenditure, for nearly all of them are directly or indirectly attributable to the opening up of this scheme.

Mr. INGRAM. What is a train-load for these engines?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Five hundred tons is the maximum, but for the class of engines we had in operation down to the period when I undertook to increase its locomotive power, on a 1 per cent grade.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that the highest grade you have?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, with the exception of one little spot. This statement is made in respect of a 1 per cent grade. The present locomotives are capable of hauling 1,100 tons with perfect ease up a 1 per cent grade. In other words, the hauling capacity of the present locomotive is between two and three times that of the locomotives in use down to 1896.

Mr. INGRAM. What number of loaded cars?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Some of these locomotives are loaded to the extent of twenty-five or thirty-five cars.

Mr. INGRAM. They haul them up a 1 per cent grade?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. POWELL. I think the hon. Minister was giving what these locomotives start-

ed out to do, that is, to haul 1,100 tons, but in practical operation they can only haul 900 tons. They haul more than the old engines, but they move along at a snail's pace, and do not make much more than half the mileage. It is well to keep the fact in mind when thinking of the saving in respect of the cost of transportation.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Yes, that is an item.

Mr. **HUGHES.** What is the weight of the rails on the road?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** It varies. A part of the road is 56, a part 67, and a part 70. We are proposing, if things go right, to have a much heavier rail on in the future.

The committee rose and reported progress.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2.35 a.m. (Friday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 14th July, 1899.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

**PRAYERS.**

**FIRST READING.**

Bill (No. 172) to incorporate the British American Pulp and Paper Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

**THE QUEEN VS. SKELTON ET AL.**

Mr. **DAVIN.** I wish to mention the case of Queen vs. Skelton et al. Skelton and others were convicted of perjury, and were sentenced, and about the middle of March last an order was made for their liberation. I ask the Government to lay on the Table of the House the report of the Minister of Justice, on which this action was taken. It will commend itself to the Government, I think, that the House ought to be in possession of the reasons why so grave a step was taken, and I ask the Government to dispense with my making a motion.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). I will speak to the Minister of Justice about the matter.

## SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER.** I ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) when we may expect the supplementary Estimates for the year 1900 to be brought down.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). I have a strong hope that on Monday they will be laid on the Table.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—RESOLUTIONS RE SENATE REFORM.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER.** I ask the Prime Minister whether he will be able to favour us with the resolutions in regard to the Senate on Monday?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** Yes.

## YUKON CROWN PROSECUTOR—MR. WADE.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). The hon. leader of the Opposition asked me the other day in reference to the employment of Mr. Wade as Crown prosecutor. I was unable at the time to speak definitely as to the terms on which Mr. Wade was appointed, but am now informed by the Department of Justice that his appointment is that of Crown prosecutor generally, representing the Minister of Justice for the Yukon district. It carries with it the performance of the functions usually in charge of the Crown Attorney of one of the counties of Ontario. The terms of his appointment, so far as the financial aspect are concerned, are simply that he hands in his bill for his fees, and they are taxed by the Department of Justice in the usual way.

Mr. **DAVIN.** Is Mr. Wade still registrar?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** No, he has no office at the present time except Crown prosecutor.

## SUPPLY.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Galops Canal enlargement..... \$619,560

Mr. **HAGGART.** Would the Minister give us a short account as to why the canal was placed where it is, the present condition of the works, when he expects to have a fourteen-foot navigation? I understood him to

say last year that it would be ready on the 1st of May last.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). The hon. gentleman was not in the House when I made a statement as to that a day or two ago.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Would the Minister repeat that portion of his statement in regard to when he expects to open the fourteen-foot navigation through ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I shall be glad to repeat our view on the question. We had very strong hopes last year from the assurances that were held out to us by the contractors upon the various works along the St. Lawrence route that we should be able to open the canals sufficiently, at all events, to permit of the using of the fourteen-foot channel early in the month of May.

**Mr. HAGGART.** All through ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Well, not all through, but that we would be able, at all events, to afford a navigable channel all through to the depth of fourteen feet. Our expectations in that regard, I am sorry to say, were not realized. It is a fact within my own personal knowledge that last fall was a most unfavourable season for prosecuting the work speedily. There was a great deal of rain, and it is well known that in the rainy season such works are necessarily delayed. I am assured by our officers and by the contractors, that four or five weeks were lost by reason of that fact. The contractors have been working with a very great deal of energy and expedition, and are doing their best to meet our expectations, and to implement their promise to us. I believe that the delay was not their fault. We did not expect to have the Galops Canal completed but we have made an arrangement under which the contractor engaged to furnish the necessary tugs to take the barges and other vessels used in transportation up the rapids, and they, of course, could use the rapids coming down. Therefore, during the time that the Galops Canal would remain uncompleted the contractor was under obligations to provide a sufficient route by way of the river.

**Mr. HAGGART.** For fourteen-foot navigation ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Yes, of course, more than fourteen feet in the river. We have been spurring on the contractors during the present season, and I may say they have clapped on all sail, and we have their assurance and the confident opinion of the engineers, that unless something absolutely unforeseen occurs, we will be able, by the first week

**Mr. HAGGART.**

in September, to afford a fourteen-foot channel all the way through.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** When do you expect to complete the Galops Canal ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The Galops Canal will not be completed this season. We will use the river in the way I have indicated. But the canal will be completed before the end of another season, without a doubt. Our confident hope is that by the first week of September it will be possible for us to let the water into the canals which are now under construction, without a single exception. While the canals themselves will not be finished, while there will still be a good deal of work to do in the way of touching them up, and while some portions of the prisms in one or two places will have to be dredged, we will be able to afford a sufficient and useful channel for 14 feet draught after the first week in September.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Will the hon. Minister be kind enough to tell us where this Galops Canal is located ? If I am informed rightly, it is at the back of the village of Cardinal. I would like him to tell us the reason for selecting that route, instead of the front along the river, and give us the estimated cost of the two different routes.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The hon. gentleman is correct in saying that we are going through the rear of the village of Cardinal. The reason we selected that route was that after mature consideration by the engineers, and I may say by myself, we determined that it would be very much to the advantage of ship-owners and freighters if they could be assured of a direct channel rather than a circuitous channel. We are giving them a splendid straight route, and I am sure that it has been a matter of extreme satisfaction to the people engaged in the shipping business that this decision was reached. It was the opinion of our engineer, Mr. Rubidge, that that route, not only by reason of its being so straight, but having regard to other considerations, would be as favourable as the route first thought of. The first impression was that it would be about \$200,000 more expensive, owing to the deeper cutting that would be necessary ; but when the matter came to be inquired into, and the comparative cost of the properties which we would have to expropriate for the purpose came to be considered, we found that it would cost a very great deal more than was first estimated to adhere to the route first thought of.

**Mr. HAGGART.** What is the cost of the work ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The whole estimated cost of the enlargement of the Galops Canal is \$4,300,000.

Mr. BERGERON. How much has been spent already ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. \$3,123,000 up to the 1st of May. This will leave a balance of the estimated cost of \$1,176,795. The estimate expenditure from the 1st of May till the 30th of June was \$100,000. We have estimated that the Iroquois section will require during the current year an expenditure of \$125,000, the Cardinal section \$513,400, and the upper entrance, \$50,000, making a total of \$688,400.

Mr. HAGGART. That will be all that will be required to finish the work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not quite.

Mr. HAGGART. If you are going to finish it next year, why not take enough for the whole work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We do not expect to pay out more than this in the next fiscal year, because on these great works, as the hon. gentleman knows, there is always a large balance awaiting final estimate, and we think a moderate estimate of the amount required for that is about \$300,000. We expect that it will be some months after the expiration of the fiscal year before we shall be required to pay the difference between the sum now asked for and the actual cost of the work.

Mr. HAGGART. The statement of the hon. gentleman fully justifies some remarks I made with regard to the Galops Canal some time ago. I doubted very much the necessity of building that canal at all. It involved an expenditure of \$4,300,000, which the department might very well have avoided. I am aware that the Minister's action is justified by the report of Mr. Rubidge and the other engineers of his department ; but I think the engineers of the department would not mind having their opinion on the subject strengthened by outside expert evidence. However, the Minister says he has made arrangements with the contractors for building this work, and that in the event of their not getting the work finished this fall, they will furnish means of towing vessels drawing 14 feet up and down the Galops Rapids. My idea was that the canal enlargement would be totally useless for barge navigation.

The only way to make it economical and useful at all would be to have vessels of the full size and capacity of the locks, with cheap navigation. Vessels with a capacity of 11, or 12, or 13 knots per hour would never use this canal at all, either going down or coming up, and the very fact that the Minister has made arrangements with the contractors to tow these vessels up the canal shows that it is perfectly feasible. If it is deep enough for a 14-foot navigation, if

these vessels could be towed up the canal, there is no need for these locks at all, because the locks at present constructed are perfectly large enough for barge navigation. If you are going to build barges of the capacity of 14-foot navigation, I tell you that your scheme is entirely useless. It is impossible to navigate Lake St. Louis with a tow of barges, and having only 200 feet channel to go down and come up, if there is the slightest wind in the lake.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Would it make any difference, if the channel were 300 feet ?

Mr. HAGGART. Not a bit, or if it were 500 or 600 feet. The parties who are at present excavating and taking the tow down with barges, will know it is impossible with a 300-foot channel to keep the barges in the channel, with the slightest wind and the current at present in Lake St. Louis. The only way the canal can be utilized is by large vessels, 14-foot draught, and the full extent of the capacity of the canal. If you have those vessels, there is no need of the enlargement of the Galops Canal. I am not blaming the Minister for following the advice of Mr. Rubidge, superintendent of the canals, but I hold to the opinion which I have long held, that the expenditure of such a large sum is unnecessary, when the river itself can be utilized by vessels of sufficient power. The hon. gentleman may recall to me that, before my term of office expired, I asked for tenders for this enlargement. It is true ; I wanted to know exactly what it would cost. I intended to look fully into the matter, and get the advice of engineers thoroughly competent, as to the necessity of the work at all. However, the expenditure is now being made. I cannot understand the Minister, when he says that for expropriation purposes he gets the land at the back of the village cheaper than in front. I thought he owned the front already ; I thought that that was in the possession of the Government, and there would be no need to expropriate any property at all, except we might have interfered with some water-powers that are there at present. I know that a person below the water-power, where the starch factory is, pretended to have some claim.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are cutting right through the built-up portion of the town by the other alternative route.

Mr. HAGGART. You could have done it without cutting through the town at all. The Minister is fully informed, no doubt, on that subject, and I suppose he thinks the expropriation of what I consider the property at present belonging to the Government requires a certain sum. I should think it will be only to expropriate some imaginary rights. However, he is, no doubt, bet-

ter informed on that subject than I am ; but I had the idea that the best place for building the canal is in front of the village.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. On the river.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, that was the first plan.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No plan of that kind has come to my notice at all.

Mr. HAGGART. The first plan proposed was in front of the town. I ordered that survey and the plan for building it at the back of the village, but the plan first intended was in front of the town, and I think every one in that neighbourhood was rather astonished at the placing of the work where it is at present. I would like to know the position with regard to the Soulanges Canal. Are the contractors doing their work? What difficulties have the engineers met in its construction? Are those difficulties costing the Government a great deal more than was first contemplated in building the canal, and when is that portion of the work to be completed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We expect to have the Soulanges Canal navigable by the first week of September. There have been, I suppose, the usual difficulties in the way of prosecuting the work to early completion. We have met with some extraordinary difficulties, three or four slides, causing a displacement in the canal, in some instances, after the work was practically completed.

Mr. BERGERON. There will be some more, too, in the same place.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not like to say that there might not ; but I hope not, because every day we are nearing the period when the water will be let in, and, when it once gets in, I think we can count with some confidence on slides not again occurring. We had two serious slides, one quite recently. They add, necessarily, somewhat to the cost of the work, but not very much. They did not in either case extend over a length of 1,200 or 1,300 feet. The last was about 1,200 or 1,500 feet. I do not know of any other troubles looming up.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the increase over the estimated cost?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The estimated cost is \$5,550,000, and it will require \$704,214 to complete. Up to the 30th April there was spent \$4,845,788. I do not think that the cost of the slides will very greatly enhance the amount that the work on the whole will cost us. I am not in a position to say what the removal of the earth which was precipitated

Mr. HAGGART.

into the prism of the canal, is going to cost us, but not a large sum. Otherwise, the work is about completed at these points. Considerable of the earth has not yet been removed, and we do not know what it will cost entirely to replace the broken points where cavities have occurred. A quarter of a million, I am informed, would be an outside figure to be added to the item, resulting from the casualty.

Mr. BERGERON. It will go nearly six millions?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Probably.

Mr. HAGGART. Will this \$126,000 finish the Lachine Canal enlargement?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. And will \$3,500 finish the Lake St. Louis channel?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think not quite. Probably a few thousand dollars more will be required.

Mr. BERGERON. Have all the land damages been settled on the Soulanges Canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is hardly safe to make a general statement on a thing of that kind. We have endeavoured to settle them, but there may be some few remaining.

Mr. BERGERON. But the money for them is voted?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. It is a matter of discretion whether they accept or prefer to go to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. HAGGART. Passing for a moment from the St. Lawrence canals, I see an item for \$350,000 for deepening the entrance at Port Colborne—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am sorry the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) did not happen to be present when I explained this matter. I suppose he would rather read my explanation as it is in "Hansard" than have me to go over it again. But while I am on the subject, I may say that we have plans in progress which involve not only the deepening of the entrance, but also the providing of some berths and slips, so that vessels of large tonnage coming in may be able to moor and transfer their cargoes to smaller vessels. The amount was originally asked for the purpose of enlarging or deepening the entrance. But while the item was going through committee, I asked that "deepening" might be changed to "improvements" so as to enable us to use any portion not required for deepening the entrance for the

purpose of providing berth accommodation and slippage for the steamers using the harbour. I may say that this is only a portion of what Parliament will be asked this session to authorize, as there will be an amount for a breakwater in order that there may be a safe harbour at that point.

Mr. BRITTON. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to a matter, which, perhaps, would have come up better under item 124: "St. Lawrence River and reaches—river, reaches and canals."

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not been paying very close attention to the order of discussion.

Mr. BRITTON. If I may be considered in order, I should like to refer to a matter which I promised some vessel men I would call to the attention of the Minister. At the entrance of the Morrisburg Canal, a new and very strong pier has been built. This is sheathed with iron and has a very sharp corner; and vessels coming up, especially from the south, when there is a high wind are sure to drift against it—a tow particularly—and always with more or less damage to the vessel, because the vessels are not so strong as the pier. What has been asked for by the resident engineer is what, I understand, is called a ruffle on the pier. It is made by driving piles around the corner leaving them a little loose, but bound together with a chain and connected by a chain to the pier. A vessel striking upon this ruffle suffers no injury. Attention was called to this matter, I believe, as long ago as 1897. I can understand that, in the great works that have been going on from time to time, little things like this have been overlooked. But, in the meantime, considerable damage has been done. I have spoken to men who are connected with the transportation companies on the river and I call the attention of the Minister to the point as I promised them I would do. A few dollars comparatively would make the desired improvement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The attention of the department has been called to this point by the transportation men. According to the opinion of the superintending engineer it was not necessary to make an expenditure for this purpose, but I think he has lately come to a different view. At all events instructions have been sent to him to put a cluster of piles round the nose of the pier, and that will be done.

Mr. HAGGART. I would ask the hon. Minister to take up the item for the Beauharnois Canal, as my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) is obliged to leave early this afternoon.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Very well.

Beauharnois Canal—

Steel bridge and masonry at St. Timothy .....	\$3,600
Surveys and defining land boundaries..	1,440

Mr. BERGERON. I wish to ask what this item refers to: "Steel bridge and masonry, St. Timothy"?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman probably knows the condition of the bridge across the canal at St. Timothy, and whether it needs to be repaired or replaced.

Mr. BERGERON. I cannot say as to that. There was a wooden bridge there.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a wooden structure and I am advised it is rotten and not safe. We have thought it our duty to ask Parliament for an appropriation to enable us to put a new steel bridge there.

Mr. BERGERON. The other item is for surveys and defining land boundaries, what is that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That has reference to the canal reserve lands at Valleyfield. They are leased to a number of people, and we have found it necessary to have a general plan, and so surveys have to be made and some expert assistance procured in defining the boundaries.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is going to make the survey, will it be the engineer of the department?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not decided. Possibly our staff may be too much occupied, and we will have to avail ourselves of outside assistance.

Mr. BERGERON. There is very little to do, in fact I do not see that there is anything. The Government have maps and plans of these lands.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose my hon. friend has informed himself upon the subject; but the conclusion he has arrived at does not correspond with that of the officers of the department.

Mr. BERGERON. There may be something that I do not know about. The item is a small one and being as the Minister explains, I do not wish to say any more.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is all that it is for. The hon. gentleman knows that there are a number of acres of canal reserve land in the neighbourhood.

Mr. BERGERON. But they are all marked and posted. They are marked with

stones set five or six feet in the ground and sticking up so that any person can see them, even at night.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think my hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I desire to ask my hon. friend about the thousand dollars which was paid to the Estate Bergevin. He promised to bring down the papers. To whom was the money paid?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have given the officers a memorandum two or three times to ascertain from the Justice Department in whose name the cheque was actually issued, in addition to the name of the owner of the land. I understand it is the custom in the Justice Department in such cases to put on the cheque the name of the agent of the Department of Justice in addition to the name of the owner of the lands to whom the money is going. If the title has been examined into and the conveyances are found to be right, an officer of the Deputy Minister of Justice endorses the cheque and hands it over.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I want to know whether the man for whom the money was paid actually got the money, or if it remains in the hands of the agent.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is what my deputy tells me was done in this case.

Mr. **BERGERON**. The hon. gentleman promised me the other day to bring down some papers by which I could see the name of the agent.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The Deputy Minister says he rather overlooked it. I spoke to him about it once or twice, and in the pressure of business he forgot to get the name of the agent of the Department of Justice. I think during the course of the afternoon I will be able to send a memorandum of it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. **BERGERON**. There was an accident took place some time ago at lock No. 7 on the Beauharnois Canal, where a propeller went through the lock, and I am sure a good deal of damage was done. I brought the matter to the attention of the Government some time ago when my hon. friend was not present. The Prime Minister took a note of it, and told me that he would bring the matter to the attention of the proper department, so that justice might be done to those who suffered the damage. A similar accident occurred before, and there was a great deal of difficulty in coming to a settlement.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I understand the case is situated  
Mr. **BERGERON**.

in this way. The owner of the vessel that did the damage has made a deposit in the usual way, and he states that he has satisfactorily settled with the persons who suffered the damage, and that the amount has been agreed upon between them. He has recently made application here to have the deposit released for the purpose of paying it over, in part or in whole, to the claimants.

Mr. **BERGERON**. My hon. friend has been misinformed. Of the four or five persons who suffered damages, I think two or three have accepted the settlement proposed by the owners of the steamboat, but one of them has not. I saw him myself at Valleyfield on the 1st of July, and he told me he had refused. These farmers have nothing at all to do with the steamboat company, they have only to deal with the Government. But the Government has to deal with the steamboat company, as was done in former years. The farmers make their claims, the engineer goes and makes an examination of the damages along with arbitrators chosen by the farmers, and they agree upon an amount, and the Government then asks the company to pay the amount to the Government for the farmers. The steamboat company pays the amount to the Government and the Government distributes it to the claimants who suffered the damages. In this case the employees of the Government have refused entirely to have anything to do with the matter, and told the farmers to go to the steamboat company. The farmers went and talked to the representatives of the steamboat company, which was not the proper way to do. They were treated by the company *haut la main*, they were told that the company was not ready to give them anything, and they might run for it. One of these farmers, a man named Pilon, has refused entirely to settle with the company. One of these men asked \$300, and they offered him only \$100; he would not accept it, and they told him he never would get anything more. Then these men got frightened and accepted an agreement by which they were to receive \$100 instead of \$300, but to this arrangement Pilon refused to accede. My hon. friend is misinformed when the company tell him that everybody is satisfied. If my hon. friend has in his hands any deposit of that company I hope he will not pay it back until these men are indemnified for their damages. This is an important matter for the farmers. Their lands were all sown, they had done their work in the spring, and the water overflowed the land about four feet and has caused damages for two or three years. Of course, from their past experience, they do not claim anywhere near the damages they have suffered.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I am glad to hear my hon. friend say that the claims for damages in that

locality are rather under than over the mark.

Mr. BERGERON. About one-third of what they were asking.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understood my hon. friend to say that the claims for damages which are usually made in that neighbourhood are less than the actual damages which the party suffers. I am glad to hear that, because that has not been my experience in other parts of the country.

Mr. BERGERON. It is not a general thing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can assure the hon. gentleman, however, that in the interests of these parties for whom he is speaking, I will not consent to refund the deposit until these persons who have claims are settled with. I do not think the department could be in any sense responsible for any settlement the owners of the steamboat might make with the claimants. We cannot prevent them from going and making a settlement on their own behalf with the company. That is a matter in which they might be assumed to be able to take care of themselves, to look after their own interests.

Mr. BERGERON. The proper way is for the farmers to deal with the Government, and not with the steamboat company at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Still, if parties see fit themselves to deal with the owners of the steamer, how can the Government possibly prevent them from doing so?

Mr. BERGERON. In this case the officers of the Government, the superintendent at least, said to them: I will have nothing at all to do with it, because I have had so much trouble in the past with these claims. You must settle with the steamboat company yourselves. These farmers did not know any better, and they took his advice.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the officers of the Government made any such statement, that alters the case. I have in my mind a case of a similar character that arose on the Welland Canal, and we were very glad to have the owners of the vessel put themselves to the trouble of seeing the claimants and adjusting the damages with them. It is very much easier, I think, for them to reach an understanding than it would have been for us to have done so, and I would not discourage it in any case. I would rather favour it, of course, always providing that no misrepresentations are made to the parties, the parties being left free to exercise their own will in the matter.

Mr. BERGERON. I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman speak in that way. These are my opinions, too. But the parties were deceived: they were told that if they did not deal with the steamboat company, the Government would have nothing to do with them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will try to protect them.

Chambly Canal—

Surveying property and planting stones.. \$900

Mr. HAGGART. What is this for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is to mark the canal boundaries. We have had a great deal of trouble by reason of the fact that the boundaries are not well defined.

Rideau Canal—

To deepen rock cut at Kilmarnock.... \$6,750

Mr. HAGGART. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether that work is to be done by tender or day work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) that it will be done by tender, if it is at all possible to do it. I know of no reason why it should not be done by tender. All of our work is done by tender, where it can be done.

Murray Canal—

To provide floating landing stage..... \$1,800

Mr. HAGGART. What is that floating landing stage for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. For vessels to stop at.

Welland Canal ..... \$53,640

Mr. INGRAM. What are these bridges for between Port Robinson and Port Colborne, for which a vote is taken? Are they railway bridges over the canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, they are ordinary highway bridges.

Mr. HAGGART. What will it take to complete the pier at Port Dalhousie for which \$15,000 is asked? This work has been going on for a number of years.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Which pier is the hon. gentleman referring to?

Mr. HAGGART. The west pier.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We had an appropriation of \$20,000 last year for the west pier, and \$15,000 is to continue the work. It is concrete, and it will probably require a further vote.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the total estimated amount that it will require to finish it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The probable cost of the whole work will be in the neighbourhood of \$50,000.

Mr. HAGGART. It is being done by tender, I suppose.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, every bit of it.

Mr. McCLEARY. I would like to ask the hon. Minister in reference to the four bridges between Port Robinson and Port Colborne, if this money is intended to be expended on repairs to the old bridges, or if the Minister contemplates the erection of new bridges.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is for putting in new concrete piers. The old wooden ones have decayed, and we are replacing them with concrete piers, both east and west.

Mr. HAGGART. There is a vote of \$20,000 towards the renewal of the entrance pier at Port Colborne. What is the estimated amount that will be required to finish these piers?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am afraid I cannot give the hon. gentleman that information.

Mr. HAGGART. You say you have a plan for the construction of docks, and piers, and everything else, at Port Colborne. How does this come to be a separate item? Is it not part of the scheme?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a proper and necessary charge on the revenue of the year. It is for work which is quite disconnected from the works for the deepening of the entrance and the improvement of the harbour. It is quite a different work. The others will necessarily be a capital charge, while this, being a renewal, is a revenue charge.

Railways and Canals—  
Miscellaneous ..... \$51,187 20

Mr. HAGGART. I see there is an increase of from \$8,000 to \$15,000 in the item of surveys and inspections on railways. What is the reason?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We find that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is called upon to do so much additional work, and make so many additional inquiries, that something will have to be added to the vote to cover that class of expenditure. Moreover, the adoption of the principle upon which in

Mr. BLAIR.

1897 we decided to grant subsidies in aid to railways, authorizing an additional amount beyond the ordinary and customary amount of \$3,200 a mile, based upon the added cost of the work, in excess of a fixed sum, makes it necessary that we should have a great deal more of engineering inspection and closer inquiry than we had required ordinarily under the prior existing circumstances. We have asked Parliament to give us this additional sum, so that we may have sufficient to make proper inspection and to have expert inquiry in regard to these questions that come before the Railway Committee from time to time.

Mr. HAGGART. Could the Minister give us the names of the officers?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have no permanent employees engaged in connection with that work.

Mr. HAGGART. You take about \$15,000, quite a large sum.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will try the experiment this year, and another year we can fix more definitely the sum we require.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this vote intended to provide for any new men, or are they all the same employees?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have made no changes. With the single exception of two officers, I have the same staff in my office that the hon. the ex-Minister (Mr. Haggart) had when he left it.

Intercolonial Railway..... \$3,285,000

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I wish to ask the Minister if tenders were advertised for and contracts awarded to the lowest tenderers for the uniforms supplied to the Intercolonial Railway employees?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Nothing has been so fruitful of discontent among the conductors and other officers who have been supplied with uniforms than the character of the clothing which had been furnished them in times past. Before I came to the department, the system of calling for tenders generally had been abandoned, and I was inclined to agree, that the system which had been adopted and continued I think for some years was satisfactory. The only difference there has been since I came in is, that we have supplied a better quality of cloth, and consequently at a somewhat increased price. We select the quality of cloth, and we say to the merchant tailor in St. John, or Halifax, or Quebec: We want an article of that quality and we will require you to furnish cloth up to that standard, and we will pay you so much per suit for the making and allow you the

cost of the cloth and a fair margin of profit. We have selected the tailors in the different localities, and under the system we have been able to give better satisfaction to the men than was possible when some years ago tenders were generally called for, and a few suits were made in one place and a few suits made in another, in all the towns and villages where there were tailor shops. There was always discontent and grumbling under the old system, one officer complaining that the other had a better suit or a better fit, and so on, and my officers informed me that it was an intolerable nuisance. The plan that has been in operation for the last four years or longer, has given better satisfaction, and we have not paid more than the customary price for the work.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Minister will remember that there was some discussion as to the increased rates that have been charged on the Intercolonial Railway. I have received a letter from a very respectable and intelligent gentleman, who writes :

I find a vast difference in local freights. Lime was carried from St. John to this station (that is Thompson's station, in the county of Cumberland) for 56 cents per cask ; now it is 76 cents, which is only 9 cents less than the cost of the lime. A cask of oil costs 93 cents from Halifax ; former price, 60 cents ; nearly everything in the same proportion. Car lots are taken from one station to the next station for \$4 per car ; now \$6 is the smallest charge.

I mention this because the statements here seem to conflict with the impression left upon the House by the Minister, that there had been no increase in the local rates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am surprised to hear of these instances, because I have been assured that while, in some cases, there might be exceptions, the general effect of the revision of the tariff schedule which took place some time ago, was in the direction of reduction rather than of increase. I think I explained that it was absolutely necessary to establish a greater uniformity in respect of the rates and the classification of goods. Our classification differs entirely from the classifications of the railroads with which we are connected, and with which we expected, and I think very properly expected, to do an increased business. For instance, take the case of lime. On the Intercolonial it would perhaps be classified as No. 3, No. 5 or No. 10, whereas on the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway it might be included in No. 6 or No. 8 or No. 11. So that there was unavoidably a great deal of friction and difficulty in establishing rates and in carrying on smooth intercourse and exchange between the two roads. Our traffic manager brought these facts to our notice. He also brought the fact that we were endangering the security of life and property by allowing the cars

to be overloaded, as they had been for some time. A car that was not capable of carrying more than twenty tons was allowed to be loaded up to twenty-five or thirty tons, and was liable to break down and block trains and occasion accidents. He suggested that it would be safer and wiser to base the charges upon weight rather than upon the car-load. We would thereby be able to regulate and control the load that would be put upon the cars. For these and other reasons, it was deemed desirable to revise the classification. We did not touch the rates, although they were indirectly affected. Some goods that were in one classification we put into another, and the rates are applied to the classification ; so that, of course, when we altered the classification of some goods, we altered the rates which were applied to them. On a careful examination of the results, as they were furnished to us by our traffic officers, we concluded that the general effect was to reduce and not to increase. There were occasional instances of increase, but they were not general. Since my hon. friend has called my attention to these specific instances, I shall see them in "Hansard," no doubt, and be able to refer the matter to the traffic department, and will find out what that department has to say in regard to it.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the hon. Minister some system of securing a similarity of classification on the part of all the railroads ? Is there no means by which the railroads can come to an agreement as to classification ? Any change in the classification or in the rates of the railroads has to be approved by the Government, and I think it is absolutely necessary that there should be a similarity of classification on all the roads. With regard to the clothing I had a controversy with the Minister of Finance last session in reference to the supplies for the Intercolonial Railway. I made the statement that there was not a single article purchased, even to a paint brush, when I was Minister of Railways, that was not purchased by tender. The hon. Minister of Finance said that perhaps that was so, but that the parties who were tendering for the goods were so few that it amounted absolutely to no tender at all. At that time I asked the Minister to bring down the names of the parties from whom I asked for tenders for the different articles required on the Intercolonial Railway, and, if there was a new list, to bring that down, so that we might compare them. I suppose the hon. Minister of Railways has followed the rule of the department in that respect, and has not purchased anything for the Intercolonial without tender, and has also left to the officers themselves the judgment of the articles furnished. The question whether an article of mechanism was up to the standard, was left to the man in

charge of the mechanical department; and in the case of a chemical article the opinion of the authorities of McGill College was obtained. I suppose the Minister follows the same course, which is the only proper one. I will ask him, before the supplementary Estimates come down, to furnish me with that information, which I asked for last session.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think there will be no difficulty in getting a list in time for the hon. gentleman, though, I should imagine, it would be pretty extensive. The system pursued is identical with that which was adopted when I came into the department. The officers of the supply department do not in all cases call publicly for tenders by advertisement in the newspapers. Sometimes they do so by posters. For many things they circularize the trade, as the hon. gentleman used to do. The department has a list of all the firms to whom circulars must be sent. I suppose my hon. friend exercised some discretion as to whether he would have the circulars sent to B as well as to A, or have them withheld from B and only sent to A. But I shall be glad to give direction to have the lists prepared so that they will be on hand if the hon. gentleman cares to look at them.

Mr. **INGRAM**. With respect to the clothing, I suppose the department tells every conductor, brakeman, station agent and porter to purchase one of these suits every one or two years?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Two suits every year. We do not furnish the station agents with suits. The conductors, the porters and the brakemen on passenger trains get them.

Mr. **INGRAM**. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he asks each merchant tailor to purchase cloth according to a sample furnished him, and that the tailor is allowed so much for making the suit.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes.

Mr. **INGRAM**. The hon. gentleman has not stated what the men pay for these suits.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. They do not pay anything. They are given to them.

Mr. **BELL** (Pictou). I was going to ask the Minister to explain more fully how that part of the business is carried on by which the department supplies cloth to the contractor.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We do not supply the cloth. We supplied it one year, and found that there was no particular advantage in doing so; but we exercise careful supervision as to the quality of the cloth, and we see

Mr. **HAGGART**.

that it is uniform. We try to avoid every possible cause of friction between the men owing to one man's cloth being suspected of being better than another man's.

Mr. **BELL** (Pictou). If the Minister does not advertise for tenders, does he ask a certain number of parties to tender or select some one friend to do the whole business?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We do not select any one firm, although we do not ask for tenders. We fix a price for the suits and take a reliable firm in each town and give it a certain portion of the suits to make. A certain portion, for instance, will be given to a firm in St. John, another portion to a firm in Halifax, and so we divide it among the different towns and give it to those who are competent to do the work and are fairly entitled to be considered. Perhaps in the spring a Halifax firm will do it, and in the fall a St. John firm will do it.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. How do you fix the value of the cloth? You say that you take a sample to a merchant tailor and ask him to make suits of that quality of cloth. He gets the cloth where he likes, but how do you determine the price you should pay him?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We have tenders, too, from wholesale men, and we allow the merchant tailor the price for the cloth at which the wholesale dealer would supply it to us.

Mr. **HAGGART**. The hon. gentleman is introducing a very bad practice. I had the same experience in the Post Office Department. Every town throughout the country insisted that the boots made for the letter carriers in that particular town should be made there, and the result was that we had the worst kind of boots and the worst uniforms you could imagine. Just fancy doing the same thing with reference to the volunteers—getting boots made for the Toronto troops in Toronto, and the London troops in London, and getting the uniforms for a St. Catharines regiment made in St. Catharines. The more satisfactory way would be for the Government to fix upon a standard of cloth and get the uniforms made by satisfactory parties, after calling for tenders. That would be much better in every way and relieve the department of a great deal of political trouble and bother. It would relieve the hon. gentleman of the bother of a member asking him to give a particular shoemaker in a certain town the contract for shoes, and to give to a particular tailor the contract for clothing in a particular town.

Mr. **INGRAM**. The system adopted by railway companies is, first, to call for tenders for making the uniforms. Then the successful tenderer is taken over the road and takes the measurements of the different

employees. The clothes are made by the one party, and at the one price.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would bring to the attention of the hon. Minister a matter as to which I have received a communication from the Board of Trade of the city of Halifax, and which no doubt he is cognizant of. The communication I refer to is in the shape of a letter from Mr. Geo. Mitchell, President of the Halifax Board of Trade, inclosing a letter from Furniss, Withey & Co., who represent a line of steamers from the ports of Halifax and St. John to European ports :

With regard to the cheese traffic, we are absolutely unable to secure any cheese for our Liverpool steamers, for the reason that the railroads have not suitable cars available for shippers. Had they been able to give us proper cars, we have not the least doubt that we could have secured 20,000 boxes of cheese for Liverpool on the basis of 20s. ocean freight. Mr. Hardwell, the agent here, has done all he could to secure us proper cars, but he advised us this morning that he is unable to get them. We are, therefore, obliged to let the cheese business alone, which is much to be regretted, as there is in Montreal some 400,000 to go forward, and there is no reason why Halifax should not have a share of this traffic from Montreal at equal rates as from St. John, Portland and Boston. In consequence of not being able to get suitable cars we are obliged to send all our Manchester cheese to St. John, otherwise we should have been able to give a share of the business to the Intercolonial Railway to Halifax.

As I understand, the action of this firm results not only in a loss to the trade of Halifax but to the Intercolonial Railway, because when they send their goods to the port of St. John for shipment to Manchester, I understand that they send them by the Canadian Pacific Railway. No doubt this has been brought to the attention of the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I wish my hon. friend had been here last evening when the subject came up. I pointed out then that I felt that perhaps the committee might think I was making an unreasonable demand in asking to be allowed to equip the road with increased cars to the extent I did, but I was trying to keep well within the needs, and could very well have asked for an increased number. I quite admit the accuracy of the statements made by my hon. friend and which were communicated to me by the Board of Trade of Halifax, and I am doing the best I can within reasonable limits to supply the deficiency.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As I understand, the vote asked for will be applied to securing cars suitable for that purpose ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. For that very purpose.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). At what date will the rolling stock be in proper shape to receive this freight ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As soon as the appropriation passes we will set to work and make contracts at once for the earliest possible construction of these cars.

Prince Edward Island Railway..... \$225,000

Mr. MARTIN. Will the Minister please say who has the contract for supplying passengers on the Prince Edward Island Railway with books, &c. ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The same person who has had the contract for more than a year. There has been no change.

Mr. MARTIN. I notice an advertisement calling for tenders for this service on February 7th, 1899. I understand that some business men in the city tendered for this service, and I would like to know if the lowest tender has been accepted, who the tenderer is, and what was the amount of his tender ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will get that information for my hon. friend (Mr. Martin). I do not recollect the facts, and the papers are not at hand at the moment. The tenders came forward to Ottawa since the session opened, but I have not taken any action either in the direction of withdrawing the contract from the present contractor or placing it in the hands of one of the tenderers. I will get the information to-morrow.

Mr. MARTIN. This seems to be a very singular procedure—to call for tenders and then not award the contract. The summer season is pretty well over now. I think the lowest tender should be accepted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not been able to deal with it yet. I do not think there is much difference in amounts between the tenderers. Of course, I wished that if there was a change, the contract should go to one in whom we might have confidence and who would give the public a satisfactory service. I really have not had time to take the subject up and deal with it.

Mr. MARTIN. I have a letter from a party who tendered for this service and he says he thinks his tender was the lowest. He wrote to the superintendent at Moncton, but got no reply.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The matter has been hung up here. If blame attaches to anybody, it attaches to me, I suppose.

Mr. MARTIN. The procedure, as I say, seems very strange. I shall be glad to have the information from the hon. Minister to-morrow.

## Canals—

Repairs, &c., operating expenses..... \$505,350

Mr. HAGGART. There is an increase here of \$25,900. Will the hon. Minister please explain the reason?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) has before him on the same page a table showing the items in detail. We expect that the Soulanges Canal will be in operation and will require to have a staff of employees like the other canals, and there is an item of \$25,000 to equip the canal in this way. As to the other items, it will be seen that the increases and decreases about balance one another.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the hon. gentleman will take the whole staff from the Beanharnois Canal and move them to the Soulanges Canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is easier for the hon. gentleman to say it can be done than it is to do it.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know what we want two canals there for.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can only say that a good many changes have been made in the canals, and I do not know of a single instance where a canal has been closed. You have to face that contingency.

Mr. HAGGART. There is a decrease of \$8,300 in the Lachine Canal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is in repairs.

Mr. HAGGART. What repairs are there on the Trent Canal calling for an increase of \$3,500?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am sorry I cannot give at the moment the details of these repairs.

## Superintendent of Insurance—

To meet expenses in connection with this service, including \$800 for the salary of J. R. Morton, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act ..... \$7,200

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). This is the usual vote for the Superintendent of Insurance. The amount is the same as last year.

Mr. HAGGART. Who is this gentleman to whom you are giving \$800, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He takes the place of another gentleman, who was getting \$800. This gentleman was appointed to succeed him; he received a smaller salary at the beginning, and is now receiving the same salary as his predecessor.

Mr. HAGGART. What special knowledge has he, that he jumps in at \$800?

Mr. MARTIN.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He came in at \$750 and his predecessor received \$800.

Mr. CLANCY. How long has he been in the service?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is his second year.

Mr. HAGGART. Who was his predecessor?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I forget the name. He left our service to take the position of actuary in an insurance company. This is one of the difficulties that we have in keeping good men, owing to the smallness of the salaries.

Mr. HAGGART. Can the hon. gentleman say that he has some special knowledge, some special qualification, which ought to exempt him from the Civil Service Act? Is he an actuary of experience?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We cannot get an actuary of experience at that salary. As the Act stands now, there is no half-way house between the \$400 at which a temporary clerk starts, and the \$1,100 of a second-class clerkship. There is a very long step, and we think it may be necessary to provide for something to fill in that blank. Meanwhile, if you want to get an officer who has something more than the ordinary qualifications of a temporary clerk, you have to provide for him in this way. This gentleman had special qualifications for the post, being skilful in mathematics, which gave him adaptability for this class of work.

Mr. WALLACE. It appears he was appointed a year ago at \$750. I believe he is now twenty-three years of age.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He has graduated at Dalhousie College, Halifax, and was recommended to me as having special qualifications. I do not know as he passed with honours in the university, but he has special skill in mathematics, and is valuable for that purpose in the insurance office.

Mr. POWELL. What is his special work there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is practically the work of an actuary, work largely of a technical character. He is under Mr. Fitzgerald.

Mr. WALLACE. How many clerks are there in that department?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think there are three in the office of Mr. Fitzgerald. If the hon. gentleman wishes, I will give him the information later in the evening. This is the usual vote, and I had not brought any information concerning it.

Mr. WALLACE. I think this is not the usual amount for a new man.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. It is work of more than the ordinary character. It is not work that you can get a man to do having simply the qualifications of a temporary clerk. He must not only be a well-educated man, but have special adaptability for this class of work, and I am sure you cannot get a man suitable for that class of work who will do it with success, with the ordinary salary of temporary clerk.

Mr. **WALLACE**. You have in that office Mr. Blackadar, Mr. Morton, Mr. Riley, and other specially qualified men, along with Mr. Fitzgerald. And here is a junior coming in, quite a young man, at \$750 a year, and \$800 for next year, which is contrary to the spirit and letter of the law. A Minister may say that special qualifications are required in order to perform these duties; but special qualifications are required in every branch of the public service, if an officer is to be capable and efficient. If he can give this young man \$750 for the first year and \$800 the second year, then any of the other departments can do the same thing, where there are many branches of a technical character.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. There is some force in my hon. friend's criticism, and I do not hesitate to say that is the law as it stands now. At present you cannot get qualified men for some of this work in some of the departments. For example, in the department of one of my colleagues not long ago, a gentleman died who was getting \$1,700 or \$1,800 a year. Now, you could put in his place a temporary clerk, if you wished, at \$400 a year, or you could appoint a second-class clerk at \$1,100. If my colleague to whom I refer had appointed a second-class clerk at \$1,100 to do the work performed by the gentleman who died and who was getting \$1,700, nobody would have found fault with that. But as a matter of fact, he was able, by taking a young man in at \$700, to get the work done, but he had to get a very good man at that class, and you could not get him in at the \$400 rate. This difficulty arises from the fact that in the civil service there is no half-way house between the \$400 at which you appoint a temporary clerk, and the \$1,100 which is the minimum of a second-class clerk.

Mr. **PRIOR**. That is the trouble in all the departments.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes, and it will have to be corrected. You may require an officer somewhat better than an ordinary \$400 man, yet you do not want to give him \$1,100 at the start. Take a young man who has come out of the university, who has graduated with honours in some special department, and you offer him \$400, which is not very attractive, but you offer him \$1,100, and you are starting him too high. You must reach the happy medium

somewhere. I think we shall have to legislate before the session is over in order to meet that difficulty.

Mr. **WALLACE**. The hon. gentleman thinks the law is all wrong.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I think so, and I think it will have to be amended.

Mr. **WALLACE**. Why not amend the law and act under it, instead of violating both its letter and spirit. I think the Ministers are not justified in these cases. If the law needs rectification and amendment, let the Government bring down a Bill and justify whatever changes they propose. But, while the law exists, they should not violate it, as they have done in this instance; not only the letter, but the spirit of it.

Civil Government—

Department of the Interior..... \$92,766 60

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. This item has been considered before, but some of the information asked for was not given at the time. There was a question asked about the fund out of which Mr. Ferguson, one of the second-class clerks, was paid, before his appointment as a second-class clerk. I was not prepared to answer the question, and at the request of the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), the item stood over. Mr. Ferguson was paid from the contingent fund last year.

Mr. **WALLACE**. Is he on the civil service list?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. No. The hon. member for York asked as to what fund he was paid out of, but I did not recollect at that time.

Mr. **WALLACE**. What is his Christian name?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. James N.

Mr. **WALLACE**. Will the hon. Minister explain why he was made a second-class clerk?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. We had an explanation in regard to that at the time the item was up before, when I explained it fully, but have no objection to repeating the explanation now. A vote was taken for a second-class clerk to supply the place of a clerk who died.

Mr. **WALLACE**. Who was the clerk who died?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. Mr. Genest. He was getting \$1,000 a year, which is the maximum salary of a third-class clerk. We wanted a man to take his place, but the matter was in precisely the same position as that explained by the hon. Minister of Finance a moment ago. We could not appoint a third-class clerk, and

we could not get a man fitted for the position at \$400 a year, which is the salary of a temporary clerk. We found that Mr. Ferguson was qualified, and it was decided that we would recommend him for a second-class clerkship to take the place of Mr. Genest. In the meantime, he was appointed a temporary clerk at \$400 a year.

Mr. WALLACE. Has he passed his qualifying examination?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, he is fully qualified.

Mr. DAVIN. What are the duties of the geographer?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The geographer of the department was Mr. Johnston, who died some considerable time ago, and since that time we have had no geographer. The duties of the geographer are practically to supervise the geographical work connected with the map-making of the department. The Department of the Interior is responsible for practically all the maps got up by the Government, and it is necessary to have a skilful and qualified officer to supervise their preparation. Since Mr. Johnston died the department has several times felt very much the need of a skilful and qualified man, and we have now made an arrangement whereby Mr. White, who has been connected with the Geological Survey, and has been doing the geographical work for that branch of the service, will be transferred to the Department of the Interior.

Department of the Interior—

Clerical and other assistance, including \$730 for J. D. Bollard and \$425 for T. W. Hodgins, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act .....	\$ 5,005
Printing and stationery .....	8,500
Sundries .....	7,000
	<hr/>
	\$20,505

Mr. DAVIN. There is an increase here of \$1,480.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. These two items "notwithstanding anything contrary in the Civil Service Act" are exactly the same as last year's vote, with the exception of the increase of \$1,480, which is made up by taking a vote for one additional temporary clerk at \$400 a year, who has been appointed, and we are also taking an appropriation for three additional temporary clerks who have not been appointed as yet, but whom we will require during the year, on account of the very great increase in the volume of the clerical work in the department.

Mr. POWELL. In consequence of the Yukon?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Largely that, but there has been an enor-

Mr. SIFTON.

mous increase in almost every branch of the department. The work of the Dominion Lands branch, at the head office, has largely increased by reason of the fact that homestead entries have more than doubled. The Yukon work, at the head office, in connection with the superintendence of affairs and of correspondence, is additional. Immigration work is very much larger, and consequently the clerical work is greater than in former years. I am asking for an additional vote for three temporary clerks who are not yet appointed, but whom I will need during the year, not perhaps just now, but towards the fall, when the work becomes heavy. There are six statutory increases to temporary clerks. Temporary clerks are paid \$400 a year, and under a provision of the law they get a statutory increase of \$30 a year instead of \$50. That makes \$1,780, from which there will be deducted \$300, which, by a special provision, was last year paid to my private secretary. Four temporary clerks at \$400 each make \$1,600. Six statutory increases of \$30 each make \$180; that is \$1,780, but \$300 voted last year was paid to my private secretary by special provision and will not be required this year. That will make an increase altogether of \$1,480. I was wrong in saying that all the statutory increases were for temporary clerks. One is for Mr. Bollard, whose name is mentioned in the vote, and there are also increases of \$30 each for Miss Mercer, Mr. Morrisette, Mr. Duhamel, Mr. Scott and Mr. Hodgins.

Mr. HAGGART. Why do you mention the names of Mr. Bollard and Mr. Hodgins particularly?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Bollard's salary was raised by a special vote in 1897, and the Auditor General holds that his name must appear in the Estimates every year. Mr. Hodgins was a messenger in the department when I came there, but through some technicality he having been transferred from one department to another department and retransferred, his name was allowed to lapse and consequently I have to put his name in every year.

Mr. HAGGART. The Auditor General seems to apply a rule to your department that he does not apply to any other department. There must be other officers similarly situated whose names do not appear from year to year.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not that I have appointed. The only exception I know is Mr. Rothwell, the Law Clerk, for whom there is a special vote.

Geological Survey ..... \$56,700

Mr. DAVIN. While there is an increase here under other heads of expenditure there is a decrease of \$7,000 for artesian borings in the North-west Territories. Would the Minister explain that?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The amount voted for the Geological Survey has varied from \$50,000 to \$60,000, and it is a vote that can be made smaller or larger, as the expenditure depends upon the number of parties that are sent out. The \$3,000 for artesian wells is simply to finish up the borings which have been taking place north of Edmonton for several years.

**Mr. WALLACE.** Would the Minister give us a history of these boring operations?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The director of the Survey informs me that there is a very full history of the progress of the work in the summary report of the Survey, which has been laid on the Table. The boring at Pelican River was abandoned after 837 feet, on account of a very violent rush of natural gas. The boring for petroleum at Victoria, near Athabasca Lake, was continued until last summer when it reached 1,650 feet. This work had been carried on by the director of the Geological Survey for some years before I took charge. In my opinion, the utility of this work is more or less doubtful. The first year the director brought the matter before me to submit a vote to Parliament, I expressed the opinion that it was a matter which ought to be left to private enterprise, and that the money expended in making borings at great depth for petroleum was out of proportion to the benefit derived. However, the director was very anxious to proceed with the work, and after some discussion I agreed that up to a certain point I would sanction its continuance. I have made up my mind, if not absolutely, yet with some degree of firmness, that I will not take a vote again for this unless there is some new light thrown on the subject. The borings have not resulted so far in showing the existence of petroleum in paying quantities, and we have had no satisfactory results, except the knowledge as to the geological strata, which has been secured by the department. Everything is in good order, and operations will shortly be resumed, with the object of going to 2,000 feet if found possible. The boring is fully paid for to a depth of 1,000 feet.

**Mr. WALLACE.** What does it cost per foot to bore?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The cost varies according to the depth. It becomes more expensive the further down you go. From 1,000 to 1,650 feet 70 per cent of the contract rate per foot has been paid, the balance being held till the depth of 2,000 feet is reached. The cost of completing the boring from 1,650 feet to 2,000 feet, according to the contract, is \$2,125; that is, exclusive of the casing and transport of the same, which is paid for by the department. The way the account stands at the present time is this. There is a balance on

hand from last year's appropriation, which I thought, when these estimates were prepared, would be paid out before the end of the year, but was not, of \$2,643.48. The amount we are asking for now is \$3,000.

**Mr. DAVIN.** I quite agree with the view of the Minister, that it is not the function of the Government to bore for petroleum products; but there is a field of activity in which artesian well boring might be gone into by the Department of the Interior very profitably to the country. As the hon. gentleman knows, there are vast tracts of splendid land in the North-west Territories, where, at the present time, there is a complete destitution as regards water; and it is in my opinion the duty of the Minister of the Interior to see if water cannot be found on these vast and otherwise fertile tracts. Boring for water is in a wholly different position from boring for oil, because the Minister by his pamphlets and his agents invited men to come and settle in every part of the North-west Territories. Now, it does not do to say that the local government should take care of that. The duty does not rest on the local government unless you give the local government the administration of the land. While the Minister of the Interior administers the land, and invites people to settle upon it, and sells the odd section to those who are ready to buy, the responsibility of finding water is thrown upon him; and the true way to do that, in my opinion, is by means of artesian wells. I know that the predecessors of the hon. gentleman have to some extent tried to throw off their responsibility in this matter. They had a few well-boring machines, which cost a few dollars, and these they gave over to the local government. The local government have supplemented these with others; and they send these machines here and there at the bidding or request of some member of the local legislature. These well-boring machines are very defective. They go down a certain distance, and if they meet a rock their usefulness is gone. Though the Minister of Public Works in the Territories is doing his best to make the well-boring machines as effective as possible, the grant given to the local government by the Dominion Government is not enough to meet their needs and also to supply effective well-boring machines. Even if it were, it would not relieve the Minister of the Interior of his responsibility in this matter. Therefore, I urge him to take the matter up. I have urged it upon each of his predecessors with whom I have had to do business, I think in one case with satisfactory results. They bored for water at Deloraine, did they not?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** That was a very exceptional case. They went to a depth of about 2,200 feet. It was a very expensive work.

**Mr. DAVIN.** Yet I think the results were satisfactory. In travelling in Dakota I have

seen from the roadway what seemed to be a lake. I have seen cattle grazing on fields which seemed to be perfectly well watered, and I asked a farmer about the watershed of the country. I said, "You have a fine lake here." He turned around to me and said: "This a lake; all that is produced by an artesian well."

**THE MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.**  
In Dakota.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, not very far from one of the stations on the Northern Pacific, probably 12 miles west. I rode up to where the artesian well was, and saw a pipe going up probably about six feet, and near to that a vast tank into which the water from the pipe flowed and then overflowed from the tank, so that you have always in the tank perfectly pure water, overflowing and following the sinuosities of the country. When it came to a valley, it formed a sheet of water that was not only an ornament but a convenience for the cattle and irrigated the land. I point this out to the hon. gentleman as an example of what may be done. If this can be done by the United States Government, why should not this Government do it for our settlers in the North-west? Take the tract of land—I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has ever driven over it—north-west of Pense, there is not in the North-west Territories a finer tract of land. I suppose the black loam is eight feet deep. Nevertheless as you drive north to Stony Beach, where there is a large and successful settlement, you will find on your way an extent of 16 or 20 miles on which no land is taken up, and the reason is that up to the present no water has been found there. There cannot be the least doubt that there is plenty of water to be had. If the Department of the Interior would once find water, the prospective settlers could easily calculate what the finding of the water would cost and whether the watering for a section or two sections would be within the compass of the means of three or four farmers. It would be easy for three or four to subscribe if that were the limit of charge. Suppose some portion had to be placed on the land, to be liquidated from year to year, until gradually got rid of, that would be acceptable to persons wishing to settle on these lands otherwise so desirable. When you travel east, you will find that there is a piece of land north of Whitewood that has as fine land also as is to be found in the North-west Territories, and yet no water has been found. It is the duty of the hon. Minister to solve this problem and it can only be solved by him. He cannot depend on the North-west Government because the moral obligation is not on that government and if it were you do not give that government the means of dealing with it.

**THE MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.**  
I perfectly agree in almost everything the  
Mr. DAVIN.

hon. gentleman has said, and am pleased to find that he entertains the strong views he has expressed. The question of the water supply is one of vast importance. Shortly after taking office, I did take some steps in connection with this question by purchasing a number of boring machines and arranging with the North-west Government, who have better local knowledge of the situation, for the operations of these machines. I may say that part of the understanding which I had with that government, when its subsidy was increased by \$40,000 in 1897, was that it should operate these machines. I am this year asking for another vote for four or five of these machines, and I am told by the members of the North-west Government that the operations of these machines have been extremely beneficial. That, however, I quite understand is not the same question as the question of boring artesian wells for the purpose of getting a larger supply and one that might be used for irrigating purposes. That question has been brought before me several times and has my perfect sympathy, but the operation is one which must be conducted with great care and after a thorough survey of the country, so as to make sure that the money will not be wasted. An irrigation survey is being carefully carried on, and I am in hopes that by the time Parliament meets again I will be able intelligently to place before Parliament a scheme which will be the result of the work of the irrigation survey and be able to place data before the House that will justify voting a sum for this work. I do not think I will be justified in going into this on too large a scale at first, but experimental work can be carried on with the object of finding out what can be successfully done. I propose during the next year that this \$60,000 shall be spent as follows:—\$25,000 to exploration. Publications connected with the department will take \$15,000. To pay temporary assistants in the office and out of the office, \$11,500. Instruments for laboratory purposes and library and miscellaneous, \$3,000. Advances to explorers, \$6,500. Last year the work of exploring was divided as follows:—Nova Scotia, three parties: east coast of Hudson Bay, one party; New Brunswick, two parties; Quebec, one party; eastern Ontario, two parties; western Ontario, two parties; Alberta, including boring operations, two parties; Yukon district, two parties; British Columbia, one party. That is not an absolutely accurate statement, because the work of a party will sometimes spread from one province into another. But approximately and as nearly as it can be given, that is an accurate statement of the disposition of parties last year. The work for the next year will not substantially differ in character from the work of last year. In the North-west Territories and British Columbia, we are going to give special attention to the West Kootenay, Atlin and Klondike districts, and Great Slave

Lake. A member of the staff who wintered at Hudson Bay will make exploration there.

Mr. HAGGART. As I understand, the Minister stated, in boring at Pelican Lake gas was struck at a depth of over 800 feet. What was the pressure?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think we have that information.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you let the gas run there since you struck it?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It burst out. The place is so far away that the gas is absolutely useless.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister ought to have had it plugged up. It is disgraceful to have it running. I have been told by people who are in that neighbourhood that there is a roar from the escaping gas that can be heard for miles. It is too bad that a commodity like that should be wasted.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What the hon. gentleman says is true. If he can suggest any way to make use of the gas I shall be glad to adopt it.

Mr. HAGGART. But even if you can not make use of it, you can plug up the well and keep the gas there.

Mr. DAVIN. In connection with what I have been saying I am glad to hear that the Minister takes the stand he does on this question. The hon. gentleman knows, of course, that the well-boring machines are not for testing for water, but for helping the farmers. They have done a good deal of good, though they are not numerous enough, and in some cases, not effective enough. I believe the hon. Minister has received a memorial from the Agricultural Society, the town residents and settlers in the district of Moose Jaw.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think I have.

Mr. DAVIN. One is almost averse from bringing these things before the House for the reason that they may give a false impression. For instance, take the district of Moose Jaw. I had the pleasure last year of driving with an ex-Minister through the Moose Jaw district, and he was perfectly surprised at the seas of grain he saw and the signs of prosperity to be found on every hand. I would ask the Minister to give special attention to this memorial. It is addressed to him by the Moose Jaw Agricultural Society, and town residents, and settlers throughout the district:

#### SCARCITY OF GOOD WATER.

Memorial to the Hon. Mr. Sifton, Minister of the Interior, and to the Dominion Government, by the Moose Jaw Agricultural Society and town residents and settlers throughout the district:

That the lack of good, pure water in areas in the North-west, larger than some provinces in

the east part of the Dominion, has detracted greatly from the comfort, progress and prosperity of settlers, and a pregnant cause and stumbling-block to immigration and settlement of the country.

That much benefit has been derived in numerous localities by settlers' efforts in digging ponds to be filled by the snow of the blizzard and by the liberal aid given by the local assembly and executive in constructing dams across coulees or gullies and digging ponds on the level prairie, at an average cost of from \$200 to \$400 each.

That experience of this system that costs so much labour and money has demonstrated that the water every passing year gets more foul and contaminated, and that many of the larger dams and ponds are already, especially in the winter season, unfit for the use of man and beast, and that new dams and ponds must be continuously constructed if good water cannot be got in some other and better way.

The hon. Minister will be aware what happened with regard to these ponds. No doubt what the settlers should have done was to fence the ponds in. Being unfenced, the cattle had gone in and sometimes wallowed in them, and the result is that the ponds, especially when they are frozen, have become very dangerous to health.

That fevers have made their appearance on the open prairie, and that in the opinion of the medical profession they are caused by the stagnant, foul, surface water.

That three-fourths of the settlers have practically no water in winter, and are compelled to water their stock with snow, and melt it for use in the household; that while we rejoice that non-working horses and cattle, from yearlings up, can be successfully wintered on snow for water, if regularly given, yet the lack of water in winter effectually stops all winter dairying, which otherwise would be the most profitable, and renders the fattening of cattle in winter next to impossible.

That pure water is indispensable to the manufacture of first-class gilt-edged butter that will command the highest price on the British market, and that the lower price that has thus far been obtained for North-west creamery butter is directly traceable to the extended use of stagnant water, whereby the aroma or flavour is affected; otherwise our creamery butter is quite the equal of the best Danish or any other butter ever made.

That the lower price commanded by our creamery butter in the British market, added to the cost of transportation over such an immense distance, lessens the profit to the North-west producer to such an extent that very many are deterred from engaging in it; while if we could obtain the highest Danish price for the bulk of our creamery butter, which we would undoubtedly get if better water could be got for our cows, what with our pasture—unlimited in quantity and unexcelled in quality—and other facilities, would enable North-west farmers to derive a large and ever-increasing income from making creamery butter.

That mixed farming, so absolutely necessary to success in the North-west is handicapped at every turn through lack of water.

That many tests in various localities have been made by settlers with boring-machines and by digging from one to two hundred feet in depth without success.

That it is freely admitted on all sides by our

leading men of all parties, in and out of the Parliament of the Dominion, that the future hope, strength, greatness and durability of the Dominion is interwoven and inseparably connected with the success of the North-west.

That we therefore confidently appeal to the Premier and Minister of the Interior and the other members of the Dominion Government, and to the Senate and Commons Houses of Parliament, to vote the necessary funds to accomplish the solution of the water question in the North-west.

That the purpose of this memorial is not to ask aid for the water that can be procured by the use of the North-west boring-machines, but for test artesian wells in the localities where good water cannot be got by the use of said boring-machines.

That we rejoice to know that there is to be a large surplus over expenditure this year, thus putting it within the power of the Government to make the necessary grant without borrowing the money or largely curtailing other necessary expenditures.

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

You see, Sir, that the farmers around Moose Jaw are ready to make the appeal on the ground of the large surplus. And if any appeal on that ground should be successful, it ought to be in this case. Certainly they can make out, in my opinion, a very much better case than the lawyers can make out for the appointment of more judges in order that there may be nice positions for legal gentlemen. If the surplus is to be used usefully, it cannot be used more usefully to the whole of Canada—and I am sure the hon. Minister will admit it—than in providing water for the most deserving class of our community, in the vast tract of territory which is the backbone and body of the Dominion. As the Minister of the Interior knows well, you cannot do anything better for Toronto, for Montreal, for Hamilton, for Guelph, for any of our manufacturing centres, than to make the North-west prosperous. That is the great custom field in the future for our manufacturers in Quebec and Ontario. Therefore, the Minister of the Interior, who develops these territories on every line, and in every branch, who endeavours to increase our population and increase the attractiveness of that country, by showing that that portion of the North-west has every advantage at present save that of water—the Minister of the Interior that takes that view will not only bring credit on his department, but will do the greatest possible service to the people of Canada. I would urge strongly on the Minister even now to appeal to his colleagues in the Council to give him some of this surplus to be used in the way that these memorialists urge.

**THE MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I agree practically with all the hon. gentleman says on this subject. However, when it comes to practically working it out, it is necessary to proceed, not with great delay, but with considerable care in order that the

**Mr. DAVIN.**

expenditure of the money may not be in vain. I may say that the question of water supply for the farming population upon the prairie country is a subject to which I have had occasion to give considerable attention. It often happens that there may be a few years in which there is a lack of water in certain districts, and when it would not be good economy for the Government to undertake to supply that lack by means of an artesian well, because, perhaps, the amount of benefit to be derived in that case would not justify the expenditure. I do not say that that statement applies to the case of the farmers around Moose Jaw, but I say it would be unwise for us to proceed with the idea of boring artesian wells for the purpose of securing a water supply except as the result of a careful survey, so that we would know, first, that we were boring in a place where we were likely to succeed in getting a water supply, and next, that we were boring in a place from which the water could be economically distributed. Those are points which have to be considered in connection with this matter. I may say to my hon. friend that the matter has already been discussed between myself and the Minister of Public Works of the North-west Government, at considerable length upon different occasions, and I have discussed it with the officers of my department, and one of the subjects which the members of the irrigation survey will be asked particularly to study during the remainder of this season, will be that question as to the possibility of securing a water supply by the boring of artesian wells. They will also make estimates of the cost, so that I will be able, as I hope to be at the next session of Parliament, to submit the results of an intelligent and scientific examination of the country so that Parliament will know that the money will not be wasted when it is expended, so far as scientific skill is able to prevent it.

**Mr. DAVIN.** But have not the surveyors of the department already surveyed the district around Moose Jaw and the district I especially speak of, between Pense and Stony Beach? I am under the impression that the hon. gentleman has in his department reports from surveyors in respect to these sections of the country.

**THE MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** There are some reports; how full they are, I am not able to say. But I have not reports which bear particularly upon this subject. The measurements in many cases are there, but they are not such measurements as would enable me to say definitely what ought to be done. I have some recommendations on the subject, but, as I say, the information is not sufficiently full to enable me to lay before Parliament a proposition which is likely to be borne out by the results.

**Mr. DAVIN.** Suppose that in that country around Moose Jaw, or in that fine country I have spoken of north of Qu'Appelle—

supposing that the sinking of an artesian well would give water, the hon. gentleman must be fully aware that the delay of a year would be not only false economy, but would result in loss to the whole country, loss to the individual farmers, loss to the district, loss, in fact, to the whole North-west. I can never put out of my mind that the Department of the Interior had a tremendous opportunity for good before responsible government was handed over to the North-west Government, and when the whole thing was in the hands of the Department of the Interior. My belief is that they could have done the greatest service that any department ever did for Canada by devoting adequate funds to tests for water in various parts of the North-west, as is prayed for in this memorial.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** My hon. friend was not so zealous in impressing the late Government as he is in impressing this one.

**Mr. DAVIN.** I am glad to have that confession. I will say this, that I have nothing to complain of the hon. gentleman in regard to any suggestions that I have made, and up to the present I have never made a suggestion that was for the good of the country that has not been promptly attended to.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** It will always be so when you make good suggestions.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Can the hon. gentleman say the same of my predecessor?

**Mr. DAVIN.** Well, my memory sometimes—however, I am persuaded that the hon. gentleman is as convinced of it as I am myself. Let us suppose that the sinking of an artesian well north and west of Moose Jaw, or in that splendid region from Pense to Stony Beach, would result in getting water, what would be the advantage of that to the country at large? Why, the cost of it would be a mere fraction, it would be lighter than the dust of the balance, compared with the advantages that would accrue. I am very glad to hear the assurance of the hon. gentleman that he will take this into consideration next year, but I would prefer, for two reasons, that he should do it this year. First, I do not like the "to-morrow" business; I do not like putting off until to-morrow what you can do to-day. There is another reason. I should like my hon. friend to have the credit of doing it, and if he puts off until another year, such are the accidents of life, that he may not have the chance.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I might say to my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) that if we should not be here, no doubt the hon. gentleman will be in my position, and it would be done all the same.

**Mr. WALLACE.** I have listened, with a good deal of surprise, to some of the state-

ments made by the hon. Minister of the Interior. He tells us about the large expenditures of money, running into the millions, that come under his charge, but when a necessary work, inaugurated by his predecessors, that is, the boring of artesian wells for the purpose of getting a supply of water—

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** My hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) is mistaken. I am quite sure he does not intend to misrepresent the facts. The work that I do not intend to carry on was boring for the purpose of testing the country for oil. My predecessor did not inaugurate any work in the way of boring for water.

**Mr. WALLACE.** Oh, yes, he did; the machinery was purchased, and the boring was started.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The hon. gentleman is mistaken. He should not make that statement.

**Mr. WALLACE.** That it was not started by his predecessor?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Not boring artesian wells. My hon. friend, I am sure, does not intend to make a statement that is incorrect. When I took office, I found an estimate of \$4,000 or \$5,000 for the purchase of well-boring machinery, but not machinery that would be capable of boring artesian wells. I expended the appropriation, purchased the machines, sent them up, and I am asking for \$5,000 more for the same purpose. There was formerly no boring of artesian wells.

**Mr. WALLACE.** It is a distinction without a difference. It was boring deep wells for the purpose of getting water. We called them artesian wells. That is an enterprise that might well engage the attention of the hon. Minister. He has done very little. The former Government voted money for the purpose, and started the enterprise. That is what I said. The Minister has almost abandoned it.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Not at all; I am going on with the work.

**Mr. WALLACE.** In connection with boring for oil, the statement of the hon. Minister was, that they bored at Pelican Lake to a depth of 830 feet, that they then struck gas and abandoned it, letting the gas run out. An hon. member says that an enormous quantity of gas is escaping; he suggested that it should be plugged up. The party to which the hon. Minister belongs has reduced the practice of plugging to such a scientific exactitude that they could go into that without a bit of hesitation, and—

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** We have no use for gas.

Mr. WALLACE. If they have not been able to plug it up before, I am sure they could easily obtain a contingent from the province of Ontario for the purpose, and we could freely spare them. The hon. Minister tells us, further, that they have bored 1,650 feet at Victoria, and for the addition of 350 feet, to make up the 2,000 feet, they propose to expend \$2,225, or \$6 a foot. I happen to know something about work of that kind in Ontario, and I know of a contract for boring 2,500 feet being let at about \$1.10 a foot. Boring in Ontario is as difficult as it is in the west. In this case, the Government are paying \$6 a foot. I admit that you could not get the work done quite as cheaply out there as you could in Ontario, but 40 cents or 50 cents a foot additional would be an ample margin of difference. It seems to me extraordinary that the Government should pay \$6 a foot, when contracts have been let in Ontario at \$1.10 a foot. I think it is time for the hon. Minister to quit that kind of business, involving an unjustifiable expenditure of the public funds. Apparently, the whole of the work has been performed on the same scale. Parliament voted last year \$10,000 for the purpose. Having bored 850 feet in one place, and 1,650 in another place, the hon. Minister tells us that the whole of the work was not done last year, that there were appropriations in former years, so that, prior to the appropriation of \$10,000, we do not know how many other thousands of dollars have been expended. I think this is an extravagant expenditure of the public money. The hon. Minister cannot stop the work too soon, unless he is prepared to adopt business methods and go on with such enterprises as may be desired, on some sound and economical plan.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I would say in regard to the cost of the work, that the work has been done altogether under the supervision of Dr. Dawson, Director of the Geological Survey, in precisely the same way that it was being done before I took office. I left it almost entirely to him, excepting that he submitted his contracts and his operations to me for my approval. I can assure the committee that Dr. Dawson has not expended a single dollar that could be avoided, and I am perfectly satisfied that the work has been done as economically as it was possible to do it.

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

### After Recess.

#### BELLEVILLE PRINCE EDWARD BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. HURLEY moved that the House resolve itself in committee on Bill (No. 152)

Mr. SIFTON.

to incorporate the Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Company.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself in committee on Bill.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. PETTET. I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hurley) is there any change proposed in the tolls under this Bill, as compared with the old Bill?

Mr. HURLEY. There is no change in the tolls. The Bill is just the same as the old Bill, except in some minor particulars.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

#### RELIEF OF ABRAHAM ARONSBURG.

The House resolved itself in committee on Bill (No. 144) for the relief of Abraham Aronsburg.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would ask that this Bill be allowed to stand.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the hon. gentleman ask that this Bill should stand, in the interest of the petitioner?

Mr. LANDERKIN. There are some hon. members who wish to say something on the Bill, and as they cannot be here this evening, I ask that the Bill should stand.

Mr. WALLACE. When shall it come up again?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Probably on Monday next.

#### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Indians—

Nova Scotia ..... \$4,950

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This item was reserved when the main Estimates for the Indian Department were going through the committee some days ago, and I was requested by some members of the committee to give the committee some information in regard to Indian education, and also in regard to the operations of the Indian Department in the North-west, and the results that have been attained. The idea of the committee, I think, was that the information contained in the annual report on these subjects should be as briefly as possible summarized and placed before the committee. There were two subjects in particular on which I was asked to give some information. One was the success attending the efforts to bring the Indians to a self-supporting condition; the other was the obstacles in the way of conducting a system of Indian education. The work of attempting to make the Indians of the

North-west self-supporting was begun, substantially, about 1879, when farming instructors were appointed for the purpose of instructing the Indians in farming and endeavouring to induce them to settle down to an agricultural life. The result at the present time may be briefly stated as follows:—We have an aggregate of 14,562 Indians settled on their reserves in the North-west Territories. Of these, 4,854 are rated as self-supporting, and the other 9,708 are still receiving more or less assistance from the Government in the way of rations and clothing. In the province of Manitoba there are 6,716 Indians settled on the reserves and of these 6,166 are rated as self-supporting, and only 550 are receiving aid from the Government. The larger proportion of self-supporting Indians in the province of Manitoba is largely accounted for by two facts. First, the Indians of Manitoba were not, in the ordinary sense of the word, prairie Indians, but wood Indians, and consequently they have much more easily settled down to civilized methods of life. There has not been so much change in their circumstances as in the case of the roaming Indians of the plains. For many years they have had little houses and settlements of their own, and have supported themselves very largely by fishing, hunting and doing whatever work they could get in the neighbourhood. The fishing and hunting which they were able to carry on in former years has not been very seriously interfered with by the progress and settlement of the country. The extension of the fishing operations of the fishing company on Lake Winnipeg has resulted to a considerable extent in augmenting the earnings of the Indians, and giving them better opportunities of earning a livelihood than they formerly had. The Indians in some of the settlements around Lake Winnipeg are in a very advanced condition. Some of their villages present the appearance of white villages, and they live a very decent civilized life. The prairie Indians are a very different class; they are the hardest class of Indians with whom the Government have to deal. They are necessarily nomadic in their habits, and hereditarily opposed to anything in the nature of steady and continuous labour. The extinction of the buffalo having taken away almost entirely their means of livelihood, they are very much more dependent on the Government than the Indians of Manitoba and British Columbia. However, very substantial progress has been made even in the case of the Indians of the plains. Even on the Piegan and Blackfoot reserves, where the greatest difficulty has been encountered to get the Indians to settle down and follow anything like an agricultural life, success is now beginning to attend our efforts, and I apprehend that considerable progress will be made in the next few years. Considering the difficulty that confronted the

Government fifteen years ago, very great and substantial progress has been made by the Indians; and it may reasonably be concluded that in a very few years the Indian population of Manitoba and the North-west Territories will be practically self-sustaining. So far as any demand on the Government for direct aid in the way of food and clothing is concerned. The general policy which has been pursued has been that of giving the Indians as much farming instruction as possible, and inducing them by various means, which the agents have devised, to take an interest in farm-work. Various expedients have been devised for that purpose. On many reserves it has been found necessary to adopt a scale of pay for the Indians, either in rations or money, for the time they actually put in by working on the farms on the reserve. As I pointed out to the committee before, on the Blood and Blackfoot reserves a system was adopted of guaranteeing the Indians an extra price for the meat they raised, in order to induce them to take an interest in cattle-raising. While some success has attended the efforts of the department to induce them to take to agriculture, a greater success has attended our efforts in inducing them to follow the occupation of cattle-raising. There is not such a radical difference between the mode of life required of them in pursuing cattle-raising and their former mode of life, as there is in raising grain. However, on the whole, there is a general improvement, and the policy of the department has been to encourage the Indians along these lines by giving them agricultural implements, with a view of awakening in them a sense of responsibility for the care of what has been given to them, so that after a while they would get a sense of proprietorship and independence.

In 1888 there were 10,228 acres under cultivation, and in 1889, 16,844. Taking five as the average family, that we give  $3\frac{1}{2}$  acres to each family, but inasmuch as a considerable number of the Indians are hunters and fishers and do not carry on agricultural operations at all, those who do would, on the average, have a considerably larger acreage under cultivation.

At present the Indians actually have in use 480 mowers, 400 horse rakes, 52 reapers, 38 land rollers, 27 seed drills and 14 cultivators.

In 1888 they had 6,910 head of cattle and in 1898 they increased their stock to 15,871, averaging  $3\frac{1}{2}$  to each family of five. Of other live stock, including horses, ponies, sheep, &c., they had 3,578 head in 1888 and 15,464 in 1898. The cattle have improved greatly in quality, owing to the policy of the Government in that regard, which I explained to the committee when the matter was up before.

An illustration of the progress made by the Indians is the quantity of hay put up on

the reserves. One of the hardest things the department has had to contend against is the natural improvidence of the Indian and indisposition to provide ahead for his requirements. We have great difficulty making them undergo the necessary labour to put up hay to provide for the coming winter. In 1888 the amount of hay stored was 13,064 tons, and in 1898, 49,656. This is a very respectable amount for them under the circumstances.

For the housing of stock in 1888 they had 1,554 barns and stables, and in 1898 2,600, many of a greatly improved class.

At present, with few exceptions, the Indians live in houses except in the summer months when many prefer to live in tepees. In 1888 they had 5,279 houses, and in 1898 6,345, but their houses are now of a much better class than formerly.

Those facts will give the committee a good general idea of the results of the operations of the Indian Department, and if members of the committee will take the time to glance over those figures, as they appear in "Hansard," and consider them a few minutes, they will remove from their minds the very prevalent and general idea that the operations of the Indian Department are a failure, in so far as any improvement of the Indians is concerned. There is no greater fallacy. It would be a serious mistake for the House to accept the idea that the operations of the Indian Department were not conceived in a spirit of national economy. It is in the interest of the very highest national economy and well-being that these tribes of Indians should be self-supporting citizens. They can only become so by persistent and patient effort along the lines followed in the past.

On the subject of education let me give a few figures which will show the committee the condition of affairs in that respect. We had, up to the time the last annual report of the department was compiled, a couple of months ago, 273 Indian schools in operation. There was a total enrolment of school population for these schools of 9,886 pupils and an average attendance of 5,533 or 55 per cent of the enrolment. Any hon. member of the committee, who has given attention to the school statistics, especially in rural districts, will see that an average attendance of 55 per cent of the total enrolment is a very large average attendance and compares very favourably with the average attendance in white schools under similar circumstances. I may say that the average attendance as compared with the enrolment is looked upon by educationalists as an indication of the efficiency of a school system and the interest taken in it and the closeness with which its operations are looked after. Two hundred and nineteen of these schools are day schools, and the enrolment of pupils amounts to 6,736. Thirty-two are boarding schools, and the pupils number

Mr. SIFTON.

1,156. Twenty-two are industrial schools, with 1,994 pupils on the roll.

Of these 273 schools, 91 are under the auspices of the Roman Catholic Church, of which 71 are day schools, 14 boarding schools, and nine industrial schools.

Church of England—88 schools, of which 70 are day schools, 11 boarding and seven industrial.

Methodists—42 schools, namely, 36 day, two boarding and four industrial.

Presbyterian—12 schools, of which are six day schools, five boarding and one industrial.

Moravian—one combined boarding and day school. The remaining 36 schools are undenominational. By provinces these schools are distributed as follows:—

	Day.	Board- ing.	Indus- trial.	Total.
Ontario .....	71	1	5	77
Quebec .....	17	..	..	17
Nova Scotia .....	8	..	..	8
New Brunswick..	6	..	..	6
P. E. Island.....	1	..	..	1
British Columbia.	27	4	7	38
Manitoba .....	46	4	4	54
N. W Territories.	34	20	6	60
Outside treaty limits .....	9	3	..	12
	219	32	22	273

The Indian population as shown by the census return is given according to denominations:

Roman Catholic .....	34,364
Church of England .....	14,424
Pagans .....	13,280
Methodists .....	8,855
Religion unknown .....	7,994
Presbyterians .....	1,054
Other Christian beliefs .....	1,581
	81,552

The balance of the Indians shown in the census, 18,561, which make up the grand total of 100,093, are outside treaty limits.

Of the 219 day schools, the salary for 177 is voted by Parliament, and for the remaining 42 the salaries are charged against the interest money of the band (33 in Ontario and four in Quebec). The running expenses of these schools are paid in the same way as the salaries. The day school salaries in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick run from \$200 to \$300, while in the other provinces \$300 is the fixed salary. I have here a list of boarding schools, but perhaps it would not be worth while to read it. We have 42 day schools, not in charge of any denomination, but all the boarding schools and industrial schools are in charge of some denomination, except that of Rupert's Land, which is a Government school. In the industrial schools of Manitoba and the North-west Territories there had been a total enrolment of 2,280 up to 31st December, 1898. Of these, 1,221 have been discharged. Of the whole num-

ber who have been discharged, 404 have died. That is a point which the committee will note as being of some importance. The fact that 404 out of 1,221 have died, goes to show that sufficient care was not exercised in selecting as pupils children who were healthy and free from hereditary taint. Latterly, however, we have been giving special attentions to requiring the pupils who enter the schools to be subject to a more careful examination, with the object of not permitting the entrance of children who are not, as far as possible, free from serious disease. Of the discharged children, 460 are reported as doing well in various lines of life. About ninety have returned to the Indian mode of life. The remainder have been lost sight of in one way and another. I said at a previous sitting of the committee that, when this item came up, I would explain some of my ideas on the subject. I perhaps cannot fully carry out those ideas, on account of the situation in which I found the department, and find it yet. My idea is, that the expenditure of money on industrial schools is perhaps not altogether the wisest. Of course, that is a matter of opinion, and there are very experienced men in the matter of education that do not agree with me in that opinion. My own judgment, however, is in the direction of believing that the schools for the Indian children should be extended on the basis of boarding schools, rather than on the basis of day schools or industrial schools. My observation leads to the conclusion that the day schools are not as efficient as they should be, by reason of the fact that the Indian children are not removed from the surroundings which tend to keep them in a state of more or less degradation. In order that the education may be efficient, I think it is necessary that they should be removed from those surroundings. They can be removed by being taken to boarding schools. On the other hand, while the industrial school answers the purpose of removing the children from their old surroundings and giving them a larger amount of education and a longer term, the attempt to make the Indian boy a mechanic capable of taking care of himself in competition with the white mechanic, is, in my opinion, a little premature. They have not yet arrived at such a stage of physical and intellectual development that the education given them is likely to result in fitting the individual Indian to take his place in the ordinary ranks and engage in the ordinary competition of life. My observation, as well as the observation of the officers connected with the service, will confirm the conclusion at which I have arrived. I found, when I took charge of the department, that the officers of the industrial schools manifested the greatest indisposition to allow the pupils to be discharged. They were disposed to keep them there,

after they had long since arrived at an age when, if ever, they should be ready to go out into the world and take care of themselves. This was because of the fear the officers had that they were not fit to cope with the ordinary conditions of life, or to take care of themselves in competition with other people; in fact, they did not feel safe in allowing them to go. I only need to state these facts to show that it is questionable whether that system is an efficient one. Another point is, that this system of education is extremely expensive. If you take into consideration the cost of the buildings themselves and the amount that is paid per capita, and all the incidentals in connection with the carrying on of these schools, it costs an enormous amount of money to educate an Indian child; and the result, as I say, is not altogether satisfactory. If the same amount of money were expended in a number of boarding schools, which would give not so great amount of education, but a reasonable education, to a much larger number of Indian children, the result would be better on the whole for the Indian population than we have now. I would not, for a moment, think of endeavouring to carry out my views on this subject to such an extent as to stop this expenditure or to destroy the effect of the expenditure that has taken place on the industrial schools up to this time. We have these industrial schools. It is not so clear that their work is not of a beneficial character as to justify us in abandoning them, or rendering nugatory the expenditure that has taken place. But I am carrying out my views by not extending the industrial school system, but where an extension is required, adding to the number of boarding schools, rather than to the number of industrial schools.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Can the hon. Minister tell me how the amount for medical attendance and medicine is distributed among the counties in Nova Scotia?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The vote is a bulk vote, and is not apportioned among the several counties. We pay the actual expenses, as the bills are sent in.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I understand that the sum allowed for the county of Pictou is \$75. I have been asked by a medical man if I could not secure remuneration for him for attendance upon Indian patients. I understand that the system is to have a medical man who is looked to to perform this service.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have a bulk vote, which is estimated according to the average amount for each county. There may be a larger expenditure in one county than the other. I may say that there is a constant struggle between the department and the medical officers in

Nova Scotia as to this expenditure. It shows a violent tendency to increase.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Is any provision made by which any but the one medical officer appointed gets remuneration for attendance upon Indian patients or for medicines supplied to them?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. At the present time, I believe, in the county of Pictou, there is only one officer. But we are not bound by the appropriation to do that. This salary is not specially voted so that it cannot be changed. If there is any sickness amongst the Indians it is not an uncommon thing, if the regular physician is not there, for some other physician to attend the patient and send in his bill.

Mr. DAVIN. Has the hon. Minister begun to carry out any policy in the direction of contracting the outlay for industrial schools?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, Sir, I think the statement that has been made by the Minister will show those members of the committee who seemed on a previous occasion doubtful as to the desirability of the expenditure that was being made in the direction of educating the Indians, not merely theoretically but practically, that the results have been satisfactory, and I think their doubt will be, to a considerable extent, dispelled by the statement that has been made. It would be a most unfortunate thing, in my opinion, if the people of this country, who have a great duty to discharge towards the Indians, to whom the Indians stand in the position of pupils and wards, if, after an experiment ranging over some twenty years, and which has been as successful as could have been expected, if after an experiment of that sort which has been attended with the results given by the hon. gentleman, showing that a large percentage of the Indians are capable of taking care of themselves—I say it would be a most unfortunate thing if now we were to grow faint in our endeavours, and to hark back on the road of doing our duty to the Indians. Now, I will glance rapidly over the statements the hon. gentleman made in regard to the Indians. In regard to the position of the Indians in the North-west and Manitoba, I consider that the statement he has made, and which I can confirm, is one that we can regard with satisfaction. It is perfectly clear that the Indian is making progress in civilization. When first those territories were opened up, the Indian there was a pure savage; in fact, he understood none of the arts of life whatever. He gradually was coaxed to being a trader, coaxed to being a farmer, coaxed to being a rancher, and a considerable number of them to my knowledge, all over the territories, are on the way to be self-supporting farmers. I think we may look forward with

Mr. SIFTON.

some confidence to the time when these men or, at all events, their children, will be in as large a percentage self-supporting as the Wood Indians in Manitoba, who are, as the hon. gentleman pointed out, in a more satisfactory position. Now, I am glad to know that the hon. gentleman is carrying out the policy which was begun by some of his predecessors of directing the attention of the Indians to cattle-raising; and I think he will make no mistake if he acts on a suggestion I ventured to make on a previous occasion when his estimates were up, that he might not only direct his attention to cattle-raising, but direct his attention also to horse-raising. I think if the hon. gentleman will inquire, he will find that it would not entail anything like as much expense as he anticipates to improve the stock of horses by adopting the same methods as were adopted in the case of cattle.

Now, with regard to the schools, I am rather sorry to hear the tone of doubt as to the usefulness of industrial schools. The same remarks that I have made deprecating a change in our policy in regard to the Indians in other respects, will apply to the industrial schools. I have seen good results within my own experience from those industrial schools; and in this very city one of the cleverest printers that has ever been employed in the "Citizen" office was an Indian reared in our industrial schools. The hon. gentleman probably put his finger on the weak spot in our industrial school system when he said that in choosing the children sufficient care had not been taken. I think he will find that if, instead of allowing these persons interested in the school to take in all children that present themselves or that can be had to join these schools, some principle of selection is adhered to, the main principle of which should be the health of the children, why, then, I consider he will have taken a step that will do away with certainly some of the adverse criticism that ran through his remarks this evening. Now, I have had an opportunity, and probably the Minister himself has had, of seeing the results of the industrial schools, not only in our own North-west, but in the United States. I have visited the Indian agencies in the United States where they have industrial schools. I have seen those schools in operation, and have seen very happy results produced in consequence of the very same system which is pursued by our Indian industrial schools; so that, I would rather deprecate the Minister looking with too strong an eye of scepticism on the efforts that have been made in our industrial schools to civilize the Indians.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not want my hon. friend to misunderstand me. I said I had arrived at that opinion myself with a good deal of hesitation, and I did not express a great degree of confidence, because I am quite aware that other gentlemen who are well acquainted with the

system of Indian education do not agree with me ; many, however, do. It is a matter with regard to which there may be strong differences of opinion. As the matter is quite arguable, I have not taken the responsibility of at all interfering with or curtailing the operations of the industrial schools after they have been established, and have been kept up to a proper degree of efficiency, and I have no idea whatever of interfering with them.

Mr. DAVIN. I am very glad to hear that the Minister does not intend to interfere with the existing machinery. I may tell him that in 1879 I visited the Indian agencies in the United States, where the same industrial school system that we have prevailed ; and I saw there the very best results. I have not lately followed the progress of industrial education in the United States, but I have no doubt that some of the officers of the Minister will be able to inform him how that is turning out at present. Now that a still longer period has elapsed, he will be able to form a better judgment of the efficiency of the system, and what has been its effects in the United States.

I may say that I would deprecate any steps, and I am glad to know that no such steps are to be taken to curtail the usefulness of our industrial school activity. Let me say this, however, that I do think that it would be advisable, in our industrial schools, and it will in no way interfere with their principle, to direct the attention of the pupils more to farming than to trades. Those who have aptitudes for trades should have these aptitudes developed, and they have been developed with the happiest and best results. But, so far as possible, I think it is better to direct the attention of the young Indian to farming, to make him a scientific farmer, if that is possible, but certainly to make him an efficient farmer. I think that, on the reserves, we might devise some means of appealing to the Indian's love of gain, even more than we do, in order to make him cultivate a larger amount of land than he does. I understand the hon. Minister to say that the amount of land cultivated is on the average of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  acres to the family.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course, that is very small, and I think some means should be employed to appeal to the Indian's love of gain, which is strong.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In those sections where they do carry on the cultivation of the soil the average is much more than  $3\frac{1}{2}$  acres to the family, but there are large numbers that we have not got settled down at all.

Mr. DAVIN. We know the Plain Indians have a strong love of gain, and they should be encouraged in the growing of hay and

bringing it into market where they can get a good price for it. The commercial instinct can be cultivated in the Indian as well as in the white man, and once cultivated it becomes a civilizing influence of a high order. I am glad to hear that the hon. Minister does not intend to interfere with the industrial schools.

Mr. GUILLET. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, if I am permitted to do so at this stage of the discussion, if the department are considering the advisability of selling the islands in the St. Lawrence belonging to the Missisauga Band ? They have passed strong resolutions urging the Government to sell these Islands. They think the time is opportune, and they need the income which would be derived from the capital which would be increased by the sale. They have passed strong resolutions and sent petitions to the Government urging that the sale of the islands be continued.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There have been some resolutions passed, and the position is simply this : When I came into the department I found that the former Minister had caused a few of the islands in the St. Lawrence to be sold, but there was so much opposition on the part of the public to the sale that he discontinued it. I have left the matter where it was at that time. I have formed no positive opinion as to whether it would be better to go on with the sale or not.

Mr. GUILLET. I think it is very unfair to the Indians that public sentiment should be allowed to interfere with what is a private interest of their own. If the islands are to be reserved for the benefit of the public, they should be bought by the Government and kept for park purposes or for such purposes as might be thought desirable. But it is not fair that the Indians should be called upon to bear the expense of their preservation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think the hon. gentleman is probably correct, that if the public want these islands to be preserved they should pay for them, and the Indians should get the benefit of it. I will give the matter my attention.

Mr. OLIVER. Before the vote for Indian schools is passed I would like to make a few remarks, as I do not agree with the position taken by the hon. member for Assinibola (Mr. Davin), in regard to Indian Industrial schools. I had the honour, during the first session in which I was in this House, to draw the attention of the House to the large amount of money involved in the grant to industrial schools for Indians in the Territories. I thought it was only right that, in so far as I was acquainted with these schools, I should give my views and such information as I had in regard to them to the commit-

tee. The conclusion I had come to and which, I believe, is very largely shared throughout the Territories is that the large expenditure, however good may have been the intention in regard to it, and however well it may have been administered, certainly has not been justified by results; that the improvement in the condition of the Indians generally, or in the condition of the Indians who attend these schools has not been such as to warrant the very large expenditure of public funds that is made upon these schools from year to year. This is a statement which I wish to repeat to the committee to-night, as far as my knowledge and judgment go. I do not wish that there should be any breach of faith with the Indians or with anybody; I do not wish that there should be any drawing back of the charity or good-will that may have been expressed to the Indians, but, I think it is only right that, if a certain result which has been attempted to be achieved, has not been achieved, that statement should be made. I have nothing to say against the motive in the establishment of these schools; I have nothing to say against the management of the schools, either by those who directly manage them, that is to say the different churches, or the officials of the Government. I believe that all is done with the very best of intentions, but I say that, as a matter of fact, the result desired to be achieved, has not been achieved. A sufficient time has elapsed since the experiment was started for results to be attained, and if results have not been attained, and I say certainly they have not, then it is time for Parliament to consider whether this is a proper expenditure or not. I say to the committee that not only have results not been achieved, but that in the nature of things, results cannot be achieved when the fact is that when you take the white man's money to educate the Indian's child, to compete with the white man, you are doing an injustice to the white man if you succeed, and when you take the white man's money to educate the Indian's child to compete with the white man and fail, you are wasting the white man's money and you are doing the Indian no good. You can have it either way and whichever way you take it you are doing wrong. I say that as a matter of fact, you have taken the white man's money to make the Indian a white man, and you have utterly failed. An Indian who has passed through an industrial school, is an Indian still, but he is not as good an Indian as before he went in. I do not say that he is not as good morally, or religiously, or educationally, but he is not as good. considered as a self-supporting person, as he was before he went in. The fact is, that when you put an Indian into an industrial school you teach him the white man's trade, and the white man's ideas, but unless you can on top of that give him the white man's ability to exercise

Mr. OLIVER.

these ideas so as to be a self-supporting and self-respecting citizen, you have thrown your money away. That is something you cannot educate into the Indian any more than you can educate it into the white man, for unless it is not in him you cannot put it into him; and I say, you have utterly failed to do that as regards the Indian in your Indian industrial schools. It is in the nature of things you should fail with the Indian; you have failed, and you could not do anything else. What the Indian wants is the self-supporting idea, the idea of independence, the idea that he has not only the ability to support himself, but the desire to support himself. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Indian can support himself as a pioneer, as a freighter, as a voyageur, as a hunter, possibly as a herder of cattle, and possibly as a farmer on a small scale. There is no question but that he can support himself in any of these lines if the circumstances surrounding him compel him to do so. But the Indian cannot support himself as a tailor, as a shoemaker, as a blacksmith, as a carpenter, in competition with the white men in those trades surrounding him. It is not because he cannot make a horseshoe, or put on a horseshoe as well as the white man; it is not because he cannot do carpenter work as well as the white man; but it is because he has not in him that idea of supporting himself; and because he has not that idea of managing his own business for his own support that the white man has. Now, that idea, if it were in him originally, would, as far as possible, be taken out of him by the system which we have adopted in our industrial schools. It is a system which takes away from the Indian the necessity of his own initiative. It is a system under which the Indian is merely a part of a machine, and any idea of initiative that he had in him in the beginning, is, as far as may be, educated out of him by the industrial school. The fact is, that the native initiative is taken from him by the industrial school system, and nothing of equal value to him is put in its place. This is the theory which I beg to lay before the House. But it is not a matter of theory; it is the results which we have attained which should guide us. As I have said, the question is not whether the Indian can make a shoe, or whether he can shoe a horse, or whether he can plane a board, but the question is in relation to the Indian: whether he can do these things for his own support, for his own credit, and for the support of his relatives and friends. I say the Indian has certainly not succeeded in doing that; I say that the results prove that he has not succeeded. I say, that the results prove that the Indians who have been at these industrial schools are not using their natural ability and the training which they learn in these schools, for their own support as citizens of the country, as it was expected they would. That being the case, I take the liberty of putting my view, based on my own knowledge, and from the information I have

received, before the House. I go further, I say that the Indians in the part of the country in which I live, were, to my mind, at the time that the treaty money was first paid to them in 1877, better men than they are to-day, inasmuch as they were more self-supporting than they are to-day. I saw the Indians of Whitefish Lake in that year of 1877, drawing their own grain raised by themselves, to the water mill at Victoria Settlement to be ground, and I say here, Mr. Chairman, that these Indians at Whitefish Lake were in 1877 better men to my mind than they are to-day. That is to say: they were more self-supporting and self-respecting than they are to-day. And, Sir, it is the same with all the Indians. I repeat, that the system inaugurated and continued for the improvement of the Indian has not been a success, and so far as making them self-supporting and self-respecting citizens goes, they are not as good men to-day as they were twenty years ago.

Mr. DAVIN. But, Mr. Chairman, I suppose as a fact, there is not an Indian in Canada to-day, as fine a specimen of a man as the noble savage that first greeted the intruding white man. There is no doubt whatever that our contact with the Indian has degraded him from being the noble savage that we met first.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member (Mr. Davin) is speaking no doubt for himself.

Mr. DAVIN. We have arrested the Indian at a certain stage of progress from savagery. If we had not interfered with the Indian the chances are that he would have passed through the same process towards civilization as other races have passed through. When the Roman visited the Island of our fathers, he found our fathers very much what our ancestors in Canada found the Indian—fighting, internecine struggle, painted, using bows and arrows. But it would have been a most unfortunate thing—for we would never have had a Milton, nor a Shakespeare, nor would we have had my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) representing Alberta in this House—if our ancestors had been arrested in the same stage of development as the North American Indian was.

Now, Sir, we have a responsibility to this Indian race. It is plain that the results have not been such as, for instance, would attend the educating of white children with their inherited aptitudes of a long line of ancestors devoted to industry, and with the Indian we could not expect anything much better than has resulted. But merely because we have not had great success—I do not believe we have had it—that is no reason why we should retire from our duty to these Indian people. Let me put it this way to my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver). Let us suppose that in the education of one generation of these Indian children, we get one really bright and

clever man—and we have got such a man—or one really bright and clever woman—and we have got such a woman—these two individuals showing good results from our system of education, and showing to what the Indian can be brought would justify all the outlay. And, Sir, what after all signifies the outlay compared with what we owe these people? We cannot get rid of the sacred obligation we owe the Indian, and we will not discharge that obligation by merely considering what is best to enable him to get a livelihood. We have to consider not only that, but we have to consider how far can we develop this Indian in the right direction of civilized man; how far can we raise these poor Indian people in the civilized scale. That is one of the questions we have to ask ourselves.

And, Sir, the missionary! We have read here how the Indian has, at all events, one thing in common with civilized man—he seems naturally a sectarian, because we have Methodists, Presbyterians, and Church of England, and Roman Catholics, and some Pagans. We have them divided in religious opinion just as if they were white people, and they are just as zealous in their sectarian views as any of us. That, I think, indicates the same characteristics as the white man in certain directions. That, instead of repressing hope, probably gives ground for hope as to the possibilities of educating the Indian. But we certainly never would discharge our sacred duty to the Indian by merely asking ourselves what is the best way of making him get a livelihood for himself. Shall we leave him to be a trapper, a hunter, a voyageur? No; I say, make him a farmer and a cattle-raiser, but also give him, just as you do the white man, an opportunity of education; and if there is a bright boy or a bright girl amongst the Blackfeet, the Sioux or the Crees, let him or her have the chance of education. I do not know whether my hon. friend ever met Poundmaker. If he did, he stood before one of the noblest specimens of manhood that ever met the human eye. No man ever entered this House or any other English-speaking House of Parliament that had on him more completely the stamp of greatness and nobleness than had Poundmaker. When he stood in the dock at Regina, he seemed like a prince of men, whom an inferior race had by some machination got hold of. And am I to be told that the children of a race that could produce such a man are not to get the opportunities of education? Let me take the late chief of the Blackfeet, a friend of one of the foremost and most estimable missionaries who have illustrated devotion and self-sacrifice in the North-west. That chief was a born statesman. If he had been educated, none of the diplomats of Europe whose names have been handed down as household words would have been able to cope with him; certainly none of

them would have been able to get the better of him.

Mr. BEATTIE. What about Oronhyatekha?

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend mentions the name of a man whom we all honour. I will not venture to pronounce his name, which I have never attempted to do without falling ignominiously. It is much more than we had to bear when we were young, according to Lowell, who refers to the spelling of long syllables:

We nerved our larynx for the desperate thing,  
And cleared the four-barred syllables at a spring.

I cannot do that in the case of my friend Dr. Oronhyatekha. Look at his executive power. I suppose there is not an insurance man on the continent with superior executive power to that of my friend who is at the head of the Foresters. He is a man of extraordinary executive power and grasp. He is a man who would have made a statesman, though I am afraid I may lose his friendly feelings by considering him as a possibility in that respect. He may say to me what Col. Sellers said to a man who wanted to make him a member of Congress: "No, what have I ever done to you that you should ask me to stoop to such a thing as that?" Joking apart, what is the test of the civilized man? It is the ability to adopt means to ends. There is the fruit and flower of the highest culture; and in this man's case, you have that power exemplified to an extraordinary degree. I do not know whether my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior ever had the pleasure of meeting the late chief of the Black-foot tribe. He may have met him travelling on the train.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.  
Crowfoot?

Mr. DAVIN. A more spiritual face no one could wish to see—a most refined face. And I remember the chief of one of the Indian tribes—I cannot just now think of his name—whom I saw leading his tribe from the nomad state to take up their abode on a reserve. His profile was the profile of Gladstone. No brother of Gladstone had a profile so like that of the great statesman. You could not see him managing that difficult task—because a difficult task it was—of bringing that tribe of Indians to go on the reserve, without seeing that he was a born leader of men. I remember when, in 1879, I was visiting in Winnipeg, I went down to the St. Peter's reserve. I do not know whether the chief I then met is still there.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.  
Henry Prince—he just died lately.

Mr. DAVIN. All I can say is that a more consummate orator never used speech than Prince was. Why, Sir, talk about

Mr. DAVIN.

volubility. No orator ever spoke in this House that he could not outspoke. I was there in an official position, as a commissioner, and he had a certain right to address me—I suppose about his grievances. He addressed me from a quarter past seven in the evening until twelve o'clock. I was told that he would go on until six o'clock the next morning, and I had to make a diplomatic excuse to escape.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.  
Highly civilized.

Mr. DAVIN. I am pointing that out. What seems to be the flower of statesman-like civilization among ourselves but somewhat long speeches? Although I have referred to Prince somewhat jocosely, nevertheless he was a remarkable specimen of capable manhood. It would be a monstrous thing to say that the children of a race capable of producing such men are not to get their chance of education, merely because some of them fail. Why, how many fail under our own system of education, which is vaunted as so perfect that we are never tired of praising it? We know that the results are not always satisfactory. I think it would be presumptuous on our part to say that it always produces the highest type of cultured manhood. Certainly many of those who are the subjects of it are failures. But are we going to give it up because it fails to accomplish all we hope? No, it is the best thing we can do. We have to take the failures with the successes. Though I agree to some extent with what my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) says, yet it is only a half truth, and nothing is so misleading as a half truth. I do not think it would be wise for the department to be influenced in this matter by my hon. friend from Alberta. It is much better to go on in duty, faith and hope with regard to our Indian wards, make them farmers capable of cultivating their reserves, make them horse-breeders, or, if you like, guides and scouts. They would make good scouts and you could make good policemen out of them, for I saw them used in that capacity on reserves in the United States. But let us give a chance to any bright children amongst them of having their intellects educated and their moral natures softened and developed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I shall not detain the committee by further discussion, except to say that while there may be honest differences of opinion about the best results to flow from a particular class of schools, my own matured and deliberate opinion is that the attempt which has been made to improve the standard of the Indians and bring them to a state in which they cannot, by any possibility, be a menace to the peace and safety of the rest of the country, is an attempt that ought to be pursued with all possible energy and deter-

mination. Looking upon the results which have been achieved, particularly in connection with the Indians of the North-west Territories, as distinguished from those of Manitoba—because there was not so much to do in the latter case—these results are simply phenomenal, under the circumstances. My hon. friend from West Assinibola (Mr. Davin) is quite correct when he says that a very few years ago all these Indians were absolutely savages, under no restraint, without any idea of civilized life, and I venture to say that in fifteen or twenty years from to-day that Indian population will be an agricultural population, almost entirely self-sustaining.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to detain the House long, but I cannot quite agree with the airy manner in which the hon. member for West Assinibola (Mr. Davin) dismisses the question of a vote of \$200,000, which is about the amount expended on these industrial schools. That is an amount which, in the minds of the House, is charged against the North-west Territories. In so far as it is chargeable against the Territories, it could be used to much greater advantage to the people of the Territories and the Dominion at large. \$200,000 of an expenditure in the North-west Territories is a very important item, worthy of the most serious consideration, particularly by members representing the North-west Territories. It bears a very large proportion to the total amount available for the support of the schools of the whole population of the Territories, the maintenance of public roads, the carrying on of all public purposes. When we see the sum of \$200,000 absorbed year after year in the ineffective attempt to educate a handful of Indian children, and when we find that that amount of money is required for the purposes of the white people, and when we find this House none too anxious to provide for those necessities as they arise, when we find that, on every occasion almost when a vote is asked for the purposes of the North-west Territories, we are met with the cry to look at the large expenditures made there—when we find all this, it is a matter of importance to this House to consider whether value is received for this expenditure. The success in the education of one or two Indian children, after years of experiment, instead of merely fifteen years, is not sufficient return for this expenditure of \$200,000. Let the House not miss the point. There is no question about the intellectual brightness of the Indians. The Indian is just as bright intellectually as the white man. He can learn a trade just as well as the white man, he can study out of books just as well, and, as the hon. member for West Assinibola has told the House, there are Indians who are just as good speakers as white men. In fact, the gift of oratory is more general amongst the Indians than

among the white men, and we might almost be led to believe that our friend from West Assinibola has in his veins some trace for connection with that race. There is no question at all about that side of the Indian character. You can educate the Indian, but to make the Indian use the education you give him for his self-support is the problem that has not yet been solved in any satisfactory degree whatever, and it is only right the House should be fully informed upon that point. A few minutes ago the hon. member for West Assinibola alluded to the fact that there were certain bright people who shone from amongst the Indians in certain lines of life. He pointed to a certain Indian doctor in this eastern country who appears to have a business ability which is not common to the Indian, as well as that intellectual ability which is common to them. There is also a lady of Indian blood whose name is prominently before the public as a poetess, and whose views, I suppose, regarding the Indian question, are entitled to some consideration. I may quote her opinion on the question of these industrial schools, and it is this, that no system of education which teaches a child to despise his parents will ever be successful in elevating the intellectual and moral sentiment of that child. That is exactly what is taught in the industrial schools, or they are not what they are represented to be.

Mr. DAVIN. It is very important that the statement made by my hon. friend should be met, because it is one with which we are often met in the North-west Territories. The hon. gentleman's argument would be cogent if we could suppose that were this money not voted for the Indians, it would still be voted for the North-west for some other purpose. But it would not. If it were not voted for these Indians, it would not be voted for anything. This money is not voted for the North-west Territories at all, and is not charged against the North-west Territories. The money that is voted for the North-west Territories is voted on a wholly different ground. It is voted on the same ground as the money voted to each of the other provinces. The Government, no doubt, think that the amount which they give the North-west Territories is a fair and equitable adjustment of the relations between the Territories and the Dominion. I have always contended that the amount is insufficient, but on each occasion I am told that the North-west Territories have been settled with on a fair adjustment and on the same basis of principle as the other provinces. I know very well that you cannot go anywhere in the North-west Territories but you meet some men who say: Look at this money given to the Indian schools; it would be better to give it to some purpose that immediately affects us. But the answer is:

You must not consider that the money spent on that industrial school, if not so spent would be spent on your pet object. It is fallacious to suppose that if this money was not voted to industrial schools in the North-west it would necessarily be voted to some other North-west purpose. I have always contended—but that is entirely apart from this question—that in the North-west Territories we did not get the amount we should get for carrying on the Government. I have shown here that on any fair analysis of our claims we are entitled to more. Of course that is a different question from the question of the money spent on Indians. Each of these tubs must stand on its own bottom. I must say that one of the greatest possible compliments I have ever been paid is that paid by my hon. friend. I have heard the same compliment paid to Mr. Gladstone; I have heard it said that Mr. Gladstone might have been an Indian because of some qualities he displayed. I thank my hon. friend for the compliment, and I must try to emulate the grace and the picturesqueness of the diction of our Indian wards.

Government of the North-west Territories ..... \$322,073 10

Mr. DAVIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, here is the vote where my hon. friend can come forward and fight the battle of the North-west Territories. As I have said, I have always contended, that this vote is not enough. Take into account the fact that we have a vast territory, in which you could absorb three or four of your greatest provinces; take into account the fact that we have not the administration of our own land, and it will be seen that this paltry sum of \$282,000 odd to pay grants for schools, clerical assistance, printing, and so on, is not sufficient. I am perfectly certain that the Government of the Territories must have represented to the Minister of the Interior that we are entitled to a great deal more.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I must say that they are not in fault in that respect.

Mr. DAVIN. I should be surprised if they were. There is an item of "incidental justice, &c., including clerical assistance." Is that now under control of the Lieutenant-Governor's office or is it under control of the local government?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, it is under the control of the local government.

Mr. DAVIN. You have several other sums specially voted. You have \$5,580 for the Lieutenant-Governor's office, \$15,000 for registrars, \$50,000 for insane patients—that \$50,000 really goes to Manitoba, for we have to send our insane patients to Manitoba—and \$2,000 for schools in unorganized districts. But for schools, for clerical assistance, for all the numerous expenditures in

Mr. DAVIN.

carrying on the affairs of the country with a population now of from 120,000 to 150,000, you have only this main sum of \$282,979. I have often made the calculation—and I will not worry the committee with it now—to show that on the basis of the provinces—our being deprived of the administration of our own lands, we are entitled to more. If we had the items calculated on a proper basis—so much, for instance, because we have no right to impose customs duties while our people pay customs duties to the Dominion Government—taking all these things into account, instead of this item of \$282,000, we should have at least \$400,000, and even with that amount, the Government would be cramped. I was in strong hopes that instead of having the same amount placed here for the North-west Territories as last year, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) would, at least, add \$100,000 for this year.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The amount placed in the Estimates for the government of the North-west Territories, that is, the amount paid in the nature of a subsidy is \$282,979. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) will remember that since this Government took office, the amount voted has been increased by \$40,000, and \$40,000 per annum is a very respectable addition to the amount voted. My hon. friend will remember that he laboured for a considerable number of years, while his friends were in office, to secure that increase and did not secure it. I think the hon. gentleman will admit that the \$40,000 of an increase that was made two years ago was a very substantial one. I am far from saying that the amount paid to the government of the North-west Territories was sufficient to enable them to meet the demands which were made upon them. It is true, they had a larger subsidy than the province of Manitoba had in proportion to population, but I perfectly understand that the nature of the country, the nature of the demands that are made upon them, the position of the people, and the social problems that have had to be worked out there, are such that the cost of local government per capita must necessarily be much greater in the North-west Territories than in a province where the people are settled more closely together. A great portion of the difficulty in those territories comes from the immense extent of country over which a small population is scattered. They are compelled to build roads over an immense stretch of country; they have demands on them for bridges, and for public works, and for assistance to schools among a scattered population. While I am conscious of all the need which exists for a large subsidy, at the same time the hon. gentleman must recognize the fact that we have done something substantial towards increasing that subsidy during this parliamentary term, and that for the present at least a

further increase will have to stand over until next year. I may say that I discussed this matter very fully with members of the North-west Government, and, while I am not in a position to say that there was anything in the nature of an agreement between us, yet I think it was understood that the increase which Parliament voted in June, 1897, was considered to be a reasonable increase at that time. It is only fair to the members of that government to say that they have, prior to the present session, pressed very strongly upon me the necessity for an increase, but I have not been able to see my way clear to recommend any addition this year.

Mr. DAVIN. I should be very much surprised, if the members of the government of the North-west did not press on the hon. gentleman the claims of the North-west to a higher subsidy, because I know what is the opinion of each one of them in regard to that. I know that each one of them has a very strong opinion in the same direction as that I have already expressed, and the hon. gentleman's own statement just now indicates that he is fully sensible of the weight of the circumstances which point to the justice of increasing that subsidy. You cannot, on any fair computation, on the same basis of principle as the subsidy is voted in the provinces, make a calculation which will show that they should not get \$400,000, instead of \$282,000. The hon. gentleman will certainly feel that if my contention is right, the North-west is entitled now to \$400,000. Every year that passes on a pinch subsidy, is an injustice, not merely to the North-west, but an injustice really to Canada, because it will infallibly keep back the North-west from a rate of progress which it would otherwise attain. However, I suppose it is useless now to contend for any more than we have this year; but I certainly must say that I am disappointed that there is not, at all events, \$50,000 more added to the subsidy.

**Dominion Lands—**

Chargeable to capital..... \$135,000

Mr. DAVIN. Has the hon. gentleman brought down those papers about scrip that he promised to bring down when we came to this item?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The committee will understand that the vote which is being asked for now is the usual vote for Dominion lands service. The other day I had a Bill before the House, which was quite fully discussed, upon the subject of the issue of scrip to the half-breeds in the North-west Territories, and in connection with it there was a discussion concerning the necessity of a treaty being made with the Indians in the unceded territory. I may explain to the members of the committee that, while in the mind of the average citizen of Canada there is no

special difference in regard to the jurisdiction by the Dominion Government in respect of any particular portion of Canada, yet in the minds of the Indian of the North-west Territories there is a very marked difference. The Indian of the North-west Territories knows where the line is which separates the ceded territory from unceded territory, and he regards that as a line which is absolutely fixed, and beyond which the Government has no right, in his view, to extend its operations further than is absolutely necessary for the purpose of keeping possession of the country, and maintaining the ordinary state of affairs, keeping the peace and preventing any undue disturbance. The presence of the Mounted Police even is resented in the unceded territories. It was explained in the debate upon that question that, when my Indian estimates were before the House, a vote had been taken for the purpose of sending commissioners up there to negotiate a treaty for a portion of the unceded territory. Settlers, prospectors, hunters and trappers have been for the last two years going in considerable numbers into the unceded territory to the north-west of Edmonton, and to the north-west of Athabasca Lake, in what is known as the Athabasca district, and in that district the Indians have been manifesting a considerable degree of restlessness. I foresaw from the reports that were laid before me, what was likely to take place, and rather more than a year and a half ago it was my intention last year, if possible, to send a commissioner up there for the purpose of negotiating a treaty with these Indians. I may say, while I am upon that point, that these Indians so resent the presence of white people who go apparently for the purpose of taking up land or of settling in that territory, that they are quite willing and quite ready to threaten open and deadly hostilities against persons who go there before any treaty has been made with them. It is not an idle threat, nor is it a thing which should not be regarded with the utmost seriousness. For that reason I decided that negotiations for a treaty would have to be undertaken. After consulting with the other members of the Government, it was finally decided that a treaty must be made, and arrangements were undertaken for that purpose. An attempt was made to negotiate a treaty last year, but it was found that it would not be possible to get notices to the attention of the Indians in that far off district, scattered as they were, in sufficient time to insure their attendance at the various points where the commissioners would be able to meet them. Therefore, upon the advice of those best acquainted with the subject, I was compelled to relinquish the idea of negotiating a treaty last year, and the result was, that the matter was laid over until this year. We now have an Indian com-

mission sent up there for the purpose of negotiating treaties with the Indians of that district. In connection with this necessary work of negotiating a treaty with the Indians, arose the question of dealing with the half-breeds, and of the extinguishment of their claim for scrip.

Hon. members of the committee will have understood, from the discussion that took place on the Bill, which was before the House the other day, that the half-breeds of the Athabasca district claim that they are entitled to the same consideration as was received by the Indians of Manitoba at the time that the transfer took place. They received certain considerations in the way of an issue of scrip to them, which was a payment to them in an alternative way, enabling them either to take up land or to accept scrip which would be receivable in payment for Dominion lands and which they could sell, it being transferable, as an ordinary security for money, payable to bearer. The half-breeds of the Athabasca district claim to be entitled to the same treatment. The half-breeds of the North-west Territories claimed to be entitled to the same treatment and they were accorded the same treatment by the settlement made after the rebellion in 1885. I may say that the fact that the settlement was not made, prior to 1885, was largely a contributing cause to that rebellion. There were a number of circumstances which contributed towards it, and while the non-issue of scrip could not be held, perhaps, to be the principal cause, it was one of the causes which led to the irritation of the half-breeds resulting in the rebellion which took place in 1885. A commission was named, and scrip was issued to the half-breeds, but the children that had been born in the North-west Territories between 1870 and 1885 were not, even then, recognized. We had to consider this whole question in connection with negotiating a treaty with the Indians in the North-west Territories and the half-breeds of the Athabasca district. The half-breeds have the greatest interest in the Indians, and our advices, which circumstances have proven to be correct, were to the effect that it would be useless to endeavour to negotiate a treaty with the Indians unless we were prepared to deal with the half-breeds at the same time, and to extinguish their claims. We were further advised, and I think the soundness of that advice is not now questioned seriously, that we would have to deal with the whole of the half-breeds whose claims had not been settled, otherwise we would not be successful in dealing with any of them. The intermingling of the half-breeds of one part of the country with those of another part of the country make them perfectly familiar, one set with another, so that they know each others claims and sympathize with each other. We were informed that our only hope of making a treaty with the Indians lay in settling this whole question at once.

Mr. SIFTON.

I explained these facts somewhat to the House the other day when the question arose in connection with the issue of scrip as to whether it was a wise course for the Government to pursue to issue scrip, as had been done before, giving the half-breeds the privilege of taking up 240 acres of land, or in the alternative, giving them the privilege of taking scrip which would be receivable in payment to the extent of \$240, for Dominion lands wherever such payments might happen to be made. The effect of taking money scrip was that the half-breeds would sell that scrip as a security for money. It would be a security for money just like any other security for money, and the percentage value would be judged by the amount of scrip on the market and the amount of Dominion land deferred payments outstanding. The matter was discussed the other day. Some hon. members, amongst others, the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), particularly, took pretty strong ground that the course which had been pursued in the past and the course which we were now pursuing was not a wise course. The ground was taken that it was not a wise course because the half-breeds would improvidently dispose of the money scrip, that it would be disposed of at very much below its face value, that the money would be wasted, and that, as a result, the benefit which it was intended should go to the half-breeds, in providing this issue of scrip, would not go to the half-breeds to the same extent, or so substantially, as if some other method of giving assistance were provided. The idea which was expressed in the discussion, most largely, was the idea that the assistance should be given in some other way. The hon. member for York suggested that it should be given in implements, or stocks, or in some kind of assistance that would not readily be capable of being disposed of, and would not, at all events, be likely to be disposed of in an improvident way. There is much to be said in favour of that view. Suggestions were made on the line of the same principle indicating that the view of some hon. members was that assistance should be given in some way that would prevent the half-breeds from having the power of making away with whatever was given to them. I pointed out the difficulty of dealing with the matter in that way. I pointed out that the half-breed considered himself to be an independent citizen perfectly capable of doing his own business and taking care of himself. The half-breeds claim for scrip, in his mind, arose from the fact that he was one of the aboriginal inhabitants of the country, that other half-breeds had been treated in a certain way, that a kind of standard had been raised up as to what the treatment of the half-breeds should be, and that any deviation from that treatment would be looked upon by him as an injustice and a reflection upon him, particularly if that deviation had followed the line of taking from him the

power to dispose of what might be given to him, or had followed the line of refusing to recognize his power to deal with what is given to him, or of refusing to recognize his ability to take care of himself, and do his own business. Some hon. members who are familiar with these people and have had dealings with them speak pretty strongly of the independent characteristics of these people, and they do not speak any too strongly. Having a considerable knowledge of these people, that is the impression that has been made upon my mind very strongly, and I have grave doubts about the ability of the Government to get these people to agree to any settlement of their claims that does not follow pretty substantially the plan which has been followed in former years. I would be willing to follow a better plan if it could be suggested, or if a settlement could be made with the half-breeds upon the basis of any better plan, but I have myself serious doubts as to whether that can be satisfactorily done by any other plan. The members of the committee will see the immediate necessity for dealing with this subject which has been put off for some years past, but which is all the time becoming a little more acute, and the people getting a little more impatient to have it dealt with. The immediate necessity for this lies in the necessity for putting ourselves in a position to make this treaty with the Indians of the Athabasca district. I pointed out to the committee that I have taken one step which I thought would, to some extent, preserve the value of the scrip to a considerable portion of the half-breeds, and that was that I changed the form of the certificate of scrip so that it could not be transferred to bearer on delivery. I changed the certificate so that it required to be legally assigned, and I knew perfectly well that was a great impediment in the way of transfer. The difference between getting a certificate payable to bearer and getting a certificate which had to be legally assigned and properly attested by witnesses is very great in respect to the half-breeds, and in the case of minors, where a legal assignment is required, of course it is prohibitive until the minors come of age. The Half-breed and the Indian Commission went northward leaving Edmonton about the 24th of May. My hon. friend from West Assinibola (Mr. Davin) has called my attention to the fact that notwithstanding the form of certificate, the Half-breed Commission have issued a certificate payable to bearer, and he has asked my explanation. That is a fact, and I was not in the position to explain it until a few days ago, when certain correspondence arrived, which I shall read. Suffice it for the present to say, that the Indian Commission and the Half-breed Commission, at a joint meeting, decided that it was necessary they should

make this change, and they have sent me their statement in regard to it, and the matter is now before myself and my colleagues to decide whether we shall approve of their action. I want to be perfectly frank with the House, and I am bound to say that I believe we shall have to recognize the decision of the commission, in so far as the half-breeds of the Athabasca district are concerned. As to whether it shall be necessary to follow the same course in regard to the half-breeds of the older portions of the North-west Territories, that is a matter which we shall have to consider. The commission we have sent out there is a commission which I think every member of the House will agree is worthy of all confidence, in so far as the capacity of the members are concerned. The Hon. David Laird is one of the Indian Commissioners and I need only mention his name in order that every member of the House will admit that he is a man of the highest possible character, a man of most mature discretion and judgment, and in every possible way an ideal man to entrust with this work. Hon. Mr. Laird was formerly Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories and Indian Commissioner; he was a member of the Government of the late Alexander Mackenzie, and is now again Indian Commissioner after a lapse of considerable years. Mr. Laird is a man who has had long experience with the Indians, and I may say here that no man who had ever to do with the Indians and half-breeds of the North-west Territories is regarded by them with greater respect and affection. I think every one will agree in that, without regard to political predilections. Hon. Mr. Laird is chairman of the commission. Mr. James H. Ross, Minister of Works of the Territories, is another commissioner. Mr. Ross is a gentleman who has lived in the Territories, and who is familiar with everything that has gone on there for a great many years, a man of good judgment and good sense. The third commissioner is a permanent officer of the department, Mr. J. A. J. McKenna who is one of the most capable and one of the best posted officials in the Indian service. We have on the Half-breed Commission Major Walker, formerly of the North-west Mounted Police, and Mr. Coté, a permanent officer of the department here, who has considerable experience in relation to matters connected with the issue of scrip and land matters generally in the North-west Territories. We could hardly have got together a body of men more capable, from their variety of information and soundness of judgment in matters of this kind, to cope with any difficulties that may arise. The members of the committee will see that the circumstances are very peculiar. These commissioners are sent into that country under such circumstances that instructions can-

not be given to them. Notices were sent out over a year ago, that the commissioners would be at certain points on certain dates. When they get there the Indians are there, and the commissioners have to either make a treaty or fail to make a treaty within a few days. There is no time for instructions from Ottawa, there is no time for them to communicate with the Minister or with the Government, and so we have to depend upon the judgment and discretion of these commissioners. They have, to some extent, to take the responsibility in connection with these matters which, under ordinary circumstances, officers of the Government would not be expected to or allowed to take. A few days ago, in connection with this subject, I received the following papers marked "confidential," but under the circumstances, of course, the papers cannot be confidential, and I presume they were so marked by an error of the secretary or typewriter :

(Confidential.)

Half-breed Commission,  
Lesser Slave Lake, 24th June, 1899.

Sir,—We beg to inclose herewith a copy of an extract from a minute of a joint meeting of the Indian Treaty and Half-breed Commissions, held here on the 22nd instant, together with one copy each of the two forms of scrip certificates as they now stand. The reasons which led to the change in the wording of Form (A) are fully set out in the minute, but we deem it advisable to state further in this relation that, apart altogether from the protests and general dissatisfaction which resulted from our announcement as to the terms upon which it was originally intended to issue money scrip, it was felt that the object which the Government had in view in providing for the assignment of money scrip, namely, the protection of the rights of minors, would be totally defeated by the fact that their parents, in the great majority of cases, had fully made up their minds to refuse land scrip, and that the scrip-buyers were prepared to purchase the money scrip certificates of minors from their parents. According to the wording of certificates (A), as it stood before the change and as it now stands, the money scrip called for thereunder is made "payable to bearer," and as there would appear to be a legal point involved as to the right of parents to act as the legal guardians of their children, and to thus appoint agents or attorneys to receive the scrip of the former, scrip-buyers signified their intention to take their chances as to the ultimate result of the Government's decision on this point, and to buy the scrip certificates of minors at a much depreciated value. The consequence of this would have been that while the rights of minors would not have been safeguarded, the interests of the whole half-breed community throughout the district of Athabasca would have suffered considerably. As a result of the change in the wording of the certificate, the value of scrip has risen considerably, and some of the claimants are now holding out from sale in the expectancy of a further rise.

We also beg to inclose herewith a copy of a letter on this subject dated 22nd instant, addressed to the Hon. Mr. Laird, chairman of the Indian Treaty Commission, in which the former urges very strong reasons for the change which was decided upon by the commissioners.

Mr. SIFTON.

The work of the half-breed commissioners at this point, although only commenced two days ago, is now progressing favourably, but in view of the large settlement of half-breeds in the vicinity of Lesser Slave Lake, it is not likely that we will be able to complete our labours here for twelve or fifteen days more.

After mature consideration, we have decided to follow the Indian Treaty Commission, and visit all the points advertised this year. It was feared that there might be trouble in making Indian treaties at Fort Chipewyan and at other places if it were known that the half-breeds there were not to be dealt with this year, so we have concluded to follow the Indian Treaty Commissioners as quickly as possible; but, on the other hand, we will not be able to make as complete an examination into the squatters' claims here as we first intended to. We will, no doubt, experience some difficulties and hardships in making the round trip after this date, but by working long hours and hard travelling, we believe we can accomplish it and get out to Edmonton before winter sets in.

We have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servants,

(Sgd.) JAMES WALKER,

J. ARTHUR COTE,

Half-breed Commissioners.

Then follows an extract from a minute of the joint meeting :

Extract from a Minute of Joint Meeting of the Indian Treaty and Half-breed Commissions, held at Lesser Slave Lake, District of Athabasca on the 22nd June, 1899.

Hon. David Laird in the chair.

Present : Hon. J. H. Ross and Messrs. J. A. J. McKenna, James Walker and J. A. Côté.

These are the members of the two commissions—

The half-breeds of Lesser Slave Lake, at a public meeting held this day with the commissioners, objected to the form of the scrip certificate (Form A), and claimed that it should be in the same form as was employed in the other portions of the Territories. They claimed the right to use the scrip of their children, for the latter's benefit, during their minority, and urged that to do so would be more in the interest of the children than would be the locking-up of the certificate before the issue of the scrip to any one but the person named in the certificate. Inquiry has shown that the half-breeds are determined not to take land scrip, but money scrip for themselves and their children, with the object of immediately realizing upon it, and that scrip-buyers are prepared to purchase the certificates of the old and young, notwithstanding the requirement as to assignment, but at a very low rate on account of that assignment. The requirement intended to benefit the half-breeds is therefore being turned to their disadvantage, but, at the same time, the dissatisfaction thus created is likely to spread in advance of the commissioners and lead the half-breeds at the points at which the Indians have yet to be met to use their influence to prevent the further extension of the treaty. The half-breeds of this district have evinced much intelligence and industry, and are much better able to look after their own interest and the interest of their children than were the half-breeds of the older portions of the territories. Consultation with the natural advisers of the half-breeds has led to the conviction that they would make good use of their children's scrip, and that it would be in their interest to

have it at their disposal. It has, therefore, been decided to strike out from the scrip certificate (Form A) the words "and to be delivered to the said.....or assigns," which appear at the fifth and sixth lines between the word "bearer" on the fourth line and the word "and" on the sixth line.

That would make the certificate assignable by delivery, and to be recognized in the hands of the bearer, whoever he might be—

(Sgd) DAVID LAIRD,  
Chairman.

J. H. ROSS,  
J. A. J. McKENNA,  
JAMES WALKER,  
J. ARTHUR COTE.

Now, one man who adopted the view expressed by the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), I think also by the hon. member for West Assinibola (Mr. Davin), and one or two other members of the House, that another method of assisting the half-breeds than that of issuing scrip in the old form should be adopted, and the man who adopted that view most strongly, and was best able to form an opinion on the subject, was Father Lacombe, a well-known Roman Catholic missionary, whose name is familiar in every wigwam and half-breed's house in the North-west Territories. There is no man who is so universally known and respected among the Indians and half-breeds. I had a discussion with Father Lacombe myself, but it turned on other subjects at the time, and he hesitated to express a strong opinion to me; but to others, I believe, Father Lacombe had some time ago expressed a very strong opinion against the use of money scrip. He also had issued a strong opinion in favour of assistance, if any were given, being given in such a form that the alienation of the assistance or the proceeds of the assistance would be in some way restricted. Therefore, he might be taken to have been one of the very strongest of those who held the opinion expressed by some though not all the members of the House when the Bill was before us a few days ago. Father Lacombe's services were considered so valuable by the Government that we secured his assistance and sent him up along with the commissioners. He is not a commissioner; he does not hold the position of being a member of the commission; but he simply goes as a representative of the Government in an advisory capacity, for the purpose of assisting the commissioners in connection with the treaties with the Indians and also in connection with the settlement with the half-breeds. Father Lacombe having had that opinion, I was extremely surprised when I received, along with this paper, the following letter from Father Lacombe, which is addressed to Mr. Laird, the Chairman of the Commission, and is inclosed with the other papers for my information and for the information of the Government:—

Lesser Slave Lake, June 22nd, 1899.

Sir,—Referring to the meeting of the half-breeds to-day, at which I acted as intermediary and adviser, after careful consideration of what was urged as to the form of scrip, I have come to the conclusion that very much trouble will arise if the parents be not able to make use of their children's scrip for their benefit during their minority. As you have no doubt observed, the half-breeds here have evinced more intelligence and industry than did the half-breeds to whom scrip was issued in 1870 and 1885, and although I came here strongly impressed with the desirability of doing everything possible to prevent the parents from using the scrip of their children and freely disposing of their own, the conditions here have led me to the conclusion that action in that direction will not result in any benefit to the half-breeds here, but to their disadvantage, for they are determined to make prompt use of their scrip and that of their children. I find that the half-breeds here, when they heard that scrip was to be issued counted upon turning it into money for investment in cattle for themselves and their children. Very, very few, if any, of them will take land scrip, and I am convinced that none of those who take money scrip will use it in direct payment for land, and the result of the impediment to free disposition will, therefore, be the depreciation of the scrip. They are bound to dispose of it, and it is in their interest that they should be in a position to get the best return possible for it. The dissatisfaction with the form of certificate is so great and so widespread that I fear if the commissioners have to persist in using it the dissatisfaction will spread in advance of the Indian Commission, and make it very difficult, if not impossible, to further extend the treaty, which I am so anxious to have all the Indians enter into. In the interest of the half-breeds, and in the public interest, I would therefore advise that if it be in the power of the commissioners, they should take upon themselves to amend the scrip so as to meet the wishes of the half-breeds.

With respect and consideration,

I remain sincerely,  
Truly your devoted servant,  
(Sgd.) FATHER A. LACOMBE,  
As Adviser in the Commission.

The members of the committee will see that the man who is so conservative in his views and so well posted with reference to the whole subject, and who held such strong opinions on the subject as Father Lacombe, has entirely changed his opinion, and has endorsed the view, first of all, that a settlement in regard to the scrip upon satisfactory lines must be made before the Indians can be dealt with; and, next, he has endorsed the view, which I was not inclined to take myself, and on which I did not act, that the scrip should be issued in such a way that it could be assigned by delivery. The position of the matter now is that the certificates have been issued for the half-breeds in the lower portion of the territory, namely, the Athabasca district and the Lesser Slave Lake, and the commissioners have gone northward, and we will see no more of them until they return in the fall. No doubt they will issue certificates in the form in which they have issued the first for the half-breeds of that district. As for the half-

breeds of the older portions of the Territories, we can deal with them as we see fit later on. But as regards the half-breeds of the Athabasca district, it is practically out of our power to modify the action of the commission, and it appears quite evident that it would not be in the public interest to do so. I am satisfied that the committee will agree that the commissioners, having exercised their judgment in that way, considering it to be for the best interests of the commission, the Government will be right in endorsing what they have done. Apart from the remarks of the hon. member for Assiniboia and his request for information, inasmuch as I have stated my views to the House, I made up my mind, as soon as the papers came, that I would take the earliest opportunity of putting the House in possession of all the facts.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sure the committee will learn with deep regret the position in which the matter now stands. Past experience shows that the attempt to promote the interests of the half-breeds by the issue of scrip had lamentably failed and that practically almost all that was accomplished was to enrich a lot of scrip brokers, who followed the heels of the commissioners and who managed to secure possession of this scrip from the Indians by putting them under the influence of intoxicating liquor or by other means. The hon. Minister of the Interior was so strongly impressed with the deplorable failure of former Governments to accomplish anything in the interests of the half-breeds by this issue of scrip, that he wisely determined to take every possible means of preventing a recurrence of the former practice. The majority of the House listened to his statement with much interest and marked approval when he said that the Government had determined to take the most stringent measures for the purpose of preventing an abuse of the concession made to the half-breeds for the extinction of their claims. He said :

Let me point out to my hon. friend what has been done already. The practice in former years was to issue to the half-breeds a certificate which was so drawn that one might fancy it had been drawn for the express purpose of making it as easy as possible for a broker to get hold of it. Notwithstanding all the years I lived in the North-west, I never saw one of these original certificates until I came to my department. When I came to examine the certificates I found that it simply said: "This certificate entitles John Smith or the bearer to \$240 worth of scrip," setting out the particulars. So that when a certificate was issued, all that a broker had to do was to get possession of it without making himself liable for stealing it, and he would be entitled to come here and make a demand for the scrip. I decided to have the form altered to say that the assignee would be recognized upon a proper assignment being filed in the department. I venture to say that assignments cannot be filed in the department for a large number of the certificates, for the

Mr. SIFTON.

simple reason that probably two-thirds of the half-breeds are now under age, and are not legally qualified to make an assignment, and the certificate would be simply held by them until they were qualified. At the same time, they would feel that their rights were recognized.

I may say that both sides listened to this statement of the policy of the Government with great satisfaction. There was, of course, a discussion as to whether some better means could not have been adopted, as to whether it would not really promote better the interests of the half-breeds, to give them land instead of scrip, because the settlement of the country was continually making land more valuable and the land would be much less easy to part with than the scrip, but we all approved of the restrictions and the protection with which he promised to hedge round the half-breeds in the issue of this scrip. But it appears now that the Government are not governing the country. They appointed a commission and gave that commission instructions, as clearly set out in detail by the Minister of the Interior, and which commended themselves to the judgment of the House, as a great improvement upon the former practice which had resulted in almost entirely defeating the objects of the Government; but it appears that there is a crowd of brokers, following on the heels of this commission, ready to buy up this scrip and to a large extent ruling and controlling the commission. The result is that the commission have thrown over the instructions received from the Government. I am at a loss to know where they obtained the power. They have gone back to the old practice that proved so utterly fallacious and useless, so far as the objects which Parliament and the Government had in dealing with these people were concerned. So far as the Athabasca district is concerned, the Government will be unable to do anything, the hon. Minister tells us, to set aside the action of the commission in violating the instructions under which they had been appointed. The House will learn with great regret that there does not seem to be any means of undoing what the commissioners have done. There is a good deal of weight to be given to such a letter as Father Lacombe has written for he speaks with great authority, but I do not think that he and his associates should have authority to disregard the instructions under which they were appointed, without first communicating with the Government and obtaining a revocation of these instructions. I think it is greatly to be regretted that such a course is taken. It is now perfectly obvious that the proper design of the Government to settle the claims and to settle them in such a way as to do most good to the half-breeds is going to be entirely defeated; and the result of the expenditure of this enormous amount of public money will be to demoralize a great many half-breeds and to hand over not only their rights but the

rights of their helpless children to a number of brokers who will make a fortune out of this scrip.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. The hon. gentleman I think is under some misapprehension with regard to the facts. It is true that the commissioners have really exceeded their instructions, have done something that was not contemplated by their instructions. It is true that the effect of this is to remove a restriction which it was decided by the Government should exist. Of course, the Government has not authorized the endorsement of that action, nor have they confirmed it; but I have said frankly to the commission, that in all probability the logic of circumstances would compel the Government to endorse that action and stand by what the commissioners have done. But it must be remembered that the financial benefit to the half-breeds is not the primary object the Government had in view in making this arrangement. I say that is not the primary object. It is desirable that the provision which we make for this scrip being given to the half-breeds should be as great a benefit to the half-breeds as possible. That would commend itself to the common sense of any member of this committee. But the main reason for making this arrangement is to pacify and keep pacified the North-west Territories, to settle a claim which must be settled before the people of Canada can make a treaty with the Indians of that district—and the Indians of that district must have a treaty made with them, otherwise we shall be in danger of having an Indian trouble on our hands, the very slightest of which would cost us two or three times the amount of the scrip we issue. It only requires two or three hundred disaffected Indians—in fact, less than that will do—to cause a disastrous war. When we consider the disastrous effect upon the whole country and the enormous trouble and expense of dealing with such a trouble far beyond railway communication, the committee will see the immense importance of dealing with this question, and dealing with it in such a way as to meet the exigencies of the occasion. I am bound to say that I sympathize to a great extent with the gentlemen who formed that commission. I do not entertain the idea that any member of the commission, least of all the chairman, Mr. Laird, a gentleman of long experience of public life, a gentleman who, it must be admitted, fully realized the responsibility he was taking in going beyond his instructions—I do not believe for an instant that that arrangement was come to, that Mr. Laird sanctioned the proposal that was carried out, without the strongest possible reasons and without feeling that it was his duty to the Government to take the responsibility of that particular action, that it was his duty to the Government of Canada and to the people of Canada, whose

servant he is in that particular, to place himself even in a position to be criticised for taking this responsibility. I have no doubt that any person who knows the kind of man Mr. Laird is, will endorse what I say in that respect. Then, we have a statement following that of Mr. Laird, who held very much the same opinion on the subject as I did—we have a strong statement of Father Lacombe, who only a few months ago, before he was confronted with these circumstances, held much stronger opinions on the subject, and in the same direction that hon. gentlemen opposite have expressed. Father Lacombe has been upon the spot; he has seen the circumstances of the case, and knows the extreme danger of trouble with these Indians. He knows how a spark might cause a flame which would cause trouble, would cost the people of Canada hundreds of thousands of dollars to deal with and put down. And, knowing these circumstances, knowing that a treaty could not be made if the views of the half-breeds were not met, he has changed his opinion, and has taken the great responsibility of advising the course which he knew was not in accord with my view when he left, and not in accord with his own at that time. I submit to the members of the committee that it is not likely that any one of these gentlemen has lightly advised the course which that commission has taken. I think that every member of the commission fully realized the responsibility under which he was acting, and I do not think that any one of them would sign that document without feeling that he was doing what his duty to the Government of Canada required and what was in the best interests of the country. This is one of those cases in which ordinary rules do not apply; it is one of those cases in which you cannot act as you would act in the ordinary case of departmental work, where you can put your hand on a telegraph operator, and have a message sent, and instructions changed, and new circumstances, as they arise, considered from time to time by the Government. Here we have a number of gentlemen sent off into a distant part of the country, where instructions cannot be got; and they felt that unless they succeeded in making a treaty at that time, dissatisfaction might arise, for years to come a treaty could not be made. As they have taken that responsibility, it will be great responsibility for the Government to take, if they refused to endorse the action of the commission.

Mr. DAVIN. Would the hon. Minister say how far they were from the railway when they made the first treaty?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. At Lesser Slave Lake.

Mr. DAVIN. That is about two days' journey from the railway, I think.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not know the exact number of miles.

Mr. DAVIN. I confess that I think the commissioners have taken a very high-handed course. What they have done is practically to vote want of confidence in their Minister, and put him in the very awkward position of being obliged to argue—and he argues very cleverly and very strongly—against the utterances of the Minister of the Interior who denounced, a few days ago, what these gentlemen are doing.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is quite mistaken. I did not denounce anything. I explained, in temperate terms, what was proposed. I had the views that I explained. But the commissioners and Father Lacombe, who had the same views, have changed their opinion. I do not say that my own opinion has changed. But, as they have changed their opinion, I am bound to consider that changed opinion, keeping in mind the fact that they were probably in a better position to form a sound judgment than I or any other member of the committee.

Mr. DAVIN. There is a document there that is entitled to great weight, and that is Father Lacombe's letter, but to know how to judge that, as affecting the conduct of the men, we should know whether it was written before or after they have taken the unwarranted action they have done. If it was written afterwards, as there seems some reason to believe, it does not necessarily imply that this is the deliberate opinion of Father Lacombe.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It was written after, because if he was there he would have known what was done, and he would not have written a letter advising that it should be done after it had been done. That would be impossible, unless the hon. gentleman wishes the House to assume that Father Lacombe deliberately falsified the letter.

Mr. DAVIN. No, it would not be at all necessary, if these gentlemen had taken that course, and had then gone to Father Lacombe and asked him for a letter endorsing their course. Now, I will read the language used by the hon. Minister :

The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that all these things were brought to their attention at the time.

That is, to the previous government.

They did not even take the small step I have taken in the way of changing the certificate; they let the certificate go fixed up just to suit the broker.

The very thing that is done now.

One would think the broker must have drawn the certificate himself, or got a lawyer to draw it, because there is no other explanation for it.

Mr. DAVIN.

It was drawn to enable the broker to get hold of that scrip in the easiest possible way. I think my hon. friends opposite lose sight of the fact that this is not a new question.

Then, in another place, the hon. gentleman says :

So that it is not at all the same thing to permit a man to hand his property over without any assignment at all, and to compel him to make a formal assignment of it before the transfer is complete. It will make the difference of perhaps two-fifths of the scrip being disposed of very quickly, and a very small fraction being disposed of it.

And again, when an hon. member from this side of the House said :

The Minister sees the viciousness of the old course. But why should he not depart further from it? He says it was a vicious thing to make an arrangement that enabled the half-breed to alienate his scrip the moment it came into his hands.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have a check upon that.

And again :

The safeguard is what the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well, that in four cases out of five the broker never could get an assignment executed at all. The scrip issued by the late Government did not require any assignment or endorsement, but was practically like a note of hand payable to bearer. Why was it made thus? Does the hon. gentleman suppose that the men who passed that law did not know what they were doing? The scrip was made out in that way because of the difficulty of obtaining an assignment. You can get a certificate out of the possession of a half-breed when you could not get an assignment from him signed before a witness.

Now, the hon. gentleman had sent up a form of scrip, and here is this commission, a short distance from a telegraph station abolishing the assignment without referring to the Government that created them, taking the matter entirely into their own hands. It is a most extraordinary thing. Of course, it takes away entirely the one bright spot there was in the policy of the Minister as it was explained here. I sympathize with the position of the Minister to-night. He is in a most humiliating position. He tells us frankly he has no course before him but to accept this statement on the part of his commissioners, that he did not take the right course. Now, what I fear has taken place is this: The brokers are following the commission. When they saw that the half-breeds were to have scrip that would require an assignment in order that it should be alienated, they went to the half-breeds and stirred up feelings among them; and you are not dealing in effect with the half-breeds at all, but you are dealing with the brokers. So here is the humiliating position of the Government, that they adopted a policy which had certainly one wise feature in it, and the very persons that were guarded against, that were buttressed against, these very persons, by going and making a few

half-breeds wag their tongues, and say they would not accept scrip in that way, accomplished the very ends the Minister hoped to avert. So here you have a weak commission giving away to the mutterings of a few half-breeds. My hon. friend speaks of the Hon. David Laird as a very strong man. He is a very amiable man, but he is not a strong man.

**THE MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** My experience of Mr. Laird is quite the opposite. I have found him to be a man of great firmness and great strength of character.

**MR. DAVIN.** That is not the general impression among those who know him. Their impression is that he is a weak man, and he has behaved weakly here. A little firmness shown to the half-breeds, a little statement made to them that he had no power to alter it, that the form of this scrip came from Ottawa, and the difficulty would have been got over. The Minister feels that the humiliating position in which the Hon. David Laird and his friends have placed him, and I am sorry for him, because he has to stand here to-night and argue against what he said five or six nights ago. I greatly regret what has taken place for the sake of the half-breeds.

**THE PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).** My hon. friend need shed no tears over the misfortunes of the Minister of the Interior. On the contrary, I think the Minister of the Interior has reason to congratulate himself that he has selected so prudent a commission. If the hon. gentleman will give it a moment's attention, instead of finding fault with what has taken place, he will come to the conclusion that it was the best thing that could be done. The hon. gentleman in making the inquiry he did a moment ago—at what distance were they from the railway—implies that before the commission came to the conclusion to which they came, and the position they finally adopted, they should have communicated with the Minister of the Interior, and then having communicated with him, taken his decision. But my hon. friend forgets one thing. The notices which have been given to the half-breeds and to the Indians, have been posted for twelve months, and they were to the effect that the half-breeds and the Indians would be met by the commission at certain places. Consequently, the commission could only spend a certain number of days at each place, and then they had to hurry forward, otherwise they would be unable to keep their appointments with other Indians, which would tend to break up all their arrangements. So there was no time to communicate with the Minister, they had to go on. At the Lesser Slave Lake they could only spend a certain number of days, and thence they had to go on to other places in order to meet the Indians and half-breeds according to appointment. Now, under such

circumstances, having taken counsel by themselves, what could they do? Their instructions were positive, that the old form of scrip should not be followed, but that another form should be adopted which would place it out of the power of the half-breeds to dispose of it. As the Minister of the Interior has said, what is the primary object to be sought in this matter? It is to benefit the half-breeds, it is to satisfy them, and to make them surrender their rights in the land.

If the half-breeds are not satisfied, the Indians will not be satisfied either, and if the half-breeds had created trouble and refused to take the scrip, so great is the influence they have over the Indians that the Indians would probably have refused to make a treaty, and we would have had enormous difficulty, and probably difficulty which might lead to very grave consequences. We have had experience in this matter in the North-west Territories and on the Saskatchewan. The Government dilly-dallied for a long time before coming to the conclusion that they were not satisfied to deal with the half-breeds on the Saskatchewan, as they had before dealt with the half-breeds on the Red River, and the waiting and waiting policy of to-morrow finally brought on a rebellion. Surely my hon. friend would not advise that we should delay. If it is not everything we desire, we had better come to a decision and settle these claims because, if the claims are settled and the half-breeds are satisfied, the Indians will sign a treaty, we will have peace, and there will be no trouble after having reached a settlement of this question in these distant lands. There is nothing else to do than to approve of what has been done. We would have all preferred that a settlement should have been made which would have been more beneficial to the half-breeds, but, at all events, we have secured peace in that land, and they have surrendered the territory.

**THE MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The charge of inconsistency does not alarm me at all. If I am never charged with any sin worse than inconsistency, I will be perfectly satisfied. Consistency is said by Emerson to be the bugaboo of small minds. I do not wish the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) to think that I am making an application of the remark to him.

**THE PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).** My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) will not charge you with inconsistency.

**THE MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The view which I expressed when the matter was before us was simply this, that the result of my observation had been that a change ought to be made. I made a change, believing that it could be carried out. I do not claim to have, personally,

such an accurate knowledge of the Indian and half-breed population of the Athabasca district that I could be absolutely certain that my view could be carried out. I thought that would be an improvement; I think so still, and I am very sorry that my view was not carried out. But, we have sent a competent commission up there, the best commission we could get for that purpose. They have been met by unexpected and important circumstances which have arisen in connection with this matter, and they have exercised their own judgment, and, in view of the great change that has taken place in the opinion, particularly of Father Lacombe, I am not prepared to say that their judgment was not well exercised, or that, if I had been there myself, I would not have changed my own mind. Hon. gentlemen, in discussing this question, are losing sight of what is the important thing in connection with the matter, and it is that the commission is to be congratulated upon the fact that a treaty was made with the Indians. That was the important matter, and the fact that a treaty has been made with the Indians is a matter of very great importance in connection with our affairs in the North-west Territories, because it has been possible, in the last twelve months, that there might have been trouble, which, commencing in a small way, might have become comparatively serious before it could be put down. I think the committee is to be congratulated upon the fact that the commissioners have been successful in negotiating a treaty. I am sorry the view I had intended to be carried out has not been carried out, but I am not prepared to say that the commissioners have not been wise in exercising the judgment that they did.

Mr. DAVIN. I would not be surprised if the hon. Minister of the Interior is not consistent, but I should be surprised if any member of the Government were consistent, and I am sure the apothem of Emerson, that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) gave him, that consistency is the bug-aboo of small minds, must be a great consolation to him. When I look at that Government, I am unable to get out of my head the words of an absurd character in Latin comedy—

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.  
All the talents.

Mr. DAVIN. All the talents and all the inconsistencies—"vigilans quippe somnio; vigilans dormio; sanus et vivus intereo."

Mr. MCGREGOR. Steady, steady.

Mr. DAVIN. Shall I translate it for the hon. gentleman?

Mr. MCGREGOR. No, I do not want it translated.

Mr. DAVIN. A character who dreams, and says he does not know where he is;

Mr. SIFTON.

vigilant and yet asleep; living and sound yet dead. That must be the position of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. And it would be an astonishing thing to me if in any policy, whether in regard to Indians, whether in regard to the tariff or anything else, they were consistent. To be consistent, they must be inconsistent. It reminds one of what Lord Houghton said of Goethe:

And from beauty passed to beauty,  
Constant to a constant change.

Their consistency is inconsistency, and the only possible way that you can think of them in any homogeneous light is in the kaleidoscopic position of perpetual change. The defence of the Prime Minister and the complimentary defence made by the hon. Minister of the Interior I certainly cannot and do not think the country will look on with approval. We have the spectacle of a great Government issuing a commission, that commission going off and doing its own sweet will, changing completely the boasted policy upon which the hon. Minister had prided himself. I do not think the people will look on it with approval.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to say that the hon. member for West Assinibola (Mr. Davin) is somewhat mistaken about the distance from Slave Lake to the nearest telegraph office. The distance is about 250 miles.

Mr. DAVIN. I thought it was 200 miles.

Mr. OLIVER. And the shortest time in which the journey has been made is about seven days. I do not know, if in this particular season, it can be made in that time, but that is the shortest time I ever heard of its being made in.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.  
About eight days.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, about eight days. Therefore, the position stated by the right hon. Prime Minister holds absolutely good that if the commission had delayed their operations at Slave Lake until they had communicated with Edmonton, in other words sixteen days, they would have missed their other connections throughout the country which would have been very unsatisfactory and might have produced a disastrous result. I would just add that it was very necessary from the events of the past year that an Indian treaty should be negotiated in that country. There is not a very large number of Indians, but a very considerable number of white people went into that country last year, and, unfortunately, to some extent, came into collision with the Indians, so that it was necessary that there should be an arrangement as to the rights of these Indians to avoid future collision. The practical inaccessibility of the country, up to the present time,

(or until last season, when the government of the North-west Territories, and now with the assistance of the Dominion, undertook the building of a road into the Peace River country) made it practically impossible for the Government to preserve order there except by the good-will of the Indians. Therefore, it is necessary, in the last degree, to retain the good-will of the Indians, and also of the half-breeds. The half-breed population at Lesser Slave Lake is about 1,000, so that they are in sufficient numbers and in a sufficiently favourable position to make more trouble than this Government would care to have to deal with; and trouble that it would be very expensive to deal with. In regard to the question of these villains and scoundrels, and I do not know what else they are according to gentlemen opposite—these scrip buyers who follow the commission—let it be understood that it is these men and the money which they pay for that scrip, that alone makes the scrip valuable in the eye of the half-breed. Let it be remembered that if the half-breed cannot turn the scrip into money, he does not want the scrip. And why should he? He would not consider that his title was extinguished unless he received in return something he could use. I ask again, why should he? These people who follow the commission may be very undesirable—personally, I do not know anything about it—but it is the fact of these men being prepared to pay money for that scrip that makes the scrip valuable to the half-breed, and that makes the attempt to extinguish his right effective. With all due deference to the gentlemen who differ from my view, I say that anything which detracts from the cash value of that scrip impedes the efforts that are being made by the Government to extinguish the half-breed title. The circumstances which were not within the knowledge of all the parties concerned at the time, were such that the scrip had to be made a cash article, or else the attempt to wipe out the half-breed claim would be a failure. I say that the commissioners who were sent to negotiate with the half-breeds of that country and with the Indians were well chosen, and if I am not getting into deep water, I will take the liberty of altogether disagreeing from the contention that the commissioners have put an insult upon the Government by amending the form of scrip. I say it is right and proper, when sending a commission into a far-off country to transact important business, that the members of that commission should be of such standing and character that they should be entitled to exercise their judgment so as to render their work effective. The fact of their having exercised their judgment, so far from reflecting discredit upon the Government, reflects the greatest credit possible upon the Government who appointed men of such strength of character that they were not afraid to

take the action which was shown to be necessary in order to effectively carry out the work which they were sent to do. I for one say that it was in the nature of things that this change should be made if the work of the commission was to be successful.

Mr. WALLACE. Eleven days ago the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) told us that he did not propose to follow the course followed in the past, and that he was going to adopt a new system to protect the half-breeds, and especially the minors from that wicked class of scrip financiers whom the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) is defending now. Eleven days ago the Minister (Mr. Sifton) told us:

If prevented from alienating the scrip for the first three months, the immediate danger is averted. That is the danger of the half-breeds selling their scrip to people who will follow the commissioners, and resort to the peculiar means of buying the scrip which is resorted to in such cases.

The Minister secured the commendation of Parliament for throwing that safeguard around the half-breeds, but eleven days after he announces that he is going to adopt an exactly opposite policy. The Minister told us then that there was no latitude given to the commissioners, and that their instructions were positive, but now we find that the commissioners totally ignore the instructions of the Minister, and treat them as waste paper. Under the circumstances, if I were the Minister I would send a special messenger to recall these commissioners and dismiss them at once. The First Minister told us to-night, that twelve months ago notices had been given that the commissioners would meet the Indians at certain places on certain dates, and now the commissioners report that they will not carry out the instruction of the Government, but that they will make a law for themselves without any authority or justification. We are told to-night by the Ministers that this scrip is given, not to financially benefit the half-breeds, but to satisfy them, and so we are alienating from the half-breeds hundreds of thousands, we may say millions of acres of land, without recompensing those who are entitled to recompense. The statement of the Government that this scrip is given not to financially benefit the half-breeds is most extraordinary.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not say that.

Mr. WALLACE. It was said that the prime object was to satisfy the half-breeds, but apparently the object really is to pull the wool over their eyes and to hoodwink them. Does the Government suppose that they are going to deceive the half-breeds, and that if they deceive them now, the half-breeds will not discover at a later period that they have been deceived. If the object

is not to assist the half-breeds financially, what view are they to take of it? They get the scrip supposing that they are getting something of value; but the Government say that is not the object at all, to assist the half-breeds financially; but the primary object is to satisfy them for the time being, and to compel them to surrender their rights in the land. Well, if the half-breed is the character we are told he is, a man of considerable intelligence and a man who is anxious to stand up for his rights, he will quickly discover what the Minister of the Interior has said and what the First Minister has said, that the primary object was not to assist him at all. Then he becomes, not satisfied, but dissatisfied; so that the Government, instead of promoting peace and harmony, are raising distrust and discord among that class of people—the very class it should be the object of the Government to smooth down and assist. They are giving away these millions of acres of land; but they say: "We do not care a snap of our finger whether the half-breed gets any advantage from it or not." The primary object is to deceive and mislead the half-breed—to give him to understand that he is getting some benefit, while his benefit is of the most illusory character. In transferring the scrip there is to be no form of law complied with, but the holder of it gets the benefit, whoever he may be. The camp followers who follow the commissioners, as the hon. member for West Assiniboia told us, have stirred up strife among the half-breeds, and have compelled the commissioners to take a course which is not in the interest of the half-breeds nor of the Government, nor in the interest of peace and harmony, but simply in the interest of this gang of camp followers who are following the Government commissioners for the sake of making their fortunes out of the half-breeds. And the Minister of the Interior tells us that he can do nothing now, that he is perfectly helpless, that his hands are tied, that he cannot remedy what he himself tells us is a great wrong. He says, "I do not think I am so wise as I thought I was a week or ten days ago, or some months ago, when I gave these instructions to the commissioners"—he had not as intimate a knowledge of the Indians of the North Saskatchewan as some others had. Though he made that positive statement a week or ten days ago, he does not adhere to it now, as he has not the same confidence in his opinion or his ability that other people have in theirs. I admire his humility and self-abnegation. The Minister, when it suits his interest, shows himself to be as meek and humble as the late lamented Uriah Heep. The Government claimed to have a well-considered scheme, one which should commend itself to the people of the country, one which in that short time the hon. Minister recommended to the people of the country, and for which he received their approval in

Mr. WALLACE.

this Parliament; yet to-day the hon. gentleman says: "I was altogether mistaken; I thought I was right, but I am a person who does not claim to have all the knowledge and wisdom on this subject, and from the fact that I find that the commission, at the dictation of the scrip purchasers, have changed the whole policy, I must give my approval to what they have done, though I am reversing the course I took ten days ago." I do not think that will meet with the approval of the country. I do not think it will be good for the district where this has taken place, but that it will lead to troubles in the future which I am sure every one of us is anxious to avoid. If mistakes have been made in the past, surely we should profit by the experience of the past, and endeavour to take a course which will prevent these difficulties in the future; but the Minister has not done so. He says there were errors and difficulties in the past; he denounced them a week ago. He asked our approval a week ago for one course, and to-night he is asking our approval for another course, without giving any reason for the change, except that the commissioners who have been sent to that country have ignored the instructions which he gave them, have ignored the law, and have taken a different course.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to relieve the mind of the hon. member (Mr. Wallace) as to the difficulties that are likely to arise because the Government have not sufficiently assisted the half-breeds in the issue of this scrip. The half-breeds of that country are not asking for assistance from this Government under the present circumstances. They do not assume that position on this occasion. They are asking for what they consider to be their rights. They claim that they have certain rights to scrip, and when the Government deals with them in regard to those rights, and gives to them the scrip to which they are entitled, I say, so far as my knowledge of them goes—and it goes a little further than that of any other member of this House—that there will be no trouble, and they will be satisfied.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the scrip under these circumstances has little value, would they be as well satisfied as they would if the scrip had considerable value?

Mr. OLIVER. They are satisfied if the Government discharges its duty to them by giving them scrip which they can dispose of to the best possible advantage. They would not be satisfied if the Government gave them scrip which they could not dispose of to the best possible advantage. That is the reason why the change was made by the commissioners. But I say that if the Government pay the half-breeds what the half-breeds consider they are entitled to, there will be no trouble. In proof of what I say, I would remind the hon. gentleman that the

scrip was given to the half-breeds of Manitoba and the North-west Territories according to an arrangement that was made with them. It has been alleged that much of that scrip passed out of the hands of the half-breeds without reasonable value being received for it. But there is yet to be recorded a single kick from any of the half-breeds of Manitoba or the North-west Territories who received scrip, that they wanted more, or that the Government had not dealt fairly with them. These people are business people, they know what they are doing just as well as any other people; they understand a bargain just as well, they are not lacking in intelligence any more than other men; they know that if they are entitled to a certain thing and get it, the matter is settled, and they are as good people to stand by their arrangements as any other in the world.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to deal with another subject, but one still germane to Dominion lands. The hon. gentleman is aware that several times I brought before him a matter which I hope in consequence is in better shape, but I would like to submit to him a petition that no doubt has already come into his hands directly. It is a petition to the hon. gentleman from the Moose Jaw Agricultural Society and town residents and settlers throughout the district, with regard to seed grain in bonds. After recounting the circumstances that led to the issue of seed grain the petition goes on to say:

That the community were thus brought face to face with a dilemma: either to go bondsmen for their less fortunate neighbours—while they frequently had more than enough to do to keep their own heads above water—or see the most needful in the community go without seed and their lands go to weeds.

That the result was, all got bondsmen and seed.

That in consequence of the crop grown from the said seed turning out, as above stated, another miserable failure, many quit the struggle, left the country, or sought a livelihood from some other employment, and left the bonds to be paid by their bondsmen.

That patents have since been granted to individuals without settlement of said bonds; but on examination it is seen that said bonds are registered against said lands, and entered on said patents, constituting a bar to mortgage or sale, and a continual encumbrance.

That we, therefore, respectfully petition and urge that the said bonds be all cancelled; and that if, unfortunately, payment of relief is demanded contrary to the prayer of this petition, that each be only charged for what he personally received, without interest; and that the bad debts, if any there be, shall be borne by the Dominion Government, and not by the settlers, who, through feelings of compassion and humanity, came to the relief of their less fortunate neighbours.

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

J. E. BATTELL,  
Pres. Moose Jaw Agricultural Society.  
B. FLETCHER,  
Secretary.

Then there is another petition I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister. It is a petition concerning the interest on pre-emptions, and reads as follows:—

Memorial to the Hon. Mr. Sifton, Minister of the Interior, and to the Dominion Government, by the Moose Jaw Agricultural Society and town residents and settlers throughout the district:

That a grievance exists in the North-west, the result, we believe, of an oversight or an anomaly in the Dominion Lands Act, re homesteads and pre-emptions.

That the homestead law, as it applied and was in force in pioneer days, enacted that a settler could take up a homestead and pre-emption and have three years to complete his duties, and was then supposed, but not compelled, to apply for his patent.

That immediately on applying for and getting his patent, interest at the rate of six per cent per annum began to accrue on his pre-emption.

That many settlers fulfilled their settlement duties promptly and applied for their patents, thus fulfilling in the letter and spirit the homestead law requirements; while others, equally, if not more numerous, took advantage of the law, not being compulsory as to the time when they should apply for their patents, and held their pre-emptions many years without being charged any interest, thus saving \$24 a year.

That those who fulfilled their settlement duties in the letter and spirit of the law felt, and still feel, aggrieved, that the Government thus favoured the law-breaker instead of the law-keeper, and accordingly stopped making payments on their pre-emptions, money being much needed for other necessary purposes.

That they memorialized the late Government on the matter, asking that both parties should be placed on the same footing, not by retroactive legislation compelling those to pay interest who were exempt by the letter of the law, but by cancelling the interest on the pre-emptions of those who fulfilled the law in the letter and spirit.

That the late Government failed to make known their decision in this matter.

That we respectfully solicit a decision on this, to us, important matter, as there is a disquieting feeling prevalent amongst the pioneers as to what they may be required to do regarding both principal and interest on their pre-emptions; and we express a hope that, in the event of an unfavourable reply, they be not taken short in this matter.

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

Then comes a petition on tree planting which I would also ask the permission of the House to read. After reciting a number of circumstances bearing upon the question of tree planting, the petition goes on to say:

That to purchase right of way, fence, cultivate and caretake would require a very large first outlay, and a yearly grant for many years.

That in view of the vast benefit that would be derived by resident settlers, and the great stimulus it would give to immigration to have groves of trees planted, properly cultivated and successfully grown in every district where no bluffs existed; that resident settlers be encouraged and prompted to plant belts of trees around their homes or premises.

That the money required to carry out the plan suggested by Professor Robertson, if spent to encourage and prompt tree-planting amongst settlers around their homes or premises, would effectually fulfil the purpose aimed at by the worthy Professor and the Government that prompted him to it, and would avoid the many difficulties of the six-mile belt system.

That if payment of principal or interest on pioneer pre-emptions would be accepted for a specified area of successful tree-planting properly fenced and thoroughly cultivated by each resident settler, it would be accepted as a great boon by the pioneers, and would be eagerly grasped at and successfully carried out.

That in addition to the successful tests made by Mr. McKay, of the Experimental Farm at Indian Head, resident settlers without Government or any other outward assistance, and without the expenditure of money except fencing and thorough continuous cultivation, without the application of manure or one pailful of water, have successfully raised belts of trees, without any loss from frost-killing in winter or hot winds or drouth in summer, with an average growth of two feet per annum.

That if a part of the yearly Dominion immigration grant was spent in promoting and stimulating tree-planting, in procuring water and preventing prairie fires in the North-west, that in addition to being a vast boon to resident settlers, it would so very largely improve and transform the appearance of the country, increase the value of property, and make life and home more congenial and comfortable on the treeless prairie, besides turning resident settlers into volunteer immigration agents; that the purpose aimed at by voting an annual immigration grant of upwards of \$250,000 would be more speedily and satisfactorily accomplished than by expending all, as at present, in giving assisted passages and the spreading of immigration literature in the east, &c., &c.

Your memorialists, therefore, earnestly pray that a considerable portion of the annual immigration grant be spent in the North-west as suggested in this and accompanying memorials.

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

Three of those petitions I have brought before the hon. gentleman to-night, and on a previous occasion I brought a fourth petition before him. At this late hour I will not take up the time of the committee by enforcing any of the prayers of these petitions. With reference to one of them especially, the hon. Minister knows my views and that they go a great deal further than the petition. I refer to the petition with regard to seed grain, but as the hon. gentleman knows my views I will not take up the time of the committee further to-night by giving expressions to them.

**THE MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The question of the method of dealing with the bondsmen on the seed-grain debt is a question on which I hope to submit a Bill this session. I had thought I could not get to it this session, because I thought some time ago that the session would close earlier. But I apprehend now that I shall be able to bring it up for consideration early next week. I have already under consideration the other two petitions that the hon. gentle-

Mr. DAVIN.

man has referred to, one of them be that relating to tree-planting, which is worthy of great consideration. I have the greatest interest in the subject and will give it my best attention.

Dominion Lands—

Chargeable to income..... \$91,108 80

Mr. DAVIN. Does not the Minister think he has made good progress with his Estimates and—

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is early yet.

Mr. DAVIN. Some members who are not present desire to speak on this vote.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is practically unchanged, except a small increase in the outside service.

Mr. DAVIN. Is this the last vote that the Minister intends to take to-night?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have a number of small votes on the following page. Then I have items 92 to 95 inclusive, under the head of immigration. There is item 220, salaries and expenses of the administration in the Yukon. These are all matters that have been discussed in the House this session.

Mr. DAVIN. What is the explanation of this increase of \$3,198?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is caused by the fact that we have two additional employees, Mr. Perrin and Mr. Taylor, who were taken from the immigration office at Winnipeg, and transferred to the Dominion Lands branch. Then the salary of one timber agent has been increased by \$100. We are having about \$1,000 additional for expenses in connection with the forests which are being attended to more closely than before.

Mr. DAVIN. It is now twenty minutes to twelve, and I think if we allow this vote to go through the Minister should be satisfied. We have had a very laborious week. When does the hon. Minister propose to rise?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think we can finish these votes to which I have referred. This item of Dominion lands does not involve any special discussion, the vote being practically unchanged. The immigration vote was discussed for three-quarters of a day during the present week. Then, as to the question of the Yukon, it has been discussed for weeks. The vote I desire to take in connection with it is for salaries for the department. The subject will come up again under other items, and hon. gentlemen will have ample opportunity to discuss it. There is no use of discussing a subject on every item. There is no reason why we should adjourn at twenty minutes to twelve.

Mr. WALLACE. I think there is good reason. This is not a very full House, barely a quorum being present. We want a fair discussion of these subjects. There has been no attempt to prolong the debate, as the Minister will admit.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no fault to find at all.

Mr. WALLACE. Fair progress has been made. If the hon. Minister fixes an hour when the House should adjourn, that would be all right, but he must not ask that we put the whole of his Estimates through, for that would not be a fair proposition. I can say to the Minister also—what he knows himself—that by adjourning at twelve or half-past twelve the greatest progress is made.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I quite admit that hon. gentlemen on the other side have treated me quite fairly, and I do not wish to act improperly by treating them unfairly. I think if they will pass these items and the miscellaneous on the next page I will allow the immigration and the Yukon items to stand.

Expenses of Government in the district of Keewatin ..... \$2,190

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is to pay the expense incurred by the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, who acts in the capacity of Lieutenant-Governor of Keewatin.

Mr. WALLACE. Could the Minister tell us where Keewatin is?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Keewatin is a sort of no man's land; it runs to the north-west of Manitoba. The Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba has a sort of general supervision over it, but the functions of government are not very actively exercised there. However, there is some slight expense connected with it. The estimate is about the same every year. The increase this year is caused by the travelling expenses of Lieutenant-Governor Patterson. Here are his estimates:

I have the honour to inclose estimates of expenditure for the district of Keewatin for the year 1899-1900. I hope the item for travelling expenses will not be cut out, as was the case during the past year, as I wish to visit posts in the districts this summer which I was unable to reach during my visit in 1897.

The estimates are as follows:—Private secretary, \$600; clerk, \$480; travelling expenses through the district of Keewatin, \$750; stationery, \$50; postage, \$10; charity fund to be distributed by J. K. McDonald, J.P., of Norway House, \$200; miscellaneous, \$100, making a total of \$2,190.

For the relief of distressed Canadians in foreign countries other than the United States ..... \$450

Mr. PRIOR. Does that include relief for miners in the Yukon country?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In the supplementary Estimates we take a vote of \$25,000 under this head. We have sent an expedition to the Hudson Bay by way of the Stikine River, and provisions are being distributed to the men through the Hudson's Bay Company. We cannot tell how much the expenditure will be, but we have instructed the company by telegram to go ahead and convey provisions.

Mr. PRIOR. There is a case to which I wish to call attention on the Stikine River. It seems the Government had made some arrangements, as the Minister says, with the Hudson's Bay Company to relieve them, but before that was done the relief was sent to them by the Alaska Trading and Transportation Company at the request of the provincial agent there. They got in quite a lot of food and stuff to them. Now they write a letter to me, which I only received yesterday, and think they should have some compensation. I have not yet had a chance to bring it before the Minister. Now the Government are subsidizing the Hudson's Bay Company's steamers to run up the river to look after men in cases like that, and this steamer is in competition with the Alaska Transportation Company, which they think hardly fair, as their boat was put on the river before the Hudson's Bay Company's steamer. They were the first to take up the relief, and now the Government subsidizes the Hudson's Bay Company's steamer, which now takes all the business away from them. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to bring this matter up on some other item, we will let it stand for to-night.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Certainly, the hon. gentleman can bring it up on going into Committee of Supply. If he wishes to speak of it in the House, I would be glad if he would let me have a statement of the matter, so that I could deal with it. The members of the committee will see that the consequence that follows in the apparently unfair competition with a private company's steamboat is not a consequence that is contemplated by the Government.

Maintenance, construction of roads, bridges and other necessary works in connection with the Hot Springs reservation, near Banff Station, Northwest Territories ..... \$9,800

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The items connected with this resolution are as follows:—The salaries are the same. We are asking for \$2,500 for repairs to buildings in the park. Any gentleman who has been at the park will admit that that is a desirable expenditure. The buildings have not been in a state creditable to the country. We are taking \$1,000 for repairing roads; we are taking for new roads \$500; for painting the bridge over the Bow

River, \$600; for small contingencies, \$480. We are taking \$1,000 for taking care of a herd of buffalo, including the salary of the caretaker. I may say that the enterprise we engaged in in a small way for the purpose of preserving the buffalo has turned out very successful. The herd are getting on phenomenally well.

Mr. WALLACE. How many are there?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have about sixteen. Three of them came from Texas, contributed to the Government as a gift by Mr. Thomas G. Blackstock, of Toronto, on condition that we paid the freight on them. The rest of them were given by Lord Strathcona. They were in rather a dilapidated condition when we got them, but they are in good condition now, and doing well. Then, we have \$1,300 for new piping to carry the hot water down to the sanitarium. That makes \$9,800.

Mr. DAVIN. I forget whether any means are adopted to get an income from the spring.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. What income does it bring?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman will find the information in the annual report.

Committee rose, and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether he can inform the House what the Government intend to take up on Monday?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Government intend to go on with Supply, but before Supply some of the smaller Bills will be taken up.

Mr. PRIOR. I would also like to ask the hon. Minister if he can say whether the supplementary Estimates will be down on Monday?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We hope that the supplementary Estimates will be down early in the week.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. Minister inform us what are the smaller Bills to which he refers?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are two or three on the Order paper—one as to public health, and one or two more, perhaps one respecting shipping. The main business will be Supply.

Mr. WALLACE. But the hon. Minister intends to bring these Bills up?

Mr. SIFTON.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will not say absolutely; they may come up.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to know.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman more than that. The right hon. Prime Minister thought that possibly we might bring up the Public Health Bill, and perhaps some of the smaller Bills. There is nothing of great importance.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.00 a.m. (Saturday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 17th July, 1899.

### ABSENCE OF MR. SPEAKER.

Upon the meeting of the House at Three o'clock,

The CLERK said: I have the honour to inform the House that on account of the unavoidable absence of the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker will take the Chair, in accordance with statute.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER thereupon took the Chair.

### PRAYERS.

### PORT GEORGE, N.S.—PETITION FOR PIER IN HARBOUR.

Mr. MILLS asked:

Has any application been made by any one to have another pier at Port George, Annapolis county, to be located on the east side of the harbour formed by the present pier? Is it the intention of the Government to build such pier?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). A petition of the nature referred to has been received, and the matter is under consideration.

### DEATH OF THE HON. W. B. IVES.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, the very melancholy duty again devolves upon me of referring to the sudden and untimely death of one of my late colleagues and a member of this House. I have conferred with my right hon. friend the leader of the House, who would have been most glad to have met this melancholy occasion by the adjournment of the House had not the present state of public business and the period of the session rendered that almost impossible. I need not say to this House,

of which the late Mr. Ives has been so long a member, that perhaps no gentleman could be removed from this House whose absence would create a greater void. As an able lawyer, as a man of great business enterprise and capacity, as a member of the legislature for many years, and as an administrator of an important public department, Mr. Ives has filled an honourable place in this country, and has well and faithfully discharged the various duties devolving upon him. In the Eastern Townships of Canada, and in regard to the English-speaking population of the province of Quebec, he occupied a very important position, as every person in the House well knows, and I am quite certain that his loss will be deplored not alone by his Conservative friends in this House but by every member of the House, as perhaps no man on either side of the House to a larger extent enjoyed the kindly feeling and friendly regard of all who compose its membership. To me and to the party to which he belonged, his loss is a very great one indeed; and to Parliament and the country at large it is a loss that must necessarily be severely felt. Death has visited the members of this Parliament in an extraordinary degree during the present session. It is only a short time since one of the most prominent and distinguished Senators of the country, who left us in the enjoyment of a fair amount of health and vigour, and whom we expected to see return to us in a few days—I need not say that I refer to the late Hon. Senator Sanford—was suddenly snatched away by death. It only reminds us how frail, how slight, is the tenure by which we hold our positions here. I am quite sure that every member of this House will join in tendering their heartfelt sympathy, not only to the family of my late lamented colleague, Mr. Ives, but also to the family of the late Senator Sanford, who have been bereaved in both instances in such a remarkably sudden manner of the heads of those families.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, on behalf of those who sit on this side of the House, and who were not the political friends of the late Mr. Ives, I beg the privilege of joining my voice to the voice of the hon. leader of the Opposition, who has so feelingly spoken of his untimely death. I re-echo fully what he has said, that it would have been to me and to my friends a most agreeable though painful act, to have adjourned the House in order to testify all the more to the high esteem in which he was held among us. Mr. Ives, I need not remind you, was one of the most influential, important, and useful members of this House. Hon. gentlemen who came into this Parliament at the last general elections, were perhaps unable to appreciate him as fully as others, because being much engaged in commercial and business pursuits, he had not of late taken the same active part

that he did in former years in the proceedings of this House; but those who have sat in the House with him for the last twenty years, can testify that he always imparted much useful information to the discussion of every subject he chose to speak upon. On some questions, indeed, it is not too much to say that he was an authority. In everything that pertained to finance, business, commerce, agriculture, lumbering and mining, he had a vast amount of knowledge and a great deal of experience, which enabled him to speak on all these questions as a master, and his loss amongst us will be all the more felt when we have to deal with such questions as these. To his friends, his political friends particularly, I can realize that the blow must be a very severe one, because he was a man of great wisdom in council, of great pertinacity of views, and of unflinching courage, and these qualities must have been invaluable to his party. I may perhaps be permitted to say that to myself personally, the death of Mr. Ives is a particularly sad one, because before I had the opportunity of meeting him in this House, when he and I were both young, struggling lawyers, we had occasion often to follow the same circuits. Many a time we were engaged together, sometimes on one side, sometimes on opposite sides, in the keen contests of the bar; and it is a pleasure for me to remember that the friendship we enjoyed at that time continued to the last to be of the most cordial character. I may be permitted, therefore, for myself and on behalf of my friends, to join in the expression of deep sympathy which we all feel for his wife and his friends in their sad bereavement. I may say also that I cordially join in the expression of sympathy which the hon. leader of the Opposition has uttered in reference to the death of the late Mr. Sanford. His death was a particularly sad one to his family, and under such circumstances the melancholy of death appeals to us all the more keenly.

#### EMPLOYMENT OF A. F. MARTIN, D.L.S.

Mr. ROCHE (by Mr. Davin) asked :

1. Is Mr. A. F. Martin, D.L.S., an employee of this Government as a surveyor in Manitoba, or has he been employed to do any work during this season?
2. If so, is he the same gentleman who is the Liberal candidate for the constituency of Woodlands in the ensuing elections in that province?
3. Will his services be continued by the Government while he is engaged in party politics?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). Mr. A. F. Martin is not an employee of the Government, but is the holder of a contract for surveying. He is not therefore under the control of the Government, and the Government has no power to sever whatever connection there may be between him and the Government.

**ADMINISTRATION OF YUKON—  
"TIMES" CORRESPONDENT.**

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to read to the House a telegram that, on June 29th, was sent to the London "Times":

Ottawa, June 29th, 1899.

Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, in his speech last night arraigning the Government's methods in the Yukon district, declared that the condition of affairs in the Yukon was satisfactory until Mr. Sifton took charge; that in his administration of the Yukon the Minister had been guilty of serious neglect of duty and maladministration; that he had misstated facts in Parliament as to his information upon the requirements of the district; that he appointed mining inspectors who were incapable and corrupt; that Mr. Sifton's late law partners were illegally given gold leases; that Dawson City was so shamefully neglected as to sanitary arrangements that an epidemic resulted; that several officers named were guilty of corruption in office and took bribes; that official information was improperly disclosed; that Judge Dugas became improperly interested in mining claims, and that the late Commissioner Walsh acted improperly in the discharge of his duties and brought contempt upon Canada.

Mr. Sifton, replying to Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper to-day, maintained that the Government had not been guilty of neglect or delay in administering Yukon affairs. He denied emphatically that he granted a gold-dredging lease to his late law partner, but if he had done so there would be nothing wrong in his action. Commissioner Ogilvie made a careful inquiry into the charges of alleged wrong-doing, and his report, as far as it went, completely exonerated the officials. When his full report was received, the Government would consider it, and if it were found that a further and more complete investigation was required the Government would provide for it, but Ministers did not consider it proper that the question of their political responsibility should be taken from Parliament and sent to a commission of judges, as demanded by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.

On June 30th this telegram was sent to the "Times":—

The House of Commons, by a majority of 50, to-day rejected Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper's motion for a judicial inquiry into the administration of the Yukon. Three Liberals voted for the motion.

On July 3rd occurs the leader of the "Times" that I took the liberty, on a similar occasion to this, to quote to the House. I am not going to make any comments, so it will not be necessary for me to move the adjournment of the House. I wish only to point out to my right hon. friend that nothing could be more restrained than the language of that telegram, that it is most restrained within the limits of what actually occurred, and that therefore the language used by my right hon. friend on that occasion:

All I have to say to my hon. friend on the present occasion is that we have another Richard Pigott, another slanderer in the land, and that the "Times" has once more been made the

Mr. SIFTON.

victim of a hoax, written by somebody on this side of the ocean—

I think my right hon. friend will feel that that language was not quite within that circle of urbanity that usually characterizes whatever falls from him, and he will, no doubt, make an amend to the "Times" correspondent.

**SUPPLY.**

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

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

The Department of Public Works—

Civil Government ..... \$45,950

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The increase is due to a number of the clerks having received statutory increases. There is nothing else.

Mr. BERGERON. How many received it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There were thirteen eligible for the increase, and six got it.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the hon. gentleman give the names in each case?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The following get the statutory increase:—

A. G. Kingston, R. C. DesRoches, R. J. Robillard, H. Rouleau, F. Gélinas, J. T. Costigan.

The following do not get the increase:—

E. F. E. Roy, J. C. Taché, J. A. Theriault, E. Dionne, T. J. McLaughlin, R. Bouchette, J. F. Hyndman.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. On a former occasion I brought this subject forward; and I would like for a single moment to draw the attention of the Government to the very unsatisfactory manner in which the civil service are dealt with. The arrangement of withholding the regular statutory increase from the civil service as a body and selecting certain persons who are to enjoy it, without any reference to the terms upon which that statutory increase formerly was given, I think, ought to receive the attention of the Government. I suggested on a former occasion that, as a number of lawyers in this House, gentlemen of standing in their profession, were of opinion that the members of the civil service had absolutely legal claim to the statutory increase, where their conduct was such as to merit the approval and recommendation of the Deputy Minister, the question, in my judgment, ought to be settled. If it be the policy of the Government to change the law, as it was held to be for many years, and no longer to withhold the statutory increase

from persons whose neglect of duty or other cause prevented them from claiming the recommendation of the Deputy Minister, that would be one thing. But, as the opinion is held that under the existing law, a fiat granted by the Government would enable a civil servant who was in a position to comply with the requirements of the law and the practice under it, to obtain redress, I think that matter should be settled; I think the Government should either refer that matter to the Supreme Court for its opinion, or they should provide the means of having a friendly suit that would settle the question. And, if it be found that the law is being violated, as in my humble judgment and in the opinion of many who are much better qualified than I to form an opinion on a legal question, it is, then let the Government comply with the law, or else introduce such an amendment as will enable them to withhold the statutory increase at their will without assigning a reason for it. This is a matter that affects a large number of civil servants who entertain the confident belief that they are being dealt with illegally. I think it is most undesirable that in regard to the administration of public affairs there should be a case in which a single doubt can arise as to whether, in dealing with the civil service, the Government were complying with the law or not.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). The statements made by my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) clearly show that this is a matter on which legal gentlemen have differences of opinion, for he states that he is advised by excellent lawyers that the law, as it stands, gives the civil servant an absolute right to a statutory increase—

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Under certain conditions. I do not say they have an absolute right, except where they have obtained the approval and recommendation of the Deputy Minister.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. My hon. friend is aware, from what occurred in a previous debate—

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. I was not here.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. But the hon. gentleman is probably aware, from his general knowledge of the subject, that we were advised by the Minister of Justice, to whom the subject was referred, that the construction the hon. gentleman gives to the law was not the proper construction, and upon that advice, which was concurred in by other legal gentlemen of eminence, we adopted the policy which has been proclaimed in Parliament. If we were persuaded that my hon. friend's view of the law was correct, I am afraid we should be obliged to introduce an amendment to the Civil Service Act, because the Government

does not think it is desirable that a civil servant should have an absolute right to that increase. We have, under advice and subject to the difference of opinion that the hon. gentleman has stated, held that there is a measure of discretion in the Governor in Council; and, if it were shown that that discretion did not exist, I think there would be strong reason for introducing such an amendment to the law as would confer it, because the Government holds that this increase should not be granted year after year, unless the officer has merited it by special work. I am free to admit that, for my own part, I am not satisfied with the present method of selection. Admitting that there should be the discretion to which I have referred, there should be some uniform method of selection, and I have been endeavouring to devise some means, not in amendment of the law, but of the machinery by which it is carried out, whereby we might have a system with something like uniformity in the rules under which selection is to be made. The same reasons may not govern the one Minister in recommending a civil servant for the increase that may govern another. If it is possible to devise some means of greater uniformity, so that it may be as much as possible a matter of merit, and as little as possible a matter of favour, I should like to see that done. So far as the present time and the Estimates now under consideration are concerned, the Government have to hold to their present view, taken under legal advice, though, no doubt, legal gentlemen on the other side might give a different opinion.

Mr. **McNEILL**. I think it would be difficult to find a matter of greater importance to bring before this House than that which has just been brought forward by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper). I take it, Sir, that a good civil service is one of the essentials to the continued prosperity of any country. I did not know that this matter was coming up, but I happen to have in my hand at this moment Lecky's "Democracy and Liberty," and I find that on page 45 of that very able work, a work which has commanded such attention, and is regarded of such great weight and authority, I find this:

A good permanent civil service has often saved a country when its nominal rulers were utterly untrustworthy.

It is absolutely impossible, I think to aggregate the benefit of the civil service to the country; and any course of policy on the part of the Government which causes the civil servant to feel that he is not in such a position as he ought to be in, is calculated to impair the usefulness of the service. The course that has been pursued by the Government in regard to the matter which the hon. leader of the Opposition has

brought to the notice of the House, has caused the feeling among the civil servants that they have not been kept faith with by the Government of this country; and I do not think that any greater mischief could very well be imagined than that such a feeling should exist among the civil service.

Now, I would like to ask my hon. friend what possible reason there is for refusing to have this matter settled. Why should we not know absolutely and definitely what the law is with regard to this matter? Is there any reason why we should not know? Is there any reason why the civil servants should not know? Is there not every reason why the civil servants should know? If civil servants are not entitled to this statutory increase legally it is very much better that they should know that is the case. It is very much better they should know that, than that they should imagine that they are not only being unkindly treated by the Government, but that they are being illegally deprived of that which they can claim. If I understand the hon. gentleman aright, he says that he does not think the statutory increase should be given to the civil servants. That is another matter altogether. We are not discussing what the views of the hon. gentleman, or the views of the Government, may be, with regard to this matter. If the Government think that it is not good policy to give the statutory increase to the civil servants, why, that is one question; but it is another question whether the men who are now in the service have a right to the statutory increase. I say that if they have a legal right to that statutory increase, it does not matter one straw what the views of the Government may be on the subject. If these men have a right to the statutory increase they must get it; and surely the Government are not going to stand up and say: We will block this inquiry; we imagine that they have not got the right; but whether we are right or wrong, we are not going to have this matter settled because we do not wish them to have the statutory increase. That is the view, I understand, that is put forward by the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not exactly.

Mr. McNEILL. Well, pretty nearly so. I understood him to say he did not approve of the statutory increase.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that.

Mr. McNEILL. I understood him to say he admitted that there were able, legal members of this House who believed that the civil servants have a legal right to that statutory increase.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend said so, and I assume that is correct.

Mr. McNEILL. And the hon. the Minister of Finance repeated the statement.

Mr. McNEILL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I assume it is correct, if the hon. gentleman says so.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. Minister of Finance did not deny it, he did not deny that there is a body of legal opinion in this House which holds that this is a legal right of which the civil servants are being deprived. Well, if there be such a body of legal opinion which holds that the civil servants are being deprived of a legal right, I want to know on what ground the Government refuse to have that matter settled and determined authoritatively. I do not think anything more mischievous could be imagined than that the whole body of civil servants should know that a large body of able legal opinion is satisfied that they are being illegally deprived of this statutory increase. On what possible ground does the Government refuse to do what my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has asked that they should do? The only ground I heard my hon. friend allege was that he did not approve of the statutory increase. Surely that is no ground, that is not law. What is the law? That is what we want to know, and that is what my hon. friend will not let us know. My hon. friend says: I disapprove, and the Government disapprove of giving the statutory increase. We want to have an authoritative opinion as to what the meaning of the Act is. I have heard no argument or no reason whatever assigned why we should not have that authoritative opinion, except the statement of my hon. friend that he disapproves of the statutory increase, and I think that is a very poor reason.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot quite understand my hon. friend's position. He says that if this is a right, the civil servant must have this increase whether the Government will or no. Well, if that is so, we need not debate it this afternoon, because if there is a "must" in it, and whether the Government will or no the civil servant must get this, that ends the matter. I take it for granted that by some process my hon. friend knows they will get it. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition stated that he was aware that eminent legal authorities differ from the Government in this matter. I am bound to accept the hon. gentleman's statement at once; he would not make that statement unless he had been advised, I presume, by some legal gentlemen. But the Government are obliged to take their law from their proper adviser, the Minister of Justice. In this matter they acted under the advice of a gentleman who is not now in the Ministry, a gentleman who has a high reputation as a constitutional lawyer in this country, Sir Oliver Mowat, who advised the Government that they had discretion with regard to these statutory increases. But we are told to-day: Why don't we take some means of having a decision thereon. I am not aware that any proposal was

made before the last fifteen minutes to take such a decision.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I made the proposal a year ago.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend says we ought to ascertain what the law is on this point. Well, it is quite competent for any civil servant to obtain a fiat, and take the case into the courts, but I have not heard up to this moment of any application for such a fiat. I am not aware that any civil servant challenges the soundness of the law under which the Government are acting in this matter. The Government have obtained legal advice that the law authorizes them to do precisely the thing which they are doing; believing that there is a measure of discretion in the Governor in Council in this matter, they are exercising that discretion, and awarding the statutory increases in certain cases and denying them in others. I am not aware of any application ever having been made to the courts by any civil servant challenging our legal view of the matter that all civil servants should not obtain increases. That those who do not obtain increases are dissatisfied, is highly probable, I would not be inclined to doubt that. All I can say is that the Government are acting under competent legal advice, the only legal advice which the Government are at liberty to accept.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to say to my hon. friend that what we ask is simply that there shall be an authoritative opinion, that the Government will assist in having an authoritative opinion upon this question which is in dispute. My hon. friend says that Sir Oliver Mowat has given an opinion to the Government. We have asked over and over again to have that opinion laid upon the Table of the House, and we have never seen that opinion.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was brought down last year.

Mr. McNEILL. I asked for it, and I have never seen it, it has never been laid on the Table of the House that I am aware of. At all events, we have not been told till this session that Sir Oliver Mowat said that if the Deputy Minister recommended the increase, the Government had power to refuse it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will answer my hon. friend at once. I do not recollect the words of Sir Oliver Mowat's advice, but certainly that was the substance of his advice. I do not remember whether he reported in writing or verbally. I am not aware that any one ever asked to have the opinion laid on the Table of the House; but I say at once that the substance of Sir Oliver's advice was that the discretion did remain in the Governor in Council, because we have been acting on it ever since.

Mr. McNEILL. We would like to see the words, if possible. I think my hon. friend, when he looks into the matter, will find that he has gone a little too far in his statement that he has made as to Sir Oliver Mowat's views, although I am quite sure he is perfectly sincere in the statement that he has made. But waiving that matter altogether, why should the Government not assist in having this cleared up? The hon. gentleman says that no civil servant has challenged the course of the Government. Well, now, what civil servant is going to challenge the course of the Government? My hon. friend knows very well that civil servants are not in a position to come forward and to challenge the acts of the Government in a hostile sense. It is only a matter of the simplest fair-play, and surely no Government could refuse such a request; we are simply asking for an authoritative statement as to what the law is. We ask the Government to assist us to obtain that, and I am sure it is not very much to ask. I am quite sure that it is such a request as the country will endorse. Suppose that it does cost money to give this statutory increase! When a civil servant has entered into an arrangement with this country to the effect that he is entitled to this increase, have we any right to say that because it costs money we will not pay it? I regard it as a crying scandal that men, having been induced to enter the civil service on the distinct understanding that they should get this increase, and every civil servant has entered it upon that understanding, that the Government should turn around and say: We will not carry out that understanding, and that they should take refuge behind a miserable legal technicality to deprive these men of the statutory increase that they believed they were entitled to when they entered the service of the country. We are simply asking the Government, as a matter of fair-play to have this matter decided once and for all, so that we may know what the legal status of the civil service is. I should wish to be understood as saying this, that I, of course, consider that if the Government believe that the statutory increase ought not to be granted, they have a perfect right to make any new rules they like for new men. But, I say that, in respect to men who went into the civil service on a distinct understanding, that understanding ought to be faithfully carried out.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that any person with an unbiassed mind, who reads the Civil Service Act, can come to any other conclusion than that the clause relating to statutory increases is entirely subject to the recommendation of the deputy head or the head of the department. If the deputy head or the head of the department does not think

that a civil servant is entitled to an increase, he is not obliged to report favourably on the application. I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill), who has been an employer of labour, has always found that all his clerks are equally meritorious. If the deputy head or the head of the department chooses, owing to the fact of the efficiency of the civil servant and his devotion to duty, to grant him an increase, it is quite right he should have one; but if, on the other hand, the clerk is not up to the mark or is inefficient in the performance of his duties, he has a perfect right to decline to recommend him an increase. I have never, in my own business experience, found all my clerks equally meritorious. If the law is properly administered and all clerks that are entitled on account of meritorious service, to an increase are granted an increase, I think that is all that can be asked. If the law is mandatory, if every clerk is to have an increase, and if there were no reservation, the deputy head or the head of the department would have to recommend that everybody get it. If my hon. friend will read the Act, he will find that it provides that in every application, the deputy head and the head of the department must join in recommending that an additional amount be granted. If this is the case, if the Act is mandatory, I cannot see the necessity for making such a condition as that, because otherwise every member of the civil service would be entitled to the increase. I admit that the Civil Service Act should be recast, and I am sorry that it was not done long ago. The hon. leader of the Opposition was a member of the Government that appointed a royal commission upon two occasions to investigate and report upon the conditions of the civil service of the country. But the recommendations, which they made in the interest of the civil service and of the country, were not carried out. In 1892 a commission was appointed, which reported by Bill, and pointed out many ways in which the Civil Service Act could be amended in the interest of the service and of the country. That report remains a dead letter, and the Bill which was recommended was never introduced or passed. There is a great need to recast the Civil Service Act from top to bottom. There are a great many provisions in it to-day which should be revised, and the whole Act should be recast, so that it become more satisfactory to the civil service as well as more just to the country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the position of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), differs very much from my own, but the point I raised was not the policy of the Act, but the legal position of the question, which I think is an important one, and which my hon. friend the Minister of Fi-

Mr. McMULLEN.

nance (Mr. Fielding) meets by a rather evasive answer, that it would be of no value to the civil service if you were to refer this question to the judges of the Supreme Court, and they were to say: Yes, under the Act the civil servant who diligently discharges his duty, subject to a recommendation for an increase from the deputy head of the department or the Minister, is entitled to it—it would be of no value, because the Government do not approve of it. He says we would just bring in a Bill to change the law and to prevent a deserving civil servant from getting promotion in that way. The position of the Government is a most unjust and undesirable one, and I am quite sure that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) agrees with me that, if members of the civil service do their duty faithfully and efficiently it is of great benefit to the country, while if they neglect their duty or perform it inefficiently and in a slovenly and disreputable manner, it is a great injury to the country. The policy of the old Government, and which was the policy down to the time that the present Government came into power, was that, when young gentlemen who had obtained a good education and passed the necessary qualifications to usefully serve the country, were induced to go into the civil service at a low salary with the assurance that at a later occasion, if they worked hard and faithfully, and if they were diligent in the discharge of their duties and gave satisfaction to the Deputy Minister who was placed over them, and he recommended them to the Government for an increase, the increase would follow as a matter of course. I am quite willing to admit that the law was not, perhaps, observed with sufficient stringency, and that it was applied to persons who were very efficient, faithful and diligent, and at the same time to persons who were very much the reverse. I am quite willing to admit that there was a good deal of difficulty in that way, but I believe it is of great moment to the country to have a well-qualified civil service, which you will not have if you intimate to the members of the civil service that however efficient they are, however interested in their work, it will be of no benefit to them, and that they can get no further advantage, and as long as they see young men brought in and put over their heads who have no qualifications, by the favouritism of the Minister or some person who has influence with the Minister.

They find that notwithstanding all their hard work it goes for nothing, because the political favouritism that is used to their disadvantage leaves them without hope of promotion in the future. It creates a feeling of dissatisfaction throughout the service when our public employees know that merit alone is not rewarded. Does the Minister of Finance think that it is wise to keep the

civil servants of this country in the condition they are in at present? The Deputy Minister may say to the Minister: Here is a most hardworking and diligent public servant and I want you to increase his salary; but under the present system which the Government have adopted, that recommendation is treated as naught. It would be infinitely better in my opinion to change the law than to continue that condition of things. I think the law ought to be changed by providing that the Deputy Ministers should be held to a rigid and strict account for recommending any one for an increase who is not absolutely entitled to get it on account of the efficient discharge of his duties, but providing also that those civil servants who earned the increase should get it every year. We see the Minister of one department bringing down recommendations for a large number of statutory increases, and another Minister bringing down no recommendations. The inference is that in one department the civil servants have faithfully performed their duties, and that in another department they have not, but the Ministers themselves will be the first to tell us that such is not the case, and that they have many deserving men in their departments whom they have not recommended. I believe the country would save money by rigidly carrying out the law as it now stands, and giving that incentive to a faithful and efficient performance of their duties which ought to be given to every deserving civil servant. I believe that the work of the country would be done better, if the civil servant knew that by a vigorous and faithful discharge of his duty he would get that promotion to which his labours and ability entitle him.

Mr. BERGERON. In the particular case now before the House, could the Minister say if the recommendations for these increases were made by the Deputy Minister?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In every case, as the law requires, where an increase was granted it was recommended by the Deputy Minister. I understand as regards the others, that there was a consultation between the Minister and the Deputy Minister, and these were selected and recommended by the Minister and the Deputy Minister. I have no doubt that the deputy would be glad to recommend a larger number if the Minister would concur, but the Minister must take the responsibility of recommending these to Parliament. I know in my own department the deputy recommended more than I was able to agree to.

Mr. BERGERON. The language of the Act seems to indicate that when a young man joins the civil service, he does so with the understanding that he would get an annual increase until he reached the maximum of his class, provided he did his work to the satisfaction of the deputy. It is indicated in the law that the annual increase

shall be given on the recommendation of the Deputy Minister who is supposed to be above political influences, and is presumed to recommend the increase only on the knowledge that the man recommended has done his duty. The Act states that an increase must be given unless there are good reasons for not giving it. Since the present Government have been in power, the Ministers have interpreted that law so as to enable them to reward those whom they personally want to reward, and to leave aside those whom they did not want to favour. The Minister of Finance asked: Why did not some of the civil servants bring this matter before the courts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not exactly say that, I said none of them had asked for that.

Mr. BERGERON. Does not the Minister know that none of them would dare to do so. Such is the tyranny under which civil servants are living to-day, that if any one of them would dare to go to a member of Parliament to ask his influence he would be dismissed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Oh, no.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes. If I am not mistaken I heard a few years ago that it was announced to the civil servants, that if they dared to bother members of Parliament or Ministers asking for increases of salary, or even for the statutory increases to which they are entitled to by law, they would be immediately dismissed. Why, the public servants in Ottawa are shaking in their boots for fear of being dismissed without any reason whatever. I have brought before the House the cases of civil servants who were permanently employed and who paid into the superannuation fund, and yet they were dismissed without any cause whatever. The Government even went so far as to repay these gentlemen the amount they paid into the superannuation fund, with five per cent interest added, thus admitting that these officials were dismissed for none other than political reasons. It strikes me, without giving a legal opinion on the case at all, that the Civil Service Act is now being administered purely and simply with a view of political favouritism on the part of the Government. How can men be expected to perform their duties faithfully and enthusiastically if they know that so long as this Government is in power they shall have no increase of salary, and that they will lose \$50 a year for four or five years? Perhaps this is the reward that the present Government has given to the civil servants in Ottawa, most of whom voted for their candidates at the last election. I endorse the opinion of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, that there should be a test case submitted to the courts in order that we should have a decision as to whether or not the civil servants are entitled

to this increase of \$50 a year. If they are entitled to an increase, they must have it; if not, the law should be changed, because as it stands it is deceptive. Young men joining the service, join it with an incorrect idea, if the law is that they are not entitled to an increase. Why should we not have laid on the Table of the House the reports of the different heads of departments as to who are recommended for an increase and who are deprived of it by the political head of the department? The whole thing would then be plain at a glance, and the time of the committee would not be taken up discussing the matter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend has introduced one new feature into this debate, which his predecessor did not refer to. He speaks of the tyranny under which the civil service are living under the present Government. He says that if a civil servant goes to a member of Parliament and asks for his intervention on his behalf, he is liable to dismissal. I would remind my hon. friend that the rule as to that is one which was established by himself and his honourable colleagues. No change whatever has been made in that respect since the present Government came into power. The rule passed by the Treasury Board a great many years ago, I think, under the administration of my distinguished predecessor in the office of Finance Minister, the late Sir Leonard Tilley—though as to that I am speaking from memory—was that if any civil servant should seek the intervention of a member of Parliament to obtain an increase of salary, that would be a proper cause of dismissal. I almost wish we had enforced that rule under the present Administration, because I think there is a good deal to be said in favour of it. When a civil servant seeks the intervention of a member of Parliament to secure an increase of salary, I think it may be taken as a pretty fair evidence that he is not willing to stand on his merits; and Sir Leonard Tilley showed considerable wisdom in adopting that rule. At all events, if that is an exhibition of tyranny, it is something of which we on this side of the House have not been guilty, and the hon. gentleman, who has exhibited so much sympathy for the civil service on this occasion, must charge it to the account of his own friends. I agree with all that has been said as to the desirability of having an efficient civil service. I have been long enough in public life to know how much members of Government must depend upon the efficiency of the civil service. Both in England and in this country things have frequently happened for which a large share of the credit was due to some deputy or clerk who received very little recognition. I fully recognize the desirability of having an efficient civil service in Canada—a service free from politics. While it is right

Mr. BERGERON.

and proper that a man may seek admission to the service for work which he has done for his political party, the very moment he enters it he should recognize that he is no longer the servant of that party, but the servant of the state, the servant of both parties. I have known many such men in the provincial service, and I testify with great satisfaction that gentlemen who were appointed by my predecessors showed that they had that correct understanding of their duties; and I can say the same in reference to many in the civil service of the Dominion. I do not believe the civil service are so much alarmed as my hon. friend says in regard to the present condition of the law. I believe they realize that the Government are dealing with them on sound principles. What, after all, is the difference between us? The practice under hon. gentlemen opposite has been that if twenty clerks were eligible for an increase, the whole twenty were recommended. There was no discrimination between those who were deserving and those who were not; the thing worked automatically; it was a purely mechanical arrangement. But we say that there is a measure of discretion for which the responsibility must rest on the Minister, and the Governor in Council. There is a possibility that one Minister will use that discretion according to a different rule from another Minister, the two not thinking absolutely alike. This is a difficulty which might be overcome by some uniform system. But I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that there is any material difference in regard to the interpretation of the law. He says he knows eminent legal gentlemen who take a different view from ours. He has not given the names of those gentlemen, and I have no right to ask him for them. I am bound to accept his statement; but I want to tell him that we are interpreting the law exactly as it was interpreted by the late Government for a series of years, and I have the evidence of that under my hand. This very point as to whether the law was mandatory, or whether it allowed discretion to the Minister and the Governor in Council, was threshed out last session, and in the course of that discussion, after some gentlemen had asserted that there was no discretion to the Minister, but that the increase was a matter of obligation, the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) spoke as follows:—

There is no doubt about the law in the matter. The law upon the matter is, as stated by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that it is not at all obligatory upon the Government to grant these statutory increases each year. The law is merely an empowering Act which enables the Government, upon the report of the deputy head of a department, and upon the certificate of the head of the department, to grant the statutory increase. We have had opinions again and again that the Act is an empowering one. I differ en-

tirely from my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) in reference to the matter; it is not obligatory at all. I had an opportunity when I was at the head of a department, of getting the opinion of the Minister of Justice and others in reference to this matter, and I must say, in justice to the present Government, that the opinion then obtained was precisely the same as that stated by the leader of the House.

Mr. COCHRANE. I agree, to a certain extent, with the contention of the Finance Minister, and also with the ex-Minister of Railways. As I understand the question, it is this: the law is that upon the recommendation of the Deputy Minister the increase shall be given.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. May be given.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then, what have we before us to-day? The trouble, to my mind, is this, that the Deputy Minister may recommend, and if the Minister does not see fit, he does not grant the increase. The Minister of Finance told the committee, if I understood him aright, that the Minister of Public Works had a consultation with his deputy; and it amounted to this, that the Minister recommended to his deputy the men he wanted recommended to get the increase. It amounts to a political machine. The Minister of Public Works told his deputy what persons to recommend, and these persons got the increase. That is the condition of things in the civil service to-day. I am not here to sympathize with the civil servants or to plead that they were induced to go into the service, because, no doubt, plenty would be willing to take their places, if they would leave, but I say that, when men join the service on the understanding that if they faithfully perform their duties, they shall be given the statutory increase, that condition of the contract should be carried out in all cases, and not only in some specially favoured ones. I think myself that a young man of ability is a fool to go into the service at \$400, if there is to be no promotion, and I am confident that many would not have gone in, were it not for that provision in the law entitling them to the statutory increase, if they do their work faithfully. Is it not disgraceful that we should find men brought into the service and put over the heads of men who have been in it for years, and who must be more competent to do the work, if they have any brains at all? Men who have been working for years at salaries ranging from \$400 to \$700, find a man brought in from outside and appointed over their heads at \$800. One can easily conceive the sense of humiliation which these men, who have been doing their work for years faithfully, should feel at thus being passed over. There ought to be some final interpretation given to this Civil Service Act. It is only right

that those gentlemen in the service should know really where they stand. They should know whether they are to get the increase on the recommendation of the Deputy Minister, that they have faithfully done their work, or whether that recommendation must be submitted to the political head of the department and their right to the increase set aside at the whim of the Minister, despite the recommendation of the deputy. We should have the opinion of the Minister of Justice put on the Table. We have heard it stated that his opinion was put on the Table, but again we find the Minister of Finance saying that he is not sure whether that opinion was given in writing or not. If it was not given in writing, it could not be on the Table. We ought to have that opinion, and we ought to have an authoritative decision on the matter.

Mr. McNEILL. I just wish to say to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance that I do not think the quotation he has given from the remarks of the former Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) at all advances the argument. We do not deny that there is a discretion. If the civil servant has not discharged his duties efficiently, we do not say that he has any right to a statutory increase. But we say that those who do discharge their duties efficiently, and who are recommended—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Who is to be judge?

Mr. McNEILL. The Deputy Minister.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not what the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) said.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not think he said, if the Deputy Minister recommended, the Minister was free not to act.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. McNEILL. If he did, it only makes it the more necessary that we should have the matter decided. I want to call attention to the fact that my hon. friend's colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) when this measure was going through the House, distinctly said that, in his judgment, a civil servant would be entitled to the statutory increase, when recommended by the Deputy Minister.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What measure?

Mr. McNEILL. The quotation was made by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and there can be no doubt that the hon. gentleman expressed that opinion. The hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) expressed the same opinion, and I suppose my hon. friend would have some regard for the opinion of probably the greatest lawyer who ever sat in this House, the Hon. Ed.

ward Blake, who said that the increases would proceed automatically, provided the Deputy Minister recommended them, under this Act. If the hon. Minister of Finance has any doubt as to whether there was a great body of legal opinion in favour of the view that these gentlemen are entitled to the statutory increase, if they efficiently perform their duties, I think surely the opinion of his colleagues and of the Hon. Edward Blake ought to satisfy him. What is it we ask? Simply that this matter shall be decided, so that the civil servant may know whether or not, under the law, they are entitled to this statutory increase. That is all we are asking. We ask the Government to have the matter decided by a competent authority, and not to decide that they alone know. My hon. friend said that he had an opinion from the Minister of Justice, and that he knows what that opinion was, yet he does not know whether it was a verbal or a written opinion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is very probable. It was given two or three years ago.

Mr. McNEILL. If it was, the hon. gentleman must know very well that it is exceedingly difficult to carry in his mind for two or three years exactly what that opinion amounted to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I know what the opinion was, because it has been acted on.

Mr. McNEILL. We agree on this side that it is discretionary, but how far is it discretionary? How far did Sir Oliver Mowat say it was discretionary? But suppose my hon. friend is correct, and Sir Oliver Mowat did, as Minister of Justice, give that opinion, I say we ought to have this matter settled in the courts, and we ask the Government to be good enough to have it so decided.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I think I caught the name of Costigan as one of the gentlemen who got the increase.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Is he a relative of Mr. Costigan, a member of this House?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My deputy tells me that he is a nephew. That gentleman gets an increase of \$100 from \$450 to \$550, but there is nothing in this vote to authorize it, and, therefore, the usual words will have to be inserted. In the other cases the increases are \$50 each.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend said that the statutory increases were recommended *holus bolus*, and that the Minister then selected the most deserving. But what is very strange is, that these increases always fall on the same side. In the last three years I know of clerks in the service

Mr. McNEILL.

who have always been recommended by the deputy head as having faithfully discharged their work, and yet who have never had an increase since 1896, whereas others, who have since come into the service, have got their increases every year. This shows that it is not altogether a matter of accident, but that it is done with a purpose, and it is just to avoid this favouritism and injustice that, I repeat, we ought to have the question decided by the courts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot contradict my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) in relation to other departments, not having the necessary information. But in my own department, there is not one officer who is eligible who has not received the increase one year or the other. As to what has been said of an officer being brought into my department and placed over the heads of others, there is no such case. The gentleman brought in was not placed over the heads of others. In every case the officers who were there were receiving higher salaries than the newcomer, and no officer had any ground for complaint. So far as my own department is concerned, the hon. gentlemen's criticism is not deserved.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman is acting Minister of Public Works. I would not say the same about the hon. gentleman's department that I would about others, as I believe the conditions are not the same as in others.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not intend to go into this matter fully, because I expressed my views last year. But I wish to point out one feature in the estimates of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), and of the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock). This year, we find the salary of nearly every officer in the department increased. The view of the Act taken by the Government facilitates this thing. The Ministers say: We will not give these civil servants the promotion they had the right to look forward to, the prospect of which is held out to them by the Act and the traditions that have obtained in the service, the promotion that is sanctioned by a common sense, horse sense—but, next year, when we are coming near a general election and when we shall have to look to these people's vote as well as to others, we will give them the increase. That is the only construction I can put on the action of some of the departments, especially that of the Postmaster General. Why, the change in the Postmaster General is phenomenal. It is hard to recognize him. He appeared in previous sessions as a taskmaster and slave driver; but this session he is as mild as milk and full of consideration for all the officers in his department. Now, Mr. Chairman, one of the things that must awe the minds of every man interested in the future of our country is the growth of corruption. The one dark cloud upon our horizon at present, in the

midst of our prosperity, is corruption. And could any form of corruption be more insidious, could any form of corruption be more calculated to demoralize and degrade than that which would use the salaries paid to civil servants to secure their vote? Could anything be worse than to say to the civil servant: On the eve of a general election we will promote you, and if you do right in the election we will promote you! When these accretions of salary occurred mechanically, when these civil servants got their increases from year to year, they could be independent. If they did their duty, they could go to and from their work with easy minds, they could walk the earth like men. But now that the statutory increase is given only as a matter of caprice, it is capable of being made one of the most efficient wheels in the great threshing machine upon which hon. gentlemen opposite rely. Mr. Chairman (Mr. Ellis) I know well, because I have read your writing, that there is no man in Canada who is more sensible than you are of the importance of purity of election. And you know, Sir, that no more deadly blow could be dealt to a country than to strike at its liberty in the franchise. And yet, within the last three or four years, we have not been able to turn up a stone in the Government garden without finding the worms of corruption wriggling underneath. Their treatment of the civil service is a case in point. Why is it that this year in every department we see a departure from sound principles? Is it not because a general election cannot be far off, and this is an attempt to make the very departments where our Government business is carried on a part of this threshing machine system which, if it continues can only result in the demoralization of the country? I wish to put my protest upon record against this system of promotion by caprice, because it really makes it possible that the Government of the country may become accessory to this system which has alarmed public-spirited men!

Mr. PRIOR. While we are on this question of the promotion of civil servants, I would like to ask the Finance Minister if he can inform us who is the chief engineer of the Public Works Department, and whether anybody has been appointed to succeed Mr. Coste?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No formal appointment has been made, but Mr. Lafleur, who is the next in order, has been acting as chief engineer.

Mr. PRIOR. Is it the intention of the Government to appoint Mr. Lafleur to the position? It must be bad for a department like that to be without some gentleman in full charge of such important work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Lafleur, I have reason to believe, is a very competent officer and is performing the duties

of the office well. But I should prefer that the Minister at the head of the department should decide the question of the appointment, and I could not undertake to answer the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) on that point just now.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I must protest against the statement made by my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) that there is such a reign of terror in our departments that none of our officers would dare to ask for an increase of salary for fear of dismissal. I have repeatedly had requests from officers in my department to obtain an increase of salary, and it never entered my mind for a moment to treat them with any harshness. In many cases I could not help acknowledging that I would have been very glad if I could give them an increase. But however impatient I may have felt sometimes at the persistency with which they asked for an increase, there is not a single case in which it ever entered my mind to dismiss a civil servant for making that request when he conscientiously believed he was entitled to it. I feel perfectly certain that every one of my colleagues in the Government has had the same experience. I would be very sorry if the public at large should get the impression that the civil service is at present under a regime so cruel as that.

Mr. BERGERON. Although my hon. friend is looked upon as the most humane of all the Ministers, he has not even heard what we have heard ourselves.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I do not claim to be better than my colleagues. I feel very certain they have all the same feeling of sympathy that I have with the officers in their departments.

Department of Public Works—

Printing and stationery.....	\$ 4,500
Sundries .....	5,500

Total .....	\$10,000
-------------	----------

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is an increase in sundries of \$2,300. It will be remembered that the practice in former years was to charge telegrams in connection with the construction of public works to each particular work, thus distributing them over the works generally. The Auditor General took exception to that, although it was a long-established practice, and thought it better that the telegrams should be charged to one special vote. Therefore, in order to comply with the Auditor General's desire in the matter, which I think is not an unreasonable one, we asked for a larger vote for telegrams.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that the only reason for the increase?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, that substantially covers the whole increase.

There is an increase of \$1,700 for printing and stationery. That is due to the general increase of the work in the department, which requires additional printing.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the increase of \$2,300 in sundries is due entirely to this new way of charging telegrams?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy informs me it is due entirely to the telegraph bill.

Mr. BERGERON. What will the hon. gentleman do with the other \$3,200 which was the amount voted last year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are telegraphic accounts generally for the department, and there is a certain large telegraphic account which was distributed over the various public works throughout the country. That portion is now added to the special telegraphic account.

Mr. BERGERON. From which item will that former sum be struck off?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is nothing struck off. It would go in reduction of the various public works. Where a wharf or repair was being constructed, the item for telegrams was charged to that particular work. It will no longer be charged to that particular work, but will go to the special account for telegrams.

Mr. DAVIN. We ought to have more particulars for so large an increase. Does the present Minister of Public Works resort to telegraphic communication where his predecessors wrote letters?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know that he is doing so, but even if he did, I should not consider it was a crime. In these days we use the telegraph more than we used to. The progress of the age is such that much work is being done by the telegraph to-day which a few years ago was done by correspondence. But I do not know that that is the case between the present Minister and his predecessor. This is due entirely to the fact, I am advised, that these charges were made to the various public works of the country, and the Auditor General thinks they should be shown in the contingencies department and not be distributed over the public works.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Will any reduction be made in the other votes for telegrams?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, because it would be so trifling a sum in each one.

Mr. DAVIN. Was this change made in consequence of what the Auditor General wrote to the Secretary of Public Works on 7th March, 1898, page 255 of his report:

Sir,—Let me call your attention to the payments for telegraphing for the Public Works De-

Mr. FIELDING.

partment at Ottawa, since July 1, 1897, charged to votes other than "Civil Government Contingencies":

Canadian Pacific Railway Co.'s Telegraph—	
July—Dredging, generally.....	\$132 32
August—Harbours and rivers, generally.	117 74
September—Repairs to buildings, Manitoba .....	118 46
November—Harbours, &c., Ontario generally .....	152 99
December—Repairs to buildings, N.W.T.	104 66
Great North-western Telegraph Company—	
July—Dredging, generally.....	\$247 86
August—Harbours and rivers, generally.	205 62
September—Repairs to buildings, British Columbia .....	160 98
November—Harbours, &c., Ontario generally .....	153 02
December—Repairs to buildings, British Columbia .....	92 01

We shall need for the above-mentioned accounts, information similar to that provided by other departments for all but Ministerial telegrams, that is, the names of the senders and receivers, and the cost of each telegram. This information was supplied by you for the October telegrams, which were paid by the Accountant of Contingencies, and charged to Civil Government—being the only month yet charged to that vote in 1897-98. A request for similar information was made in my letter of June 15, 1891 (see Report for year 1890-91, page C-332), but it has never yet been furnished.

It is not proper to charge all the telegrams in a month to some one outside vote.

Well, now, what I should like to know is this: Has this increase any relation to that letter of the Auditor General?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Auditor General did ask for information in that letter, and personally also in communication with the department. The information which my hon. friend refers to, I am advised, was afterwards given to the Auditor General. As to the charges being concealed in this way, I am advised that is the way they were charged for during a very long time, and the Auditor General called attention to what he regarded as an improper practice, and suggested a change, and that change has now been adopted.

Mr. BERGERON. It seems to me that there were some irregular charges made. I see that \$250 has been charged by the Great North-western Telegraph Company in British Columbia for telegrams, when they had no office there, and the Auditor General remarks that that sum of money has been spent there. We do not know whether those amounts have been properly expended or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised that the Great North-western Company operates in connection with the Western Union there.

Mr. BERGERON. I will read what the Auditor General says in his report:

For instance, the September and December payments of \$160.98 and \$92.01 to the Great

North-western Telegraph Company: Instead of paying these from the vote for "Repairs to British Columbia Buildings," (while the G. N. W. Co. has no offices in British Columbia, as appears from their printed list, and all British Columbia services were probably performed by the C.P.R. Co.) any telegrams concerning, say, "Toronto Harbour," should have been charged to that vote, and similarly for other works.

Please see that all telegraph accounts since July 1, 1897, are thus distributed, or charged to Civil Government Contingencies.

I have no objection to taking these amounts from one vote and another for different public works throughout the country to which they are improperly charged, so that the country does know how much is actually spent in this way.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If you take time to distribute them over the various sums, you will find that they are small amounts in each case.

Harbours and Rivers, Quebec—

River St. Lawrence ship channel..... \$354,000

Mr. BERGERON. This requires a good deal of explanation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This vote of \$354,000 is required to cover expenses of management and the working expenses and maintenance of the dredging plant operating in the ship channel between Montreal and Quebec, as well as for the completion of two new steel elevator dredges now under construction, two new tugs to be built of wood, two new hopper scows, one stone-lifter, viz. :—

Working expenses of our dredges and one stone-lifter .....	\$100,000
Completion of two new steel elevator dredges, now under construction (total estimated cost of each dredge, \$110,000) .....	50,000
Two new tugs to be built of wood, with new boilers and compound engines similar to tug "Emilia" (to be used in ship channel).....	25,000
One new stone-lifter, to be built of British Columbia fir (to be used in ship channel) .....	12,000
One set new cast steel buckets and links for steel elevator "No. 3," now under construction .....	12,000
Repairs to one set of old buckets and links for "No. 4" steel elevator dredge, now under construction....	5,000
For two new 300-yd. hopper scows, to be built of British Columbia fir, for use principally in Lake St. Peter..	18,000
Completion and equipment of new tug "St. James".....	12,000
Expenditure in connection with the St. Lawrence River, surveys, &c.....	20,000
	<hr/>
	\$254,000
Towards the construction of two new steel elevator dredges (total estimated cost of each dredge, \$110,000).....	100,000
	<hr/>
Total grant required for 1899-1900..	\$354,000

Mr. BERGERON. Where are these elevator dredges made?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At the establishment at Sorel.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand the department has acquired some property at Sorel.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No property has been purchased at Sorel. There is a property under lease with an option of purchase.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the amount of rent per year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. \$1,200.

Mr. BERGERON. From whom is the property leased?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. From the McCarthy estate.

Mr. BERGERON. What are the dimensions of the property leased?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About eight acres.

Mr. BERGERON. Have the Government built any works or buildings on it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A new building has been erected there, containing machinery, at a cost of \$14,000. The centre building is for machinery, and the other buildings have been repaired.

Mr. BERGERON. What machinery have you?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Machinery for making boilers and ironwork in connection with the construction of these vessels.

Mr. BERGERON. Are these buildings placed there permanently?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The machinery building is permanent.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the policy of the Government since they have not purchased the property, but have an option to buy and a lease at \$1,200 a year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It would be difficult to answer my hon. friend on that point. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) has had some negotiations. The purchase has not been concluded, and the property is under option. I cannot give the hon. gentleman definite information at this moment.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand the position of the hon. Minister, but it is very unsatisfactory to the committee. If the hon. Minister of Public Works is not here, it seems to me that he should have left an answer to everything we might ask with the deputy head of the department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I quite admit that it is unfortunate that the Minister of Public Works is absent, because the committee has a right to very much

more information upon these points than I can give them. But if, on any of these points, any hon. member wishes any additional information, if he will kindly put the question, if I am able to obtain it, I will do so before the Estimates are through or before the item passes.

Mr. DAVIN. I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) will bring the information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. There are some answers that the hon. Minister can obtain from the Deputy Minister. Out of this \$354,000, how much will go towards payment, not only of the lease, but towards the building which has been put there and the machinery which has been put into this building, how much towards the dredges and scows which are being built there, and how much upon the actual deepening of the channel?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The items which I have read contain no reference to the building; they are entirely for the construction of the plant and operation of the dredges. The first item of \$100,000 is for the working expenses of the dredges and the remainder is for the construction of the plant.

Mr. BERGERON. How much?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. \$254,000 would be for construction and \$100,000 for operating expenses.

Mr. BERGERON. Out of \$354,000, two-thirds are for construction and about \$100,000 would be for the deepening of the channel.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman could not deepen the channel if he did not construct the machines to do the work with.

Mr. BERGERON. But these machines have been constructed for the last twenty years.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But they are all the time improving them.

Mr. BERGERON. There are so many dredges in the river that you can scarcely pass through the stream. How long is the lease for on the property at Sorel?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will give the hon. gentleman that information later on.

Mr. BERGERON. What I want to know is this: The Government have leased this property at Sorel for \$1,200. I do not know how many years they have the option for, but in the meantime they have gone on and built a large permanent building and put in some very heavy machinery. The Government are taking the credit in that part of the country for having all the scows and dredges in the whole Dominion built in Sorel, and

Mr. FIELDING.

they are making that a great cry with a view of carrying the next elections. We find now that out of this vote for \$354,000, over \$200,000 will be spent on the plant, and that is done by day's labour without tender and without contract. Five hundred or six hundred men are employed by the Government there, and we have no one in this Parliament to tell us, no means of finding out whether we are paying one cent too much or one cent too little, or whether we may not be robbed right and left. I leave it to the Parliament of Canada and to the country, to say whether such a system should be continued. I believe that nothing that has been done by any previous Government of Canada is so reprehensible as this. Does not the Minister of Finance himself see that this is a most extraordinary way of doing business. We are asked for \$354,000 for deepening the St. Lawrence ship channel, and if the Minister of Public Works is making a speech in Paris to-morrow, he will no doubt say that the Government are spending all this money to secure 28 feet of water for bringing European commerce here, when as a matter of fact, three-fourths of that sum is spent on plant by day's work, costing probably twice as much as by contract, and only \$100,000 is spent on the ship channel. It is a most unfortunate thing that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), who is primarily responsible for all this, is not in his place to give us information as to how this money is being expended. The Minister of Finance and his colleagues must know it is wrong, and yet they dare not say so. A few days ago I asked the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) where he was having his scows made, and although he did not answer me then, I have no doubt that this same Government, expending the same money of the people, are having their scows for the Railway Department built in the United States. The Minister of Railways is fond of dealing with the Americans, and the Minister of Public Works deals at Sorel, and is spending bushels of money there without the control of Parliament. The law requires that every expenditure over \$5,000 should be made by contract, but here the Minister of Public Works is spending hundreds of thousands of dollars without contract.

Mr. HAGGART. The Auditor General should not allow them to.

Mr. BERGERON. The Minister of Finance told us that they were having some scows built at British Columbia. British Columbia is 3,000 miles away from Sorel, and how is the Government going to explain including both of these in the same vote?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The only reference I made to British Columbia was to say that these scows being built at Sorel, are in several instances constructed of British Columbia fir.

Mr. BERGERON. Who was that British Columbia fir bought from ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that the quotations are obtained from agents for the sale of this wood at Montreal, and of course it has to be brought from British Columbia.

Mr. BERGERON. Then I wish to get the names of those who sold that timber, what it originally cost, the charges of transportation, the quantities and the price laid down at Sorel.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will take a note of that and get the information.

Mr. DAVIN. Will the Minister say how this work is being done at Sorel ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is rather difficult, I am afraid, to please my hon. friends opposite. They complained a few days ago at the Minister of Railways having some work done out of the country, and now they complain because the Minister of Public Works is having some work done in the country by day's labour and by Canadians.

Mr. BENNETT. Not at all. We are complaining that the work is not being done by tender and contract.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You cannot get a tender on day's work. I take it for granted that the Canadian Pacific Railway, having large machine shops, are doing their work there by day's labour.

Mr. BENNETT. What we are complaining of here is : That you are spending this money by day's labour for building new machinery, and not for repairing old machinery.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Quite so. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) contends that it would be better to do it by contract than by day's labour in the Government workshops, it is a fair subject for contention, and in the absence of technical knowledge I cannot offer an opinion on it. It has been the practice of the Government of Canada for a great many years to have workshops at Sorel where work of this character is done, and I am informed that it is done under the supervision of Mr. Howden who was there under the late Government.

Mr. BERGERON. He is not in charge of the shops.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised by officers of the department that Mr. Howden is in charge of the shops.

Mr. BERGERON. Is he an engineer ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that he is a mechanical engineer and has the general supervision of the shops at Sorel.

Mr. HAGGART. They are repair shops at Sorel and if you vote money for repairing, of course the work of repairing could be done there by day's labour. But here you are voting money for new work and the law is imperative that when the expenditure is over \$5,000 it should be done by contract and tender. The Prime Minister gets out of the difficulty by saying that the Governor in Council may override the law by assigning sufficient reasons. But where is the Order in Council justifying this expenditure ? How is it that the Auditor General pays these sums contrary to law ? My contention is that urgency is the only reason for making such an expenditure without contract, such urgency as where a canal bank breaks and it has to be repaired immediately. Here is an expenditure of \$354,000 and we have not even the farce of an Order in Council being brought down to justify it. Three years ago the Minister of Public Works stated that the deepening of this channel was about completed, that there would be no further use for repair shops at Sorel and that the Government would have this sum of money at their disposal for doing work in other parts of the country where these dredges could be used. Now, we have \$254,000 for dredges and \$100,000 for day's labour, nearly double the amount that was expended last year. The House is entitled to the Order in Council which overrides the law in connection with this expenditure. We want to know how much material, both of earth and rock, is to be dredged to make the St. Lawrence navigable up to the standard required by the Government. I see that the dredge is wanted to deepen Lake St. Peter. Has the Government taken over the dredging of Lake St. Peter from the Harbour Commission of Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that the dredging was taken over in 1889.

Mr. HAGGART. That is what I understood too. Is there a report from the department as to the necessity of these dredges ? We want to have all this information, so as to be able to judge whether the work is being done by day's labour as economically as it would be under contract.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The only answer I can give to my hon. friend is a general one, that he may trust the Auditor General not to permit this to be done if it is contrary to the law.

Mr. COCHRANE. You override the decision of the Auditor General.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think my hon. friend can give an instance of that. At any rate, he will find that this is carried out according to law.

Mr. HAGGART. Has he an Order in Council for it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy says that he has not ; but you may safely leave it to the Auditor General to see that the law is rigidly carried out.

Mr. DAVIN. The Order in Council, dated March 20th, 1880, says :

On a joint memorandum, dated March 20, 1880, from the hon. the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Railways and Canals, recommending that hereafter all public works involving an expenditure of over \$5,000 shall be let by public tender and contract, unless owing to urgency or other cause it be deemed advisable to take different action, and that in all such cases authority be obtained by an Order in Council.

If there is no Order in Council, how does the department get over that ? I do not see how the Minister can ask us to vote such a large sum as this without some explanation as to how the work is done. It is perfectly clear that the law in this matter is being systematically violated. That is confessed. Then, how is the work done ? Is it done in a manner that this Parliament can approve of ?

Mr. COCHRANE. I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to one instance in which the Treasury Board overrode the decision of the Auditor General ; that was in connection with money that was voted for immigration being applied to the Lake St. John Railway.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are cases.

Mr. COCHRANE. In that case the money was voted for one purpose, and applied to another. Now, in reference to this item, I think there is a deception practised on the people of this country. Here we have the sum of \$354,000 voted for the River St. Lawrence ship channel, and when we come to get the explanation from the Finance Minister we find that only \$100,000 is to be used for deepening that channel, and that part of the \$254,000 is to pay rental for a piece of property. The balance to build scows and dredges. To my mind it is the most absurd proposition that has ever been submitted to this committee. Instead of buying scows and dredges by contract, the department sees fit to turn the Government shops, which are for repairing purposes, into establishments for the manufacture of dredges and other things that they want. I believe that the Minister in his heart knows that there is a fraud being perpetrated on the people of Canada by the construction of these dredges in that shop. I am sorry that the Minister of Finance is put in the humiliating position of having to answer for such a job. It would be impossible for me or any other man in this committee to give an intelligent answer to the electors when they ask where that money has gone.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I quite appreciate the difficulty in which the hon. Minister is placed. We all regret very much the  
Mr. HAGGART.

absence of the Minister of Public Works, and we know how difficult it is for a person, especially with the duties that devolve on the Minister of Finance during the session, to take charge of a department like the Department of Public Works, and at once master all the details. But this is a very large sum and the subject is a very important one, and I would suggest to the Minister of Finance to let this item stand over until he obtains the fullest particulars that he can as to the whole situation, and take it up at the next sitting.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If there is any particular information required, I shall quite assent to that, for the House is entitled to the fullest information. I think, however, that hon. gentlemen opposite are interpreting the Order in Council which was quoted by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) in a way in which it has not been interpreted hitherto by the Auditor General. I presume that that Order in Council means that you cannot make an arrangement by contract except according to its terms. But that does not apply to work done by day's labour. I am informed that day labour has been employed in the Sorel workshops for many years.

Mr. BERGERON. For repairs, not for building.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As a matter of principle, so far as the Order in Council is concerned, there is no distinction between day labour for repairs and day labour for anything else. The Order in Council was to prevent the making of a private contract for an amount in excess of \$5,000 ; but day labour is not a matter of contract. As to the statement that there is a fraud in this, I think my hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) will on reflection see that he has been hasty. There is nothing in this transaction that is not creditable to the head of the Department of Public Works. He has, no doubt, come to the conclusion that these vessels and tugs could be constructed at these shops by day labour more advantageously than by contract. That is a fair matter for difference of opinion ; but because the Minister has so decided, it does not follow that there has been extravagance or wastefulness, much less fraud. Hon. gentlemen must remember that the navigation of the St. Lawrence is a matter of great public importance to the Dominion, as well as to the city of Montreal or the city of Sorel. The hon. gentleman must be aware that there have been difficulties in the navigation of the channel. Ships are all the time growing bigger, and the channel is not growing in proportion. We have had the navigation of the St. Lawrence attacked during the last few months, and the rates of insurance growing up. Because some vessels touched ground, the rates of insurance have advanced to a point which is the subject of

strong protest from the commercial bodies of Montreal and Quebec. There must be a large increasing expenditure on the dredging of the St. Lawrence and in keeping open this channel. If the expenditure is larger than before, it is because the needs of dredging are greater than before. You cannot dredge the channel without dredging material, and the construction of sufficient plant for the purpose is a proper charge against the dredging. Hon. gentlemen are not right in saying that this is not just as much a charge for dredging as any other money spent on that work, unless they show that the material was not necessary for the dredging of the river. I do not think that any one would seriously pretend that there is ample equipment for the dredging of the river beyond the requirements of the growing trade of the St. Lawrence. In the lower provinces we constantly have complaints that we are not doing enough dredging, and we have to reply that there is no use in our asking for additional votes, because we have only two or three dredges at our command. If that is true in the lower provinces, no doubt also the St. Lawrence, with its growing needs, requires an increased sum for dredging. This increase, therefore, is justified by the great needs of the service. If hon. gentlemen opposite desire information on any particular point, I shall be most happy to see that it is brought down.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is altogether mistaken in dealing with this vote as if there was any objection to the appropriation of a sufficient sum for the efficient dredging of the St. Lawrence. There is no difference of opinion on that subject, and no want of readiness to do everything shown to be absolutely necessary to provide proper facilities for the trade of Montreal. But the question we are bringing up is altogether different. An Order in Council was passed in 1880, declaring that, except in cases of urgency, all public work must be done by public tender and contract. Is my hon. friend able to show that since then a dredge was ever built in Canada by day's work? If not, I would recommend him to let the item stand and get full information as to how the various apportionments of this very large sum, between \$300,000 and \$400,000, are to be expended, and what is actually going on in connection with it. The committee would altogether fail in its duty, if it were to allow a sum of that magnitude to pass obviously in violation of the plain decision at which Parliament has arrived, and my hon. friend is making a mistake in pressing this item through under the circumstances. We want a complete statement in detail with reference to that large sum for dredging the St. Lawrence.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend has asked me whether it can be

shown that since the passing of the Order in Council of 1880 any dredge has been undertaken to be built by day's labour. Yes, the late Government did commence to build a dredge by day's labour in the works at Sorel, and the dredge was unfinished when the change of Government took place.

Mr. HAGGART. Was there not a specific vote for that specific purpose?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that it was built just as this one, out of the funds voted for the ship channel. Therefore, in this matter we are following precisely the practice established by the late Government.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the name of the dredge?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The dredge was begun by the late Government, and when the change of Government occurred, it was named the "Laurier." It never would be suspected that a dredge so named was begun by the late Government, but I understand that the hull was constructed before the change of Government.

Mr. DAVIN. Whoever told the hon. gentleman that we interpreted the Order in Council improperly, has, I think, failed to advise him correctly. If he will look at the Order in Council, he will see that what he has been advised as to its interpretation is quite wrong. The Order in Council states:

We recommend that hereafter all public works involving expenditure of over \$5,000 shall be made by public tender and contract.

My hon. friend says he is informed that that Order in Council does not apply to works of this kind.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that it has not been so interpreted.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like very much, if he, or whoever advised him, would give their reasons for interpreting the Order in Council that way.

Mr. BERGERON. To show the hon. gentleman how important it would be to allow that item to stand until he gets all the information, I want to put him some questions which he may answer later on. Where were the dredges made before 1896, and how were they made?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They were bought by the Harbour Commission and transferred to the Government.

Mr. BERGERON. How many dredges were there working in the channel before 1896?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Five.

Mr. BERGERON. What were their names?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They were numbered—6, 9, 8, 11, 12.

Mr. BERGERON. How many men were working in the Sorel shops before 1896 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There were 470 at one time. At present there are 250.

Mr. BERGERON. What were the wages paid before ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. -The same as now.

Mr. BERGERON. I mean the amounts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That would be according to the number of men employed.

Mr. BERGERON. For how long were the 470 men at work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About three months last winter.

Mr. BERGERON. Was it during last winter ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. When was the appropriation voted ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As part of the general vote last year.

Mr. BERGERON. How much is generally done in a year in deepening that channel between Montreal and Quebec ? How much was done in 1896 and how much is done now ? I would like to have the number of dredges employed and the number of cubic yards taken out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can give from the report of the Minister what was done last year, but the comparison with 1897 cannot be made off-hand. The report shows that a total of 625,448 yards of material was taken out, the average per day per dredge being 810 yards.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) understands that I wish to be able to make a comparison between 1896 when we have these five dredges and to-day when we have the new plant.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can obtain a statement for my hon. friend. It will be merely collecting facts that have appeared in the report and are before the country, still, I will have one of the officers collect it.

Mr. BERGERON. How many dredges will be working this summer on this channel ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Four.

Mr. BERGERON. That is less than before 1896.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The other dredges are old ones and have been replaced.

Mr. BERGERON. Which ones have been replaced ?

Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Nos. 6, 7, 9 and 11 have been retired.

Mr. BERGERON. Where are they now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are dismantled.

Mr. BERGERON. How long were they in use ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About twenty-five years.

Mr. BERGERON. How many new ones are being built now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They have four at work, and two are being built, and it is proposed to build two others which will replace two of the older ones.

Mr. BERGERON. How much per day is spent on the whole work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I could not answer that question off-hand. I am told that this appropriation of \$100,000 is not out of proportion to the former grant.

Mr. BERGERON. It would be more satisfactory to have the information as to how much the work is costing per day. My hon. friend will understand that we are as much interested in having the channel deepened between Quebec and Montreal as he or the Government are, and we wish to help him to have as much work done as possible during the season.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The engineer tells me that each dredge costs from \$100 to \$125 per day for working expenses, including the crew, fuel, oil, &c.

Mr. BERGERON. How much work does the dredge do in cubic yards ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In average material, about 3,000 yards in ten hours.

Mr. HAGGART. If I understood the Minister aright, the average work last year was 810 yards.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is correct ; some of the dredges worked to some extent in boulders. Still, they are capable in softer material of removing 3,000 yards.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is the machinery that was taken out of the old dredges ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is being used in the new dredges.

Mr. BERGERON. And where is the machinery required for other dredges now under construction obtained ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No contracts have been awarded for new machinery.

Mr. COCHRANE. Have they called for tenders ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do they intend to call for them?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will leave that to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) when he returns.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, how about the two new dredges built last year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There were not two dredges built last year; two are under construction, and it is contemplated to build two more.

Mr. BERGERON. Where was material bought for the two that are under construction?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Quotations were obtained from several firms, including Lewis Bros. & Co., J. W. Wurtele & Co., Cavanagh & Co., and J. M. Pyke.

Mr. BERGERON. From whom was it obtained?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Partly from J. W. Wurtele & Co. and partly from Cavanagh & Co.

Mr. BERGERON. What amount was obtained from Wurtele & Co.?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About \$20,000 from each.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this Wurtele in the steel business?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is a commission agent for goods of that class.

Mr. BERGERON. What were the prices of the four tenderers?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not got the figures with me, but I will bring them down for the hon. gentleman. In every instance where the hon. gentleman has asked for specific information, I feel it my duty to bring down that information.

Mr. HAGGART. You remember I asked for the quantities to complete the navigation of the St. Lawrence. I want to know what it has cost per yard for excavation, both of earth and of rock, and when it is to be completed. I want to know what is the difference between the required prism of the river now, and what it was when the department took hold of it four years ago.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend will find most of that information in the report of the Minister, which is now in his hands. But I will bring down anything additional that he requires.

Mr. HAGGART. The quantities are not here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised that it is set out in full in the report of the Minister, at page 138. There are elaborate tables.

Mr. BERGERON. Where are the dredges working now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Two at Varennes, one at Cap Santé, and one at Quebec.

Mr. BERGERON. How long will it take to complete the work, and what will be the cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To give a 29-foot channel, which is the least that the present shipping requires, it will take these dredges three years, working night and day, at a cost of between \$100 and \$125 per day each. They will work about seven months in the season.

Mr. BERGERON. When were the tenders asked for the steel which went into the construction of these dredges?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the spring of 1898.

Mr. BERGERON. When was the material bought, and when was the money paid to Mr. Wurtele?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Payments were made a year ago, in the month of June and July, partly out of the old year and partly out of the new.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that a son of Judge Wurtele, of Montreal?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. One other point. The hon. gentleman asked me as to the practice of doing work by day labour notwithstanding this Order in Council. I am informed that the post office in the city of St. John, after the fire, was rebuilt by day's labour at a cost of \$170,000. The whole thing was burnt, there was little or nothing left to repair, it was practically a new building.

Mr. HAGGART. Still, there is an Order in Council for the building of it in that way. You need an Order in Council for this expenditure, and I doubt very much if there is one.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will get it for my hon. friend, if there is one.

Mr. HAGGART. But we do not know even yet that there is one. As to the building of that dredge down there, if I remember rightly, the statement was made to the House when the dredge was to be built, and when the money was voted for building it at Sorel. I think I will be able to get the particulars after dinner. If I remember rightly, Mr. Ouimet brought down the estimates, stating where the dredge was to be built, and he asked a vote for building it at that particular place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend may be confusing another vote with this. I am advised there was a special vote taken for a dredge operating in the mari-

time provinces, but there was no special vote taken for this particular dredge, which was afterwards called the "Laurier."

Mr. McALISTER. Was not a portion of the old walls of the post office in St. John utilized? In that case it would be difficult for tenderers to know exactly what it cost to rebuild.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the old walls were utilized; but still a very large amount of work, costing \$170,000, was done by day's labour.

Mr. HAGGART. Was not this statement made: That on account of the difficulty of finding out what was required to be done, it would have to be done by day labour? I think that statement was made when the vote was taken.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is quite likely.

Mr. BENNETT. I think there was an expenditure included in this for the construction of a tug called the "Challenge," which was built at Sorel last year. Can the Minister tell me what the cost of the hull was?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was no hull for a tug of that name.

Mr. BENNETT. Then it was the "Trudeau."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total cost of the tug was about \$8,000.

Mr. BENNETT. I have only this to say, that if all the expenditures that have been made at Sorel are on a par with the expenditure in connection with this "Trudeau" tug, then there should be a minute inquiry. The circumstances were these: The "Trudeau" being a very old tug, was employed in connection with the Government dredge named "Challenge." The tug being old, the machinery was taken out of her at Midland. Instead of calling for tenders, as the Minister might have done for the construction of a new hull, at that point where different parties would have tendered, the tug being very small as compared with the tugs that have been built there, the machinery was taken out of her, and then it was shipped down to Sorel to be placed in a new hull, and the new hull was brought up to Midland. This tug, the "Trudeau" is a comparatively small tug, and instead of costing \$8,000, it is a notorious fact that a tug half as big again there was offered for nearly \$5,000. When the hon. Minister states that it cost \$8,000 to build the hull, I presume he includes the carriage of machinery from Midland to Sorel. The price is a large one as compared with the price of tugs that I have known of in that locality. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether that includes the cost of the transport of the boiler and the engine from Midland to Sorel, and the placing of them in the new hull?

Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) the information now, but I will take a note of it and see that it is produced.

Mr. BERGERON. Did I understand the hon. Minister to say that James Howden is the superintendent in charge of the works at Sorel?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. I have always understood that he was in charge of the tugs only.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is in charge of the whole establishment.

Mr. BERGERON. Is he a permanent employee?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is not technically in the civil service, but he is practically a permanent employee.

Mr. BERGERON. In looking over these accounts I see some most extraordinary charges. It looks as if hon. gentlemen were trying to get some of our good Conservatives by buying goods at their places. I suppose that these goods have been bought without tender.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Without public tender, yes.

Mr. BERGERON. I see that goods amounting in all to \$175,000 have been bought without tender.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. All from Conservatives?

Mr. BERGERON. No; the largest amount is that paid to John Cavanagh, \$30,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Who is Mr. Cavanagh?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is a hardware merchant in Montreal.

Mr. BERGERON. I see Mr. Wurtele figures for \$20,000, and that is without tender.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In that case, although I said without public tender, we invited quotations for these goods.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. Minister has promised to bring down the names and the figures, prices in each case.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly.

Mr. BERGERON. There was paid \$350 for wood to La Sclerie at St. Agathe. That is going very far away to get wood and I am surprised at the expenditure. For spruce, \$11 was paid. There was paid to a man by the name of Remi Boyer \$15 for measuring the tugs "Laurier" and "Iberville."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that the information was asked

for in the House and that the measurements had to be made for the purpose.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Who is Boyer? Why was the measurement made by a special person, and not by the engineer or whoever is in charge of the works down there?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Boyer is a custom-house official.

**Mr. BERGERON.** An employee of the Government?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Yes.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Why should the Government pay \$15 to measure two tugs when he is an employee of the Government already paid a good salary?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I will be glad to get that information for my hon. friend. I cannot answer his question, but I will be pleased to bring the information. I cannot answer off-hand a great many of the questions that the hon. gentleman has asked me.

**Mr. BERGERON.** No, and if the hon. Minister of Public Works himself were here he could not answer a great many of these questions.

**Mr. BENNETT.** Perhaps the hon. Minister can answer my question as to whether the old boiler and engines were placed in the "Trudeau."

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The chief engineer tells me that he is not quite sure, but he thinks they were.

**Mr. BENNETT.** Will the hon. Minister please, then, let me have the figures as to the comparative cost of the hull and where the balance of the \$8,000 was expended?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** We will try to get that information for the hon. gentleman.

**Mr. DAVIN.** I understood the hon. Minister to say that this item would stand until the information was brought down.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I thought I had given such a large amount of information upon this item that hon. gentlemen would not ask to have it stand. I have promised, in each specific case, to bring down the information as soon as I get it. If hon. gentlemen want the item to stand I shall have no objection, but I think that we could further the business by allowing the item to pass on the understanding that in concurrence the information shall be furnished. I will see that a memorandum is made of every request, and that information will be brought down.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Here is an expenditure of \$354,000 which is proposed to be made entirely without an Order in Council. The hon. gentleman says that perhaps he has an Order in Council. Here is a department

which has violated every promise that was made by hon. gentlemen when in Opposition, and which has acted in direct violation of the statutory law of the country. You may violate your own Order in Council by changing the Order in Council and substituting another for it. Here is a department in which over \$700,000 has been expended in direct contravention of the statutory law, of the Orders in Council and of the promises which hon. gentlemen, when in Opposition, made again and again. What the country expects is the carrying out of the law and the pledges of hon. gentlemen, no matter whether the hon. Minister of Public Works is correct or not in saying that he can get a better service by adopting the day labour system. He stated that the best thing for the people of this country was to allow the Minister of Public Works to continue to work upon the day labour system. It has been contrary to the practice and principles of every Government in the country, contrary to the principle which has been insisted upon by the members of the Government when they were in Opposition, and contrary to the direct promise which had been given by the Government again and again, when a sum of money has been voted that the work for which it was designed would be done by public tender. Here is a department which is asking for authority for an expenditure of \$354,000. We have no promise of the kind, and in looking over the accounts for last year we find that nearly the whole of the work done by the Public Works Department was in violation of the law and Order in Council, and in direct violation of every promise hon. gentlemen opposite made when they were on this side of the House.

**Mr. DAVIN.** Let me give an illustration of what my hon. friend has just been showing. The Minister of Finance has told us that Remi Boyer is a permanent employee of the customs, and yet that he received \$15 for measuring the dredge "Laurier" and the tug "Iberville." Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) aware of this clause in the Civil Service Act of 1888:

Subsections 1 and 2 of section 51 of the Civil Service Act (R.S.C., cap. 17) are hereby repealed, and the following substituted therefor:—

"51 No extra salary or additional remuneration of any kind whatsoever shall be paid to any deputy head, officer or employee in the civil service of Canada, or to any other person permanently employed in the public service."

In the face of that clause of the Civil Service Act, the Minister of Finance tells us here that this permanent employee has been paid \$15 for measuring the "Laurier" and another dredge. It is not merely that they violated the Order in Council that was passed in order to protect the public, but they have actually violated the express provision of the law. The Minister of Finance told us to-day that we did not inter-

pret that Order in Council properly. I do not know who inspired him at the moment, but if it was the Minister of the Interior that hinted that, I should like the Minister of the Interior to tell us, as a lawyer, how he interpreted that Order in Council other than as I had interpreted it. Here is a clause of the Civil Service Act deliberately violated in the case of this Remi Boyer. I need not tell the Minister of Finance that it is the desire of every man on this side of the House to facilitate the conduct of business as much as possible and bring this session to a close, but when we are confronted, in one department after another, with this systematic violation of the law, systematic violation of Orders in Council, systematic violation of all the safeguards that the wisdom of the past has fenced around these departments so as to prevent extravagance and corruption, how can we do otherwise than analyse and probe, and in the public interest try to get at the bottom of these irregularities? You know very well, Mr. Chairman, that where there are irregularities, you cannot prevent suspicion. If people want to carry on business honestly, why not carry it on regularly? If they carry on business irregularly, they need not be surprised that the Opposition in Parliament will criticise them as we do, and they need be still less surprised, if they find that the public of Canada will refuse them that confidence which they vainly expect.

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

### After Recess.

#### RELIEF OF ABRAHAM ARONSBURG.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 144)—from the Senate—for the relief of Abraham Aronsburg.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I have no knowledge of this Bill myself, but I am informed that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), who gave the matter some attention before the Committee on Private Bills, desires to express his views upon it. Unfortunately he is not present, and if there is no objection, I would like to move that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again, so that he may have that opportunity. I have no knowledge or opinion whatever on the Bill myself.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would prefer that the hon. Minister should go further and move that the committee rise. From all the information I could gather in regard to this case, I think the more it is investigated the more we shall be inclined to refuse the application.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I was on the committee and I heard the whole matter discussed. The parties are complete strangers to me, but I do not think there is any element in the case that would justify us in putting off the consideration of the Bill. This is the second time it has been put off, and no reason has been given why it should be postponed, especially as most of the members of the committee are here. On Friday night it was postponed because of certain parties not being present. A postponement is again asked to-night, on account of the same parties not being present. It appears to me that if these parties are interested in their side of the case they should make a point of being here when the Bill is being considered.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I think the promoters of the Bill will gain nothing by pressing it at this time, and the motion that has been made by the hon. Minister of Finance is the only proper one under the circumstances. In fact, I would have been ready to cut it short, but at the same time I think we must give the matter very serious consideration, because there is great objection to the Bill.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The hon. gentleman would vote against the motion anyhow, as I think his mind is made up.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I rise to a point of order. I deny the right of the hon. gentleman to say which way I will vote when the question comes up. He has no right to make that imputation.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Perhaps not. If the hon. gentleman will vote on our side I will take it back. I heard the evidence, which was given very clearly, and I do not know that in my experience in this House we have ever had a clearer case. I do not see why it should be put off any longer. The witnesses were brought before the committee, and they gave their evidence, and the man, who is a poor man, I believe—I never met him before—said he had spent \$500 or \$600 on the case, and was unable to go any further. One of the parties said that he ought to have another witness from Toronto, the man who had married his divorced wife. If this Parliament is to be a divorce court at all, I am satisfied that a divorce should be granted in this case.

Mr. McCLURE. I heard the evidence given before the committee, and I am sorry to say that I arrived at an entirely different conclusion from that of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. I do not want the matter postponed, for I am prepared to vote on it now, and I certainly would vote against the Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not any knowledge of the case; but I was informed that my colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries took a warm interest in this Bill, and I merely made the motion

to enable him to have an opportunity of expressing his views. Having done that, I have no further interest in the Bill.

**Mr. SCRIVER.** As Chairman of the Committee on Private Bills, I see no object in postponing the consideration of this Bill. The taking of evidence in regard to it was rather an unusual course for a Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills. When the Bill was first brought before the committee, some members thought it was desirable to have further evidence. That further evidence was taken, and was carefully considered on both sides. For my own part, I consider that there is no object in postponing the consideration of the Bill.

Motion for the committee to rise and report progress negatived.

Bill reported.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 145) to amalgamate the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company and the Canada Atlantic Railway Company under the name of the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 20) to incorporate the Zenith Mining and Railway Company.—(Mr. Poupore.)

#### NIAGARA, ST. CATHARINES AND TORONTO RAILWAY COMPANY.

**Mr. CLARKE** moved second reading of amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company. He said: This amendment limits the company to issuing securities to the extent of \$20,000, instead of \$25,000, per mile.

Motion agreed to; amendment read the second time.

#### LA BANQUE DU PEUPLE.

**Mr. PREFONTAINE** moved second reading of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 6) respecting La Banque du Peuple. He said: The amendments are unimportant with regard to the principle of the Bill. The first is, that nothing in this Act shall affect any security held at the time of the passing of the Act by any judgment creditor of the bank. This is to cover a judgment creditor who obtained security in appeal. He obtained judgment, and the case was carried to appeal, and the directors gave him security for the amount of judgment and costs. The next amendment provides, that if, on the liquidation of the remaining assets and securities a sum be realized more than sufficient to pay 45 cents on the dollar, any surplus shall be divided among the shareholders.

The objection was raised against the liquidation being made by the directors, who are personally responsible, that they might make money out of the liquidation. In order to avoid that contingency, the Senate thought proper to add this clause, and, in order to guard more securely against any eventualities, it thought proper to appoint Hon. Mr. Desjardins, president of the Jacques Cartier Bank, as one of the liquidators. This is accepted by the representatives of the creditors and depositors of the bank, as offering more security to them, who are specially interested in this liquidation.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Do I understand that the shareholders are the only participants in the amount that may be realized over the 45 cents on the dollar?

**Mr. PREFONTAINE.** Yes.

**Mr. HAGGART.** And the directors are relieved from all personal liability whatever? And the judgment creditors will be paid in full, while the others will not?

**Mr. PREFONTAINE.** I may be allowed to explain. There is one judgment creditor in favour of whom an exception is made, and that is because he has obtained security from third parties, and so, of course, stands in a different position from other judgment creditors. The others are not preferred but stand on the same footing as the other creditors. As the creditor who has been excepted had taken security of the other parties, it is thought reasonable that his security should not be taken away from him.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prefontaine) explain why this distribution of the amount over 45 cents on the dollar is limited to the shareholders?

**Mr. PREFONTAINE.** The representative of the creditors had nothing to do with that. It was to answer the objection as I have stated, that the liquidator might make money enough out of the liquidation. And it was suggested that whatever might be realized over the 45 cents should be deposited with the Deputy Minister of Finance here in Ottawa. Different ways were suggested, and the one resorted to was the one in the Bill.

**Mr. LaRIVIERE.** It must be borne in mind that there is only one class of creditors, and they are the depositors. No others have claims. The depositors will get 75 cents on the dollar, and if there is a surplus over and above the 75 cents, when the whole assets of the bank are liquidated, that will go to the ordinary shareholders of the bank. Some of the depositors had sued the bank and taken judgment, and one has gone further than that and obtained security, and he is the only one preferred.

Motion agreed to, and amendments read the second time and concurred in.

## SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Harbours and Rivers, Quebec—

River St. Lawrence ship channel.... \$354,000

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. Minister gave no explanation of the payment to Mr. Remi Boyer directly contrary to the Act of Parliament.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I have asked the proper officer to ascertain the facts of the case, but they have not yet been furnished me. I am satisfied that it will be found that this payment is not contrary to the Act of Parliament, but I am not able at the moment to give the hon. gentleman the information. It has been suggested to me—I do not give it as the explanation—that customs officers sometimes act as registrars of shipping and are allowed to receive payment as such. I will give more definite information. The amount is a small one, and it may prove to be a mere matter of expenses.

Mr. DAVIN. There are a number of other questions not answered.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As far as possible, I have endeavoured to get the information asked for. One question was with regard to steel plates for the construction of dredges. I stated that quotations had been asked from Ed. Cavanagh & Co., of Montreal, Lewis Bros., of Montreal, J. M. Pyke and J. W. Wurtele & Co., of Ottawa. Their tenders were as follows: Wurtele, \$20,460; Cavanagh, \$20,460; Lewis Bros., \$22,400, and Pyke, \$24,000. The tenders of Messrs Wurtele and Cavanagh being the lowest and being equal were both accepted and the work was divided between them.

Mr. BERGERON. How can the tenders be made in that way. This seems to be a lump sum?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The specification was submitted and they were asked to tender a lump sum for the quantity stated.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the hon. Minister that specification?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not. I was not asked to produce it. My hon. friend might ask the same question regarding any one of a thousand items mentioned in the Auditor General's Report. We cannot have all these papers at hand at the moment. But it can be obtained.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the name of that firm Lewis Bros., of Montreal?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. LARIVIERE.

Mr. BERGERON. I see they are down here for a pretty good amount in the Auditor General's Report.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was asked to give some information also as to the McCarthy Estate at Sorel. I have ascertained that the property was first leased to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal by Mr. McCarthy in 1874 for five years, at \$1,600 per year. In 1879, the lease was extended at the same rate for three years, with the privilege of a two years' extension. In 1893, the lease was made to the department for five years at \$1,200 per year. On the 5th of September, 1898, the department secured from the McCarthy Estate a promise of sale, the price to be fixed by arbitration, and the department to retain the property under lease at the same rental until the Minister signified his desire to purchase. Therefore, we have a lease at \$1,200 a year with the right to purchase by arbitration at any time.

Mr. HAGGART. No part of this vote is for the purpose of purchasing?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. I was asked to give information as to the cost of the dredging, and I have obtained the following memorandum:—

Year.	No. of Dredges.	Cubic Yards Dredged.	Average cost per Cubic Yard. cents.
1895 .....	4	423,735	26 3-10
1896 .....	4	437,632	28 2-10
1897 .....	5	330,207	24½
1898 .....	5	625,488	28½

One dredge, I am informed, only worked for part of the season, and was afterwards sent to Kingston, so the five dredges were not constantly employed there.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the cost of the repairs been charged to that work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, that has been the practice.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister was to bring down the Order in Council showing his authority to do certain works without tender.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed there was no Order in Council, nor has it been the practice of the department to obtain an Order in Council under such circumstances. I have obtained from the department a list of a large number of works constructed by the late Government without Order in Council, and, I am advised, by day's labour; and the practice of the late Government in that respect, I understand, has been followed by the present Minister. The statute does not bind a Minister as closely as the terms of the Order in Council. But the Order in Council has not been interpreted by the Minister of Public Works in the line of hon. gentlemen

opposite, and I am informed he has followed the practice of his predecessors in that respect.

**Mr. BERGERON.** The hon. gentleman said this afternoon that all these amounts shown in the Auditor General's Report had been bought without tender.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Not exactly without public tender, but I said that in large and important cases quotations had been asked.

**Mr. BERGERON.** It is not asking for tenders when the department goes to its friends and asks for figures; that will not satisfy the public that the cheapest rate is obtained. The Minister of Public Works tries to be as good as possible to his friends. He does business in a most extraordinary way, and some hon. gentlemen opposite, whom I see, would make an awful fuss if that were done by a Conservative Government. Now, the Minister of Public Works has bought a good deal of coal, but he does not call for tenders. He buys it right and left from his friends. I see here he buys from Benson & Co., Sydney, steam coal, 11 tons at \$3.65. I find also that he buys from Alfred Lavallée, Sorel, 568 tons at \$3.50; T. F. Moore & Co., Montreal, 3,597 tons of Scotch coal at \$2.90, 23 tons at 60 cents, O. S. steam coal, 1,035 gross tons at \$2.85; smith's coal, 130 gross tons at \$4.15, and so on. Everybody gets a share. I have not time to go over the accounts. He buys wood also, a bit of everybody, some from J. & B. Grier, Montreal, over \$1,900 worth; iron from B. J. Coughlin, Montreal, also without tender. I suppose he asked his price and gave him what he wanted. I mentioned this afternoon there was something bought from the saw-mills of St. Agathe. Then, there is lumber bought from Shearer & Co. Montreal, and goods from Lewis Bros., whose name figures very often here. He was asked for prices, and given his prices, I suppose, just as were Wurtele & Co., and Cavanagh & Co. I suppose the Minister of Public Works thought he must be generous, and distribute his favours all round. He divides it up among his friends so that they all get a share. I see the Minister of Public Works does not neglect the friends of his colleague the Minister of Railways and Canals, for he goes down to St. John and gives McAvity & Sons orders for \$790 worth of goods, all bought at retail prices. It is like a man going to a retail merchant in a village and buying articles by retail.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** T. McAvity & Sons, St. John, are manufacturers.

**Mr. BERGERON.** But these are bought at retail. There is no use going to a wholesale merchant and buying goods by retail, and without asking for tenders. C. O. Paradis, Sorel, gets an order for \$237; W.

F. Patenaude, Sorel, gets an order for \$2,282; Thibaudeau & Co., Sorel, get an order for \$241; A. C. Trempe, Sorel, gets an order for \$452. Of course, all these men will now be friends of the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau). It is like that all the way through. It is clear as day that this is not at all the way which we have been told in the past business would be carried on if hon. gentlemen opposite reached the Treasury benches. I am amazed at the silence of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who sits there when we are unearthing the most scandalous transactions that ever came before this House. I am not at all surprised that the Minister of Public Works is too sick to stay here and pass his Estimates; it would have been impossible for him to explain all these. Of course, I sympathize with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. He says, in answer to our questions: I know nothing at all about it, the man who did that is not here. I must congratulate my hon. friend for being so patient and doing as well as he can to give us information. But he cannot be expected to answer all the questions which we would be entitled to ask if the Minister of Public Works was here.

**Mr. HAGGART.** The Minister in charge of this department must remember that when these items were voted the Minister of Public Works promised us that every article would be bought by tender. Besides that, the hon. gentleman says that the statute is not as binding upon them as the Order in Council. My reading of the statute makes it imperative upon the Minister to ask for tenders. He buys two lots of material, one at \$20,000 and one for \$22,000, without tender, given to two parties out of four who are asked to put in prices. That is not the way I understand the meaning of this section regarding public works:

The Minister shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of all works, except in cases of pressing emergency, in which delay would be injurious to the public interest, or in which, from the nature of the work, it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department.

There is no evidence of that kind here.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The Minister must be the judge of that.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Not at all, it is not a case of emergency.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE:** Who is to judge?

**Mr. WALLACE.** The House of Commons.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The House has a right to review, but the Minister, at the time is judge.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that these contracts worth \$20,000 and \$22,000 could be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department? Is it a work of emergency? Does it come under either of these heads? Surely the hon. Minister does not contend that. It is true that the right hon. Prime Minister states that an Order in Council is necessary for the letting of the contract, and that no work amounting to more than \$5,000 shall be done in any way other than that. He says that is merely an Order in Council; we can revoke an Order in Council. An Order in Council is not binding upon us. But here no Order in Council is passed. You do not even go through the formality of that. You do not get an Order in Council for doing that work, and the statute is obligatory upon you. Surely the hon. Minister of Finance does not pretend that any of these works come under the classification of works of pressing emergency.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What I mean to say is, that the terms of the Act give the Minister a discretion in that case, and my contention is, that the Order in Council has not been interpreted in times past as the hon. gentleman now seeks to interpret it. It has not been so interpreted by the late Administration. But in the particular case to which he refers, there was an Order in Council, and these tenders to which I have referred, were accepted by Order in Council. All I can say is, that an Order in Council has not been held to be necessary in the case of work that is to be done by day labour. It comes under the words of the statute where the Minister thinks that the service can be better done by the officers of his department. In doing the work by day labour I believe the hon. Minister was carrying out the intention of the statute and the Order in Council.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister puts a curious interpretation upon an Act of Parliament. He says that the Minister of Public Works got an Order in Council. All the Minister does is to ask a person what he will do a certain piece of work for. The person replies: I will do it for \$20,000. Then the hon. Minister goes to his colleagues and gets an Order in Council. The hon. Minister of Finance contends that that is a compliance with the statute.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do.

Mr. HAGGART. It is a most extraordinary compliance. Perhaps the hon. Minister has not heard me. Is it a case of pressing emergency or one which, from the nature of the work, can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department? The hon. Minister does not pretend that this

Mr. FIELDING.

work has been done by the officers or servants of the department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not that particular job, but my hon. friend admits that the greater part of the work has been done at Sorel by day labour by the officers of the department.

Mr. HAGGART. Repairs and that will comply with the statute.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And construction.

Mr. HAGGART. No; it will not apply to construction. The department gets a vote for the purpose, say, of constructing dredges. There must be some reason more than the fact that the work can be more economically and expeditiously done by the department. To comply with the statute the hon. Minister should get an Order in Council first. What is the use of the statute, what is the use of the Order in Council, if the Minister at any time can let a contract, and if, after the contract is let without tender to any man that he pleases, the Minister can come to his colleagues and get an Order in Council accepting the offer? Does the hon. gentleman contend that that is a compliance with the statute and with the Order in Council?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Will my hon. friend say what the statute requires?

Mr. HAGGART. I read it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Does the statute say anything about an Order in Council?

Mr. HAGGART. Not at all:

The Minister shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of all works, except in cases of pressing emergency, in which delay would be injurious to the public interest.

It does not require an Order in Council, because the statute is imperative.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Who decides whether it is a case of emergency?

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister decides as to whether it is a case of emergency, and does the work at once.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is what he did in this case.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman contend that the purchase of steel, or wood, or coal, for the purpose of carrying on this business down there, constituted a case of emergency? A case of emergency is where a building is burned, and requires to be immediately erected, or where a canal breaks, and the work of repair must be immediately undertaken. I think, in most of these instances, the Minister has to go to Council to get an Order to complete the

work. The only exception that is made is in case of emergency or where the work is required to be done by the officers and servants of the department. In these two cases, I think, it is requisite that an Order in Council should be got for the purpose of doing the work.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance when will the dredge "Laurier" be in condition to work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the dredge is an honour to her namesake, and is working well.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he has any information as to the cost of the tug "Trudeau"?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not been able to get the information. It was asked for this afternoon, when the department was closed, and I have not been able to obtain it, although I sent an officer for it.

Mr. BENNETT. I understood the hon. Minister to say this afternoon that this tug that was built at Sorel cost about \$8,000. I have only this to say, that if the rest of the work done at that institution costs the country as much proportionately as that small tug did, it is no wonder such large figures appear in the public accounts. The Government, or rather the hon. Minister of Public Works, is asking for \$354,000, under the heading of "Improvement of the River St. Lawrence Ship Channel," and in the ministerial press it will be heralded through the country that the Government is making great preparations to accommodate the shipping trade of Montreal. As a matter of fact, on reference to the Public Accounts of last year, we find that a very trifling part of the money went into the work of deepening the ship channel. Of the expenditure last year of about \$200,000, we find that about \$53,000 is for wages in workshops which the hon. Minister of Public Works is carrying on at Sorel, where upwards of 400 men are working by day's labour. There has been purchased material amounting to about \$100,000, and the difference of about \$35,000 was paid in wages and the operating expenses of the dredges engaged upon the work, so that, in other words, \$35,000 of dredging was accomplished out of this expenditure of \$200,000. Let us come down to the general principle of the matter. As I understand it, no contract can be entered into by any department where the amount exceeds \$5,000, unless under certain terms which have been stated. Nobody can profess or pretend in this case that urgency removed the hon. Minister from the necessity of entering into a contract for the work. The hon. Minister, utterly disregarding all the principles of contract and tendering, goes to his party

friends and purchases, without fair and open competition, from one upwards of \$20,000 worth, and from another \$20,000 worth, and in the purchase of \$100,000 worth of material the formality of public competition is never indulged in. The hon. Minister of Public Works asserts his rights, and a good deal more than his rights, because in other departments, no matter how trifling the amounts may be, tenders must be invited. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) stated that one or two concerns did make calculations, and, although the amount purchased was nearly \$20,000, by a most wonderful coincidence these two concerns had exactly the same figures. It seems like a romance that two different firms, one in the city of Ottawa and one in the city of Montreal should tender for supplies of material amounting to \$20,000, and that these two tenders should be exactly the same when they are figured out. The Minister (Mr. Fielding) cannot fail to see that a certain amount of suspicion must attach to that. The Minister was anxious to distribute favours among his party friends, and so he went to these two firms, one of whom, Mr. Wurtele, is a commission merchant, had no steel to sell, and who I believe for the first time indulged in a transaction of selling a pound of steel. When the Minister wants oak at Sorel, in the province of Quebec, does he purchase it there? Not at all. The oak is brought down from the Georgian Bay to Sorel, and the Government pay about \$300 on account of freight. Surely there must be any quantity of oak in the province of Quebec, and yet Mr. James Playfair, of the Georgian Bay district, is given \$1,213 for oak, and of this amount \$311 was for freight. I know a reason why probably Mr. Playfair, who is a very ardent Liberal although a personal friend of mine, had handed out to him this one thousand two hundred odd dollars. As I stated this afternoon, there was an old tug there named the "Trudeau," and it was necessary to build a new hull for her. Mr. Playfair and other gentlemen were in the business of constructing tugs, but the Minister (Mr. Tarte) was not anxious that the tugs should be brought at the cheapest possible price by open competition, for he wanted to take the work down to his shipyard at Sorel where he could employ more men by day's labour and purchase more supplies from his friends in the province of Quebec, and so when the tug was not built at Midland, where it ought to have been built, Mr. Playfair is appeased a bit by handing him over \$1,200 for oak, and this business Government pays \$300 for freight on oak from the Georgian Bay to the town of Sorel.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Where would the oak be got?

Mr. BENNETT. Surely all the oak that has been used for years past in the province

of Quebec has not been brought from Ontario.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think you can get oak cheaper in that direction than you can anywhere else.

Mr. **BENNETT**. And if the Government wanted to buy \$1,200 worth of oak in Midland, why did they not ask for tenders? All through the Public Accounts this same Mr. Playfair had very considerable sums paid to him for repairs to scows, and no tenders were invited, but he being a party friend of the Government was handed over this work at his own price. So anxious is the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) to please all his friends, that he actually goes down to the city of St. John, N.B., and buys hardware there amounting to thousands of dollars. Let it be understood in the country that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) is conducting his department just as he likes, and that when he asks for this vote of \$354,000 Parliament does not know but that he is going to spend the whole sum by purchasing supplies from his party friends privately at their own figures, and not by open competition. I am surprised how the other Ministers, and more particularly the Ontario Ministers, can sit there quietly in their places and tolerate such conduct as that. I will not say anything about the gentlemen behind the Ministers who are absolutely silent at this extravagance and illegality on every occasion. But how can the Ontario Ministers sit quietly by and see the Minister of Public Works expending hundreds of thousands of dollars without asking for tenders. Let me ask the Minister of Finance how much of this \$354,000 is to be spent in purchasing materials?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The working operations of the dredges are estimated at \$100,000. The estimate for the construction of new dredging plant and for the repair of the old dredging plant is \$254,000.

Mr. **BENNETT**. Then judging by our past experience of the Minister of Public Works, he will place three or four hundred men at this work, pay them what he wishes, and then turn round and spend \$254,000 in materials without asking for tenders. If business is to be conducted on business principles, why does not the Minister call for tenders for the construction of these dredges and award the contract to the lowest tenderer? Let us contrast the conduct of this Minister (Mr. Tarte) with the conduct of the other Ministers. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) wants to place some buoys in my district, at an annual cost of from \$50 to \$100, and he calls for tenders for that work as he properly should do. The Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) calls for tenders for carrying the

Mr. **BENNETT**.

malls for trifling distances, and I commend him for doing it, but when the Minister of Public Works asks us to vote \$254,000, the House can get no guarantee that one single dollar of that will be expended on the principle of open competition. There is to be no competition and no tender for the building of these tugs and dredges. The Minister will go around the country irrespective of where the parties may live, and in order to give a certain amount of pap to a friend on the Georgian Bay he will buy the timber there, and in order to distribute the pap widely he will buy the hardware at St. John, N.B., and pay the freight on it to Sorel. It surprises me that the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) does not look after his party friends when this patronage is going around. Why should not merchants in the city of Toronto supply these materials? There are shipbuilding concerns in the city of Toronto, and when the Minister wants to construct a dredge or a tug, why does he not ask for tenders in that city if he will not do it in Midland? We have no guarantee here to-night but that this \$254,000 will be expended among the party friends of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) and not a dollar of it expended by tender.

Now, taking the expenditure of last year, what do we find? First, we find that in the town of New Westminster, B.C., there is purchased about \$4,450 worth of timber from a firm there; I assume that there was no competition in that. Then, we find that from Mr. Cavanagh there was purchased about \$25,000 worth of material. The Dominion Foundry at Sorel was given a contract for about \$1,500 without tender. Mr. Grier, of Montreal, was given a contract of about \$2,000 for timber. Lewis Bros., hardware dealers, of Montreal, were given a contract for about \$1,300. Lavallee, of Sorel, was given a coal contract for nearly \$2,000. Moore & Co., of Montreal, were given a contract of nearly \$14,000. McAvity & Sons, of St. John, were given a contract of about \$800. The Nova Scotia Steel Company was given a contract of about \$920. Pateauade of Sorel, was given a contract of over \$2,000. Playfair, James & Co., of Midland, Ont., were given a contract of about \$1,200. Shepherd & Son, of Sorel, were given a contract of \$2,600. Wurtele, of Ottawa, was given a contract for iron goods of \$20,500—a man who never was known to be dealing in the question of iron, much less selling it.

An hon. **MEMBER**. He is a Tory.

Mr. **BENNETT**. Well, I will be bound to say that he is a much better friend of the Minister of Public Works than he is of any gentleman on this side of the House. While this vast amount of money is being voted by this House, hon. gentlemen opposite, knowing that the Minister of Public Works last year spent these large sums of money without indulging in the formality of asking

for public tenders either for work or material, are going to-night to give him carte blanche to spend \$354,000, knowing that only about \$100,000 is going into the actual work of improving the river.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I hope it will be thoroughly understood by the intelligent people interested in the dredging of the St. Lawrence that the hon. gentleman opposite and some others who have taken the same view are determined to regard the construction of the dredging plant for that work as a squandering of public money, because they are determined to distinguish between the mere expenditure on operating the dredges and the construction of the dredges themselves. How you are going to meet the demands of that great national highway without constructing and improving your dredging plant is something that I cannot understand; yet hon. gentlemen opposite are determined to brush aside every dollar of expenditure for the purpose of producing this dredging plant, and to say that all we spend is \$100,000 for the operating of the dredges. That is a line of argument in which I cannot follow hon. gentlemen opposite, and I venture to say that the hundreds of thousands of people who are interested in the navigation of the St. Lawrence will agree with me that in order to dredge the St. Lawrence we must provide the machinery for doing it; and when the Government use the workshops at Sorel for the purpose of building the dredges for that work, most sensible people will say that is a proper course to pursue. Hon. gentlemen have talked about the purchase of supplies, but in no instance is it pretended that any excessive price has been paid. If hon. gentlemen thought that there was, we would have had an inquiry before the Public Accounts Committee long ago, and all sorts of questions would have been raised and returns would have been asked for showing that such was the case. Let it be understood that there has been no change in the method of buying the supplies for this work. It has not been the practice of the department under the late Government to call for public tenders for these supplies. If hon. gentlemen turn to the Auditor General's Report for past years, they will find items of precisely the same character year after year. The late Minister of Public Works, in the exercise of the discretion which the law gave him, obtained these supplies, I presume, from his party friends. I make no complaint of that, provided he got them at fair and reasonable prices. There is no evidence given up to this time that the present Minister of Public Works has paid excessive prices; but hon. gentlemen opposite are determined to insist that every dollar of this expenditure went into the hands of political friends. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) says that one of the persons from whom supplies of hardware were bought, never handled any-

thing of that line before. I am informed that the gentleman was in the habit of supplying goods of that character, and that he supplied them to the late Government. Most of the names which my hon. friend read are the names of persons unknown to me; but he happened to read the name of one firm in the province of Nova Scotia which is known to me. I happen to know that both the president and the manager of that company have been strong opponents of the present Government, and the president sat in this House as one of the most determined Conservatives, as he is to-day; and if I may judge of the other persons whose names he has read from this case, which I do know, I venture to say that a considerable portion of the money that has been expended has gone into the hands of Conservatives, and properly so, because they were engaged in the particular business and were prepared to supply the goods at fair prices. I think hon. gentlemen have failed to make a case against the Minister of Public Works, because he carried out both the spirit and the letter of the law, and took the same course as his predecessors in these matters.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? When the Minister of Public Works estimates for the construction of a dredge which his engineers say will cost \$25,000, do hon. gentlemen opposite say that he should buy the material from his party friends and construct the dredge at Sorel rather than ask for tenders for the construction of that dredge?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a matter on which there may be a difference of opinion. There are not many people in Canada who manufacture dredges; and because the Minister (Mr. Tarte) decided to construct a dredge at Sorel, it does not follow that that is a wasteful and improvident conclusion. I have no doubt the Minister had good reasons for the conclusion he reached.

Mr. BENNETT. If it is within the power of the Minister to purchase supplies for the construction of a dredge, it is equally within the power of a public contractor to do so.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But every public contractor might not have the facilities.

Mr. BENNETT. If the Minister could secure the services of a competent man to overlook the construction of the dredge, a contractor could do the same. From my superficial knowledge of dredges, I do not think their construction requires a great deal of scientific knowledge. I know that they have been built on the Georgian Bay by practical men. But the Minister of Finance is laying it down to-night as the view of this Government that if they require to expend \$20,000 or \$30,000 for a dredge, they will not ask for public competition, but they will, as in this case, purchase materials from their party

friends without competition, and then, irrespective of the cost, will construct a dredge in the Government workshops at Sorel.

Mr. TAYLOR. As I understand, this vote which the Minister is asking is \$354,000, to be expended on the River St. Lawrence ship channel. Last year a vote of \$256,000 was taken for this service. Referring to the Auditor General's Report to ascertain how that money was expended last year, we must come to the conclusion that this vote is going to be expended in a similar manner. Now, I want to ask the Minister who has charge of this matter to turn to the Auditor General's Report, at page Q-26, and tell me what the items I read there had to do with the improving the ship channel of the River St. Lawrence. There is a sum of \$186.50 paid to R. K. Holland, of Montreal, for the following items: 275 Japanese lanterns, at 17½ cents; 150 do., at 12 cents; ¾-gross of rockets, \$11.67; 450 bucket lanterns, \$20.75; 10 dozen torches, at 90 cents; 100 torches, \$20; sundries, \$54.20; cases and cartage, \$4.75. I presume the Japanese lanterns, the torches and the other things were for a Liberal demonstration. I can see no other reason, except it was a reception to the hon. Minister. No doubt the \$54.20 for "sundries" was for something unmentionable for drinking purposes, and the \$4.75 was to put it in cases and take it down to the dock.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you think the Auditor General would pass such an item as that?

Mr. TAYLOR. He has passed it, and the figures are here. What I ask is that the Minister should explain how these things were used to improve the ship channel. The hon. Minister challenges anybody to show a case where exorbitant prices had been paid. On this very same page, we have the account of Cyrille Labelle who is paid for the storage of sixteen barrels of oil, \$8. He might better have bought the oil. He is also paid for 2,600 pounds of English oakum at 6½ cents. Any person in the trade knows that you can go into any hardware store and buy oakum for 5 cents. But the Government, as they say they are carrying on large works, they could easily import the oakum getting it at the lowest wholesale price. But instead of that they go into a little hardware store and pay more than the retail price. I would like the Minister of Finance to explain about these torches and Chinese lanterns and sundries for which \$186.50 was paid?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I am not able to answer. The hon. gentleman can ask 5,000 questions concerning items in the Auditor General's Report which cannot be answered off-hand. I have no doubt that these goods were bought and used for a proper purpose. The hon. gentleman seems to be well acquainted with the methods of the late Government, because

Mr. BENNETT:

he assumes that every item must be intended to cover something wrong. It seems to me it would be only fair to assume, in the absence of anything to the contrary, that these goods were got for a proper purpose. The hon. gentleman is too ungenerous and too suspicious in taking the contrary for granted. The hon. gentleman speaks of extravagant prices, but we know that he called attention to what he said were extravagant prices before, and on investigation, it was found in every case that the hon. gentleman was mistaken, and that the prices paid were reasonable.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like the hon. Minister to point out one case in which I was mistaken. I have not heard the contradiction from any authoritative source of any statement I made.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Oh, oh.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries laughs. I gave him a good many instances of high prices paid by his own department and he failed to answer a single one of them. He paid, for instance, \$9.60 a case for condensed milk made down in his own country, and milk of the same brand is sent across to British Columbia and sold there for \$5. I think that this committee have a right to ask the Minister of Finance for an explanation of this item of torches, rockets, &c. He has his officers beside him, who can give him the information. Last year we gave this money to be spent in the improvement of the ship channel, and now we would like to know in what way this part of the money so spent, helped to carry out the work. His officer can tell whether the money was used for a political demonstration or whether it actually went into the improvement of the St. Lawrence ship channel.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The officers of the department are unable to give the hon. gentleman the information. With every desire to give the fullest information, which I have been trying all afternoon to do and which I intend to continue to do, until the snow flies if necessary, I have no expectation of being able to satisfy my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor). I know he is determined to ask questions that cannot be answered, to make it his special business to ask questions from the Auditor General's Report concerning which it is impossible to have the information to give him off-hand. It is true, that every cent of public expenditure is a legitimate subject of question, but at a proper time. I do not think that I am bound nor are the officials of the department able to say off-hand what every dollar was expended for. The Auditor General's Report is designed to give us the fullest information on these points; and if that is insufficient we have another way of dealing with the matter through the Public Ac-

counts Committee—where the hon. gentleman is most vigilant and where he has right to call for the information. But if he does not seek the information in that way, it is unreasonable for him to expect to be told off-hand the minutest details of every dollar of public expenditure.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think it is outrageous for the Government to come here and ask to be entrusted with the public money unless they are prepared to show what was done with the money with which they have already been entrusted. The hon. Minister tells us that he wants every dollar of this money to improve the ship channel, but that was the promise made last year, and here we find \$186.50 spent for Japanese lanterns, rockets, torches, &c., &c. Now, what improvements does this \$186.50 represent? The hon. Minister speaks of charges concerning high prices having been explained away and tells us we cannot show any cases of extravagant prices. Here on this very page, we find a record showing that for goods wanted for this ship channel instead of buying at Montreal the Minister comes up here to Ottawa to favour his friend, Mr. Charleson, and Mr. Charleson's accounts shows the following:—

Files : flat, 14-in., 3 doz. at \$4.45 ; half-round, 3 doz. of 14-in. at \$5.80, 2 doz. of 12-in. at \$4.40 ; 1 doz. of square, 18-in., \$15 ; 3 doz. taper, \$2.75--\$57.30.

All these prices are outrageous as anybody in the trade will know. The Minister could have done better at any wholesale hardware store in Montreal. I do insist that the Minister should ask his officer—and I know that his officer knows—what these rockets and Japanese lanterns and torches were for, and how they improved the St. Lawrence ship channel? I protest, on behalf of the people, against their money being expended in this way to get up a demonstration for the Minister of Public Works or anybody else.

Mr. HAGGART. We have drawn attention to some cases where a higher price has been paid than in others. When we come to look at the items we find one of \$20,000 and another of \$22,000, and how are we to tell whether these are correct prices or not? The hon. gentleman says we might have made a motion in the House and got the details, or we might have gone to the Public Accounts Committee and examined the accounts. We presumed the law was being obeyed, that the work was being done as the statute directs, as the Order in Council directs ; we presumed they were asking for tenders for these articles, and that they had been bought from the lowest tenderers. We find now that was not done, that there was no tender within the meaning of the law, that these contracts are given to favourites, or possibly to men who are not favourites. But we object that the Order in Council has not been com-

plied with. The hon. gentleman states that because we object to \$254,000 being expended in that way, the country will understand that we object to improvements being made in the St. Lawrence. The hon. gentleman is begging the question. What we contend for is that the law should be obeyed, that these dredges should be built according to law and according to Order in Council. We do not object to the expenditure when it is necessary, but we do object to paying 28½ cents per cubic yard for excavation when it can be done for very much less. I will tell you what the Minister ought to do. He should consult the officers of his department to see where they can build a modern dredge. Let him go over to Liverpool, and find out what the dredges they build there can do similar work for. They can do similar work for 3 cents. Go down to New York, where material is being taken out of the harbour and moved six miles, and the contract price is 8 cents. Let him make a comparison of what his department is doing with what it cost the Montreal Harbour Commissioners to dredge out Lake St. Pierre. Let him compare their prices with what he is paying here. If I remember rightly, the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal pay for their dredging 11 or 12 cents. I know that dredges are now being built that will move that material for one-fourth the amount that the Minister has paid. He should employ modern dredges for this work. But what we object to is the principle that underlies this transaction. The Minister may say that his predecessors in office did the same thing. I deny it. I deny that work was given to favourites without contracts to the extent of \$40,000, let alone \$254,000 worth of work. We object to the public money being expended by the Minister precisely as he thinks proper. What we find fault with is that the Minister promised this House, when he got his votes, that he would use all diligence to get everything done at the lowest price by tender and on specifications, and he has done the very opposite. I have been looking over the accounts, and if I remember rightly, he has spent \$700,000 on works without tender, on works, we may assume, that he has given to favourites. I am aware that the Minister justified it in the House, and the Prime Minister justified it. They tried to interpret the statute in a manner entirely different from its plain meaning. They said it was a mere Order in Council, that it was not binding upon them, and that they could alter it. I say, as I have said before, that the principle is a bad one. They may get the work done as cheaply by day labour under the superintendence of the department, but that is not the proper principle. The principle which has been adopted by both sides of the House is that in every case where it is possible, the work should be given out

by tender. Here is a sum of \$254,000 spent for building dredges which the Minister says cannot be built in Canada. The best dredges we ever had were built by contract in Canada. There is a party on the Welland Canal who has improved machinery for building dredges as good as can be built. They are being built in the city of Ottawa. The Department of Railways and Canals has built them in the basin down here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Did the Government build them?

Mr. HAGGART. I think they were built by tender. But I say that these new dredges are not up to the mark, they are not up to the requirements for dredging harbours.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Has the hon. gentleman seen the new dredges the Minister of Public Works has built at Sorel?

Mr. HAGGART. No, I have not seen them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then, how can you state they are not good?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know anything about them, but I know that he spent over \$100,000 last year in building dredges, and the work they do costs 28 cents per yard, while the old dredges were doing the work for 28 cents. I do not know the amount the Montreal Harbour Commissioners paid for dredging, but I think it was a good deal less. But I know that by modern methods it can be done for a great deal less than that rate. But the principle I am contending for is that of giving contracts to parties after tender. Every man in this country has a right to tender and supply the Government with material. No Minister has a right to take the public money and spend it in this way, although he may get as good value for it, and I will admit that he does sometimes. But it casts suspicion upon the department to let the work without tender, it is against the law, it is against the Order in Council, it is against the principle that both sides have always advocated in this House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend insists that it is against the law, it is against the Order in Council, it is against the practice. I wish to insist that it is not against the law, it is not against the Order in Council, and it is not against the practice; but it is exactly in line with the law, as the hon. gentleman himself interpreted it, and it is exactly in line with the Order in Council as the hon. gentleman interpreted it. I want to thank the hon. gentleman for an admission he made incidentally. In the very sentence that he declared himself against the policy of building dredges at Sorel, by the Government,

Mr. HAGGART.

he admitted that he, in his own department, had built a dredge for the Intercolonial Railway in Ottawa.

Mr. HAGGART. I did not admit it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is it not a fact that a dredge was built by his own department by day's labour?

Mr. HAGGART. I am not aware of it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is the hon. gentleman in a position to contradict the statement?

Mr. HAGGART. No.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Because I have been informed that the hon. gentleman built the dredge to which he referred, in Ottawa, that it was built under the supervision of his own department and by the servants employed by his own department.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think I built it at all. It was not built by my department. The Public Works Department had two places for repairing dredges, one at Sorel, and another here. I had nothing to do with it, as it was not in my department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is not going to shirk responsibility for what the Public Works Department did.

Mr. HAGGART. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He must accept responsibility for the action of the Public Works Department in his day, as I have to accept it for a brother Minister now. I want to point out how very unfair it is for my hon. friend to quote prices for dredging here and place them in comparison with very low prices for dredging elsewhere. He quoted the average price for dredging here, and placed it in comparison with the price paid at Liverpool. Dredging has been done in Canada as cheaply as it has been done in Liverpool, according to official statements. There are cases in Canada where dredging has been done as low as 11 cents, 6 cents and 5 cents per cubic yard, but the hon. gentleman takes the average and puts it in comparison with some very low quotation. I find, in the Report of the Department of Public Works, that in 1895 the cost of dredging, under the late Government, was 54½ cents for the dredge "Laval," dredging the ship channel between Montreal and Quebec. I have no doubt that in this case there were exceptional circumstances. I presume it was hard material. I do not wish to say that the hon. gentleman opposite paid too much, but I wish him to be fair and not take a piece of work where the material is easy to handle, and place it in comparison with more difficult work. There are some places where you can get the work done for 5 cents or 6 cents per

yard, and there other difficult pieces of work that will cost 54½ cents a yard.

Mr. HAGGART. What did it cost the Harbour Commissioners ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not the figures here.

Mr. HAGGART. I think it was about 11 cents.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For the same work in the ship channel ?

Mr. HAGGART. For work in Lake St. Peter, I think, but I may be mistaken.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy informs me that he thinks the price was higher than our own, but I am not positive.

Mr. HAGGART. I may be wrong.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words in regard to the statements of the hon. Minister of Finance. He becomes highly indignant, and he tells us that we are entirely wrong in coming with our complaints before this committee. He asks: why do you not look up the Auditor General's Report and go before the Public Accounts Committee? He does not need to be told why we did not do that, because he knows that while the Auditor General's Report, according to law, should be placed on the Table of the House within eight days from the beginning of the session, it was weeks and months afterwards before it was placed on the Table of the House. The Act of Parliament, by which the hon. Minister should be guided, as well as the humblest citizen of this country, was violated in that regard. When the hon. Minister asks: Why do you not study up the Auditor General's Report, we supposed that the law had been complied with, and that these supplies had been furnished by public tender. If that had been the case, whether the prices were high or low, we would not have a legitimate ground for complaint. But when we find that the law in that regard has also been violated and that the Government have not asked for tenders, except in the flim-flam way that they do their business, we have a right to enter a protest. They say: We asked two of our friends to tender. These two friends, by a remarkable coincidence, tendered for exactly the same amount. There is no honesty in such a course as that, because every dealer and manufacturer and contractor, where public money is concerned, has the right to have an opportunity of tendering, and it is a duty that we owe to the country to ask for tenders and to give the contract to the lowest tenderer, if it is found that he is a man of reputation, who can fulfil his contract. In some countries they adopt the practice of making the tenders known to the public, while here tenders are opened behind closed doors, and calculation and computations are

made by the officers of the department; but I say that there is no reason why this secrecy should be observed. Let contracts be opened before the world, and the people interested will make their own calculations. The public will know what is going on; it will be an additional safeguard to the people that the money will be properly expended. In regard to going before the Public Accounts Committee, where the hon. Finance Minister invited us to go, I may say that hon. gentlemen did not call a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee until the session was nearly three months old, and when the Railway and Banking and Commerce committees were meeting. Hon. gentlemen who are members of the Public Accounts Committee, are also members of these other committees, and they cannot attend two committees at once and do justice to both. The investigations that had been postponed from last year, had to be taken up first by the Public Accounts Committee, and, as our time was limited, we had not an opportunity of making all the investigation that we desired before the Public Accounts Committee. Yet we are told by the hon. Minister of Finance to go before the Public Accounts Committee. We come before this House because it is the right place to come. There are some very interesting items in connection with the dredging of the St. Lawrence channel.

The Minister tells us it is right and proper that a portion of the money which is appropriated for the dredging of the channel should be devoted to the building of dredges because without dredges we cannot do the work. That is a most extraordinary statement. Suppose you take \$50,000 to dredge the harbour in Toronto, and suppose \$45,000 of that was used in the construction of the dredge and \$5,000 in the work of dredging, would you say that the \$50,000 was spent for the purposes intended by the vote? Not a bit of it. The proper course would be to ask an appropriation for the building of the dredges and then an appropriation for the purpose of dredging. That would be the honest businesslike way of proceeding, but that is just exactly the way the present Minister did not take. With reference to some items, I see that the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) quoted some expenditures about which he vainly demanded some explanation. On Q-24, for instance, I see that on a dredge where they have a crew of eight people, they have no less than four cooks. I find on the tug "St. James," which has eight of a crew, there are four cooks. They must have been living on the fat of the land.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Were they all there at the same time?

Mr. WALLACE. I ask the hon. Minister if they were all there at the same time? I am asking the questions.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend said there were four cooks to eight men, and I think we must hold him to that.

Mr. WALLACE. I see there are four cooks' wages and the wages of eight men, and I would like to have the Minister explain.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Some people cannot keep their cooks.

Mr. WALLACE. Here is the tug "C. J. Brydges." On this there are three cooks and about seven or eight of a crew. Then there is another matter in which the figures are larger and more important. I see J. W. Wurtele, of Ottawa, contract dated January 11th, 1898, for \$20,460, less \$7.50 freight, and \$70 of other items added. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if Mr. J. W. Wurtele is a dealer in those goods?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that he is an agent for the manufacturers of these goods in England.

Mr. WALLACE. What is his business there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Commission agent.

Mr. WALLACE. In what line?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Metals and hardware, and he supplied goods in that line for the late Government.

Mr. WALLACE. Did he supply them by tender or without tender?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To the late Government?

Mr. WALLACE. The late Government is not on its trial now. It will not do for the Minister to state that certain things were done by the late Government. He simply makes a statement and cannot give any proof.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, I have the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. WALLACE. He says that certain things were done by the late Government. That is merely a statement of his own, but even if the late Government did wrong, and we have not a particle of proof in that connection, that could not be an excuse for the present Government doing wrong.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I agree in that.

Mr. WALLACE. We want to know whether the contract with J. W. Wurtele of January 11th, 1898, for \$20,460 was let after public competition. I do not mean by bogus tenders asked from two or three persons.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have given the information already, but the hon. gentleman may not have been present. Four parties were asked to tender. I gave the

Mr. WALLACE.

names and the amounts in each case, but will give them again if the hon. gentleman did not hear them. There were two tenders of \$20,460, and two others, one of \$22,400 and one of \$24,000. The two tenders, Cavanagh & Co. and J. W. Wurtele, being the lowest and equal, the work was divided equally between them.

Mr. HAGGART. Is that the Wurtele who furnished steel goods to the late Government? If I remember rightly, he was agent for cement.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that he furnished what might be called the hardware supplies, the same as he did before.

Mr. HAGGART. I found out about the dredge built in the city of Ottawa. The dredge that was built in this city was the "Laval." It was built under the superintendence of the Public Works Department. It was done by public tender and given to the lowest tenderers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the dredge which I found on inquiry cost 54½ cents per yard for doing the work. I am afraid they did not make a very good job of that.

Mr. WALLACE. That will hardly be an answer to the statement made by the hon. Minister, first, that the Railways and Canals Department had built a dredge by days' work, and then that the Public Works Department had done it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will look into that more closely, but no doubt the hon. gentleman's statement is correct, and I accept it.

Mr. WALLACE. As regards Wurtele & Co., and Cavanagh & Co., we are told that a large amount of angles, rivets, nuts, &c., were furnished, and that the two tenders were precisely the same. That is clear evidence that they were bogus tenders and that there was collusion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Did my hon. friend never know two tenders to be alike?

Mr. WALLACE. I never heard of a work, where a long series of different articles supplied were tendered for, in which two tenders were alike.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In a bulk sum?

Mr. WALLACE. These tenders must have been made on some basis, so much for steel angles, so much for rivets, so much for nuts, and so on. I suppose that in the doctrine of probabilities it would not occur once in a million times that two tenders would be exactly alike.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When they tendered at a lump sum?

Mr. WALLACE. These parties made out their tenders for exactly the same amount, which shows that there must have been collusion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have known that to occur fifty times.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, when I was discussing the law question a while ago, said this was directly in accord with the law, and that the hon. Minister of Public Works performed his duty according to the law and the Order in Council. I would like to have the hon. Minister's authority for that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not remember making any definite statement, and certainly did not rise to my feet to make any, but I did say that it was not contrary to law to do the work by the servants and officers of the department.

Mr. HAGGART. Certainly not. But is Mr. Wurtele an officer of the department?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I was taking part in the discussion about building dredges, by the officers and servants of the Department of Public Works, and I said that was not contrary to law. The law says you may do it either by tender, or if the Minister thinks it can be done more expeditiously and economically by the officers and servants of the department. I was not entering into any question other than this. I was not discussing whether the law is right or wrong, but pointing out that the law permits the work to be done in that way.

Mr. HAGGART. I was discussing the two contracts given to Cavanagh and Wurtele for supplies over and above \$5,000 used in the construction of these dredges. I was stating that there was no question of urgency, and the work was not done by officers of the department. But even if there were urgency, that urgency ought to be reported to the Governor in Council, and the Governor in Council should give the Minister authority to go on with the work. In this case no Order in Council was had in the first instance. In this case no Order in Council has been obtained.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The law does not say that the question of urgency is the controlling one.

Mr. HAGGART. I was not talking of the law; I was talking of the Order in Council after the law, and here is what the Order in Council says:

On a joint memorandum dated March 20th, 1890, recommending that hereafter all public works involving an expenditure of over \$5,000 shall be let by public tender and contract unless, owing to urgency or other cause, it be deemed advisable to take different action, and that in all such

cases authority be obtained by an Order in Council.

I suppose the other cause referred to in the Order in Council is "being economically instituted by the officers and servants of the department." There is not even a pretense of an Order in Council in this case.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) referred to the expenditure on the tug "St. James," and pointed out that four cooks had been employed on that tug at a cost of \$162.46. The Minister said: These cooks were not all there at one time." Now, if he looks closely at the Auditor General's Report he will find there was no necessity for a cook at all, because he will find that there was paid to Capt. Chevrier for boarding crew from 12th April, eight hands; May, nine hands; June, seven hands; and washing, \$221. Then, for the balance of the season, Capt. Laferriere was paid for boarding crew, July 1st to October 31st, eight hands, four months; November, seven hands and washing, \$40. Therefore, there was paid \$661 for the boarding of the crew of that tug from the opening to the closing of navigation.

Mr. BERGERON. It is the same with every one of these boats.

Mr. TAYLOR. Here the Government paid for the boarding of the crew and there was no necessity for cooks at all. While the Minister is getting the information to explain that, I certainly wish him also to explain about this \$186 expended for Chinese lanterns and torques and rockets.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I cannot furnish the information regarding the lanterns, but as to the cooks, I am informed that the arrangement is that the captain is allowed so much for boarding the men, and that we supply the cook in addition to that.

Mr. BERGERON. On the "John Pratt" there were six cooks.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are some housekeepers who cannot keep their servants, and perhaps the captain of the "John Pratt" is one of these.

Mr. BERGERON. Where do we find the expenditure for the tug "Eureka" that the Minister of Public Works went promenading on last summer?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That will be included in the Auditor General's Report next year.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose we will know it all then?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. Wait till you see us next year.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the cost of these two dredges that were built last year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are two now under construction, but they are not finished.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the contemplated cost of each?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About \$100,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Last year the Minister (Mr. Tarte) stated that there were to be two new steel dredges at a cost of \$75,000. He does not say "each," although the reading might mean that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised that the estimated cost would be \$100,000 each, but that a portion of that cost represents old machinery used, to the value of about \$25,000. The Minister (Mr. Tarte) would therefore be correct in estimating the new work at \$75,000 each.

Mr. BENNETT. Are there to be any more dredges built this year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, it is proposed to build two new elevator dredges, costing about \$110,000, and about \$100,000 of that will be expended this year. The \$100,000 represents, in addition to the new dredges under construction, the proportion of the two.

Mr. HAGGART. The two dredges that are being built will have cost \$254,000. Is the rest to be applied to dredges?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, there are scows and other appliances in connection with them.

Mr. TAYLOR. As the hon. Minister cannot inform me what this \$186.50 was expended for, perhaps his friend who is sitting at his left (Mr. Bruneau), and who is stated in the papers to be one of the three men who control Canada to-day, can give me the information I require. I understand that that hon. gentleman kicked some time last year and tendered his resignation, and afterwards withdrew it. Perhaps this was a demonstration got up to celebrate that event; for every person knows that this \$186 of the people's money was not expended for deepening the St. Lawrence ship channel.

Mr. A. A. BRUNEAU (Richelieu). Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) that the Roman candles he refers to were not burned in my honour. I suppose the hon. gentleman has read the statement I sent to the newspapers, contradicting that ridiculous telegram, to which he has also referred; and I think he should be satisfied with this information.

Mr. BERGERON. Does not my hon. friend think we might take the other items and let this stand until we get the information we have asked for?

Mr. BENNETT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have given my hon. friend all the information I am able to give him. I do not think we ought to wait for the information about the Chinese lanterns.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend knows that we are entitled to get all that information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On concurrence.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman knows that we cannot get much information then, when the Speaker is in the Chair. Under the circumstances, the hon. gentleman should let the item stand until we get more information in regard to these different matters.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman must recognize that we have given him all the information that it is possible to give in the absence of the Minister of the department. I hope that hon. gentleman is not serious in pressing for information about the Chinese lanterns; but I will promise him that if he allows the item to go I will give him some information in regard to that matter at another stage.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman promise that all the material furnished for the dredges shall be got by tender?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can assure the hon. gentleman that I am the hardest man in the world to get a promise out of—slow to promise, sure to perform. I cannot give the hon. gentleman a promise for the Minister for whom I am acting at the moment; but I can assure the hon. gentleman that the law will be complied with, as we contend it has been already. I will undertake that the contracts shall be brought down.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister must promise that all contracts for over \$5,000 shall be let by tender.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the hon. gentleman ought to be satisfied with my promise that the law will be complied with.

Mr. HAGGART. No matter what the law is, the Minister has always promised that all materials required for the construction of the dredges, costing over \$5,000, shall be bought by public tender.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot give any promise. It is not right that I should give a promise in the name or on behalf of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. HAGGART. Somebody ought to be in a position to do it. We had the distinct promise of the Minister last year, apart altogether from the interpretation of the Act of Parliament or the Order in Council. We had the promise of both the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Railways and

Canals on nearly every occasion that all this work should be done by public tender and competition.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That only goes to show that I should be careful not to make these promises.

Mr. BERGERON. But the Minister of Public Works might have changed his mind. I remember that when he spoke about building dredges it was a new departure for the department. He declared that it was done because the dredges in Canada were in the hands of Conservatives, and he did not want to use them, and thought it better that the dredges should belong to the Government.

Mr. DAVIN. I really think we ought to take some steps as a committee to bind on the mind of the Minister of Finance, the acting Minister of Public Works, the conviction of the necessity of obeying the Order in Council and the law in the two particulars which I had the honour of bringing before the committee. There is another reason why we should do so. I see my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) behind the Minister of Finance, and there is great danger lest the Bourassian philosophy should have completely captivated the mind and conscience of the present Government, and therefore even a promise is not enough. We must invent some chains that will be even stronger than the chains of a promise, because the Bourassian philosophy is this, that when you utter an opinion or a promise, it only means that you utter your state of mind at that particular time, and if on the following day your mind should change, then the promise is of no effect. Then, there is another thing: That philosophy, as expressed by my hon. friend, does not fully explain this Ministry. We have had a more recent and, I think, probably, a more authoritative utterance from the head of the Government, who states his philosophy to be that the object is not to do good or to do right or to carry sound principle into effect, but to satisfy people. I exceedingly regret that the right hon. First Minister should have carried my hon. and learned friend away with him into so depraved a path of statesmanship. That philosophy would explain much. It will explain what up to the present has been the inexplicable, and tortuous, and extraordinary course of this Government. It will explain its course with regard to the tariff, and the plebiscite, and a hundred and one things in which it has completely falsified all its promises. Take that very thing we are discussing. If, when the Conservative Government had office, there was an item of \$186 for fireworks, Chinese lanterns and other things that we could not account for, expressly such items which naturally give rise to suspicion—magic lanterns, for instance, Japanese lanterns, rockets, torches, and this most suspicious of all, "sundries," we would have heard no end of objection from hon. gentlemen opposite.

What is there underneath these "sundries"? Sundries, \$54.20, just about the amount that would have to be paid for certain interesting cases that might be put on board to meet the exigencies of a little trip, such as the one the Minister of Public Works made up to the Indian school near Winnipeg. I want to know what is behind those sundries.

Mr. TAYLOR. The sundries were done up in cases, and the cases were charged for.

Mr. DAVIN. Cases, \$4.75. I say that if, when the Conservative Government was in power, an item such as that appeared in the Estimates, we would have had—but where is the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen)? Not merely is that mellifluous voice silent, but his very seat is empty. He seems to have had a premonition that an item like this was coming up, and got out of the way. Many a time and oft have I seen that hon. gentleman get up, like a sheeted ghost, to criticise some small items—items connected with napkins at Rideau Hall, spittoons, and so on—for I must give my hon. friend great credit for this. In his absence I will not attack him. He has a genius for the infinitely little. If parties were reversed, we would have my hon. friend here, dwelling for hours on this one detail of the very large item we are asked to vote. I say here, in all seriousness, that, for the credit of the Parliament of Canada, for the credit of this committee, for the credit of the Opposition, for the satisfaction of the people of Canada, an item like this should not be allowed to be swept away with a wave of the hand on the part of the acting Minister of Public Works. I have no doubt whatever that the hon. gentleman has had many a difficult hour in Council with the redoubtable Minister of Public Works. No doubt there was many a stormy scene over that Council board, but that hon. gentleman is now away, and what language do we get from the man that we ought to depend on, to use Alexander Mackenzie's language, to lie on his arms in order to defend the treasury, with regard to this item of \$186? He says: I really cannot tell you anything about it. But the bill must be in the Department of Public Works, and if it were produced, we would have an idea of what the sundries were. Otherwise, there will be a feeling in the minds of the committee that the hon. gentleman does not want to explore the secrets of this special item. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance need not be surprised, if we should be reluctant to take a course that might cast discredit upon our duties in Opposition, and I regret that particulars of this item have not been brought down.

We have, besides, a violation of that safeguard which the Government of Canada, in better and happier days, put into operation

in order to prevent too great a drain on the public purse. This precaution is, however, cast to the winds by an hon. Minister who tells us that he would like to expend all our public moneys by day's labour. He would like to trample under his heel the obligation to call for tenders. Of course, in the absence of the Minister of Public Works, the cause of whose absence we deeply regret, we cannot expect the Minister of Finance to be versed in all the details, but we can expect him to be open and frank.

That is a thing we are accustomed to. And, although I shall feel obliged, however reluctantly, to let this item go, so far as I am concerned, nevertheless I record my protest that it is a most unsatisfactory state of things that an important detail like this is absolutely without explanation. I see before me the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). He is silent—he, the representative in this House of the Dominion Alliance, although this item of "sundries, \$54.20, cases and cartage, \$4.75," remains unexplained. It is a sight that is far from edifying. Here is a man we would naturally expect to be up and demanding in stentorian tones what was underneath that item. I do not wonder that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) buries his attention in a book and seeks to avoid the unpleasantness of this debate; but I should expect the member for Yarmouth, on his left, would rise and in that earnest way that he knows so well how to assume, ask what was beneath this "sundries, \$54.20; cases and cartage, \$4.75."

Mr. BENNETT. Before the resolution carries, considering the large amount involved and the unsatisfactory expenditure in the past year, I beg to move this resolution:

That in the expenditure of \$354,000, St. Lawrence Ship Channel (item No. 150), no work shall be performed exceeding \$5,000 in value, and no materials exceeding \$5,000 in value should be purchased, unless public tenders shall have been first invited and the lowest tender accepted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) desires to move that, I would suggest that it would be better done in the House. I do not say that it could not be done in committee, but it would be rather inconvenient to put it as an amendment to a particular item. It would be better at a later stage.

Mr. HAGGART. It would be perfectly correct to do it in the committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But it would be inconvenient; it would have to be done by way of amendment to my motion that the appropriation pass.

Mr. WILSON. The Government might accept it. It is only asking that that shall be done which is customary, and I do not see how there can be any objection.

Mr. DAVIN.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If we are to discuss this seriously, I would only say that it is not possible to lay down any universal rule in this matter. There must be some discretion which the Government must exercise, for which they must be responsible to Parliament. Even though we lay it down as a general principle, there are cases, as the law itself contemplates, in which it should not be followed. The law seems to contemplate that where it can be conveniently done, and where it is in accordance with the public interest, there should be public tender and contract. But the statute provides that it shall not be a universal rule, or a law that shall not be departed from.

Mr. TAYLOR. It makes it obligatory.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, the statute does not say so. The statute in this case is the Public Works Act, and it provides that the Minister shall advertise for tenders except in cases of urgency or cases in which, in his opinion, the work can be best done by the servants of the Government.

Mr. BENNETT. This motion has not reference to expenditure of the past, but to the proposed expenditure of \$354,000. Now, it cannot be argued that the Government have not to-day a full idea as to how this money is to be expended; and this resolution only asks them to confine themselves in the expenditure of this amount to the system of tender and contract. If my motion is in order, I would ask that it be put.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). It might as well be understood what this resolution means. It strikes a blow at the vote. The vote is moved for and this is by way of amendment. If the amendment is carried the vote is lost.

Mr. BERGERON. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In effect it is. It places limitations upon the expenditure which would make the service unmanageable, and cannot be accepted.

Mr. TAYLOR. It will prevent the spending of \$186.50 for Japanese lanterns, torches, &c.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not at all; the Government can spend all they like on fireworks, &c.; it only means that they should ask for tenders before they do it.

Mr. BENNETT. Let it be attached simply as a rider to the item.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) is serious, it should be understood that this motion and the vote upon it will not go upon record. It is a very good way of airing a little fad without putting one-

self upon record. But if he wishes to go upon record and assert a principle, he should move it on concurrence.

Mr. BENNETT. I can do it on concurrence too, and divide the House upon it.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. Minister (Sir Louis Davies) speaks about fads, but it seems a rather good fad to ask that the public money be properly expended.

Mr. BENNETT. If the acting Minister will state that in this expenditure no amounts exceeding \$5,000 for work to be done and materials to be furnished will be spent without tender and contract, I will withdraw the motion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think it would be politic for me to make a promise of this kind. We will have to ask the House to give us this money with whatever limitations the law and the practice of the department imposes. If further limitations need be brought about, that can be done by amendment to the statute. Beyond saying that we will comply with the law, I do not feel like making promises in the name of the absent Minister of Public Works.

Mr. BERGERON. Why cannot the Government of Canada do the same as the large companies? Why buy putty by the pound, nails by the pound, oil by the gallon, and so on? Why not do as the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway or the Pullman Palace Car Company do—call for tenders for everything they require during the year, and buy it at the lowest possible price? What the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) asks is simply that the Government of Canada shall do its business in as businesslike a way as these large companies. What we want is to lay down rules so that it will be impossible for the Minister to squander any public money. The Minister of Finance knows that lots of this money has been squandered, and spent for nothing. It seems almost impossible to hold the Minister of Public Works to the law. Nobody has ever been able to do it, and I imagine nobody ever will be able to do it. But the Minister of Finance, as one of his colleagues, is responsible for all these things, and he should be willing to put the Department of Public Works under proper checks, not only for the sake of the country, but for the sake of the credit of the Government. My hon. friend, I presume, desires to remain in public life, and he should be anxious to preserve the credit of the Government and prevent anything like a waste of public money in any of the departments. I think he should be glad to accept a motion like this. I do not see why we should have to divide the House upon it at all, after the revelations that have been made.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No revelations have been brought before the

House to-night which reflect the shadow of discredit upon the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) or anybody connected with the department. There may be, for aught I know, expenditures in these accounts where prices have been paid higher than should be, but, if so, we have had no evidence of the fact, and no attempt to establish that fact before the most competent tribunal for that purpose, although I am bound to believe that if it was possible for hon. gentlemen to show anything in this respect not fair, just and proper, they would have done so before the Public Accounts Committee. I know why they do not go there; it is because they are satisfied that they could prove nothing wrong. They would be glad to go there if they felt they had a good case. I accept at once the view that it is desirable we should buy in the cheapest possible way, providing we can get as good material, and if you buy at a fair price I do not object to any Minister giving the preference to his own political friends, always provided that fair and reasonable prices are paid. But the law on the statute-book, I think, is ample. If hon. gentlemen desire to make it more stringent, their proper course is to amend the law. I do not think any good end can be served by the amendment which has been moved. It would be placing a limitation upon this vote which could not possibly be carried out, and in that way it would be a blow at a service for which that vote stands.

Mr. McNEILL. The rule of the last Government was that work of this kind should be carried out by public tender.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Was that the case in the Curran bridge?

Mr. McNEILL. I understand it was. At all events, it was the general principle adopted by the late Government, and if hon. gentlemen opposite were able to put their finger upon any case where that general principle was not carried out, this Chamber rang with denunciations of the Government on every such occasion. Now, we are simply asking them to carry out the general principle in reference to this expenditure, and I think it will be very much better in the public interest that we should agree to it without a division at all.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me that the point taken by the Minister of Finance against members on this side of the House for not raising this question in the Public Accounts Committee, is not well taken. There are fully one hundred, if not one hundred and fifty, members of this House who are not members of that committee. For my part I have been in this House some eleven sessions, and I was never on the Public Accounts Committee, and never had an opportunity of seeing a single account through that committee. Now, if hon. members who

are members of that committee have not asked for these accounts, I do not think I should be debarred from getting information simply because other members of the committee have not thought fit to take that course. I think in the interest of all the members of the House who are not members of that committee, the Minister of Finance ought to grant the request that has been made and bring down this information to the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What information?

Mr. HENDERSON. The information that has been repeatedly asked for in regard to these items of expenditure, and that have not yet been explained. It has been stated that there are some very suspicious items indeed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Who says that?

Mr. HENDERSON. It has been stated by members on this side of the House that there are items of a suspicious character. Take, for example, the cost of these Chinese lanterns, and rockets, and torches, and a number of other things, particularly the sundries. I want information with regard to these items, and I am unable to give an intelligent vote without that information. I hope the Minister of Finance will let the matter stand until he brings down the information; or, perhaps, from his deputy who sits close by him, he may be able to get the information to which the House is entitled before we pass this item.

Amendment negatived.

Public Works—

Ontario—River Kaminstiquia ..... \$13,000

Mr. BERGERON. What are the works being carried on there now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This vote is required to continue the work of dredging in the River Kaminstiquia to attain a depth of 20 feet to the Canadian Pacific Railway elevator.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to know why the Government are expending that money in the River Kaminstiquia? Do I understand that this money is to be expended between the elevators of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the entrance of the river?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. From the entrance of the river to the elevator of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BERGERON. I always understood that there was a very great depth of water there, and I cannot understand how this work can be necessary.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The information I have is, that between the 2nd of July and the 9th of November, 1898, the

Mr. HENDERSON.

dredge "No. 9" was engaged in Kaminstiquia River. Resuming operations where left off last year, between McKellar and Mission rivers, the dredge made a further cutting of 3,629 feet long, having an average width of 190 feet, to a depth of 20 feet, arriving nearly opposite the mouth of the Mission River. A cutting was also made opposite the new steel elevator of 562 feet in length and 150 feet in width, to within 40 feet of the dock; also to a depth of 20 feet at low water. A shoal was also removed at the mouth of the Mission River, 370 feet wide, to a depth of 16 feet. The materials removed, consisting of hard pan, boulders and sand, amounted to 146,450 cubic yards; cost, \$6,701.91.

Mr. HAGGART. That is what was done last year. What do you propose to do this year?

Mr. BERGERON. How much has that work cost already?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total to March, 1899, is \$250,725.66.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there any sign that there will be an end to it? Is there any quicksand that fills in the channel and has to be removed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will take a couple of seasons' work of a similar character to complete it.

Mr. BERGERON. Do I understand that there is quicksand, or any such kind of earth, that fills in the channel?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The bottom is silt, sand and mud.

Mr. BERGERON. Could the engineer not find a way of putting the entrance of the river in such a condition that we will not be called upon to vote money for this work every year? Would it not be better to construct some kind of masonry there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised that the cost of masonry would be enormous, and that, while the present method is somewhat expensive, that would be more so.

Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand that the harbour silts up every year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. What would be the cost of removing that? How many yards are there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Last season's operations cost 4 6-10ths cents per yard.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the work done by our own dredge?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The work was done by our own dredge.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I know that part of the country, and I know that they have to do some work every year, as there is quicksand in the entrance. The object is to furnish a harbour for steamers running in there to connect with the railway.

Hallfax Drill Hall (including lapsed amount (\$6,389).....	\$13,000
Kentville public building .....	15,500
Liverpool public building.....	12,000
Windsor public building (reconstruction of building destroyed by fire, 17th October, 1897).....	3,500
Windsor Drill Shed (reconstruction of building destroyed by fire, 17th October, 1897).....	1,900
	\$45,900

Mr. BERGERON. Is this drill shed at Halifax finished?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This appropriation finishes the drill shed at Halifax.

Mr. BERGERON. And there will be no more asked for it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not at present. It is a completed work; but there may be something asked for maintenance.

Mr. BERGERON. But this finishes the construction?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. PRIOR. What is the total cost of this drill hall?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total cost, including this amount, is \$275,000.

Mr. PRIOR. What is the size of it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is 304 x 160, inclusive of a projection 20 x 65.10, and four projecting circular turrets.

Mr. PRIOR. Was it needed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Halifax is rather an important military centre. The old drill shed had been built before confederation, and had simply decayed away.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the work of building the Kentville and Liverpool public buildings been commenced?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The work at Liverpool is under construction. The work at Kentville has not been commenced, but the site has been acquired.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the building at Kentville?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a public building—customs-house, post office, &c.

Mr. BERGERON. What will it cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Twenty thousand dollars.

Mr. DAVIN. What is the population of Kentville?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). About 3,000.

Mr. DAVIN. What is the population of Liverpool?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a little less.

Mr. BERGERON. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) remember what was said about the Laprairie post office?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I remember what was said about the Liverpool post office.

Mr. BERGERON. Will this complete the Kentville building—\$15,500 this year, and \$5,000 last year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. At the time that estimate was prepared it was anticipated that there would be some expenditure at the close of the last year. With the contemplated expenditure this would have completed it, but no work having been done, before the close of the year, this will not complete it. The total, however, will be about \$20,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the work be done by contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the case of the Liverpool building a contract was awarded after public advertisement, and I presume the same method will be followed in the case of Kentville.

Mr. BERGERON. Does not the hon. Minister think that it should be done by contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the case of the particular building in my own constituency, I did think so.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if \$20,000 is to be the cost of these buildings?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No; I think the Liverpool building will cost less. The Kentville one is the more expensive.

Mr. WILSON. One will be \$20,000, and the other will be how much?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Liverpool building will cost \$17,000.

Mr. WILSON. What is the population?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is about 3,000 or less. It is the shire town of the county.

Mr. BRITTON. What was the cost of the building in Napanee?

Mr. WILSON. Something over \$50,000, and it is one of the best buildings of the kind in Ontario.

Mr. BRITTON. What is the population of Napanee ?

Mr. WILSON. About 3,500.

Mr. BERGERON. It shows that hon. gentlemen opposite were no better than we were, though they believed they were.

Mr. WILSON. I recollect that my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) shed a great many tears over that building, and that he opposed every building of that kind. I think myself perhaps, there was more money expended than there should have been, but I may say that I always took the ground that when public moneys were being expended, my county should have a fair share, and I think that is right. I do not find fault with gentlemen doing business in that way, except that they denounced it when we did it, and it is not a satisfactory answer for them to say: It was wrong when you did it, but we are justified in doing it because you did it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) will see that if his friends spent \$50,000 on a building in Napanee, and we are spending only \$20,000 in a place of more importance, we are making great progress in the right direction.

Mr. WILSON. But I will not admit that there is any town of more importance than Napanee.

Mr. HAGGART. Unless we get a promise that these buildings will be erected by contract and tender, I give the Minister notice that he may expect a division of the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a fair question for argument.

Windsor, N.S., public building..... \$8,500

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These votes will complete the drill-shed and public building in Windsor, N.S. Immediately after the fire there was great distress, and the Minister (Mr. Tarte) undertook to build these.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the Kentville building been commenced ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The site has been acquired.

Mr. BENNETT. Do I understand the Minister to say that he will give no assurance that public tenders will be asked for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the case of the Liverpool building it was done by public tender and contract. The hon. gentleman has asked a fair and proper question, but I would prefer he would ask it later on.

Mr. BENNETT. If the promise is not given that these buildings will be erected by public tender and contract, I shall move that this item be struck out.

Mr. WILSON.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The usual practice is to have new buildings erected by public tender and contract, and I have no desire that that rule shall be departed from. I fully understand that will be done. It has been the practice in the past, and I should certainly recommend it myself.

Mr. KAULBACH. Is it the intention of the Government to erect a public building at Bridgewater, N.S., which I inquired about some evenings ago ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. While I warmly sympathize with the condition of affairs in Bridgewater, I am afraid I cannot at present anticipate the supplementary Estimates. However, I may say that the supplementary Estimates will be brought down at the opening of the House tomorrow, and I am afraid my hon. friend (Mr. Kaulbach) will not be as well pleased as I would like him to be.

Mr. KAULBACH. It is very unfair that the people of Bridgewater should be disappointed in the matter of a public building, for they are deserving of one; far more deserving than some other towns in the Dominion that got public buildings. I trust the Government will consider the way the people of Bridgewater are suffering in consequence of that sad calamity by fire, through which the whole business centre of the town was destroyed. The revenue from the town of Bridgewater warrants the Government in granting this appeal, which I urgently make on their behalf. In refusing it, I believe the Government are standing in their own light. I ask it not as a favour, but I ask it as a right, and I ask now that the Minister should place an amount in the Estimates so that this work may be proceeded with at once.

Marysville, N.B., public building..... \$3,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This building has not been commenced. The vote was placed in the Estimates by the late Government, and it has been carried on.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not exactly understand how under the statute, these buildings can be erected except by contract and tender. The Minister (Mr. Fielding) seems to think there is some discretion in the matter. There is no discretion under the Act so far as I can understand, unless it is a case of pressing urgency.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend will see that the Act is more than that. I am not saying they should not be erected by tender, but I think the Government have power to erect them without tender if they wish.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) says there is something else in the statute ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know there is something else in the statute, but there is nothing else which justifies what the hon. gentleman evidently suggests. There is this further in the statute: The case where from the nature of the work it can be more expeditiously and economically executed, by the officers and servants of the department. But I do not understand that authorizes the construction of any of these buildings by days' work. I should suppose that the officers and servants of the department referred to in the statute, are the permanent officers and servants of the department. It does not mean that you can employ persons to construct the building by days' work, and then say that you are within the meaning of the statute because these persons are officers of the department within the meaning of the statute, for to my mind it is perfectly clear they are not. Therefore, it does not seem to me that this further provision of the statute at all assists the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) in what he suggests.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) was not present during the earlier part of the evening when we threshed this out in relation to another branch of the public works. The view which we have taken, and the view which we claim has always been taken of that statute, is: that this is a question in which the Minister must exercise his own discretion. Somebody must determine whether it is or not in the public interest to depart from the first provision of the statute, and that somebody is the Minister of Public Works. Of course he must come to Parliament and justify his conclusion. As a matter of law, the late Government and this Government held, that the Minister did have power to construct a work without public tender. However, in relation to public buildings the practice has been to ask for public tenders, and I have no desire that that practice should be departed from.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to make myself clear. There are two exceptions mentioned in the statute: One the case of pressing urgency, and to a certain extent the Minister must be the judge of that; but if he judges on ridiculous and absurd grounds that there is a case of pressing urgency, when it is perfectly obvious to every one but himself there is not a case of pressing urgency, he is of course responsible to Parliament and should be censured by Parliament. I am speaking now altogether apart from the Order in Council. With respect to the other branch of the section, namely, the case in which from the nature of the work it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department; that is a case in which the construction of the statute is involved. I would not have

very much doubt that what I suggested a moment ago is the true construction of it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Who is to be the judge of whether it would be more expeditiously and economically performed by the officers of the department?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman does not grasp my meaning. What I say is that "officers and servants of the department," do not include men hired for the purpose of erecting a public building. It seems to me to include only officers and servants who are regularly or permanently or continuously in the employ of the department. If a contrary interpretation has been placed on the statute, either by this Government or by the late Government, I would, of course, put forward this view with a good deal of diffidence; but it is a matter which I think might fairly be submitted for the opinion of the Minister of Justice, and I would be very much surprised if he took a different view from the one I have indicated to the committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps I should hesitate, as a layman, to express an opinion on this question; but I think the construction which the hon. gentleman wishes to place on the law is a very forced one. I would say that the intention is that on certain conditions—whether these conditions are wise or not is not a question of law—a building or other public work may be constructed by the officers or servants of the Government. If the hon. gentleman means to imply that that means the deputy, the clerks and the permanent staff, there could be no such construction at all, because any one must see at once that they could not construct a building. It must mean persons employed from time to time by the Government; not permanently, because mechanics, except in a limited degree, are not permanently employed by the Government. I would suggest that to my hon. friend as showing that his construction is a forced one.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not agree with that at all. I am more familiar with the Department of Railways and Canals, which has a number of skilled mechanics and workmen permanently in its employ in the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I understand that the statute refers to these men; and, having these men, the Minister must judge whether a work can be more advantageously constructed by them or by contract. But the statute cannot apply to a case where you employ men solely for the purpose of constructing a public building or other public work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman's interpretation is helped, of course, by the fact that the Department of Railways has a number of men permanently in its employ. But that construction

could not be applied, except in a very limited sense, to the Department of Public Works and it is not the construction that has been applied either by the present or the late Government.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman speaks positively as to the construction of the late Government. I was always of opinion that the interpretation given to the Act by my hon. friend was the interpretation given to it by the late Government. There is a slight anomaly in the Order in Council, I admit, where it mentions the \$5,000 limit. There is no limitation in the statute. The Department of Railways and Canals had a number of men on the canals, on the Intercolonial Railway and on other public works, permanently employed from one year's end to the other; and where work was to be done, such as improving the entrance to the Welland Canal or building a bridge over the Lachine Canal, it was within the discretion of the Minister to say whether he would do it by means of the permanent employees of the Government or by contract; but it was never contemplated that such a discretion should be exercised in the case of a new building.

Public Buildings—  
Quebec ..... \$61,100

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The principal item of increase is in the case of the quarantine station at Grosse Isle; otherwise the votes are about the same as before. There is a vote of \$14,000 to make provision for the construction of a water system, including basins and water closets, at the Grosse Isle quarantine station.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the first item of \$12,000 for renewals, improvements, repairs, &c., of Dominion public buildings?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is the usual vote for small repairs for all buildings in the province of Quebec.

Mr. BERGERON. What was done at the Benthier post office for which there was some money voted last year and the year before?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The building was reconstructed and is now occupied. About \$5,000 was spent.

Mr. BERGERON. Who made the valuation of the house that was bought?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Deputy Minister of Public Works visited the district for the purpose of inquiring into the valuation and obtained his valuation from the assessor's books.

Mr. BERGERON. What legal work did Mr. Chenevert do for the \$50 paid him?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He was searching the title.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. BERGERON. That was done by the registrar.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Both these gentlemen were employed—one a lawyer and the other a notary. One searched the title and the other prepared the deed.

Mr. BERGERON. Who supplies the light to the Montreal public buildings?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Royal Electric Light Company.

Mr. BERGERON. Were tenders asked for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed not. The arrangement prior to that was made with the "Gazette" Publishing Company, but by the new arrangement we effect a considerable saving. The arrangement with the "Gazette" company was three-quarters of a cent per lamp per hour, and the arrangement now is three-fifths of a cent. There is a small increase in the number of lights, but a very material saving has been effected by the change.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the cost per light per annum?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The amount paid to the "Gazette" Printing Company was \$6,911.52 in 1896-97, and the amount for the present year is \$4,424.32, being a saving of \$2,500.

Mr. TAYLOR. How many lights?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. 399 at present.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was the cost of installing these lights?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The installation was already the property of the Government, having been purchased from the "Gazette."

Mr. BERGERON. Why then does the hon. Minister ask a vote for installing the electric light?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This vote does not contemplate any installation in the post office, but in other buildings in Montreal.

Mr. BERGERON. Here is an item for covering the roof with copper. Were tenders called for in that case?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Who had the contract, and what was his price, and how many tenderers were there and their prices?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contractor was Joseph Lamarche. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman at the moment how many other tenderers there were or what their tenders were. The contract given to Mr. Lamarche was for \$9,400. I will get the other information for the hon. gentleman later on.

Mr. BERGERON. If the contract is for \$9,400, how is it that we are asked for \$7,000? Was money spent upon it before?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The vote includes other things than the work done by Mr. Lamarche. The total work is \$14,999. The expenditure up to the 31st December, 1898, was \$211.32, and up to the 30th June, 1900, it is expected to be \$7,768, making a total of \$7,979. The vote is in round numbers, \$7,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the public clock in this building in good order?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not working very well.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there anything to be done to it? It is a very deceiving clock, and I have heard many complaints about it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We would not like anything for which this Government is responsible to deceive anybody. The clock shall have attention.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not see anything in the Quebec vote for a post office and public building at Valleyfield, that was promised by the Minister of Public Works last fall.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot give the hon. gentleman any information in that case.

Mr. BERGERON. I am surprised not to see an amount here for this purpose, because in November last, in the last local election the Minister of Public Works promised at a public meeting solemnly that a large amount of money would be placed in the Estimates for a public building at Valleyfield. The town deserves it. It is a town of over 11,000 people; it has a custom-house, excise office and a post office entirely too small for the accommodation of the public. Of course, my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) cannot tell me whether there is an item in the supplementary Estimates. I suppose the agreeable surprise is in store for me of seeing this in the Estimates.

Public Buildings—Ontario—

Arnprior public building (revote of lapsed amount).....	\$ 3,400
Dominion Public Buildings, renewals, improvements, repairs, &c.....	10,000
Ingersoll post office, &c.....	10,000
Kingston drill hall.....	40,000
Ottawa Public Buildings—	
Repairs to masonry walls.....	4,000
Langevin Block, improvement to fire-proof character of the attic and roof, including steel shelving and additional vault accommodation...	24,000
Rat Portage post office, &c. (proper site given free of cost by municipality)..	14,000
Sarnia post office, &c.....	10,000
Toronto Dominion Buildings, improvements, renewals, repairs, &c.....	6,000
Woodstock post office, &c.....	20,000
	\$141,400

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I do not see any item here for the public buildings it was proposed to build in Alexandria. I would like some information as to the cost of the work so far done and of the site. If the hon. Minister has not that information at hand, perhaps he could furnish it later.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will promise my hon. friend during the discussion of the supplementary Estimates to give the information he desires.

Mr. TAYLOR. As to the Arnprior public buildings, I notice on page Q-44 of the Auditor General's Report, an account of the Arnprior Electric Light Company wiring 31 lights and two switches, \$49.50. That amounts to \$1.50 per light. I would like the hon. Minister to compare that with the price paid for installing lights in this building—\$3.50 or thereabouts?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The wiring of a new building is always less expensive than the wiring of an old one.

Mr. TAYLOR. Not much.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that any builder will tell the hon. gentleman that it makes a considerable difference.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is all that is paid in my own town, even for old buildings, and it is not necessary to buy a thousand lights as you have here in order to get it done to that price. There is another item in connection with Arnprior post office. I notice Mr. J. W. Tierney, a gentleman whom we had before the Public Accounts, and where it was proved he was a party heeler running a dry goods store, is paid \$2 a day for 335 days, which includes Sunday and every day from July until May. Six hundred and seventy dollars has been paid this young storekeeper for being clerk of works.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have some recollection of that case. I recollect this gentleman, while not a practical mechanic, and, perhaps, therefore, open to this criticism, was a man of exceptional intelligence, and acquitted himself before the committee admirably. The price paid him was only that which has been customary to pay in all other cases. I believe subsequently a practical mechanic was placed in charge of the work.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to ask if he is in charge yet, and is still drawing his pay.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Tierney, I understand, has not been in the service for a considerable time. The gentleman who has been in charge since is Mr. Marina. Mr. Tierney has not been there for some months. I suppose the inspector would have to be there until the contract is taken off the parties' hands.

Mr. PETTET. I notice several items here for the province of Ontario. I want to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that the late Government purchased a lot in the town of Picton for a public building, and I think the last year that they were in office they voted \$13,000 for the purpose of constructing a public building at that place. The present Government for some reason struck that item out. I think we have strong claims in the county of Prince Edward for a public building. We have never received any expenditure of public money in that county, not even a subsidy to a railway or a public dock, with the exception of a vote which has been spent in Picton harbour. That is the only money spent in the county since confederation. I want to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that Picton is our county town, it has about 4,000 of a population, two large canning factories, two large seed houses, a tannery, a foundry, and other institutions; so, therefore, I think we are entitled to some expenditure of that kind.

Mr. McALISTER. Can the Minister say what is the population of the town of Ingersoll?

Mr. WILSON. I wish to say with reference to public buildings in the town of Picton, that there was an appropriation made by the old Government for a building in that town, and I think a site has been bought for the building. I am of the opinion that there are very few towns in Ontario that better deserve a public building than the town of Picton. It is a beautiful and an enterprising town, and the Government have already got the site. I think, as this Government has carried out so much of the policy of the old Government, that it might go a step farther and make an appropriation for a public building in Picton.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The speeches of the hon. gentlemen respecting Picton interest me very much. Let those gentlemen remember the old adage: If at first you don't succeed, try, try again. The hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. McAlister) asked me the population of Ingersoll. I understand by the last census it was 4,200, I presume it has increased since.

Mr. McALISTER. Has anything been done towards erecting this post office?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the contract has been issued. The contract price is \$13,437.

Mr. HENDERSON. I take no exception to this vote to erect a public building in the town of Ingersoll. But I wish to say that it seems to me a wrong principle has been adopted, not only by the present Government, but possibly by the late Government, in the erection of public buildings in the different counties in the province of Ontario especially, with which I am acquainted.

Mr. FIELDING.

Now, I say candidly, that I do not approve of the general principle of erecting an expensive building in any town of 2,000 or even 3,000 population. There is not only the first expenditure, but there is a continuous expenditure in taking care of the building. A caretaker has to be paid as well as the postmaster, and altogether it takes up too much of the revenue when a building costing \$15,000 to \$20,000 is erected for the purpose of a post office in a town even of the size of Ingersoll. I would urge upon the Government to adopt the principle that where there are four or five towns or villages of a reasonable size in a county, instead of erecting one public building at a large expense, say \$30,000, that money should be divided into four or five parts, and four or five buildings should be erected in the different towns and villages throughout the county. In the county I have the honour to represent there are five incorporated towns and villages of about the same population, and we are without a public building altogether in the county. It would appear from the policy adopted by the present Government as well as by the policy adopted by the late Government, that until we have a town of something like 2,500 of a population or over, we will never be entitled to a public building. Instead of asking the Government to expend \$30,000 in the erection of one public building even in a county town, I would ask the Government to divide that sum into five different parts, say \$6,000 each. You can erect five different buildings, good substantial brick buildings, sufficient for the purposes of a post office and a residence for the postmaster. A building costing \$6,000 would be sufficiently commodious to accommodate the post office, and also to afford a residence for the postmaster, who would be the caretaker of the building. In this way the Government would have a fireproof vault for the protection of the mails and the property of the public. Not only that, but they would save the expense of the rental which is yearly paid to these postmasters for the different offices throughout the county. I may say in my own county the post offices are too small. In the evenings and in the mornings when the mails come in, there is a great deal of crowding and inconvenience for lack of accommodation. Until the Government provides some better buildings or furnishes a larger rental, we cannot expect the postmasters to furnish a more extended accommodation than they do now. I hope the Minister of Finance, who is at the present time acting as Minister of Public Works will bear this suggestion in mind. I am under the impression that when I brought this matter up last year it received the favourable consideration of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I hope he will look favourably upon the suggestion at this time. The Government will certainly not be the losers. Money is cheap, and if the money has to be borrowed for this purpose it will be saved to the country in the rentals which will not

be required to be paid after these buildings have been erected. I hope the hon. Minister will bear this suggestion in mind, that he will draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to it on his return, and that throughout the country generally a policy of that kind will be adopted. I am sure it would result to the benefit of the treasury, and the comfort, convenience, accommodation and safety of the general public.

Mr. BENNETT. As to this expenditure of \$24,000 in the matter of improving the Langevin Block, is that to be an entire contract for the whole amount, and will tenders be invited?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That work is done by the workmen of the Department of Public Works, with the exception of steel files and shelving and vaults, which, of course, have to be obtained elsewhere.

Mr. BENNETT. If this \$24,000 is intended to be expended upon work to be performed by the permanent employees of the department, what proportion of it will be for material, and will this material be purchased by tender? The reason I call the attention of the hon. Minister to the work is that a little time ago some Estimates were passed for this work, ending in the last fiscal year, and a very considerable expenditure has been made without any tenders being invited, although the amount exceeded \$5,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I find that, when I referred to the work being done by the men of the department that refers to work which has actually been done. This vote is taken for steel shelving for the Department of the Interior, \$10,000, and for a vault for the Post Office Department, \$14,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Will tenders be invited for the vault and shelving?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Tenders have already been invited for the vault, and the matter has not yet been determined. In the other case, there are only two firms making shelving, and they are both doing work for the Government.

Mr. BENNETT. Is that to be by public competition or merely asking a few persons for figures?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In a case where there are only a few persons in the trade it would hardly be necessary to go to the expense of advertising. Circulars have been sent out to the few people making these things, and tenders were invited from the people in the trade.

Mr. HAGGART. Does this cover the full amount required?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is an estimate. The tenders are in. An order has been given for the vault, and the price is \$13,365.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the name of the firm?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Messrs. J. & J. Taylor, Toronto.

Mr. BERGERON. What is that work—repairs to masonry walls?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Pointing the walls throughout the buildings generally.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely it does not cost that amount?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The amount seems large, but it takes a great deal of money for buildings like these, and if the work is not properly done, they will rapidly go to decay. I discovered the other day a swallow building its nest in the front of this building where there did not seem to be any room. The work proposed is necessary.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister should get a less prominent place than in the front of this building where we can see the amount of work that is being done every month.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We want to let you see what we are doing.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there any of that money going into Major's Hill Park fence?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the large amount wanted for the Kingston drill hall?

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether an examination has been made of the upper portion of the Victoria Tower, the main tower of this building, where large amounts of stones fell some weeks ago?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the architect has made an examination of the part of the building to which the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. In what condition did he find that particular portion of the building?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He found nothing beyond the falling of one piece of stone; but another examination will be made.

Mr. MILLS. While the hon. Minister is speaking of the parliament building, I would like to draw his attention to the reading-room. It is very poorly lighted; you can hardly read the papers in some portions of it. It is the most poorly lighted room in this building, and it should be the best lighted.

The ventilation is also very bad. I draw the hon. Minister's attention to both of these things, and I trust that next session will see an improvement, particularly in the lighting of the reading-room. I congratulate the hon. Minister on having provided a fine light in this Chamber. I think it is a great credit, and if he would extend his improvements in that direction I think it would be a step in the right direction.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I quite agree with the hon. member (Mr. Mills) that we ought to have a good light in the reading-room, and I will call the attention of the department to it.

Mr. HUGHES. While we are on this subject, I would draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that the lavatories and bath-rooms are entirely behind the times.

Mr. BERGERON. You might add that they are very badly kept.

Mr. BENNETT. What proportion of the Rat Portage building has been done, and has the work been done by tender?

Mr. CLARKE. Before passing from that item, might I ask the hon. Minister for the names of the firms asked to submit tenders for shelving.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are only two concerns, the Office Specialty Company and the Eclipse Furniture Company. They are both doing work for the Government.

Mr. BERGERON. What about the Kingston drill hall?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) asked me about the Rat Portage building. It has been placed under contract.

Mr. BERGERON. To whom?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. William Garson, of St. Catharines, at \$18,975.

Mr. BERGERON. How many tenders were received?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Several tenders were received, but I have not the memorandum.

Mr. BERGERON. Cannot the hon. gentleman get the names and the amounts of these tenders?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can get them later on if the hon. gentleman wishes them.

Mr. HUGHES. Were they tenders or invitations?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Tenders.

Mr. HUGHES. By advertisement?

Mr. MILLS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Advertisements in the press. The Kingston drill hall will cost \$40,000. This is the amount estimated by the chief architect which will be required for carrying the work of the Kingston drill hall during the next financial year.

Mr. BERGERON. Was this work let by contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was let by contract for \$61,930, which, of course, does not include heating and furnaces, &c. M. Sullivan and Wm. Langdon, of Kingston, have the contract, and the lowest tender was accepted.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has a site been selected for the Sarnia post office, and if so, which site?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What is known as the Alexander site has been selected.

Mr. HENDERSON. Better known as the Lister site.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The name adds merit to it.

Mr. HENDERSON. You have to go back one generation to get the name of Alexander. Alexander is dead years ago, and from Alexander it came down to Lister.

Mr. McALISTER. Which Lister?

Mr. HENDERSON. Pretty nearly Judge Lister. I must congratulate the Minister on the selection of the site, as I think the Lister site is the proper site for a post office in Sarnia. There were three sites spoken of. The up-town site would have been very expensive, inasmuch as valuable buildings would have to be torn down, if the property were expropriated. The Maclean site was back from the main street, and would not have been desirable. I congratulate the Government on selecting what they call the Alexander site, and I hope the building will be erected there, and no change made.

Mr. BERGERON. What about the Woodstock post office? I am afraid my hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) will now lose the grievance he had for so many years.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A site has been purchased in Woodstock for \$6,900 from Alexander Watson and Mary E. Adams. No work has yet been done.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it going to be done by tender?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the usual practice in public buildings, and I presume it will be followed.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the population of Woodstock?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Ten thousand.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think Woodstock is a bad place to put a post office in.

Mr. CLARKE. What are the details of these proposed alterations and improvements in the public buildings in Toronto?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The chief architect estimates them as follows:—examining warehouse, \$2,040; customs-house, \$250; inland revenue, \$250; post office, \$2,415; incidental expense, \$1,041; total, \$6,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Several deputations have waited upon the Government from time to time, requesting that additions should be made to the drill shed for the accommodation of the cavalry and artillery corps. The Minister will not forget that the city of Toronto purchased the site upon which the drill shed is erected at a cost of \$150,000 to the citizens; and the original plan provided for the construction of the cavalry and artillery quarters. Several deputations appeared before the Government, asking for the completion of the original plan of that building, and I would like to ask is it the intention of the Government to place a vote in the supplementary Estimates to complete the drill shed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a matter in which the Public Works Department has to be guided to a considerable extent by the advice of the Minister of Militia. I know there has been an agitation for that extension of the drill shed, but I am not able to make any statement to my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) as to what action shall be taken.

Mr. CLARKE. Of course, a much smaller and less expensive site would have suited, if it was not the intention of the Government to complete the building as originally intended. When a deputation wait upon the Minister of Militia about this matter, they are generally referred to the Minister of Public Works. It is certainly necessary that accommodation should be supplied for the different arms of the service in the city. The matter has been brought to the attention of the Government time and again and I was in hopes that provision would be made in the Estimate to complete the drill shed.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not mean to say that the rural corps would expect to have drill sheds built at the expense of the taxpayers of Canada, as the city corps are having drill sheds built for them. But I understood there was to be a proposition this year whereby armouries would be erected for the rural corps. I draw the attention of the Minister to that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Militia has brought that matter to the attention of his colleagues, and it is receiving our best consideration.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I would like to ask whether the Minister of Public Works contemplates the erection of a passenger elevator in the Toronto customs-house?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The matter has been mentioned by the Public Works Department, but I am unable to give my hon. friend (Mr. Robertson) the assurance that it will be done.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was an understanding several days ago between the right hon. the Prime Minister and several hon. gentlemen opposite that to-morrow there would be taken up the Bill relating to the preservation of health on public works; and if it is desired to-morrow that that be done, it will be done; otherwise, we shall go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BERGERON. There was also the resolution on the Senate.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was the intention of the Prime Minister to put that on the notice paper. If he has not done so, he will do it to-morrow.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the supplementary Estimates be down to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The supplementary Estimates will be on the Table to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.05 (midnight).

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 18th July, 1899.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DEATH OF HON. MR. GEOFFRION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It is only yesterday that we had to deplore the loss of one of our colleagues, and only twenty-four hours later the angel of death has again visited this House and taken a victim from amongst our ranks. I have to announce to the House the very sad news of the death of one of the most esteemed, one of the most popular, and certainly one of the most beloved members of

this House, the Hon. Mr. Geoffrion, who died this morning after a very short illness. The House, I am quite sure, does not realize the magnitude of the loss which it has sustained in the death of Mr. Geoffrion. He had only come late into this Parliament, and though he was always a strong party man, he had no taste for political life, and it was only out of the abundance of his heart and generosity that he consented to become a member of this House. In it he never had the opportunity of giving the full measure of the ability that was in him. His influence among us, however, though not actively engaged in politics, was extraordinary, and it was the result of the many eminent qualities with which Providence had endowed him. It resulted from his great talents, his sound judgment, his strength of character, his kind heart and his broad fair mind. All these combined qualities made of him a ruling personality in the sphere in which he moved. In the city of Montreal, of which he was a citizen for more than thirty years, and especially at the bar of that city, he leaves a void which, I am sure, can hardly be measured and cannot be filled. For more than thirty years he was daily engaged in the discharge of his professional duties before the courts. Daily he was giving all the genius of his mind, all the treasures of his intellect, and all his ability to the administration of justice. He was always strong with the bench and popular with the bar. He was a friend of all, no matter to what station they might happen to belong, and his loss to-day is a loss to every man who has anything to do with the administration of justice in Montreal, whatever may be his station. His loss is simply irreparable. We can never have in any man the same amount of prestige and influence which he enjoyed; but if there was in a man so eminently and generously endowed, a quality which was perhaps superior to all others, it was his unfailing kindness of heart. He was my friend for more than thirty-six years, and during all these years I am free to say I never heard from him an unkind word of anybody, and my experience in that respect is the experience of all. He was one of those men who honour mankind, and his whole life was spent in doing good.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I had not the pleasure of the same intimate acquaintance with the late Hon. Mr. Geoffrion as the right hon. leader of the House has enjoyed, but I have seen enough of him and know enough of him to have no hesitation in associating myself in every word that has fallen from the lips of the right hon. the leader of the House. Mr. Geoffrion was known to be, as has been justly said, one of the most able, one of the most influential, and one of the most important members of this Parliament, and he has at all times shown all these qualities for which he has

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

been given credit by the leader of the House. His loss is one, not only to be deplored from a party point of view by hon. gentlemen opposite, but to be deplored alike by every member of the Parliament, of which he was an ornament, and by the whole of the country in which he occupied so prominent and so distinguished a position in every phase and walk of life. I desire to tender my most sincere condolence to the right hon. leader of the Government for the immense loss he has sustained and to say that in the feeling of sorrow by which he is animated, he only experiences that which every member of the House I am sure on both sides experiences.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION—RE APPOINTMENT OF JUDGES IN MONTREAL.

Mr. FORTIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I rise to a question of privilege. In a report made of the few observations which I delivered in this House on the question of appointing additional judges to the Superior Court in the district of Montreal, the Montreal "Gazette" ascribed to me the following words:—

The judges in Montreal and the province of Quebec received the same salary they did thirty years ago, and with the enhanced cost of living. If the judges received more salary, perhaps the work they did would be greater. At any rate, it would be an inducement to the best class of men to accept positions on the bench. The best men could not now be secured, and second-class men, though good to a certain extent, had to be appointed to the positions.

I find in the Montreal "Star" a report pretty much to the same effect. In that paper I am quoted as having said:

The judges in Montreal were receiving to-day the same salaries as they received thirty years ago, though the cost of living had largely increased. He thought the judges would be encouraged to do more and better work if they were more adequately paid. Another feature was that owing to the miserable salaries paid it was impossible to get the best men to accept judgeships, and the positions had to be filled with second-rate men, much to the injury of the judiciary.

Although, Mr. Speaker, I did say something in favour of the idea of increasing the salaries of the judges, I never laid down a proposition so broad as that I have just read, namely, that only second-rate men accepted positions on the bench. What I did say is fairly reported in "Hansard," with perhaps the omission of a couple of words in the sentence which I am now going to quote. I said, as reported in "Hansard":

I may say, however, that it is by no means certain that the appointment of additional judges will do all the good that is expected. Something more than that is required, at least in the district of Montreal, and that is an increase in the salary of the judges. The judges in the district of Montreal receive the same salary to-day that they received thirty years ago, and everybody

knows that the cost of living in large cities has greatly increased during the last twenty or thirty years. It seems to me that if the judges received a better salary than they receive to-day, possibly they would perform a greater amount of work; at all events, it would be an inducement to them. We have been told, and it is a matter of notoriety, that some of the legal gentlemen who accepted positions on the bench have done so at a great personal sacrifice.

It is notorious that eminent members of the profession in the district of Montreal, and I may say in all the large centres of population, will not accept a position on the bench for the salary at present attached to that position. The consequence is that the best men cannot be secured, and second-class men, although very good men usually, have to be appointed to these positions.

It is in this last sentence that some words must have been omitted, because what is here said does not logically follow from what precedes. What precedes is this: That some of the legal gentlemen most affected by this have only accepted positions on the bench at personal sacrifice. This refers to a particular case or to some particular cases of some of the judges. What follows is this, that it is notorious that some—not all—of the best men do not accept positions on the bench for the salary attached to that position.

Now, I am charged with having drawn from these particular cases the general conclusion that none but second-class men are appointed to the bench on account of the others refusing such positions. The idea I had in my mind and that I am as positive as it is possible to be that I have pronounced, might be expressed as follows:—

The consequence is that the best men cannot always be secured, and that, in consequence, in some cases, second-class men, although very good men, have to be appointed to these positions.

By the addition of these three or four words, Mr. Speaker, the idea I had in my mind and that I intended to convey is completely expressed, although the subject matter of the proposition might be open to discussion. Now, I say this in all fairness to the gentlemen who occupy positions upon the bench. I had in mind in that debate the position of the judges in the province of Quebec, and, more particularly that of the judges in the district of Montreal. And I would not, for any consideration—such a thing was far from my mind—make any sweeping statement of the nature of that attributed to me applicable to all the judges of the province.

Besides these two newspapers, I have had the honour of being criticised by another important newspaper in the city of Montreal. And the statements attributed to me in that newspaper go even further than those I have quoted and are far from the idea I desired to express on the occasion referred to. I allude now to the newspaper "La Presse." In its issue of Saturday, the 15th inst., under the heading: "Un Mot Mal-

heureux," that newspaper published the following—I read from the French text—

"Si les juges étaient mieux payés, peut-être travailleraient-ils plus. Dans tous les cas, un meilleur salaire déterminerait une meilleure classe d'hommes à accepter ces postes. Aujourd'hui, on ne peut pas obtenir la meilleure qualité, et il n'y a que des gens de seconde classe, quoique bons quand même, qui acceptent d'être juges." Si l'on avait offert une récompense pour la plus grosse ineptie incontestable, personne n'aurait songé à celle-là, et M. Fortin prend d'emblée le premier prix d'incongruité.

Then the article goes on with comments with which, I may say, I myself agree. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the statements attributed to me by this newspaper are entirely incorrect. I have read that portion of my speech as I delivered it on the occasion referred to, and there is no such statements as is to be found here:

Dans tous les cas, un meilleur salaire déterminerait une meilleure classe d'hommes à accepter ces postes.

And there is surely nothing whatever to justify the sweeping assertions that to-day the best men cannot be obtained, and that none but second-rate men are appointed on the bench. I am the more surprised to find in the newspaper "La Presse," when I read its issue of the 13th July, and not the report of this debate by its correspondent in this House. That report, I may say, is a fair one to me and expresses the idea that I had endeavoured to express. This report of the 13th of July has nothing resembling the words that are attributed to me in the article of the 15th. This is what the correspondent says, and to this I agree:

M. Fortin, député de Laval, appuie chaleureusement le discours de M. Madore, et fait ressortir la position intolérable faite aux avocats et aux plaideurs par l'encombrement des tribunaux de Montréal. Il profite de l'occasion pour faire remarquer que le traitement des juges est actuellement ce qu'il était il y a trente ans, et notoirement insuffisant, maintenant que tout a augmenté de prix.

As may be seen here is the report given by the correspondent, who is supposed to be present in the House, and who makes a fair report of what I said. Nevertheless, two days afterwards words are attributed to me in the same newspaper that I never said, with no other apparent object than to injure my position before the public, and statements are attributed to me that I never did nor intended to pronounce before this House.

I must explain that this is the first opportunity I have had of calling the attention of the House to this subject. This debate took place on last Wednesday, in the afternoon. I left the same evening and only returned to Ottawa last night. Last night after six o'clock was the first opportunity I had of seeing "Hansard," and, as I have stated, to explain the omission of one or two words in one or two sentences of the report.

With this exception, what I said is correct, and I adhere to it; but I repudiate the expression and ideas attributed to me by these newspapers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I listened with great attention to the interesting speech delivered by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin), delivered on the occasion referred to, and I have listened to the explanation the hon. gentleman has now given to the House with regard to that speech; but I confess I am greatly at a loss to know why he has called the attention of this House to the subject at all. I understood the hon. gentleman to make two rather important statements. The one was, that if the judges—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think it is absolutely regular to discuss this question now. I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fortin) raises the question of privilege, and though no motion was made, I take it that he was in order in discussing the question of privilege and drawing the attention of the House to the fact that he had been misrepresented in the newspapers. But I do not think it would be regular to discuss that question—

Mr. DAVIN. I move the adjournment of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am inclined to think, Mr. Speaker, that reference to the precedents will show you that it has been customary, on questions of privilege, to hear remarks upon observations of gentlemen bringing up questions of privilege. I may be mistaken, and, perhaps, it is more regular to have the motion made. I did not want to make a motion, because I did not want to deal so formally with the subject as to require that. But, as the press has been attacked for misreporting, and as the accuracy of "Hansard" has been questioned, I feel it right to say a few words. In the first place, I understood the hon. gentleman to make two statements, both of which were very important. He complained that the salaries of the judges in the province of Quebec were not sufficiently high, and he gave as one reason why the salaries should be increased that if the judges were better paid, they would do more work. That statement, I think, the hon. gentleman will find is made in the "Hansard," although he said that in some instances the judges undoubtedly did give a great deal of time to their work. That was a very important statement, and it is one that I hope is not correct. I hope that the hon. gentleman was entirely mistaken in supposing that any of the judges in the province of Quebec do not discharge their duties fully and completely because they are not better paid. I hope the hon. gentleman is mistaken on that point. But he certainly did lead the House to suppose, or led me to suppose, at all events, that one of the great reasons why a larger amount should be paid to the judges in Quebec was that as the salaries

Mr. FORTIN.

now stand, the best and ablest men at the bar refuse to accept judgeships.

Mr. FORTIN. Some.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not all, no, I do not think the hon. gentleman said all, and it was unnecessary to say that. If it be a fact that the Government are obliged, in selecting judges for the province of Quebec, to take second-class men as the hon. gentleman himself intimated, because the ablest men at the bar could not be induced, with the present salaries, to accept positions, that is a most important statement.

Mr. FORTIN. The hon. gentleman will allow me to say that I made two statements. First, I said that some of the judges have accepted their positions at great personal sacrifice, and I may cite the instance of Sir Alexander Lacoste, Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals.

Mr. BERGERON. How many more?

Mr. FORTIN. There are a good many more. The second statement I made was that it was well known that some of the best men would not accept, but have positively refused to accept positions on the bench because the salary is insufficient. Now, I did not give this as the only reason for increasing the salary, but the chief reason was in the increased cost of living. The present salaries were established shortly after confederation, over thirty years ago, and since then the cost of living has increased.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That does not at all touch the subject I was dealing with. I was dealing with the statements made as I understand them to be made by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin), and I was giving what I understood to be the purport of his argument. I do not think that those who listened to him to-day will say that he has in the slightest degree changed the position or altered the argument from what it was. I need not go into the reason why the salaries require to be larger now than in former years. That is another very important consideration. But the great question is this: Are the salaries paid to judges in the province of Quebec sufficient to enable the Government to secure the services of first-class men to fill vacancies on the bench of that province? That is a most important matter. If the hon. gentleman is correct in saying that because of the present salary the best men at the bar in the province of Quebec will not accept judicial positions, and consequently the Government are obliged to take second-class men, to use his own words, that is a very serious matter, and no doubt will receive the careful attention of my right hon. friend the First Minister and of the Government. It is of the first importance that the country should be able to se-

cure the very best and highest talent for these high judicial positions, every person agrees with that. Now, I do not know whether my hon. friend the member for Laval has, in the revised report of his speech, made those corrections to which he refers to-day.

Mr. FORTIN. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Very well, then we must, of course, take the speech with these corrections, but even then the two great facts that were brought out by the press remain: One is that my hon. friend suggested that better work could be done by the judges, or many of them, if they were better paid; and, secondly, that the salaries are too low to secure the services of first-class men, and therefore the Government are obliged to take second-class men. Now, I felt a little personal interest in this matter, because while the salary remains as it does we are likely to have the pleasure of retaining the presence of my hon. friend from Laval in this House, and we all recognize that it is a great honour and credit to this House to have him amongst us, and we would probably be able to retain him longer if the law remained as it is, and if he was not subjected to the temptation of a higher salary. I merely rise for the purpose of saying that I do not think my hon. friend made out a strong case against the press for having misrepresented him, because I think that the corrections which he has given to his own speech leaves it very much in the position in which we all understood it when it was delivered.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would call the attention of my hon. friend and of the House to the fact that there is nothing to debate at all upon this motion to adjourn, which was made after the remarks of my hon. friend from Laval. My hon. friend from Laval simply availed himself of his right as a member of this House to rise and make a personal explanation, saying that he had been incorrectly reported. Having said that much, there was no occasion at all for raising a debate. Having given the House a statement of what he said on that occasion, the House has only to accept the correction as an accurate version of the remarks which he then offered to the House. I will only say that we are all disposed to accept the correction that he has made to-day of the views which he offered to the House, because if my hon. friend had made the remarks which have since been attributed to him in "La Presse" the same controversy would have arisen at the moment which has arisen since. But the fact that his remarks were not questioned at the time, is a presumption that he has not been correctly reported. I think, perhaps, the most accurate report of his remarks was found in the correspondence

of "La Presse," which certainly cannot be found fault with.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

#### MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY— SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I have the honour to present a Message from His Excellency the Governor General, signed by his own hand:

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ended 30th June, 1900, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,  
Ottawa, 18th July, 1899.

I move that the said Message of His Excellency, together with the Estimates, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

#### BOUNTIES ON STEEL AND IRON.

Bill (No. 161) respecting steel and iron made in Canada (Mr. Fielding) read a second time. The House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. MILLS. Does that contemplate that the bounty shall be paid on iron manufactured from foreign ore, or on iron manufactured from Canadian ore only?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). It is a continuation of the existing law. It allows the bounty to be paid on iron made from either native or foreign ore, but there is a discrimination in favour of native ore. That is the existing law, and there is no departure from it.

Mr. HAGGART. Does this permit of a mixture being made?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They get bounty in proportion to the ore used.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to protest against bounty being paid on iron produced from foreign ore. We have a lot of iron ore in Canada, we have many mines capable of development in Ontario, Quebec, the maritime provinces and British Columbia, and if we are going to pay bounties upon the manufacture of iron, it should be upon iron manufactured from ore produced in our own country, so as to encourage the development of our own mines. I have, in my own constituency, no less than two iron mines capable of being developed. One of them was worked for quite a number of

years, until three or four years ago, when it was closed down. If this bounty were given upon iron produced from Canadian ore entirely, these mines would be open, and would be developed to-day. I make my protest, not long, but firmly and strongly, against paying a bounty on iron from foreign ore, believing that it should be given only upon iron produced from ore from Canadian mines.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I am obliged to differ very strongly from my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills), who has just taken his seat. The object, of course, is to create a great iron industry in Canada, and I am inclined to think the course proposed by my hon. friend would have the effect of defeating that object to a large extent. I raised the question, as the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) knows, as to whether Newfoundland ores should be treated as foreign ores. The hon. Minister was not willing, and, I think upon reconsideration, probably with a tolerably fair ground, to accede to my suggestion that we should treat a sister colony as in a different position from a foreign country, but, as my hon. friend thought it would be opening the door rather too wide to do that, I was obliged to agree with the policy which he proposed in regard to this point. But to go so far as the hon. member for Annapolis would suggest, I think, would defeat the entire object of the measure, and I hope my hon. friend will not press that view upon the House. I am quite aware that there are in his county valuable iron mines which will become still more valuable under the operation of this Bill.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Mr. Chairman, I entirely differ from the views of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) upon this important question. I am of the opinion that the principal object of these bounties is not for the working of these smelting furnaces, but for the development of the mines of our own country. The law, as introduced before, I know, admitted a certain percentage of foreign ores into the manufacture of iron and steel. The argument adduced was, that it was necessary to have these ores for the purpose of smelting. What is the object of developing large industries in the shape of manufactures in the country, if the mines of the country are not developed at all? The sole object of this protection ought to be, in the first instance, the working of the mines of the country, so as to encourage their development. For these reasons, I agree with my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills), that, with the exception of a percentage of foreign ores which might be necessary for the purpose of smelting our own ores, the protection should be devoted entirely to the development of our own mines.

**Mr. MILLS.**

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I am going to apologize to the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) for taking so prominent a part in the discussion of this question. I would not have done it, if the attack had not come behind me. I do not at all relish being attacked in the rear. I will give my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) two reasons opposed to the view which he has advanced. First of all, the Bill of which he was one of the fathers and authors, and which was placed on the statute-book of the country, deals with the question of foreign and domestic ores precisely as this Bill does, so that my hon. friend and the Government of which he was long a member, adopted that policy and are responsible for it. In the next place, I would be glad, if my hon. friend would tell us how he is going to develop iron mines without manufacturing iron? Under this Bill iron mines in every section of Canada will be developed to an extent that otherwise would be absolutely impossible, and they will be developed because under this measure capital will be brought in, which will lead to the establishment of iron industries and create a demand for the iron contained in our own mines.

**Mr. WALLACE.** Section No. 2, as I understand it, reads that no bounty shall be paid on steel ingots made from puddled iron bars, but that the bounty is to be paid on the puddled iron bars.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Yes.

**Mr. WALLACE.** That is, in the first place the bounty is paid on the pig iron, and then the bounty is paid on the puddled iron bar. If I understand it, the steel is made directly from the pig iron and it does not ordinarily go through the process of conversion into malleable iron or puddled iron bars; so that if this were done, it would be simply for the sake of getting the bounty. As to making the bounties payable on the iron ore brought in from Newfoundland, I can heartily endorse the statement made by the leader of the Opposition, that we should pay a bounty on the iron ore brought in from Newfoundland, and for this reason: We are told there is in that colony a kind of iron ore that is not to be found in Canada, or if found in Canada, then at such a distance away from our smelters that it would be economically impossible to transport it. If that ore is found on the northern shores of Lake Superior it would be manifestly impossible to send that ore to Cape Breton or New Glasgow where we now have smelting furnaces. If we are to become a great manufacturing people we must make the pig iron, and there should be no restriction. As to importing the iron ore, we should take that ore wherever we can get it, in Newfoundland, if not in Canada. If they can get it as they do near New Glasgow, they would utilize it there. I think that for

other considerations, Newfoundland should not be treated as a foreign nation. We hope to have Newfoundland in our confederation, and we should not by any act of ours now, do anything to alienate the people of that colony. On the contrary we should go a step towards winning them for political reasons. As an economic proposition alone, we should permit the Newfoundland ore to come into Canada and to receive the same bounty that is given for the native ore. It will do more to promote the manufacture of pig iron and steel in this country than anything else you can do in addition to what is now proposed to be done. I submit to the Finance Minister that he should permit the Newfoundland ore to come in, and to receive the same bounty as the Canadian ore.

**Mr. BENNETT:** When this question was before the House on a former occasion, I called the attention of the Minister to the fact that in the manufacture of pig-iron with charcoal, a great deal more labour is employed than in its manufacture from coke. I may mention that there is at present a smelting furnace at Hamilton, and as I understand it the coke used there is all brought in from the United States, and consequently little or no labour is afforded in that respect to Canadians. Now, on the other hand, there is at present a smelter at Deseronto and another is being erected in Midland, both of which use charcoal, and an immense amount of employment will be afforded to our people in producing that charcoal. I understand the capacity of the Midland concern is about the same as that at Hamilton, but at the Midland smelting works, they will consume yearly about 50,000 cords of wood, while at Hamilton they will simply import the coke from the United States. It is evident that there must be a great deal of employment afforded in the taking out of the 50,000 cords of wood, and I ask the Minister whether he has considered the question of putting an increased bounty on pig-iron produced from charcoal as compared with iron produced from coke.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I remember that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) brought this matter to my attention, and I admit that there is a great deal of force in his argument. Nevertheless it would be difficult to distinguish between the two classes of fuel used in producing iron. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), who opened this discussion, argued that Newfoundland ore should not be admitted to the bounty at all, and the hon. gentleman from West York (Mr. Wallace) advanced a view which goes to the other extreme, viz., that we should pay the full bounty for the Newfoundland ore. The Government have decided on a happy medium. We do not propose to shut out Newfoundland ore, but we do not propose to put it on even terms with Canadian ore. I feel quite satisfied that the good people of Newfoundland will not regard

this as an unfriendly measure on our part, but on the contrary, that they will consider that in admitting their ore to a part of the bounty we are dealing in a friendly spirit with them.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I hope in a short time they will come into the confederation, and bring their ore with them.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I commend the sentiment of the hon. leader of the Opposition. There is no doubt that the probability of the sister colony of Newfoundland coming into confederation at no distant date, is a consideration we might well have in mind. And when that time comes, if it comes within the continuance of this bounty, Newfoundland will receive the additional advantage of getting the full bounty. There is another view of the question which I am obliged to take as Minister of Finance, and that is, that the sum of money which we may be obliged to pay under this bounty may be a considerable one; and if it were enlarged still further by paying the full bounty on Newfoundland ore, my fear is that the charge on the treasury would be too large, and the House might hesitate to consent to it. I can assure hon gentlemen that all these things have been well considered, and we think that the Bill in its present shape will serve its purpose of encouraging a very large development in the iron industry in the different parts of the Dominion. I trust the committee will be able to accept the Bill as it stands, without amendment.

**Mr. HAGGART.** What is the difference in the bounty you pay on iron manufactured out of foreign ore and iron manufactured out of native ore?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Three dollars a ton bounty from the native ore and \$2 a ton from the foreign ore, and if it is a blend, as very often happens, then we will pay in proportion to the quantities of the native ore and the foreign ore entering into the blast furnace.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Notwithstanding the policy pursued by the last Government I have not altered my opinion on this matter. The reason given for admitting foreign ore into this country was, that it was impossible to smelt our ores without adding some foreign ores, and especially so in Nova Scotia. But take the case of the Hamilton smelter. We not only have a customs duty on the iron coming into the country, but we give a bounty of \$2 per ton on iron manufactured out of the ore taken from the American mines on Lake Superior. I think that is entirely wrong. If it is necessary to take a percentage of foreign ore for the purpose of smelting our own ore, it is all very well. They will manufacture the steel and iron out of the iron ores, if you give them bounty enough, but if you only make a difference of

one dollar a ton between iron manufactured from foreign ore, and iron manufactured from native ore, the probability is that on account of the larger development of the United States mines, they will take their supplies altogether of foreign ore, and that would be no advantage to Canada at all. The object of this bounty should be, and all our efforts ought to be directed to the development of the iron mines of Canada. I have no objection to our treating Newfoundland in an exceptional manner, as a sister colony. It may be necessary even to admit its ores free, or to put them on the same basis as our own.

But my argument has reference to the mines on Lake Superior. The Americans have developed their mines on the south shore of Lake Superior to the fullest extent. It is admitted that we have as good minerals on the north shore. What was the object of this bounty? It was for the purpose of developing the iron mines of our own country. Back of Kingston and in the county of Hastings we have as good iron as is to be found anywhere else in the world. We want all this ore manufactured in our own country, and we are perfectly willing to give a large bonus for the purpose of developing these deposits and starting the manufacture. But if the effect of that bonus is not to develop these mines, but to smelt foreign ores brought into the country, it is of no good to the country. You are only developing the foreign trade, and asking the people of this country to pay, in the shape of duties, a higher price for their iron than they otherwise would.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman says that we could make our iron from native ore, if we only gave bounty enough. To a certain extent that is true. I suppose we might raise oranges in Canada, if only we would give bounty enough; but I am inclined to think it would take a higher bounty than any of the hon. gentlemen opposite would be willing to give, in order to carry on an iron industry confined to the ores of Canada. It is well known that you must have the ores of different countries to blend together in order to have a satisfactory manufacture of iron. I think the argument of the hon. leader of the Opposition was most logical and conclusive. If you want to develop an iron industry in the country, you must have ore of different varieties, you must get your furnaces, and I am afraid that you would not succeed if you confined the furnaces to native ore. But if you provide for the use of both native and foreign ore, you are creating a market for the native ore, which would otherwise not be created at all; and I have no doubt that by the operation of this policy, not only considerable foreign ore will be used, but opportunities for the production of the native ores of Canada will be afforded, and in that way we shall develop our native ores

Mr. HAGGART.

in a much better way than by any other policy we could adopt.

Mr. EDWARDS. I was opposed to the original iron resolutions, when they were introduced in 1887; I was equally opposed to the resolutions on which this Bill is based, and I am now opposed to the passing of this Bill. I am opposed to it because I am opposed to the system entirely. I need not dwell upon that, because it is well known. But what amuses me is, that hon. gentlemen opposite support a system which has for its end the gradual wiping out of these bounties altogether. That is what the Liberal party have advocated. That portion of the Bill is the only solace it has for me—that in a few years the whole system will be wiped out. But what amuses me is, that hon. gentlemen opposite support this wiping-out process. It seems to me that the ground they are taking, and have been taking for some time, is, that it is a mistake to lower the duties by degrees. It seems to me that they have been going back entirely on the principles they have advocated.

Mr. CRAIG. I do not rise to discuss this question, but only to say that what amuses me and all other gentlemen on this side of the House is, that a gentleman who professes in words to be an ardent free trader, always supports a Government that has adopted protection. Now, I do not know why the hon. gentleman got up to-day to talk at all—

Mr. EDWARDS. To make you look ridiculous.

Mr. CRAIG—except to amuse gentlemen on both sides of the House. If the hon. gentleman were consistent, he would not support the present Government, because they are as protectionist as the Government that went out of power.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Would it be more consistent to support a Government which advocates what is right and best in the interests of the country in the lowering of the duties, or a Government who persistently say that the farmers and producers of this country shall be everlastingly burdened with high taxation?

Mr. CRAIG. I do not want to take up the time of the committee, but I just want to say that I think that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, rather gave away his case. He asked: Would it be more consistent to support the party on this side of the House, or the party who say they are doing things for the farmers of this country? I am satisfied that he should support the party who say they are doing these things.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

## COMPANIES' ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 160)—from the Senate—to amend the Companies Act (Mr. Fielding) read the second time, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

## PRESERVATION OF HEALTH ON PUBLIC WORKS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved second reading of Bill (No. 105)—from the Senate—for the preservation of health on public works.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a result of the report of the commission which was appointed last year to investigate certain complaints which had been made in connection with the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. There is no doubt that that investigation revealed the fact that a most unfortunate condition of things had existed with regard to the health of the men, and the Government have come to the conclusion to offer some legislation, with the view of obviating a recurrence of such a condition of things. In a country like Canada, with such a vast extent of territory, a large portion of which is as yet unsettled, and in which many public works will no doubt be constructed, several thousand men may happen at any moment to be congregated together at one point in what is practically a desert, far away from the means of communication and from the advantages of civilization.

Unless provision is made to compel these companies to look after the health of the men they employ the same condition of things will be renewed which took place on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. The Government, by this legislation which it has introduced, will provide, I believe, a sufficient means of having the health and comfort of the men looked after. This Bill is intended to apply to all public works that come under the jurisdiction of this Parliament. It will apply, as stated in the first clause, to every railway, canal, bridge, telegraph and other work within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada. It provides that whenever such a public work is under construction, the Governor General in Council shall have the power to make regulations for the preservation of the lives of the men and their comfort as well. Of course, the reason why we place this power in the hands of the Governor in Council is because there may be occasions when there will be no necessity for any such regulations. If a public work is constructed in the older and settled portions of the country, where a population is at hand, where there are all the comforts and elements of civilization, the normal condition of things will be sufficient to regulate any new conditions which may arise and provide for the health and

comfort of the men. But if a public work is carried on, say in the Rocky Mountains or the prairies or any other portion of Canada where the men may be thousands of miles away from all the comforts of civilization, the Governor in Council may have the power to make regulations regarding the health and comfort of the men. These regulations are five in number. First of all, to provide regulations as to the extent and character of the accommodation to be afforded by the houses, tents or other quarters occupied by the employees on the work. If, as has been the case on former occasions, and as I believe was the case on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, the men were quartered in railway boxes and so cramped that they had not the requisite quantity of pure air, the Governor in Council can make regulations to compel the employers to provide these men with sufficient space to breathe in and make other provisions for their health. The Governor in Council may make regulations for the inspection of such houses, tents and other quarters, and the cleansing, purifying and disinfecting thereof where necessary. Also regulations to compel the company to provide the requisite number of medical officers, and hospitals, and for the isolation of persons suffering from contagious disease. We know, unfortunately, that deaths have occurred for want of such regulations on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. After having read the evidence very carefully, I am not prepared to mete all the blame on the employers for the death of these two young men, and believe it was due rather to the conditions in which they were placed, but the investigation has shown conclusively that whenever you have such a lot of men as we had on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, it will be indispensable that we should have regulations made and promptly carried out. I think all these rules will commend themselves to the judgment of the House. There is only one thing to which there may be an exception. Clause 4 provides:

The Governor in Council may, until Parliament otherwise provides, prescribe punishments, penalties and forfeitures for breach or non-observance of such regulations, and may also prescribe the procedure for enforcing same.

This is rather, perhaps, stretching the power which Parliament may be disposed to place in the hands of the Governor in Council, but, on the whole, I believe that this stretch of power is sufficiently qualified by the following provision, which enacts that no punishment by way of imprisonment to be prescribed by the Governor in Council, shall exceed three months. With this qualification, I think we can safely leave to the Governor in Council the providing not only of the regulations, but of the punishments for violating these regulations. In any case, the punishment by imprisonment is not to exceed three months. If this punishment

were to prove inadequate, then we would have to come to Parliament to provide an adequate punishment, but on the whole I think that this measure, which is a tentative one, should commend itself to the judgment of the House.

Mr. POWELL. What is supposed to be the maximum money penalty?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is not mentioned here.

Mr. JOHN ROSS ROBERTSON (East Toronto). On the principle that prevention is better than cure, it is a pity that this Bill had not been introduced in the session of 1896. I suppose it is natural that a Government, like all human organizations, should display hindsight instead of foresight. This Bill strikes me as a tardy example of the policy of locking the stable-door after the horse has been stolen. I wish the Government could have seen its way to have punished those who stole the horse, I mean to place the criminal responsibility upon the corporation or men who are to blame for the crimes which attended the expenditure of public moneys in the Crow's Nest Pass work. I hope that this Bill will protect the fair name of Canada from a repetition of the Crow's Nest Pass disgrace; and I must say that if the hon. Minister of Justice is as slow to use the authority conferred upon him by this Bill as he was to act on the complaint of the late Dr. Meade, this Bill will be a sham and a delusion. While on my feet, and as the subject is pertinent, I may just as well say what I have to say in relation to the Crow's Nest Pass atrocities and Mr. Clute's report. I am not going to weary the House with an elaborate repetition of my views on this question. I have read the report and a good deal of the evidence. The facts, as shown in the evidence, are softened somewhat in the report. I mention that, not to the discredit of Mr. Clute, but to show that he has been careful not to go beyond the facts. The evidence and the report justify every single solitary word that was said last session by the members of this Parliament who held that the Canadian Pacific Railway was guilty—yes, blood guilty, in this matter. There is a lot of talk about one story being a good story until another is told, and that the Canadian Pacific Railway would meet its accusers with a complete defence; but where is this complete defence? The evidence and the report prove the guilt of the Canadian Pacific Railway, because that corporation accepted a subsidy from this Parliament and spent that subsidy under a system which rendered the theft of men's labour and the taking of men's lives inevitable. I am not going to consider Mr. Haney and the sub-contractors in this matter. Mr. Haney was the representative of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the sub-contractors were mere

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

incidents in the Canadian Pacific Railway system of building the Crow's Nest Pass road. I have been told on good authority that everybody in sight, except Mr. Haney, were sweated in the building of this road. The sub-contractors were ground down until there was not profit enough to buy a suit of clothes let alone take care of sick men. The whole business seems to have been one huge carnival of callous greed; Canadians were decoyed to the Crow's Nest Pass work to build a railway for their board, the company kindly consenting not to charge anything extra for their coffins. It is all right to call down vengeance on the sub-contractors who were the victims of the system which Mr. Haney created under the auspices of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and for which the Canadian Pacific Railway should be held responsible. I think I can justify my conclusions by the acts of the Canadian Pacific Railway subsequent to the death of these poor men. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that I would have risen in my place to-day to add one word to the discussion of this painful subject had I not felt it my duty to say a word in praise of the one man who shines in the blackness of this infamous transaction, and that man, Dr. Meade, the humane physician and brave coroner of Pincher Creek. No word of mine can reach the ear of that man who soothed the dying moments of these poor Canadian boys abandoned to a cruel death in an old box car. Dr. Meade, since this subject was last discussed, has passed beyond the sting of earthly censure and beyond the sound of human praise. The facts show that he did his duty as long as there was life in these poor Nova Scotians, and then he tried to do his duty by taking steps to avenge their deaths. It is all right for the glib agents of the Canadian Pacific Railway to say that this obscure individual and the other sub-contractors are responsible for the death of these two young men. Perhaps Dr. Meade thought as the Canadian Pacific Railway now pretends to think. In his capacity as coroner, he took steps to find out who were responsible for the death of Fraser and McDonald. Surely if the Canadian Pacific Railway were not to blame, the Canadian Pacific Railway had no need to suppress inquiry. A person would have thought that Coroner Meade, in his efforts to get at the truth, would have run up against the sub-contractors or other individuals who were to blame. But when Coroner Meade tried to place the blame for the death of these two poor men, whom did he find he was up against? Was it the sub-contractors? Oh, no. When Coroner Meade tried to move in accordance with his duty he found himself up against the whole might of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the Government of this country. I did a great wrong to the Deputy Minister of Justice last session. I blamed him for the red tape preliminaries which played into the hands of

the Canadian Pacific Railway and baffled Coroner Meade. I am glad that the Minister of Justice has assumed responsibility for the shuffling which disgraced the Government of this country. If the Minister of Justice were in this House, I would tell him that in my judgment his responsibility is not a light one. He split hairs and coiled red tape around that coroner at Pincher Creek, who showed more humanity and more patriotism in this matter than the whole Government of Canada. If Dr. Meade were technically disqualified from holding an inquiry, why did not the Minister of Justice send out agents to investigate and prosecute those who were guilty of the murder of these men? On the contrary, the Minister of Justice threw the whole weight of the Government into the scale against Dr. Meade. The Canadian Pacific Railway had its way, as it always has with this Government. These murdered men were buried, and the Government were finally compelled to move. I suppose that the Canadian Pacific Railway did not object to a movement when it was too late to do anything, and now, I suppose, nothing can be done. I have nothing more to say than to express my solemn conviction that the hon. Minister of Justice has very little reason to be proud of this episode in the history of his department. And, with all his gifts and with all his eloquence, the Government of the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in this matter cuts but a poor figure alongside the lonely man at Pincher Creek who tried to do his duty, but who was throttled by the Canadian Pacific Railway, aided by the Minister of Justice, and, as far as I can learn, with the full approval of the whole Government of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that clause 2 of this Bill would be an encroachment upon provincial rights, because it is with the provinces that the duty of looking after the public health rests. And while these public works might be carried on in the Northwest Territories or in districts which are governed by the federal authorities, still, they are as likely to be carried on in the older provinces of the Dominion. So, I think there is a possibility of coming in conflict with the provincial authorities if this is carried out.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). I feel that the action taken by the Government in introducing this Bill is entirely in the direction in which the country would like them to move. There can be no doubt that the revelations made in the case of the death of two of my constituents on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway were very sad; and while nothing can now be done to help these poor young fellows, because they have passed beyond earthly aid, it will be a comfort to their relatives, I am sure, to feel that, in a sense, the loss of their

lives is to bring to an end what was unquestionably a very great evil and a great reproach to Canada, having led the Government to take the action it has taken in order to insure that in the future similar scenes may never occur in our fair Dominion. I believe the Government have done the thing absolutely essential in this case. The evidence brought before Mr. Commissioner Clute shows that means were provided to protect these men so far as organization was concerned, but it was not efficient and I think that nothing but the supervision of the Government, nothing but the power in the hands of the authorities of the country to inflict penalties as provided in this Bill, will meet the case. I think it is certain that, so far as the Canadian Pacific Railway was concerned—while, I presume, the responsibility, in the first place, did rest upon them, because it was that company that was carrying on the work—they took the steps that they thought necessary in order to give to the employees upon that work such medical attendance and protection as would be sufficient. But the facts brought out before Commissioner Clute go to show that, although they did that, although they created machinery to provide medical attendance and supplies for these men, yet the inefficient manner in which that purpose was carried out, in that remote district, led to an enormous amount of suffering, and, in some cases, resulted in very cruel and painful death. The company seemed to have taken great care to supply medical attendance and medicine for the men. Their system was a complete one, so far as the machinery was concerned. They had an organization which was in itself complete, but it was inefficient because it was left to work in the hands of men who did not feel responsible, who were more engrossed in making money than in protecting those employed and who did not take the steps necessary to make the expenditure, which was willingly undertaken by the Canadian Pacific Railway, efficient. The Canadian Pacific Railway was not disposed to economize so far as this service was concerned. The figures brought down in the report, which I am glad to see and to which I am glad to refer here—because it was my duty in a previous session to direct the attack against the Canadian Pacific Railway for the death of two of my constituents—show that while the sum collected from the men in this service was \$12,816, the Canadian Pacific Railway expended the sum of \$17,731. The Canadian Pacific Railway paid out something like \$5,000 in addition to the amounts which they collected from the men employed upon that road. So it is clear that the unfortunate results in this case were not results of neglect on the part of the company, nor of parsimony on the part of the company, but were consequences of the fact that there was not that supervision, that responsibility applying not only to the contract

company but to the sub-contractors as well, which would compel them to look upon the care of the health and the lives of those men under their control, as a charge which they must answer for to the people of Canada, and if necessary to the Government of Canada. The facts brought out show that they had a complete organization, they had a medical man of high standing, a graduate of McGill, a leading physician of Lethbridge, who had charge of the whole work. He had ample powers so far as the evidence goes, he had full authority to employ subordinates and establish hospitals. But that was not done, and the result was that when the critical moment came, when the lives of my young countrymen depended upon the care and attention which should have been theirs, the machinery was wanting, the medical men who had charge of those districts had too much to attend to, their divisions were too long, they had no hospitals for isolating infectious cases, and the result was that the two young fellows who died were carried 70 miles out of one medical district through another and into a third without having, in the course of that long and fatal journey, met with a medical man whom they should have met at some point in their journey. Three medical men were there to take charge of the districts through which they passed, still from want of proper organization and a proper system these unfortunate fellows passed by all this means of relief until death overtook them, and death in the most horrible form. Inquiries were made at a later stage and as a result of their death the machinery was improved, additional hospitals were provided, isolation hospitals for infectious cases were provided, but it was too late. Now, it would appear from a perusal of Mr. Clute's report that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who were primarily the responsible parties, had done a great deal to anticipate so far as they could such misfortunes and to provide for what was wanted. But it appears also that the medical contractor, the man who was at the head of the service did not devote himself to it with that assiduity and care for the protection of those men that he should have done. It would appear that the medical man who had charge of all this long line of railway, these thousands of men—for at one time there was something like 4,000 or 5,000 men employed—had a large practice in Lethbridge, and he was fully occupied there, his practice took up nearly all his time, and he did not give that supervision to his outside work on the railway which was absolutely necessary. In fact when he was examined it would appear that he had to a certain extent left the responsibility and care of providing for the health of the men to the medical men who were presiding over these special districts; and the commissioner found this difficulty when he wanted to know why a hospital

was not provided at a certain point, and Dr. Mewburn said that the medical man who had charge of that division should have provided a hospital, or should have seen that it was provided. When asked: Was it not your duty to see that it was provided? He was of course enabled in that way to evade the responsibility of attending to that work. But no hospital was provided, because no such machinery as is now provided by the Government was in existence. To-day after this Bill becomes law, I presume each medical man in charge of a district will be responsible for death if he has not done his duty. If he has hampered his subordinates, if he has not given them sufficient power to do certain things which it was their duty to do, he would be subject to pains and penalties. It would appear from the evidence that to a certain extent all concerned in this matter looked upon it more from a financial point of view than a humanitarian point of view, as a work in which men should think less of money and more of responsibility to their fellows. It appears among other things that no less than three medical men having charge of subordinate districts were discharged from the employment of the company, or from the employment of Dr. Mewburn, who was the subordinate medical officer, and who had power of appointing or dismissing; they were dismissed because they had ventured to say before the coroner that their district was so large that they could not attend to all the work devolving upon them. If that be the case it strikes me that he was not taking the best means to keep a medical man in a position where he could do good work, but rather taking a course which would prevent him from reporting that he could not overtake his task, that he had more work than he could attend to. Consequently, while in the first place the company may be primarily responsible and should be held responsible for the illness and death that has occurred on that road, it yet appears that to a large extent the unfortunate results were not due to the parsimony of the company, not due to the fact that they had not looked ahead and made provision for medical attendance, because the evidence shows they did provide the machinery, but they were owing to the fact that there was not that feeling of responsibility, not that care on the part of the subordinates which was necessary in order to bring to the men who were in a large sense their wards—not sufficient to bring to those unfortunate men who were entirely in their hands at the time, that loving care and tenderness which they should have received from the medical men who were appointed to give it to them. It is an unfortunate thing that anything like a contract system should apply here where men are induced to take work at the least possible figure. Where you give a man a contract and in a sense he sublets the care

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

of the sick to others, to a certain extent you are introducing the contract system and bringing into prominence the money consideration. It strikes me the Bill is entirely in the right direction. Unfortunately it comes too late to help the poor fellows in whom I was more particularly interested; and I am sure no greater source of gratification to their friends could arise now than to know that in their sufferings and in their death good has been done and good will result in years to come.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). I congratulate the Prime Minister upon the introduction of this Bill. I am glad as a member of this House, to know that human life is held in greater esteem than wealth, and that men who have to earn their living upon public works of this kind are going to have at least as much protection thrown around them as around those who employ them. This is indeed legislation in the right direction, and the more we recognize that men's lives and everything relating to their health is of more value to us than the prosperity of this country can be, the more we are moving in the right direction. We hear a good deal in this House of the wrongs that workingmen have to bear, and I am bound to say that much of it is true, and this legislation indicates a move in the right direction. But it would be very unfair that the remarks of the hon. member for Toronto should go without one word of criticism. I am not the apologist of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I trust I shall always be found with them when they are right, and opposed to them when they are wrong. But I am bound to say that in these two instances the Canadian Pacific Railway did what was greatly to their credit. They recognized no legal liability, they had the best legal authority in coming to that conclusion, but they recognized that a great wrong had been done to the parents and relatives of those two young men, and they voluntarily gave \$1,500 in each case to their relatives, not under compulsion but simply as a gratuity. But they did more than that. At the same time they gave that money, they stipulated distinctly that it was not to prejudice any legal action the parties might bring.

The parents and friends of Fraser and McDonald are as fully entitled to-day to bring action as if they had never received that gratuity. If they think they have a case in court against the Canadian Pacific Railway they are at perfect liberty to bring suit. I only mention this lest it should be thought that the remarks made with such vigour by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) contained all the facts. I think it is only fair that there should be this recognition. It will not repay the friends and relatives of these two noble young men for their loss, but it is something to know that there is a recognition that a wrong was

committed, and it is a recognition which the Canadian Pacific Railway indicate that they felt, although a corporation, and it is a feeling that corporations as well as others have under such circumstances. I think the action which has been taken is a matter that affords cause for congratulation to every member of this House. I heartily support the Bill, and I hope that, as various circumstances may arise, indicating reasons for further legislation, this Parliament will always be found ready to do what it can in the direction of adopting such legislation as will entrench the position of the workingman so that capital and strength and power may not ride roughshod over him, but that, while working in a far-off land for a wage he may have that protection to life and health which this Parliament should guarantee to every subject.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, as one who last year brought this subject before the House of Commons, I may perhaps say a word in regard to the legislation that has been introduced by the Government. In respect to the information we have just listened to from the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), as to the conduct of the Canadian Pacific Railway I think it is only right to acknowledge that a study of the report shows that the subordinate officers did not make use of all the means placed at their disposal to secure the safety and health of those with whose safety and health they were charged. The failure of justice was in not reaching the person or persons responsible for the disaster that befell these young men, because some person or persons must have been responsible. I am exceedingly glad to hear what has fallen from the lips of the hon. member for Guysborough as to the provision made by the Canadian Pacific Railway for the relatives of these young men, and of the rider that was attached to it that it no way interfered with whatever rights the relatives of these young men might have in court. In reference to this Bill I would like to point out that it places an enormous amount of power and discretion in the hands of the Government. This Bill simply provides that the Government shall practically pass by Order in Council legislation for dealing with companies employing large numbers of men, and there is a double disadvantage, as it seems to me, in a measure of this kind. In the first place, the Government are taking power which properly belongs to this House, and in the next place, we have no guarantee that the Government will do that which should be done if a Bill dealing with the whole question were brought into this House. Of course, a measure of this kind would place the gravest responsibility on the Government and would make them amenable to Parliament if they shall not have provided for such cases as that which led to this legislation. I just

throw this out as a criticism, and I think that it would have been more satisfactory if an elaborate Bill had been placed before Parliament so that we might here arrange what should be done in the premises. I see that it is provided that the punishment under this Bill shall not exceed imprisonment for three months. For conduct, such as is easily imagined, a punishment of three months' imprisonment is a very small matter. There ought to be a further money penalty. However, the Bill, when passed, will not only place large discretion in the hands of the Government, but will place great responsibility upon them, and, when passed, there is a certain security that henceforth we shall have such incidents as that which led to this legislation guarded against.

Mr. F. OLIVER (Alberta). Mr. Speaker, I gather from the discussion, as far as it has gone, that it appears to be in the minds of hon. members that this Bill is rendered necessary by reason of an occurrence that took place on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. I am not in a position to say that the Bill is not necessary, but I would like to take this opportunity of correcting the House as to the idea that there was a failure of justice on that particular occasion because there was a lack of legislation. I take the opportunity all the more for the reason that I find it is necessary to make a personal explanation, not only on my own behalf, but also on behalf of the late Coroner Meade, who was connected with this case, and whose action, or inaction, was stated by the hon. Minister of Justice in the Senate to be the cause of the failure of justice on that occasion. If the House will bear with me I will state the case in a very few words. The deaths of these young men occurred on January 23rd, 1898. Coroner Meade, in pursuance of his duty as coroner, called an inquest on February 5th. An injunction to prevent him from holding an inquest was secured at the instance of Mr. Haney, manager for the Canadian Pacific Railway. The fact of the injunction having been secured was brought to the attention of the Department of Justice and to the personal attention of the hon. Minister of Justice. He took the ground that it was not his business, as Minister of Justice, to take any action in the premises. The injunction was argued, and judgment was reserved. When that took place it was again brought to the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice, and it was represented that some action on his part was desirable. It was represented that it was desirable that if Dr. Meade was not competent to act for any reason, if there was any doubt as to his competence, or any probability that the injunction would be upheld, or that the decision in reference to the injunction would be delayed, Dr. Meade should be asked to withdraw and that another coroner should continue the case. The Deputy Min-

Mr. DAVIN.

ister of Justice, on behalf of the hon. Minister of Justice, replied that the department had no authority in the matter. Afterwards the department did communicate with the Crown prosecutor in the locality. He wired to the department here that "Dr. Meade apparently is indisposed to retire." The department then suggested that, as the decision would likely be received soon, it would not be necessary to demand his withdrawal, and that it might be well to await the decision and then, if under the decision Dr. Meade was barred out, another coroner would be directed to act in his place. On the statement of the Deputy Minister that Dr. Meade had refused to withdraw, and in the expectation of an early decision by the judge, I agreed. I was at Pincher Creek at the time that the death of these two men took place. And as I was personally acquainted with the facts of the case, I interested myself personally in the department concerning it, and brought these matters to the attention of the Minister of Justice and the Deputy Minister. On their representation that the decision on the injunction was likely to be received soon, I agreed to let the matter stand. The decision on the injunction, however, was not given until 15th April. I am not prepared to say what the department might have done as to hastening the decision on that injunction, but it seems to me that some indication might have been given to the judge which might have induced him to give a decision within less than three months of the time at which the affair occurred, when it was one of these cases in which it is easily understood that upon prompt action depended the attainment of justice. Speaking in the Senate on the question of jurisdiction over coroners, the Minister of Justice said:

I may say, in the first place, that the coroners are not officers of our department; in fact, they are not officers of the Government of Canada in that territory, but they are the parties who hold their office, they are not necessarily connected with the administration of justice at all. They are ministerial officers, whose duties are inquisitorial, and who may inquire into any matter that may subsequently call for legal investigation \*\* appointed by the local governments. We have no jurisdiction over them.

On that point it may be well to give to the House the opinion of the Premier of the Territories as to the jurisdiction over these coroners. Mr. Haultain writes:

Office of the Attorney General,

Regina, 22nd July, 1898.

Dear Sir,—Coroners are appointed in the Territories by the Lieutenant-Governor on the advice of the Executive Council. So are justices of the peace. All the duties of coroners, and many of the duties of justices, are in connection with the administration of the criminal law, which belongs exclusively to the Department of Justice at Ottawa. We have no responsibility or duty in respect of the institution

or conduct of criminal proceedings, except the responsibility involved in the duty to appoint proper men as justices and coroners. If a justice or coroner neglected his duty or misbehaves himself he is amenable to the discipline of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, who may remove him. You will understand the position. If an inquest is necessary, or an investigation should be held, it is no part of our duties to have those things done, but we have the right to inquire into the manner in which our appointees conduct themselves officially.

Our duty is to supply coroners and magistrates; it is the duty of the Department of Justice to set the criminal law in motion through these officials.

Yours faithfully,

F. W. G. HAULTAIN.

F. Oliver, Esq., M.P.,  
Edmonton, Alberta.

Therefore, the Premier of the Territories holds the opinion with great distinctness that the coroners are under the jurisdiction of that authority which pays them for the performance of their duty, and that the Department of Justice at Ottawa is the authority to order these proceedings to be taken. But the question may be left as to whether the Minister of Justice is right in saying that the Department of Justice has no authority in such a case; a case in which the lives of two men were involved, a case in which it was perfectly plain that prompt action was necessary to meet the ends of justice. I wish to take up now the question of Dr. Meade's action in the matter, and the responsibility that was thrown upon him by the Minister of Justice through his speech in the Senate on that subject. The Minister of Justice said:

The first communication we had in reference to the subject was the telegram that came to the department from a Dr. Meade, a coroner, who had undertaken to hold an inquest, and who had been enjoined from holding that inquest by parties interested, some officials connected with the contract of the Canadian Pacific Railway. \* \* \* When we received this statement from Dr. Meade, our instructions to him were that he had better withdraw from the case and let another coroner be appointed in order that the inquiry might proceed. This he declined to do, and, therefore, there was nothing for it but to permit him to take his own course and be subjected to the delay which the injunction would impose upon him.

The responsibility for the delay is, in that speech, directly thrown upon the shoulders of Dr. Meade. The Minister states distinctly that the department did instruct him to withdraw, and that he refused to withdraw. Now, at the time that statement was made by the Minister of Justice in the Senate, I did not have copies of the papers on the subject in my hand. I have them now, and I take the liberty of reading them to this House in justice to Dr. Meade, and to show that whoever is at fault, it was not Dr. Meade's fault that justice was not done. I beg to read the following telegrams:—

Lethbridge, via Macleod, 1st March, 1898.

H. R. Meade, Pincher Creek.

Re diphtheria inquest, how do matters stand? How would it do to get a coroner outside of district, say Calgary, to continue?

C. F. P. CONYBEARE.

To that Dr. Meade replied:

Pincher Creek, March 3rd, 1898.

C. Conybeare, Public Prosecutor, Lethbridge.

Re inquest, suit yourself. I have no animus against C.P.R. Dr. Jenkins, living here, is a coroner. Could another coroner take over my jury, as I don't think you could get any one to dig up bodies on account of infection?

Dr. Jenkins could sit with me, if nothing else will do. Inquest stands adjourned, pending judge's decision.

DR. MEADE.

Now, I ask this honourable House is there any indication in that telegram that Dr. Meade refused to withdraw from sitting on that inquiry? Is there not, on the contrary, a plain indication on the part of Dr. Meade of his willingness to withdraw, or to take any other means that might be necessary in order that the proceedings might be carried on; the urgency of which proceedings he points out in this very telegram. You may say: Why did not Dr. Meade withdraw in any case. I will read you why. Here is a letter from the Crown prosecutor to Dr. Meade, dated Lethbridge, March 3rd, 1898:

Lethbridge, March 3rd, 1898.

H. R. Meade, Esq., Pincher Creek.

Dear Sir,—Your two letters of 25th and 26th both arrived on the afternoon of the 1st inst. We had telegraphed you on the morning of that day before receiving them. The department are determined, in view of the circumstances attending these men's deaths, that a full inquiry shall be held, and thought in view of the motion for injunction that it might expedite matters if the work were taken up by another coroner without awaiting the decision; hence the reason of my question, whether you would be willing to withdraw; but I presume the judge will give an early decision. I have to-day sent copy of your telegram to the department, and possibly by the time they receive it we may know the result of the judgment on the motion. At all events, you may rest assured that the inquiry will go on, either by yourself or another coroner.

Yours truly,

(Sgd. CONYBEARE & GALLIHER.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask you is there not in Dr. Meade's telegram a clear indication of his willingness to withdraw in favour of another in order that the inquiry might go on, and is there not a clear indication to Dr. Meade in this letter of the Crown prosecutor that he does not need to withdraw, that the responsibility is taken off his shoulders and assumed by the department for the fullest inquiry into the matter. In the face of these facts, I am required, in justice to Dr. Meade, and in view of the statement made by the Minister of Justice in the Senate last session, to place the circumstances before the House. Further, I

will say this: Last session I blamed the Deputy Minister of Justice for the delay and for the consequent failure of justice. The explanations of the Minister of Justice have changed the position to the extent of showing that he was responsible with, as well as for, his deputy.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmorland). As there were one or two of my constituents employed upon the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, I had special occasion to look into this matter, and I must congratulate the Government on submitting this Bill to the House. Whether or not the Government will have sufficient power under the Bill to compass the object that is sought to be compassed and is so desirable, may be questioned. But in looking into this matter, I came to the same conclusion as the hon. the First Minister with regard to the unfortunate events which took place in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway being rather a necessary result of the condition of affairs in a rough and undeveloped country, a necessary concomitant of pioneer life, rather than the blame-worthy conduct of any person, or set of persons, or company. I also agree with the hon. First Minister in this, that the evils were more in connection with the treatment of the well than of the sick. The abodes which were provided for the workmen by the contractors with the Canadian Pacific Railway, were simply such as would necessarily undermine the health of the strongest men. For instance, their hovels were buildings of about 40 x 60 feet in extent, and on either side there were bunks, 4 x 6 feet, constructed in two tiers, while the roof was only 6 or 7 feet high. It can easily be seen how, with a large number of people crowded into such a small space and breathing each other's breath, disease, if not asphyxiation, would almost inevitably take place. The result was, that the number of invalids to be found in these hovels was almost incomprehensible to people who know how very salubrious and healthy the climate of that country is. At the same time, an astonishing fact, running parallel with this, was that the percentage of convalescents among them in the hospitals provided by the Canadian Pacific Railway was so very large. It seemed that the best thing that could happen to a workman was to get sick. The percentage of convalescent patients was greater than is to be found in the best hospitals of the Dominion. In the case of typhoid patients, the percentage of deaths was only 1, which is somewhat extraordinary in febrile disorders of that class. The right hon. First Minister has said that for the sad deaths of the two young Nova Scotians that took place, no blame should be attached to any person. In corroboration of that, I may say that, in looking carefully into the report, I found that the deaths of the two unfortunate young men were almost

Mr. OLIVER.

entirely the result of errors of judgment. For instance, they were at Mann & Kennedy's camp when they were taken sick, one on the 15th of January, if I recollect aright, and the other on the night of the 19th or the morning of the 20th of the same month. On the 20th of January they were, contrary to the rules laid down by the medical authorities, despatched to the hospital at Fort McLeod, which was 80 miles or more away. Now, it seems almost incredible, but as a matter of fact, there was a hospital for contagious diseases provided by the Canadian Pacific Railway within a mile and a half of the camp, and only 70 yards from the road; and yet these two unfortunate patients, exposed to the inclemency of the weather, although it was a beautiful winter day, were taken on sleds for a large portion of the 80 miles.

Mr. BERGERON. Without food and without stimulants.

Mr. POWELL. Without food and without stimulants, as is suggested by the hon. member for Beauharnois. Now, I took the trouble to look into the preparations that were made for the care of the sick, and I might follow up what the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) has said, by stating that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who were not even indirectly responsible, had assumed what was largely a work of charity and gone to a great deal of trouble and expended a large amount of money in seeing that the sick were properly attended to. They employed a principal medical officer, so I learn from the report, at a salary of \$3,000. They also employed Dr. King to act as chief medical officer of a hospital which was situated at Fort McLeod, or some other place in that vicinity. They also secured the services of an eminent father of the Roman Catholic Church, who was also a skilful doctor, a regular graduate of a medical college, and who had with him, as trained nurses in his hospital, several Sisters of Charity. At the hospital expressly for the workmen at Lethbridge and at Fort McLeod they provided a number of trained nurses at a very large expense. They employed five perambulating physicians at a salary of \$100 per month each with all expenses of transportation and maintenance paid. The duty of these gentlemen consisted in passing along the line, backwards and forwards, some making two trips a week, and some one trip a week, to see to the health of the employees. The company also provided tents for temporary hospitals or isolated hospitals for contagious diseases. They limited the principal medical officer in no way. A great difficulty, as hon. gentlemen can understand, is always experienced among people generally, from the fact that they become alarmed at the presence in their midst, or in their vicinity, of one who is afflicted with a contagious or infec-

tious disease. They are not willing to take him into their homes or provide him with meals. That was the case here. These poor fellows, while in the unfortunate condition of affliction by diphtheria, went through the country in a deplorable state, and people were absolutely unwilling to run the risk of contagion by taking them in. The result was, that they died a horrible death under horrible circumstances, all owing to the fact that through the error of Mann & Kennedy, for which the Canadian Pacific Railway was in no way responsible, they were driven by the hospital provided almost at their door. I trust the Government will enact drastic regulations, and see that proper sanitary arrangements are made for the preservation of health. It is very unfortunate these people should die without having received proper medical attendance; and that they should die under such circumstances as those attending the deaths of these two young men, seems unnecessarily sad; but for their death, which all must lament, no one is to blame. Against providing such hovels as the contractors provided for these men, the Government should set its face firmly.

Mr. L. A. CHAUVIN (Terrebonne). May I ask the hon. First Minister if he had an interview with some men who had been employed on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and who were represented here by Mr. Pierre Denis, of Montreal; and if so might I ask him what answer was given to them, and what steps were taken to remedy their grievances?

The PRIME MINISTER. I would suggest to my hon. friend that this question will come better when we are in committee on the Bill. I will answer it then.

Mr. CHAUVIN (Terrebonne). (Translation.) I do not rise to discuss the question, but only to tell the House and the Prime Minister that I approve of the principle of the Bill now before us. In my opinion, this legislation is a move in the right direction. There is no doubt that the Government should not too often interfere with the labour question, as it would likely lead to abuses; but in such cases as this, it is only a fair exercise of authority on the part of the Government to come to the relief of the workmen by making regulations for the health and for the preservation of the lives of the men.

In my capacity of representative here, with other hon. gentlemen of the Canadian Society of Social Economy, of Montreal, I may say that we approve and are ready to approve of any measure providing for the improvement of the condition of the working classes in this country.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). I read with a good deal of care, some weeks

ago, the report and the evidence on which that report was based, and I must say that the conclusion I came to, looking at the matter as dispassionately as I could, was that neither the Government nor the Canadian Pacific Railway were to blame. We were all, of course, very much shocked at the tragic death of these two young men. We thought of the sufferings they had undergone before they died, the painful journey they experienced, and every one who read about them was deeply grieved, but a careful perusal of the evidence shows, as has just been said by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Powell), that their death was the result of circumstances in that country, and in connection with that work, that could hardly be provided against, and that no one, under the circumstance, could have done, perhaps, more than was done to prevent the sad occurrence which we all regret. If the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) had read the evidence, I hardly think he would have considered that the term blood guiltiness, which he applied to the Canadian Pacific Railway, was warranted at all. These two men were not in the employ of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Have you read the evidence?

Mr. BRITTON. Yes.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. The 450 or 500 pages of evidence?

Mr. BRITTON. Not every word, but a good deal of it. They were not in the employ, in the first place, of the Canadian Pacific Railway at all, but of the sub-contractors, Mann & Kennedy. These men were primarily responsible for taking care of the health of these people and for looking after them in case of accident. It is quite true that provision was made by the Canadian Pacific Railway by the establishment of what are called base hospitals, and that the sub-contractors were charged a fee for every man in their employ, and it is quite true that the amount was inadequate to provide what was necessary for every emergency. But they did take such precautions as they thought were necessary, and in no case were they niggardly in supplying or going to expense to meet any call they then anticipated. Even the conclusion to which the commissioner came—and whether I read all the evidence or not, I read the report of the commission—is not so much against the Canadian Pacific Railway as against the system they pursued in first establishing only base hospitals, and not being able to establish emergency or isolation hospitals, where men might be taken in cases of contagious diseases. The hon. gentleman said that foresight is a great deal better than hindsight. So it is. Reading the evidence now, we can see just what possibly might have been done;

but placing ourselves, as far as we can, in the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the first instance, or Mann & Kennedy, or anybody who had charge of these men, it is difficult to see what at the outset ought to have been done other than was done to provide against such unfortunate occurrences as did take place. Nothing that can be done or said now will aid these men, and I am glad this Bill has been introduced so that the power will be in the hands of the Government, and they will be responsible to a greater degree than they can now be, under present legislation, for the health of persons employed on public works in this Dominion. Then, if anything occurs we will know where the responsibility is to be placed. Without such legislation, how can the Government be charged, as the hon. member for East Toronto has charged them? In what are they blameable? They can only be blamed for not having had the investigation more quickly. If any other responsibility is sought to be placed on them, it can only be such responsibility as they would have been subjected to had a Bill of this kind been adopted before. Surely this Government could not be responsible for the injunction granted by a judge restraining the coroner from taking any action to investigate the deaths. Nobody finds fault with Mr. Meade now, knowing all the facts, knowing his willingness to retire from the inquest or to continue to conduct it, nor can any one say that he would not have conducted it, perhaps, well enough if he had been allowed to continue it. But here was an important principle that Mr. Haney invoked to prevent his holding the inquest. It appeared in the course of the evidence that morphia had been administered to one of the men, that there were circumstances in connection with his death, and with which this doctor had to do, that might perhaps, be urged against his acting as coroner. Mr. Haney, as the person interested, implicated if you will—but I do not say he was implicated—was within his rights in applying for an injunction to restrain the coroner from acting. The judge held his decision for some time, and it is suggested here that the Minister of Justice ought to have intimated to him to give his decision sooner than he did. But that would have been an interference with the judge in the discharge of his duties; I think it would have been an unwarranted interference in the administration of justice. To intimate to this judge that he should give his decision before he was ready to do so would be to intimate to him the direction in which he should give it. It is going a long distance out of our way to attack this Government because one of its members did not take some action with regard to the judge who granted the injunction restraining the coroner from action. Looking at the whole case, and without troubling the House with the evidence, without saying what the Canadian Pacific Railway did to provide for the preservation

Mr. BRITTON.

of the health of the men in the employ of the sub-contractors, without stopping to show the care that they took, I say that a careful perusal of the evidence will show, however much we may sympathize with these unfortunate men and their friends, that blame cannot fairly be attributed to either the Government or the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to ask my hon. friend first if he thinks the judge should have issued that injunction which he did, and if he thinks the judge should not have been brought to book for having kept back his decision so long. I think he is greatly to blame in the whole matter.

Mr. BRITTON. If the hon. gentleman wants us to bring the judges to book for their delay in giving decisions in cases before them, we shall have our hands pretty full.

Mr. BOSTOCK. I am very glad indeed that the Government have brought in this Bill and are ready to deal with this question for the preservation of health on public works. The particular matter referred to in the report which has been discussed is one that affected a part of the constituency which I have the honour to represent: and people in that part of the country felt very strongly about the way the whole medical service was handled in the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. The feeling is that the men in charge of the construction of this line who were responsible for the carrying out of the work, did not see to it that this medical staff was sufficiently competent to look after the health of the men on the work. I was not present when this matter was first brought up; but I understand that the junior member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) went very fully into this matter, and showed from this report of Mr. Clute the way in which that medical service was dealt with. That being the case, it is not necessary for me to go into the matter. I simply hope that the Government will see to it that in these public works, some of which are going on in British Columbia at the present time, stringent regulations are made to provide for the health of the men working upon them. It is pretty well known, at any rate, by contractors who have much to do with the construction of such works, that there is often a great deal of sickness caused simply by the turning up of fresh soil which has never been worked before, combined with the crowded condition in which the men live in these bunk-houses. These things combined cause a tendency among the men to fall ill, and it is necessary, therefore, that they should have proper medical advice and proper care. Another point is worthy of attention, but it is not dealt with in this Bill—I refer to the collection of money from the men engaged in the construction of

works of this kind. There is a feeling among the men that some better system should be adopted whereby this money which is collected from them every month should be dealt with. Occasions have arisen where large gangs of men have been at work, and they have felt, although not able to give actual proof of the case, that the construction company was actually making money out of the collections for this medical service. They have taken so much a month from the men's wages for this hospital and medical service, and, at the same time, as far as the men can see the cost to the company was nothing like equal to the amount collected from them every month. I think that is a matter that, in the interest of the men ought to be dealt with, if in any way possible. Where so much is taken from the men to supply them with medical necessities and hospital accommodation, a statement should be made by the company to show how the money is expended. I should like to have seen a clause in this Bill dealing with this point. I think it is necessary that this matter should be looked after much more closely than it has been in the past, and so I am very glad that the Government have introduced this Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not rise for the purpose of continuing the discussion; but I think that before the Bill receives its second reading, we ought to have from the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or from some gentleman on the Treasury benches, a statement as to the question that has been raised as to whether, outside of the North-west Territories or even outside of the organized portions of the North-west Territories, this Bill would not be ultra vires. It is a very serious question whether the Government will have power to carry out the provisions of this Bill in any of the older provinces or even in those parts of the North-west Territories the control of which has been assigned to the Governor and his Council. Of course, I speak under correction, and would be glad to know what the opinion of the legal gentlemen on that subject is. I am afraid that a conflict of jurisdiction would arise in reference to the important question of the public health and the machinery to be used under this Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This question has engaged the attention of the Department of the Minister of Justice, and, while, in my judgment, at all events, the question is not wholly free from doubt, still, I think there is good reason to believe that the position taken by the Minister of Justice in this matter is correct. The first section provides that this Bill shall apply to all works under the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada. This applies clearly to all works in the North-west Territories—there is no doubt about that. It

applies also to certain works in the older provinces. Take the canals, for instance—these are clearly under the jurisdiction of this Parliament. On the other hand, the question of health is under the jurisdiction of the provinces. But it is a principle of construction that wherever a power is vested in Parliament, all the necessary incidents for the carrying out of that power are also vested in Parliament, even though they may conflict with a power vested in the local authorities. And, as the question of building a canal or a railway, which is declared by Act of this Parliament to be for the general advantage of Canada, is undoubtedly a matter over which the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction it may follow that all the incidents for carrying out of that power are also under the jurisdiction of this Parliament. That is the construction placed on this Bill by the Minister of Justice—that as we have the power we have of building public works, and not only building them, but ordering their building—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is expressly provided for.

The PRIME MINISTER. But the rule of construction, which, I believe, is well understood and admitted and beyond doubt, is that all the necessary incidents for carrying out these powers are also vested in this Parliament. I must say, if I am to express my own opinion, that it seems to me the question may arise whether this is a necessary incident to building of these works. This question may be raised in the courts; but I do not see how we can obviate that. I may say, however, that it is not probable that the evils this Bill is intended to provide against will ever arise in the older provinces. It is not probable that such things will ever occur in the older provinces, where the population is dense and where the men employed in works of this kind find, in the midst of that population, all the means of preserving their health that are intended to be provided in the remote portions of our unorganized territories by this Bill.

Suppose the Crow's Nest Pass Railway had not been built in the Rocky Mountains, thousands of miles away from the comforts and advantages of civilization, but that it had been built in the thickly settled portion of Ontario, or in any part of the older provinces within easy access of the resources of civilization, what has taken place in British Columbia could not have taken place here. While I do not think the case may ever arrive of putting this Bill into operation in the older provinces, still I have no doubt there will be an occasion to test the constitutionality of the Bill. In my judgment, the question will be, whether this is a necessary incident of our power to build public works. If it is held to be a necessary incident, there is no question that we have the jurisdiction; but if it is held that

it is not a necessary incident, but only a remote one, then the Bill may be ultra vires.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I would ask whether it is the intention to draft rules and regulations to harmonize with the provisions of this Bill, and meet cases where its machinery is put into operation?

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee on said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know whether I understood the Prime Minister to say that it was not contemplated to apply this Act in the older provinces.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He said there would be no necessity for its application in any of the older provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. That may be, but I think if there was, there would be some conflict of authority. The Health Act of Ontario provides that in every organized municipality there shall be a board of health appointed, with an inspector, whose duty is clearly laid down in the provincial law, and who has power to enter any premises and examine them to see if they are in a sanitary condition. This provision would seem to be in conflict with the provincial law.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am far from saying that the point raised by my hon. friend is not well taken. But the Bill is intended to apply to every part of Canada where public works are being constructed. Certainly it embraces the older provinces, and I quite agree with my hon. friend that the question may arise as to whether this Act is constitutional. But at all events, we intend to apply it to all parts of Canada where works are going on under the legislative authority of this Parliament. It may be that the point is well taken, and I hope there will be no occasion for testing the point, because it is quite probable that no necessity will ever arise for putting it into force in the older parts of Canada, but simply in parts of Canada which are yet unorganized.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With regard to the point which has been taken by the right hon. leader of the House, I think there may be some doubt as to the jurisdiction of this Parliament. A somewhat similar matter came up in Ontario in the case of Regina vs. Stone. There was an Act of the legislature of Ontario dealing with the matter of frauds in connection with the sale of milk to cheese factories. Almost exactly the same matter was subsequently dealt with by another Act of this Parliament, and in both cases the Act was held to be intra

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

vires. The Ontario Act was held to be intra vires in the case of Regina vs. Watson, because it was dealing with contracts and regulating civil rights. When the Dominion Act came to be dealt with afterwards, it was contended that it was ultra vires in Regina vs. Stone, because it practically dealt with the same matter, and the Ontario Act had been held by the Court of Appeal to be within the powers of that legislature. I think the reason upon which the court upheld the Act of this Parliament was, that this Parliament can create a crime, although the provincial legislature have already dealt with the same subject matter by way of provincial regulation. Now, if this Act is dealing with a criminal matter, as distinguished from a local regulation, it may be held that this Parliament has power to pass it. Whether or not the Bill is couched in such words as would bring it within the principle I have mentioned, may be open to question. It may also be that it can be upheld upon the principle that the power to pass such legislation is incident to the jurisdiction of Parliament over public works.

On section 2,

Mr. BERGERON. Is not that very broad?

The PRIME MINISTER. It has run the gauntlet of the other House, and I think we may accept it, though the terms are broad.

Mr. SPROULE. The Provincial Health Act reads as follows:—

The Provincial Board of Health shall take cognizance of the interests of health and life among the people of the province; they shall specially study the vital statistics of the province, and shall endeavour to make an intelligent and profitable use of the collected records of deaths and of sickness among the people; they shall make sanitary investigations and inquiries respecting causes of disease, and especially of epidemics; the causes of mortality and the effects of localities, employments, conditions, habits and other circumstances upon the health of the people; they shall make such suggestions as to the prevention and introduction of contagious and infectious diseases as they shall deem most effective and proper, and as will prevent and limit as far as possible the rise and spread of disease; they shall inquire into the measures which are being taken by local boards for the limitation of any dangerous, contagious or infectious disease, through powers conferred upon said local boards by any Public Health Act, and should it appear that no efficient measures are being taken, and that the said powers are not being exercised, it shall be competent for the provincial board, in the interests of the public health, to require the local board to exercise any of the said powers which, in the opinion of the provincial board, the urgency of the case demands; and in any such case where the local board, after request by the provincial board, neglect or refuse to exercise their powers, the provincial board may, with the approval of the Minister of the department under which the board is for the time being acting, exercise at the expense of the municipality any of the powers of local boards which under the circumstances they may consider necessary, and

they shall, when required or when they deem it best, advise officers of the Government and local boards of health in regard to the public health, and as to the means to be adopted to secure the same, and as to location, drainage, water supply, disposal of excreta, heating and ventilation of any public institution or building.

These are the powers conferred on the provincial boards. Then in the event of the local board not being appointed in a municipality the inspector may make a report and the Governor in Council has power to appoint an inspector to go into the district to carry out the regulations or instructions of the provincial board of health. They not only have that power, but they must exercise it. In the Muskoka district, where the local municipalities are not so well organized as in the older settled portions of the country, and where they do not have municipal boards of health the same as in the better settled parts, invariably the provincial board of health act when anything calling for action is brought to their attention.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I do not dispute anything which has been said by my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), but, I would simply call his attention to this consideration: Suppose the Crow's Nest Pass Railway had been built in Ontario, there would have been no occasion for enacting a special law to deal with such an incident as this. The provisions of the Ontario Health Act would have been sufficient to preserve the health of those employed upon the work and to give them the protection to which they are entitled. My hon. friend asks: What is the use of such legislation in the province of Ontario? It would be of no use if Parliament had only to provide for the province of Ontario, but there are other provinces which have not the same legislation that Ontario has. I do not think that such legislation exists in British Columbia, and I am not quite sure that it exists in some of the maritime provinces. In these parts of the country a condition may arise which may require such an Act as this. My hon. friend, I am sure, will agree with me that no Government, sitting here in Ottawa, would care to exercise the power vested in them by this Bill unless there was no Act to deal with the matter in the part of the country where the trouble arose. For instance, no Government would care to exercise the power vested in them by this Bill, in Ontario, where there exists ample machinery to cope with any contingency that may arise such as is provided for in this Bill.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I drew the attention of the hon. First Minister to the point in the hope that, perhaps, it might be provided that this Bill would only apply to districts under the jurisdiction of this House and not to provinces where provincial boards of health already existed.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. The Senate looked at the Bill very carefully and came to this conclusion. There may be a point in what

my hon. friend says, but I think we may take the Bill as it is.

On section 3,

Mr. **BERGERON**. There are very large powers granted under this section. The question which was, a few moments ago, raised by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), I think, applies to this section, which provides for the extent and character of the accommodation to be afforded. How can we enforce this law against a contractor on the Soulanges Canal, for example? My right hon. friend says that most probably such a Bill would not be enforced in the older provinces, but he does not say that it will not be. How could you force a contractor on the Soulanges Canal to build his houses and his tents in such and such a way? This is a matter of civil rights which belongs to the local governments. You cannot give him the dimensions of his buildings and tents which he puts up for the use of his men. How would you provide for the inspection of the houses and tents and quarters? Who will be the inspector appointed by the Government? Who shall pay his expenses? Will you force the contractor to pay the expenses of a man whom he does not require, who says that he has carried on works for thirty or forty years without any such accidents as that which we are deploring this afternoon having happened under his supervision? Will you force him to pay an inspector who will be there, purely and simply, to earn a few dollars, because, that is the way that his position will be looked upon? How can you force a contractor to abide by your restriction as to the number of medical men whom he shall employ? We have proof in the commission, which was read this afternoon, that there was sufficient medical attendance on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. It was not because there was not enough medical men that the accident happened which did happen. It was rather due to bad management, if I read the evidence correctly, on the part of the sub-contractors. With what justice can my right hon. friend force a contractor, say, upon the Soulanges Canal, and I only take that as an instance because it is near here, to employ the number of medical men which the hon. Minister of Justice might judge necessary. The last two lines I think particularly objectionable, which gives power:

To make such other provisions for the attainment of their object as the Governor in Council thinks proper.

I think this is leaving a great deal too much in the hands of the Governor in Council. Not only have I a great deal of doubt as to the constitutionality of the Act, but my impression is that, if it is enforced, it will create a great deal of dissatisfaction, and probably more than that, and if it is not to be en-

forced, why put on the statute-books such an extraordinary Act ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not at all agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron), and I think, on reflection, he will be very much disposed to modify the views he has expressed. The hon. gentleman says that we have no authority whatever to compel a contractor, on the Soulanges Canal say, to provide quarters of a certain specified size in which to lodge his men. The hon. gentleman says it is a civil right. I think it can hardly be called a civil right, but everything depends upon what is a necessary incident of the power we have and the power which this Parliament has to order the construction of public works. If we have the power to allow certain contractors to build certain works, on the Soulanges Canal say, or elsewhere, and to employ a thousand men, is it not within the power of Parliament to say that he shall give to each of these men the amount of air to breathe which we know, by the laws of science, is necessary for a man to breathe ? It is an extraordinary imposition, or an injustice, to say to a public contractor, that he shall not allow a man he employs to do the work which we authorize him to do, unless he provides the conditions which are indispensable to his health ? Is it at all against the natural justice of man, that we should compel the contractor to have the quarters of his workmen clean and well ventilated so that they shall not be subject to disease ? It seems to me there is nothing unjust to anybody there. Not only is there nothing unjust, but we are plainly only doing our duty when we provide that the men who are employed on the public works of this country shall have all the comforts which are indispensable for their good health. We certainly have the power to construct these public works in Canada, and in my individual judgment, I believe we have the incidental power to provide the conditions under which these works shall be carried out, so that the public health shall not be endangered.

Mr. BERGERON. Up to the present we have been talking of the duty of the contractors towards their men, but take the case of the workmen on the Soulanges Canal for instance, and a great many of them are living in tents and houses erected by themselves and which belong to them. Would they come under the operation of this Act ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We provide nothing specific in this Bill, but we give power to the Governor in Council to make rules and regulations. It is not likely the Governor in Council will be called upon to make rules and regulations in regard to such a work at the Soulanges Canal, because such a condition of things has never arisen in the older provinces as would necessitate the Governor in Council exercising these powers.

Mr. BERGERON.

It is in such a case as the Crow's Nest Pass Railway that these powers will be exercised. Complaints will be made to the Government that the men have not the necessary comforts of life, that they have not sufficient medical attendance, and so on, and it will be the duty of the Government to make regulations with regard to that. We have had no complaint from the Soulanges Canal, and apparently the men are satisfied there. In the civilized portions of the country where large works are being carried out, the men are surrounded by doctors, and other comforts of life are within their reach, and if not they can make their complaints very readily. This Bill is simply to provide for workmen in remote regions where their complaints cannot be heard. We have not provided any cast-iron rules in this Bill, because we believed it better that it should be left with the Government to decide as the occasion arises. It is not a very pleasant duty which this Bill places on the Government. It is a law which I hope we shall never need to enforce, but if there ever should be a repetition of what took place on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway two years ago, we want to have this law so that we can enforce it.

Mr. BERGERON. Would it not be better to have these rules and regulations incorporated in the law, so that it may be known what they are. My impression is that if this Bill passes, a contractor who tenders to build a railway or any other public work, would have to seriously take its provisions into consideration when tendering. If the contractor knew exactly what provisions he had to make for the convenience of his workmen, then the case would be quite different. For instance, a contractor in tendering might have his plant on hand ; he might have tents of a certain size, and timber to erect houses of a certain size ; but if he thinks that the Government will make provision that different tents and different houses should be used, then it would influence his tender. We must remember that this Bill if it becomes law would not only apply to the older provinces but to the whole Dominion, and as I have said, it would be better to have all the requirements printed in the Bill so that they may be known. If my right hon. friend were always in charge of the enforcement of this law I would trust him that he would not make any harsh regulations by Order in Council, but I can easily see that under this Bill there might be blackmail levied on the contractor.

The PRIME MINISTER. If I am not always here to enforce the law, some of your friends on the other side will be in my place.

Mr. BERGERON. I did not intend to express the hope that my right hon. friend should always be in power, but I have no objection that somebody like him should be in a position to enforce this Act. What is to

prevent any person going to the contractor on the Soulanges Canal, for instance, and saying: The quarters of your workmen are not properly ventilated; you have too many men in a tent, and so on, and I will make a complaint against you under this law. It is true that he would have to come before the Government and the Government might not yield to his demands, but we do not know that. There is a danger of blackmailing, and that would be prevented if we specified all the details in this Bill. We could also say that it would not be put in force in certain parts of this country, where it would not be necessary. If you do not do that, I am afraid you will do more harm than good.

Mr. HAGGART. We have the power of constructing public works, and surely as an incident of that power we have the power to regulate as to what food is required by workmen, and under what conditions they should work. It is an incident, and not a remote one of our power, that the public health of the employees should be looked after by us. I have no doubt as to our power in this matter, but the advisability of this law is another question. I would not like to have the absolute responsibility of looking after the health of the employees on every public work; although perhaps it may be the duty of the Government to exercise their jurisdiction in that respect, however unpleasant that duty may be. On the whole, I doubt very much the advisability of exercising this power except in very special cases. If the contractor does not properly provide for his men, the responsibility is on the Government by this Bill of seeing that the houses, the tents, and the quarters of the workmen are in good condition. But suppose the contractor does not do that, how are you going to punish him? Have you taken any power here to provide that the amount necessary to put the workingmen in a comfortable position shall be deducted from the amount of the contract? Then, again, if the work is let to a sub-contractor, power should be taken in that case to enforce the law. I doubt very much whether you would have power, after letting a contract, to deduct any sum of money from it for such purpose. I merely rose to say that I think there is not much doubt that the Government have the power. It is an incident in the construction of the work.

Mr. PRIOR. I wish to say just one or two words in regard to this measure. I am thoroughly in accord with the right hon. leader of the Government, and I think this legislation is on proper lines. It seems to me there are no contractors worthy the name who would object to such a law being passed and put into operation, because it is to their advantage to see that their men are well housed, that they have plenty of fresh air, that they are guarded from danger, and that their health is well looked

after. If the Government can legislate in that direction with regard to miners and with regard to men employed in factories, they can surely do the same for men employed on railroads and great public works. I do not know that I need say much on the subject, except that I am strongly in accord with this legislation. There have been some frightful cases of ill-treatment of men by contractors who are at a long distance from civilization, and this legislation is fair for both the employer and the workingmen.

Mr. POWELL. Is it the intention of the Government to take the very large powers contained in subsection "a," that is, to make regulations "as to the extent and character of the accommodation to be afforded by the houses, tents or other quarters occupied by the employees"? or is it the intention simply to regulate the accommodation provided by the employer?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is not that what it does?

Mr. POWELL. No, it goes further. It is very general. Suppose the employees boarded at a house that was not under the control of a contractor. This provision is so broad that it might imperil the measure on constitutional grounds.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The regulations will provide for that.

Mr. POWELL. \*If the Act is unconstitutional, the regulations would be no good. I simply make the suggestion.

Mr. TISDALE. It seems to me there is a good deal in the suggestion of my hon. friend. I think the provision should be limited to the accommodation provided by the contractor.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If you did that, he might evade the whole Act.

Mr. TISDALE. Suppose the men were boarding themselves. I am in accord with the Act, but this provision is very broad. It never struck me until the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) mentioned it and I think it is worthy of serious consideration.

The PRIME MINISTER. Six o'clock.

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

### After Recess.

#### PRESERVATION OF HEALTH ON PUBLIC WORKS.

On section 4,

Mr. DAVIN. Under this clause the Government will not be able to impose any fine.

Does not the hon. gentleman think it might be necessary to impose a fine ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think that is included in the words "penalties and forfeitures."

Mr. BERGERON. A forfeiture would have to be imposed by the local law.

The PRIME MINISTER. If we have to collect fines, we will have to use the local courts; but we must pass the law here ourselves.

Mr. BERGERON. Why not put in a special clause providing that the Bill will not become law until put in force by Order in Council ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We must have the power to make the regulations, and if we make regulations, they will only operate in the place described therein. Suppose this law had been in force when the Crow's Nest Pass Railway was being built, our regulations would have only applied to that work and the district in which it was being constructed. By this Bill we have all the power required to make regulations, whenever necessary, and apply them to a particular district.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

#### SUPPLY—LOBSTER FISHING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. ANGUS McLENNAN (Inverness). I hold in my hand the report issued in September last by the commission appointed to inquire into the condition of the lobster fisheries in the maritime provinces, with the view generally of providing regulations for their protection. The reason particularly assigned for the issue of the commission was the fact that all the fisheries officers throughout the maritime provinces reported to the Government from time to time during a number of years past, that the lobster fishing grounds were becoming exhausted, and it was evidently the desire of the Government to find some means or other by which the depletion of these valuable grounds should be stopped. I find, on looking over this report, however, that the duration of the season within which the fishing could be carried on, has been extended, instead of shortened, as was supposed to be the object in contemplation. It has been extended, particularly in certain districts along the Cape Breton coast, in fact, in the vast majority of districts, with the exception of the county of Inverness, which I have the honour to represent in this House. As will be seen by reference to the map of Nova Scotia, the

Mr. DAVIN.

county of Inverness extends the whole distance of the western side of the Island of Cape Breton. In the spring of the year the gulf ice, in its exit, strikes against the shores of this county, and that fact elicits this remark from the commission: That the lobster fisheries of the eastern counties of Nova Scotia are not so easily to be conducted in view of the fact that the ice remains there very late in the season along the four counties of Cape Breton, naming particularly the counties of Richmond, Cape Breton and Victoria, but to these the commission adds the county of Inverness.

And, notwithstanding, I may say, in passing, that they make this remark in the report, yet they suggest to the Government that the season for fishing lobsters in the eastern counties of the Island of Cape Breton should be three weeks longer than on the western shore, in other words, along the western coast of the county of Inverness. The result is that the fishery officials are commanded by the department at this very time to call upon 400 lobster fishermen along 140 miles of the coast of Inverness to cease fishing, whereas those along the coast of the three other counties of the Island of Cape Breton—those on the eastern side of the island—are permitted to fish for the next two weeks or more—that is, from the 15th July to the 1st August. In view of the fact then that the commission have given no evidence whatever to justify such a course, I protest against this feature in their report. Again I call the attention of the Minister in charge of the department and of the Government of which he is so distinguished a member, to the fact that this commission have done great and grievous injustice to the lobster fishermen in the county of Inverness. To emphasize this declaration I wish to submit to the Government in this connection that the four counties of Cape Breton, under the old regime, were under the same fishery regulations with regard to the lobster fishing season. This industry must appear to every person who pays the slightest attention to the matter one of the greatest importance to the people along these shores, an industry which has grown in the past quarter of a century in the maritime provinces from a mere nothing, until to-day it yields products to the value of \$4,000,000 a year, of which this same county of Inverness, during the past year, produced about \$70,000 worth. The partial extension feature of the report will be the more surprising when I read this extract from the report of Prof. Prince, the superintendent of fisheries of the Dominion. He, in turn, quotes, in justification of his contention in this regard, the New York "Fishing Gazette," of February 26th, 1897. He says:

The New York "Fishing Gazette," February 26, 1897, significantly published the following intimation:—

"It is believed that there will be no lobsters packed on the coast of Maine during the coming season. The principal packing will be done in the British provinces."

Prof. Prince then goes on :

In the Dominion of Canada there remains the last great lobster fishery of the world, and it is not too much to say that this fishery has reached a critical stage.

The signs of exhaustion are unmistakable. Small immature lobsters, 5 to 8 or 9 inches long, which a few years ago were rejected with contempt, are now eagerly taken, and form in some districts the staple article upon which the lobster canners depend. Instead of two or three lobsters sufficing to fill a 1-lb. can, not less than five, six, seven and even ten lobsters are now required.

As I have already stated, the commission was supposed to suggest means to the Government by which this great industry would be likely to be preserved. Forewarned by the experience of the New England States and other countries where no restrictive laws were passed or enforced, Prof. Prince was, no doubt, one of the prompters of the Government in suggesting the advisability of appointing this commission in order to suggest the means, as I have already said, by which this industry might be preserved to Canada. Instead of placing any restriction on the limit of time in which this valuable fish should be taken, this commission has extended the time, as I have shown, except along the coast of the county I have the honour to represent. It is true, as the Minister himself has urged, that other localities have complained just as Inverness does. But I contend there is no other locality in which the same conditions prevail as prevail along the 140 miles of coast in the county of Inverness. In small coves and inlets along the shore of Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick or Nova Scotia the conditions may be similar to those existing along the coast of Inverness, but I say, and repeat, that there is not another length of coast in the maritime provinces where the same conditions exist as in the county of Inverness. And, Sir, especially am I surprised at the conduct of this commission in view of the fact that I took the trouble, as hon. members in this House will bear me out in stating, when this commission were comparing notes in this city before preparing their report, to meet them in order that I might give them my views in regard to the local conditions in the county of Inverness. I have been given every assurance by these gentlemen that my suggestions in this regard will be carried out, that the greatest disparity that would be made between the two sides of the Island of Cape Breton would be between the 20th July and the 1st August. Thus they had given me every assurance that my views would be carried out, and I think the hon. member for Halifax will bear me out

in the statement, because he also sought to impress the commission with some views that he held with regard to this fishery. He was present, and I am sure that he and others will bear me out in the statement that I had been given every assurance that my suggestions were reasonable and would be carried out by the commissioners. In this connection, I may say that, while this commission asked for evidence along the coast of the county of Inverness, there were a great many localities where it was impossible for them to take evidence, owing to the inclemency of the season of the year. I, therefore, consider that I had a right to appear before them in order to supplement any evidence they may have found within their reach during their tour of the county. In this connection also, I may instance the cases of the Magdalen Islands, where we have no evidence whatsoever, unless it be the evidence of the gentleman who packs lobsters on those islands. I consider, then, that I had at least as much right to give evidence before the commission as Mr. Leslie, who packs lobsters in the Magdalen Islands, and I believe his evidence was the main evidence taken before that commission with regard to the fishing grounds of these islands. Notwithstanding then, that I took pains to appear before the commission, and that I made several appeals afterwards, it would seem that the fiat has gone forth that the fishermen along the coast of the county of Inverness must cease fishing two or three weeks before their neighbours in the other counties of that Island. It is only a few days ago that I was comparing notes with a gentleman representing one of the maritime counties, and he, among others, assured me that in his constituency the packers and fishermen gave up the lobster fishery very early in July, and why it is that the coast of western Cape Breton, where the ice floats along for a couple of weeks further, and sometimes later, should be put on a par as to time with a coast thus situated, I cannot divine. I would appeal, then, to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to yet favourably consider my request, in view of the fact that he has not yet actually decided, or asked the Government, as a member thereof, to pass a minute of Council with regard to those regulations, so far as I know. If he has done so, it must be in this way, that the recommendations of the commission shall be taken with regard to any relieving clauses have they inserted in their report, whereas the restricting clauses are held in abeyance. I thus feel that the Minister has not definitely pronounced upon the report of the commission at all, and, therefore even yet I am not without hope that the Minister will reconsider this matter. In view of the evidence I submit to him, in view of the fact that the commissioner from the county of Inverness has refused to sign

this report, owing to the fact that the other commissioners did not agree with him to include Inverness with the other counties of Cape Breton—I say, in view of these facts, I hope the Minister will take my evidence into favourable consideration, which I think, as representing the people of that county and their interests, should have much more weight with him than the views of commissioners hailing from distant parts of the Dominion. I say that, representing, as I do, these people and their interests in this House, I hope the Minister will consider the point that I have raised in their behalf, and include the county of Inverness with the other counties of the Island of Cape Breton in the extension clause. I want no further concessions for that county in this regard. I merely wish that it be included in section "c," which I believe covers the balance of the Island of Cape Breton. I merely ask, on behalf of these people, that he should consider this matter carefully, and give the weight that I think is due to my evidence, when I plead for them as their representative in this House. I desire that he should consider particularly the clause in the report of the commission which refers to floating or drift ice around the Island of Cape Breton, while it takes no account of this in dealing with the question of the open season for fishing along this very coast. Let him also consider the fact that for the past twenty or twenty-five years these counties have constituted a fishing district of themselves.

I observe another clause inserted by the commission, which, in their wisdom, they declared should be applied to the fishermen, and that is, that from three to five days of grace should be given them, when they receive notice to take in their fishing gear. I only hope the Minister has seen fit to give these days of grace at least to the fishermen of Inverness, while this fishing gear is yet in position, and that he will yet consider the petition I now make to place them on the same plane with their neighbours and fellow fishermen of the Island of Cape Breton. But if he should fail to hearken to the appeal I now make, I hope at least that when the Government take action in this matter and pass a minute of Council to make this report, or any part of it, permanent, the protest I now make on behalf of these people will be considered, and that he will place them on the same footing as their neighbours.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) I am glad the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan) has brought this matter up for consideration. The lobster industry is of vital importance to us in the lower provinces. I sympathize very much with the position that the hon. gentleman occupies. I sympathize equally with that occupied by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). I recognize how difficult it is for any Minister

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness).

of Marine and Fisheries to make an arrangement that will be satisfactory to all parties, in fact, it is impossible to make different seasons in different localities absolutely satisfactory to all parties. Notwithstanding my sympathy with the hon. member for Inverness, I am of opinion that, the only safety that the hon. Minister has is to follow strictly the recommendations of the Lobster Commission, because, if he departs from it in the Island of Cape Breton or in the county of Inverness, he opens up the question extending over the whole of the coast of the maritime provinces. The opening up of that question involves greater consequences and will produce greater dissatisfaction than if the Minister were simply to say: Here is the report of the commission and I must abide by it. I do not propose to go into the question as to how the commissioners arrived at their conclusions. I may assume that, after taking evidence they arrived at their conclusions and for the best possible reasons. The only safe course for the hon. Minister is to follow their recommendations. But in that portion of Prince Edward Island that I have the honour to represent, we have to complain that the hon. Minister has ignored the report of the commission. The report in respect to a certain portion of the island shore extending from West Cape to Carleton Head, recommended a season from the 20th of May to 10th of August. We have to complain that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has not seen fit to follow the recommendation of the commission and has in the face of it shortened up the season to the 1st of August. He has deprived us of ten days legitimate fishing. The reasons assigned to the Lobster Commission, for a special season for this particular section of the island shore, were varied and manifestly convincing. One was that the profitable fishing on this section of the island shore did not commence until about the 6th of July. Consequently, all their real fishing had to be done after that date. They took the ground, as it was their right, that every section of the coast has an equal right to the privileges of fishing—to the bounties of nature. That argument was pressed home upon the commissioners who came to the conclusion that it was nothing but common justice to give to this section of the island shore a fishing season from the 20th of May to the 10th of August. I am free to admit that the hon. Minister does the best he can in the interest of the fishing industry, yet I am at a loss to understand why he should single out this portion of the coast and refuse to apply to it the recommendation of the commission. I think these people have a right to complain and a just right to complain. I am not going into another matter, that is personal between the hon. Minister and myself, in regard to our conversation and understanding on this subject. He takes one view and I take another.

But I insist that the people upon this section of the coast have a right to the privileges of the fishing suggested and embodied in the recommendation of the Lobster Commission. There is another remark that I desire to make in this connection, and it is in regard to the manner of closing the season. I think that the fishermen ought to have a week in which to take their traps ashore; during that time they would not be permitted to bait their traps, nor should they be held liable because their traps were found unbaited in the water. It is difficult to assign a particular limit of time, because you can never tell whether a season will be stormy or otherwise, but, at any rate, it is not fair, nor reasonable, nor just, to say to the fishermen that if their traps are found in the water, unbaited, after the season expires, these traps shall be destroyed. This is the course which the Government has seen fit to pursue in the past in regard to the lobster fisheries. Wherever there has been an infraction of the law in this respect, the Government has taken these traps and destroyed them. I think the policy of the Government upon that point is wrong; I think that the property under no circumstances should be wasted or destroyed. The ropes and traps and gear should be taken ashore and sold. I do not intend to take up the time of the House, but as my hon. friend brought this question up I thought I would take advantage of the opportunity to represent exactly the position of affairs and to press the claims of my constituency upon the consideration of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). Before this motion is carried, I desire to say, in answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Bell, East Prince), that no one regrets more than I do, that in the interest of the fishery, that he represents so ably, I was not enabled to comply with his views. Hon. gentlemen know the great importance of this fishing industry to the people of the maritime provinces. They are aware that it is about the only industry of the kind left in the world. They have seen similar industries along the coast of Great Britain and the United States absolutely destroyed for the want of proper protection, and it is only because the Department of Marine and Fisheries, for many years past, have been enforcing, with vigour and energy, the close season in respect to the lobster fishery in the maritime provinces, that we have that industry remaining at all. I have no hesitation in saying that if any relaxation in the enforcement of these regulations had taken place the industry would not have survived more than a year or two and the source of livelihood, for many thousands of people, would have been taken away. It is a constant contest between the fishermen, who are engaged in the industry, and who look, more naturally, to the immediate catch

than to the protection of the industry, on the one hand, and the department on the other, which looks more to the protection of the industry and less to the immediate catch. Charged as I am with the responsibility of controlling these fisheries, I would be false to my duty if I did not follow out the lines laid down more or less by my predecessors. I think, if I have erred, I have erred upon the side of severity and extra rigour, because having lived amongst these people, I saw that the injury was being done and that the industry was being destroyed along our coasts by the same means and in the same way as it has been destroyed along the coast of Maine. Everybody who has any knowledge of these things knows that, if these men were allowed to fish in their own way, two years would not roll by until the lobster became an extinct crustacea, as far as the maritime provinces are concerned. Yet, I was pestered with applications, from one part of the coast and another part of the coast, to grant extensions of time on special grounds, which were always forthcoming. I came to the conclusion after consultation with my colleagues last year, that it was due to myself, due to the Government, and due to the lobster fishermen, that a commission should be appointed of nine capable men who should visit all the localities in the maritime provinces, take the evidence of the fishermen in each of these localities, and after collating it make a report to the Government as to what means should be devised for preserving this industry from extinction. This commission was appointed, and my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. McLennan) had the nomination of one of the nine gentlemen on that commission. There is no minority report, and that gentleman, I understood, reported in conformity with the unanimous decision of the commission. As I say there was no dissent.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness) He did not sign it at all.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. That may be, but at all events he presented no minority report, and as far as I could judge the report was unanimous. This commission decided that the close seasons which had been in operation for years before should be given up, and that five different seasons applying to different specified localities on the coast should be adopted instead. Now, as far as the two points of the complaints are concerned, I shall confine myself to them. The people on the east coast of Cape Breton which is washed by the Atlantic Ocean, had been complaining for many years that they were at a disadvantage as compared with the rest of Cape Breton, and as compared with the province of Nova Scotia and the province of Prince Edward Island, on account of the gales which beat upon their coast, and the ice which prevented them fishing there as

early in the season as at the other places. With reference to that particular locality, the east coast of Cape Breton, the commissioners have recommended an extension of time. I have granted that extension for this year. So far as my present mind is concerned I intend to recommend to my colleagues the continuation of that extension as far as the east coast is concerned. As to the county of Inverness, what my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan) states is perfectly true. He came to me after he learned that the commission were inclined to report adversely to the extension in his county, and he pressed on me the very great necessity and importance that the same extension should be granted along the west coast of Cape Breton that was granted along the east coast. I discussed that matter at length with the lobster commissioners, but the commissioners did not report in favour of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan), and it is perfectly obvious to any one who is acquainted with the facts, that if there had been an extension granted to the western coast of Cape Breton a similar extension must have been granted to the adjoining coasts of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia. These coasts are within sight of each other, only a few miles separated, and it would have been absolutely impossible within the Gulf of St. Lawrence to have granted an extension to the west coast of Cape Breton and refused it to the east coast of Prince Edward Island and the north coast of Nova Scotia. The position I took was this: that while I am in receipt of hundreds upon hundreds of letters and petitions from all parts of the coast asking for similar extensions to those granted upon the east coast of Cape Breton, I found that unless the whole report of the commission was to be torn up and nullified, I would have to adhere to the recommendations of commissioners with respect to the territory defined by them. There was only one other place where they recommended an extension of time, and that was in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, between Catfish River and Tormentine in New Brunswick, and between West Cape and Carleton Head in Prince Edward Island, the narrow part of the straits. There they recommended an extension up to the 10th of August, and my hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Bell) complains that while I granted an extension in that locality, I had not granted it for the full length of time the commissioners recommend. Well, Sir, I have not granted it this year for the full length of time the commissioners recommended, and for the very obvious and unanswerable reason, that by the commissioners report they are not permitted to fish there until the first day of May, but this year they have commenced to fish before the first day of May. The restriction, therefore, did not apply to them this year, and inasmuch as they commenced to fish the moment the ice moved away, I said: You have had the advantage of fish-

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

ing before the first of May, and we will stop you on the 31st of July. I think the majority of sensible men will say that is a reasonable and proper conclusion. Next year, as far as I am concerned, I shall feel myself bound to grant the extension in the terms in which the commissioners reported, and I think I may fairly say that to the large majority of lobster fishermen who have many hundreds of thousands of dollars invested in this valuable industry, the decision I have reached will give satisfaction. I am aware that there are many hundreds to whom it has not given satisfaction, but they are the class of men who look to the immediate future for the immediate profit, and ignore altogether the preservation and conservation of the industry itself as a means of livelihood for the thousands of people who live by it along the coasts of the maritime provinces. In addition to the extension of time, the commissioners have recommended that there should be added three or four or five days grace for the purpose of taking up the traps, and a word as to that. I have not been able to make up my mind to accept that suggestion for the very obvious reason that to me, it represents simply an extension of the season by that number of days. I am too well acquainted with the facts down there not to know, that if four or five days time is given to take up the traps, these days will be utilized for fishing purposes, and you might as well grant the extension for the extra number of days first as last. I therefore hope that my hon. friends will see that the position the Government has taken in this matter is the only possible position they could take, and adhere to the recommendations of the commissioners who held sixty-five meetings, and examined many, many witnesses; so far as territorial divisions are concerned. I regret extremely that notwithstanding the pressure which my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. McLennan) has brought to bear upon me from the month of April last, when the report was first made down to the present day, I have not been able to concede his demands, because if I did concede them it would involve a similar concession to the adjoining provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. A. C. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I do not rise for the purpose of finding fault with the report of the commissioners appointed to inquire into the lobster fisheries of the maritime provinces. I have no doubt whatever but that these gentlemen did their work carefully and according to the best of their ability. I also wish to say, that I heartily approve of the position taken by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) in his desire to do everything in his power to conserve that very valuable industry to the people of the maritime provinces. I think, Sir, that the hon. Minister should be commended and supported in every

step he takes with respect to the preservation of that important industry, and for my part I shall be prepared to back him up in every way in my power, as I have done heretofore with his predecessors in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. This is a very difficult matter to legislate on or to regulate, because the different localities always find various causes on which to base complaints. Now, Sir, I represent that portion of the Gulf of St. Lawrence where the lobster canning was first introduced, and it has been the longest fished of any portion of the Gulf. The fishermen there, in their own interest and in the interest of conserving and preserving that industry as far as it is possible for them to do, do not look for any extension of the season I would say to my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. McLellan), who, very properly, interests himself upon behalf of the many fishermen whom he represents in that county, that if the fishermen themselves could only look at the matter in a proper light, and in the interest of continued fishing on their own coasts they would not desire to have an extension of the season. The people of my locality, knowing that the fisheries are getting fished out, are prepared, without any law or regulation of the department, to stop fishing even before the time that is set down for the season to close. Of course, there are seasons in which it may be very hard to comply with the regulations. On the north side of the province the coasts are often beset by spring ice a week or two later than they are on the south side, so that the herring, which is used as a bait for baiting the traps for catching lobsters, cannot come in, and the fishermen are thus prevented from prosecuting their business successfully. That has been the case this spring. However, I believe that the way to preserve this very important industry is to take every step that it is possible to take in a reasonable way to shorten the season.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). The commission extended the open season.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) So far as any extension of the season has been recommended by the report of the commission, I would strongly advise the Minister of Marine and Fisheries not to accede to that extension. When the lobster business was first prosecuted, a pound can would consist of two or three lobsters. Now, it takes from eight to ten and sometimes as many as a dozen lobsters to fill a pound can.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As many as sixteen in some cases.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) We can easily see by this that the industry is getting fished out. The only thing that makes it pay at all at the present time is the immense number of traps that are

set out, covering the fishing ground from one end of the coast to the other. The number of traps is being increased yearly to such an extent that it is only a matter of a very short time, I very much fear, when the whole lobster fishing industry will be destroyed. If some means could be devised without injury to individuals by which the fishing could be stopped altogether for two or three years, in order to give the fisheries a chance to recuperate, it would be in the interest of the fishermen themselves as well as in the interest of this very important industry as a whole.

Mr. ELLIS. Hear, hear. That is the only thing to do.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will take all steps possible to conserve this very important industry to the maritime provinces.

Mr. GANONG. I do not rise to make any particular complaint myself of the report of the commission, but rather to voice the feelings of the fishermen of the county of Charlotte in regard to the manner in which they were totally ignored by that commission. Although the Commissioner of Fisheries was several times asked that the commission should hold one of its sittings at the town of St. Andrew's or at some other convenient point in the county of Charlotte, it did not seem possible, under the arrangements of the commission, for them to come to that county, although it is one of the most important counties in this line of fishing in the province of New Brunswick. Some idea of that industry will be had when I state that in the year 1897 out of 2,205,000 pounds of fresh lobsters that were caught in New Brunswick altogether and exported, 1,547,000 pounds went from the county which I have the honour to represent. That was somewhat less than the quantity of the previous year, when 1,876,000 pounds were caught in that county. I do not think there is a county in the whole country more largely interested in this industry than the county of Charlotte. That county is very close to the United States market, and for that reason the live lobster market is very much more valuable to us than it is to some of the more northern counties. To give you some idea of the difference in value between the live lobster business and that of lobsters for canning, I may state that at a meeting recently held in our county, a fisherman who had just come from his traps stated that there were twenty lobsters in his traps, and that he had sold seventeen for 3 cents apiece and three for seventeen cents apiece, getting the same amount for the three as he did for the seventeen. This shows that some attention is required to be paid to this lobster business, or we shall eventually lose the whole of it. The fishermen of our county feel that they have

been totally ignored in this matter of the Lobster Commission, and they feel it very strongly. I believe they have sent a representation to the Minister on the subject, and I hope that some time in the future the Minister may find it convenient to come down to the waters of the county of Charlotte, and learn more of the fisheries that are so very valuable to that county.

**Mr. KAULBACH.** I fully realize the many trials which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has on his hands when protests are made by the fishermen along the coasts of the maritime provinces, and the difficulties he has to encounter in trying to satisfy the caprices of different people in connection with the fishing of lobsters, with regard to both the close season and the size limit. It appears to me that from the western end of the province of Nova Scotia and around the Bay of Fundy to the American boundary there has been a discrimination against western Nova Scotia on the Atlantic coast, which I think has been unfavourable to the interest of the fishermen, in making the size limit of the lobster nine inches, whilst those fishing north of my county have the limit of seven inches. It appears to me that the reverse should be the case. The fish that inhabit the waters of the district which I represent are in warmer water than those further north; and, besides, the waters of the Bay of Fundy and along the Atlantic coast off my county, have been fished earlier than those farther north, and consequently the size limit should not be against us.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies).** I think the size north is eight inches, not seven.

**Mr. KAULBACH.** Anyway, it appears to me that this discrimination should not exist, but that the reverse should be the rule. Complaints are made from year to year that the lobsters are becoming less plentiful. If the waters are so depleted, and no effort made to restock with young fry, in the course of a very short time there will be very few, or almost extinct. We all know how very prolific the lobster is. When you consider a lobster of twelve inches producing about 22,000 ova or eggs, of that only about 2000 ova or eggs wasted, and the rest can be cultivated in fish hatcheries or in incubators, an idea can be gathered as to the profitable enterprise that can be arrived at by the introduction of fish hatcheries by the means of incubators. I think that the Government is very lax in not taking more active measures to see that the lobster fisheries are carefully looked after in the way of cultivating the fry. A large amount of money is spent in a variety of ways, but I have my doubts whether in many cases it is profitably spent. But this I do know, that no more profitable in-

**Mr. GANONG.**

vestment could be made than the expenditure of a sum of money in the establishment of fish-hatcheries along the coast of the maritime provinces. If this were done, we could keep the fisheries well supplied, so that all the catching that could be done would never exhaust the waters of their fishing grounds. I therefore hope that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will seriously consider the propriety of granting a sum of money by way of bounty to the fishermen for this purpose, to be utilized in re-stocking the waters of the coast. What I believe we should do is to send some scientist to Norway, Sweden or Newfoundland, to ascertain how the fish-hatcheries are working in these countries.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** We have one of our own.

**Mr. KAULBACH.** I know that, but it appears that that little nursery has not been so successful as to give the hon. gentleman encouragement to further efforts in a similar direction, owing, as I consider, to sufficient interest not being taken to follow it up.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** We are making an advance this year, as you will see by the supplementaries.

**Mr. KAULBACH.** Yes, but it is so slow that by the time any advance is made, the fish will have been all caught, and there will be none to deposit eggs or fructify them. I am sorry I did not know that this matter was coming up, because it is one in which I am deeply interested, and I would have liked to have taken the opportunity of discussing the cultivation of codfish as well, and also the utilizing of cod-liver for the making of cod-liver oil for medicinal purposes. That is a question which could be profitably discussed by the whole House, and it seems to me that it will be in the interest of this Dominion, and especially the maritime provinces, if the hon. gentleman would endeavour to formulate some plan whereby the objects I am now advocating might be successfully carried out.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

**Experimental Farm—**

New buildings and improvements, renewals, repairs, &c., in connection with existing buildings, fences, &c... \$9,000

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** This appropriation is to provide for the improvements, renewals and repairs at the several experimental farm stations established throughout the Dominion. Eight thousand dollars are to be expended on the Central Experimental Farm, and the remainder divided among the various branch experimental farms.

Public Buildings, Ottawa, including ventilation and lighting—Repairs, materials, furniture, &c.....	\$100,000
Rideau Hall, including grounds—Renovations, improvements, repairs, furniture and maintenance .....	17,000
Allowance for fuel and light, Rideau Hall .....	8,000
Grounds, Public Buildings, Ottawa.....	5,000
Removal of snow, Public Buildings, Ottawa, including Rideau Hall.....	2,000
Heating, Public Buildings, Ottawa, including salaries of engineers, firemen, elevator attendants and caretakers....	65,000
Gas and electric light, Public Buildings, Ottawa, including roads and bridges..	13,000
Water, Public Buildings, Ottawa, including Rideau Hall.....	16,500
Telephone service, Public Buildings, Ottawa .....	5,000
Major's Hill Park, Ottawa.....	3,500
Rents—Dominion Public Buildings.....	18,000
Furniture—Dominion Public Buildings...	6,000
Salaries of engineers, firemen, caretakers, &c., Dominion Public Buildings.....	80,000
Heating, Dominion Public Buildings, fuel, &c.....	55,000
Lighting, Dominion Public Buildings....	45,000
Water, Dominion Public Buildings.....	16,000
Sundry supplies for caretakers, engineers, firemen, &c., Dominion Public Buildings .....	5,000
Dominion Immigration Buildings—Repairs, furniture, &c.....	4,000
Dominion Quarantine Buildings—Maintenance .....	4,000
Dominion Public Buildings—Electric and other power for running elevators, stamp-cancelling machines, &c.....	5,000
	<u>\$473,000</u>

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The grant for a number of years for the repairs of the buildings at Ottawa was upwards of \$100,000. Last year it was reduced to \$75,000, but the officials of the department have made a memorandum setting forth the reasons why, in their judgment, it was quite impossible to maintain the buildings in proper condition with the reduced vote. They have gone into the question very carefully, and they say that the deterioration in buildings of this character is of such a nature that unless we have a larger appropriation, it will be quite impossible to keep up the buildings in that substantial condition in which we all desire this beautiful pile to be continued. I should be glad to give any further information that hon. gentlemen may desire.

Mr. HAGGART. What are the main items of the expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A memorandum placed in my hands states that the works found necessary are mainly performed by the mechanics and labourers employed by the Department of Public Works under the direct supervision of officers of the department in compliance with requisitions of the various departments and in accordance with the plans of the chief architect. The expenditure for the wages of the men is \$50,000, and the purchase of material and of

such ready-made furniture as cannot be constructed in the Government workshop, about \$50,000. The buildings which have to be maintained are the Parliament Buildings, the Eastern and Western Blocks, the Langevin Block, the Supreme Court, the Geological Survey Building, the Printing Bureau, the Fisheries Building, and the National Art Gallery.

Mr. BENNETT. How much appears in the supplementary Estimates in addition to this amount relative to public buildings in Ottawa, including Rideau Hall ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On page 7 of the supplementary Estimates, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) will find several items, including :

Ottawa—Post office, custom-house, new boiler .....	\$ 1,600
Supreme Court, Ottawa, new boiler....	1,200
Removing old and replacing new wire in Parliamentary Library.....	7,000
Ottawa Departmental Buildings—East and West Blocks, concrete floor, cleaning and painting passages, linoleum, &c. ....	7,500

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman will look at the preceding page of the supplementary Estimates, he will find an amount of \$104,709.69 to be expended on the public buildings in Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, but these are not for maintenance. They are really items on construction account, and chargeable to capital, as follows :—

New Departmental Building (Langevin Block) Ottawa—Balance and interest due contractor .....	\$29,811 73
Ottawa Public Buildings—Fire protection and electric lighting, &c.....	21,897 96
Ottawa Military Buildings, new store..	25,000 00
Ottawa Astronomical Observatory.....	16,000 00
To complete reconstruction of portion of Western Departmental Block, destroyed by fire 11th February, 1897.	12,000 00
	<u>\$104,709 69</u>

Mr. BERGERON. On the question of ventilating this Chamber, I think we were promised by the Minister of Public Works last year—if not last year certainly the year before—that something should be done. The ventilation of this Chamber, when it comes to a summer session, is certainly an important matter for us, for we should take care of our health as well as look after the health of others.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I know that the Minister of Public Works made an effort to improve the ventilation. I do not know whether the experience of other members is the same as mine, but it seems to me that the ventilation is improved, and at present is by no means bad.

Mr. WALLACE. It seems to me that the conditions in this Chamber at times are almost unbearable. During the whole session

we in this part of the Chamber have had to complain of a draught from above. We have communicated with the officials when we could get at them, but have not been afforded relief. Within the last ten minutes this portion of the Chamber has been very unsatisfactory.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I must say that at times I have experienced the same draught. I think it is due to the fact that the windows on the north are opened. The architect is of the opinion that that is the case.

Mr. WALLACE. We should have somebody to watch these things.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I agree that it is very important.

Mr. BERGERON. As to this amount of \$100,000 for work and material—all this seems to be without tender. I see here in the Auditor General's Report about ten or twelve pages devoted to items for goods bought in small amounts and without tender and paid for. I suppose, at the highest prices.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that there has been no change in the method of obtaining supplies. They are bought just as they were under the late Administration.

Mr. BERGERON. But we were promised a great change.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, where an improvement could be made; and many important and necessary changes have been made. It does not follow that everything that the late Administration did was wrong. If this is one case in which they did the business well, we should be commended for following them.

Mr. DAVIN. As the Deputy Minister is at the left of the acting Minister of Public Works, I would again bring up the question of the ventilation of the Reading Room. This is not only in the interest of those who use the Reading Room, but in the interest of the Ministers themselves, because a number of them have rooms off the Reading Room, and cannot have failed to notice the mephitic state the atmosphere is in. The Minister of Public Works promised me that something should be done about it, and the caretaker of the Reading Room says that an officer of the department was sent there and took some measurements, I suppose with a view to carrying out some plan; but nothing has been done. Of course, we are getting now to the end of the session and may be able to live through it. But for next session, in the interest of members of Parliament, something should be done. I also spoke about the lighting of the Library. There is not a shop, there is not an humble dwelling in Ottawa but is better lighted for purposes of reading than the Library. Of course more

Mr. WALLACE.

burners should be put in or the candle power of those already in should be increased. It is a perfect disgrace that members of Parliament going there to do the country's work should be metaphorically burning the midnight oil but actually burning out their eye sockets.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The question of lighting was referred to in the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Davin) absence. As to ventilation, I agree that something should be done. The architect informs me that he has the matter under consideration, and it is under contemplation to put in an electric fan, which it is thought will improve the ventilation. We shall increase the number of lights. I hope the House will be better accommodated in these respects next session.

Mr. DAVIN. We were promised a considerable amelioration of the expenditure on Rideau Hall. I am the last member of Parliament that would pinch or starve Rideau Hall, but there is a long distance between pinching and starving Rideau Hall and extravagant outlay. Now, here we have \$17,000 for Rideau Hall, for grounds, renewals, improvements, repairs, furniture and maintenance. That is an enormous sum for practically jobbing around Rideau Hall. Then, allowance for fuel and light, \$8,000. Then, removal of snow, public buildings, Ottawa, including Rideau Hall, \$2,000. I would like to know how much of that belongs to Rideau Hall. Then, there is \$16,500 for water service. I suppose for water service and maintenance not less than \$30,000 go to Rideau Hall. Why, it is a monstrous thing. I would like to know very much whether there is any hope of a reduction.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hon. gentlemen, if they will look at the public accounts in former years, will find that in some cases the expenditure for Rideau Hall was in excess of what it is now. In the year 1897, the expenditure was \$22,341; in 1898, \$17,736, and we are taking this year \$17,000 for the same class of service. With regard to the water service, there is already on the notice paper a resolution which we shall come to in due course, regarding a new arrangement with the city of Ottawa, which will cover that item. For the present we pay the water rates.

Mr. BERGERON. If my hon. friend could have heard the speeches that used to be made by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) upon that item, he would get gray. Now, what is the new arrangement about heating? Some change was decided on two years ago for heating the public buildings in Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the apparatus was changed from wood to coal. About 5,000 tons of coal are used for Dominion buildings in Ottawa.

Mr. BERGERON. Who supplied that coal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was bought by public tender, and supplied by Mr. Heney, of Ottawa. He was the lowest tenderer complying with the specifications. There was another tender offering a different class of coal which the department did not accept.

Mr. TAYLOR. I notice a similar sum was asked last year for Rideau Hall, and I presume is all expended. I want to ask the member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers), and the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), how they approve, on behalf of the farmers of this country, of the Minister of Public Works spending \$1,500 on articles which I will read, for the benefit of Rideau Hall. I presume these goods were purchased without tender. They were procured from a Montreal firm, Cuddy & Brodeur, I presume a third rate retail house. I hope the member for Frontenac will take a memorandum of this, and when he goes back inquire from the Patrons of his county if they approve the Government spending \$1,500 for the following list of goods :—

20 Water bottles at \$1.50.....	\$ 30 00
12 Water jugs at \$1.....	12 00
6 Decanters .....	7 50
12 Champagne jugs at \$1.....	12 00
200 Champagne goblets at 70c.....	140 00
100 Finger bowls at 65c.....	65 00
130 Ice plates at 65c.....	84 50
10 Sugars at 70c.....	7 00
10 Sugars at 75c.....	7 50
50 Wine tumblers at 65c.....	32 50
24 Soda tumblers at 60c.....	14 40
70 Punch tumblers at 50c.....	35 00
200 Claret glasses at 70c.....	140 00
100 Port glasses at 65c.....	65 00
100 Sherry glasses at 65c.....	65 00
70 Liquer glasses at 60c.....	42 00
	<hr/>
	759 40
China cups and saucers, &c.....	39 70
Dinner dishes .....	295 50
Tea and breakfast dishes.....	299 00
	<hr/>
	1,393 60
On Page 82.....	79 70
do .....	31 80
	<hr/>
	\$1,505 10

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand these goods were bought in the same way as under the late Government. In some cases it would be rather inconvenient to get these goods by tender, because the purpose of this appropriation is to keep up the supply at Rideau Hall according to the established standard, and the goods must be purchased to match those which are already in the establishment. I do not know whether they were bought wholesale or retail. To make amends for breakages, you have to get odd pieces that you would not get in a wholesale house.

Mr. BERGERON. Why buy so many glasses so closely after a plebiscite vote for prohibition ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Prohibition does not yet apply to the whole Dominion, and I am not absolutely sure that we are in a position to enforce it at Rideau Hall, even if we desired to do so.

Mr. DAVIN. How is it that such an enormous quantity of these articles are required every year ? There is a small item here, but from its reading I would like to know what it means : "Boyden & Son, articles short return."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The practice in some cases is not to purchase these goods, but to hire them for emergencies, and where there are breakages they are short return, and have to be paid for as broken goods.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to ask about the lighting. We were told last year that the whole system was to be changed, gas was to be done away with and electric lighting was to be introduced into all the buildings. Still, I see we have paid over \$12,000 for gas in the buildings here, as well as over \$11,000 for electric light. If we are using electric light, why should we pay for gas ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A small portion of the building is still lighted by gas. The hon. gentleman will see that we could not change the whole system immediately. We have a portion of the building in which gas is still used, but the gas account is much smaller than formerly.

Mr. BERGERON. I see that the gas account is over \$12,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is for 1897-98.

Mr. BERGERON. That is the last account we have.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The lighting has been changed since then.

Mr. BERGERON. I would ask my hon. friend to allow one item to stand, as the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) has expressed a desire to say something upon the subject of lighting. We might allow one item to stand, so that the question may be discussed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no objection ; I think the suggestion is quite reasonable.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the hon. Minister the explanation of the expenditure of \$18,000 for rents. Is that for buildings rented by the Dominion Government in the city or outside ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is in various places throughout the Dominion, where there are no public buildings, and where the departments have to be supplied with rented buildings.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether the Public

Works Department has taken into consideration the advisability of providing a separate plant for the purpose of supplying the public buildings with electric light?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. An arrangement has been made from year to year with contractors in Ottawa. We are, of course, free to provide our own plant, but it is not immediately contemplated.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Has it ever been considered?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The matter has received some attention, but the hon. Minister of Public Works thought the arrangement that he had made with the local company was a satisfactory one. It is terminable at short notice, and we are free to establish our own plant, if it is deemed expedient.

Mr. OSLER. I do not wish to object to any of these expenditures on Rideau Hall, because I think Rideau Hall should be kept up in a proper manner. It is an old building, and the question might arise as to whether it would not be better to erect a new building, because an old building must entail enormous expenditures from year to year. What I want to ask the hon. Minister is, what system is adopted in bringing in the main Estimates and the supplementary Estimates? I see in the main Estimates an item of \$470,000, and there is added to it in the supplementary Estimates \$104,709, and certain items at Rideau Hall, amounting to \$30,000. In looking over these supplementary Estimates, I cannot see one item that might not have been included in the main Estimates. Why are these items picked out to be brought down in the supplementary Estimates? I think it would have been a fairer thing to have included items which appear in the supplementary Estimates, in the main Estimates. It is proper that the supplementary Estimates should be reduced to the smallest possible amount.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly, what the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) proposes is very desirable, but the experience of all governments has been that it has been found exceedingly inconvenient, if not impossible. The main Estimates are brought down immediately after the opening of the House, and as the session advances, important matters come to the notice of the Administration which must be provided for in the supplementary Estimates. I think my hon. friend will find that the amount of the supplementary Estimates is not exceptionally large. The experience of this Government, as I think it has been the experience of all governments, is, that it is necessary to provide for certain sums in the supplementary Estimates at an advanced stage of the session.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON.

Mr. BERGERON. Has my hon. friend ever heard of Estimates amounting to \$5,000,000?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend will find that in the past there have been supplementary Estimates, chargeable to income, as large as we have them to-day.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend might ask his hon. colleague at his right (Sir Richard Cartwright) if such has been the case.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Without asking my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright), I think I can make the statement, that there have been supplementary Estimates, chargeable to income, quite as large as those we have here to-night.

Mr. DAVIN. I quite agree with my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) that we must keep up Rideau Hall. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance a question. I saw to-day, in the streets, with a distinguished member of the ministerial side, Mr. Smith, the organiser, and I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance whether he saw a campaign sheet that was issued by Mr. Smith in 1895, in which he puts it forward, as one of the planks of the Reform party, that the cost of the maintenance of Rideau Hall would be reduced?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no recollection of that valuable document. In the particular portion of the Dominion from which I come we generally entertain ourselves at election times with the larger questions affecting the Dominion, and that must account for the fact that my attention has not been attracted to that particular document.

Mr. DAVIN. I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Finance is so hard upon the Reformers of the big province. It is a very polite way—and the hon. Minister of Finance always does everything in a polite way—of telling his Ontario friends that they are small-minded people.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Oh, no.

Mr. BERGERON. To show how recklessly money is expended under this Government, I will draw attention to a small charge that I see in the Auditor General's Report:

Cab-hire of officials—

To pay employees at Rideau Hall: I.	
Coté, 7 trips at \$1; J. B. St. Laurent,	
jr., 13 trips at \$1.....	\$20

Nearly \$1 a day.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They must have been going on Sundays when there are no cars.

Mr. BERGERON. I think that they went on the cars, and put the rest in their pockets.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I think my hon. friend is not serious in assuming that these persons took the cars and charged for cab fees. If so, it would be a dishonest transaction. The deputy informs me that there is an explanation of the item, although he does not have it at the present moment.

Mr. **BERGERON**. As the whole item stands, I would be glad if the hon. Minister would get it.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Without having the item stand, I will get the information.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I understood that the item would stand.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes, one item will stand.

Mr. **BENNETT**. What is the name of the caretaker of the public building at Orillia, when was he appointed, and what is his salary?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. John Frawley; salary, \$15 a month; appointed several months ago.

Mr. **BENNETT**. I regret that the hon. Minister of Public Works is not here. However, I want to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to the fact that there was a very suitable man employed as caretaker of that building, that there were no charges made against him and no investigation as to whether his services should be dispensed with, but he was summarily dismissed. I brought the matter up a year or two ago, and the hon. Minister of Public Works gave me his pledge that no person would be appointed to succeed him, stating that he had made an arrangement with the postmaster to take charge of the building. I regret that the Minister is not here, so that I could tender him my compliments on his veracity; however, the people of that neighbourhood can understand the veracity of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte).

Mr. **CLARKE**. How many telephones are in these buildings, and how much is paid for each telephone?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. There are 129 telephones chargeable to the several departments, at a cost of \$35 for each telephone.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. Has there been any innovation in respect to the lighting and heating of Rideau Hall. I see by the Auditor General's Report that there has been \$8,000 paid to the Earl of Aberdeen on this account. Why should that be paid to him direct?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The practice has been for many years to pay this sum over to the Governor General as an allowance for fuel and lighting, and the

Governor General pays for these out of that sum.

Mr. **HAGGART**. On what principle do you put telephones in the houses of Judge Burbidge of the Exchequer Court, and Registrar Audette?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. That has been the practice for many years and I have never heard it called in question before.

Mr. **BERGERON**. What was the use of changing the Government then?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. We have changed a great many things.

Mr. **LaRIVIERE**. Name one.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. We do not want to be so ungenerous as to suppose that the late Government never did anything right.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Are these telephones placed in the houses of the Ministers as well as in the houses of the deputies?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes, and always have been.

Mr. **BENNETT**. Down to what grade of clerks are supplied with telephones at the public expense? Why not let them put in their laundry bills?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. They are supplied to the principal officers who have to be called up frequently. They are supplied to officers who do not confine themselves strictly to office hours, but have to be called up after office hours.

Mr. **BERGERON**. It is understood that the item of lighting here remains over for general discussion.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Quite so.

Harbours and Rivers—

Nova Scotia..... \$104,450

Mr. **BENNETT**. What is the policy of the department as to the construction of these wharfs? Are they to be constructed and maintained by the Dominion or are they subscribed to in part by the municipalities? I find that hundreds of thousands of dollars are being spent on these wharfs all over the Dominion. Is it the policy of the Government that wherever political friends may require assistance, the Government will build docks to come into competition with the docks owned by private parties. Or is it the policy of the Government that where there is no possible business to be done at these docks, the Government, in order to make political friends, are going to waste tens of thousands of dollars. It seems quite evident that if there be a place where there is any considerable shipping done, private enterprise would be prepared to build these docks. Now, is it the intention of the Government

simply for political reasons, to build docks where they will not pay, and where there is no shipping trade. Take the first item here, of Advocate Harbour, N.S., where a wharf is to be constructed for \$2,000. Is there a wharf there already; is any shipping done there or is the trade so small that private capitalists will not build a dock there? I know instances where this Government, in the province of Ontario, have built docks in competition with the docks of private owners, which is manifestly unfair. I have known cases also in the province of Ontario where the Government had no excuse whatever for building a dock except that it was done for party purposes. Will the Minister do me the gratification of explaining to the House why the Government are now building these docks. It is quite plain that if the building of these docks were profitable, capital long ago would have been invested in their construction.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The hon. gentleman used the word "docks" when of course he means wharfs, because docks have a different and special meaning. Where there is a certainty of private enterprise furnishing all the wharf accommodation needed, it is not necessary for the Government to step in, but in places where the people require wharf accommodation but where it would not pay to invest private capital in furnishing such accommodation, the Government might properly be called on to build a wharf.

**Mr. PRIOR.** Are the provincial governments not supposed to do that work?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I think not. At all events, from my experience, they do not, and I am not going to discuss who it is that absolutely should do it. The practice has been for the Dominion Government to construct these wharfs in the various provinces of the Dominion. Every wharf so constructed is in every sense owned by the Dominion, and whatever is required for its maintenance must subsequently be supplied by the Dominion. These wharfs are usually placed in charge of wharfingers, who receive a percentage of the income for their services, but the keeping of them in repair is a charge on the Dominion. It is a very considerable item, and while I am not prepared to say what may have happened in any particular section, no doubt the expenditure on public works of this character has been a great benefit to the people in various sections. This is not a new policy but one which has been carried out for years, and I do not think anybody has previously ever urged that it is not a proper policy.

**Mr. BENNETT.** Whether the practice was carried on by the late Government or not is a question on which I do not propose to enter. The hon. gentleman maintains that the building by the Dominion Government of a new wharf at the head of Indian River

**Mr. BENNETT.**

in a place called Keene in the province of Ontario, which is only a creek, not as wide as from where I stand to the wall, is a proper expenditure. It happens, however, that it is in the riding of a Government supporter. If the money were asked for the building of a bridge, there would be some sense in the vote, but to build a dock on a creek no wider than from here to the wall is perfectly absurd. The Government lay down this proposition that wherever it will be a convenience to the public to have a dock erected, their application for that dock must be filed, and the dock will be built, provided of course political leverage can be used, because that is the lever that seems to have been used in the case I have cited. Here is a place that has been from the days of Adam without a dock, and in which no rational man would expend a dollar in the construction of one, because it will not produce any income, as there is no business to be done there. Could anything be more absurd?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The wharfs are not constructed under the impression that they are going to be paying institutions, but they are not a source of expenditure to the Dominion, so far as the care of them is concerned. The maintenance of course is a charge on the Dominion. It is quite possible that you might build a number of wharfs in places where there would be no source of income, and yet where these wharfs would be a great convenience to the public. The hon. gentleman cites a place where a wharf is to be built and where there never has been one since the days of Adam. If there had been a wharf there, it would not be necessary to build one. If there is a reasonable number of people, within a reasonable distance of the locality, it may be a proper place to build a wharf, notwithstanding the fact that there never was one there before and that it may not be a source of income. The business of the Government is to provide accommodation for the people to assist them in carrying on their trade.

**Mr. BENNETT.** On that principle the hon. gentleman should in every town, irrespective of its population, erect a post office.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** In every town the Government provides a post office, and in larger places provides a special building.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Is not the hon. gentleman stretching the principle a little far? This year he is providing for 89 wharfs of which 54 are in the supplementary Estimates.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Nova Scotia happens to be a province with a large sea-coast. We would not build a great many in Manitoba.

**Mr. OSLER.** Looking over the Estimates, I find that there are 35 Government wharfs aided in Nova Scotia. That is a fair

number for the Government to take charge of and maintain for all time as the hon. Minister tells us the Government is bound to do. But when we look at these little pleasant supplementary Estimates, which appear so innocent, and which the hon. Minister tells us were merely brought in at the end because they were never thought of before, we discover 56 new wharfs provided for in Nova Scotia, 56 added to 35 makes 91 wharfs and piers which the Government are taking charge of and which they are bound to maintain for all time. Surely there must be an election coming on in Nova Scotia if not in the rest of Canada. Yet this is the Government which was to economize. In summer time I live on Lake Simcoe where I have a wharf which I had built at my own expense. There are 40 wharfs all round Lake Simcoe, and the Government, I venture to say, does not expend on them one dollar in the year. There may be one or two, on which they spend money, but I venture to say that there are more calls made and business done at eight or ten of these wharfs than in 80 out of the 91 in Nova Scotia. Where there is a business to be done on the sea-coast, fishing and ordinary business, the Government should maintain a proper wharf but by all that is reasonable and businesslike surely they have not suddenly discovered 91 wharfs in Nova Scotia that are ports of call for boats and business generally. Very often hon. members say of Nova Scotia that it is a poor province and not well treated. Great Scott, a province with 91 wharfs, maintained at the expense of the Government, and this province complaining that it is badly treated! If you are going to maintain the wharfs on the sea coast from Maine to Labrador, and from the southern part of British Columbia to Alaska, on the same relative appropriation as you are providing wharfs for the accommodation of the citizens of Nova Scotia, it will take all the money of this country to keep up our wharfs and piers.

This list of 91 wharfs and piers that we are asked to provide for in Nova Scotia is simply an outrage. I care not how many wharfs were built, or how much has been spent on them in the past. I have not looked back to see how much the late Government spent on wharf accommodation; but I tell my hon. friend that for this Government to maintain 91 wharfs and piers in Nova Scotia is an outrage on the people.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I am not much surprised at my fresh-water friend making the observations he did. He probably is slightly acquainted with the maritime provinces, that section of Canada which came to the relief of old Canada some years ago, when, according to the testimony of the leader of the Opposition, the old province of Canada was somewhat embarrassed financially, and came down and

got Nova Scotia to assist her out of her financial difficulty. My hon. friend will not take that upon my statement, but I ask him to look in "Hansard" at the beginning of the session, and he will find this statement made in the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition. I regret that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) made the observations he did. I think the difficulty is just this, that when we in the maritime provinces want an appropriation we are content to ask for small amounts to satisfy the demands of the different sections of the province. I think if we were to come in and ask for \$700,000 or \$800,000 in a lump sum, in the good old fashioned way of some of the provinces, my hon. friend would not object. But because the province is content to make application for a number of small works, my hon. friend brings in his analytical mind to the examination of how many works there are in the country, utterly disregarding the fact that the total amount asked for for the province may be a very limited and reasonable one. However, joking aside, I can assure my hon. friend that, so far as I know the object of these appropriations, they are all designed to serve the people of this country. What serves the people in one section in the way of great public expenditure may not happen to serve the people in another section; and to select the items the hon. gentleman has selected and hold them up for special condemnation is not fair, it is not generous, it is not worthy of an hon. gentleman representing the great city of Toronto, and the great province of Ontario.

**Mr. OSLER.** I had the advantage, before I was a member of this House, of seeing some of the expenditures of the nature which it is now proposed to carry out that were originally made by the late Government. And of all the useless expenditure that it is possible to conceive, I think none could possibly be more useless than that upon some of the works in the lower provinces. Many of the wharfs were not used; in some cases they were not get-at-able. I am sure no one in this House will object to expenditure that is in the public interest; no one will cavil at improvements which are intended for the public good. But from what I have seen in the lower provinces, and from what I see here, I believe that nine-tenths of the expenditure asked for in these works is merely for local purposes and not for the good of the community. These are works given simply for patronage in a district. I am not objecting to expenditure in Nova Scotia. I am proud of Nova Scotia as a province; I believe it to be one of the richest in this Dominion, and I think it will increase in riches and prosperity to an enormous extent. But I do not believe it is wise for the Government to take charge of these wharfs. If they take charge of ninety-one this season, it is not unlikely they will take charge of 191 next season.

Mr. DAVIN. It is impossible for any one to go over the estimates and compare them with those of last year and not come to the conclusion that in the multiplication of little wharfs to be assisted, this time there is something extremely strange, if not alarmingly fishy. Now, if the hon. Minister will turn to the Auditor General's Report, pages Q-3 and 4, he will find that there were just thirty-five wharfs that required to be helped last year, and this year there are ninety-one. That looks alarming. And the names of some of the wharfs are very suggestive. How comes it that these wharfs to be helped are so numerous this year, especially in the supplementary Estimates? Is it possible to believe that the fifty-six for which items appear in the supplementary Estimates, if they really needed repairs, would not have been found worthy of attention by the Public Works Department in time to place them, or at least some of them in the main Estimates? Is it possible to avoid the conclusion pointed out very properly by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler), that there must have been some other motive than putting wharfs in good repair to make their extraordinary accession to the supplementary Estimates. It throws us back on the methods in every department that we have been observing for the last three years. Never in the history of Canada has there been such an electioneering Government as this. In other cases, we have had Ministers who, on certain occasions, would, no doubt, pay a good deal of attention strengthening themselves before the electorate. But we have in office to-day a Government that, from the moment it came into power, seems to have realized that it was only by desperate efforts it could retain the power it had won by a fluke, and so, there has been abundant evidence that in the administration of every department, and not in that of the Public Works only, they have had in their minds only electioneering. I will not say corruption; it would probably not be parliamentary; but, Sir, nobody need be astonished, if, outside of this House in no bated breath, the people of Canada murmur and mutter "corruption."

Mr. LANG. I would inform the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) that the Indian River is not so small a stream as he represents it to be. To the village of Keen, where it is proposed to build the wharf is navigable, and has been for fifty years. There has been a wharf there since before he was born. It is rotting now and falling down, and there is not a great deal of business, I admit; and the people do not feel like renewing the wharf. But the people there have as good a right to a little help as other places have to a great deal.

Mr. BENNETT. The best answer I can give is that the predecessor of the hon. gentleman, Mr. Burnham, was in this Parliament two or three terms, and he had either

Mr. OSLER.

one of two things, either the good sense not to ask for this appropriation or lack the temerity to propose it to the Government.

Mr. LANG. Because he never got anything for the county.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Burnham represented the riding on the merits of the Government he supported and not on the strength of petty grants of a few hundred dollars.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) If I were a resident of Ontario, I should feel like speaking very much along the lines followed by those gentlemen from that province who have just spoken. I can quite understand that they should regard with suspicion a great many of these small votes for Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. But I would ask them to remember that there is another side to this question. Let them regard it from the stand-point of a representative of the maritime provinces. Take an illustration. Canada has spent \$80,000,000 on its canal system. Now, Prince Edward Island pays a proportion of about one-fortieth of that sum or the annual interest on it. The people of Prince Edward Island are in an isolated position where they do not derive one cent of benefit from it. Nevertheless we pay our share and pay it without grumbling. Now, if you look at that 80 millions as a matter of investment, how much does it repay? If you take the trouble to make the calculation you will find that it does not return or repay one-third of one per cent. The money is expended in Ontario and Quebec to provide a national waterway to the sea. You cannot look at these things simply from the stand-point of how much the receipts are, you must look at them as public works for the general benefit of Canada. That is the way in which we must regard the wharfs in the lower provinces. They are for the general benefit of Canada, and if they do not make the returns that some people expect, they stand, at least, upon an equal footing with the canal system of Canada. If the people of the lower provinces do not grumble, but pay honourably their share towards the sustentation of the canal system from which they derive little or no benefit, surely the people of the west ought to be ready to contribute to the wharf system of the eastern provinces, even although they get but little direct benefit from it. Both systems are for the general benefit of Canada, and we ought to be prepared from all the provinces to contribute our fair share towards sustaining them.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister is asking for a vote for repairs to a breakwater at Cow Bay. We voted \$5,000 last year, and he is asking for \$15,000 this year. Has that work been let by tender, and if so, in what state of progress is it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a large and important work which has al-

ready received a very large sum of money. The work is being done by day labour. Perhaps I ought to apologize for the expenditure at Cow Bay, for it happens to be in the constituency represented by the leader of the Opposition. It is a large and important public work, and the people in the neighbourhood are very anxious to have it entirely renewed, but it is an enormous expenditure, and we have decided to expend just enough money to keep it in fair condition. It has been done by day's work, entirely in accordance with the law and the practice.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** The hon. gentleman stated it was in the constituency of the leader of the Opposition. I have no doubt he is employing men to work by the day and getting a pledge from them that when the next election comes around they will vote against the leader of the Opposition. Otherwise, why should he ask for \$15,000 of the people's money to be spent on repairing a wharf by day's work, when the law distinctly declares that for any work costing over \$5,000 tenders must be called for?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** In the first place, it is not contrary to law, it is not contrary to practice, but it is entirely in accordance with the law and with the practice of the late Government, though I do not say that justifies this method of doing the work. But as to taking pledges from the men, I cannot blame my hon. friend for his suspicion, for that is the kind of strategy that he is most familiar with.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I think the hon. Minister is not exactly right in saying it is entirely in accordance with the law and practice of the late Government, because it was under the late Government that a Bill was passed saying that any work above \$5,000 must be let by tender and contract. It may be a modern practice, but it certainly was not the practice under the late Government.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The hon. gentleman is mistaken. But it was admitted in discussion last night that in the matter of repairs at all events, it was entirely in accordance with the law; and I cited a case where \$170,000 was expended by day's labour by the late Government in the city of St. John.

**Mr. BERGERON.** What is the estimated cost of the Cow Bay breakwater?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** It is not contemplated to make all the repairs which the people in the neighbourhood desire, but with this sum we will put the work in as good a condition as we can. It would cost too much to make a thorough repair of the whole work.

**Mr. BERGERON.** You cannot put any money into a work without having an esti-

mate of how much it will cost. We cannot go it blind like that.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** It will cost just as much as we are willing to vote. We think, by this expenditure we can keep the work alive. It is not contemplated to complete all the repairs at present. This breakwater was built many years ago by the Archibald family who conducted large coal mining operations at that place. They sold it to the late Government and the late Government spent a considerable sum of money on it. At that time there were large mining operations conducted at Cow Bay. Subsequently, mining operations were discontinued. But a new company is about being started to renew mining operations, and it is likely there will be a considerable shipment of coal at that place.

**Mr. HAGGART.** What has been the total cost up to date, including these repairs?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The total cost up to the 31st of December, 1898, is \$210,741.

**Mr. DAVIN.** Could the hon. Minister tell where Ingonish is? Is that in Victoria, as represented by the hon. member for Victoria, N. S. (Mr. Bethune), who has translated himself to the other side of the House?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Ingonish is in the northern part of Cape Breton island, in the county of Victoria, represented by the hon. member referred to.

**Mr. CLARKE.** Is this work to be done by tender and contract? Has anything yet been done?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** No, nothing has been done. The plans are in course of preparation.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Will it be done by tender?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I think it probably will. Most of the new work is built by tender.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Would my hon. friend do it by tender?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I think I would; but there may be good reasons why that principle cannot be complied with.

**Mr. WALLACE.** We know now what caused the hon. member for Victoria to transplant himself to the other side of the House.

**Mr. CLARKE.** What is the estimated cost of the work?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The total estimated cost is \$21,500.

**Mr. CLARKE.** What was done with the \$2,000 voted last year?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Nothing has been done with last year's vote. This

is a breakwater, such as is usually built in the lower provinces.

Mr. BERGERON. What is this work for: what is the object of it? It has never been wanted before now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend says that it has never been wanted, but in that he is mistaken. It is a breakwater, and I do not know that I can give any explanation of what a breakwater is to my hon. friend, who represents, in a sense, a maritime province, and who knows what a breakwater is.

Mr. BERGERON. I know that hon. members generally ask for everything they can get, but I do not remember that there ever was a demand for a work there. I am surprised that the demand is made this year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can assure my hon. friend that many applications for work are made that are not granted.

Mr. POWELL. What is the trade of Ingonish?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It has not much of what might be called trade. It is a fishing village.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the population?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The population is scattered along the coast. There is no settled population, in the sense of a village population, but it is scattered along the coast.

Mr. DAVIN. I see an item here of \$8,000 for Port Hilford, in Guysborough. I am told that this is a very small place, and that there is no need for anything there. It has been done to meet the importunity of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser).

Mr. COCHRANE. I am surprised that the hon. Minister of Finance, acting for the hon. Minister of Public Works, should pass these things over so lightly, and tell hon. members on this side of the House that they ought to know what he meant by a breakwater. I have the honour to represent a riding which is bounded on the south by Lake Ontario, where we have a great many wharfs, and there is a good deal of difference between a breakwater and a wharf. A breakwater means a pier built for the protection of a harbour, and a wharf means a place where grain is delivered and vessels tie up to put off merchandise and take on produce. I have no objection to money being spent where it is spent for the benefit of the country, but when we are told by the hon. Minister that he is building breakwaters for which there is no need, it appears to me that he is going rather too far. When my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island compares his little docks on

Mr. FIELDING.

the Island to our wharfs, I will venture the assertion that we have one wharf in the harbour of Presqu'île that ships more grain than the whole of Prince Edward Island. I am surprised that an educated legal gentleman would have his mind so warped as to compare a paltry little dock in Prince Edward Island with the canal system of this Dominion. The hon. Minister does not deign to tell us what is meant by a breakwater that is to cost \$19,000 or \$20,000, or what it is being built for, and hon. gentlemen opposite will cackle and laugh because they are supporting the Government, which have favours to give them. We are spending somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$51,000,000, and hon. gentlemen, when they were on this side of the House, said that the country was robbed, and that the farmers had been bled white, when our expenditure was \$40,000,000 a year. It is all very nice for these hon. gentlemen. My hon. friend from East Peterborough (Mr. Lang) said that the member representing that riding before him had never been able to get anything for the riding. I am glad, for the credit of the Conservative party, that he was not able to get such an expenditure for a wharf on a paltry stream running into Rice Lake. He told us that there was a wharf at that place before we were born. I am glad that the old Government did not grant any money for that purpose, because they would have spent \$2,000 to build a wharf where there is no more need than there is for a wharf on the Parliament grounds at Ottawa. Hon. gentlemen opposite are building this enormous number of wharfs and doing the work without contract. They say it is according to law now, but when we were on that side of the House, we could not draw our breath unless it was done by contract. We could not let a five-dollar job without contract, and now we have this \$19,000 or \$20,000 to be expended on this wharf, and the hon. Minister says that the law which requires the work to be done by contract, is a dead letter, and that everything is all right. If an election were coming on, I wonder if we would not have the same job as was perpetrated on the Western Block when the election was on in Wright. I see the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) looking serious. I wonder why there was not a sum in the Estimates to dredge Toronto harbour. The hon. gentleman is getting more protection than he got under a Tory Administration, and he is willing to accept that protection and let the harbour of Toronto go to the dogs. I was just wondering if we had an election on, if this money would not be spent in the same way as money was spent on the Western Block when the election was on in Wright. I was told that they had so many men on that job that they were carrying in laths one at a time, and I did see five men holding a ladder for one man to work on. Just as

soon as the election was over, the men went back to Wright—the county of Wright; I do not say it was a right job. We were told the poor farmer was bled white when the Tories were in power, but I would like to know what colour he is being bled now. I know, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Ellis), that you look on these matters from a serious point of view, and I know you must feel sad to see how much money your political friends are spending on day's work, when it should be done by contract. I do not expect that the Minister of Finance should explain these matters as fully as the Minister of Public Works, but when we ask for information, he has no right to say: Oh, we ought to know it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that.

Mr. COCHRANE. You said that to the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron).

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say he ought to know it, I said he did know it.

Mr. COCHRANE. Well I do not know it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) does know because he has given a very excellent definition of what a breakwater is.

Mr. COCHRANE. But I do not understand how you can spend all that money along a coast which is so sparseley settled that you can hardly find a village in it. We have large shipping interests all through the province of Ontario, and if you are spending this money lavishly in Nova Scotia we are entitled to some expenditure in Ontario. I venture to say we are shipping more grain out of Brighton harbour than they will ever ship over this wharf until it rots down again. I do not object to your building wharfs if it be in the public interest, but I do object to your squandering the money of the people for party purposes. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask you if the Minister will not give us the information, why it is that these wharfs were not built during a long number of years past, and that it now suddenly crops up in the year 1899, that they are necessary.

Mr. BENNETT. I would ask the Minister of Finance if the following breakwaters and wharfs are situated in the county he has the honour to represent. Clark's Harbour breakwater, expenditure \$5,000; Coffin's Island, \$300; East Ragged Island wharf, \$1,500; Port Latour breakwater, \$3,000; Upper Port Latour wharf, \$400; Shag Harbour wharf, \$2,000; Upper Woods Harbour wharf, \$1,600; Port Mouton wharf, \$2,000; Port Medway breakwater, \$500; Upper Port Latour wharf, \$300; Lockeport breakwater, \$3,000; East Ragged Island wharf, \$1,000; Jordan Bay east breakwater,

\$1,200; Newellton Cape Island wharf, \$2,000. Are all these expenditures in the constituency of the Minister of Finance?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) has apparently been reading from the main and the supplementary Estimates, and I think all these named are in the counties I have the honour to represent. I have to apologize to the House for asking such very small sums,—for these are all very small sums,—and I am sorry that I could not do better. As they say: Wait till you see next year.

Mr. BENNETT. I employed my time with the assistance of the "Post Office Guide," in discovering these places, but owing to the insignificance of some of them, I find they are not even post offices. Is it not a pitiable position for a Minister of the Crown to come down before the House—I was going to say taking advantage of the temporary occupation of the position of Minister of Public Works,—to ask to have these numerous amounts placed to his own credit in his own riding. I welcome it for the reason that the Minister of Finance must feel very uneasy in his own constituency. What did we find last night? We found that this same Minister of the Crown is placing in a town in his constituency—in Ontario it would be ordinarily termed a village—a public building at a cost of over \$15,000. Look at the position of the Minister of Finance. After he had gone from one end of his own province to another, and even coming up to the other provinces stumping in the general elections of 1896, he could not find a member from the province of Nova Scotia who would resign his seat and give way in order that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) might get a portfolio. And what happened? He could not get a seat until Mr. Forbes who represented a Nova Scotia constituency in this House, dropped into a judgeship. After that humiliating position into which the Minister of Finance was forced by his own party friends in his own province, we find him coming down here and despoiling the public treasury, to do what? To build piers and docks and breakwaters at every conceivable point in his own riding. It is no wonder that those who sit behind him expect that they shall have grants of money, in order that they may strengthen their own position. I am glad to see that the Minister of Finance feels so weak and unstable in his own constituency, that he has to offer these bribes, as I claim they are bribes, to help him get returned to Parliament.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is much which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) has said that I need make no reference to. It will go down on "Hansard," and it will do its proper work at the right time. I have the honour to represent in

this House two counties, and the aggregate amount these counties have received will be but a drop in the bucket as compared with the sums voted for public works elsewhere. But, because they happened to be small sums distributed over a number of places, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) imagines that by reading this list of names he can convey the impression that there is a large sum being voted for my constituency. I have not made a calculation; I have no mind for that sort of finesse; but I believe it will be found that in the two years, covered by the Estimates, the county represented by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) will have at least as much money out of the public treasury as the counties which I represent. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) misunderstands entirely the public of Nova Scotia, and of the Dominion, if he imagines he can make any capital whatever by delivering a speech such as that which he has just placed on "Hansard."

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the answer given by the Minister is to his credit or is an excuse for this expenditure. It will be admitted by every one that where trade has to be accommodated a reasonable expenditure should be made from the public treasury for the purpose of accommodating that trade. But the Minister has given us the information that in a place where we have already spent \$200,000, it is only a very small village; practically a fishing village.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Where is that?

Mr. SPROULE. Cow Bay.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is confounding two places. Cow Bay is in Cape Breton and is a coal village.

Mr. McISAAC. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) should consult his leader about that.

Mr. SPROULE. I am consulting no one except the Minister of Finance who is supposed to give us sufficient information to satisfy us that we should vote this sum. I say that where there is business to be accommodated there can be no reasonable objection to voting money to accommodate that business. But how can it be possible that after all we have spent in Nova Scotia there remain ninety-one places on which expenditure is necessary to accommodate the trade in that province. If you take the trade of the whole province and divide it amongst ninety-one places you will see how small the trade must be for each. As my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) has said, some of these places are so small that you cannot find a post office there. They are simply small fishing villages, and in Ontario no one would have the hardihood to ask for such

Mr. FIELDING.

large expenditure in similar small places. If in the province of Ontario, we get a couple of thousand dollars of expenditure in our large towns from year to year, the Government think they are dealing most generously with us. If you take the Trade and Navigation Returns you will find that these Ontario towns do far and away greater business than is done in these insignificant places in Nova Scotia. One of the members from Prince Edward Island in comparing the expenditure said: Oh but we have built the canals for you in Ontario. Does the hon. gentleman not know that these canals are the great highways for commerce for the whole country, and that their benefit does not accrue to the province of Ontario alone, but to the entire Dominion. They are important for the whole Dominion. They not only are useful for carrying the trade belonging to the Dominion, but also the trade of the western country bordering on ours and which comes through the Dominion. There is no comparison in an expenditure for that purpose and one such as proposed in the items before us. This money is to be expended in some places where no trade at all is being done, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns; and when we ask for expenditure in Ontario at large ports, where considerable trade is done, we can only get a beggarly amount of \$2,000 or \$3,000 to do a little dredging.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the province of Ontario the hon. gentleman will find that the votes run from \$10,000 to \$60,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Take the city of Toronto, with 200,000 of a population, and it gets but \$50,000. Take the city of Hamilton, how much does it get?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In each case what they need.

Mr. SPROULE. The people of Toronto do not think they get what they need. They think that \$200,000 would be a moderate estimate for the needs of that port. But in the maritime provinces, a little fishing village, with no trade at all to speak of, gets \$25,000. If you will compare the amounts voted for Ontario with what are voted for the province of Nova Scotia, if you will take a particular town in Ontario and put the expenditure there alongside of a particular town in Nova Scotia, you will find that the proportion of trade done in Ontario is \$4 to \$1 in Nova Scotia, and yet the proportion of expenditure in Ontario is very much less than in Nova Scotia. We object to this expenditure because it is being made at places where there has been comparatively no trade in the past and where there is likely to be comparatively none in the future. The hon. gentleman has not given us the information upon which he submitted to Council the proposals for this expenditure.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. If the hon. gentleman will ask me in any particular case, I shall be glad to give the information. He is mistaken when he says I refused it.

Mr. **SPROULE**. The information was asked for over and over again to-night and not given.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. No information was asked for and refused.

Mr. **SPROULE**. It was asked for by the hon. member for Beauharnois and not given.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Every question put by him was answered.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I think that the hon. member for Beauharnois asked, in the first place, what was the nature of these repairs on the Cow Bay breakwater. Two or three questions were put to ascertain the nature of this expenditure, because if it were piles or crib-work, the work ought to be let by tender and contract.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The hon. member for Beauharnois asked several questions which were answered evidently to his satisfaction. If the hon. gentleman will mention any item on which he desires information, I will do my best to give it to him.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I asked the hon. gentleman what were the repairs required to be made.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. For the Cow Bay breakwater it is chiefly concrete work.

Mr. **SPROULE**. How much does his engineer estimate requires to be done of concrete work ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The concrete work on the whole would amount to \$24,750.

Mr. **WALLACE**. What is the nature of the concrete work ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. A concrete slope to protect the work which had previously been done.

Mr. **SPROULE**. The hon. Minister does not say whether it is proposed to do this by day's work.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I stated that it was being done by day's work.

Mr. **SPROULE**. What is it costing per yard doing it by day's work ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. \$5.50 per cubic yard.

Mr. **SPROULE**. The hon. gentleman proposes to have this all done by day's work ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. A part has been done by day's work. We have already spent \$5,000.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Does the hon. gentleman believe that he can do this work as cheaply by day's work as by contract ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Well, I happen to have some little experience in concrete work, and my observation is that it can be done better by day's work under competent supervision.

Mr. **SPROULE**. The hon. gentleman has a different opinion from what his friends had when on this side. If there was one principle more invariably pressed on the attention of Parliament than another, it was the principle that any work costing \$5,000 or over should be done by contract.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Repairs ?

Mr. **SPROULE**. Any kind of work, but the hon. gentleman is going to spend \$24,000 and do the work by day's labour. I can only say that his experience must be different from that of every other Minister of Public Works. This is a kind of work that can be easily done by contract, as there is no difficulty in making plans and specifications. And, therefore, above all others, it is a kind of work that could be done by contract. And the hon. Minister has not even invited tenders to find out what the work would cost, but does it on the strength of an estimate given him by his engineer. The estimate may be right, but I think he is doing the work in a much more expensive way than is at all necessary.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Do I understand the hon. Minister to say that it was estimated that this work would cost \$24,000 and that \$5,000 has already been expended ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The amount expended last year was \$5,000. Other expenditures have been made in previous years.

Mr. **CLANCY**. What I wish to ascertain is how much of the \$24,000 remains to be expended ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. According to the Auditor General's Report we expended in 1897, \$9,000 on this work, and in 1898, \$5,000. With the appropriation now to be taken we expect to finish the work contemplated by the engineer. The concrete estimate was \$24,000, but there are some other expenditures beside. Had we carried out the repairs regardless of cost, the amount necessary to be expended would be about \$100,000, but the engineer cut this down to \$30,000, of which half has been expended and we are asking the other half now.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Is it the intention to do more work than will be covered by this \$30,000 ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. That is all at present. A portion of the work was practically abandoned, no attempt being made to renew it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like the Minister to explain whether the estimate of the engineer on a basis of \$24,000 is intended to cover the extent of the wharf which originally existed. A large portion of the breakwater was carried away between the years 1895 and 1896, and there was a break in one or two places between the extreme end and the shore.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This does not cover the whole extent of the wharf. The work we have undertaken does not extend to the outer work—that is practically abandoned. In view of the expense and the falling off of business in the place, we thought we would not go beyond \$30,000 at the present time.

Mr. McDOUGALL. How much of the wharf will this expenditure cover?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About 200 feet of the structure is practically abandoned and will not be touched by the present repairs.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am afraid my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) will find that abandoning this 200 feet will prove a great disadvantage to the shipping that seeks the protection of this harbour. He must be aware also that another coal company is opening at that point with the intention of making use of the breakwater, as the coal company that previously existed did. I quite understand, that for years we have had to struggle with the difficulty of keeping that breakwater in repair; and when on one or two previous occasions a great break was made in it by heavy storms, we had to contend against very large estimates on the part of an engineer. At one time since I first had the honour of a seat in this House, the engineer of the department made an estimate of \$100,000 for the repairs on that breakwater, which brought up the question whether the Government should abandon further repairs on the breakwater or expend this \$100,000. The difficulty was to provide this \$100,000, making it necessary for the department to change their plans, and the result was that some \$22,000 or \$24,000 was spent on the breakwater twelve or thirteen years ago instead of \$100,000. That kept the breakwater intact from that time until 1895, when a heavy storm made one or two breaks, and application was made to the department for immediate repairs. It was not possible for the Government at that time to undertake the repairs for want of money. It was intended in the session of 1896 to provide a sum to make at least the necessary repairs to save the breakwater from further destruction by storm.

As my hon. friend will remember it was not possible to put any Estimates through the House during that session, and in consequence the breakwater suffered greater dam-

Mr. FIELDING.

age, with the result that now a much larger amount of money is necessary to put it in the condition it formerly was. I hope the Government will be able to extend it to its original length as soon as opportunity offers, because I believe that the people who are now engaged in opening up a new coal mine there will make that enterprise a success, and will therefore need that breakwater, as it was needed by the people who carried on a very large work there some twenty or thirty years ago. My hon. friend knows that the coal mines that were being operated in that locality and which made use of that breakwater, became the property of the Dominion Coal Company, and for reasons best known to that company, and perhaps to my hon. friend, those coal mines have been closed, and the port has been practically abandoned as far as shipping coal is concerned. Now that a new company is opening up another mine in the same locality, with the intention of making use of this breakwater, I hope my hon. friend will see that it is put in such a condition that it will be a permanent benefit.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With most of what the hon. gentleman says regarding the importance of the breakwater, I cordially agree. He came in late in the discussion; if he had been here an hour earlier he would realize some of the difficulties which the Government experience in making liberal grants for these services. It is so difficult to make our friends—I speak of gentlemen on both sides of the House and in other parts of the Dominion—realize the need there is for works of this character on the Atlantic coast of our province; and when we ask for liberal votes in that direction I am much surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think that too much money is sought. Considering the amount of criticism we have had to stand for the expenditure that is now asked, imagine what the situation would have been if we had asked for the extra \$70,000 which would be necessary to put that breakwater in good condition. It is unfortunate that a number of these important public works throughout the lower provinces have been allowed to go into decay. I am not blaming anybody for it, it may have been unavoidable. Whatever the cause of it may be, it is a fact that along the coast of the maritime provinces you will find a great many important structures, not always so large as the one at Cow Bay, but nevertheless large and important, which have been allowed to go to decay. In my own constituency there is one work which would require, according to the engineer's report, \$70,000 to restore it. But I knew it was absurd to ask Parliament at present to make that appropriation so I have had to let it stand and wait for another opportunity. In my hon. friend's county there is an important breakwater at Gabarus, which was re-

ferred to the other night. It is a case in which it would require a liberal grant to put it in good condition, but I found it was impossible to make a large grant without swelling these Estimates to an unreasonable limit. Similar cases to those I have cited may be found along the coast of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, where considerable sums of money have been spent in the improvement of these works and in constructing new ones. I accompanied my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works during part of his tour last summer, and I know that the result of his examination satisfied him that he would require a much larger appropriation for those public works than they had had in the past, and in justice to that hon. gentleman I want to say that he was so deeply impressed with that view that in his first draft Estimates he recognized the claims of a number of places which, on a careful review of the whole matter, we found ourselves unable to sanction on account of the extent of the expenditures that would be required. With regard to Gabarus, we have taken a small vote, with which we hope to make a beginning, but it is one of the class of works that, if you touch at all, will require a large expenditure in the future.

Mr. McDUGALL. That work at Cow Bay has been kept up by public grants from this Parliament for some thirty years. It was first undertaken by private individuals operating a coal mine and was subsequently taken over by the Government, and has been maintained up to the present period. On account of the exposed place where this work was, it has suffered great injury and that injury might have been prevented had it been possible for the Department of Public Works to undertake the expenditure without the consent of Parliament. I may say that in my own experience cases have frequently occurred where it has cost twice as much to make repairs as it would have cost if the department had been able to act promptly without waiting for the consent of Parliament. Now, a word about Gabarus. On two occasions since the opening of this session I have asked questions about it. On those two occasions I asked if the Minister had visited that place when he was down at Cape Breton. I felt anxious that something should be provided for that work. On one occasion I was answered, I think by the Minister of Finance, who informed me that the Minister of Public Works did not visit the place. Now, that is a mistake. The hon. Minister did visit the place and he was presented with an address by the people and brought to the point where a survey was made with the intention of building this breakwater. I cannot understand how it is that the answer to my question, on two occasions, was to the effect that the Minister had not visited the place. I am glad to see that this grant is

made now, but I cannot understand, unless my hon. friend will be able to explain when the supplementary Estimates are being discussed, what is intended to be done with this \$8,000. I hope my hon. friend will be able to explain in some satisfactory way how this \$8,000 can possibly be expended with the view of being of any advantage to the people of that part of the country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will go into that on the supplementary Estimates. In regard to the hon. Minister of Public Works visiting Gabarus it is certain that there must have been some misunderstanding. He visited so many places that I suppose it was impossible for him to carry them all in his mind. However, I am glad to know that he did visit Gabarus and has a personal knowledge of the work.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister how he proposes to repair a work, that was formerly constructed of timber, with concrete?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised that the department repair the work by putting the concrete in the outer chambers of the cribs and building a concrete slope outside for the protection of the breakwater which would otherwise be carried away.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Do they build the crib wholly of concrete?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not wholly, but they built it so that it forms a concrete wall.

Mr. GANONG. I do not rise for the purpose of defending the Government in using these grants for election purposes or of justifying them in doing these works by day labour instead of by tender and contract. I have just this to say in regard to the maritime provinces that I think hon. gentlemen from the west do not appreciate the condition in which we are down there. In my own county there are numerous places that demand greater attention than they have had in the past. I regret that the hon. Minister of Public Works did not reach my county, but when he got through with the happy country across the Bay of Fundy, he took a direct line for Montreal, totally ignoring us. On my representation he kindly sent his engineer to my county who made a survey of a work that is greatly needed at Seal Cove, Grand Manan, where a deep water wharf is required by the fishermen to make direct connection with the boats of the West India Steamship Company. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), states that nothing appears in the Trade and Navigation Returns respecting these places along the coast. That is no evidence whatever. The Trade and Navigation Returns show that the maritime provinces do \$13,000,000 out of the \$22,783,000 of the fishing trade of Canada. There is also this to be

considered, that while there may not be any great population in those fishing villages, it is scattered along the shore and these breakwaters are the sole protection of the lives and property of the fishermen for fifteen or twenty miles. I know in my county of a breakwater which needs repairing, and I am glad to see that the hon. Minister of Public Works on my representations, intends to repair that work, which is the only protection there is for thousands of fishermen along the shore. This not a question of the number of inhabitants; it is a question of the protection of the lives of the fishermen for many miles. These breakwaters in the Maritime Provinces have been built to protect the lives and property of 40,000 or 50,000 people who are engaged in the fishing industry, and who have \$4,000,000 worth of property afloat. It is quite essential that these men, who are engaged in this work, which is the hardest work that could be undertaken in the whole country, should have adequate protection for their lives and property.

**M. SPROULE.** I do not object to a reasonable expenditure for the purpose of giving fishermen necessary facilities for carrying on their work, but when I compare the answer that is given to us when we apply for an expenditure of public money for that purpose in Ontario, with what takes place in the maritime provinces I think we have just ground for complaint. When I applied to the department for an expenditure of public money for such a purpose, I have always been told that the department cannot pretend to spend money for the purpose of making harbours for fishermen. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance, when Parliament votes money for such works, what assistance the people in the locality give? In Cow Bay for instance, upon which, I believe, \$200,000 will be expended—

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** \$200,000 has already been expended. All we contemplate, in regard to expenditure, is \$15,000.

**Mr. SPROULE.** How much has been contributed by the locality?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I do not think anything at all. The work was built originally by Archibald & Co., a big mining concern, and it was ultimately taken over by the late Government as a Government work for the protection of the harbour generally. It has been repaired by the Dominion Government and no municipal aid was given. Municipal aid is not usually given towards works of that character. I am sorry to hear my hon. friend say that there is any disposition to discriminate against Ontario. I can assure him that there is no idea of that kind present in the minds of the Government, and if there are cases in Ontario, where the fishermen require break-

**Mr. GANONG.**

waters, I think they ought to receive aid and encouragement the same as people in any other part of the Dominion.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I am only speaking of the experience I have had for some years. Whenever I applied to the Government for the purpose of having a work constructed of that kind that was the answer that I received from the department, and I take it that the same principle prevails now. Do I understand the hon. Minister to say that localities in the maritime provinces give no assistance towards the building of these wharfs?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I think that is correct.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Let me compare that with what takes place in the province of Ontario. There is not an important harbour in Ontario that has been improved towards which the municipality has not given aid over and over again. Take Collingwood, Meaford, Thornbury, Owen Sound, Wiarton, Port Elgin, Kincardine, and other places. There is not one of these municipalities but has contributed a very respectable share towards the improvement of their harbours. More than once these places have passed by-laws for \$10,000, \$15,000, \$20,000 and \$25,000, and these amounts have been supplemented by money belonging to the country. When we asked for such a public work in a town of perhaps ten thousand inhabitants in the province of Ontario, the Government say to us: What is the municipality going to do? All through Ontario the municipalities are assisting, but when you go to the maritime provinces, the whole expenditure comes out of the Dominion treasury, and so the people of Ontario have a good deal to complain of.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The hon. gentleman will find in the Estimates a number of expenditures in Ontario to which the people are not contributing, and I do not think they should contribute. The hon. gentleman cannot be referring to anything that has been said by the present Minister of Public Works. It is so manifestly unfair that he should have said that in Ontario they must contribute locally, when at the same time he is doing work in the lower provinces without any local contributions, that it is not at all probable the Minister ever said so.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Will the Minister point to any one such case in the province of Ontario?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) says that he knows of his own knowledge that in every one of these cases in Ontario the municipalities have contributed, I will accept his statement, but I think he is mistaken. In the province of Ontario in cases where even private companies were interested, although the Government did not own the works, the

Government contributed to them in the public interest. There is no provincialism in this matter, and there ought not to be. If a dollar has been corruptly or improperly spent in any part of the Dominion, we should investigate it and condemn it. I should be sorry to see this question considered as an Ontario question, or as a maritime province question. It is a question for the whole Dominion. Ontario is a great province, and we look to it as being liberal and generous, and if the people of Ontario understand the wants of the maritime provinces I believe they will vote whatever is fair and reasonable, just as the maritime provinces people are willing to contribute to necessary public works in the province of Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. The Government does not own these works in Ontario because the Government will not take them over from the municipalities, and although they are in the name of the municipality they are no more useful to the municipality than are these works in the maritime provinces. I am speaking of what I know, and I can tell the Minister that I remember when Collingwood voted \$15,000, Owen Sound, \$25,000; Midland, \$10,000, and Thornbury, \$10,000, for just such public works as these the Government are paying all the expenses for the maritime provinces. That has all taken place within the last twenty years. I asked for a return to see how much had been spent by the municipalities and how much by the Government, and I found in almost every instance the municipalities in Ontario have contributed a respectable share to the expenditure. Up to a couple of years ago, at all events, it was the practice to make the Ontario municipalities contribute. Now, that has not been the custom in the maritime provinces, and the only excuse the Minister now gives is that in the maritime provinces the Government own the docks. These docks are of no benefit to the Government in the world, but the Government keeps them up simply for the local needs of the trade. It is no argument to say that because the public works are in the name of Ontario municipalities, the municipalities in Ontario should be obliged to contribute a large share of the expenditure, while in the maritime provinces for the same purposes the municipalities contribute nothing, and the Government does the whole thing.

Mr. McDOUGALL. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is mistaken, and I am sorry the Minister of Finance is not better informed with regard to the large expenditures made by private individuals on wharfs in the maritime provinces.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) was referring to municipal contributions.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I can inform my hon. friend that Little Glace Bay harbour in my constituency was maintained for thirty

years by private expenditure, and at a cost of not less than \$200,000, without a one sixpence assistance from this Parliament or any other.

Mr. SPROULE. We have the same kind of docks in Ontario, but they are owned by private individuals.

Mr. McDOUGALL. This property was owned, or at least controlled, by private individuals, but the public had the benefit of it.

Mr. SPROULE. And they charged harbour dues to recoup themselves.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The harbour dues were controlled by the Government, but the top wharfage was controlled by the people who spent the money, which was quite right. A few miles from that is another harbour kept open for a number of years, in connection with the development of the Caledonia and another coal mine, and a large amount of private money, probably \$100,000, was spent in keeping that harbour open. I remember that in the county of Victoria on one occasion, I had to do with inducing the department to make a grant for the opening of a harbour at a fishing village, and the fishermen were obliged to contribute a large amount of work in helping to open that harbour. It is not generally done, but it has been done in a great many instances to my own knowledge. I wish to ask the Minister of Finance if he can tell me whether it is the intention of the Government to make provision for the repair of the wharf at Big Pond in the county of Cape Breton? The wharf has been injured, and I understand that the engineer of the department has made two or three visits within the last six or eight months to that place, with a view of repairing the old wharf or building a new one.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is one of the numerous things which we have had before us, and which we have not been able to deal with. We have not included it in our estimates, and whether it can be dealt with out of the general vote is a question for consideration.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It is too expensive a work to be provided for out of the general vote, I presume.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I see we have made no appropriation for it up to the present, and, therefore, we cannot do it out of any money in these Estimates.

Mr. McDOUGALL. We want the information as to what is the result of the survey.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no doubt that the wharf is in need of repair, but if we were to make an appropriation at every place immediately on a survey being made, I would have considerably

more difficulty putting through the Estimates even than I have.

**Mr. McDOUGALL.** Will the hon. gentleman give me the information on the supplementary Estimates?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I will.

**Mr. McDOUGALL.** When the engineer was sent there, twice at least within the last few months, I had good reason to infer that it was the intention of the department either to repair the old wharf or build a new one. There must be some definite information as to the result of his visits.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** No doubt, the information will show that the wharf needs repair, but unhappily a great many things require to be done, and they cannot all be done at once.

**Mr. McDOUGALL.** I would like some information with respect to the wharf asked for some years ago at the eastern end of Bras d'Or Lake, which was the terminus for many years of a line of steamers that ply on that lake, especially between Baddeck and eastern points. There are times when steamers that are on the lakes making connection with the railway at the Strait of Canso, cannot always make their way around to Sydney on account of stormy weather. In such cases they go to the extreme eastern end of the lake, at a point known as Little Bras d'Or, where a wharf was kept for a number of years, first by private individuals, and subsequently by a steamboat company. Since the building of the railway, the business of the steamboat company was not so profitable as to justify the expenditure necessary to keep up the wharf or build a new one, and consequently the place has been for three or four years without a wharf. Application was made to the late Government, and surveys were made, and I think we had very good reason to believe that it was the intention of the late Government to put a wharf there, looking on it as an important point within 3 miles of the town of North Sydney, and at the terminus of the route plied over by steamers which call at other points that were placed at an inconvenient location from the railway. By means of these lake steamers going that way, the people were brought closer to the railway at this point than by any other means. I was in hopes that my hon. friend, taking an interest in the patronage of those constituencies in the Island of Cape Breton not represented by members supporting the Administration, would have seen that this important point was not neglected, when such ample provision was made for works of a similar character elsewhere, and possibly not of such great necessity. I would be glad, if my hon. friend would give me information on this point, when the supplementaries are being discussed. I find an item in the Estimates for

**Mr. FIELDING.**

a wharf at Iona, in the county of Victoria, and, although I have not to do with the representation of that constituency, I still feel an interest in obtaining some knowledge as to the intentions of the Government with regard to the maintenance or building of a wharf at that point. It is in my immediate neighbourhood, where I have business relations with the people interested in that wharf, and I would like to ascertain what the plans of the department are with regard to the rebuilding of it. Is it the intention of the department to repair the present wharf, or to build a wharf at another point which has been recommended by some people, and which, I understand, was examined by the engineer of the department within the last year?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The matter is not yet decided. Either the present wharf will be reconstructed, or a new wharf built on another location which is outside the Grand Narrows bridge. The Minister of Public Works has not decided as to which is the best policy.

**Mr. McDOUGALL.** Having spent my life in that locality, I know something about how that particular point is affected by the different winds, and so on. I cannot too strongly urge upon my hon. friend to ascertain from some people more competent to judge, as to the dangers that attend shipping coming to a point such as that, where there is a very strong current and a bridge in the way, with wind on the shore. There is considerable danger attending shipping coming to that point where it is proposed to put the new wharf. The point where the present wharf is situated is not as satisfactory a place as people would like, but it is the best locality that can be selected. There is greater shelter there for shipping coming from all directions. The other place is at a point of the beach where a 4-knot current is quite common, and within a few hundred feet of the bridge. My hon. friend will understand the danger to shipping of attempting to come to a wharf put at such a place. The danger must necessarily be very great. There are times when, without the danger caused by the current at all, there is danger with easterly winds and a high sea that washes over that bridge to a height of some 15 feet, and my hon. friend will understand that a wharf, under conditions of that kind, could not be used. The location of the old wharf is about the best place that could be selected. It is not as satisfactory as people would like, but it will be more satisfactory than to extend the new wharf into the lake at a very exposed point. If the intention of the department is to build a wharf on piles, that will not cost as much as to build a wharf of cribwork. And if it is to be built of creosote piles, sufficient shelter and room can be had in the place where the old structure was. So far as I

am concerned, I wish to see the wharf placed where it will be of the best service to the public, and if my hon. friend will be good enough to take the warning, I would advise him to take the opinion of mariners, rather than that of people who use the wharf from the land. It is immaterial to the latter where they get their landing, but it is of great importance to mariners where they bring their vessels, and the location of the old wharf is the only place where landing can be made with safety.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. Minister tells us that he does not know whether the Government intend to put up a new wharf or repair the old one. I always understood that it was the duty of the Minister to submit definite plans, or specifications, or estimates of the work proposed before asking the House to vote money. Because it is only by that means they can intelligently vote money. In this case the idea seems to be to vote the money first, and afterwards find out what is to be done with it.

Mr. BERGERON. There is the election to be considered.

Mr. SPROULE. There is enough to make us regard it in that light if we cannot get more information than the Minister has given us.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) has shown the difficulties. There are peculiar circumstances owing to the currents and the winds in that locality which raises a doubt as to which is the proper course to be pursued. What the hon. member for Cape Breton says may be correct, and the old wharf may be the better place. One or the other plan will be adopted.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not be better to settle that before asking for the money?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It would be better to do a great many things that we do not do. We do not expect perfection in government, but only a reasonable approximation to it.

Mr. SPROULE. This is departing wholly from the old correct and established principle. The usual course and the reasonable course is for the Minister to have a definite plan and an estimate of the cost of carrying out that plan. Without that, the House is not justified in voting the money. The hon. gentleman should send his engineers, and after he gets his information, decide whether he will build the new wharf or renew the old one, and then come and ask for the vote.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) and I differ slightly as to the proper course to be taken. In this case the sum asked is a sufficient vote to build the wharf. It may be more in

the interest of the people to renew the old wharf; but with the knowledge that one or the other must be done, I see no reason to delay the appropriation.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Has the hon. Minister an estimate of the cost of building the wharf as proposed at the new place?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the estimate is \$5,500.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman cannot build a wharf there that would be worth much for \$5,500.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The engineers advise me that it can be done.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Has the hon. gentleman taken into consideration the cost of providing railway connection?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the engineers say that they have considered that.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What length is it proposed to be?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is to be 250 feet long.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That is not a wharf that would be of much value to the people. In my judgment, it should be more like 500 or 600 feet, unless built direct into swift current.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In that case, we shall have to come back for more money.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That is just what I assure my hon. friend—that if he undertakes to build the wharf there he will not get one that will be worth anything to the people under \$15,000, including the railway connections. One of the reasons given for putting the wharf at this place is to run a railway track upon it and have the cars discharge into these steamers. The railway roadbed must be extended for a distance of at least 200 feet, and the track put on that and then continued on the wharf. More than that, the wharf cannot be built as high as it was necessary to have that railway track to be of service. All these difficulties will stand in the way of my hon. friend if he undertakes to put a wharf at that point. Then, he has to secure the land. At the present site the Government have the land; they have it at a point where it is not necessary to spend a single dollar in making a roadway. All that is required to be done is to go about 150 feet, which will give ample wharf room and plenty of water, possibly twenty or twenty-two feet.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We shall have to look into these things.

Mr. McDOUGALL. While I am on my feet, I would ask what is to be done regarding Englishtown wharf, and what is

to be done also with the \$19,500 for Ingonish North Bay ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Ingonish was up before the hon. gentleman came into the House. With regard to that, the plans are being prepared. No work has yet been done. As to Englishtown, tenders have been invited; the advertisement is now appearing in the newspapers.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If nothing is prepared with regard to Ingonish, how can the hon. gentleman ask for a vote ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Plans are not prepared, but we have an estimate.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the nature of the work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a breakwater such as many others along our coast. This is a scattered fishing population, with a large number of boats. The vote covers the construction of a breakwater at Ingonish North Bay, including the purchase of the land. The structure will be 430 feet from high water mark, with an L of 100 feet in length, and twenty-four feet wide on the top, affording eleven feet of water at low water. It will be constructed of creosoted timber. The estimated cost \$21,500.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is this near the place where a large expenditure was made for the breakwater many years ago ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it for the purpose of building a protection to the beach which was broken into some four or five years ago and some works and buildings carried away ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the breakwater at North Ingonish, and the hon. gentleman refers, I think, to another work.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Then there was no money spent previously in this locality ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not on this work, so far as I know, it is absolutely a new work. Tenders are called for on the Ingonish work concerning which the hon. gentleman asked a question.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that he is providing \$19,500 for a work for which the plans are not prepared ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The plans are now being prepared. The specifications are in the hands of the printer.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the Minister propose to do this work by contract or by day labour ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it will probably be done by contract. The

Mr. McDOUGALL.

other work referred to a moment ago was already advertised, and if I had to do it at once, I would issue tenders. The matter may remain until the Minister returns, and I do not want to speak for him.

Mr. KAULBACH. The Minister of Finance kindly expressed himself a few moments ago as desirous of meeting the wishes of all the people along the coast where repairs were needed and new works required. I would ask him if he has favourably considered an application that was made for repairs to the breakwater at Petite Rivière. It is an old structure, and for the want of repairs which were applied for three years ago or more, it has suffered considerably from the action of the sea. The application has been renewed since, even so late as a few months ago. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman intends to give anything to repair that work the present year? It is really very necessary, for the reason that every storm is injuring the temporary work more and more, and unless something is done very shortly all the money that has been expended in the past will be utterly useless. I think it is a matter that should receive the serious attention of the Government. I cannot complain that I have been very badly treated in my county. True, there is an amount given to the Tancook breakwater which is very necessary, but I say the Petite Rivière breakwater is equally necessary. I asked for a breakwater at Mill Cove, St. Margaret's Bay near the county of Halifax in my county, both of which are necessary. The fishermen of Mill Cove are on a very long stretch of shore, and are subject to serious loss in case of a north-east gale; they having no harbour in which they can run their boats for safety. I have asked for that work for some time past and have repeatedly appealed to the Government the past few years, but without any favourable result. I am glad to see that the hon. Minister has placed in the Estimates a sum for work near my town of which he was made aware last autumn as much needed, that is the Sawpit wharf, and Young's Landing. Both those are necessary. I am glad he has yielded to my appeal, but as to whether the amount is going to be sufficient to meet the needs of the two last named works, I am not prepared to say. I think, however, a larger amount would be necessary in order to make it such a work as will satisfy the needs of the public.

Mr. CLANCY. I think any person who has listened attentively to this discussion must be convinced that if Nova Scotia absolutely requires the whole expenditure that is contemplated, the size of the amounts would not be a reason to reject one dollar if the expenditures were meritorious. I do not think any member on this side has made any attempt at drawing sectional lines. But I am sure the Minister himself must have concluded long ago that in some places

where new charges are created and in other places where old charges are continued, good sense would suggest that they should be dropped. Now, I fancy there are hundreds of harbours in the province of Nova Scotia that are being kept up to-day for every one of which some excuse may be offered. But that is not enough. It is a growing charge upon the treasury of Canada, and unless they are of sufficient importance they should be dropped. It is not enough that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House urged that certain public works ought to be continued because they are important. I have no doubt there are many important works in that province. I admit the province is peculiarly situated, there are large fishing interests there that must be protected. But when you have admitted all that, is it not true that many of these places are being kept up that are going into decay, much like the work suggested by the hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Lang). He admitted there was no need there. I ask the hon. gentleman why he spends a dollar there? Why does he spend a dollar in similar cases in the maritime provinces? I have been looking over the Estimates of this year and last year, and I have discovered no less than 110 such works, some of them of a trivial character, yet they are kept up year after year. The evil is one that my hon. friend must see, especially when we are approaching another election is a growing one. I would like to point out to my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell) some estimates that have been put in, in the past that have all the significance of an election. Take the River Sydenham, for which \$5,000 was voted three years ago, and of which \$1,600 has been expended. The whole of last season has passed over and we have reached this present time, and that work is not done. Why? Simply because hon. gentlemen are keeping it for an election, and it looks as if some of these harbours in the province of Nova Scotia are being kept open in view of an election.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Why did not your friends do it in the last eighteen years?

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend said that if his friends got into power it would be done. Now, why is it not done? Why is the dredge taken away from there? The work so far in the River Sydenham is of no practical advantage whatever. I believe my hon. friend got \$2,000 for the improvement of a little creek. Why was not that money expended? Is he holding it for an election? There is a revote this year. My hon. friend is waiting. I say, and holding it until an election comes on, and so this money is hung up.

I shall take occasion later on to inquire whether it is the intention of the Government to expend the money this year, and if it is not, I think it is the duty of the committee to

refuse to vote this money that is to be hung up and waved before the people, here and there, so that hon. gentlemen can hold out expenditures to the country which are promised in the Estimates, and do the work when it suits them in order to carry constituencies. That is nothing short of a system of bribery. I am not going to prolong the discussion. It could not be expected that the hon. Minister of Finance would be as well informed in regard to these Estimates as the hon. Minister of Public Works himself, but the hon. gentleman has undertaken the burden for the hon. Minister of Public Works upon himself, and my hon. friend will not be surprised if we should be just to ourselves and just to the country and demand the most explicit information in regard to every item that the hon. gentleman is asking this House to vote. I think that would not be an unfair proposition, and that this House would be lacking in its duty if it did not insist upon getting that information from the hon. Minister. We cannot expect that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will trouble themselves very much about how the money is expended. They learned long ago that it is not part of their duty to inquire into expenditures. Without knowing anything about the harbours of Nova Scotia, I have no hesitation in saying that, while there are many expenditures that are meritorious, there are many that might, in the public interest, be dropped.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the nature of this work at Ingonish?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is cribwork.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the length of the work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. 430 feet from high water, with an L 100 feet in length and 24 feet wide on top.

Mr. SPROULE. What will be the depth of this cribwork?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Eleven feet at low water. About half the length will be 11 feet in depth.

Mr. SPROULE. And the other a little deeper. Is this to complete the work or only to do a portion of it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. \$21,500 will complete the work.

Mr. SPROULE. Including this \$19,500?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, that will cover the whole of it.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance what method or principle is adopted in the department respecting works that are done by day labour, or by the department itself? Does the department ascertain from contractors what they would do the work for, in order that it may estimate what is the probable cost

of the work and find out if it can be done more economically by day labour? The plan adopted in other departments and municipalities is that, when they ask for tenders, the departments themselves put in a tender, and if the departmental tender is found to be lower than the tender of any contractor, the departments get the materials and do the work themselves. I am in favour of doing these works by day labour if it is found that they can be done as efficiently and as economically as under contract.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It sometimes happens that tenders are invited and the prices found to be above what the engineers of the department think is fair and reasonable. In that case the department undertakes the work by day labour. In other cases the work may be done cheaper by tender and contract. There are some works which, by their nature, can be done better by day labour, and in that case the report of the engineer is had as to what is the fair value of the work. The department has the advantage of having divisional engineers all over the country familiar with the works, who are able to give the department estimates and reports in every case.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the department ask for tenders for all these works, and if it is found that the tenders are in excess of the appropriation, does the department then do the work by day labour?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That occurs in some cases. In some cases they do not ask for tenders, but a large number of works is done by public tender and contract.

Mr. CLARKE. Take the course of this work at Ingonish. Plans and specifications have been prepared. The department knows exactly what the character of the work is, the dimensions and everything in connection with it. Is it proposed to invite public tenders for that work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, it is the intention of the hon. Minister of Public Works that that shall be done.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the item that was declared to be passed include the whole vote?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have been roaming over the whole of it.

Mr. CLANCY. While there was a general range of discussion, I presume that only the items down to that for Cow Bay, have been passed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If that were the case I would have been able, half a dozen of times, to take exception to the debate. One hon. gentleman said that it would be more convenient to discuss these items without being confined to a particular one, and the debate has roamed over the whole of them. If there is any item upon which addi-

Mr. CLARKE.

tional information is wanted, I will be glad to furnish it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I find that \$400 was voted for Cribbin's Point last year. How much was expended last year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Up to the 31st of December, 1898, \$390.14 was expended in completing the creosoted piling, in re-ballasting the balance of the empty face chambers, and in the removal of a quantity of gravel which had been thrown up by the sea on the covering at the inner end of the wharf.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What work is proposed to be done with the \$300?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is to make good the damage done to Cribbin's Point wharf during the disastrous gale of the 27th November, 1898. That in the supplementary Estimates is for the extension of the same wharf.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What is the nature of the boat harbour at the Eastern Passage requiring an expenditure of \$2,000?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is intended to afford the fishermen of the locality increased facilities. It is a new undertaking at the eastern side of the entrance to Halifax.

Mr. SPROULE. Will \$2,000 complete the work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. McDOUGALL. How much was expended on East Ragged Island wharf up to the present?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The work is in progress, and \$2,500 is the cost. It is under contract.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What has been done to Judique wharf?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is under contract, and it is approaching completion. This \$5,000 will complete it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What is this vote of \$3,000 for Livingstone Cove wharf?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is for the completion of Livingstone Cove breakwater. It is to cost \$6,000, and we have expended \$3,000.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it built of creosote or is it built of ordinary timber?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is built of native timber, and by day's labour.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I thought the department had long ago given up the construction of these works with ordinary timber, as it is in danger of getting worm-eaten.

Mr. McISAAC. On the north side of Cape George, in Nova Scotia, they use native timber, because there are no worms there.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I cannot see how there can be any difference.

Mr. McISAAC. All the reports show that at the north side of Cape George ordinary native timber can be used, and it has been used for thirty years, and has never been interfered with by worms. It is very strange, but it is a fact nevertheless.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There is a revote of \$4,000 for New Harbour. How is it that the money has not been expended before now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Public Works stated last year that it was his intention to make a personal visit, but I believe he was not able to reach that place, and perhaps the vote was not considered large enough.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But this whole \$4,000 is a revote.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) knows that it is utterly impossible to do all these works at one time.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Then, what is the use of keeping that exact sum in the Estimates year after year, experience having shown that the amount is not sufficient for the work? It is simply dangling that before the eyes of the people.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) regarded the cost of the work as somewhat high, and he deferred the matter until he could make a special visit to the place. He mentioned that specially to the House last year. The hon. Minister (Mr. Tarte) probably did not realize the extent of the maritime provinces, and he thought he could reach all these places in one year.

Mr. CLANCY. My recollection is, that the Minister of Public Works was unable to locate this place last year, and I doubt if the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) knew where it was, although it was in his own county. I am not surprised to know that the Minister has not yet found out where it is. Before we vote this item, which is enlarging and aggravating the admitted evil of the Government hunting up harbours to spend money on, we should inquire more about it. The Minister of Public Works, as the Finance Minister admits, has been unable to locate this place or visit it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say anything of the sort.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, what did the hon. gentleman say? I am either very dull, or the Finance Minister was not quite so clear as usual.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) is not very dull, but I think he is making a mistake in criticising

items with reference to the maritime provinces of which he can possibly have no knowledge whatever. The hon. gentleman might infer that the gentlemen interested in the maritime provinces would know something about these votes generally. I protest against his statement that this is an extension of an admitted evil. There is no evil, unless it can be shown that these moneys are improperly spent, for they are legitimate expenditures, and it is not fair for the hon. member (Mr. Clancy) to treat them as evils. He has heard from gentlemen on his own side of the House to-night that, far from regarding these expenditures as extravagant, there is great need for larger expenditure. The Minister (Mr. Tarte) has not been able to visit the place, but he asks the item to be revoted, in the hope that he will be able to visit it and decide later.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose I am somewhat indebted to the Minister for that lecture.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) deserved it.

Mr. CLANCY. I want to say to the hon. gentleman that if I were well informed about those works in Nova Scotia, I would be in a better position than the hon. gentleman himself. I desire him to tell us precisely the character of the work and what it will cost. I imagine it was rather gratuitous on the part of the hon. gentleman to suggest that because we happen to live in the province of Ontario, we should keep our mouths closed and pass in silence any votes the hon. gentleman may choose to submit. I have this to say to him, that since he has taken the place of the Minister of Public Works he ought to be able to make it perfectly clear how much any particular work, for which he asked us to vote an expenditure, is going to cost and what the character of that work is. If he cannot do that, he should hesitate before giving these little lectures at which he is such an adept. Such lectures are not a very good answer, and this committee requires something better in reply to their legitimate demands for information than these little displays of cheap intellectual fireworks. Let the hon. gentleman stop this little war of words and become good-natured, and give us the explanations we require.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have been consistently good natured throughout, but hon. gentlemen will persist in treating all these Nova Scotia items as excessive and extravagant.

Mr. CLANCY. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not say that any hon. gentleman opposite is bound to hold his tongue when expenditures in any province to which he does not belong

are under consideration, but the whole spirit of the remarks regarding the items of expenditure in Nova Scotia is unfair and ungenerous, and not warranted by the facts. I have given all the information I have about New Harbour, and if the hon. gentleman wants any more, and if I can get it from the department, I will give it to him.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the expected cost? This vote was discussed last year at considerable length, and while there might have been some excuse last year for not being able to explain it fully, there can be none this. What is the object of the work? Has the hon. gentleman any estimate before him?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not able to give very much more than what I have given. It is a breakwater designed for the protection of the fishing interests in that neighbourhood. It is likely to cost more than the Minister of Public Works believed it would, and therefore it is not intended to take further action beyond asking a revote until he can make further investigation.

Mr. CLANCY. Has there been an estimate made of the work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the engineer's estimate was \$27,550.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the character of the work according to that estimate?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To provide towards the formation of a boat harbour for fishing boats at the mouth of the St. Catharines River by constructing two piers of pile and brush and stonework converging at an angle of about 20 degrees towards the open Atlantic, to a southerly direction, so as to form a wave trap and dredging a channel four feet wide leading to the mooring-ground in the estuary resorted to by boats in stormy weather for a length of 1,200 feet to six feet depth at high water, ordinary spring tides. The east pier is to be 750 feet long, 25 feet wide for the inner 350 feet, and 30 feet for the outer 400 feet, and to have a wing 60 x 30 feet turned to the eastward at its outer end, the west pier to be 580 feet long, 25 feet wide for the inner, 200 feet and 35 feet wide for the outer 380 feet, so that both piers will extend to three feet depth at low water, spring tides. The detailed estimates of the proposed work amount to \$27,550.

Mr. OSLER. I think the explanation we have heard from the Finance Minister is a very startling one. Last year an amount of \$4,000 was put in the Estimates for work to be done. No one knew where and no one knew the cost. This has been discussed this evening at considerable length and the Finance Minister was rather indignant that he should have been pressed to give further explanations.

Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not at all, I was quite willing.

Mr. OSLER. Well, it is only just now that the explanation has been given.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The question has only been asked.

Mr. OSLER. Here is a \$4,000 item put in the Estimates, and the hon. Minister explained that this appropriation was perhaps a little under what the work would cost.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that.

Mr. OSLER. I submit, with all due deference, that the only inference we could draw was that when the appropriation was \$4,000 it was a little doubtful what the work would cost, but it might cost something more and probably would.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not what I said but the hon. gentleman can draw his own inference.

Mr. OSLER. That is the inference I draw. Now, we have the admission of the Finance Minister that he had before him all the time the estimate of his engineer, showing that this work was going to cost \$27,000. To my mind, it is simply playing upon the public to bring in this item of \$4,000 for a wharf, which last year the Minister of Public Works did not know where it was, could not locate it. This year we have a revote of \$4,000 to begin the work—the New Harbour breakwater. The natural business inference would be that that amount of \$4,000 would probably be the cost. But now we have the statement that all this time the Minister of Finance had before him the figures from his engineer, stating that this work is going to cost \$27,000. He proposes to get authority to spend \$4,000, and proposes to commit the country, by this vote, to an expenditure of \$27,000 without telling the House what the work was going to cost. That is neither proper nor defensible.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Strike it out.

Mr. OSLER. I will vote to strike it out if you will, or if you will bring in a proper estimate and say that the work is worth \$27,000, that it is going to serve its purpose, that the wharf will be worth that expenditure, I will vote for it; but to submit a vote of \$4,000, and ask us to pass that now, and then, during the next year or the year following as it may happen, when an election comes near, go on with this expenditure on the ground that Parliament had authorized the work, is a course that cannot be defended. And if there are other items in this long list of Nova Scotia wharfs in the same position, the Government are so thoroughly to blame that there is not a man on the back benches who will dare stand up and defend them. To lead this House

to suppose that the expenditure on this work will be \$4,000, when the engineer's estimate is \$27,000, is an outrage on the country, on common sense and common honesty.

Mr. COCHRANE. It seems to me that the Minister is not treating the committee fairly when he says that we do not ask for the information. I was a member of this House long before the Minister of Finance entered it, and I want to tell him when the Conservative party was in power, the committee was never treated as he is treating us to-night. When a Minister of the late Government came down with an appropriation for works, he brought estimates, plans and specifications and told the committee what he proposed to do. But if we criticize the Minister the Minister treats us in a rather insulting manner. He tells us that he gives us the information we ask for. I want to tell him that it is his duty, as the servant of the people, when he asks for a new appropriation instead of letting us drag the information out of him—and it seems generally to take a yoke of oxen almost to get any information from these Ministers—to state the nature of the work and how he proposes to spend the money. Did I understand the hon. gentleman aright that there was to be a depth of water got by dredging of 6 feet?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE: Yes, that is the engineer's estimate.

Mr. COCHRANE. Now, does it strike the Minister of Finance as absurd to have an expenditure of \$27,000 to get a harbour that would have a depth of 6 feet. I remember this debate distinctly when it came up last session. The Minister of Public Works could not even tell us where this breakwater was going to be put. They have located it since, and we have forced the Minister to give us some information. And we find that we are to have a harbour which, I suppose, he will say is for the benefit of the people of Canada as a whole, and this expenditure of \$27,000 upon it is going to give us a harbour with 6 feet of water.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). If my memory does not play me a trick, I remember when this matter came up and the Minister of Public Works was asked for an explanation as to where it was proposed to make this outlay and as to the peculiarities of the harbour.

And while the discussion was going on the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) who was advised of the discussion came in and gave a very full, and it seemed to me, a very satisfactory explanation of the subject. He explained to the House what, at all events, impressed my mind favourably—that this harbour was intended to be equipped for the accommodation of the very large fishing fleet of small vessels pro-

secuting their business on the coast. Like all coasts this is subject to severe storms and it was absolutely necessary for the safety of the fishermen that a harbour should be provided. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) says that it is absurd to have a harbour with only 6 feet of water—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is only for a channel leading to the moorings.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Six feet, at certain parts of the harbour, I can well imagine might suffice for the boats that are going to put in there in case of stress of weather, and I cannot think it fair to call the whole thing a sham because the dredging is to secure a depth of six feet. The hon. member for Guysborough gave a very full explanation of the case.

Mr. COCHRANE. The hon. member for Guysborough is not responsible for the expenditure. And I think it is humiliating to admit that a member knows more about the matter than the Minister who has undertaken the job.

Mr. OSLER. In looking over those 34 items, I find that 15 or 16 of them are designated in practically the same way as the item under consideration. Are there any of them in which the vote is merely a preliminary for further expenditures. In my ignorance I have been reading these items as though these figures covered the whole estimated expenditure.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that in most cases it will be found that the sum estimated covers the work, but it will be impossible to give the hon. gentleman assurance that in every case the money will be found sufficient. It is no uncommon occurrence for votes to be given year after year for the same service. I think that no item stands in exactly the same position as this. I have already stated that owing to the estimates made by the engineers the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) decided not to proceed with the work without further inquiry, but asked to have this sum re-voted. Now, as to dredging the harbour to a depth of 6 feet, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) heard me aright and wished to be fair he would have known that the dredging for 6 feet was only in the channel leading to the harbour, but it does not imply that there is only six feet generally.

Mr. CLARKE. Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) give us some information with regard to Port Hillford breakwater, for which \$8,000 is asked?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The estimated cost of the work is \$8,000, and tenders have been called for.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) This question of New Harbour was up last ses-

sion and was discussed. The Minister knew little about it. The member for the county made the case as good as he could. We now find that this vote of \$4,000 is the beginning of an expenditure of \$27,000, and the amount of the estimate prepared by the department is only going to give us a little boat channel of six feet and a half of water. I say it is ridiculous to expend such an amount of money in a portion of the province of Nova Scotia which is more indented with harbours than any other part of this Dominion. They should expend \$27,000, \$50,000 or \$100,000 on the rock-bound shores of the island of Cape Breton, either on the west or on the east coast; why they should expend so large a sum in the county of Guysborough already indented by harbours from one end to the other is beyond my comprehension.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the Minister propose to spend that money by contract or by day's work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman the manner in which this money will be spent. Until the Minister of Public Works returns, none of it will be spent. The desire of the Minister was to make further inquiry before approving the report of the engineers, which he thought was excessive. My impression is that the cost of the work is so large that I doubt if the Minister will proceed with it on the present plans.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be much better for the hon. gentleman not to put such an item in the Estimates at all if he is unable to give the House no more information with regard to it than he has given us. To commence with \$4,000 to do a \$27,000 job seems to me very poor business. In the first place he puts it at a sum so small that he need not call for tenders. Therefore, it is frittering away money without getting a proper return. But the Minister cannot say whether the work will be undertaken at all. We have already voted it once, and it has stood on the books for over a year. In my judgment the House should not be asked to vote any such item.

Mr. CLANCY. I would ask the Minister of Finance whether he thinks that this committee ought to vote money to place in the hands of the Minister of Public Works to decide hereafter whether he will use it or not. He may expend it or not, as he thinks proper. This House should have definite knowledge that the Minister of Public Works deems this an important work; so far he does not deem it so. If we vote this \$4,000 now, it will commit this country to the expenditure of \$27,000. I ask the hon. gentleman if he proposes to proceed in this House with estimates of that kind? I think the hon. gentleman should drop that item.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Do you want yours dropped?

Mr. CLANCY. I have not asked for any. I say I wanted the Public Works Department to go on last year, and I want them to go on this year. It is a work of utility that can be defended on every ground. I would like similar information in regard to this New Harbour. It is well named New Harbour, because it is a new state of things, and one which the Minister of Finance finds it difficult to defend, with all his ingenuity, and although he is usually so able to make out a good defence. I think the hon. gentleman would do himself credit to drop that item rather than ask this committee to vote \$4,000 and thereby commit the country to an expenditure of \$27,000 for a work that the Minister of Public Works declared to this House a year ago, and which the Minister of Finance reiterates to-day, is not a work for which any need can be shown to exist.

Mr. McCLURE. This work may be new to the hon. gentleman, but it cannot be new to all the members of this House, because there was a full explanation given of it last year. Not only that, but it is a matter that was inquired into by the late Government. After a petition had come from the community largely signed asking for the building of this work, the late Government sent an engineer who made a full examination and reported. That full information is in the department, and it was explained to the House last year as will be in the recollection of members here, that it provides a harbour of refuge on a coast where there is no harbour for a long distance. The people up that river are obliged many times to take refuge far away from home, and this work is intended to provide for them a refuge nearer home. This information was all given last year very fully, and I recollect distinctly that so full and complete was the information, that when it was given hon. gentlemen opposite allowed the vote to go through immediately. Now why should we fight it over again? If this sectional kind of discussion is going on and if hon. gentlemen are going to oppose the item simply because people cannot tell the exact latitude or the exact longitude of the coast where the work is situated then it will be in order for somebody to inquire why the Government expends \$50,000 or \$75,000 to straighten some little creek up in Toronto which the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) himself knows nothing about, and concerning which he has taken no pains to inform himself.

Mr. OSLER. The hon. member says that there has been \$70,000 voted for straightening a creek in Toronto, I am not aware of it. I am not objecting personally to the expenditure of this money, and there is no one in this House who has ever found me objecting to a proper expenditure of money.

Mr. GIBSON. What are you objecting to?

Mr. OSLER. I am objecting to the Government bringing forward here an item of \$4,000 which purports to be the whole cost of the work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it does not. My hon. friend is mistaken. That is not the rule.

Mr. OSLER. It is most unfair if every item in the list is open to criticism in the same manner as this. I do not object to an expenditure estimated at \$4,000, costing \$5,000 or \$6,000, because it is impossible, in works of this kind, to come within one or two thousand dollars of the actual amount. But what I do object to is to have the bald statement that \$4,000 is to be taken as full cost for a new breakwater. When this came up last year, the hon. Minister of Public Works gave an answer, so far as an answer was elicited, showing, according to my recollection, that he knew absolutely nothing about it. It was promised that he would find out what the work entailed. All he knew was that, somewhere on the coast something was necessary. I appeal to my hon. friends opposite whether it is fair, or honest, or businesslike, to bring in an item of \$4,000 when the Government have in their possession an estimate which is seven times the amount they ask for here. The Government are asking for a vote that is merely an instalment of what will be required, and the hon. Minister's explanation is that he knows nothing about it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I never said that I knew nothing about it. I have a memorandum here giving all the information that the hon. gentleman wants.

Mr. OSLER. I admit that, at the last moment, the hon. gentleman told us that he had in his possession information which should have been given to this committee before it was asked to vote one dollar.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. OSLER. In an ordinary business transaction when discussing an estimate of expenditure, if I say I want \$4,000 to build a breakwater, and conceal the fact that that breakwater is going to cost \$27,000, I am not acting fairly or honestly with the man whom I am asking to join me in spending that money. If this is a proper place to build a harbour, I will vote \$27,000 or \$50,000 for that harbour. But I appeal to hon. members, on the other side of the House, if it is fair to ask the hon. members of this committee to vote \$4,000, presumably to build a wharf which, according to the information in the possession of the Government will cost \$27,000 at least. There will be no money expended on that harbour this year. I do not think there is the slightest question that the Government do not intend to spend any

money there this year. I think it would be fair and proper to strike out the item and come next year and ask for a full appropriation towards the completion of that work if necessary. From what I have gathered from the discussion of this item it makes me suspicious that every item on the list is open to similar criticism. I cannot conceive that this one item is the only item that has been treated in this way by the Government. My own feeling is that the Government are not treating the committee fairly when they bring in an estimate in the bald manner in which they have brought this in, absolutely deceiving the committee and seeking to submit the country to an expenditure seven times more than the amount that is asked for.

Mr. FLINT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) seems to be displaying a great deal of Brummagen indignation over a state of things which has always existed in this House. This is precisely the way items have always been placed in the Estimates, and hundreds and thousands of dollars have been expended where only a portion of the money has been asked for from year to year. If time permitted I would point to dozens of cases in which votes have been taken in that way. In the harbour of Toronto, the city which the hon. gentleman represents, large expenditures have been made, although only portions of the money were placed in the Estimates each year. I consider that the hon. gentleman is simply assuming before the committee an indignation that he does not feel, because, no hon. gentleman, who has listened to the conversation in the committee in regard to that new harbour, and who was present last year when the fullest explanations were offered, can pretend that he was not aware that a larger sum than \$4,000 was to be expended. It was well known that this was only a portion of the contemplated expenditure, as the hon. Minister of Finance has pointed out. I think it is taking up the time of the committee to no purpose.

Mr. McDUGALL. I think it is quite evident that it is not the intention of the Government to spend any money on this work during this present year. The hon. Minister of Finance has told us that, according to the estimate of the engineer, it will require \$27,000 to complete that work and make it satisfactory to the people. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals told us that it was proposed to make a channel six feet deep for the accommodation of fishing vessels. I can understand my hon. friend, if he is referring to open boats, but anything other than open boats could not use a channel affording only six feet of water. My hon. friend must know that in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, no fishing craft larger than a common open boat is used to any extent of a less tonnage than about twenty tons, and a twenty-

ton craft will require about six feet of water. Four thousand dollars was provided in the estimates last year and the experience of the department is sufficient to enable them to know whether \$4,000 could be used or not. We have the right to come to the conclusion that \$4,000 could not be utilized for the purpose that is intended, and yet they are continuing that vote of \$4,000 for another year. There is only one object, and it is to deceive the people interested in that harbour. Four thousand dollars is about one-seventh of the estimated cost of the work, and it is only sufficient, according to the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, to give these fishermen one foot of water. They are told to wait until Parliament gives them \$4,000 more and they may have another foot of water. If nothing can be done with this money Parliament should add \$4,000 or \$8,000 to the vote so that progress can be made with the work, because putting this amount of money in the Estimates is only trifling with the intelligence of these people. We have no information to justify us in coming to any other conclusion.

The intention is to deceive the people who are interested in the expenditure of this money. It is worse than absurd to attempt to make such an explanation as to why \$4,000 are kept in the Estimates for a work for which \$27,000 is required, in view of the statement of the Minister of Railways that this vast expenditure will only provide 6 feet of water. This \$4,000 is evidently kept in the Estimates to keep the people quiet for the time being, and without the Government intending to spend a single dollar on the work. Why did not the Government put in at least double the amount, as they have done with regard to other works? I am in favour of expending money to afford harbours for the fishermen who are engaged on our coasts. They are entitled to every protection this Parliament can give. They are pursuing a dangerous employment, and the Government are only making their difficulties greater when they deceive them by putting amounts in the Estimates, when they have no intention of spending this money. Let the Government drop this item altogether, or else provide sufficient to carry on a larger portion of this work than \$4,000 will provide.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was understood that we should take all these items together, and they have been so discussed, and I am not aware that any question asked to-night has not been fully answered. The hon. gentleman from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) assumes that it is a monstrous proposition to keep an item standing in the Estimates which only covers a portion of the work. On the contrary, I think it is a very sensible procedure. The Minister found that the estimate by his engineers was very large, and it was the most natural

Mr. McDOUGALL.

thing in the world for him to say: I will not go on with the work on the basis of that expenditure, but I will try and devise some plan that will be less expensive. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) says that we are deceiving the people, and that the item should be struck out, but if he will go down to New Harbour, I do not think the fishermen there will agree with him. On the contrary, he will find they are glad to have the vote in the Estimates, as an evidence of the desire of Parliament to carry on the work. If this is found to cost \$27,000, the Minister will hold the matter over for inquiry, and try and devise some other plan, with the assistance of his engineer, which will cost less money, and which will meet the wishes of the people. Of course, it is only burlesque to say that no one knows where this harbour is. It is a place for boat fishermen, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) knows that there are thousands of fishermen in the lower provinces who earn their living in boats which do not draw 6 feet of water.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But these boats are not called "vessels," as the Minister of Railways called them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, "vessels" is a very broad term.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It is a misleading one.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This work is intended for the accommodation of boat fishermen, and at New Harbour there are thirty smacks, manned by 75 men, while there are a dozen smaller smacks engaged in the lobster fishery.

Mr. McDOUGALL. These are open boats.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And the hon. gentleman knows, a large portion of the fishing industry of the maritime provinces is carried on in small boats, and we believe that the lives of men working in small boats have to be protected. Although \$27,000 is larger than I should wish to see spent for this purpose, I am not prepared to say that under no conditions should a break-water be constructed there, even at a cost of \$27,000. It is a larger expenditure than I contemplated for the work, and I entirely agree with the Minister of Public Works, that this vote should be kept standing until he has an opportunity of consulting with his engineers to see if they cannot reach the same end for a more moderate expenditure.

Mr. GIBSON. I am in the judgment of the House, when I say that the Minister of Finance has answered every question to-night as rapidly and as fully as it was possible for him to do so. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler), who takes such an interest in his city, raised no question about the sums of money we voted for the city of Toronto.

Mr. OSLER. We have not come to the discussion of them yet.

Mr. GIBSON. Wait until I get through. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) says that the Finance Minister does not know where this expenditure is to be made, but I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) who is an owner of ferries in Toronto, can he tell the House the part of Toronto harbour which requires dredging the most? I do not believe he can, and yet he stands up here and finds fault with the Minister of Finance because he cannot tell him everything about some harbour in Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Every question he asked was answered.

Mr. GIBSON. I have had a little experience on this side as well as on the other side, and I leave it to the sense of hon. gentlemen on both sides if it has not been the custom ever since I have been here for the government of the day to simply ask for an appropriation based upon what might be the amount expected to be spent during the year. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) will not pretend to say that because an item of \$75,000 is put in for Toronto harbour, the Government are deceiving the public since the work to be done in that harbour will cost a great deal more. He knows as well as any man that the work in Toronto harbour has been going on for years, that \$1,000,000 has already been spent on it and will still have to be spent before the harbour meets the requirements of the trade of that great city. To argue on the line the hon. gentleman takes, we ought to strike out this item of \$75,000 because it does not represent all the expenditure that will have to be made on that particular work, and that consequently the Government are deceiving this House and the people. Take up any item of expenditure in any of the estimates that have been presented to this House during the past ten years, and you will find the Government asking for \$30,000 or \$50,000 or \$100,000, as the case may be, for the expenditure on a certain work during the coming season. The hon. Minister of Finance pointed out to the hon. member for Toronto that the engineer's estimate was that this work was going to cost \$27,000, and that the Minister of Public Works did not think he was justified in going to that expenditure. A sum was voted last year, and the intention of the Minister was to make a personal examination of this new harbour before incurring any expenditure. If he thought the work was one which would warrant the expenditure on it, he would then begin with the \$4,000 and come back to Parliament for the balance required. There was no deception practiced on the House. The hon. Minister of Finance frankly told the committee, at the beginning of the discussion, that the information which the Gov-

ernment had was to the effect that this harbour was going to cost \$27,000.

Mr. OSLER. That information only came out at the last moment.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The moment the hon. gentleman asked the question, he got the information. If he did not get it before it is because he did not ask for it.

Mr. GIBSON. I am right when I say that the Minister of Finance replied more than once that the work was going to cost \$27,000. That question was answered a year ago. The Minister of Public Works stated in the House a year ago that all he asked for was an appropriation of \$4,000 and that he intended going down himself and examining the work. He was prevented from doing so by illness, which we all regret, but if he should go down and find, from the experience he has gathered as Minister of Public Works, that another scheme can be devised by which the same advantages may be gained for the new harbour at a less expense to the country, he should rather be commended for his caution instead of being criticised. There is not an item of public works expenditure that has not exceeded the estimate at the final completion of the work. First and foremost, the Government decide on a certain work being done. They receive from their engineer an estimate to cover the whole cost of the work. That estimate may be asked for or it may not, but if it is asked for, the Minister in charge of the work gives it to the House. But the Government do not ask a million dollars appropriation for a work because the work is going to cost that amount. It finds out from its engineer how much money he will require to spend during the coming year, and upon that basis the Government is justified in putting into the Estimates the sum they are advised by their engineer will be required for the season's work. That goes on from year to year. It has sometimes happened under the late Government, and will happen under all Governments, that circumstances arise which cause the work to cost more money than was contemplated, and the Government have to come back the second time for an appropriation, but in such a case they must give the reasons why the cost of the work exceeded the estimate. But to say that, in this instance, the Finance Minister was attempting to mislead the House is to make a statement that is utterly unfounded. The Finance Minister has answered in the most gentlemanly manner every question asked of him by every hon. member opposite, and in all fairness the committee ought to allow these items to pass. They have been well discussed and I do not think there is any object to be gained by simply discussing the thing off and on after we have been going into all the details for the last four hours.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was in the House the en-

tire evening or not. But if he were, he would hardly have used the language respecting the criticism of my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Osler) which he has just given expression to. At any rate an examination of the official report of this debate will, in my humble judgment, abundantly justify the remarks of my hon. friend. The information as to the entire cost of this work and the fact that the engineer had estimated the cost at \$27,000 were not brought out until this matter had been discussed at very considerable length. I do not know if the Finance Minister was asked the question directly, but I have a vivid recollection of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) having to insist on his rights to demand the fullest explanation of the item before the information he asked for was vouchsafed. My hon. friend on my right (Mr. Osler) expressed his willingness to vote any sum declared by the department to be necessary for the construction and completion of any work required in the public interest on the coast of Nova Scotia or anywhere else, but what he did object to was that after this item and the expenditure in connection with it had been discussed for a length of time, the information was vouchsafed that seven times the amount of the vote was the estimated cost of the work. My hon. friend said it would have been much more honest for the Finance Minister to have given the statement to the House at once showing that \$27,000 was the estimated cost of the work, although he only asked for a miserable appropriation of \$4,000. If this information was in possession of the Minister, if the estimates of the engineer were in his possession and given to the House last year, how is it that something has not been done on this work yet? Is my hon. friend from Cape Breton justified in his opinion that the whole thing is a blind?

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. Minister of Finance gave you an answer when he said that the Minister of Public Works was unable, on account of illness, to go and visit the work.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The Minister of Public Works visited the neighbourhood, but did not think enough of the work to give himself the trouble to go and see it. He was in the immediate neighbourhood of the place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman either means that the Minister of Public Works did visit or he did not. He did not visit the place.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I said that he visited the neighbourhood and passed by the place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What right had the hon. gentleman to imply that the Minister of Public Works did visit the place? If he was somewhere in the neighbourhood, that would be of no use unless he were close.

Mr. CLARKE.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The intention of the department was evidently not to have the work gone on with, or the Minister would have made some effort to inform himself when he passed within a few miles of the locality.

Mr. CLARKE. Hon. gentlemen opposite declare that the fullest information was given twelve months ago, and also again tonight. If the intention was to go on with the work, why did the Government not ask for a larger appropriation, and give a contract, and go on with it? The hon. members for Lincoln, and Colchester, and Yarmouth have made reference to an item which is not under discussion at all, the item respecting the dredging of Toronto harbour. When that item comes up, if these gentlemen ask for information from the Minister, and he cannot satisfy them that the appropriation is a reasonable and necessary appropriation, let them move to strike it out. I can tell the hon. gentlemen, if they are not aware of the fact, that the city of Toronto has contributed a very large sum for these works for the preservation of the harbour, under arrangement with the Government. The criticism of my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) was perfectly justified, because the information which the Opposition thought they had a right to demand, had not been given at the time. The department is in possession of facts to give to my hon. friends from Colchester, Yarmouth and Lincoln to show good reason why expenditures are being made in Toronto harbour. As I say, an agreement was made years ago with the Dominion Government, under which Toronto was to pay a portion of the cost of these works, and the share of the city of Toronto has long since been handed over.

Mr. GIBSON. How many years ago?

Mr. CLARKE. Several years ago. The city provided the sum of \$100,000, if my memory serves me well, for this work; and this discussion of the work in Toronto harbour does not apply, as my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) did not object to this expenditure on New Harbour.

Mr. McCLURE. Yes, he did: he said it was deceiving the people.

Mr. CLARKE. I repeat, that my hon. friend did not object to the expenditure of \$27,000 on this work in the New Harbour, if it was found to be a work of necessity and a benefit to the people of that locality. What he did say—and I am in the judgment of the committee—was, that it was a deceptive way to introduce this work by asking an appropriation of \$4,000 year after year, when, according to the estimates of the engineer, which the Government have in their possession, the cost of the work would be at least \$27,000; and that information was not given to the committee un-

til after the matter had been under discussion for three-quarters of an hour or an hour. I protest that it is the right of members on this side to criticise both the expenditure and the method adopted by Ministers in giving information.

Mr. McCLURE. I did not criticise the expenditure on Toronto harbour, as it was not under discussion, but I referred to it as a matter of illustration. This item was objected to on the ground that only \$4,000 was voted, while the expenditure would be much more. It was shown that the proposed vote for Toronto harbour is \$75,000, and it is well known it would cost \$500,000. As to the information, if the hon. gentleman's memory was as good as his imagination is fertile, he would know that this information, which he says was dragged out at the last minute in this debate, was given over twelve months ago, when the Minister of Public Works said that it was reported to him that the work would cost \$25,000, and he was going to visit the place and ascertain if a good harbour could not be provided for \$8,000.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Why did he not go ?

Mr. McCLURE. That has been explained; and the matter stands in the same position to-night, and the same vote is asked, and the same information given, as a year ago.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. McClure) say why the estimate was \$25,000 last year, and is \$27,000 this year? Has there been a new estimate of the work?

Mr. McCLURE. There is a difference of \$2,000. Probably, last year the Minister of Public Works was speaking from memory, while this year the acting Minister is speaking from record. There may be comfort in that for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy). It is an idea about large enough for him to get comfort out of.

Mr. BENNETT. How far is Port Hilford from New Harbour ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I could not tell the hon. gentleman, but it is in the same general vicinity.

Mr. BENNETT. Will \$8,000 complete the work at Port Hilford ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the estimate is that \$8,000 will complete the work.

Mr. SPROULE. When the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) draws a comparison between this item and the item for Toronto harbour, he ignores the real difference between the two. The principle upon which these appropriations are made is to appropriate in each case all that can usefully be expended within the year, or all that the Government can afford. What is to be done with \$4,000 out of this estimated expenditure of \$27,000? If it is for the

breakwater, you cannot let a contract, because the money will not cover the expenditure; and, if it is for dredging, you cannot do that work until the other part is done. So, it is the part of wisdom to hold this back until the House can vote sufficient money to do the work efficiently and without waste. The case of Toronto harbour is very different. The sum of \$75,000 can be spent there to advantage in a year.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What explanation has the Minister to give of the item for Tancook harbour? There was \$1,500 of a revote last year. Was any money expended on the work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been an expense in former years, but none lately. The expense up to the 21st of December, 1898, was \$6,422.76. This vote is for repairs, and it will complete them.

Mr. KAULBACH. I do not think this amount is sufficient to pay the cost of the repairs. It is quite a long breakwater, and an increased amount should be added in order that it may be carried out to the channel where there would be sufficient water to float vessels. It is the only means whereby exports can be shipped from that island. It is a large island, a polling district in itself, and the people really need a convenience of that kind. At the time an expense of some \$6,000 was made, it enabled vessels to go to the head of the breakwater and part way on the side; but since then a great deal of sand from the action of the sea has been driven in, and the breakwater now requires to be extended. I think the Minister will find that this amount will not be sufficient to complete the repairs to that work.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sure that hon. gentlemen opposite will agree that the point that was sought to be made against the member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) that he had taken objection to the item on the ground—

Mr. LANDERKIN. Let him defend himself.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman requires somebody to defend him very often.

Mr. GIBSON. You have spoken forty times to-night already.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, this is the forty-first time, and I now appeal to the Minister of Finance if he is not asking the committee to leave it to the judgment of the Minister of Public Works rather than to the judgment of this House whether that work should go on. I appeal to the Minister himself to say if there is a parallel case in a single item in that whole sum of \$163,000 standing in precisely the same position as this one. If he says there is, then I will not attempt to discuss it any further.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend will remember that I stated some time ago that where the Minister of Public Works found that an expense was likely to be much larger than he contemplated, I thought it was quite reasonable that he should take a revote of the sum in order that he might make further inquiry. I do not think the Minister of Public Works would go on with the work on the basis of the present estimates. I have stated that last year his desire was to obtain a re-examination of the work to see if he could not obtain a plan of doing it at a less cost. I think the quotation made from his speech showed that he thought a fair sum was \$8,000 or \$10,000. I would not understand from that that the Minister of Public Works would go on with the work on the basis of a \$27,000 estimate, and I would expect that he would obtain a further examination and try to obtain a reduced cost. I do not think there is anything unreasonable in asking the item to remain under those conditions.

Public Works—Prince Edward Island—  
China Point, reconstruction of head  
pier ..... \$1,500

Mr. MARTIN. I want some explanations from the Minister about the progress made.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This vote of \$1,500 is to provide for repairing and reconstructing China point head pier, 73 by 30, that has been weakened and partly carried away. The estimated cost is \$2,300. There was at the time this memorandum was made an estimated expenditure for the then current year of \$800, which had probably since been expended. The revote applied for \$1,200, and the new vote of \$300 made the appropriation \$1,500 which, added to the \$800 which is probably all expended, makes the total cost \$2,300.

Mr. MARTIN. I find that in 1896, \$500 was voted for this work. I would like to know from the hon. Minister how much was spent in 1896.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The expenditure in 1896-97 was \$284.

Mr. MARTIN. Has the rest of the \$500 lapsed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, it lapsed at the end of the year.

Mr. MARTIN. The whole expenditure on this work, up to the 23rd May last, according to a return that was brought down, was \$693.58.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was \$800 estimated up to the 30th June, and the balance might have been expended. This estimate of \$800 was made in the latter part of the year, but the work is under contract and probably the amount the hon. gentleman

Mr. CLANCY.

has quoted represents the exact expenditure.

Mr. MARTIN. I wish to call the attention of the committee to the culpable delay of the department. In 1896, \$500 was voted to repair this work which had been carried away, I think, in that year. We find that the sum that had been spent up to year 1898 was \$253.70, and I have information that there is nothing practically done towards the construction of that work up to the present time. In 1897, \$2,000 was voted, and I would like to ask the hon. Minister why the work was not proceeded with. How much was expended out of that vote?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was practically no expenditure in 1897-98. The accounts only show an expenditure of \$13.

Mr. MARTIN. This only shows the justification there is for the discussion which has taken place to-night. I find, in this item, that out of \$81,400 voted last year, there is \$44,700 not expended at all. Although there was a vote of \$500 in one year and of \$2,000 in another, practically nothing has been done yet.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The work is now under contract.

Mr. MARTIN. When was it put under contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In February last.

Mr. MARTIN. A work that was carried away in 1896.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are lots of works carried away which are not under contract yet.

Mr. MARTIN. I am going to give the committee an account of the way this matter was dealt with. I have here the statement of the expenditure on this wharf. I find that in 1897 the Government bought material to the value of \$253.70. That material has been upon the ground from 1897 up to the present time. There was only expended during that time for labour \$38.72. Here we come to a course which the Government do not pursue in a great many other cases. We have been discussing the fact that dredging work was done in the St. Lawrence River without tender, but, for this small work in Prince Edward Island, the Government have invited tenders from all over Canada. Out of this expenditure \$96.13 has been paid for advertising. For this small work of repairing a wharf in Prince Edward Island the following amounts were paid out for advertisements for tenders:—"La Patrie," Montreal, \$13.20; "The Guardian," Charlottetown, \$8.40; the "Prince Edward Islander," \$5.25; printing department, \$8.65; "Herald," Montreal, \$15.75; "Advocate," Pictou, \$6.30; printing department, \$10.02; "Chronicle," Halifax, \$8.40;

"Echo," Halifax, \$8.40; "Pioneer," Summerside, \$3.36; "Acadian Reporter," Halifax, \$8.40. This is the way the money went. That is what you call feeding the reptile press.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Did they advertise in the British Columbia papers?

Mr. MARTIN. It is a greater wonder they did not advertise in the British Columbia papers. When there are large contracts for \$300,000 or \$400,000, the Government contends that the work must be done by day's labour without calling for tenders, but in the province of Prince Edward Island, when there is a trifling expenditure for repairing a wharf three years are wasted, and it must be advertised in the "Herald," and "La Patrie" of Montreal, and in the Halifax papers, perhaps the Minister's own paper, but I do not know.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman does not know, why does he suggest it?

Mr. MARTIN. The Minister (Mr. Fielding) can tell us whether the "Chronicle" is his paper or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) means to suggest that I have a penny's worth of interest in the "Chronicle" he is mistaken. It is a most excellent paper, and if my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) will read it more regularly he will get a lot of information.

Mr. MARTIN. All the information I can get here is that the "Chronicle" was paid \$8.40 for advertising repairs to a small wharf in Prince Edward Island, which the Government did not repair after all. I have called attention to it time and again in this House, and attention has also been directed to it by residents of that locality. One letter from China Point, dated 13th January, 1898, says that materials which cost about \$250 are lying there waiting for a sufficient sum to carry on the work. This material was lying there, and although the money was voted it would not be sent down to go on with the work. I have a letter here, dated the 30th December, 1897, which states as follows:—

I have not yet heard from you in reference to the proposed repairs. Kindly let me know what is intended to be done, as the people are dissatisfied over the delay in repairing the wharf.

Here you have the man who is in charge of the work asking for money which had been voted to repair a wharf that was damaged three years previously, and yet not a dollar is forthcoming for the work. I see a letter in this correspondence from the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries calling attention to the importance of this work, and yet that letter is also neglected. There is also a letter dated May, 1897, from Mr. Welsh, who formerly represented the constituency, and no satisfaction is given him, his influence

went for nothing at all. The culpable negligence which the Government has shown in regard to this, and the waste of public money in advertising in "La Patrie" of Montreal, and the "Herald" of Montreal, and the two Liberal papers in Halifax, and another in Pictou, is a fair sample of the executive ability of this Government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) has, perhaps, more ground for complaint than have his friends who have been complaining because work has not been let by tender and contract. I believe that for an expenditure on a small wharf there is no need of advertising over all creation, and, perhaps, in this case, advertisements were inserted in too many papers. But having decided to advertise for tenders, if the Minister confined himself to one or two papers in Prince Edward Island, instantly some gentlemen opposite would rise and complain that the people of the whole Dominion who were paying for this work had not the opportunity of competing for its construction. On the whole, I do not know that the public would blame the Government for advertising. I would rather be accused of advertising too widely than the opposite.

Mr. MARTIN. The Minister of Finance takes great credit to the Government for advertising this work extensively, but the fault I find is that when there is an item of \$2,000 to repair a small wharf in Prince Edward Island, they advertise it all over the Dominion, but when they are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars they do not advertise it at all, nor do they call for tenders. If the Minister would pledge himself that the Government would continue that system of public advertising in every case, I would be inclined to pardon him in this instance. Why did they not advertise the sale of hundreds of tons of binder twine which were sold without public tender, after a wink had been given to their friends? Why were not tenders put in "La Patrie," in the Montreal "Herald," and the Halifax "Chronicle," asking for tenders for the dredging at Montreal?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the advertisement were put into all the papers of the Dominion, or all the Liberal papers, of which there are a great many, there would not be money to put into the wharf at all.

Mr. MARTIN. The whole expenditure up to the 30th May on this work was \$393.58, and the cost of advertising was \$96.13. The labour performed cost about \$22 and the advertising \$96.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The \$96 advertising was for a contract representing \$2,000.

Mr. MARTIN. I am quoting from a return furnished by the Department of Public Works.

St. Peter's Bay, pier reconstruction..... \$500

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is required for levelling up and reconstructing the top portion of the present breakwater, putting in new base timber, stringers, &c.

Souris, Knight's Point, strengthening of breakwater, &c..... \$15,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is required to continue the work of reconstructing the Souris breakwater. The total estimated cost is \$20,500.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Is that just lose stones thrown over outside the breakwater?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Stone laid down roughly and not cemented—Nova Scotia stone. The only contract is that of D. H. Ransay for \$8,900. This contract covers all that remains to be done.

Mr. MARTIN. Has it come under the hon. gentleman's notice that the contract entered into in 1895, for repairing this breakwater at Souris, P.E.I., and given to George Wightman, was entered into on the 1st July of that year; that the work was to be completed in three months, that there was some delay in the execution of the papers, so that if the contract was not signed until some time in August—I think, the 3rd or 5th—through no fault of the contractor. That there was a clause in the agreement and specifications under which the contractor was not allowed to proceed with the work until the engineer in charge had laid it out for him. That the engineer in charge, even when the contract was executed on the 3rd August, did not visit the place, and consequently some further delay occurred before the contractor was allowed to proceed with the work. That would only give him from the middle or the 20th August until the 1st October to complete the work—say six weeks. The consequence was that the storms, which are periodical at that season, had swept the whole work which he had under construction away. At that time \$7,000 worth of material had been swept away and the contractor was the loser to that amount. The contractor claims, and I think correctly, that one of the chief reasons for not having the work ready and fully ballasted before the storm arose, was the delay in the execution of the papers and the delay in laying out the work for the contractor in good time. There is also this claim that is set up, that a part of the wharf which was not to be repaired by him had been left insecure, not being properly ballasted—that is the part nearer the shore than the part the contractor was building. The consequence was that a storm came up breaking away part of the work between the shore and the work the contractor had undertaken to perform carrying away \$7,000 worth of material. That was why the work which he was engaged on was carried away. He suffered loss to the extent of

Mr. MARTIN.

\$7,000. I think that is the amount for which he has put in a claim. I believe the claim is a good one, and would ask the Minister to give it his close attention. If nothing else is done, a fiat might be issued to enable him to bring suit against the Government, because he says he has a legal claim in the case. I may say that he is no political friend of mine, but I think he has a just claim and I hope it will be considered.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Has application been made for a fiat?

Mr. MARTIN. I understood that the Minister was to give a fiat, but it has not yet been done.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is in the department of Justice, and I am not in a position to say what may be done. But if they feel they have a legal claim, I hope they will make application for a fiat. I am advised that the view taken by the department was that any mishap that occurred was due to the fault of the contractors and not to the fault of the Government. Any delay in the signing of the papers might be a reason for the contractors refusing to enter upon the work, but, having entered upon the work, I take it that they would have to assume all risk. However, I have no personal knowledge of the matter and am only giving what I believe to be the view of the department. If the gentlemen cause application to be made to the Department of Justice for a fiat, it will receive consideration.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings, P. E. I.). I have some knowledge of this matter, and I can say that delay occurred between the acceptance of the tender and the signing of the contract—some two or three weeks—the fine weather of summer; and that is the of work that should be carried on during the fine weather of summer; and that the first cause of the claim that Messrs, Wightman and Mellish make upon the Government. Their work was behind, and the storm came up and broke away, as the hon. member for East Queen's (Mr. Martin) has said a part of the structure to which they had to connect their part of the pier. So he could not go on with his work until he had entered into a contract for the part of the work he had to do. Therefore, he had to carry on his work at a time when it was almost impossible to do it with satisfaction and economy; and a storm carried away one of the large crib works which he had constructed. He alleges that this is largely owing to the delay of the department in the first place and to the other hindrances caused by a carrying away the part of the work with which he had nothing to do. He fulfilled his contract, notwithstanding his loss, and not only that but I am informed, he filled the cribwork with hard stone, which the contract did not call upon him to do. Under the circumstances I

believe that if not a legal, he has at any rate a good equitable claim, and I thought if the matter was brought to the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works, by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, he would give it his careful consideration. As my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) said, this gentleman is no political friend of mine. Though my next door neighbour, he works tooth and nail against me. Still, I believe his claim is an honest one, and if I had anything to say in the matter I would beg the Government to give the matter their very best consideration.

Mr. CLARKE. What are the details of the expenditure?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The amount under contract is \$8,900, with superintendence and contingencies \$500, making an estimate of \$9,400. In addition there is the replacing and securing of close piling of 70 feet of seaward face and providing further riprap protection of this face, and other items amounting to \$11,100, making a total cost of \$20,500. This is the estimated cost of the work.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I suppose the rest will be let by contract also?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It probably will, but I am not in position to give my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) a definite answer.

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Prince Edward Island—

Summerside Harbour ..... \$30,000

Mr. MARTIN. There has been a petition from the people of Wood Island about the extension of the breakwater at that place. An expenditure was made by the late Government of \$13,000 or \$14,000 on the harbour, but still there is not accommodation for vessels of any capacity. A petition had been forwarded to the Government, I understand, for the extension of what is known as the western block. I would like to know what the hon. Minister intends to do about it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Application has been made, but the amount is not provided for in the Estimates. For the present we will not be able to do the work.

Mr. CLANCY. Is this Summerside harbour a new harbour?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is an entirely new work. It is not let yet.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) I may explain that this is a work that has been in contemplation for some time. The grant of \$30,000 is a revote from last year. It is the only expenditure that has ever been proposed to be made upon the harbour of Summerside. This harbour is second in importance in Prince Edward Island. It is an excellent one, giving easy access from the straits of

Northumberland, but it is very much exposed to westerly winds. From these winds in the fall of the year there is no shelter for shipping. The proposition here is to vote a sum of money towards building a breakwater from a place called Indian Head on the island shore out to the lighthouse. The effect of that will be to give vessels a shelter. They can run into the harbour under shelter of this breakwater, instead of having to go two or three miles further inland to find a precarious shelter behind some wharfs. The main benefit to be derived from the expenditure of this money is, first, to provide a shelter for the shipping. In the next place, the object is to protect and to prevent the filling up of the harbour. There is a sandbar upon the spit that runs from Indian Head to the lighthouse, and the action of the wind and waves tends to drive this sand into the harbour. The construction of the breakwater here will prevent that sand being driven into the harbour and filling it up. The next benefit will be, that the current of the river will be kept in a more condensed volume, and so in the spring of the year the channel will open more quickly by reason of the action of the heavier current. It will also have the effect of keeping the channel open later in the fall and for the like reason. Also, by condensing the water in the channel it will cleanse it and deepen it. All these benefits will arise from the construction of the breakwater. It is a matter of great importance to the town of Summerside, and I trust it will not remain, as heretofore, a mere proposition, but that it will be carried into successful effect immediately.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the Minister state whether he has an estimate of the whole cost of the work, and whether it is intended to let it by tender?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This work will cost a considerable sum. It has been advertised, and the lowest tender received was \$147,000. The Minister thought the amount excessive, and he declined to award the contract. His engineers are now readjusting the plans, and expect to get the work done for about \$100,000; therefore, it is well that the House should know that it will involve ultimately an expenditure of about \$100,000.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman does not propose, under such circumstances, to expend \$100,000 without letting the work by tender.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For the present no decision has been reached. The contemplation was to do it by tender and by contract, and tenders were taken for that purpose. But finding the price excessive, the Minister decided not to award the contract.

Mr. CLANCY. If the Minister of Public Works were here himself, I am sure the committee would ask him whether that work would be let by tender or not. Now, as the vote is being asked pending the action of the Minister of Public Works, I think the hon. gentleman ought to be in a position to state whether this work is to be done by tender, because, if we voted it and left it to the discretion of the Minister, without any statement whatever that it should be let by tender, it would be giving him a free hand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Public Works having attempted to let it by tender, and having failed to get a satisfactory tender, if he were satisfied that he could carry on the work under the direction of his own engineers for a less sum of money, or for a reasonable sum of money, I think he would be justified in doing it. At the same time I am not prepared to say that that is his intention. He advertised twice for tenders for this work, and the last tender was one which he regarded as excessive. Under these circumstances, if he was satisfied that he could carry on the work under his own officers for a less sum of money, I think he would be justified in doing so, although I am not in a position to state that he contemplates doing it in that way.

Mr. MARTIN. What is the estimate of his engineers for the whole of this work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The reduced estimate the engineers make is \$104,000.

Mr. CLARKE. What was the lowest tender?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. One hundred and forty-seven thousand dollars, but since then the engineer has made some reduction of the plan, with a view of getting it down to a lower cost.

Mr. MARTIN. So, the work now is not to be done according to the former specifications?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the Minister in what papers he advertised this work to cost \$100,000? When he advertises a little contract of \$2,000 for repairing a wharf, and spends \$96 in advertising, I suppose, in advertising a contract of \$100,000, the Minister has given the advertisement to papers all over the country who are supporting his Government. I would like to have a list of the papers, and the amount paid for advertising.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid the hon. gentleman will have to do us the favour to ask for that information later on. I have not a list of the papers at

Mr. FIELDING.

hand, and am not able to give him the information now.

Mr. MARTIN. There is one thing I wish to say about it, and it shows how the business has been done here for three years, as the hon. member for East Prince has said. This amount of \$30,000 has been placed in the Estimates for three years successively, but not one dollar has been expended, and very likely, although we have \$50,000 this year, the result will be the same. When the session is over the hon. Minister or some one for him will come down to Prince Edward Island and say: See what a handsome sum we have in the Estimates for Prince Edward Island. There is \$50,000 in one item and \$40,000 in another. When we come here next year we will find that there is not one dollar expended. The hon. Minister will not give a promise to this committee, where \$100,000 of money is concerned, as to whether the work is to be done by tender or not. This committee should see that this work is let by tender. A paltry work, such as we were discussing of \$2,000, must be let by tender and advertising in "La Patrie" and the "Herald" of Montreal, and the "Chronicle" of Halifax, but when we come to work involving an expenditure of \$100,000, they do not know whether it is worth while to invite tenders for that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have already expended a good deal of money in advertising for tenders.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, and there may be a great deal more money in doing the work by day labour for the hon. gentleman's friends. I do not wish to impute motives, but I think that this committee should insist that this work should be let by tender. Such works as this have invariably been done, in Prince Edward Island, by public tender by the late Government. The hon. gentleman has given the whole case away by stating that the specifications have been changed. The estimate of the work was \$105,000, but they are going to change it, and to adopt a new specification. I should like to know the difference between the old specification and the new one. They will come before this House in a short time and say: We asked for tenders for that work and the lowest offer was \$147,000, while we got it done by day's labour for less than \$100,000. I shall insist that we know the difference between the present specifications and the original proposal. I am not opposing the vote; I think it is a necessary work, but I think that this committee is entitled to some guarantee as to the expenditure of this money. If we cannot get it we might as well not come here at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This item has been in the Estimates for a couple of years. The fact that the hon. Minister of Public Works advertised twice for tenders for this work is a clear indication that he

had it in his mind to have the work done by tender and contract. He intended to do it by tender and contract, and I have no doubt that he will do it in that way, but if the hon. gentleman asked me to give him an undertaking that it will be done in that way I could not do so.

Mr. MARTIN. I think we are entitled to know the difference, what is proposed to be done now and what was proposed before.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The change under the new specifications, chiefly, is a reduction in the height of the work, so that the quantity of work to be done will be less. I will be glad to give the hon. gentleman the specifications. The specifications are now in the hands of the engineers.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if tenders have been called for since the plans have been modified.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, the engineers are modifying the plans now.

Mr. SPROULE. I object entirely to this mode of voting money. This is a work which the hon. Minister admits will cost somewhere about \$100,000, and he comes to this House without any definite plan. He says that the plan has been changed, but he does not tell us what the change is. The committee will only sanction an expenditure of money based upon intelligent information as to what the cost ultimately will amount to when the work is completed. Yet we can get no information from the hon. gentleman as to what this work is likely to cost. I do not understand the hon. Minister to say that the Government have come to a final decision to undertake this work. The vote has been in the Estimates for two or three years, and the money may not be expended. I think that method of voting money is entirely wrong. It might be used corruptly if an election were being carried on in that part of the country, and I say that it should not be used in that way. Parliament should not undertake a work of this magnitude or nature without knowing sufficient about it to justify it in undertaking it with a definite object in view.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot quite understand what information the hon. gentleman desires. I think the purpose of the work has been made perfectly clear. The hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Bell) made an explanation of the work from his local knowledge which I could have made if necessary. It is a breakwater; tenders were invited, but the cost was found to be excessive. The engineers are reducing the plans, and they have reduced the estimate to \$104,000. I anticipate that the hon. Minister of Public Works will do the work by contract. He has already shown his desire to do it in that way by twice advertising for tenders. I cannot give the hon. gentleman a solemn guarantee that it will be done by contract, but the hon.

Minister of Public Works has indicated his desire to do it in that way.

Mr. SPROULE. That item must have been submitted to Council, and it must have been decided whether the Government shall go on with the work or not. If they do not intend to go on they should make that statement to the committee, and if they do intend to go on they should say so, and they should submit the plans and estimate of the engineers showing the cost of the whole work. The hon. Minister will not say whether the work will be gone on with or not. My opinion is that it will be gone on with, but evidently there has been no final decision in Council, otherwise he could give the committee as definite a statement as was given to Council whether it is the intention to go on or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the work was found to cost an excessive amount the hon. Minister of Public Works would not go on with it, but our anticipation is that, by a reduction in the height of the work, he will get it down to a moderate figure and the work will be done.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not think that is at all satisfactory; it is far from being satisfactory. I think this is a case where the hon. Minister should tell us what is actually to be done. Of course, we have had some information from the hon. member for East Queen's about the desirability of the work and where Summerside is, but we have no idea of the work that is to be done. Under the new specifications it is not to be raised as high as under the old specification. We have no explanation of the difference except that this work will not be raised as high by a foot or two feet. Otherwise, we are altogether in the dark. If this contract is to be let by tender, why is it that the sum is not voted here?

If it takes \$105,000 to complete the work why is not that amount put down in the Estimates? The very fact that this is done on the instalment plan one year after the other, leads to the conclusion that it will not be done by contract. The Government commenced to straighten a curve in the Prince Edward Island Railway, and although it was only going to cost a few thousand dollars they expended \$25,000 on it by day's labour. That makes me very suspicious of this vote. I think we should have before us the old specifications for this work as well as the new specification, so that we may see the difference between the two, and that we may decide which is best in the interests of the public.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman could hardly expect to get much information from the old specifications, but he certainly should have the specifications under which the work is now proposed, and as soon as they are printed there is no reason why he should not have

them. We have given all the information about this that any one could rationally demand.

Mr. MARTIN. What was the first estimate?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not at hand the first estimate, but the lowest tender was \$147,000.

Mr. MARTIN. That is altogether beside the question. Before the members of this committee can have any idea of what we are talking about, we must have the specifications for the new work, and also the first estimate of the engineer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that he should have an estimate on which we do not propose to do any work, but there is nothing to conceal, and there is no reason why he should not have all the estimates in the department.

Mr. MARTIN. I want to know the difference between the lowest tender that was submitted previously, and the estimate the engineer made of the cost. I would like to know if the lowest tender was much above the engineer's estimate at that time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The acting Chief Engineer informs me that the first estimate was for about \$135,000, and one tender was as low as \$95,000, but the person tendering at that sum refused to go on with the work. Then a later advertisement was issued, and the lowest tender was \$147,000. The Minister thought it excessive and declined to go on. New specifications are now being prepared, and though they are not complete, the engineer is able to state that the estimate is \$104,000.

Harbours and Rivers—New Brunswick—

Burnt Church Wharf..... \$8,000

Mr. McALISTER. What is the nature of this work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a wharf on the Miramichi River, between thirty and forty miles from Chatham, and it is absolutely necessary for the convenience of the people living along the river.

Mr. CLARKE. Was it built by tender?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it has been. Tenders were asked by the late Government, but the tenders were higher than it was calculated the work would cost, and it was not proceeded with. The plans have been very much cut down and new tenders have been received for \$14,000. The steamers traversing the river stop there and the business is considerable.

Mr. McALISTER. What sort of business is carried on?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Fishing business.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the full cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. \$14,500.

Campbellton, repairs to ballast wharf.... \$750

Mr. McALISTER. What is the reason there is only \$750 this year and there was \$2,500 last year? There was no expenditure made there that I am aware of.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a further amount in the supplementary Estimates.

Mr. McALISTER. Yes, but that only makes \$1,750. What has become of the other \$750?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The balance has been expended on the purchase of materials.

Mr. McALISTER. From whom were these materials purchased?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The timber was purchased from Mr. Shives several months ago.

Chatham, N.B., reconstruction and repairs to custom-house wharf..... \$6,000

Mr. PRIOR. Why is this increase of \$5,000 over last year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This increase is asked for on the report of the engineer. The work has not yet been undertaken. The acting chief engineer tells me he doubts if it can be advantageously done by contract. \$6,000 will complete the work.

Clifton Breakwater—

Creosote block, stone talus and repairs. \$9,500

Mr. McALISTER. Is there a harbour there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is required to place a stone slope around the side of the wharf. The estimated cost is \$11,180. \$500 was spent during the past year. It is repair work, and the probability is it cannot be done by contract.

Mr. PRIOR. Does not the hon. Minister think it about time for the House to adjourn?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Having made a maritime night of it and having left the field clear for Quebec, I propose that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and committee rose and reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What does the Government intend to take up to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I believe there was an understanding between the right hon. the Premier and the leader of the Opposition that the question of preferential trade might be brought up on the

first motion for Supply, but that was postponed to-day on our having reached Supply at a late stage. I think it will be taken up to-morrow. The House will be moved into Supply with the expectation that that discussion will be entered upon.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 3.05 a.m. (Wednesday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 19th July, 1899.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FISHERY GUARDIAN, DISTRICT No. 1, N.B.

Mr. GANONG (by Mr. Bell, Pictou) asked :

Is Isaac Dick a fishery guardian in District No. 1, New Brunswick? If not, when was he dismissed? What was the cause of his dismissal? Who preferred the complaint? Was any inquiry held? Who has been appointed in his place? By whom was he recommended? At what rate is he to be paid for his services? Is he a British subject?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Isaac Dick, Fishery Guardian, District No. 1, N.B., is not now in the employ of the department. The employment of these officers is not permanent, and there is no formal appointment and no formal dismissal. I am not aware whether Capt. Pratt has appointed anybody to succeed this officer; but I have telegraphed to ascertain. Capt. Pratt will know whether a new appointment is necessary or not.

DRILL HALL AT VANCOUVER, B.C.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. Has the Government awarded the contract for the erection of the drill hall at Vancouver, B.C.?
2. If so, to whom, and at what price?
3. How many tenders were received for the work, from whom received, and at what prices?
4. Does the contract awarded, if any, include all the work required to complete the building in accordance with the plans and specifications as approved by the Minister of Militia and Defence?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). 1. Yes. 2. Contract awarded to Viau & Lachance at \$65,658. 3. Seven tenders were received, viz. :

Viau & Lachance, Ottawa.....	\$65,658 00
John G. Brown, Victoria, B.C.....	78,638 00
Edward Cook, Vancouver, B.C.....	78,873 00
David M. Fraser and David Saul, Vancouver, B.C. ....	79,500 00
Thos. Bradbury, Vancouver, B.C....	83,550 00
Charles Lemoine and Fran. E. For- tin, Pembroke ....	87,214 90
Geo. Calder and Alex. Bruce, Vancou- ver, B.C.....	91,070 00

4. Yes. A note is appended that the Militia Department, however, have since asked that the main drill hall be increased 30 feet in length. The present contract does not cover this, as the Minister of Public Works declined to alter the specification.

DRY DOCK CHARGES, VICTORIA, B.C.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. Has a petition, signed by Thos. Shaw and others, been received from Victoria, B.C., in favour of the late reductions in the dry dock charges? If so, what are the names of those signing?
2. Have any other petitions of a like character been received?
3. Have any protests against said reductions in rates other than those mentioned by the hon. Minister of Finance on 29th June, 1899, in answer to a question on this subject, been received?
4. If so, who are they from?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). 1. A petition favouring the reduced rates has been received. The names on list, are as follows :—

J. Fred. Hume,	W. G. Stevenson,
H. Glide,	Geo. A. Bird,
D. Morrison,	J. H. Cragg,
Capt. D. D. McIntosh,	Jas. Grahame,
Alex. W. Hardie,	Jas. Dudgeon,
F. M. Yorke,	J. Durham,
D. E. Whittaker,	F. C. Berridge,
Wm. Beynon,	W. J. Buckett,
J. A. Côté,	John Dougall,
D. Cartmel,	Geo. W. Wynne,
B. S. Oddy,	Robt. Wickens,
Robt. H. Swinerton,	Joseph Mellor,
Chas. Rollinson,	R. W. Savage,
Saml. Doncaster,	C. M. Cookson,
George Lespierre,	R. Porter & Sons,
A. W. Rhein,	H. Thompson,
John Harman,	A. Loopman,
S. Whittaker,	F. McKenna,
Wm. Whittaker,	Michael Harkin,
James Erskine,	L. Oliver,
Frank Campbell,	J. Pearce,
P. A. Phillips,	D. Lindsay,
Wm. McCulloch,	L. Wille,
James Cranford,	T. Meade,
George E. Hinton,	M. C. Winn,
L. H. Hardie,	Victor Steastrom,
Chas. Hayward,	F. Silva,
J. L. Beckwith,	A. E. Ford,
Wm. Wilson,	Paul K. Hobbs,
F. W. Stevenson,	Jno. Teague, Jr.,
F. J. Sehl,	H. McTeigh,
E. J. Haughton,	F. Henderson,
John Harman,	Ed. Caldwell,
Joe Bruce,	F. Lansbery,
Henry Cushing,	Jas. A. Grant,
Ivan George,	Wm. Turpel,
A. B. Fraser,	M. P. Cutler,

D. Beaton,  
H. B. Ball,  
S. Allan,  
C. Turnell,  
Jas. Rutledge,  
Alex. B. Meikle,  
Albert Omons,  
Thos. Plimley,  
C. J. Le Jeune,  
E. H. Hiscock,  
Jas. Bell,  
J. H. McIlmoyl,  
E. Adernoch,  
W. B. Hall,  
R. Penketh,  
Barlur Bros.,  
R. C. Davies,  
J. Baker,  
W. V. Brown,  
D. F. Adams,  
Jos. E. Phillips,  
Geo. Bishop,  
Fred. Weldon,  
W. H. Snider,  
D. Stewart,  
A. Tolmie,  
A. Scmieter,  
H. S. Cole,  
D. Saunders,  
E. W. Hall,  
T. Harman,  
F. Platt,  
W. F. Hall,  
John Bell,  
Moore & Co.,  
B. Rombough,  
J. H. Matthews,  
P. Rowland,  
Dan Adams,  
Andrew Rusta,  
Wm. Hauston,  
R. D. Stephens,  
Chas. H. Waller,  
Jas. Turnbull,  
Andrew Davidson,  
Frank Campbell,  
Robt. R. Saur,  
Sam. J. Payne,  
Maurice Law,  
Archie Muir,  
D. C. Hutchison,  
H. M. Gallaway,  
Richard Baird,  
P. McLean,  
Walter Morris,  
W. L. Leigh,  
A. G. Hay,  
James Welsh,  
Fred. Butler,  
Geo. Keown,  
G. A. Caldwell,  
E. Harrap,  
T. H. Trahey,  
Thos. Shaw,  
J. C. Voss,  
E. E. Leason,  
L. Hafer,  
A. H. Loft,  
C. J. Savage,  
G. W. Penketh,  
James Shaw,  
John Robertson,  
Samuel Turpel,  
D. G. McBeatt,  
Hubert J. Cook,  
G. M. Barker,  
Jeffrey Lawrence,  
R. Bennett,

Alex. McDonald,  
D. L. Rainey,  
C. W. Winbechalty,  
John Horn,  
E. L. LeBlanc,  
William Grant,  
Sprott Balcam,  
J. C. Foote,  
Walter Walker,  
J. G. Mann,  
W. J. Stephens,  
Wm. Sleightholne,  
C. J. Magirl,  
Wm. Hannan,  
Clement Royds,  
W. H. Turnbull,  
A. Garnett,  
Andrew R. Anderson,  
John Woodriff,  
G. Scott,  
F. Galley,  
A. Bissell,  
Victor Jackalexix,  
Chas. Hackett,  
E. B. Marvin,  
Geo. B. Meyer,  
Wm. Dalby,  
T. Adam,  
C. Clunes,  
George Marsden,  
C. H. Bowes,  
James Fletcher,  
D. A. Fleming,  
Herbert N. Pauline,  
W. S. Goodwin,  
J. E. Day,  
Richard Shaw,  
L. Basso,  
G. Bebbington,  
A. Almconeyla,  
V. Howard,  
Wm. W. Robinson,  
Austin Gill,  
A. R. Morrisay,  
Wm. Dockings,  
P. J. Riddell,  
Wm. Carse,  
Chas. E. Stephens,  
Saml. Waldron,  
John Taylor,  
J. Lemuel Arthur,  
John Nute,  
J. Baker,  
F. McDonald,  
E. Min. jr.,  
Wm. Gilchrist,  
H. King,  
Wm. McArthur,  
Wm. Jas. Eakin,  
Geo. Kerthley,  
A. McCrummon,  
R. E. Snider,  
James Morrison,  
E. Renwick Fulton,  
Wm. Gregson,  
Robt. C. Morrison,  
Jas. Ault,  
Emil Ofendner,  
A. Gilmore,  
R. Davidson,  
T. Neill,  
H. P. Mellish,  
Chas. Post,  
C. Cullen,  
J. F. Reilly,  
S. Cousins,  
Wm. Murray,  
F. Catterall,

W. Ettinger,  
C. R. Thompson,  
P. A. Babington,  
Leonard H. Masters,  
Archie Neill,  
Thos. H. Brown,  
Wm. Atkins,  
R. F. Stephen,  
E. W. Andrews,  
F. Wills,  
J. Hagenbuch,  
John F. Settingington,  
W. E. Baker,  
James Morrison,  
F. S. Stewart & Co.,  
Geo. H. Gourn,  
John T. Orr,  
A. Lewis,  
Fred. J. Robertson,  
Jas. Ritchie,  
Thomas Gough,  
Colin Hill,  
Muirhead & Mann,  
F. T. Stevens,  
O. Jepson,  
R. W. Etherington,  
H. Roach,  
A. W. Duncan,  
F. Smith,  
— Applewhite,  
M. Gallagher,  
Jos. Mowat,  
G. M. Tripp,  
R. H. Spuling,  
W. W. Boag,  
P. de Ridder,  
J. McL. Muirhead,  
E. J. Ike,  
B. J. Thomas,  
D. Thompson,  
J. T. Muirhead,  
Jas. Ford,  
J. Sherk,  
G. I. Post,  
E. L. Ethendye,  
F. Taylor.

2. A letter has also been received from the Union Steamship Company of Vancouver, B.C., favouring the reduction. 3. Yes. 4. E. P. Davis, of Vancouver.

#### THE BRITISH COLUMBIA ALIEN ACT.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to disallow the Act intituled : " An Act to amend the Placer Mining Act " (otherwise known as the " Alien Act " ), passed by the provincial legislature of the province of British Columbia, on the 18th January, 1899 ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Government has not yet received the report of the Minister of Justice on the statutes passed by the British Columbia legislature at its last session ; therefore, it has not given any consideration to the statute mentioned in the question.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—MORNING SESSIONS.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That on Thursday next and for the remainder of the session, this House shall meet at eleven o'clock in the morning ; that in addition to the usual intermission at six o'clock p.m. there shall also be an intermission on each day from one to three o'clock p.m. ; that the House shall also meet on Saturdays at the same hour of eleven o'clock, and Government Orders shall have precedence at such sittings.

He said : I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this motion will be agreed to by my hon. friend. In making this motion it is my duty to inform the House what business still remains to be introduced by the Government. I may say that the only important business which still remains to be introduced is the railway subsidies, and I think we will be able to place them on the Order paper during this week, at the latest, probably on Saturday. Then, there are one or two de-

Mr. FIELDING.

partmental Bills of no great moment, which I believe will not entail much discussion. Then, there will be a measure of some importance which will especially interest the members from British Columbia; we propose to submit to the House resolutions to amend the Chinese Immigration Act.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I would take this opportunity of asking the Minister of Finance if there are to be any further supplementary Estimates of any kind.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** At the present moment we have no intention of submitting any, but it may be possible that some small items which have been overlooked will be introduced. If so, they will be merely to correct omissions and will not be material.

**Mr. BRITTON.** Is it the intention to proceed with the Bill from the Senate in reference to the Criminal Code?

**The PRIME MINISTER.** That is a question as to which I am not prepared to give an answer to my hon. friend to-day. I think we are all looking forward with some degree of earnestness to prorogation; and the Government will not be indisposed, with the concurrence of hon. gentlemen opposite, to curtail the session and bring it to as speedy a close as possible.

**Mr. TISDALE.** I think, in view of the period which the session has reached and the important matters, though few in number which the Prime Minister has mentioned, we had better leave that Criminal Code Bill for another session. It has been printed now, and I have reason to believe that several gentlemen who are interested in the administration of criminal justice have a number of matters to suggest that would, I am sure, entail such a lengthy discussion that, in the interest of the Bill itself, it had better be left over until another session.

**Mr. CHARLTON.** It would be regrettable, I think, if a Bill of the importance of this one should be allowed to stand over. I am aware that there is a great difference of opinion as to the provisions of that Bill, but why it should entail a very lengthy discussion, I am unable to understand. I hope the Government will see its way clear to let that Bill be considered. Of course, we are all desirous of prorogation, we have spent a great deal of time here; we have spent time on a good many matters of less importance than the Bill that has been mentioned. It is a Bill so important that I think it is incumbent on this House to consider it, and I trust the Government will take that view of the case, and, if possible, allow it to be considered before prorogation takes place.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton), who has just

taken his seat, has given the best possible reason for the course that has been suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Tisdale), that this measure should stand over, having been printed, until another session. The hon. gentleman himself says it is a Bill of very great importance and it does not require a word to accentuate that statement, because it is a Bill affecting criminal procedure, and all such Bills are of very grave importance. At this late period of a summer session, I am afraid that a measure of that kind cannot receive that careful consideration that it should receive in the interest of justice. I have no doubt that my hon. friend opposite will see the point.

**Mr. ELLIS.** Will there be an understanding that Saturday sittings will close at six o'clock, or will they continue after six?

**The PRIME MINISTER.** We will be guided in this matter very much by the wishes of the House. Our intention is to sit until evening, but I will not make any special rule as to that. We will be guided by the wishes of the House every day.

**Mr. MILLS.** Does the right hon. Prime Minister intend to sit every morning?

**Mr. DOMVILLE.** I would like to ask if the temperance resolution of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) will be taken up before the close of the session or not. If not, it should be struck off the list, as it is only misleading the public.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** This matter will be given an opportunity of discussion.

Motion agreed to.

#### QUEEN VS. SKELTON ET AL.

**Mr. DAVIN.** Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to mention to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) the case of the Queen vs. Skelton et al. The hon. Minister was good enough to say that he would speak to the hon. Minister of Justice about laying his report upon the Table.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies).** I took a note of the hon. gentleman's request the other day, and wrote a line to the hon. Minister of Justice, who asked me to come and see him. I went and saw him, and he was anxious to know if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) had made out a formal motion. I did not know exactly what the hon. gentleman wanted, whether he wants all the papers or what papers he exactly wants, because there was a report made by the Department of Justice, and if he wants that report simply, or if he wants all the papers, it will be well for the hon. gentleman to make a formal motion. Would the hon. gentleman

make a formal motion for the papers, specifying what he wants?

Mr. DAVIN. What I asked for was the report of the hon. Minister of Justice. Am I to understand that the hon. Minister of Justice sees no objection to bringing down the report? Really, all the papers ought to be brought down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think it would be more satisfactory, if a motion were made. The papers are voluminous. The hon. Minister of Justice showed me the file. I do not think you could discuss the matter intelligently unless you had the papers.

Mr. DAVIN. I should be quite contented at this stage of the session with the report of the hon. Minister of Justice. The report, I suppose, is a reasoned report?

#### PORT COLBORNE AND PORT MAITLAND.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I might mention to the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who is acting for the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), that some time ago the hon. Minister of Public Works directed that an examination by engineers be made of the two harbours, Port Colborne and Port Maitland. I see in the Estimates which are to be discussed very shortly, a grant of an amount for Port Colborne harbour. I should like that the hon. Minister of Finance should bring down, before this is to be discussed, the report of the engineers upon the two harbours. Will he be good enough to do that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I shall be glad to inquire into the matter, and, unless there is some reason why it should not be brought down, I will bring down the information.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FORTIN. Mr. Speaker, since the motion for morning sittings of the House has been passed, I beg to move:

That the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections have leave to sit during the time that this House is in session.

Motion agreed to.

#### INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. McDUGALL. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to a return brought down in response to an Order of the House of the 15th of May. The return was brought down on the 23rd of June, and it is not complete. I drew the attention of  
Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) two weeks ago to the fact that the return was not complete, and the right hon. gentleman made a note of it in the absence of the hon. Minister of Railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) will point out what the deficiency is, I will bring it down.

Mr. McDUGALL. In order to assist the hon. Minister in supplying the shortage, I will call his attention to a letter of Mr. Pottinger, addressed to his chief engineer, dated the 26th of October, 1897, where he proceeds to say:

Dear Sir,—At Grand Narrows, allow a man named McNeill, under lease, to erect a building—  
And so on. This is the first communication that is on file, and before the general manager could have written such a letter, he must have had an application, and there must have been some correspondence. I am aware that there was an application. Further on in the papers there is a letter of the applicant, addressed to the general manager, dated the 31st of December, 1897, in which he proceeds to say:

Dear Sir,—I have made an application to the Government over two years ago for a lease on a piece of land here,—

And so on. That application is not on the file.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman want the application?

Mr. McDUGALL. The Order calls for all the correspondence including the application of course.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, but I would like to know what papers the hon. gentleman wants.

Mr. McDUGALL. I want all the correspondence that took place during the two years up to the 31st of December, 1897.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like the hon. gentleman to have in his mind that the officers were directed to furnish all the correspondence; but if there is any deficiency, and if he will state what the deficiency is, I will call their attention to it, and try to supply it.

Mr. McDUGALL. The officials have only given the latter part of the papers, but there is some correspondence that took place previously.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to know what the hon. gentleman wants, so that I can look at it myself. The application, apparently, is the only paper that is missing.

Mr. McDUGALL. The application is missing, and the applicant says in his let-

ter that he made application two years ago. All the correspondence that took place subsequent to the date of the application down to December, 1897, is not in this file.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not likely that there is a great deal of correspondence.

#### SUPPLY—PREFERENTIAL TRADE.

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

Mr. KAULBACH. Mr. Speaker,—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I must call my hon. friend's (Mr. Kaulbach) attention to the fact that this day has been set apart for a particular motion on going into Committee of Supply, and I would have to ask him to defer, until the next motion is made to go into Committee of Supply, what he proposes to take up. At the request of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), I propose now to move a resolution in reference to preferential trade of which notice was given some considerable time ago, and which appeared in the Votes and Proceedings. At the outset, I may say that I intend to be as brief as I can be, consistently with the importance and gravity of the question that is now brought before the House, which I do not hesitate to say, I consider at this moment probably the most important question which is before this country. I think it would be well to intimate now that I intend to make a very substantial change in the resolution of which notice is given. I will state very frankly to the House why I do this. The question of preferential trade is one upon which I do not think there ought to be any difference of opinion in this House, and believing that there ought not to be any difference, I have, with the consent of my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill), modified this resolution in such a manner as to enable the Government, if so disposed, to accept it. The resolution of which my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) gave notice, was one that we could not naturally expect the Government to accept, because it involved a censure, to a certain extent, upon the Government, and I now propose to change the character of the resolution somewhat. I need not detain the House to read it over at length at this moment, further than to point out an important change which is embodied in the first three lines of the final clause, which said :

And this House regrets that the Speech from the Throne contained no intimation that the Government have (in response to these repeated advances from the Imperial authorities) made any attempt to secure, &c.

I propose, Mr. Speaker, with the consent of

the House, to change these lines of the resolution and to substitute the following :

That in the opinion of this House, it is the duty of the Government in response to the repeated advances by the Imperial authorities, to endeavour to secure for the produce of Canada that preferential treatment in the markets of the United Kingdom which would be of such inestimable value to the farmers and other producers of Canada competing against foreign rivals in the markets of the United Kingdom, would set in motion a great tide of immigration to our shores, people the vast wheat areas of the Canadian North-west, enhance farm values in the older provinces, promote the unity of our Empire, and speedily deliver it from—

I strike out the word "dangerous" in the resolution here.

—and speedily deliver it from dependence upon a foreign food supply.

My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will see at once, that the change which I propose to make in this resolution places himself and the Government, and in fact every member of this House, in a position to give this resolution their support if they so desire. As I have said, this is a question which not only ought not to be of a party character, but it is a question which has obtained the support of all parties in this House and in the country in the past, and so, I thought it desirable to make such modification as would enable the Prime Minister to frankly accept it in the spirit in which it is offered, I shall deal with the subject, therefore, from the point of view, that in my judgment there is nothing to prevent the adoption of this resolution by the unanimous vote of the House, and such a unanimous vote would, of course, be calculated to greatly strengthen the hands of my right hon. friend and of the Government in giving effect to it. The House is familiar with the whole subject, and as my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) has embodied in the resolution the statement made by the Duke of Devonshire upon a very important occasion bearing upon this subject, I do not propose to go at any very great length into the history of this matter, except in so far as is necessary, to put as succinctly as I can before the House the position which this question in my judgment now stands.

I may say that in 1891, the United Empire Trade League was formed by a number of gentlemen in the House of Lords and the House of Commons of Great Britain, who, although disagreeing upon political questions generally, came to the conclusion that a great advantage to the Empire would result from the adoption of what was called preferential trade between Great Britain and her colonies. By preferential trade between Great Britain and her colonies, they meant, and so stated, that it was to be a policy under which Great Britain would admit to her markets the products to her colonies on better terms than similar products coming from

foreign countries, and that in return her colonies would give a tariff preference to imports coming from the United Kingdom. That, in a word, was the principle of preferential trade. There was a great difficulty which stood in the way of this, as was fully recognized by the Empire Trade League, and they sent a very important deputation to the Marquis of Salisbury, who at that time (1891) was Prime Minister. That deputation was sent to press upon His Lordship the abrogation of the Belgian and German treaties, which formed an insuperable obstacle against the colonies giving to the mother country any preference in their markets over that which they gave to all the other countries with which Great Britain had most-favoured-nation treaties. Lord Salisbury on that occasion referred to those two treaties as "unlucky treaties." He stated he could not understand how such treaties ever came to be made, pointing out, that there were great difficulties in the way of their abrogation, but promising that the Government would give prompt attention to any means by which these treaties might be abrogated so that the difficulty of establishing preferential trade between Great Britain and her colonies would be removed. Lord Salisbury spoke of preferential trade as one of the most important questions that, in his judgment, could engage the attention of public men of any party, but he also spoke of the fact that it would cause a very great change in the relations between Great Britain and her colonies, and that unless the subject was so agitated as to obtain the support of public opinion, the Government could not be expected to abrogate these treaties, the abrogation of which would be attended with some considerable difficulty. I shall not detain the House further than to say, that these steps were promptly followed up on various occasions, notably at what I might call the Imperial Conference held in this city of Ottawa in 1894, at which my hon. friend, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, presided. On that occasion, not only was the Government of Canada represented, but, as the House well knows, the Governments of Australasia and of South Africa were represented, and Her Majesty's Government considered the question so important that they appointed Lord Jersey, a peer of very high standing, to represent them. At that conference, the following important resolution was unanimously adopted :

That provision should be made by Imperial legislation enabling the dependencies of the Empire to enter into agreements of commercial reciprocity, including the power of making differential tariffs with Great Britain, or with one another.

That any provisions in existing treaties between Great Britain and any foreign power, which prevent the self-governing dependencies of the Empire from entering into agreements of commercial reciprocity with each other, or with Great Britain, should be removed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

That important resolution was, as I have said, unanimously adopted at this Imperial Conference. As matters stood, it is well known that Great Britain had the power of receiving articles sent from the British Colonies free, as at present, but that same freedom applies to the products of foreign countries which came into competition with these colonies, and the whole aim of the repeal of the Belgian and German treaties was to remove the difficulty which stood in the way, and which prevented Great Britain from accepting from any colony any remission of duties and placing them in return upon better terms than those foreign countries which had most-favoured-nation treatment with Great Britain. I may say that my right hon. friend, as is very well known—and I do not intend to go into this subject at all any further than absolutely necessary to the discussion of the question—in common with, I may say, everybody else, came to the conclusion that the adoption of preferential trade between Great Britain and Canada would be of immense value to Canada. When I had raised this question at a meeting before the Chamber of Commerce in the city of Montreal, the organ of the Liberal party stated very emphatically that the obtaining of preferential trade, which would give the products of Canada a better position in the Imperial market than those of foreign countries that came into competition with them, was a question on which there was no difference of opinion in this country, that we were all agreed, if such a thing could be obtained, it would be greatly in the interests of Canada and the Empire that such a policy should be adopted.

My right hon. friend, in the campaign of 1896, which led to his obtaining power, spoke very emphatically in the city of London, Ont., in favour of this principle, and I think also at Toronto gave his cordial adhesion to it, and pledged himself to use any influence in his power to secure its accomplishment, and he pointed out there in language quite as strong, perhaps more forcible than any I could use, the immense advantage which such a policy would be to Canada. I may say that subsequently another very important and significant occurrence took place, and that was the appointment by the Board of Trade in Toronto of a delegate in the person of one of the members of Toronto (Mr. Osler) to represent it at the third meeting of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire in London, and this meeting passed a resolution, embodying the views of the Toronto Board of Trade on this question as to what might be done in order to accomplish preferential trade between Great Britain and Canada. Mr. Osler submitted that resolution at the meeting of the Chamber of Commerce, which was held in June, 1896, and on that occasion I think that meeting was opened by a very

famous speech from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, in which he then adopted practically, as a solution of this question, the resolution which had been passed by the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto, as forming the basis upon which he believed could be worked out this question of preferential trade between Canada and the mother country, and in fact between all the colonies and the mother country. I do not intend to detain the House by reading the resolution, which is already in our "Hansard," or the speech of Mr. Chamberlain in which he practically adopted and endorsed the views of the Board of Trade of Toronto, and which is so well known as to make it unnecessary that I should detain the House by going over it, but I may say that that was followed by the Jubilee. I need not tell the House that to me it has always been a source of the most deep regret that my right hon. friend, who represented Canada on that important occasion, did not avail himself of that most happy opportunity that could possibly present itself to accomplish the work which he and, in fact every person in Canada, had agreed it was of the greatest importance to Canada to accomplish, and to secure the accomplishment of which was worthy of every possible effort. But it will be remembered that from some cause, and I do not intend to go into that matter further, my right hon. friend did not see his way clear to the adoption of such a course as we had been led to expect. But, perhaps, as it is so important, although it is not new to the House, I may read the statement made by the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the Premiers assembled on the occasion of the Jubilee, in which are embodied in a few words his views and the position in fact of Her Majesty's Government on that subject. He said:

In the meanwhile, however, I may say that I note a resolution which appears to have been passed unanimously at the meeting of the Premiers in Hobart, in which the desire was expressed for closer commercial arrangements with the Empire, and I think it was suggested that a commission of inquiry should be created in order to see in what way practical effect might be given to the aspiration. If that be the case, and if it were thought that at the present time you were not prepared to go beyond inquiry, if it were the wish of the other colonies, of Canada and of the South African Colonies, to join in such an inquiry, Her Majesty's Government would be delighted to make arrangements for the purpose, and to accept any suggestions as to the form of the reference and the character and constitution of the commission, and would very gladly take part in it.

The view that the right hon. Secretary of State for the Colonies has invariably taken from the first in regard to this matter, is, that it would not be promoted by any dictation on the part of Her Majesty's Government, but that Her Majesty's Government would be only too happy to treat

in a broad liberal spirit, and in no "huckstering" manner, with the colonies concerning anything that would bring about so desirable a consummation as the binding together more closely Great Britain and her colonies by substituting such a tie of self-interest as would be created by these mutual beneficial and advantageous relations which preferential trade with Great Britain and her colonies would involve. I merely indicate that in passing to show what the position of the question was. The Duke of Devonshire's remarks at the reception of the Premiers at Liverpool are embodied, to a certain extent, in the resolution of my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), who copied them from a leading paper in Liverpool, which gave a full report on that occasion of the remarks made by His Grace the Duke of Devonshire. But since then, the British Empire League, of which His Grace the Duke of Devonshire is the president, have published no doubt a revised copy of his remarks on that occasion, and I may, perhaps, as they will be still more accurate than the statement in the resolution and I think quite as strong, I may, perhaps, be permitted to read a few words:

There never was, in my opinion, a time at any period of our history when the colonies and our dependencies filled a larger place in the thoughts of the people, and in their political dealings. Never at any time—even at times when we have been fighting to acquire or to retain our colonial possessions—never at any time when the stream of emigration has been most rapidly building up our colonial expansions—never at any time have they filled a larger part in the thoughts of the public than to-day. It would be too much to say that they now occupy the attention of our statesmen to the exclusion of more purely domestic matters, or that those domestic matters do not still occupy the largest portion of the time which we devote to politics, but there is, I think, at the present time something in the air—there is something which, if I am not mistaken, is growing into a great and irresistible force which is speaking to the minds, and more than to the minds, to the hearts, of the people, and which tells them that they are citizens of a greater state than that which is contained within these little islands on the north-west of Europe—(applause)—that they have to deal with larger issues than those of the success or defeat of this or that political party—that even their relations with the European states are of less importance than the relations which they may be able to establish or to maintain with those younger, vigorous and prosperous states which it rests with the people of this country in a great measure to decide whether they shall grow up as portions of our Empire, or whether, by neglect or mismanagement, we shall compel them to found for themselves an independent and a separate existence. (Applause.)

His Grace followed that statement up with an elaborate statement showing the utter failure of the predictions made for the policy of free trade, which he refers to in very strong terms. He said:

The world has not become the commercial paradise which was predicted in the early days of free trade opinion, when it was hoped that free trade would bind all the nations of the earth so closely together that it would be a matter of comparatively little importance by whom they were ruled or under what influence they were governed. We have since learned by painful experience that no old or new markets are being thrown open to us by the influence of free trade alone, and that if we want to provide for the increasing commerce which is necessary for the support of our increasing population, we must find those markets for ourselves—(cheers)—and must use every opportunity, either of expanding or of consolidating our colonial possessions.

That language was very gratifying, and I need not say that it was interpreted by the Australasian representatives who were present on that occasion as practically an offer of preferential trade. And it was so regarded by the press of Great Britain. I need not remind the House that the day after the Duke of Devonshire made the statements to which I have referred, he was attacked by all the Cobdenites and extreme free trade papers throughout the kingdom, as having, for the purpose of meeting the views of the colonies on this question of preferential trade, thrown over the doctrines of free trade altogether. I will call attention for a single moment to the utterances of the newspapers on the subject of this speech, which, I think, will satisfy the House as to what was in the mind of His Grace when he thus approached the Premiers with the statement of which I have made reference. The "Times" said:

This silent, gradual process of awakening throughout the country on the trade question has brought about an astonishing change, which is now beyond all controversy. The recent tariff legislation in Canada and the discussions as to Australian confederation seem to indicate that we may be on the eve of some remarkable development.

The "Morning Post" said:

The Duke of Devonshire's speech is a funeral oration on the Cobdenite school. It is obvious enough that the lead taken over the seas on this question finds a response in the growing opinion of the British people.

The "Standard" said:

The Duke of Devonshire's candour was complete and creditable.

I will not take more time referring to that, because I think it is very conclusive as to what was intended to be conveyed by His Grace, what was accepted by the press and by a number of the Premiers who were present as to his views on this question of preferential trade. But I may say that when the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) returned, the course which he had pursued in England in regard to this question of preferential trade was somewhat severely criticised—I will not say that it was too sever-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

ely criticised—you could hardly expect me to say that. My right hon. friend met these criticisms by a speech made at a banquet in Toronto, which was given him after his return from England. I wish to call special attention to what he said there, because I think I have a ground on which I may fairly claim to-day his hearty support and that of his Government and of his friends in this House, for the resolution which I propose to move. He referred to the criticisms made on his failure to demand preferential trade and gave a reason—and it is only just that that reason given by the right hon. gentleman himself should find a place in my statement. He said:

I claim that we must look at this question upon a broader surface, upon a broader motive, than this motive. Certainly, if I thought I could have obtained for my country, for the products of Canada, a preferential treatment in the markets of Great Britain, I would not only have been wanting in patriotism, but I would have been wanting in reason—I would simply have been an idiot—if I had failed to obtain such preference.

The right hon. gentleman there commits himself just as strongly as he did before the general election to the opinion that preferential trade would be of the greatest importance to Canada if it could be obtained. And he went on to explain that the reason why he had not pressed that question more strongly was that he felt that, in order to accomplish preferential trade, the vital point in the first instance was to obtain the abrogation of the Belgian and German treaties, and he was afraid that if he combined the two measures, he might fail to accomplish either, but that separating them he would have a better chance of securing consideration for this measure. He said further:

But let me say that above all things, in matters political, I have learned my lesson from British precedents, and I know that all reforms have to be taken one step at a time, and he who endeavours to do more than that is likely to end in failure. That has been too often the case in past years. If ever Canada is to obtain preferential treatment in the markets of Great Britain, the first and foremost condition, the essential condition, was to obtain the abolition of the Belgian and German treaties.

My right hon. friend was quite right, as we all admit, that these treaties absolutely precluded the accomplishment of the reform, and that their abrogation was an essential preliminary to it. But I do not agree with him, as he is well aware, that it was necessary to separate the two questions. The abrogation of the Belgian and German treaties had been put forward by the United Empire Trade League, and all the advocates of this reform, as something to be accomplished in order to secure preferential trade between Great Britain and the colonies. Without that, so far as the colonies were concerned, there was nothing great to

be accomplished. The right hon. gentleman proceeded :

The treaties have been denounced, there is nothing in the way now, the coast is clear, the ground is ready for discussion.

I invite my right hon. friend's attention to that, because I am not dealing with this as a party question. I say frankly that I consider the question of preferential trade as infinitely above and beyond party. It has been declared over and over again by the highest authorities representing both parties in this country, that this is a question upon which there is no difference of opinion, and concerning which the only question that remains for solution is the manner of its accomplishment. Now, I invite my right hon. friend's attention to the renewed pledge that he there gave to the people of Canada that, this impediment having been removed by the abrogation of the Belgian and German treaties, the question was open for discussion, and that he still regarded it as a question of the greatest importance to the people of Canada, and he would not fail on every opportunity in pressing it to a successful conclusion, if possible.

Now, one of the great difficulties that has been presented by a gentleman than whom no other has entered upon this question of preferential trade with greater enthusiasm, has been the fact that the people of England were so wedded to free trade that it was practically impossible to induce them to regard this proposition favourably, and that it was no use for persons to exhaust their efforts in endeavouring to obtain its accomplishment. Now, I want to combat that opinion. Of course, no man can enter upon an arduous effort to accomplish any object if he despairs in the outset of ultimate success. I want to say to hon. gentlemen opposite, who, perhaps, have been too ready to take that view, that there is no ground for the hopelessness that many of them have entertained on this subject. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that a good many things have happened, even since the date of the speech of my right hon. friend, to which I refer. It is well known that about the same period, I think, no less a person than the then Governor General of Canada, Lord Aberdeen, made a speech in Toronto in which he pointed out the uselessness of any effort in this direction, because the action that had recently been taken in England had shown that that country could not be induced to entertain the question of countervailing duties, even where it was very important to colonial interests that it should be entertained. Now, this curious answer has already been given on this question of countervailing duties. I may say at the outset that Lord Salisbury long ago put on record what was practically an official declaration, for it was written by his private secretary at his direction to a gentleman who made an inquiry, declaring that a preference between England and her

colonies did not involve any violation of the general principles of free trade; that the principles of free trade had reference to the relations between England and foreign countries, and had no bearing upon such relations and such principles as might be adopted within the Empire; that the imposition of a small duty against foreign countries that imposed very high duties against Great Britain, could not be held as attacking the principles of free trade, because they would not themselves be protective; that it was where a duty is not a revenue duty, but is so high as to prevent the introduction of an article into a country from abroad, that you can treat it as a protective duty. That principle Lord Salisbury laid down with a good deal of force.

We now come to the question of countervailing duties, and I draw the attention of my right hon. friend and of the House to the fact that this question has recently received very important consideration, and one that lies at the very foundation of the objection of some gentlemen who take an interest in the question of preferential trade and who think it impossible or impracticable. Now, every person in this House, I presume, knows that India is governed from London; that while there is a local government composed of the Governor General and a Council assisting him in the government of India, that government is practically in the India Office, presided over by the Secretary of State for India in Great Britain, and that without the imprimatur and sanction of Her Majesty's Government in England, no such principle as the adoption of a countervailing duty could be carried out. Well, the time came when the Indian authorities represented to Her Majesty's Government that in the interests of India countervailing duties ought to be imposed upon France, Germany and other countries sending their products into India in competition with the manufacturers of that country. Now, I need not say that Lord Farrer is, perhaps, recognized everywhere as undoubtedly the ablest supporter of the Cobden school in all its entirety; and as my hon. friend knows, he is the recognized leader of the school; and that hon. gentleman, in the strongest way and with all the vigour that his great abilities allowed him to use, denounced this proposal for the Government of England to go back upon the principles of free trade by permitting the Government of India to introduce these countervailing duties in India against the products of France, Germany and other countries. The question was fought out in the strongest possible manner. The Right Hon. Mr. Fowler, who, perhaps, is one of the ablest men in the Liberal party at present, and who has long been regarded on the floor of the House of Commons of Great Britain as second to no man in ability and in debating power, attacked on the floor of the House of Commons, Lord George Hamilton, the Secretary of State for India, and attack-

ed the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, Secretary of State for the Colonies on this question of countervailing duties. He denounced it as an utter abandonment of free trade, as simply sweeping away the whole theory upon which free trade in England has been conducted. Now, what was the result? The result was that Lord George Hamilton and the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, having grappled with the question in emphatic terms, carried the House of Commons with them, and Mr. Fowler's resolutions against countervailing duties in India were voted down by a majority in the House of Commons of no less than 141. I give this as the best possible evidence of the unwisdom of despairing in a question like this, a question in which we know there has been a steady undercurrent of change in all classes of people in England, and, perhaps, in no class more than in the operative and the labouring classes. And as a complete and thorough answer to the speech delivered by Lord Aberdeen in the city of Toronto on this subject, in which he intimated that the House of Commons never would permit anything in the shape of countervailing duties to receive their authority or imprimatur. Permit me, anxious as I am not to take up the time of the House unduly, to read what Mr. Chamberlain said, and this bears directly, in my judgment, upon the whole question. He said:

It is a dangerous thing to teach the people of this country that free trade is inseparable from gross injustice and unfair prejudice to their employments and occupations. The member for Cardiff (Mr. Maclean) dared the members of the Government to go to their constituents and propose countervailing duties. I should not be at all afraid to go to my constituents. On the contrary, I think there is a growing feeling in the country, which to a certain extent alarms me, that the injustices which have attended upon free trade—which are not necessarily incident to free trade, and are not, in my opinion, due to it—the pressure of these injustices produces so great an impression on the working classes, that I am alarmed lest they should go a great deal further than I should, and should be ready not merely to remove abuses but to deny the doctrine and the principle of free trade as a political religion, and it has had the hard fate of all religions. It has been corrupted since it was promulgated in its original purity; it has suffered from commentators, annotators, and false prophets. With some the doctrine of free trade has become a dogma, and the religion has become a fetish. I think we had better go back to the original fountain of inspiration, to clear away from this religion the corruption which has been imposed upon it, and to remove from it the results of the fanaticism of certain subsequent professors. \* \* \* I maintain that there is no justification in the argument or speeches of any of the great free traders for the doctrine that countervailing duties are opposed to free trade. What hon. members opposite desire to do is to buy in the cheapest markets. That is where you stop, but Cobden said "at its natural price," and that is what you have forgotten. The main object of the old free traders was to secure natural sources

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

of production and exchange. Their idea was that each country would produce that which it was naturally best fitted to produce, and exchange it without artificial arrangements. They disapproved of trade being turned into unnatural channels, but they advocated countervailing duties in cases where it was necessary to restore equality.

I have detained the House with this because it puts on record in the clearest and most definite manner a statement that in regard to countervailing duties which were treated by Mr. Fowler as striking at the basis and foundation principle of free trade, in the interest of India and the same thing would apply to the interests of Canada and the great colonial Empire, it would be perfectly right and possible for them to disregard such dogmas as these. I need not remind the House of how great an authority the London "Times" is in Great Britain. This great authority, in my opinion, largely depends, not upon its leading public opinion, but upon its prescience in seeing the trend of public opinion, in knowing where public opinion is going, and while it appears to lead, it is actually, by its thorough knowledge of the condition of the country, often in a position to predict what the trend of public opinion will be and to anticipate it. That is one of the great reasons of the authority which the London "Times" has undoubtedly obtained. Everybody was astounded the morning that the Chancellor of the Exchequer intimated that it would be necessary to find new sources of revenue. The London "Times" astonished the world to a large extent by saying that the time would soon come when the British Government would have to radically consider the question of the sources of revenue, and that in their judgment there was no source of revenue that could be better dealt with than the imposition of a tax upon corn, which includes all our wheat and other grains, and the imposition of a duty on sugar. The London "Times" propounded that, as in its judgment, a position to which Her Majesty's Government would soon have to turn their attention, as not merely a measure to sustain the revenue of the country at that high position that was necessary but to carry on their great defensive measures that were so important to the maintenance of the influence of Great Britain. I hold in my hand a copy of the "Globe" newspaper, of Toronto, of March 6th, in which it is said:

The "Times" points out that it is not merely an expedient to tide over a single year that has to be found. "The mischief goes much deeper than any casual miscalculation of this or that Chancellor of the Exchequer. For at least twenty years back the country has been pursuing a course of financial policy which has disturbed the financial equilibrium, and has tended more and more to alter the centre of gravity of taxation. The danger is that it is so easy to get over a temporary difficulty by the simple

expedient of raising by an income tax an additional penny a pound."

#### A Corn and Sugar Duty.

Its conclusion, which has taken the free trade essayists' breath away, is that "it is mischievous to encourage the idea that a free breakfast-table is the privilege of British subjects like the trial by jury or habeas corpus. The true policy is to extend the scope of indirect taxation by the reimposition of the shilling duty on corn, which was not felt while it was in operation, and which would bring in at present a very large sum. This is one proposed reform. A duty of a half-penny a pound on sugar, which would bring in some six millions a year, is another. If some such measures are not adopted, we will find ourselves confronted by far more serious financial problems in the immediate future."

When this question of preferential trade within the Empire was brought up the London "Times" gave it a large measure of support on the ground that the unity of the Empire would thus be secured. Now, I may say that the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, although somewhat disheartened by not seeing this question of preferential trade pressed more vigorously at the time of the Jubilee, has evidently not given the question up. After the Jubilee he referred to this subject in strong terms. On the 3rd of February, 1898, Mr. Chamberlain said :

In what form I know not—it would be foolish to attempt to predict. It may be in the shape of commercial union—

He spoke of how the unity of the Empire could best be promoted.

—of the Imperial Zollverein, which I do not think to be so absurd as do some political economists.

And he said :

It may be in the shape of some Imperial council, which will represent the federation of the British races, and which has been advocated by men as different in other respects as the late Mr. Forster, Lord Rosebery, and Lord Salisbury ; but, in whatever way it may be represented to us, we shall not be deterred, either by the economic pedantries or the selfishness which is a virtue with some politicians, from giving favourable consideration to any proposals which our brethren across the seas may make to us. And in such a consideration, I for one do not believe the English people will keep a strict account of profit and loss—that they will seek to be assured of a present pecuniary gain in return for so much concession on their part. No, I think they will look, and look wisely, rather to a future time when we shall find our reward ; and that the splendid isolation with which our foreign critics sometimes taunt us, will be transformed into a close alliance of the British race, and when the sons of Britain throughout the world shall stand shoulder to shoulder, to defend our mutual interests, and our common rights.

I give that as an evidence that that right hon. gentleman, Mr. Chamberlain, by no means despairs of taking this question up.

Again, in Liverpool, that right hon. gentleman gave expression to the same sentiments in perhaps even stronger language, and, as late as January, 1899, Mr. Chamberlain spoke on the subject at the annual dinner of the Birmingham Jewellers and Silversmiths' Association. This paper, dated February 2nd, 1899, says :

And, gentlemen, what do these things prove ? They prove conclusively that Britons throughout the world are animated by the same aspiration, and that they are preparing the way for that greater federation which, I believe, is coming within the range of practical politics, and which will have the most beneficent and far-reaching results in promoting the peace and the civilization of the world. I do not think that we at home have been backward in forwarding this movement. We have endeavoured to meet our colonies half-way at least, we have welcomed every project—as, for instance, the Imperial penny post and the proposals for improved steamship and telegraphic communication—

And, Sir, I am delighted to learn that Her Majesty's Government, although hesitating for a moment in regard to the Pacific cable, have finally reached a conclusion to carry out practically, as I understand, the decision arrived at by Lord Selborne's Committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That right hon. gentleman, Mr. Chamberlain, continued to say :

—everything, in fact, which will extend and strengthen that invisible organization which, like the nerves of the human body, carries sensation to every part, so that nothing can happen of good or of evil, even to an extremity, which does not send a thrill through the whole of the rest.

#### Unexampled Activity.

In describing the flourishing condition of the self-governing colonies, Mr. Chamberlain said :

"The Dominion of Canada is passing through at the present time a period of unexampled activity. The manufacturers of the east share this prosperity with the farmers of the west, and the great province of British Columbia, with its untold mineral resources, is rapidly being developed, and will shortly, I believe, be the home of a vast population. It is a startling and almost an astounding fact that Canada, Australia and South Africa, with a population all told at the present time of not much more than thirteen millions of people, are taking from us every year very nearly as much as the three greatest European states—Russia, Germany and France—combined, with a population all told of 220,000,000."

No language that could be used shows better the enormous advantage of drawing the bonds of the Empire more closely together, and of increasing that trade which so undoubtedly follows the flag, as is indicated by such a startling statement, that three sections of the Colonial Empire—Canada, Australia and South Africa—with a population

of only 13,000,000, took about as much of the products of British industry as the three greatest European states—Russia, Germany and France—with a population of 220,000,000. That matter is accentuated by the following:—

The "abstract tables" of the trade of the United Kingdom just published in Blue-book form, enforce one fact with all true Imperialists—sane Imperialists, shall we say in deference to Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman—will take due note. During the last five years British exports to British possessions have increased much more rapidly in proportion than to the rest of the world. Here are the aggregate figures:

	1894.	1898.
To foreign countries..	£195,000,000	£204,000,000
To British possessions.	78,000,000	90,000,000

In other words, the trade which follows the flag has increased at the rate of 15 per cent, while trade with other nations has grown only at the rate of  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. What will Lord Farrer have to say to this, we wonder?

That is the comment upon this remarkable statement upon British trade. Let us look now at the Trade Returns of the United States, which make a very remarkable exhibit, and which cannot fail to make an impression on the minds of British statesmen in a direction favourable to the accomplishment of what we wish, viz., the great aim and object of preferential trade, by which colonial products should have a position in the British market that the products of foreign countries have not. The December monthly summary of the commerce and finances of the United States gives a statement showing the value of the merchandise imported into and exported from the United States in each of the last ten calendar months, together with the names of the countries from which, or to which, exported or imported. For the purpose of comparison, the following figures are taken for the calendar year 1898—prior to the McKinley tariff—and for the calendar year 1893. The United Kingdom sent to the United States in the year 1889 \$179,566,373 worth, and in 1898 that comparatively small amount sent by the United Kingdom to the United States of America fell to \$111,361,617 worth. Contrast for a single moment that with what the United States sent to Great Britain. The United States in 1889 sent to Great Britain \$650,616,283 worth, and in 1898 the United States sent to Great Britain \$981,134,110 worth. It will thus be seen that while there was a falling off in the imports by the United States from the United Kingdom, from 1889 to 1898, of \$68,000,000, there was an increase from the United States to the United Kingdom, in those years, of no less than \$331,512,000. It is impossible, in view of these figures, for any British statesman to gainsay the fact that while they are giving to foreign countries all the advantages by taking the products of these countries on precisely the same condition as those from Canada

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

and the other British colonies, not only have they received no equivalent, but, as I have shown in the case of the United States, their exports have largely decreased under the influence of the high American tariff, and this decrease is accompanied by a vast increase in the imports from that country. Take the question of German trade, it is well known that by the system adopted by Germany, of giving large Imperial subsidies to steamers sailing to the Australasian colonies, low transit has been provided for German goods and these are consequently crowding out British goods. That is one of the things recognized by the present Secretary of State for the Colonies as a ground for the Imperial Government giving subsidies for steam communication to Canada and China and Japan on the western coast and contributing a subsidy for a fast service to the British West Indies.

I do not intend to detain the House longer than to say that I quite recognize the step taken by this Government, and taken no doubt with the intention of largely increasing the imports of Great Britain into Canada, but my right hon. friend knows that it has met with a very moderate result, so far as British industry is concerned. In fact, I may say with no result. Having gone further into the calculation, I find that instead of having increased our trade with Great Britain, that trade to-day is smaller than it was in 1896 before the change of Administration. That certainly is not a satisfactory result, but I am perfectly satisfied that with the adoption of a policy of preferential trade, such as that which all parties in this House and out of it in Canada are committed to, which all recognize as one which would be an enormous value to Canada, there will be such increase in the population of Canada and in its productive capacity that will realize our most sanguine expectations. Just imagine, here is Great Britain receiving this enormous import of breadstuffs mainly from the United States of America, while in Canada we have the soil, the climate, the pasturage, and a wheat-producing capacity that would, under a policy of preferential trade, furnish the mother country with all the bread and meat that she requires to consume, over £100,000,000 sterling worth per annum.

I need not say to this House what it would do for Canada. Not only would it develop our prairie lands and all the other resources of Canada, but it would furnish such a vast population as would in turn be able to make a corresponding preferential return to the mother country.

I shall not go into the question of the enormous interest this is to Great Britain. Statisticians of great ability and the highest character have taken that subject up, and have shown that in case of war England will be placed in an extremely delicate and difficult position, probably at no distant day, from the fact that at present she is largely

dependent upon Russia and the United States, two foreign countries, for the main portion of her food supply. And she remains thus dependent while she has possessions on the continent of North America alone that, under a policy of preferential trade, would furnish her with all the products of the soil which she is compelled annually for the subsistence of her people to import at present almost entirely from foreign countries.

The advantages are so great and obvious that I do not intend to detain the House, at this late period of the session, by dwelling further on this question, but it is one, in my judgment, of vaster import to Canada and the Empire to which we have the honour to belong than any other question that is engaging the attention of the people of this country. I beg to move :

That in March, 1896, the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, Secretary of State for the Colonies, suggested that duties favouring the colonies should be imposed by the United Kingdom upon her imported foreign produce, provided the colonies would in return make large preferential concessions in favour of the United Kingdom ; and he asked the colonies to "better" the offer they had previously made ;

That in June, 1896, Mr. Chamberlain said that he found the germs of a satisfactory proposal for such preferential trade within the Empire, in a resolution passed that year by the Toronto Board of Trade ;

That on the 13th of June, 1897, in the presence of the Prime Minister of Canada, the Duke of Devonshire, a former leader of the Liberal party in England, said (while declaring himself still to be a free trader) that "Virtues were given to free trade which it did not possess, and results were predicted which have not followed" ; that "its speedy universal adoption all over the world was prophesied, and that prophecy has been falsified" ; that "the thick and-thin admirers and believers in the Manchester school seek to persuade us that although that prophecy has not been fulfilled, it was the best thing for us that we should be the only free trading country in the world" ; that "very few disciples of free trade of fifty years ago would have believed for a moment that at this time France and Germany would have been carrying on enormous trade under strictly protective conditions" ; that "the world has not become the commercial paradise that was predicted in the early days of free trade opinion" ; that "we have since learned by painful experience that no old or new markets are being thrown open to us by the influence of free trade alone" ; that "if we want to provide for the increasing commerce which is necessary for the support of our increasing population, we must find these markets for ourselves" ; and that "colonial expansion and consolidation are essential to the maintenance of our continued prosperity."

That the speech in which the Duke of Devonshire gave utterance to these views was regarded in England as a foreshadowing of the adoption by Lord Salisbury's Government of the proposal above referred to, made by Mr. Chamberlain in March, 1896.

That in his interview with the Colonial Premiers during the Jubilee celebration of 1897, the Colonial Secretary said :

"In the meanwhile, however, I may say that I note a resolution which appears to have been

passed unanimously at the meeting of the Premiers in Hobart, in which the desire was expressed for closer commercial arrangements with the Empire, and I think it was suggested that a commission of inquiry should be created in order to see in what way practical effect might be given to the aspiration. If that be the case, and if it were thought that at the present time you were not prepared to go beyond inquiry, if it were the wish of the other colonies, of Canada and of the South African Colonies, to join in such an inquiry. Her Majesty's Government would be delighted to make arrangements for the purpose, and to accept any suggestions as to the form of the reference and the character and constitution of the commission, and would very gladly take part in it."

That in March, 1898, Mr. Chamberlain once more returned to the subject of this great British policy, and said "he thought he had already convinced the colonies that the Imperial authorities were ready to meet them more than half-way in any proposal they make for closer union" ; that the Imperial authorities "would not be deterred either by economic pedantries or selfishness" from giving favourable considerations to any such proposals, and that "he did not think the English people would keep a strict account of profit and loss, or would seek to be assured of present pecuniary gain, but would look, and look wisely, to the future for their reward."

That in the opinion of this House it is the duty of the Government (in response to these repeated advances made by the Imperial authorities) to endeavour to secure for the produce of Canada that preferential treatment in the markets of the United Kingdom which would be of such inestimable value to the farmers and other producers of Canada competing against foreign rivals in the markets of the United Kingdom, would set in motion a great tide of immigration to our shores, people the vast wheat areas of the Canadian North-west, enhance farm values in the older provinces, promote the unity of our Empire, and speedily deliver it from dangerous dependence upon a foreign food supply.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I certainly have no fault to find with the manner in which my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) has introduced this motion. On the contrary, I very highly appreciate the moderation with which he has approached the subject. I know that my hon. friend feels very strongly upon the subject on which he has addressed the House this afternoon, and I all the more cordially appreciate the moderation of which he has given us evidence on this occasion, a moderation, I may say also, that highly befits the importance of the subject in hand. If I have one fault to find with my hon. friend, it may be expressed by saying that it seems to me unfortunate that he has waited until this period of the session to bring in this resolution. For, at this moment, when we are all looking for the blessing of a prorogation, the House is hardly in a mood, I believe, to discuss any questions except those which are capable of immediate solution, and that cannot be said of the question in hand. But I will endeavour, without any circumlocution, to come to the main point at once and to meet

the motion of my hon. friend directly and squarely. The motion affirms that it is the duty of the Government to endeavour to take steps with a view to obtaining for the products of Canada preferential treatment in the markets of Great Britain. To that proposition I have not a word of dissent to offer; on the contrary, I fully concur in it. I say at once it is the duty of the Government of Canada, by all means in its power and as soon as it is possible to do so, to get preferential treatment in the markets of Great Britain. I am sorry to say, however, that my hon. friend has chosen to base this declaration as to the duty of the Government upon a statement of facts which, for my part, I cannot agree to, and which I believe is absolutely unfounded. The assertion is made in this motion that the Government have received repeatedly from the Imperial authorities invitations and advances to enter into negotiations in order to obtain that which we hope for the products of Canada in the markets of Great Britain. As I say, I cannot accept this statement of fact. I do not believe—I am sorry not to believe—that it can be substantiated at all. I would direct the attention of the House to this fact—that it would be strange indeed if the Government of Great Britain, if the Imperial authorities, to use the language of the motion, have made advances to the Canadian Government or to the colonial governments at large, to give them, if they were so inclined, preferential treatment in the markets of Great Britain—it would be strange indeed, I say, if the Government of Great Britain had not embodied their views in a state document. It is not the habit of the British Government to be coquetting and flirting and, like a blushing maiden, to make advances, to be courted and won half willingly and half unwillingly. It is the tradition of the British Government, on the contrary, to come directly to the purpose, to invite cordiality by cordiality and frankness by frankness. If my hon. friend could state truly that the British Government had made advances to the colonial authorities, as he asserted in this motion, he would have been able to quote a state despatch upon the question. He has not done so. But, Sir, there is a state despatch upon this very question; and, if it has not been quoted, I imagine there can be but one reason, and that is that it does not support the view advanced in this motion that the British Government had repeatedly made advances to us on this subject. There is the despatch written by the predecessor of Mr. Chamberlain in the Colonial Office, the Marquis of Ripon—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Oh, that is ancient history.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is not so ancient history, after all; it was written in

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

1895, and so is only four years old. And I shall show that since that time there has been no departure from the position taken by the Marquis of Ripon, either by Mr. Chamberlain, the Duke of Devonshire, or any other of the Imperial authorities. The Marquis of Ripon was answering the resolution adopted by the Colonial Conference, which met in this city in 1894, and he wrote as follows:—

The resolution does not advocate the establishment of a customs union comprising the whole Empire, whereby all the existing barriers to free commercial intercourse between the various members would be removed, and the aggregate customs revenue equitably apportioned among the different communities. Such an arrangement would be in principle free from objection, and, if it were practicable, would certainly prove effective in cementing the unity of the Empire and promoting its progress and stability. But it was unanimously recognized by the delegates that the circumstances of the colonies make such a union, for the present, at any rate, impossible; and it is, therefore, unnecessary to discuss the practical difficulties which stand in the way of its realization.

Now, before I proceed further, let me call special attention to the opening words of this utterance of the Marquis of Ripon:

The resolution does not advocate the establishment of a customs union comprising the whole Empire, whereby all the existing barriers to free commercial intercourse between the various members would be removed, and the aggregate customs revenue equitably apportioned among the different communities. Such an arrangement would be in principle free from objection.

Sir, if there is anything to be inferred from this it is that the Ottawa resolution, offered a hybrid system, a bastard system, of protection on the one hand and free trade on the other, a system whereby protection would be retained by the colonies and free trade with respect to our products or a preferential tariff by England. But if, instead of that hybrid system, the resolution had offered to the Imperial authorities a system of freedom of customs duties within the Empire, then, Sir, the inference is that the Marquis of Ripon would have been ready to consider that proposition—a proposition to establish free trade within the Empire. I shall show presently that all the quotations made on this occasion from the speeches of Mr. Chamberlain and other distinguished Imperial statesmen, move in the same direction, not in the direction of keeping this hybrid system of protection in Canada while at the same time we give preferential treatment to England, but of establishing a system of freedom of trade within the Empire. I am reminded of a statement made by my hon. friend a moment ago when he referred to the speech of the Duke of Devonshire, speaking of Canadians and people of all the other colonial possessions as citizens of the British Empire. So we are; and I take my stand upon this very proposition,

that we in Canada are just as really citizens of the Empire as are Englishmen themselves. But I want to know at once, is it the intention of hon. gentlemen who will not dispute that we are citizens of the same Empire, to say that in any degree at all the citizens of one part of the Empire shall be taxed for the benefit of another part of the Empire? Rather shall not the citizens of the Empire meet each other on common grounds, without any distinction between one part of the Empire and another? That is a question which, I believe, a great many Imperial statesmen of the present day are willing to approach, and I think I can show before I sit down that this is the view taken by all the Imperial statesmen whose opinions have been quoted by my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), who brought forward this motion. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) said a moment ago that the Marquis of Ripon's despatch was ancient history. Well, then, let us put it aside, and let us come to this motion, which is contemporary history. Let us take the statements attributed to the Duke of Devonshire and to Mr. Chamberlain, and we will review them as given in this motion. I shall take first the views attributed to the Duke of Devonshire because in this motion greater prominence seems to be given to them, and in order to do justice to my hon. friend who drew up this motion, and who, I know well from long experience, feels deeply upon it, I shall quote to the House from the language of his motion on this subject. This is how it reads:

That on the 13th of June, 1897, in the presence of the Prime Minister of Canada, the Duke of Devonshire, a former leader of the Liberal party in England said (while declaring himself still to be a free trader) that "Virtues were given to free trade which it did not possess, and results were predicted which have not followed"; that "its speedy universal adoption all over the world was prophesied, and that prophecy has been falsified"; that "the thick-and-thin admirers and believers in the Manchester school seek to persuade us that although that prophecy has not been fulfilled, it was the best thing for us that we should be the only free trading country in the world"; that "very few disciples of free trade of fifty years ago would have believed for a moment that at this time France and Germany would have been carrying on enormous trade under strictly protective conditions"; that "the world has not become the commercial paradise that was predicted in the early days of free trade opinion"; that "we have since learned by painful experience that no old or new markets are being thrown open to us by the influence of free trade alone"; that "if we want to provide for the increasing commerce which is necessary for the support of our increasing population, we must find these markets for ourselves"; and that "colonial expansion and consolidation are essential to the maintenance of our continued prosperity."

Sir, is that all? Is that an invitation given to the Canadian Government and to myself in particular, since I was present when that speech was delivered, to enter into negotia-

tions to obtain for the products of Canada in the markets of Great Britain preferential treatment? I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend who drew up this motion has dealt a rather severe blow to some members of this House and to the press of this country, and, perhaps, to himself as well; because, if I recollect aright, the statement was made again and again in the press and even on the floor of this House that upon that very occasion, on the 12th of June, 1897, at Liverpool, in my presence, the Duke of Devonshire had offered to me as representing Canada, preferential treatment in the markets of Great Britain for the products of Canada.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend does not say I made that statement?

The PRIME MINISTER. I thought my hon. friend had made it.

Mr. McNEILL. Oh, never.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am glad to accept his statement; but if he did not, others did in this House make the same statement. Now, the only thing that can be inferred from the quotations which have been made here from the speech of the Duke of Devonshire was that, though still a free trader, he had been very much disappointed with the results of free trade in Great Britain, and that, perhaps, he was prepared to consider another condition of things. I have no doubt this is the view which my hon. friend has taken himself of that speech of the Duke of Devonshire. Mr. Speaker, we know very well that it is characteristic of mankind that they readily believe what they wish for. My hon. friend on this occasion has seen the fact in the wish. We know very well that men are apt to deceive themselves, and by dint of repeating a thing, at last they persuade themselves that it has taken place. We have the example of old King John IV., who began by saying that he had been present at the battle of Waterloo, and by dint of repeating it he finally became firmly persuaded that he had been present at that battle. There are other instances of the same kind. It is on record in history that at a time when religious controversy ran very high, men, strong casuists, did not hesitate to manipulate the text of scripture in order to establish a point, and even to make interpolations, to abstract one text and interpolate another, so as to convey the impression they wanted to convey. In old times they used to call such a process a pious fraud. Now, I will not say that my hon. friend who drew this motion has been guilty of a pious fraud. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the term fraud would be parliamentary, even if it were qualified by the adjective "pious." But my hon. friend, I am afraid, has not done full justice to the speech of the Duke of Devonshire, he has not quoted it entirely; one sentence in particular he did not quote, and by omitting it he has convey-

ed an impression of the speech of the Duke of Devonshire which the duke himself had no intention to convey. I again call the attention of the House to the first sentence which is placed in the mouth of the Duke of Devonshire :

That on the 13th of June, 1897, in the presence of the Prime Minister of Canada, the Duke of Devonshire, a former leader of the Liberal party in England, said (while declaring himself still to be a free trader) that "Virtues were given to free trade which it does not possess."

Now, I submit to my hon. friend that the qualification which he places here in the mouth of the Duke of Devonshire as saying that he still proclaims himself a free trader, does not convey the force of the expression which the duke himself used on that occasion; far from it. This is the very text of the words spoken by the Duke of Devonshire upon that occasion, and I quote from an authentic version which my hon. friend has no doubt seen :

I continue, said His Grace, to believe, as I have always believed, that free trade is the best and wisest policy of our country, but virtues were given to it which it did not possess, and results were predicted which did not follow.

Promises were made and results were predicted for free trade which did not follow; still, notwithstanding these misgivings, notwithstanding this condition of things, notwithstanding these failures, the Duke of Devonshire said that free trade still continued to be the best and wisest policy for Great Britain. If that be so, if the Duke of Devonshire believes that free trade is the best and wisest policy for Great Britain, I cannot see that there was any invitation or offer of preferential treatment for the products of Canada in the markets of Great Britain.

I pass from that to the language adopted by the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain. The hon. gentleman has quoted from the speech delivered by Mr. Chamberlain in March, 1896, before the Canada Club. My hon. friend summarized what Mr. Chamberlain said on that occasion, in this way :

He suggested that duties favouring the colonies should be imposed by the United Kingdom upon her imported foreign produce, provided the colonies would, in return, make large preferential concessions in favour of the United Kingdom, and he asked the colonies to "better" the offer they had previously made.

I am afraid that the power of analysis of the hon. gentleman is not much more reliable than his memory. The hon. gentleman has neither actually nor accurately summarized the very important language used by Mr. Chamberlain in his speech before the Canada Club. According to the summary which the hon. gentleman has given, Mr. Chamberlain might have been content on that occasion to set out simple disjointed ideas, whereas the truth is, that Mr. Cham-

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

berlain laid down the policy and outlined a plan which would gain for Canadian products in the markets of Great Britain that preferential treatment which my hon. friend yearns for. The hon. gentleman put me a question to answer, and I shall put him a question—no, I shall not put him a question, but I shall make a statement at once, and it is this, that my hon. friends on the other side of the House doubt at this moment, and would not accept of, preferential treatment, as it was offered on that occasion by Mr. Chamberlain, upon the condition laid down by Mr. Chamberlain himself, because, as I shall show presently, the condition which was laid down by Mr. Chamberlain, the policy which he outlined, and the plan which he proposed, was free trade within the Empire, with the elimination of duties.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no.

The PRIME MINISTER. The elimination of all customs duties, in so far as they involved protection, as I shall show presently that Mr. Chamberlain put the question again and again. Every one knows, and the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) by his protest shows, that he is not prepared to accept preferential treatment offered by Mr. Chamberlain with the conditions attached. I will quote from the speech of Mr. Chamberlain to refresh the memory of the hon. gentleman upon this subject. I quote from the "Foreign and Colonial Speeches of Mr. Chamberlain," page 168. But before I go to that, it would be well at this stage to review the offer which had been made by Canada upon that occasion, because the hon. gentleman recalled the fact that Mr. Chamberlain had on that occasion asked the colonies to better the offer they had previously made. It is proper that we should at this moment remind the House of what was the offer made by Canada. Mr. Chamberlain was reviewing the resolution passed by the Colonial Conference at Ottawa in 1894, which declared :

Whereas the stability and progress of the British Empire can be best assured by drawing continually closer the bands that unite the colonies with the mother country, and by the continuous growth of a practical sympathy and co-operation in all that pertains to the common welfare ;

And whereas this co-operation and unity can in no way be more effectually promoted than by the cultivation and extension of the mutual and profitable interchange of their products ;

Therefore resolved,—That this Conference records its belief in the advisability and practical possibility of a customs arrangement between Great Britain and her colonies by which trade within the Empire may be placed on a more favourable footing than that which is carried on with foreign countries ;

And further resolved,—That pending the assent of the mother country to such an arrangement, in which she shall be included, it is desirable that the colonies of Great Britain, or such of them as may be disposed to accede to the view, take immediate steps to place each other's products on a more favourable customs

basis than is accorded to the like products of foreign countries.

Now, this was the mother idea ; but it was supplemented, in fact it was supplemented at that very moment by a motion made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) himself, who upon more than one occasion, as the House will recollect, has made motions emphasizing the position taken by the Colonial Conference. In 1894 my hon. friend had moved the following motion :—

If and when the Parliament of Great Britain—

Mr. McNEILL. I beg the right hon. gentleman's pardon. That was two years before.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes. I will show it had been moved before ; but the hon. gentleman has been moving in the same circle ever since.

If and when the Parliament of Great Britain admits Canadian products to the markets of the United Kingdom upon more favourable terms than are accorded to the products of foreign countries, the Parliament of Canada will be prepared to accord corresponding advantages by substantial reductions on the duties imposed upon British manufactured goods.

In 1896, just a few days before the speech delivered by Mr. Chamberlain, the hon. gentleman moved again. The language was not the same, but the idea was absolutely the same :

That it would be to the advantage of Canada and the Empire as a whole that a small duty (irrespective of any existing tariff) be levied by each member of the Empire against foreign products imported by them, and that the proceeds from such duties be devoted to purposes of Imperial intercommunication and defence.

But now, on this latter occasion, my hon. friend proposes to provide at once that duties should be levied, and Mr. Chamberlain, speaking before the Canada Club, reviewed this last proposal of my hon. friend. This is the language he made use of :

I observed in the "Times" this morning a telegram from Canada, which tells us that Mr. McNeill, the gentleman who moved the patriotic resolution to which I have already referred, has moved another resolution in the House of Commons of Canada, by which he proposes to declare that it is desirable in the interests of Great Britain and of the colonies that a moderate ad valorem duty, independent of any existing duty, should be imposed both by the colonies and by the mother country upon all imports from foreign countries.

That was the proposal which was before Mr. Chamberlain. Let us hear the remarks he made upon it :

That, therefore, is the suggestion—for I will call it no more—it is not a formal proposition, but it is the suggestion that has been made to us by our colonies for carrying out a system of commercial union. At any rate, a proposition of that kind is entitled to respectful consideration, and if we object to it, we ought, I think, to

propose an alternative, or we ought—and this is the only other thing for us to do—to say at once that all we have said, all that we have thought about Imperial unity, has been thrown away, and that that idea must be abandoned as an empty dream.

Now, Sir, do not let us minimize the proposition we are asked to consider. It would involve—in the case of the United Kingdom—a most serious disturbance of trade ; it would be a great change in the principles which for many years past have guided our commercial policy. It involves the imposition of a duty, it may be a small one, but it is a duty upon food and upon raw material, and whatever may be the result of imposing such a duty, as to which, if I had time, I could discourse for many minutes—whatever may be the actual result—the tendency is to increase the cost of living, which would intensify the pressure upon the working classes of this country, and it would also have a tendency to increase the cost of production, which would put us, of course, in a worse position than now in competition with foreign countries in neutral markets.

After elaborating that idea, Mr. Chamberlain said :

But my first point is that in the proposal and suggestion which has hitherto been made, there is no sufficient 'quid pro quo,' the advantage offered is not enough to induce this country to take the certain loss and the possible risk which would be involved in revising altogether its present commercial policy. Having regard to the amount of the colonial duties which are at present time levied upon British produce, it is evident that a fixed addition such as is suggested would be a much smaller preference in the case of goods going to the colonies than it would be in the case of goods coming from the colonies to this country. In the case of this country, the preference would be given on the present cost price of the goods, but in the colonies the preference would only be reckoned on the cost of the goods plus the heavy duties now imposed. The percentage, therefore, would be much more in favour of the colonies than it would be in favour of the United Kingdom.

The second point, which is much more important, is that our foreign trade is so gigantic in proportion to the foreign trade of the colonies that the burden of an arrangement of this kind would fall with much greater weight on the United Kingdom than upon our fellow subjects in the colonies.

I therefore think we may very fairly ask them to better their offer if, as I believe, they desire to proceed upon those lines, and if those lines do really offer the best direction in which we can proceed.

Now, Sir, there was an invitation to my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) to better his offer. I shall show presently how he responded to that invitation, but before I do, let me further quote from the speech of Mr. Chamberlain, in which after having made the invitation to the colonies to better their offer he gave them their direction and showed them the way how to do it. Mr. Chamberlain then went on to speak as follows :—

I have laid down four propositions, which I think cannot be controverted. The first is that there is a universal desire among all the mem-

bers of the Empire for a closer union between the several branches, and that, in their opinion, as in ours, this is desirable—nay, it is essential for the existence of the Empire as such. My second proposition is that experience has taught us that this closer union can be most hopefully approached in the first instance from its commercial side.

We all agree to that.

My third proposition is that the suggestions which have hitherto been made to us, although we know them to have been made in good part, are, when considered from the point of view of British interests, not sufficiently favourable to be considered by this country. My fourth proposition is that a true Zollverein for the Empire, that a free trade established throughout the Empire, although it would involve the imposition of duties against foreign countries, and would be in that respect a derogation from the high principles of free trade and from the practice of the United Kingdom up to the present time, would still be a proper subject for discussion, and might probably lead to a satisfactory arrangement, if the colonies on their part were willing to consider it.

Mr. McNEILL. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very well, my hon. friend assents to all that. Now, Sir, Mr. Chamberlain after having laid down the different propositions as to how we could bring about the union which we all desire by approaching it from the commercial side, goes on to say:

My second point is that we are dealing with an entirely exceptional state of things, and that we cannot, even if we wished, imitate exactly the German Zollverein. We are not conterminous countries; we are countries, as I have said, separated by thousands of miles, in some cases, and the circumstances of our different countries vary so considerably that it is evident that in any arrangement as to general free trade within the Empire exceptions must be made in the case of articles that are chiefly taxed for revenue purposes. For instance, we cannot admit free trade in spirits or in tobacco, and to any gentleman who has any experience other articles will suggest themselves, which, in one part of the Empire or another, are the subject of strictly revenue duties, and might, by common agreement, be excluded from any such arrangement.

That is the whole question, and I will refer to it later on.

But the principle which I claim must be accepted, if we are to make any, even the slightest, progress, is that within the different parts of the Empire, protection must disappear, and that the duties must be revenue duties, and not protective duties in the sense of protecting the products of one part of the Empire against those of another part.

Now, Sir, this is very plain language, but I am sorry to say that I have to charge it against gentlemen on the other side of the House, that whenever they have approached this subject, instead of approaching it in the frank and open manner indicated by Mr. Chamberlain, they have always equivocated

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

and quibbled about it. I have again to call the attention of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) to this language of Mr. Chamberlain:

For instance, we cannot admit free trade in spirits or in tobacco, and to any gentleman who has any experience other articles will suggest themselves which, in one part of the Empire or another, are the subject of strictly revenue duties, and might, by common agreement, be excluded from any such arrangement.

What is the purport of this language? The purport of this language is simply, that if we are to have this customs union with Great Britain under which we can have preferential treatment, we must do it in the form of a Zollverein, but Mr. Chamberlain points out exceptions to which we can all agree. In the German Zollverein, as we know, there is an absolute absence of excise or customs duty in one member of the Zollverein as against the other. There are no customs duties within the German Zollverein. Mr. Chamberlain says very frankly: We can have a customs union with Canada; we can have a Zollverein, but if we have that Imperial Zollverein, we must prepare to make exceptions for tobacco, and spirits, and other similar products. Then he goes on to say, that for the general run of the tariff there must be an absence of customs duties; that must be the rule though there might be some exceptions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no. "Customs duties for protection."

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, it is impossible to construe this language in any other way:

For instance, we cannot admit free trade in spirits or in tobacco, and to any gentleman who has any experience other articles will suggest themselves which, in one part of the Empire or another, are the subject of strictly revenue duties, and might, by common agreement, be excluded from any such arrangement.

Can anything be clearer than that, if we are to have that Imperial Zollverein, there should be no customs duties except on articles of excise, spirits, wines, tobacco, and certain other articles to be specified. Well, Mr. Chairman, is my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) prepared for that? Is he ready to say: that he is prepared for an Imperial Zollverein removing all customs duties from manufactured products, with perhaps an exception here and there. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) knows he is not prepared for that, and there is not an hon. gentleman sitting on the other side of the House who would be prepared for an Imperial Zollverein. These gentlemen opposite have been taunting us during this very session, that we have maintained the principle of protection in the tariff; they have been taunting us that we are not able to remove it. I do not accept the taunt, but I say very sincerely that the condition has not yet arrived in

Canada when we can do without a customs tariff. And if we are in that condition, it is no use to argue that we are ready for an Imperial Zollverein. If gentlemen on the other side of the House will propose to respond to the idea of Mr. Chamberlain, they must be prepared to say that they are ready for an Imperial Zollverein which will remove all customs tariffs from Canada, except excise duties, wine, spirits, tobacco, and a few other articles.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Chamberlain does not say "a few other articles."

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) says "no, no," but I rely on the language of Mr. Chamberlain. These gentlemen opposite, then, are ready to maintain the customs duties; they want to have preferential treatment in Great Britain for the products of Canada, and to maintain at the same time a customs duty against manufactured British products. That is the position which they take. I am very glad they do because we know where we are. This is their proposition, that we should have a Zollverein—no, I cannot dignify it by that name—but a system whereby the products of Canada shall be admitted into Great Britain at a preferential tariff while at the same time we maintain our customs tariff against the manufactured products of Great Britain.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the right hon. gentleman tell us the date of that speech of Mr. Chamberlain?

The PRIME MINISTER. March, 1896.

Mr. BERGERON. He has changed his mind since.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend says he has changed his mind since. I would like to know when and where?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At the meeting of the Chambers of Commerce when he accepted the resolution of the Toronto Board of Trade.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend has spoken too previously. I shall come to that presently, and I shall show that Mr. Chamberlain did not then modify his views, but rather emphasized them. Let me at once refer to the speech of Mr. Chamberlain and show that hon. gentlemen opposite will find in that very speech a condemnation of the system they propose. Mr. Chamberlain, in the speech which I have just quoted, shows the injustice involved against Great Britain for the benefit of Canada in the policy suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Chamberlain said:

Having regard to the amount of the colonial duties which are at the present time levied upon British produce, it is evident that a fixed addi-

tion such as is suggested would be a much smaller preference in the case of goods going to the colonies than it would be in the case of goods coming from the colonies to this country.

Let me call particularly the attention of hon. gentlemen to the following sentence:

In the case of this country, the preference would be given on the present cost price of the goods, but in the colonies the preference would only be reckoned on the cost of the goods plus the heavy duties now imposed.

Here you have the answer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will my hon. friend allow me to point out that the argument is the very reverse. Mr. Chamberlain there is dealing with the proposal to give an advantage to Great Britain by imposing a duty against foreign goods, and leaving us our present duties against England.

The PRIME MINISTER. Would the arrangement be different? The arrangement would be that a preference would be given to Canadian goods on the cost of the products and given on British goods on the cost plus the duty. There is no parity there. Let the same preference be given to the goods on the one side and the other.

Mr. McNEILL. I just wish to say to my hon. friend that what he is saying now shows us this is but a matter of negotiation and arrangement.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is, but there must be a basis for this negotiation and arrangement, and the basis my hon. friend wants is customs duties imposed on British products and none against Canadian products. So long as he wants that, he cannot hope ever to come to any conclusion with England. I want to put the question to hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Chamberlain said: If you are to have preferential treatment in Great Britain, you must abandon protection in Canada. Are hon. gentlemen opposite ready to say now that they will abandon the principle of protection? If so, let them speak, for this is the time. I do not expect them to answer at once, but before this debate is concluded I want them to say whether it is their intention to abandon the principle of protection. If it is, it was not the idea of their leader in 1896, because in his manifesto addressed to the people of Canada in that year, the hon. leader of the Opposition thus gave his views on the question of preferential trade:

With a tariff based on mutual concessions, it is reasonable to expect a still greater development of our trade in that market, and we should, at the same time, be rendering material assistance towards the unity and strengthening of the Empire, without involving a lessening of the protection to our industries.

I want to know how hon. gentlemen can be protectionists and at the same time expect to have preferential treatment from

Great Britain. Either one thing or the other. If hon. gentlemen opposite tell us they are ready to abandon the doctrine of protection, we shall know where we are and treat them accordingly. but they will not, even on this occasion, dare tell us that they abandon that policy. They have always maintained it, even during this very session, and even for the purpose of making a point on this occasion, they dare not abandon it.

Mr. SPROULE. Do we not give a preference to England now without giving up protection?

The PRIME MINISTER. What we are discussing is preferential treatment for Canadian products in England, and that we cannot have unless by renouncing the doctrine of protection.

Now, I come to the other part of the motion and the speech delivered by Mr. Chamberlain in 1896, before the assembled Chambers of Commerce of Great Britain. The language of my hon. friend's motion is as follows:—

That in June, 1896, Mr. Chamberlain said that he found the germs of a satisfactory proposal for such preferential trade within the Empire in a resolution passed that year by the Toronto Board of Trade.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That was in June, 1897. The meeting of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire, at which the Board of Trade of Toronto's resolution was proposed, was held, I think, in June, 1897.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is mistaken. It was held in June, 1896. Let me quote to the House the resolution of the Toronto Board of Trade, which was moved on this occasion by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler). That occasion was the third congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire, held in the hall of the Grocers' Company, from June 9th to June 12th, 1896. There were about 95 Chambers of Commerce at that meeting, representing all parts of the Empire, Great Britain, Canada, the West Indies, the East Indies, Africa, Australia, &c. The Board of Trade of Toronto had entrusted its delegate, Mr. Osler, with a resolution, which was couched in these words:

Whereas the stability and progress of the British Empire can be best assured by drawing continually closer the bonds that unite the colonies with the mother country, and by the continuous growth of a practical and sympathetic co-operation in all that pertains to the common welfare; and whereas this co-operation and unity can in no way be more effectually promoted than by the cultivation and extension of the mutual and profitable interchange of their products;

Therefore resolved,—That this Congress records its belief in the advisability and practicability of a customs arrangement between Great Britain and her Colonies and India, on the basis of preferential treatment, and recommends that steps be taken by Her Majesty's Govern-

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

ment to bring about an interchange of opinions on the subject between the mother country and the other Governments of the Empire.

It is quite true that in the speech delivered by Mr. Chamberlain on this occasion, to which I shall allude later on, he said that he saw in that resolution "the germ of preferential trade." But I call the attention of the House to this fact, that that germ never germinated. The motion was made by my hon. friend from Toronto, but was not accepted. The feeling in England in favour of free trade is so strong that the motion was not accepted. After the motion had been made, and after some discussion had taken place, Sir Donald Smith, who represented Canada, saw clearly that the discussion was going against the motion. Therefore he moved the following amendment. Taking the same preamble, he submitted this resolution:

Therefore resolved,—That this Congress records its belief in the advisability and practicability of a customs arrangement between Great Britain and her Colonies and India on the basis of preferential treatment, and recommends that steps should be taken by Her Majesty's Government to bring about an interchange of opinions on the subject between the mother country and the other Governments of the Empire.

Resolved,—That in the opinion of this Congress the advantages to be obtained by a closer union between the various portions of the British Empire are so great as to justify an arrangement as nearly as possible of the nature of a Zollverein, based upon principles of the freest exchange of commodities within the Empire consistent with the tariff requirements incident to the maintenance of the local government of each Kingdom, Dominion, province or colony, now forming part of the British family of nations.

But again objection was taken, and the president called attention to the fact, and this is the way he spoke:

The latter clause in the amendment was handed me at the time by Sir Donald Smith. I, of course, accepted what he suggested. It appears, however, there is a conflict, and that this latter clause should be erased. Do you agree that I should remove the last clause of the amendment, Sir Donald, which the Congress seems to think is inconsistent?

Sir Donald Smith.—Yes.

The President.—Then the amendment will read as follows:—

"Whereas the stability and progress of the British Empire can be best assured by drawing continually closer the bonds that unite the colonies with the mother country, and by the continuous growth of a practical sympathy and co-operation in all that pertains to the common welfare;

"And whereas this co-operation and unity can in no way be more effectually promoted than by the cultivation and extension of the mutual and profitable interchange of their products;

Therefore resolved,—That this Congress records its belief in the advisability and practicability of a customs arrangement between Great Britain and her Colonies and India, on the basis of preferential treatment—"

Continuing the motion of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler).

This again was amended, and finally the motion was withdrawn, and the following was accepted and carried:—

That this Congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire is of opinion that the establishment of closer commercial relations between the United Kingdom and the colonies and dependencies is an object which deserves and demands prompt and careful consideration. The Congress, therefore, respectfully represents to Her Majesty's Government, that if the suggestion should be made on behalf of the colonies, or some of them, it would be right and expedient to promote such consideration, and the formulation of some practicable plan, by summoning an Imperial conference, thoroughly representative of the interests involved, or by such other means as Her Majesty may be advised to adopt.

So, as I said, the germ contained in the resolution of the Board of Trade of Toronto did not grow. The result of all was this very anodyne proposition, which asked for a conference upon the subject. I have no doubt that all this was a great disappointment to many of the gentlemen there assembled. I have no doubt that a good many had hoped that from the resolution of the Board of Trade of Toronto something would spring which would bring about preferential trade. But the reason why this motion did not carry, I believe, is shown in the speech delivered by Mr. Chamberlain on that occasion, in which he indicated the policy he had formulated in the month of March preceding, when he stated that he was not a pedantic free trader, but was ready to consider free trade within the Empire. Now, let me quote the speech delivered by Mr. Chamberlain at the opening of this Congress of Chambers of Commerce of the Empire. He said:

The establishment of commercial union throughout the Empire would only be the first step, but it would be the main step and the decisive step towards the realization of the most inspiring idea that ever entered into the minds of British statesmen. \* \* \* But up to the present time we have not been agreed as to the methods by which this object may be reached. It appears to me that there are only three lines of progress which have been suggested to accomplish this great object. The first of them is a proposal that the colonies should abandon their own fiscal system and should adopt ours, that they should carry out fully the doctrines of free trade, that they should open their markets not only to us, but to all the world, and that they should abandon entirely the protective duties upon which now they rest very largely for the revenues which they collect.

That is the first thing—that we should abandon our system of protection and of customs tariff. Then he goes on:

That is a proposal which is supported by the Cobden Club, by the extreme, or perhaps I should say by the orthodox free traders, and there is no doubt a good deal to be said for it. I do not deny that possibly it might be for all concerned the best solution: at the same time I

am bound to point out that that would not bring about commercial union in the sense in which we have generally understood the word.

Now he comes to the question in point:

Gentlemen, free trade in this country has been developed, no doubt, to the great advantage of this country for a period of half a century, but in spite of that it has made no converts. We do not find—again I am speaking generally, because I know there are exceptions—that there is any considerable approach to our system on the part of the colonies, and there is no approach to it on the part of foreign countries. Well, I pass on to the second proposal which has been laid before a similar congress to this, which found expression at the great Congress at Ottawa a year or two ago—that is a proposal which has been favoured by some of our principal colonies and described with great force and eloquence by leading colonists, and it is the very reverse, in spirit at any rate, of the proposal which I have just been considering; for whereas the first proposal requires that the colonies should abandon their system in favour of ours, this proposal requires that we should abandon our system in favour of theirs. It is, in effect, that while the colonies should be left absolutely free to impose what protective duties they please upon foreign countries and upon British commerce, they should be required to make a small discrimination in favour of British trade, in return for which we are expected to change our own system and to impose duties on food and all raw materials. Well, gentlemen, I express again my own opinion when I say that there is not the slightest chance that in any reasonable time this country, or the Parliament of this country, would adopt so one-sided an agreement. (Hear, hear and cheers). The foreign trade of this country is so large, and the foreign trade of the colonies is comparatively so small, that a small preference given to us upon that foreign trade by the colonies would make so slight a difference, would be so slight a benefit to the total volume of our trade, that I do not believe the working classes of this country would consent to make a revolutionary change for what they would think to be an infinitesimal gain. (Hear, hear.) Well, gentlemen, you will see that, so far, we are only arrived at a deadlock. We have a proposal by British free traders which is rejected by the colonies. We have a proposal by colonial protectionists which is rejected by Great Britain. We have, therefore, if we are to make any progress at all, to seek a third course, a course in which there shall be give and take on both sides, in which neither side will pedantically adhere to preconceived conclusions, in which the good of the whole shall subordinate the separate interest of parts. And I admit that, if I understand it correctly, I find the germs of such a proposal in a resolution which is to be submitted to you on behalf of the Toronto Board of Trade. What is that resolution? I hope I correctly explain it. That resolution I understand to be one for the creation of a British Zollverein or customs union, which would establish at once practically free trade throughout the British Empire, but would leave the contracting parties free to make their own arrangements in regard to duties upon foreign goods; except that this is an essential condition of the proposal that Great Britain shall consent to replace moderate duties upon certain articles which are of large production in the colonies. Now, if I have rightly understood it, these articles would comprise corn, meat, wool and

sugar, and perhaps other articles of enormous consumption in this country, which are at present largely produced in the colonies, and which might be under such arrangement wholly produced in the colonies, and wholly produced by British labour. On the other hand, as I have said, the colonies, maintaining their duties upon foreign imports, would agree to a free interchange of commodities with the rest of the Empire and would cease to place protective duties upon any product of British labour. That is the principle of the German Zollverein; that is the principle which underlies the federation of the United States of America; and I do not doubt for a moment that if it were adopted it would be the strongest bond of union between the British race throughout the world. (Cheers.)

Now, mark what follows:—

I say that such a proposal as that might commend itself even to an orthodox free trader. It would be the greatest advance that free trade has ever made since it was first advocated by Mr. Cobden, to extend its doctrines permanently to more than 300,000,000 of the human race, and to communities, many of which are amongst the most thriving, the most prosperous, and the most rapidly increasing in the world.

Well, Sir, you see the doctrine there laid down by Mr. Chamberlain. He was ready for an arrangement with the colonies, he was ready to depart from the orthodox principle of free trade as advocated by the Cobden Club to the extent that he would limit the application of free trade within the British Empire, even if the British Empire had to impose customs duties against foreign nations. That was a departure from the orthodox principle of the free trade school. At the same time, Mr. Chamberlain defended his course on the authority of Mr. Cobden himself, as I find in a speech which he delivered in the month of March, 1896:

I do not say that merely because a proposal of this kind is contrary to free trade principles; because, although I am myself a convinced free trader in the sense of believing that the theory is undoubtedly the theory on which the world would become most prosperous, yet I have not such a pedantic admiration for it that, if sufficient advantage were offered to me, I would not consider a deviation from the strict doctrine. Mr. Cobden himself took this view, and compromised his principles in making the French treaty; and it cannot be expected that we, his disciples, should be more orthodox than the apostle of free trade himself.

We say, therefore, that our object is free trade within the Empire. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago that we should not make a party question of this, that we should approach it from a broad and patriotic stand-point. I re-echo this sentiment. I do not care whether we are protectionists or free traders in this Parliament; let us consider the question as it stands to-day. Is any man in this Parliament ready to say that at this moment we are able to dispense with a customs tariff even upon British goods? There is not a man who can say that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No such thing is proposed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then I do not understand the English language. What is the meaning of this language? If the colonies which are maintaining duties upon foreign imports were to agree to a free interchange of commodities with the rest of the Empire, would they any longer be putting a protective duty upon the products of British labour? Is that not a sufficient argument in itself? Now, let me call the attention of the House to a speech delivered by Mr. Buxton, a former Colonial Secretary of State, in which he said:

What the colonies will have to face on their part is this: Are they prepared to obtain their revenue in a different way? Are they prepared to obtain it by what I may call internal taxation rather than endeavouring to obtain it from taxation on British goods?

That is the question. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to obtain his revenue to-day by dispensing with the taxation on British goods? If so, how will he replace it? It is no use blinking the facts. We have to consider the question as reasonable and sensible men. It will not do to say this and that at random, to say that we can dispense with duties upon British goods. If the hon. gentleman were to make such promises as that he could not fulfil them.

There was in Mr. Chamberlain's language a grand and noble idea, and I do not despair to see it realized even in our own time. Mr. Chamberlain's idea, repeated many a time by other statesmen of the Imperial school, devoted members of the Cobden school, is that it would be possible, without at all departing from the principles of free trade as laid down by Cobden, to adopt them within the British Empire. There would in that case be a British idea, as there is a French idea, as there is a German idea, as there is an American idea. At the moment that I am speaking, though it is said that free trade has not advanced, I say that it has made immense strides in Europe during the last fifty years. There is free trade to-day amongst 36,000,000 Frenchmen, there is free trade to-day amongst 40,000,000 Germans, there is free trade to-day amongst 75,000,000 Americans; and who will say that the time may not come when we shall have free trade amongst 300,000,000 British subjects all over the world? That is the idea. It is not possible of realization at this moment, but still let us cling to it. We have already moved forward towards that idea when we made a reduction two years ago of 25 per cent on British goods. We are thus preparing the way, and the step which we have taken is not the last step, it will be followed by another at the proper time. And if ever we are to have the blessings of freedom of trade within the British Empire, among 300,000,000 of British subjects all over the world, history will attest that the first step taken towards securing that blessing was taken two years ago when this Government and this Parlia-

ment reduced the duty on British goods by 25 per cent.

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

### After Recess.

#### THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 144)—from the Senate—for the relief of Abraham Aronsberg.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

#### SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 172) to incorporate the British America Pulp and Paper Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

#### SUPPLY—PREFERENTIAL TRADE.

Mr. ALEX. McNEILL (North Bruce). Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a few words in support of the resolution before the House, I have, in the first place, to express my regret that the right hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) did not think it right to accept the proposal which was made by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), and join hands with us in an earnest attempt to promote and forward this great British policy. I regret also that the right hon. gentleman, in the remarks that he was good enough to address to the House, did not follow the example of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. Although he commended the course that he had pursued he did not follow that example, but he allowed himself to speak of those he differed from, in reference to this matter, in terms which, I think, were far from courteous. The right hon. gentleman declared that we on this side of the House had resorted, in reference to this matter, to prevarication and quibbling. These are strong terms to apply to hon. members of this House who are honestly and sincerely endeavouring to promote a policy which they believe to be in the best interests of the country. However, I suppose we must be content to accept these remarks from my right hon. friend, but perhaps before the debate is concluded, the House and the country may be able to decide to which side of the House these terms may be more properly applied. I will not, at the present moment, follow the very ingenious and eloquent special pleading of the right hon. gentleman, but I will take that matter up a little later on. In the meantime, I desire to say that I am rejoiced to know that, in any observations one has to offer in reference to this question, we may take for granted to-day a great deal that was in dispute between the two sides of the House a few years ago. For example, it is no longer necessary that we should endeavour to disprove that, because the United Kingdom is 3,000 miles away and the United

States is lying close along our border, in the latter country and not in the former, is to be found our natural market. For a great many years hon. gentlemen held to that view with extraordinary tenacity, I had almost said, audacity. But I am glad to see that they have now abandoned it. We may now venture from this side of the House, without throwing hon. gentlemen into a ferment, to say that it is advisable to cultivate the market of the United Kingdom. We may, from this side of the House, venture to say that in the United Kingdom, we can find a market for our horses without being ridiculed by hon. members from the back benches opposite, and we may even go so far as to say that, in the mother country, we can find a good market for our eggs without being rotten-egged, metaphorically, by the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who, on one occasion, told me that I need not attempt to cram any such nonsense down his throat as to suggest that we should ever find a profitable market for our eggs in the mother country. The prescience of that hon. gentleman is shown by the fact that while some eight or nine years ago we sold \$83,000 worth of eggs to the mother country, last year we sold \$1,250,000 worth, an increase of 1,400 or 1,500 per cent in favour of the mother country in that one article. I think we may say, in short, that hon. gentlemen now admit what they so long strenuously denied, namely, that in the mother country, and not in the United States, is to be found our best market. This is an important advance. There is another question that we do not require to argue in this House; we do not require any longer to argue for the unity of the Empire. I recollect when an hon. member of this House was ridiculed as the member for the Empire, because at times when he found covert or open attacks made upon the fundamental principle in Canadian politics of British connection, he was in the habit, to the best of his humble ability, of repelling these attacks. I am glad to say that to-day every hon. member of this House desires to be regarded as the member for the Empire. I do not think we are obliged to combat any longer the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, continental, free or commercial union. That, I think, has been discarded by hon. gentlemen opposite along with the rest of their anti-Imperial pro-American garments. We have heard a good deal about hon. gentlemen opposite having stolen our clothes. Well, I do not know that "stolen" is altogether a parliamentary term; I would rather say "borrowed." But when our friends on this side of the House complain of that, I think that perhaps after all they are a little hard upon hon. gentlemen opposite, because in view of all the Liberal protestations in favour of economy we must have expected them to practice economy in some regard, and if they borrowed our clothes as a matter of economy, we must

give them credit to that extent for this virtue.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They want it.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, so far as this matter of economy in dress is concerned, I think hon. gentlemen opposite have always been—while they were in Opposition at least—consistent; for they wore their anti-Imperial-pro-American suit, until it was horribly soiled and threadbare. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether I am in order or not; I do not know how far one may be in order in speaking disrespectfully of the garments of members of this House; or how far you can separate that from speaking disrespectfully of the gentlemen who wear the garments, but if I am in order I would venture to say that these garments of hon. gentlemen opposite, to which I have referred, were from the first disreputable and ragged and almost falling apart. We all know how it was that they succeeded in keeping them together when they threatened utterly to fall apart; they simply clapped on a patch. Sometimes it was unrestricted reciprocity, and sometimes it was commercial union, and sometimes it was continental free trade, and sometimes it was free trade as they have it in England, and sometimes it was a revenue tariff. We have heard of the shreds and patches of the Dominion from a very high authority; a gentleman whose mind at the time was so imbued with the grandeur of the great republic to the south, that our British Columbia, and Manitoba, and the provinces by the sea, and even our North-west Territories seemed to him to be utterly contemptible. The shreds and patches of the Dominion we have heard of, but if there ever was a suit of shreds and patches, it was the suit to which I have referred and that was for so long worn by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. BERGERON. It was indecent.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) says it was even indecent. Well, at all events I remember the first occasion on which hon. gentlemen opposite put it on in this House after they had added the unrestricted reciprocity patch to it. So long as my memory lasts I shall never forget that occasion. I shall never forget the pity and the shame of the occasion when these hon. gentlemen donned that suit with that patch upon it. It was not merely, Mr. Speaker, that the great Liberal party of Canada had been reduced to such a depth as that they were obliged to adopt a policy that was almost falling apart, but it was, as we were told by them, that the very warp and woof of the material they had chosen, the very essence of it was such that any one wearing it must be prepared to discriminate in the markets of Canada against the goods of the mother country. And that was not all; because we were told as an excuse for the adoption of that policy, that we owed very

little to the mother country, that we owed very little or nothing, unless it was Christian forgiveness for the mismanagement of our affairs.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). A most correct statement.

Mr. McNEILL. A most correct statement, the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) says; that we owe nothing to the mother country, nothing whatever to the mother country unless it be Christian forgiveness for her mismanagement of our affairs. And, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) has the audacity to repeat that statement in this House to-night—

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, I repeat it.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman says that we owe nothing to the mother country that has protected us for over one hundred years.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, I do.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman says that we owe nothing to the mother country that was prepared then as she is to-day to send tens of thousands of her sons to shed their blood in our just cause.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) if he wants to know, that England owes more to Canada than Canada does to England.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman says that we owe nothing to that country, that we owe nothing to the mother country that is ready to bring to our aid the greatest fleet of war that ever the salt sea bore upon its breast, a country that at the very moment the hon. gentleman was making his unnatural proposal to this House—for he himself was the man who made the proposal—had east and west her lions of the sea crouching on guard at the portals of Canada. And, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) says: We owe nothing to that country. He told us then—for he was the spokesman on that occasion—he told us that what we ought to do was to discriminate against the mother country and in favour of the country whose heavy hand had been against us for many a long year. That is the policy that was propounded by the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) then, and I recollect very well that during the debate I told him, that if he made an appeal to the people of Canada upon that issue, when the people of Canada came to understand what he meant he would have one answer and one answer only from every part of our Dominion, and that answer be: Confound your Yankee politics; God save the Queen.

And, Sir, what have we seen? We have seen these gentlemen who, in 1891, ventured

Mr. McNEILL.

to appeal to the people of Canada on this policy of discrimination against the mother country, we have seen them at the very next election compelled by the irresistible sentiment of the people of Canada, not only to abandon that policy, but to adopt a policy the very reverse—at all events, compelled to declare that they were in favour of a policy the very reverse of the policy on which they appealed to the country in 1891. We see the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) himself, to-day a member of a Government that appeals to the people of Canada for their continued support largely on the ground that they have adopted a policy which gives preference in the markets of Canada to the mother country against every foreign nation. That is what the course of events has been in regard to this matter, and I am not sorry for the interruptions of the hon. gentleman.

Now, Sir, it is gratifying for us all to see that these hon. gentlemen opposite, to-day admit a number of the principles which they so long denied, and which we so strongly urged upon them at that time. But, although they have recanted to a large extent, and although they have avowed themselves in favour of some courses which I approve, and although they have done some things which make for the unity of the Empire, I say, Sir, that so far as the course of hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to this particular policy of preferential trade is concerned, which the right hon. gentleman told us they have forwarded, the trail of the serpent is over it all. I have never denied that these hon. gentlemen have done certain things which have been favourable to Imperial unity. I admit that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), in what he did, and still more in what he said with regard to the West Indies, advanced the cause of Imperial unity, for he recognized our Imperial obligations. I admit that the course pursued by the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) in reference to Imperial penny postage went straight as an arrow to that goal, and I believe it was intended by the hon. gentleman to go there. I hold, more perhaps than most of those on my own side of the House the importance of the course which the hon. gentleman pursued on that occasion. I would not for a moment desire to deprive Mr. Henneker Heaton of any share of the credit which belongs to him. As a matter of course, by far the greater share of credit belongs to him for this long years of persistent and able effort. But I do say that notwithstanding all that Mr. Henneker Heaton had done, we might have been many years longer without Imperial penny postage had it not been for the strong and energetic action of the Postmaster General of Canada. I admit also that the Government deserve a certain amount of credit for the denunciation of the Belgian and German treaties. I do not admit that they deserve nearly so much

credit for that as they themselves claim. I think that the main reason why we should have desired to have those treaties denounced was in order that they might be able to follow up with this preferential trade policy, and I am sorry to see that the Government have not done that. I admit that the policy which the Government have pursued has resulted in what I might call, with certain reservations, a true British preference; but I deny, Mr. Speaker, that it was the intention of the Government that that should be the result. I say that the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and the speech of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), and the resolution itself demonstrated that that was not the intention. I say that the Government stumbled into the British preference, that they set out on a path with which they were unfamiliar, for unfortunately their exertions had been in an altogether different direction heretofore. They set out on a path with which they were not familiar, and they suddenly found themselves entangled in the meshes of the most-favoured-nations treaties. They found that just as soon as one of those nations obtained entry into our markets, because its tariff conformed with the conditions of our statutory offer, every other one of those nations had to come in, because of the most-favoured-nation clause. And so from day to day the Government found themselves more and more entangled, because from day to day one country after another was claiming admission, which the Government could not refuse; and there they lay absolutely helpless, rolled up in this net, if I may so express it, until Mr. Chamberlain came to their relief and pointed out to them how they could honourably escape. He pointed out to them the only means of honourable escape, and that was that they should change their offer of reciprocity to all the world into an offer of preference to the mother country alone. They accepted Mr. Chamberlain's advice, and they escaped with two knighthoods, and I am quite sure that the country was very glad that they had saved so much. That is what occurred exactly. So much with regard to that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to guard myself. I said that we had a true British preference, but I wish to guard myself against misapprehension. We have theoretically a true British preference against all the world; we have practically a true British preference against every country except the United States. The tariff of 1897, which was introduced with such a blare of trumpets and beating of tom-toms as a great British policy, gave no shadow of advantage to the mother country which it did not give to every other nation in the world conforming to our statutory offer; but while it gave no shadow of advantage

to the mother country, it did give, as my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) was the first to point out, very substantial and material advantages to the old allies and friends of hon. gentlemen opposite in the United States. Of that tariff, I think I may fairly say that it was more ingenious than ingenuous. It was a tariff which was supposed on both sides of the Atlantic to have reduced the duties by 12½ per cent in favour of the mother country as against the duties of 1896. It was supposed to have reduced the duties of 1896 by 12½ per cent. That was the impression sought to be conveyed by the Government at the time. I know that a different explanation has been put forward by the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) this session. He wishes to compare the reduction with the general tariff of 1897, but I will prove to the House that what was intended to be understood by the country was that there had been a reduction in favour of the United Kingdom from the Conservative tariff, from the tariff that existed in 1896 and up to 1897. In the "Globe" of April 28th, 1897, I find this:

The Liberals, at the first opportunity, have endeavoured to put the principles of Mr. Davies's amendment into practice.

Now, what was Mr. Davies's amendment? That was the amendment that he moved to my resolution in 1892:

Inasmuch as Great Britain admits the products of Canada into her ports free of duty, this House is of the opinion that the present scale of duties exacted on goods mainly imported from Great Britain should be reduced.

The "Globe" tells us that the Liberal party took the first opportunity of giving effect to that principle, which was that there should be a reduction in "the present scale of duties," namely, the rate existing before their tariff came into force. Therefore, it is idle to say that that was not the intention. But the "Globe" goes further, and the next day says:

Our Conservative friends talk as if England, having got our tariff walls lowered, would act on the principle of taking all she can get, while not disposed to give anything in return.

Having got our tariff lowered—showing again that the desire was to lead the people of this country to believe that this was a lowering of the tariff in favour of the mother country. Well, we know now very well that it was not so; we know that, in place of this being a lowering of the tariff, it was, in point of fact, a raising of the tariff so far as British goods were concerned, and we found that in point of fact the tariff was nearer 12½ per cent higher than 12½ per cent lower than it had been before. That result was reached by a simple process, which was pointed out at the time by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). The duty was raised, in the first place, upon the lines of goods which we

Mr. McNEILL.

mainly imported from the mother country before any reduction took place. Now, I wish to call attention to the fact that this was the very opposite to the principle which was proposed by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). My hon. friend from West York was kind enough to hand me a memorandum on this subject. I asked him if he could give it me, as he was more familiar with this subject than I was. This memorandum shows that the tariff was raised on eighteen lines of goods imported from the mother country. The proposal of my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) was, that the tariff should be reduced on the goods mainly imported from England; but while they increased the duty on goods which were mainly imported from England, they lowered the duty on twenty-five main lines of goods, I am informed, that we import from the United States. I think I may say frankly that the manipulation of this tariff of 1897 has always seemed to me more like the subtle and expert work of American tricksters than the policy of Canadian statesmen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say one word personal to myself, if the House will kindly forgive me. After I had given notice of the resolution, the amendment to which we are discussing, a leading article appeared in the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, which had all the appearance of an inspired article, stating that I had surrendered the Imperialist to the partisan. An observation of that kind does not affect me personally, because it flies altogether wide of the mark. But I have no doubt it was not meant for the purpose of wounding me at all; it was simply meant to create a prejudice in the public mind, and as far as possible to discount what I might say in reference to this matter; and I do not feel inclined to allow that attempt to be successful. Therefore, I wish to state what I told my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) I would state, and what he said I was justified in stating—that I sought interviews with members of the Government, with the right hon. leader of the Government, with the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, with the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and others, for the express purpose of endeavouring to keep this question beyond the scope of party politics. I endeavoured to reach a conclusion which would be satisfactory to both sides of this House, so that we might be able to send over to the mother country one united message from the Commons of Canada, strengthening the hands of those in the mother country who were endeavouring to fight this great battle for us there, this battle in favour of a great, beneficent, British, Imperial policy. And it is only due to the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) who leads the Opposition to say that he did everything he could to assist me in that

regard, although he knew that hon. gentlemen opposite could not play this game better than by opposing this policy. He said he would not allow any party consideration to stand in the way of the promotion of a policy which was of such vital importance to the best interests both of Canada and of the Empire; and, therefore, he did all he could to assist me in this regard. When I introduced the resolution last session, I deliberately chose a resolution of the most general and mildest terms possible; in fact, I took the resolution adopted by the Conference and moved that, in order that we might have something on which both sides could agree. I could scarcely believe that the Government would not allow their followers to support a resolution passed by the great Colonial Conference in 1894. But the Government would not allow their followers to support that resolution. They would not go so far as to say, in the terms of that simple resolution, that it was desirable that we should have preferential treatment in the markets of the United Kingdom for the products of Canada, and they put up one of their ablest supporters in this House to move an amendment. And what was it?

That this House will at all times favour every practical means of developing inter-Imperial trade, and expresses satisfaction with the action already taken by the Government in that direction.

Well, Sir, colourless and ambiguous as the first part of this resolution was, I expressed my willingness to accept it, again instigated by the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, and who once more showed his desire that we should unite in support of this policy. But how were we met? We were met with the statement that we must take the resolution as it stood, take it altogether or not at all. I pointed out that it was impossible that we should accept the latter part of the resolution, that it was purely controversial and contrary to our views. But I was told that hon. gentlemen opposite considered the last part of the resolution the most important part. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we were told that hon. gentlemen opposite, as a party, considered it more important that they should declare that they, as a party, had been right in regard to this matter and that we, as a party, had been wrong, than that we should join together here in the House of Commons, Liberals and Conservatives, lay party aside and send one united message over to the mother country to strengthen the hand of those who were labouring for this great policy there. And yet, notwithstanding this, the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite comes out with the statement that I have allowed the Imperialist to surrender to the partisan in reference to this question. I suppose that is all right in party warfare; but I think it is only right that I should make the ex-

planation I have made in reference to the matter.

I have never been able to understand—I think it is something very remarkable—how it is that hon. gentlemen opposite are always prepared to range themselves in line against us, when we propose to obtain a preference in the English markets for Canadian goods. Here we are, five or six millions of people, with a neighbour of over seventy millions, lying along our border. We are both anxious to sell our goods in the markets of the United Kingdom, the great mart of the world. We produce mainly the same class of commodities, and, therefore, we are perforce rivals—I am glad to think to-day, friendly rivals—for the first place in that market. The United States, having been great, and populous, and wealthy before the Dominion of Canada, as such, came into being at all, had secured a great position in that market long before we were able to make any organized effort on our own behalf. Now, let me for a moment call the attention of the House to the immensity of that market. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns of the United Kingdom for 1898, the mother country imported of articles of food and drink, that is, articles duty free, not including tea, tobacco, coffee, and so forth, not less than £166,000,000 sterling worth. Now, you may add ten millions at least to that for cattle and sheep, and you have the enormous sum of £176,000,000 sterling worth of goods imported into the United Kingdom last year. Now, of these articles, Canada could supply about £60,000,000 sterling worth—I mean of articles that we can produce here, say, in round numbers, eight hundred millions dollars worth. That is the market we are striving for. Now let me read to you a list of articles imported into Great Britain in 1898, showing the proportion that Canada furnishes:

Article.	Total Imports.	Imports from Canada.	Imports from United States.
Wheat . . .	\$ 130,000,000	\$ 9,750,000	\$ 76,330,000
Barley . . .	34,000,000	83,300	4,600,000
Oats . . . . .	22,000,000	2,200,000	11,400,000
Flour and Meal . . .	57,750,000	5,000,000	47,000,000
Cattle . . . . .	46,750,000	8,750,000	31,000,000
Bacon . . . . .	51,500,000	5,000,000	32,000,000
Hams . . . . .	19,500,000	1,100,000	18,000,000
Beef (fresh)	29,250,000	60,000 (97)	23,000,000
Butter . . . . .	77,750,000	3,300,000	
Eggs . . . . .	22,500,000	1,250,000	

It is worthy of remark that though we can produce much better barley than the United States, still the United States sent to Great Britain  $7\frac{1}{2}$  times as much as Can-

ada did. There is a splendid opening in the United Kingdom for our pears, our plums, and, I believe, our grapes; but I am sorry to say we are losing to a large extent that market for our apples, and I am afraid it is largely owing to the fact that some of our Canadian packers are not as careful—to use a very mild term—about the quality of apples they send there as they ought to be. That is a great pity, because, with the exception perhaps of the Newton pippin, we can supply very much better apples to the mother country than the people of the United States. Of pulp and paper they imported \$26,000,000 worth, and we sent them scarcely anything.

Now, I want to call attention to this fact, that this vast market is not a diminishing, but an increasing market. In 1876 they imported one pound of flour per head of the population; in 1896 they imported three pounds of flour per head, although the population had increased greatly during that time. In the last two years they have increased their importation of fresh meat to the extent of no less than \$25,000,000 worth. Therefore, I say that this great market is an increasing market.

Now, as I have said, our cousins to the south have secured the lion's share of that market, because they had the incalculable advantage of having been first in the field. We think that we, as British subjects, have a better right to the lion's share of that market than they have. We think that in all British markets in every part of the Empire British goods ought to have preference over foreign goods. Our cousins to the south and every foreign country pursue that policy: they give in their own markets better terms to the goods of their own people than they give to the goods of foreign nations. We say that the time has come when that natural and common-sense principle ought to obtain in the British Empire, and when British subjects ought to receive preferential treatment for their goods in the markets of their own Empire. We say that if the Imperial authorities will only recognize this natural, common-sense principle, and will only carry out the suggestion made by the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Chamberlain, to which my right hon. friend has referred, and which I will refer to shortly, the result will be, that the market of the United Kingdom, in place of being dominated and controlled, as it is to-day, by the foreign rivals of the Empire, will very speedily be supplied by our own British people, as it ought to be. We say that the adoption of that principle will confer a direct and immeasurable benefit upon many classes of producers in Canada, and a great indirect benefit to many classes more. We say that if the settlers of Manitoba and the North-west Territories could get free entry into that market for their wheat, and if the farmers of the older pro-

Mr. McNEILL.

vinces could get free entry for their bacon, hams, butter, cheese, eggs and poultry, fruit, oats, barley and horses—if they could get free entry into that market for these goods that they produce, while a duty were imposed upon goods sent there by their foreign rivals, the result would be, that these commodities produced in Canada would be of greater value than similar commodities produced in the United States. The result will be that a man would be willing to give more for a farm in Canada than he would be willing to give for a farm of otherwise equal value in the United States. The result would be that men coming to settle on this continent would desire to come and settle in that part of it where the produce of the farm was of greater value rather than in that part of the continent where the produce of the farm was of less value. The result would be that the stream of immigration which has, for so many years, flowed south of the line, which carried with it this very year, up to the 24th of May, no less than 56,000 British people, would be diverted to Canada and we would have our territories in the North-west speedily filled with good, loyal British subjects prepared to take up arms, if need be, in defence of the British Empire, rather than with the outcasts of Europe. I say that, for many years, as I have said before, the United States by reason of its enormous wealth and its greatly developed industries, has been acting as a magnet drawing our people south. Just as soon as this policy is adopted the conditions will be absolutely reversed, and Canada will be the magnet drawing the population north. We shall see such a re-peopling of this country by Canadians, who have settled in the United States as no man before has ever dreamed of. I want to know who will wish to farm in the United States when, by coming to Canada, he will get more for all he raises on the farm. That will be the result of this policy. The fisherman, the lumberman, the provision merchant, and every one who has anything to sell in the markets of the United Kingdom will benefit also, and I venture to say that by the adoption of this policy we will see such a development of the latent resources of this half of the continent as will astonish even the most ardent believer in the future of Canada. I say it is most extraordinary, in view of these considerations, to find that hon. gentlemen opposite range themselves in opposition to this policy when we bring it before the attention of the House. As long as they pursued the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, it was natural enough because it is the very antithesis of this policy that I am now advocating. When I say that they have always ranged themselves against it, I wish to correct the statement, because I admit that during the period between the dissolution of the House in 1896 and the reassembling of the House again, hon. gentlemen did not

oppose it, but said that they were in favour of it. When we urged them in this House to adopt this policy we were always met with the same argument, and the right hon. Prime Minister has very nearly repeated it to-day. I do not think he would venture to repeat it, but he has very nearly repeated it. We were met with the statement that it was perfectly useless to make such a suggestion because no British statesman would ever dream of putting duties upon foreign articles entering the British market, that that was contrary to the principle of free trade, and that England would never, in any degree, depart from her free trade policy. We pointed out that, by doing this, England would be developing her best markets, that of her colonies; we pointed out that the future of the mother country was with her Empire, that the colonies were only outlying portions of the British soil, that their people were her people, that their prosperity was her prosperity, that every deserving immigrant, drawn from foreign territory and diverted to their shores, was added wealth and strength to the mother country herself, and that by adopting this policy, we would fill up the North-west Territories, people our wheat areas and place the mother country in a position of independence of foreign food supply. To all this we had the one stereotyped answer: You are simply dreamers of dreams. I remember the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), for whom I have a very high regard—I had almost said a very warm affection—almost, if that were possible, exceeded all his former efforts in forensic extravagance in his endeavour to depict the proposal I had made as something utterly impracticable and even grotesque. He said that no Imperial statesman would entertain the idea for one moment. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has been obliged somewhat, though not so far as I would have liked, to modify that position to-day. What is the fact? The fact is that this very policy which was declared by my hon. friend opposite and those who sit beside him as something too absurd to imagine that an Imperial statesman could endorse it, is the policy par excellence of the Colonial Secretary himself to-day, and has been so described by leading statesmen and journalists from one end of the United Kingdom to the other ever since the 26th of March, 1896. On that day Mr. Chamberlain, referring to what I may describe as that spontaneous shout of loyalty and affection that went up from the colonies at a time of threatened danger to the mother country, and which Mr. Chamberlain said, reverberated throughout the world Mr. Chamberlain said that the time had come to give practical effect to these high sentiments, and he there and then proposed a policy of preferential trade within the Empire. He there and then proposed that the mother country should impose duties in

favour of the colonies as against foreign countries. My right hon. friend has endeavoured to explain away what Mr. Chamberlain said on that occasion, and I listened to his special pleading with very great interest. I want to call the special attention of the House to what Mr. Chamberlain said. The right hon. Prime Minister quoted Mr. Chamberlain quite fairly, but I want to call attention to this, that having said that if they had a Zollverein, such as they have in Germany, he thought the mother country would probably agree to such a proposal if the colonies would agree to it. He went on to say:

My second point is that we are dealing with an entirely exceptional state of things, and that we cannot, even if we wished, imitate exactly the German Zollverein. We are not conterminous countries; we are countries, as I have said, separated by thousands of miles, in some cases, and the circumstances of our different countries vary so considerably that it is evident that in an arrangement as to general free trade within the Empire exceptions must be made in the case of articles—

What articles? Articles

—that are chiefly taxed for revenue purposes.

Chiefly taxed for revenue purposes, not even taxed only for revenue purposes, but chiefly taxed for revenue purposes. I need not continue to read further from Mr. Chamberlain's speech, because my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has already referred to it, but I wish to say that it is almost inconceivable how any one having read that statement of Mr. Chamberlain that I have now quoted, as well as other statements here, should say or fancy, that Mr. Chamberlain then proposed a Zollverein based on the principle of free trade within the Empire. Before you can arrive at that conclusion you have got to strike out the sentences I have read, as well as several other sentences from Mr. Chamberlain's speech. But the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself very clearly and very succinctly explained to the people of London, Ontario, what Mr. Chamberlain's proposal really was. It is useless for the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to speak as he did to-night on the subject, in view of his own recorded words spoken to the electorate of London, Ontario, during the elections of 1896. Here is what the Prime Minister said:

Mr. Chamberlain spoke upon that subject a few weeks ago. I might quote the whole of his speech, but I have not time at such a meeting as this. Let me quote some portions of it. Mr. Chamberlain says: "It seems to me that if the principle of a revenue tariff were to be adopted by the colonies, there would be a reason for calling a council of the Empire, and I cannot but think that something like a satisfactory and workable arrangement might be arrived at."

That is what the Prime Minister told the people of London. Further, speaking of what the people of England might say, the

right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said :

We do not ask you to go to the length that we go ; we do not ask you to remove the customs tariff altogether, we only ask you to remove the protective system.

I earnestly ask the House to listen to these sentences :

It can be conceived that you want a customs tariff, but bring it down to a point that it will simply be a revenue tariff—a tariff for your own benefit, but not a tariff hostile to us, and then we will be ready to discuss the principles of preferential trade.

Now, can anything more explicit be imagined than that. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has explained in the most absolute and conclusive way to the people of London, Ontario, what Mr. Chamberlain meant, and I say it is idle for the right hon. gentleman to attempt now in this House to give any other interpretation to the speech of Mr. Chamberlain than he gave on that occasion. Then, Sir, what have we got established? We have got established the fact that Mr. Chamberlain proposed a preferential trade within the Empire—that is, established by Mr. Chamberlain's own speech and that is established by the admission of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We have got this further fact established on the authority of Mr. Chamberlain's speech, and on the authority of the right hon. gentleman: that the preferential trade which Mr. Chamberlain proposed on that occasion was a preferential trade, not on the basis of free trade, but on the basis of a revenue tariff. Let us remember that we have got these two facts firmly established, and what follows? Following that was the resolution of the Toronto Board of Trade, which Mr. Chamberlain declared had in it "the germs of a satisfactory proposal." And how did the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) deal with the Toronto Board of Trade resolution? He said the germ had not germinated. He said that at the meeting of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire, that resolution had not been carried. I am not talking about the carrying of that resolution at that meeting, I am talking of what Mr. Chamberlain said about it, and the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has not ventured to answer in the smallest particular what I said Mr. Chamberlain said with regard to it, namely, that it held within it the germs of a satisfactory arrangement. If my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler), who moved that resolution, were here, he would tell the right hon. gentleman that had that resolution gone to the convention it would have been carried. However, that is beside the mark, because what I am concerned with, is what Mr. Chamberlain said and what he is prepared to do, and I am confining my remarks to that issue.

Now, the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) accused us of prevarication and

Mr. McNEILL.

quibbling, which I think are somewhat hard terms, and I do not wish to repeat them. But, I cannot help saying that I am sorry the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), when he was quoting from Mr. Chamberlain's speech at the meeting of the chambers of commerce of the Empire, did not continue and quote a little further. He quoted what Mr. Chamberlain said with regard to free trade, but he left this out :

Of course the details of such a scheme would require the most careful examination. There may have to be exceptions made to the principle, although I believe the principle itself must be adopted if any progress is to be made at all ; but I am not going to discuss these exceptions on the present occasion.

In other words, Mr. Chamberlain was referring to his speech before the Canada Club, and to those exceptions of which I have already spoken, when he said: that it was evident that these exceptions must be made. Then, Mr. Chamberlain goes on to say :

I only want to impress upon you my personal conviction, that if a proposal of this kind came to us from the colonies, backed by any considerable support on their part, it would not be met with a blank refusal by the people of this country. I say, gentlemen, if it were proposed to us by the colonies ; because I do not consider that it would be wise or practicable that a proposal of this kind should come in the first instance from the United Kingdom.

But the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says there has been no advance at all, because there is not a state document, in the face of the statement of Mr. Chamberlain, that he thinks a proposal of this kind should emanate from the colonies. Continuing, Mr. Chamberlain said :

If they desire, as we desire, and as we believe they do, this closer union ; if they are willing to make some sacrifices of their present arrangement,—

That is not a statement, that we are obliged to make the sacrifice of all our present arrangement and adopt free trade.

If they are willing to make some sacrifice of their present arrangement and convictions, in order to secure it, let them say so ; let the offer come voluntarily from them,—

The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knew very well these words were here :

—and I believe it will be considered in this country, not in any huckstering spirit, but that it will be entertained as a part of a greater policy which was intended to unite in the closest bonds of affection and interest, all the communities which are under the British flag, and all the subjects of Her Majesty throughout the Empire.

I think it unfortunate that the right hon. gentleman did not quote these sentiments of Mr. Chamberlain when he was reading Mr. Chamberlain's speech.

Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, that I may say that we have reached a point in this matter

when it would have been reasonable that some attempt should be made by concession and compromise on the one side and the other, to arrive at a satisfactory arrangement in reference to this great question.

Here is Mr. Chamberlain making a proposal that there should be preferential trade, saying that there must be exceptions to any policy of free trade within the Empire, saying that he finds the germs of such a policy in the resolution of the Board of Trade of Toronto, and telling us that if we simply go forward and ask for this thing we shall be met in no huckstering spirit. I say that the time had then come, at this stage of the history of the question, when it would have been reasonable and right that we should enter into negotiations. But, at the very moment when Mr. Chamberlain was making that speech, we were in the throes of a general election, and of course nothing could then be done. But the leaders of both parties in this country recognized the transcendent importance of this question, and both pledged themselves to do all that in them lay to further this policy. Mr. Chamberlain had proposed, in his speech at the Canada Club, that there should be a commission of inquiry in reference to this matter, and the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who had evidently very carefully read Mr. Chamberlain's speech, said to the people of Canada that if they would only entrust him with the management of their affairs, one of the very first things he would do would be to set about obtaining the appointment of such a commission of inquiry. Well, the election took place and brought about a change of Government, and there was the short session of 1896. I do not think that any one could very well expect that in that session anything could have been done, but I think we had every reason to expect that the right hon. gentleman would have implemented his promise to the people of Canada before he met the House of Commons for the second time. We had every reason to expect that he would have approached Mr. Chamberlain in reference to this matter before the session of 1897. The session of 1897 came, and there was no intimation in the Speech from the Throne that the right hon. gentleman had done anything whatsoever towards carrying out the policy which he promised the people of Canada, if they entrusted him with the management of their affairs, he would endeavour to carry out. In that session he introduced by his Finance Minister, his tariff, and his Finance Minister explained that tariff as one which was favourable to the mother country. He said that the goods of the mother country would enter every customs port in Canada on preferential terms immediately after that tariff went into force.

Well, that was also the year of the Jubilee. The right hon. gentleman went over

to England at that time. He went there when the recollection of the action of this Parliament, in offering armed assistance to the mother country in the time of her peril was still warm in the hearts of the people of England, and when these words of his own Finance Minister declaring that we were giving preferential treatment to England were still ringing in the ears of the English people. He went over there in the white heat of the Jubilee and under the circumstances was almost the hero of the hour; and I think it is not too much for me to say that the right hon. gentleman was in a position of commanding influence at that time to have prosecuted efforts to procure the adoption of this policy by the Imperial authorities. The right hon. gentleman was met at Liverpool by the Duke of Devonshire, and the Duke of Devonshire delivered the speech, from which quotations are made in the third clause of this resolution, and to which the right hon. gentleman has already referred. I confess that I am quite unable to understand the nature of the complaint which he brought against me with reference to the quotations that I had made from the Duke of Devonshire's speech. He quoted the statement of the Duke of Devonshire that he was in favour of free trade for England, that he considered it still the best policy. But in my resolution, I distinctly state that the duke made these other assertions while he was proclaiming himself a free trader. What more did the right hon. gentleman think I could have said? I am quite unable to understand what the purport of his criticism was in that regard. However, the Duke of Devonshire made these most remarkable, and I think it is not too much to say extraordinary statements in that speech. Those statements, coming from a statesman of the Duke of Devonshire's status and antecedents, and from a man of his extreme caution and reticence, were regarded as of extraordinary significance, and were considered of the utmost importance. They brought down upon his head the denunciations of the free trade party in England. So hard were they hit by what he had said that Lord Farrar allowed himself to make use of such terms as these with reference to a statesman who is revered and beloved in England as probably no other statesman in England is to-day. Lord Farrar said:

When the Duke of Devonshire forgets the history and political knowledge he must once have possessed to throw dirt on his former self and on the great colleagues with whom he acted.

The House can understand to what a paroxysm of indignation Lord Farrar must have been wrought when he allowed himself deliberately in an interview with the representative of a newspaper, to make use of such language. I understand that the Radical press accused the Duke of having adopted Mr. Chamberlain's views. I do

not know personally if that is so, but I understand it to be so. It is certain, at all events that the Duke of Devonshire considered that we were on the eve of a most important inquest in reference to matters of trade, because in another speech which he made on the evening of that same day, he made use of these very remarkable words, showing that he considered there was very serious business ahead of the colonial Premiers. He said :

The visitors and those who preside over the Colonial Department have a busy time before them. Doubtless they will have many subjects of business to discuss, and if I mistake not, the time of our guests will be occupied, not only by official communications with the Colonial Department, but will be also largely occupied with communications with the leading men of the communities such as this, who are largely interested in the development of the colonies.

Showing that the Duke of Devonshire considered that there was a very busy time before the Premiers, and that there was to be a great inquest in reference to trade matters. It is, therefore not surprising, Mr. Speaker, that we should have this most explicit statement cabled across the Atlantic by a gentleman who could have no possible desire to misrepresent the trend of public opinion in the mother country, but who, on the contrary, had every reason to wish to faithfully state what that opinion was. The correspondent of the New York "Evening Post," a gentleman whose ability I have seen referred to in a cable despatch since this House has been in session, cabled to his readers as follows :—

The Duke of Devonshire's speech at Liverpool on Saturday, following Mr. Chamberlain's lukewarm attitude towards free trade, is interpreted as indicating the readiness of the Imperial Government to make some move in the direction of Imperial customs union when the question comes up in conference between Mr. Chamberlain and the Premiers.

This may include duty on such foreign imports as meat, flour and wheat from America and the Argentine, as competing with Canadian and Australian products.

This is the statement made by the able correspondent of the New York "Post." He says this was the view which was entertained in England at that time of these most remarkable utterances of the Duke of Devonshire, and I do not think that any fair-minded man would suppose that a statesman of the Duke of Devonshire's temperament would deliberately go out of his way to make these extraordinary statements with reference to free trade without an object, and I think that most people will think that the object attributed to him by the people of England, who knew him best, according to this gentleman, was the object that he had in view in making these remarks.

Well, Sir, that is how affairs stood then. We have this fact established—that Mr. Chamberlain offered preferential trade, that

Mr. McNEILL.

he offered it on a basis of a revenue tariff. I see my right hon. friend smiles at that. He himself made that statement, at all events, at London, to the people of Ontario, and Mr. Chamberlain's speech entirely bears out the statement the right hon. gentleman made. We have the fact that the right hon. gentleman said that he was anxious to have a commission of inquiry appointed ; we have the fact that the Duke of Devonshire met the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Liverpool with a speech of the most extraordinary kind, which one of the ablest correspondents of the American press said was believed in England to be a foreshadowing of the adoption by the Imperial authorities of Mr. Chamberlain's view. What followed ? An untoward incident which we have discussed in this House before, but which I do not desire to comment upon until I read further from this despatch, in order that the House may know how the right hon. gentleman's course in regard to preferential trade was considered on the spot and at the time. I call the attention of hon. members to this :

Mr. Wilfrid Laurier, the Canadian Premier, has given a new and somewhat dramatic turn to the talk of schemes of Imperial unity and aggrandizement, of which the air in England is very full just now. Every other colonial Premier now here, while overflowing with expressions of loyalty, is assuring England of the dire consequences if she will not barter away her free trade in exchange for tariff preference in colonial markets. The Duke of Devonshire's speech at Liverpool on Saturday, following Mr. Chamberlain's lukewarm attitude towards free trade, is interpreted as indicating the readiness of the Imperial Government to make some move in the direction of Imperial customs union, when the question comes up in conference between Mr. Chamberlain and the Premiers. This may include duties on such foreign imports as wheat, flour and wheat from America, and the Argentine, as competing with Canadian and Australian products.

This was part of Mr. Chamberlain's Zollverein idea. It is at this interesting moment that Mr. Laurier steps forward and declares the Zollverein to be mere protection, and asserts that protection, which has been the curse and bane of Canada, to be the greatest possible mistake for England and the Empire. "By our tariff," says Mr. Laurier, "we in Canada give you preference as a free gift. We ask nothing in return ; we do not desire you to abandon the grand principles of free trade ; we desire rather to follow in your free trade lead, trading where trading is most natural. Protection must weaken you, and so hurt the Empire, and Canada as part of it."

That is a summary of the position taken by the right hon. gentleman in England at that time, as cabled across by this correspondent. It is a most accurate summary of the position taken by the right hon. gentleman at that time. I presume he will not controvert that statement, that he will not venture to say that it is not an accurate summary of the position he took. I have here his speech delivered in Liverpool and also extracts from his interviews according to the "Chronicle," and I say this is an admirable summary of

the position the right hon. gentleman took at that time in reference to this policy. It was immediately on his arrival in Liverpool, the very day the Duke of Devonshire had made these statements, which were supposed in England, according to this correspondent's statement, to be the foreshadowing by the English Government of the adoption of Mr. Chamberlain's policy. The right hon. gentleman told the people of England: We do not want a quid pro quo, we do not want to interfere with that free trade policy under which England has prospered so much. And he argued against the policy in his interview with the "Chronicle," and put his case, if possible, stronger there than he did in Liverpool. Now, this position taken by the hon. gentleman was practically a blow struck at preferential trade with all the concentrated force of all the eight self-governing colonies of British North America, these colonies that had been heretofore the principal champions and advocates of this policy. It was a blow, altogether unexpected by Mr. Chamberlain, who had risked his political status in making the declaration he had made in our favour at the Canada Club. I say it was an unexpected blow—it was just as though a modern gladiator engaged in a contest with a formidable opponent, should receive suddenly, in the supreme moment, when victory was within his grasp, a sledgehammer blow behind the ear from his principal second. It was utterly unexpected, it was irresistible, it was a knock-down blow, it was a knock-out blow, and there was no more hope of Mr. Chamberlain's preferential trade policy during the Jubilee celebration of June, 1897. It became for a time a matter of ridicule. Lord Roseberry said in reference to it, that he must speak of it with reverence, for he spoke in the presence of a corpse. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say, it is a pretty lively corpse to-day, but, if it is so, that is not owing to the good offices of my right hon. friend opposite. Notwithstanding the extraordinary course pursued by my right hon. friend, Mr. Chamberlain did not lose heart. He had declared that this was the greatest of all Imperial policies, and he did not abandon it. He had summoned the Colonial Premiers to a conference, and at that conference he came back to the charge once more, and what did he say? At that conference Mr. Chamberlain returns once more to the Zollverein, and says:

I have said that I believe in sentiment as the greatest of all the forces in the general government of the world; but, at the same time, I should like to bring to the reinforcement of sentiment the motives which are derived from material and personal interest. But undoubtedly the fiscal arrangements of the different colonies differ so much among themselves, and all differ so much from those of the mother country, that it would be a matter of the greatest complication and difficulty to arrive at any conclusion which would unite us commercially in the same sense in which the Zollverein united the Empire of Germany. It may be borne in mind that the

history of that Zollverein is most interesting and most instructive.

He calls the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the Zollverein once more, and to the great benefit that the German Empire derived from it, notwithstanding the sledgehammer blow it had received from the right hon. gentleman only a few days before. He says:

It commenced entirely as a commercial convention, dealing, in the first instance, only partially with the trade of the empire; it was rapidly extended to include the whole trade of the empire, and it finally made possible and encouraged the ultimate union of the empire.

But, he says, and very naturally, after what had occurred a few days before—

But this is a matter upon which at the present time, rather than suggest any proposals of my own, I desire to hear the views of the gentlemen present.

In the meanwhile, however, I may say that I note a resolution which appears to have been passed unanimously at the meeting of Premiers in Hobart, in which the desire was expressed for closer commercial arrangements with the Empire, and I think it was suggested that a commission of inquiry should be created in order to see in what way practical effect might be given to the aspiration. If that be the case, and if it were thought that, at the present time, you were not prepared to go beyond inquiry, if it were the wish of the other colonies, of Canada and of the South African Colonies, to join in such an inquiry, Her Majesty's Government would be delighted to make arrangements for the purpose, and to accept any suggestions as to the form of the reference and the character and constitution of the commission, and would very gladly take part in it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered that the right hon. gentleman had declared to the people of Canada that he was most anxious to have such a commission of inquiry appointed; and here we have Mr. Chamberlain telling the right hon. gentleman that he can have this commission of inquiry. Not only so, but we have, I think I may say without exaggerating in the slightest degree—we have not only the Colonial Secretary assuring the right hon. gentleman that he can have the very commission of inquiry which he declared he was anxious to have, but we have Mr. Chamberlain earnestly inviting the right hon. gentleman to take part in such a commission of inquiry. I say, earnestly inviting him, because Mr. Chamberlain does not say merely that Her Majesty's Government will take this matter into their favourable consideration, or into their serious consideration, but he says Her Majesty's Government will be delighted to promote such a commission, and will gladly take part in it. Therefore, I say we have the right hon. gentleman earnestly requested by the Colonial Secretary to take part in the very commission he told the people of Canada he wanted to have. Was that an approach on the part of the Imperial authorities, or was it not? The right hon.

gentleman has told this House that there has been no approach on the part of the Imperial authorities. Is not that an approach? I say it is impossible to conceive that a statesman in the position of Mr. Chamberlain could have given a more distinct invitation to the right hon. gentleman and to the Premiers to take up this whole question of preferential trade, and have it investigated, and endeavour to see whether a satisfactory arrangement could not be arrived at.

I think I might safely rest my case here, and say that we have proved enough. But as if it were to make assurance double sure, as if it were to remove every possible ground of quibble—if that is the term my right hon. friend likes to use—Mr. Chamberlain was not content even with that, but last year, just before the meeting of this House, at Liverpool he again returns to the charge, and what do we find him saying at Liverpool? He speaks in terms so plain, so pointed, so unambiguous, so unmistakable, that no hon. gentleman can possibly be at a loss to understand what he means:

What I think we have already accomplished is to convince them—

That is, the colonies.

—that wherever they live, however far their home may be from the centre and from the mother land, we, at any rate, are prepared to meet them more than half way in any approach which they may make to us, in any desire which they may express for their closer union.

“We are ready to meet them more than half way.” Then he goes on to say:

We should not be deterred, either by the economic pedantries or the selfishness which is a virtue with some politicians, from giving favourable consideration to any proposals which our brethren across the sea may make to us. And in such a consideration, I for one do not believe the English people will keep a strict account of profit and loss—that they will seek to be assured of a present pecuniary gain in return for so much concession on their part. No, I think they will look, and look wisely, rather to a future time, when we shall find our reward.

That speech was delivered in January of last year. I may say that I had myself ventured to make a speech in reference to this subject, which had been sent to Mr. Chamberlain, and in that speech I quoted the arguments which had been used in this House, and which were always thrown across the floor of the House at us, namely, the argument that the mother country would not think of imperilling her great foreign trade for the comparatively insignificant trade of the colonies. I will not trouble the House, as I did last session, with reading the passage. I ventured to say that I thought that was a short-sighted policy. I thought that the people of the mother country ought to look to the future, and not to the present condition of colonial trade. Mr. Chamberlain answers the remarks I made

Mr. McNEILL.

on that occasion—if you can take this as an answer—whether he read my speech or not. As he had read speeches of mine delivered previously in this House, and quoted from them, I think I may assume he read this speech, for it was sent to him; and if he had sat down and written me a letter in reply, he could not have answered more satisfactorily, to my mind, than he answered in that speech I have referred to. He deliberately tells any one who has any doubt with regard to this matter, that the Imperial authorities are ready to meet us more than half-way; that if any one is afraid they will only deal on purely trade principles, he tells them: We will allow no economical pedantries to stand in the way. If any one says that they will not imperil their great foreign trade for the trade of the colonies, he tells them that in the mother country they will not weigh the profit and loss of the moment, but they will look, and wisely look, to the future for their reward.

So I do not think, as I have said, that anything more explicit or satisfactory could possibly be imagined. Now, then, I want to ask any reasonable man, who is not overborne with party prejudice, whether he does not feel, in view of the statement I have made and the statements that have been made by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, that a government, sincerely desirous of promoting this policy of preferential trade, would at once have closed with Mr. Chamberlain's proposal for a commission of inquiry, and would also at once have hailed with delight Mr. Chamberlain's utterances at Liverpool and taken immediate steps to make it known that Canada, on her part, was ready to meet them more than half way? I ask any man, who regards this question from any other aspect than from a purely party aspect, whether, under these circumstances, he does not believe that if that course had been taken by the Government very substantial progress might have been made already in this direction, and whether we might not now have had an arrangement which would have been of immeasurable benefit to every farmer throughout the whole Dominion of Canada, by giving him a position of commanding superiority in his competition with his foreign rivals in the markets of the United Kingdom? We have been told by the right hon. Prime Minister that we should have had a state document. Mr. Chamberlain has warned us, over and over again, that if we want the mother country to adopt this policy, to make so great a change in her fiscal policy as this policy would demand, we must say that we want it. We must take the initiative. In his Canada Club speech, Mr. Chamberlain said that in one sense, at all events, the colonies must take the initiative in a movement of this kind. In his speech, which I have already quoted from, before the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire, he repeats the same thing. He says:

I say, gentlemen, if it were proposed to us by the colonies, because I do not consider it would be either wise or practical that a proposal of this kind should come in the first instance from the United Kingdom. We know how strenuously the colonies cling to their own independence, and their own initiative. If they desire, as we believe they do, this closer union, if they are willing to make some sacrifice of their present arrangements and convictions in order to secure it, let them say so.

In his speech at Liverpool he says the same thing. He says that they would not urge the colonies; that that would be foolish, but that we would rather follow their lead. Therefore, I say that it is nothing less than trifling with the intelligence of this House for the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to talk to us about there not having been given a state document in regard to this matter. I say that any Government that makes use of such an argument as that, any Government that adopts an excuse so flimsy as a reason why they have not acted in support of this policy, is a Government hostile to this policy, and I say that the Government of the right hon. gentleman is hostile to this policy. I say that it is to the Government of my right hon. friend that the people of Canada owe it, that since they have obtained the reins of power, this policy has made no progress. I say that they have blocked this policy today in this House by refusing to accept the proposal of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. Hon. gentlemen opposite have very often, when on this side of the House, been accused of inconsistency; that they have been accused of inconsistency, I believe, often with truth, but I can bear testimony that, from the day that the right hon. gentleman, in violation of his pledges to the people of Canada, made use of his position as the Prime Minister of Canada to strike down in England a policy which he promised the people of Canada he would promote—I say that I can bear testimony that from that day the Government of the right hon. gentleman has been remorselessly consistent in its determination to deprive the people of Canada of any preference in the markets of England, over the right hon. gentleman's old allies and friends in the United States. I say before the right hon. gentleman what I have said when he was not present, because I like to repeat before himself things that I have said behind his back, at the first opportunity. I say that there never was a flock of sheep more helplessly sold to the shambles than the right hon. gentleman sold the confiding people of Canada to their rivals of the United States on that occasion. When I say "sold," I am not speaking of a monetary consideration. I do not know what the consideration or the motive was, but I know that the thing was done. I know that the right hon. gentleman promised the people of Canada to do his utmost to obtain for

them that which he described as a great boon, and I know that when he went to England, on the very first occasion that he opened his lips in Liverpool, he told the people that he did not wish them, in order to give Canada that great boon, to interfere with the free trade policy of the people of England. Now, I am afraid that I have wearied the House. I have spoken too long, but there is one observation I should like to make, and it is this: If it be urged that this policy would interfere in any way with the friendly relations which are happily growing up between the United States and Canada, I utterly repudiate that argument. I am a believer in these friendly relations; I believe that these friendly relations will last. When I say that they will last I mean that they are not the result of any mere evanescent impulse. I believe that they will last, but, I believe, that they will be found to obtain chiefly in regard to foreign relations. I think we shall find a co-operation between the mother country and the United States in reference to foreign relations such as we have never seen before, but so far as internal relations or trade matters are concerned, I believe that the ambassador of the United States did his duty merely when he warned the people of England, on his arrival in London, that they would still find the people of the United States their rivals in matters of commerce and trade. And I think, in presence of that friendly warning, it behooves us of the British Empire to put our house in order, and to be prepared to meet this friendly rivalry of the other firm. One of the essential conditions upon which we must enter into that friendly rivalry is, that the people of Canada shall have that preferential treatment in the markets of the Empire which the people of the United States have in the markets of the United States. That is one of the essentials, and I say that no country regarding us with friendly eyes has any right to take offence at a domestic arrangement of that kind. As a free people we are entitled to enter into such an arrangement without causing offence to any country, much less to any country that professes to regard us in a friendly way. I say further, that any Government, colonial or Imperial, that would deprive Her Majesty's subjects of this simple measure of justice in order to gain favour with any foreign power, would pursue a policy which in my opinion would be short-sighted and dangerous, and unworthy the traditions and the dignity of the people of this Empire. But I call the attention of the House to the fact, that if there be an objection from this point of view, that objection is not to be taken by the Government of Canada but by the Imperial Government. It is for us to put forward our claims; it is for the Imperial Government to consider them. I want further to call the attention of the House to this fact, that whatever excuse there might be in connection with this, it

does not in any degree hold with regard to the course which has been pursued by the Government in the past, because this proposal of Mr. Chamberlain's for a conference. This speech of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) at Liverpool and the interview he granted to the "Chronicle," all took place before this rapprochement with the United States—Mr. Chamberlain's speech at Liverpool was delivered in the early part of last year.

I say, as I said before, the simple explanation of the unwillingness of the right hon. gentleman to accept the proposal made to him by my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) to-day, comes from the fact that this Government is hostile to preferential trade. That is the reason of it. It is this Government which is blocking the preferential trade movement. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) struck it down in England for the time being. He thought he had destroyed it, but he was unable to do that. The man does not breathe who can do that, because this is a policy which is instinct with the very spirit of the race to which we belong for it appeals at once to the Imperial aspirations, to the impulses of affection, and to the trading capacities of the British people the world over. Therefore, I say, that the man does not breathe who can destroy it. But I say that the man, or the Government, or the party, that seeks to thwart it will be destroyed by it. I say, Sir, that these hon. gentlemen opposite may have dammed back the stream for the moment, but the stream is fast swelling into a mighty river that will pursue its triumphant course in spite of them, and burst their barriers, and sweep to the ocean like the idle foam on its surface, any miserable obstacles they may seek to place in its way.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Mr. Speaker, at this advanced period of the session, and also having regard to the lateness of the hour, I will not trespass for any length of time upon the indulgence of the House. With reference to the subject of preferential trade with Great Britain, and of matters that make for closer union between the mother country and the Empire, it would be in the direction of that desirable end if all Canadians would forget their party spirit, when dealing with so important a theme. I listened with great pleasure to the remarks of the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), and if I may be permitted to congratulate him, I do so in all sincerity upon the form and manner of his speech this afternoon. I may have to controvert the substance of it, but I certainly admired the improved tone, so different it appeared to me from that which many times he has adopted when addressing the House. In saying that, I do not wish to detract at all from the approbation with which I observed the hon. gentleman's tone to-day. With reference to my hon. friend

Mr. McNEILL.

from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), I would say that I hardly think he did himself justice. I greatly appreciate the generosity with which he alluded to the doings of some members of the Cabinet, myself included, and I here make public recognition of my gratitude to him. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) would have better advanced that object which he has at heart, if upon a subject of such Imperial importance as this, he had omitted to suggest that the Canadian Government of the day in seeking to promote a British preference in Canadian markets have done the work of American tricksters. That is an observation which I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) regretted as soon as it was uttered.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) sought to prove the advantage to Canada of a preference for Canadian products in the Imperial markets. I am not aware that there is any issue upon that point. I think all Canadians would rejoice if we had a preference in Imperial markets for Canadian products. If we had a preference there, all Canadians I am sure would be glad of any advantage we might get over the rest of the world in the markets of Great Britain. I shall address myself to-night simply to the form and the substance of the resolution which we are asked to vote in favour of. If my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) had desired wisely to secure a unanimous expression of opinion from this House, he perhaps would have been able to have more fortunately expressed his views than in a controversial proposition such as is now in your hands. Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McNEILL. That was hopeless.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend says it is hopeless, and I may say that he is scarcely willing to give us credit for anything. For example, he pointed out that preferential trade with Great Britain has made no advance since the present Administration took office. May I ask him what advance it made during the eighteen years of our predecessors in power? I will not take up ancient history nor will I hold my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) responsible for the utterance which is correctly attributed to the great organ of his party, but if I sought to retort in kind I would remind the hon. gentleman that the great organ when in 1879, his party adopted a principle of high protection called the National Policy, and when it was pointed out that the adoption of such a policy as that it might endanger British connection, the organ of the Conservative party then, as it is now, said: If the National Policy endangers British connection, so much the worse for British connection.

Mr. McNEILL. It was Mr. Farrer, I think, who wrote that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would prefer, however, to try and avoid everything

controversial, and to give such reasons as suggest themselves to me why the House cannot adopt the resolution now proposed. This resolution sets forth matters of inducement why we should declare in favour of opening negotiations for preferential trade with Great Britain. What are those matters of inducement? In brief, they are that Mr. Chamberlain, the Colonial Secretary, made the proposal of a preferential tariff, and that His Grace the Duke of Devonshire endorsed it, and that, inasmuch as these two distinguished Imperial statesmen made this alleged proposal, it is our duty to open negotiations. It is perfectly clear, in the first place, that the Parliament of Canada would not be warranted in passing a resolution declaring that, in our judgment, what these gentlemen or what either of them stated amounts to a proposal such as is attributed to them by hon. gentlemen opposite. We certainly would not be warranted in giving a parliamentary interpretation to the utterances of Mr. Chamberlain or the Duke of Devonshire contrary to or not absolutely what they did declare. No Parliament, especially a British Parliament, would be warranted in placing an inaccurate statement upon its journals. I need not deal with the observations of Mr. Chamberlain, for my right hon. friend the First Minister has effectually dealt with them. But taking up the case of the Duke of Devonshire, we have several gentlemen placing their own construction upon his words. We have my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and my hon. friend the member for North Bruce, and we have my hon. friend's witness, the correspondent of the New York "Evening Post."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And you have the London "Times."

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend read extracts from a number of papers, but I fail to find in any one of them any statement going anything like the length that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition contends they did go. He seems to forget that the proposition of preferential trade involves something absolutely different from a proposition to impose a tariff. It is in one sense protection, and in the other sense free trade. Great Britain, a free trade country, might adopt a protective tariff or a revenue tariff, which would not in itself awaken any hostility to her on the part of foreign countries, but if she should discriminate, even in favour of her own colonies, that might excite new considerations. So that when any one alleges that the Duke of Devonshire or Mr. Chamberlain offered to give to Canada a preference in the markets of Great Britain, he alleges two things. He alleges that these representative men propose, in the first place, to make dutiable what is not dutiable to day, or to increase the duties on what is

dutiable to-day in England; and, in the second place, to apply lesser rates on similar articles that come from Canada. These are two distinct propositions. Now, what is there to support the contention that the Duke of Devonshire made the offer he is alleged in this resolution to have made? This resolution contains a quotation from a speech delivered by the Duke of Devonshire on the 12th June, 1897, at Liverpool, and in order to clinch the matter, alleges that it was delivered in the presence of the Prime Minister. The fact, I suppose, that it was delivered in his presence, is to be taken as clear proof that it was intended to go as far as these hon. gentlemen think. This resolution, to which we are asked to assent, declares:

That the speech in which the Duke of Devonshire gave utterance to these views was regarded in England as a fair adoption by the Salisbury Government of a proposal, above referred to, made by Mr. Chamberlain in March, 1896.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend says "hear, hear." Well, the alleged gist of Mr. Chamberlain's utterance, as stated in this resolution, is as follows:—

That in March, 1896, the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, Secretary of State for the Colonies, suggested that duties favourable to the colonies should be imposed by the United Kingdom upon her imported foreign produce, provided the colonies would in return give preferential concessions in favour of the United Kingdom.

There we have the statement in this resolution that Mr. Chamberlain proposed a preferential tariff between the colonies and Great Britain, and that the Duke of Devonshire endorsed this proposal, and, in the second place, it is alleged that the Duke of Devonshire's utterances of the 12th June, 1897, amounted to an offer of preferential trade. Just think for a moment of the absurdity of the proposition that two statesmen, however eminent, should deliberately propose a reversal of the fiscal policy of Great Britain and the adoption of a new policy, or, in other words, the abandonment of the old doctrine of free trade that had been in existence half a century, and the adoption of a new policy instead—that these two gentlemen should seriously propose, in an informal way, one at the Board of Trade and Commerce in 1896 and the other at Liverpool in 1897, a radical change of policy and that such a change of policy would become law on its acceptance by the Colonial authorities. My hon. friend seems to think that in Great Britain the mass of the people are not going to exercise their own judgment on a great question such as this. He seems to think that a great economic revolution such as is suggested, would not have to be preceded by any expression of public opinion at the polls.

But apart from the absurdity of such a proposition, let us come down to what really took place. I will not, as I have said, allude to the utterances of Mr. Chamberlain, but shall confine my attention to those of the Duke of Devonshire. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is never tired of telling us what he considers the meaning of the Duke of Devonshire's utterances. Well Mr. Speaker, there is a journal published in the city of London called "Britannia," which is the organ of the Empire League. Her Majesty is the patron and the Duke of Devonshire is the president of the British Empire League. This interpretation that hon. gentlemen opposite have been placing upon the utterances of the Duke of Devonshire, which did them service in Canada, where it was calculated to mislead the public mind in regard to the meaning of these utterances, found its way to Great Britain, and was referred to in this journal in its issue of August, 1898. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall read the article to which I refer, and which is entitled "A Challenge." This is an editorial:

Has not the time come when the Toronto "Mail and Empire" may fairly be called upon to give chapter and verse for its repeated assertion that the Duke of Devonshire made Sir Wilfrid Laurier "an offer" of preferential trade at Liverpool in June, last year, or, in default, to withdraw it once for all. This fable,—

My hon. friend will observe that.

—as it must be called, recently took the following form:—

"The Duke of Devonshire, it will be remembered"—so the "Mail and Empire" wrote on May 19th—"urged the Premier to consider the project favourably and to enter into negotiations." Now we say emphatically, that we challenge contradiction that neither of the Duke's speeches contained any passage which is capable of being represented in this sense. Let it be clearly understood that neither "Britannia" nor the present writer has any concern with the controversy which still rages as to the Canadian Premier's policy or diplomacy in the matter. The "Mail and Empire" is, of course, free to hammer to its heart's content. That is a question of party politics in which the British Empire League, comprising, as it does, many members both in Great Britain and in Canada who dissent from Sir Wilfrid Laurier's action as well as many who cordially approve of it, has no intention of meddling. But for the very reason that the League, having the Queen herself as its patron, is an organization of a national character, it becomes a sheer impropriety to misrepresent its president as having committed himself on a highly disputatious topic, when he has done nothing of the kind.

Now, I ask my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition if, in the face of that utterance by the organ of the British Empire League, of which the Duke of Devonshire is president, he still persists in declaring that the utterance of the Duke of Devonshire amounted to an offer of preferential trade?

Mr. MULOCK.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will my hon. friend allow me to make an observation?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has just read, and correctly read, a statement in what he calls the organ of the British Empire League, that members of that league, many of them, dissent strongly from Sir Wilfrid Laurier's views on this question, while many approve them. So the statement that this organization, the British Empire League in London, is composed of parties who hold strongly both opinions is quite true; and I may say at once that the editorial management of that paper is, in my judgment, in the hands of the parties who strongly dissent from the views of the United Empire Trade League, and from preferential trade as we hold it. I do not consider the statement in the slightest degree affects the position of His Grace the Duke of Devonshire, who is the president of the league, although it appears in that paper. They are dealing with a succinct statement taken from the "Mail and Empire," in which, probably, an over statement was made of the duke's position. I have not made that statement, I have quoted the words that the Duke of Devonshire used on that occasion as proving that virtually he had come to the conclusion to endorse the views taken by Mr. Chamberlain. And I give to my hon. friend who is now dealing with this subject the proof that several Premiers who responded to that speech treated it as an offer of preferential trade made by His Grace. And I shall be glad to put the revised publication of the speeches made on that occasion by the representatives of the British Empire League in the hands of my hon. friend. He will find the response of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Why should the right hon. gentleman go out of his way to repudiate it as an offer of preferential trade, unless it were so. The fact that he treated it as a proposal of preferential trade and answered it in the negative, the fact that several other Premiers treated it in the same way and expressed their approval of it, is strong evidence that the views of the Duke of Devonshire did in fact harmonize with those of Mr. Chamberlain. And what more? The Cobdenite press throughout the British islands denounced the Duke of Devonshire in round terms because he had abandoned in that speech his free trade proclivities in order to meet the views of the colonies who wished preferential trade. I give these as good grounds why it should be said that the Duke of Devonshire's speech might be interpreted, not as a proposal absolutely to be closed without reference to the people, as my hon. friend said, but as a tentative proposal to be discussed. And when my hon. friend takes, in connection with that, the fact that after that speech Mr. Chamberlain, the representative of the British Government, in the paper he laid on

the Table in the House of Commons, stated that if Canada and South Africa agreed with the desire expressed by the Australian Premiers at Hobartown, he was prepared to issue a commission, to take part in it, to take this question up and consider whether it could be arranged. I give these facts to my hon. friend in support of what I have said. I am glad he has indulged me with the opportunity to say this much, as, I suppose, I should not have the right to speak again, and I am greatly obliged to the hon. gentleman for the opportunity to make this statement.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have to thank my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) for having assisted me in making a speech. I understand my hon. friend to say that the "Mail and Empire" article referred to in the article I have quoted may be an overstatement of what he said—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it was a little strongly drawn—

\* The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will read a statement of some one else, and we will see if it is rather strongly drawn. This is the report of a speech appearing in the Toronto "Mail and Empire" of the 29th February, 1899. In good big letters it is announced as being "a ringing address by the chieftain" at "the third ward's big smoker." There are several columns of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, we have heard it all a good many times in this House. But I will read a portion given under the heading "Inter-Imperial Trade"

Sir Charles Tupper went on to deal with the question of inter-imperial preferential trade, which he held to be the great future policy for Canada. At the time the Conservatives went out of power, matters were ripening for its adoption. Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain had been converted thereto. That policy had been thrown back for years by the base betrayal of Canada's interests by the present Premier of Canada, Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear. I say so now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (reading)

This language he had used on the floor of Parliament, and this language he was prepared to defend. During the campaign of 1896, Mr. Laurier had gone from hustings to hustings saying he was as much in favour of preferential trade as Sir Charles Tupper.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear; so he did.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We will see if the hon. gentleman says "hear, hear" to the rest of this:

He had given his solemn pledge that if placed in power he would send a commission to England to negotiate with Lord Salisbury for preferential trade. He became Premier, and he

went to England in the midst of the glory of the great jubilee.

At the time when everything was favourable to the accomplishment of such a policy, he was met, almost on landing, by the Duke of Devonshire, who made a speech, offering this great boon in unmistakable terms.

Is that an overstatement?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have already stated to my hon. friend that I read the Duke of Devonshire's words, and claimed, as all the Premiers did, that such a construction could be put upon them, that it was an offer of preferential trade.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then, my hon. friend says this is not an overstatement. I will read it again:

He was met almost on landing by the Duke of Devonshire who made a speech offering in unmistakable terms. In proof of this latter fact the morning after, every Cobdenite, every ultra-free-trade journal in England—

There was not an exception, bear in mind.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Richard is himself again.

Every ultra free-trade journal in England denounced the Duke of Devonshire for having gone over to the other side and for having adopted Imperialistic views. The speeches of the other colonial Premiers delivered at the same time almost showed what the trend of the offer was. But, asks Sir Charles, what did this man, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, do? Why, he turned his back on his solemn pledge and declined the boon.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In most unmistakable terms.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. So, Mr. Speaker, even the quotation in "Britannia" from the "Mail" is not an overstatement. The hon. gentleman has not discredited his own testimony; his own testimony is strictly accurate, that the Duke of Devonshire made this preferential offer in unmistakable terms at Liverpool, and my hon. friend repudiated it, and turned his back upon it. Now, in this state of affairs, I wonder who is best able to know what was in the mind of the Duke of Devonshire. Is it the correspondent of the New York "Evening Post"? It proves nothing to say that the Cobdenite journals denounced him for having made some heterodox observations on the subject of free trade. Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to settle this question and ascertain what the Duke of Devonshire really did mean, I wrote to His Grace a letter. Perhaps some other persons are anxious to know what construction to put upon his utterances. We are asked tonight to declare by a solemn resolution that the trend of the remarks of the Duke of Devonshire was, as my hon. friend stated at the big smoker in Ward 3, on the 22nd of February last, an unqualified offer of preferential trade. We are asked to inter-

pret his utterances in that way, and to pass a resolution of Parliament saying that was his meaning, and to open negotiations with the British Empire. Well, Sir, I have heard the hon. gentleman on more than one occasion speak as he is reported in the "Mail" to have spoken. I had read and reread every utterance I could find of the Duke of Devonshire upon the subject of preferential trade, and I confess that I had never been able to draw the deduction that my hon. friend has drawn from any of his utterances. At last, in order to relieve myself of my dilemma, and to make clear what was misty, I took the liberty of addressing a communication to His Grace the Duke of Devonshire upon the subject. And, in order to make no mistake, I quoted this interesting article that I have read from the "Mail," and that I have now for ever made lasting by placing it upon the pages of "Hansard." Before reading His Grace's reply, I will read my letter, that the hon. gentleman may see whether or not I presented the case fairly to him :

Ottawa, 1st April, 1899.

My Lord Duke,—

I inclose a copy of the "Mail and Empire," of Toronto, of the date of the 23rd February, 1899, upon page 7 of which you will observe a report of a speech of Sir Charles Tupper, delivered at Toronto the previous evening, wherein Sir Charles is reported as having spoken as follows :—

"During the campaign of 1896, Sir Wilfrid Laurier had gone from hustings to hustings saying that he was as much in favour of preferential trade as Sir Charles Tupper. He had given his solemn pledge that if placed in power he would send a commission to England to negotiate with Lord Salisbury for preferential trade. He became Premier, and went to England in the midst of all the glory of a great Jubilee, at the time when everything was favourable of such a policy. He was met, almost on landing, by the Duke of Devonshire, who made a speech offering this great boon in unmistakable terms. In proof of this latter fact, the morning after, every Cobdenite, every ultra free-trade journal in England denounced the Duke of Devonshire for having gone over to the other side, and of having adopted Imperialistic views. The speeches of the other colonial Premiers delivered at the same time almost showed what the trend of the offer was.

"But," asked Sir Charles, "what did this man (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) do? Why, he turned his back on his solemn pledge and declined the boon."

I take the liberty of inquiring whether you made to Sir Wilfrid such an offer as is stated by Sir Charles, or any offer to give to Canada a preference in the market of Great Britain, and, if so, would you have the goodness to state the particulars of such offer.

Sir Charles states the occasion of the offer being made as almost at the time of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's landing in England, and I presume Sir Charles Tupper's statement is based upon some public utterance of Your Grace about that time. If, on any public occasion during Sir Wilfrid Laurier's visit to England in 1897, Your Grace made any public deliverance upon the subject, might I ask if your remarks were accurately

Mr. MULOCK.

published in the British press, and if so, where I could procure authentic copies of any papers containing reports of your speeches upon the subject?

If not too much trouble, I should be most grateful if Your Grace could cause to be sent to me copies of any public journals containing speeches of Your Grace's having any reference to any offer made to Sir Wilfrid with reference to preferential trade in favour of Canada in the markets of Great Britain.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is incorrect: I made no such statement.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Let me continue reading my letter:

When in England last summer I observed an article in "Britannia" referring to statements published in the Toronto "Mail and Empire" to the effect that Your Grace had made an offer of preferential trade to Canada, and that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had refused it; and "Britannia" challenged the correctness of the "Mail and Empire."

I would be glad to be permitted to make public use of Your Grace's reply.

I am, my Lord Duke,

Your Grace's very obedient servant,

His Grace the Duke of Devonshire, K.G.,  
Devonshire House, 78 Piccadilly West,  
London, Eng.

Mr. Speaker, I have a reply and I have permission to make use of it in any way I like. I do not think I can make a better use of it, both in the interest of truth, which is a consideration always, and in the interest of fairness to His Grace and fairness to the great subject we are discussing, than to remove doubts and to let us know where we stand upon this question. I think, for these considerations, that it is wise to give publicity to his reply. To propose to solemnly ask the Parliament of Canada to declare that a member of the Imperial Government, as the Duke of Devonshire is, in the name of the Imperial Government, made a certain proposition and to ask this Parliament to make a declaration as to what that hon. Minister may have said, when he did not say it, would be lowering to the dignity of Parliament.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) is misstating the resolution.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) may make any observations he likes afterwards. Let me read the reply of His Grace:

Privy Council Office,

2nd of May, 1899.

My dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 1st April.

The best answer I can give to your inquiries is to inclose you a copy of the report of the speeches made on the various occasions in the summer of 1897, when I had the pleasure of meeting the colonial Premier, in my capacity as president of the British Empire League.

I do not think that, in any of those speeches, you will find anything to support the view of my

opinion on the question of the policy of granting preferential trade to the colonies, which appears to have been held by Sir Charles Tupper, and by some of the journals in this country, which seek to attribute what they term "Protectionist heresies" to members of the Unionist Government.

It was, no doubt, my speech at Liverpool on the 12th June, 1897, which was referred to by Sir Charles Tupper, and my admission that free trade had not done for us all that was once expected, may have been commented on by free traders or opposition journals.

But, while I congratulated Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Dominion of Canada on the offer which had been made to admit British goods at reduced rates, as compared with those on the goods of other nations, as an important step in the direction of the Imperial Unity, I had no authority to offer, and did not offer to Canada a preference in British markets.

You are at liberty to make what use you please of this letter.

Believe me, my dear sir,  
Yours faithfully,  
(Sd.) DEVONSHIRE.

The Hon. W. Mulock.

The Duke of Devonshire probably knew what he said. I have read his letter here. In the face of these words I ask my hon. friend if he thinks it would be in harmony with fairness, or with the fitness of things, that we should here make a solemn declaration, and place upon the Journals of the House, the opinion of the Canadian Parliament that the Duke of Devonshire made to Canada on the 12th of June, 1897, or at any other period in his life, an offer of preferential trade.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, I am going to finish now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to answer the question that he has asked?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will allow the hon. gentleman if he will not make a speech.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will not make a speech, I will call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that he is misstating the resolution, and that the resolution contains no such statement as he has made. The resolution gives, verbatim, the expression of the Duke of Devonshire and it adds that the speech in which the Duke of Devonshire gives utterance to these views was regarded in England as a foreshadowing of the adoption by Her Majesty's Government of the proposal above referred to, made by Mr. Chamberlain in March, 1896. The Duke of Devonshire's letter says that this is true. He says that a number of papers did give that construction to these expressions. That is what the resolution says.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It suggests that speech, in which the Duke of Devonshire gives utterance to these views,

received a certain interpretation in England. Is that a statement which should appear in the Journals of the House after what I have said? After what we know, even assuming that the technicality that my hon. friend would resort to were good and sound after we know now that the view, as it appears in this resolution which is said to have prevailed in England is, incorrect, I ask the hon. gentleman if we should endorse a rumour that he says is flying about here and there in England, and predicate upon that the statement that Great Britain is prepared for a great commercial revolution. Should we, in justice to the Duke of Devonshire, endorse a view which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) says is in existence, but which His Grace says is incorrect?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, he does not. He does not deny the truth of Mr. Chamberlain's statements.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Speaker, I think I have effectually shown that if my hon. friends opposite had started out in a wiser way to secure an expression of opinion from this House in reference to preferential trade, I believe a resolution could have been framed that would have met the unanimous opinion of Parliament; but, Sir, a resolution has been framed here partly aiming at preferential trade, I will admit, but partly and chiefly aiming at the right hon. Prime Minister and at the Government of Canada. Under the guise and cloak of patriotism the hon. gentlemen are attempting to make a party question out of a question that should be superior to Canadian party politics, and they are seeking to divide the people upon a subject upon which we should all be united. For these reasons I submit that the resolution should not receive the endorsement of the Canadian Parliament.

Mr. A. H. MOORE (Stanstead). Mr. Speaker, it is with very great diffidence that I rise to express my views upon this important question, partly from the fact that it is an intricate subject, partly from the fact that it has been discussed so ably by those who have preceded me, and partly from the fact that owing to the lateness of the hour and the advanced stage of the session even an important question does not receive the consideration and respect it would command at an earlier period. This is a very important subject, and I think, Sir, that no one will dispute the statement when I say that no question or subject has been presented to this Parliament that is of so great importance to all classes of the people as the one which has been presented for the consideration of hon. members of this House. It has been said that the restless spirit of man permeating the nations of the world, is ever seeking for new methods, new inventions, and new channels in which they can

place themselves in a more favourable position than their competitors. It has been said, too, that the sentiments of nations are undergoing great changes. At one time nations rose to great power and magnificence by conquering others adding their domain to their own, and reducing the conquered people to a state of vassalage. We will not have to delve very deeply into the pages of history to come to that time, when successful warriors and ambitious rulers, as the poet said :

Unsheathed the sword, dipped it in blood,  
And wrote their names on lands and cities  
desolate.

But the nations of the present day have come to the conclusion that a country at peace grows faster and stronger than a nation at war. The plough, the loom and the forge are looked upon as mightier implements than the sword. And to-day one of the most important conventions that has ever been held in the world is convened for the purpose of devising means by which international disputes may be settled by peaceable and diplomatic measures, without resorting to the sword. The great struggle of nations then, is not as it was in former times, to add to their domain, their importance and their influence by conquest; the great struggle to-day is for commercial and industrial supremacy. Each nation is struggling to capture the greatest possible portion of the world's trade, and in consequence of her commercial supremacy the envious eyes of all the nations are now directed towards Great Britain. Our mother country has grown in wealth, and its population has increased to such a great extent and her territory is so small that she cannot support the forty millions of her inhabitants by the products of her own soil. In that little sea-girt isle, only about half the size of the province of Quebec, only about half the size of the province of Ontario, and only about one-third the size of the province of British Columbia, they can raise only enough food to support 17,000,000 of their people, leaving the other 23,000,000 to depend entirely upon outside countries for their food. To-day there is a great struggle among the food-producing countries of the world to secure the largest possible portion of these supplies. England, we have heard to-night, imports and consumes \$900,000,000 worth of food annually, and we find from statistics that she imports annually of wheat, barley, oats, flour, animals for food, preserved meats, cheese, butter, eggs, fruit, fish, lard, condensed milk and potatoes, poultry and game, amounting to \$600,296,366 worth. These, you will observe are articles of production which Canada can supply to the best advantage. It is, then, a matter of great importance that we should be permitted to enter into the markets of Great Britain upon more favourable terms than the foreign food-producing nations of

Mr. MOORE.

which we are rivals. The value of the imports from Canada in 1896 was \$6,000,000 worth to the United States, and \$40,000,000 worth to the United Kingdom. In 1897 we exported to the United States \$7,000,000 worth and to the United Kingdom \$46,000,000. In 1898 we exported to the United States \$5,000,000 worth and to the United Kingdom \$66,000,000 worth. In 1898 for every dollar's worth we sent to the United States, we sent to England \$13.10 worth. Therefore, it strikes me that if the present Government would make the same effort to secure the markets of Great Britain that they have made to secure the markets of the United States, the farming industry of Canada would be very much more benefited. I believe, too, that their efforts in the direction of securing the British market would meet with greater success, because if they were successful in securing reciprocity with the United States, it will only be on such terms as will work injury instead of benefit to the people of Canada. In the next place, Sir, we might consider for a moment the magnitude of the great Empire to which we belong, and in which we take great pride in belonging. I have here the figures giving the population of the 38 colonies, dependencies and protectorates belonging to Great Britain, and that population amounts to 381,404,960. The area of British territory is 11,473,408 square miles, and so we have within the British Empire one-fourth of the population of the world, and one-fourth of the earth's surface. Therefore, we can truly say that the British Empire to which we belong is the grandest Empire the world has ever seen. In regard to the trade of that Empire, we find that in all her possessions she imported \$80,000,000, and exported \$85,000,000 worth in 1897. The total trade of England amounts to: imports, \$3,639,464,555, and exports, \$2,246,225,040, showing a balance of trade against the Empire of many hundreds of millions of dollars. This question of the competition of Canada with the different food-producing countries of the world in the British market is therefore a very important one. It is, therefore, important that we should ascertain, if possible, the cost of raising wheat in the different countries with which we have to compete. I have here statements which were made by Mr. James Long and by Sir John Lawes, men competent to judge, and excellent authorities upon that question. Mr. Long says, quoting from Sir John Lawes, an authority of unexceptionable worth on agricultural questions, a statement made in 1879 :

The whole question, however, turns upon price, and in recent years the rates obtainable for cereals have fallen so seriously that British arable land continues to be laid down in grass. Farmers will not grow what does not pay. He then gives some figures as to wheat production. In 1877 the average price per quarter in the year was 56s. 9d. ; in the winter of 1894-95 it fell to 20s.

Twenty years ago the export from the United States reached only 76,000,000 bushels; in 1891 it rose to 227,000,000 bushels. Between 1880 and 1899 the wheat area in the Canadian North-west increased to 953,000 acres, while the production in the Dominion increased by 10,000,000 bushels. In 1880 India exported less than half a million bushels; now her average export is 30,000,000—in some years rising to 50,000,000 bushels. In 1861 Australia's wheat area was 733,000 acres; in 1892 it had risen to 3,822,000 acres. The export of Argentina in 1889 was only 680,000 bushels; in 1894 it had grown to 61,800,000. Needless to say that to put so much extra grain—annually increasing—is equivalent to a material reduction of prices. Save on a diminished area of the best lands, the production of wheat in England is a thing of the past. Taking England as 100, the relative cost of the production of wheat is (as Mr. Crawford recently showed before the Royal Statistical Society) in Dakota, 57; in Russia, 54; in India, 66; and in the United States, 70. Farmers in Kansas profess to raise wheat at 1s. a bushel, and Mr. Long has conversed with farmers in Dakota, Manitoba, and Assinibola, who could pay their way if they obtained an average yield of 15 bushels to the acre, and a price of 50 cents, or 2s. 1d. In England it is difficult to produce a crop of wheat for less than 85s. an acre, where a rent of 20s. is paid. As for distance and freight, the ocean is scarcely a barrier, as wheat can be carried from Chicago to Liverpool for 6½ cents a bushel, or 9s. 9d. a ton. Mr. Long has, himself, on the other hand, paid 11s. 11d. a ton for grain conveyed in four-ton lots a distance of a hundred miles, and for barley offal, from Burton to Hertfordshire, no less than 16s. 8d. If an Englishman has to live by farming, therefore, it is positively an advantage, where transit is necessary, to farm in the United States or Canada.

We have heard discussed to-night pretty freely what preferential trade would do for Canada. We have between 200,000,000 and 300,000,000 acres of arable land in Manitoba and the North-west Territories that have never been touched by the spade, scratched by the plough, or tickled by the hoe, and that are awaiting immigrants from other countries to settle upon them. This land is capable of raising large quantities of cereals, sufficient to supply the whole English market. If that were occupied, it would increase our population to an enormous extent, which is one of the great objects that this Government should have in view. Nothing would attract immigrants to a greater extent than a preference in the English markets for our products, and, inasmuch as the farmers in that country cannot raise grain in competition with the grain-growers in this country, and cannot obtain a living on their land, they would immigrate to this country, and in that way our population and material wealth would be largely increased, and this increase of population would furnish customers for the manufacturing industries of the east. Thus the one industry would develop the others, and the time would come when we would have much greater title than we have even to-day to consider ourselves the most important colony of any belonging to the British Crown. From the point of view of what this im-

provement in our condition would do for the mother country, we must keep in mind the fact that the time may come when England may be at war with some of the important nations of the earth. At present, if a nation like Russia and some other foreign nations were to join together and place an embargo upon wheat, they could starve out England in a very short time. But if England would give us a preference in her markets, that would be a great encouragement to immigration to this country, and we would then be enabled to raise all the wheat and cattle that England requires, so that she would be absolutely independent of any other nation under any circumstances whatever. Mr. Long gives 233,400,000 bushels of wheat as the quantity required to supply the population of Great Britain. The home production of Great Britain he estimated as 64,000,000 bushels, raised on 1,980,228 acres, so that it is necessary for Great Britain to import from outside countries 169,400,000 bushels, with some 3,000,000 bushels for seed. Are the British colonies equal to the production of this quantity? Canada's wheat acreage Mr. Long estimates at 50,000,000 bushels, raised from 2,875,814 acres. Australasia produces 39,719,489 bushels from 4,165,494 acres. Deduct for home consumption 54,275,000 bushels, and the Indian surplus of 90,728,509 bushels added, if exported to England, would fall short about 100,000,000 bushels. Looking to Canada for the solution of this difficulty, we find that, at 18 bushels to the acre, 5,555,000 acres would furnish what we require. In Canada 55,550 farmers, each occupying a quarter section of land and growing 100 acres of wheat, would suffice for the purpose; and it is estimated that we have over 200,000,000 acres of land uncultivated, suitable for raising wheat and other grain in our great North-west. Therefore, we see that if England would take this matter up and give us a preference in her markets, farmers from the old world would take up these lands and make England in a short time independent of all the nations in the world as regards her food supply.

In times past we heard great complaints made with regard to the public debt of this country. It used to be said that the country was being ruined by the Liberal-Conservative party, owing to the great national debt which had been incurred by them. It was further urged that that party was much more favourable to the manufacturing industries than to the farmers, and prejudice was sought to be raised against us on that score. Well, if you will take the opportunity of looking at the amount that has been expended on railways and canals and the improvement of the navigation of our waters.

It will be found that we have built over 16,500 miles of railway, with ordinary share capital of \$255,807,476; preference share

capital, \$105,267,864 ; bonded debt, \$336,137,001. The Dominion Government has spent on railways \$149,413,309 ; the provincial governments, \$30,055,147 ; the municipalities, \$14,494,757 ; and individuals, \$8,640,952, making a total invested in railways of \$389,817,900. The figures concerning our canals are as follows. First, the number of miles:—

St. Lawrence system.....	71
Ottawa and Richelieu system.....	29½

Total No. of miles..... 100½

The figures of expenditure on canals show :

Amount expended on canals to 1896...	\$36,992,736
For renewals, repairs, &c., and staff...	13,932,786

Total expenditures..... \$50,925,522

So, we have a total expenditure on railways and canals of \$980,743,422, and on public works, \$212,130,002. In 1896, there were steamers and vessels numbering 7,277, with a tonnage of 789,299 tons. Of these vessels 1,762 were steamers with a tonnage of 251,176.

Now, what has been the object of this great investment but to open up the distant portions of the country to colonization and settlement and to furnish cheap transportation for the farmers and other producers, so that they may lay down their products in the English market at as low a cost as other food-producing nations with which we come into competition. And if England would only give us a preference in her markets over foreign nations who are not commercially friendly to this country, it would make this great outlay of money in Canada, designed to give rapid and cheap transportation, of additional value. It strikes me that it is well worth while to make an effort to secure this preferential trade, whatever the contentions may be in regard to the different opinions and views held by the different individuals in this country and in England. Canada wants preferential trade ; Canada can get it if she pushes hard enough and continues to press for it. The Liberal party of Canada seem to be very weak and timid in regard to preferential trade. They exhibited the same timidity between 1874 and 1878 in regard to the National Policy. They said that that policy would endanger British connection, and they were afraid that if it were put into operation it would injure this country in the estimation of the people of England. They further said that the Liberal-Conservative party would never put that policy into operation. They said that even after the policy had been submitted to the people in the elections of 1878 and had been supported by an overwhelming majority at the polls. But the Liberal-Conservative party had promised the people of this country the National Policy, and they carried out to the very letter the promise they had made. Had all the Reformers of the world been as timid as the Liberal party seem to

Mr. MOORE.

be with reference to preferential trade, a very few reforms would have been carried out in the past. In reading history, we find the record of the efforts to abolish the British slave trade, and we see how long Wilberforce, Clarkson and others were pleading with the British Government and how their supplications and petitions were disregarded. But the time came when the people of England were converted to the idea of these reformers, and the slave trade was abolished. Had these men been as timid as this Government, the slave trade would have been continued until the present day. We have read something of the great efforts made to secure freedom of trade in England. It was many years before Richard Cobden, John Bright, Villiers and others were able, by discussion and agitation, to secure the reform they advocated. Had they taken the first "no" for an answer and discontinued their work, the hon. Premier of this country would not have had his breast decorated with a Cobden medal as he has had, and the system of protection would have been continued in England. I say that the National Policy was feared by hon. gentlemen opposite because they thought it would injure British connection. Protection was half the policy, we may say. It was carried out in 1878, to give control of the Canadian markets to the Canadian producer. But the other half, for which we are contending now, is to get control of the English markets for the Canadian producer ; and when that is carried out it will be a great boon to the people of this country, it will make this country indeed bud and blossom like the rose. The effect of this policy will be to give to this country something of the power that, according to the legend, the magic mittens and the enchanted moccasins gave to Hiawatha. With the magic mittens, he could break asunder the hardest rock, and with the enchanted moccasins he could outstrip the wind in fleetness. And so, with the National Policy as adopted in 1878 and carried out by this Government, securing control of the Canadian markets for the Canadian producers, and, as we now propose, securing control of the English market for Canadian producers, we break down all opposition to the progress and prosperity of this country and enable her to outstrip every nation in her advancement. I will not take up more time discussing this important question, but will close with the lines of the poet :

There is a land of every land the pride,  
Beloved by Heaven o'er all the world beside,  
Where brighter scenes dispense serener light,  
And milder moons imparadise the night.  
Ho ! all ye pilgrims, wherever you may roam,  
That spot this country, that land our home.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). At this late hour, I do not propose to occupy the time of the House at great length in dealing with this subject, though I regard it as one of such great importance that any

member would be justified in devoting a good deal of time to it. I was pleased to hear the statement made by the leader of the Government in the beginning of his speech that we were all agreed as to the desirability of preferential trade. So, it is reasonable to assume that the only point of difference is that the Government believe preferential trade is not obtainable, while the leader of the Opposition and the Conservative party believe that it is obtainable.

The Postmaster General rather complained that his resolution was moved when we were going into Committee of Supply, and that an effort had not been made to frame a resolution which would be acceptable to both sides of the House. He forgot that only a year ago an effort was made to frame a resolution that would voice the sentiments of both political parties in Canada, and at that time the Postmaster General's friends moved an amendment to that resolution, deliberately burking the aim of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), and his friends. Sir, I have always regarded it as a matter of great importance that we should agree upon some resolution embodying the views of both sides of the House upon this important question. Every effort which has been made on this side of the House has been met either by a refusal from the other side or by such an amendment as would prevent it from giving expression to our united views. The importance of the principle involved in this resolution is so great that it scarcely requires any time to prove it to the Canadian people. Its importance will be realized when we think for a moment that our aim is to obtain an advantage in the greatest market of the world over all foreign competitors. The British market is above all markets the most important one to us. It is a market that is growing rapidly, and as time goes on it will become more and more important to us. Now, if we could so arrange our trade relations with the mother country that we should have an advantage over the United States and over other foreign countries now competing with us in that market, it is plain to every Canadian what immense benefits we should reap from that state of affairs. Therefore, I am sure that I am but voicing the sentiment of the Canadian people when I say that the leader of the Opposition and my hon. friend from North Bruce, who have on every possible occasion given expression to the opinion of the Conservative party of the desirability of this arrangement, are deserving of the gratitude of the Canadian people and their eternal thanks for their efforts in that direction. We regard this as the best means of impressing upon the people of Great Britain the importance of such an arrangement for both the mother country and her colonies. From no deliberative assembly in Canada could a voice go up

more likely to be heard with respect, and more likely to be heeded by the British Parliament, than from this Canadian Parliament. This is the place where we should express the wishes of the Canadian people. The present leader of the Opposition and the Conservative party have invariably availed themselves of the opportunity to express their desire of bringing about these commercial relations with the mother country. That is the admitted policy of the Conservative party. We have always endeavoured to accomplish that object by cultivating a Canadian sentiment in that direction, and we have endeavoured to impress upon the mother country the wisdom of giving us that special consideration in her market. The action of the present Government, in our judgment, in making a reduction of the duty on goods coming from the mother country, was regrettable and detrimental to the interest of Canada, because it was done at a time above all others when there was the very best opportunity of advancing the principle of preferential trade that had been advocated by the Conservative party for many years. That was in the year of Jubilee when the Premier of Canada was there along with the other colonial Premiers, but the speeches of the Premier of Canada were strongly calculated to deter the mother country from making any advances or any offers in that direction at present, and for a long time to come. Why do I say so? Because when I read in one of the British papers a report of his speech, I find the Premier is credited with saying, when speaking of the preferential offer they had given to England:

This we have done voluntarily, not asking any compensation.

That is in contradiction to what the Conservative party were always asking. Whenever we made a concession in the interest of the mother country, we asked for a quid pro quo.

There is a class of our fellow citizens who ask that all such concessions should be made for a 'quid pro quo.'

He might have said that that class are the Conservative party in Canada. They have always held that it is the duty of public men, being the custodians of the rights of the people and the trustees of the people's money, to give away nothing belonging to Canada without getting something in return for it. That is a principle which is held by the Conservative party, and this is the class of whom the right hon. Prime Minister is referring when he speaks of a class of people in Canada who ask that all such concessions should be made for a quid pro quo.

The Canadian Government has ignored all such sentiments.

The Canadian Government, as represented by the right hon. Prime Minister, has ig

nored all such sentiments. We are prepared to give away what is regarded by the other class in Canada as a valuable interest belonging to Canada without asking anything in return. We have ignored all such financial sentiment, all such commercial sentiment, all such selfishness, in the interest of the Canadian people, and we have given away liberally of Canada's rights and interests, but we have not asked anything in return for them.

We have done it because we owe a debt of gratitude to Great Britain. We have done it because it is no intention of ours to disturb in any way the system of free trade which has done so much for England. But we are told that this policy, which has been adopted by the Canadian Government, cannot last, because it is coming into conflict with existing treaties. Let me tell you this, the Canadian people are willing to give this preference to Great Britain; they are not willing to extend it to other countries at the present time.

I merely refer to this for the purpose of drawing the attention of the Canadian people to the statement of the right hon. Prime Minister that we have given away these concessions without asking anything in return for them. The sentiment prevailing in England at that time was such that, if a united effort on our part were made conjointly with the Premiers of all the other colonies we might get some concessions in the British markets that foreign countries cannot get, but we have ignored all that. We voluntarily give away this right of Canada; we ask nothing for it in return. This marks distinctly and plainly the difference between the two political parties in Canada. The Conservative party have ever held that a party charged with the duty of governing the country are not entitled to give away anything belonging to Canada without getting something in return for it. The Reform party say: We believe we are justified in giving away this great consideration and concession to England, and we do it voluntarily without asking or accepting anything in return. The time at which the Prime Minister made that statement was the time, above all others, when there was a sentiment which would justify the belief that, if a reasonable effort had been made by Canada, as the premier colony in the Empire, we were most likely to accomplish what both parties hold is desirable in the interest of Canada. But at the very time that there was hope of accomplishing this object, when there was an invitation to make an offer and to endeavour to get preferential trade the Prime Minister of Canada does not ask anything, but gives the great concession that he has given by the preferential tariff and asks for nothing in return. I am justified in holding that the action of the Prime Minister was most unfortunate having in view the interest of Canada. It was unfortunate in regard to the time he made the statement and it was unfortunate,

Mr. SPROULE.

as well, in regard to the action. I believe that this is one of the surest ways of securing and perpetuating Imperial federation, because the establishment and carrying out of the principles of commerce and trade, mutually beneficial to two countries, is the surest way of binding these countries together. When we establish relations that will be mutually beneficial to both countries for all time to come, we bind these countries together by a tie that appeals to the selfishness of human nature in both. If we can accomplish this, it is the surest way to advance Imperial federation. The Reform party join with us in the ambition to advance Imperial federation. They are members of the Imperial Federation League, and they express their desire, as well as we do, for closer relations with the mother country. In my judgment, it is one of the ways by which we can establish closer relations with the mother country and by which we can forge an indissoluble chain binding us to the mother country. The time, above all others, was the most appropriate time for pressing this claim upon the attention of the mother country. It was the Jubilee time, when the Premiers of the various colonies were all in England, and when they, in response to the invitation of England, expressed their views upon this important question. Yet the Prime Minister of the great colony of Canada did not avail himself of the opportunity of saying a word in the interest of Canada in connection with this very important question. He says that there is no difference of opinion between the two political parties as to the wisdom of this policy if we can obtain it. That is exactly what he told the people of Canada before 1896, when he went through the country proclaiming that his party were as anxious for Imperial federation and preferential trade with the mother country as the Conservative party. If the people of Canada entrust us with the duty of governing the country, we will go over to the mother country and endeavour, as far as it is in our power, to promote those better trade relations with the mother country which we all regard as desirable. Immediately after being entrusted with the government of the country, the right hon. Prime Minister went over to England, and, instead of carrying out that pledge, instead of carrying out consistently the policy that he enunciated before the Canadian people, he said: We give these concessions voluntarily without asking anything in return. We do not ask England to disturb the principles of trade that she has carried out for so many years in the past. We do not ask her to give anything in return, but we voluntarily give her a preference for which we ask nothing in return, although he had told the people of Canada that it was desirable that we should have a preference in the markets of the United Kingdom. He comes back and admits to-day that it is desirable that

we should have it, but, when a favourable opportunity presented itself he did not move a hand, he did not utter one word in furtherance of that desire. If preferential trade is desirable, as they say, why are not the right hon. gentleman and his friends making an effort to obtain it? Sir, they never have made such an effort, and they are not making that effort to-day. They avail themselves of every opportunity to discredit the assumption that it is possible to attain it. Their whole argument, both here and in England, is, that in the first place, it is impossible to obtain it, and in the second place, it would not be in the interests of the country, if it were obtained. They say, if it were obtained, it would result in a fiscal policy which, in the judgment of the right hon. gentleman, is not in the best interests of the country, and it would be inimical to the policy of free trade, which governs the mother country. In the next breath, the right hon. gentleman says it is desirable that we should have preferential trade. How inconsistent he is. He must be a living enigma to the Canadian people, if he does not make an effort to obtain this boon, which he says is so desirable. He tells us that we cannot have preferential trade with England unless we abandon protection, but in the same sentence he tells us that his Government has given us a substantial preferential trade with England, in advance of what any other Government has given to Canada. He tells us that the preferential trade which he has obtained is of advantage to Canada, and of advantage to the mother country, and at the same time he tells us that we cannot have preferential trade with England unless we do away with protection. But if the hon. gentleman has preferential trade with England, as he claims, he has it without lowering the protective duty, because he has left the principle of protection the same in the Canadian tariff as it was before. What is there in the proposition which would necessitate our doing away with the right which we enjoy of imposing duties upon goods coming from every other country in the world except England and her colonies, or imposing a higher duty on goods coming from every other country than upon English goods? In my judgment, there is nothing incompatible in the situation. We could just as well have the preferential trade which this resolution calls for, as the preferential trade which the Prime Minister tells us we have to-day. We could have it without any interference with the principle of protection, which we are carrying out in our tariff at the present time. The preferential trade which the Liberal party has given to Canada, has proved delusive in the highest degree as to any beneficial results accruing to Canadians. The right hon. gentleman told us that it was intended to develop trade between Canada and the mother

country, but the Trade and Navigation Returns prove that, while it is true that in some few lines trade has increased slightly, the undeniable fact remains that we are increasing our trade with the United States to a larger extent since the introduction of this new system than before. If the Liberal preferential trade had worked as it was prophesied it would, it would have reduced our trade with the United States and increased our trade with the mother country, but it has worked in the very opposite direction. We are reducing our trade with the mother country generally speaking, and we are increasing our trade with the United States, and, therefore, I say that this preferential trade which the Liberal Government inaugurated, is a delusion and a snare. Not only that, but, in my judgment, it is distinctly detrimental to the interests of Canada, and why? Because it destroyed whatever chance we had of getting a proper preferential trade with England. There is no doubt whatever that on account of the educational forces that were kept up all along the line, the sentiment of the British people was in favour of giving Canadians a preference in the British market, but the action of the present Government destroyed our chance of getting that preference. They have given England what England desired, namely, access to our markets with a lower rate of duty than they impose on other countries, and they got from England nothing in return. When we ask England to give us an advantage in her markets over other countries, her answer will be: What are you going to give us in return? We have given away for nothing what would have brought us a quid pro quo, and now we have nothing to offer England in return for a preference in her market. Therefore, I say that the preferential trade of this Government was distinctly detrimental to Canadians. Let me ask, Sir, is it probable, or possible, that preferential trade could be secured with the mother country, as aimed at in this resolution? The difference between the two political parties in this House seems to be, that the Conservative party believes that it is not only possible, but that it is very probable, we could secure this preferential trade, if a proper effort were made; but the present Government either believes that it cannot be obtained, or else they do not desire to obtain it. The difference between the two parties was similarly exemplified with regard to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Reform party of that day held that the resources of Canada were not equal to cope with the building of that road, and, therefore, that it could not be built. On the other hand, the Conservative party said that the road could be built, and that if they had an opportunity, they would prove that it could be built within the resources of Canada. The Conservative party got that op-

portunity, and they proved to the world that the Canadian Pacific Railway could be built. The difference between the two political parties in Canada to-day on the question of preferential trade is exactly parallel to that. The Reform party say that preferential trade with the mother country cannot be secured, and, therefore, they do not make an effort to secure it. If that is their conscientious conviction, they might be justified in not making the effort; but if, on the other hand, they say it is desirable to secure it, and they do not make the effort, then they show that they have not the same hope in the future of this country that the Conservatives have. The Conservative party in Canada to-day not only claim that it is possible, but more than possible, and highly probable, that preferential trade can be secured, if a proper effort is made. So long as the party which controls the destinies of the country does not make an effort for preferential trade, so long will the country be without that great boon. We are, therefore, justified in coming to the conclusion that it is possible preferential trade could be secured, judging by the pronouncements of public men in England on that question.

We had to-night the argument presented to this House by the hon. Postmaster General that the sentiment of the British people is opposed to preferential trade, and he based that argument on a letter from the Duke of Devonshire written to him in reply to one of his own, asking His Grace what he meant by certain public enunciations which he had delivered on this question. That letter he gave as conclusive evidence that English sentiment was not in favour of this policy. But I contend that the quotations which were made to this House by the hon. leader of the Opposition and by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) from the speeches of Mr. Chamberlain and the Duke of Devonshire justify us in coming to the conclusion that, in their opinion, if the colonies desired preferential trade and asked for it, the mother country will be prepared to meet them more than half way. That being the case, I am warranted in saying that it is possible for the Canadian people to obtain preferential trade, if they will only try to get it. But so long as we never make the attempt, we are not likely to get it, and the present Government not only will not ask for it but declare to the Canadian people that the reason they will not is because it could not be had even if they did.

I had intended to touch on a few other subjects in connection with this question, but considering the lateness of the hour, I think it the part of wisdom to refrain, and shall confine myself to saying in conclusion that I think I am voicing the sentiment and the policy of the Conservative party when I say that, in the judgment of that party, preferential trade is a policy which would be beneficial to Canada and which we should

endeavour to obtain. We pretend further that not only is that policy desirable, but that it is obtainable if proper efforts were made. So long, however, as the present Government remain in power, it is impossible for the Canadian people to obtain this desirable object; and as time goes on and both parties lay their political platforms before the people, the distinction between the two will become more and more apparent. It is the policy of the Conservative party that we should have preferential trade with the mother country based upon the principles enunciated in this resolution, and the sooner the Conservative party returns to power the nearer we will be to the day when this desirable boon will be secured for the Canadian people.

But we are told by the hon. Postmaster General that there is something inconsistent in this resolution, because it is not in harmony with the sentiments expressed by the Duke of Devonshire and Mr. Chamberlain. Well, I have read the resolution very carefully, and do not see a single word in it that is inconsistent with the public utterances of these gentlemen on this question. The resolution merely recites what they have said, and then goes on to say that, in the opinion of this House, it is the duty of the Government, in response to the repeated advances of the Imperial authorities, to make an attempt to secure for the produce of Canada preferential treatment in the markets of the United Kingdom. Have the Imperial authorities not made advances when Mr. Chamberlain said: We are prepared to go even more than half way, we are prepared to do more than would be expected of us, we are not going to be even economical or niggardly in our treatment of the colonies on these lines should they express a desire for preferential treatment. When we have such public announcements made, are we not justified in saying that this resolution is entirely in harmony with their utterances, and that in response to such declarations we should make an effort in the direction indicated. It is the opinion of the Conservative party that we should make the effort, but the Government will not make the slightest move in the matter. On the contrary, they tell the Canadian people that although preferential trade is desirable, they will not make the slightest effort to get it. That plainly shows the difference between the two political parties. The Conservative party is in favour of such a preferential trade with the mother country as will give us an advantage in the home market over our foreign competitors. The Conservative party is in favour of better trade relations with the mother country, and are asking her to give something in return for what we are prepared to offer. We are in favour of preferential trade relations with the mother country of such a nature that we will always get something in return for what we give, so that we will not be giving away

what is valuable to us without getting anything in return. That is the platform of the Conservative party in contradistinction to that of the Reform party, and in my judgment, therefore, I consider this resolution a proper one. It is one that could be accepted by the leader of the Government without doing any injustice to his own party or his own public pronouncements on this question or to his conduct of affairs in this House. This is not a motion of want of confidence in the Government, and that notwithstanding the fact that it is made in amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply they can accept it. Why do not the Government accept it since its right hon. leader says such a preferential trade is desirable? If it be desirable in his view, why does he not accept it in the wording of this resolution? The reason is he is not prepared to obtain it. But if the Canadian people think it is desirable, then we say to them: When you are given the opportunity to express your views, we ask you to do so, and to return that party into power which not only claims that this policy is a desirable one, but that it can be put into effect, if a proper effort be made by the Canadian people to acquire it in the interests of the country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before we proceed further, I would like to ask my right hon. friend, as it is now late and we are to resume our session at eleven o'clock to-morrow, and will not, therefore, be able to conclude this debate to-night, whether it would not be desirable now to adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend tells me that a number of his friends want to speak, I do not want to press him unduly, but I think we might hear my hon. friend (Mr. McMillan) and then we can adjourn.

Mr. JOHN McMILLAN (South Huron). This is a very large question, Mr. Speaker, indeed, and one that has occupied the attention of this country for a considerable length of time. I am astonished that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and other members of the Conservative party should blame the Reform Government in such strong terms for not taking steps to obtain a preferential trade with Great Britain. Why, when they were in office seventeen or eighteen years, what steps did they take? How far did they advance the prospect of our obtaining preferential trade during all the time they were in office? We know that in 1894 an interesting provincial commission sat here in Ottawa. We know that the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) drew up a resolution to the effect that it was desirable to have preferential trade between Great Britain and her colonies. We know, moreover, that that commission examined very carefully into this question. And Lord Jersey, the commissioner sent out from Great Britain said:

England would have to consider what effect any great change in her fiscal policy would have on this enormous trade, this over 76 per cent of trade, which she carries on with the world; and as has been pointed out by the figures, a good deal of that trade consists of articles which are manufactured from the raw products of the colonies.

Sir Charles Mills has handed me a paper which I will ask you to allow me to read:

"It may be useful to recall the figures of the trade of the United Kingdom, as summarized by Sir Rawson Rawson for the year 1890 (and they are essentially the same for 1893), and to avoid the use of totals, which convey very little to the mind, we may avail ourselves of the figures representing the percentage proportions. Adopting this method, we find that the colonies—excluding India, the Straits Settlement and Hong Kong—represent 15.1 per cent of the total trade of the United Kingdom, of which 2.7 represents the trade with North America, 7.5 the trade with Australasia, 2.2 the trade with South Africa (Cape of Good Hope and Natal), and 2.7 that with all our other colonies."

And what is the position of Great Britain to-day with respect to this trade. I had the last agricultural returns of Great Britain placed in my hand the other day, and I find that of grain and breadstuffs, she imports 179,762,948 hundredweight. Of this, Canada sends 13,945,870 hundredweight, or 7½ per cent of the whole grain and breadstuffs imported into Great Britain. The other colonies send only 806,340 hundredweight, or 9-20th of 1 per cent of the whole import. So we see that Great Britain imported from her colonies a fraction over 8 per cent of the whole amount of breadstuffs. Consider what it would mean for Great Britain to pay a duty upon 92 per cent of the enormous quantity of breadstuffs imported into that country which would be necessary if preferential trade were adopted, as hon. gentlemen opposite propose. Now, of the trade of Great Britain that with the colonies is 25 per cent of the whole, that with the United States 19 per cent of the whole, with France 10 per cent, with Germany 8 per cent, and with various other countries 38 per cent. So we see, 25 per cent of the whole of Great Britain's trade is carried on with the colonies. And to give a preference to that, it is proposed to injure the 75 per cent with other countries by levying a preferential duty upon it. Why, Sir, the United States sends 102,873,290 hundredweight of the grain and breadstuffs imported by Great Britain or 57.3 per cent of the whole. Think of passing a law to tax that trade, particularly in view of the fact that the United States probably buys more of England's manufactured goods than any other country in the world. Will Great Britain endanger her trade with the whole world in order that she may protect 8 per cent of her breadstuff trade which comes from the colonies?

We have heard a good deal about Canada discriminating against Great Britain and about the election that took place in 1891.

The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) told us that that election was run under such conditions that the result was a declaration in favour of granting special trade privileges to the United States. I wonder if the hon. gentleman forgets the pretext made before the people for dissolving the House and calling on the election. Was it not in order that the representatives of the Government could go to Washington and discuss reciprocity with the United States? I think that the leader of the Government declared that they had been asked to go to the United States and discuss reciprocity.

Mr. GIBSON. And the hon. member for North Bruce swallowed that.

Mr. McMILLAN. So he did, and so did the rest of his party. But the statement was not correct that they had been asked to go to Washington; the fact was that they had asked to be allowed to go to Washington, and the Government there had agreed that the representatives of Canada should go to Washington for a private conversation—not a discussion by commissioners, but a strictly private interview to see if arrangements could be made for the sending of commissioners to negotiate a treaty. And was that kept private by the Government of Canada? No. The present leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) declared that they were going to Washington at the instance of the United States Government to discuss reciprocity. But when he went to Washington and saw Secretary Blaine, the first thing he had to do was to admit that he had stated what was not correct, and that it was at the instance of the Canadian Government that they went there. Further, Mr. Blaine said that he was astonished that the Canadian Government had announced throughout the length and breadth of the land an arrangement which was in reality confidential. If Canada ever was disgraced by her public men, she was disgraced by the present leader of the Opposition at that time in making to the country the statements that he did. Newfoundland at that time had entered into a reciprocity treaty with the United States, and the Canadian Government acting the part of the dog in the manger, not having got reciprocity themselves thought to prevent Newfoundland from getting it. They appealed to the British Government and said that it would injure Canada to have a reciprocity treaty between United States and Newfoundland from which Canada was excluded. They must have felt that Canada would be benefited by reciprocity with the United States or why did they apply to the British Government to be taken in along with Newfoundland? We have heard it stated that the United States is not our best market but that Great Britain is our best market, but we still hold that we should be very much

Mr. McMILLAN.

benefited if we could get so near a market as that of the United States. I beg to submit some evidence for making such a statement. I have here a statement showing some of the exports from Canada and the duties paid:

Article.	Number.	Value.	Duty.
Horses, over 1 year	2,392	\$ 295,919	\$ 71,760
" under 1 year	65	11,205	1,950
Total.....	2,457	.....	73,710
Cattle, under 1 year	12,231	108,001	24,462
" over 1 year	75,674	1,137,747	312,880
Total.....	.....	.....	337,342
Swine.....	314	3,137	471
Sheep, under 1 year	252,691	770,620	189,518
" over 1 year.	17,509	71,300	26,263
Total.....	.....	.....	215,781
	Bushels.		
Barley.....	58,105	43,583	17,434
Peas.....	77,707	72,780	31,052
	Tons.		
Hay.....	3,296	24,958	13,184
	Bushels.		
Potatoes.....	964,613	327,323	241,153
Turnips.....	643,837	64,360	16,090
	Lbs.		
Dried apples.....	361,966	15,517	7,259
Barrels apples.....	7,933	18,879	5,949
Wool.....	1,010,969	176,436	101,066
Totals.....	.....	3,141,966	1,060,531

Mr. Speaker, will any gentleman tell me that it would not be a benefit to the Canadian farmer to have the United States market if we could get it upon honourable terms? We have always found that whenever we had two customers coming to our markets we could get better prices. Now, potatoes and turnips are perishable goods that we cannot take to the old country, so that for these goods the United States would be our best market. But let me say that the farmers of Canada are more independent of the market of the United States to-day than they ever were since Canada was a country, simply because we have been brought more prominently before the people of Great Britain, and we have sent them more of our products. The present Prime Minister of Canada, surrounded by the noble band of men forming his Cabinet, has formulated a policy that has galled the Conservatives to the very quick. They see now that during the eighteen years they were in power they did nothing of any real benefit

to the country. Their jealousy is enormous, because this Government has been able to formulate a policy that has benefited this country beyond any policy that ever was adopted. Why, Sir, the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite during the last seventeen years had reduced the value of farm property in the province of Ontario by \$100,000,000; and it has only begun to take a rise since the present Government came into power.

Now, Sir, of animals and their products, in 1889, we exported a total of \$23,854,707. Of these Great Britain took \$16,227,000, and the United States took \$71,370. But in 1898 we find that our exports of animals and their products amounted to \$44,301,470, of which Great Britain took \$39,739,089, showing that our exports in that line are rapidly increasing to the mother country. Then, in agricultural products, in 1889, we exported \$13,404,011, of which Great Britain took \$3,674,055 and the United States took \$9,125,707. But in 1899 we exported, of agricultural products, \$33,063,285, of which Great Britain took \$27,747,140, and the United States only took \$1,133,293. That is an enormous increase, both of animals and their produce, and of agricultural products going to Great Britain. Now, let me state that in manufactured goods also there has been an increase of our exports to Great Britain under the present policy, something that did not take place under the policy of the late Government. In 1889, of manufactured goods, we exported \$4,434,949, of which Great Britain took \$1,679,359, and the United States took \$1,822,948. But when we come to 1898, we exported of manufactured goods, \$10,678,316, of which Great Britain took \$4,900,806, and the United States only took \$2,829,510. So that even in manufactured goods we are exporting a larger quantity to the British market than we did during the reign of the National Policy. "Canada for the Canadians" was the cry of the Conservative party. I say "Canada for the Canadians," but let Canadians secure access as far as possible to the markets of other countries. Although hon. gentlemen opposite declared that the National Policy was going to benefit the farmers of Canada, as a farmer, I say that the farmers have been injured by that policy. Neither in the prices of their animals nor in the prices of their agricultural products have they received any benefit because they have always found, and I speak from experience of my own county, which raises a larger number of horses and cattle than any other county in Ontario, that United States buyers have come in to buy horses which has given us a much better market than we otherwise would have had, and that the National Policy has been no benefit to us. We have found that, as a rule, prices in the United States were higher than those which prevailed in Great Britain.

While I am on my feet I may just say a word in reference to the question of free corn in regard to which, a great deal has been said in this House. I have been astonished at the ignorance displayed by a great many hon. gentlemen on the floor of this House in respect to the importation of corn. We imported 19,700,000 bushels of Indian corn during last year, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns. We re-exported of that 14,332,000 bushels of corn, leaving 5,368,000 bushels to be consumed in Canada. With what result to the farmers of Canada? Mr. Speaker, I will tell you. We had 5,368,000 bushels of corn in the winter of 1897-98, and corn was purchased at 21 cents per bushel. Oats were selling at 21 cents a bushel. I have placed both at 22 cents a bushel. Take for granted that you would sell of oats 5,368,000 bushels at 22 cents a bushel, it would bring in the same amount as the same number of bushels of corn brought in at 22 cents. But you would gain in quantity inasmuch as corn is 22 pounds heavier to the bushel than oats. You would gain 2,008,857 bushels of corn which at 22 cents a bushel would make a gain of \$401,771. This is the amount of money by which, at that price, the farmers of Canada would be benefited by selling their oats and purchasing corn. Now, we will take the larger price at which oats were selling in Toronto and make another comparison. Oats were selling in Toronto on the 11th of May at 38½ cents. No. 2 yellow at 39 cents, and No. 3 yellow at 38½ cents. By purchasing that quantity of corn, 5,368 bushels, and selling that quantity of oats, at the price which I have quoted, there would be a saving to the farmers of Canada of \$763,365. Yet hon. gentlemen will get up in this House and declare that the farmers of this country have been injured by the action of the Government in allowing corn to come in free of duty. In regard to the importation of corn I may say that the price of oats in the United States is not as high as in Canada, although they have the competition of the whole of the corn that is raised in the United States. This is the way that hon. gentlemen opposite try to delude the farmers of this country into believing that an injury has been done them, when, in fact, they are benefited by the action of the Government. Now, the farmers know who their friends are, and they know whether they are benefited or not. Hon. gentlemen may call aloud and try to mislead the farmers of the country, but I say that this is one of the greatest benefits that was ever conferred upon the farmers.

The next question I will take up is that of cordage. A good deal has been said about binder twine and about the effect that the removal of the duty upon binder twine has upon the farmers. We have been told that the rise in the price of binder twine was caused by the Government of the day re-

moving the duty upon that article. If the removal of the duty brought about the rise in the price of binder twine I would like to know how it was that the price was higher in the United States than in Canada. I may be allowed to state, that what I stated the other day, that all the binder twine sold by the late Government is not yet paid for. I have made inquiry upon that point and I find that of the amount agreed to be paid for binder twine, there is still \$7,000 not in the hands of the Government. I may say that I made a mistake in my statement the other day when I said that raw material could have been sold at a price 3 per cent higher than it was purchased at. I meant to say 3 cents per pound as the advanced price at which raw material could have been sold at by a certain binder twine company. The Binder Twine Company of Brantford could have sold their raw material at from 3 cents to 4 cents per pound higher than they purchased it for at the railway station. It has been said that the taking off the duty from the binder twine has closed up a great many of the establishments of this country. What was the cause of the closing up of these establishments? In view of the past history of the Consumers' Cordage Company this petition was sent to the Government of the Dominion of Canada asking them not to again impose the duty upon binder twine:

That in view of the past history of the Consumer's Cordage Company, your petitioners feel assured that the replacing of any duty upon binder twine would simply have the effect of putting the Canadian farmers and consumers at the mercy of this combine, as they have been for years past. Under the former tariff of twenty-five per cent duty on binder twine, it is a matter of common knowledge that the Consumers' Cordage Company were able to subsidize and purchase the following binder twine industries at that time in existence in Canada:—

Bannerman Bros., of Lachute, Quebec, whose mill has been closed for seven years, during which time they have received the sum of about \$3,000 per annum from the Consumers' Cordage Company for keeping the mill idle.

John Brown & Co., of Quebec, whose mill was bought up by the Consumers' Cordage Company for about \$140,000, double the actual value, and has been closed ever since the purchase, over six years ago.

Thomas Connor & Sons, of St. John, N.B., whose business was bought up by the same combine about seven years ago, at a very large figure, and has been closed during the whole of that period.

James Lochrie's mill, at Toronto, which has been kept idle for about six years at an expense to the Consumers' Cordage Company of about \$6,000 per annum.

Ferguson Bros., of Kingston, whose mill has been closed for about three years, at a compensation of about \$1,800 per annum.

A. Main & Son, of Hamilton, who received the sum of about \$3,000 per annum from the same combine for keeping their mill idle, while other factories controlled by this combine have been

Mr. McMILLAN.

kept idle for long periods during the past few years, that were formerly in full operation.

Let me say to hon. gentlemen opposite that this was the result of their policy. My hon. friend who sits opposite said that he was astonished that I should stand up and defend the action of the Government. I do not stand up to defend the action of any Government, but I wonder that he would favour a system that would produce the results that are shown in this petition, the formation of combines to compel the consumers to pay three times the amount for their binder twine that they otherwise would have to pay.

That your petitioners feel assured that there is no reason in the interest of the consuming class of this country, or in the interest of any legitimately conducted binder twine industry, that calls for the re-imposition of any duty, and that it is unfair that the farmers and consumers of this country should, in addition to the twenty-five per cent duty on rope and cordage, be further taxed to pay dividends upon the enormous subsidies and largely watered stock of this giant combination.

Your petitioners desire also to repudiate the representations made on behalf of the Farmers' Binder Twine Company, of Brantford, whose name might be taken as an indication that it represented the views of the farmers in this country, while we are satisfied that inquiry would show that the controlling interest in the Company is held by men who are not farmers.

Your petitioners therefore pray that your Honourable House may not pass any legislation taking binder twine off the free list, and that the amendment of the session of 1897 may have a fair test in the interest of the farmers of Canada before it is in any way interfered with.

And your petitioners will ever pray as in duty bound.

Let me tell the House that the Consumers Cordage Company last year paid a dividend of 40 per cent, besides putting a sum to the rest account, and the Brantford Cordage Company paid a dividend of 60 per cent, besides lying by a large rest account, showing the ability of the farmers to conduct their business on even better principles than the Consumers Cordage Company could. I believe and know that these cordage companies to-day would impose on the farmers in the same manner as they did before, if they had a chance, but I hope they will never again have an opportunity of doing anything of the kind.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the hon. gentleman say what he is reading from?

Mr. McMILLAN. That petition was from a number of farmers and was sent to the Government of Canada.

Mr. CLANCY. When?

Mr. McMILLAN. In 1897.

Mr. HENDERSON. Might I ask if these farmers were shareholders in the Brantford

Cordage Company, which pays a dividend of 60 per cent. ?

Mr. McMILLAN. I am not posted in the inward working of the Brantford Cordage Company, and I never stick my nose in other people's business that I am not interested in. Now, Sir, with respect to the tariff, let me say that in the tariff as it exists to-day, the most aggravating items of the old tariff have been entirely abolished. I refer to combined specific and ad valorem duties. There is not an article of prime importance of consumption by the farmers and workmen of this country upon which there is to-day both a specific and ad valorem duty. There are twenty-one articles in the present tariff upon which there is both a specific and an ad valorem duty, and these are they :

ARTICLES IN THE TARIFF, WITH AD VALOREM AND SPECIFIC DUTIES.

	Specific.	Ad valorem
		Cts.
Almond paste confectionery. . .	½c. p. lb.	35
Candied peel, lemon, orange and citron. . . . .	½c. "	35
Chewing gum, if sweetened. . . . .	½c. "	35
Confectionery and sugar candy. . .	½c. "	35
German spirits of nitrous ether, sweet "nitre," \$2.40 Imp. gall.	\$2.40 I.G.	30
Bolts, with or without threads, nuts and washers, rivets, strap hinges. . . . .	¾c. p. lb.	25
Iron, wrought iron or steel nuts and washers, iron or steel rivets, with or without threads, bolts and hinge blanks, N.E.S., T and strap hinges. . . . .	¾c. "	25
Perfumed spirits in bottles, flasks or other packages, weighing more than 4 oz. . . . .	\$2.40 I.G.	40
Pop corn in cakes or balls. . . . .	½c. p. lb.	35
Alcoholic perfumes. . . . .	\$2.40 I.G.	40
Nitrous ether, sweet spirits of nitre, aconite or ammonia. . . . .	\$2.40 I.G.	30
Sugar candy, brown or white, unsweetened gums, candied peels, pop corn . . . . .	½c. p. lb.	35
Tobacco, cigars, cigarettes, including paper cover. . . . .	3c. p. lb.	25
Varnishes, N.E.S. . . . .	20c. p. gal.	20
Vegetables, tonatoes, fresh. . . . .	20c. p. beh.	10
Wines of all kinds, except sparkling wines, including orange, lemon, strawberry, raspberry, elder and currant, containing 26 p. c. or less of spirits. . . . .	25c. p. gal.	30

There is not a single article in that list, except, perhaps, bolts and rivets, that is of prime importance to any class in the community, and these are the articles upon which specific and ad valorem duties are at present levied. Let me remind the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that on one occasion in this House, which I remem-

ber very well, the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) proved to him that in connection with these specific and ad valorem duties under the former Government the farmer paid 100 per cent. Does not he remember that the hon. member for East Huron took a shoddy blanket weighing eight pounds and proved to him that the farmer paid 100 per cent on that blanket, under the obnoxious system of specific and ad valorem duties. You cannot show one article in the tariff to-day in woollen or cotton goods which cost over 35 per cent duty, and that is a great advantage to the farmers and consumers of this country. The duties that were imposed on these goods under the old tariff of the Conservative Government were something enormous. Let me say that if the present Government had made no other change in the tariff except to abolish ad valorem and specific duties on articles of prime consumption, they would have conferred a great benefit upon both the workingmen and the farmers of Canada. Let me give here a number of articles showing the difference in the old duty and the new, as well as the duty under the preferential rate, and of those articles a great many are imported :

	Old.	New.	Pref. Tariff.
	p. c.	p. c.	p. c.
Collars of cotton or linen. . .	52	35	26½
Cotton embroideries, white . .	30	25	18½
Duck, gray . . . . .	22½	22½	16½
" white . . . . .	25	22½	16½
Jeans, sateens, for corsets and stays . . . . .	25	20	15
Cotton sheets . . . . .	32½	30	22½
Cotton shirts, costing more than \$3 per doz. . . . .	38	35	26½
Socks and stockings, 10c. p. pr.	35	35	26½
Cuffs, cotton linen . . . . .	59	35	26½
Earthenware, demi-johns, churns, crocks. . . . .	38	35	26½
Boots, shoes, with cloth uppers	30	35	26½
Plaster of Paris, per brl . . . . .	40	12½ per 100 lbs.	
Socks, stockings, 10c. per doz.	35	35	26½
Yarns costing 30c. lb. manufacturers. . . . .	30	20	15
Carpets from . . . . .	39-36	35	26½

I have still another list that I want to submit to the House, a list of agricultural implements that have been reduced in price, and I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite state that there has been no reduction in the duty on agricultural implements. Let me say that the present Government had reduced the duties upon a very large number and a more valuable number of agricultural implements than the late Government reduced the duty upon. The late Government only reduced the duty upon eight implements, and did they reduce the

duty from 35 per cent to 20 per cent? Not at all, because when that question was before the House I asked the late Finance Minister whether or not he intended to retain the power then in his hands of making a re-valuation of the goods over their invoice value, and he said that he intended to do in the future as he had done in the past. Often 10, 15 and as high as 20 per cent was added to the invoice value for the purpose of the duty, and this did away with a great deal of the apparent reduction of the duty. But I dare hon. gentlemen opposite to show a single case now in which the invoiced value of the goods, when that value was honestly given, has been added to for the purposes of imposing duties. We are thus giving the farmers a far greater advantage than they were given under the late Government, by not insisting on a re-valuation of the goods imported and for which honest invoices were furnished. I have another list here of cotton fabrics.

	per cent.	per cent.
Windmills.....	30	25
Horse powers.....	30	25
Tread mills.....	30	25
Portable engines.....	30	25
Threshers, separators.....	30	25
Pumps.....	30	25
Stoves, Eng.....	27½	25
Wire fencing.....	27½	15
Buckthorn strip.....	½ ct. lb.	15
Barbed wire.....	Free.	.....
Other wire 9, 12 and 13.....	"	.....
Soap.....	30	25
Binding twine.....	Free.	.....

That is a list of goods on which the farmers have obtained considerable reduction, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite would attempt to make them believe that these goods are not in reality reduced in price under the present tariff. I can remember the time when they attempted to make the farmers believe that they paid no duty on agricultural implements, and when they declared that these implements were all made out of the timber that grew upon their own farms. They did their best really to impose on the ignorance of the farmers and make them believe that their agricultural implements were all made out of timber, but they found that they were in a Rip Van Winkle sleep and woke up as they left the Treasury benches to realize what a great mistake they had made.

We have heard a great deal about the civil servants and the increased expenditure of the present Government, and I just wish to go through the Public Accounts and show what a considerable reduction has been effected in this department.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon gentleman must confine himself to the motion before the Chair unless with the unanimous consent of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Let him go on.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am merely trying to show the benefit that the preferential tariff has been to the farmers of this country, and how it has enabled the Government to reduce the number of civil servants and the salaries paid them. In 1896 we had 4,109 civil servants, and in 1898, 3,857, showing a reduction of 252, according to the Public Accounts. Their total salaries in 1896 amounted to \$3,537,059, and in 1897, \$3,373,028, showing a reduction of \$164,000 under the present Administration. This is a considerable reduction, with which the country will be very much pleased. I am astonished that hon. gentlemen opposite did not notice that large reduction and find fault with the Government for dismissing so many public officers. The trade with Germany, France and Belgium under the reciprocal tariff has not been reduced, as was prophesied. Let us compare the trade of these countries with Canada for 1896 and 1898:

	Old tariff.	General.	To 30th June, 1898.	From 1st August, 1898.
	p.c.	p.c.	p.c.	p.c.
Cotton fabrics, printed or dyed.....	30	35	30½	26¼
Cotton clothing.....	32½	35	30½	26¼
Furniture of wood, house, cabinet or office. ....	30	30	26¼	22½
Hats, caps and bonnets.	30	30	26¼	22½
Hardware.....	32½	30	26¼	22½
	Ton	Ton		
Pig iron.....	4	2 50	{ 26¼ } { 22½ }	{ 218½ } { 187½ }
Boots and shoes.....	25	25	21½	18½
Cloths coatings and tweeds.....5 per lb.	25	35	30½	26¼
All fabrics wholly or part wool.....	30	35	30½	26½
Clothing ready made wholly or part wool....	5 30	35	30½	26¼
Stoves, stove plates of all kinds.....	27½	25	21½	18½

Comparing the first nine months of 1898 with the first nine months of 1896, we find that there is a reduction on the whole of the goods imported into this country of nearly 2½ per cent, yet hon. gentlemen opposite make the statement that there is no change in the tariff.

Here is a list of implements that have been reduced to the farmers. Windmills have been reduced from 30 per cent to 25 per cent. I have been watching windmills run water when I looked across the House and saw hon. gentlemen opposite fortifying themselves with tumbler after tumbler of water as they went on making the extraordinary statements they did. The following is the list, showing the reductions in the present compared with the old tariff:

Mr. McMILLAN.

## EXPORTS FROM CANADA.

	To France.	To Germany.	To Belgium.
1896... ..	\$ 581,540	\$ 757,531	\$ 98,031
1898.....	1,025,262	1,837,448	973,994

## IMPORTS INTO CANADA.

	From France.	From Germany.	From Belgium
1896. ...	\$2,810,942	\$5,931,459	\$ 920,755
1898... ..	3,795,351	5,584,014	1,230,660

This shows an increase in our trade with these countries. Now, there is another question I want to touch upon. I do not know whether I shall be in order in doing so, but I think it is pertinent to the resolution. I desire to show that wages have increased in this country under the preferential tariff. Under the old tariff wages went down. In 1882 the average farmer of Ontario, with a farm of 100 acres, received \$789. In 1896 the average was \$400. In 1897, the first year of the preferential tariff, the receipts of a farmer with 100 acres of land went up to \$477. Farm servants, with board, received in 1896 \$144; in 1896, without board, \$243 per year; 1897, \$236; 1882 to 1897, \$251; 1897, \$144, and in 1898, \$148 by the year.

Mr. PRIOR. I think this is going a little too far. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMILLAN) is not in order.

Mr. McMILLAN. I wish to make only one other statement, and that is as to the expenditure of the Government. This Government might have expended \$1,300,000 more during the last financial year for which we have an account, and not have spent more per capita than the late Government spent during the space of thirteen years. As it is growing late, I shall not weary the House further. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members for their kind indulgence.

Mr. DAVIN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

## FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 173)—from the Senate—further to amend the Penitentiaries Act.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Thursday).

247

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 20th July, 1899.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## SUPPLY—PREFERENTIAL TRADE.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding: That the Deputy Speaker do leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply, and on the motion of Sir Charles Tupper in amendment thereto.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). I had not intended to speak on this question, owing to the late period of the session, and also to the fact that it had been so exhaustively and powerfully debated by those who have taken part. But when I heard the Postmaster General, I felt that it was necessary to make a few remarks in regard to his speech, which was of a somewhat extraordinary character. It is quite clear from the tenor of the Postmaster General's speech that it was made for the purpose of merely introducing a letter of the Duke of Devonshire, the purport of which he not only misapprehends, but almost amusingly, Mr. Speaker, misapprehends and misinterprets—of course unconsciously. Now I wish to say a few words as to the state of opinion in Canada and in the United Kingdom prior to the summer of 1897. I intend to be very brief, and I ask the attention, and I hope the close attention, of hon. gentlemen who may take an interest in this question. It is a matter known to the whole world that for many years there was a strong party in England, originally founded and headed by the Right Hon. W. E. Forster, having for its object the bringing about of some form of Imperial federation. First, you had in England the Imperial Federation League, and subsequently, and a very short time before the year 1897, that became defunct, and then you had the British Empire League. The difference between these two combinations may be stated, I think, generally, in a sentence, to be this: That the one that had been founded by the Right Hon. W. E. Forster aimed at political union, and at first laid down the lines even of union. This was found to divide persons who were very anxious to unite on the broader ground of trade, and the league was dissolved, and the British Empire League was established in its stead. The head of the British Empire League in 1897 was the Duke of Devonshire, and so far back as 1887, the Duke of Devonshire made a speech which led him to be hailed by the Imperial Federation League as having come over to them. In the Imperial

Federation Journal of April 1st, 1887, over ten years before June, 1897, you have an article headed: "Lord Hartington converted to federation," and he is thus quoted:

We are all proud of our colonial dependencies and our Indian empire. But some of us are anxious that the political union which exists between these colonies and the mother country should be still further increased and strengthened, and that we should be brought into more direct political communication with those great nations which are rising up around us, and which are our children and our own relations.

In 1897 he was the president of the British Empire League, one of whose main objects was closer commercial union. What happened in Canada? In Canada my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), always being in the forefront, there had been going on a movement partly for the purpose of educating Canadian sentiment and partly for the purpose of bringing Canadian sentiment to bear upon sentiment in the United Kingdom. So successful had that effort been, so successful had the twin movement in England and in Canada been, that we find the two leaders of the great parties here in 1896, standing squarely on the platform of mutual preferential trade between England and Canada. It is not necessary for me to quote my right hon. friend at London, or at Toronto, in 1896; but I will just quote one sentence from what he said in St. John, where, as in Toronto and in London, he professed himself a believer in mutual preferential trade, just as we had the leader of the Opposition, then the Prime Minister, going all over the country proclaiming that he was in favour of mutual preferential trade. This is the language of the right hon. gentlemen:

Yet it is possible for us to make an arrangement by which England will give us a market for our products if we give something like reciprocity to certain English products. I am for that policy.

Under no possible straining of interpretation can you construe these words as meaning anything but that my right hon. friend at that time looked for some favour not vouchsafed to other nations in the British market. What had taken place in free trade England? Why, in 1896, a meeting was held at the Bath Arms Hotel, in Wiltshire, at which Mr. T. K. Harding presided, and among those present was Viscount Folkstone, M.P., and a number of notables. But what was still more impressive was the fact that leading farmers were present, leading citizens were present. What happened there? You find a gentleman making a speech quoting first the Right Hon. Arthur Balfour, the present leader in the House of Commons, in England, of the Conservative party.

The Right Hon. Arthur Balfour has given his views as follows:—"Should the colonies desire to adopt the policy of customs union, and the treaties between Great Britain and Belgium and the Zollverein interpose obstacles in the way of

Mr. DAVIN.

the realization of such a desire, it would be the duty of Her Majesty's Government to consider how to remove those treaty restrictions, and to shape their course accordingly."

Mr. McNEILL. That was in 1896.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, in 1896. As far back as 1887 this present colleague, this free trader, the Marquis of Hartington, now the Duke of Devonshire, had given his adhesion to the principles of the Imperial Federation League and had been hailed as a convert. The present Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, in a deliberate letter, in which, of course, the utterance would be more reserved than in a speech wrote on April 5th, 1887:

He did not imagine that differential duties in favour of our colonies, whatever might be said for or against them, can be properly described in the term "protection."

I call special attention to that language, and I will tell hon. gentlemen why. Lord Salisbury, writing in 1887, in favour of a proposal for preferential duties, wants to guard against being stigmatized as a protectionist. I entreat the attention of hon. gentlemen to that. Here is the resolution passed at that great meeting of the South Wilts Chamber of Agriculture:

That in the opinion of this Chamber a commercial federation of Great Britain with all her colonies and possessions on a trade basis, giving preferential treatment to all within the Empire, is of the most supreme importance.

That passed unanimously. So that I have proved that in England, on the eve of 1897, you had, not merely the utterances of statesmen, but you had large bodies of men giving their adhesion to mutual preferential trade. Before my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) came in, I read from a speech of the Duke of Devonshire, delivered in 1887, in which he professed his adhesion to the doctrines of the Imperial Federation League, and he was hailed as a convert in regard to that. I dwell on that, because, what I am coming to, is most important. As far back as 1887 the Duke of Devonshire was a convert to the doctrines of the Imperial Federation League. What was the natural state of mind of the Duke of Devonshire and of Mr. Chamberlain in 1897? They had read, of course, what the right hon. Prime Minister, then as they knew him, Mr. Laurier, had stated in London, in Toronto and in St. Johns, as I have read it. They had read what the then leader of the Government, now the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), had stated on every hustings where he had spoken, and they had been familiar with the strenuous utterances of the present hon. leader of the Opposition, when he occupied the position of High Commissioner in London. Surely my hon. friend will not question for one moment, that it must have been in the

minds of these English statesmen, with their knowledge of colonial affairs, that, when the Canadian Prime Minister went across the Atlantic, he would be ready to state his views in favour of preferential trade. Not only that, but Mr. Chamberlain said: We are in favour of the movement, we are in favour of closer trade relations, but we cannot make a proposal, we cannot lay down lines, we invite you to lay down lines, and when you lay down lines, even though they may jar with some of our cherished opinions, we will not meet you as hucksters.

Mr. McNEILL. He was ready to meet us more than half way.

Mr. DAVIN. That was the state of feeling. Let me come to what occurred. The right hon. Prime Minister went over to Liverpool, and with the other colonial premiers, was entertained there. It will be found, and I will prove, that there was actually this expectancy in the minds of the English statesmen which we would naturally conclude, would be there. I will prove it, and I will show, too, Sir, that there was that expectancy in the minds of the journals that had been worshippers at the feet of the fetish of free trade ever since free trade came into existence in England. I will show that the "Times" newspaper expected that something would be proposed, and I will show that the "Times" newspaper was very much surprised when something was not proposed. There was first a gathering; there was a dinner and there were luncheons and speeches. The Duke of Devonshire spoke two or three times, but he made a considered and reasoned speech at Liverpool. In regard to that speech the present hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), spoke in Toronto, in February, 1899. Evidently he referred to that speech as a speech holding out before the Canadian delegate, before the present Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), before the other premiers, that England was ready to do something, in fact, holding out what we may fairly call an offer, not a formal proposal, not a proposal coming from a Minister representing a government that had passed an Order in Council or come to a resolution, or who was fortified by a resolution passed in the House of Commons, but such a proposal as we might expect from a gentleman, with the history of the Duke of Devonshire, associated with Mr. Chamberlain, the man who had said: We expect you to lay down lines on which this closer union will be built and framed. I do not believe my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock), considered what he did when he wrote that letter to the Duke of Devonshire, because I am going to tell him that he was guilty of a very great indiscretion. I do not believe he intended it; he did it impulsively, but, the moment I point out to him what he did, I think he will say that

he was guilty of a great indiscretion and when I show him the character of the Duke of Devonshire's reply, he will see that His Grace politely, as an English gentleman would do—I do not want to say it rudely—snubs the hon. gentleman. Not only that, but it actually gives the hon. gentleman point blank, the very answer that would have been desired by the hon. leader of the Opposition and the contrary answer to that which my hon. friend seems to think the letter contains. I will prove it to the hon. gentleman, and I am taking a different course to what I usually do in discussions in this House. My tendency is towards disquisition, but on this occasion I will just argue the matter as I would argue a case in banc. I have in my hands, the report of the meeting which my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock), sent to the Duke of Devonshire. What is that report? It is a report in the third person, that is to say, it is a mere summary. But suppose it was a verbatim report, surely the Postmaster General, who has read the repudiations made by the leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) of reports of his speeches, reported verbatim, surely the Postmaster General ought to have pondered a little before taking the action he did. Here is a speech of the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) which lasted over two hours and does not extend over three columns, all reported in the third person, and summarized, and yet the Postmaster General sends it to the Duke of Devonshire as the utterance of my hon. friend and he asks the Duke respecting that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The leader of the Opposition endorsed it last night.

Mr. DAVIN. No, he did not. On the contrary, the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) repudiated it, and I can further tell the Postmaster General, that not only did my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) repudiate it last night, but I am in a position to say that no sooner did he see it on the morning it was published, than he repudiated it to the editor of the paper and said he was misrepresented. But suppose that report had been in the first person, even then, with the precedent before him of his leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) repudiating professedly verbatim reports he is inexcusable. Before the Postmaster General sent that speech to the Duke of Devonshire to ask him what his view was with regard to it, he should have sent that report to the leader of the Opposition and asked him: Will you tell me is this a correct report?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Let me read to you the way the speech is reported, to show that it is in the third person:

He (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had given a solemn pledge that if placed in power he would send a

commission to England to negotiate with Lord Salisbury for preferential trade. He became Premier and he went to England in the midst of all the glory of a great jubilee, at a time when everything was favourable to the accomplishment of such a policy. He was met almost on landing by the Duke of Devonshire, who made a speech offering this great boon in unmistakable terms. In proof of this latter fact, the morning after every Cobdenite, every ultra free-trade journal in England denounced the Duke of Devonshire for having gone over to the other side and of having adopted Imperialistic views. The speeches of the other colonial Premiers delivered at the time almost showed what the trend of the offer was. But, asked Sir Charles, what did this man (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) do? Why he turned his back on his solemn pledge and declined the boon.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think that answer is given in italics.

Mr. DAVIN. You mean it is given in quotation marks.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. Very well, but what I want to point out is that the language of the leader of the Opposition is not given. But suppose it were a professedly verbatim report, the Postmaster General if he had sent it to the Duke of Devonshire as he did would be guilty of an indiscretion, and "a fortiori" he is guilty of indiscretion in sending it when it was a third person report and without having the endorsement of the leader of the Opposition. But let me point out that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) committed a greater indiscretion towards himself by telling us anything about what he did, because I am going to show that the answer given by the Duke of Devonshire endorses every statement made by the leader of the Opposition. The Duke of Devonshire is said to be of all the dukes in England—I quote the "Spectator"—the most You-be-damndest of them all; this was written when the "Spectator" was praising him. Another eulogy of the Duke of Devonshire is, that like Lord Palmerston he is a nasty horse to go up to in the stable, and every one who knows anything of English horses knows what that means. Whatever the reason is, our horses are not so hard to go up to in the stable, but the English high-spirited horse is under the circumstances rather an unpleasant animal for any one but his groom. The Postmaster General writes this letter to the Duke of Devonshire:

My Lord Duke,

I inclose a copy of the "Mail and Empire," of Toronto, of the date of the 23rd February, 1899, upon page 7 of which you will observe a report of a speech of Sir Charles Tupper, delivered at Toronto the previous evening, therein Sir Charles is reported as having spoken as follows:

"During the campaign of 1896, Sir Wilfrid had gone from hustings to hustings saying that he was as much in favour of preferential trade as Sir Charles Tupper. He had given his solemn pledge that if placed in power he would send a commission to England to negotiate with Lord

Mr. DAVIN.

Salisbury for preferential trade. He became Premier and went to England in the midst of all the glory of a great jubilee, at the time when everything was favourable of such a policy. He was met, almost on landing, by the Duke of Devonshire, who made a speech offering this great boon in unmistakable terms. In proof of this latter fact the morning after every Cobdenite, every ultra free-trade journal in England denounced the Duke of Devonshire for having gone over to the other side, and of having adopted Imperialistic views. The speeches of the other colonial Premiers delivered at the same time, almost showed what the trend of the offer was.

"But," asked Sir Charles, "what did this man (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) do? Why, he turned his back on his solemn pledge, and declined the boon."

I take the liberty of inquiring whether you made to Sir Wilfrid such an offer as is stated by Sir Charles,—

Is it to be supposed for one minute that the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) speaking on the events that were known to every one, would describe them as a formal offer made personally to Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

or any offer to give to Canada a preference in the market of Great Britain, and, if so, would you have the goodness to state the particulars of such offer.

Sir Charles states the occasion of the offer being made as almost at the time of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's landing in England, and I presume Sir Charles Tupper's statement is based upon some public utterance of Your Grace about that time. If on any public occasion during Sir Wilfrid Laurier's visit to England in 1897 Your Grace made any public deliverance upon the subject, might I ask if your remarks were accurately published in the British press, and if so, where I could procure authentic copies of any papers containing reports of your speeches upon the subject.

If not too much trouble I should be most grateful if Your Grace could cause to be sent to me copies of any public journals containing speeches of Your Grace's having any reference to any offer made to Sir Wilfrid with reference to preferential trade in favour of Canada in the markets of Great Britain.

When in England last summer I observed an article in "Britannia," referring to the statements published in the Toronto "Mail and Empire" to the effect that Your Grace had made an offer of preferential trade to Canada, and that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had refused it; and "Britannia" challenged the correctness of the "Mail and Empire."

I would be glad to be permitted to make public use of Your Grace's reply.

I can easily fancy the way the Duke of Devonshire would receive that letter. He would say: This colonial politician wants to drag me into a colonial squabble; what interest have I in it? And then the Duke of Devonshire would only have two objects in his mind in answering that letter. First, he would want to behave like a gentleman and answer it politely, and next he would want to guard himself, as the letter was to be published, just as some years before his present leader, the Prime Minister of England, guarded himself when he declared his adhesion to mutual preferential trade, to differential duties in favour of the

colonies, by saying : this is not protectionism. So we should expect that the Duke of Devonshire, a one time free-trader and follower of Mr. Gladstone, would guard himself against the stain—as it would be supposed by many of his supporters—of protectionism. Now, what is the answer of the Duke of Devonshire—and I do not know that my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) has not been impolite to the Duke, because he has not given to the House the answer of the Duke of Devonshire. I am going to read the letter, and I will show the House that the Postmaster General has not given the answer of the Duke of Devonshire, which, however, I intend to give :

Privy Council Office,  
2nd May, 1899.

My dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of April 1st.

The best answer I can give to your inquiries is to inclose you a copy of the report of these speeches made on the various occasions in the summer of 1897, when I had the pleasure of meeting the colonial Premier, in my capacity as president of the British Empire League.

Therefore, the best answer to the inquiry of the Postmaster General were these speeches which have not been read to the House.

Mr. COCHRANE. And which we did not hear.

Mr. DAVIN. But which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) is going to hear, and they will interest him immensely.

I do not think that in any of these speeches you will find anything to support the view of my opinion.

Mark this :

I do not think that in any of these speeches you will find anything to support the view of my opinion on the question of the policy of granting preferential trade to the colonies which appears to have been held by Sir Charles Tupper and by some of the journals in this country, which seek to attribute what they term "protectionist heresies" to members of the Unionist government.

What is the meaning of that? "I do not think you will find anything in my utterances on mutual preferential trade that will countenance the construction of those ultra free trade journals that I am tainted with the heresy of protectionist views." He is on the same base precisely as his leader was twelve years before, when he said, "While I am in favour of differential duties for the colonies, I am not going to admit that that is protection." The letter goes on :

It was, no doubt, my speech at Liverpool on the 12th of June, 1897, which was referred to by Sir Charles Tupper ; and my admission that free trade had not done for us all that was once expected may have been commented on by free trade or opposition journals.

But, while I congratulated Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Dominion of Canada on the offer which had been made to admit British goods at reduced rates, as compared with those on the goods

of other nations, as an important step in the direction of Imperial unity,—

Does that say that he regarded it as a final or conclusive or satisfying solution ?

—as an important step in the direction of Imperial unity,—

Does he say : "I did not give opinions of my own ?" No ; he says :

—I had no authority to offer, and did not offer, to Canada a preference in British markets.

Why ? Because, Sir, they had all the time been waiting for proposals from Canada and the other colonies, in order that they might then be in a position to say : "We may probably be able to do so," and would have a meeting of Council, and would go before Parliament and see if Parliament would sanction the policy. So that if my hon. friend had read that letter with the careful eye of scrutiny which his legal studies ought to have given him, he would have thought ten times before reading it to this House ; because—to use the phrase of the London "Spectator," which was at that time edited by so cultivated a man as the late Mr. Hutton—there is a great deal of "you-be-damned" in that note. Now, Sir, I am going to show the House what is the real answer. If you turn to page 7 of these speeches, you will find that the Duke of Devonshire, as the President of the British Empire League, lays down what are its objects in these words :

This League, then, has been founded as a successor of the Imperial Federation League, with all the general objects of doing everything in our power to bring about closer commercial and other connections between the colonies and ourselves, but on the principle of a complete elimination of any attempt at the present time to bring about any political or organic change in our relations.

That would refer, of course, to the political or constitutional relations, so that by implication it means bringing about grave changes in other respects—for instance, grave changes in our commercial relations—

All we, who are members of the League, are at liberty to hold our own opinions and to advocate this or the other form of political or organic change ; but as an association our aim is to bring about closer connection with the colonies, by means of better commercial relations, by means of improved communications, by means of increased sympathy with each other, of increased knowledge of each other, and for the present, at all events, we abstain from offering any suggestions, still more do we abstain from any appearance of dictating as to what form, if ever it should come about at all, a closer connection between us and them is to take.

Now, you can easily see why he uses the word "step" in that letter to my hon. friend. If the only change in the commercial relations is to be such changes as were made by this Government in 1897, what would they want to do in bringing about anything ? They have no control over such

things at all. If you turn to pages 10 and 11, you will find what was regarded in England at the time as rather a politico-economic recantation of the Duke of Devonshire; and not only in England, but as I shall show, by some colonial Premiers themselves who listened to him. Why, they actually took the same view as the press and the same view as the hon. leader of the Opposition, that there was in this speech a proposal, or offer, or shadowing out or suggestion of something to be done:

I continue to believe, as I have always believed, that free trade is the best and wisest policy for our country, but virtues were given to it which it did not possess, and results were predicted which have not followed. Its speedy universal adoption all over the world was prophesied, and that prophecy has been falsified, and the thick-and-thin admirers and believers in the Manchester school seek to persuade us that, although that prophecy has not been fulfilled, it was the best thing for us that we should be the only free trading country in the world. Very few disciples of free trade fifty years ago would have believed for a moment that at this time France and Germany would be carrying on an enormous trade under strictly protective conditions, and not only that they would not have opened their markets to us, but they would be competing with us for the possession of as large a portion as possible of the surface of the earth, not for the purpose of opening it out for the universal benefit of the trade, but for the purpose of excluding from those portions English trade. The world has not become the commercial paradise which was predicted in the early days of free trade opinion, when it was hoped that free trade would bind all the nations of earth so closely together that it would be a matter of comparatively little importance by whom they were ruled or under what influence they were governed. We have since learned by painful experience that no old or new markets are being thrown open to us by the influence of free trade alone, and that if we want to provide for the increasing commerce which is necessary for the support of our increasing population, we must find those markets for ourselves.—

How? He says, not by free trade. He is pointing out that they have not been able to do it by free trade, that they cannot do it by free trade. Then it must be by something that is different from free trade; and what more natural than that commercial union which was in the air and which was talked about and advocated by the league of which he was president, and it must be remembered that at that time they were meeting under the auspices of that league—

—and must use every opportunity either of expanding or of consolidating our colonial possessions. I hope that it may be understood that in these observations I am not consciously speaking in any spirit of disloyalty to those who were to a great extent my own political leaders, although even at that time I was frequently obliged to find myself in opposition to them upon various Imperial questions.

There is a palpable, direct reference to Mr. Gladstone, and a clear reference also, but more remote, to Mr. Cobden—

Mr. DAVIN.

I am only seeking to show you what has been done, of the causes why a great change has come over public opinion in these matters, and why colonial expansion and colonial consolidation are now regarded, not, as they were then, as a policy of doubtful principle, as a policy which was perhaps to be shunned, but as a policy which is essential to the maintenance of our continued prosperity.

Now, Sir, has that any sense whatever—is it not the ravings of a maniac, unless in the speaker's mind there was as we contend an advocacy of mutual preferential trade? Turn to page 19 of this pamphlet, where we have the speech of Sir George Turner, the Premier of Victoria:—

I do not desire to follow His Grace with regard to the remarks which have been made in respect of free trade with Great Britain. I represent perhaps the most protective colony of the whole group, and were I to enter upon contentious matter perhaps I would throw the apple of discord into this gallery.

Is that not proof clear that he considered that the Duke of Devonshire had uttered views hostile to absolute free trade?

But while free trade may suit Great Britain, there is no doubt that young colonies, struggling against competition, it is absolutely necessary at some period of their existence, they should have protection against the outside world, and that is the feeling which actuates us. But although we may be protected, although we may feel it is absolutely necessary in the interests of our struggling manufacturers, that we should have that protection, if proposals be made to us which will show us that the whole of our trade, the whole of our dealings can be on fair, just and equitable terms, conducted with Great Britain, we will be only too willing to enter into that bargain, because we know that that will be manifestly for the benefit and advantage of all of us who are part of this great empire.

Thus we have this Prime Minister of one of the colonies under the southern cross uttering the view which the "Times" and other newspapers took, and saying further that he was there expecting a proposal to be made, no doubt in answer to suggestions from them. And he goes on:

The task which has been allotted to me this afternoon is indeed a pleasant one. We have heard the admirable address couched in the kindest terms to our colonies, in which His Grace has pointed out his past faults and misdemeanours.

What were his past faults and misdemeanours? No doubt his unqualified adherence at an earlier period in his political life, to free trade.

Evidently showing that the years which have passed have convinced him of the error of his ways.

The error of what ways? Evidently the error of his free trade ways. I come now to Mr. Seddon, the Premier of New Zealand. For what I am doing my hon. friend the Postmaster General should thank me, because I am doing what he should have done. The Duke of Devonshire said:

The pamphlet of speeches I inclose to you is the best answer.

And our hon. friend never quoted that pamphlet, but I am doing it for him, and I hope he is appropriately grateful to me. I hope he is appropriately grateful. This is what Mr. Seddon said :

Since thirty years ago, when this matter was first discussed, there has gone forward a movement which will increase in strength and volume until all doubts will be removed and that instead of that which you all require.

Mark this.

Going to foreign nations.

It is clear that he is misreported there. It is clear that what he meant to say is coming from foreign nations.

We can give you that help ; and we desire to do so. Help us to do it. We asked the Duke of Devonshire, we ask Mr. Chamberlain : Help us to do it.

To do what ? To supply you with what you are supplied now with foreign nations.

And you are doing your duty to the great empire to-day to which we all have the honour to belong. Let me remind you of what took place at the conference in London last June. There the thinking men of our nation, those who command our manufactures, those who command the commerce and trade of our country, showed that they desired to put to the world and to put to those in charge of Imperial affairs what their views honestly were on this subject.

We know what they were, and he adds :

And who is at the present moment the head of colonial affairs—I allude to Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain—said : Let the colonies come to us with a proposal or proposals, and it shall not be treated in any huckstering spirit.

What would you think of a man who should say : I will not treat with you in a huckstering spirit if you do not ask anything from me. You would look upon him as a mocker or maniac. That invitation evidently meant, we expect you to make proposals ; and Mr. Seddon quotes it as having the same meaning which the hon. leader of the Opposition attaches to it, and which any man of sense must attach to it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And which the English press attached to it.

Mr. DAVIN. And which the English press attached to it. Mr. Seddon goes on :

Later on, in answer to Mr. Chamberlain's suggestion, Canada made her proposal unconditionally.

That was not what he expected.

It was such as to startle the whole civilized world.

He did not expect it ; the whole civilized world did not expect it, but expected something very different. Then, the same Premier says on page 28 :

We have an augury that the opportunity furnished by the present Diamond Jubilee will be taken advantage of.

What did he expect ? Did he expect mere academic utterances and eloquent platitudes ? Was that all expected ? Clearly not. Mr. Seddon evidently is a very practical man.

We belong to a vast and glorious empire, we are the dominant people, as has been proved in the past and will be continued in the future. I trust that the league under whose auspices we have met will be the instrument in promoting closer trade relationships between every part of the world in which the English tongue is spoken.

Were they not crazy, were they not lunatics, if they were not looking for some action on the part of England ? If they meant free trade, they had it. England's ports were open. But it is perfectly clear that Mr. Seddon looked for some action on the part of England to meet action on the part of her colonies.

And I would advise that in all the colonies, branches of this league should be established.

I want now, as my hon. friend was anxious to get the opinion of the Duke of Devonshire by letter, to give you what the Duke said at the close of that very interesting afternoon. A vote of thanks was moved and in reply, this is what he said :

I entirely share with you in the anxiety to hear what the Canadian Premier has to say. And I wish that my place in these proceedings this afternoon had been allotted to him.

The Canadian Premier had just been asked to speak, but being desirous of reserving himself for the banquet, declined. The Duke of Devonshire said he was anxious to hear the Canadian Premier, and he gave the reason why. It was because the Canadian Premier was not merely the Premier of a colony, but of a federation of colonies and of course wielding the weight of the eight colonies behind him.

I will show you by and by what a cold douche the Canadian Premier's speech was. It is a curious thing, Sir, that you actually have within the pages of this pamphlet the evidence—the evidence ? you have the demonstration—that, for the time being, a deadly blow was dealt at mutual preferential trade by the Canadian Premier. Now, turn to page 26, where you have the Duke of Devonshire again, speaking at the banquet that took place in the evening, and at which the Prime Minister of Canada was the principal guest :

Ladies and gentlemen, I should rather like to take this opportunity of impressing upon others that which I feel very strongly myself—that we have at present an opportunity which may not, within any very short time recur, of hearing that which we ought to know respecting the feelings and the wants and the wishes and the views of our fellow-countrymen in the colonies, and that we shall better utilize that opportunity by en-

deavouring to learn from them rather than to impress upon them our own views.

Still looking to proposals from the colonies. And, Sir, fancy a man, the President of the Privy Council of an Empire, saying, that if all he expected were the fireworks of well-turned phrases and pleasant little fanfares of rhetoric. I turn again to page 28, and I find him saying :

I will only, before I sit down, once more express my opinion that the present time and the weeks which are to succeed to it may be a time of momentous importance to the British Empire.

Maintenance of the British Empire! And this to be replied to by a gentleman saying : We do not want anything from you ; we love you so much and are so exceedingly grateful that we do not ask any reward for what we have done ; we will do everything for you in the abounding kindness of our hearts. On the same page :

The unity which we desire will not be brought about, such unity as we possess will not be maintained, unless both parties feel that it is to their mutual interest and advantage.

He contradistinguishes the present unity from the prospective, and he says that even the present cannot be maintained unless with mutual considerations of advantage, and, above all, that the prospective unity that, with great, ambitious patriotism, they were looking forward to—that could not be maintained without mutual interest and advantage.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask my hon. friend to read down to "cheers." It is very important.

Mr. DAVIN (reading) :

And I do not believe that even the ties of mutual advantage would be strong enough to cement the union of the Empire as we hope to see it, unless those considerations were supplemented by others of a more imaginative character. The proceedings of the next few weeks will, I think, afford material of both these characters.

That is, the embodiment in noble phrases of the sentiments of loyalty and patriotism and the embodiment in careful language of terms for interchange of goods between England and her colonies. That, clearly, is what was on his mind.

And I think we and our guests will both hear and say much which will strengthen the conviction that the continued and increased unity of the Empire is to the material advantage of both the United Kingdom and the colonies.

My hon. friend the hon. leader of the Opposition suggests that I should anticipate an extract from Mr. Chamberlain, speaking, I think, at Birmingham, who said :

My Lord Mayor, if our self-governing colonies desire now, or at any future time, to take their share in the glories and in the responsibilities of the Empire, they will find that we are ready to meet them more than half way.

Mr. DAVIN.

More than half way.

And that we will make it our duty to establish firmly that principle of our connection—"each for all and all for each other,"—

That is no jug-handled policy—

—upon which alone the stability and the prosperity of the Empire can depend—and if they are wishful to draw closer the commercial relations between themselves and us, now or at any future time, again I say we will meet them, and in no huckstering spirit.

He repeats what he had already said and which had been quoted by the Australian Premier :

We will not treat this as a transaction in a ledger to be weighed in proportion to the exact balance of profit and loss. No, there is a principle, and, as I have said, a sentiment behind it which will carry all before it, because we see in such tightening of Imperial bonds a guarantee for security and for continued unity.

I want to show what the Prime Minister said at the banquet. I quote from page 36 :

To-day the sentiment exists in Canada in favour of a closer union with the mother land.

Then, at page 38 :

There is a colonial aspiration for a closer union, for a broader citizenship.

Then, at page 38 :

I claim for the present Government of Canada that they have passed a resolution by which the products of Great Britain are admitted on the rate of their tariff at 12½ per cent, and next year at 25 per cent reduction. This we have done, not asking any compensation. There is a class of our fellow-citizens who ask that all such concessions should be made for a quid pro quo. The Canadian Government has ignored all such sentiments. We have done it because we owe a debt of gratitude to Great Britain. We have done it because it is no intention of ours to disturb in any way the system of free trade which has done so much for England.

That is the way he met the held-out hand of the Duke of Devonshire and the hand of Mr. Chamberlain. They said : Tell us what you want, tell us your proposal, we are ready to meet you half way. And the Premier replies : We do not want anything from you ; and brushes the Imperial hand aside with graceful scorn.

We have done it because it is no intention of ours to disturb in any way the system of free trade which has done so much for England.

And this, although, that very morning the Duke of Devonshire had declared that free trade was a disappointment, and they must look to other means for extending their markets. I want to turn to the utterance of another Premier, Mr. Nelson, of Queensland, reported at pages 41 and 42 ;

He was one of those who believed that free trade was best for the whole world—but it was to be coupled with the most important condition, and that was that the whole world should accept it—because it was the case with that principle as

with many others—that they may be made a hobby of and may be ridden to death, and occasionally act in a way contrary to what was intended when those principles were established. With regard to protection, he must say that his sentiments and the sentiments of the people he represented amounted to this, that protection also was a policy that must be entertained with the greatest caution. When they found themselves surrounded with other nations who would not deal fairly with them, they must do something to protect themselves to a degree that was necessary to obtain fair and equitable trading conditions. Taking a concrete example, for instance, in the matter of sugar. They were now enjoying the privilege of using sugar as at a price somewhat less than the cost of production.

That was accomplished by means of protection in foreign countries, but it was worthy of consideration whether we might not be living in a fool's paradise, and might not ultimately have to pay more for our sugar than we should if other countries were acting in a fair and straightforward manner. Could they afford to allow the sugar industries of the West Indies, the Mauritius, the Fiji Islands, Queensland and other Australian colonies to be destroyed, as they must be if the present policy was pursued?

What present policy, Mr. Speaker? The present policy of free trade as they have it in England?

In such case the Empire must inevitably suffer, and he was therefore strongly in favour of the scheme shadowed forth by the Colonial Secretary.

He is, therefore although a free trader, strongly in favour of a mutual arrangement in which we should find that the Imperial authorities were no hucksters.

Some scheme should be devised whereby the mother country would draw her supplies of raw products from her own colonies instead of being dependent upon foreign nations. He need hardly say that if any scheme could be formulated which would effect that object, it would have the entire sympathy of the whole of Australia.

Here we have an Australian Premier declaring that if that scheme can be formulated, a scheme of preferential trade between the Empire and her colonies, a scheme of preferential duties—if such a scheme can be formulated, although he is a free trader, the whole of Australia will go with him. That great Empire of colonies below the southern cross was ready as this Premier declares, to go on the lines suggested by Mr. Chamberlain and the Duke of Devonshire; and you will see by and by who set that all back.

He could answer, at any rate, for the colony that he represented. The effect of such a policy would be an immediate benefit to the colonies, a benefit to the Empire, and to the home country in particular.

Then, Sir, we have Mr. Kingston, the Premier of South Australia, and here is what he says:

They, he believed, were equally desirous of similar outlets for their manufactures. If some scheme—

Not words.

—could be happily arrived at between the mother country and her colonies by which those objects could be achieved, they in South Australia would be only too glad. They had been told that it was their duty to feed the hungry—

I call your attention to this.

They had been told it was their duty to feed the hungry; they would be only too glad to discharge that duty with Australian meat. They had been told it was their duty to give drink to the thirsty; might they also entertain the pious aspiration that the day might come when the thirst of Great Britain might be more largely assuaged by the use of Australian wines?

What does that mean? Why, he means a preferential duty in favour of the wines of the colonies of the Empire. Turn to page 47, where we have a speech of the present Prime Minister of Canada, made at Edinburgh on June 14th, 1897, and this is what he says:

The time will come when the present relations of the colonies to the mother land, satisfactory though they are to-day, will not be satisfactory; and when that time comes, my fellow-countrymen, the relations must become one of two things—either they must break altogether, or they must become closer.

But he himself says they cannot become closer on commercial lines, and he indicates elsewhere the political lines, for which he has been brought to task in the press of his own province. He is not in favour of commercial lines. Well, Sir, it is a very ominous thing to have the Prime Minister of Canada saying that he thought we must disrupt unless there is some closer political relations which is a heresy that Canadians will not endorse for one minute. At page 52 we have Sir George Turner speaking at this banquet, and what does he say?

Whatever the results of our visit may be, I feel perfectly certain of this, that they will enable us to go back and tell those whom we represent here that it is your desire, as it is our desire, that that bond of union which exists between us may be strengthened, and year by year may become stronger and stronger.

What is the meaning of that? How are you going to strengthen it? Mutual preferential trade was in the air; it is clear they were all thinking of the same subject. Then, at page 57 we have Mr. Seddon again. He is a Scotchman, and he is speaking at Glasgow, and this is what he says:

And then when I make inquiries as to where your food comes from, where your greatest trade lies, it pains me to think that we who are your own flesh and blood, anxious and willing, while barred by these nations—

Pointing contemptuously to the foreign nations—those nations being protectionist—

—cannot help you as we desire to do.

That is to say, that we cannot have that

preferential trade which would enable us to help you.

This brings me to the question of closer trade relationship with the British Empire, and as level-headed Scotsmen, you want to know something of what can be done, and be done on lines beneficial to you, and at the same time, helpful to the colonies. We must not for a moment urge a departure from the policy which has been mentioned here to-day and laid down. It is not now for us to go into details or to raise anything of a controversial character, but it is for us to prove and to show to you that it is to your advantage, outside altogether the ties of affection, outside altogether the ties of tradition, to cultivate that trade.

What he means is this: He is looking forward to the conferences that were soon to take place, secret conferences in which those gentlemen would show Mr. Chamberlain and his colleagues what would be the advantage to the Empire of a preferential trade arrangement. Then we turn to page 64, to the Manchester function, at which we find Mr. Kingston speaking again:

And surely it would be better for this country to draw her food supplies when she could, from the colonies rather than from foreign countries with whom at any day England might be at war.

How is it to be done? England cannot do anything to secure that by having a free trade and an open port for all, but only by giving a preference.

In these circumstances could not something be done to effect closer commercial relations between the colonies and the mother country?

In what circumstances? In the circumstances that at present we are not supplying you with as much food as we would like to do.

The question had engaged a good deal of attention in the Australian colonies, and a resolution had been arrived at to do what they fairly could to encourage British enterprise and commerce. It was time to have done with high-flown sentiment—

Mark this. I hope there is no slight satire in it.

—and to approach the matter in a business spirit.

I have already read to you what Mr. Chamberlain said in his admirable speech. Now, I want to show you what Mr. Sprigg said, which you will find on page 77, at one of the numerous functions.

I was rejoiced indeed to hear the speech of the right hon. gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies, when he announced that the Government of which he is so distinguished a member, was prepared to meet us even more than half way in all our applications and desires for a united Empire, and I can only assure the right hon. gentleman that, let him stand by—and I feel thoroughly convinced that he will stand by—the policy which, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, he has announced as the policy which it is intended to pursue with regard to the colonies generally, and especially with regard to the

Mr. DAVIN.

colony which I represent here to-day, I can assure him, I say, that if he stands by us we shall, as a united people, stand manfully by him.

The meaning is, that they interpret Mr. Chamberlain's language in this way; they expect negotiations will eventuate in secret conferences, and that probably before they left England, or the following year, they would have been crystallized into an Imperial statute, and that at the time when we are now speaking, we should have a preference that would have flooded this country with wealth and done the greatest good to every farmer and tradesman throughout the Dominion, I turn to page 84, and I find what the Duke of Devonshire said again:

We feel that this sentiment, the existence of which no one can doubt, will have missed its mark if, in the future, these nations of which I have spoken shall not grow up into one empire, which shall be connected with us by ties which may be more or less close, more or less uniform, more or less definite, but still which shall be substantial ties connecting us together in everything which connects our Government, our general policy, our commercial relations, and our general defence. The lesson which has been impressed upon us more than ever in these last few weeks—the idea which we have grasped more perfectly than at any previous period—is, I think, that the unity of the Empire is an equal privilege and advantage to every part of the Empire. We know that while our colonies and our dependencies can, by strengthening unity greatly enlarge and enhance our power and influence in the world, yet, at the same time, we have much which we can offer to them, and which we do offer to them; and it is not in the interest of these islands alone—it is in the interest of the whole English-speaking race—that we advocate the idea of unity, and we urge upon you to take every measure that it is in your power to take to cement and strengthen it.

Now, I ask the attention of hon. gentlemen to this:

But, ladies and gentlemen, we believe ourselves the British race both here and abroad, that we are not only a sentimental people but a practical people, and the idea which must have occurred to many of us, after witnessing the demonstrations at home and abroad, which we have witnessed in these recent times, is, what is to be the practical outcome of it all.

Evidently looking again to the negotiations. He is referring now to the meetings that had been taking place, and he says:

The opportunity has been taken of the presence of the distinguished colonial statesmen among us, some of whom we are able to welcome here to-day—the opportunity has been taken by the Minister who is responsible of our colonial relations, not only to have interviews with each one of them individually, interviews necessarily of a confidential character upon matters relating to their own especial country—but also to hold meetings of them collectively—meetings which also, up to the present time, have been of a confidential nature, but at which questions of a more general character affecting the whole range of our relations, have been considered and discussed. As I have said, up to the present time those meetings have been entirely confidential.

And again :

Whether this is to be so or not, I did not think I am violating any confidence when I say that the subject which these colonial statesmen have been invited to discuss with Mr. Chamberlain are to a very great extent similar to, if not absolutely identical with, those contained in the constitution of the British Empire League—the extension of our trade with the colonies, the effect of existing laws and treaties upon our commercial relations with each other, the subject of communication between the mother country and her colonies, or between the colonies themselves, by means of steamships or telegraphs, the subject of postal communications—above all, the subject of Imperial naval and military defence. Those are the practical questions which our guests have been invited to discuss and are now discussing with Mr. Chamberlain, all in the sense of leading up to, tending to an ultimate discussion of the greater, but perhaps more distinct object of a closer political and constitutional connection.

Again he says :

I would also ask these gentlemen to remember that it is for promoting a knowledge of and encouraging discussion upon these very questions which they are now discussing with the colonial ministers that the British Empire League exists, and when they return to their colonies, I hope they will remember that they can do us no greater service, they can confer no greater honour or favour upon us than by making use, in any degree to which they may think expedient, of the services and the organization of this league for making better known and for promoting the discussion of questions in which they may happen to feel an interest. We can assure them on behalf of this league that we have no preconceived schemes, either political or commercial, either naval or military, to advocate. Our object is simply to help to discover, and when discovered to make known, what are the opinions of those of our fellow-countrymen abroad who are most concerned in these matters.

I have done what the hon. Postmaster General should have done : I have read the answer of the Duke of Devonshire to his letter. What was the view of these negotiations, and what was the effect of my right hon. friend's course in these matters ? The "Times" of June 14th, commenting on those now historic proceedings at Liverpool, said :

It would be strange and disappointing if, when these warm and generous feelings prevail in all quarters, it should be found impossible to draw closer the bonds of union between the mother country and her daughter nations. The recent tariff legislation in Canada and the discussions upon the question of Australasian confederation seem to indicate that we may be on the eve of some remarkable developments. But both in Mr. Laurier's remarks and in those of some of the Australian ministers on Saturday there were signs that all is not quite plain sailing.

In fact, as we saw, the right hon. gentleman threw a cold douche on the aspirations for closer commercial relations :

To overcome such obstacles as exist is a work that will confer an abiding fame on the statesmen who are able and fortunate enough to achieve it.

On July 5th, the same paper said :

These communities are now ready to draw closer the ties that bind them into one Empire, as soon as the wisdom of statesmen, the maturing of public opinion, the growth of material links shall enable effect to be given to the wishes shared by all.

I might have read these extracts from the "Times" at an earlier part of my remarks to show that the "Times" had precisely the same view of the utterances of the Duke of Devonshire and of Mr. Chamberlain that the hon. leader of the Opposition has always taken. I read them now to show, at the close of these proceedings, what the "Times'" view of the subject matter of discussion was, and also its view of the effect of the manner, the words and the actions of the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada on that occasion was. I do not intend to go further in this question ; I have confined myself to showing that the answer made by the Duke of Devonshire to the question of the hon. Postmaster General, proves that the hon. leader of the Opposition, in the course he has always taken in speaking of that transaction at Liverpool, has been in entire accord with the utterances of the Duke of Devonshire and Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. J. H. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to go profoundly into this question, chiefly for the reason that I am unable to do so. Any remarks of mine will be directed at the fringe of the subject, rather than into the heart of it. Permit me to say, in the first place, that there are some sentiments to which expression has been given with which I am in entire accord. I rejoice, as a Canadian, at the change of sentiment that I see manifested on both sides of the Atlantic—manifested between England and her colonies throughout the world. There was a time, scarcely thirty years ago, when a different condition of sentiment prevailed. In England at that period, we had Gladstone, and Granville, and Kimberly advocating the independence of the colonies viewing with equanimity and satisfaction the separation of the last link which bound the colonies to the mother land. In 1869, Earl Grey wrote to the "Times" :

The breaking up of the great colonial Empire would in my opinion be a calamity to the colonies, to this country, and to the world, and I cannot doubt you are right in believing this to be the result which must be looked for from the policy distinctly declared by Her Majesty's Government.

That policy, so far as Canada was concerned, was semi-officially announced to us. It consisted, first, in the withdrawal of British troops, second, in the cessation of the Imperial guarantee, and, third, in the declaration of the independence of Canada at the earliest possible moment. That was the condition of affairs thirty years ago when Lord Granville dominated the Colonial

Office. In Canada we had a similar condition of things. We had statesmen like Sir Alexander Galt, L. S. Huntingdon, the Hon. John Young, and others, advocating independence for Canada. I refer to this to show that a different condition of things now happily exists. The dismemberment craze has passed away, and in its place we find a broad and abiding Imperial spirit looking to the consolidation of the Empire. What has brought all this about? The causes are varied. The discovery of Watt and the improvements in steam navigation have bridged the oceans and brought the colonies into more immediate association and contact with the motherland. But there are other causes. That condition of isolation created in recent years, when the nations of Europe arrayed themselves against the motherland. That isolation and danger evoked the sympathy of her children—rallied them to her side—they would stand or fall together. There are other reasons of still more recent birth. They bear the date of the year 1897, when the colonies and independencies were represented at the capital of the Empire, and when the British people first realized their greatness, and took advantage of the pageant to shout and manifest the Imperial spirit that was abroad. But no other single cause operated with greater effect than the reduction of 25 per cent on British imports. That policy inaugurated by this Government, went straight home to the hearts of the English people. It is a policy which the other colonies now propose to follow, and it has contributed more than any other towards the creation and spread of Imperial sentiment.

I recognize the fact suggested by the leader of the Opposition and by my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), that one of the difficulties we have to surmount before we can bring about Imperial federation in its entirety, is in connection with our trade relations. Some of the strands of Empire have been already woven. One of the most important of all has been the creation of an Imperial settlement. Another is, the institution of Imperial penny postage. Another, that which has recently come to a successful issue, the construction of the Pacific cable. These have been already woven, but others remain to be completed. One, the Fast Atlantic service, another improvement in sending our products to the Home market, and another, the teaching of our people that in future we will have to bear more than we have borne in the past of the cost of the British fleet, in view of the protection it affords to Canada. But, Sir, our main difficulty lies with our trade relations. We have to devise some means by which we can harmonize the two opposite systems of trade that exist in the colonies, and in the mother country. The question is, in what manner shall that be

Mr. BELL (Prince East, P.E.I.)

done? The leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) have made certain propositions, and I have been trying in my humble way to understand exactly what these are. I find in the first place that the propositions made by these two hon. gentlemen differ the one from the other. The leader of the Opposition says: Leave the system of protection in Canada as it stands, but let an arrangement be made by which the colonies would get the benefit of a duty of, say, ten per cent in the English market as against the world. In that event he would, I think, be prepared to make some reduction upon goods imported from England. The proposition of my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) is essentially different. He says: Leave the present import duties in Canada as they are, but in addition, let the colonies and the motherland be considered as one unit, and let that unit place say ten per cent on all the products of all other countries, and let the proceeds of that tax be devoted to improving the intercommunication between England and her colonies, and to the protection of the Empire. These are the two propositions, as I understand them. Both involve the element of protection, so far as England is concerned. Both involve the idea of England placing a tax of say 10 per cent upon breadstuffs and other articles of consumption used by her people. These proposals do not appear to me to be practicable. Neither the British Government nor the British people are prepared, under present conditions, to enter into an arrangement by which a tax would be imposed upon the masses of the English people for the benefit of the colonies. The proof of that is not so clearly manifested in the declarations of English statesmen as in the recent action of the British Parliament. The question came up for consideration when the wine duty was before Parliament. A request was made on the part of the people of Australia that while those duties should be imposed as against the world, they should be remitted as against that colony. That was a proposition for the benefit of a British colony. That proposition was made to the English Parliament. Mr. Balfour, who spoke on behalf of the British Government, stated distinctly in the Commons that a preference to Australia was tantamount to a tax on the English consumers and therefore the proposition could not be entertained. It was voted down—only 27 voting in its favour. We have here the best proof of the condition of British sentiment.

The hon. member (Mr. Davin) has referred to the fact that British statesmen have always been suggesting to the colonies to make an offer. That statement is true. British statesmen have studiously avoided making any offer to Canada or to any of the colonies—why? Because had they done so, it would have looked like dictation on the part of the

Imperial authorities. British statesmen know that if they would be successful, they may suggest but not dictate. They desire any proposition to come voluntarily and spontaneously from the colonies. They desire that the proposition should emanate from the good sense and the generous heart of the colonies themselves. No Imperial federation scheme, unless it emanates from that source, can possibly be successful or permanent. That very consideration proves to me more clearly than anything else, that the Duke of Devonshire never made an offer to Canada, because to have done so would have been contrary to the policy of the British Government. What British statesmen did do was to invite offers from the colonies.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear hear; that is the whole case.

Mr. BELL (East Prince). They had before them what they regarded and treated as an offer from Canada in the shape of a resolution submitted by my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). That offer embodied that hon. gentleman's policy as I have outlined it. That offer was considered by the statesmen of England, and notably by Mr. Chamberlain, and it was distinctly repudiated.

Now, Sir, I take the ground—different from that taken by my hon. friend from North Bruce and the leader of the Opposition—different also to a slight extent from that taken by the leader of the Government. I contend that we have no right to ask England, under present conditions, to give us what is called preferential treatment—in other words, to put a tax upon her labourers and artisans for the benefit of her colonies. I am aware that this perhaps may not be considered a very popular contention. Nevertheless, I consider it a righteous one—why? Because I think we have a right to look at this matter from a broader stand-point than merely the interests of Canada. We have to consider ourselves as being not only at the present, but, more especially in the future, integral parts of the British Empire. We should be ashamed to make, and ought never to make a proposition to the Empire for the benefit of Canada alone. Let me give an illustration of what I mean. Down in Prince Edward Island we raise a great quantity of oats. Now, I might make a proposition to this Parliament in this form; give us a bonus upon the export of oats, and what would be the effect on Prince Edward Island? The necessary result would be that you would increase the value of the land, you would promote immigration, you would encourage the introduction of English capital, and you would have a greatly increased production of oats, which in case of war would be of great advantage to Canada. I might argue strongly along that line. But why do I not make a proposition of that character? The benefit of it to the Island must be obvious. I say, never-

theless, I have no right, as representing a constituency in Prince Edward Island, to propound such an argument, simply because such a policy, though beneficial to Prince Edward Island, would be prejudicial to the rest of the confederation. The same reasoning applies to the proposition of preferential trade which these gentlemen have now submitted to the House. It is a proposition which involves this: Benefit to Canada? Yes, I admit that the effect of preferential trade, as these gentlemen advocate it, would be of advantage to Canada. It would tend to increase the stream of population which now is flowing towards our North-west country. It would have the effect of attracting to our country British capital. It would increase the value of the lands of our North-west. It would increase the value of the products of these lands. If England were to impose a tax of 10 per cent on foreign food products, that would add the like amount to our agricultural products. I admit all that and more. But I say, in the face of that, we have no right to make a proposition to the English people that would be inconsistent with the general benefit, and advantage, nay, that would be a menace to the very existence of the Empire. That is what the proposition of hon. gentlemen opposite involves. It involves such a change in the fiscal system of Great Britain as would injure, if it would not imperil the Empire. Why, what does it mean? It means this, if it means anything. It means that the people of England, especially the poorer classes, will have to pay 10 per cent more for their food supplies, if this proposition goes into effect. It means the increasing of the burden of taxation upon the artisans and labourers of England. That is contrary, in the first place, to British policy, because in England the tendency has been since 1845 to shift the burden of taxation from the shoulders of the poorer classes. But this proposition asks Great Britain to reverse that wise policy and to increase the taxes of the artisans and labouring classes of England, that are the least able to bear it. We ought to hesitate before asking the English people to accept any such proposition.

There is more than that involved in it. I read with interest the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, made two or three years ago, on this very subject. He argued that England ought to adopt Imperial federation, because that would give a stimulus to her declining industries. He saw a decline manifested in English industry, manufactures and commerce. I have never been able yet to see any indications of that decline. I hold in my hand the latest returns showing the total value of the import and export trade of the United Kingdom, in recent years, and I find the following figures, as indicating the volume of trade for the respective years:—

1894 .....	£682,000,000
1895 .....	707,000,000

1896 .....	£738,000,000
1897 .....	745,000,000
1898 .....	761,000,000

The volume of trade makes a steady increase and is the best indication of continuing prosperity. I do not see, therefore, any cause in the present condition of things why the British people should reverse their policy. But if there were a cause I do not see how the proposition made by the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) is going to help matters. Why, the hon. leader of the Opposition argues that England is now being pushed to the wall that her manufactures cannot successfully withstand competition with those of the United States, Belgium, Germany, and other countries. Yes, she is being pushed to the wall. Their panacea is: Let us have Imperial federation; let us have preferential trade, that will rectify the condition of things and restore prosperity to the motherland. In the first place, I say that prosperity does not need to be restored, it exists already. But I say more: The effect of putting an increased tax upon the breadstuffs of the English artisan—making him pay more for the necessities of life, will inevitably be to increase the cost of English manufactures by the amount of additional tax which we impose upon these food products. If to-day England, as they say, cannot stand competition in manufactures, what condition of things will result, if you increase the cost of those manufactures? If England is pushed now to the wall, the time of her dissolution would be hastened by the injurious specifics these hon. gentlemen would administer.

But this is not all. I can plainly foresee other calamitous results in putting a tax on English imports in favour of the colonies. You will thereby, in the first place, create dissatisfaction and discontent among the colonies themselves, who will find fault with each other and with the mother country as to the extent and effect of that preferential tariff. More than that, you are going to create dissatisfaction in Ireland, because the people of Ireland will say that they have as much right to favoured treatment with regard to their products as the people of the colonies. You are going to create difficulty with regard to countries already hostile to England, because if England should impose preferential duties in favour of the colonies, you may provoke a spirit of retaliation. I do not say this would necessarily result.

I do not believe it would result, but at the same time, there is a danger that it would result. The colonies have, therefore, no right to ask Great Britain to place her transcendent interests in peril and jeopardize her superiority among the nations. There is more involved in this than my hon. friend from North Bruce and the leader of the Opposition seem to suppose; there is involved

the national welfare—nay the very existence of the Empire. As there is so much at stake, we ought to hesitate before we make a proposition to the mother country which might prejudice her predominance in manufactures or upon the seas. If she declines, we go down with her.

It being One o'clock, Mr. Deputy Speaker left the Chair.

House resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.). Before the House rose at one o'clock, I was endeavouring to point out the reasons why Canada, as a colony and as a partner of Great Britain should hesitate to ask the mother country, for the benefit of the colonies, to impose a duty on foreign food products. Now, even if we should decide to ask that, it seems to me we should still be a long way from obtaining it. In a matter that affects the manufactures of Great Britain in the most vital manner, in a matter which concerns the interests and the general welfare of the mother country, in a matter which involves her national existence and ours, the statesmen of England would not attempt to make any such radical change of policy without first referring the question to the British electorate. I think I read somewhere that recently a deputation waited on Lord Salisbury to ask him to promote Imperial federation by imposing a duty on foreign breadstuffs of the benefit of the colonies. What was his answer? He replied substantially: "Go forth and educate the English people, and as soon as public sentiment is ripe and ready for the measure, I am ready to enact it." His answer was akin to that given by this and past Governments to the prohibitionists of Canada, "Go forth and do missionary work among the people. Educate the masses to your views and as soon as the temperance sentiment of the people of Canada is ready for the measure, we are ready to enact it. Neither Lord Salisbury, nor Mr. Chamberlain, nor Mr. Balfour, nor any other English statesman would be ready to make a proposition of this kind involving such tremendous consequences to the colonies and to the Empire without consulting the electors of England. Suppose the electorate of England were consulted, what would be their answer? We must look at it from the stand-point of the people of England as well as from our own. They would be inclined to say, in the first place: We pay too much already toward the support and protection of the colonies. There are mutterings among them even to-day. Our fleet means for England an annual expenditure of thirty-five millions of pounds sterling. Expended for what? Not necessarily for the protection of England, because she needs none, but for the protection and benefit of the colonies. And, Sir, the people of England, the labourers and artisans, the people who would be most in-

terested, would naturally say : We pay enough already, we pay too much already, toward the support and protection of the colonies without paying an additional ten per cent for their benefit upon the food products that we import from foreign countries. The masses would say further : If you want to increase the tax, do not increase it upon the food of the poorer classes—that is contrary to British policy—but lay it upon the shoulders of those who are best able to bear it. They would have still another answer : Look at the system we have had in force in this country for the last fifty years to govern our fiscal affairs. What has that fiscal policy accomplished for England ? They would point with pride to the fact that during that period the result of that fiscal policy has been first, that population has increased one and a half times; or, if we take into account the population that has gone to the colonies, it has doubled. The revenues have also doubled under that system. The wealth of England has increased three-fold. The hardware manufactures have increased in that period six-fold; commerce has increased seven-fold; the volume of trade has multiplied from one hundred and fifteen millions in 1840 to seven hundred and sixty-four millions in 1898. The people of England would be able to point to the fact that in the past fifty years their free trade policy has accomplished all these results, and they would naturally ask the question : Why do you want us to change a fiscal policy that has been productive of such results ? They would go further, and they would point to a condition of things prior to the passage of the corn laws, to a period in English history when trade was stagnant, and when a system of extreme protection prevailed. More than that, they would point to the condition of things that obtain in this country. They would probably say to the leader of our Opposition and to the representative from North Bruce : Why, look at the results of your own policy. You have had protection in Canada for eighteen years, and what has it done for you ? But the moment that a freer trade system was introduced, that moment an impetus was given to the volume of trade and to the general prosperity of Canada. Now, then, how can you come over to this side of the Atlantic and expect us to adopt a system that in your own country has manifestly wrought such injurious results ? They would probably wage another argument. The common people of England would speak out, and after all, it is with the common people that the controlling power of England really rests ; it is not with the aristocracy. In consequence of the extension of the franchise the great voting power of England to-day rests with the labouring and the artisan classes. These classes would naturally say : Why, you are making a proposition that involves a charge

of 10 per cent more upon our bread and upon our food. Therefore, you can hardly expect that the people of England or those especially interested would consent to any proposition of this kind. They would emphasize the fact that increased cost of food means increased cost of manufactures and that nothing could be more injurious to Britain's interest. These would be some of the reasons the people of England would naturally urge, and which would inevitably lead them to the conclusion that so far as this proposition was concerned they were not ready for its acceptance and never would be. And I think that these considerations ought to induce the conclusion in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite that it is utterly hopeless to expect to persuade the English people to accept their views in the face of such arguments.

Now, Sir, the leader of the Opposition and other gentlemen who have spoken upon this question, have endeavoured to show that the signs of the times in England are in the direction of a system of protection. What are those signs ? They have referred to the West Indies and to India ; they have referred to the countervailing duties that the British Government has consented to have imposed with regard to those two colonies. I do not propose to go into the question of countervailing duties. I am aware that there is in the minds of many free traders a doubt upon this question. Some of them argue that countervailing duties are not inconsistent with the principles of free trade, that it is perfectly right to impose these duties in order to place Great Britain and her colonies upon a fair footing with regard to the products of the world. There are others who say that the principle of protection is involved. I am not going to argue that point, I merely want to point out that there never has been any breath of a proposition to put on countervailing duties in any place except English colonies. There has never been a proposition to adopt them in England. The proposition has been applied to India, not because Great Britain was of the opinion that countervailing duties were best for India, but because Great Britain has dealt towards India as she has always dealt towards her colonies—in the most generous possible spirit ; she has given to them absolute discretion to say and do what they think best for their own interests. She has invariably adopted whatever principle the colonies have suggested, or dictated, as best suited for their conditions. So that so far as countervailing duties are concerned, there is not much satisfaction to be had by those who contend that they indicate conversion to protective theories. Then, again, my hon. friend has stated that a number of prominent English statesmen have recently advocated protectionist principles. They have expressed dissatisfaction with free trade principles. They have said that the nations of the world have not become free traders as was anticipated

when that policy was first inaugurated in England. But they have never gone yet to the length of making any suggestion favouring the adoption of the system of protection in England.

I want now to refer to a matter suggested by the leader of the Opposition last evening, when he pointed to the "Times" newspaper as advocating what he called a system of protection. He rejoiced that the "Times" had diagnosed public opinion in England and foreshadowed an approaching era of protection.

Now, Sir, I have read somewhere that the "Times" newspaper advocated, at one time, that British Columbia should not join hands with the confederation of Canada, but should enter into union with the United States of America. That proposition was made deliberately by that newspaper; that was the extraordinary forecast the London "Times" made not 30 years ago. I have read also that the "Times" newspaper deliberately advised the people of Canada to prepare for the inevitable result that was ahead of them, namely, their independence of and separation from the motherland. If my hon. friend examines these political forecasts made by the "Times" in past years, he will find little to congratulate himself upon so far as regards the capacity of that newspaper to foretell the adoption by England of protectionist fallacies. Now, Sir, I have concluded that I cannot see anything to justify the hope that England will consent to put a tax on her food products for the benefit of her colonies, and it is idle and useless to look for Imperial federation in that direction. In what direction should we look for the consummation of Imperial federation? It seems to me that, although Mr. Chamberlain has not made any distinct offer to the colonies, yet, nevertheless, he has made a suggestion which it might be well for us to seriously consider. He stated that the first and primary condition upon which we might have Imperial federation is that free trade must obtain as between the colonies and the mother country. The element of protection must be eliminated from the fiscal policy of the Empire. What does that mean? We have a different idea in Canada from what they have in England as to what free trade actually means. It means in England an entirely different thing from what it means here. What was Mr. Chamberlain's idea? Free trade in England implies this—putting a tax, for instance, upon tea, which is entirely imported from abroad and which is, in no way, produced in England. Free trade in England implies that, where you manufacture certain goods, as, for instance, liquors, you put a duty upon the importation of that article to place all people upon the same footing. No protection is extended to the manufacturer of that article in England. The excise duty and the import duty exactly counterbalance each

other. That is what Mr. Chamberlain implied by free trade in England, and that is what he suggested as the first pre-requisite upon which the colonies might enter into the federation of the Empire. Now, the question is: Are we ready for the acceptance of that offer? Are the Liberal party of Canada ready for it? The Liberals have said substantially that they are not ready for it at the present time, but they will be, and they have gone a long distance, they have already gone one-fourth of the distance in the direction of a compliance with the condition laid down by Mr. Chamberlain. What about the Conservative party? The Conservative party say that they are not now ready to comply with the condition and never will be. That is the manifest interpretation and effect of their protectionist policy. They are not only not ready to comply, on the contrary, if I interpret aright the proposition of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), it goes in the direction of increasing protection rather than of diminishing it. So that, I look upon the position taken by the Conservative party as an absolute bar to the accomplishment of our hopes for Imperial federation. It cannot be consummated along that line. What suggestion or advice would I offer to the Conservative party?

It is their duty as it is ours to make all reasonable financial sacrifices. That they are prepared to do. They have joined hands with the Liberal party in Canada and indicated to England their readiness to make concessions—sacrifices to promote Imperial federation. I hold that they as well as we have the right to go further—to make further sacrifices—sacrifices of political principles, or, if you like, of protectionist policy, if we find, as I believe we will, that it is impossible for England to accept and adopt the protectionist theories and principles of the colonies. If it be found that the mountain will not come to Mahomet, it is the duty of Mahomet to go to the mountain. That is what I suggest is the proper course which the Conservative party of this country ought to take with a view to promote Imperial federation. If they want to accomplish anything in that direction—and I believe that they are all sincerely desirous of accomplishing it—they must accommodate themselves, they must subordinate protection to the British fiscal policy.

I will conclude with a reference to the manner in which this debate was inaugurated. I have to compliment the hon. leader of the Opposition upon the manner in which he opened up and entered upon the discussion of this important question—upon the broad and statesmanlike views that he manifested in his address. I am sorry, however, that I cannot pass the same compliment upon my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). If I did not know that hon. gentleman as well as I do, I would say that he has given ample proof in the statements he

has made of the charge that has been preferred against him in some of the newspapers of this country, namely, that he has subordinated his Imperialism to his partisanship. What did he say: He said with regard to the Liberal party that they had stolen the policy of the Opposition with respect to Imperial federation; he said that they were now disloyal and always had been; he said, with respect to their policy, that they had blundered into their 25 per cent reduction on British imports; he said that over every effort that they had made towards preferential trade the trail of the serpent was manifest. He said: The Liberals were like a helpless flock of sheep sold in the shambles. I say, Sir, that in the discussion of such a question as is now before the House—a question that should be kept above party politics—the man who makes statements of that kind is open to the charge of having subordinated his Imperialism to his partisanship. Nay, more, I say that charges of that kind have no influence towards promoting Imperial sentiment, but, on the contrary, they have the necessary effect of retarding the progress and development of that grand ideal which is now beginning to dominate both England and her colonies.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). The hon. member for Prince (Mr. Bell) has eulogized the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) for his moderation and patriotism in proposing the resolution; but he was unfortunate enough to state that the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) instead of adhering to that high ideal, subordinated his imperialism to his partisanship. Sir, no imputation could be more ill-founded than that. There is no member in this House on either side who has shown a greater devotedness to the imperialistic idea than has the representative of North Bruce. In season and out of season, even when the idea was not so popular as it is to-day, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) was the stoutest champion and advocate of imperialism, and in view of the action of the Liberal party on this question, it ill-becomes a supporter of the Government to make such a charge against the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill). We remember that last year the hon. member (Mr. McNeill) proposed a resolution that might very well have been endorsed by the unanimous vote of this House. It was a resolution so impartial in its tone, that it was an exact copy of that which had been passed by the Imperial Trade League and endorsed by both political parties, outside of this House and in Great Britain. And when the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) moved that resolution, the partisans on the other side of the House brought in an amendment which was untrue in its assertions, partisan in every letter of it, and which the members on this side of the House could not vote for. Al-

though the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) and the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) magnanimously agreed to accept that amendment if they omitted the offensive and incorrect statement attributing to the Liberal party all that had been accomplished in the line of preferential trade, the gentlemen on the other side of the House rejected that concession. We are in the judgment of the House and of the country when we say that the Imperial idea was not originated and was not promoted by these gentlemen opposite. They always gave it the cold shoulder, until they found that its popularity was growing in the country, and then they did as they have done in connection with other policies of the Conservative party; they adopted it in a half-hearted way in spite of themselves. Let me point out that the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Bell) has made statements directly contrary to the statements made by his hon. leader. Yesterday the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said to us: Why, you cannot produce any document from the Imperial Government endorsing this principle, for there is no such state document. To-day the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Bell) tells us that the proposition must emanate from the colonies, and, Sir, that is exactly our contention, and it is a contention in direct opposition to that propounded by the Prime Minister yesterday. Did not the Duke of Devonshire and did not Mr. Chamberlain say: We are ready to receive proposals from the colonies; we wish you to say what you want, and we will receive your proposals in no niggardly spirit. That was the statement reaffirmed at every meeting by the leaders of the British Government in England. And when the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says that no document on this question has emanated from the British Government, he is begging the question. He knows, because he was there, that he was invited to make proposals, but the whole burden of his speech was devoted to arguing that the Imperial statesmen had not committed themselves to any policy on this question. Take the statement of the Duke of Devonshire, and take the comments on it by the leading English newspapers. Every one got the idea, and no one got any other idea, from the Duke of Devonshire's speech at Liverpool, but that he advocated preferential trade with the colonies. All the English newspapers, both Liberal and Conservative, construed the Duke of Devonshire's speech in the same sense as did the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper). Commenting on that speech the day after it was delivered, the London "Times" says:

This silent, gradual process of awakening throughout the country on the trade question has brought about an astonishing change which is now beyond all controversy. The recent tariff legislation in Canada, and the discussion as to

Australian federation seem to indicate that we may be on the eve of some remarkable development; but the remarks of Mr. Laurier, and those of some of the Australian Ministers show signs that not all is plain sailing.

What does that mean? It means that the British Ministers had held out an invitation and a helping hand, but as the London "Times" says in effect, Mr. Laurier had discouraged the idea and had shown that all was not plain sailing. What does the London "Morning Chronicle," the leading Liberal organ, say?

It must be admitted that the Duke of Devonshire represents a good deal of floating opinion, but we shall do our colonial friends ill service if we lead them to suppose that England will ever join in the protectionist ring.

That is good sound doctrine from the Cobden organ, one of the most extreme of free trade papers.

We think it is very doubtful policy to denounce the treaties with Germany and Belgium,—

This was said on the 14th June, and yet six weeks after the Government of England denounced these treaties, in opposition to the desire of the London "Morning Chronicle."

We think it is very doubtful policy to denounce the treaties with Germany and Belgium, and thereby risk losing a far greater volume of trade, in order to gain a slight advantage with Canada, whose trade must sooner or later by the laws of nature be largely concerned with American markets.

Of course, the Liberal organ in England had got its inspiration from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who were then parading the opinion that our trade was to be gobbled up by the United States, and now, as a matter of fact, we know that our exports to England are increasing enormously, and that our exports to the United States are shrinking in the same proportion.

Let me refer now to the statement made by the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) yesterday. I have never yet heard a more humiliating statement made with such ostentation. The Postmaster General spent an hour of the time of this House in trying to demonstrate that the Duke of Devonshire had repudiated the statements made by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), and in attempting that the Postmaster General made an absolute failure. Sir, as the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has shown, this letter of the Duke of Devonshire demonstrated the contrary of the contention of the Postmaster General. What are the facts with regard to that? On the 1st day of April the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) sitting in his seat, where he is to-day, writes a letter to the Duke of Devonshire, attributing certain statements to the leader of the Opposition. He knew that those statements were not a

Mr. WALLACE.

verbatim report; he knew that they were not an accurate report. I had the honour of being present and hearing the address delivered on that occasion by the leader of the Opposition. I was in company with the leader of the Opposition the next day, when he saw that report in the "Mail and Empire," and when he denounced it as a most inaccurate report of the speech, and it was.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Did he get it corrected?

Mr. WALLACE. Did he get a whole speech corrected?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Did not the hon. gentleman say last night that it was correct?

Mr. WALLACE. I say that the report of the speech in the "Mail and Empire" was denounced by the leader of the Opposition the next day, in my presence, as a most inaccurate report of his speech.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He endorsed it last night.

Mr. WALLACE. But what do we see the Postmaster General doing? Sitting at his desk and writing a letter. He could do it in such magnificent terms! Did he not buy a copy of Debrett's "Peerage" at the country's expense, so as to be able to address the Duke of Devonshire as "Your Grace," and "My Lord the Duke"? But, Sir, would it not have been a manly part, demanded by that courtesy which every gentleman in this House is entitled to expect from another, that he should have gone across the floor and said to the leader of the Opposition: Is that report in the "Mail and Empire" a correct report of what you stated on the 23rd of February? He did not do so. Do we not know that the leader of the Government has time and again repudiated speeches attributed to him on important matters, though they were verbatim reports in the newspapers? Here is a matter which the Postmaster General thought of sufficient importance to write to the Duke of Devonshire about, and he does not consult the leader of the Opposition to ascertain whether or not it is an accurate report; but in order to influence, and to influence improperly, as I consider, the course and the language of the Duke of Devonshire, he sends off that report. Such a thing is unknown in my recollection in this House. But, Sir, what may we expect from an hon. Postmaster General who did not think it beneath his dignity, or an improper course on his part, to take all the private and confidential letters that he could find in his department, addressed to his predecessor, and have them published in blue-book form, ignoring all those unwritten laws which are supposed to guide gentlemen in their intercourse with one another? I say that the Postmaster General, in this instance, has

just followed the course which he had previously taken with regard to the private correspondence of members of Parliament and others, which he found in his department when he entered office, and which had been left there by a previous Postmaster General.

Now, with reference to the question itself, what is its history? In my opinion, it stands just in this way. When the Liberal party came into power in 1896, in the first session their business was simply passing the Estimates, and they refused to transact any other business. Of that I do not complain. They wanted sufficient time to mature their policy. They met Parliament again in the early part of the year 1897. They were confronted with difficulties because of the mistakes they had made and the pledges they had given while in Opposition. They could not adopt a free trade policy, to which they had pledged themselves; they could not adopt a revenue tariff policy, to which they had pledged themselves, because a revenue tariff policy, pure and simple, has never been attempted to be put in force, either by hon. gentlemen opposite or by any other political party in this country, at any rate in recent years. They could not destroy the National Policy, because that policy was too strongly engrafted in the affections and the interests of the people of this country. It is true, in the first draft of the tariff which they submitted to this House in April, 1897, they injured, and would have destroyed, many Canadian industries; but, Sir, they were compelled by the force of public opinion, and by having a more accurate knowledge of the business and manufacturing affairs of this country, to adopt an entirely different fiscal policy in the tariff which they brought down a month later. That tariff came nearer to the National Policy than the previous one, which in many lines would have utterly destroyed the manufacturing industries of this country. They were confronted, I say, with a difficulty. They could not carry out the pledges they had made to the people. They could not destroy the National Policy, which they had threatened to do. What were they to do? They had to meet Parliament and have the appearance of doing something. Well, Sir, they met Parliament. They found in Great Britain and in Canada the Imperialistic idea, the Imperial sentiment, was growing. The idea of a closer conjunction between Great Britain and all her colonial possessions was gaining strength and power, not only here, but in the old land. Here was the Jubilee year, the culmination of those forces, and sentiments, and interests, which had been growing year by year; and these gentlemen said: Now is the time for preferential trade; preferential trade means a trade that will be reciprocally preferential; we will give advantages to Great Britain in our

markets, and Great Britain will give advantages to us in her markets. Sir, that sentiment was growing, and would have culminated in practical effects of usefulness, by which we would, I believe, by this time have secured a preference for our cereals, our provisions, our meats, in the markets of Great Britain. But, Sir, that did not suit these hon. gentlemen. Something had to be done during the session of 1897, and done quickly. Public sentiment was not sufficiently advanced in England, and the negotiations could not be started and carried into completion before the session of Parliament. So, they conceived the idea of riding on the wave of popular sentiment and saying: We will give to Great Britain a preference in the markets of Canada to the amount of one-fourth the duty, and we will not ask any preference from her. No greater mistake, Sir, could have been made. Nothing more suicidal to the interests of Canada could have been proposed than what the Premier suggested. He had just received the Cobden medal, and he said: "We do not ask or want any preference in your markets; we believe in free trade; what we are doing we are doing out of love and good-will to the motherland." These are his words:

I claim for the present Government of Canada that they have passed a resolution by which the products of Great Britain are admitted on the rate of their tariff at 12½ per cent, and next year at 25 per cent, reduction. This we have done, not asking any compensation. There is a class of our fellow citizens who ask that all such concessions should be made for a 'quid pro quo.' The Canadian Government has ignored all such sentiments. We have done it because we owe a debt of gratitude to Great Britain.

But, Sir, the Imperial Government had invited them to take a different course. It had said to them: "No suggestion will come from our side; but you say what you want, and we will meet you in no niggardly spirit." And, having read the speech of the right hon. the First Minister which was delivered in London in June, 1896, they were quite justified in coming to that conclusion. What did he say on that occasion? He said:

But I want to point out to you, my fellow countrymen, upon this occasion, that in addition to the many reasons which we have had up to the present time, there is now another reason which must strongly appeal to the sense of the Canadian people at large—preferential trade. That is a new idea having within the British Empire a preferential trade in all parts of that Empire.

It was not so very new; but it was new to Sir Wilfrid Laurier and to the party of which he was the leader, because they had always either opposed it openly, or given it the cold shoulder. But, Sir, it was endorsed by the Government of that day, by the Conservative party, and was not to them a new theory at all. He says:

Goods of English make would be admitted free to this country,—

You see, he was a free trader at that date. And, further, he says :

—and our goods would be admitted free to England as they are now, but in addition to that we would have for our goods a preference which would not be given to the goods of any other nation.

That is what the right hon. gentleman said in June, 1896, when asking the people to elect him to power. He was in duty bound to carry out, when he got into power, the very proposition upon which he based his right to govern the people of Canada. But he totally forgot the position he had taken. He went back on it because he found he could not adopt free trade, he could not destroy the National Policy. These hon. gentlemen said that preferential trade was popular in this country and Great Britain, and then they deliberately sacrificed the interests of the people of Canada in order to obtain a temporary advantage for themselves politically. The right hon. First Minister said then :

Now, the statesmen of Great Britain have thought that the Governments of the colonies have come to a time when a new step can be taken in their development. What is that? That there shall be a commercial agreement between England and the colonies. That practical statesman, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, has come to the conclusion that the time has come when it is possible to have within the bounds of the Empire a new step taken, which will give to the colonies in England a preference for their products over the products of other nations. What would be the possibilities of such a step if it was taken? We sell our goods in England. We send our wheat, our butter, our cheese, all our natural products, but there we have to compete with similar products from the United States, from Russia, and from other nations. Just see what a great advantage it would be to Canada, if the wheat, cheese and butter which we send to England, should be met in England with a preference over similar products of other nations. The possibilities are immense.

Well, Sir, the possibilities would be immense for Canada, because, as we need hardly point out, if the English Government will give a preference to the colonial products in the markets of Great Britain, even the smallest preference would give us an enormous advantage over the rival markets of the United States and all other foreign countries. Therefore, I say that the possibilities are so enormous that the Government should have strained every nerve to obtain this preference. But what do we find? We find the right hon. First Minister getting up and spending an hour or more in trying to demonstrate that the thing is impossible. He said in 1896 that the thing could be done and pledged himself to use his best efforts to have it done and that it was just in the line of Imperial policy. We find that the hon. Postmaster General

Mr. WALLACE.

and the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Bell) take the same line as the right hon. First Minister, although the hon. member for Prince Edward Island did not go quite so far in that direction. But all these gentlemen, who are the only gentlemen who have spoken on this question on the opposite side, have endeavoured to demonstrate that nothing can be done. Three years have elapsed since the First Minister made that speech to the people of Canada; two years have passed since the preferential tariff was introduced. I would like to ask the members of the Government where they have uttered a single word or written a single line or made the slightest effort for the promotion of this preferential trade between Great Britain and the Dominion? They cannot point to a single effort made by them in those two years. Why? Because they are not enamoured of the idea, because they are still looking to the country to the south of us, because they have still apparently that hostile feeling towards British trade.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. Oh, no.

Mr. WALLACE. The Prime Minister said he would prefer the Yankee dollar to a British shilling. That expressed the feeling of the Prime Minister then, and we have never heard him repudiate that sentiment since. And when the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Featherston) gets up and says "Oh, no," he seems to have forgotten the facts of history. I say that these gentlemen are not able to point to a single line or a single act in favour of this policy. They were to have had a conference, to go on a commission, to do something to promote this preferential trade. The right hon. First Minister said in Toronto: We cannot get everything at once, we must go step by step at a time, we have given preferential trade, we have got them to denounce the German and Belgian treaties, and he added that if we had asked for more at that time, we would not have got it but must advance step by step. I would ask him to state what further step they have taken, what effort they have made? They cannot mention a single effort, and they do not appear to want to make any effort to get preferential trade with Great Britain. But they are making attempts to get reciprocity with the United States. Is it possible that for this they are sacrificing the interests of Canada, the interests of that Imperial trade, which would be of most enormous advantage to Canada, because put it alongside of any reciprocity treaty you could possibly get from the United States it would not compare in comparison with the preference in the British markets, as that would mean increasing the value of every acre of land in Canada and the cultivation of millions of acres of our Canadian North-west that to-day are lying idle? The possibilities are so enormous that it staggers one to contemplate them. Yet in their vain efforts to obtain reciprocity with the

United States, these gentlemen are not only neglecting our interests with Great Britain, they are not only failing to grasp that British trade which we ought to make every effort to get hold of, but they are pursuing a will-o'-the-wisp in attempting to get reciprocity with the United States. I have no hesitation in saying that the people of the United States are never going to give us a reciprocity treaty that will be beneficial to the country.

There are loyal men in the ranks of the Government, there are men in those ranks who believe, as we do, that an effort to obtain preferential trade with Great Britain should be made. I have here a speech delivered by the Hon. Geo. W. Ross, the Minister of Education for Ontario. His speech has the right ring. It has the patriot sentiment. It has that sentiment that the Conservative party believed in. Here is what he says :

I see no reason why Canadians should hesitate to look to Great Britain for some encouragement and response on her part. True she admits our products free of duty, but then she confers a similar favour upon foreign nations.

Have we not a right to expect that her own subjects, though living abroad, will be treated more favourably than the Magyar or the Russian, or the citizen of the United States? The personal and political privileges of her subjects, even under a foreign flag, are protected against encroachments. Why should not the commercial interests of her own subjects under the same flag, though separated by a few leagues of water, be equally the subjects of her protection?

He says further :

There was still more significant evidence, in the denunciation of the German and Belgian treaties, of the desire of Great Britain to improve and further colonial trade, particularly with Canada. It declared that the question could only be made an important issue, and thus separated from all commercial complications. The watchword would not be "free trade" or "protection," but the unification and the consolidation of the Empire, and on this view of the question it is not hard to predict what the attitude of the British Empire League should be.

I shall not dilate to-day upon the bonds that should draw the various portions of the Empire closer together, but shall simply point to the commercial aspect of the question, and point to the fact that you cannot do anything more likely to draw two countries together, politically and sentimentally, than by cultivating between them a commerce reciprocally advantageous to both and injurious to neither.

But the hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Bell) said—and so does the right hon. the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—Do you suppose that Great Britain is going to impose a duty on her corn and increase the price of the loaf to the consumer in Great Britain? Well, Sir, public opinion is changing in Great Britain. A few years ago free trade was accepted without question as the policy of both political parties. To-day, what

do we find? The hon. member for East Prince says that Great Britain has never, in recent years, adopted any protectionist idea. I beg to differ. The hon. gentleman mentions the case of the countervailing duties. Why, Mr. Speaker, a committee of the House of Commons, of which Baron de Worms was chairman, reported in favour of these countervailing duties on sugar. This was manifestly in accordance with the sentiment of the British people. The hon. member for East Prince says that these duties were adopted in India, it is true, and were authorized by the Imperial authorities in England because it is the policy of Great Britain to allow her dependencies to take their own course. But nothing could be done with regard to these countervailing duties without Great Britain's consent, and the very fact that the House of Commons recognized that it was to the advantage of her great eastern dependency that these countervailing duties should be imposed, was an acquiescence in a protectionist scheme and a proof that the protectionist spirit is growing. The old Cobdenite theories are utterly vanishing in Great Britain. They are judging every question that comes up to-day by the standard of what is best for the people of the Empire. And to-day the people of England see with dismay that Germany is bringing in her manufactured goods, and that the United States, perhaps the most highly protected country in the world, has been supplying Great Britain with large quantities of iron and manufactures of iron, and that although they do not supply so much to-day it is only for the reason that they are utterly unable to supply their own home market. The demand has grown so enormously that they cannot supply it, and so they do not seek to compete in Great Britain for the prices offered in that country. Take just one example. About a year ago, pig iron was selling for \$11 a ton; to-day it has gone up to \$20 a ton. And yet the cost of production is about the same; there can be very little difference, because the wages and the cost of the raw material are both about what they were. But this increase in price shows the enormous demand. The manufacturers of the United States are working to supply their own market, when, a year or two ago, they were invading the markets of Great Britain. I say that Great Britain is looking with dismay upon the invasion of their market in woollen goods, cotton goods, silks, manufactures of iron and many other manufactures, by the producers of countries that are highly protected, such as the United States, Germany, France and Belgium. The duty of this Government is plain—it is to adopt the resolution proposed by the leader of the Opposition, and not merely to be satisfied with the adoption of the formal resolution, but to go on and carry out the spirit of it, to use their best efforts to bring about preferential trade. This they have failed to do for the past two years. They have been supinely

resting on their oars. They have been hostile or indifferent to the best interests of the country; they have been engaged in plundering this country, in putting through deals of the most iniquitous character, in bulldozing electors in the various constituencies, in increasing the expenditure until now it is far over fifty millions of dollars, and exceeds by more than ten millions that in any year under their predecessors. This Government which has been doing these things, which has thus been neglecting the welfare of Canada, should give place to a Government that is loyal, that is patriotic, that is economical and devoted to the best interests of the country.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Mr. Speaker, as I am an ardent protectionist at all times, it may seem strange to hon. gentlemen opposite that I should rise to support the present motion, especially as, from the remarks made by hon. gentlemen on the other side, they seem to think that preferential trade and protection could not be made to work together. Though we have arrived at a late period of the session, yet I realize that, under the present circumstances, the time of this House is well spent in discussing the important motion which has been placed in your hand by the hon. leader of the Opposition. The Liberal party have placed upon the statute-books of this country a policy of preferential trade, but it is not the kind of preferential trade that we on this side of the House have been asking for and that we desire. What we want is a preferential trade that will be mutual as between Canada and the mother country. I may say I have no special love for even a mutual preferential tariff, but if the Government insists on retaining the existing preferential duty, then I think the proposition before the House is a self-evident one. Its importance is so apparent that I do not consider argument necessary to convince this House or this country of the propriety of introducing it. We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that we now have a preferential tariff; the right hon. leader of this House has said that we have "touched the heart of John Bull."

But we want to do more than touch his heart, we want to get something in return for what we have given. We want a mutual preference, one that will benefit this country as well as one that will benefit Great Britain. In return for the preference that we are giving Great Britain now, we ask in this resolution, and nothing less will be satisfactory to this side of the House, nor, I believe, to the people of this country—we ask that in return we be given a preference on the agricultural products of this country. We want a preference on our wheat, on our oats, on our barley, on our beef, and on all other products of the farm, in return for what we are giving. We want something that will enhance the value of our farms, something that will promote im-

Mr. WALLACE.

migration, something that will enable us to people the vast wheat areas of the west, in the words of the resolution moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition. The kind of preference we want is the kind of preference that the First Minister, when courting the electors of Ontario two or three years ago, advocated in London, Toronto, and elsewhere, not the kind of preference that was advocated or approved by the First Minister when he set his foot upon the shores of England. He tells us that we have touched the heart of John Bull, but the pockets of the farmers of Canada, of the working people of Canada, by reason of the preferential tariff, have been touched injuriously. Duties have been increased on many articles that are of every day requirement and consumption by the people of this country. Our markets have been invaded by free agricultural products from a foreign country. Free corn to the extent of 19,770,000 bushels, was admitted into this country last year, to the immense injury of the farming community, who, in the province of Ontario, of corn alone, produced \$10,198,452 worth in 1897. Our country has been invaded by wheat at a reduced duty, it has been invaded by flour at a reduced duty to the injury of our agriculturists, and nothing of advantage is coming to us in return. Besides this, our German market has been destroyed by reason of the discriminating duties imposed by that country on account of the action of Canada in giving a preference to Great Britain. On our pease they have placed a discriminative duty of 3 3-10 cents, on oats 4 4-10 cents, on wheat 9 7-10 cents per bushel, almost absolutely excluding from the German market these products of our farmers. We say that the farmer's burdens have not been reduced by the preferential tariff, that on the contrary, they have been increased. We were told by the First Minister last night that we cannot have preferential trade and retain protection. I ask why? Canada has given preferential trade to Great Britain, and still we have retained the protective principle. On the other hand, Great Britain does not need to give up protection to obtain preferential trade, because protection does not prevail in England. Some years ago we had a preference in the English market, where protection did not prevail, in the shape of allowing our cattle to be imported freely into that country, whilst cattle from the United States and other foreign countries were scheduled. Why could not the same thing be given us to-day? A small duty on the natural products of foreign countries imposed by Great Britain would give an immense advantage to the people of Canada and the other British colonies. I care not how this preference is given by Great Britain so long as it is given; but when we have given a preference to the people of Great Britain in the markets of Canada, I say we have a right

to demand in return a preference to the producing classes of this country. Great Britain is spending year by year millions upon millions of treasure, and the blood of her best sons, in order to find markets in the uncivilized parts of the world. Great Britain, if she chose, instead of putting a duty on food supplies, might give a bonus to the products of Canada, thus giving us a preference without enhancing the value of those commodities to the people of Great Britain. We say Canada has no preference in Great Britain at the present time; and therefore if the preferential tariff that we have enacted does not give us advantages at home by enabling us to purchase our supplies cheaper than we did before, then we have no preference whatever. I purpose to examine into this phase of the question, and in doing so I will be obliged to quote considerably from the Trade and Navigation Returns; because I consider that if our farmers are not relieved by the enactment of the preferential tariff, which we have upon our statute-book, then it is our duty at once to adopt this resolution and urge upon our Government to endeavour to secure from the British Government such a preference in their markets as will grant us the relief we are entitled to, and enable us to settle up our wheat areas in the western country, to promote immigration, and advance the value of the farms in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I intend to quote from the Trade and Navigation Returns to show that the people of this country are not benefited by the preferential tariff which we have at the present time, and in doing so I will take as examples some of the most common articles of consumption in this country, something that enters into the consumption of every household, articles like cotton goods. Under the general tariff last year we imported cotton fabrics, printed, dyed or coloured, of the value of \$709,596, paying a duty of \$248,368. Under the preferential tariff, we imported \$1,719,515 worth, paying a duty of \$526,610, showing a total duty of \$774,978. Now, had these goods come in under the tariff that existed prior to the adoption of this preferential tariff, the duty, instead of being \$774,978, would only have been \$728,733; or, in one year, on the article of coloured cotton fabrics alone, we paid an increased duty of \$46,245, an increase of 6 per cent in the duty instead of a decrease of 12½ per cent on the duty, as we were promised by the advocates of this preferential tariff. But hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that the preferential tariff was not in full force. Had the full 25 per cent reduction been in force, what would have been the result? We would have paid under the general tariff \$35,480, and under the preferential tariff \$64,481, or a decrease for that year of \$29,001. The decrease is only 4 per cent, instead of a decrease of 25 per cent, as we

were promised by the advocates of this preferential tariff. We must bear in mind that there were other countries exporting to this country under the preferential tariff besides Great Britain, and if we were to take the imports from these countries into consideration, it would only show a decrease of 3 per cent, instead of 25 per cent. Taking the first two years of the operation of this tariff into consideration, we find that the increase of duty in the first year is \$46,245, and the decrease in the second year on the same imports would be \$29,001, showing an increase in the two years of \$17,243, or 2½ per cent of an increase in duty, instead of a decrease of 25 per cent, as was promised by hon. gentlemen in introducing this tariff. Practically, it would be three years before the people of Canada derived any benefit whatever from the preferential tariff as applied to cottons, printed, dyed or coloured. Of the article of cotton clothing under the general tariff we imported \$178,382 worth, and paid a duty of \$62,431. Under the preferential tariff we imported \$120,927 worth, and paid a duty of \$33,031, or a total duty of \$99,462. Had these goods come in under the former duty, we would have paid \$95,779, thereby increasing the duty under the preferential tariff by \$3,683, an increase of 3¾ per cent, and not a decrease, as was promised by hon. gentlemen opposite, of 12½ per cent. Had the full preferential tariff been in force, we would have paid under the general tariff \$4,459 of an increase, and a decrease under the preferential tariff of \$7,558, showing, on the whole, a decrease of \$3,098, or a simple decrease of 3 per cent of the duty, and not of 25 per cent, as claimed by hon. gentlemen opposite. Assuming, as I have said before, that the imports of 1898-99 would be the same as those of 1897-98, we would have an increase still for the two years of \$585 on the article of cotton clothing alone, an increase of nearly 1 per cent of the duty, instead of a decrease of 25 per cent. What I contend is, that the advantages that we gain under the preferential tariff do not at all compensate us for the loss we sustain by reason of the loss of employment, the loss to the farmers of this country in supplying those who labour in the factories in producing what they require. In gray unbleached cotton fabrics in 1897-98 we imported under the general tariff \$29,892 worth, paying a duty of \$7,472. Under the preferential tariff we imported \$14,839 worth, paying a duty of \$3,248, or a total duty on gray unbleached cottons of \$10,720. The duty under the old tariff would have been only \$10,004, showing an increase actually paid on gray unbleached cottons, an article entering into the consumption of every household, rich or poor, of \$656, or an increase of 6 per cent, instead of a decrease of 12½ per cent. We are told that the full preferential tariff was not in force. Had it been, the increase under the general tariff would have been

\$747, and the decrease under the preferential tariff \$556, showing an actual increase, with the full preferential tariff in force, of \$191. Therefore, in the article of gray cottons, which is an article of clothing for the people of this country, an article that enters perhaps as largely into the consumption of every household as any article that we could think of, there was an increase of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent in the duty, and not a decrease of 25 per cent. Yet hon. gentlemen would tell us that we have the preferential tariff already, and that nothing more is necessary. The preferential tariff that we have operates against the best interests of the people; it discriminates against the consuming population and the workingmen of this country, who are compelled to pay higher duties under that tariff on such articles of clothing than under the old tariff, without getting any advantage in return. We are taxed above and beyond what we were when, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, we were bled white with taxation. The same thing applies to cotton batting. I have taken several articles entering into the daily consumption of the farmer and the workingmen. Under the general tariff we paid in duties on cotton batting, bats and wadding, and goods of that kind, \$1,917, while under the preferential tariff we paid \$40, making a total duty of \$1,957. Under the former tariff we would have paid \$1,767, or an increased duty of \$190, an increase of 10 per cent duty, and not a decrease of  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, as was promised by hon. gentlemen opposite. Had the full preferential tariff been in force at that time, the increase under the general tariff on cotton batting, bats and wadding would have been \$192, and the decrease under the preferential only \$7, or an increase of  $9\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, if the full preferential tariff had been in force, instead of a decrease of 25 per cent. I will give another illustration. I have dealt with lines of cheap goods. I will now take an article of a more expensive character. In a country like Canada, where we have to wear light clothing in the summer and warm clothing in the winter, furs are just as essential amongst the farming community in the colder season as cheaper and lighter clothing is in the summer. Under the general tariff we imported in 1897-98 \$29,870 worth of furs, comprising caps, muffs, coats, cloaks, &c., on which we paid a duty of \$8,962. Under the preferential tariff we imported \$35,219 worth of furs, paying a duty of \$9,245, or a total duty of \$18,207. Had these been imported under the tariff of the former Government that was in force before this preferential tariff was introduced, we would have paid only \$16,272, showing an increased duty of \$1,935 on furs alone, or an increase of  $10\frac{1}{2}$  per cent duty, and not a reduction of  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, as promised by hon. gentlemen opposite. But they say that the full preferential tariff

Mr. HENDERSON.

was not in force. If the preferential tariff had been in force, we would have paid under the general tariff \$1,493 of an increase, and a decrease under the preferential tariff of \$880, making an increase, all told, under the preferential tariff on furs alone of \$613, or an increase of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent in the duty, and not a reduction of 25 per cent, as was promised by the advocates of a preferential tariff. Should we not demand a mitigation of this loss to the people of this country, and insist that they should be entitled to secure from Great Britain something in return for the preference that we have given them in our markets, under which, instead of being an advantage to us, we are actually sustaining a loss? Now, who gets the benefit of the preferential duty? We are told that the consumer does, and the Minister of Customs has told us time and again of the large amount he has saved to the consumers of this country. Let me inquire into that for a moment. I contend, Sir, that the consumer does not get the benefit of the duty on low-priced goods, and neither does it go into the treasury of this country. To my mind, the only man who gets the benefit of the preferential tariff under this law is the exporter from Great Britain, or the importer or trader in this country. I say, Sir, that it will remain a standing blunder on the part of the Government that they ever enacted this preferential clause. Let me illustrate. Take one yard of print, an article of common use, which costs in England 3 pence 3 farthings per yard, and which, when laid down in this country, would cost about 10 cents at the ordinary rate of 60 per cent advance on the sterling. The reduction of duty on 3 pence 3 farthings would be a shade over one-quarter of a cent on a yard of print. This was formerly sold at, say, 12 cents a yard, and do hon. gentlemen opposite claim that that yard of cloth would be sold any cheaper under the preferential rate? No, Sir; that article, which was sold three years ago at 12 cents, to-day is sold at 12 cents, and not at  $11\frac{1}{2}$  cents. Take gray cotton, sold in England at 2 pence 1 farthing per yard, and laid down in this country, duty and all other expenses paid, at 6 cents per yard. The reduction on 2 pence farthing at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent would be one-sixth of 1 per cent, and does any one suppose for a moment that the consumer of gray cotton in Canada is going to buy his cotton at one-sixth of a cent less per yard than he paid before? No; if the former price was 7 cents per yard, the present price is 7 cents. The consumer gets no benefit from such a preferential rate, and the only man who is benefited is the importer or the middleman on the large amount of their importations. The Canadian manufacturer is a loser, inasmuch as he loses the profits on manufacturing these goods; the Canadian artisan is a loser, inasmuch as he loses his wages to the extent of the in-

creased goods which are imported into this country; the Canadian farmer loses the supply of his products to the workingman employed in our Canadian manufactures; and, consequently, it is only the importer who benefits to any degree by the preferential law which we have now on our statute-books. This preferential tariff was intended, no doubt, originally to discriminate in favour of Great Britain, but as it discriminates against Canadian workmen and Canadian farmers, it must either be wiped from the statute-book or we must do something to counteract its evil effects, by getting for the people of Canada a preference in the markets of Great Britain, which will, in the words of the resolution, enable us to people the vast wheat areas of the great Northwest, enhance our farm values, promote immigration, and increase the value of the products of the country.

Now, Sir, so much for the character of the preferential clause at present enacted in our tariff. I realize keenly that the masses of our people do not receive from it the benefits which they ought to receive, and I hold it to be the duty of this Government to seize upon the opportunity which now offers, to support the resolution before the House, and to endeavour to give effect to that resolution by getting our products a preference in the markets of Great Britain, in order to compensate for the loss we have sustained by reason of the present preferential clause. This we ask, and this, if granted, will without doubt be of benefit to the country. Last night we had an hon. gentleman put up in this House to endeavour to prove that an advantage had accrued to the farmers of Canada by reason of the preferential tariff. I do not believe that I would have spoken in this debate, had it not been for the broad statements made by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), but I feel it my duty to point out to this House, and through this House to the country, that so far as the agricultural classes are concerned, in enabling them to purchase their implements and necessities of life at a cheaper rate than before, the preferential tariff is simply a delusion. I shall illustrate that by a few quotations from the Trade and Navigation Returns. When the farmer in the spring of the year buys a plough to plough his land, he finds that the duty on his plough has not been reduced—20 per cent before, 20 per cent now; \$32,315 paid in duty on ploughs last year. There is no preferential reduction on ploughs, but spades and shovels were reduced from 38 per cent to 35 per cent, and the farmer only by adopting the methods of a hundred years ago, and digging his land with a spade, instead of ploughing it can get the advantage of the preferential tariff or reduction of 3 per cent. The plough, an indispensable article to the farmer, has not been reduced in duty, and it does not come under the preferential

rate, because last year only seven ploughs were imported into Canada under the preferential tariff. Harrows are 20 per cent now, and were 20 per cent before; and we paid last year \$7,232 duty on harrows. Cultivators, 20 per cent before, and 20 per cent now; we paid \$2,829 duty on cultivators last year, and only fourteen came in under the preferential tariff. Seed-drills, 20 per cent now, and 20 per cent before; we paid in duty on them \$10,876, and none came in under the preferential tariff. On the harrow, the cultivator and the seed-drill the farmer received no benefit from the preferential tariff, a tariff which gives him no countervailing advantage in the markets of Great Britain. But garden rakes and hoes have been reduced from 35 to 25 per cent, and if the farmer adopts the method of putting in his grain with garden rakes and hoes, he can have a slight advantage. There has been no reduction in the duty on mowing machines, an article that the farmer wants, not only in Ontario, but largely in the province of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories. But, says the advocate of preferential trade, you do not look at the whole question. You must remember that although mowing machines were 20 per cent before and 20 per cent now, scythes and snaths have been reduced 10 per cent. But these hon. gentlemen opposite who argue so, are under a wrong impression, if they think that farmers nowadays cut their hay with scythes. If they want to give the farmer any benefit, they must give him that benefit on the mowing machine, which he uses now, and not on the scythe, which went out of use many years ago. As if the Government were determined that the farmers should have no benefit from the reduction of duty on scythes and snaths, they actually increased the duty on grindstones from 12½ per cent to 25 per cent. The same applies to self-binders, on which the duty was 20 per cent then and it is 20 per cent now—no reduction whatever. Only 15 self-binders came into Canada last year under the preferential tariff. On binders \$81,464 of duty was paid. But the farmers were told that the duty on sickles and reaping-hooks was reduced 10 per cent, as if they cut their grain with reaping-hooks, instead of self-binders. What a farce it is to speak of the farmers being benefited under this preferential tariff simply because the duty on sickles and reaping-hooks has been reduced from 35 per cent to 25 per cent. We find the same thing all through the tariff. Take the horse-rake, a modern instrument used by the farmer; last year we imported 1,973 horse rakes, not one of which came in under the preferential tariff, and on these the duty is the same now as it was before; whereas on hand rakes, costing 7 cents apiece, the duty has been reduced from 35 per cent to 25 per cent. Then, the duty on lawn mow-

ers was 35 per cent before and it is 35 per cent now. There is no reduction on the article which the farmer wants to buy to trim his lawn, while there is 10 per cent reduction on the sickle, which he does not want to buy. If the farmer wants the modern implement he is obliged to pay the same duty as before. We were told last night in a boasting way, that barbed wire was put on the free list. I grant it; but with farmers of this country barbed wire has largely gone out of use; no good farmer uses it. While the Government takes the duty off the kind of fencing the farmer does not use, they retain the duty on the kind he does use. All through this preferential tariff, from beginning to end, the great agricultural classes of the country have not been considered; and hon. gentlemen opposite oppose a proposition which asks for a preference to be given to the products of Canada in the mother country in return for the loss the people of this country are put to every year by reason of this preferential tariff. The same thing applies to articles of household use. For instance, a clothes-wringer, which costs \$2.50, formerly paid 30 per cent, now it pays 35 per cent, while the old washtub and board are allowed to remain at the old rate, 20 per cent. The modern article, which is wanted, is increased in duty, and the article which has largely gone out of use is reduced or allowed to remain at the old rate. Almost every farmer uses a cutter, not only for pleasure, but as an actual necessity. In the North-west, I fancy, nearly every farmer requires a cutter for driving over the prairie. He also requires to be clothed in furs; his wife requires a fur cloak; he needs fur mitts and fur robes to protect him from the cold. I cannot fancy a farmer of that country supporting the Government opposite, who have put on his cutter a 5 per cent increase, on his fur coat and his mitts a 5 per cent increase, on his wife's fur cloak a 5 per cent increase, and on his fur robes a 5 per cent increase. This is what they call a preferential tariff; but this is not the kind of preferential tariff we on this side of the House want. We want a preferential tariff that will help Canada—not one that will impose additional burdens on the people of this country for the benefit of the artisans and workmen of England. The farmer in Manitoba who drives into town in his cutter on which the duty is increased 5 per cent, with robes on which the duty is increased 5 per cent, and with an overcoat and mitts on which the duty is increased 5 per cent, perhaps sees a bank clerk walking down the street bent on pleasure with a pair of skates slung over his shoulder on which the duty has been reduced from 40 per cent down to 35 per cent, with a further reduction under the preferential tariff. Fur goods are higher to-day under the preferential tariff, even with the full 25 per cent reduction, than they were before. Not

Mr. HENDERSON.

a single cutter came in last year under the preferential tariff. Go into a farmer's household and see how this one-sided preferential tariff works. An organ is an instrument which you will see in nearly every farmhouse, but pianos not so frequently, as they are a luxury more largely confined to people in cities and towns. On the organ the duty is 30 per cent, as it was before, whereas the duty on the piano of the rich man in the city, is reduced from 35 per cent to 30 per cent. Take the matter of transportation, and see how the preferential tariff applies. Every farmer wants a wagon; he cannot do without it; it is his means of transportation. I am not aware that any wagons came into Canada last year under the preferential tariff. The Government knew quite well that wagons would not come in under that tariff, so that the farmer still pays 25 per cent on his wagons the same as before. On the other hand, how do the Government treat the railways? We have had complaints session after session that the great railway monopolies are grinding the hearts out of the people of this country; but while this paternal Government, which professes to be looking after the interest of the farmer, imposes 25 per cent duty on his wagons, the same as before, they came down handsomely to the railway companies, allowing them to import their fish-plates and tie-plates at a reduction of 20 per cent on what they paid before and their spikes at a reduction of 33½ per cent from the previous duty. Engines and boilers are put at a reduced duty, and so on. The railway companies can obtain a reduction, but the poor farmer who must have a wagon is told that he must not benefit by any reduction on it by reason of the preferential tariff. I would not find so much fault if we had a preference on the other side. If we had a preference in England in return for the disadvantages under which we labour, I would be willing to put up with a great deal of the inconsistencies of the present preferential tariff; but we see how carefully the Government have overlooked the interests of the great producing classes of this country. Take a list of the articles, for instance, that are an absolute necessity in every farmer's household:

Tinware—25 per cent under the old tariff; 25 per cent now.

Wooden pails—20 per cent under the old tariff; 20 per cent now.

Tubs and churns—20 per cent under the old tariff; 20 per cent now.

Brooms—20 per cent under the old tariff; 20 per cent now.

Cotton bags—20 per cent under the old tariff; 20 per cent now.

Wheelbarrows—30 per cent under the old tariff; 30 per cent now.

Furniture—30 per cent under the old tariff; 30 per cent now.

Road-scrappers—30 per cent under the old tariff; 30 per cent now.

Even take the boots and shoes that the far-

mer wears, and the rate is the same now as before, 25 per cent. So that on articles of absolute necessity in every farmer's household, there is no reduction, and on few indeed of these is there any advantage to the farmer by reason of the preferential tariff.

Now, take other articles that are of absolute necessity, and we find the reduction so small that no perceptible advantage can accrue to the consumer :

	Old. p.c.	New. p.c.
Table cutlery—		
A reduction of 2½ per cent....	32½	30
Saws—		
A reduction of 2½ per cent....	32½	30
Locks—		
A reduction of 2½ per cent....	32½	30
Curry combs—		
A reduction of 2½ per cent....	32½	30
Butts and hinges—		
A reduction of 2½ per cent....	32½	30
Stoves—		
A reduction of 2½ per cent....	32½	30

The wall paper which adorns the walls of the farmer's house is reduced by 4 per cent. On such common articles of common daily use, as hammers, picks, and axes, the reduction is from 35 per cent to 30 per cent—the smallest possible reduction that the Government could make on articles that come under the preferential tariff. Take saws, for example, on which there is a reduction of 2½ per cent, we imported last year \$81,148 worth, of which only \$3,613 worth came in under the preferential tariff, the United States alone sending to this country \$76,643 worth. Axes, on which there is a reduction of 10 per cent, we only imported \$8 worth from Great Britain, while we imported \$36,579 worth from the United States which paid the full duty. On locks, of which we imported \$97,168 worth, only \$8,868 worth came from Great Britain, and \$85,233 worth from the United States. The same remark applies to adzes, picks, hammers, and other tools. Of these goods \$37,032 were imported under the general tariff, but only \$565 worth came under the preferential clause. Of stoves, we imported \$88,778 worth, and only \$679 worth came under the preferential clause. Butts and hinges we imported to the extent of \$14,368 worth, and of these only \$323 worth came under the preferential clause. Boots and shoes we imported \$360,194 worth under the general tariff, and \$14,685 worth got the benefit of the preferential tariff. Harness leather, an article required by every farmer, we imported to the extent of \$5,443 worth under the general tariff, and \$359 worth came under the preferential tariff. Pronged forks, an article of every-day requirements, we imported to the number of 58,098, and only 50 came under the preferential clause. Wire nails, an article of every-day consumption, we imported under the general tariff \$6,907 worth, and not a dollar's worth under the preferential tariff, showing that the smallest advantage possible comes to the consumer

of those articles under the preferential tariff, whereas the reduction on many of them, under the ordinary clause of the tariff, is very small indeed. Who gets the benefit? Does the consumer gain anything on the reduction of these articles even in the general tariff? Take a saw which costs 60 cents, the reduction in duty would be a cent and a half. Would that saw be sold at 73½ cents instead of 75 cents? I do not think it would. Take curry combs, the reduction in duty is half a cent, would that article be sold at 24½ instead of 25 cents? Hammers cost 40 cents and the reduction in duty is only two cents. No one will say they are sold any cheaper because of that reduction. On a stove which cost \$25, the reduction of duty of 2½ per cent by this paternal Government which claims to be a friend of the farmer, would be 50 cents. It would still be sold at \$25 as before. The reduction of duty on all these articles, whether they come under the preferential clause or not, is so small indeed that it is no advantage to the consumer, but is a great injury to the manufacturing industries of the country. Every farmer has to buy a wagon, and on that the duty remains the same, but every farmer does not want to buy a potato digger, yet this is one of the articles that is being held aloft to us as an evidence of the great reduction in duty under the new tariff. One of the great advantages claimed for this preferential tariff is that a reduction has been made on potato diggers, post hole diggers, manure spreaders, weeders, hay-tedders, and a number of other articles. Last night we had a list repeated over and over again to show the immense advantage accruing to the farmers by reason of the reductions in duty. But while every farmer needs a wagon, on which there is no reduction of duty, every farmer does not use a potato digger. Last year only ten were imported under the general tariff and not one under the preferential tariff. Perhaps on an average only one implement of this kind is used for every two counties. Then there is the post hole digger, an article which costs about 60 cents. How the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance and other hon. gentlemen on that side have boasted of the great advantage to farmers by reason of the reduction of duty on post hole diggers. Well, as I said before, one of these implements cost 60 cents, and last year we imported under the general tariff 231 of them and none under the preferential tariff. Then we have had held out to us the immense advantages that have accrued to the farmers under the one-sided preferential tariff, from the fact that manure spreaders were reduced in duty from 25 per cent to 20 per cent. But I find that last year we imported only two manure spreaders under the general tariff and none under the preferential tariff. I have lived in an agricultural county all my life, and I never saw one. Very few of these implements are used in the province of Ontario,

and perhaps you would not find more than one in the province of Quebec. Weeders is another of these articles. We imported last year 88 under the general tariff and none under the preferential tariff. Where then is the saving to the farmer on that article? In fact scarcely any of these articles, on which there is a reduction, is used. The duty under this preferential tariff, is reduced on the articles which the farmer does not use, but those which he must have, on his wagons, and cutters and so on, the Government have carefully picked out and not included in the reduction of duty, and only on the articles that our farmers use in a very limited way is there any reduction. On articles of every-day consumption, such as cottons, woollens, the farming implements I have spoken of such, as ploughs, drills, cultivators, mowing machines, reaping machines, and all these more costly implements the Government were careful to give no relief. The latter do not come in under the preferential tariff, and consequently there is not relief as regards them to the farmers. Are we wrong then in saying that when this country is invaded by millions of bushels of foreign grain placed on the free list when the duty on flour is reduced, when the farmer is robbed of his farm, are we wrong in asking the Government to stand by the great producing classes of this country and demand from the mother country a preference in her markets in return for the preference we give her.

Hay-tedders are reduced from 35 per cent to 25 per cent. Last year there were imported under the general tariff 1,793 hay-tedders, and under the preferential tariff, none. I suppose there would be an average of one of these implements, costing about 44 cents, for every two townships. As I said before, this being an article not in general use, this Government very generously reduced the duty 10 per cent. Grain crushers were reduced from 35 per cent to 25 per cent. One of these implements costs about \$18.50. Under the general tariff last year we imported two, and under the preferential tariff, we imported none. You can see how much advantage accrued to the farmers by the reductions on grain crushers. Then we come to the windmills. We heard the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) last night telling about the immense advantage to the farmers in the reduction on windmills from 30 per cent to 25 per cent. One would suppose from what the hon. gentleman said that every farmer had a windmill. Last year 378 were imported under the general tariff, and none under the preferential tariff. How many farmers have windmills? One in every twenty. I doubt if there is more than one in every thirty. The use of them is very limited indeed. But the old rule applies, and the article that the farmer does not buy or that is not in general use is reduced by five or ten per cent, but the

Mr. HENDERSON.

farm wagon is not reduced, the mowing machine is not reduced, while the scythe is reduced, the binder is not—and the reaping-hook is reduced, an article that the farmer does not want, that has gone out of use fifty years ago, just as this Government will soon go out of use—these are the articles on which this paternal Government are giving the preference and not the articles required for every-day consumption. The time has come, I say, when we should raise our voice and demand that some redress should be obtained for the great producing classes of this country; and if they are to be taxed, if they are to be “bled white” by increasing the duties on cottons and woollens and furs, on agricultural implements and cutters, articles, that are used by farmers generally, while there is a trifling reduction on what they do not buy except in limited quantities—if that is the kind of law we are to have in this country, if that is the preferential tariff we are to have, the time has come for the people to rise in their might and demand that the Government of this country should at once insist that the mother country should give us a preference in return for the preference we give to her. Feed cutters were reduced from 35 per cent to 25 per cent. Last year we imported \$12 worth under the general tariff, and none under the preferential tariff. What a boon to the farmers of this country the preferential tariff is.

Now, I propose to look for a moment at the other side of the shield. We have seen how this affects the farmers. The list of articles used by the farmers has been very carefully gone over. I am surprised the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) can approve of it. Let us see now what consideration is shown to other people, not the great producing classes of this country. For instance, tower clocks are reduced from 30 per cent to 25 per cent. Electric light carbons are reduced from 44 per cent to 35 per cent, the larger ones from 25 per cent to 15 per cent. The farmers do not use electricity, and that accounts for the reduction. Then, you take seamless tubing for bicycles, reduced from 15 per cent to 10 per cent. The farmers have got a little the start of the Government in this, because they are beginning to use bicycles. I suppose, however, the Government did not know this two years ago, otherwise this material for bicycles would not have been reduced. Then, we find a reduction on nitro-glycerine of from 4 cents to 3 cents. Why, even the safe-cracker gets an advantage under this Government; every class gets consideration except the farmers. Composition metal for the manufacture of jewellery is reduced from 25 per cent to 10 per cent, a reduction of 60 per cent. I do not mean to say that the farmers' wives in this country do not wear jewellery, I am glad to know they do, notwithstanding the extortion of this preferential tariff. But the Government are very careful to see that this

composition metal is reduced by this large percentage. Then we come to salad oil. I am a farmer's son, and I never saw any salad oil in the house in which I was brought up. We did not indulge in these luxuries, and I do not think they are indulged in as a rule by farmers. The farmers live as comfortably and as happily as other classes of the community, but they do not have salad oil on the table at every meal—that is rather for the dinners given by Ministers of the Crown. This is reduced from 30 per cent to 20 per cent. But the poor farmer's cutter is raised from 30 per cent to 35 per cent, the fur coat that protects him in the winter is raised from 30 per cent to 35 per cent, the fur mitts he wears—even his wife's cloak—they would not allow even her to escape—must bear an extra tax under this tariff. This Government is always ready to consider the luxuries, The duty on the labels put on the cigar boxes is reduced—and I do not know but they reduced the duty on the cigars—

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. At any rate, the label on the cigar box is reduced from 46 per cent to 35 per cent. And the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), ever mindful of his own interest, takes mighty good care that the labels on confectionery boxes or biscuit boxes are reduced from 46 per cent to 35 per cent. Nothing for the farmer. His wagon was 25 per cent before, it is 25 per cent now; but the label on the confectionery box or on the biscuit box is reduced from 46 down to 35 per cent. I say it is a hardship to the people of this country to have to submit to this tariff. Let us look a little further. They ask us to look at their free list. Take asphalt; it is put on the free list. Now, I believe that the farmers of this country do not use asphalt at all. In the cities that article is used to a very large extent, and it is on the free list. Then, we come to quebracho. Is that used by farmers? No, if it was, it would not be on the free list. That is a sufficient definition of it, to my mind. Then, you come to extract of nut galls. Is that an article used by the farmers to any extent? It was reduced from 20 per cent down to nothing. Then, powdered rubber—I do not know what that is, but I am satisfied it is something that the farmer does not use, or you would not find it on the free list. Oleostearine is reduced from 20 per cent down to nothing. What is oleostearine? Why, Sir, it is an article that is produced largely by such men as Swift and Armour, of Chicago, and is brought into this country free to compete against the farmer's tallow. I confess that I was instrumental myself, under the former Government, in having that article put upon the free list for the purpose of a dressing in making harness leather. But I was careful to protect the farmer. I said to the then Min-

ister of Finance: I will undertake to say that if oleostearine is placed upon the free list to be used by tanners in the production of harness leather they will use more tallow for mixing in the dressing than they use now; and that result took place. But this Government undid what I did at that time. They not only allowed it to remain on the free list for that purpose, but they put it on the free list for all purposes, so that for any purpose whatever now oleostearine comes into competition with the farmer's tallow and tends to depreciate its value. Then we have another article placed on the free list for the benefit of the farmer, Russian hair skins, an article that farmers did not use very much, they are content with a cheaper kind of fur goods.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is for the benefit of the Doukhobors.

Mr. HENDERSON. It may be; perhaps they had in mind the importation of the Doukhobors when they placed Russian hair skins on the free list from 15 per cent. I find that China goat rugs are placed upon the free list. For the benefit of the farmer? How many farmers buy China goat rugs for their houses? I am sure that is not the kind of rugs you will find in farmers' houses, you can be sure of that. Mr. Speaker, otherwise they would not have placed it upon the free list. Then finally, in order to give a boon to the farmers of this country, to show that they are the farmers' friends, they come down at the end of the list and put mushroom spawn on the free list. How many farmers benefit by putting mushroom spawn on the free list?

Now, Sir, I have given you these illustrations to show that the existing tariff is a one-sided tariff. This preferential tariff strikes at every industry in this country. It strikes hardest at the producing classes of this country. It strikes the workingman, because the more you increase the importation of manufactured goods from Great Britain, the more you reduce the value of the labour of the workingman in this country. It strikes him not only in his work, but it strikes him in his wages. We were told last night that farm servants and others never got better wages than they have received since this paternal Government enacted the preferential tariff. What mean all the strikes we hear of? What means the strike on the Grand Trunk Railway for the advance in wages that was asked for? What mean the strikes all over the country, if this preferential tariff is bringing back prosperity and happiness to the workingman? It is because it is not doing so that we on this side of the House are asking for some compensation. As we have no power to get rid of that preferential tariff, being unable to persuade the Government to repeal the enactment to which they are wedded, all we can do is to rise in our

places, and in our might to demand that some counteractive, some antidote, should be given, and that, if we are compelled to submit to the injustice of the preferential duties given in the tariff legislation of two years ago, then we ought, on the other hand, to be allowed a preference in the British markets for the products of this country which would enable the great producing classes of this country to find not only a more ready market, but a more profitable market, for the articles they produce; and in that way in the words of the resolution which has been proposed by the leader of the Opposition, great and inestimable advantages would accrue to the farmers and other producers of Canada competing against foreign rivals in the United Kingdom. In that way it would tend to set in motion a great tide of immigration to our shores, and help to people the vast wheat areas of the North-west, while enhancing the farm values in the older portions of this country.

Mr. D. D. ROGERS (Frontenac). I pray the indulgence of the House for a short time to reply to some of the remarks of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), who has just given us a repetition of a portion of a former speech. I have not hitherto trespassed on the patience of this House in speaking either in the debate on the Address, nor upon the Budget. If I had known I would be allowed the privilege which has been granted to others, probably I would have taken more pains to prepare the matter which I wish to speak about. The subject under discussion is preferential trade with England, and I notice that our hon. friends on the Opposition side have suddenly become deeply interested in this question. We never heard anything about it from them in the past, until the present Government introduced their legislation giving a preference to British goods coming into this country. In the past we have not tried to obtain preferential trade with the old country but unfortunately the present Opposition, who were then in power, were too much wedded to their protection idol to think of such a thing. Of course, preferential trade with England would be a slap to the principle of protection. I will admit that I was a protectionist myself in my younger days. In the seventies the farmers felt that something was necessary to improve the condition of the country. I suppose that in my youthful days I thought that protection would remove the evil which existed. And so, with many other good patriots who were farmers, I endorsed the principle, believing that it would be a desirable change. In this connection, I may say that there is no class of the community more loyal and patriotic than the farmers. They are willing on all occasions to bear their share of the burdens of the country; in fact, they are willing to

Mr. HENDERSON.

bear an extra share of the country's burdens if it is necessary for the good of the country that they should do so. I remember that that late Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald said that protection was only a means to an end. It was never intended that it should be continued for any great length of time, but it was only designed to give our manufacturers a foothold in the country, so that they might be able to hold their own with the manufacturers of other countries. That same view was expressed by other politicians at that time. One of the eye-openers to me was the speech delivered by the late lamented Mr. Dalton McCarthy, who condemned the National Policy, on the ground that it had not produced the results which it was designed to bring about. He took the ground that it was time to commence to retrench and take the heavy burdens from the shoulders of the farmers. But it appears that the Conservative party were so firmly tied to the chariot of protection that instead of reducing the burdens of the farmers, they were determined to continue them. I will admit that they did reduce the duty a little on agricultural implements, cutting it down from 35 per cent to 20 per cent. This was due to the agitation of the farmers throughout the country, and it showed one result of the activity of the Patron organization. The late Government found that something was necessary. Farmers belonging to the Conservative party were breaking away from the ranks and joining the Patron organization, and the agitation became so strong that the Government felt obliged to do something in that direction. I am not at all satisfied with the reductions made by the present Government along the line approaching the principle of tariff for revenue, but I do say, as I said when I addressed the House upon this matter before, that while I feel that they have not done as much as they should have done, I am convinced that there is some good in the preferential tariff. I believe it will have some effect in reducing the burdens of the farmers. Hon. gentlemen opposite, I find, from the utterances which have come from that side of the House time and time again, are as strongly protectionists as ever they were. The late hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) said once in this House—and I was rather surprised to hear him—that if this Government raised the duty to the old standard, it would receive the hearty support of the Opposition. I am sure such a statement as that does not encourage the farmers to expect from those hon. gentlemen a removal of the burdens of protection. I do not care, even if there were only 1 per cent reduction of protection, but I claim there is a much greater reduction. I have come to this conclusion from conviction, as the result of my observation and sad experience, and not owing to any favour from any party which, it has been suggested, that I have asked for, that I cannot con-

scientifically support a policy of that kind any longer. I may say that since I have entered this House three years ago, I have been further weaned away from the principle of protection than ever.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rogers) allow me to ask him a question? He says that he is against the principle of protection. Was he opposed to taking the duty off meats of 3 cents a pound; mutton and lamb, 35 per cent; cheese, 3 cents per pound, which is about 40 per cent; eggs, 3 cents per dozen, or butter, 4 cents per pound?

Mr. ROGERS. Give the farmers a fair field, and they ask no favours from any one.

Mr. WALLACE. These duties are from 35 to 40 per cent, while the duty on agricultural implements is 20 per cent.

Mr. ROGERS. As long as the principle of protection is in existence, we naturally claim our little share; but I say that I do not believe in that principle. It would be very foolish to say that as long as protection lasts, we should not apply the principle to the farmers, although it cannot be said with any truth that home consumption materially affects the price of articles we have to sell. The price of every article of farm produce that we have to sell is regulated in England. I propose to take up the question of corn in a little while, if hon. gentlemen will give me time. Wherein has the policy of protection benefited the farmers? Wherein has a protection of 35 or 40 per cent on agricultural implements been of any advantage to the farmer? Upon an average farm in the province of Ontario it will take \$1,000 to \$1,200 to provide the farmer with agricultural implements. The annual outlay would be from \$150 to \$200 a year for repairs, wear and tear and such new implements as may be required. The original outlay would involve an addition for duty of \$300 or \$400, and you would have to expend in duty on account of repairs from \$75 to \$80 a year. I cannot see in what way the principle of protection can benefit the farmers. Judging from our experience and from the statistics we have, there must be something radically wrong in Canada, if protection has not produced the results promised for it. We have had protection for the last seventeen or eighteen years, and we look in vain at the statistics for proof that it has been of any advantage to the farmers. Unfortunately, we have not statistics so fully prepared for the other provinces as we have for the province of Ontario. In the year 1898 in what condition do we find the farming population of Ontario? It was represented to us that we were going to retire at the end of a certain number of years with our pockets full of money. I will show what protection has done, as the results are indicated by the

annual statistics for 1898 of the province of Ontario.

We know that the population improved in the cities and towns, but the misfortune is that it decreased in the agricultural portion of the country. The population of the rural district of Ontario in 1887 was 1,140,138, but in 1897 it was 1,113,530, a decrease of 35,326 in the rural population of that great province. The natural increase should be 40 per cent for the decade, and that being the case we should have 100,000 greater population instead of 35,000 less. And what about immigration? It is computed that from the year 1893 an average of about 80,000 a year came into the Dominion. The returns brought down show for the year the number of immigrants for 1882, 112,458; 1883, 133,624; 1894, 103,824, in the three subsequent years about an average of 80,000 a year. Surely Ontario, the garden of Canada, should have a portion of these immigrants remain with them, but we find that in our rural districts we lost not only the natural increase, but over 35,000 on the actual count, and together with our share of emigration. The total expenditure by the Dominion Government on immigration, from confederation down to 1892, was \$6,347,629, and it is also computed that about \$1,500,000 was, in addition, expended by the provinces for the same purpose. Surely, in view of the expenditure in immigration and the decrease of our rural population, protection has not done much for the country. These facts cannot be disputed, and it, therefore, remains undeniable that there is something radically wrong in the principle of protection. The cities and towns increased their population by 279,656, but they grew at the expense of the rural districts, taking away our young men, the real source of wealth, and creating a condition of things which is not a healthy sign in any nation. Under this marvellous system of protection the assessed value of our lands, in the province of Ontario, decreased to the extent of \$11,387,085, whereas the assessed value of the cities and towns of the Dominion increased by \$103,010,607. That is an extraordinary way to make an agricultural country prosperous. Surely, in view of these facts, the policy of protection cannot be endorsed by an agricultural people. The amount of taxes gathered from the rural districts was \$181,396 less than ten years previously, and, of course, the depreciation of farm values could not help but bring about that result. Now, during that period, the cities increased their taxes by \$2,922,522, and we know that the citizens must get that money to pay their taxes, indirectly, from the farmers of the country. In the end it all comes out of the farmers, notwithstanding, as I have said, that the assessed value of their lands has decreased by \$11,000,000. I am glad to say that the province of Ontario decreased its bonded indebtedness to the extent of \$1,597,909. The farmers of Ontario bore direct taxation for the purpose of hav-

ing the bonded debt reduced, and in doing that they deprived themselves and their families of many necessaries and comforts of life. I say here that the willingness of the farmers to bear direct taxation to wipe out the bonded indebtedness proves to this Government, or any other government, that the farmers do not like an increased debt. I hope it will be a warning to this, and to every other government, not to increase the debt. It is to the credit of the farmers that they did reduce their bonded indebtedness, and it shows that they are ready to do business in a business way. But we must remember that in the same period, the towns increased their bonded indebtedness by \$5,680,908, and the cities increased their bonded indebtedness by \$17,390,308. Let me ask, where do the cities and towns get the money to pay this indebtedness and the interest on this indebtedness? It must come out of the farmers of this country, and any system that taxes the rising generation of the country, and takes them from the rural districts to the cities, must be a disadvantage. But the worst feature of the thing is that in the last ten years the chattel mortgage indebtedness of Ontario has increased by \$1,300,000, and the total chattel mortgages of Ontario to-day is \$3,933,600 on the farmers. This is the prosperous condition in which the National Policy has left the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. ROGERS. It is all very well for some gentlemen to laugh, but they will have to be very serious about it when they appeal to the farmers of this country. The principle of protection has injured our country, and I say that it is a curse to any agricultural country on the face of the earth. Now, let us look at the United States. By the census of 1890 there were 12,000,000 families living on farms, and of that 12,000,000 there were about 6,000,000 who owned their own farms, but 30 per cent of these owning their farms were encumbered. There were 6,628,735 families living on rented farms in that great protected country. That is what protection has done for the American farmers; and if the farmers are not prosperous we all know that the rest of the country cannot be. In the United States 47·80 per cent of the farmers own their own farms and 52·20 per cent hire their farms. Now, let us see what the condition of the farmers is in the states close to the border. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) a short time ago said that after a visit across the border, he had found that our farmers in Canada were as well off or better off than the farmers in the States. I am sure that is no argument for protection, so far as it affects the farmers. In the great state of New York the total number of families on farms is 1,308,015. Of that number 290,025 farms are free, 201,258 are encumbered, and 816,732 are hired. That is how protection has benefited

Mr. ROGERS.

the farmers of that great state. In the state of Ohio there are 785,291 families living on farms, of these 302,943 own their own farms, 123,423 farms are encumbered, and 358,925 are rented farms. If you call that prosperity, I do not. It shows what protection has done for the farmers of that state. The same thing is true of the state of Illinois, which we all know is a very fine farming country. In that state 778,015 families are living on farms, of that number 260,124 own their farms, 126,250 farms are encumbered, and 391,641 are hired. In the state of Maine, another border state, the whole number of families living on farms is 150,355, of whom 78,040 are living on free farms, 21,721 are on encumbered farms, and 50,594 are on hired farms. Then take the state of Massachusetts, which is in the very midst of those great city markets which we hear so much about. In that state the number of families living on farms is 479,790, of whom 108,804 are living on free farms, 66,249 on encumbered farms, and 304,737 on rented farms. That shows what protection has done for that country.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to say where he gathered these statistics?

Mr. ROGERS. I got them from the American census of 1890. We have not any later reports, which I am sure would make a very much worse showing. I am not speaking from hearsay. Anything I state in this House I generally try to corroborate by figures. As I said before, one great objection to protection is that it has built up the cities at the expense of the farmers. It has also taken the best of our young men away from the farms.

An hon. MEMBER. Where have they gone?

Mr. ROGERS. To the big manufacturing centres. If that is prosperity, it is not the kind of prosperity that I like to see.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who is feeding them?

Mr. ROGERS. I do not believe in sacrificing the great interests of this country even for the sake of building up large cities. The cities and towns in Canada do not materially affect the prices of farm products. The prices of all agricultural products, not only those of Canada, but also those of the United States, are regulated in England. When we can send cheese and butter to England at a cost of less than half a cent a pound, we can see how little the distance counts, and how accessible that market is to our farmers. We want a home market when we can get it at a fair and reasonable cost, and when it does not grind the lifeblood out of our people.

As regards the preferential tariff between this country and the old country, all that I have said leads to that indirectly. The late-

Government could not very well say much to England on that subject; but we find that the exports of farm products to Great Britain have grown from about \$48,000,000 in 1895-96 to \$75,000,000 in 1897-98. Such an increase in three years gives us good hope for the future. The farmers of this country in past years have been looking too much to the interests of "the other fellow," the manufacturer, instead of looking after their own. There was a market for our produce in England in the past, even 30 per cent better than now, there were the same waters to carry our produce, there was the same opportunity, and why did we not get the market? It was because we were building up towns and cities in Canada at the expense of the farmers, and neglecting to develop our trade with England. To give an illustration of how we have been looking after the interests of "the other fellow" instead of the interests of the farmer, I may say that in the year 1880 we exported about 16,000,000 pounds of butter, whereas in 1889 our exports of butter had dwindled down to only 902,000 pounds. What were other countries doing at the same time? Denmark improved its system of butter-making, its government aiding in every possible way, until its exports into Great Britain increased from 42,289,632 pounds in 1885 to 130,230,240 pounds in 1895. What did Australia do at the same time? In 1890 Australia exported to England only 4,535,776 pounds of butter, whereas in 1895 it exported 35,083,664 pounds. What was the reason of this great increase? It was because Australia had a business Government, which looked after the interests of the farmers of the country, providing cold storage and good accommodation by both land and water, carrying their goods 6,000 miles, part of the way under the torrid zone.

The late Government say that they have looked after the cold storage for our produce. I want just to refer to the meeting held in Montreal in 1896, at the instigation of the Patrons. There has been an agitation for a fast line of steamships, and a subsidy has been offered of \$750,000 a year for ten years, and \$500,000 for ten years more, for that purpose. Well, there was something talked about cold storage in connection with that fast service, but everybody must admit that if we should have the cold storage accommodation it must be at the expense of speed, for you cannot provide that accommodation in those steamers and enable them to run at 20 knots an hour. The Patrons were very much opposed to this subsidy for a fast steamship service, and made their opposition known by means of resolutions and deputations to the Government, and in my opinion, it is to that agitation we are indebted for the cold storage accommodation we now enjoy instead of a fast service. I believe that it was that agitation which prevented the consummation of a scheme for a fast line of

steamers. What we require is better cold storage accommodation, better freight accommodation, both by land and water, cheaper freights, and the fast service may come afterwards. In the fall of 1896 not much had been done, and this large meeting of the Butter and Cheese Association of Montreal was held at the instance of the Patrons. It was explained at that meeting that Denmark, Australia and every other country had provided cold storage accommodation, had agents in Great Britain looking after their interests, and that if we wished to compete with those countries we would have to follow their example. The large steamship representatives were there, and to show you how they thought on the subject, Mr. Torrance, the representative of one of the large lines, claimed that the steamship companies had no interest in providing it. He said that some years ago they had spent \$10,000 to provide cold storage accommodation in one of their vessels, and could not get enough freight of that kind to make it pay. The railway companies had not furnished refrigerator cars or cold storage accommodation, nor was there any at Montreal, and the company, not being able to obtain sufficient freight, had to tear out the facilities they had provided, and Mr. Torrance declared that unless they had some substantial encouragement they would not attempt the experiment again.

A resolution was moved by Mr. Arthur Hodgson, seconded by Mr. John McKernan, and carried unanimously:

That this association approves of the importance of providing increased refrigerator accommodation, and that a committee of at least ten members be appointed by the association to work with the Central Board of the Patrons of Industry and Live Stock Association, to wait upon the Premier of Canada and place before him the absolute necessity of such accommodation being provided, and to procure complete information with regard to the facilities afforded by other countries for the exportation of agricultural products to the British markets.

That resolution was carried unanimously. Another resolution along the same lines was moved by Mr. D. McFagan, and seconded by Mr. D. M. McPherson:

That all the different interests of producers, manufacturers and shippers of perishable food products of Canada be invited by this association to send representatives to join this association in a deputation to meet the Hon. Mr. Laurier with reference to the obtaining of improved means of transportation to the consuming markets.

At that meeting there was not a word said about this fast steamship line, but a great deal said about better freight accommodation. And we know the result. Cold storage accommodation was afforded, and our export of butter a short time ago had increased from 4,000,000 pounds to 11,000,000 pounds in less than three years, and other perishable goods in like proportion. It is in

that direction that this Government should work—the direction of providing better markets for our products and cheaper and better freight accommodation, so that we may be better able to meet competition in the English market, and had there been more farmers in our Governments, this matter would have been attended to before this.

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

### After Recess.

Mr. ROGERS. Speaking of the effects of protection upon a country, I had, before recess, just touched upon the fact that one of the greatest injuries that protection had done to the agricultural community was in taking away our brightest young men into other callings in life. The effect of protection has been to increase the incomes of those living in the cities, to increase the profits of the manufacturers and improve the wages of the artisan and tradesmen, and to such an extent has it succeeded in doing this that it has drawn away from the farms our young men who, of course, seek occupations that afford the best remuneration. A marked instance of that has been the enormous exodus of our best and brightest young men to the United States. No doubt, protection there was rather overdone, and while for a time they were able to pay higher wages, the hard times of recent years have had a tendency the other way. There is no doubt that, if left to itself, protection will work its own cure. Production goes on and the natural effect of competition is to lower prices. But then comes in the curse of corporations, monopolies and trusts. It is hardly necessary to illustrate—the example of the United States is sufficient, where the whole country is ruled by trusts. Unfortunately our own people have been following in the footsteps of our neighbours to the south of us, and the great trusts of the United States have been reaching over and forming branches in this country. On the other hand, the agriculturists cannot form a trust even if they would, and are, therefore, at the mercy of monopolists. Unfortunately also we have too few representatives of the great labouring masses to take places in this House and fight for them. I am sorry to say that in this country, as in any other country, it is too often party first, the great tolling masses being left out of consideration. To show how combines are promoted by the protectionist policy, I will read a summary of an article here quoting the evidence of the representative of probably the greatest monopoly of them all—Mr. H. O. Havemeyer, the representative of the great sugar trust. I think this pretty well fills the bill as applied to this country as well as the United States:

The chief owner and promoter of the American Sugar Trust has made statements before an  
Mr. ROGERS.

investigation commission to the effect that these combinations could not exist without the aid of the tariff which permits them to plunder the people. Under free trade it would be quite possible for all the sugar refineries in the United States to organize a trust and cut down the cost of management and manufacture by combining their business under a single head. But it would be impossible for them to charge the consumers more than the natural price for their product. The existence of the trust does not depend on the tariff, but its evil effects do. Without the aid of the tariff the trust could cut down expenses, but could not advance prices. It could not levy a price sufficient to pay dividends on watered stock, for outside competition would make that impossible. In Britain an attempt at the American method of fictitious capitalization has resulted in a failure, because there was no protective tariff to aid in the securing of inordinate profits.

One of the great evils of protection in any country is the power it gives to raise the prices and so oppress the people. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) spoke about the effect of the preferential tariff. It is quite true, as the hon. member was able to tell us, that the returns do not show a great deal of increase of imports. But he cannot measure the effect of this tariff in reducing prices by the mere quantity imported. We know and feel every day by observation and inquiry that prices are lower. Our manufacturers feel that they must reduce prices or else face the competition of imported goods. It is not necessary that the goods should actually come in in order to compel the reduction of prices—the goods are there to be brought in, and even though returns show no increase of imports, the object is achieved just the same. It is not to be forgotten also that the effect of such a tariff is not immediate. One of the leading importers of the country said that it would have a marked effect in the future, that many of the merchants had a large stock on hand, and they were obliged to hold up prices as well as they could in order to avoid loss; but the next importations would show the effect of the tariff in the reduction of the prices of goods. In woollen goods, there has been a very considerable reduction. If these results had not followed to a certain extent at any rate, the Conservatives would have been shown to be very bad prophets. The first year they declared that this tariff would close up all our factories. It could not do that except by reducing goods to prices below what our own factories could produce them for and pay dividends. If the tariff were to have no effect in reducing prices, why did the Conservatives raise that howl? But in a short time, they gave that up and said that the Government had adopted the Conservative policy. It is quite true, and I repeat it, that we have too much protection. We are not satisfied with the tariff as it is, but we are thankful for the reform that has been effected, so far as it has gone, and we live in hopes, from the promises made, that it will go further. And I feel confident that

at the next election the Government will hear of this so strongly that they will be compelled to make further reductions. The movement has been in the right direction, even if it has not been so rapid or has not carried us so far as we desired. A great deal has been said about binder twine, so much that one would think there was nothing more to say. But the hon. member for Halton in a former speech spoke about the abolition of the duty, saying this was actually the cause of the increase of the price. It has been said that the effect was to close our factories and throw the manufacture of binder twine into the hands of a few. But the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) showed that the factories were closed, not because of the abolition of the duty but because, from three to four years before the abolition of the duty, these factories had been bought or leased and closed. The hon. member for South Huron mentioned the different factories—there is no use going over the list again—and the annual cost of keeping these factories closed was about \$30,000. This the Cordage Company paid in order to secure a monopoly of the business. Then the Farmers' Binder Twine Company of Brantford is sometimes dragged into this discussion. Last year this company issued a circular to the farmers of the country, a copy of which I have here. They claimed that they had kept down the price of binder twine by fixing their own prices at a comparatively low scale compelling the others to come to them. I do not say that they would not go into a combine if they could not make ends meet otherwise. But this is what is shown by their circular: The price of binder twine in 1892, made by that company, was 12½ and 14½ per cent; in 1893 it was 8½ and 9½ cents; in 1894 it was 7 and 8 cents; in 1896 it was 7 and 8 cents; in 1897 it was 6½ and 7½ cents; and last year it was offered to the farmers of this country at 6½ and 7½ cents. Here is what they say in their circular:

This company again setting their figures on binder twine, good to the 20th of June next, is intended to assist the farmers in getting the benefit of low prices on all binder twine in the hands of the opposition, and preclude the possibility of exorbitant rates being exacted as against them.

A large deputation waited upon the Minister of Finance asking him to put a duty of 25 per cent on binder twine. They said they could not live, that their factories would be closed up if they were not protected. At the same time the Farmers Binder Twine Company were selling their output last year at 7½ cents retail. It has been published broadcast, and never denied that they made 60 per cent on their capital. Now, the average amount consumed in Canada of binder twine, is about 7,000 tons, of which the Kingston Penitentiary manufacture about 500 tons, Central Prison 1,000 tons, and about 1,000 tons were imported. That left

249½

about 3,500 tons to be manufactured by the cordage company. The cordage company had a protection of 25 per cent on all other cordage they manufactured. Still they had the audacity to come to the Minister of Finance to clamour for more protection. As for the prison work, some means should be taken, if possible, so that it would regulate the price, so that this very necessary commodity, which the farmers have to use, should not be allowed to get into the hands of a combine. A deputation waited upon the provincial government in 1897 asking that the binder twine factory of the Central Prison be closed up, on the ground that it caused them an unfair competition; and still they were making 60 per cent all the time. If they could make 60 per cent on a thousand tons they ought to make 300 per cent on 3,500 tons and a protection on all other cordage they manufactured. Still a request was made to the Dominion Government to close the factories in connection with the Kingston Penitentiary and the Central Prison. I myself have bought binder twine in the latter part of August at 7 cents, after the contract had run out. I say the Government should take some strong steps as regards this prison binder twine, to prevent a recurrence of its getting into the hands of a combine.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I interrupt my hon. friend for a moment? I am sure we can hardly afford, at this stage of the session, to spend two or three hours talking against time. Since the hon. gentleman got up he has spent scarcely fifteen minutes in dealing with the motion that is before the Chair. At this period of the session we are all anxious to get on, and I presume the Government are desirous of going on with their Estimates. I see no reason why this debate should not be brought to a rapid close, provided you have the goodness to keep the speakers to the question of preferential trade.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I would remind my hon. friend opposite that our excellent friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) is a very infrequent speaker.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I know he is, and therefore I hesitated on that ground.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not think that all the speeches that are made on the other side of the House bear any more on the question of preferential trade as contained in my hon. friend's motion than this discussion, which, I think, by the way, was provoked a good deal by what was said on the other side.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. I may remind the hon. member for Frontenac that the discussion should be strictly confined to the question of preferential trade, which is now before the Chair. If the hon. gentleman wishes to discuss the general ques-

tion of the tariff, he can find an opportunity of doing so after this motion is disposed of.

Mr. ROGERS. I wish to remind the leader of the Opposition that no objection was taken to the long harangue of the hon. member for Halton, which was but a repetition of a portion of a former speech, and I claim the same freedom of discussion. The hon. member for West York spoke about the Canadian Pacific Railway and a lot of other things, and he was allowed to go on. But it is all right. Of course, I bow to your decision, Mr. Speaker, but the more I am stopped the more I will hammer at these things. I think I must have been hitting pretty hard or there would not be so much objection taken; however, I will abide by your objection, Mr. Speaker. In regard to the preferential clause of the tariff, in the sense in which the present Government have brought it in, I may say that I heartily endorse it, as I think the country does, and I am sure that the results will be of great benefit to Canada. I am only sorry, however, that at the conclusion of the speech of the right hon. leader of the Government, he did not intimate that the Government were so well satisfied with the working of the preferential clause that it was their intention to make another reduction of 25 per cent. As to the effect of preferential treatment of British goods, I am bound to say that I believe that we have not yet attained to that position that we can bargain with the mother country for concessions in her market for our products. In the future the time may come when we have attained to such dimensions, commercially and in other respects, that we will exert such an influence upon the mother country and improving and increasing the volume of the goods that we send to her, that we may expect her to approach us with a view to larger trade relations, as well as us approaching her. I believe it is the duty of Great Britain to approach the colonies, instead of it being the duty of the colonies to approach Great Britain. I cannot see on what ground we can expect Great Britain to give us a preference, unless we share in the glories of the Empire. I believe that what Mr. Chamberlain meant, when he spoke of sharing in the glories of the Empire, was, that we should bear a part of the expense of maintaining the Imperial army and navy. It is doubtful whether what we would gain by preferential trade would compensate us for this responsibility, should it be imposed upon us, although I am free to say that if Great Britain were in need of assistance, she would find Canada prepared to bear her share. I cannot see any particular harm in this resolution. If there is anything to be gained by making an approach to the mother country, there is no harm in passing such a resolution, and I did not get up with the idea of objecting to the resolution. I feel that some good may come out of it in the future. It may en-

Mr. ROGERS.

courage the people of Great Britain to take more interest in Canada by bringing us more prominently to their attention, and for this reason I do not see any possible harm in it. It may have good result in the near future. But I do feel that there is no reason why we should not show our good-will on every possible occasion. Perhaps it is better, Mr. Speaker, for the patience of the House that you did not permit me to go into some of the questions that I had proposed bringing up, but I just felt that there was no need for the little check that I received, and which I think was not called for.

Mr. OSLER. Mr. Speaker, at this hour of the night and at this stage of the discussion, I propose to say a very few words. I fancy that nine-tenths of the people of this country, and perhaps hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, agree, that if we can get preferential trade between the Empire, it would be a good thing for us, at all events. There is only one way to obtain preferential trade, and that is by persistently working for it, and by getting the people of Great Britain to see that it is a benefit to them as well as a benefit to us. I had the honour to represent the Board of Trade of Toronto at the meeting of the Chambers of Commerce in 1896, and that is the only reason why I feel called upon to make a few observations on this subject this evening. The Toronto Board of Trade resolution, suggesting preferential trade within the Empire, was thoroughly debated. There were objections to the resolution as it was presented, but had it been pressed to its final stage, the majority of the members of the chamber would have voted for it. Of course, a large number would have been against it, a great many out-and-out free traders. The only objection that we hear raised against preferential trade is the one objection, that Great Britain is so thoroughly free trade that she could never be induced to adopt any such plan. Surely, hon. gentlemen opposite have shown that free trade has not so many virtues that they must live up to it. Having changed their minds, surely they cannot assume to say that it is not possible, quietly and in time, to change the minds of the English free traders. We cannot expect them to change wholesale, as has been the case with our hon. friends on the Government benches, but we can expect to gradually show them that preferential trade within the Empire, while perhaps more beneficial to us colonists, will eventually be more beneficial to the parent country, because, as we produce more of the food supplies which they want, so much more will they get the benefit, and so much more will the country generally profit. Trade with the colonies is always more profitable to the mother country than trade with foreign countries, so that preferential trade, by developing the colonies, will secure more profit to Great Britain. I do not propose to go

into the arguments, because this question has been fully discussed. I merely rose to make these few remarks to show that I am thoroughly and entirely in sympathy with this movement, and that I believe that, if we persistently give evidence of our desire for preferential trade within the Empire, the day is not very far distant when the goal will be reached, and when we will have preferential trade within the Empire, to the great benefit of Canada and of all parts of the Empire, and in time to the greater benefit of the mother country.

Mr. MacPHERSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire, in a very few words, to express the opinion which I have entertained for a great many years, and I may say that I very much regret that I cannot agree with my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler). The impression I have had for many years is, that we cannot by any possibility bring about preferential trade within the Empire until we can show that the trade between Great Britain and the rest of the world is less than she can attain within the borders of her own colonies and her own dependencies. There is no question about that, so far as I can come to a conclusion from the facts and figures. Until we can show that there is a possibility of such a state of affairs existing, it is idle and a waste of time for this House and this country to discuss the question. I believe that when we can show that, we will get down to a basis where it will be worth while considering the question. As far as I am concerned, I do not think there is any possibility of reaching that position during the lifetime of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), with all respect to him, and with every desire that he shall have a long life and prosperity. I simply say that he and I—and I do not wish him that fate—will be in our graves for many years before it can be proved that the trade between Great Britain and her colonies and dependencies has increased to such an extent that it would be greater than her trade with the rest of the world, so that it would be worth the while of Great Britain to consider this question of Imperial inter-commerce. The thing to my mind is altogether beyond doubt, that we are never going to attain it. It has been said by the great Napoleon that the English are a nation of shopkeepers. So long as they are a nation of shopkeepers they will consider the balance of trade, and if they can do more trade with the people outside of their dependencies, they will never consider the question which we are now discussing. I think we are really losing time in discussing a matter of this kind. It has been brought up over and over again without any benefit to us, and, in fact, I believe, to the discredit of the intelligence of the people of this colony. I entirely disapprove of continuing debates of this sort. We ought to get down to business

and settle the affairs of Canada, and by discussing practical questions pay more respect to the common sense of the people who sent us here. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition must realize the condition of commerce in the old country, and the way people look at these matters there. The English people think of nothing else except what will enure to the benefit of the old country. They look upon these matters in a purely business point of view, and we, knowing that, it is a pity to waste time year after year and session after session discussing this question, which I believe has been brought up too often. If there were any possible chance of bringing about any advantage to Canada, or if there were any possible chance of bringing about this so-called preferential trade, I would go hand in hand with hon. gentlemen opposite, but from my knowledge, and I have studied the question for over twenty-five years, I am convinced that the discussion of this thing is utterly useless, and that, therefore, it ought to be dropped.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I must express my regret that the very genial member for Hamilton (Mr. MacPherson) has thrown cold water upon the question which is now being discussed upon the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition. So far from agreeing with my hon. friend that the time taken up in discussing this question is wasted, I beg to submit to him, and to this House, that at the present stage of the history of Canada this is the most important question which the public of Canada have to consider. It is a question which, if agitated to success, will do more for the prosperity of the Dominion, whose prosperity, I am sure, the hon. gentleman (Mr. MacPherson), as well as all of us, desires, than any other question which has for many a day been discussed in this Parliament. I was rather astonished that the hon. gentleman (Mr. MacPherson) was so faint-hearted as to ask us to give up the struggle in which we are engaged, though he himself admitted that if that struggle could be carried on to success it would be a boon to us. The Canadian people have carried on struggles in the past amidst the expression of just such discouraging sentiments as have fallen from the hon. gentleman to-night. Only twenty-eight years ago, in this Parliament and out of this Parliament, the question of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was looked upon as a useless expenditure of time when it was discussed. Men looked upon it as a dream when they discussed it first in the old Parliament of Canada, and so was the confederation of the provinces looked upon as a dream, but those dreamers, in both cases, many of them, fortunately lived to see their dream become a reality. So, Sir, I trust that the member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), who has given such devoted services to this question, to which he has paid such great attention, may

live to see his fond dream a reality, and a reality that will confer a great boon upon the Canadian confederation.

Now, Sir, so far as the statement is concerned, that we will never be able to secure Imperial and colonial preferential trade without we first win the hearts of the British people, I quite agree with that sentiment, and I fancy every one in this House agrees with it. There has been no proposition to coerce the people of the United Kingdom into this proposition, but the whole effort of the hon. member for North Bruce, the whole energy of the leader of the Opposition, here and elsewhere, in connection with this question, was to educate public opinion in Great Britain, and to educate it colonial-wards for the purpose of creating and arousing sympathy in connection with this great problem. It is true that the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) has been from year to year called a faddist. It is true that when he first introduced his resolution on these lines into the Parliament of Canada, he had scarcely a listener in this Parliament, and only a few sympathizers, because there were only a few in all Canada who were au fait with the question. And yet, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) stuck to his task, and he stuck to it with such ability, and he stuck to it with such determination, that his speeches have not only been read throughout the Dominion of Canada, but, as I can personally testify, they have been read in the wider field of Great Britain, and have influenced public opinion there to no small extent. It was for me a pleasure when I heard the right hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Chamberlain, deliver his celebrated speech at the Canada Club dinner; it was for me a pleasure to hear that Imperial statesman, who has done so much for the promotion of colonial interests, quote a member of the Canadian Parliament (Mr. McNeill), and quote him approvingly as one of the warmest friends that the Empire had, either at home or abroad. Some reference has also been made to the leader of the Opposition, and this much ought to be said in this Parliament: That the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) during the time that he represented Canada in London, did more to arouse public sentiment upon the importance of this question than any other agency which has been used for that purpose. In every portion of Great Britain the leader of the Opposition, who was then serving Canada in his capacity as High Commissioner, addressed meetings; and if public opinion is to-day alive upon that question in the various portions of the three kingdoms, I repeat, and I repeat advisedly, that it is due largely—more largely than to any other agency—to the patriotic efforts of the present leader of the Opposition in arousing that public sentiment by his great speeches, and by his interviews with public men and leaders of public thought in the wider field of Imperial politics.

Mr. MacPHERSON.

Now, Sir, there are two or three things in connection with this debate which I had hoped to say were absolutely admitted; yet I am afraid, after some of the sentiments I have heard expressed, that I shall have to make one or two exceptions. I was going to say that there was no difference of opinion throughout the length and breadth of Canada at the present moment, that it would be of immense importance to Canadian interests if we could secure this boon in the markets of Great Britain; and I am astonished, as I think every other member of this House is astonished, to hear some of the sentiments that have been expressed by some hon. gentlemen who have addressed this House. Is there a man in the Parliament who, after looking thoroughly into the question, will deny that if to-morrow or the next day or at any time in the future, we should be able to secure the very smallest preference in the markets of Great Britain, it would be a better immigration agent than all the expenditures which can be made by this Government or by any other Government for the purpose of securing settlers for our North-west fields which at present are untilled? I go still further, Sir, and say that if we were able to obtain that Imperial concession, we should find the north-west of the United States emptying to our advantage; for farming there would not be on a par with farming in the Canadian North-west if we were recognized, as I have no hesitation in saying we ought to be recognized, by the sympathetic ear of Great Britain. Well, Sir, I thought that every party in Canada were agreed upon this question until we came to this debate. There was another point on which I thought we were agreed. I thought we were all anxious to do whatever we could to secure that boon; and I was rather astonished at the answer given by the members of the Government who have addressed the House on this question. What was the answer of the hon. the Postmaster General last night? He dealt with one portion of the resolution of my hon. friend, and his objection was that a technical error had been made in stating what had been the meaning of the statement made by the Duke of Devonshire in his speech which has been so much quoted in this House. Well, Sir, if that were the only point in that resolution to which the Postmaster General and the Prime Minister objected, I am sure that the leader of the Opposition, and I am equally sure that my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), who introduced this resolution, are not wedded to the form of it.

Mr. McNEILL. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What they wanted was a declaration from this Parliament—a declaration which would have been of immense value and importance to our friends in the Imperial sphere, who are fighting this fight, and struggling for this boon; a unani-

mous declaration that the Parliament of Canada, representing all classes and every province of Canada, was anxious to draw close and closer the ties of Imperial and colonial preferential trade, to gain for the colonies the sympathetic ear of the centre of the Empire in trade matters, and to give our sympathetic ear to the centre of the Empire in return; and if the objection raised is the only objection, it can, I am sure, be easily remedied. If the declaration as to the Duke of Devonshire is the only objection from hon. gentlemen opposite—and it is practically the only one that has been urged—that clause can be expunged from the resolution, and this Parliament, if it is so minded, can pass a unanimous resolution looking to the main end in view, namely, the influencing of public opinion in the old country.

Now, Sir, as regards the very much discussed question as to what the Duke of Devonshire said, I am not going to deal with that further than to say that the meaning which was taken from the words of the Duke of Devonshire by the leader of the Opposition, and so expressed in his public utterances in this country, was the meaning which was taken from them, as the hon. Minister himself explained, by the colonial Prime Ministers who heard him, and it was the meaning taken from them, as the Duke of Devonshire, in his epistle to the Postmaster General himself admits, by the press of Great Britain who criticised him as abandoning the policy of free trade and espousing the policy of protection in favour of the colonial position. But, Sir, if there is a dispute as to the opinion expressed by the Duke of Devonshire, there can be no dispute as to the opinion expressed by the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain. Nor can there be a single scintilla of doubt as to what Mr. Chamberlain meant to say when he made that speech at the Canada Club dinner which I had the pleasure of listening to. I am not at liberty now to enter into a discussion of the conversations which I had with Mr. Chamberlain on that subject, but I am here to say this—and Mr. Chamberlain I am sure would give the words a hearty echo if he heard them—that Mr. Chamberlain looked upon it as one of the grandest themes which loomed up for discussion before the great British people. He looked upon it as one of the great saving policies of the Empire, and I am sure that he would ask no better reward in the public life of his nation than to have it said of him when he is gone that he had promoted imperial and colonial preferential trade, and had brought it to a successful issue. So whatever doubt may be expressed as to what the Duke of Devonshire said, I know what the policy of Mr. Chamberlain was, and I know that the desire of Mr. Chamberlain was to receive suggestions and encouragement of every sort from the colonial portions of the Empire, in order that he might be the better

able to carry on that struggle to a successful issue in Imperial circles. And, Sir, that is the point at which I conceive that the Government of the day made a mistake in their preferential work, and it is the point at which I consider they are making a still greater mistake when they refuse to accept the proposition of the hon. leader of the Opposition as to a unanimous expression of the opinion of this House in favour of this great policy. This much must be depended upon. The colonies for a number of years were exceedingly underrated in the British mind. England was at one time asleep as to the importance of her colonial possessions. But, Sir, a new race of public men have sprung up in Great Britain. They are a race who look to the glories of the Empire in the future being won in her colonial fields, and with that feeling abroad, with the newer race of public men in Great Britain, there is a determination to help the colonies in every possible way to achieve the destiny which is in store for them as a part of the Empire. And among these men I have no hesitation in saying that the principal one is the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, the Colonial Secretary, whose efforts have always tended towards drawing the colonies closer, and the one thread, the one cord which he desired strengthened and made more vigorous for that purpose is this very tie of colonial and Imperial trade, and I only rise to express my regret that the other side of the House, instead of combatting the idea, instead of opposing it on technicalities, have not joined with the leader of the Opposition in passing a unanimous resolution, which would have done much to encourage those who are trying to help us in the circles of Imperial politics.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois.) As the seconder of this resolution, I claim the indulgence of the House, Mr. Speaker, only for a few moments. I am afraid that we have wandered a little away from the question since the debate began. Some gentlemen have been discussing free trade and protection. As one gentleman said a few moments ago, that might have been germane to the discussion, but I think it was very far away from the motive of those who put that motion into your hands. My impression is that to discuss this matter thoroughly, we must go a few years back and recall the time when Canada, both under Liberal rule and Conservative administration, had been trying to obtain better commercial relations with the United States. We all know that in 1877 Mr. Brown was sent by a Liberal Administration to Washington to try and effect a renewal of our former commercial relations with the United States.

Mr. WALLACE. In 1874.

Mr. BERGERON. Twice then, in 1874 and 1877. Similar efforts were made again by

Conservative administrations from 1878 down to 1891, which, I believe, was the last time when members of this side went to Washington for that purpose, under the Administration of the present leader of the Opposition. Even at that time, the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), who, we all know, has been working ever since he has occupied a seat in this Parliament for the attainment of this great object, and whose zeal we all acknowledge is only surpassed by his patriotism, had taken up this great question. But when he first approached this subject, he had few people to assist him and very few sympathizers. Public opinion, however, through his persistency and on account of the circumstances, began to side with him and to conclude that if we could not have the commercial relations we desired with the United States, we might turn our eyes to the mother land. Thus it was that public opinion was turned strongly in favour of that policy, and the leader of the Opposition, when First Minister of Canada, went to the province of Ontario and there preached this policy of closer commercial relations with the mother country. So much did public opinion sympathize with his views that the right hon. gentleman who now leads the Government determined to follow his lead and use the wind which seemed to be filling his sails. In the city of London and in the city of Toronto he declared that he also was in favour of commercial relations with the mother land just as much as was Sir Charles Tupper the then leader of the Government. We need not enter into any very long discussion to find out why the right hon. gentleman and those who are following him have since changed their mind. In 1897 the right hon. gentleman went to England to represent Canada at the Queen's Jubilee. At that time some of the broadest-minded politicians in England, the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, the Duke of Devonshire, and others, were preparing public opinion in the mother country to favour closer commercial relations with the colonies. We all know how conservative the English nation is and how hard it is to change public opinion in that country. We all know how hard it is to make free trade England appreciate any movement in the direction, I will not say of protection, but even fair trade. Still the good work was going on, and when the right hon. gentleman arrived in England in 1897, with the other Premiers of the different colonies of the Empire it had made considerable progress. I was astonished the other night to hear the right hon. gentleman say that in England it was useless to speak of such a policy because any commercial relations that might take place between the colonies and the mother country would have to be on a free trade basis. He seemed to have forgotten that when he arrived in Liverpool, even before he had time to meet the Duke of Devon-

shire or Mr. Chamberlain or any others of the leading men of England, he immediately knocked the whole scheme on the head by declaring that Canada was not prepared to do anything in the direction of this policy, because Canada did not want to touch the free trade policy of England, which was the best policy. No doubt it was that speech of his which earned for him the Cobden Medal. In that speech he declared that the policy of his Government was in the direction of free trade, but that he had not yet arrived at that goal, and that consequently he could not be expected to give in his adhesion to the policy of preferential trade. That declaration of the right hon. gentleman put a stop to the movement. It was no use talking about it any more. Lord Rosebery declared that he was afraid to talk about the matter because it seemed like a corpse, and Mr. Chamberlain said he would not touch it with a ten-foot pole. It was dead. What were the reasons given last night by the right hon. gentleman for opposing this resolution? I was surprised at his not accepting it because it is framed in such a way that he could have accepted it, and it would then have gone forth to the world that the Parliament of Canada was in favour of such a policy. What were the reasons he gave? They were, first, that Canada has a protective policy. Why, during the past three years we have heard hon. gentlemen opposite declare that their policy is not protective but that we had a revenue tariff. The right hon. gentleman, however, to-day declares that his policy is one of protection and that there could be no closer commercial relations with the Empire except on the bases of free trade. I was astonished, a few moments ago, when I heard the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) declare quite the reverse. He is opposed to this resolution because he is in favour of free trade. I do not know how the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government and his supporter from Frontenac can agree in voting both alike on the same question, when both oppose this motion from a completely different stand-point and for exactly opposite reasons.

The hon. Postmaster General last night seemed to think he was giving a blow to the whole scheme when he read a letter from the Duke of Devonshire. The hon. gentleman's proceeding seemed to me to rather lack courtesy. He had sent to the Duke of Devonshire a newspaper from Canada purporting to contain a report of a speech made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and it seems to me it would have been more courteous on his part to have first asked the hon. leader of the Opposition if he had been correctly reported in that paper. Still he sends to the Duke of Devonshire what is supposed to have been the utterance of the leader of the Opposition, but which the leader of the Opposition has declared since were not correctly reported—

Mr. MONTAGUE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I did not say that. I may say that the statement my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) made, that the speech was very incorrectly reported, was quite true. I took occasion to call the attention of the editor of the "Mail and Empire" of the very imperfect report that was made of my speech, and he explained that owing to the sickness of the reporter who was to have attended the meeting, a very inferior reporter had to be sent to take his place. While the report was an imperfect one, I did not complain of the statement made so far as referred to by the Postmaster General.

Mr. BERGERON. What I heard the Postmaster General say was this: That he sent to the Duke of Devonshire a paper in which an utterance to this effect was printed—that an offer had been made by the Duke of Devonshire to the right hon. gentleman—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say that.

Mr. BERGERON. That is what I was saying, that the leader of the Opposition had declared that he had not used such language.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend will allow me still to explain. The position that the Postmaster General put the question in was not correct, because my reference was to what the Duke of Devonshire had said to the assembled Premiers at the meeting. I did not say that the Duke of Devonshire had made a definite proposal to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and that is what I took exception to in the letter of the Postmaster General, and in the answer of the Duke of Devonshire.

Mr. BERGERON. The whole thing is here in "Hansard." The Postmaster General brought to the knowledge of the Duke of Devonshire that it had been said that he had made offers to the Premier of Canada. It was not true; this had not been said in that way. What had been said was that the Imperial authorities had gone very far towards helping such a policy—and that is perfectly correct. But the Duke of Devonshire, in his answer, does not say anything which could give to any man in this House a pretext to vote down this resolution, as has been declared by some of the hon. gentlemen opposite. The Duke of Devonshire admits that his utterances were heralded in the papers as something against free trade, although he says he did not do it for that purpose. But one thing is clear in all this, and that is, that the Imperial authorities, the Duke of Devonshire with the United Empire League, the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, and Mr. Vincent—he was Mr. Vincent when he was here a few years ago, but I am informed that he is now Sir Howard Vincent—advocated drawing closer the relations between the mother country and the colonies.

Then, the right hon. Premier (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) immediately on arriving in England, for what reason we do not know, but surely not for the reason that he gave last night, poured cold water upon the whole scheme. But that did not prevent him obtaining the Cobden medal, and to-day he is back in Canada at the head of a protectionist Administration. And in spite of his utterances he refuses—what? The terms of this resolution are very clear, and this is what he refuses:

To do anything to secure for the produce of Canada that preferential treatment in the markets of the United Kingdom which would be of such inestimable value to the farmers and other producers of Canada.

That is the whole case. Does my hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) assume his present attitude because he expects to meet in a few days or in a few weeks the American commissioners? If so, my impression is that he is putting his case in a worse position. If he refuses to do anything to thus obtain better commercial relations with the mother country, and if he does not succeed—and it is my impression he will not succeed—with the American commissioners, where does he stand? As has been well said in the speech of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson—a fine speech and one containing every possible reason why this House should unanimously support this resolution—Canada has everything to make her great in every possible way. Canada has now a little over 5,000,000 of inhabitants. We are perfectly well satisfied with the position we occupy. We are perfectly satisfied with the protection we have had under the British flag. Every part of this Dominion is satisfied, and, if I may speak more particularly for the province of Quebec, I would say that in no other province of the Dominion are there more devoted and loyal subjects, or subjects better satisfied with the system under which we live than in that province. The people of Great Britain import over \$600,000,000 worth of goods every year, the greater part of them of such classes as we could furnish. What is our share in this \$600,000,000 worth of goods? About \$50,000,000. The greater portion of these products come from Russia, France, Germany, Belgium and the United States. Why should we not help on the policy which has been promoted in England by men of such importance as the Duke of Devonshire and Mr. Chamberlain to bring about closer relations between England and the mother country? Under such a policy we could use more of the goods manufactured in England, and we could send to England much more of what is produced in Canada. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers), considering that he spoke particularly in the name of the farmers. If there is one class more than another that would benefit with such a policy as we advocate, it would be the farmers of Canada. My hon. friend from Frontenac, in

his long discourse, spoke about direct taxation. If the Minister of Trade and Commerce would speak openly, I believe he would speak in the same sense. That is a matter to be debated. Some gentlemen are in favour of direct taxation as being in accord with sound political economy, while others favour the system that we have today. It has been the boast of some of the Liberal chiefs in the old times that they were in favour of direct taxation. The right hon. Premier, when he discussed the matter at Liverpool, never mentioned that. If he is a free trader as he pretends; if he is worthy to have the Cobden medal which he wears, he should be in favour of direct taxation, as they are in England; and if he is not, I say he is not sincere. He comes here and stands at the head of a protectionist administration, and refuses, as by the declaration made last night—and I suppose he will carry with him the whole of his party—to do anything toward the realization of the hope of a great many people in England and of a great many people in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will not say any more on this subject. It is the last shred, I believe, which has been thrown to the winds by the right hon. gentleman and his party of all the promises they made before the election. They have been false to their promises upon the tariff question, they have been false to their promises upon the economic question, they have been false to all the promises made when on this side of the House, and the right hon. gentleman has even been false to the position which he took not earlier than 1896. Is that an explanation of these immense Estimates which have been brought down by the Minister of Finance this session? We are now called upon to vote nearly \$55,000,000 this year, and afterwards, I suppose, hon. gentlemen opposite are going to the country to try and induce the electors to support them, in spite of the fact that they have been false to their promises. We know that they have been successful in some by-elections, but how, Mr. Speaker? The machine has been working hard and we are seeing into the way it works in some other part of this building. But let me tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that though they have been able to succeed in a few counties, through the worst elements of those counties, when the great electorate of the Dominion of Canada has an opportunity to pronounce its voice, it will send those hon. gentlemen back to occupy the position which they occupied before and from which they never should have emerged.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). I would not think it necessary to make any remarks upon this occasion were it not for the short but pithy speech of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. MacPherson); and when a gentleman in this House feels so strongly upon the subject that he declares this House of

Mr. BERGERON.

Commons is wasting time in discussing this question, I really think that every person in the House who differs with him, and who looks upon this as a live question, as a very important question, should in some way express himself to that effect. Now, I think I may say this much, that there is no other question at present before the Canadian people which is more generally thought of than preferential trade. It may be that the hon. member for Hamilton is perfectly right when he says that this is an entirely unattainable object; but I think that a great number of the electors of Canada know pretty nearly what preferential trade means, and I think a large percentage of them hope to see it realized. I know, for my own part, that the farmers, so far as I have met them, are anxious indeed to see the markets of Great Britain opened to us on better terms. There is no question as to the importance and value to the farmers of Canada of obtaining, if necessary, a preferential position in the British market. That has been adverted to upon a great many platforms throughout the country. I think it is perfectly understood everywhere that if we could obtain a preferential position in the markets of Great Britain, it would be, as was expressed here to-night, a force more potent for the advantage of Canada than anything that could be devised by any expenditure of ingenuity or outlay of money.

There are other reasons, it strikes me, that tend to assist this movement. Not only do our farmers hope to reach the markets of England, but there is a large school of people who hold that the most important and dearest of all Britain's interest, her security and safety, require that she should as fast as possible develop the trade of her colonies, that she may be able to feed herself from friendly countries, from her own colonies if necessary. It is realized in England, as I think it is probably realized by the enemies of England outside, that a country with her enormous population, which has only about six weeks provisions on hand, and which, being an island, is liable to be cut off from communication with the rest of the world, is in a condition that would be really desperate if by any accident the two great countries that at present feed her, Russia and the United States, should refuse to send her supplies, or if an enemy could command her ports so as to blockade them. Every person who has considered this subject, agrees at once that that danger which some people seem to think may threaten England, is of such magnitude that there ought to be an effort made to secure such a state of affairs as would enable Canada to supply England. Canada is the nearest portion of British territory which is in a position to supply her with food, and furthermore, the route across the north Atlantic, by which supplies could be carried from

Canada to England, is one which the great naval power of England could make absolutely secure. Even in time of war, it is unassailable from the northern side, and controlling the Atlantic as Great Britain does, the development of the farming interest of Canada to such an extent as to guarantee the satisfactory feeding of the British population would, coupled with the power of Great Britain, make her position not only independent, but absolutely secure.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think, although the member for Hamilton does not think so, that throughout the English-speaking world, not only in Great Britain, but in all her colonies as well, there is a strong tendency at work to draw the people of British blood and British origin closer and closer together. There is an idea now, I think, universally felt that Great Britain is not the whole British Empire. I think that all the great self-governing colonies, and indeed all the possessions of Great Britain, are gradually coming together and being welded into one great politically united government. This tendency will, at a very early period, make necessary such changes in the form of government as will result in the aggregation of the various provinces and dependencies of the Empire with a consolidated central government, and unquestionably it will be one by which the power and strength and resources of every portion of the Empire can be brought together for purposes of defence or for purposes of attack. The first object, I believe, that is going to be realized, is to consolidate the different parts of the Empire in a form in which they can present the whole British Empire as a united front against the rest of the world, though not in a hostile sense at present.

Now, there are some features about this discussion which, I think, must have struck any person hearing it. In the first place, instead of discussing the question of trade between Great Britain and her dependencies, one that we would naturally expect to occupy the first importance in the discussion of this question, it will be found that all the earlier speeches in this debate dwelt altogether upon a different subject; they dealt entirely with the question as to what was the real attitude of certain British politicians and statesmen. Nearly the whole speech of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, the speech of the leader of the Government, the speech of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), as well as that of the member for West Assinibola (Mr. Davin), were entirely devoted to trying to make clear what was the precise attitude and what were the real opinions held by certain prominent British statesmen. Now, that may seem a little strange, still I think it was the proper course to be followed in this discussion, because when we come together to settle this question, as some time not very late, I believe we will, it will be found that the opinions which will have

to be considered, the opinions which were referred to by the member for Hamilton, the opinions of free trade England, England being the senior partner in the concern, must necessarily have a controlling influence. It will be necessary to know what is the attitude of the great public men of England, without which it will be impossible to take a step or to have the slightest idea as to what lies before us.

Now, I think that, as far as this discussion has gone, the facts elicited and opinions developed as being held by the leading public men of England, are of a character certainly not to discourage those who are in favour of preferential trade, but rather to encourage them. The opinion of Lord Salisbury, as expressed some years ago, when the question of the German and Belgian treaties, which were even at that day realized as being stumbling-blocks in the way of preferential trade, was discussed, was in favour of the abrogation of these treaties, he going so far as to say that they should never have been drawn. The expressions quoted from the Duke of Devonshire go to show that, so far as he is concerned, the strong and fixed attachment to free trade as the only system calculated to meet the requirements of Great Britain, is not held by him, as by some political economists, so strongly as to be an obstacle in the way of preferential trade. When we consider the position of Mr. Chamberlain, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, as set forth in the different quotations which have been made from him, we find that there is but one sentiment pervading the whole of his utterances, and that is, that he looks upon the question as one ripe for discussion. He does not refuse to discuss it, but he takes the ground that it is a question which must be discussed, not upon a proposition made by Great Britain, but made by the colonies, and he deliberately invites the colonies to an expression of opinion, and assures them that they will be met in a generous spirit by the mother country. That being the case, I think that, instead of feeling discouraged, instead of looking upon it as a perfectly hopeless thing, the colonies should continue to make advances to the British Government in this direction. It seems to me that the time is ripe for a full and free discussion of this great question, and I believe that, while it is the duty of the representatives of the people of Canada, as represented in this Parliament, to confirm that fact, and to urge the Government to take that course, it is for the Government, as a body charged with the business of government, to make advances, either directly to the British Government, or by conference with the representatives of the other colonies, so that they may all unitedly approach the British Government. I believe that the British Government expect that, and I feel satisfied that a consideration of what has been done

in this direction should not discourage the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. MacPherson), but rather ought to encourage him to believe that he may live—and I do not think it will be many years hence—to see this hope, indulged in by so many people in Canada, realized. This matter has already been brought in official fashion to the notice of the British public. At the Conference of the Colonial Premiers, held in Ottawa in 1894, a resolution was passed which was submitted to the Home Government and replied to by the Marquis of Ripon, as representing that Government. This reply was distinctly unfavourable, but upon what points, let us see. In the first place, the existence of the Belgian and German treaties was urged against the adoption of the plan. In addition to that, it was argued that a preference given in the colonial markets could not be weighed fairly against the disadvantage that might result in foreign markets, because it was shown by statistical authority that the trade of the British colonies only represented about one-fourth of the foreign trade of Great Britain. Now, there is nothing discouraging in that. It is a reason and in consequence a matter with which you can deal, because when you have a person opposed to you advancing reasonable arguments, you are in a position to consider his arguments, and if you can show that they are unsound, or that circumstances and the passage of time are bringing about different conditions, you may hope to persuade your opponent to take a different position and to come to a different conclusion. It will be found, when we examine the trade of Great Britain, that to-day we do not meet exactly the same state of affairs which was met by these colonial Premiers, to which the Marquis of Ripon replies. Within four years these two treaties which, as he pointed out, were plainly stumbling blocks of a most serious character to any negotiation, have been removed absolutely. During the sixteen years preceding 1897, from 1881, the question of the denunciation of these treaties had engaged the attention of the Government of Canada, but it was not until the tariff of 1897 had been passed that at last the British Government gave way and these treaties, which were a stumbling block to preferential trade, were removed. They were removed in consequence of steady and persistent efforts, supported by logical reasons and facts. I believe that the other difficulties which stand in the way, and the other reasons advanced by the Marquis of Ripon, in a similar way will be disposed of, and that we will have perhaps a complete solution of this matter, because, whereas the Marquis of Ripon was perfectly right in saying that the whole trade of the British colonies only bears a proportion of one-quarter to the whole foreign trade of Great Britain, it will be found, in addition to that, when we come

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

to consider the total export trade of Great Britain, as between her colonies and foreign countries, that instead of it being 25 per cent, the British colonies represent 32 per cent of the trade. The consequence is, that every day, and every year, the trade of the British colonies, British possessions, and British dependencies is becoming a more important trade to that enormous class, that influential and powerful class, which I presume to-day controls the politics of Great Britain, the great manufacturing and exporting business class, the merchant class of which the hon. member for Hamilton spoke. The trade of these dependencies and colonies is becoming a great trade, and is becoming more important to the British people. I maintain that, instead of having any reason to be discouraged, when we consider the utterances of Lord Salisbury and of the other public men which have been cited, when we consider the result that is following these constant efforts to-day, when we consider the tendency of Great Britain's trade at this moment, I think that every one will see that we have reason to feel satisfied that all that is required to carry to a satisfactory conclusion at an early day our effort to see a greater Britain and a greater Empire consolidated, with preferential trade arrangements established throughout all these colonies, is steady, persistent action on the part of the several dependencies concerned. There is one objection that may be urged to the programme so long and so ably advocated by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), and it is, that he has not submitted a plan, that no person is in a position to submit a perfected plan. Even that is in sight, because the utterance of Mr. Chamberlain almost exactly indicates the line and direction upon which action must be taken, and indicates it in the most liberal sense, because he says that the British public and British Government, instead of binding themselves to a strong adherence to free trade theories and doctrines, are perfectly willing to give the colonies a great deal of latitude in the establishment of customs tariffs for the several portions of the Empire, and in the maintenance of revenue tariffs as between one portion of the Empire and another. We might expect that from Great Britain, because, although we are always in the habit of speaking of Great Britain as a free trade country, we should speak of her as a free trade country with great limitations. A large amount of the revenue of Great Britain is derived from a customs tariff upon the same articles that are taxed in this country, and I think that for the necessary services of the greater Empire, which would result from this consolidation, a greater latitude would be allowed the component parts of the Empire to impose duties to sustain their revenues. I think the language will go to show plainly, that a certain amount of even protective

tariff might be allowed as against the outside parts of the world. The complaint of those who oppose our contention is that we are not able to show any vestige of a plan for our scheme. I appeal to those in this House and in the country who have been imperial federationists in the past, and there are many of them here, to remember how fifteen or twenty years ago the name of Imperial federationist was derided, how those of us who believed in this term, which I may say is now almost realized, were scoffed at. The great argument of the enemies of Imperial Federation was then to say to us: You have no plan; and, Sir, when we spoke in reply to that, we said that the strongest ground for the faith that was in us was that we had no plan, that we expected Imperial Federation when accomplished not to be the device of any one man's mind, but a growth, as that great country of which we are citizens was the growth, of a people who had the instincts of government, and the capacity to found states and to develop them. We maintained that in the very fact that we had no plan lay our greatest strength, for we felt we were parts of a great movement which had gone on to great things in the past and would go on to greater things in the future. I believe that this great question of preferential trade, which is only one of the subordinate questions in connection with the greater Britain, will be worked out in the same way. We know that the Anglo-Saxon people of which we form part have while showing themselves tenacious in adhering to everything good in their past, tenacious of respect for their traditions and established institutions, possessed at the same time that higher and greater virtue of not being tied to these traditions, but ready when the time came to change and shape them and conform them to the conditions existing under which they could work out greater and greater things than had been accomplished in the past.

Mr. A. BRODER (Dundas). I do not care to give a silent vote on this question, but I shall claim the indulgence of the House for only a few moments. I shall take the opportunity of referring to some remarks addressed to the House by hon. gentlemen opposite who spoke against the motion now in your hands, Mr. Speaker. In the first place, let me deal with my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Macpherson), who, I think, has taken a very peculiar position on this question. He seems to think that the English people will deal with this matter only from a business stand-point. I admit that to a very considerable extent, but I point out that that statement does away altogether with all that these hon. gentlemen have claimed for their Premier, in giving to England a preference under this system, viz., that with one stroke of his statesmanship, he changed the whole sentiment of the English public in reference to Canada. And by

what means did he do it? By giving a preference in our market of 12½ per cent, and if public sentiment in England could be changed by that, then I think the English public did not look from a business stand-point upon the action of the Premier of Canada in that respect. I venture to say that if my hon. friend (Mr. Macpherson) will look into the matter, he will find that while it is true the English people do in a practical commonsense way look upon those matters from a business stand-point, that is the strongest reason why we can approach them to obtain the preferential trade sought by this resolution. Did not Mr. Chamberlain state a short time ago in England, that Canada, Australia and South Africa with 13,000,000 of people, take as much in value of goods from Great Britain as do Germany, France and Russia, with a population of 220,000,000. I fear my hon. friend (Mr. Macpherson) did not look on this question in all its bearings when he reached the conclusion he did, as to the remoteness of our chance of obtaining this preference in England, because of the smallness of our population and the comparatively small business we are doing in the English market. I wish further to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a question which is more important than many hon. gentlemen in this House seems to think it is. If you look at the English market for the last twenty years you will find that it has been substantially a stationary market. What I mean is, that its importation of agricultural food products has only increased as the population of the country has increased. I do not speak of all the natural products that England imports, but I speak of the agricultural food products which the English people buy from foreign countries including the colonies. If you look from the year 1878 down to the present, you will find that the importation of this class of goods into England has only increased as the population has increased. I wish to make the point, that that market being stationary, there is very little elasticity in it, and therefore it is most important that the colonies should secure a foothold through preferential trade in that market if possible, before it is still more closely occupied by other countries than Canada. If we go into the English market sitting in the front seat, rather than in the hind one, to use a common expression, it would be a great boon not only to the farmers of this country but to all the producers of Canada. It is a great deal better for us to go into the English market on a clear road, than to go in as a country, that would, so to speak, have to jump hurdles to get there. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that hon. gentlemen opposite take a serious responsibility if they vote against this motion. There can be no greater danger in the interests of this country, than that on a motion like this hon. gentlemen opposite should vote against it. The significance of this House

of Commons composed of 213 members, by a solid vote asking this advantage from the mother country, would have a moral weight on the British mind that is almost incalculable. If we in Canada and the other colonies could approach England as a unit on this question, the treatment we now receive at the hands of other countries would be modified before two years. The responsibility that hon. gentlemen opposite take, in keeping the position of things as they are, so far as other country's treatment of us and of England is concerned, must rest with these hon. gentlemen. I assert here, that if it once entered into the minds of the American people, for instance, that the colonies and Great Britain were sitting down in Council together to decide upon a policy in reference to their trade with each other, a policy that would give to each of them a preference over outside countries, the policy of the United States towards this country and towards England would be modified before two years. That same argument applies to every country that exports goods into England. I make that statement for the reason that the great carrying trade of the world is largely in the hands of England and her colonies. You may go to any seaport you like, and nearly every vessel that is going or coming thence is either going to a British port or coming from her shores. And, Sir, the gentlemen opposite, who take the responsibility of saying to England: We do not want this preferential trade from your hands, take a responsibility that no patriotic Canadian ought to take.

Now, Sir, I wish to deal with this question for a moment or two from the farmer's stand-point, and I do that simply for the reason that some might take the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) as an exponent of that class of the community. That gentleman (Mr. Rogers) has made statements which cannot be accepted by any man who claims to belong to that humble class of individuals in this country.

Mr. EDWARDS. Noble class.

Mr. BRODER. Noble class, if you like, but they are badly represented sometimes. I say that no class of the community is so much interested in this preferential trade movement as is the farming class. What does it mean to the farmer? It means to him that not only the possibilities of a great development immediately within his reach in this country, but it means to him a preference in the vast English market over other countries. And, Sir, when you hold out to the farmer the inducement of increasing his products by improved means of agriculture the corresponding responsibility rests upon the public men of this country to find him a market for these products. When hon. gentlemen look over this country and consider its great possibilities, as any class of public men ought to do, the corres-

Mr. BRODER.

ponding possibilities must rest upon them of endeavouring to secure for Canada a foothold in that market to which the world has to look for the disposal of its surplus products. The farmers of this country have a right to expect at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite, if we take their past promises into account, something more than stone when the people ask for bread. The people have got nothing but stone from hon. gentlemen opposite; they have got promises, but in reality nothing more. While the hearts of these hon. gentlemen were bleeding for eighteen years while they were in Opposition for that particular class of people who they declared were abused at the hands of the Conservative party when it was in power, do we find their hearts bleeding to-day? No, they are to-day after a different class of people; they are giving their attention to the manufacturers and the great corporations. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) condemn the proposition before the House. I was surprised to hear that hon. gentleman, who claims to stand here as the exponent of the farmers and producers of this country, condemn this attempt to assist that particular class. The farmers of this country, however, will be a unit in endorsing the effort of that part of this House which is supporting this movement on their behalf; for the farmers of this country are alive to their interests in this matter. While they are alive to improved methods of farming, they are equally alive to the best markets for their products. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim that the English public are not ready to accept any such proposition as this; yet they, as leading public men, followed by the whole rank and file of their party, were willing to commit this country to a shadow, and to hand its fortunes over, not to England, but to a foreign country, without any official recognition on the part of that country, or any indication that they would accept what hon. gentlemen opposite offered to give. Those hon. gentlemen asked the people to take them on trust, and they were willing to entrust to the American nation all the interests of this country; but they are not willing to-night to trust England. These hon. gentlemen have condemned themselves in this respect, that if there is anybody under heaven we can approach in this matter, it is England. If the colonies approach England, England will be very slow to say no to a proposition from her own colonies. The English public mind to-day is in touch with the colonies, so far as the unity of the Empire is concerned. Only a few years ago the significance of that position was strongly brought to the front by the position of the colonies in reference to England, when, as an American Senator said, "She stood with her back to the wall, facing a world in arms, undaunted and unafraid." When she stood in that position, her colonies showed a disposition to stand together in her defence. That sentiment is still alive to-day.

Yet the hon. gentlemen on the Government side are willing to attempt to stifle that sentiment in the interests of their party. As the leader of the Opposition has shown a disposition to meet hon. gentlemen opposite with a resolution without a sting of condemnation in it, but only expressing the hope that something might be done in the interest of preferential trade, those hon. gentlemen are not willing to stand with him in expressing the hope that something may be done to promote this great movement which every Canadian ought to endorse.

House divided on amendment of Sir Charles Tupper.

**NAYS :**

**Messieurs**

- |                          |                    |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Angers,                  | Lang,              |
| Bain,                    | Lavergne,          |
| Bazinet,                 | Lewis,             |
| Beith,                   | Livingston,        |
| Belcourt,                | Logan,             |
| Bell (Prince, East),     | Macdonald (Huron), |
| Bethune,                 | Macdonell,         |
| Blair,                   | Mackie,            |
| Borden (King's),         | MacPherson,        |
| Bostock,                 | McClure,           |
| Bourassa,                | McGregor,          |
| Bourbonnais,             | McGugan,           |
| Britton,                 | McHugh,            |
| Burnett,                 | McMillan,          |
| Campbell,                | McMullen,          |
| Cartwright (Sir Rich'd), | Malouin,           |
| Casey,                   | Marcell,           |
| Champagne,               | Martineau,         |
| Cowan,                   | Meigs,             |
| Davis,                   | Mignault,          |
| Demers,                  | Monet,             |
| Desmarais,               | Morrison,          |
| Domville,                | Oliver,            |
| Douglas,                 | Paterson,          |
| Edwards,                 | Pettet,            |
| Ellis,                   | Proulx,            |
| Erb,                     | Richardson,        |
| Flelding,                | Rinfret,           |
| Flint,                   | Ross,              |
| Fraser (Lambton),        | Russell,           |
| Gauthier,                | Scriven,           |
| Gauvreau,                | Semple,            |
| Godbout,                 | Sifton,            |
| Haley,                   | Somerville,        |
| Hutchison,               | Stenson,           |
| Holmes,                  | Talbot, and        |
| Johnston,                | Tucker.—77.        |
| Landerkin,               |                    |

**YEAS :**

**Messieurs**

- |                   |                       |
|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Beattie,          | McDougall,            |
| Bell (Addington), | McInerney,            |
| Bell (Pictou),    | McLennan (Glengarry), |
| Bennett,          | McNeill,              |
| Bergeron,         | Martin,               |
| Borden (Halifax), | Montague,             |
| Broder,           | Moore,                |
| Cargill,          | Merin,                |
| Clancy,           | Powell,               |
| Clarke,           | Prior,                |
| Cochrane,         | Robertson,            |
| Ferguson,         | Roche,                |
| Ganong,           | Rogers,               |
| Guillet,          | Rosamond,             |
| Hale,             | Stubbs,               |
| Henderson,        | Tiedale,              |

- Klock,  
Macdonald (King's),  
MacLaren,  
McAlister,  
McCarthy.

- Tupper (Sir Charles),  
Tyrwhitt,  
Wallace, and  
Wilson.—41.

**PAIRS :**

**Ministerial.**

**Opposition.**

- |                                 |                               |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Madore,                         | Monk,                         |
| Rutherford,                     | Caron (Sir Adolphe),          |
| Christie,                       | Roddick,                      |
| Davies (Sir Louis),             | Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert), |
| Snetsinger,                     | Reid,                         |
| Featherston,                    | Carscallen,                   |
| Penny,                          | Quinn,                        |
| Gibson,                         | Corby,                        |
| Sutherland,                     | Taylor,                       |
| Savard,                         | Dugas,                        |
| Dyment,                         | McCormick,                    |
| Ratz,                           | Ingram,                       |
| McLennan (Inverness),           | Gillies,                      |
| Calvert,                        | Hughes,                       |
| Fitzpatrick,                    | Casgrain,                     |
| McInnes,                        | Earle,                        |
| Maxwell,                        | Robinson,                     |
| Hurley,                         | Craig,                        |
| Costigan,                       | LaRivière,                    |
| Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),          | Davin,                        |
| Mulock,                         | Haggart,                      |
| Lemieux,                        | Mills,                        |
| Fisher,                         | Hodgins,                      |
| Joly de Lotbinière (Sir Henri), | Foster,                       |
| Comstock,                       | Seagram,                      |
| Heyd,                           | Pope,                         |
| Charlton,                       | Osler,                        |
| Dechene,                        | Marcotte,                     |
| Dobell,                         | Maclean,                      |
| Tarte,                          | Poupore,                      |
| Turcot,                         | Chauvin,                      |
| Bazinet,                        | Blanchard,                    |
| Frost,                          | Kendry,                       |
| Fraser (Guysborough),           | Sroule,                       |
| Wood,                           | Gilmour,                      |

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Bowmanville, Ont., harbour..... \$5,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is required to complete the repairs to the pier at Bowmanville Harbour.

Mr. FOSTER. Will this finish the work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it being done by the department ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Bruce Mines Wharf, Ont..... \$10,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A vote was taken last year which proved insufficient, and this is to be applied towards the construction of a public wharf at the foot of Market Street. The estimated cost is \$15,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this the commencement of the work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. There has been a wharf there for twenty-five years, and it must be open to the public.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a private wharf there which has been recently acquired by the mining company, and is not open to the public. This is to be a Government wharf.

Mr. BENNETT. We ought to know what the policy of the Government is with respect to construction of docks in the different provinces. I have not been at Bruce Mines within the past three or four years, but when I was there, there was a very considerable dock at that place at which all the boats on the lake called. As I understand it, the Government have not commenced, but are about to undertake the construction of a wharf which will cost \$15,000; is that correct?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. I think it only fair to the House and the country that the Government should announce their policy with regard to such works. Are they to be constructed only in ridings which are represented by friends of the Administration? Are they to be constructed irrespective of the trade to be done? Are they to be constructed without any assistance from the municipalities? This vote seems to be unfair, because other towns have been forced by the Government to contribute towards the construction of docks before the work was undertaken, as was pointed out by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) the other evening.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think there is anything new in the policy with regard to such votes as this, nor does the vote call for any explanation except to say to what particular purpose the money is to be applied. It has not always been the practice heretofore to insist on municipal contributions towards such works. In some cases municipal grants have been given, but I am informed that in many other cases, not in one province alone, but throughout the Dominion generally, public works of this kind have been constructed by the Government without any municipal contributions. There may be special circumstances in cases where the work is expensive, or where the people particularly desire to have the work completed and are ready to contribute; but I do not think the Government is in a position to insist that this should always be done. I do not think they should insist on contributions in Ontario, when in other provinces they have built such works without that, and even in Ontario, I am informed, municipal contributions have not always been given. As to the political side of the case, it is quite true that there should be no distinction,

Mr. SPROULE.

but that wherever they are required these works ought to be constructed. But I suppose there is a little human nature in party politics. It is alleged that during all the years the Conservative party were in power, they gave a preference to counties represented by their friends. I do not discuss how far that is correct. If it is so and for a time some of the counties that were overlooked received a little consideration, perhaps in course of time, matters will be evened up.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask if there are any cases of docks built by the Government on Georgian Bay and also what is the population of Bruce Mines and its business?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Bruce Mines has a population of 600, I understand. I do not think that the question of population is a vital one in connection with the construction of a wharf.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps my hon. friend would give us some idea of the business.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A memorandum furnished me gives the following information:—

Bruce Mines, a village in the district of Algoma, situated on the north shore of Lake Huron, opposite the east end of the Island of St. Joseph, on the location of the Bruce, Wellington and Huron Copper Bay mines; 387 miles from Collingwood and 45 miles south-east of Sault Ste. Marie. It contains four churches, one hotel and four stores. The copper mines, which are very extensive, are worked by Messrs. John Taylor & Sons, of London, Eng. Steamers from Collingwood and Sarnia touch at this place en route for Thunder Bay, Fort William and Duluth. Population, 600.

Mr. FOSTER. What railway communication has it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that the Sault line of the Canadian Pacific Railway runs in the vicinity.

Mr. FOSTER. "In the vicinity"—what does that mean?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know how closely it runs.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is not able to say that there is any commercial communication between the Sault line and Bruce Mines now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Most of the trade, I am informed, is taken by water—by boat from Collingwood.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the hon. Minister told us that there was a wharf there, but it had been secured by private parties and was not open to general trade.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am so informed.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is an extraordinary state of affairs. The only people who have a business there, apparently, own

the wharf. I cannot conceive of them not allowing boats belonging to other lines to call at the wharf, and so get a revenue from it. Can the Minister tell us who this wharf was built by?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I am advised that it was built by the former owners of the copper mines and the company which now operates the mines has recently purchased the wharf.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. What evidence has the hon. Minister that other people cannot use the wharf.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I have only the information given me by the officials of the department.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I do not think that information is correct, because I have called at it often, and I never understood that any vessel going up the lakes was not at perfect liberty to call at the wharf. I am aware that the old Bruce Mines Copper Company built that wharf originally, but every boat that went up the lake usually called at it. I am aware that a wharf is very much needed there, but the question is whether the present wharf could not be repaired and utilized, thus avoiding the expenditure of building a new wharf. Otherwise there will be two wharfs at a place where one is quite sufficient. On the other hand, I do not understand why the Government take over that wharf and refuse to take over many others. Take Spanish River, for instance, or Little Current; there are no Government wharfs, as I understand, at either, but there are wharfs available to all boats going up or down. The same is true of Sault Ste. Marie. There is one belonging to Marks and the other to the Government. Owners of wharfs are glad to have boats call in order to get a revenue.

Mr. **BENNETT**. What was the cost of the dock built at Thessalon, a village near Bruce Mines?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The contract was \$11,000.

Mr. **BENNETT**. Is it finished?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes.

Mr. **BENNETT**. Thessalon is even smaller than Bruce Mines. But they have a saw-mill, something that Bruce Mines does not possess. Will the hon. Minister assure the House that this work will be done by contract?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I am advised that that is the Minister's intention, but I would not like to give any absolute undertaking.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Will not the Minister of Finance, in accordance with the custom which has prevailed, say whether or not

tenders will be asked for for this dock? Has the Government really undertaken to set aside the principle of tender and contract entirely? I think we have a right to ask the question and get the policy of the Government upon it. To my mind, this was a surprising vote. I cannot help saying so. Here is a little village of 600 people. There is a wharf there. The country near it is not a farming country, it is rocky and barren. Almost the only business done there is done by these mines, and the mine company have their own wharf commodious enough for themselves. There is no railway communication for this town. And the Government proposes to expend \$15,000 to build a wharf which is not necessary, because the present wharf is quite sufficient for the use of the place.

Now, I would like to hear the report of the engineer of the department as to why this was necessary. I must say that it is an astounding thing, and then the Minister, on top of it all, is not disposed to tell this House that the usual rule should be carried out, and that the contract shall be made upon tenders asked. It looks simply like an election job. It is one of the rankest small things I have known in this House for some time.

Mr. **BENNETT**. May I ask if the site has been acquired for the location of the dock, and if so, from whom was it purchased, and at what price has the contract been entered into?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. No site has yet been acquired. With reference to the statement of the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), the Minister, of course, is governed by the statute in regard to public works, and that will have to be followed.

Mr. **FOSTER**. He is not governed by the statute, he has openly again and again violated the statute, and violated it in the face of long-established rules, and he has been supported by the Minister of Finance in doing it, I understand. There was no question more frequently asked, when the former Government brought votes down, than this: Are you going to follow the usual rule? Will this work be done by tender and contract? And we had to answer, and did answer, that they would be so done. Here, in instance after instance, we are told, not only that it is not contemplated to do it in that way, but that before the money is voted the work has been commenced. I think the House ought to know at once, when we entrust the Government with money, whether they are going to job it out, or do it on the square plan of tender and contract. This country is being demoralized, and the Government is responsible for it, in the developments this year and last year with reference to the disposal of public money which is placed in their hands. Not only do they go to work and order expenditures before they have a vote, but they entirely set aside the salutary rule that tenders shall be called

for, and that there shall be competition in these matters.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. If it was the only correct rule, I do not think the predecessor of the present Minister set the example in his department of following that rule. We have had this question threshed out in the absence of the hon. gentleman, and cases have been cited where the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member, spent large sums of money without tender and contract; but I would not reach the conclusion that it was necessarily spent corruptly, I would rather assume that it might have been spent quite legitimately. My hon. friend stating that the Government has set the laws at defiance, does not, by any means prove that they have, that is his opinion. But, on the other hand, we have the opinion of other gentlemen who think that in all substantial particulars the law has been complied with. I have no doubt that in this matter the law will be followed. My own opinion is that the law regarding the construction of such works will be carried out. But I am frank enough to say that, in the absence of the Minister of Public Works, although I do not make any engagements on his behalf in matters which I have not had an opportunity of discussing with him—and I ask the hon. gentleman to consider that fact—it would be absurd that I should undertake on his behalf to give an absolute promise in matters of detail. Whatever the law requires must of necessity be carried out.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Surely you have not come to this pass, that all you have to do is to send the Minister away and then the Government is entirely irresponsible as to how the money shall be spent. The hon. gentleman represents the Minister of Public Works, and the Government is there to say what shall be done. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that because the Minister of Public Works is not here, therefore, nobody can promise that the law will be carried out?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. On the contrary, I say the law will be carried out. I did not need to promise that the law will be carried out, because the Government are bound by the law and must carry it out.

**Mr. FOSTER**. The Government is bound by no law. There was a law as express as English words could make it that the voters' lists were to be printed by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and there is a Minister in another House who interposed his length between that officer and the written statute, and did not print, and has not up to this date printed, what this House declared by solemn statute should be printed. And yet the Government carries out the law!

**Mr. SPROULE**. We have some anxiety with regard to this, because we have an example in that same district where, in my judgment, the law has not been carried out.

**Mr. FOSTER**.

There was a lighthouse to be built there a short time ago. The Government asked for tenders, but some authority interposed after the tenders had been received for the building of that work, I am informed, at a very moderate cost. The tenders were cancelled, and it was built, not by contract, but men were sent on to build that lighthouse, and we find the result was that it cost several hundred dollars more than it would have cost if the tender had been accepted. We find afterwards that it was done through the instructions of the member of the riding, and that the timber which went into that work was bought from the member's book-keeper, not from the member himself, because it would have had to appear in his name; but the timber was sold by the member's book-keeper, it was taken out of the member's mill yard, and was paid for by the Government at a much higher price than, I am told, the same lumber could have been bought for in Owen Sound, and taken up there and put into that lighthouse. Now, when we know that has been done, we are justified in suspecting that this work may be done in the same way. The Minister reserves the power of doing it otherwise than by contract, and he can buy the materials from some friend of the Government, probably from the member for the riding who owns large mills in that part of the country, and who has cut timber. Therefore, it may be supplied in the same way that that lighthouse was supplied. There is another feature to this case. There is a dock there already. True, it is owned by a private corporation, but it is in the interest of that corporation that as many vessels shall call at that dock as possible. Yet, there is no overcrowding, there is ample room for the vessels to call there. It might require a little additional expenditure to give the convenience necessary for all classes of vessels to call, a small expenditure may have to be incurred, but if they undertake the erection of a new dock in that locality, it will mean much more money. How many docks have they taken over on Manitoulin Island and on Georgian Bay? Why have they taken over this dock, when in almost every harbour along that shore the docks are either owned by the municipality or by a private corporation? The business is done over these docks, and the country is saved the expense of constructing new ones. There is just ground for suspicion that this is another job, which is going to be perpetrated upon the same lines as was done in connection with the building of the lighthouse up there. I see that there is a proposal in the supplementary Estimates to make a grant for a dock at Providence Bay. I do not want to be understood as saying that the expenditure is not necessary there. I believe the expenditure is necessary and that it is justifiable. I do not know that there is a dock to accommodate the public at that point, but I do say that

where there is a dock already built, whether owned by a private corporation or an individual, or the municipality, the country is not justified in incurring the large expenditure which must be incurred to build a new dock for the requirements of the travelling public.

Mr. WALLACE. In my opinion, this expenditure is utterly unjustifiable. The Government have not, apparently, considered the matter. The hon. Minister of Finance pleaded, that, because the hon. Minister of Public Works is not here, he did not have the information asked for.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What is the information that, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, I said I did not have?

Mr. WALLACE. What did the hon. Minister tell us?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What is it that I said I did not have?

Mr. WALLACE. The first question asked was, whether this work was to be built by tender.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a question for the future; that is not information.

Mr. WALLACE. That is something that we are entitled to know, when we are called upon to appropriate that money, and that is the information which the hon. gentleman refused to give us. We are entitled to know whether the Government propose to follow the precedent, as mentioned by the hon. member for East Grey, established in the case of the building of a lighthouse in the same constituency, when an hon. member's book-keeper was interested in the scheme. We have not been furnished with any information as to whether a wharf is necessary there or not. The Government ought to be prepared, as the hon. Minister of Finance was not prepared, to give every particle of information in regard to this work. He says that the old wharf, belonging to a private corporation, was locked up. Just imagine a man keeping a hotel, or a man keeping a store, on Sparks street, locking it up and refusing to allow his customers to go in. On public waters they have no power to lock up a wharf. These properties are under the control or regulation of the municipal corporation or the Government, and there is no power to lock them up. The hon. Minister of Finance has utterly failed to justify this expenditure of \$15,000 for a harbour at Bruce Mines.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose the hon. Minister of Finance knows enough of the construction of public works to know that there are always difficulties in getting them constructed. It usually takes deputations and a strong presentation of the case to secure the construction of a work. I would ask the hon. Minister to tell us whether he

has had any request from any board of trade, or any associated business interests, of Bruce Mines, or any corporation there, in connection with it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I cannot assure the hon. member (Mr. Montague) that such associations have made these representations. This work has been urged upon the hon. Minister of Public Works by the representative of the riding. I regret very much that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dymont) is not here to-night, because, if he were here, I have no doubt that he would be able to give a satisfactory answer to all the questions asked.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be well to allow this man to stand until he is here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that he has gone away, and he may not be back at this advanced stage of the session.

Mr. WALLACE. We will wait.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) may be willing to wait, but others may not be willing.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Finance Minister said that he would be willing to stay here until the snow flies.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did, but I do not want to remain here all alone.

Mr. MONTAGUE. At whose request has this work been undertaken?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At the request of the hon. member for the riding (Mr. Dymont). If there was anything wrong with the book-keeper of the hon. member for Algoma, the hon. gentleman, instead of waiting to this period of the session, when the hon. member for Algoma has gone away, should have brought it before a committee of the House, and taken means to discover it.

Mr. WALLACE. It was brought up by the hon. member for East Grey, when the hon. member for Algoma was in his place, and he did not reply.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. member for Algoma did not reply, the reason was, that he could not. I am credibly informed, and I believe it is true, that these were the facts: that he had so manipulated the building of that lighthouse that his book-keeper sold the lumber that went into it, and charged for it a higher price than it could have been purchased for elsewhere, and that the lighthouse cost several hundred dollars more than a respectable man in that locality would have been willing to erect it for. The hon. Minister of Finance, who is acting for the hon. Minister of Public Works, will not give a guarantee to this committee that the work will be done by tender. In view of what took place in regard to this other transaction, we are justified in being suspicious that this is only another election

job. If the hon. Minister of Finance is doing the work of the hon. Minister of Public Works he ought to be prepared to give a guarantee that the usual course in constructing public works will be followed in this case, if he expects the committee to grant this money. If we were convinced that we were only voting this money for the purpose of carrying on political jobbery, the committee should not be expected to vote it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister of Finance, or the Government, must take the responsibility. We are going to vote hundreds of items for public works in these and in the supplementary Estimates. What we do want to know, when these items are up, is, whether the usual course established in connection with new public works will be adopted. There is no reason in the world, in the case of new public works of these dimensions, why tenders should not be called for and a contract based upon tenders let. If there is any reason in this case, let the hon. Minister of Finance tell us what it is. We are going to meet hundreds of cases of this kind, and the Government must take the responsibility of saying whether or not they are going to carry out the rule of having tenders called for and a contract made upon tender. They cannot escape from this responsibility by saying that the hon. Minister of Public Works is not here, and that they dare not promise for the Minister. Therefore, they must take the responsibility of saying that they will, or that they will not; the committee is entitled to a positive answer one way or the other. If they are not going to call for tenders, they must say so, and we will know what we are doing. Over and above that, I want to ask the hon. Minister of Finance for the grounds for building a \$15,000 wharf at this place. Is it business or is it not? As I have represented, this is a small village that is perfectly isolated from all business outside. There is no farming country about it, but it is a rocky place, with no railway running into it. The only business that is done of any extent is the business of the mines. The mine-owners have their own wharf, and that wharf is quite sufficient for any little extra business in that town of 600 people. Six hundred people means only a little more than one hundred families, and there cannot be much other business.

I know and the Minister of Finance knows, dozens of places in the maritime provinces and on the lakes where there is large traffic, and where there is no wharf built by the Government, and where they have asked for a wharf and where they could not get it. \$15,000 is a tidy sum of money and it is too much to give away for the building of a wharf where there is no necessity for it. Surely, simply because Mr. Dymont asks for the expenditure of \$15,000, the Department

Mr. SPROULE.

of Public Works does not grant it without reports from their officers which set out the reasons for the building of this wharf, and states the possible business that will be served by it. Are these reports in existence?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I entirely differ from my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that it is customary to place on the Table of the House the engineer's reports and detailed plans regarding every item. Under exceptional circumstances that information is brought down, but it is entirely unusual to do so on every item.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) is wrong. When Sir Hector Langevin was Minister of Public Works he came to this House with his plans, his measurements, his reports, and everything in hand. Then it was always considered necessary and proper to give that information. This House is the custodian of the people's money, and this House should know that the people's money is not spent without good reasons. It is no answer to say that Mr. Dymont wants it, and, therefore, it ought to be done. That is the last answer in the world, but if there is a commercial basis for it then perhaps the money should be expended.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I agree that the House is entitled to all information, but I ask the House to bear witness that I have given that as far as any human being could give it, and if the Minister (Mr. Tarte) were here he could not do more. I have given the memoranda of the officers, and in this vast country the Minister cannot be expected to personally visit and have personal knowledge of every public work. I know it is a good trick for hon. gentlemen opposite to say that we refuse to give information; that is part of the game.

Mr. WALLACE. Order; no imputation of trickery.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is entirely in order. There is a little plan here, and I will send it to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), but I do not think it will help him much after all the information I have given, and I have given all the information in the department.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend has given all the information in the department, he has furnished the best reason why this vote should not pass. If the department has only that little plan and the little information the Minister gives us, they never should have asked for this vote of \$15,000. There is no game in asking for this information. It is an expenditure which is altogether unusual and we should have a better basis than we have now for voting this money.

Mr. WALLACE. The information which the Minister of Finance gave us was taken

from the Ontario Directory and not from the departmental report.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not happen to have that document.

Mr. WALLACE. Whether you had or not, it is nevertheless the information that is contained in the Ontario Directory, and I can add a little more information to it. This is a customs port, and the revenue collected from Bruce Mines last year was \$336.15, and the revenues from all other sources were \$21.50. That is the sum total of the business done at this place for which you ask an appropriation of \$15,000 to build a wharf.

Mr. FOSTER. How much do they pay the customs officer there ?

Mr. WALLACE. I presume they pay him about \$300 a year.

Mr. CLARKE. Is that for the winter, too ?

Mr. WALLACE. Only for the summer months, he has nothing to do in the winter. The Minister tells us this vote is asked at the request of the member for Algoma (Mr. Dymont). Well, Sir, we are entitled to have the reasons that induced the Minister to comply with the request of that hon. gentleman (Mr. Dymont) and to report to Council that \$15,000 was needed for a wharf at Bruce Mines. That information converted the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Finance, and it might convert us too. But, Sir, that information will not be presented to the House, because here is what the information supplied by the hon. member for Algoma was : It is going to help me in my elections, so give me \$15,000 for that corrupt purpose.

Mr. McDOUGALL. And provide a market for his timber.

Mr. WALLACE. No, provide a market for the timber of his book-keeper as in the case of the lighthouse.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is this the first wharf the Government has ever undertaken to build on the shores of the Georgian Bay ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are no others on the north shore.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then this is a new department ? How much is the Minister going to pay for the site on which he is going to erect a wharf, and how much will the entire work cost when completed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have already given all that information, but perhaps the hon. gentleman was not in the House. The site has not yet been acquired and consequently nothing has been paid. The estimated cost is \$15,000, and I have all the details of the work for that.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the large items ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The largest item in the \$15,000 is : part of approach from shore 600 feet to be built of stone and earth, 4,560 cubic yards estimated at 75 cents a yard, \$3,420. Balance of approach 500 feet long, to be built on piles, 6 piles each bent, 12 feet 6 inch span, \$3,000 ; cribwork, front of landing block, 20 feet x 90 feet, 30,600 cubic feet at 7 cents, \$2,142 ; balance of landing block, 70 feet x 90 feet, on piles, \$1,600 ; dredging approach to proposed landing, 14,000 cubic yards, at 20 cents, \$2,800 ; construction of a freight shed, 50 feet x 20 feet, \$500 ; superintendence and contingencies, \$1,538, making the amount of the estimate \$15,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. That information is very valuable. I want to ask the hon. Minister where else in Ontario, either on the north shore of the Georgian Bay or on any other shore of the lakes the Government have built a pier and erected a warehouse for the accommodation of the public ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The officers tell me that they cannot name a place.

Mr. TAYLOR. In my experience, on all the lakes in Ontario, and at Bruce Mines—and I have been there—where there is business to be done, private enterprise builds wharfs, piers and warehouses, and keeps them up. I know of no other place where the Government has gone into a business of this kind ; and at this little village, which has a population of only 500 or 600, with a revenue of only \$300 all told, and that all paid to the revenue officer to collect it, why the Government should expend this \$15,000 I cannot understand. I would like to know what the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) thinks of this. He used to talk of the late Government perpetrating jobs in constituencies. I would like to know what he and the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) think of the Government branching out into a business of this kind, simply to help one of their supporters to carry an election which they see looming up in the distance. Surely the Minister will drop this item, and not ask his friends to back up a job of this kind. He cannot expect the Opposition to consent to it.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the Minister if he estimates for a dock of a certain length, how does he know, if he has not got the site, what the depth of water will be at the end of the dock ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am told that the site is at the end of a street, and the plan is based upon the depth of water at that point.

Mr. CLARKE. Was any petition received from the inhabitants of the place asking this expenditure to be made ? If so, will the Minister read the petition, and give us the names of those who signed it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have already stated that there was no petition, but that representations were made to the department personally by the member for Algoma (Mr. Dymont).

Mr. SPROULE. Who owns that property ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is the end of a public street, I am told, and not private property.

Mr. BENNETT. The water lot may have been acquired by a private party.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I am informed it is a public water lot.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the Government require to purchase this property ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it is not the intention of the Government to purchase the property.

Mr. TAYLOR. Can the Minister explain what the warehouse is to be for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The warehouse to be placed on the wharf is for steamboat freight, to keep it in out of the wet.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that this is worse than we supposed. There is a customs officer here whose salary is \$400, while the collections amount to only \$300. Is it proposed out of this to make up the deficiency in the salary ? I must beg hon. gentlemen not to press a vote like this. It ought not to be pressed. There is not the least thing to found it on, except the request of the member, and he is not here to press his request. I do appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite not to press such votes as that in this House.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). There is something else for the customs officer to do besides collecting a revenue. This officer, I fancy, has been there a good many years, and there seems to be a good deal of trade going on there. There are to-day 86 arrivals of vessels and 210 departures.

Mr. TAYLOR. They are little fishing smacks.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where did they call if there was no wharf ? I think the Minister of Customs has given away his case. If these vessels call there, there must have been a wharf at which they were accommodated ; and if so, why should there be a new wharf ?

Mr. SPROULE. On what data does the Minister base the cost of this wharf ? He tells us that there is so much cribwork and so much piling to be done. On what information does he base this ? Was there a survey made of the locality by the Government ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A survey was made by the resident engineer of the

Mr. CLARKE.

Government. The information I have been reading is the substance of his report.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is the street built at the end of which the Government propose to build this wharf, or is it only a reserve for a street ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The street runs right to the water. I am informed that it is a street. I am told that it is at the foot of a street known as Marks Street, and that it runs off Taylor Street.

Mr. TAYLOR. Do the Government intend going into a forwarding business, putting up a warehouse, and receiving and shipping freight ? If so, do they intend to appoint an officer to take charge of this warehouse and wharf ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The general practice of the Government is to appoint a wharfinger, who collects fees, and out of them receives a percentage for his services.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman will remember that this is not the first time that a wharf has been built in that country. I do not know how far this locality is from Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Thirty-seven miles.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The late Government, of which the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) was Finance Minister, spent many thousands of dollars in buying the nucleus of a wharf from Mr. Plummer of Sault Ste. Marie, and then having purchased the wharf on consideration that Mr. Plummer should be made the wharfinger at a certain salary, they proceeded to spend many thousands of dollars in extending it into the channel, and on the end of it they spent a large sum building a very large freight shed. There is an enormous traffic there, so large that the Government had to pay a very large sum every year, out of all proportion to what is usually paid wharfingers, to the wharfinger at that wharf. There was a dispute between the Government and Mr. Plummer because he was not paid \$600 or \$700 a year and he sent in a claim. The Deputy Minister of Marine was sent to hold an investigation, and after a lengthy investigation he reported that an enormous amount of work had to be done by the wharfinger that he had to stay up all night receiving packages, and the result was the Government determined not to pay as high a sum as he demanded for having sold the wharf. He put in a claim for what the wharf originally cost, which the Government afterwards had to pay. This is not the first wharf built in that locality, and I do not think that any hon. gentleman who has been there and seen the business done would complain. Wherever a trade requires to be developed, the people have as much right to the construction of wharfs

in that part of the country as we have in the maritime provinces.

Mr. FOSTER. What has all this to do with the item under discussion?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Because the hon. gentleman said this is a new departure and the first wharf built on that north shore.

Mr. FOSTER. The Finance Minister has told us that this is the first instance of such a work having been done on the north shore of the Georgian Bay. Here is the Minister of Customs, than whom no man sitting in this House was so loud-mouthed and strong-voiced and vehement against unnecessary and over-expenditures, and a good second to him is the present Minister of Marine. These two men to-night have not a word to say in favour of a job of that kind.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no job.

Mr. FOSTER. Neither has given one iota of reason why \$15,000 of the people's money should be spent at that place. They do not pretend to show that there is a shadow of a commercial reason for it. Let us be honest with ourselves and the country. Have we the right to put \$15,000 of the people's money in that place. This is one of the most shameless votes I have ever seen brought down. I am not blaming the Minister of Finance because he found these things ready made, and it is his duty to put them through in the absence of the Minister of Public Works, but the Government must take the responsibility. The best way would be simply to withdraw that vote or let it stand until Mr. Pymont is in his place and can give us some reason.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is wrong with reference to the wharf at Sault Ste. Marie. That was built by the Plummers themselves.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was begun by the Plummers and bought by this Government.

Mr. WALLACE. It was built by the Plummers alone, and completed and utilized by them for many years. Then the Government had to acquire it for the construction of the "Soo" Canal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not at all.

Mr. WALLACE. The Government then took it over from the Plummers and a dispute arose as to the terms.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It had nothing to do with the Sault Ste. Marie Canal. I have been at the wharf and examined the evidence, and found that the Plummers had been urging their claim, and there was a report from the Public Works and Justice Departments

concerning this claim of \$7,000 for the purchase of the wharf. It had nothing to do with the Sault Ste. Marie Canal!

Mr. McDOUGALL. Did not the building of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal have to do with the providing of business for that wharf? The hon. gentleman said that I knew nothing about the place or the work.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Were you ever there?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I was.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ever at Bruce Mines?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not talking about that.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The Minister of Finance said the population was 600. The best authority gives it as only 450. The Minister could not tell how far it was from Sault Ste. Marie, and I was able to tell him it was 37 miles. I can tell him more, if he is not willing to take the advice of hon. gentlemen on this side, let me read him a little advice from the Montreal "Witness," a strong Liberal newspaper supporting the Government, on items such as this:

The votes are not, perhaps, excessive in any individual case, but the objects of expenditure are extremely numerous, and it is more than doubtful whether many of them are justifiable from any point of view. A great deal of money is being frittered away upon projects which will yield no adequate return, but the expenditures will please the constituencies. Numerous small sums—three, seven, ten and twenty thousand dollars—are to be expended upon building wharfs and dredging streams, which even small steamers will not use above once a week, if that often.

In the past, under the late Government, it was customary, when application was made for public works of this kind, to obtain information, in the first instance, before making any move in the matter, as to what business was to be done, for what the public wharf or breakwater was required, how many people were likely to use it, what class of business was to be done. The hon. Minister is unable to tell us what class of business is to be done at this wharf even after it is constructed. We have no reason to believe that any business at all will be done. There is only a population of 450 people at this point and we have evidence to the effect that the customs business done there in the past has only reached the sum of \$300 per year, although the expenditure in maintaining that customs point amounts to \$400 a year. Are we going to saddle the country with further expenditure and get nothing in return? We have no proof that it will ever yield a return to the value of a hundred dollars to the country. If the department has such information it should be given to us. The Minister is unable to assure us that the money will be spent by tender and contract,

his reason being that the Minister of Public Works is not here. In my opinion that is no reason at all. The Minister who is in charge of these Estimates should give the information required by the House. It appears that this never went before Council, or if it did, that they were without information as we are. But if Council acted recklessly that is no reason why we should act recklessly. It is our duty to demand necessary information, and to insist that the conditions upon which the money is voted shall be such as are satisfactory to the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. I asked if this was the first wharf and warehouse ever constructed by the Government on the north shore of Georgian Bay, and the Minister of Finance told me it was. Then the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) contradicted that statement and said one had been built at Sault Ste. Marie. Now, at the Georgian Bay ports of Owen Sound, Collingwood and Midland, wharfs and warehouses have been constructed for the traffic. Some years ago all freights passing from the west went by the Sault Ste. Marie Canal. The Plummers had a wharf and warehouse erected there and collected a toll. The Canadian Government, in its wisdom decided to build a canal on the Canadian side, and in carrying out their policy they had to acquire Plummer's wharf. And this is made the excuse for building this wharf which should be left to private enterprise. This is merely throwing so much money into the constituency for election purposes, because this wharf is not needed for the business to be done. If this is carried out as a Government enterprise, we cannot treat other places worse than we treat Bruce Mines, and we shall be expected to acquire all the wharfs at these other ports and put men in charge of them to collect tolls. But, if we leave this to private enterprise it will do all that is necessary to be done. I was going to ask the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) to explain how wharf accommodation was provided at Gananoque, where I live. His late father built the first wharf, ever built there, and private enterprise has always been trusted to provide accommodation for the traffic, not only at Gananoque but at all the other places, so far as I know, along the St. Lawrence. Why, then, should the Government undertake such a work as this at Bruce Mines? I move that the item be struck out.

Mr. SPROULE. There is another objection, Mr. Chairman, to this proposal. We not only incur the expense of building the wharf, but we saddle the country for all time with the salary of a wharfinger. If the business will not yield the sum necessary to pay the salary, it must come from some other source. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has spoken of the wharfinger at Sault Ste. Marie. What surprises me was

Mr. McDougall.

that that hon. gentleman should make such a comparison.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not make a comparison: I was removing a false impression that no money had been spent there in building public wharfs. I thought it was information that the committee ought to have that many thousands had been spent by the Government in extending the wharf and building a freight shed.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the Minister to say that we did the same thing at Sault Ste. Marie that it is proposed to do here. But he forgets that Sault Ste. Marie is one of the important towns of the country. One of the largest pulp mills on the continent is there; there are stores by the dozen, the Canadian Sault canal is there; an immense trade is done and a railway is being commenced. It is the gateway between Lake Superior and the lower lakes and Georgian Bay. And what is Bruce Mines? For twenty years it has been a deserted village, you may say. The hon. Minister said there were about 600 people. When I was there some time ago, I doubt if there were 150 people. If they are opening up the mines, there will be more labourers there, and the population, no doubt, will be larger. It is one of the calling places of the boats, but if trade is being done, it must be done by the corporation owning the mines, because there is no settlement in the locality nor anything to make trade. The company owning the mines have a wharf. I called at it twenty years ago, and I am sure that boats have called at it as long as thirty years ago. At the end of the wharf was a building for receiving freight. I know that a new company have purchased the mines and contemplate opening them; but if they do, they will provide accommodation not only for themselves but for the public as well. If the necessary accommodation will be provided by private enterprise, as it assuredly will be, there is no excuse for the Government entailing this expense upon the country. There is this other feature about it. We will not only be subject to the expenditure of building a new work, and in all probability of purchasing the land from some political friend at an exorbitant price—

Mr. DOMVILLE. That is simply rubbish. No land will have to be purchased; it runs right out to the wharf.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you been there?

Mr. DOMVILLE. Yes, and I know more about it than you do.

Mr. SPROULE. I tell the hon. gentleman he knows nothing at all about it. He cannot tell me to-night whether there is a town site or not. The Minister cannot tell whether they will be obliged to purchase that property, or whether they have a right to occu-

py one foot of it without purchase. It is not only entailing an expense for building a new work that is not required, but it is saddling upon the country for all time to come the expense of keeping a wharfinger there. Now, these mines may fail after a time; then there would be no settlement there, and no one to use the wharf. The expense which is contemplated now of \$15,000 will in all probability increase in a few years to \$20,000, \$30,000, \$40,000 or \$50,000. I know it will increase, because the water is very shallow there; you have got to do a lot of dredging, and from the nature of the soil I would assume that the harbour will fill up again. Then, a breakwater may be required. This is only the commencement of an expense which will be very large in future years.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to my hon. friend during this session. I think in every committee we have had at least four speeches from him. If you turn up the "Hansard," you will find that he has taken up, perhaps not quite half the space, but a large percentage of it. He seems to break out on every subject; possibly he may be the next leader, and so he must have some latitude. I know something about Sault Ste. Marie and about the Bruce Mines. The hon. gentleman says he has been there; then, he knows that at least thirteen or fourteen copper mines were in operation there, and I think there are three churches if not more.

Mr. SPROULE. Are there thirteen or fourteen copper mines in operation to-day? Where is there one?

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend does not seem to catch on. I said there were at one time thirteen in operation, and the works are there to-day, or were there. There are large possibilities in the Bruce Mines. The Canadian Pacific Railway runs 30 or 40 miles back of the Bruce Mines. There have been new discoveries of metal. There is a large shipment of fish; every steamer that stops at that wharf loads boxes packed with fish in ice to go to Duluth and other places.

Mr. SPROULE. The fish goes down to Buffalo.

Mr. DOMVILLE. No matter where it goes. You could not run that steamer onto the bank of the river; you must have a wharf.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a wharf already.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Well, if a wharf is there, that is all right; but the wharf does not remain for ever, does it? It has to be repaired. Now, my hon. friend knows there are great possibilities there. When these mines were opened, copper was found on the other side of the lake, on American ter-

ritory, and it was so much more valuable to work that they abandoned these mines. To-day, with the price of copper so high, many people are there prospecting for copper.

Mr. BENNETT. For coppers.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Well, perhaps my hon. friends want more than coppers over there; I think they do. They have got lots of brass. If they have not got coppers. Then, my hon. friend endeavours to lead this House to believe that there is no necessity for a wharf. I think he is entirely mistaken. I have not been there lately, but there are many buildings there, and there will be more when those mines will be opened up. I do not see what my hon. friend wants a breakwater for. Where are you going to put the breakwater? The channel is not very broad.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has given this House a great deal of information. I never said there was no need for a wharf. I admit there is need for a wharf, but I said there was one there already.

Mr. DOMVILLE. How long ago?

Mr. SPROULE. Forty years ago, thirty years ago, twenty-five years ago. I was there fifteen years ago.

Mr. DOMVILLE. It is a pity you did not stop there.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a pity the hon. gentleman could not give us some information about it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ellis). The hon. gentlemen should address the Chair.

Mr. SPROULE. I know there are great possibilities there, but they do not justify the expenditure of money before it is known there is need for it. He says many mines have been worked there. I admit that, but they have been lying dead for many years; for nearly a quarter of a century they have not been worked at all.

Mr. DOMVILLE. They could not lie, if they were dead.

Mr. SPROULE. Some things lie when they are not dead. But the fact is, they have been abandoned for a long time. It is true, that since the revival of copper mining, that a new company have purchased these mines, and they may turn out valuable in the future, or they may not. If the mines turn out valuable, then we may have a property that will bring us a return. But my contention is, that there is already accommodation there, provided by private enterprise, and why go to this expense for a work which can only come into competition with what has been provided by the company? There is no urgent need for a wharf of any description there at this time.

It is true, that they land their little fishing boats.

An hon. MEMBER. Question, question.

Mr. SPROULE. I am talking to the question. Is the hon. gentleman in such a condition that he does not know what the question is? If so, it would be creditable to him either to hold his tongue or get out.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPROULE. I say that I am talking to the question.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ellis). I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is in order.

Mr. SPROULE. I am talking directly to the question, and I have a right to take the line that I am taking at the present time. If it be found that these mines have no value, the expenditure of that money will be useless. It is true that this is a little fishing station where they land their small boats, skiffs and row boats, but they have been doing that for twenty-five or thirty years. If the Government have no information in regard to this expenditure, in my judgment, they are not justified in asking us to vote the money.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance if he has thought of a question which follows this. If you give to the hon. member for Algoma \$15,000 for a wharf in a place like this, with no commercial reason at all, how can you avoid giving the same to other members? Is the Government setting up the precedent of building \$15,000 wharfs in villages inhabited by 450 people, where there is no industry but mining, and where the mining industry has its own wharf, that is quite sufficient for all purposes? All over this country private wharfs have been built by private means. Private enterprise will say: We have just as much political influence as the hon. member for Algoma. There is no use in paying our money, because the Government will do the work, and there is no end to the tremendous expenditure that follows in the wake of such a precedent as this. It is a matter which business men on both sides of the House ought to think about. Does the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), who is a good business man, justify an expenditure of \$15,000 in this place, where they have a population of 450, where the whole of the customs collection, last year, was only \$300, where there is only the business which is conducted by mining men, who have their own wharf sufficient for the purposes of the place, where there is no railway communication in the town, and where there are no surroundings to the town but broken, rocky, bleak country? I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he thinks this is a businesslike expenditure. There is no justification for it. We have talked about it and now the Government must take the respon-

Mr. SPROULE.

sibility before the country if they think that they can justify it, and they will have to justify it before the country. For my part, I move that the item be struck out.

Mr. EDWARDS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) challenges me to give my opinion, I may say that I know nothing at all of the situation. In general terms, I may say that I do not believe in the Government building wharfs that private enterprise might build, but there are situations and situations, and while, in this locality, there may be only 400 people, the position possibly may be that it is quite justifiable to build a wharf there. Whether it is or not, I am not in a position to say: I can only say that we have wharfs ourselves that are built by ourselves, but I think, in a general way, that wharfs, such as we own, are built by private enterprise. As to this situation, it is one which can be discussed by those who understand it, which, as far as I am concerned, I may say, I do not.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has not a right to know the reasons for this expenditure? Has he not been sent here by the people to see that their money is properly expended, and is he going without a shred of information, because the hon. Minister has not given one bit of information, further than that which I have given, to show that there is any commercial basis for this expenditure, to support this vote? Is the hon. gentleman justified in standing by this vote without asking the hon. Minister for information?

Mr. EDWARDS. I simply say, in reply to the hon. gentleman, that I am not sent here by Algoma. I suppose that the responsibility in regard to this matter will rest upon the hon. member for Algoma. If the wharf was one in this district I certainly would be prepared to state frankly my opinion upon it. But in so far as this wharf which is being erected in Algoma, I know nothing about it, and it would be a great impertinence on my part to offer any opinion upon it at all. In general terms, I think that Ministers who are responsible for expenditures of this kind should give explanations, and I do not think that I am called upon to give any explanation. I have not heard any explanation by the hon. Minister upon it, but I have no doubt that the responsible Minister is quite qualified to give an explanation upon the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. That is about the oddest statement of parliamentary responsibility that I have heard in a long while. Here is a level-headed business man, who represents an intelligent constituency, who is an intelligent man himself, who rises at this period in the history of parliamentary institutions, and says, from his place in the House, that he would consider it an impertinence for him to say anything in reference to a proposal to expend money in another man's constituency.

Mr. EDWARDS. I did not say that at all.

Mr. FOSTER. It comes to that. The hon. gentleman's statement was that because it was another man's constituency he thought it would be an impertinence for him to express an opinion, and so he abrogated his duties and placed them upon the hon. Minister of Finance.

Mr. EDWARDS. That is a very ingenious way of putting it.

Mr. FOSTER. It cannot be put in any other way.

Mr. EDWARDS. That is not correct. Notwithstanding that it is in another constituency, if I knew anything of the situation, I would be prepared to offer an opinion upon it, but I say that it would be an impertinence for me to offer an opinion upon a question I know nothing at all about. If it were in my own locality, I would be supposed to know something about it, and if I happened to be at Bruce Mines I might know something about it, but I know nothing of the question at all, except from the discussion I have heard here to-night. I leave it to the common sense of the House if it would not be imprudent as well as ridiculous on my part, to offer an opinion on a question I know nothing about.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the doctrine of parliamentary duty and responsibility? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) is sent here to know about these things, and if he does not know he is sent here to obtain the information. He is sent here as a member to ask, and the Minister is there as a Minister to give the information. My hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) is just as responsible for every dollar of public money that it is proposed to expend in Algoma, as he is for the money proposed to be expended in his own county. He cannot excuse himself because he says: I have not taken the diligence to make myself acquainted with this. The people of my county and of his county sent us here in order that we might make ourselves acquainted with these things and see that any money taken out of the common fund of the people is properly expended in all constituencies. To carry out any other doctrine would leave a man irresponsible for everything that did not take place in his own county. Under such circumstances there could be no parliamentary responsibility. This is a case in which I even yet hope that the Minister will withdraw the item, or let it stand until he gets further information.

Mr. McCLURE. Whatever may be my vote on this question, I am very glad to know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has at last become a convert to the doctrine that no money should be spent unless there is a commercial necessity for it. If he will come down to the province of Nova Scotia, I will take him to a dozen wharfs built under his own administration that do not

come within that category. I will take him to fifty other places in the province of Nova Scotia—

Mr. McDOUGALL. Name.

Mr. McCLURE. Yes, and I will give him the names if he wishes of places in my county and other counties, where wharfs were refused when there were good commercial reasons for building them, and they were refused for no other reason than that it did not suit his (Mr. Foster's) political views.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I ask my hon. friend what argument he founds on that?

Mr. McCLURE. I found no argument upon it; I simply congratulate the House that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has become a convert to a sound doctrine which he did not practise when he was in power.

Mr. FOSTER. I congratulate my hon. friend (Mr. McClure) on supporting that doctrine in this House.

Mr. McCLURE. I shall support any right doctrine, even though the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) should propose it.

Mr. McGREGOR. When I was a small boy some fifty years ago, I had the pleasure of seeing three or four vessels loading at that dock with copper, but of course they had to load the copper in barrels and it was very troublesome. Copper went down in price and it was found that it could be produced much cheaper in Michigan and other states as well as in South America. Bruce Mines were then abandoned because they did not pay, but we know that within the last few years, copper has advanced greatly in price and mines which did not pay a few years ago are paying well to-day. I am informed that the old Bruce Mines are being re-opened, and they expect to have an immense revival in trade there. There is no better copper ore in America than there is at Bruce Mines, and with the new facilities for taking out the ore and smelting it, I have no doubt that it will pay well and that this place so long dead will come to life and be of great value to Ontario.

Mr. TAYLOR. They have a wharf there now.

Mr. McGREGOR. How do you know?

Mr. TAYLOR. Because I was at Bruce Mines and saw it.

Mr. MACKIE. There seems to be some misunderstanding on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the necessity of this wharf at Bruce Mines. The mines died out some years ago and a great many people left there, but lately they have sprung up again, and I know myself that over ten different mines have been found there lately and some of them are working. There is

quite a settlement going in there from the Ottawa valley as well as from other places.

Mr. FOSTER. A settlement going in where?

Mr. MACKIE. To Bruce Mines.

Mr. FOSTER. Into the town?

Mr. MACKIE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. On farming land?

Mr. MACKIE. Yes. The wharf that is there now is practically useless and is rotting down.

Mr. BENNETT. Not at all, the boats call there every day.

Mr. MACKIE. But the wharf is rotten and the boat is not able to land at it. I know myself that there are agricultural settlers going in to that locality, and a great many people are going in to work the mines, so that I believe the wharf will be required for the accommodation of these people.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McClure) complained that the late Government had spent money on some ten or twelve wharfs in Nova Scotia that were not needed. Now, even supposing that to be true, why does that hon. gentleman to-night support a Government which is doing exactly the same thing? Why not speak of things as they are? When these gentlemen now in power were in opposition they sometimes spent nights discussing items of this kind, and denouncing them as something very corrupt and extravagant. Now I will take it for granted, for the sake of argument, that in 1896 the people of the country turned the Conservatives out of power because they believed the statements of the Liberals with regard to extravagant expenditure. But does not the hon. member for Colchester and his friends see that the Government which they support are now spending more money and with less reason than the Conservatives ever spent? It seems to me that if these gentlemen on the other side had any respect at all for their professions in the past they would vote against this useless and wasteful expenditure of the people's money.

Mr. McCLURE. If the hon. gentleman will give as good reasons for voting against this item as we gave for voting against Conservative extravagance, I have no doubt he will make converts on this side of the House. I am yet waiting to hear a reason why I should vote against this appropriation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot agree in the theory that the building of wharfs anywhere depends on the commercial necessity, or the earning power of these wharfs. It has been found expedient in the past to erect wharfs where the probabilities of trade were moderate, but which were

Mr. MACKIE.

necessary to accommodate a large number of people. If you have a large settlement and an extensive trade in a place, private enterprise would probably provide wharfs, but it is in places where the population is limited that the Government may be reasonably called upon to grant aid in order that the people may be accommodated.

I think that is a sound and sensible reason. As to this particular wharf, it is unfortunate that my hon. friend from Algoma is not here. It is unfortunate that the Minister of Public Works is not here. Both these gentlemen have discussed this matter fully. I am bound to believe that the hon. member for Algoma has asked for this wharf for a legitimate purpose. I regret to see that hon. gentlemen opposite, in anything of this kind, can only see a job, a trick or an election dodge. It is strange that the minds of these hon. gentlemen should dwell on things of this kind. It seems that they cannot imagine a public work to be constructed on any other basis. One would suppose that they had experience of that sort of thing—that suspicion haunts the guilty mind. It appears, from information furnished to the department, that the wharf which exists at Bruce Mines is owned by a private company, that the mail boat calls there, and that the company object to the wharf being used by the public. I am advised that the department had some negotiations with the company through their engineer, with the view of purchasing that wharf in order that it might be made available to the public, and that the owners of the mines declined to consider its sale, declaring that they wanted it for their own private purposes. Thereupon, the hon. member for Algoma asked the Government to provide a wharf for the public. Its cost is large, because I am informed that the water is very shallow, and the wharf must be built out a great distance. I think the explanation is a reasonable one, and the hon. member for Algoma, who is a respectable member of this House, is unfairly attacked in connection with the matter. The Minister of Public Works was satisfied, from his representations, that it was a fair and proper demand, and I think we may ask the House to pass this vote, with the assurance that the work will be done in accordance with the law, and that there will be nothing in the transaction that will not be creditable to the member for Algoma and to the Department of Public Works.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). It seems to me that this is a very expensive piece of work for a place the size of Bruce Mines. If it is done for a political reason, it is expensive on that ground also, because I find that only 97 votes were polled there at the last election. If this work is being done for the purpose of influencing votes, you are paying from \$160 to \$200 for every vote polled. If votes cost that much all through

the country, I am not at all surprised at the extravagance of the present Government.

Mr. SPROULE. There was a vote last year of \$5,000 to commence this work. Will the Minister tell us why that was not expended ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was found that the work would be more expensive, and it was thought better to wait until they had a larger appropriation.

Mr. GUILLET. Despite the statement made by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McClure), I have no recollection of any proposition similar to this being made by the late Government. If there was one, I am sure it would have been strongly denounced from the Opposition side of the House. I know that no such case has occurred with regard to the harbours of Ontario. When I urged strongly on the Government to make an appropriation to improve the harbour of Lakeport, which is a very important harbour, being the outport of the village of Colborne, a large village of some thousand inhabitants, where a customs officer receives a salary of \$700 and collects twice or three times the amount of his salary, I was refused point blank an appropriation for that purpose. The Government pointed out to me that it would be absolutely impossible for them to expend large sums of money to improve small ports. They pointed out that there were a large number of small ports in the maritime provinces, in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and on the Pacific, and that private enterprise had to be relied upon to improve these small harbours. I know of no instance in which the late Government made appropriations of similar character to this, and I challenge any hon. gentleman to point out a case.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance what he thinks of the statement made by the hon. member for Colchester, following the little bit of bad temper which that hon. gentleman showed a few days ago with regard to the expenditure in Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman says he knows of dozens of cases where money was spent by the late Government to no purpose; but he did not name them or any of them. We had better settle that question. The Minister gave us to understand that there was no expenditure in that province that could not be justified on any ground whatever, and I think we ought to have the matter settled between the Minister of Finance and the hon. member for Colchester. If the hon. gentleman is silent, we will conclude that he made a statement which was without foundation. I want to ask if there are not two other wharfs proposed to be built in the same constituency in close proximity to the one under consideration. I think one is at Providence Bay and the other at Sheguindah.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are wharfs proposed on Manitoulin Island.

Mr. PRIOR. I want to ask the Minister of Finance whether I understood him to say that in sparsely populated districts it was right that the Government should build wharfs at places where private enterprise could not be got to build them. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say so ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I said such cases might arise, and the fact that the investment was not a paying one would be no argument against it. I did not lay down any general principle at all.

Mr. PRIOR. That has been the policy of the Government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It has been in no respect a departure from the policy of our predecessors.

Mr. PRIOR. I do not ask whether that was the policy of the late Government or not, but if the present Government have money to spend on such places, there is no reason why British Columbia should not have some of that money. There are dozens of places on the coast where there is a small population, and the people cannot get any wharf from the provincial government or private enterprise. We have always understood it was the duty of the provincial government to build wharfs, and that it was not the duty of the Dominion Government. I am glad to hear that it is.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You are in favour of it.

Mr. PRIOR. No, I am not. I consider it an outrage to build a public wharf at a place where there is already a private one and no occasion for a Government wharf; but if the Government are going to expend money in building wharfs at places such as this, then I say we are entitled to a similar expenditure in British Columbia.

Motion of Mr. Foster negatived: Yeas, 22; Nays, 33.

Mr. FOSTER. Will tenders be called for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is as well we should have a general understanding. It is the practice of the department, in most cases, with new works, and especially works of any considerable size, to invite public tender. I think that is a sound policy. This work is of more than ordinary size, and in general I would approve of the policy of asking for tenders. The law places certain restrictions on the Minister of Public Works with regard to the construction of such work, and the law will be complied with; but if my hon. friend asks me to give a guarantee that every certain work will be let by public tender, regardless of the circumstances, I do not think that is a reasonable request.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to know whether public tenders will be invited for the construction of this work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I believe that the practice will be carried out of inviting tenders, but I cannot, in the name of the Minister of Public Works, give that guarantee. I have only undertaken to look after his estimates, and not to manage his department generally.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been in the House of Commons a considerable number of years, and never heard an answer like that before. It is unworthy of any Government. Simply because the Minister of Public Works is not here, the Government abdicates its responsibility and refuses to tell the House what it has a right to know. It slides out of the responsibility.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not sliding out of the responsibility, but accept it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman sits there as a Minister putting through the Estimates, and dare not say whether the Government will or will not call for tenders. That is treating the House with contempt. The hon. gentleman simply rises in his place and says: I do not know what the Minister of Public Works will do. There is a law; he may obey it, or he may not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will obey the law, and whatever restraint the law places on the department will be observed; and, since the law defines the power of the Minister of Public Works in this matter, the request of the hon. gentleman for information is really not necessary.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman think he is treating the House fairly, or himself?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think so.

Mr. FOSTER. I have never yet heard a Minister, when putting through his estimates, refuse to say whether or not he would call for tenders on a particular work. If the Minister of Public Works were here, he would be frank enough to say what he would do. When putting through his estimates last year, he told us whether he would call for tenders or not. And, when he thought it was better to do the work by day's labour, he would do so, and give his reasons. We have the right to know, when we are putting \$15,000 into the hands of the department, whether the Minister is going to ask for tenders or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The law says that the Minister of Public Works will do this work by public tender and contract, unless, in his judgment, he believes that it would be advantageous to the public to pursue a different course. My hon. friend

Mr. FIELDING.

should not press for an answer further than this. I believe the policy of calling for tenders a proper one. But the hon. gentleman has asked me to enter into a hard-and-fast contract as to whether this work shall be put up to tender.

Mr. FOSTER. I call the members of this House to witness that in no instance—and I think my memory is pretty good—has a Minister, when asked a similar question before, sheltered himself behind a simple recitation of the law. He has been sufficiently manly to say whether he would call for tenders or not. The hon. gentleman is contemplating a special expenditure, and he had no business to ask us to vote it, unless he knows the circumstances, and he must be assumed to have known them, before he asked us to pass this item. He ought to be able to tell us whether it is new work or old work; he ought to have his plans ready, and to be able to give all information. He has the distinction of being the first man in a ministerial position that I can remember who has refused to answer the House fairly and squarely. Can he give any reason why this work should not be put up to tender?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. None.

Mr. FOSTER. Has it not been the rule to do so?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not remember.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not the law?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In some cases it is.

Mr. FOSTER. I have asked the hon. gentleman to tell us whether there is any reason for departing in this instance from the custom and law. Are we not to have an answer with reference to this special case?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I thought I gave an answer.

Mr. FOSTER. And is the hon. gentleman satisfied with that answer?

Mr. BERGERON. I think the Minister of Finance is very prudent. He knows that last year the Minister of Public Works promised the House, when his Estimates were passed, that all such works should be done by tender and contract. But he did not carry out that promise. The Minister of Finance will not make a promise, because he knows it is impossible to keep the Minister of Public Works within the law.

Mr. BENNETT. In accordance with the statute providing that, in the case of any expenditure of \$5,000 or over, on such works as this, there shall be a contract given after tenders are called for, I move:

That the expenditure of \$15,000 for the construction of a dock at Bruce Mines shall be made under contract, for which tenders shall be publicly asked.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. There is no statute such as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) refers to. It was discussed the other night, and we know what it is. I am quite content to take the responsibility of asking the committee not to accept the hon. gentleman's motion.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The hon. gentleman's (Mr. Bennett's) statement may be controverted or not, but the resolution stands by itself.

Mr. **BENNETT**. As the Minister of Finance has taken me to task, I may reply that when the statute was debated the other night it was admitted that it was only in the case of works of urgency, and in cases of necessity suddenly arising, that contracts should not be called. That cannot be pleaded in this case.

The **CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Ellis). Of course, I have not had a great deal of experience, but I doubt whether I can accept a resolution of this kind referring to one amount in the item before us. I would suggest that it might be better to have the resolution come at the end of the item.

Mr. **BENNETT**. The item has not been passed.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. That which appears before the Chairman is the whole item, No. 168, and the amendment refers to only one of the amounts of which it is composed. I think it would be better to have such a motion at the end of the whole item.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The item being before us as a whole, and it seems to me that is the proper way to look at it—this is an amendment to the item as a whole, and I believe it to be in order.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. But we are not discussing the item as a whole.

Mr. **FOSTER**. But, as I understand, the item as a whole is before us.

Mr. **BERGERON**. It was understood that we should proceed by items, which is a matter in the discretion of the committee. Under the circumstances, my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is perfectly in order in moving that a special item shall only be passed on certain conditions.

Mr. **CHAIRMAN**. It is quite in order to move to strike out an item or to reduce it.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Or to pass it with certain conditions.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I do not wish to be technical, otherwise I might point out that the word "dock" is not in the item, nor is there a vote here for \$15,000; but I wish to avoid technicalities and to push on with the business.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 18; nays, 39.

Harbours and Rivers—Ontario—

Burlington Channel—Repairs to piers. \$40,000

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. I am glad to see this amount here, but I think there will be considerable disappointment in the city of Hamilton that the sum is not considerably larger. It seems to me that this amount is small compared with some others. Take, for instance, the item we have just passed—\$10,000 for a work in a town of 450 souls. This item relates to the city of Hamilton, which, I need not remind the House, is one of the most important centres in the Dominion. The city of Hamilton has been hampered, there can be no doubt, by reason of the poor arrangements in connection with its harbour. I think, perhaps, the hon. Minister of Finance was one of the members of the Government who received a deputation a short time ago in connection with this work. The hon. gentleman knows that recently private enterprise in the city of Hamilton erected large smelting works, which, I am very glad to be able to say, have been exceedingly successful. Quite lately consolidation has taken place of the smelting works and the rolling mills. These smelting works are of so much importance that, I am told, they will have need of, perhaps, 200,000 tons of ore, a great part of which will have to come in at the Hamilton harbour.

The deputation which waited upon the Government represented that they desired three things done, if I remember correctly. First, of all they desired the piers rebuilt, next, they desired the channel of the canal deepened, and next, they desired some light-houses to be built, or some lights to be put in place in order to make a harbour of refuge as well as to increase the commercial advantages of the port. I think the information given by the deputation to the committee of council was that the work would cost something like \$300,000. I have here a plan of the work. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman who is in charge of the estimate has a plan also. This is the Burlington Canal, and what the deputation desired and what I think is really necessary, was that this should be extended on both sides in order to lengthen the course, and that this channel here should be very materially deepened. The hon. gentleman must be aware that \$40,000 will not begin to do the work which is being asked to be done in the city of Hamilton. I notice by the item that it is for repairs to old piers. I think it is a question as to whether much money should be spent in connection with the repair of these old piers. I see the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) before me, who knows more of this work than I do, and I think he will agree with me, as well as the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) that these piers are 60 or 65 years old, and it would be better to construct new ones than to spend money in repairing them. Then I see there is no vote apparently for deepening the chan-

nel. Now, if the work is to be carried out in the way that is asked, the channel must be deepened. I am told, and I think those facts were given to the Government, that the parties whose vessels come into Hamilton are unable to get them insured by reason of the slight depth of water, and by reason also of the want of lighthouses and other conveniences which should exist in such a port. I should like to have looked over the supplementary Estimates, and I am surprised to see that a further sum has not been placed in the Estimates for the work of deepening the channel as well as the construction of lighthouses. I would ask the Minister what this \$43,000 is to be spent for, and whether it is the intention of the Government to confine the work simply to repairing the old piers, or whether it is the intention to deepen the channel. Might I also ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether it is the intention to erect any lighthouses there as asked for by the deputation from Hamilton?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This vote of \$40,000 is for Burlington Bay. It is proposed to repair the old work on an estimate of about \$44,000. It is quite true that a petition was sent in for deepening the water, but there is a serious difficulty there. The old piers are only 12 or 15 feet deep, and if the surrounding section were dredged to the depth of 20 feet the whole work would tumble. I am told the construction of the work on the large scale contemplated by some of those who approached the Government, would cost upwards of \$400,000. That was a larger sum than we felt justified in appropriating, and it was deemed expedient to repair the old works on an estimate of \$44,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think an estimate was made by the local engineer, and I think he reported that the works as proposed by the deputation, namely, the extension of these piers and the deepening, and I am informed the lighthouse work as well, would only cost something like \$225,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Was that by the departmental engineer?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, I think, perhaps, by the city engineer. Does the hon. gentleman intend to extend the piers?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, for the present this vote does not contemplate an extension, it is simply to repair the work.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am sorry the hon. gentleman, in this year of abundance and of enormous estimates, could not find a larger sum for an important city like Hamilton. The Minister of Railways and Canals found a way of dredging the side of an old wharf and fixing it up down in the city of St. John, and, perhaps, it might be done here. But the hon. gentleman sees it is a very small vote. Here we are spending \$15,000 at Bruce Mines, where there are 450 people, where no

one has asked for it except the member for Algoma (Mr. Dymont), and I recognize he has a perfect right to try and get public improvements for his constituency. But I say here we are spending \$15,000 for a wharf where there is one already, and we are not to spend three times as much in the great city of Hamilton, notwithstanding that it has been pressed upon the hon. gentleman by the Board of Trade, by those whose money is invested in enterprises there, enterprises which I am told are hampered a great deal by reason of the want of these improvements.

Mr. BAIN. I may be allowed to say a word about this matter, as it happens to lie in my county, and I have some information with respect to it. A year ago I discussed this matter pretty fully with the department here, and the feeling then was that the repairs that were made on the piers at that time were sufficient for the temporary preservation and maintenance of the works in their present condition. But at the same time the feeling was that, as the Minister has said, the channel was deeper than the foundations of the existing piers that were put down long ago when conditions were very different.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They are about 60 years old, are they not?

Mr. BAIN. Over 40 years, at least. It was felt at the time that it would not be economical to spend any more money in repairs. At that time there was an item of \$10,000 standing in the Estimates, and the conclusion we then reached was that it would be desirable to make provision for deepening that channel by commencing new piers and sinking the foundations lower. Since then the Hamilton people have asked for the extension of the pier on the inner side, on the bay side, further into the bay, for the sake of giving vessels a better opportunity to take the mouth of the channel in going outwards when the wind was unfavourable. They asked for the extension of that side, and there was a small light placed on the extremity in connection with the existing lighthouse on the lake end of the pier. To make economically useful now an expenditure of \$40,000, you would require to commence to replace one of these piers, sinking it sufficiently to allow for dredging just as soon as the work is carried out. The Hamilton people ask for \$75,000, and I see an item of \$40,000 in the Estimates, but, if the money is economically expended, it will be expended in that way. There are no temporary repairs except of the most trifling character, that can be economically applied to the maintenance of the present works, beyond the process of making provision for a deeper channel. I think we all agree that with the amount of traffic that is involved with the city of Hamilton and with the additional traffic that will

Mr. MONTAGUE.

naturally come upon the extension of the smelting works by the erection of the new steel plant, this is one of those works that every one believes it is in the general public interest should be commenced and carried on to completion with a reasonable degree of attention and urgency. There is always necessarily a large trade with the city of Hamilton, and with the addition to the smelters and on account of the fact that their traffic is over the lake in boats of the large size which they are using, it is desirable that this work should receive attention; and it will be found that the only economical way of spending that money is by commencing new permanent piers and sinking the works to a depth so as to permit of a deeper channel.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How is it contemplated to expend this money?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will be practically a renewal of the large portion of the old piers, and if the extension be continued later on the work that is now done will be a part of it. This vote is for repairs.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Of course, if there is to be no extension the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not propose to do anything in the way of a light.

Mr. BAIN. The south pier will be the one that will engage attention first in the expenditure of this money, because that is the side that the traffic goes to, and that is the side where the difficulty has been found.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. Minister tell us which pier it is proposed to attend to first?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The chief engineer informs me that the first pier to be attended to will be the south pier, but practically the whole work is in a bad state and the renewals will have to be pretty general.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Which end of the pier will be attended to?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Hamilton end.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the work is constructed into the harbour. Is it the intention to extend the pier?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not at present; this does not provide for an extension.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is no extension provided for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not in this vote; that will probably have to follow, judging from what has been said this evening. This vote only provides for renewals.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is to be another vote in the supplementary Estimates?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We all hope to see another year.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What I understand is that the hon. Minister intends to renew the whole work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We intend to renew it as far as the present estimate of \$44,000 is concerned.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is a beginning.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I recognize the work as one which is likely to make further demands upon the treasury, and I have no doubt that these demands will be met in a generous spirit, but I am not prepared to say anything will now be done beyond what is contemplated under the appropriation of \$44,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am pleased that this item appears in the Estimates but I am rather surprised that the amount is not larger than is asked for. I am quite aware that \$44,000 is not at all sufficient for the amount of work that is contemplated or required there, but, from the remarks dropped by the hon. Minister, I apprehend that this is only the beginning of a work which may take years to complete. I am sure it is a matter of necessity to the people of Hamilton and of the country all around that part of Lake Ontario that this channel should be put in the best condition possible, and that the best access to the city of Hamilton should be obtained that the Government can provide. If all the Estimates that were asked were of such a meritorious character as this one, we would not take very long to pass the Estimates, and we would not be called upon to hold these late sittings.

Collingwood Harbour—Improvement..... \$60,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This vote of \$60,000 is required for the purpose of continuing the deepening of a portion of the harbour of Collingwood to a depth of eighteen feet below low water, and also deepening the 20-foot channel leading to the harbour. The work is estimated to cost \$150,000 which includes the sum expended during the past year.

Mr. FOSTER. How is this work being done?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. By contract, the contractors being Boone & Armstrong, of Toronto and Collingwood.

Mr. FOSTER. Were tenders asked?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Were these contractors the lowest?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How much has the town contributed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. \$25,000.

Mr. SPROULE. That was the town and railway both.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The town did a certain portion of the work and contributed money for the balance, representing altogether \$25,000.

Mr. BENNETT. I did not catch aright what the hon. Minister said. May I ask him now what the present contract with Boone & Armstrong is for? What depth of water will be provided?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This money is voted to deepen a portion of the harbour to 18 feet below low water mark, and also for the deepening to 20 feet of the channel leading to the harbour. The contract with Boone & Armstrong is for \$144,966. The total expended up to the 1st March, 1899, on the whole work, which includes past expenditures as well as those involved in the present operations, is \$282,898.34. The total contract with Boone & Armstrong is for \$144,966. They have performed seven-thirteenths of the work, and have been paid in proportion, excepting the drawbacks.

Mr. BENNETT. How much would that be?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. \$60,201.

Mr. BENNETT. What depth of water has been secured by the expenditure so far, and over what area?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The channel is not completed yet. The available depth at present is 17 feet.

Mr. CLARKE. What will be the width of channel?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. From 250 to 300 feet.

Mr. BENNETT. What area has now been completed for that expenditure of \$60,210?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The officials cannot give the information off-hand. It is a bulk sum, and they have not all the quantities.

Mr. GANONG. Is it all rock work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is partly rock and partly mud.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How much do they get per yard for the mud?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contract is for a lump sum.

Mr. BENNETT. How many yards of area does this contract of \$144,000 cover. I understand that there is a channel 250 feet wide. How far out is that channel of 250 feet made for this contract price of \$144,000?

Mr. MONTAGUE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total length of the channel is about 6,000 feet, as the engineer hurriedly estimates from the plan.

Mr. BENNETT. Will 6,000 feet go out beyond the lighthouse?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About 1,200 feet beyond the lighthouse.

Mr. BENNETT. Do I understand the Minister to say there is a uniform depth of 17 feet of water in a channel 250 feet wide?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not uniform.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it the intention of the Government, when this \$144,000 has been spent on this channel of 250 feet to 300 feet in width—will there then be a uniform depth of 17 feet of water from this distance out to the lighthouse?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contract requires the depth inside to be 18 feet, and the depth outside 20 feet.

Mr. SPROULE. And this expenditure will give that depth?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the requirement of the contract.

Mr. BENNETT. Two years ago, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) stated:

The estimated cost of the work is about \$200,000; we intend to begin the work as soon as possible.

Is it the intention of the Government, after they have spent this \$150,000, to make a further large grant in order to secure this uniform depth of 18 or 20 feet of water? In view of the fact that over a quarter million dollars has already been expended in Collingwood harbour, it is proper that the House and the country should know what the intentions of the Government are in respect to it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Before the Minister answers that question, I wish to call his attention to some particulars in regard to the Collingwood harbour, of which perhaps he may not be aware. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) will remember that when this matter was discussed in 1896 and 1897, it was then brought to the attention of the House that the Conservative Administration had asked for tenders and had had their engineers make an estimate of this work. That engineer's estimate stated that it would require an expenditure of \$200,000. Upon that estimate tenders were asked and received, and the subsequent acceptance of the tenders was carried out by the present Administration. Therefore, the estimate of the late Government, when they commenced and intended to carry out the work, was, that it would cost \$200,000. The present contract was only

for \$144,000. I, therefore, desire to call the attention of the Minister to that fact before he answers the question.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The question of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) is, as to what may be done by the Government in future years, and the House will see that that is a matter which cannot very well be gone into.

**Mr. BENNETT.** In view of the fact that this expenditure will provide but a narrow channel, it is an important consideration for the Government and the House, whether or not a large expenditure of this kind should be undertaken. It must be patent to every one who has a knowledge of the trade of the upper lakes, that there are very large steamers plying there now, and it is a question for us to consider, whether it is wise to enter on such a large expenditure, \$150,000, without knowing where that may lead us to.

**Mr. McCARTHY.** The hon. gentleman knows very well that the Minister can hardly answer that question at the present time, for the reason that the water in the Georgian Bay rises and falls. He will know that from his own harbour at Midland. This year the water is higher than it was last year, and it will depend to a large extent upon what Providence does, whether any further expenditure will be necessary by the Government. If Providence decrees that the water shall be higher, then a further expenditure will not be asked; but if Providence decrees that the water shall be lower, then a larger expenditure will be necessary. As most hon. gentlemen know, Collingwood is an important and growing town. It has now 7,000 inhabitants, has a great many enterprises, and has a number of people who are ready to invest capital to aid the progress of the town. It is hardly a fair question to ask the Government whether it proposes to expend any further money there, for it will depend largely upon the requirements after the present contract is completed. It may be that no further expenditure will be required, and it may be that further expenditure will be necessary. However that may be, the House will be able to judge in the future whether we should make a further grant to carry out this work. It is more important than ever that this work should be promptly concluded. There is no doubt that it is the policy of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that Collingwood harbour should be made suitable for accommodating the increased transportation of freight from our western country. I enlarged somewhat upon this question during the debate on the Address, and I will not now weary the House with further reference to it. The object of deepening Collingwood harbour commends itself to all, and the policy founded upon that object was initiated by hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in power, and it has been, I am

glad to say, adopted by the present Government.

**Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry).** The Minister (Mr. Fielding) says that the contract is for a lump sum. Is there any schedule of quantities upon which to base your estimates?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I am informed, not.

**Mr. McLELLAN (Glengarry).** On what do you base your progress estimates?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** They take the total amount, and, having ascertained the actual amount for dredging, for instance, they pay the proportion to the whole.

**Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry).** But they must have some estimate made before letting out the contract, and they must have based it on certain scheduled quantities. At what price do they estimate the earth and rock excavation for progressive estimates?

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** The hon. Minister stated a moment ago that a certain fraction of the work was done. How could he tell what fraction was done if he had no estimate of the total work?

**Mr. GIBSON.** That is a matter that can be very easily ascertained. If the length of the harbour is 6,000 feet, and if 3,000 feet of that work is done, it is quite easy for the Government engineers to ascertain what the Government should pay. I understand that the answer given by the engineer was that seven-thirteenths of the work had been already done. On that it is very easy to ascertain with this difference, that the Government would not require to have an inspector to measure the work done. In this case the tender is for a bulk sum, and on that basis the engineer would arrive at the amount of the work done.

**Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry).** That might be done; but before letting this contract at all it would be necessary to estimate the quantities, and I want to know how they arrived at the quantities, and what price they estimated for rock, and what price for earth.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** There has been no price per yard, so far as the department is concerned. The department originally had an estimate as to the quantity of the work involved, and the proportion of the work done to the whole work, is ascertained by soundings. The contractors tendered, not on a price per yard, but on a bulk sum.

**Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry).** You did not estimate on quantities. You estimate according to the nature of the work to be done, as some soil is easier than others to work, and some rock is twice as hard as

others. There must have been some estimates in the first place as to the value of the work for which the contract was made, and I want to know on what basis per yard you made the estimates.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the hon. gentleman that the estimated cost of this work prior to 1896 was \$200,000, and that the late Government advertised for tenders on that basis. In answer to that advertisement this tender of \$144,000 came in.

Mr. BENNETT. What depth of water ?

Mr. McCARTHY. By that contract it was 18 feet outside and 20 feet inside, or vice versa.

Mr. GIBSON. No one knows better than the hon. member for Glengarry that before that work was submitted to the Government for approval, cross-sections had been taken, the depth of the soil had been found, and the quantities of silt, sand, clay and rock ascertained. The estimate was based on observations taken in that way, and the engineers estimated that the work was worth \$200,000. My hon. friend knows that an engineer, in estimating for a large work of this kind, is always liberal in his quantities and prices, so that sufficient money may be provided to cover all contingencies. The contractor then takes the same trouble as the engineer did in ascertaining for himself the quantities of the different materials he has to encounter in the work. The point lost sight of and referred to by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is, to my mind, more important than the estimated amount of work. The suggestion he throws out is that arrangements should be made to have this harbour made of a sufficient depth to admit of the entrance of the largest craft that sails on the upper lakes. No doubt the water rises and falls almost daily on the upper lakes as well as elsewhere. If I might be pardoned for giving an experience which I had, at the town of Oakville, in sinking a pier under water at a depth of 13 feet, some 90 or 100 piles had to be cut, and we found, on taking our levels every day, that the water in Lake Ontario varied in level, being an inch higher or an inch lower on one day than on another. I have no doubt the same thing happens in the Georgian Bay. Apart from that, there is a fixed bench mark or datum, as the engineers call it, from which measurements are taken, and whether the water is high or low does not affect the depth of dredging which has to be done. What the hon. member for Glengarry wants is not a difficult matter for the engineer or the inspector or the clerk of works to arrive at in sending in his report from month to month to the Government of how much work has been done. I think it is more important to the Government, when taking charge of a piece of work of this kind, to put it beyond peradventure that the harbour will be deep

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry).

and wide enough for the largest class of vessels that ply on the upper lakes.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I have no desire to place any obstacle in the way of passing this item. What I particularly wish is to get some idea of how the Government made up their estimates of the quantity and price per yard of rock and earth. Surely they never let the contract without going over every detail so as to see what the work was worth. I want to know how the hon. Minister arrived at his approximation of the estimates and how he estimated rock per yard and earth per yard ? I want to know what the progressive estimates are for rock or earth as the case may be, and the price the Government placed upon these before calling for tenders and letting the work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that progress estimates are not made up in the way the hon. gentleman suggests. The contract being a lump sum and there being an estimate of the quantity in the whole work, it is simply a sum in proportion to determine what amount we should pay for the work done. There is no question of the price per yard entering into it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In order to make up that estimate of \$200,000, the engineer must have figured up how many yards of rock and earth there were and the price. When you are making progress estimates, you must figure the number of yards of earth and rock to be taken out at a certain price.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). You would never let a contract without knowing what you were letting—without making estimates and having some idea what it was worth.

Mr. GIBSON. I understand that the hon. gentleman is building a number of houses. No doubt he is building them by contract and for a lump sum, and his architect would tell him every week, when paying for the building how much he should pay.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). If I let a contract for a house or anything else, I get a detailed statement as to the value of everything that goes into the work in order to make progressive estimates. Surely you are in a position of knowing exactly what you are doing. There was never a work let of that description without the department having some knowledge of its quantity and character. If this Government let a contract without knowing anything about the value, they certainly did not act in a business way.

Mr. SPROULE. I believe the understanding was, when this work was undertaken, to complete it, no matter what the cost, so as to give a depth of water of 18 feet in the inside of the channel and the channel itself 20 feet. The town of Collingwood represented that this work would cost about \$150,000, but the Government engineer said it would cost \$200,000. The town of Colling-

wood offered to give \$15,000 and the Grand Trunk Railway \$10,000, provided the Dominion Government undertook the work. The estimate of the Government engineer was that the work would cost \$200,000, and the Government called for tenders to ascertain what it could be done for, and I believe the intention was that if it could be done for the price estimated by the town of Collingwood, the work would be gone on with but if it would cost a larger sum the Government would consider whether it was wise or not to undertake it. Tenders were invited, and one tender was as low as the town of Collingwood estimated the work would cost, and the succeeding Government coming in let the contract upon this tender. Therefore, the town of Collingwood can reasonably claim that no matter what the work cost, it must be completed on the understanding which was arrived at when the \$25,000 were given.

Mr. BENNETT. When was this work to be completed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. 30th June, 1899.

Mr. GANONG. Are we to understand that Collingwood in this work shall be represented by a trench 2,000 feet long and 250 feet wide with a variation of 14 to 18 feet of water.

Mr. McCARTHY. That represents only the channel. The harbour is a great deal wider. The water outside the channel is from 9 to 14 feet deep.

Mr. SPROULE. It is said that the contractor has failed or is failing to carry out his contract. Is there anything in that rumour?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There have been some difficulties and delays owing to his not having the proper machinery, but I am informed that the work is going on all right now.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad to know that, because it brings up a very important question on which the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) was trying to get information. The work was to be finished by this June, but I am told that it is a long way from completion yet. If the contractor has been paid a greater sum than a fair proportion for the work completed, it is most unlikely he will be able to carry out his contract. It would be important to know what payments have been made and what proportion of the work has been done.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You have been told how much money has been paid.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, but not how much work has been done.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Seventeenth.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman will know, as he lives in close proximity to where this work is being carried on, that the contractor found a great deal more hard-pan than he expected, and this caused the dredges to break more frequently than was anticipated. He has realized that stronger dredges are necessary; and with these, I believe the work is proceeding satisfactorily.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the contractor given notice that he will claim extras?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no question of extras known to the department.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I revert to the item for Burlington channel for a moment? I suppose that that work will be let by tender?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The engineer tells me that the work is practically repair work and can hardly be done conveniently by contract.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will it be done by day's labour?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the engineer thinks it probable.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). During election time?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course, we would not stop the work on account of the elections.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I fear that the hope of my hon. friend from South Wentworth (Mr. Bain) that the money, if economically spent, will do much good will be largely blasted.

Harbours and Rivers—Ontario—  
Goderich—Reconstruction of breakwater and repairs to piers..... \$46,500

Mr. FOSTER. What is this for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This vote is required to continue the construction of the breakwater at Goderich and for diverting the course of the Maitland River and effecting repairs upon the entrance piers. The contract was awarded on the 11th of August last to F. C. Smith and D. McGillicuddy for the breakwater, at a lump sum of \$56,700. The total amount of which estimated is \$65,500.

Mr. FOSTER. How many tenders were asked?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Public tenders were invited on two occasions. The deputy tells me that about six or seven tenders were received.

Mr. FOSTER. Was this the lowest tender?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, on the second call. After the first call for tenders a contract was made, but the contractor broke down and the work had to be re-let.

Mr. SPROULE. Who was the contractor?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Mr. Luke Madigan.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Which of this present firm of contractors has the plant and experience to engage in this work? One of them runs a newspaper.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The man who can run a newspaper successfully can do any work. I know it; I have run one myself.

Mr. **SPROULE**. It seems to me we should get some more information about this, especially in view of the rumours in regard to it. Although it has been repeatedly stated that tenders were called for, the rumour is persistent that there were no real tenders, but, by some kind of private negotiation, the contract was given to this firm and that one of the reasons why it was given was to appease Mr. McGillicuddy, who was opposing the Government on account of some appointment made which did not meet his approval. If that was the object, it appears to have accomplished it, because his paper, so far as I know, has not said a word against the Government since.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Will the hon. Minister bring down the tenders?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The deputy thinks that they have been brought down; but, if not, they shall be brought down.

Mr. **HOLMES**. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is unfair to one of the contractors in saying that this contract was given to him to appease him because he was against the Government. He was never against the Government. There was a personal difference between himself and the late member for the riding, but Mr. McGillicuddy never took issue with the Government. If the hon. member will turn up "Hansard" he will find that the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), I think it was, asked for an explanation when the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) was present, and the hon. Minister replied stating that tenders were advertised for in a number of newspapers, and that the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer. No special consideration has been shown Mr. McGillicuddy. He happened to interest a moneyed man in the work, and they put in a tender. And the opinion of the department is that they will not make much money on their contract.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I think the hon. member (Mr. Holmes) is hardly correct, for I remember seeing some of the criticisms in Mr. McGillicuddy's paper, and I think he found fault with the Government for making certain appointments.

Mr. **HOLMES**. I still maintain that I am thoroughly correct. I am familiar with the matter, for it is in my own locality. Mr. McGillicuddy did not take issue with the Gov-

Mr. **SPROULE**.

ernment for the appointment made; he took issue with the member.

Mr. **SPROULE**. The articles were there for anybody to read; and I read them and certainly understood them to be in criticism of the Government for the way in which the appointments were made. But I did not refer to this matter so much because of information possessed of myself, as because of the rumours that are circulating. The interesting question to people in the west was whether a man in that capacity was prepared to do this kind of work, or whether it was not a cinch for him especially.

Mr. **HOLMES**. I object to the statement that there was any cinch at all. The matter was thoroughly threshed out in this House when the hon. member for Halton asked the question across the floor, and the Minister of Public Works gave a full explanation. If the hon. gentleman will consult "Hansard" he will find that a full explanation was given in connection with that particular contract. I entirely repudiate the insinuation that there was any cinch about it. The matter was dealt with as a departmental work, which was left to the lowest tenderer, and there was no favouritism. So far as Mr. McGillicuddy is concerned, I presume the contract is being filled to the satisfaction of the department. As the Minister of Finance says, a man who can run a newspaper can do any kind of work.

Mr. **CLARKE**. How much money has been paid upon this contract entered into with Mr. McGillicuddy?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. My memorandum does not show anything. The chief engineer's opinion is that nothing has been paid. They are working now.

Goderich Harbour—

Dredging ..... \$20,000

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. This dredging is being done by the Malton Dredging Company of Goderich. They receive \$18 a day of ten hours, and their average day's work is 600 yards. It was not let by tender. There is some rock which has to be blasted out by the department separately, but the material on which the dredge is working is of a pretty uniform character.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I presume the Government have an inspector there looking after this work.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes. The instructions are that the inspector is to remain all the time on the dredge during working hours. Mr. William Watson is the inspector. He makes a return once a week, giving the number of hours the dredge has worked and the amount taken out.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. What is Mr. Watson's business?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy informs me that he does not know what his occupation was ?

Mr. SPROULE. I have been told that at Owen Sound the inspector was not steadily on the dredge, and it is found that the water is not of a uniform depth in portions of the harbour gone over : that whenever they got into a soft place they took out as much as possible, and when they got into a hard place they took out much less, so that the bottom of the harbour is very uneven and a uniform depth of water is not given. In some places it is found that where the depth was to be 18 or 19 feet, they have dredged it to 21 or 22 feet, because the material was soft, and in other places they have only taken out enough to give 15 or 16 feet because the material was hard.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that at Goderich there is not only an inspector who is constantly present, but there is an engineer in charge of the works of the harbour.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Perhaps the member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) could tell us what this man's business is.

Mr. HOLMES. I cannot say. I know the name, but I do not know anything about him.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is he a resident engineer ? Because I observed on a former occasion, when improvements were being made in Goderich harbour, that an engineer from Toronto was employed, and he was paid \$165 for travelling expenses. Surely a town of the size of Goderich has an engineer of sufficient ability to take charge of these works. I would draw attention to another item of expenditure in Burlington channel last year. I find that an engineer from Toronto was employed who charged 50 cents cab-hire from his house to the railway station, he charged his fare from Toronto to Hamilton, he then charged his fare from Hamilton out to Burlington, with cab-fare between the stations and the city of Hamilton, and then again cab-fare from the Union Station at Toronto back to his residence, making altogether, with board, a sum of about \$200, which, to my mind, is money thrown away. I think that in a case of this kind, if possible, the resident engineer should be obtained, and thus the expenditure would be very much reduced.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The engineer now engaged is a resident engineer. Mr. Brough, but formerly a Toronto engineer was employed.

General repairs and improvements to harbour, river and bridge works..... \$15,000

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the hon. Minister where the dredge "Challenger" is now working.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At Thornbury.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it intended to dredge the shoal, upon which work was done some years ago, on the north shore of the bay at Midland ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A survey is being made with regard to Midland, but I am not in a position at present to answer the question of the hon. gentleman.

Kingston Harbour—

Dredging ..... \$10,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. How is that work being done ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The work is being done at Kingston by one of the Government dredges.

Little Bear Creek—

Dredging ..... \$2,000

Mr. CLANCY. What is the extent of the work to be done there ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is in Kent county. This vote is required for dredging Little Bear Creek for the accommodation of vessels navigating three miles from the Channel Ecarte, to a landing, pier and basin on the creek. This creek was dredged to 8 feet of water in 1883-86. Since that the banks having fallen in some places, the above sum is required to clear out the stream again so as to give vessels a chance to use the creek.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. Minister why this work is not gone on with. That vote has been in the Estimates for a long time, and if hon. gentlemen are going to put it in merely as a sort of sign, they had better strike it out or go on with the work. I would like to ask what the department intends to do about it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The only difficulty in doing a work of that character is getting dredges. It is not always possible to get dredges.

Mr. CLANCY. There is another work for which a vote appears in connection with the Sydenham River, and it is absolutely useless to vote Estimates if there is no dredge in sight for the purpose of doing the work. I expected a strong protest from my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Do you want it struck out ?

Mr. CLANCY. I would infinitely rather see it struck out than see it put in there for no purpose. If the hon. Minister says that he does not propose to go on with the work, I will vote to strike it out.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will you move to strike it out ?

Mr. CLANCY. No ; I want to see the work done.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You need not fret about it.

Mr. CLANCY. I am as much concerned as the hon. gentleman is. I know a great deal more about that work than he does, so that the hon. gentleman need not say that I need not fret about it. The hon. gentleman need not be quite so fresh over this matter. I think it is fair that we should have at least some statement as to whether the work will be done this year or not. It is an important work to the people there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We want to do the work, and if we can get a dredge it will be done.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the department not find enough dredges to do a work that is required?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Dredges are rather scarce.

Mr. MCGREGOR. You can get all the dredges you require up there. The work will be done.

Mr. CLANCY. You can get all the dredges you want. The Martin Dredging Company have three or four dredges and they are good ones too. One of them did some work for the department on a former occasion. There is no excuse for not going on with the work. We never will get it done if we wait for the Sydenham work to be done.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It will be all right.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend's assurance is not satisfactory, and I would rather ask the Minister. Since there are dredges that can be procured, will the hon. Minister say that, in the event of the Government dredge not being available, a local dredge will be employed to do the work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I should almost think that if a dredge can be obtained the work will be done. I have no personal knowledge of the locality, but I will say to the hon. gentleman that if there are dredges to spare I would thank the hon. gentleman to send some of them down to the maritime provinces where we could employ them. I am glad to know that dredges are so plentiful, because I understood that they were not easily available.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. Minister will show a little anxiety about our work up there, I will try to induce some of these dredges to go down to the maritime provinces.

Oakville—

Repairs to piers and dredging..... \$4,500

Mr. HENDERSON. Last year the work at Oakville was commenced by dredging the harbour which had been filled in in consequence of a break in the pier. The break in the pier was not repaired, is not yet repaired and consequently the work done last

Mr. CLANCY.

year was destroyed inasmuch as the gravel and sand was again, by the storm, forced through the break in the pier and the harbour has, to a certain extent, again become filled up. The people of Oakville are very anxious that this work should be completed at once. The town has expended money in building a temporary pier outside of the break and it has also spent money, as well as the vessel owners, in dredging the harbour to make it at all useful for the purpose of a harbour until such time as the Government could get to work and complete it. The people of Oakville will feel thankful if the Government will push the work forward, and I do not think there is any reason why they should not do so. I understand that the timbers are on the ground and if the work is put in operation and completed as speedily as possible, there will be no fault found with the Government by myself or by the people of Oakville.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The materials have been purchased for the work, and there is no reason why it should not be gone on with.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think I can take the hon. gentleman's statement to mean that this work will be proceeded with.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, that is the intention.

Owen Sound—

Dredging, renewal and extension of pile protection works ..... \$19,600

Mr. BENNETT. Is that a contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it is an arrangement with the Owen Sound Dredging Company, the same as in the case of Goderich, to do the work at so much per day.

Mr. SPROULE. If this is the work in reference to which I had the information with regard to the inspector, I think it would be desirable that the Minister should make inquiries to ascertain whether the allegations are correct or not, and if they are correct, the Minister should have instructions given him to be there steadily at his work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will promise to see that instructions are given to the engineer to inquire into that.

Rainy River—

Improvement of navigable channel.... \$15,000

Mr. FOSTER. Why was not some work done on this last year? I do not suppose that there is an improvement anywhere so absolutely necessary as this. Every boat that goes up there has to be hauled up by means of a rope and a steam winch, or the hands of the Indians. The trade of that country is now very considerable. An immense amount of machinery is going in there, and I do not see any reason in the world why, when the money was granted

and the necessity so pressing, the work was not carried out.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. There were some differences of opinion as to the best methods of proceeding with the work, and the Minister was not satisfied, and hence the delay.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What is the position now ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The acting chief engineer informs me that he has no instructions from the Minister, but I do not see why the work should not go on, if the vote is taken and the conditions are as stated by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. **FOSTER**. It is impossible that it should go on, unless the department has a plan. Although the department had a vote of \$15,000 last year, it does not appear yet to have a plan.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The chief engineer informs me that he had no instructions from the Minister before he left, but that he has prepared the plans.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Does he propose to build a lock ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The portion affecting the lock is a separate vote in the supplementary Estimates. This work contemplates the removal of boulders and sandbars in the channel above the Manitou Rapids.

Mr. **FOSTER**. That is just where the difficult part of navigation is, and that is where the work should be done, and done at once.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. It is suggested to me by the engineer that the building of the lock may change the situation somewhat, as it may flood these rapids. There will be a dam in connection with the lock, which may change the conditions.

Mr. **FOSTER**. If you are going to build a lock and a dam there, you will want more than \$100,000. I am not an expert, but I believe that a reasonable amount of money properly expended there would aid navigation, so as to overcome the difficulties and render it easier for boats to get up. But there is the department, and there is the money, but somehow or other they did not do the work.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I think they will proceed at once and do something. What is done there now is this. In the centre of the stream, just above the rapids, there is a crib put down, and on that is a big rope and a place to tie the rope, and when a vessel comes up, she has to wait until the whole tribe of Indians come out, and get that rope attached from the vessel to that point, and then the vessel is hauled up by the Indians by means of that rope. Every vessel has to go over that obstruction

in that way. It is the only way in which it can be done.

Mr. **GIBSON**. What is the depth of water ?

Mr. **FOSTER**. I do not know. There is plenty of depth for the "Keenora." The trouble is not in the want of depth, but in the strength of the current. I very much doubt whether the amount of navigation would justify the construction of a dam and lock ; but I would like to have an assurance that the department will get a hustle on.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The question of improvements at this point and the question of the lock seem to be so blended together that they will have to be considered together. The engineers are strongly of opinion that the completing of the lock will flood this place, and that it would not be necessary to make any other improvements in the river. However, I think the hon. member may rely that as soon as the Minister returns, that matter will be looked into.

Mr. **FOSTER**. So far as the other improvements in the river are concerned, the people do not care a button for them. This is the one they want.

Sydenham River—

Dredging ..... \$5,000

Mr. **CLANCY**. What work is contemplated here, and how much has been expended ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. This is a revote of \$5,000 towards dredging the north and south branches of the Sydenham River. I understand that no work is going on at present.

Mr. **CLANCY**. I understand that only \$1,600 has been expended out of the vote that was taken last year of \$5,000. What is the extent of the work contemplated ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Some dredging has been done there. In the south branch of the river two cuts of 1,050 feet long, giving a width of 50 feet, were made to a depth of 10 feet. On the north branch three cuts were made, of 1,000 feet, 600 feet and 300 feet respectively, to a depth of 9 feet. A large number of snags and sunken logs were also removed from the channel. The total cost of the work done was \$1,700.

Mr. **CLANCY**. At Dresden, which is an important town, I am informed by the business men there, the dredging which has been done so far is practically of no benefit whatever ; and if the work is left in its present condition it might just as well be left alone and no work done at all. I am surprised at the statement that a cut of the description given by the Finance Minister has been made there. I think it would be difficult to find any one in the locality to discover that any work of value has been done. I am informed that the people there

have had the promise of the Minister of Public Works that a dredge would be sent there to finish the work at once. Is it the intention to get some dredge this year to go and do this work? It is very important that it should be done this year. It is hardly fair to put the vote in the Estimates and not go on with the work. It is not difficult at all to get dredges in the locality. They will be available if the Minister will order them to go on and do the work. I think the Minister should make some definite statement on the subject.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not in a position to give my hon. friend any further assurance. I am sure that the Minister of Public Works did not put the vote in the Estimates without intending to do the work, but what particular plan he may have in view I cannot tell.

Mr. CLANCY. I am not asking about the plan. I am asking whether it will be done at all this year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot say that it will be done, but I hope it will.

Mr. CLANCY. If I promise to get a dredge, will the Minister promise that the work will go on?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will promise to submit that proposal to the favourable consideration of my colleague the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. HENDERSON. I wish to ask the acting Minister of Public Works if he has a record of any requisition for a pier to be built, and dredging to be done, at the village of Bronte, in the county of Halton, about 12 miles east of Hamilton? This is a somewhat important place, as the home of the cisco fishing industry, which employs a considerable number of people and a considerable number of small vessels. This harbour belonged to a private individual up to a short time ago; but in order to have public money expended on it, the municipal township of the township of Trafalgar, in which township the village is situated, purchased the harbour, and a deputation was sent to Ottawa with the view of securing a grant of money for the purpose of improving the pier and dredging the harbour. In urging a liberal grant I would ask the Minister if any promise has been made to this deputation that something will be done to assist these people at Bronte in the way of improving the harbour?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that a deputation did come and a petition was forwarded, but I am not aware that any promise was made. This was one of the many works pressed on the department which they were not able to go on with at once. The fact that no promise was

Mr. CLANCY.

made does not imply that any adverse decision was arrived at.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2.20 a.m. (Friday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 21st July, 1899.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### SUPPLY—ADMINISTRATION OF THE YUKON.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I would like to call attention to a very peculiar despatch that has been sent from Ottawa to the "North British Daily Mail."

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Where is that published?

Mr. DAVIN. In England. You have heard, Mr. Speaker, of the press bureau which exists in Ottawa and which sends out to all parts of the country from, it is supposed, one of the departments, in fact, it is confidently so alleged. Some of the papers in the Northwest Territories have received letters from the gentleman in charge of this inclosing a leading article cracking up a certain honourable member of the Government and making out that everything is couleur de rose, that large expenditure is economy, in fact, that the obverse is the reverse, and so on. It will be remembered that, in regard to the motion that was made in this House by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), and voted down, the "Times" newspaper, while speaking in the early part of the article, somewhat eulogistically of the Government of Canada took the view that it was a regrettable thing that the Government should not take the course of having a searching inquiry into the charges made, respecting the maladministration and corruption of every kind in the Yukon, by an independent commission. Any aspersion that was cast on the "Times" was without any foundation whatever, because, I have read to the House the reserved, the cautious telegram, well within the truth, that had been sent to the "Times" newspaper as to the proceedings that had taken place here. When I read that report, an hon. gen-

tleman of the highest standing in this House flouted the "Times," and said that the "Times" was deceived by a slanderer, that the "Times" had been hoaxed, and so on. Not only that, but one of the newspapers has held me up to the vengeance of a large portion of the community of Canada because I showed so much reverence for the "Times," and actually went on to say that, if I dared endorse the "Times," that paper which did not approve of the Liberal Government would be found supporting it. I do not dwell upon the logic. The reason that I refer to it at all is that it shows the legitimate effect that has been produced by reading the criticism of the impartial, or, at all events, disinterested journal of the standing of the "Times"; it was the opinion, judging by the action of the "Times" for the last three years, of a friend of the present Government. An opinion from so influential an organ as the "Times" newspaper produces an effect, and in order to counteract it, we find another telegram sent from Ottawa, dated July 6th, in the following terms:—

Reuter's agent is requested to publish the following—

This is not a spontaneous act of Reuter's agent, sitting in the gallery. He is requested to publish the following. By whom could he be requested? Certainly he could not be requested by any person on this side of the House, or by a man in the street; he must have been requested by a Minister of the Crown, and what Minister of the Crown was it that requested him? The Minister of the Crown in whose department we find that bureau for the distribution of truthful political literature, which sends broadcast throughout this country leading articles—identically the same articles—to appear in a dozen or more papers professing to be the opinion of the locality, but conceived, written, composed and gotten up here in Ottawa. This, therefore must be the source of the suggestion to Reuter's agency. Here is what was suggested:

The "Times" editorial references to Sir Hibbert Tupper's motion for further investigation into the administration of the Yukon have caused some surprise in Canada.

I do not think they caused any surprise. Everybody who read them endorsed them. They produced an effect in Canada, and the reason they produced such an effect was because it was a judgment of a perfectly disinterested man. The editor of the "Times," because that is the man writing the leading article, is not interested in our politics. It is of no consequence to him whether the Conservative party in Canada are in opposition or in power, or whether the Liberal party are in opposition or in power. It was, therefore, the deliberate opinion not only of a man perfectly disinterested, but of a man perfectly informed, because, not only had he before him all that had taken place in this House, but he had before him the correspon-

dence of one of the most enlightened journalists living, that is the colonial editor of the "Times," Miss Shaw.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he read the article through so that we can get the thread of it, and make his comments afterwards. These comments, interspersed through the reading, throw one off, and we are not able to follow the thread of the article.

Mr. DAVIN. I would not for the world not oblige the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton). I will read it through and then comment on it.

Ottawa, 6th July.

Reuter's agent is requested to publish the following:—The "Times" editorial references to Sir Hibbert Tupper's motion for further investigation into the administration of the Yukon have caused some surprise in Canada. The facts are as follows:—The motion was very largely a repetition of Sir Hibbert Tupper's charges made two months ago. Most of these charges referred to Commissioner Ogilvie, and an investigation was held. Part of the evidence and of the report had been received at the time the motion was made, and the remainder was on its way. The motion made by Sir Hibbert Tupper was one of want of confidence and as an amendment to going into Supply, in order, presumably, to prevent any amendment. No personal charges were made against any member of the Government, but Mr. Sifton, the Minister of the Interior, was charged with favouritism and partiality in granting licenses. These charges professed to be based upon an official return which the Government brought down, which was quoted as proving the charge. Mr. Sifton replied, and read the return, which proved the facts to be directly contrary to the allegations in the resolution. Sir Hibbert Tupper was compelled publicly to admit that these charges were without foundation. Mr. Sifton then challenged Sir Hibbert Tupper to make a personal charge, and declared that an immediate investigation would be ordered if such charges were made. The challenge was refused. The resolution also embraced charges of malfeasance against Judge Dugas's violating the constitutional rule requiring the examination of charges against judges to be made in the Superior Courts. The Government opposed the resolution on grounds that its most serious statements were admitted to be false, that it was impossible to refer the charges against a judge to a commission and ignore the practice long constitutional usage provided, that only part of the evidence taken and of the report made by Mr. Ogilvie had been received, and that until it was shown that the investigation had not been thorough it would be absurd to order another. The Government's reply was generally considered satisfactory, and only 29 Conservative members voted for the resolution. Sir Wilfrid Laurier announced that if, when Mr. Ogilvie's report was received, it did not appear thorough and complete a further investigation would be held, and nothing left undone to bring all the facts to light.

Now, Mr. Speaker. I have read that, and I think my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) will agree with me that it is a tissue of fabrications. There is hardly a sentence there in regard to which any man within my hearing would not be ready to

say: Well, that is not true. What is the meaning of that? What is the meaning of somebody in the interest of the Government, some member of the Government presumably; what is the meaning of that man suggesting to Reuter's agent here to send a telegram of this kind over to England? It is palpable that the blow of that disinterested and informed critic in the "Times" newspaper struck hard here and struck hard in England, and this is an attempt—the language I am about to use is the only language that will describe it—this is an attempt to throw dust in the eyes of the people of England.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am afraid the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is trying to do that with us; wasting our valuable time.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend (Mr. McGregor) thinks I am trying to throw dust in his eyes. It would be superfluous, because so much dust is there already that he is purblind. We might draw a mountain into this Chamber, and if that mountain was in any way opposed to the present Government, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) would put on his spectacles, he would take a microscope or a telescope and look at it, or he would use both, and then say that it was nothing but a mole hill.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is not smart.

Mr. DAVIN. The despatch says:

The "Times" editorial references to Sir Hibbert Tupper's motion for further investigation into the administration of the Yukon have caused some surprise in Canada.

They caused no surprise in Canada. Caused surprise in Canada! when you find three members of the Ministerial side voting against the Government and in favour of the motion of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). Fancy such a statement as that being sent to England; when the "Times" says there should have been an impartial inquiry by an authoritative body and by a body that the public would have confidence in. I cannot go into matters that would bear on this at the present moment, but, Sir, we have plenty of evidence here of what a farce it would be to refer an inquiry of that kind to a committee of this House. There would be no use in doing it. We have plenty of evidence here of how useless that would be; the evidence is ringing in our ears at this moment. Now mark this, Mr. Speaker. The facts are as follows:—

The motion was very largely a repetition of Sir Hibbert Tupper's charges made two months ago. And, they were very properly a repetition. What was said when the member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) referred to these matters two months before? It was said: that he had not the courage of his convictions, that he would not pledge his

Mr. DAVIN.

personal honour or his position. Then the hon. member (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) comes and says: "Very well, I will accept that challenge, and I will pledge my position and my personal honour; and he makes charges and he fulfils the conditions, and then the Government try to quibble out of it."

Most of these charges referred to Commissioner Ogilvie.

That is not true. Most of the charges referred to the management of his department in the Yukon by the Minister of the Interior. That is what the charges referred to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does it not seem from the context that the word "were" is omitted there: "most of the charges were referred to Commissioner Ogilvie."

Mr. DAVIN. Well I will accept that if you wish.

—and an investigation was held. Part of the evidence and of the report had been received at the time the motion was made and the remainder was on its way. The motion was made by Sir Hibbert Tupper one of want of confidence and as an amendment to going into Supply, in order, presumably, to prevent any amendment. No personal charges were made against any member of the Government, but Mr. Sifton, the Minister of the Interior, was charged with favouritism and partiality in granting licenses.

He was charged with favouritism, with incompetence, with partiality in granting licenses, and there were special cases mentioned in regard to these licenses, cases that were so near the Minister, that were so close to the Minister, that a man of spirit would not have hesitated for a minute but would have said: We must have an inquiry; that is, if he felt conscious that the inquiry would remove the cloud that had settled with such darkness upon him and his department.

These charges professed to be based upon an official return the Government had brought down, which was quoted as proving the charge.

They were not all based on it, but to some extent they were based on it. The reliance that was placed upon the return was to show, that the report of Mr. Ogilvie confirmed all the charges that had been made, who complained that the commission that was given to him was quite inadequate for the purpose of the inquiry. Could anything be a better or stronger argument in the mouth of a man moving for a judicial inquiry, than to quote the language of the Commissioner who had been chosen by the Government of the day in which he says: Unfortunately my commission is inadequate: I am not able to make a thorough inquiry that I would like to make, and further powers should be given. Mr. Speaker, I want to call your attention to this—

Mr. Sifton replied, and read the Return, which proved the facts to be directly contrary to the allegations in the resolution.

Of course this is a palpable falsehood ; there is no truth in any form in it. It is altogether untrue, and that is all that need be said as to that. What was done—and of course I am only able to describe it—what was done was to make a special-pleading reply ; what was done was to avoid the real issue by raising trifling issues.

Sir Hibbert Tupper was compelled publicly to admit that these charges were without foundation.

Utterly untrue again. Not only did that hon member (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) not admit anything of the kind, but he reiterated the charges in another place, and pointed out how completely the Minister of the Interior had failed to touch them in his defence. And here in this House, when in regard to what was a minor charge, a slight inaccuracy not amounting to more than a verbal inaccuracy was brought forward, and he was asked by the Postmaster General what he would do if he had to formulate the charges again, the member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) took the official documents and showed that the facts actually bore out in substance every charge that was in the indictment. This statement in Reuter's despatch is therefore a pure fabrication.

Mr. Sifton then challenged Sir Hibbert Tupper to make a personal charge and declared that an immediate investigation would be ordered if such charges were made.

Well, Sir, when the hon. member for Pictou made his original charge, he was told that if he pledged his honour and his position, the charges would be inquired into. He came and did it, and then they said : "We thought you would make a personal charge against a member of the Government." It is not enough to point out that Major Walsh did this, that, and the other ; it is not enough to point out that your servants up there have been plundering the Government and the public ; it is not enough to point out that there has been the grossest maladministration and corruption in that district ; it is not enough to make 50 or 60 charges of the gravest sort. They say, "you have not pledged your position and your honour ;" and when the hon. member for Pictou comes and says, "I will forfeit my position in Parliament and my right to any position in the Government of Canada if I cannot establish these charges, the answer is, "Oh, can't you make a personal charge against myself ? If you do, we will send it to a committee of this House." What would be the use of sending it to a committee of this House ? If you did so, you would have one of the most lamentable spectacles which could be presented to a free people ; you would have every lawyer on the Government side using every means he could devise to burk inquiry. As I once said once before—it is a strong phrase—it

would be like going to law with the devil in the court of hell.

The challenge was refused. The resolution also embraced charges of malfeasance against Judge Dugas's violating the constitutional rule requiring the examination of charges against judges to be made in the Superior Courts.

There were charges made against Judge Dugas ; and what has happened since ? You, Sir, as a reader of the French press, are familiar with what appears in those papers, and you know that Judge Dugas has actually written over his own signature, saying that he has been doing the very things which the hon. member for Pictou charged him with. We showed in that debate that there was no such constitutional rule as is here referred to. I quoted the Prime Minister's own language at the time the then member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) now the Minister of Public Works, made charges of the grossest kind against Judge Bossé and others ; and when I cited the constitutional rule in this House, the hon. member who answered me was the present Prime Minister, and he declared in the broadest terms that we could make any charges in this House against whomsoever. The constitutional rule refers to charges looking to the impeachment or removal of a judge. But to suppose that a judge, no matter to what court he belongs or how high his position is, can break the law and do what is wrong, be false to his position, and that a member of this High Court of Parliament cannot mention it, is preposterous. Of course, the proper place to make charges of the kind I mention is in this House.

The Government opposed the resolution on grounds that its most serious statements were admitted to be false—

There is an utter falsehood. Who admitted that a single serious statement in the resolution was false ? Nobody. To this hour every man on this side of the House, aye, and three men belonging to the other side, and hundreds of Liberals throughout the country, say these are charges that have not been properly inquired into :

—that it was impossible to refer the charges against a judge to a commission, and ignore the practise long constitutional usage provided—

The charge against Judge Dugas was only one detail in that long indictment—

—that only part of the evidence taken and of the report made by Mr. Ogilvie had been received, and that until it was shown that the investigation had not been thorough it would be absurd to order another.

The answer to that is this, that Mr. Ogilvie himself tells us that it is impossible that his inquiry can be final ; and when Mr. Ogilvie himself tells us that by the very terms of his commission he cannot make a thorough inquiry then it is wholly unnecessary to wait for the second instalment of his report.

The Government's reply was generally considered satisfactory, and only twenty-nine Conservative members voted for the resolution.

Is there a great point in that? We know very well that there are times when a vote is taken in this House which will affect both sides of the House, and when a larger number of members belonging to one side will be away than at another time. There is nothing in that. The real point is that in addition to these twenty-nine Conservatives—in addition to every Conservative in the House—three Liberal members voted for the resolution, and those three Liberal members were from the west, from those portions of the country where men are in touch with what has been going on in the Yukon. What is the significance of their so voting? We say these three members will go a great way in swallowing what comes from the Treasury benches, and we may be quite certain it was not for love of the bright eyes of the Conservative party that they voted with us on that occasion. The real reason why they voted that way was this: They represent by that vote hundreds and hundreds of Liberals in their constituencies, and they dare not go back to seek election if they had to stand on the hustings and say, "We refused an inquiry into those charges which the people of this country know should be thoroughly investigated."

Sir Wilfrid Laurier announced that if when Mr. Ogilvie's report was received, it did not appear thorough and complete, a further investigation would be held, and nothing left undone to bring all the facts to light.

Even in England to-day a statement like that about my right hon. friend must certainly sound amusing; because in England they must understand, though not so well as we do here, what the soft and sunny smiles and the gentle words and promises of my right hon. friend amount to. Suppose this meant that we were to have an inquiry. Is it not a monstrous thing to have said that if the second instalment of Mr. Ogilvie's report is not a satisfactory and thorough one, then we will have another inquiry. Is not that a perfect insult to the intelligence of Parliament and the intelligence of the people of Canada, in the face of the fact that Mr. Ogilvie himself stated that he could not possibly make a thorough inquiry? The evidence shows that from beginning to end—and I think my hon. friend from Norfolk will agree with me—this telegram made by Reuter's agent here, at the suggestion no doubt of a Minister of the Crown, is not merely a tissue of fabrications, but so absurd that it has only to be read to be laughed at. This is a very serious matter because not merely have this Government committed political crimes of a magnitude and number unequalled in the history of Governments in Canada, but they have reduced to a system the manufacture of public opinion, and when the people are called

Mr. DAVIN.

on to express their opinion by electing a representative to this House, this Government put their forefinger and thumb on the jugular of the political liberty of Canada and deify the threshing machine. You must have read that in Rome the Temple of Fame was placed behind the Temple of Virtue. That was to indicate to the young Roman that in order to arrive at the Temple of Fame he must pass through the Temple of Virtue.

Mr. MCGREGOR. What would be your choice?

Mr. DAVIN. I did not catch what the hon. gentleman said, but I know that he is not interested because into the Temple of Fame or the Temple of Virtue he will never enter. The Temple of Fame was so placed in order to indicate to the young Roman that it was only by good service to the commonwealth and noble deeds he could enter it. But to-day we find that the hierarchy of the party opposite have placed before the Temple of Fame the threshing machine, and the young Liberal is taught to-day that if he desires to enter the high court of Parliament, he must hug the machine. A highly paid missionary of this Government, whom we have sent across the Atlantic to represent us, has given this memorable advice to the candidates of the party opposite for parliamentary honours: You are to hug the Threshing Machine.

Serious as is the individual case of wrongdoing to which I have referred, what it indicates is still more serious, namely, that in Ottawa we have a systematic machine for the manufacture of public opinion here and which actually dares, by misrepresentation, false statements and wholesale fabrication, to also manufacture public opinion in England too.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). I am much surprised that no hon. gentleman on the Treasury benches has risen to meet the formidable indictment preferred by the hon. member for West Assinibola (Mr. Davin). It will be impossible to place on record more completely and thoroughly the deplorable position in which the Government of Canada finds itself. It is an admission on the part of the Government of Canada that they occupy such a position in the presence of the English public as to oblige them to resort to the fabrication of lying telegrams for the purpose of changing English public opinion. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) has charged distinctly that the Reuter's agency has been made use of in this city to send the message which he read to the House, and which I do not hesitate to say has more palpable falsehoods condensed in it than it is possible to conceive could be placed in a similar number of lines. Reuter protected himself by not sending this message as a Reuter's telegram but by saying he had been requested to send

it. It was sent for the purpose of counteracting the action of one of the strongest friends and supporters in Great Britain of this Government, the London "Times," which has given this Government every possible assistance, as it is its custom to give to the Governments of the day. The "Times" deplored the fact that the Government of Canada had allowed the name of Canada to be tarnished throughout three continents by voting down the reference of these charges to a judicial and independent commission. The Government found their position so utterly indefensible that they dared not consent to the appointment of an independent commission, but referred the charges for investigation to a dependent official of their own and a relative of the Minister mainly responsible. The "Times" found it impossible to endorse such a course and gave its imprimatur, and a very important imprimatur it was, to the declaration that the Government had failed in what it owed to itself and to Canada, when, after having challenged any member of this House to formulate charges on his personal responsibility and after having voted down the first motion for reference to a commission on the ground that no charge had been made on such a personal responsibility, they subsequently, even after one of the leading members of this House made the charges and declared his readiness to establish them before a judicial commission and staked his own seat in this House and position in the country upon his ability to establish the charges he had made, still voted down any reference to an independent commission. They got their supporters brought up to vote for the first proposition. And then, Sir, when they are taken at their word, and challenged on the floor of this House by an independent member who staked his position in this House and in this country upon his ability to prove these charges, they fell back upon the most paltry, the most insignificant, the most contemptible pretenses as reasons for asking their friends to vote down that proposition. But they could not get them to do it. Three gentlemen, supporters of the Government, left their ranks and voted with the solid Opposition. They talk of 29 members only supporting this resolution. Why, Sir, the man who induced Reuter to send such a telegram, by the payment, as I believe, of the public money of this country—I have not a doubt about it—knows and every person knows that a more monstrous policy could not be uttered than that only 29 members of the Conservative party could be found to vote for that resolution. They challenged two gentlemen as having refused to vote for it, and both of them declared that they were unaware that the Government intended to force the question to an issue that night, and, wishing to speak upon it, and expecting an adjournment, they had left the House. They were confronted with the fact, as everybody knows, that every Conservative sitting on

these benches—not only the solid Conservative party, but those who claim to be independent Conservatives—voted, every man of them who was in this House, solidly in favour of this resolution, while every Conservative who was out of the House would have been glad to vote for it. Why, you might as well tell us that because the Government, at a late hour last night could muster only 33 votes in their support upon an important question, therefore they had only 33 men to sustain them in this House. They know that that would be as base a falsehood as men could utter. And yet this monstrous fabrication, this monstrous lie is attempted to be choked down the throat of the intelligent British public by this Government as a means of controverting the position the "Times" has taken and rehabilitating themselves in the opinion of the British people. I am glad to know that the British press, as I understand, have treated this telegram with the contempt it deserved; that, except the "North British Daily Mail," to which it was sent, not a single London paper has given it admission to its columns so completely transparent was this miserable attempt by a broken-down Government, convicted out of their own mouths and by their own actions of being unable to defend themselves here or anywhere.

Reuter's telegram has had a high character. The foundation of this great system of telegraphic communication throughout the world was laid by Baron Reuter, a gentleman of high character and high standing; and his energy and enterprise have made Reuter's telegram a great institution, not only in England and in America, but throughout the civilized world wherever telegrams go. But I remember the time, Sir, when, owing to just such acts as this, Dalziel's telegrams came to be known as Dalziel's lies, because Dalziel permitted their telegram system to be used as Reuter's agent has permitted Reuter's system to be used, not in the service of the public, but in the service of parties and individuals.

My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) has brought before this House a matter of the utmost importance. And if this Government had wished to convict themselves out of their own mouths of having no defence, they could not adopt a better course than to send these falsehoods for the purpose of imposing on the British public and leading them to suppose that they were not in that miserable broken-down, thoroughly defenceless position that they stand in before this House and before the people of this country.

And what about Judge Dugas? It is stated here that the Government could not permit that commission to be issued, because, under the Canadian system, Judge Dugas could only be tried by the Superior courts. Such a word was never uttered in this House; no man on the Treasury benches was found daring enough to make a statement so utterly at variance with the facts.

Judges in this country are not tried by the Superior Courts, and everybody knows it. When a judge is to be tried at all, he must be tried by Parliament; he is impeached on the floor of this House and here he stands his trial, and not before the courts, as this lying telegram in the defence of this Government seeks to make the public believe. The flimsy, futile arguments the Government gave to show that they could not permit the commission were brushed away as a mass of cobwebs. What was their defence? First, that the Government could not be put on trial before judges. And, by the way, this telegram says there was no charge against any member of the Government; yet the Minister of the Interior defends himself on the ground that the accusation was a proposal to impeach the Government and bring them before a judicial bar to be dealt with. That was an utterly preposterous statement. No one ever proposed that this judicial commission should deal with the Government of Canada. That commission was moved for for the purpose of obtaining reliable, independent testimony, to be reported to this House, where the Government would have to stand their trial. And so the whole fabric that the First Minister proposed as ground upon which his friends could stand in voting down this resolution were shown to be an utterly idle fallacy that no rational man would for a moment entertain. As I say, this telegram would have the British public believe that there were no charges against the Government. Why, three Ministers had grave charges preferred against them, by an hon. member of this House, who staked his seat in this House and his character in the country upon his ability to prove the accusation that these three Ministers had been guilty of gross maladministration of their departments:—First, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) whose incapacity, whose neglect, whose maladministration had led to a carnival of corruption that had disgraced Canada throughout the world; next, the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) who was charged with utter maladministration of his department; and next, the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) who was charged with having committed a gross fraud against Canadian and British rights by permitting a vessel worth \$60,000 to be entered in the customs at a value of \$10,000 and to come into competition with British vessels. Here were three Ministers charged with grave maladministration, and yet this lying telegram undertakes to say that no Minister was charged. The Minister of the Interior took up the time of this House and asked this House to regard it as a matter of great moment that a typewriter had written "six" instead of "eight." That was one of the most substantial grounds that the Government were able to present to this House when they called upon their followers to vote down the resolution for that commission. Fortunately for the character of the Liberal

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

party, three men were found of sufficient independence to say to the Government: After your solemn pledge that, if it were found that Mr. Ogilvie's commission was insufficient, you would issue a judicial commission to investigate these charges, and after Mr. Ogilvie himself has declared in his own court that he was utterly incapable of doing justice to this subject, and has asked for enlarged powers, we cannot stand by you, but demand that you shall carry out the declaration upon which you obtained our votes on a previous occasion.

There were three independent members left that side of the House, and with a solid opposition, fortified by three members supporting the Government, this lying declaration is sent to England that only 29 Conservatives voted for the motion, without the slightest reference to the action of the three Liberal members associated with them. Yet they knew there was not a Conservative member in this House of Commons that would not have been glad and proud to record his vote, if the Government, knowing their weakness, feeling their inability to sustain this debate, had not forced this measure through at an early hour in the morning in the absence of the great body of the members of this House. I say my hon. friend has done a service to Canada, and I feel it right to call the attention of that great institution of Reuter's telegraphic communication throughout the world to the fact that their reputation will be compromised if their agents permit Cabinet Ministers or anybody else, however high and influential, to induce them, by the payment of public money, as I believe was done in this case, to send such a tissue of misrepresentations across the water, because they feel that otherwise there will be but one sentiment in the British public, and that is that this Government stands in such an utterly indefensible position that it has no other means of protecting itself. I do not hesitate to say, Sir, that they were wise in their day, ruinous as it is to their own character, ruinous as it is to the character of Canada, for them to have voted down this independent commission. They were confronted with the horns of this dilemma: If they granted the commission, the Government would be driven out of power; proof would have been given of the most dastardly and most widespread corruption so brought home to the Government themselves that they would have been driven out of power, and they knew it. Therefore, they either had to resist that commission, or take the consequences of being driven from the Treasury benches.

Now, Sir, the Minister of the Interior put forth a statement that a mistake had been made in this long indictment respecting the granting of leases in the Yukon. What did he tell this House? He pretended to read from a report, but he read what was

not in the report. He read the names of the parties that the member for Pictou had indicated as the late partners, if not the present partners, of the Minister of the Interior, and he endeavoured to lead the public to believe that the late partners, with all kinds of aliases, with all kinds of alibis—one day so and so was at Brandon, another day so and so was at Vancouver, another day so and so was at Ottawa—to lead the public to believe they were different parties who had entered their names for a large number of dredging leases in the Yukon, and he undertook to read from this report "granted, none." There is no such word in the report. He added a word which does not exist there. What took place was this: They were allowed to enter their names for leases, and I believe to-day that were this investigation held, those men would stand in the position of having put in their claim wherever they wanted a lease, for the purpose of hawking them about the country, as they had been in the habit of doing the last two years, and then do as they did in this case, which I have under my hand, which the Minister of the Interior seems strangely to have overlooked: A. E. Philp, Klondike, another alias; because this is the same as the A. E. Philp of Brandon, the same as the A. E. Philp of Vancouver; and yet here we find their names entered for a number of those leases, names of people who were concealed under those names. Then they could hawk them about and give, as the member for Pictou was prepared to prove they had given, declarations that the Minister of the Interior and Major Walsh were both interested in these leases, for the purpose of selling them. That was the position. And when they could make a sale, as they evidently did, of these 20 miles in one of the richest gold rivers in the world, though the Minister of the Interior found it convenient to declare that not a lease had been issued to one of these people, I believe all these leases would have been given wherever they could trade them off, as they were able to trade this one off. The member for Pictou pledged himself to prove:

That the said Philp, heretofore a partner of the said Minister, represented in writing that he was engaged in a dredging venture in the Yukon—

20 miles of the richest gold river in the world.

—and in endeavouring to induce another to join him, represented in writing that Mr. Sifton, the said Minister, and Major Walsh, were also interested with him, but their names did not appear as he wrote "for obvious reasons."

Is that a charge that ought to have been voted down? Is a proposal to investigate it by somebody besides Mr. Sifton's uncle, one that ought to have been voted down, and the parties prevented from bringing

their proof? Why, the hon. gentleman knew that their colleague would have been driven ignominiously from the seat he occupies if that evidence was established and the proof was given that the member for Pictou had pledged himself to give. And yet the right hon. gentleman declared that his party would stand by the Minister of the Interior, declared that he was an admirable Minister, and all that was necessary to cause him to be hugged as the West Elgin machine was invited to be hugged, was for Conservative members to attack him. That is the way in which the First Minister defended his colleague. He said, Those attacks by his opponents have so endeared himself to us that we clasp him to our bosoms, just as Mr. Preston urged Mr. Macnish, whom he had succeeded in electing for West Elgin, to hug the electoral machine by which he had secured his election. And this page, as I say, the Minister of the Interior held in his hand when he declared that not a lease had been issued to one of these parties that were formerly connected with him. Why, he had these words under his hand: A. E. Philp, Klondike, 20 miles on the Klondike River, \$2,000 paid. And so the rest would have been filled up in the same way provided that, by hawking them around the country, this former if not present partner of the Minister of the Interior, could have got the parties to join him in the venture. They had better read the "Free Press" of three days ago, stating that a gentleman is suing Philp for \$4,000 for having induced him to go in with him for the purpose of taking up one of those leases, and he now demands this sum for his services. I say that my hon. friend the member for West Assiniboia has done a service to the country by bringing to the light of day this miserable, unworthy attempt of a helpless broken down Government to sustain itself in the presence of the British public. I say he has done a service to the Reuter telegraph agents and to every other telegraph agent in the world that operates in Canada; he has shown these gentlemen how dangerous it will be even at the suggestion of a Minister of the Crown, backed with what influences they have, to accept a message, saying, "We have been requested." I must do the Reuters' agent the justice to say that he had undoubtedly refused to send this lying message except as stated, at the request of the party who presented it to him. I say again that we owe our thanks to the member for Assiniboia for dragging this occurrence to the light, and exposing it in the terse manner he has done in order to awaken the slumbering conscience of the people of Canada in regard to these dishonest and dishonourable means by which the Government are endeavouring to hoodwink not only the people of Canada, but the people of the mother country as well.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). Mr. Speaker, I think the helpless and broken-down Government, if they are helpless and broken down, would ask no better friend than the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper). When an hon. gentleman, in his position, will persist in occupying—I will not say wasting the time of the House—with a repetition of charges which have been brought forward twice at enormous length, twice discussed, twice refuted, twice disposed of and voted down by an overwhelming majority in this House, when, in the very last days of the session he will persist in repeating these charges, I am bound to say that he could give very few better illustrations of the fact that, so long as he continues to be the leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition, so long will the helpless broken down Government continue to occupy these benches. I had not the pleasure of being present at the last discussion of these charges, but I was present at the first. I was a patient victim of the seven-hour speech delivered by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), and I heard not merely his charges—charges, perhaps, is not the proper word to use—I heard not merely his rambling and incoherent assertions, but I heard the reply of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), and if it will gratify the hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Charles Tupper), I can tell him that I think no hon. member ever rendered a greater service to another than did the hon. member for Pictou in the attack which he made on the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). And I may add for the further information of the hon. gentleman that if he chose to consult his own supporters behind him, he would find that a large percentage of them would entertain the opinion that I do as to the contrast presented by the hon. member for Pictou and the hon. Minister of the Interior.

Mr. COCHRANE. Not one.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I am afraid the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) speaks for himself only. As I say I did not hear the last effort in which, I believe, the hon. member for Pictou surpassed himself in the ratio of nine hours to seven, but I did peruse the charges themselves, and I have to say this to the hon. gentleman that I, as a member of the House of Commons, utterly and entirely repudiate the doctrine that this House of Commons is not the place wherein to try charges preferred against the Government of Canada. We are here, Sir, by right of the support we obtain from the hon. members of this House, and it is a gross libel, a gross slander on the Parliament of Canada to say, as the hon. leader of the Opposition and his friends have insinuated, that they can obtain no justice from a select committee of this House, a committee on which they have themselves

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

the right of having something like two-fifths of the whole membership. What did we do under similar circumstances? We were not afraid to go before committees of this House when we had charges to prefer. What did Mr. Huntington do when he had occasion to impeach the hon. gentleman's colleagues, and the hon. gentleman himself for the gross scandals which initiated the first attempt to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway? Did he ask for a judicial commission? Was he unwilling to trust his fate to a committee of the House, although he knew that the majority of the members of that committee would necessarily be adverse to him? Mr. Huntington came forward, made his charges specifically, staked his reputation on them and proposed to investigate them before a committee of the House. What did our present hon. Speaker do under somewhat similar circumstances? Did he ask for a judicial commission? No, he was perfectly willing to go before a committee of the House to support and maintain the charges that he had made. What did Mr. Lister propose to do when he brought certain charges against another member of the late Government? Was he afraid? Did he cower at the thought of appearing before a committee of the House, although it was composed of a majority of hostile members? What did the hon. gentleman's friends do on that occasion? They refused to allow these charges to be tried either in the case of Sir James Edgar or Mr. Lister. The hon. gentleman tells us that it was with difficulty that our supporters were brought up to the mark to vote down these charges. There was a difference between our supporters and the supporters of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman will not deny that but a small proportion of his supporters were brought up to the mark to support these charges. This was not a snap vote; this was the conclusion of a formal charge preferred by a prominent member of the Opposition, the hon. member for Pictou, after days and days of discussion and the hon. gentleman's friends had a perfect right and were perfectly able to have appeared in the House and voted in support of these charges if they had been so disposed to do. I think it is worse than useless, after these charges have been twice repeated and twice disposed of, and that it is contrary to the rules of debate, for the hon. gentleman to come forward now and repeat all these allegations which have been made and refuted. I will say one thing, as the hon. gentleman appears to think that a charge is possible to be brought against the hon. Minister of the Interior. The hon. gentleman says that the hon. member for Pictou made a charge that the hon. Minister of the Interior was interested in the disposal of certain mines. Does the hon. leader of the Opposition say that he means to substantiate such a charge?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say that the hon. member for Pictou submitted to the

House that he was prepared to prove that the late partner of the hon. Minister of the Interior, who had received a lease of twenty miles of the Klondike River, had, in writing, declared that the Minister of the Interior and Major Walsh were both interested with him, and that writing can be produced.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. A very different thing, Sir. If the hon. gentleman himself, or the hon. member for Pictou will rise in his place and say that he is informed and believes that the hon. Minister of the Interior was interested in the sale, or the proceeds, of any mining location, he will receive at once every facility for the proof of his charges if he can prove them, as our friends proved their charges in the case of Sir Hector Langevin and in the case of others that I have mentioned before a committee of this House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman had better go up-stairs; he had better spend an hour up-stairs.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The very last committee they asked for, the very last committee they obtained. If hon. gentlemen have any confidence in any charges they can make they will rise in their places; they will not shelter themselves behind anonymous communications—the authors of which they dare not give, but they will come forward and ask for a committee of the House, and if they do so they will have a committee of the House at once. They are in the full face of day; the whole press of Canada is standing by, and they will have an opportunity of showing on what substantial grounds they prefer charges against members of the Government. But if they will not do that, for very shame, they should hold their peace. It is not creditable to this House, or to the records of Parliament, that the hon. gentleman himself, or the hon. member for Pictou should rise in this House and shelter themselves behind hearsay statements and anonymous communications. Their duty is, if they think these charges are true, to say so and to ask for a committee of investigation. They will get full justice; they will have every opportunity; they will have an opportunity to summon witnesses from the ends of the earth, as they have done on more than one occasion; they will have all the publicity that they desire; they will have the press beside them, and if there has been wrong-doing, I will stand beside hon. gentlemen in punishing wrong-doing as quickly as any other hon. member of this House. I deprecate this idle and senseless waste of time, this repetition of charges that have been preferred, that have been formally adjudicated upon by this House. There is one way known to English history, known to constitutional usage, and there is a way sanctioned by our practice and precedents

in this House, and it is to do as I have said the hon. member for Huntingdon did, as Sir James Edgar and Mr. Lister were prepared to do, as was done by Mr. Tarte, in the case of those inquiries which culminated in the expulsion of Sir Hector Langevin from public life, make these charges, ask for a committee to investigate them, and if they do so they will have every possible publicity and the press and the public will be able to judge between the accuser and the accused.

Mr. GEO. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) seems, with a curious abnegation of the intelligence that he generally shows to have steered entirely clear of the question that my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) brought up. I have no doubt that he saw the point, I have no doubt that he listened intently as it was being developed by both gentlemen who have spoken, and when he rose to his feet he may have had some faint idea of alluding to it, but he has been entirely successful in sitting down after a fifteen-minute speech without one single sentence of allusion to the question which was brought up. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) congratulates himself that he and his party have a very steady and very valuable friend in the person of the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper). I am quite willing to join my congratulations with the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright). I hope he may long continue to have such a friend, and so long as the sins of the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) himself, and of his colleagues appeal to high Heaven and to an honest electorate as they do, I hope we shall have the leader of the Opposition in his place to point them out and to keep these hon. gentlemen, at least, in remembrance of them—Lest they forget, lest they forget. Well, Sir, there is another great friend also to one of the special members of the Government. As the leader of the Opposition is a great friend in a sort of wholesale way to the Government, so the member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is a special friend to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). And my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) gives his congratulations to the member for Pictou because of the great friendship evinced in his attack upon the Minister. I hope he may long live to enjoy that kind of friendship as well. But Sir, I want to say to the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) that the country will have a very different opinion on the charges made on the Yukon matter, and on the way the Government has met them; a little different view, I think, from what my friend himself takes, and I think my hon. friend and his colleagues will find it out before he is many years older.

The fact is that the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) has within the last three years diligently, from day to day, from

month to month, from year to year, been engaged in stripping from himself every vestige of the reputation which he formerly held in this country.

Mr. DAVIN. He is as naked as Adam was the day he was created.

Mr. FOSTER. At this moment he has pretty well succeeded in showing his utter nakedness in that respect to the people of this country.

Mr. DAVIN. He has not even a fig leaf.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot congratulate a clever man, an old politician, a man of intelligence, I cannot congratulate him, very strongly, either on behalf of the public life of this country, or on behalf of the intelligence of this country, or on behalf of the hon. gentleman himself, on the success which has undoubtedly attended his efforts in that respect. Can the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) name to this House a single position that he took during the seventeen years he was in Opposition; can he name to me a single position that he took on great points of policy during that time, that within three short years he has not entirely traversed, repudiated, and thrown from himself. I may tell the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright), and he can have that to take with him day and night if it is any solace: that the solid-minded, reputable people of this country are looking at him this day with a good deal of pity, and from time to time it is being mingled with something which is not so elevating and so refreshing for a public man as pity is. Why, the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) will recognize himself in this picture which I show him; a remarkable good picture; not quite as jovial as he appeared in the edition of the Bytown Coons as from week to week they delighted the people of this country and provoked good-natured humour, and did more—provoked more deep conviction than possibly anything else that has appeared in that line in this country. "I cannot sing the old songs." How true is it? And with what infinite pity we look upon the countenance of my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) as he sits tranquilly and peaceably before us. With what infinite pity we look upon him and sympathize with him, that his good old, strong, well-modulated and well-pitched songs of eight or ten years ago have entirely passed into the limbo of the forgotten; and he can never—yes, he can recall them, but he can never honestly sing them again. What did he say just five years ago when he struck exactly that characteristic attitude which we see in the picture here? What did he say in March, 1894—and the same thing, but stronger, he said down to June, 1896:

Sir, Canada had no business, and never had, to spend thirty-six millions or thirty-seven millions a year. It is a monstrous thing, properly understood, wholly apart from the amount of real tax-

Mr. FOSTER.

ation paid by us, that an expenditure of thirty-six millions or thirty-seven millions a year should be saddled on 5,000,000 of people in the position of the people of Canada.

That was one of the old songs; my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) cannot sing it to-day. He, to-day, has to dance to the nimble jig of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). He, to-day, has to model his aged limbs in motion to the agile member who represents the province of New Brunswick in that Ministry. The old songs! Oh, no; they cannot be sung by my hon. friend. It is the new, and alien, and high-pitched tunes of my hon. friend, which he, parrot-like, has to sing after and to the accompaniment of his more ambitious and more enterprising, and more daring, and I am bound to say, less scrupulous colleagues in the Government, of which he is not at the present moment by any means an important member.

Well, Sir, to come back to the question. They, if you will make charges, they will give you a committee. You had committees and you have held investigations before, and every man in this country knows, that when Sir John Thompson sat with that committee on the Langevin charges, as they were called, there never was a fairer judicial tribunal in this country than Sir John Thompson gave to these gentlemen, and never a more unfettered and untrammelled access to all the evidence and all the information in the case.

Mr. BERGERON. Their own lawyer was paid by the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, their own lawyers were provided and paid by the Government. "No commissions," says the hon. gentlemen opposite. Why, the Caron charges were carried on before a commission, as my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) knows right well. Nay, it does seem that this Government constantly is bound to try to, and to attain if possible, its ends by a crooked rather than by the straight way. This morning Reuter's telegram is read from a British paper. Reuter has the instinct of self-preservation well developed, and although Reuter succumbed to influence and to the pay of the telegram, Reuter tries to preserve itself by saying, that, in this case, "it is published by request." Well, if anything could damn the despatch in the eyes of intelligent reading men in the old country, that would. You might just as well try to convince men by setting before them an advertisement for Pears soap, or St. Jacob's Oil, or anything of that kind which is put in by request and paid for and does not voice the editorial sentiment. There may have been payment for this despatch or there may not, but this was published "by request," and the very end so ingeniously sought by the gentleman whom we have often seen and whom we shall see yet in this House; the very end sought by him

was discounted by the fact that before the honourable Reuter would insert that telegram in that way, he prefaces it by saying: This is "put in by request," and we are not responsible for the truth or the falsity of it. Now, Sir, what appears in this? It appears that the same crooked means are taken by the Government to support themselves with public opinion in Great Britain; the very same crooked means by which they got into power in this country and are today keeping themselves in power. Will any gentleman who has an ounce of common sense in his brain—and I am going to except some gentlemen from that category—read that telegram as it was read here to-day, and having been seated in this House when these transactions were going on, will he say that was in any way a fair representation of what took place in this House?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, let him get up and produce his statement and argument, and show this House how it is a fair statement. Why, Sir, it is as unfair and garbled a statement as could possibly be manufactured without defeating its whole object, to convey absolute unverity and deception. Do you not know that the skilful prevaricator succeeds where the blunt one does not, and it is the skilful prevaricator whose hand is shown in that telegram, which by request was transmitted through Reuter's agency to the public press of Great Britain. But no man who values his reputation for common sense and veracity will attempt to show in this House that that is at all a fair representation of the facts with reference to these Yukon charges. Not one. If he did, he would soon find that a very large discount would be attached to it in the public mind. When these gentlemen are cornered, when there are charges made, and when the status, and prospects, and reputation of one of the most reputable gentlemen, who has been, and is to-day, in this House, is staked on the proving of those charges, these hon. gentlemen shelter themselves by saying that they are not going to abnegate their functions and transfer them to a royal commission—that they are not going to have a Government tried by royal commission. Some second-rate men did advance that argument in this House; but I never expected the Minister of Trade and Commerce would reiterate an argument of that kind. How does this House come to its conclusions? I am not going to say how it sometimes does come to its conclusions; but I am going to say, what no man will controvert, that this House ought to come to its conclusions on full and correct information; and what was the royal commission to do? Was it ever suggested in this House or in the country that the royal commission was to try the Ministers, judge the Ministers, apportion the penalty to the Ministers? Never once. That is what a court does in a judi-

cial way; but the only and sole object of a judicial commission was to insure that neither party should have an advantage, but that a commission of cool, uninterested men should do—what? Not try the Government, but sift the facts and present them to the members of this House, so that on full, and impartial, and as perfect information as possible, this House could make up its mind whether the Ministry was culpable or not. Does any one object to that? No Ministry that feels confident of its strength, its standing and its purity, ought to object to a course of that kind, or to information being laid on the Table of this House by a commission of that kind. But that is what my hon. friend objects to; and the very fact that this statement appears by request in Reuter's telegrams shows that these hon. gentlemen feel the sting, and feel it keenly. They feel that the enlightened public opinion of Canada and of the world, as shadowed forth by the "Times," condemns them for not going as far as a Government that was well convinced of its innocence ought to go under the circumstances. They feel that the verdict is against them; it rankles in them; and so, by this crooked way, somebody high in the ministerial ranks by request sent this telegram to the British public—what for? To counteract that verdict and the impression, which they feel is being made against them, and which is voiced by the editorial in the "Times." And so this crooked, indirect, prevaricating method of putting themselves right before the British public throws a lurid light on the birth, the genesis, the nurture and the present maintenance of this Government. They were born in deception, and they know it. They went to the electoral community of this country for five years—to go no further back—before the time they took office, and they were either grossly ignorant of the state of feeling of this country, or they were deceiving the people of this country in order to get power. For what they have done is the exact opposite of what they declared they would do; what they have embraced is the exact opposite of what they denounced; what they now declare to be their policy and are carrying out, is the exact opposite of what they declared would be their policy. If there is any crooked way of doing a thing, this Government will do it in that way. If they want to make an extraordinary expenditure in the Yukon, through a tool and servant of one of the Ministers, they ignore the foundation of parliamentary appropriations that they shall have money granted before they spend it. They filch from honest votes for an illegal purpose money which was never granted to them, to put it into the pockets of Charleson, to send him west to operate, without a vote of Parliament; and they do it in the face of what? They do it in the face of two Acts of Parliament, passed under the supervision of the Ministers themselves, in-

corporating companies and granting them the franchise for building a telegraph line into the Yukon. They do it in the face of a correspondence in which a member of this House had a prominent part, but as to which he has not yet opened his mouth in this House, because he does not wish to condemn his friends; for he feels that he could not speak on that subject unless he did condemn them. They do it in the face of six months of a correspondence, persisted in and continued, which bore the imprimatur of the Government and of a member of the Government—which went further, which gave the secret and confidential assurance of one member of the Government that he was heart and soul with them, and that he would watch for them against a rival company in the field. In spite of all that, and up to the very time these negotiations were going on, this company, shielded by what they supposed was the good faith of the Government and of a particular Minister, went on with their work, organizing and getting their material ready. In the face of all that, this Charleson business was got up; and to-day we have in the Estimates an item of \$400,000 for a telegraph line into the Yukon, not one cent of which ought to have been spent by this Government, and not one cent of which was necessary to have been spent. All the Government had to do was simply to recognize the franchise they had allowed to be granted, to carry out in good faith what they had pledged themselves to this company to do, and to demand, as a result of that, that preference should be given to Government telegrams into the Yukon, and they would have had all they wanted. Thus the people's half million dollars, which will be spent before this business is over, would have been kept in their pockets and every service of the country would have been as adequately carried on; but the Minister of Public Works would not have had his little cinch, and his dependents would not have had their greater cinch, and the Government would not have had its patronage to bestow, and, above all, the hard-earned money of the taxpayers would not have been squandered worse than uselessly, as it is being squandered to-day. But what can we do? The peculiar efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite must be taken into account. The Bourassian method is the specific basis of their action. But last night we had an explication of it from a hard-headed business man, who declared, in so many words, that, representing one county, it would be the height of impertinence for him to attempt to criticise any proposed expenditure within the limits of another man's county. Consequently, half a million dollars may be wasted in the Yukon, a million dollars may be spent on public works, given without tenders being called for, and given at a double

Mr FOSTER.

price, but not a word must be said by an independent member, working on the Bourassian method. It is none of his business, because it is not spent within the precincts of his own county.

But there is still another development. These hon. gentlemen are going still further. Not content with the deception which is written on their brows, from first to last, in their political career for this last five or six years, they go still further. They have ruthlessly, with one sweep of the hand, taken away what has hitherto been the principle guiding the expenditure of public money in this country since confederation—the principle of contract with open and public competition and tender. To show how far they have gone, last night the hon. Minister of Finance did not dare, when bringing in a vote, to say what he was going to do with the money. Why? Because the master of the Administration was not present, and he did not know what the master of the Administration would choose to do when he came back, and he did not like to risk his position in the Government by attempting to declare its policy while the master of the Administration was absent. Was anything ever heard like that in this Parliament before? Take those supplementary Estimates, take the Estimates through and through. Some we have passed already and some we will have yet to come to, and I do not hesitate to say that they are redolent of that kind of corruption in the constituencies about which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), in the old days, when he struck that heroic attitude with which we are all so familiar, and was singing the old songs, used the strongest and most vehement language as regards economical principles.

But that is not enough. The new Liberalism goes further. They have deceived, they will bribe and corrupt, and now they are stealing. This is a new phase. Now, the honest elector, who is impervious to the seduction of public works and private bribes, and who deposits his ballot as an honest elector, finds, when the ballots are counted, that his vote has been stolen from him by the enemy. There it lies in the black record that these hon. gentlemen have got to face in this country, in the West Elgin McNish confession. There it lies in lines which are every hour being written in blacker ink, in the committee of members of this House now sitting. The same practice that went on under the management of the local Liberals in West Elgin was continued under the Dominion Liberals in West Huron. One of the Liberal papers, in its buoyant joy when Mr. Holmes was elected, bowed down in lowly admiration before the wonderful genius and wonderful organizing power and the persuasive persistence of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), who was in the riding conducting

the campaign. "Hug the machine." Let the old Liberalism give place to the new from this time forward. Now we have the Bourassian method adopted—the principle of limited liability as applied to members of Parliament, according to which every member is simply to be liable and responsible only what goes on in the precincts of his own county. They are a limited liability company. The Department of Public Works is a limited liability concern, and the hon. Finance Minister showed last night very clearly that he was only a limited liability. Yes, and the good old chorister, the singer of the good old songs (Sir Richard Cartwright) is himself but a sadly limited liability. They do that, and then what do they do? As though not content with deception, bribery, thievery of the poll boxes, they take the next and final step in their degradation, and reward by a fat salary the men who invented and run and are responsible for the machine. Where is Preston to-day? He is the man who, more than any other, built and ran the threshing machine in West Elgin? He did it, Sir, by his own admission. He did it in the mighty province of Ontario, and so gloried in it that when the news came that McNish was elected by means of the stolen ballots of honest men, he wrote, overflowing and over-bubbling with joy:

Dear Donald McNish,  
St. Thomas, Ont.

Hearty congratulations. Sorry from the bottom of my heart that I cannot be with you to-night. To be supported by such a noble army of workers should make you the proudest man in Ontario.

The noble army of workers have been unmasked—partly, partly. By what? By the most abject confession a public man ever made—the confession made by McNish in West Elgin, a confession that will live in the annals of corruption and of hypocrisy on the part of the Liberal party in the province of Ontario.

"Noble band of workers." Capt. Sullivan was one. Duncan Boles was another, and who are the others? Their name is legion. McNish says that Smith and Preston sent these men into the constituency. I am innocent, he says, I did not know anything about it. All he did was to write out recommendations for every one of those persons who are implicated, and give them access to the places where they could work their fraudulent methods. McNish throws the onus on the men who were sent in by the organizers, Smith and Preston, the men who flooded his constituency with these people, who, as McNish acknowledges, personated, stole and manipulated the votes in the ballot boxes.

A noble army of workers. Shake hands with the boys.

Mr. DOMVILLE. And the girls.

Mr. FOSTER. I leave that to the hon. gentleman.

Shake hands with the boys, and hug the machine.

What for?

Auld Lang Syne.

It was not a new thing; it had been done before. I could understand that the thing would have quite a different aspect if it were something new, if it were entirely unprecedented. But that is not the case. When he thinks there is no danger, Preston says: "Hug them." Because they did it for the first time? No. "For Auld Lang Syne." If Preston had been that night with his boon companions, unbosoming himself to them in confidence, we can easily understand that something like a conversation of this kind would have taken place: Ah, boys; the threshing machine did well in this case. Ah, boys; how often have we done it before. Ah, boys; the mystic circle of hands joined, the loving cup and the chanting of Auld Lang Syne has gone on before in many constituencies—down in Cornwall, for instance, and in many others. For Auld Lang Syne, hug the same boys of the same old threshing machine. And where is Preston to-day? Taken hold of by these purists, given \$3,000 a year and a roving commission and travelling expenses. Devlin was not treated so well, Devlin! He was an old-time supporter, but, on one occasion a little too frank; and he has to be satisfied with \$2,000 a year and live in Ireland. But Preston, who hugged the machine that he made, who, for Auld Lang Syne, hugged the machine that had done its business often and often before—he is not confined to the Emerald Isle, but is free to go among the Galicians, to sail upon the beautiful blue Danube, to sweep down the lordly Rhine, and now and then, to show that even he can be pent up to take a row upon the Thames. The world is his field, and \$3,000 a year, with the plaudits of a supporting Government and travelling expenses galore—all this for the maker and operator of the old threshing machine in this prosperous period of Liberalism. The McNish confession has come; the Holmes confession is still to come—but it will come—and if the light of day can be let into these other constituencies, the same things may be shown. For shame, Sir, that my hon. friend, who, of old times, stood in this House and in the country for honest principles and pure government and economical administration, should allow himself to repudiate all his principles, become a mere item in a limited liability company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), who began this debate, commenced his address, I was at a loss to understand what possible purpose

he could have in view. I had supposed that we had reached a stage of the session when there was a somewhat general understanding that we wished to push the business through as rapidly as possible; and why, in this morning session, when we had assembled with the intention of carrying on the immediate business of the House, the hon. gentleman should rise and enter upon a lengthy address upon the Yukon question was, at the beginning, one of those things that no fellow could understand. But after the hon. gentleman had concluded his address and the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) and the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) had also addressed the House in the manner they have done, I think we could easily see the purport of it all. There has been no lack of opportunities to discuss the Yukon question, heaven knows well. We have had it hour after hour, day after day, week after week; and hon. gentlemen have, to their hearts' content, occupied the time of this House and filled the pages of "Hansard" until they have made that document almost a burden to those of future generations who may be tempted to read it. But, after two long discussions, initiated with speeches surpassing in length, I believe, anything ever known before in the history of the Parliament of Canada, and after the whole thing has been threshed out as fine as it could have been, even by the threshing machine that the hon. gentlemen are so much interested in, what do we find? They have made their appeal to Canada, they have made their appeal to the wide Empire, which they say has been stirred up on this question; and, after it all, they discovered that they had failed to make any impression upon the public opinion of Canada or the public opinion of Great Britain; and so they come back again with the hope that by some further talk, when the House is tired and weary of the whole subject, they may possibly mislead some people whom they have failed to mislead in the former discussions. Such, and such alone, can be the purpose of hon. gentlemen.

May I say a word or two as to the side issues introduced by the hon. member for York? He went at some length into the question of the Estimates. My hon. friend has rather anticipated the discussion. If he wishes discussion on these Estimates, at a later stage and at the proper time, we shall be glad to oblige him; and if he finds in these Estimates one single item large enough to perceptibly affect the total—for it is the total that they are talking about—let him move to have it struck out. But I venture to say he will not have the courage to move to strike out these items, unless he adopts a new policy. In fact, the hon. gentleman and his friends, year after year, wall in the country about the magnitude of the Estimates; but when the

Mr. FIELDING.

time comes in this Parliament to deal with Estimates, except for an item of a few hundred or a few thousand dollars here or there, they have never mustered up the courage to vote against them. More than that, the hon. gentleman and his friends have assailed the fiscal policy of the Government. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), in the long speech which he delivered only a few hours ago, attacked the Government and the tariff policy. But, from the moment that question was submitted to the House down to this present time, not one of these hon. gentlemen has ever dared to challenge a vote upon it. I wish the House to take note of that, in view of all that has been said.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) introduced this debate with a reference to a despatch which had appeared in a British newspaper. I never had the pleasure of reading the despatch or of hearing it until the hon. gentleman read it in the House. I speak of it as I have heard it from the hon. gentleman; and, as I heard it, subject to a verbal alteration here or there which would be almost manifest from the reading, that telegram contained a substantially fair and true statement of the facts of the case. But what worries the hon. gentlemen is that they have been endeavouring to mislead the country with statements that were not true, and they thought they could accomplish something by using for their purposes quotations from the London "Times." I have the greatest respect for the "Times" newspaper. I am perfectly satisfied that the able and distinguished lady who went to the Klondike as correspondent of the "Times" acted in a conscientious manner, and with every desire to do her duty to the "Times"; but I think she failed to obtain information in the short visit she made which would enable her to form an intelligent judgment. I think her conclusions were unwarranted, but I am satisfied she desired to be fair and just, and that the "Times" also desired to be fair and just. Unfortunately, with respect to the "Times" for the present, and until something better on the subject can be learned, we are not able to regard the "Times" as being well advised on Canadian affairs. I regret to call attention to the fact that the "Times" has for its correspondent a gentleman who occupies a dual position; and, while I believe he would like to do his duty, yet, after he has spent hours in getting up acceptable literature for the Toronto "Mail and Empire," we can well understand that it is not easy for him to turn around and assume that attitude of dispassionate fairness that should characterize a gentleman filling the position of correspondent of the "Times." Let it be known that the "Times" correspondent, who telegraphs from Ottawa, is at one moment engaged in furnishing information to the "Times," and in the next in supplying the delectable arti-

cles that we find in the Toronto "Mail and Empire." I think it is unfortunate that that dual position should be occupied, because even though the gentleman would like to do his duty faithfully, yet the fact remains that you cannot serve God and mammon—you cannot work for the Toronto "Mail and Empire" and give correct information to the London "Times" at the same time.

It being One o'clock, the Deputy Speaker left the Chair.

House resumed at Three o'clock.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). When the House rose for recess, I was referring to a newspaper despatch which had been brought forward by the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) as the basis of the present discussion. That despatch, published in an English paper, contains certain statements regarding a debate that had occurred in this House on the question of the Yukon district. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to take exception to one or two things that that despatch contains. I had to remark that I had not the pleasure of reading the despatch, I never saw it nor heard of it before I heard it read in the House. I had no opportunity of analysing it, but judging entirely from hearing it read in this House, I formed the impression that, subject to some mere verbal errors and omissions, which might be almost seen from an ordinary reading of the despatch, I regarded its statements as substantially true and correct, and as fairly describing the condition of affairs to which the despatch referred. There were two things stated in that despatch which seemed to give offence to the hon. gentlemen opposite, not because they were untrue, but because they were absolutely true, and truths of very considerable importance. One of them was a truth of the utmost importance, and that was the statement that throughout the whole discussion of this Yukon business no charge whatever had been made against any Minister of the Crown, that is to say, no charge affecting his integrity, his honour or his position as a member of this House. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that such is the fact. We have had long speeches and many insinuations, but it is true now as it was true from the beginning, that the hon. gentlemen who discussed the question failed from beginning to end to make any charge whatever affecting the position, the honour, the integrity or the seat in this House of the hon. the Minister of the Interior, or of any other member of the Administration. That that fact was so clearly and forcibly brought out in the despatch, seemed to give great offence to hon. gentlemen opposite.

Then there was another fact stated in the despatch to which hon. gentlemen took great exception, not because the statement was untrue, as I said before, but because the

statement was absolutely correct, and that was the statement that only 26 members of the Conservative party took interest enough in the matter to remain in the House and vote for the motion of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). There is no question as to the fact; why, then, should hon. gentlemen be so indignant because the writer of the despatch, whoever he may have been, mentioned that which the Journals of the House of Commons will prove to be correct? But, said the leader of the Opposition, it was a mere accident, it was a mere snap vote, it was an accident such as occurred last evening when we had a vote in Committee of Supply in which only a few members cast their votes. Sir, as pointed out by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, there is no comparison between the two cases. A vote in Committee of Supply at a late hour is something which nobody can expect; no member is aware whether a particular vote is coming up. But that was not the case with regard to the Yukon matter. We had had that matter before the House in many shapes and forms from the beginning of the session. The hon. member for Pictou had formally placed his views before the House in a most elaborate resolution, and in a much more elaborate speech he had discussed the subject, others had followed, and everybody was looking forward to that division as one of the most important of the session. Every hon. member on the other side of the House who was interested in the matter, therefore, had the amplest opportunity to cast his vote if he desired to do so; and the fact that only 26 of them remained for the purpose is a fact of some interest. I do not attach as much importance to it as, perhaps, others may; still, it is a matter of fact, and since it was stated in the despatch, I do not see why hon. gentlemen should concern themselves very much about it. I think the inference that hon. gentlemen opposite were not, as a rule, very deeply interested in the matter was a fair and natural inference, and I think it is not unfair to say that the hon. gentleman who promoted that discussion failed to make any impression upon the House, failed to make any impression in the country, and what seems more strange, he actually failed to make any great impression upon his own followers, since he could not prevail upon more of them to remain in the House and cast their votes for his resolution.

The hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), who is not in his place, had very much to say in the course of his speech with respect to the public works of the country, and to discussions which had recently taken place. He referred to some remarks that were made last night by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards). No greater misstatement of the position occupied by the member for Russell could have been made than that which was contained in the ob-

servations of the hon. member for York today. Now, what were the facts? A number of hon. gentlemen opposite, exercising their undoubted rights of criticising any item, had made observations regarding certain public works, of which they could not be expected to know anything, and when the member for Russell was appealed to as to what he thought of this particular matter, he was candid enough to say that as he had no knowledge of the facts of the case, he was not prepared to express any opinion, but he was content to accept the view taken by the Minister of Public Works when he agreed to put that item in the Estimates. Now, that is a vote of confidence in the Government, particularly in the Minister of Public Works. If hon. gentlemen say that this is too generous a vote and too generous a confidence, that is fair criticism; but to say that the member for Russell should be censured because he declined to occupy the House in talking of things about which he was frank enough to confess he knew nothing, is, to my mind, a very strange method of dealing with an opponent's remarks.

Then my hon. friend from York had very much to say about the absence of the Minister of Public Works, and the policy of the Government in relation to public works in his absence, and here again the whole matter was most unfairly stated. What are the facts here? The hon. Minister of Public Works, who has been most assiduous in the discharge of his duties, is broken down in health. He remained at his post as long as possible. Then at the last moment, up to the time when he had hoped to remain in the House and take charge of these Estimates, he was ordered away by his physician and had to go to Europe in search of health. That produced a certain difficulty. I agreed with him at the time of his departure, not to undertake the management of his department generally, as the important duties of my own department would not permit me to do that, but that I would undertake the management of his Estimates in the House. When I came to the House I frankly told the House the circumstances under which these Estimates were presented; and I had to confess, although it was not necessary to confess, that I could only give to the House information on those matters which I could obtain from the officials. I do not think there was anything in that which indicated a want of any confidence on my part, or unwillingness on my part to take the House into my confidence. But hon. gentlemen say, again and again, that because I would not, in the name of the Minister of Public Works, who is absent for a few weeks and who will be here very soon again—because I would not agree to pledge the Minister of Public Works to do something as respects every particular item of these Estimates, therefore, the Government are shirking their responsibility.

Mr. FIELDING.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is unfair and unreasonable discussion. I think the explanations which I gave in the matter of those Estimates, so far as I understood the votes, should have been accepted by the House, and I think they were accepted as fair and reasonable.

But, says my hon. friend from York, we are setting at defiance all the laws respecting the letting of works by tender and contract. He stands up and with a vast amount of virtuous indignation, proclaims himself as the champion of tender and of contract as against doing work by day labour. Why, Sir, if there ever was a burlesque in this House it was the idea of any member of the Government to which he belonged, championing the system of doing public works by tender and contract. Did they apply the principle of tender and contract to the Curran bridge, in the very heart of the great city of Montreal? He knows they did not, but they applied the principle of day labour. The principle itself is capable of being applied intelligently and successfully, but by the abuse of that principle, and the neglect of their duty, they allowed the public treasury to be plundered, and a great scandal to be perpetrated to the dishonour of Canada, as everybody knows. Tender and contract, forsooth, and those gentlemen its champions! Look over the records of the Public Works Department and you will find year after year the testimony that they have done work in total neglect of that principle. Did they take tender and contract for the work on the Sheik's Island dam? Did they take tender and contract when they spent \$174,000 for the hon. gentleman himself, under his own special knowledge, in his own city of St. John?

They rebuilt the customs-house, the public building, in the city of St. John; they spent not \$10,000, not \$15,000, but the enormous sum of \$170,000 by day labour. Then the hon. gentleman comes into this House and puts on an air of virtuous indignation because the Government would not pledge itself to do a work of \$10,000 or \$15,000 by tender or contract. I think my hon. friend will see that the public understand that and that anything that he, at least, may say in defence of the principle of contract is not likely to be regarded with very great favour by the public. But, Sir, let me return for a moment again to the question which was raised by the speech of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and that is the question of the Yukon charges. As I said a moment ago, what the hon. gentleman complained of was that a despatch had been published in the English newspapers telling some very important, but to him, unpalatable truths. That despatch told the story that, from beginning to end, no charge whatever had been made by the hon. member for Pictou against the Minister of the Interior, or any other member of this Administration. By long speeches and by editor-

ials in the newspapers, the Conservative press and the Conservative party have done their utmost to convey the impression that the hon. member for Pictou had made some grave charges against the Government, but, if you read the speech of the hon. member, you will discover that, beside insinuations of the vaguest character, no charge is made against the hon. Minister of the Interior, or any other member of the Government. True, hon. gentlemen did make a charge of favouritism. Well, what does favouritism mean? I suppose that, if a Liberal and a Conservative were, at the same time, seeking employment from the hon. Minister of the Interior, he would exercise enough favouritism to prefer his own political friend, and who could object to that, provided he employed a competent and qualified man? Are we going to employ a commission of judges of the Supreme Court to inquire into questions of favouritism, or anything of that kind? The hon. member for Pictou said that he was prepared to maintain his charges, that he was prepared to resign his seat if he failed to prove them—what? Not a charge of wrong-doing against the hon. Minister of the Interior; no—analyse his statement and all you will find is that he undertook to prove that somebody else had lied about the hon. Minister of the Interior. That is the whole story. The point of the whole complaint, so far as it seemed to have a personal character as against the hon. Minister of the Interior, was in relation to a man named Philp, who appears to have been a partner of the hon. Minister some years ago before he entered the Ministry, and before he entered this House. What was the charge? Is it that the hon. Minister of the Interior had had any improper relations with Mr. Philp? If the hon. member for Pictou believed that he had, if he had been in a position to prove that he had, he would have stood up in this House and said: Mr. Speaker, I have reason to believe and I do believe, and I am prepared to prove, before a committee of this House, that the hon. Minister of the Interior was improperly connected with Mr. Philp in that transaction. But he did not do anything of the kind. All that he was going to prove, the great thing that he was going to prove, or forfeit his seat, was that somebody else had said that Mr. Philp and the hon. Minister of the Interior was connected in this matter. It was a most ridiculous thing, and the hon. member for Pictou and other hon. members who repeat it, who get despatches sent across the water with the object of giving that colour to it, are not going to conceal from the people of Canada the great fact that no charge was ever made against the hon. Minister of the Interior by any one of the hon. gentlemen in this House who discussed the question. They made great efforts to convey that impression, but they failed to give any evidence and they failed to make a charge that for one moment is deserving of the consid-

eration of a Royal commission. A Royal commission, forsooth! Against whom were the charges made? With the exception, if you like to make that one exception, of Major Walsh, all the charges were made against what might be described as the minor officials of the Interior Department. Let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that Major Walsh could have been proved guilty of some wrong-doing. What penalty could have been imposed upon him? I do not admit that there was any wrong-doing on the part of that gentleman, but if you take the worst view of the case and suppose that, as a result of an inquiry something should be proved against him, what could have been done? Major Walsh is no longer in the employ of the Government. He had passed out of the employ of the Government a year ago or more; he was no more than a private citizen, and, therefore, all that could have resulted from an investigation, assuming that he was in the wrong, has already happened, that is, he has ceased to be a member of the public service of Canada. I would like to emphasize the fact that, as against Major Walsh, an investigation could have served no good purpose at all, as he had already ceased to be a member of the public service. I would also emphasize the fact that there was no charge made against Mr. Ogilvie. From the moment that Mr. Ogilvie entered upon his duties as commissioner of the Yukon territory down to the present moment, the universal testimony is that the public affairs of the Yukon have been administered with great vigour and intelligence and beyond a suspicion of wrong-doing. If that is the condition to-day; if the commissioner who was appointed to the Yukon territory has, by his character, by his reputation, by the attention he has given to his work, created such a condition of affairs in that country that the public are entirely satisfied with his administration, what is there to investigate so far as he is concerned? It should be remembered that Mr. Ogilvie was not interested in any of the charges. All the charges, as I have said, had relation to the administration of his predecessors, to the minor officials of the Interior Department, or to the administration of Major Walsh. Therefore, Mr. Ogilvie was a perfectly disinterested person to conduct an investigation. But we are told that this investigation should not be conducted by officials of the Government. Why, Mr. Speaker, who other than officials of the Government are usually appointed to conduct investigations? In speaking in the previous discussion, I pointed out, and I repeat it again, that there is nothing in these Yukon charges as respects the hon. Minister of the Interior, because there was no charge which was really a charge as against him; and there is nothing in the situation as respects these minor officials which differs from a charge against any other public official, for instance, against an officer of

the department of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), or an officer of the department of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair). Suppose that a charge were made to-day that an officer of the Customs Department had, in Vancouver, or in St. John, or Halifax, or Quebec, been guilty of some wrong-doing, what would be the course? Appoint a Royal commission? Apparently that is what the member for Pictou, and other hon. gentlemen opposite think should be done, but what the hon. Minister of Customs would do would be send one of the higher officers of his own department, a man in whom he had confidence, a man in whom he thought the public had confidence, to investigate the matter just as is done every day in the public service of Canada. If there is a charge against subordinate officials the proper person to investigate that charge is one of the higher officials. This is what is done again and again, and it is the only way that you can carry on the public business. But it is not the only way when you come to a Minister of the Crown, and if these hon. gentlemen had the courage to make any charge in this House affecting the integrity and the honour of the hon. Minister of the Interior, they were told, over and over again, and I tell them now, that they have only to make the charge and they will get a committee, and that committee will take it up.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. "Hear, hear," says my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper).

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A packed jury.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), whom they are so ready to abuse in his absence, did not make the miserable plea of a packed jury when he levelled his charges against Sir Hector Langevin. That hon. gentleman had the true constitutional idea of parliamentary government that the House of Commons of Canada is the proper tribunal to inquire into a charge against a Minister of the Crown. And though with a packed jury and a prejudiced committee, the hon. member for Montmorency of that day, the hon. Minister of Public Works now, was perfectly satisfied to accept the constitutional principle and appeal to a committee of the highest tribunal in Canada, the Commons House of this Dominion. It will be well if hon. gentlemen opposite should follow the same example. They have a supreme contempt for committees at some times, and a supreme regard for courts at other times, but now, we have discovered that they are manifesting a supreme contempt for courts and a supreme regard to committees. In this particular matter they demanded a judicial inquiry. They wanted the judges, chiefly because they knew it was a preposterous claim, and that they never would be

Mr. FIELDING.

allowed to conduct the public business in that way. But what happened later? We had an election in West Huron, not long ago, and which is now occupying some attention. The press of hon. gentlemen opposite, the day after that election, claimed that they were able to prove fraud and corruption. But why did they not go to the courts? They had the courts open to them, they had the judicial inquiry—which they are so anxious to have in another case—open to them. All they had to do was to put out their hands and touch the button, and the courts would do the rest. But when they had a chance of having a judicial inquiry there, they slunk away from it, and they afterwards come to this House and they demand—what? What the hon. gentleman opposite has just called a packed jury. A judicial commission is demanded by these gentlemen to investigate the case of an Indian dog-driver who perhaps takes a tip for admitting a man into the side door of the Dawson post office. But after they have at the first ignored and despised the judicial authority, they are ready to come into this House and submit the West Huron election to a committee. These hon. gentlemen can demand a committee, when they believe they are not going to get a committee; but when they think they are going to get a committee, they are not likely to be in a hurry to ask for it. There is another point in connection with the Yukon matter to which perhaps I might refer. The attempt to connect, by insinuation, without following it up by a charge, the name of Mr. Philp with the name of the Minister of the Interior, was a mean and miserable thing, unworthy of any member of the House of Commons. But, Sir, if there was one thing that was meaner than that, it was the miserable attempt that has been made again and again to prove that my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) had some improper motive in sending Mr. Ogilvie into the Yukon, because, forsooth, they found that Mr. Ogilvie was a distant relation of the hon. Minister's wife. These gentlemen opposite have done their utmost to convey the impression that Mr. Ogilvie was chosen by the Minister of the Interior to go into the Yukon because of his relationship, because of some undue interest he had in him. They have by that line of argument attempted to conceal from the public the great and important fact that Mr. Ogilvie was never appointed to the civil service of Canada by my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton), and that Mr. Ogilvie was a member of the civil service of Canada and engaged in the Yukon years before the Minister came into office. But they say: Oh, Mr. Ogilvie is a relative of the Minister. Well, Sir, it appears that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) never saw Mr. Ogilvie until after he became a Minister, and was introduced to him as one of the officials of the Dominion Government. Mr. Ogilvie married an aunt of the Minister of the Interior.

Some hon. MEMBERS. His wife's aunt.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, Mr. Ogilvie married an aunt of the wife of the Minister of the Interior, and I think I am correct in stating that the hon. Minister never even saw the aunt, and certainly never saw Mr. Ogilvie for years. I believe I am correct in stating the further fact that that estimable lady passed away to Heaven many years ago.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Oh, they will never see her.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the chances are very remote of these hon. gentlemen opposite seeing that estimable lady. Because, forsooth, that under these circumstances there is that distant relationship through the dead aunt of Mr. Sifton's wife; because that good lady was the wife of Mr. Ogilvie, notwithstanding that Mr. Ogilvie was then a public officer of the Dominion of Canada, tried and trusted, and honoured by these gentlemen opposite; then, because he was continued in the public service by the Minister (Mr. Sifton) and given a higher position, in which his ability could be used for the good government of the Yukon territory, these hon. gentlemen opposite make out the miserable insinuation that there has been some improper action on the part of the Minister in appointing Mr. Ogilvie. With these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I think that subject may be dismissed.

I wish before concluding to say something more with reference to the West Huron election, about which hon. gentlemen opposite have said very much to-day. In view of the fact that this matter is now before a committee of the House, it would, I believe, have been more seemly for hon. gentlemen opposite to have made no reference to it. Considering that they are only at the beginning of this inquiry, it was most unjust that they should treat that investigation as if it were closed, and as if all the facts had been laid before the House. We may fairly ask this House, we may ask the country, to reserve its judgment on that matter until all the facts are laid before us. And these hon. gentlemen opposite had much to say about Mr. Preston. Well, Sir, I have read what has appeared in the press regarding Mr. Preston, and I have no desire to apologize for him, if he has done anything wrong, but I say, as a reader of the newspapers, and taking all that appeared on the subject, I have yet to see the first word in the press which reflects on Mr. Preston, and which shows that he has done anything wrong.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These gentlemen opposite have been able to quote a somewhat ridiculous telegram which Mr. Preston, it is said, sent on the night of the election, when he was exulting at the vic-

tory. They give all sorts of tortuous interpretations to the expression about "hugging the machine."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These gentlemen opposite seem to know more about hugging the machine than I do.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I confess that I do not know what it means, and unless some information is laid before the House in regard to it, it would be the part of decency and fair-play not to put any interpretation upon that telegram which the telegram itself does not bear. I am informed that there is to-day on the bulletin board of one of the newspapers of this town a statement that Mr. Preston has brought an action for libel against the people who slandered him outside of this House, and I suppose he will have cause to deeply regret that the penalties of the law cannot be visited on hon. gentlemen in this House who are ready to speak of him as they have before the question has even been considered.

But suppose you do find some things in connection with the West Huron election that are not right, suppose you do find in one county, or in more than one county, some evidence that there has been wrongdoing in connection with the elections; what then? The Liberal party of Canada will demand that the men who have done the wrong shall be punished. But let not these gentlemen opposite lay the flattering unction to their souls that on that account the people of Canada are going to trust them. I say, Sir, that it will take a large amount of corruption—a much larger amount than is ever likely to be found in any Ontario constituency, or, I trust and hope, in any constituency in any other part of the Dominion—it will take a much larger volume of corruption than is ever likely to exist, to lead the people of Canada to again trust the leader of the Opposition and his friends with the management of the affairs of this country. The people of Canada know that, though they may not find perfection in the Liberal party, they are likely to find perfection in a much smaller degree in the party of hon. gentlemen opposite. If the time shall come when the honest people of this country cease to have faith in the Liberal party, they will hesitate a long time before they will give their confidence to the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) and those associated with him. The people of Canada know that you cannot take grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles, or virtues from hon. gentlemen opposite.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The late Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald once said that there was this great difference between

the two parties: that the Tories would never believe anything wrong against the leaders, but that the Liberals were ready to believe everything wrong against their leaders. That statement, unjust as it was, nevertheless contained a compliment to the Liberal party, because it testified to the great principle, that the mass of Liberals do expect to get honest, and virtuous, and good government from their leaders, and that they will insist upon it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And they have got it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is true that the people of Canada expect more from the Liberal party than they expect from the Conservatives, and I believe, Sir, that experience will show that the people of Canada are justified in that expectation, and that the reasonable wishes of the people will be honestly met by this Government. I would like to remind my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) that when the question was raised in this House respecting the West Huron election, instantly—although we might have very well taken the point that they had had an opportunity of proving their case in the courts, and that it should have been sent to the courts—yet, so desirous was the right hon. Prime Minister that there should be no shadow of doubt of the desire of the Liberal party to give the country pure elections and honest government, that he instantly consented to have that matter referred to a committee of this House; and nobody was more surprised than the hon. members opposite, who never wanted the inquiry at all. And in this connection I would like to point out that among those who assented to that motion, none did so more readily than my hon. friend the member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes), whose seat was affected, but who instantly said he desired to have the fullest and fairest investigation. That, Sir, is an example which I would commend to my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Foster). I would ask him if he remembers anything about ballot-stuffing and wrong-doing in elections in by-gone years in his own province of New Brunswick? I would ask him if he ever heard of the rascalities of the Queen's county election?

Mr. FOSTER. Do you mean the last?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I mean the Queen's county election, in which a Tory was sent to a seat in this House which he never honestly won. And I would ask my hon. friend if he remembers when his own election was challenged in 1891, when there was a suspicion of ballot-box stuffing in his own county, and when he had not the manliness to stand fire like my hon. friend from West Huron, but ran away from his county. If the hon. member has forgotten, I want to tell him that the public are not going to forget, that on the night of that

Mr. FIELDING.

election, he found that he was virtually beaten, and he had thrown up the sponge; but at the last moment there came in news that a certain poll, from which he had no reason to expect anything of the sort legitimately, had given him a considerable majority. Two or three days afterwards the ballot-box was mysteriously missing; it could not be found. There was delay and a demand for a recount, when the hon. gentleman, fearing investigation into the ballot stuffing, ran away from the county; and when the hon. gentleman's seat was called in question by an attempt to have a recount, the hon. gentleman, by his solicitor pleaded that inasmuch as he had not been personally served he was not liable to answer to the summons; and he sat through that Parliament in this Commons of Canada as the representative of a constituency which in all probability he never honestly carried, and which he was only able to represent in this House by pleading a miserable, petty plea against an investigation, that the papers has not been served upon him at the proper time.

Mr. FOSTER. All I wish to say with reference to that, for fear silence might lead to the opinion anywhere that the hon. gentleman is stating what I consider to be the truth, is that to my mind there is not a word of fact upon which the assertion which my hon. friend has just made can be fairly based.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am amazed that my hon. friend should meet my statement by that blank denial, because I would have supposed that his ingenuity, which is sometimes remarkable, would have enabled him to plead something that would be a little more plausible.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman say whether or not in 1891 or 1892 he got rid of an election petition on the ground of insufficient service, or some similar technical ground?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I should be delighted to answer my hon. friend. In the year 1890 something—I forget the year—I was told that an election petition was going to be filed against me. I was going out of town, but I took the trouble to remain in town and send a message to the sheriff to bring along his petition.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask the hon. gentleman whether or not the petition was not dismissed on the ground of defective service?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It certainly could not have been dismissed on the ground of defective service on me, for I hunted up the sheriff to serve the petition, as the hon. gentleman will find if he refers to the sheriff of Halifax. I want, in conclusion, to repeat what I said a moment ago, that the thousands of honest Liberals throughout Canada do believe that they will get from the Liberal party cleaner govern-

ment and better government and purer elections than they will get from the other party. The Liberal party are not going to be content to say that two wrongs make a right. They are not going to be content to have any man in the Liberal party plead that because another did wrong, that is an excuse for the Liberal party doing wrong. That doctrine will not be accepted, and should not be accepted by the Liberal party of Canada. They demand, and they have a right to demand, that their leaders in power shall, in respect of the management of public affairs, be above suspicion; and when the moment comes when the Liberal leaders can no longer maintain that position before the party and the country, then the Liberals of this Dominion are not going to sustain them. But if the time shall come when the people of Canada cease to have confidence in this Government, by reason of losing faith in the leaders of the Liberal party, they will still hesitate a long while before they will take the extreme step of giving their confidence to hon. gentlemen opposite. When that moment comes, intelligent men will look back to the record of the Conservative party. They will find that in 1872, at the very first opportunity after the union, when the Conservative party, after a short period of office had occasion to appeal to the country, they had to resort to the grossest bribery and corruption. What was the situation? If ever there was a moment when there should have been an appeal to all the patriotic instincts of the Conservative leaders, that was the moment. They had brought about the union of the provinces, which they regarded as a great step in advance; and undoubtedly it was, particularly as respects the upper provinces, which were enthusiastically in favour of it. They had brought about a coalition of the leading Liberals and the leading Conservatives of the old province of Canada. They had virtually broken up party lines. There was practically no opposition in the first Parliament of Canada. One would have thought that in such circumstances they would have had an easy mind in approaching the elections. But so little faith had they in their own resources and in their own policy, that in these very early years of the union they dare not approach the people without producing a grand corruption fund to demoralize the electors of Canada. And so we had at that very early period of the country's history that miserable story of the Pacific scandal, which led the London "Standard," the great Conservative organ of England, to declare that the men of the Government of that day should never again be permitted to enter office in Canada. The people of Canada will remember that when they are called upon to condemn the Liberal party; and they will remember the Public Works scandals of 1891; they will remember the Curran bridge; they will remember the whole record of Tory corruption; and while they may deeply regret to find

evidence of wrong-doing in the Liberal ranks they are not going to be in a hurry, because of some small wrong-doing in certain districts, to hand over their confidence to the hon. gentlemen opposite, who during all those years, in the way I have described, squandered the money of the people of Canada, betrayed their interests, dragged their honour in the dust, and in going to their dishonoured political graves, had not even the small comfort that they were loyal to their own colleagues and their own leader. The hon. gentleman said that this Government was born in deception. I tell him that his Government died in treason.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, the House has just listened to a rather strong disquisition on public affairs at the hands of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), and I cannot help feeling that the remarks that he has addressed to the House on the Yukon question are probably the same remarks that he addressed in private to the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes), and the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), all three staunch supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, but every one of whom failed to respond to the party crack, and voted that there should be an investigation into the Yukon charges. Why, the hon. gentleman cannot claim that the Government, with all their strong defence, could hold their own friends, much less win votes from this side of the House. And even the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), whose allegiance to hon. gentlemen opposite nobody will deny, saw fit on that occasion to depart from the House without recording his vote in favour of these hon. gentlemen. Let me ask the Government, how can we expect to get the votes of honest Liberal electors, when they cannot hold their own party followers in this House?

The hon. gentleman asks why did we go to a committee of the House for an investigation. But he knows very well that owing to the number of charges made and owing to the fact that the witnesses are thousands of miles away, it would be preposterous to talk of bringing them from the Yukon district before a committee of this House. The hon. gentleman is very brave, but he did not dare, nor did the Minister of the Interior dare, to appoint a judge of their own selection to go into the Yukon district and permit these men to come before him.

How anxious they are to be judges in some cases. They had a Redistribution Bill, and they were eager to seek the solace which the judges might afford them in that matter. They were not afraid to go before the judges then. Why? Because they thought they had a tolerably good case, but they were afraid to appoint a judge to go into the Yukon district and hold an investigation

into the Yukon charges, because they knew that these charges would be proved.

I am astonished that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) should have dared to do what the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) had not the effrontery to do, and what the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) or any other Minister had not the face to do, namely, to stand up in this House and condone the keeping in the public service of this man Preston. The hon. gentleman talks of Mr. Preston going into the courts. Well, Mr. Preston would no more be seen inside a court than would the hon. gentleman under similar circumstances. Where is Preston to-day? He is in the employ of this Government, and where is the criminal law of Ontario to-day. In the face of the admission made by Mr. McNish, that every kind of rascality had been perpetrated, that every kind of wrongful act had been committed in the county of West Huron, where is the criminal law to-day in the province of Ontario? It is paralyzed, Mr. Speaker. The county attorney, who is paid by the people of this country to prosecute criminals, actually stood up at the police court at St. Thomas, and asked that the accused should be admitted to bail for a month, and succeeded in having him admitted to bail by a friendly police magistrate. Where is Mr. Duncan Bole to-day? These are the hon. gentlemen who talk about respect for law and justice in this country. Why, their own provincial government, through its own officers, actually connived to get criminals out of the country. Then, the hon. gentleman exclaimed: Look at the constitution of the country how could such investigations be conducted by referring such matters to judges. Will the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), who sits behind him, tell me that when he had investigations in the province of Ontario, he did not employ judicial officers to hold the inquiry. The hon. gentleman sits there and acquiesces in the statement that he had. The hon. Minister of Customs is the very man who would call in the officials of the court when he has inquiries to make. In a case at Parry Sound, where he held an investigation into the conduct of an officer, he did not appoint one of his own officers to hold it, but sent a judicial officer from Brantford to hold the investigation. I am not going into the whole question of the Yukon. That is to-day within the knowledge of the people of the whole Dominion, whether on the Atlantic or Pacific coast, and when the Government cannot hold under the party whip their own supporters—for three of them voted against them on that occasion and another supporter, the hon. member for North Simcoe, would not even stand up and vote—what can be the opinion of the people throughout the country. When the electorate pronounce on that, and on all the other mat-

Mr. BENNETT.

ters for which this Government is responsible, then the result will be known.

What did the hon. Minister say in conclusion. He said that the Conservative party was rank with corruption from the time of confederation, more particularly in the election of 1872. I am not going to resurrect the ancient history of this country, but will tell him that from 1873 to 1878 there was a Liberal party in power in this country, and God knows, compared with the men who sit opposite us to-day, they were honest men. But when the electorate got the chance at the polls, they speedily dispensed with the services of these men. And so I believe, when the time comes for an appeal to the electorate, the Conservative party will not have any reason to be afraid of the result.

Mr. JAMES DOMVILLE (King's, N.B.) I hardly thought it was worth while to make any statement in the House, but when I saw my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) exhibiting such wild indignation, I was struck by his versatility and assurance. One would almost think he was immaculate. One would almost think that in his own province and county he enjoys the reputation of being the kind of man which he once described himself to be. At that time he was not a Conservative, but was backing and filling on both sides, in one locality a Liberal and somewhere else a Conservative. He then talked temperance to the people and promised them legislation which he never carried out. It was then that in describing the ideal to which he aspired, he said he wanted to emulate the great man who had gone before him, Sir Leonard Tilley, so that when he walked along the streets, even the small boys would point at him and say: There goes a great and good man. I heard him say this himself. Will he deny it now. Perhaps the reason why he did not present himself in King's County last election was because these little boys, who were to speak of him so favourably as he went along the road, would have hooted at him. Every man has a right to do as he thinks best, and it is not my business to pitch into anybody for his private acts, but I have a right to do so as regards public acts. When the hon. gentleman undertook to say that he did not believe in this electorate corruption, what was he posing before the country as? He was posing as a purist of the first water. The country has been flooded with his speeches—the speeches of the Hon. Geo. E. Foster. But what do the people think, knowing him as they do? Does the hon. gentleman think he can play Hyde and Jekyll with them. He has played this double character for all he is worth, and I do not hesitate to say that if there ever had been a fair election run in King's County he would never have been elected. After the first election he was unseated for corruption. But although he had to admit

it in open court, the next day his paper came out and said he had been acquitted.

Now, that was tantamount to saying that there was nothing wrong at all. The last election, as my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) said, he bolted. It was a deplorable scene. Here was a man not knowing whether his leader would abandon him as he was ready to abandon his friends in the Cabinet, and anticipating what would be done to him from what he was willing to do to others. He had lost all that pluck and nerve we see him display here, and he telegraphed to Sir John Macdonald: I am defeated; what is to be done? And Sir John telegraphed back: Never mind; come up and we will see about it. He did not know whether Sir John would stand by him or if he would tell him his usefulness was gone. And his private secretary—the hon. gentleman talks about the relations of the Minister of the Interior, why he himself had a relation as his private secretary, and that poor disturbed mortal walked up and down in the Royal Hotel's, saying: Oh, what is to become of Jenkins. And when the Conservative party met at their headquarters to talk over the results, where was their leader, where was the man who speaks in this House to-day as one in authority? He abandoned these gentlemen, sent his telegram to Sir John Macdonald and went to bed. Will the hon. gentleman deny that?

Mr. FOSTER. No, Mr. Speaker, I will not deny that I went to bed; but I will emphatically deny that I sent such a telegram.

Mr. DOMVILLE. You did send it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. In such a case the hon. gentleman (Mr. Domville) is bound to accept the statement made by an hon. member of the House.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Mr. Speaker, am I to accept the statement when I know to the contrary?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member is bound to accept the statement.

Mr. DOMVILLE. In that case, I accept the statement; and I am sure it will astonish my constituents to know that I would accept it. Now, reference had been made to ballot-box stuffing. It has gone on so long among the hon. gentleman's friends and they were so accustomed to it, that they thought it nothing wrong. I have an affidavit here somewhere from one of these men who says he was present when there were 100 ballots put in the ballot-box.

Mr. FOSTER. We would like to hear that affidavit.

Mr. DOMVILLE. You ought to have heard it at the time, and you would have heard it if you had not cleared out. The hon. gentleman's own newspaper, the "Sun," with his name published as one of its editors, came

out after the election and gave the minorities for every parish, acknowledged defeat and apologized for it. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) say that that is not true? He should never have got the seat. He always understood that, for he never went back. He brought out three different candidates, and each one of them had to get out of the road. It was very much as it was when he came down to Westmorland before the last provincial election. He says that the country will turn this Government out of power, that it has no confidence in anybody except himself. And yet in New Brunswick, after all his boasting in Westmorland, the province gave him hardly a single supporter in the provincial legislature. What does that indicate? It indicates that they have had enough of him. They have had enough of him in King's—he would not dare to get back again. They have enough of him in York—he will not appeal to the people there again. I pledge myself to this House that he will not try it again in York or King's because he knows better. The time came for contesting his election, in order that there might be fair-play—for that was all that was asked. But his agent, carpet-bag in hand, went out one night and the hon. gentleman himself had disappeared by morning. As my hon. friend said, he was not served. We served him in Ottawa through a legal firm, but it was decided not to be sufficient, and so he, like the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. G. F. Baird) held a seat that he never won. He knew that he had never won it. The telephone was set going and the message sent to his friends in one parish: What have you done with my money? Will he deny that?

Mr. FOSTER. What, telephone in King's in 1891?

Mr. DOMVILLE. There was a telephone.

Mr. FOSTER. Where?

Mr. DOMVILLE. It ran from Norton to Springfield.

Mr. FOSTER. Where at Springfield?

Mr. DOMVILLE. It was a store opposite and not very far George Scovil, and the hon. gentleman knows it well.

Mr. FOSTER. I know the store well, but I do not know of any telephone that was set going.

Mr. DOMVILLE. The House must accept my statement or the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Foster), and I think that my statement will be as reasonably accepted as his. I should hope so, at any rate. I state as a fact and one that I know, that a message was sent: What have you done with my money; you have given me no votes for it?

Mr. FOSTER. No such telephone message was sent between Norton and Springfield or between any other two points.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Then how did the hon. member send it?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I will leave that to the ingenuity of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Domville).

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend is right to deny it. I know I should be ashamed of such a thing myself. I should be ashamed to call them to account when they had gone back on me. My money being gone, I should swallow the indignity, there would be the end of it. Will the hon. gentleman deny that when they were calling upon people to rally around the flag of prohibition and temperance and to support the hon. gentleman as a temperance candidate at Rothesay, there was a booth overflowing with liquor placed there in his name and in his interest?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know anything about it; but I should judge my hon. friend (Mr. Domville) would know, if anybody.

Mr. DOMVILLE. That is right, and if I had got any of it, that is about the only thing that anybody ever got of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster).

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad my hon. friend acknowledges that.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend went down to a place called Westfield to canvass a widow woman for three or four votes in the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, that is serious. I want to know the name of that widow woman?

Mr. DOMVILLE. I can give my hon. friend her name.

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to have her name.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I will give it to the hon. gentleman privately.

Mr. FOSTER. I would just as soon have it publicly.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I know my hon. friend likes these things in private, and I think he is right. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was saying—

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has not given the name. This is a grave question, you know.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend, I am sure, is aware of the name. I was going to say—

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman give the name of the woman—

Mr. DOMVILLE. What woman do you want me to tell you about?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to know about the widow woman that my hon. friend is talking about and whom, he says, I canvassed.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Let it be a widow woman or any other kind of woman; it makes little difference. The story I am telling is correct and can be corroborated. She entertained my hon. friend, and he was grateful for the board and lodging he got. He said to her: I must leave early, and I do not want you to have the trouble of seeing me off. Leave some bread and milk on the table, and when I get up I will get it myself. That was all the poor widow woman shared out of the hon. gentleman's generosity. I could give the hon. gentleman some more instances a little nearer home, if he liked; I do not want to do it. I heard him talk about hugging machines. I really hardly know what he meant by it, and I turned up Webster's dictionary afterwards to see how he explained a machine, and I found there were so many explanations that I did not know which machine the hon. member for York meant, when he spoke of hugging a machine. Well, I want to say that when my hon. friend gets up in this House and assumes this rôle of honesty, of morality, the people do not take that stock in him that he thinks they do, or that he wishes they would do. I believe myself that if you show a little courtesy to your fellow members, it is not necessary to pound your hands right and left in order to make the people of this country think that you are important. Everybody knows that my hon. friend is wordy. We all know that he is a fair speaker. I think Sir John A. Macdonald once referred to my hon. friend as a windmill run by water-power, or something of that kind. If hon. gentlemen on this side, who are quite as good as they are, quite as good as my hon. friend, can show quite as good a record at home or abroad—if they were to be as personal on this side and imitate the hon. member for West York in throwing out personalities against members opposite, where would it tend? If he was a courageous man, Mr. Speaker, if we were living in the days of courage, why, there would be a duel out in the lobby. But my hon. friend knows that he is protected in this House, he is protected from a suit at law, he is protected by his seat in Parliament from anybody bestowing on him that physical influence, we will call it, which might be brought to bear upon him. He sits in this House, under the privilege of Parliament, and casts all these slurs against our people in the Yukon, and everywhere else, and attacks the Minister of the Interior without daring to make a charge against him. When it was first brought up in this House, I told the House that I had been to Dawson City, and although there were things done there that the Government could hardly be responsible for, I said that if hon. gentlemen on the other side would make a charge against the Minister of the Interior, a charge that had anything in it, I would vote with them for an investigation. Now, why did not they do it, then?

They cannot say that we on this side would not have given them a fair tribunal. I am satisfied that other gentlemen on this side would have done the same as I offered to do. I am satisfied that the Minister himself would have asked for it. He would not be satisfied to sit here and allow anybody on the other side to charge him, and not refute it. Now, why do not they do it? It is still open to them. But that is not the custom of the hon. member for York. His custom is to vilify everybody. I have been on the hustings with him in New Brunswick, I have followed him inch by inch, and I am prepared to meet him to-morrow in King's County, or any other county in New Brunswick, and assist the Minister of Railways and Canals to chase him and his friends out of that province. They shall never show their face there again successfully. And that is what makes my hon. friend so vituperative, so mad, in this House—if I may use that expression—because he knows the county he came from has had enough of him. He boasted of being a King's County boy. It was in all the papers: He is a son of King's County; hold up King's County's son. But King's County would not hold their son up any longer, and he cannot go back, and he feels sad about it. I, who have lived thirty odd years in that county, have had to put up with all the villainy that took place in all the elections there, such as the robbing of those ballot-boxes, and I am able to stand here to-day and see him and his party in that position to which the country have relegated them. But my hon. friend will make nothing in this House, or in King's County, or anywhere else in New Brunswick, or in Ontario, or anywhere else, by flinging out these aspersions, because, after all, when the people get home and think the matter over, they will say: It is only George Eulas Foster, and we know him.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The hon. member for King's, N.B., (Mr. Domville) has treated the House to a delectable entertainment upon the morality and honesty of the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster). It is quite refreshing to hear it, because of the source from which it comes. It is somewhat a matter of surprise to strangers in this House, why it is that the member for King's can never listen to anything coming from the member for York without getting excited over it; but to those who have been in this House for any length of time, the explanation is quite plain. Since the little incident that took place in the Public Accounts Committee, in which the member for King's was one of the actors, the disclosures that were brought out by the member for York were quite sufficient to make the member for King's his eternal enemy. But I think it will be well for the member for King's, before criticising either the integrity or the honesty of any

other hon. gentleman in this House, to square himself with the Militia Department in regard to his connection with it for the last few years.

The hon. Minister of Finance gave us quite an entertainment this afternoon with regard to the Yukon charges and other things connected with the party of which he is an interested member. He started out by telling us that it was no matter of surprise that the vote was so small on the Opposition side in support of the Yukon charges that were made by the member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). He forgot to tell the House that he and his friends forced that vote on at the close of the second day, when the discussion would otherwise have lasted three or four days. Many supporters of the Government intended to take part in that debate and to vote in favour of the resolution moved by the member for Pictou, but they were unable to do so, because the debate was concluded much sooner than they expected. I speak as one knowing the situation, and as one who did not vote on that question, although I intended both to speak and to vote upon it, had there been an opportunity given. It was not believed that the debate would close that night, and it would not have closed but for the fact that the Government forced a vote before half the members on this side of the House had spoken on it who wished to speak. But I can tell him, for his information, and for the information of the country, that had that debate gone on for the length of time that was expected, and that the nature of the charges required, a large number of members on this side of the House would have spoken out plainly in condemnation of the nefarious mismanagement of affairs by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) in the Yukon district.

Had an opportunity been given, I know, and I think I know what the voice and sentiments of hon. members on this side of the House was, there is not a single member of the Opposition but who would have voted in support of the proposal that was made in these resolutions for the appointment of a commission. There were no dissensions on this side of the House, but it was not so on the other side of the House. Hon. gentlemen opposite were quite unable to keep their own friends together, and three of their most independent supporters voted against them and in favour of the resolution that there should be an investigation before an independent tribunal. The hon. Minister of Finance does not do justice to himself, or to this House when he says that the debate of these resolutions was a lengthy one. I say that had the debate been allowed to run its usual length, to which a debate of this importance should have extended, three or four days, an op-

portunity would have been given to several hon. members on this side of the House to speak, and not only that, but many hon. members were unavoidably absent who would otherwise have been here and would have voted in support of the resolutions. Everybody, he says, was free to cast his vote upon this question. On the contrary, a large number of hon. members, due to the action of the Government, backed by the force of their majority in forcing the vote on that night, were prevented from casting their votes. The hon. Minister says that no charge was made against any Minister of the Crown. I deny that statement. I say that two or three Ministers of the Crown were included in the charge of incompetence and mismanagement. A charge of incompetence and of mismanagement was made against the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), against the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), against the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). I say distinctly that the resolutions contained these charges as plainly and strongly as the English language could make them. Yet, we are told that no charges have been made. Could the hon. gentleman imagine that the memory of the country is so short, that the people are so forgetful, that those who have read these charges which were made so plainly, so forcibly and so directly in this House will not remember what was charged? After challenging the hon. member for Pictou to make these charges, and promising that an investigation would take place, though the charges were made, a commission was not given for their investigation because hon. gentlemen dare not give it, and all that was said by the hon. Minister of the Interior, with that bravado of his, in challenging the Opposition to make the charges, was simply, if the expression is not unparliamentary, a sheer bluff and nothing else. When charges were made hon. gentlemen opposite dared not consent to the appointment of the commission. The hon. Minister of Finance says that the people of the country expect honest government from the Reform party. He says that thousands and hundreds of thousands of honest Reformers expect honest government. I say that they did expect honest government, but you have only to look at the state of affairs to-day to see how they have been deceived. Have they had honest government; have they had consistent government? The records up to the present show the reverse. Has honest government been exemplified in the conduct of their friends in West Elgin, where we have the humiliating admission from Mr. McNish of the corruption that took place. I am told that these campaigns were engineered largely by the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), that he assisted Preston to engineer the campaign in West Huron, which was conducted by the same class of men who had it in hand in

Mr. SPROULE.

West Elgin, yet, the statement was made by the hon. Minister of Finance that the Reformers expect honest government. If they expect honest government they have been deceived and disappointed by the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite. If they had had honest government there would be a different record from that which is presented to-day. The hon. Minister of Finance said that we had referred to West Huron, and that it would be to our credit to say nothing about it as it was before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Yet, he goes into the conduct of this case and refers to West Huron himself. He does not require to go to West Huron for evidence of bribery, of corruption, of rascality and scandal. He could have found it if he had gone to South Ontario, where Mr. Dryden was obliged to resign on account of it. The same class of men who were in charge of the machine in West Elgin, and the same nefarious practices enabled hon. gentlemen to carry other elections. The hon. Minister of Finance asks us why we do not go into the courts. What is the result when we do go into the courts? Witnesses are sent off; they are handed money and tickets to go away; some are in Detroit and some are in Kansas, and when we go to the courts it is impossible to find these witnesses with a search warrant and a hundred constables. Money was supplied them by people, some of whom we believe are here and that it was furnished them for the purpose of sending them away, and I am told and I believe it to be correct, that the same thing is going on at the present time in connection with the same men who have been doing this nefarious work in West Huron. Men like Duncan Bole or Linklater are let out on bail, and when they are called in court they are not to be found. The court has called their names time and time again, and it was obliged to adjourn because such men had gone out of the country and could not be obtained.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The matter to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is referring is before the Privileges and Election Committee. It is almost unnecessary to refer to the fact that it is improper to discuss the question as to what may or may not be the result of the inquiry. If I am able to understand the hon. gentleman, he is striving to create the impression, in fact, he is very close indeed to making the direct and positive charge that friends of the Liberal party and friends of the Government are here in Ottawa raising money for the purpose of burking that inquiry by sending certain witnesses out of the country. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if I understand him correctly, and if he has evidence in support of that charge.

Mr. SPROULE. I was only referring to West Huron in reply to the statement made by the hon. Minister of Finance.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Let the hon. gentleman answer the question as to what I have referred to. I understood the charge to be very clearly expressed by him that friends of the Liberal party, in Ottawa at the present time, were raising money for the purpose of sending witnesses required in connection with the inquiry out of the country. Does the hon. gentleman mean to charge that?

**Mr. SPROULE.** I made my statement; it is in "Hansard," and the hon. gentleman can put what construction he likes upon it.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The hon. gentleman will not say whether he intends to make that charge or not.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I will tell the hon. gentleman what I spoke of. After the election in West Huron the hon. Postmaster General was complimented as the Minister representing the Government who engineered the campaign up there. Preston was there, Smith, the organizer, was there, Bole was there, McDonald was there; they had lots of money; they bought up the constituency, and it is coming out by degrees. Because of that the hon. Postmaster General was complimented, and the question arises as to where the funds came from. I say I believe they came from the same source and were raised directly or indirectly through the same men.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Does the hon. gentleman mean to say, while the inquiry is pending before the committee, that members of this Government were guilty of complicity in the corruption that is alleged to have taken place?

**Mr. SPROULE.** I did not hear what the hon. gentleman said.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The hon. gentleman is discussing the West Huron election.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I am not discussing the West Huron election, I am discussing the West Elgin election, and I mentioned the West Huron election incidentally because it had been referred to by the hon. Minister of Finance.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** It does not make any difference as to whether it was done incidentally or not.

Some hon. **MEMBERS.** Order, order.

**Mr. SPROULE.** If the hon. gentleman wants to make a speech he may do so after I am done.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.** The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) does not want to give way.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** May I be permitted to say, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. SPROULE.** No, no.

Some hon. **MEMBERS.** Order, order.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.** The hon. member (Mr. Sproule) has the floor and does not want to give way.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I would not have mentioned the West Huron affair were it not that the Minister (Mr. Fielding) referred to it, and criticised my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) for speaking of it. But we need not have referred to West Huron, for we could have referred to South Ontario and to West Elgin where the same crowd of men were carrying on the same class of work. I stated that I believed they were engineered by the same parties, and I believe still that the money to carry on their operations came largely from the same source. I remember, too, that the Postmaster General was complimented by the "Globe" for his success at the head of that crowd in carrying the elections, and I am justly entitled to believe that there is a connection between the whole crowd, and that in all probability, how they carried on their nefarious work there was not unknown to some members of this Government. That is what I said and I wish it to carry whatever force can attach to it. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) told us that he yet failed to see the first word in the press of the country that reflected upon Mr. Preston. Well, it would seem that the Minister has not lived long in this country. Preston who was engineering the party machine, stood up in the court once, and twelve honest yeomen of Canada swore they would not believe him on his oath. That is the man who is doing the work of the machine, and against whom the Minister of Finance has failed to find one single word. He (Mr. Fielding) told us that he was informed that it was published on the bulletin boards, that Mr. Preston was taking some one into court for making these statements. Well, I can tell the Finance Minister that Mr. Preston is not likely to take any one into court. He would be the last man in the world to attempt that. He had one trial of the courts and that satisfied him. It will be a long time before he goes to the court again, for he fears a repetition of what occurred last time when twelve honest yeoman who knew him well, and had business transactions with him, swore they would not believe Preston under oath. This is the man whom the Finance Minister holds up as an honest man against whom there never was a word said. The indignation of the Minister of Finance in criticising what is said against Preston will be amusing to men who know Preston and his system. The honest Reformers of Canada expected honest government from these gentlemen opposite, but they know they are not getting it, and they are speaking out their minds freely. We saw supporters of this Government turn against them and vote in favour

of the resolution of Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper which contains the most specific and direct charges I have ever heard made against Ministers of the Crown in this House or outside of this House.

Mr. BERGERON. Hug the machine.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, hug the machine. The Minister of Finance asked us if we remember anything about the Pacific scandal, and I would ask the Minister, if he remembers what the country did to the party who made these charges, on the first opportunity the country had of dealing with them? What became of the Liberals in 1878, when they thought they had discredited the Conservative party, and when it was said of the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald that he was gone down like Lucifer never to rise again? Why, Sir, at the very first opportunity, Sir John Macdonald did rise again, and after the people of the country had an experience of five years of the Liberal Government, they accorded them one of the most ignominious defeats that any party ever experienced in this country. And did not the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie tell us when he was leaving public life, that he had to lie on his arms night and day to protect the treasury against his own friends. That was a sad acknowledgment to come from the leader of the Liberal party, who was respected from one end of the country to the other. The Finance Minister talked about honest government to-day but he never mentioned the name of Alexander Mackenzie. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) that the people are sadly disappointed because he and his friends have failed to give them honest government, and I believe that when they appeal to the country they will have a repetition of their Waterloo of 1878. The honest people of Canada will say to them: We took you for honest men judging by your words; we gave you an opportunity of showing your worth and integrity, but in every respect you have disappointed our expectations, and as we did in 1878 we will turn you out of power and keep you in Opposition for eighteen years; we will give you the same schooling as the children of Israel got in the wilderness for forty years.

#### INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I want to ask the Minister of the Interior to give me a little additional information. I have here a return of copies of correspondence with any parties in connection with the granting of permits for the taking of liquor into the Yukon territory. I find that the return is incomplete. I find that there is a letter here on page 438, an application from R. H. Patterson for a permit, and in connection with that application he says that he writes on the advice of Mr. G. R. Maxwell, M.P., and he forwards a

Mr. SPROULE.

letter from Mr. G. R. Maxwell, M.P. The other letters referred to are brought down, but the letter of Mr. Maxwell, which accompanied that of Mr. Patterson's, is not brought down. I would like that letter.

Similarly there is a letter referred to here as from Mr. Copp, M.P., but the letter of Mr. Copp is not here, and I would like a copy of that letter.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. On what pages in the return are those referred to?

Mr. FOSTER. Pages 428, 445, 446, 447 and 490.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will have them looked up.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, again, I asked for a return on the 26th of June from the Minister of Railways and Canals, with reference to the Michaud-Belanger matter of Trois Pistoles. The order was passed by this House, but it has not yet been brought down, and I would like very much that it should be. The Minister is not here, but I may state that this information is to form the subject of discussion and the sooner it will be brought down the sooner we will get over it. It will be impossible to get through unless we do have these papers.

In order to facilitate business, I want to ask the Minister of Finance to have brought down all the papers in connection with the following votes:—(1) Item No. 23, the payment of Walter Shanley's award to the Hon. J. Snowball. (2) Item 26 in reference to the payment of \$211,505 to Messrs. H. Ryan & Co., and (3) Item No. 30, the papers and reports in reference to the payment to Heney & Borthwick of extras. Although we want information on all these items we want this particularly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are all in railways?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. And we want the specifications and the tenders for the new wharf at St. John, which the Minister promised to bring down.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I want to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Customs to a motion which I made on the 8th of May last: "for a copy of the commission issued to investigate into the charges made against W. A. Hogg, landing-walter at the port of Collingwood, the evidence taken by the said commission, the report made by the commission, the Order in Council made thereon, and all correspondence and papers in connection therewith." This return has not yet been brought down, and I would ask the hon. Minister to have it brought down as soon as he conveniently can.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). I will take note of the matter and inquire. I dare say it is ready. At any rate, I will see that it is brought down.

Mr. **KAULBACH**. I desire to solicit information with respect to the trade of the British and the late Spanish West India Islands; but as the right hon. leader of the Government is not in his place, I shall defer it to some other time.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Harbours and Rivers—Manitoba—Lake Manitoba—

Opening of additional outlets to prevent overflow of lake, and maintenance of same at proper level for navigation purposes..... \$25,000

Mr. **FOSTER**. I would like to know exactly what has been done, what is being done, and what the total cost will be?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The appropriation is required to make provision for opening a supplementary outlet consisting of a straight trench or canal about 1,300 feet in length, and the bottom width 200 feet, with side slopes of one foot vertical to one foot horizontal, to be excavated from a point in the line of a half foot depth at normal low water in Lake Manitoba, near the south-west end of the bush road opened between Lake Manitoba and the Fairford mission and Hudson Bay Company's post to a point on the east side of Fairford River, about 1,000 feet below or north-east of its exit from the lake on the east side of Portage Bay. The amount of the contract is \$27,500; for superintendence and contingencies, \$3,000; making the estimated total cost, \$30,500. It is under contract.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Were tenders asked for this?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes, tenders were taken and the lowest accepted.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What is the general result that will be effected when this \$27,000 is spent?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). The purpose of the work referred to is as follows. Lake Manitoba is a shallow lake surrounded by a very swampy country. After a series of wet seasons, the water in the lake rises from one to four feet, and overflows the lower portions of the country known as the north part of the Portage Plain. Miles of the country have been flooded. The floods are very disastrous when a strong north-west wind blows. I may say that for years past this work has been strongly advocated.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Is the land settled land?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. Oh, yes, there are settlers all around, and they have been flooded out year after year. Some have been driven back, in dry seasons, they have returned, and afterwards they have been driven back again. Before the change of Government took place in 1896, the local government had surveys made for this work; but the Department of Public Works here and the local government were unable to agree about the details. I do not know the particular nature of the difficulty that arose between the two Governments. It was some question about the navigation of the lake. I impressed the necessity of the work very strongly on my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Macdonell) has a more accurate knowledge of the whole matter than I have; but I know that there has been a strong agitation among the settlers to get the work done. The purpose is to make an additional outlet for the river that connects Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg. The main channel is large enough to carry off the water, but the mouth of the river becomes choked up, and the result is that the level of the lake rises. By making an additional channel at the mouth, the water of the lake would be lowered and kept at a permanent level.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Is this in any way for the purpose of navigation, or is it only for the purpose of drainage?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. It is to prevent the lands of the settlers being flooded.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What co-operation is there between the local government and the Dominion Government?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I do not think there is any. The work is being done wholly by the Dominion Government.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Was there not an amount expended before for deepening the river?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. No. There was a survey made in former years, but no work was done.

Mr. **HAGGART**. But there was another plan for draining the water from Lake Manitoba?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. There was another plan, a very much more expensive one. I think it would ultimately have cost \$200,000 or \$300,000. I did not approve of that.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Does the Minister remember the difference between the level of Lake Manitoba and the level of the Assiniboine River? I believe that sometimes the waters of Lake Manitoba get so high that they flow over to the Assiniboine River. Does the hon. member know the difference between the levels of the two?

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). The Assiniboine is 14½ feet lower. When a strong north wind blows, and at times of extreme high water, the waters of the lake have overflowed at the south end across the farming country into the Assiniboine River.

Mr. HAGGART. Was it ever considered that it would be better to drain Lake Manitoba of the water that overflows into the Assiniboine River?

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). The channel of the Assiniboine is not now sufficient to carry its own high water. The lands adjoining the Assiniboine River are lower than the immediate banks of the river, and some of these lands are flooded at time of high water, and if the waters of Lake Manitoba were added would be flooded even down to the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. CLANCY. There was a good deal of discussion last year on this same matter. The Minister of Public Works then had no estimate of the cost, and we have now the statement that it is intended for the purpose of draining. Hon. gentlemen opposite are departing from a sound principle, when they undertake to construct works of drainage. In Ontario such works are entirely undertaken by the local municipalities. If the municipalities are unable to undertake the work, it is the duty of the local government to do it, rather than the Dominion. Is there an estimate of the cost, and is it proposed to do the work by tender?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The amount of the contract is \$27,500, and the contingencies will bring that amount up to \$35,500. The work is under contract, and the contractor is Mr. Lemoine, of Montreal.

Wharf on Lake Winnipeg..... \$9,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to construct a wharf on Lake Winnipeg in the Icelandic settlement of Gimli. There was a wharf constructed for another settlement, costing \$9,000. This is estimated to cost the same, and will be built on substantially the same plan.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it commenced?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. How is it to be done—by contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The other one was done by contract, and no doubt this will be.

Mr. WILSON. How can the hon. gentleman determine what wharfs should be built by the Dominion, and what by the municipalities?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a navigable water, and it is the practice of the Dominion Government to build wharfs on navigable streams. As regards private enterprise, I presume that in this, as in

Mr. HAGGART.

other cases, if private enterprise would undertake the work, the Government would not.

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). Within a year this will be one of the most important harbours of Lake Winnipeg, the terminus of one of the branch lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is a population in that district of about 3,000.

Mr. WILSON. I never heard of such a thing as the Government building a wharf, or giving any assistance to build a wharf, such as this. The Government will have applications from localities everywhere to build wharfs. If they do it for these people, why not do it for Lennox and other places?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That wharf would be used by the fishermen in that district. Thirty-five steamers ply on the lake, which is most dangerous, and there is no place today in Canada where there are as many fresh fish as in that neighbourhood. Lake Winnipeg abounds with the finest fish in America. There is another reason. These Icelanders are a most industrious and frugal people. No settlers that have come to Canada have made the progress that they have done. They have become Canadians almost at once. They are industrious, and are first-class fishermen and farmers. If there is any way possible to encourage any people in Canada, the Icelanders should get a fair share of that encouragement.

Mr. WILSON. The reasons advanced are very good ones why private enterprise should build such a wharf. Where there is lots of business, wharfs will be built, and, where there is not, they are not needed. It is entirely a new departure for the Dominion Government to build wharfs simply because strangers have settled in a locality. They are doing things for new-comers that they never did for the old settlers.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Some of those settlers have been there for twenty-five years, and have struggled against poverty and many difficulties. I am satisfied, from my knowledge of the country, that this is a good investment for the Dominion to make. It will help those people and encourage business on the lake.

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). Lake Winnipeg is over 300 miles long and 40 to 100 miles wide. This is the second dock the Government have undertaken to build. The population of that country depends very largely upon fish, and there are some thirty-five steamers traversing the lake. There is no point in the Dominion where the Government would be more strongly justified in affording such conveniences and facilities to the people as on Lake Winnipeg.

Mr. CLANCY. Who are the owners of the steamers?

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). Who are they anywhere? They are private individuals.

Mr. BENNETT. Last night the officials of the department informed the Minister that, although to-day they proposed to build at Bruce Mines, an unimportant village, an important dock to cost \$15,000, and although they were going to build two more in the same constituency of Algoma, the department could not produce a single instance where they ever built a dock on Georgian Bay. And they were quite right, except for one case, and that was the case of a dock that was built in the same constituency last year at the small village of Thessalon. Now, let the Minister frankly admit that in this there is no line of precedent, so far as Ontario is concerned. The reason for such a vote is simply to help the member for the riding, particularly if he supports hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, all along the shores of the Georgian Bay, at Midland, Collingwood, Parry Sound and other important towns, docks have been constructed; and the Minister was forced to admit that at not one of these points—

Mr. MCGREGOR. But they are dredging all the time.

Mr. BENNETT. Has there been a single dock constructed by the department? The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) says, quite truly, that they are dredging at these points. Certainly, and so the Government should dredge. When private enterprise constructs docks, and by the receding of the waters there is too limited a depth of water, it certainly is the duty of the Government to intervene and do the necessary dredging. I do not know anything of the particular circumstances of this, except what has been stated this afternoon; but from what has been stated, it seems to me there is no reason why the grant should be made, having regard to the line of precedent so far as Georgian Bay is concerned. If there are steamboat companies doing business on the lake surely they have docks at the present time. If there are growing places, surely private capital will come in and construct docks. But if this is another case, such as was frankly admitted last night in the case of the Bruce Mines dock, where \$15,000 was to be spent in a place of 450 people simply to help the member of the constituency, as the Minister practically confessed was done—

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). Will my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) permit me to make a statement? This work was originally provided for by the previous Government. The grant has not been availed of up to the present time, but the principle of constructing a wharf and the utility of it in the public interest was first declared by hon. gentlemen opposite when they were on the Treasury benches.

Mr. BENNETT. Was the money voted?

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not know the facts, and of course I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. But even though the late Government were prepared to build a dock there, I am not going to admit that it is right, because I do not believe in the principle of a constituency having a dock erected simply to please the people who may reside in the neighbourhood. It will be another matter if they do as has been done in the case of different points on the Georgian Bay, where the people have come and said to the Government: We have so much money and we want to build a dock—and then let it be a question with the department whether they shall assist in the construction of that dock. But no more glaring case could be shown than was shown last night of the construction or intended construction of these three docks in the constituency of Algoma. Of course, I except the docks contemplated in the constituency of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I find I did that hon. gentleman an injustice last night, and I wish to set him right to-day. I pointed out some eight or ten votes for docks to be constructed this year in his constituency. I have since looked over the list, and I see that I did him the injustice of leaving out four others that have been provided for. Of course a Minister is to have docks galore constructed in his county, it is to be expected that the members who support him will look for an extension of the principle to their counties as well. If this is such a case as that of Bruce Mines last night, I, for one, enter my protest against it.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it intended to handle this as a Government wharf, charging tolls and having a public wharfinger?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, in the usual way.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, the criticism of my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) is perfectly just. There is no doubt that constitutionally and according to the usual practice the Government should look after the navigable watercourses, but it never was contemplated that in the inland navigable waters the Government should provide wharfs. The Government were supposed to see that the navigable watercourses were kept open, and to build any dams or carry on any other works that might be necessary for that purpose. But the building of docks was supposed to be a matter for private enterprise, for the municipalities and the local government. But gradually there came, first, one case and then another, where a grant would be given for some interior lake or river wharf. Take the case referred to by my hon. friend from Lennox—wharfs are not built to the accommodation of business along these lake shores. If any harbour is

taken as a harbour of refuge, of course the waterways are deepened and made navigable and whatever is necessary for the protection of the harbour is done. Take the case of the St. John River, a great navigable stream. Until lately the Dominion Government gave no help, and all the wharfs were built by private enterprise assisted by the local government. In my time, examples arose of building wharfs in other places, and I said: The people of the St. John River have as good right as have those of Lake St. John or Lake Winnipeg to these works; and the scheme that was carried out in my time, was, wherever it was found necessary to build a wharf on the St. John River if the local government approved of it and would pay half of the cost the Dominion Government would contribute half. And so there was co-operation between the two Governments, and that is the extent of the small aid which has been given on that large navigable stream. On the river St. Lawrence it has not been the custom of the Government to build these wharfs. Everyone knows to what an interminable length it may go if the Dominion Government provides funds for doing all that private enterprise and the municipalities ought to do—and that they will do in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred if they are allowed to do it. But once you set the example of constructing these works by a strong central Government with a large fund, you will find that the area will widen, and the expense which may be incurred will grow actually alarming. Let it be understood that in passing a vote for a particular locality—and I call the attention of the Minister of Finance to this, the Minister of Public Works is not present—this principle of local aid should be adopted. I think it would be well for the Government to take great care how far they allow themselves to drift in this matter. I know it was a matter that the late Government had many an argument about, and it was my constant endeavour to prevent that line of expenditure from growing. I do not say you cannot find examples—you can. But I think they should rather be exceptions than examples of the rule.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). There is a good deal in what my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) says; no doubt, the practice of constructing local wharfs or piers may be carried to a very dangerous extent. In the little province which I come from there was a clause in the terms of union providing that the Dominion Government should take over the piers—the same clause as applies to the other provinces.

Mr. **FOSTER**. That is the salt-water piers?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. After the province had entered—  
Mr. **FOSTER**.

ed confederation, a formal demand was made that these piers should be taken over and paid for, and a commission was sent out by the Government to determine what were piers within the meaning of the statute and what were mere local wharfs. I cannot exactly recollect at the moment the principle on which we proceeded. I know one of the principles on which we acted was that no wharfs or piers which were of merely local use, for the local accommodation of the people, should be taken over at all, that it should only be done when the wharf or pier was used for interprovincial and commercial purposes. That was the principle acted upon and the principle we have introduced in our discussion at the Council board on most of those piers and wharfs which are being discussed here. The question is constantly asked: Is this a wharf for local purposes? If so, it must be built by the municipality or by the provincial government. If, on the contrary, it is a large work useful for interprovincial trade, or a large current of trade, then it may be justified as being built by this Government. But I acknowledge that the line is a very shadowy one between the two, and it is a matter that has to be very carefully watched and guarded.

Mr. **BENNETT**. I would ask the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Macdonell) if the Buffalo Fishing Company are fishing on this lake?

Mr. **MACDONELL** (Selkirk). To my knowledge there is no private fishing company wharf upon Lake Winnipeg. There may be some temporary landings, but they are very small, because the shore line is deep in places. At the south end of the lake that is not the case. The lake shelves out gradually to a shallow beach, and you probably go out 600 to 1,000 feet before you can reach water deep enough for a steamer to come up to a dock. The former practice has been for steamers to run in as close to the shore as possible, and use small boats to land passengers and freights. With reference to the initiation of this policy of which my hon. friend has spoken, the first dock on Lake Winnipeg was built by hon. gentlemen opposite when they occupied the Treasury benches; and there was not one-tenth the justification in the public interest for the construction of that dock that there is for the present dock. So that, as far as the principle is concerned, of the construction of the present dock, I cannot see that my hon. friends opposite have anything to complain of.

North-west Territories—

General repairs and improvements to harbour, river and bridge works, including approaches..... \$5,000

Mr. **FOSTER**. Will the Minister tell us where this sum is to be expended?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. It is required for general repairs and works in the

North-west Territories under the control of the Public Works Department. I have here the details of the expenditure last year. The practice, I am told, is to take an annual vote for this purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very convenient way of estimating. The department should know for what it wants the money, what works require to be repaired, and it should have from its officers the necessary estimates for repairs, and then you could now tell Parliament what you want the money for. I think the preferable way would be to have your officers throughout the North-west send in their reports as to what repairs are necessary and the cost.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that in the case of large and important works a special vote is taken. The practice is to take a small vote for small repairs which are not foreseen, but which are likely to arise at any time.

Public Works—British Columbia—  
Columbia River—Improvements above  
Golden ..... \$4,000

Mr. PRIOR. What are the improvements?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This money is required to continue the improvements of the Columbia River above Golden, to dredge a portion of the river where the recent revival of mining development has caused a considerable trade, and where steamers are now running.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it taking out rock or taking out drift?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The work consists in repairing and extending dams in order to confine the river to the main channel.

Mr. FOSTER. Will this finish the work which is necessary to allow boats to run up?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it will not finish it.

Mr. FOSTER. While taking sums of money to the extent of \$15,000 for Bruce Mines and the like of that, does not the department think that in a case of that kind it is better to have a sufficient amount of money to complete the business? The country is opening up there, and it is becoming very important from a mining point of view, and it seems to me the best thing to do would be to take a sufficient sum of money to make that really navigable, and to finish it at once instead of doing it by driblets.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The difficulty is that with the facilities available for dredging, it would be difficult to use the money any more rapidly. If we had a larger vote we could not use it.

Columbia River—

Improvements on narrows between Upper and Lower Arrow Lakes..... \$3,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to make provision for carrying on dredging operations during the fiscal year. The estimated cost of the proposed work is \$25,000, made up as follows: Construction of a stern-wheel dredge, \$15,000; running expenses of the dredge, \$6,000; material, wire, iron and timber for mattress work, \$4,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that work to be done, particularly?

Mr. BOSTOCK. This work is to be done in what is called the Narrows on the Columbia River between the Upper and Lower Arrow Lake. Work of this kind has been done for a number of years now, and has greatly improved the channel. The object of the work is to enable steamers to run all the year round between Robson and Arrow Head on the Canadian Pacific Railway. The difficulty has been to shipping in winter in the low water. The water gets so low that steamers have great difficulty in getting up. Last year Mr. Roy, engineer of the Public Works Department, drove in piles and did work there which greatly improved navigation, and now it is necessary to have this dredging done to keep the channel in proper shape.

Mr. FOSTER. I am awfully afraid that the machinery will absorb nine-tenths of the money, and that the real work that is to be done will be the minimum. A dredge is expensive. For that there is to be an initial outlay of \$15,000, and then there is the running expenses of the dredge. What I see is the disparity between the large expense for machinery and the small amount that is put on the river.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You could not dredge without machinery.

Mr. FOSTER. I have a great suspicion about these Government dredges. I never believed in them; I do not believe in them now, and I do not believe I will ever believe in them. I believe that they are perfect moths of expenditure. I believe that far more would be done for the river interests of the country if the whole amount of the money were put in the actual work. The answer to that is that somebody must provide the machinery. My answer to that is that Government machinery for this machinery is far more expensive than if it were in private hands. If any one will take the trouble to look through the accounts, from year to year, showing the whole dredging operations under the superintendence of the Government, he will be simply astonished by the immense amount of money that goes into the organization and maintenance generally of this work. I believe private individuals

would be found to do the work far more cheaply. However, the hon. Minister of Public Works has satisfied himself that dredges he must have; and dredges are being built and will be built. Has there been taken into consideration the improvement of the navigation from Robson down to Trail, so as to permit boats to run the whole distance? Is that possible?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. That has not been dealt with in this estimate.

Mr. **PRIOR**. It seems to me that this vote is not exactly in order. Why does the hon. gentleman take \$15,000 in this vote for dredging plant? It seems to me that new dredging plant should go under the head of dredging plant. I see on the next page an item of \$60,000 for dredging plant. Fifteen thousand dollars does not seem to be sufficient to make a good dredge, and if it were put in the other vote, and not under the head of dredging, as in this item, we would understand it better.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. There may be something in my hon. friend's criticism that this vote should be under the head of dredging. It is not a material point as it does not affect the merits of the vote.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Why should you have a distinction at all? This is not for work, it is for dredging plant.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The officers of the department inform me that they have followed the form of the estimate that has been adopted for some time. There is no novelty in it, although there is something to be said in favour of consolidating the votes under one head. In regard to the main question as to the utility of Government dredges, the hon. gentleman's colleagues, charged with that matter, must have been under the impression that Government dredges are useful and economical, otherwise they would have changed their policy in that regard.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I think the main point was that they had them and they could not get rid of them.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. If that were so, they would not have got more. The officials assure me that, after careful inquiry, there is no doubt that Government dredges are cheaper. I am inclined to think that if we were to abolish Government dredges, we would find that the work would not be effectually performed.

Mr. **WILSON**. I do not think it is fair to charge to one work the whole cost of a dredge, as it is proposed under this vote. I think that when we come to have a dredge built it should be built out of the regular vote for that purpose. In this case you are going to pay \$15,000 for a dredge, and a small balance for the work. I think we ought to know what we are paying for the

Mr. **FOSTER**.

dredging, so that we will know whether we are getting value or not.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I am so impressed with the criticism of the hon. gentleman that I have suggested to the officials that, in future, they separate their vote for dredging plant from dredging work.

Fraser River—

Improvement of ship channel..... \$25,000

Mr. **PRIOR**. Is that below New Westminster?

Mr. **MORRISON**. Yes.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. This is to continue the improvement of the ship channel of the Fraser River, and to protect the banks from further erosion. The estimated cost of the work is \$156,000. The expenditure on the Fraser River during the last year was \$49,997. The total expenditure, extending over many years, is \$402,149.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What may be said generally as to the permanent result of an expenditure of nearly half a million dollars?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The officials inform me that a very considerable portion of the old works are gone and that the results have not been as satisfactory as were hoped for. Still, I suppose, we will be obliged to go on and construct new ones.

Mr. **FOSTER**. On the same plan?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The old work was pile work and they are now making brush mattress work.

Mr. **PRIOR**. Was not the resident engineer, Mr. Roy, engaged for the last year making a plan for the improvement of the whole of the river to keep the banks from wearing away, as well as to protect the channel?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I believe that the engineer has prepared some plans in that connection, but unfortunately, they were all burnt up in the New Westminster fire.

Mr. **FOSTER**. No one doubts that the Fraser River ought to be looked after. It is not a general commercial river, but it is a river out of which a great deal of most valuable lumber goes. Nobody criticises the expenditure of an amount of money that will make it navigable, but when, after an expenditure of nearly half a million dollars in the last fifteen years, speaking plainly, one year carries away what has been done in the preceding year—they may vary in a year, but you take a few years' operations, and it has been stated that it would be taken away, and you would have to go through the same operation again and again—I think it would be for the department to inquire whether or not these plans would be the best for the

improvement of that river. Although I do not want to say anything against the ability of our Public Works Department in that respect, I think the circumstances of this case would justify us in getting the very best advice we can in this country, or in this world for that matter. Otherwise, if you go on with this business from year to year, you will be spending your thirty or forty thousand dollars a year, and you will have no better results than you have now. It may be that this is a very difficult river to put into permanent shape, but that is all the greater reason why means should be taken to get the very best expert opinion and proceed upon the basis of permanence. You may have to spend a larger amount of money to do it, but if you can get it done, and it will stay done, you will save money in the long run.

Mr. MORRISON. I am very pleased that the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) has spoken on the necessity for an expert examination of the Fraser River. The Minister of Public Works in 1897 went up the river, and he formed exactly the opinion which, apparently, the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) has: that a great deal of money had been expended on the conservancy of the river, and that a great deal of money would necessarily have to be expended from year to year, if the then existing system were to be continued. The Minister (Mr. Tarte) at once took steps to have a special survey of the river made. The river was then under the jurisdiction of the agent of the Public Works Department, Mr. Gamble, and the Minister appointed a special engineer to make a special survey and to traverse this river from its source to its mouth. A corps of competent engineers was employed upon that work, and they were getting their notes in line and their plans were about finished, when, unfortunately, the whole thing went up in smoke in the New Westminster fire, although these plans were put in a presumably fire-proof vault. The intention of the Minister was to have these plans submitted to the best available experts. I suppose, until the engineers get their notes together again and ready to be submitted to expert engineers, nothing can be done towards suggesting what other system can be followed. The river banks are alluvial deposit, very susceptible to erosion, and the practice has been to try to prevent the erosion by sinking mattresses, but the floods would come, and, by the time the next appropriation would be made, these mattresses would be covered with silt and one thing and another, and so there was found great difficulty. The Fraser River is a commercial river, and the revenue last year from New Westminster alone, on the one item of salmon licenses, amounted to as much, if not more, than the appropriation for this work. This year the reve-

nue from salmon licenses alone will double the amount that has been appropriated.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not mean to state that the Fraser was not a commercial river, for I knew of its lumber and fisheries.

Mr. MORRISON. Quite so. But I wish to mention that lumber is only one item, and that the revenue from fishery licenses exceeds this appropriation, which is a very small amount indeed. I again express my satisfaction at the ex-Minister of Finance appreciating the necessity for some expert examination of this river, and I trust that when the time shall come to discuss this matter in the House, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will give it his hearty support.

Mr. FOSTER. Most certainly, I will support that.

Kootenay River ..... \$5,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This will be spent chiefly in increasing the depth of water, so as to give navigation during eight months, instead of, as at present, five months.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was spent last year for the same kind of work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Two thousand two hundred and eighty-seven dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not enough.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am glad to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) say that.

Mr. FOSTER. If you take \$10,000 from the Bruce Mines vote and put it on the Kootenay River, you will be doing more public good.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am beginning to think my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is interested in the Kootenay.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I am interested in it for the development of the country. I have no money interest in it, but I have travelled over it, and I believe it is perhaps the most difficult piece of river navigation in the Dominion of Canada.

William's Head Quarantine Station..... \$4,000

Mr. PRIOR. I do not see the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) in the House just now, but whilst we are on this quarantine matter, I wish to mention that I hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) is likely to make a tour in British Columbia this year. If he does, I would suggest that he should take Dr. Montizambert, the head of the quarantine service, with him. I have two or three letters from friends out there, suggesting that the Minister should bring Dr. Montizambert with him, as the people there are nervous about the danger on the Pacific coast of the Bubonic Plague and other Asi-

atic diseases being introduced. They would like to have the expert opinion of Dr. Montizambert as to whether all is being done that can be done to safeguard the health of the people in British Columbia. I trust the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will convey this request to his colleague the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher).

Before this vote passes I have some remarks to make in reference to the fact that so far as I can see there is nothing in either the main Estimates or the supplementary Estimates for the harbour of Victoria. I am very much disappointed indeed to see this neglect on the part of the Government, because my colleague and I have made application to the department for some work in that harbour that is necessary, and we would like to know what the reason is that there is no vote in the Estimates. I know that it is late in the session to make any lengthened remarks, but I cannot sit in my place without raising my voice when I see the constituency which I have the honour to represent neglected in this manner. Since this Government came into power, I do not know that a single dollar has been put in the Estimates for the harbour of Victoria. When the Conservatives were in power there was a little work done in that harbour—not as much as should have been done, but still we managed to get a little.

Mr. MILLS. Follow Bethune, and you will get it.

Mr. PRIOR. I do not know what the reason is, but last night when the committee was voting money for wharfs and breakwaters in Nova Scotia, the hon. Minister of Finance made this remark:

As to the political side of the case, it is quite true that there should be no distinction, but that wherever these works are required they ought to be constructed.

I quite agree with the hon. gentleman as to what should be done, but he went on to say:

But I suppose there is a little human nature in party politics.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Read on.

Mr. PRIOR. I will read on:

It is alleged that during all the years the Conservative party were in power, they gave a preference to counties represented by their friends. I do not discuss how far that is correct. If it is so, and for a time some of the counties that were overlooked received a little consideration, perhaps, in course of time, matters will be evened up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is good logic.

Mr. PRIOR. It may be, from your standpoint. But I do hope sincerely that that is not the reason the Minister of Public Works has neglected the harbour of Victoria. If it is, I can say most emphatically and most

Mr. PRIOR.

distinctly that it will not work. The people of Victoria are not going to be starved into subjection to the wishes of the Minister of Public Works. They have a little more independence than that. I can hardly believe that this is the reason. If there was no work needed in the harbour of Victoria, I should be the last man in the world to ask for money to be expended there; but with a harbour of that importance and the amount of shipping there is there, it is disgraceful that the Government cannot afford to spend \$10,000 or \$15,000 or \$20,000 on that harbour. I firmly believe that if British Columbia had justice done to her by having a representative in the Cabinet, such neglect would never have taken place, because there would have been some one to watch the Estimates when they were put through Council, and he would have made his voice heard on behalf of his province. It cannot be because no business is done in the harbour of Victoria, for before I sit down I will give the House some figures showing the amount of shipping and the amount of business done in British Columbia, and in the port of Victoria in particular. I am sorry the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) is not here, because some time ago I saw a little article in the paper he owns, the "Evening Telegram," which stated that Victoria was asleep six days in the week. Well, I think the House will agree with me, when it hears the statistics that I shall read, that it is a good thing for the country if that is the case, because if Victoria worked seven days in the week instead of one the rest of the country would have very little business left it to do. Now, I do not wish to be sectional or to run down the rest of the Dominion. I do not wish to see the votes for other provinces reduced; but I do say that British Columbia should have a share. I am not sectional myself, but I think the Government is showing its sectionalism in the present Estimates. In looking over them, we see that millions on millions are expended everywhere except in British Columbia, and that there is practically nothing for the port of Victoria. Yesterday we saw that the province of Nova Scotia had votes for no less than 91 wharfs and breakwaters, aggregating nearly \$250,000, while a very few thousand dollars are granted to the whole of British Columbia, although the shipping of that province in sea-going vessels, both inwards and outwards, as you will see, is far larger than that of the province of Nova Scotia. I find from the blue-books that the province of British Columbia heads the list. The figures are as follows:—

Province.	Tons.
British Columbia .....	3,833,906
Quebec .....	3,477,253
Nova Scotia .....	3,294,358
New Brunswick .....	1,837,837
Prince Edward Island.....	142,145

Now, let us look at the tonnage of sea-going

vessels, both inwards and outwards, for the different ports :

	Tons.
Montreal .....	2,181,148
Victoria .....	1,914,672
Halifax .....	1,239,478
Quebec .....	1,066,312
St. John, N.B.....	997,165
Vancouver, B.C.....	835,573
Nanaimo, B.C.....	717,119

From these figures we see that the shipping of Montreal is only about 1½ per cent more than that of Victoria, or 266,476 tons. The sea-going shipping of Victoria is 50 per cent more than that of Halifax, and that of the city of Quebec is only a little more than half of that of Victoria.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Would my hon. friend permit me to ask him whether in these figures he includes all the lines that go and come, such as the Canadian Pacific ?

Mr. PRIOR. I include all that is given in the Trade and Navigation Returns.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman is just giving the gross amount of the tonnage in and out ?

Mr. PRIOR. Yes, the sea-going tonnage in and out. We find that although the shipping of Quebec is only a little more than half that of Victoria, a loan of over \$3,000,000 has been made to Quebec, and that port now owes the Government over \$1,000,000 in interest and the loan as well, whereas Victoria cannot get the expenditure of even \$15,000. The next statistics I will give to the House are the customs duties, exports and imports, by provinces in 1897-98 :

#### CUSTOMS DUTIES.

British Columbia .....	\$2,215,899
Nova Scotia .....	1,249,524
New Brunswick .....	918,594
Prince Edward Island.....	136,993

Of this sum of \$2,215,899 paid by British Columbia, \$1,078,611 was paid by the port of Victoria.

#### EXPORTS.

British Columbia .....	\$16,919,717
New Brunswick .....	11,166,218
Nova Scotia .....	10,930,936
Prince Edward Island .....	1,389,674

#### IMPORTS.

British Columbia .....	\$8,690,263
Nova Scotia .....	6,949,216
New Brunswick .....	4,925,662
Prince Edward Island.....	486,681

Of this \$8,690,263 imported to British Columbia, we find that \$3,460,164 came into the port of Victoria—a port that must be held in very low estimation by the Government if they cannot spend a few dollars on improvements there. You see from that table that

British Columbia imports were one-third more than those of New Brunswick and twice as much as those of Nova Scotia.

Just to show how the trade of the province is increasing, let me give you the exports, imports and the customs duties paid in 1888, 1893 and 1898. The exports from British Columbia were :

In 1888 .....	\$ 3,928,077
1893 .....	6,574,989
1898 .....	16,919,871

showing an increase in 1898 of 257 per cent over 1893 and 430 per cent over 1888. The imports from British Columbia were :

In 1888 .....	\$3,509,951
1893 .....	6,358,976
1898 .....	8,690,263

or an increase of 37 per cent over 1893 and 119 per cent over 1888. The customs duties paid were as follows :

1888 .....	\$ 861,465
1893 .....	1,412,878
1898 .....	2,213,593

or an increase of 56 per cent over 1893 and 157 per cent over 1888. And this year, 1899, the increase will be much larger. Excise and post office revenues in 1897-98 show the following returns in the different provinces. The Excise is as follows :

British Columbia .....	\$421,711
New Brunswick .....	210,289
Nova Scotia .....	173,403
Prince Edward Island.....	52,694

We find from these statistics that British Columbia paid in 1897-98 twice as much Excise as New Brunswick, which paid the largest amount of the other three provinces.

The post office, gross postal revenue, in 1897-98, shows the following results :—

Nova Scotia.....	\$346,985
British Columbia .....	247,282
New Brunswick .....	237,757
Prince Edward Island.....	47,548

I have a statement here that I went to a great deal of trouble in working out. I did the same some years ago, and some hon. gentlemen said it was not a fair comparison of the amount paid by the different provinces per head into the revenue, because Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick used a great deal of goods on which the duties were paid in Ontario and Quebec. But that also applies to British Columbia, for British Columbia uses a great many goods on which the duties are paid in these two provinces.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To the same extent ?

Mr. PRIOR. I think so. British Columbia does not now import anything like the amount of goods from England that she used to in comparison to her imports from other countries. In this list I have taken everything that I could possibly divide up among the different provinces—customs,

Chinese immigration, excise, post office, revenues from public works, revenue from minor public works, canals, casual, fines and forfeitures, mariner's fund, electric light inspection, steamboat inspection, gas inspection, weights and measures, cullers' fees, penitentiaries and fisheries. The total revenue from all these sources received by the Dominion in 1897-98 from all the provinces amounts to \$35,733,610.24. I have left out altogether, railways, \$3,313,847.10; ordnance lands, premiums, discount and exchange, \$191,559.52; superannuation fund, \$45,643; Dominion lands, \$975,792.34, because I could not divide them up.

The total revenue contributed by each province during 1897-98, the population of each province, and the amount contributed per head, is shown by the following statements :

Province.	Revenue.	Population.	Per Head.
Ontario .....	\$14,002,206 30	2,261,500	6·19
Quebec .....	13,296,002 15	1,590,094	8·36
Nova Scotia...	1,815,430 23	457,663	3·96
N. Brunswick.	1,409,819 32	321,285	4·39
P. E. Island..	244,174 29	109,215	2·23
Manitoba and N. W. T.....	1,911,958 06	380,000	5·03
B. Columbia...	3,054,019 89	161,451	18·91
Total .....	\$35,733,610 24	5,281,208	6·76

These figures for population I got from the Statistician, Mr. Johnston, who said they were just the same as had been given to the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs, on which to base their calculations at the beginning of the session.

Mr. MILLS. How much revenue on the Chinese ?

Mr. PRIOR. I will give the hon. gentleman that if he wishes. The Chinese tax in British Columbia amounted to \$80,202.

If any hon. gentleman thinks that the division I have made is not a fair one, I will give him the amount paid per head by the whole population of Canada, excluding British Columbia, and I find that that is \$6.38. That takes in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and the Northwest. Taking the revenue and dividing it by the population in those provinces, I get a per capita payment of \$6.38. That is just one-third what the people of the province of British Columbia pay into the Dominion treasury, and of the amount they pay, over \$3,000,000, I defy any hon. gentleman to show that the Government pays more than half that back again in the shape of public works or subsidies or anything else. So that you see British Columbia is gradually being bled to the tune of some \$1,500,000 per year for which she gets no return.

In 1898 I find that the amount of coal raised in British Columbia was 1,135,865 tons. Her lode mines gave 6,529,420 tons, and you will realize what a tremendous increase that is when I tell you that in 1890 only 4,000 tons were produced. Therefore, the produc-

Mr. PRIOR.

tion of the lode mines has increased from 4,000 tons in 1890 to 6,529,420 tons in 1898.

The lumber cut increased 19,000,000 feet over 1897. Yet, we find, when we make application to this Government for a small sum to be expended on improvements in dredging, in removing rock from the port of Victoria, the capital of the province, we cannot get one dollar. Neither has the Government seen fit to give a province of that importance, a growing province—for it is a growing time in British Columbia—a representative in the Cabinet. I consider, as everybody in British Columbia does, that this is manifestly unjust to British Columbia. It is not even decent treatment.

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

### After Recess.

Mr. PRIOR. When you left the Chair at six o'clock, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had been attempting to show how necessary it was that the Government should give a proper expenditure to British Columbia, and should also give that province representation in the Cabinet. When the late Government was in power, they saw fit to give British Columbia a representative in the Cabinet, and I cannot see any reason why the present Government should not do so. The interests of British Columbia are to-day much larger, and she is even more entitled to representation than she was then. Surely, it is not because the Ministry cannot find anybody to take the position. They have gentlemen representing British Columbia constituencies on their side of the House—four of them—any one of whom, I think, would make a good representative. I would ask : What is the matter with the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock) ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He's all right.

Mr. PRIOR. He is all right, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) remarks. He would be a most useful member, I think. He owns about the whole of the press in British Columbia. He is a man of wealth. Any one who knows him, I am sure, will say he is a man of good personal appearance. I do not see why they cannot satisfy his longings, and take him in. If rumour speaks true, he would not be averse to it. Then, there is the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison), a gentleman who is learned in the law, and who would be able to keep some of his colleagues straight, if they were inclined to run out of the right groove. The hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) has had his character given to the House by the Premier lately, so I need say nothing more about him. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) would be most tractable. When he came into this House, he started with a great flourish of trumpets, but the

interviews he has had with members of the Cabinet have toned him down, until now he is quite amenable to the party whip. I have here a list of the Cabinet, as it is composed to-day. I find that there are seventeen Ministers—that is, sixteen and the Solicitor General. I find that Quebec has six Ministers and the Solicitor General—or, rather, had, for Quebec has just lost one of her representatives, a man, I take this opportunity of saying, whom Canada could ill afford to lose. Ontario has five representatives, Nova Scotia two, New Brunswick one, Prince Edward Island one, and Manitoba and the North-west Territories one.

Now, I think that British Columbia is entitled to representation in the Cabinet on every ground you can bring forward. In the first place, her distance from the capital is, I think, a great reason why she should have a representative in the Cabinet who is thoroughly au fait with the province, who knows exactly its wants and can place those wants before his colleagues in the Council. The interests of British Columbia include mining, lumbering and fishing, which makes her totally different from Manitoba and the North-west. So, although some gentlemen may say that the Minister of the Interior represents British Columbia, I say it is impossible for him to do so. Let us take any ground of comparison—customs, shipping, imports, exports, excise, post office revenue, revenue per capita and population. If we take sea-going shipping as a standard, if Quebec is entitled to seven members in the Cabinet, British Columbia is entitled to seven. Judged by our customs receipts, if Nova Scotia is entitled to two members in the Cabinet, British Columbia, from the amount she pays, is entitled to four; if Prince Edward Island is entitled to one, British Columbia is entitled to eighteen. On the basis of exports, if New Brunswick is entitled to one, British Columbia is entitled to one; if Prince Edward Island is entitled to one, British Columbia is entitled to fifteen. Now, let us take imports as a ground of comparison. On this basis, if Nova Scotia ought to have two representatives in the Cabinet, British Columbia ought to have nearly three; and if New Brunswick ought to have one, British Columbia ought to have two; while, if Prince Edward Island is entitled to one, British Columbia is entitled to seventeen. Then, take excise. On this basis, if New Brunswick is entitled to one member in the Cabinet, British Columbia is entitled to two; if Nova Scotia is entitled to two, British Columbia is entitled to four; and, if Prince Edward Island is entitled to one, British Columbia is entitled to eight. If we judge by the total revenue from post office, then, if we should give New Brunswick one member in the Cabinet, we should give British Columbia one; and, if we give Prince Edward Island one, British Columbia should be represented by seven. On the

basis of revenue per capita, if Ontario is entitled to four representatives, British Columbia is entitled to fifteen; and, if Quebec is entitled to six, British Columbia is entitled to thirteen. On this basis, if Nova Scotia should have two representatives in the Cabinet, British Columbia should have nine; if New Brunswick should have one, British Columbia should have nearly four; and, if Prince Edward Island should have one, British Columbia should have nearly eight. If representation in the Cabinet is to be proportioned to population, and Prince Edward Island is entitled to one member, British Columbia is entitled to between one and two. So, I think that it will be plain to the House that, on any ground of comparison that may be taken, British Columbia is entitled to at least one representative in the Cabinet. Before the last election, in 1896, the Liberals of British Columbia for years had been very busy calling the Conservative Government to account for not giving British Columbia a representative in the Cabinet. I desire to quote an article from the "Times" newspaper, of Victoria, the Liberal organ, owned by a gentleman who was three times rejected by the people of Victoria, and because the people did not want him as a representative, the Government put him in a higher House. I find that on the 29th July, 1895, after the "News-Advertiser," a Conservative organ in British Columbia, had been writing some letters about Cabinet representation, the "Times" said:

One very important fact which the "News-Advertiser" chooses to ignore is that the system which he deprecates has already been adopted as regards all parts of the country except British Columbia. No impartial man can look at the Cabinet and say honestly that the "territorial distribution of offices" is not already in force everywhere to the east of the Rockies. It is a notorious fact that Mr. Daly was taken into the Cabinet because he represented a Manitoba district, and not because of his personal fitness. Senator Ferguson was made a Cabinet Minister without portfolio simply and solely to give Prince Edward Island representation. If any one of the four provinces, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, were represented in Parliament by a brainless band of noodles, still at least one of those noodles would be found a seat in the Cabinet on the "territorial" principle. This "territorial" rule has already been adopted; if it is the wrong one, as the "Advertiser" contends, our contemporary should demand its abandonment; if, on the other hand, it is right, British Columbia is most unjustly treated in being left out in its operation. We suppose the "News-Advertiser" is aware of the inference which its arguments imply, that all the British Columbia representatives are inferior in point of ability to all the present Cabinet Ministers. That estimate is not very flattering, coming from a professed friend. If it is to be taken as correct, then the sooner British Columbia sets about improving the character of its representatives the better.

Then, in regard to the "News-Advertiser" also, it says:

It is beside the fact, as we have shown, to talk against establishing the principle of "geographical distribution." The principle is already established in all parts of the country except British Columbia, while those who know the facts understand quite clearly that if the rule had not already been established, the situation of this province would require for it exceptional treatment in the other direction. British Columbians' interests have been grossly maltreated in the absence of a Cabinet representative—a fact which the "News-Advertiser" cannot gainsay.

The hon. gentleman who owns this paper used to speak very strongly in those days against the Government for not giving Cabinet representation to British Columbia. But since his own party went into power, not one word has his paper said in regard to the matter, and not one word has he said to try to get the Government to give British Columbia representation. In fact, in the same article I find this:

Our Vancouver contemporary, like Rip Van Winkle, has the happy faculty of dropping off to sleep and remaining undisturbed by current events.

That is what has happened to the hon. gentleman himself, I think. Then, also, in another place, I find that the hon. gentleman who was then a Senator for British Columbia and who is now at Government House, spoke as follows on the 4th of July, 1895:—

It is a downright shame to leave them unrepresented, and I can assure you the people will not submit to it any longer. That is pretty strong language to make use of, but I can tell hon. gentlemen that such a feeling exists in British Columbia, that they will not submit to it, and probably when another election takes place this House and the Government will realize the fact. I care not, as I said before, whether it is a Liberal or a Conservative Government is in power. We want to have a representative in the Cabinet that we can hold responsible, and that we can appeal to, and see that he carries out or tries to carry out what is in the best interest of that particular province. That is the object we have in view. I feel it; every British Columbian feels—no matter whether he is a Liberal or a Conservative—that we have been badly used.

That is what was stated by the Senator for British Columbia who is now Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia, and whose son sits in this House. I have not heard the hon. gentleman for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes), following the example of his august father, saying one word since he came here in favour of representation being given to that province. This is about all I am going to say upon the subject. I think I have made out a good case; I think I have shown that it behooves the Government to give British Columbia representation in the Cabinet. Even if hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House from British Columbia choose to keep their mouths closed for fear of offending the party which they support, I do not intend to sit in silence and see this injustice done. I take this occasion to enter my most empathic and

Mr. PRIOR.

earnest protest against this studied neglect of British Columbia, both in regard to expenditure on public works and also in regard to that province not being represented in the Cabinet.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would like to ask what work in Victoria did my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) desire to have done? I do not think he mentioned it.

Mr. PRIOR. No, I did not, because I felt that the hon. gentlemen or his colleagues would have known from the report of the engineer. If the engineer has not reported, he should have reported. There is dredging required, because it silts up, and a good deal of rock to be taken out from the bottom of the harbour to increase the depth. There is a lot of dredging required in the outer harbour also.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I asked the question of the hon. gentleman in order that I might just remind him that the work of dredging which he desires us to do would be enormously expensive, although I would not say, for that reason, that it should not be done. But to do effective work, on the lines suggested by the hon. member for Victoria, would cost a large sum of money indeed, and the Government would not feel able, in view of the already, as some persons say, large amount of the Estimates, to make an immediate advance in that direction. But if the port of Victoria is as important as the hon. gentleman thinks it is, and I am not going to dispute his statement, I think that the Government would be disposed to do what is necessary. I regret that the hon. gentleman has discussed the question of Cabinet representation from a provincial stand-point. I had thought that we were gradually getting away from the idea of provincialism in regard to Cabinet representation. At the time of the union it was inevitable that the provinces should be represented when there were so many interests to be considered, and it must be a considerable time before we can get away from the provincial idea, but I think we ought all to look forward to the time when the spirit of unity will have made such an advance that we will not be talking so much about the idea of representation of particular provinces. If that cannot be done, then all the advance in the direction of unity we have been talking about is a delusion. I think that although we have to recognize provincial interests, the time is coming when a representative taken from one province will have the respect and confidence of another province. However, we have to recognize provincial interests, and it is not surprising that British Columbia thinks it ought to have representation in the Cabinet. My hon. friend will permit me to remind him that it was 25 years after British Columbia was taken into confederation, and dur-

ing which time British Columbia gave an almost unanimous support to the Conservative party before the Conservative Government gave British Columbia representation. Yet the hon. gentleman thinks that a Liberal Government should instantly give representation in the Cabinet to that province. The hon. gentleman will remember that he sat in this House from 1888 to 1896, and he occupied a seat as a member for British Columbia during all these years before he was called to be a member of the Cabinet. The hon. gentleman pays his fellow-members on the Liberal side from British Columbia a compliment when he tells them that, in the very first Parliament in which they have sat, they are worthy of taking their place in the Cabinet. That is a compliment paid to the hon. members for British Columbia which they well deserve, but when the hon. gentleman remembers the years he served in the ranks before he was elevated to a Cabinet position, he may be more moderate in his demands. I am not disposed for a moment, to quarrel with what the hon. gentleman has said regarding British Columbia. I am not disposed to dispute the statistics that he gave, although I think they are open to criticism, but instead of disputing them, I prefer to recognize the fact that British Columbia is a great and growing province, and that the future of the Dominion is going to be largely built up by the development of the mining resources of that great province. The hon. gentleman will find, in regard to Cabinet representation and all other things that British Columbia desires, that with a little patience, the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will be prepared to give the utmost consideration and fair-play to that great and growing province. Though some of the statistics that the hon. gentleman quoted are open to criticism, I prefer not to criticise them, but I join with him as warmly as I can and I wish to congratulate British Columbia upon the progress it has made and upon the prospects before it, and, I think, that with a little patience he will find that the claims of that province will be recognized.

Mr. PRIOR. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) has said that because British Columbia was left twenty-five years without Cabinet representation, that is a good reason why we should still continue to do without it. To give one first is a very different thing to cutting off one. The hon. gentleman knows that when they came into power British Columbia had a representative in the Cabinet, and they left that province out in the cold. They might just as well have left Prince Edward Island out, indeed it is less important than British Columbia. Then, again, with reference to the expenditure, the hon. gentleman says the estimate was so big that they thought they could not put anything down for Victoria harbour.

They might just as well make that excuse apply to any other province.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. British Columbia is getting its fair share.

Mr. PRIOR. It is not getting its fair share. With regard to the provincial idea, the hon. gentleman says it ought to be done away with, and that a good man should be chosen no matter where he comes from. Well, apply that argument to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick who are as tenacious to have their own men in the Cabinet as they can be, and the same with Ontario and Quebec. I think it will be a long time before those provinces will be willing to give up their representatives.

Harbours and Rivers generally..... \$5,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the usual general vote, and the sum is the usual sum. It is for services which are not particularly specified, and is called for to cover during the fiscal year amounts required for travelling expenses, instruments, &c., which cannot be conveniently charged against any one in particular of the general appropriations for repairs in each province. There is a memorandum here of the expenditure last year amounting to \$4,949. The items are: Travelling expenses, \$952; services, \$517; stationery and printing, \$2,302; instruments, \$642; sundries, \$152; telegrams, \$323; compensation for damage to barge, \$60.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that not an odd kind of vote to have amongst expenditures on harbours and rivers, not a single cent of which has gone into the improvement of a single harbour or river in the Dominion. It is simply a vote used for contingencies. That vote has been had from time to time. I remember that for two or three years I was able to cut that vote out, because I thought it was not a vote which ought to be there in that capacity. I do not object to travelling expenses, instruments, &c., being paid for, but the vote ought to show what you are going to do with it. Anybody taking the public accounts of the expenditures believes that money is spent in the improvement of harbours and rivers, or things that are unprovided for by special votes, but in reality it is to pay for whatever the Minister chooses to pay in the way of telegrams, extra expenses and clerical work, instruments, &c.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the hon. gentleman is slightly mistaken when he says there was a vote of that kind, and that he got rid of it. There was another vote of a miscellaneous character that he did drop out; but this vote, I am advised, is a continuing vote for years. I do not quite agree that there is any impropriety in it. Everybody knows that to build harbours, one requires to pay for travelling expenses of engineers, to purchase instru-

ments, and there are various incidental expenses of that kind.

Mr. FOSTER. For every work that you are building, you should charge against that particular work its proportion of the engineering expenses, instruments or whatever you may choose, but this is a general vote for contingencies.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In that branch of the service only. The vote has been going on for a good many years in this way. Would the hon. gentleman have me transfer it to the contingent account of the department?

Mr. FOSTER. I would have it put where it would signify what it was meant for.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid my hon. friend and myself are equally responsible for that. If I follow his example I cannot be supposed to go very far astray.

Mr. FOSTER. The reason why we put a vote in the Estimates is to designate what the vote is for. This is a vote for harbours and rivers generally, but that does not indicate the uses to which it is actually put.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is for incidental expenses properly charged to harbours and rivers generally, and distributed over them all.

Mr. FOSTER. No, it is a vote which is not distributed anywhere, but it gives the Minister a right to expend it for anything he likes.

Harbours and Rivers—Quebec—

Anse à Beaufile—Improvement of entrance to harbour ..... \$7,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This vote is required for improvements to that harbour to enable fishing and other vessels to enter the same for shelter during stormy weather. The harbour is in the county of Gaspé.

Mr. BERGERON. Over \$500 was spent last year, was that spent out of the \$1,000 of the estimate of 1898?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The expenditure on the work up to this time is \$1,520. It is for extending seawardly the retaining wall built on the west side of the river. It is a fishing settlement. I have no information as to the number of the population; I only know that it is a fishing population.

Anse aux Gascons (Port Daniel East) breakwater ..... \$4,500

Mr. BERGERON. Where is that?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It is in Bonaventure county, in the Baie des Chaleurs. Port Daniel is a very well known harbour, one of the most important in the Baie des Chaleurs.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. McALISTER. Anse aux Gascons is three or four miles below Port Daniel.

Mr. FOSTER. What is there at Port Daniel East?

The PRIME MINISTER. Port Daniel is a pretty large harbour, at least two miles wide. There are settlers on each side, one side being called Port Daniel East, and the other side Port Daniel West. I imagine that Port Daniel East is the name of the municipality, which includes Anse aux Gascons.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population of Anse aux Gascons?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not really know. The population is not very large. It is one of the fishing settlements of the coast. There has been a settlement at Paspébiac for many years, and there were several small harbours more or less important around the coast which supplied fish to the inhabitants at Paspébiac. The population is not very large, but it covers a pretty large territory.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the estimated cost of that, how much has been spent, and how much is to be spent?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total cost has been \$12,129. The work is finished, and this vote will pay the balance to the contractor.

Mr. McALISTER. If I remember rightly, the wharf was completed last year. I think this breakwater is largely intended for the accommodation of fishing boats; but the steamer running between Dalhousie and Gaspé calls there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The memorandum furnished me states that before the construction of the breakwater, during southerly gales there was no protection for fishing boats, many of which were consequently broken up and damaged. The number of boats now engaged in catching codfish is 60 in the summer and 100 in the fall; the catch amounts to 400 or 500 quintals every season.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this work done by contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Baie St. Paul—Cap aux Corbeaux—  
Extension and repairs to wharf..... \$10,000

Mr. BERGERON. Is that the wharf at Baie St. Paul?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes. There has been a wharf there some twenty years. My hon. friend is quite familiar with it. The boats of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company call there, but it is very difficult to moor a boat at that wharf.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the whole cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total probable cost of the extension is \$13,750.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the work being done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Cap Santé—

Removal of boulders..... \$800

Mr. BERGERON. Could not that be done in the ordinary work of the channel ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I am well acquainted with the locality, as I live opposite it, and I can say that there is such an accumulation of boulders there that it is very difficult for the steamboats and market boats to reach the wharf. By removing these boulders easy access can be secured to the wharf, but as long as they are there, the place is most dangerous.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is in the St. Lawrence River, but not in the ship channel, and, therefore, the work cannot be charged to that.

General repairs and improvements to harbour, river and bridge works..... \$10,000

Mr. BERGERON. That is a very dangerous vote, it is spread over so much. What is it for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That also is a general vote, similar in character to one or two others we were discussing. It is for the purpose of making repairs to piers, breakwaters, bridges and other public works, as well as for travelling expenses and other expenses. The details are mostly small items.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it all for repairs ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, except an item at the close called general, \$3,600.

Mr. FOSTER. What is that for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That will be found in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. FOSTER. I find on page Q—10 that it is largely expended for salaries in the department at Ottawa. There is an item to pay J. W. Fraser, who is he ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is an engineer, not on the permanent staff.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another item to pay Alfred Gauvreau for services in cement-testing laboratory, twelve months at \$45.62, \$547.44. He is evidently employed the whole year in testing cement. This opens up a criticism that I think is a fair one. We have two classes of labourers. There is the establishment here and the temporary permanent help, that is, those who are permanently employed, but only on the temporary list. We add these all up and we see that here in Ottawa at the departments,

temporary permanent cost so much, and so many are employed. But when we look into the vote, we find other people employed all the time at Ottawa, who are paid out of a vote like this, for harbours and rivers down at Quebec. There are two injustices in this. One is the injustice of charging the salary of a man who is employed by the year in testing cement against the province of Quebec, when it should be distributed over all the provinces. Then, we cover up in these votes any number of men who may be employed in Ottawa, and who are paid out of different votes—one out of the vote for harbours and rivers, and another out of another vote, and so on. Then, the travelling expenses of the Ottawa officials—Q—245—are charged against harbours and rivers generally, province of Quebec, to the extent of \$2,323. These Ottawa officials go everywhere and are paid out of everything. One lot got paid out of the West Block construction, another out of the St. Lawrence ship canal, another out of the St. Lawrence hydrographic survey, another out of the Kaminiqtiquia River expenditure, another out of the renewals to maritime provinces buildings, and so on, until you come to the harbours and rivers of Quebec, against which you find this amount charged of \$2,323. Then there is the freight and express and departmental telegrams. It seems that the travels of the Ottawa officials is all taken out of these different votes and distributed in that way; I do not know by what rule. If you have an item for travelling expenses for the officials you could take your vote for it, and when you expend it we could have some check on it, but there is no possible check under this system.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was at first disposed to agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), that if this was a charge against the province of Quebec, where the man is doing work in Ottawa for the whole Dominion, it would be misleading. I am told the practice is not to charge in that way, but to divide his salary and expenses amongst the various public works he is called upon to visit. If he goes to another province, the charge for that is made against the particular province.

Mr. FOSTER. This gentleman is in the cement-testing laboratory here, and his salary is \$547 a year. The Customs Department has its laboratory in Ottawa, and it takes its vote for the officials in that laboratory, but it does not charge it to customs vote generally. I find here that the celebrated Mr. Charleson figures in the Ottawa officials travelling accounts for "nine trips, \$645.50." I would like to have information on this. Where did he travel? I find that Mr. Charleson is so poorly paid that he charges up his 5 cents every time he gets into the Ottawa street cars.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. He is, apparently, a very exact man.

Mr. **FOSTER**. He must be a very exact man, but I imagine the exactness comes in when he calls on the department to pay his bill, rather than in keeping an exact account of every street-car ticket. Here is street car to Ottawa station, 5 cents; remarkably exact. Anyway, if you are going to trot Mr. Charleson around on the street cars, you should give him a bundle of tickets, and they would come to less than 5 cents each in that way. Here is another charge: "Victoria, B.C., street cars, 50 cents;" another, "cabs to Ottawa station, \$3.50." Mr. Charleson is ubiquitous. He travels in the street car for 5 cents, and he travels in a cab, or several cabs, for 350 cents; and his cabs from Ottawa station are a little more than they are to Ottawa station, for they are \$3.75. Here we have some other charges from Mr. Charleson: "stations to hotels, \$9.50"; "hotels to stations, \$9.75"; "sundries, \$10.25"; "single fares, Ottawa to Vancouver and Vancouver to Ottawa." Why should Mr. Charleson charge the department with a single fare each way? Why does he not buy his return fare, as other travellers do when they are going to Vancouver and back? I would like to know whether Mr. Charleson had last year a pass on the Canadian Pacific Railway, because this same Mr. Charleson was busy a part of that year in hiring labourers for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. The Minister (Mr. Tarte) admitted that last session. It was stated, and stated, I think, without contradiction, that Mr. Charleson was once over the Crow's Nest Pass, looking after and arranging with reference to these labourers. Was it this same trip for which he charges the Government a single fare to Vancouver at \$87, and a single fare back at \$87? Then, when he goes between Ottawa and Montreal, it is a single fare each way he charges. "Ottawa to Montreal, eleven trips at \$3.50"; "Ottawa to Toronto, one trip, \$7.85"; "Ottawa to Quebec, two trips at \$7"; "Montreal to Quebec, two at \$3.50," and so on. When he goes to Quebec, he has got to come back, and why does he charge a single fare? Again, I want to know whether or not last year Mr. Charleson had a pass from the Canadian Pacific Railway? I think the chances would be in favour too of his having a pass.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The officials of the department tell me they are not aware whether he has a pass or not.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I suppose they could find out.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes, by asking Mr. Charleson.

Mr. **BERGERON**. By asking the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. **FOSTER**.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I do not know that we have the right to ask the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. **FOSTER**. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) will agree with me, that if Mr. Charleson had his pass and travels free, he should not charge the Government.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. If Mr. Charleson got a pass and charges his travelling expenses, I certainly would not defend it.

Mr. **FOSTER**. That is a fair basis, then, for my asking the question.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I do not think we should assume that he has.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will see that he is practically charging fraud on this party, and, unless he has some evidence, he should not do that.

Mr. **FOSTER**. My hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) has great faith in human nature—when the human nature is on his own side of the House.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) know, of his own knowledge, that Mr. Charleson has a pass?

Mr. **FOSTER**. No, and that is why I want the information. Will the Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) say it is unfair that we should ask for that information?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Unless the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has some reason to believe this party, whoever he is, had a pass, it is hardly fair to accuse the man.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I am not accusing him at all, but I think it would be a fair assumption that he had a pass last year.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Why?

Mr. **FOSTER**. Because he was hiring labourers for the Canadian Pacific Railway both last year and the year before, and I think it would be a fair assumption that he had a pass. If he has not, all right; but if he has, these expenses ought not to have been charged.

Mr. **BERGERON**. We had a case last year of a Government employee having a pass and charging his travelling expenses.

Mr. **FOSTER**. We have had several cases, and my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) knows it has been done.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I think it is not at all impossible in the case of the hon. gentleman's officials during his administration.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Then **Mr. Charleson** charges \$7 for carpenters, and for steamers, \$14.50. The ferry he puts down with great minuteness at 6 cents and steward 25 cents. For board in Montreal, he charges board \$60.75, and so on, and so on. There are pages and pages of these items from Q-239, on where all these travelling expenses are given. There is absolutely no check.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Should there not be in every department a person whose duty it would be to check these expenditures? They amount to a great deal of money. I call my hon. friend's attention to an item I referred to the other day, which will be found at page Q-83. To pay the men at work at Rideau Hall, the Public Works Department pay \$20 at \$1 per trip—Côté, seven trips and St. Laurent, Jr., thirteen trips. There is \$20 a month to go and pay the employees at Rideau Hall, when the street cars will carry a person there for five cents. There should be somebody in the department who has the public interest enough at heart to check anything of that kind. It would not be allowed in any private concern; it would not be allowed anywhere except in the public departments at Ottawa. If it has been going on in the past, it is deplorable and it should be changed. As to officials travelling on passes and then charging their railway expenses, the hon. Minister of Finance will remember that we had a case of that kind before the Public Accounts Committee last year.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davles). He returned the money.

**Mr. BERGERON.** He did?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Yes, do him justice; he returned it.

**Mr. BERGERON.** That is one case, then. I may be wrong, but my impression is that, from the close relations existing between **Mr. Charleson** and the company for whom he was sending out men to the North-west he probably had a pass over the Canadian Pacific Railway, and probably over the Grand Trunk as well.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** As to the Rideau Hall item the hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that he alluded to it the other day. I asked an explanation with regard to it. I am informed that one or two of the officials claim that Rideau Hall is some distance away from the street car line, and in unpleasant weather they must take a cab. But the Deputy Minister has called attention to this as an improper charge and says that it must not occur again.

**Mr. BERGERON.** But should there be twenty trips? Are men paid every two days?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** They are paid fortnightly. That would be 26 trips a year.

**Mr. FOSTER.** What about the custom of charging single fare?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I am told that instructions are given to the officials to purchase return-trip tickets where they can do so. Of course in that case they are limited to the number of days and as to the route by which they shall return. I agree with my hon. friend (**Mr. Foster**) that where it is possible a return-trip ticket should be bought.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I should like if the Minister would have an inquiry made in the department in reference to **Mr. Charleson** and a pass. As the matter has been brought up, the fact should be ascertained. If **Mr. Charleson** has not a pass, he should not be allowed to lie under the assumption that he had, and if he had we should not pay his transportation.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (**Mr. Blair**). The Canadian Pacific Railway would not tell you whether they had issued a pass.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Yes, the Canadian Pacific Railway will give a return of the officials in the department to whom they have issued passes—they have done it before.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** They did it before the Public Accounts Committee, but I think they did it with some regret, as they considered the matter a personal one between themselves and the persons to whom passes were given.

**Mr. FOSTER.** It is not a personal matter when it refers to our own employees. We are interested.

**Mr. BERGERON.** I understand that under the old regime, a civil service employee was forbidden to accept a pass from a railway company without a letter from the Minister.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I think the hon. gentleman has misunderstood the case. I am informed by the Deputy Minister of Public Works that he is not aware of such a rule. However, there is no dispute among us that if an official has a pass the public should not be called upon to pay his transportation expenses. If we have any means of getting the information referred to, I shall be glad to get it. I confess I should rather hesitate to ask the Canadian Pacific Railway to give us information as to what they may regard as their private business. However, we can consider that.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** The hon. gentleman promised to get me some information with regard to a charge appearing in the Auditor General's Report, an item for Japanese lanterns, torches and other things.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. When the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) brought this item up, I told him frankly I did not know what was the occasion for the purchase of these goods. I have since found an explanation. These were purchased for an occasion when honour was being done to the Prime Minister of Canada. But not in a party sense. When he returned from the Jubilee he was welcomed in the city of Montreal with a magnificent demonstration which was in no sense a party one. The Conservative Mayor of Montreal led in that demonstration, and in one of the great centres of the city presented an address to the distinguished gentleman in the name of the people of Montreal without regard to party, class or creed. Not only in Montreal, but up and down the river, as we passed, there was a magnificent display which was the subject of comment throughout the Dominion. Every vessel and the end of every pier was decorated that night, and every village showed its bonfires, welcoming the Premier of Canada, not merely as the head of the Government, but because he was returning to Canada after having so creditably represented Canada at the Jubilee. It was in no sense a party occasion. And when every ship along the riverside, every little tug and vessel showed its lanterns and exploded its fireworks, I do not think that anybody will complain because the dredges, tugs, and other craft along the river belonging to the Dominion did their share by throwing out their rockets and showing their lanterns in welcoming home Canada's representative from the great Jubilee ceremonial.

Mr. **FOSTER**. This is really quite affecting. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) should not spring such a thing on the committee without notice. I should have had at least five minutes to prepare myself. As it is, what can I say?

Mr. **TAYLOR**. After the Minister's explanation about Chinese lanterns and torches, now what about sundries?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I was reserving the sundries for the special benefit of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) who, I know, is deeply interested in everything of that kind. He will be, I am afraid, disappointed when he finds what sundries mean, because I do not believe there is any question which has occupied the mind of the hon. member for South Leeds so largely as this question of Chinese lanterns and sundries. I have here the account rendered by R. K. Holland, Montreal, of the articles sent.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Hollands, did you say?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I am surprised my hon. friend should recognize the word Hollands so readily. One would almost suppose he had strayed away from the old faith. I fancy there are not many gentle-

Mr. **TAYLOR**.

men in this House who would so readily recognize that word. This is the account:

6 doz. bengolas at \$1.25.....	\$ 7 50
10 doz. torches at 90c.....	9 00
10 lbs. coloured fire at 50c.....	5 00
1 doz. rockets at \$4.50.....	4 50
½ doz. rockets .....	7 90
5 doz. rockets (exhibition) at \$1.....	5 00
125 only lanterns at 17½c.....	21 88
206 only candles at 1½c.....	3 24
6 bombs at \$2.50.....	15 00
Cases and cartage (all returned, less 75c. for cartage) .....	1 00
	<hr/>
	80 02
Less—Goods returned as per credit..	33 19
	<hr/>
	\$46 83

Mr. **FOSTER**. What are bengolas?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The Minister of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) says they are Bengal lights.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Were they all bought by tender?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I think not; I think that was a job.

Mr. **FOSTER**. That is very peculiar, that some of those bengolas should be returned. Did the enthusiasm suddenly cool off?

Mr. **BERGERON**. It must have been raining. The total is \$186.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. But that includes the sundries. My hon. friend is mixing up that large amount with sundries. The item in the Auditor General's Report sets forth the Japanese lanterns, &c., with great detail to the amount of \$132.17. Then, there are the sundries, \$46.83.

Mr. **BERGERON**. How is it that the hon. gentleman had to go to all that trouble to explain what might have been explained at once in the Auditor General's Report? That seems to be an afterthought.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I am bound to say we cannot accuse the Auditor General of any lack of fulness in his report. It is pretty elaborate as it is.

Mr. **SPROULE**. It is interesting, after all the magnificent articles which came out in "La Patrie," and other Montreal papers, concerning the spontaneous celebration given to the Premier when he came home, to find out now that it was paid for at the country's expense.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Is that the hon. gentleman's complaint of a demonstration which only cost \$125?

Mr. **BERGERON**. In spite of these bombshells, we have not yet got that fast service with England.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. It is satisfactory to know that the hon. member for Leeds is silenced, at any rate.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not silenced. I think the people of this country will condemn an expenditure of \$186 without the consent of Parliament or anybody else, simply to get up a demonstration in honour of the Prime Minister of this country. Talk about its not being a political demonstration. It took that tone throughout the press at that time. If they wanted to get up a political demonstration, why did they not put their hands into their own pockets and pay for the Chinese lanterns and sundries, and not ask the people of this country from British Columbia down to Prince Edward Island to contribute to a demonstration got up by the Minister of Public Works simply to please his fancy and to honour the Prime Minister?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has such a poor conception of the Conservatives of Montreal as to stand up in this House and charge them with having paid for this demonstration out of the public treasury. I want to say in fairness to those gentlemen who did themselves and their city so great honour when they joined in that demonstration to the Prime Minister, that I have no doubt that demonstration on the St. Lawrence that night cost tens of thousands of dollars, which were paid for by the private citizens of Montreal and the villages on the river; and if the Government steamers put up Chinese lanterns to the extent of \$170, I do not think that, outside of the hon. member for Leeds, there is another man in the whole of Canada would object to it.

Mr. FOSTER. In reference to this question of single fares, I see an item in the Auditor General's Report that I would like to have explained. I want to know who Mr. Cowie is.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is an engineer of the department who travels through the country.

Mr. FOSTER. I find his bill is very large, and his fares are nearly all single fares. His whole amount comes to \$1,275.68. He made thirteen trips between Ottawa and Montreal, nearly all single trips, at \$3.50 a trip. Between Ottawa and Kingston, the same way. He has here only three return fares from Ottawa to Montreal, and it is impossible that he should have been more than thirty days absent. These are samples of the single fare carried beyond what ought to be allowed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am bound to say in reference to Mr. Cowie that I am informed he is away a good deal from Ottawa and does not always return, but is ordered by telegram to go to some other point. But I subscribe to the principle the hon. gentleman has referred to.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Gobeil, the Deputy Minister, is also down for railway fares, and others will take pattern from the de-

puty, eleven trips, Ottawa and Montreal, at \$3.50 each. Mr. Gobeil could not be spared for any great length of time, and it seems to me that these tickets might be made return.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Deputy Minister explains that he is required to travel to Montreal often with the Minister, and in the rush of business the Minister sometimes goes down by one train and returns by another, going by the Canada Atlantic and returning by the Canadian Pacific Railway. While the Minister has a pass the Deputy Minister has to buy single tickets. There is a statement of return fares also.

Mr. FOSTER. There are some return fares, but most of these seem to be single fares.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) wanted to know something about Iberville. The work is estimated to cost \$8,000, of which \$6,000 has been spent, and the balance of \$2,000 is now required to make provision for the completion of the construction and piling of the wharf. The wharf is 210 feet long by 24 feet wide, with a wing 150 feet long by 40 feet wide. It is on the east side of the Richelieu River.

Mr. BERGERON. That will be the end of it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Can my hon. friend tell me whether any petitions were received from the municipal authorities of Iberville, or St. John, or from any private parties, asking for the construction of this wharf?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy says that he cannot remember any such correspondence, but we will inquire. He has not got any petitions, but the Minister may have them.

Mr. BERGERON. I know there was some correspondence, and it is an extraordinary proceeding that the Minister should carry these papers in his pocket if they belong to the department. Not only have petitions been sent, but there has been a very serious quarrel going on between the municipal council of Iberville and the Department of Public Works. It has been published in the newspapers, and it is most astonishing that these papers should not be in the department. I am informed that this wharf has been built on the property of a public employee, who is a friend of the hon. Minister of Public Works. It is said that the wharf is built in the wrong place altogether, at a different place from that suggested by the council, and that it has been located at a place where it can only be useful for the private yachts of a few gentlemen of St. John, and not at all useful to the general public. I am giving

the hon. gentleman the information as I have heard it, and surely he will be able to find in the department something to show whether it is true or not.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I understand the hon. gentleman to make the statement that he does not know this of his own knowledge, but that this is some information that has reached him. We will look into the matter.

Mr. **BERGERON**. The department will be able to find that there was some correspondence between the mayor, Mr. Nadeau, and the Department of Public Works. The whole thing has been in the newspapers.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Now that the hon. gentleman mentions it the deputy recollects that there was such a question raised, but we will have the correspondence looked up.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Who was the proprietor of the land on the shore?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. This property was purchased from Mr. James Black, at a cost of \$200.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Is there not an employee of the Government who has property near by? I am told that there is a public employee who is a friend of the hon. Minister of Public Works who is just near this place where the wharf is being built, and that it has been located here contrary to the expectation and demands of the great majority of the people of Iberville.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. What my hon. friend wants to know is whether there is a Government employee living near where this wharf was built.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I want to find out whether the information I am giving is correct or not.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. We will look it up and see what we can find about it.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I think I must really, once again, speak of these travelling expenses. I find in the Auditor General's Report that the travelling expenses of the Deputy Minister, and I take his case, not because he is deputy, but because he is on the establishment, are charged to and taken out of different works. That is clearly not what should be done. I do not know how many of these are on the establishment, but it is very likely others are on the establishment as well. Every hon. member here knows that civil government contingencies are for the travelling expenses of the Minister and of the officers. Here we have the Deputy Minister of Public Works, instead of charging his travelling expenses, amounting to \$693, to contingencies, charging them

Mr. **BERGERON**.

to these general public works. The travelling expenses of the civil servant, as well as of the Minister, must be paid out of contingencies. Attention was called to that a year ago, and a discussion arose. The Auditor General had written demanding that, according to the Order in Council, the charges should be transferred, and pointing out that they ought to be made against contingencies, and not taken out of general votes. The hon. Minister of Public Works agreed that the Auditor General was right, and yet they have gone on this year and they are charging large sums which ought to be charged to contingencies, to these general votes. Here is the letter of the Auditor General on the subject:

Audit Office, Ottawa, May 12, 1898.

Sir,—Let me acknowledge receipt of an application from your department for a transfer entry, crediting "Harbours Generally" and debiting "Public Buildings Generally" with \$150, the amount of cheque 24964, in favour of Deputy Minister Gobell, for travelling expenses.

There is only one place for charging the travel of civil Government officers, namely in "Civil Government Contingencies." See the ruling of the Treasury Board in the case of Mr. Van-koughnet, shown at page A—8 of my report for 1889-90; and my letter to your department of January 12, 1898, shown at page Q—215 of my report for 1896-97.

Please apply for a transfer to "Civil Government Contingencies" of all travelling expense of your civil government officers now charged against outside votes in 1897-98.

The element of a possible over-expenditure does not enter into this discussion as an objection, since the payments have already been made, and must be charged where they belong.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

J. L. McDUGALL, A.G.

The Secretary, Public Works Department.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. That has since been done. In the year just closed, the blue-book for which is not yet out, it will be found in it that the request of the Auditor General has been carried out.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I am very glad of that, for it certainly ought to be done.

Lake St. John—

Piers, including improvements of approaches ..... \$2,500

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The amount expended up to June 30th, 1898, was \$11,539.81.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Do the Government own these piers?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes.

Rivière à la Pipe—

Wharf on Lake St. John, near mouth of river ..... \$2,500

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. This vote is to complete the construction of a wharf on the southern side of the river; total estimated cost is \$8,500.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Where is Rivière à la Pipe?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. It is a small village on the north shore of Lake St. John, at the mouth of the river of the same name. It has a Roman Catholic church, two saw-mills and other establishments, and has a population of 400. It is in the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

**Mr. FOSTER**. These are examples of what we were discussing this afternoon. It seems that every little village on these inland waters must be provided with a wharf at the expense of this Government. That is carrying this thing to a very large extent. These inland waters there are dotted with expensive wharfs, built for the local needs of the people in these little villages.

An hon. **MEMBER**. No.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Yes, that must be so. In other parts of the Dominion the municipalities and private enterprise do this work. Lake St. John, it is true, is a new country, and I would be quite willing to see something of Dominion effort given—

**Mr. BERGERON**. This is a closed lake.

**Mr. FOSTER**. It has no outlet for general navigation.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. It is an inland sea.

**Mr. BERGERON**. The wharfs belonging to the company at Roberval belong to the company itself, and even the Trappists there built their wharfs.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) knows that Lake St. John is an inland sea. Immigration is going in there rapidly, and it is the centre of a vast, developing country. There are a number of rivers emptying into the lake, and the settlers there are not yet in a condition to do this work themselves. This is really colonization work which the Government is doing in giving them harbours.

**Mr. FOSTER**. But this is not giving them a harbour. There might be some shadow of excuse, if it was to give them a harbour, but this is to build a wharf. Is there a customs officer there?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I cannot say.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Surely, the Department of Public Works has not undertaken an expenditure here of \$8,500 without knowing something about the place.

**Mr. P. V. SAVARD** (Chicoutimi and Saguenay). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, this appropriation is for the building of a wharf on the River à la Pipe, in the Lake St. John region. I have not the least doubt that the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) and chiefly the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) who is well acquainted with this locality, will make it a point, with

a view to fostering the interests of colonization and the progress of the country, not to object to the building of a wharf calculated to develop the territory through which flows the Lake St. John. Should the ex-Minister of Finance say that it is a bad policy,—and I am not ready to agree with him on that point—my answer is that it was initiated by the old Government. Let it be put on record, to the credit of the preceding Administration that the first wharf that was built in the Lake St. John region was built by the Conservative Government at Roberval, in 1895. Roberval is a thriving and picturesque village; and as a matter of fact, it is one of the finest localities that can be found in Canada, being a favourite resort with all tourists, Americans as well as Canadians, coming from the maritime provinces and other parts of the Dominion. Every one, on landing there, is delighted to find a wharf which was built there for the accommodation of the passengers who come and take the boats plying between the different localities on Lake St. John.

That wharf on River à la Pipe was begun a year ago and so far a sum of \$4,000 has been expended on those works. I extend here an invitation to the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) and to the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), to come and visit the Lake St. John region, and if they accept my invitation they will be delighted, on reaching that locality to land on a fine wharf. The locality I refer to is a new settlement which is progressing very rapidly. It is called River à la Pipe, and such a name, no doubt, is open to criticism. However, it must not be inferred from it that the people living there have nothing to do but to smoke away the time; far from it, and here is the reason why that locality was so called: as the hon. gentlemen are aware, the Lake St. John region is a part of the county where colonization progressed very slowly at first, despite the fact that it offers many inducements to intending settlers, and possesses advantages unparalleled in another portion of our territory. Years ago, there were shanties at that place, and the men who worked in those shanties used to while away the time, on Sundays, smoking the pipe on the bank of that river, and that is the reason why it was called River à la Pipe. As a matter of fact, those poor people had little else to do on Sundays as there was no church near at hand. And if I refer to that incident, it is in order to show the hon. gentlemen that it ought not to be inferred from the name of that river that the people there have nothing to do but smoking the pipe, on the contrary, they are very busy and hard-working settlers, bent upon developing that part of the country.

There is a very fine parish there, and one of the most promising in the county of Chicoutimi and throughout the whole Lake St. John valley. Three years ago, there were

to be found only from 35 to 40 settlers at that place, the true name of which is St. Henri de Taillon, and I hope it will not grate upon the ears of the hon. gentlemen when I tell them that it is one of the few places, in the province of Quebec, which are decorated with that name. The hon. Mr. Taillon, is the former Prime Minister of Quebec and he bequeathed his name to that locality which is a credit to French Canadians and to the province of Quebec.

There are now from 125 to 130 settlers in that parish, with a residing parish priest. There are two or three stores and two cheese factories; in short, it is one of the most promising parishes in the Lake St. John region. A wharf is being built there, and I may call the attention to the fact that it is not on the banks of the river that it is being built but on the shore of Lake St. John, which is a lake 45 miles long by 30 miles wide, and along the shores of which are to be found 10 or 12 flourishing parishes through which also flow many rivers which empty themselves into that inland sea. A great deal is said nowadays about the Northwest, but there is more to be said in favour of the northern portion of the province of Quebec. There are to be found in the Lake St. John region a great many promising parishes, and I trust my hon. friends will not raise any objection if, in the supplementary Estimates which will soon be brought down, they find several sums for the building of wharfs in the Lake St. John region.

I may avail myself of this opportunity to record here, to the everlasting credit of the Conservative party here and in Quebec, that it was they who first planned and created that system of navigation on Lake St. John. We have now five or six wharfs at various points in that country: but we need three or four more, for which provision has been made by the Government in the supplementary Estimates, which will be brought down during the session. Therefore, I trust that with their wonted liberality and with that broad-minded patriotism which characterizes the hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, not one single hon. gentleman will hesitate to vote even more considerable appropriations for the encouragement of colonization in that portion of the country. There exists, as I said, a good system of inland navigation, and we have good steamboats, which have been subsidized by both Conservative Governments here and in Quebec, and which starting from Roberval ply around on the lake and accommodate the various parishes on their route. It is, therefore, necessary to build wharfs, in order to enable those parishes to fully benefit by that navigation. I hope that, with the good will exhibited so far by the Government of the day, and I say without hesitation, with the liberality which characterizes the hon. gentlemen opposite, whenever an appeal is made in favour of the Lake St. John region and for the encouragement of the numerous

Mr. SAVARD.

settlers who are taking up lands in that country, I hope, I say, that no hon. gentleman will object to the votes proposed this year again in that connection either for the works at River à la Pipe, or for any other locality mentioned in the Estimates. I may add, without fear of contradiction, that no better use could be made of the people's money than expending it in the Saguenay region. It is a new country, but one full of promise, and I hope it will, before long, deserve to be known, as formerly, under the name of the "Kingdom of Saguenay."

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) As there was expended a sum of \$4,000 last year on that wharf, and as \$2,500 more will bring those works to completion, I have no doubt that, after what we have heard from my hon. friend from Chicoutimi (Mr. Savard) nobody will object to this vote.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Somerville) what he thinks of this expenditure, viewed in the light of the reasons just given for it. If he is well satisfied with it and thinks it is done on business principles, I do not know but I should withdraw my opposition to it. But, translated into plain English, this vote means this. Lake St. John is a closed lake, and this little Rivière à la Pipe has 130 persons living in it—

Mr. McDOUGALL. Babies and all.

Mr. FOSTER. Babies and all. It has no general trade, and scarcely any local trade, and this Government, with overflowing generosity, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Savard) has said, is putting down an \$8,000 wharf.

The PRIME MINISTER. In plain English it is simply following a precedent established by my hon. friend himself. There is not so much difference between building a wharf at Rivière à la Pipe and building one at Roberval.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any difference in business or population?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know that there is very much. All these places around Lake St. John are increasing, and I do not know that there was more population at Roberval ten years ago than there is to-day at Rivière à la Pipe. Roberval has increased, owing largely to the generosity of the hon. gentleman himself, who put the vote in the estimates for a wharf at that place.

Mr. SPROULE. Will there be a wharf appointed when the wharf is finished?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the usual practice, and I presume that it will be followed in this case.

Mr. SPROULE. How will he be paid?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The usual practice is to pay the wharfinger a commission of 25 per cent on the fees.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose there are no fees ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then, I do not know that he would get very much.

Mr. SPROULE. I have been told that where there are not enough fees to pay the wharfinger a percentage, he is sometimes paid from another source. I would like to know whether that is the case or not.

Mr. BERGERON. I believe that under the new Administration wharfingers are appointed, but under the old Administration there was no such thing done. The wharf was generally handed over to the municipality to use it and take care of it, and the navigation companies would arrange with the municipality. But the new Administration has changed all that, and appoints wharfingers ; and at some places, like Isle Perrot, trouble is caused in consequence.

The PRIME MINISTER. Isle Perrot has nothing to do with this vote.

Mr. BERGERON. But I am talking of the principle of appointing wharfingers. Under the old regime there were none.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. No new rules in this respect have been introduced at all. The same principle which was adopted by the late Government is carried out by myself. Wharfingers are appointed here and there ; but at some places people, prompted, I am sorry to say, by politicians, have objected to pay wharfage, and trouble has been caused in consequence. If wharfage is exacted at one place, it must be exacted everywhere else, and those politicians are not friends of the state who are prompting people to resist the payment of wharfage. In some cases politicians have even tried to get people to refuse to act as wharfingers in the hope that they would escape the payment of wharfage altogether.

Mr. BERGERON. I differ from my hon. friend entirely. If it was the law under the old Administration to have wharfage fees, it was never put in practice ; but the practice has been introduced by my hon. friend. In Beauharnois, on Lake St. Francis, there was no such thing as a wharfinger before the hon. gentleman appointed one. I believe he has also appointed a wharfinger at St. Timothée ; but I believe there is none at Valleyfield, at Cedars or at Coteau du Lac. My hon. friend has introduced that practice, but as a matter of fact it was never done before.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All I have to tell the hon. gentleman is that in most cases it was done. All through the maritime provinces it was done. If there are some places in the province of Quebec where this salutary rule was not applied, it must have been from political influence or from ignorance on the part of

the head of the department ; for the rule of the department is to appoint a wharfinger wherever one can be got to act ; and it is obviously fair that it should be done. Why should people in one section of the country pay wharfage and people in another section escape ? You must either collect wharfage everywhere or let all go free. There can be no system of political favouritism in the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. The trouble which the hon. gentleman encounters is owing to his way of doing business, because there is no need of it whatever. Let him do as is done in Ontario, hand the wharfs over to the municipalities, who will collect the fees and keep the wharfs in repair.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What wharf has the hon. gentleman in his mind ?

Mr. SPROULE. Collingwood, Thornberry, Meaford.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Wharfs handed over to the municipalities by this Government ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Under what authority ?

Mr. SPROULE. By statutory law.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, that cannot be. The statute was introduced by myself last year for the first time, and I handed over no such wharfs.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman may live and learn, because I got the statute for the wharf at Thornberry. It was before the hon. gentleman was a Minister.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. A special statute ?

Mr. SPROULE. A special statute to give the municipality the right to charge fees. The wharf was handed over before. I got the statute drawn by one of the officers of the hon. gentleman's department, but it was before he was a Minister. There is another advantage in this, because if the Government owns the wharf and an accident takes place, there is a suit against the country, whereas if the municipality owns it, the municipality must be responsible. Then, the country will not have to appoint wharfingers. As soon as you appoint an officer, he becomes a political agent.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Nonsense.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. gentleman allow a wharfinger to be appointed who did not suit himself politically ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. If he did, he would adopt a different principle from what he does in other lines; but in my judgment the best principle is to hand these wharfs over to the municipalities, which will collect the fees and expend them to keep up the wharf, and at the same time make the charge for wharfage dues as low as possible. And then the wharfs are taken from political control entirely.

Mr. McDOUGALL. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) referred to the general principle. Whatever may be the rule in the province of Quebec, I know that the general rule in the province of Nova Scotia has been to appoint wharfingers, though I know that there have been a few exceptions in the case of small inland wharfs. But I know that I myself, during a period of seven or eight years, paid several thousand dollars in wharfage on a wharf that did not cost more than \$4,000 or \$5,000 to construct. I know that the Government invariably, with very few exceptions, appointed wharfingers, as the returns of the blue-books will show.

Mr. BRITTON. I think the object lesson we have to-night, in the long list of grants for Quebec wharfs, and the discussion that took place last night in reference to the wharf to be built at Bruce Mines, ought to put us on our guard as to how these works are given to particular localities by the Government, instead of being left to private enterprise. Living in the province of Ontario, I am not at all jealous of any other province, and therefore would not be in favour of striving to get a wharf for any particular locality merely because some other one was granted it. It is certainly quite a new departure to have wharfs built such as those provided for by the grants last night, and we see now in the province of Quebec the continual expenditure which these wharfs entail. It is not only the expenditure of building them, which may, in certain cases, be quite proper, but the expense of maintaining them, and then the pressure to build other and larger ones. I think that the discussion has not been without great good if it will induce the Government to hesitate before granting these concessions, at all events, to certain places in the province of Ontario, where they really cannot be said to be, to any great extent, of public benefit, though, no doubt, they are a benefit to the particular localities.

Mr. McALISTER. Has the Government any regular rates for top wharfage dues?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is a regular scale of fees furnished each wharfinger, which he has to collect.

Mr. BERGERON. I never heard of such a thing done, at any rate, with regard to

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

the wharfs in my district. If this is to be the rule, what is the object?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The object is to collect sufficient money to keep the wharfs in repair.

Mr. BERGERON. We have to pay a man for that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The wharfinger does all the small repairs to the wharf.

Mr. BERGERON. As my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said a moment ago, the system followed by the old Administration was the best. Wherever the Government built a wharf the municipality paid its share. When the wharf was finished it was handed over to the municipality to be taken care of, and the Government was relieved of any further expense. I would ask my hon. friend whether he ever collected enough money out of any of these wharfs to pay expenses.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly, if the hon. gentleman will turn to the wharfs in the maritime provinces, he will see that large sums have been collected.

Mr. BERGERON. I am not talking of the maritime provinces, but of the province of Quebec.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There may be some wharfs where no wharfinger was appointed by the late Government and where no fees were collected, and which may have escaped my notice.

Mr. BERGERON. Let the hon. gentleman turn up K-163 to 165 in the Auditor General's Report, and he will find that in the province of Quebec there are many wharfs which give no return at all. I find the wharf at St. Agnes, L. A. Roy, wharfinger, no return at all. What became of the fees, and did the wharfinger ever do any repairs? St. Anicet, S. Dupuis, wharfinger, no return. What became of the money? St. Jean Port Joli, no return. Anse St. Jean, \$35.77. What repairs could have been done to that wharf, after the man who collected those fees had been paid his wages?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is the money sent to the Government. There was a total of \$47.65 collected, out of which the wharfinger's remuneration was \$11.88.

Mr. BERGERON. There is the Cascades wharf, no return, and the Cedars, of which a man named Seguin is wharfinger, no return. Chicoutimi, Juste Ouellette, wharfinger, no return. Coteau du Lac, St. Amour, wharfinger, \$33.38 returned. Coteau Landing, no return.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The repairs do not appear there.

Mr. BERGERON. I know that. It is only since the new Administration has been in power that such a system has been in force.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Nothing of the kind. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend can make an investigation, and I will prove it to him.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All my predecessors carried out the same rule.

Mr. BERGERON. It was never done, but the object is to appoint partisans as wharfingers. At St. Anicet they appointed a man named Dupuis, the brother of a lawyer in Montreal, who is one of the worst political heelers in the province. The same thing was done at Isle Perrot. The man appointed there was a strong partisan and conducted himself as if he owned the whole wharf. Before any Conservative dared to put his foot on it, he had to take off his shoes and take a bath. He was a perfect tyrant. The hon. gentleman has put little kings on these wharfs, apparently to help the Grits and hunt Conservatives off them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is talking of matters about which he knows absolutely nothing. I have hardly appointed any wharfinger since I came to power at all. They are nearly all the same men that were there when I came in. If the hon. gentleman wants to find out how very silly his remarks are, let him turn to page K-163, and he will find that in Ontario \$1,246 were collected for top wharfage dues. One wharf at Sault Ste. Marie returned \$1,304 in dues. From the wharfs in the province of Quebec there was \$1,303 received for top wharfage dues; Nova Scotia, \$3,015; New Brunswick, \$1,217; Prince Edward Island, \$1,011.

Mr. McDOUGALL. While on this subject, there is a matter to which my attention was called some time ago, and which I intended to bring up. I find some correspondence between the Auditor General and the department of which my hon. friend is the head, the Department of Marine and Fisheries. On the 23rd March, 1898, the Auditor General wrote as follows to the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as my hon. friend will find at page K-172 of the Auditor General's Report:

Audit Office, Ottawa, March 23, 1898.

Sir,—I have to call your attention to the falling off in the receipts from wharfs and piers during the present fiscal year. The net receipts last

year were \$9,096.23, from wharfs and piers, and \$395.50 from harbours. The net receipts so far brought to account this year are, from wharfs and piers, \$4,116.50, and from harbours, \$285.50. There are 19 wharfs from which the receipts for 1896-97 were \$1,369.25, from which nothing has, so far, been received for the present year. There are also 59 wharfs from which nothing has come to account this year, nor for years past.

Please give explanations.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

J. L. McDOUGALL, A.G.

The Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Now, I am aware personally of the looseness with which the duties of wharfingers are performed by appointees of my hon. friend, and I can understand that a great deal of money is not accounted for that should be accounted for, by reason of this looseness. And the facts are right here. Further on, the Auditor General draws the attention of the department to one or two wharfingers in particular, and further on again we find the following letter:—

Audit Office, Ottawa, August 24, 1898.

Sir,—I wrote you on March 23rd, calling attention to the falling off in the receipts from wharfs and piers.

There are now eleven wharfs from which no revenue has come to account for 1897-98, from which \$772.33 was received in 1896-97. These are referred to in a separate letter.

I have also to call your attention to the reduction in the receipts from the following wharfs for 1897-98, as compared with the previous year:—

Mr. BERGERON. Hear, hear. Under Conservative rule.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Year 1896-97 was under our rule.

Mr. BERGERON. You had not time to dismiss them then—they were Conservative wharfingers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They were not dismissed. Can the hon. gentleman show a case where one was dismissed?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I have a case right at my own door.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What was the name?

Mr. McDOUGALL. E. A. McNeill was dismissed, and Neil McNeill was appointed.

Mr. BERGERON. I can give you another—Masson, of St. Anicet.

Mr. McDOUGALL (reading):

Wharf.	1896-97.	1897-98.
Goderich, Ont.....	\$ 869 21	\$ 561 67
Rondeau, Ont.....	85 70	61 65
Sault Ste. Marie, Ont....	485 90	311 12
Anse St. Jean, Que.....	110 94	35 77
Baie St. Paul, Que.....	181 64	75 75
Carleton, Que.....	61 45	18 13
Grand River, Que.....	185 74	153 32
Lacolle, Que.....	41 10	14 09

Wharf.	1896-97.	1897-98.
Murray Bay, Que.....	\$ 226 76	\$ 48 92
New Carlisle, Que.....	219 64	182 76
Percé, Que.....	21 81	7 02
River Ouelle, Que.....	5 60	0 10
St. Alphonse, Que.....	225 96	115 93
St. Laurent, Que.....	40 46	28 26
Tadousac, Que.....	173 42	87 10
Barrington, N.S.....	162 03	156 27
Belleveau's Cove, N.S....	134 85	107 83
Church Point, N.S.....	85 69	39 99
Digby, N.S.....	1,646 61	1,589 59
Grand Narrows, N.S.....	170 00	63 50

That is the wharf at my own door.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Both years the hon. gentleman is quoting are under the present Government's rule.

Mr. BERGERON. Why have the receipts gone down?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How can I tell.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The wharfingers are not the same. I know that to be the case at Grand Narrows.

Mr. BRITTON. May I ask what my hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) is complaining about?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I complain that the wharfingers appointed under the present Government are not making the same returns as those under the previous Government did.

Mr. BRITTON. But if the hon. gentleman will look at the items he is quoting, he will find that the amount of remuneration they have kept is very little. The gross receipts are less, and so, of course, the returns to the Government are less.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I understand that, but the same rule applies now that applied before.

Mr. BRITTON. Surely the Government is not responsible for the falling off of the business at these wharfs.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But it is responsible for the looseness of its officials. I am a witness to one case of that kind. I am a witness to the fact that I pay my top wharfage, but my neighbour does not pay a cent because he is a Grit. He is using the wharf the year around and pays nothing for it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) is guilty before this House and this country. If he knows of a fraud of this kind committed by his neighbour, it was his duty to report it to the proper officer instead of standing up here and making a reckless charge in this House behind the man's back.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am making a charge I can prove. Let the hon. gentleman (Sir

Mr. McDOUGALL.

Louis Davies) bring his papers to this House and I can prove it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Why did you not report the man?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Because I could not get the papers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Did you ever ask for them?

Mr. McDOUGALL. No; I have asked for papers before and did not get them. I asked for papers three months ago, and have not got them yet.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Asked for these papers?

Mr. McDOUGALL. No, for other papers. A man must make a slave of himself in this House before he can get a return brought down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What papers did you ask for that were refused?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Papers from the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair). I have asked for them three or four times.

Parrsboro', N.S.....	\$43 16	\$32 91
Port George, N.S.....	124 73	71 51
Port Maitland, N.S.....	49 33	27 41
Port Morien, N.S.....	279 74	157 67
Saulniersville, N.S.....	40 74	23 75
Cape Tormentine, N.S....	575 31	342 61
Georgetown, N.S.....	21 56	15 62
Kier's Shore, N.S.....	99 10	55 63
Victoria and Crapeau, N.S.	116 73	91 36

In those cases in which the falling off is considerable, the wharfinger should be asked to explain, unless you are already in possession of the reasons.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
J. L. McDOUGALL, A.G.

The Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Audit Office, Ottawa, August 24, 1898.

Sir,—I have to call your attention to the following list of wharfs from which no revenue has come to account for the fiscal year 1897-98, the amount opposite each being the collections for 1896-97 :—

Wharf.	Collections, 1896-97.
Chicoutimi, Que.....	\$216 73
Coteau Landing, Que.....	9 21
Les Eboulements, Que.....	45 00
Rivière du Loup, Que.....	158 27
St. Thomas de Montmagny, Q.	5 08
Kingsport, N.S.....	200 00
Plympton, N.S.....	6 00
Edgett's Landing, N.B.....	2 41
Lévis Point, P.E.I.....	62 12
Murray Harbour .....	13 21
Tignish .....	54 30

I have written separately about the wharfs at Rivière du Loup and Coteau Landing.

I have to ask for explanation of the absence of revenue from these wharfs for 1897-98.

Have the wharfingers and other collecting officers of your department been recently reminded of the serious position they place themselves in when they do not promptly account for

their collections? Are the wharfingers required to give security?

I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
J. L. McDOUGALL, A.G.

This correspondence goes to show that there is the recklessness I speak of in connection with the performance of the duties of these wharfingers under the present régime. I know it to be the case that certain people are allowed to use these wharfs without paying a cent, while other people are compelled to pay.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. If the hon. gentleman will give me the names, we will soon put a stop to that.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I will give you the name of the wharfinger in my own county. His name is McNeill, a leading Liberal, who has the patronage of that district under my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and who uses that wharf from one end of the year to the other without paying for it. If he and others of the Government's friends paid what they ought to pay for the use of that wharf, they would pay more than the whole return now shows to be paid.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I want to say this, as one who is particularly interested in what goes on in Nova Scotia, that the statement the hon. gentleman makes is a surprise to me. I cannot contradict it, because I know nothing about it, but it is certainly a subject the Minister of Railways and Canals should look into, and I shall be astonished to find that the hon. gentleman's statement proves to be correct.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am willing to prove the statement I make, any time the Minister will afford me an opportunity.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not care where money is expended, if it is spent for the benefit of the country. But I want to draw your attention, Mr. Chairman, to this fact, and it bears out the contention of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton). I think the Government of the day, and perhaps the old Government, too, but especially this Government, are launching out into a business that is going to be very detrimental to the best interests of the country. When we look over the returns, we find that in Ontario there are eleven wharfs, which return a revenue of \$1,246.21. When we come to Quebec, we find returns from thirty-seven wharfs, producing a revenue of \$1,303.50, or about the same revenue as is produced by the eleven wharfs in Ontario. Now, that proves to my mind that more wharfs have been constructed than were necessary for the requirements of the people.

An hon. MEMBER. They are building more.

Mr. COCHRANE. If they are building more, then, if the same thing goes on, the

condition will be still worse. Now, why should they build wharfs where the returns are nil? It must be evident to the Minister of Finance that it costs considerable to build a wharf, and, if there is no revenue derived from that wharf, there must be something wrong. Either the wharfinger must be taking all the money himself, or, if he does not get any, he is not charging the people what he should charge for the use of the wharf. The fact, to my mind, cannot be contradicted, that if the Government builds a wharf that costs a large sum of money, and there are little or no returns from it, the wharfinger cannot be doing his duty, or that wharf did not require to be built. I think no man can get round that statement. I suppose these eleven wharfs in Ontario were built where they were wanted, and they produce a revenue. I do not object to Quebec having thirty-seven wharfs, if they are built for the accommodation of the people and if the people use them for their exports and imports. Now, we find the same thing in Nova Scotia. If it is true, that thirty or forty more wharfs are to be constructed with the money the Government are taking this year, what will be the result in another year? I think the Government ought to take in sail, and not expend so much money where it is not required. It is evident, from the discussion that took place some time ago in this House—if I may be permitted to refer to it—that a good many wharfs are built where the people do not require them, and the returns under our hands prove conclusively that either they were not required, or that the wharfingers are not doing their duty.

Mr. BERGERON. I find in K-172 a letter from R. C. Desrochers, in answer to a demand on the part of the Auditor General regarding the transfer of wharfs and piers to the Marine Department from the Public Works Department.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. They do that every year. As they build a wharf, they transfer it.

Mr. BERGERON. That may be the law, but I know it was not done, at least in some cases. This Mr. Desrochers, clerk of the Department of Public Works, says they have transferred wharfs and piers to the Marine Department as rapidly as practicable after construction, and that the department does not collect fees from persons using these wharfs or piers. It is a hard thing to make them pay fees. If a steamboat company pays fees, it gets them out of the farmers. Now, my hon. friend behind me (Mr. McDougall) has been reading a list of all the wharfs which do not pay revenue.

Mr. BERGERON. I find here about ten wharfs that have sent in no returns at all. What is the use of a law if it is not enforced?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. There are wharfs that have been washed away entirely.

Mr. **BERGERON**. My hon. friend was asking me if there were any dismissals. There was a gentleman named Masson of St. Anicet, a respectable public spirited man who was doing the work free, pro bono publico.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Was he charging fees?

Mr. **BERGERON**. No, there were no fees charged at all. He was dismissed because he was a strong Conservative, and a Liberal was appointed in his place. How much money has my hon. friend collected from that Liberal? He will find out by reading these letters in the Auditor General's Report, which are too long to read now, that there has nothing been sent in during the first or second year.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). He is acting like Mr. Masson, pro bono publico.

Mr. **BERGERON**. No, this man does not work for nothing.

The **CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Ellis). I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the discussion has taken a very wide range:

Sometimes there are a number of items in a vote or resolution, and then these may be generally discussed as forming part of a single question. Each item may then, if the committee think proper, be taken up as a distinct question, and so discussed and amended. The debate in such a case must be confined to the item, and when it has been disposed of, no reference can again be made to it when the subsequent items are under discussion.

Mr. **BERGERON**. We are on the Rivière à la Pipe, and when we go to "La Pipe" we go to have a good long talk, and that is the cause of our getting astray.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. The main and supplementary Estimates which we have now before us are on such a large scale that I would suggest to the hon. Minister the advisability of doing business on business principles. By the Auditor General's Report for last year I find that, where the Government built wharfs, they pay four or five prices for nails and iron that went into the construction of these wharfs. Why cannot the Government buy their supplies at wholesale prices? Why was \$5 per 100 pounds paid for bolt iron to cut up and make into bolts? I find that the Government bought from Henry Brassard 4,376 pounds of bolt iron at 5 cents, and 867½ pounds of spikes at 5 cents. Why should the Government pay these prices? All through the accounts you will find that they bought kegs of nails at \$3 and at \$2.50, 8-inch nails for planking, when the price of these was \$1.85 last year. Why pay \$2.50 and \$3 per keg for nails when you can

Mr. **BERGERON**.

buy for \$1.85? My hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton) referred to the fact, which I know to be a fact, that we deal differently with Ontario as compared with Quebec, Nova Scotia and the other provinces. There are three or four islands at the end of Lake Ontario, Garden Island, Howe Island and Wolfe Island. The farmers on Howe Island, many of them French Canadians and who have been there for one hundred years or more, built the wharf themselves. I wonder that the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers), when he finds Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island getting wharfs by the score, does not get wharfs for Howe Island and Garden Island, where wharfs have been built by private enterprise. Why should these municipalities be taxed for building their own wharfs while the Government come to the rescue of other provinces? I think it is very unfair to treat Ontario in that way when the Government are building wharfs everywhere else. I protest again against paying 5 cents a pound for iron and \$3 a keg for nails, when you could get them for \$1.85 last year and when iron could be bought for \$1.25. I think the money voted by Parliament should go into the wharfs themselves and not into the pockets of some friends of the Government who want to make three or four dollars a keg on iron.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I was talking about St. Anicet. At page Q-147 of the Auditor General's Report, the hon. Minister will find that there seems to be a contract given to Joseph Ed. Dupuis, of Montreal, a brother of the lawyer, who is the prospective candidate down there, at \$1,519. Beside that there were other amounts paid out, and I cannot make out whether, after giving the contract to Dupuis, the Government paid for materials that went into the work, such as hemlock, stones and bolts. The conductor of the work is Stanislas Dupuis. The postmaster at St. Heart is named Dupuis, I am not sure whether it is Stanislas or not, but I think it is. He was conducting these works forty or fifty miles away from Montreal at \$2.50 a day, and he received \$29 in one account and \$87.50 in another. He may never have gone upon the works at all, but said to his cousin: Look after the work, and I will get \$2.50. It was a family affair. This may be a small matter; it is a matter of a little over \$100, but the principle is bad.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if these wharfingers give security for the money collected?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. No; the moneys are returned quarterly, and a close account is kept.

Mr. **SPROULE**. It is not to be wondered at that we find these things which are disclosed in the Auditor General's Report—cases where no money is returned at all.

Lower St. Lawrence—

Removal of rocks ..... \$3,000

Mr. BERGERON. Where is that?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is to provide a safe landing place for the fishermen in the St. Lawrence below Matane.

Magdalen Islands—

Breakwater ..... \$10,000

Mr. BERGERON. What is this for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to afford facilities for the fishing boats of the islands and for those employed on the coasts of the lower St. Lawrence. It is for the construction of a causeway, 1,250 feet long, estimated cost, \$11,000, forming a harbour of refuge at Amherst; pile work, 1,200 feet long, and breakwater, 1,800 feet long, \$16,000; dredging, \$10,000; total estimated cost, \$37,000.

Maria—

Wharf ..... \$10,000

Mr. BERGERON. What is this for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This vote of \$10,000 is to be applied towards the construction of a wharf at Maria, 2,040 feet long, to reach 10½ feet of water at low water spring tide; the outer 1,200 feet to be constructed of solid cribwork, 30 feet wide, and the inner 840 will be built of alternate blocks and open spans, 20 feet wide; height of wharf at outer end, 24 feet at bottom, and the flooring of wharf to stand 6 feet above high water spring tides; total estimated cost of wharf placed by the acting chief engineer at \$70,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What did the Minister say the estimated cost was?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Seventy thousand dollars.

Mr. BERGERON. Seventy thousand dollars! Did the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Guite) take back his resignation, when he got that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I know nothing about that.

Mr. FOSTER. We must have a full explanation of the basis upon which the Department of Public Works proposes to spend \$70,000 on that place.

Mr. BERGERON. It is an open scandal.

Mr. McALISTER. I think the estimate of \$70,000 is correct. I have personal knowledge of the location of this wharf, and it will cost \$70,000, if not twice \$70,000, to make a wharf to 10 feet of water.

Mr. BERGERON. And for what?

Mr. McALISTER. For nothing at all.

Mr. BERGERON. There is no sense in this at all. It is the most indefensible thing

that was ever brought before Parliament. What is the population of the village?

Mr. McALISTER. There is no village there at all to speak of.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not the details of the population. The engineer tells me this is a class of work that may be done from year to year, a piece may be done this year, and a piece later on, as is done for many of these works.

Mr. FOSTER. In the very inception of this thing, I ask the Minister to let this vote stand until he can give some information about it. I want to get the full information as to why the Government should come to this House and ask us to undertake an expenditure of \$70,000 at this place. This is altogether too much.

Mr. BERGERON. There is hardly any water there. It is a bay. You can hardly see the village from where the boat stops. I do not think that even a light steamer, like the "Admiral," can get within half a mile of it.

Mr. McALISTER. They have to anchor out half a mile from the shore.

Mr. BERGERON. This is an extraordinary proposition from the Government. There is no more sense in building a wharf at Maria than there is in building a wharf down here on Sparks street.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I agree to the suggestion that this item should stand.

Mr. McALISTER. Why the revenue from the post office there is only about \$100.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That would not necessarily prove anything.

Mr. McALISTER. It would show that it is a very small place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total cost of the work is large, and the request is reasonable, that hon. gentlemen should have the fullest information. The item can stand.

Mr. FOSTER. In what county is Maria?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is in Bonaventure.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is the worst proposal yet, and we never should allow it to pass.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any correspondence in the department leading up to the initiation of this vote, and if there is, we ought to have that brought down.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall see what additional information there is.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is not a new vote; \$5,000 was voted last year.

Mr. FOSTER. But not spent.

The PRIME MINISTER. That may be, but the policy was inaugurated last year.

Mr. TAYLOR. We were never told last year the cost would be \$70,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. In view of the statement that it is to cost \$70,000, I think the committee is entitled to all the information possible, and there is no objection to let the item stand.

Rivière du Loup (en haut)—

Dredging channel from Lake St. Peter  
to Louiseville ..... \$6,000

Mr. BERGERON. What is the use of that?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am surprised that my hon. friend should ask what is the use of that. It is to dredge the channel of the river, so as to permit the steamboats to come into Louiseville. My hon. friend knows that some distance from the river, and just a little below the village, there is a large saw-mill, and he knows that the town of Louiseville is a growing one. That is the reason for the vote.

Mr. BERGERON. Then, if it is so important, will the right hon. gentleman explain why this vote has been in the Estimates for three years, and has not been spent?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is more than I can say, but I gave the reason for the work.

Mr. BERGERON. I believe that the bridges which are built on that river are solid, and that they cannot be opened for steamboats to pass.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman must know that the bridges are both above the town.

Mr. BERGERON. The only vessels that come there are small barges, and this is the first time I ever heard that steamboats could go to Louiseville unless they are yachts.

The PRIME MINISTER. They do not come now, but they will come when this channel is made.

Mr. BERGERON. It is just carrying out the principle of the Government giving expenditures to all their friends. The fact that this \$6,000 has been three years in the Estimates, and nothing done, proves to me that it is an election vote.

The PRIME MINISTER. If it were an election vote, I suppose it would be expended long before.

Mr. BERGERON. There was no reason before, but there will be this fall.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is just the same reason this fall as there was last fall and the fall before.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. McALISTER. What line of steamers go there?

The PRIME MINISTER. They are market boats.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the estimate of the total cost, and what amount of work has been done?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The estimated cost is \$14,000.

Rivière Richelieu—Belœil Channel—

Guide piers ..... \$4,000

Mr. BERGERON. Will that finish that work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Rivière Saguenay (below Chicoutimi)—

Dredging ..... \$8,000

Mr. BERGERON. Will that put the channel in proper shape?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is expected so by the officials.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is expected that it will give sufficient water to enable vessels to go to the wharf.

Mr. BERGERON. That is money well spent, if it will accomplish it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This \$8,000 will remove two shoals, which will improve the navigation very much. It will not, however, do all that is desired.

St. Alexis—Bale de Ha! Ha!—

Pier ..... \$4,000

Mr. BENNETT. Is this a new work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, this is to complete.

Sillery Cove—

Wharf at Pointe à Pizeau ..... \$5,000

Mr. BENNETT. Is that to complete?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Lighting Dominion Public Buildings.... \$45,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This item was held over at the request of the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster).

Mr. FOSTER. Is there anything in the supplementary Estimates for this?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow this item to pass, and have the discussion on the item in the supplementaries.

Mr. CLARKE. When this item was up before, the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) asked whether it was the intention of the Government to put an electric elevator in the Toronto custom-house. I thought this might be the proper time to ask that question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think no present determination has been come to on that question.

New dredging plant ..... \$60,000

Mr. BENNETT. How many dredges are intended to be constructed in the coming year for that amount?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For the maritime provinces three new scows and two new boats for the dredge "New Dominion," one new dredge bucket, two boats, one scow and one dredge bucket for the "Prince Edward," one dredge bucket and one scow for the "George Mackenzie," chains for the several dredges, three scows and pile driver; for Quebec and Ontario, two new 80-yards scows for the dredge "Challenge," new hull for the dredge "Ontario," and new hull for steam stone-lifter; for Manitoba, renewal and addition to dredging plant; for British Columbia, renewal and addition to dredging plant; and additional plant not yet determined.

Mr. BENNETT. Are tenders asked for the construction of these scows?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is probable these will be built at the Government establishment at Sorel—at any rate, those for Quebec and Ontario.

Mr. BENNETT. As these scows are to go to the upper lakes, I think that in all fairness they should be constructed in Ontario by tender. The other night it was shown that when it was necessary to build a scow or tug down there, some timber for the work had to be taken down from Ontario.

Mr. BERGERON. How far has the Co-teau dredging gone on—the contract given to Mr. Gauthier? How much has been paid to him, and how was the work done?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy informs me that he has not the information, but that he will get it before the supplementary Estimates are considered, as they contain an item relating to the same subject.

Mr. BERGERON. I also want to know the amount of money that has been spent, how it has been spent, with what plant the work was done, to whom the dredges belonged, how they were employed, what price per hour they were paid, how many cubic yards were taken out, and at what price.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will get the information for the hon. gentleman before the supplementary Estimates are discussed. I think part of the information has already been submitted to the House in answer to a question.

Mr. BERGERON. There has been some, and I notify my hon. friend that when it comes, I want to bring up some other matters in connection with that subject.

Mr. SPROULE. Where are these scows and dredges to be built?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At Sorel, in the Government workshops, no doubt, but no special arrangements have been made.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not be cheaper to build them at Midland than build them at Sorel, and then have to tow them to Georgian Bay via the Welland Canal?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These scows are built of British Columbia wood, which can be brought to Sorel at a hardly greater cost than to any point in Ontario. I shall make a note of what the hon. gentleman suggests, but the officials think the work can be done cheaper at Sorel than elsewhere by private arrangement.

Mr. BENNETT. There was an opportunity furnished the other evening, on the vote for the construction of the tug "Trudeau," to make a comparison of the cost, and that tug could have been built for much less money at Midland than at Sorel. How many men are employed at Sorel?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The number is 272.

Mr. BENNETT. It was stated the other night that the number had been as high as 450. If the construction of these scows is undertaken, it means a large number of men employed. I do not profess to put my opinion against that of the engineers of the department as to the kind of wood to be used, but I do know that scows much larger in size than those used with the dredge "Challenge" are being built in the Georgian Bay at all times for the carriage of lumber and other commodities. It is not fair to the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite and the public generally that some opportunity should not be afforded them of tendering for and constructing these scows at Georgian Bay, Lake Ontario or any other point. They are not the property of Quebec exclusively, but are used in Ontario, and it is only fair to that province that some part of this money should be expended there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Whether or not it is good policy to have the Government workshops at Sorel is legitimate matter for difference of opinion, but when we have the facilities at Sorel for doing this work, it is only reasonable that we should send it there. It would be foolish, when we have expensive workshops at Sorel, to send work elsewhere. Of course, if there was any great saving to be effected by building them elsewhere that should be done.

Mr. SPROULE. These scows can be built much cheaper by contract than by day's work down at Sorel. It is very costly to tow them from Sorel to the Georgian Bay. The cost of taking these scows from one locality to another even in the Georgian Bay is quite a large item. If you have to bring them up from Sorel, all the way round by the Welland Canal to Georgian Bay, and if you build

them by day's work, I am quite sure that will cost more than if you were to build them by contract after inviting tenders. I see that a great deal of tamarack and rock elm is being used in building boats and tugs, and you could get as good quality of that kind of wood in Ontario as in any part of the Dominion. Right from the station where I live, that kind of wood is being shipped to the state of Maine for the purpose of building boats there. If tenders were invited, these scows could be built much cheaper than by day's work by the Government.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the Minister make an effort to ascertain whether these could not be built cheaper by contract and public tender than down at Sorel?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to this. He may be expected back in a very short time.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is the new scow for Fraser River, B.C., being built?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Probably built on the coast of Victoria under the superintendence of our engineer.

Mr. BERGERON. The Conservative Government were very much abused by hon. gentlemen opposite, but when Sir Hector Langevin was Minister of Public Works there was not a question put from this side which he could not answer immediately when putting through his estimates. He had a book in his hand prepared by the department under his supervision, which contained all the particulars. I am sorry the department have lost the good habit of putting all details in the hands of the Minister so that he could answer every question. I know my hon. friend cannot do better—it is not his fault, but he will understand our position. When we take concurrence I cannot remember all these questions, so the matter will go through, whereas, if my hon. friend had had the facts before him he could give us the information to which we are entitled.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Without any disposition to disparage Sir Hector Langevin, who was known, in some lines, as an excellent administrator, the information I get from some of the older members of the House does not correspond with that which my hon. friend gives. I am told that it was not the practice of Sir Hector Langevin to answer such questions off-hand. Any hon. member can take up the Auditor General's Report and ask innumerable questions concerning the items that no Minister could answer off-hand. They are a proper subject of inquiry, but if we had Sir Hector Langevin himself here he could not answer at once such questions as those put by my hon. friend.

Mr. BERGERON. I am sure Sir Hector Langevin could not answer for many of

Mr. SPROULE.

these expenditures under the Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He had to answer for many in which he did not do as well as the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. GANONG. I would like to ask if any survey has been made of the upper entrance of St. Andrew's harbour. I believe the Minister of Public Works did send an engineer there. Can the acting Minister give me the estimate of the cost of dredging so as to open the upper passage?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Did an engineer go, and if so, when?

Mr. GANONG. Some time within a year. He called on me on the way down and told me that he was going to make a survey.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The officials tell me that they cannot recall such a report; but I will have the matter inquired into.

Mr. GANONG. If the survey has not been made, it is essential that it should be made. There is a great deal of traffic on the river by the boats of three or four steamboat lines, and, except at high water, every vessel has to go around the lower end of St. Andrew's Island, a point at which the current runs strong, especially at flood tide.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) The hon. Minister gave some information with regard to the dredge "Prince Edward." If this is the proper time to do so, I would like to ask what has been done during the past year by this dredge, and also where she is likely to work for the coming season?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The dredge "Prince Edward" during the past year worked at Charlottetown at the ferry slip, and at the Steam Navigation Company's wharf. At Summerside she worked near Holman's wharf. She is now at Charlottetown and is likely to be there for some time.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Where will she be working during the coming season?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no arrangement for her work except at Charlottetown.

Mr. KAULBACH. Can the hon. Minister inform me if we are to have any portion of this amount named in the Estimates for dredging spent in Lunenburg Harbour and in the La Have River, near Bridgewater. I need hardly remind the hon. Minister of the necessity for dredging Lunenburg harbour and La Have River. We have more vessels passing in and out of these harbours than pass in and out of any other harbour in the province outside of Halifax. And Lunenburg is a port open the year round

and frequented every day. When the hon. Minister visited Lunenburg last year in company with the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), although they had only a small boat, still, at low tide, they could see the mud stirred up by the working of the screw, proving its shallowness. The necessity for this work is known to the Minister of Public Works, because I have represented it to him in letters I have written him. When I look at the amount of work done in Yarmouth Harbour every season—I might almost say they have a dredge there from one year's end to the other—I feel that when an appeal is made for work of the character I describe, we should not be told: Well, the dredge is wanted in another quarter, and your turn will come later. That has been told me by the Minister of Public Works until he saw the necessity for this dredging. And the Finance Minister may remember that when he was leaving the port after his visit last summer, he promised me openly in the presence of quite a gathering on the pier, that the work would be attended to this summer. I asked him particularly: "Will it be attended to this summer?" And he replied, "Yes, Kaulbach, that will be all right."

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Who promised that?

**Mr. KAULBACH.** The Minister of Public Works, and in the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Fielding's) hearing.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I do not recollect it; it may be so.

**Mr. KAULBACH.** The dredging at LaHave River is a work much needed also. A great deal of debris has fallen in the channel of the river, and prevents vessels reaching the town of Bridgewater. I think that a dredge would manage, in a very short time, to cut off the corners of the channel so as to make it straight, and thus enable vessels to get up with the greatest ease by the use of a tug. At present, it is impossible to reach the town, because the channel is too winding, for vessels of deep draught to reach within a mile or two of the town. I strongly urge that these two works be attended to, and, if possible, this summer. I think that Lunenburg is entitled to the largest portion of this expenditure.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Kaulbach) will be able to convince some of the gentlemen around him of the great need of these maritime sections, notably the south shore of Nova Scotia, in the way of breakwaters, harbours, dredging, and so on, which are the subject of criticism. His remarks are a fair illustration of the needs of that coast. The hon. gentleman has stated, not unfairly, the importance of the harbour of Lunenburg. He has also mentioned Bridgewater. If he wishes to be impartial I think he had

better include Mahone Bay, because we have urgent appeals from that place as well as from Bridgewater and Lunenburg. Each of them is an important place. Lunenburg, the shire town; Bridgewater, a thriving place, and the centre of a large trade; and Mahone Bay, also a thriving and important centre. The one that seemed to press most strongly upon us was Bridgewater, but we were not able to do the dredging there because we could not get dredges for the work. We have put in the supplementary Estimates for this year an appropriation for dredging at Bridgewater, which we hope to be able to do, and if it is not done, it will not be because of our unwillingness to spend the money, but because of our inability to obtain dredges to do the work. I appreciate the importance of the work which my hon. friend has referred to, and while Bridgewater may have the priority, I do not wish to say that other works are not equally deserving and that they may not at a later date have a claim upon us. But I do not anticipate that we will be able to do any dredging in Lunenburg this year. If we can do anything in the county in the way of dredging, we shall endeavour to do the work at Bridgewater, and later on we hope to deal with the other cases.

**Mr. KAULBACH.** I am happy to hear the Minister refer to Mahone Bay. I put in an application a year ago and several times previous to that, asking for a dredge for that port. That port has a large number of vessels as well, and I would be only too happy if Mahone Bay could be recognized and placed on an equal footing with Lunenburg. I observe an amount for dredging the LaHave River, but the difficulty with me is to know whether that is going to be expended this summer. It is certainly much needed. I hope it is not an appropriation in the Estimates that is intended for another purpose, which has often been the case. I will look hopefully forward to see that the dredging of the LaHave is done this summer, and that Lunenburg and Mahone Bay are not neglected and overlooked.

**Mr. ELLIS.** Could the Minister give us an idea as to what the Department of Public Works is likely to do with reference to obtaining dredges of an entirely different character, such as are absolutely necessary for the Atlantic coast? This is an old story with me, because under the late Government I always brought it under the notice of the then Minister of Public Works, Sir Hector Langevin, and he always promised to take it into consideration, assuring me he was all right upon the subject, but it was his wicked partners who stood in the way. The dredges on the Atlantic coast are not equal to the service demanded of them. The department needs there dredges of an entirely different character, of a modern type. Dredges are now made in England of the most modern style, having ten times the ca-

capacity of the dredges which we are using. I do not wish to depreciate in any way Canadian manufactures, but it cannot be denied that it is utterly impossible to make dredges in Canada of the English type which are now used for dredging great harbours.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the cost of those English dredges?

Mr. ELLIS. I suppose something like half a million dollars, probably would fit up a good dredge. In saying that, I am really guessing, but some of those dredges are capable of steaming across the Atlantic. They are used in the great harbours of Europe, on the Dutch coast, and on the United States coast, and are used at the mouth of the Mississippi. They are well known, no doubt, to the Department of Public Works. If you go into the business of dredging harbours, and if you want to do an extensive work that will accommodate ships of the modern type, you must have these dredges. If the Acting Minister of Public Works is not able to make any statement to-day, still I would like to have from him some assurance that he will fit out dredges to some extent at least on the best modern plan. If there is to be good work done on the St. Lawrence, at least one great suction dredge of the most approved modern type should be obtained. I would like the Minister to make at least some consoling statement about it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I am in a measure responsible myself for the failure of the Minister of Public Works to provide for these dredges in the present Estimates. The Minister of Public Works fully appreciates the importance of what my hon. friend has said, he realizes that our dredging plant needs to be largely improved. But these large dredges of modern character cost a great deal of money.

Mr. WILSON. About how much?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis) says half a million. I think that is probably too much.

Mr. ELLIS. No, I think about £100,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They have very expensive machinery. No doubt the member for St. John is better informed than I am. The Minister of Public Works was anxious to have inserted in the Estimates something for that purpose, and I have to plead guilty to striking out the items, because we were cutting and pruning in order to bring those Estimates within moderate bounds, and I did not feel at liberty to support the application of the Department of Public Works for the increased apparatus, which I admit is much needed, and which, at no distant day, the Department of Public Works will have to attend to.

Mr. ELLIS.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the Minister any idea of the capacity of those dredges?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am told one of those great dredges will raise from 10,000 to 12,000 yards per day, of soft material. I have no doubt it would be economical, and would be a real saving of money to get better dredging plant. But it costs a great deal of money, and we hesitate to impose so large a charge this year.

Mr. WILSON. Can you do it with your own dredges cheaper than by hiring?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Generally speaking, Government dredges can do work cheaper than any we can hire.

Mr. McALISTER. Can the Minister of Finance say if any dredging is to be done below Campbellton?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand the "St. Lawrence" is now at Pictou, and from that she will go to Traverse below Campbellton.

Mr. CLANCY. The Minister of Finance made a statement that rather startled me when he said that he opposed a provision for better dredges on the ground of economy. I was quite curious to know just how the hon. gentleman was going to end. There is a good deal of work that must be done by dredges for which we are voting money, and we find now there are to be no dredges to do the work. It is not difficult to conclude what the outcome will be. I was anxious to hear the hon. gentleman say that they were going to increase their dredging plant.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are increasing it somewhat, but we cannot think of buying these half million dollar dredges.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose you do not want dredges of that capacity for work in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The dredges to which my hon. friend from St. John referred to would only be suitable on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. CLARKE. I see an item of \$75,000 in the supplementary Estimates for dredging in Ontario and Quebec. I would like to know what progress has been made with the dredging in the eastern channel of Toronto harbour, and what the intention is respecting further dredging for which this appropriation is made in the supplementary Estimates?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Dredges have been at work for a couple of months in Toronto, and have made only moderate progress, but it is intended that they shall continue dredging there till the required depth is reached between the two piers.

Mr. CLARKE. Is that work being done by contract, and if so, who is the contractor?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it is being done by a dredge which is hired and paid for by the hour. It is hired from W. E. Phin at \$8 per hour.

Mr. CLARKE. I think I am correct in saying that the greater part of the dredging in connection with the eastern channel was done by contract, prior to two or three years ago, at so much per yard. Why was that method changed and Mr. Phin given the work, although he did not have a dredge at all?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I believe there was a contract for large works in Toronto in which dredging was an incident.

Mr. CLARKE. There was a vast amount of dredging done in connection with the contract, and the Auditor General's statement for 1896, or 1897, shows that the dredging work, under contract, cost a great deal less than the dredging that is being done now. What is the reason that no contract was entered into for this dredging? This gentleman does not go dredging at all, but he got \$8 an hour to do the work and then farmed it out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman any particular reason why this plan was adopted, but I am assured that the cost of the dredging under this arrangement is reasonable and fair.

Mr. CLARKE. I know it is not fair to ask the hon. Minister for this information at this stage, but when the supplementary Estimates, in which, I see, there is an item of \$75,000 for Toronto harbour, are up, I would ask him to give the information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As to the cost?

Mr. CLARKE. Under this method of doing the work as compared with doing it by contract.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can give the hon. gentleman the cost, but I am afraid I cannot give him the reason that entered into the hon. Minister's mind. I will give him all the information I can.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand that the dredge that was used on this work last year has a capacity of about 500 yards per day. I remember that the hon. Minister of Public Works stated that this dredging was done in connection with some cribwork and that it could not be let by tender. I think that Phin employed a dredge belonging to somebody else. He drew a prize by way of the Liberals coming into power. Mr. Cargill's dredge then ceased to be of much value and it became available to be hired to the Government at \$8 per day. Phin got it at a less sum and pocketed the difference. I am told that the capacity of the dredge is not more than 500 yards a day and that would become very expensive. Has any change been made in the arrangement, because I under-

stand that Phin was only doing the work last year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that the average capacity of these dredges is about 600 yards per day, instead of 500 yards. As to the price, I understand that where dredges have been hired, and that is frequently, in no case have they been obtained at less than \$8 an hour, and in some cases there were even higher rates paid.

Mr. CLARKE. I think I am correct in saying that a bid was put in to do the work at \$6 an hour, and the person who put in the bid found that the work had already been awarded at \$8 per hour, not only for 1897-98, but for 1898-99. I would be obliged to the hon. Minister if he would get the information as to what bids were put in, in response to public advertisement, and the prices at which the parties tendered. I am perfectly satisfied that the hon. Minister will find that a bid was put in to do the work at \$2 per hour less, and if I am correctly advised, I should like to know why the public should be asked to pay \$20 extra per day to Mr. Phin to do this work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say an offer was sent in to the department to do the work at \$6 per hour?

Mr. CLARKE. I am so advised.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The officials say that they have no knowledge of any such offer.

Mr. CLARKE. It is hardly fair to ask the hon. Minister for this information at this time, but if the Minister will look himself fully into the facts, I think he will find that what I have said is correct. When this item of \$75,000 comes up to be discussed, I hope he will be able to give me the information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the department has the information I will obtain it.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell me the name of the dredge that did the work in the Sydenham River last year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The dredge employed was named the "Ontario."

Mr. CLARKE. Is dredging work going on in the harbour of Owen Sound at present?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Is the work being done by contract or by the hour?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is being done by an arrangement at so much per hour, the same as in the other case, by the Owen Sound Dredging Company.

Roads and bridges..... \$82,500

Mr. DAVIN. There is an item here of \$13,000 for the Edmonton, N.W.T., bridge

across the Saskatchewan. That item will have to be discussed, and as I do not think it would be proper to discuss it when the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) is not here, I will ask that it be reserved.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman wishes it to be reserved I will not object, but I suggest that, as by reserving this item you would reserve the whole vote, he allow the item to go through on the understanding that on the supplementary Estimates he shall have the fullest opportunity, and I promise that he shall.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman may carry the other items and reserve this one.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All right, I am quite willing.

Ottawa City—

Bridges over the River Ottawa, the slides and the Rideau Canal and approaches thereto—Ordinary repairs.. \$7,000

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I thought there was some arrangement entered into with the city of Ottawa whereby we were to give \$60,000, and that was to cover most everything.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No arrangement has yet been entered into with the city of Ottawa on this subject, but the Government has made a proposal, which is now in the form of a notice before the House, and it will come up in due course. It will not, however, affect this item, which is under an arrangement made some years ago by the late Government.

Ottawa—Maria Street Bridge over the Rideau Canal—

Reconstruction ..... \$40,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is practically a similar case to the last. There was an arrangement made some years ago whereby the Government agreed to maintain certain bridges, chiefly over slides and booms, and canals, and Dominion works. We do not propose to alter that arrangement in the new plan, if it should be adopted by the House. The Maria Street bridge is rather an important work, which has been delayed, owing to negotiations which have been in progress between the Department of Public Works and Mr. Booth, representing the interests of the Canada Atlantic Railway. The bridge crosses his tracks, and it was deemed expedient that his railway interests should contribute a share of the costs. It has been the subject of negotiation, causing some delay, but an arrangement has now been come to, and the plans are about complete, and at a very early date tenders will be invited.

Mr. CLARKE. And this \$60,000 will be given, in addition to the Government maintaining these bridges?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. Of course, the bridges over canals in any part

Mr. DAVIN.

of the Dominion have to be maintained by the Government.

Mr. SPROULE. What percentage is it understood Mr. Booth should contribute in regard to this bridge.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The understanding is, that it is about half and half.

Mr. CLANCY. Are these bridges maintained altogether by the Government, or does the city contribute anything?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think the city contributes, nor do I think municipalities anywhere contribute to the maintenance of bridges over the canals.

Mr. CLANCY. In view of the proposal to give the city of Ottawa \$60,000 a year, I ask, for information, if the city contributes anything towards these bridges?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My understanding is, that the city does not contribute to the maintenance of these bridges across the canal.

Ottawa—Sappers' Bridge—

Extraordinary repairs..... \$1,000

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the Minister to say that the Government maintains both the Sappers' and the Dufferin bridges.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The general rule is, that the Government has to construct and maintain the bridges over all the canals, but in certain cases a bridge is more extensive than would be necessary as a highway over the canal, and, as it affords increased traffic, there may be some contribution from the municipality. Perhaps the Sappers' bridge is one of these.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood there was some arrangement formerly entered into by which the city paid for the maintenance of at least one of these bridges. In view of the proposal to give the city of Ottawa \$60,000, it would be well to know that, so that we may see what the total benefit of the expenditure by Government is to the city.

Mr. TAYLOR. My impression is, that the city was to maintain Sparks Street bridge, and the Government to maintain Wellington Street bridge.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that the arrangement made in the time of Sir Hector Langevin was, that both these bridges should be maintained by the Dominion Government.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the Government pay for the pavement also?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The scoria blocks at either end of the Sappers' bridge were laid down under an arrangement between the city and the Government.

Mr. CLANCY. What are these extraordinary repairs ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The bridge has been widened, and this is to complete the sidewalks on both sides of it.

Telegraph line—North shore, St. Lawrence—  
Extension from Point aux Esquimaux  
eastward to Belleisle Island—To complete ..... \$70,000

Mr. CLARKE. Is this work being done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Tenders are about being invited.

Mr. CLARKE. Is \$70,000 the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the estimated total cost.

Miscellaneous—

Surveys and inspections.....,..... \$25,000

Mr. CLANCY. What is the nature of this ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the usual general vote. It is estimated as follows :—Surveys, maritime provinces, \$6,000 ; Quebec, \$10,000 ; Ontario, \$4,500 ; Manitoba, \$1,000 ; North-west Territories, \$1,000 ; British Columbia, \$2,500 ; total, \$25,000 ; expended last year, \$24,959.

Mr. CLANCY. Where are these hydrographic surveys being done—on the lakes ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. These are the surveys of engineers of the department who were sent to examine the various works which were undertaken or projected.

National Art Gallery, Ottawa..... \$2,000

Mr. CLARKE. The other day I received a letter from the president of the Canadian Institute, Mr. B. E. Walker, a gentleman, I believe, well known to the Minister of Finance. He writes to me as follows :—

It is hoped that in the supplementary Estimates a reasonable sum would be placed to begin the erection of a national museum at Ottawa. Personally, I believe the Government only need to feel that the country demands a proper building in which to exploit the resources of this country to do their duty by the Geological Survey. I venture to write to you, hoping that when the item comes up in the Estimates you will say a few vigorous words in favour of it.

I do not know whether this is the place to say the words or not. I would like to ask the Minister for some information about it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have in contemplation—and some of us entertained the hope that it might be done this year—the erection of a building in Ottawa for the purposes of a geological museum and other purposes of a like character. A work of that kind ought not to be undertaken unless we can have a handsome structure which would reflect credit on the Dominion, and although the Government are cordially in sympathy with it, it would call for such a very large expenditure of money

that I frankly say I did not myself feel like recommending it. The present Geological Survey building is in a very unsatisfactory state, and there is a pressing need for a new and suitable building ; but in view of the many demands on the Treasury this year and in view of the other things we are doing in the way of constructing public buildings and making grants to Ottawa, we are obliged to let this matter stand. Although it does not form a definite part of the plan, I entertain the hope that when that building is erected we shall have a nucleus of an art gallery that will not be unworthy of the country. The suggestion of Mr. Walker is a worthy one, and I hope it may be realized.

Mr. CLARKE. But there is no hope for action this year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it is not in the Estimates of the present year.

Statue of Her Majesty the Queen in  
celebration of the Diamond Jubilee .. \$12,500

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contract for this was awarded to L. P. Hébert, sculptor, Montreal, the sculptor of the statues of Sir George Cartier and Sir John Macdonald now on the grounds.

Mr. CLARKE. Where is this to be erected ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The particular point of the location has not yet been determined.

Mr. SPROULE. What class of work is this to be ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A bronze statue on a granite pedestal.

Mr. SPROULE. How much is it to cost ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The amount of the contract is \$18,500. The total cost, with all incidentals, is \$19,000.

Monument of the Hon. Alexander Mac-  
kenzie ..... \$8,000

Mr. SPROULE. Is the contract for this let ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. The contract has been given to two gentlemen—Mr. Hébert and Mr. Hamilton McCarthy. The exact location of the monument has not yet been determined, but it will be somewhere on the grounds in connection with this building.

Mr. SPROULE. What sort of work will it be ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will be of the same character as the other. The total estimated cost is \$14,500.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask the Minister if anything has been done with regard to procuring oil paintings of the late

Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and Sir John Thompson. There are paintings of these gentlemen now in the reading room of the House, and I had an intimation that they are to be removed. Is it the intention of the Government to procure other paintings or to allow these to remain.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I am not quite sure that the remark I am about to make will apply to both of these works; but I understood that these were the work of an artist who desired to place them there on exhibition, and that they were never acquired by the Government. That is the information I have received. The Government have formed no determination with regard to them.

Mr. **CLARKE**. They are allowed to remain in the meantime?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I have no information on that point. The question has not been raised.

Mr. **CLANCY**. I am told that these are meritorious works of art, and that some negotiations have taken place between the parties who placed them there and the Government, and that there was some dispute about the price. Will the hon. gentleman say whether the Government have considered the question of purchasing these paintings?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I have not heard of any negotiations on the subject. It is quite possible that the Minister of Public Works may have discussed the subject with some persons interested.

Mr. **CLARKE**. There have been no instructions given to any other artists to make paintings of those gentlemen?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I think not. I have not heard anything of the sort.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned 12.05 a.m. (Saturday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 22nd July, 1899.

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER** took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### ROADS AND ROAD ALLOWANCES IN MANITOBA.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill  
Mr. **CLARKE**.

(No. 175) respecting roads and road allowances in the province of Manitoba.

He said: Perhaps I had better explain what this Bill is. In the province of Manitoba some difficulty has been experienced with regard to the plans of towns and cities; the boundary lines of the different plans having been subject to dispute. Some years ago they provided a certain method whereby new plans might be prepared under the direction of the municipal councils, and providing also that any one not satisfied with the boundary lines as set out in these plans should have an opportunity of contesting them. That method has proven very satisfactory. In the case of the city of Winnipeg, however, the plans which have been prepared under the direction of the city council and approved by the local government are not absolutely effective, because the property in some of the streets of the city has never been transferred to the province, and therefore the legislation of the province is not sufficient to confirm the operation of the plans so far as regards those streets respecting which the title has never passed from the Crown as represented by the Dominion. In 1895 or 1896, an Act was passed for the purpose of confirming certain portions of this municipal plan. One portion of the plan respecting which there was a dispute comprised a street called Water Street, which has been the subject of litigation for some years, and that portion of the plan was exempted from the Act I have referred to. Neither the city council nor the local government felt disposed to take any action in view of the fact that litigation was pending. The litigation, however, has now been settled, and the city of Winnipeg and all the parties to the dispute have advised my department through their solicitors, that they are desirous that the plans should now be confirmed. This Act is simply for the purpose of confirming that plan.

Mr. **DAVIN**. There are no suits now pending that would be affected by this litigation.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. Certainly not.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

### THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION— THE ALASKAN BOUNDARY.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to make a few remarks to the House on what I consider to be a very grave and important question, and a question which I am sure is regarded as such by the First Minister, by the Government, and by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. I refer to the Alaskan boundary question and the position in which Canada stands in relation to that matter at the present time. Af-

ter giving the subject the most careful consideration that I could, I have arrived at the conclusion that it is my duty to bring it before the Parliament of Canada. The House will recollect that when the commission closed its labours at Washington a communiqué was given out by authority of the right hon. the leader of the Canadian Government, and the chairman of the American Commissioners. Although it is familiar to every member of this House, it will not, I think, be unwise for me to recall it to their attention. It is as follows :—

On behalf of their respective commissions, Senator Fairbanks, the chairman of the American body, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, acting chairman in the absence of Lord Herschell, of the Canadian body, made the following public statement respecting the action taken to-day : "The commission adjourned to meet at Quebec, August 2, unless the chairmen of the respective commissions shall agree upon another date.

"The Commission has made very substantial progress in the settlement and adjustment of many of the questions upon which it has been earnestly engaged. But it has been unable to agree upon the settlement of the Alaskan boundary. This problem has been a complicated and difficult one, but the commissioners, acting in the utmost friendliness and cordiality, have been unable to agree upon a satisfactory adjustment. The difficulties, apart from the immediate delimitation of this boundary, by the commission itself, arises from the conditions under which it might be referred to arbitration.

"The British commissioners desired that the whole question should be referred on terms similar to those provided in the reference of the Venezuelan boundary line, and which by providing an umpire would ensure certainty and finality.

"The United States commissioners, on the other hand, thought the local conditions in Alaska so different that some modification of the Venezuelan boundary reference should be introduced. They thought the reference should be made to six eminent jurists, three chosen by each of the high contracting parties without providing for an umpire, they believing that finality would be secured by a majority vote of the jurists so chosen. They did not see any present prospect of agreeing to a European umpire to be selected in the manner proposed by the British commissioners, while the British commissioners were unwilling to agree to the selection of an American umpire in the manner suggested by the United States commissioners. The United States commissioners further contended that special stipulations should be made in any reference to arbitration that the existing settlements on the tide waters of the coast should in any event continue to belong to the United States. To this contention the British commissioners refused to agree.

"It was therefore deemed advisable to adjourn to a convenient date, in order to enable the respective governments to further consider the subject with respect to which no conclusion yet has been reached."

I may say that I felt extremely indignant at the action taken and the position assumed by the United States on that occasion the moment I read what I regard as the most unreasonable attitude that it was possible

for any government to assume on a question of that kind. And, having occasion to address a large audience in the city of Toronto a short time afterwards, I used the following language in reference to what had been done :—

But I say this : They have forgotten what is due to Canada, they have forgotten what is due to the great empire of which we form a part, and I do not hesitate to say that under these circumstances I feel bound, as representing Her Majesty's loyal and constitutional Opposition in the Parliament of Canada, to enter my solemn protest in the face of the people of this country, and in the presence of the electors of this country, against such a proceeding as has now been taken. What does it mean ? It means that the United States of America have taken possession of a strip of coast on the Pacific Ocean bounding for a considerable distance the territory of Canada, and say that if an international tribunal of judicial experts, the highest international authorities the world can produce, were to declare they are in wrongful possession and that the territory belongs to us and not to them, they will not give it up. What does that mean ? It means that they intend to hold on to the means of subordinating the great Canadian Yukon gold country to the interests of the United States of America, despite treaties ; whether the treaty with Russia gives them the right or not, they intend to hold that line of communication as a means of compelling Canada to allow them to plunder the Canadian Yukon at their pleasure for the next ten or twenty years.

Now, Sir, I am in a position to withdraw a large portion of the censure which I uttered on that occasion, after having heard not very long ago the statement made by the right hon. First Minister that it was perfectly understood by the commission that they would not meet at all unless that difficulty were removed out of the way. That statement places the position of the Government of Canada in a much better light than it appeared to be at that time, and I feel it my duty to my right hon. friend and to the gentlemen engaged with him on that commission, to frankly say that I had not so understood the matter, or I would not have expressed myself with regard to the action of the Government of Canada in the strong way in which I did. I think, however, that the concluding portion of my remarks will find an echo in the mind of every gentleman in this House, to whatever party he may belong, and I believe it will also find an echo in the minds of all the intelligent people of Canada who have given any attention to this question and have at all understood it. I believe I am correctly informed when I say that it has been decided, that at present that convention shall not meet, and it shall not meet because the Government of Canada have found that all their efforts to obtain a satisfactory reference and settlement of the Alaskan boundary question have failed. I therefore desire to draw the attention of the House for a few moments to the position in which this question now stands. Those

who have read the American papers, and those who have read the London "Times," know that a great deal of misapprehension has existed with regard to this question, and that the steady and persistent efforts of the press of the United States of America to mislead the public mind on the question have been eminently successful in that country, and I regret to say too successful in Great Britain. The London "Times," very unfortunately in my judgment, permitted a correspondent holding a high and influential position—I think a Philadelphia correspondent of the press, who stated that he had been in close and intimate association with the American commissioners during the sittings at Quebec, and the subsequent sittings at Washington—to use the columns of that paper to put forth in most authentic form the statement that the position which the Government of Canada had assumed in regard to that question, was just the same as if France were to claim that the Channel Islands belonged to her—that, in fact, the grounds taken by the Government of Canada for opposing the proposals of the United States of America could only be paralleled by such an act as France undertaking to claim the Channel Islands as a part of her possessions because they were not remote from France itself. Now, I am especially induced to make a few observations on this matter to-day because I find the feeling of the United States declared by this correspondent, who had obtained access to the columns of the London "Times," to be most friendly towards Great Britain, but very far from feeling the same friendliness towards Canada. The whole aim and object of the press of the United States and the Government—for I am sorry to say that I am unable to confine this remark to the United States press—has been from the outset to lead the world to suppose that England was quite prepared to make such a settlement of this Alaskan boundary question as they desired, but that the difficulty was caused by Canada; and the press of the United States have even gone further, and have said that my right hon. friend was not unwilling to make a fair and just settlement with the United States, but that he was restrained by the fact, that Sir Charles Tupper and the Conservative Opposition in Canada were hanging on his flank and embarrassing him in dealing with the question. Now, I think my right hon. friend will acquit me to the fullest extent of having taken at any period since these negotiations were first undertaken, any course which I believed was not calculated to strengthen the hands of the Canadian Government in defending the undoubted rights of Canada. I might refer even to my perhaps somewhat aggressive speech on this subject, at the opening of this session; but it will be found, on examining that speech, that the charge

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

which I brought against the Government in relation to the negotiations was that they had conceded too much, and had shown too great a desire to do everything that was possible to meet the views, commercial and otherwise of the United States of America. My principal object, in rising to-day, is that at this critical moment in these most important negotiations, it should be understood that my right hon. friend does not represent the Government of Canada and the Liberal party of Canada, but that he represents Canada in regard to this question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And that on whatever side of the House we may sit, we are only too ready to do anything and everything in our power to strengthen the hands of my right hon. friend and the Government which he leads, in taking such a course as will preserve and secure the rights of Canada against what I consider the most unfair and unjustifiable course of the United States on this most important question. When my right hon. friend and his fellow commissioners representing Great Britain, both British and Canadian, made the proposal to the United States commissioners that they were prepared, in regard to the Alaskan boundary, to adopt a similar reference to that which was made in regard to the Venezuelan controversy, which is now being dealt with by an international commission in Paris, I think they went to the very verge, perhaps even beyond the verge of what they were justified in doing, in order to show the United States that Canada and the British commissioners were willing to adopt the policy which the United States had urged and which had been accepted by Lord Salisbury in a somewhat similar case. Now, Sir, what is this question? It is simply the question of a treaty made by Russia and Great Britain in 1825, in which a boundary line was described—not delimited, but in which the indications of where the delimitations should be made were laid down. A controversy has arisen between the United States and Great Britain, in which Canada supports the British contention to the utmost extent, that is, that the term "shore" used in that treaty, and which indicates that strip of territory from Mount St. Elias down to the Portland Channel, should be fixed and delimited at 10 leagues from the shore. I will not go minutely into the question as it is not necessary, but in general terms that is the indication of the treaty. The contention always has been, on the part of Great Britain and Canada, that the term "shore" meant along the headland.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). It may be just as well, in making an important

statement of this kind, to observe that that treaty indicates a maximum distance of ten leagues.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so, and I am much obliged to my hon. friend for the correction. It indicates a maximum distance of ten leagues, but it is to be from the shore and to the crest of certain lines of mountains. That is the position. The United States of America cannot own anything, nothing can belong to them, except that which the treaty of Russia gave them—they purchased the rights of Russia in all their completeness but those rights alone. In view of that fact, it can hardly be believed that any correspondent, any gentleman declaring that he was expressing the views and sentiments which he had acquired from intimate association with the American commissioners, should be permitted, in that great organ of public opinion in England, to say to the British public that the claim which Canada was setting up was so untenable and unjust that it could only be paralleled by the claim of France that the Channel Islands belong to her. How can the United States adopt such a contention in face of the fact that my Right Hon. friend Lord Herschell, representing Great Britain and British interests, conceded so much as to say: We will take your own case, the case in which you have set the terms on which a delimitation between the British possessions and the Venezuelan possessions shall be made, we will take your own plan, and we simply require that this question shall be referred to a body of international arbitrators, composed of experts, and if the experts of Great Britain and the United States cannot agree, it will be determined by the umpire, a high international authority, possessing all the knowledge of such subjects, one of the ablest men that can be found. What was the answer? They said: No, that which has been customary for all time throughout the world as the means of settling disputes as to the delimitation of boundaries under treaties, we will refuse to agree to. We will refuse even our own model for such a delimitation. We will refuse anything, except that there shall be three commissioners named on each side and no umpire, that is to say, that we shall be in a position to prevent any decision whatever. That is the position undoubtedly taken by the United States. Or, they say, you must allow us to name as umpire the representative of some country whose position is so subservient to the United States as to make it absolutely certain that we shall get everything in our favour. They even went further. They said: In case such an international tribunal is agreed to by us, on any terms, we require as a *sine qua non* that you will agree that if that international tribunal decides that Skagway and Dyea and the Lynn Canal belong to Canada, you must give them up

and we shall retain them. No more monstrous, and I do not hesitate to use a stronger word and say, more insulting proposition, in my judgment, could be made on the part of the United States. The position I take is this, that the Government of the United States know, that the commissioners representing the United States know enough of this subject to have satisfied themselves that a fair decision by an international tribunal of where that boundary is—and that is all that Canada has ever asked, or that England has ever asked—would be a decision on the principles that have always been applied in the settlement of such questions. I am satisfied that we can find no parallel in any country in the world for such a course as the United States have taken, namely, that in the delimitation of the boundary under a treaty, no regard shall be had to what that treaty means, but that if it be found to hold a meaning that would deprive them of the places that they have already taken possession of without right, and that belong to Canada, these places shall not belong to Canada but to the United States of America. There was no possible course left for the British Commissioners, under such circumstances, but to absolutely repudiate recognizing any such position or any such terms. I was glad to learn some short time ago, from my right hon. friend that the commission did not adjourn to meet on the 2nd August, except under the perfect understanding that these questions must be, by diplomatic means, removed to a just settlement that will be recognized by England and Canada, and I am glad to know I am able to include Canada. It is now shown that Great Britain has not been willing, notwithstanding all these efforts on the part of the United States, to overrule the just claims of Canada; and so far as I am able to learn, so far as my right hon. friend has been good enough to keep me, as a Privy Councillor, informed of the position of the Government, I have no hesitation in saying that I have assured my right hon. friend that the course his Government were pursuing had my entire support and that I believed they were taking the only course they could in justice to Canadian interests.

But I now come to a very important question, and that is the reluctance on the part of Her Majesty's Government to do that with the United States that they would do with any other country in the world. I speak from intimate knowledge, and from my personal acquaintance and official association with both the great governing parties in England—because there were many changes of Government while I held the position of High Commissioner, and I was necessarily thrown, in relation to these matters, into intimate association with both—when I say that from 1868, when I had occasion to deal with an important question relating to Canadian interests with Her Majesty's Government, down to the present hour, I

have been struck very forcibly with the unwillingness on the part of Her Majesty's Government to allow any circumstance whatever to even threaten a collision with the United States. There is every reason in the world why Great Britain should be most unwilling to have such a collision. While she would feel that perhaps the most terrible event that the civilized world could witness would be armed collision between Great Britain and the United States, apart from that the natural feeling, the feeling that they are of our own blood to a large extent, that feeling, accentuated by the closely interwoven commercial relations between Great Britain and the United States, has produced a strong impression upon the minds of the governing parties, and I do not refer to the present Government alone but to whatever party is in power in England. But I do not believe they understand the position of the United States as well in England as we do. There is no country in the world that relies more upon a determined attitude of a most inflexible character when its interests are at stake, but in my judgment there is no country in the world that will be less ready to court the national arbitrament of a struggle with any great power than the United States, provided their opponents are standing upon admitted just rights and claims, and I believe that where the diplomacy of England has failed, as in my judgment it has failed to some extent in this instance, is in not allowing the United States to understand that they must adopt the same course with them that they would with any other civilized country in the world, and that where they attempt to prevent undoubted British rights from being secured, there is a limit to human endurance, and there is a limit to the extent to which the British Government may go in surrendering or in leaving in abeyance rights that demand prompt settlement.

When the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain and Lord Sackville and myself were commissioned to negotiate certain questions with the United States of America, the Alaskan boundary was one of them, and we at once brought that subject before the then Secretary of State, the late Hon. Senator Bayard, who was the leader of the commission on the part of the United States. And he said: There is no difficulty about this question, but it is not ready for settlement. Russia made a treaty with Great Britain, and the United States has purchased the rights that Russia enjoyed under that treaty. But we have not the knowledge on either side that is absolutely necessary to a settlement. And he proposed that the United States and Canada, as representing Great Britain, should appoint gentlemen to get information, to study the treaty, to study the character of the coast lines, to get all the facts with reference to the course of mountains and everything else covered by the treaty. The

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

moment these facts were ascertained and the report made, he said, the question could be settled without difficulty. That is the reason that question went over. But, not long afterwards, this question came to be one of vital importance by reason of the discovery of gold in the Canadian Yukon. That was a sufficient reason why the United States Government, the British Government and the Canadian Government should have felt it absolutely necessary to bring that matter to as prompt a conclusion as possible, because questions arose of the greatest possible magnitude, not only as affecting these great gold discoveries in the Yukon, but also as affecting the immense volume of trade that was to spring into existence in connection with the mining industry. Now, my own opinion is this—and I give it to the House unhesitatingly, because I feel that the time has come when we must frankly recognize what the position is and, if possible, devise some means of retaining and maintaining Canada's just rights—that the Government of the United States and the commissioners representing the United States have discovered that a fair interpretation of the treaty by international experts, who would have no interest whatever in the subject, would be fatal to their claims; and they have lost confidence in their claim and in their power to retain that portion of the strip of territory of which they are now making such admirable use in the interest of their Government and their people. And, having lost confidence in their claims, they feel compelled to resort to the unworthy means of adopting an attitude that will prevent any settlement at all. No British or Canadian Government that had the slightest regard for its character or for the great interests committed to its charge should for a moment consent to the settlement of the question upon the only terms that the United States commissioners have declared they were prepared to settle it. In saying that, I think I am saying what every person will recognize as just and reasonable. But, knowing the immense solicitude of the Government of Great Britain to avoid any controversy or collision with the United States of America, the representatives of that Government are trading upon that sentiment and are simply taking a course that, on the very face of it, absolutely forbids any just settlement of the question, in order that there shall be no settlement at all. And why? Because they are in the possession of the only avenues to that great Canadian Yukon at the present time. I read with great astonishment what I regard as a most impudent insult to the common sense of the Canadian people in the "Globe" newspaper the other day. That newspaper declared that a great wrong had been done to Canadian trade and Canadian interests by the rejection of the Yukon measure. Why, Sir, they ought to know that the Yukon measure has not a friend in the world to-day.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, Sir; has not a friend in the world to-day among men who will look at the subject dispassionately and in the light of the facts. It was no sooner introduced than we saw—what? We saw a Bill introduced into the Congress of the United States that would exact duties on the Canadian products passing Wrangel. Every person knows that the United States are in the same position at Wrangel as they are at other ports, owing to the interpretation they have given to the treaty—an interpretation that, I believe, is not justified by its terms. Instead of having the free navigation of the Stikine as the United States of America as well as Russia had agreed that Great Britain had, they have actually established a customs-house, and allow nothing to enter the mouth of that river because, for a certain distance, the waters run through what may possibly be decided to be United States territory. I am not now speaking of the difficulties that have since been learned as existing in this Stikine River route. The Government's own engineers sent to report upon it, have condemned the route as utterly impracticable. But I will not go into that, because it is aside from the question in hand. I only allude to the utterances of the "Globe" newspaper because in its attempt to throw odium upon the Senate of Canada for having rejected the Yukon Bill, they are placing too much confidence in the want of intelligence on the part of their readers. I merely wish to dispose of that point in passing. Under these circumstances we have no avenue into the gold country except what is claimed and held by the United States of America. Well, Sir, what is the position? The position is what I say—that all the United States of America had to do is to resist any settlement of the question, to resist, as they have been resisting, every proposal made by my right hon. friend for an international boundary that in the meantime would relieve the difficulty, to take an attitude of utter hostility to any delimitation by competent and independent international experts—all that they have to do is simply to do what they are doing, to turn the trade, and not only the trade but the gold of the Yukon to the benefit of the people of the United States. And, while they retain that uncompromising attitude, that indefensible attitude that they are maintaining to-day, they benefit by the existing position. I think the Minister of the Interior said that 90 per cent of the miners in the Canadian Yukon were Americans. That, I hope, is very much over-estimated. But, suppose that 60 per cent of them are American citizens, where are we then? We are in the position of having the most magnificent gold territory that has in late years been discovered exploited by a majority of the citizens of the United States, to the exclusion of Canadians and other British subjects. And even

that is not the worst, as matters stand, you have all the avenues of trade into that country so hampered as to give to the cities of the American coast, a practical monopoly, a monopoly to a very large extent, of the trade of the Yukon territory.

Now, Sir, I want to make a suggestion to my right hon. friend. After thinking this matter over and considering its gravity, I have come to the conclusion that we must take some vigorous means by which Canada can place herself in a position to defend Canadian interests against this laissez faire policy which is, I am sorry to see, permitted by Great Britain to be pursued by the United States. But let me make another remark here. If England had treated France as she is treating the United States of America to-day, the Nile would not now be in our possession, French interests would have been maintained on an important portion of the Nile, and the great efforts made by Great Britain in reference to that conflict in the Soudan would have been lost to England. Had England been dealing with France in this matter, it would have been settled long ago. Great Britain would have said: You must agree to do that which every civilized country is bound to do, you must agree to an honourable, fair and rational settlement, a settlement for which many precedents have been adopted as a mode by which it could be arrived at, otherwise we shall ignore the attitude you have taken in regard to this narrow strip of coast so important to Canada at the present moment. The policy my right hon. friend has pursued up to the present is one to which I have given my hearty endorsement. The Government have only done what it was their absolute duty to do in the interests of Canada, in maintaining inflexibly, and against the pressure of England, I am afraid, the attitude it has assumed against the contentions of the United States. I say that in dealing with Canadian interests in that way my right hon. friend and the Government have adopted an attitude that will meet with the sanction and approval of the Canadian people. But it will not do simply to allow matters to rest as they are. We are in the position of standing with our hands hanging helplessly at our side, looking on while the enormous gold regions of Canada in that great Yukon territory are stripped by a foreign people at the same time that they are enjoying the rights conceded to them with unexampled liberality by Canada, a liberality that they have not the slightest conception of emulating. We are standing and looking helplessly on while the gold is being taken out of that country by a foreign people, and while the trade of that country that belongs to Canada is monopolized by a foreign people.

Now, let me recall to my right hon. friend a very curious incident. I had the honour, on the floor of this House, of propounding the policy of adopting the laws of the United

States in regard to Canada as concerns mining, and of proposing that unless they changed their law in regard to mining we should, in justice to our own people, adopt their laws. Well, within a month a Bill was introduced into the American Congress which everybody in this country regarded as a complete concession, providing that British subjects and Canadians should have the same rights on the American side in Alaska as the people of the United States have. That was very satisfactory. Was it done? No, Sir. The law of the United States enables a high official of the Government to make regulations under which the mining laws shall be carried out, and they fall back upon the miserable, untenable expedient that they had not power, that while their law conceded to British subjects all the rights the Canadian law gave to Americans in Canada, they were precluded from doing anything because their system was a mode of granting mining rights in the land in fee simple, while ours was a license. Well, Sir, with the authority that Congress had given to the official who had charge of that department, it would have been a question of half an hour to pass regulations that would have given us all the rights that the law professed to give which had been passed by the Congress of the United States. But those regulations have never been made, they have gone on shutting out as by a Chinese wall every Canadian, every British subject from holding a mining license, or from doing anything in that country, while at the same time they are sending their people by tens of thousands into the Canadian Yukon to strip the country of its gold, and they declare that no settlement shall be arrived at as long as there is an ounce of gold left in that country. That, in my judgment, is a position of things that requires that we should look at this matter, not from a party stand-point, not from a view of weakening the hands of the Government, but with a view of adopting a policy that will show to the Government of the United States that it is not Sir Charles Tupper and the Opposition who are hanging on the flanks of the First Minister, who would otherwise be disposed to do them justice; but that there is only one opinion in this country as to the utterly indefensible attitude the United States have assumed in regard to this question. We should show them that there is a determination in this Parliament to take such action as will entirely counteract these efforts that are being made to take an unfair advantage of the fact that there has been no delimitation of this boundary, nor will the United States permit one to be made. Therefore, I would propose to my hon. friend that before this House rises we should adopt such measures as will convince this whole country, as will convince the great republic to the south of us, as will convince England as well, that Canada is determined to use all

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

the powers that she may possess under the constitution in order to protect the indefeasible and unquestionable rights of Canada. I would, therefore, suggest that my hon. friend should introduce two Bills for the purpose of meeting this case, and let those Bills be passed by the unanimous vote of this Parliament. Let one Bill authorize the Government to provide for the construction of a railway from Kitimat Arm to Dawson, and let that Bill provide that it shall only go into effect on a proclamation by the Governor in Council, the moment our Government finds that this unreasonable determination on the part of our great neighbours is persisted in. I have no doubt such a measure would commend itself to the judgment of my hon. friend. It is known that the country from Kitimat Arm in British Columbia running up to Telegraph Creek, is a very good country. Two charters, I believe, have already been given by the Government of British Columbia for building a railway, and I think a subsidy of some \$4,000 per mile has been granted by British Columbia to construct a road from Kitimat Arm to Teslin Lake, provided it is found that there are no insuperable engineering difficulties. The very fact that there is water communication from Teslin Lake shows that there is a valley where it would be comparatively easy to run a line of railway down to Dawson.

It would only be a light railway that would be required to be constructed, any description of railway, however light, that would give us access, from a Canadian port in British Columbia, about which there can be no question, to Dawson. I am quite certain that if the right hon. gentleman were to call, as he could tentatively, for tenders, for the construction of such a work, with the present position existing, it would involve no very heavy cost. I would have the work constructed and owned by the parties who constructed it, and I would have the rates over the line controlled by the Governor in Council. I would put a clause in the Bill providing that this Act should only be brought into operation by proclamation of the Governor in Council. I am quite satisfied that the right hon. gentleman will find, as he will find, at an early day, if this proposed legislation does not effect a change of attitude, as I hope it may, that public opinion will thoroughly justify him in this course in so far as it would give ingress and egress to and from the great Canadian gold country to all British subjects, and in fact, to every person who desires to use it. I would add to that another Bill, and, in the same way, a Bill passed by the unanimous vote of this House, providing that, while existing rights must be respected, because neither England nor Canada would ever consent to anything like an act of repudiation or confiscation, for the protection of Canadian and British rights, from the time the proclamation of

the Governor in Council brought it into operation no license to mine in the Yukon, no permission to obtain any facilities in that country should be granted to any but British subjects. I do not propose to detain the House further than to offer these suggestions to the right hon. Prime Minister with the view of bringing the entire support of the country to the aid of the Government at what I regard as a most important crisis. In making these suggestions to the right hon. Prime Minister, I venture to hope that they will, at all events, be accepted in the spirit in which they are offered. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, there are many things, in the observations which my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) has offered to the House this morning, with which I am disposed to agree, but there are some things to which I will have to take some exception. In the first place, I am glad to say to my hon. friend that, barring the speech he made in Toronto, and the remarks he made on the floor of this House in the debate on the Address, I think he is entitled to the credit of having offered no opposition at all, but rather of having done his best to facilitate the negotiations at Washington for the settlement of the question in dispute between Canada and the United States. My hon. friend acknowledges to-day that the remarks he made in Toronto were altogether uncalled for by the events as he now knows them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. So far as they referred to acts of the Government.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this admission from my hon. friend, and it shows what we have, from long experience, known, that while negotiations are under discussion, it is impossible to arrive at any correct judgment in reference to them until the tenor of the negotiations has been laid before us. The tenor of the negotiations that have taken place at Washington has been placed before the House, and my hon. friend, being now correctly informed, comes frankly to the conclusion that he was not justified in making the remarks he did make at Toronto concerning our course. In regard to what is stated as to the attitude of the United States, the hon. gentleman feels himself more at liberty than I do to speak.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I quite admit that.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have only to say this, however, that the attitude which we have taken has the approbation of the people of Canada generally, and it is an attitude which we must and will maintain to the end. At the present time, whilst I would be disposed to feel strongly, still, on the other hand, it behooves me, in

the position which I occupy as the leader of the Government and as a member of the commission, to be very reticent upon the policy and conduct of the negotiations, and especially upon my appreciation of the attitude taken by the United States upon the Alaskan boundary question. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the case of Canada seems to be impregnable in this, that it rests upon what appeals to the sense of fairness and the sense of justice of every man who will approach this subject with a fair mind. The terms of the Treaty of 1825, upon which the three questions rests, and upon which has to be determined the ownership of the strip of territory in dispute, are, unfortunately, not so clear as to admit of a ready interpretation. In fact, they are of such a character that lawyers will differ very much upon what they really mean and as to what extent of territory is to be given to one nation and what is to be given to another. Under such circumstances there are only three methods of settling the difficulty on fair and honourable terms; one is by a compromise, by giving and taking, Canada surrendering a little of her pretensions and the United States surrendering a little of her pretensions, but I have no hope, up to this moment, or very little hope, that we can settle the question by any compromise at all. If we have no hope that we can settle the dispute by compromise, there are only two other ways in which we can settle it. One would be by arbitration, and the other would be by war. I am sure that no one would think of war, and everybody would agree that though sometimes our patience would be sorely tried, though sometimes we might believe that our opponents were taking undue liberties with us, and undue advantage over us, still, everybody will agree that we must exhaust all peaceful means of reaching a settlement by arbitration. In the negotiations at Washington, we have not been able to come to terms of arbitration. Both parties are agreed that there should be arbitration, but who should be the arbitrators, and what would be the questions submitted for reference, are questions upon which we could not come to an understanding. The matter has been referred by the commissioners to their respective Governments, and as we have seen from the reports in the press from day to day, the matter has been engaging the attention of Lord Salisbury and the Foreign Office, and of Mr. Choate, the American ambassador at London. I am sorry to say that, at this moment, in the last days of the month of July, the question is not, perhaps, any more advanced towards settlement than it was in February. The high parties to the controversy have not been able yet to come to the point of agreement, but if we have not yet reached the point of agreement, we must still have patience for a little while, at least for a few months more, until, should such be the event, we have to come to the painful

conclusion that there are no more hopes to be entertained of arriving at a basis of arbitration. I do not give up hope. I am quite sure that, between two such nations as the United States and Great Britain, even if there were not the ties that exist between these countries, there must come some honourable determination of the question. But, until we have reached that point, I must invite the House, and it is a matter that will not be difficult for any of us, to defer a little and to wait a little longer until we have to come to the conclusion which I have not come to, that we cannot hope for anything from arbitration. I will not believe, because it would be too painful to believe for a moment, that we cannot settle this question. In the meantime, what are we to do? My hon. friend commends a policy to the Government. He made a proposal, first, that we should adopt means to build a railway immediately—the second point I shall discuss later.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** That you should take power to build a railway.

The **PRIME MINISTER.** Yes, to take the power to build a railway. In a debate of this kind, it is not my wish to raise any controversial point, because on the whole I appreciate the fairness of some of the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), although I am sorry to say that I cannot altogether agree with him in his conclusion. The hon. gentleman, in the course of his address, stated that no one believes now in the Yukon Railway measure which we proposed last session. I have only to say this: It is my deliberate conviction at this moment, and after the further knowledge which I have obtained of all the facts, that if ever a crime was committed against the interests of Canada, it was committed by the rejection of the Yukon Railway Bill by the Senate of Canada. There are only two means of access to the Yukon. One by the Lynn Canal, and the other by one of the lower ports which we have in our own territory. If we had the Lynn Canal under our control, we would have a shorter way of access to the Yukon, but unfortunately at the present time it is in the possession of our rivals in business and our opponents in this controversy; it is in the hands of the Americans. Of course, if we had the water stretch of the Lynn Canal, we would have the best means of all to enter the Yukon, but we have not, and, having it not, we thought the best thing we could do was to make use at once of the Stikine River, which is not ours, but which under the terms of the treaty we have a right of access to for commercial purposes. We thought to use that at first as the basis of operation to put a railway into the Yukon country, and then afterwards extending it to this very Kitimat

**Sir WILFRID LAURIER.**

Harbour, which my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) now proposes as the terminal. Sir, let me ask my hon. friend, can he now denounce our Yukon Railway Bill? If there ever was a justification for the policy which we proposed last year, we have it now from the mouth of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), who proposes that we should take power to do what he prevented us from doing last year. If we had been able last year to pass our Bill, which provided for the immediate construction of a railway from the Stikine River to the waters of the Yukon, we would have constructed that line, and this year we would have been able to prolong it down to Kitimat Harbour. By this time, or at all events at the end of this season, we would have had a line of railway of our own extending all the way from Kitimat Harbour to the water system of the Yukon. It would be a longer route, I admit, than a railway which would connect the Lynn Canal with the waters of the Yukon, but one thing is certain, and that is, that the railway built last year from Skagway to the waters of the Yukon would not have been built. This proposition of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) I hail with pleasure, in the light that it is the best vindication we ever had of our policy in that respect. There are other reasons why we should have built a railway along that route, for there is every reason to expect that in that territory we would have found valuable mineral deposits, similar to those we have in the Yukon, and it is reasonable to suppose that at no distant date we would have a populous territory extending all the way from Kitimat Harbour to the Yukon. Sir, I will not say at present what we shall do with regard to this matter; but I may say at once that we shall take the proposition of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) into very serious consideration.

As to the other matter which my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) has brought to our attention, namely, that we should take power to exclude American miners from the Yukon, that is a proposition which must be very seriously considered before we agree to it. It is only last winter that the British Columbia legislature passed a Bill excluding American miners from the Atlin district in British Columbia. The legislature of British Columbia was within its rights when it excluded American miners from working the mines of British Columbia in the Atlin district—

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Will my hon. friend allow me to say that under that Bill they confiscated existing rights, and that is the great charge against them?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** I admit there may be something in that, but since that time I have seen the proposition urged, that such legislation was of doubtful benefit to

the province of British Columbia. I know there are two sides to that controversy. There are those in British Columbia who hold that the legislation was right, but there are also those who hold, as the hon. gentleman knows, that British Columbia will lose more than she will gain by that law. There are those who think that the people of British Columbia would have been far more benefited by the trade of the American miners, if they had been allowed to mine in the Atlin district, than they otherwise would. In the face of the controversy which is now going on in British Columbia, would it be wise that we should do the same thing as they have done? That is a question we have seriously to consider before we agree to it. It is less than a week ago since the hon. gentleman from Victoria (Mr. Prior) asked whether the Government were prepared to disallow that measure of the British Columbia legislature, and the meaning of that interpellation undoubtedly is, that the public opinion of British Columbia is coming to the conclusion that it would perhaps be better to allow the American miners to invest in the Atlin district, to bring trade and commerce there, which would inure to the benefit of the merchants of Victoria, Vancouver, and the other cities of the Pacific province. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) himself told us last year, when we were discussing the Yukon Bill, that every dollar's worth of gold extracted from the ground cost \$1 in labour to get it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is desirable to be exact. I did not say, in the Yukon particularly; I said, in the world.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then, if that be the general condition of things in the world, it appears to me that every dollar's worth of gold that comes from the Yukon costs \$2 to those who procure it. Now, if every miner who comes to the Yukon and takes out one dollar's worth of gold, spends a dollar to get that gold, I do not know that we would have any benefit from excluding American miners.

But there is another view. At this moment I express no opinion at all on the suggestion made by my hon. friend in that respect, but I desire to point out to him some of the difficulties I see in the way. Let him remember that at the present time we have no railway into the Yukon, and let him further remember that for the six months of winter the Yukon is absolutely shut out from communication from the civilized world, except via Skagway harbour and the railway over the pass from Skagway to Lake Bennett. Under such circumstances, would my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) advise us to proclaim non-intercourse with the Americans by excluding them from our Yukon mines, and possibly inviting retaliation at Skagway, by which they would re-

fuse our goods access by that route, and thus leaving the Yukon practically without any communication in the winter months? If my hon. friend would advise us to take such a step, it is a very serious matter indeed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The right hon. gentleman must not forget that I proposed that the law should only be brought into operation by the proclamation of the Governor General in Council, so that the right hon. gentleman would have the power in his own hands to select the time at which that law would come into operation.

The PRIME MINISTER. That may be. But is it wise at this moment, when we have not given up all hope of negotiation, when we do not want to make our relations any more difficult than they are at the present time—is it wise to invite the Parliament of Canada to give the Government power to proclaim a measure of non-intercourse of that kind, and to announce to the world that at a certain time we are prepared to exclude Americans from our territory?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is desirable to be exact in this matter. I have not proposed non-intercourse in any shape or form. I have simply proposed that our mining laws should correspond to those of the great republic to the south. That is all.

The PRIME MINISTER. For my part I would be disposed to agree with my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) in many ways, but, as I stated a moment ago to my hon. friend, on this very question he can speak with greater freedom than I can myself. Occupying the position I do, I must point out to him the great difficulty I see in the way of the proposition he makes. My hon. friend does not propose non-intercourse in so many words; but what other construction can be put upon his language? Instead of proclaiming non-intercourse, I would rather appeal to the Americans once more, and today we are having negotiations with Washington, which are far advanced, with the view of having reciprocity in mining laws, and if those negotiations are successful, of which I do not by any means despair, whatever privileges in the way of mining are given to the citizens of one country shall be extended to the citizens of the other. That is not the proposition submitted by my hon. friend. His proposition is rather that we should at once take power by legislation of this Parliament, at any time if we so choose, to exclude American miners from the privileges they now have in the Yukon territory. In an economic point of view there are many difficulties in the way of that proposal; but in a political point of view there are greater difficulties, which my hon. friend himself cannot be oblivious to. Under the

circumstances, I have only to say, in regard to the last proposition of my hon. friend, that it is of such serious consequence that before the Government could determine to give it their assent, they would have to weigh it carefully and at great length. As I have said, I appreciate very fully the spirit in which my hon. friend has offered his remarks. In whatever he said in regard to our negotiations I fully concur. I maintain the position that he has expressed to-day, that we cannot give up the rights of Canada; we have to maintain them as they are; but the rights of Canada are limited by the rights of the United States in this matter. There is a hazy point where the rights of the United States begin and the rights of Canada end; but as befits honourable men, as befits honourable and friendly nations, there is only one solution—to have the case referred to impartial, unbiassed, unprejudiced men, who will give to it the best judgment they are able to give.

Motion to adjourn the House, negatived.

#### THE QUEEN vs. SKELTON ET AL.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), in regard to the case of the Queen vs. Skelton, whether the report of the Minister of Justice recommending that Skelton and the others should be released from prison will be brought down?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I rather gathered from the conversation that took place across the House the other day that we had reached the conclusion that it would be better for the hon. gentleman to make a motion specifying the papers he desired. I do not mean that he should put the motion on the Order paper and wait till it comes up; but if he would put his request in the form of a motion, I have no doubt my right hon. friend would facilitate it being moved by consent. I told the hon. gentleman that I had a conversation with the Minister of Justice, who was kind enough to show me the file of papers, and it appeared to me quite plain that the hon. member would probably require more than the report, and I thought it would be better for him to move in that direction.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not understand it in that way; but I will give notice now that on Monday I will move for the papers I want in the case of the Queen vs. Skelton.

#### CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN THE NORTH-EAST TERRITORY.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved second reading of Bill Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

(No. 167)—from the Senate—to provide for the administration of criminal justice in the territory east of Manitoba and Keewatin and north of Ontario and Quebec. He said: This is a Bill introduced by the Minister of Justice in the Senate to provide for the jurisdiction and venue in criminal cases which arise east of the province of Manitoba and the district of Keewatin, and north of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. It is practically no man's land, it is almost an uninhabited territory, and the most convenient place to try any offence committed in it is the nearest court, whether that court be in the province of Quebec, or Ontario, or Manitoba. This is to declare that all offences committed in that territory may be tried before the properly constituted courts of any province.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

#### SUPPLY—COMMERCIAL TREATIES WITH THE BRITISH WEST IN- DIES, CUBA AND PORTO RICO.

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

Mr. KAULBACH. I desire to ask the right hon. the leader of the Government, or any one of the Government representing him, for the information of the mercantile marine and fishermen of the maritime provinces, more particularly Nova Scotia, largely engaged in shipping, what stage negotiations have reached in the proposed reciprocal trade between the United States and the British West Indies, the names of the islands it is proposed to include, the nature of the treaty, and its effect as respects the trade of Canada.

Considering the close relation we Canadians bear to the British West Indies as a sister colony, may I be permitted to ask what approaches have been made by the Canadian Government in the interest of Canada for trade relations between us and the British West Indies, also as to whether the right hon. leader has advised the Imperial Government to exact as one of the conditions in ratification of a treaty between the United States and the British West Indies, that Canada is not to be interfered with by any adverse tariff in these islands, beyond that that would affect the United States, that is, I mean that Canada and the United States should stand alike, and that a proviso be made that Porto Rico and Cuba, as respects trade with Canada, be also placed on an equal footing with the United States the same as at present, and that these two islands, Cuba and Porto Rico, do not, as respects Canadian shipping, come under the coastal regulations of the United States.

The trade of the British West Indies in which eastern Canada is greatly interested,

particularly Nova Scotia, is in my opinion in imminent danger of slipping away from Canada, and from British connection, unless precautions are used to prevent it.

In case anything of this sort should occur, the loss to Canada would be irreparable, as these islands serve very largely as a market for our fish, lumber, and other products.

Has the Government been on the alert? Has the Government weighed the perilous position into which we would be drifting, if not watched? Has the Imperial Government been advised, and has the Dominion Government made any effort to avert such a calamity as is threatened by this treaty?

In my opinion, and I hope I will be pardoned for saying so, the Government, I fear, from its apparent reticence, has not been properly taking in the situation, and has not apparently exercised that care and diligence, to guard, foster, and protect the trade between our maritime provinces and British West Indies, as was their duty, and which our joint trade so justly merits—so vital to our fishing industry on the Atlantic coast, particularly in Nova Scotia, and our other interests so synonymous to both countries.

I would like the right hon. leader to be impressed with what I have just stated, and to advise his associates in the Cabinet to give it their official care and thought, and indeed to make it their study, as the success in shipbuilding, which is our important industry in the county I have the honour to represent, which gives employment to hundreds of timbermen, lumbermen and mechanics, and to thousands of able fishermen, and through them indirectly to thousands of others, depends mainly upon the prudent and proper care and interest that is given it on the part of this Government.

This is a crucial point and very vital, as I have said, to the shipbuilding and fishing industry, as well as the general trade of the maritime provinces, particularly Nova Scotia. Lunenburg, as one of its counties, represents alone in round numbers in commercial value, about one-fourth of all the fisheries of Canada. This fact alone will prove how important, or at least will give a slight idea of the value of this trade to Nova Scotia. I may perhaps have exceeded the bounds of propriety in speaking at this length on a question, but I think the House will agree with me that the trade of the country and the importance of the subject is a sufficient apology.

I will be pleased if the right hon. leader will give the House some information on this important subject.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). We can all realize, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) suggests, the importance of our doing whatever is in our power to maintain and extend our trade with the

British West Indies, and, for the matter of that, with the West Indian Islands generally. However, it would be difficult for me to make any lengthy statement on behalf of the Government on the basis of my hon. friend's remarks. First, as to Porto Rico, I had the pleasure of announcing in the Budget speech what arrangements were made—and how long they are to continue, of course, I cannot say—whereby the trade of the lower provinces with the Island of Porto Rico would not be interfered with, that is, that the coasting laws would not be enforced against us. I think I am correct in stating that, as to Cuba, the coasting laws are not enforced. But that stands in a different position.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** And as to the Philippines—that is very important?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** My attention has not been directed to the Philippines; that has not been a subject of discussion. As to the general question with regard to trade with the British West Indies, as hon. gentlemen are aware, we had the pleasure of having a visit here in Ottawa from two deputations, the first from British Guiana and the second from the island of Jamaica. We have had some informal negotiations with these gentlemen, but they hardly went beyond the expression of a desire on either side for the extension of our trade relations. Our hope is that this will be followed by more formal and extended negotiations that may lead to something more substantial. One point to which my hon. friend drew attention was of great importance, and that was as to whether the arrangements that these colonies and islands in the West Indies are making with the United States might not be prejudicial to our interests. That subject received our attention at an early stage, and I am glad to be in a position to state that whatever arrangements are made with the United States by these colonies will not be allowed to interfere with the admission of our products to the markets of the West Indies, but that whatever concessions are granted to the United States will be granted, as a matter of course, to the products of Canada. To that extent I am able to give my hon. friend definite information which, I am sure, will be satisfactory. As to other points, we hope, as I say, that negotiations will result in something more definite. But I am not in a position to speak more definitely at present.

**Mr. KAULBACH.** Will the hon. gentleman kindly inform me what colonies are embraced in the treaty?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** So far as we have official information, British Guiana and Jamaica. I believe that treaties with other islands are contemplated. I see

by the newspapers that some arrangements are in progress respecting Bermuda. No doubt the islands generally are looking for trade relations with the United States. The movement attracted our attention early, and we made representations so as to make sure that the position of Canada should not be prejudiced so far as the arrangements already made are concerned.

**Mr. KAULBACH.** Are the Barbados Islands included?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** No, not up to the present time.

**Mr. DAVIN.** Do I understand that the hon. Minister made representations to the Imperial Government respecting the sugar trade in Jamaica?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The statement I made was that the outcome of our negotiations on the subject was that whatever advantages might be given in the markets of the West Indies to the products of the United States should be extended in like manner to the products of Canada. To that extent, I can speak with certainty, but beyond that, nothing definite has been done.

**Mr. DAVIN.** The reason I ask is this: The hon. Minister will remember that last year, in his Budget speech, he gave an Imperial reason for his own action looking to the amelioration of the conditions in Jamaica; and, if I may ask, I would like to know if he has made any suggestions to the Colonial Minister, on whose mind, as everybody knows, this question lays. Did my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) make any suggestion to the Colonial Minister?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** To what end?

**Mr. DAVIN.** To the end of improving the condition of the sugar-growers in Jamaica. The hon. gentleman will remember that last year he gave as a reason for the course taken by himself in this House, not merely that it might help the trade between Canada and Jamaica, but that it might be of Imperial advantage in helping Jamaica. Under the circumstances, his attention having been called to this aspect of the case, I should not be surprised if he had made representations to the Colonial Minister. For instance, his attention was called to the fact that apparently Mr. Chamberlain had been checkmated in the Imperial Cabinet in carrying out a policy which evidently he had contemplated at one time, of imposing countervailing duties so as to aid the Jamaica sugar-growers, and had fallen back upon the temporary and wholly unsatisfactory expedient of a grant; and a reason given in authoritative quarters in England why the hand of the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain was stayed was this—that to put on countervailing duties would have been to tax a great food commodity in England.

**Mr. FIELDING.**

The hon. gentleman knows that the amount of duty imposed on sugar which would have equalized matters as against the bonused sugars of the continent, some nineteen million dollars, was nearly the exact amount that is at present received from tea in England; and if when such duties were imposed on sugar the duty on tea to that amount were remitted, then there would be a complete answer to those who contended that the food of the people would be taxed. In fact it would be more advantageous to the people of England that tea should be admitted free and sugar taxed, because if tea were made much cheaper, then the drinking of tea under conditions which we know to be inimical to health and destructive to stamina, would fall into desuetude. What I want to ask the Minister is, having been led last year from an Imperial stand-point to take action in regard to this colony, whether he brought these views of the case before Mr. Chamberlain?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I am afraid that I have still failed to catch the precise point which my hon. friend thought the Government should have brought to the notice of Mr. Chamberlain. It is quite true that last year we proposed a change in our tariff, in the making of which I did suggest that it would be perhaps a means of helping the Imperial Government in the settlement of the difficult problem of how best to aid the West Indies, and when we granted a preference of 25 per cent, without any return—for which, by the way, we were called to severe account by one or two gentlemen—when we granted that preference to the West India sugar as compared with the beet sugars of the continent, we certainly to that extent were doing something for the encouragement of West India trade, and while the results have not been all we might desire, I am glad to know we have been somewhat helpful. But if my hon. friend means that it was the duty of this Government to advise Mr. Chamberlain as to the imposition of countervailing duties in Great Britain, I am afraid we could hardly undertake to tender advice on so grave a subject as that, nor could we proceed to discuss the matter with Mr. Chamberlain on the basis which the hon. gentleman does, that is to say, that Mr. Chamberlain had been "checkmated" in the Imperial Cabinet. I am not prepared to admit that Mr. Chamberlain is in the habit of being checkmated, and he would hardly thank us for proceeding to discuss public questions simply on the assumption that he had been, to use my hon. friend's phrase "turned down by his colleagues." We are bound to believe that whatever is done by the British Cabinet is done by all the Cabinet, with the full knowledge and consent of Mr. Chamberlain. The whole question of countervailing duties is a large and important one, one of the gravest problems in the political economy of

the day, and while we may all have opinions upon it, I do not think any good purpose could be served by our Government advising Mr. Chamberlain on that particular phase of the subject.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I only rise for the purpose of asking my hon. friend the Minister of Finance what changes, if any, the West India Islands made in their arrangements with the United States of America as to duties upon United States goods going into those islands. I was very glad to learn that there were no differential duties, and it would be satisfactory to know that whatever the tariff of those islands would be upon American goods in connection with their treaty with the United States, which I believe has not yet been made public, Great Britain and the British colonies would have access to their markets on the same terms. But the point I want to ask my hon. friend is whether he knows if any reductions have been made in their tariff.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have some information on the subject, but for reasons which my hon. friend, from his experience, will readily understand, it came to me confidentially and I would not be free to communicate it.

Mr. KAULBACH. In view of the fact that Cuba and Porto Rico have come into trade relations with the United States, has the Government done anything to protect our trade interests in those islands, so as to place us on an equal footing with the United States?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid they have come into pretty close relations with the United States, and I do not see how we can help it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am quite sure that the Government will make every effort in their power to have the present arrangement continued, as it would be most injurious to Canadian interests if the trade between Canada and Porto Rico were placed at a disadvantage as regards their trade with the United States.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I may say that, to our certain knowledge, that matter is engaging the most earnest attention of the Imperial Government and of the British Ambassador at Washington. However, the hon. gentleman will understand that it is not in our hands, it is an Imperial matter and must be dealt with by the Imperial authorities. But there is not the slightest doubt that they were very keenly alive to all the questions that have been mentioned.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

It being One o'clock, the Deputy Speaker left the Chair.

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

(In the Committee.)

Public Works—

Collection of slide and boom dues, including salaries of clerks in connection with this service..... \$5,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a vote of \$5,000 for the collection of slide and boom dues, including salaries and expenses connected with the service. There is one clerk for the Ottawa district, and two boatmen whose salaries, together with travelling expenses and contingencies, amount to \$5,000.

Repairs and working expenses—

Harbours, docks and slides..... \$96,400

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the same vote exactly as last year.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the expenses and receipts of the Lévis graving dock?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The receipts for 1898, as shown in the report, were \$19,839.97. The items, as shown in the statement of details, are all the expenses of management.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no additional work paid for out of this?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, there is a proposal in the supplementary Estimates to extend the dock.

Mr. FOSTER. Can you give me the revenue of the Yamaska lock?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Last year it was \$355.40.

Mr. FOSTER. What do you get revenue for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a tariff of fees for boats passing through the locks.

Mr. FOSTER. What were the receipts from the Rivière du Lièvre lock?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. \$246.84.

Mr. FOSTER. How much did the construction cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About \$245,000, I think. It was finished by my hon. friend in 1892 or 1893. I presume these are the results of my hon. friend's good investments.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend think that Maria wharf will bring in anything like these immense revenues to the Government?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it will bring in a satisfactory return for what we expect to expend upon it.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. gentleman give the revenue of the Kingston graving dock?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. \$7,448.31.

Mr. FOSTER. And the Esquimalt dock ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. \$6,227.92.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there the same scale of fees for the Lévis, Kingston and Esquimalt docks ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, the fees are not the same. The fees at the Lévis dock are higher. Those of the Kingston dock, the Deputy Minister thinks, come next, and the fees at the Esquimalt dock have recently been reduced.

Mr. FOSTER. When were they reduced at Esquimalt ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About two months ago.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the reason ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was quite an agitation in favour of it. It was alleged that in consequence of the fees being too high the dock was not receiving its fair share of business. There is a private dock, or marine railway, which was built after the Government dock was built, so that the Government did not exactly undertake to compete with private enterprise, but private enterprise undertook to compete with the Government. Thus, it was deemed advisable to reduce the rates. It has been a matter of controversy, some of the petitions, to which the hon. member for Victoria has called attention, which we received, asked that the fees be reduced, while another petition was received asking that no reduction be made. When the matter came before me I determined not to deal with it until the return of the Minister.

Mr. FOSTER. What did the reduction amount to ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On smaller vessels the reduction was considerable.

Mr. FOSTER. Would it be 50 per cent ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The reduction, I believe, was very considerable.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. Minister has the two sets of rates I would be glad to have them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman what they are, but I will look, and when I obtain them I will send them to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BERGERON. Do these graving docks pay anything to the country ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have just read from the report a statement of the revenue of the several docks. They do pay something, but if you ask me if they pay in the sense of paying on the capital invested, that is a different matter.

Mr. BERGERON. Do they pay anything to the country ?

Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are dock charges, and they contribute to the revenues of the country.

Telegraph between Prince Edward Island and the mainland..... \$2,000

Mr. FOSTER. This telegraph line is operated by the Government, is it not ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy thinks it is owned by the Prince Edward Island Government, but I think it is owned by the Anglo-American Cable Company.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it is a company that owns it. This is a subsidy.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, a subsidy has been paid from the time of confederation.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it to be a perpetual subsidy ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy thinks this is one of the terms of union. At all events, it has always been paid.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. Minister know whether there has been any reduction in telegraph rates ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been some agitation for a reduction, but we have no information that a reduction has been made.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be well for the Government to make some inquiries about that and see whether or not these rates are reasonable. I have heard they were not. I have never done much telegraphing there, but I have done some. It is a cable, and, of course, it is somewhat expensive, but we are giving a subsidy to the company, and it may be that the company's rates, having regard to increased business, are not commensurate with the commercial needs of the day. Telegraph rates are constantly being reduced, and I think the department ought to give the House some information as to the general reduction of rates by other companies so that we can see how the rates of this company compare with those of other companies.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will have this done. I noticed myself when I was through the island that the business of the company seemed to be conducted in a somewhat rural way. The hours of opening and closing seemed to be peculiar, and the people felt that they were not getting a sufficient service. I will have the matter looked into.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I hope the Government will lose no opportunity of exerting any influence they can bring to bear on the Anglo-American Telegraph Company in respect to the monopoly they hold of the telegraph business of the province of Prince Edward Island. Before we came into confederation that company, unfortunately, obtained a monopoly for all time for the

landing of a cable on Prince Edward Island. They have used that monopoly in a very harsh way, extorting rates from the people of that province which I believe are paid in no other part of this continent. We have to pay double the rates paid anywhere else. Besides, the company carry on their business in a very old-fashioned way. They will never keep their office open at night beyond eight or nine o'clock. Altogether it is a very unsatisfactory service indeed. If there is any possible way in which the Government can bring pressure to bear on that company, I hope they will not lose sight of the matter, for it is a hardship to the province of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) If the Government will look closely into the terms of the contract, they will find that they have the power of dictating terms to the company, and that they can make them give an all-day service, and can also exercise an influence in the direction of lowering the rates. That is the only way in which this matter can be remedied, and I trust, as has been suggested, that the Government will look into the matter and give it their best consideration. I may say that if the Canadian Pacific Railway had an opportunity of extending their line from Sackville across the straits to Prince Edward Island, they would do so immediately, and without charging an additional rate. If the Government use the powers they have under the Act, and under the contract, they can bring this company to time, and I trust they will do it immediately.

Land and cable telegraph lines of the sea-coasts and islands of the lower rivers and Gulf of St. Lawrence and maritime provinces, including cost of working steamer "Newfield" or other vessels when required for cable service.. \$32,000

Mr. FOSTER. What has caused the increase of \$4,000 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is in consequence of an increased mileage of the line on the north shore of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the length of the increased mileage ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We increased it by 176 miles last year, and it is proposed to make a further increase.

Mr. FOSTER. It goes now to what point ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is now as far as River Romaine, and it is proposed to extend it as far as Belle Isle. The distance from River Romaine to the Straits of Belle Isle is 315 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the length of the line the Government are now operating ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Government line begins at Murray Bay and extends about 700 miles to River Romaine. The line from Quebec to Murray Bay is

operated by the Great North-western Company.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there any side lines ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a branch line to Chicoutimi.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the total cost of operating that one line last year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Six thousand four hundred and fifty dollars for maintenance and operation.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the revenue ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The probable revenue expected was \$1,100. The accounts are not yet complete.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose that is mostly derived from this end of the line ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, probably.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you any arrangement with the company that operates down to Murray Bay, for a participation in the receipts ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not the information at the moment, but I will get it for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. At what distance apart have you operators ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At a distance of about 40 miles. The distance below is much longer.

Mr. FOSTER. Can you give me the whole cost of the line from Murray Bay to the River Romaine ? I would like also to know the number of messages sent each way.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will have notes taken of the hon. gentleman's question, and on some telegraphic vote in the supplementary Estimates all this information will be given to him.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that these lines are used for the weather service ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That was the chief purpose for which they were established ; but, of course, they are also used for all commercial business. They are in parts of the country where the telegraph companies would not build lines.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there much benefit derived from them ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think, for the purpose of saving life and property and ascertaining the movements of shipping, these lines are very necessary. They do not pay, in the commercial sense ; but we need them for the protection of life and property, and it would be very unsafe to abandon them.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not proposing to abandon them, but it would be useful to

have some information on which to base a judgment as to what they are costing the country.

Telegraph Lines—

North-west Territories ..... \$20,000

Mr. DAVIN. Who is the superintendent of these lines?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. J. McDonald.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the hon. gentleman inform the House whether or not he considers that out of these votes he is authorized in taking any amount of money for the construction of new telegraph lines?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is aware that an amount was taken out of that by the Minister for that purpose, and I suppose it is a debatable question. No doubt my colleague thought he had a very good case. I think it is desirable to confine these votes to the services designated.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it is a debatable question for a single moment. I would like to ask the right hon. First Minister whether he thinks that in a vote for the operation and maintenance of telegraph lines, slides and booms and the like, which is as definite a vote as can be made, the policy of Government would allow, in his opinion, the taking of any portion of this money for the construction of new lines.

The PRIME MINISTER. No; I would not think so, except under very exceptional circumstances.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there any circumstances?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think there may be.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my right hon. friend point out one?

The PRIME MINISTER. I can point out the case we had this year which was one of immediate absolute necessity, in which the work had to be built during the present season, and under the circumstances I think Parliament should sanction a technical departure from the absolute construction of the vote.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman not know that there are only two ways of getting the money. One is out of a parliamentary vote for the purpose and to be used solely for that purpose, and the other is by a Governor General's warrant to meet any particular contingency. Can the hon. gentleman quote any authority in law or in practice of getting money on any other lines than these two?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, I know the case where Pitt, in a very celebrated circumstance, called a meeting of the Council

Mr. SPROULE.

even on a Sunday to pledge the credit of England and thereby save the credit of the country and probably England from bankruptcy. My hon. friend himself has gone out of his way to say that if a certain work was gone on with he would see that Parliament voted an appropriation the next session.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend does not seem to get the point of my question. Pitt had a perfect right to save the credit of England, not by filching from another vote, but by pledging the credit of England.

The PRIME MINISTER. Without an appropriation.

Mr. FOSTER. If a question of exigency should arise and public money has to be expended, for which there is no parliamentary vote, my right hon. friend can have recourse to the legal method of a Governor General's warrant, but has he any right and is he going to say to this House and the country that he will, if he wants the money, filch from a vote which was given for one specific purpose and use the money for an entirely different purpose. This has been done, and my hon. friend acknowledges it, and we have had our discussion about it, but for pity's sake do not let us, because it has been done in one particular instance, raise it to the rank of precedent.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Do not let the Government, for the sake of getting over a difficulty a little easier than otherwise, think they have a right to do it.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no objection to say to my hon. friend that we will not do it again.

Telegraph Lines—

British Columbia ..... \$12,000

Mr. PRIOR. Where is this money to be spent?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to pay the expenses of managing the lines in British Columbia. It is the usual vote. There are several lines.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the receipts from those?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The revenue from the North-west lines was \$2,129.91, and from the British Columbia lines, \$1,830.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the lines in the North-west?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Qu'Appelle and Edmonton and Wood Mountain lines. The total mileage is 698.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not that strike my hon. friend as being a very small revenue?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It certainly is.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the rate charged?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Fifty cents is the general rate. Where you have a large population, you can often increase your revenue by reducing the rate, but I am not sure that that applies in a scattered population.

Mr. FOSTER. These lines run through quite a lot of settled territories and towns, and it seems to me the population is large enough to give a better revenue.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It would seem that the revenue ought to be larger.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any return of the number of messages?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, Government messages are free?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there many dead-head franks?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not one, there is no frank at all.

Mr. FOSTER. It looks very small for such an extended country. Between some of these places there is no competition, it seems to me; the Government lines are the only lines. What are the rates?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The rates vary; 15 cents, ten words, and one cent each additional word; 25 cents and two cents, and 50 cents, three cents for from ten miles to 600 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. These are not inordinate rates. How is it that it cost \$20,000 to operate a telegraph line of 600 miles? Surely that cannot be so; it would build the line.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The staff expenses are \$21,000. These people live in out-of-the-way places, and they are paid more than elsewhere.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that \$20,000 is an enormous amount to pay for the operation of a line like that. Is there any statement which shows the salaries of the operators?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You will find that in the report of the Minister of Public Works for 1898, page 23 of Part V.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish the Minister would look into this, because I certainly, and other members of the House, will inquire about it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy informs me that the Minister (Mr. Tarte) quite recently expressed the same opinion as it struck him the expenses were higher than they should be. Of course, they are practically the same expenses as in the

past, but if they are extravagant that is no reason why they should be continued.

Mr. FOSTER. If it is going to cost \$20,000 to operate 600 miles—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Six hundred and ninety-eight miles.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. If it is going to cost that to operate 698 miles, the sooner we get rid of that the better.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I fear that this is a kind of white elephant, and you might have difficulty in getting any one to take it over.

Mr. FOSTER. A number of the lines built there by the Government have been taken over, and this might be brought into the hands of a private company with reservation for Government messages. This throws rather a lurid light on what we may expect with the Yukon telegraph business which the Government have undertaken. If in a comparatively settled portion of the country like the North-west, it costs so much for the Government to operate these telegraph lines I am afraid that the Yukon line will be a very expensive undertaking for the Government.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you pay your operators a regular salary or pay them by percentage?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the North-west they are paid a percentage of 25 per cent provided they are guaranteed at least \$50.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister must see that even allowing one operator for each forty miles, and suppose the salary of each operator is \$500 a year that would be only \$7,500 for fifteen operators.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are paid more than \$500 a year.

Mr. HAGGART. Impossible.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, I find from this report of the Public Works Department to which I have referred that the superintendent is paid \$1,200; another person \$420; others, \$600, \$300, \$600, \$600, \$720, \$720, \$600, \$720, so that quite a number of them are paid more than \$500 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is the \$720 one?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Repairer W. McKay, at Edmonton.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the operator paid?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I presume that in the absence of any statement to the contrary they are operators; for instance, there is \$600 here for Miss Johnston, and I presume she is an operator.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they night and day operators?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. They practically live in their offices, and they work at all times.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Have you houses built for them by the Government?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I am informed we build huts for them.

Mr. **FOSTER**. They must be more than huts for they live there in the winter.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. They are usually, I am told, old-fashioned log houses such as the first settlers use.

Mr. **FOSTER**. So that they receive those salaries as well as their lodgings?

Mr. **HAGGART**. Are any of these stations worked by the Mounted Police?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. No. There is one place in the report marked "Special connection for Mounted Police," and the department informs me that means that the Mounted Police have an additional operator of their own.

Mr. **FOSTER**. It seems to me that with care it might be possible to make that service much cheaper. Telegraphy is not the abstruse art it used to be considered, and I should think that in these places which are fairly populated you could get some person who, in addition to his other employment, would attend to whatever little telegraph work there must be. What is the length of the line in British Columbia and between all the points?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. On page 24 of Part V of the Minister's report, the details are given of the British Columbia service. The mileage from Ashcroft to Barkerville is 276½; from Ashcroft to Lillooet, 62; from Victoria to Cape Beale, 118; Nanaimo and Comox, 81; Parksville and Alberni, 29½.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The income is a little less, in proportion, than the other. I think that both of these are well worth looking into.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I must say that the service seems rather expensive in proportion to the work done. The deputy tells me that the Minister's attention has been called to the matter, and that he is looking into it.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I should think that the Minister of Public Works, now that he is becoming a great adept in these things and travelling so extensively—from which I hope he will greatly benefit—would be able to make some improvements and might adopt the wireless system. It would be a great coup to the Public Works Department. Of course, the patronage would be less. I see my hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock) looking at me very hard, and he

Mr. **FOSTER**.

might object. At the same time, it would be a great thing to have a wireless telegraphy.

Mr. **BOSTOCK**. I understood the Minister to say that the revenues from the British Columbia offices amounted to \$1,800. According to the Auditor General's Report, I see that the revenue on the line from Ashcroft to Barkerville was \$3,739, and on the Lillooet branch, \$790.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I have given the receipts as they have appeared at page 10, part 5, of the report of the Minister of Public Works, \$1,830.40. There is a note respecting the Barkerville and Cape Beale lines:

The Canadian Pacific Railway, operating these two lines, retains the revenue, and the Government reimburses them the excess of expenditure over revenue.

Mr. **FOSTER**. That is a new element.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. In our discussion—but not in the case, because it has continued for years.

Mr. **FOSTER**. How do you adjust these accounts?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The superintendent adjusts them every three months between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Have you a superintendent of telegraphs in British Columbia?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I speak of the superintendent at Ottawa, Mr. Keeley.

Mr. **FOSTER**. But you have a superintendent in the North-west.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes, the arrangements in British Columbia are of a joint character, and the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government each contribute to the cost of the superintendent there.

Mr. **FOSTER**. With the improved means of communication by wire and railway, it seems to me that if you have intelligent operators and an intelligent repairer, you do not need a superintendent. That should be considered.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I will see to it that the attention of the Minister is drawn to the matter.

Public Works—Collection of Revenue—  
Telegraph and signal service generally. \$2,750

Mr. **FOSTER**. What does this queer little vote cover?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. This covers working expenses of Pelee Island telegraph line; telegrams, printing blank forms and other stationery; telegraph instruments and batteries; travelling expenses of staff at headquarters; petty cash disbursements; Quebec Harbour, rent and agent's salary and supplies, and allowances to offi-

cers of steamship "Newfield," re cable service.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the revenue of the Pelee Island line and what is the length of it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The revenue is \$136.68, and the length 34 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population of Pelee Island?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will have to give it up. If my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Cowan) was here—

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) can tell.

Mr. McGREGOR. The population is about 700. It is in South Essex.

Mr. FOSTER. What province is South Essex in?

Mr. McGREGOR. It is pretty nearly in the province of Ontario. Mr. Chairman, there is not a finer spot on the face of the earth than that county. They have 5,000 acres of grapes, 5,000 acres of peaches, and 4,000 acres of tobacco in that little county.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there any other means of telegraphic communication with Pelee Island than this?

Mr. McGREGOR. No.

Mr. FOSTER. One would think that with a population of 700 progressive and intelligent people, there would be more than \$136 of a revenue from the only telegraph line.

Mr. McGREGOR. Most of the people are farmers and do not have much need for the telegraph, particularly as they have steamers coming to their dock every day, one from the Canadian side and two from the American. They are a peculiar people, and get their living largely by fruit growing, and also by fishing, for this is a grand fishing section. They do not require any communication with people outside, except to sell their products to the vessels that come there, especially those vessels that come from the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the tariff there about the same as in other places?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Between local offices between Leamington and Point Pelee, the rate is 15 cents for ten words and 1 cent for each extra word; between the mainland and the island, 25 cents and 1 cent, and between offices on the island, 15 cents and 1 cent.

Mr. HAGGART. How many offices are there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are eight offices.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cost of operating?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is \$1,061.98.

Mr. FOSTER. What is it for salaries of staff?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are paid on commission. The salary is very small. The sum set down for salaries is \$100. In answer to my hon. friend from Essex, I may say that the deputy has a map here which shows the distance from the mainland to Pelee Island.

Mr. McGREGOR. It is seven miles from point to point.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I would ask the Minister if the rate which he quoted of 15 cents is for a message from the island to the mainland?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, 25 cents from the mainland to the island. That is merely the rate over the one line. Then they would probably have to pay another rate on the Canadian Pacific Railway line to Ottawa. But so far as that line extends, it is 25 cents.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) The real distance is about the same across the mainland. They just about double that.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you the gross revenue from that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the gross revenue, and they are paid by direct cheques from Ottawa.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that gross revenue pay all the salaries?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is only \$100 salary paid in that case.

Mr. FOSTER. The eight officers only get \$100?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are paid on commission.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a good thing to put into operation in British Columbia and the North-west. There is a sad lack of business enterprise. You cannot get a Christian people 700 in number that won't expend more than \$136 in a whole year in telegraphic messages from the island to the mainland, when they are fishermen and the like of that. They do not patronize your line.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We shall have to look into these things. They are legacies that we have not been able to overtake.

Public Works—

Agency—British Columbia .....\$2,500

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is described as a vote to make provision for travelling expenses of staff, stationery, fuel, and temporary clerical assistance of Public Works agency, British Columbia. The items are as follows:—Temporary clerical assist-

ance, \$500 ; caretaker, \$200 ; travelling expenses of staff, \$1,200 ; stationery and printing, \$200 ; contingencies, \$400.

Mr. BERGERON. Before we leave public works, I want to bring to the attention of the Minister the letters of credit which I find mentioned on Q-249. Let me tell my hon. friend that letters of credit are an invention of the Mercier government. It is a scheme for obtaining money without the assent of Parliament, or without any advice from Council. It has been the source of the greatest rascalities in Quebec that we have heard of since confederation, and it brought down the Prime Minister of that province to a criminal court, and brought his government to discredit and dishonour. I see this has been commenced here by the Minister of Public Works. How far it will go, I do not know. If you look at the Auditor General's Report you will find a long correspondence between the Minister of Public Works and the Auditor General. I need not say that anything that can be done to prevent the adoption of that system in the Dominion Government would be in the interest of the country. Can my hon. friend give any reasons for a letter of credit for \$100,000 after Parliament had risen, after Parliament had voted everything that was wanted by that department, and without going to Council to ask for the money? The Minister of Public Works obtained a letter of credit for that amount, which astonished the Auditor General and caused a long correspondence between the Minister and himself. I want to bring the matter to the notice of the hon. gentleman and to ask him if he can promise—I know he cannot keep the Minister of Public Works to the law—but so far as he can, and so far as he is responsible for anything that man does, will he promise that such a thing will not happen again?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I could not promise that, because it would stop the wheels of Government if I did. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken when he says the Minister of Public Works has introduced a system of letters of credit. His friend beside him (Mr. Foster) will tell him that the system of letters of credit is part of the ordinary machinery of Government which has been recognized for years, and which is deemed necessary.

Mr. BERGERON. I have never seen it before in the Federal Government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is dealing with two distinct things. A letter of credit in the sense in which he speaks of it, is a letter of credit for which there is no parliamentary authority, and that would be a very objectionable thing, only extraordinary circumstances would justify it. But where a large spending department has a large sum of money to its

Mr. FIELDING.

credit, it is allowed to take a vote of credit for a certain sum, and it is at liberty then to draw against the credit. But it must then render account to the Auditor General as to its appropriation of that money. Sometimes it happens that the Auditor General thinks the vouchers submitted are not entirely satisfactory ; he thinks this, that and the other item requires to be further explained, and correspondence is had with the Minister. My hon. friend will find it is not confined to the Minister of Public Works. He will find questions arising out of all the letters of credit which are discussed by the Auditor General. If a voucher is sent in for a particular expenditure, and the Auditor General thinks that on some particular point the information is not sufficient, he desires it to be put in a fuller way. I am sure the letter of credit my hon. friend has in his mind, and the letter of credit referred to here, are entirely different things. This is a part of the ordinary routine of Government and is eminently proper and necessary.

Lewes and Yukon Rivers—

Improvements ..... \$40,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This vote of \$40,000 is required for the improvement of the Lewes and Yukon rivers, as follows :

A cariboo wing-dam, to increase the depth of water by one foot—at least.	\$ 7,500 00
Removal of rocks in the Six Miles River, between Lake Tagish and Lake Marsh .....	2,500 00
Removal of rocks in the Thirty Miles River, from Lake Laberge to the confluence of the Lewes and Hootalinqua rivers .....	12,500 00
Removal of rocks at Five-Finger Rapids .....	6,250 00
Removal of rocks at the Rink Rapids.	1,250 00

Total .....	\$30,000 00
Estimated probable cost of improvements in 1899 and 1900.....	15,000 00
Estimated probable cost of wharfs at Dawson City .....	20,000 00
Incidentals .....	641 15

Making a total of..... \$65,641 15

Deduct—

Expenditure to the 30th June, 1899..	\$15,641 15
Proportion of vote in supplementary Estimates, 1899.....	10,000 00

Total ..... \$25,641 15

Deduct \$25,641.15 from \$65,641.15, and it leaves a balance of ..... \$40,000 00

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he can say how much has been spent in removing the rocks at Five Finger Rapids?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The men are working there now, and we cannot state what has been spent.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is the engineer who made all these reports?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Mr. Taché.

Mr. **BERGERON.** Of the Public Works Department?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Yes.

Mr. **PRIOR.** If I remember rightly the report of Mr. Coste stated that the work could be best done in the winter time for from \$3,000 to \$5,000 at the Five Finger Rapids, when the ice was on the water and when the men could work much better with dynamite. I am informed that the work was not done in the winter time, that Mr. Charleson is in charge of the work, which is being done in summer time, and that it is far more expensive. I have heard also, from a man up there, that half of his staff were off looking for gold claims instead of looking after their work.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** We have no knowledge of that.

Mr. **PRIOR.** What is the amount expended on the Five Finger Rapids up to the present time?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** We are not in a position to give the hon. gentleman the definite sum as the returns up to the 30th of June are not yet in.

Mr. **PRIOR.** Could the hon. gentleman remember what Mr. Coste's report said in regard to the expense? I think the hon. gentleman will find that he states what I say.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** These estimates were all based on Mr. Coste's report. Do you mean as to the time and season that the work should be done?

Mr. **PRIOR.** Yes, and the amount required for the work.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The later experience of the department is against the work being done in the winter. One of these rivers does not freeze at all.

Mr. **PRIOR.** Not the Five Finger Rapids.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The Thirty-Mile River does not freeze at all, and the later judgment of the department is that the work cannot be so well done in winter as it was at first supposed. It is all based on the report of Mr. Coste.

Mr. **BERGERON.** Did any person go with Mr. Taché?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Yes, Mr. Boyer.

Mr. **BERGERON.** Was Mr. Charleson there too with the party?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Yes, Mr. Charleson is in charge of the party.

Mr. **HAGGART.** Is he in charge of these works besides building the telegraph line?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Yes.

Mr. **McDOUGALL.** The hon. gentleman speaks of building wharfs at Dawson City. Are they to be on Government or private property?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** They will be built on Government land.

Mr. **FOSTER.** These works were all reported on by Mr. Coste, as I understand it. Mr. Coste was sent up and made a thorough examination and report on all the works covered by these expenditures.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Yes.

Mr. **FOSTER.** And after that report had been received Mr. Taché was sent up?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Mr. Taché is the engineer in charge of the work. He is on the ground now.

Mr. **FOSTER.** And in charge of Mr. Taché and Mr. Boyer is Mr. Charleson?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Yes.

Mr. **FOSTER.** And Charleson, under that famous letter, has absolute authority over Taché and Boyer, not only in business matters, but in engineering matters as well. He can discharge them; he can do just as he pleases. That letter was perfectly wide in these respects. He had supreme authority to say just what work should be done, how it should be done, and all these others were placed under his command. You have a certain amount of money which was indicated by the department to go to certain places on the basis of Mr. Coste's report. Is that right?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Yes.

Mr. **FOSTER.** Mr. Boyer and Mr. Taché have gone there to see that these estimates are expended in these places?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** They are not instructed absolutely and fully. They are not to be bound absolutely to Mr. Coste's report.

Mr. **FOSTER.** Are they bound by the engineer's opinion simply?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** In the first place, they will be limited by the amount of money at their disposal, but if they had reason to depart from Mr. Coste's report in any particular manner, they would be free to do so if they thought it was for the benefit of the service.

Mr. **FOSTER.** With the authority of Mr. Charleson?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Mr. Charleson has a general business view of the operations, just as the Deputy Minister, who is not an engineer, has a general command of the department. Mr. Charleson would

have a general superintendence over the business.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that there is \$35,000 put under his control, without instructions, for anything, probably, that he might consider ought to be done which has not been discussed and indicated by the department, which has not been settled upon any basis by the department here, but which has been sent out to him generally at his disposal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He has to remove the obstacles and improve the navigation between these points, and of course Mr. Coste's report would be valuable to him. But if Mr. Charleson and the engineer of the department think it necessary, I presume they may vary it. It will, of course, be impossible to give definite instructions to them at that distance.

Mr. FOSTER. And this sum is given to them generally?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, there is the specified amount for the wharfs at Dawson.

Mr. FOSTER. Some one has said, it is a matter of hearsay, but the House ought to be pretty well assured, that this is not a gold exploring party that is out; it ought to be understood that it is a working party for the Government. The statement is made here that letters came down from that portion of the country, saying that at a certain time these gentlemen were after gold mines, rather than after rocks in the Hootalinqua River. That is a matter which the department should take note of and make the necessary inquiries whether it is true or not. I do not say it is true, but it has been so stated.

Mr. PRIOR. I do not say it is true but I do state that it has been mentioned to me.

Mr. FOSTER. That being the case, the Minister should take immediate steps to ascertain it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I quite agree that Mr. Charleson should have his attention drawn to the fact that these statements have been made in the House of Commons, and they are worth investigating. Mr. Charleson and Mr. Taché and others are aware that an Order in Council has been passed that no official who goes into that district can, under pain of dismissal, engage in mining speculations. It is quite possible that such a distance from Ottawa, officials might violate that rule, but our attention being called to it, it should be made a matter of inquiry.

Mr. FOSTER. That Order in Council, I suppose, was passed after Major Walsh and his brothers had entered into that arrange-

Mr. FIELDING.

ment which had been made with Carboneau and others to exploit the mines. This is an afterthought to which the Minister was driven by the strength of public opinion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was a conclusion reached after the subject had been brought to the notice of the department, when it was alleged that certain officials had been engaged in certain mining speculations. That was a matter of common report and the Government determined that to be on the side of safety no officials should do that. It is well known in the service that the order has been issued, and Mr. Charleson and his party must know if they violate it they do so at their peril.

Mr. HAGGART. Was this Order in Council issued after Mr. Charleson went up or is he aware of it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was issued before he left. I presume he is aware of it. I have not got the date of the order, but I could find it if I had time.

Mr. HAGGART. Is there any arrangement that the foremen of Mr. Charleson should come down here in October next?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They have no orders at present respecting their return.

Mr. HAGGART. None whatever?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Item agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will take up the item with regard to the Edmonton bridge, which was postponed at the request of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) last night.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it the intention of the Government to have a session after six o'clock to-night?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). That, I presume will depend upon what amount of work we can do.

Mr. FOSTER. The work is going on all right. I think my hon. friends opposite need a few hours to prepare for the Sabbath.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Bearing in mind the necessities of my hon. friend in that respect, we will say that the House shall adjourn at six o'clock.

Edmonton, N.W.T.—

Bridge over the Saskatchewan..... \$13,000

Mr. DAVIN. Now, what is the explanation of this vote?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to complete the superstructure of the Edmonton bridge across the Saskatchewan River. The amount of the contract is \$46,-

332; freight from Montreal to Edmonton, \$11,000; superintendence, contingencies, \$2,668; total, \$60,000. Deduct estimated expenditure up to 30th June, 1899, \$22,000; contribution of the municipality of Edmonton, \$25,000; total, \$47,000, which deducted from \$60,000, makes the balance required, as per estimate, \$13,000. The contract with the Dominion Bridge Company of Montreal, was made in March, 1899, the completion to take place on the 1st of December of the present year.

Mr. DAVIN. Does that cover the piers?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The pier work, I am advised, is completed and nothing remains but to complete the superstructure which is covered by this item.

Mr. DAVIN. Has the Minister (Mr. Fielding) now any explanation of what I brought before the House last year, as to the extraordinary conduct of the Department of Public Works in changing the character of the work after they had called for tenders. The information which I have received since has justified entirely the criticism I made last year upon that work. The Department of Public Works called for tenders to build three piers and embankments of masonry, and tenders were sent in to the department by, I think, four contractors, and one tender was accepted while the Minister of Public Works was in Montreal, and on the very day that the tenders arrived in the department at Ottawa. The gentleman who got the contract proceeded at once to Edmonton, and visited the quarry there; he comes back from the quarry to Edmonton, he leaves Edmonton and inspects the quarries at Calgary, he comes to Ottawa, he goes into the department and tells them that he cannot build it of the stone from the quarry at Edmonton nor from the stone at Calgary. Then the department sends an engineer, Mr. St. Laurent, to report on the statement of the contractor, and Mr. St. Laurent reports, endorsing what the contractor, Mr. Lemoine, said. Now, the first thing to which I call the attention of the Minister—and I think that after twelve months he ought to be able to explain it—is this, that, taking the time-table of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it will be seen that if the contractor, the moment he got the contract, left Montreal, went to Calgary, went from Calgary to Edmonton, hurried from Edmonton to the quarry, hurried from the quarry back to Edmonton, then hurried to Calgary and inspected the quarry there, then hurried to the railway station, and then hurried to Ottawa, the trip could not have been made in the time that the figures in the department say it was made. The reason I call the attention of the hon. gentleman to that is this: Without calling for tenders, without giving the rivals of this contractor an opportunity to tender, the department allowed him to change the character of the work

from ashlar masonry to concrete. It was a new contract, to all intents and purposes, that was made with this man. Not only was that contract given to him without tender, but everybody knows that the cost of concrete is about half the cost of ashlar masonry.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not admitted.

Mr. DAVIN. It may not be admitted by the department, but there is not a contractor in Canada who will give an impartial opinion on the subject, who will not say that that is the case.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It would not be there, because you have to take the water line so far.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the hon. gentleman who interrupts knows more about grapes than he does about ashlar masonry.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I know about that also.

Mr. DAVIN. We did not get a satisfactory explanation of this matter last year, and I would like to get the explanation now. We have here the Finance Minister, who is the guardian of the public purse, and we would like to know how it came to pass that this man, in defiance of the law, and in defiance of economy, was allowed to change ashlar masonry to concrete?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is, I think, threshing out one of last year's debates again. My recollection is, that this matter was brought up when the Minister of Public Works was in the House, and was thoroughly discussed. The hon. gentleman has raised no new point, and I can hardly see any reason why we should go over it again. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken when he says that the cost of concrete is only half the cost of ashlar masonry. I am advised that the cost to the contractor out there was substantially the same as the cost of the masonry would have been, and, so far as the efficiency of the work for the country is concerned, the engineers are thoroughly satisfied that the Government had as good a job with the concrete as they would have had with the masonry. Indeed, many engineers prefer concrete, and it is a fact that many of the piers of great bridges are to-day built of concrete, where the best workmanship and materials are required. The hon. gentleman must remember that, in estimating the cost of concrete at Edmonton, it is necessary to take into consideration the heavy cost of hauling the cement from the East to that point, so that the cost of concrete at some other point should not be compared with the cost at such a distant point as Edmonton. From the little opportunity I have had to look over the papers, I am satisfied that the contractor has given, with the concrete pier, as good, or a better, piece of work than he

could have given, if he had used the stone out there. As a matter of fact, he has not profited by the change, because the concrete has cost him just as much as the stone would.

Mr. DAVIN. I put it to the hon. gentleman: Does that explain the giving of a perfectly new contract without tender? That gentleman got the contract in a very extraordinary manner. We will suppose that it was bona fide, although the story he told was an impossible one. But why is it that his competitors were not allowed again to compete? Why were not fresh tenders called for? It must be remembered that this is not a single case. In this Department of Public Works, instead of the rule being that tenders are called for, the rule seems to be, that tenders are not called for, but that work is given out in an irregular manner and in defiance of the law. I would like to know if there is any explanation why tenders were not called for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman could sustain his statement that the change made in the specifications gave the contractor an opportunity to put in concrete at half the cost of ashlar masonry, then he would have a right to complain; but if it be a fact that the change gave the Government an equally good job, and did give the contractor any undue advantage, then I fail to see that the hon. gentleman has made out a case. The whole question turns on whether concrete at Edmonton is cheaper than ashlar masonry, and when cement delivered at Edmonton costs \$6.50 a barrel, you have no right to compare the cost of concrete there with the cost at places where it is cheap.

Mr. DAVIN. That is not an answer to my question for an explanation why tenders were not called for.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They were, in the first instance.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the character of the work was entirely changed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not in value.

Mr. DAVIN. If this was a bona fide transaction, why is an impossible story told? Here is a story that the contractor went to Edmonton, that he examined the stone at Edmonton, that he then went to Calgary and examined the stone there, and then came to Ottawa and reported that he could not get stone fit to build this bridge, and that journey could not have been done in the time he said it was even if he had left the moment he got the contract. But that is not all. We are told that before the change was made, Mr. St. Laurent made a journey and a report, and it is a fortiori impossible that the two journeys could have been made, for that time was too brief for one journey.

Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The only question, I suppose, is whether or not these gentlemen did go out to Edmonton or not. That is a simple question of fact, and my advice is they did go out. If they did, then the whole story tumbles to pieces.

Mr. DAVIN. The story that was told by the contractor was this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman's story tumbles to pieces.

Mr. DAVIN. I will have to read the report of Mr. Coste, and have sent for it. It is set out in the formidable document that the contractor went to Edmonton and Calgary and came back to the department and reported that the stone at Edmonton and Calgary would not suit. Then we were told that Mr. St. Laurent was ordered to make an examination, and that he went out and made it, and he reported that it was quite true that stone fit for making the piers could not be found. If that were bona fide, it would be perfectly regular, but as I have told the Minister, and as I showed last year, the one trip could not be made in the time much less the two. But I could get no satisfactory explanation. The story told is an impossible one, and if any man told it in a court of justice he would be prosecuted for perjury. It is proof evident that there must be something wrong, and of course there is something wrong when a man is allowed to change the quality of the work from ashlar masonry to concrete.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What is the evidence to show that the journey could not be made?

Mr. DAVIN. The time-table of the Canadian Pacific Railway. If he did not leave the date that I gave, and I assume that he left Montreal the moment he signed the contract, the case is still worse.

Mr. DAVIS. How do you know the time he got back?

Mr. DAVIN. I took the very date of the change.

Mr. McDOUGALL. While the hon. gentleman is looking for the report, I would ask what was the cost of the concrete per cubic yard?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contract was for a lump sum. Of course we could ascertain the cost of the contract, but that did not affect us in paying the price.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Did the department make an estimate of what the concrete would cost before letting the contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, it was estimated that the cost of concrete out there for that work would be \$17.43 per cubic yard.

Mr. DAVIN. Who makes that estimate?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Mr. St. Laurent, the Assistant Engineer of Public Works.

Mr. McDUGALL. Is that based on cost of \$6.50 per barrel?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The hon. gentleman will find in the Auditor General's Report, page Q-272, every item set forth and the thing worked out to the last cent.

Mr. DAVIN. But that report of Mr. St. Laurent is in the nature of a defence. I cannot accept it nor the report of Mr. Coste, because the report of Mr. Coste giving the excuse for this change from ashlar masonry to concrete tells an impossible story. The invitation to tender calls, first, for a lump sum for the whole work, according to plans and specifications. 2. The price per lineal foot per pile. 3. The price per 1,000 feet B.M. for timber laid and spiked in the foundations of the piers and abutments.

The amount paid for the finished work would, therefore, consist of a lump sum. According to sections 14 and 15 of the specifications, the timber was to be of the very best description of the kind required. According to section 17, the piles were to be of white oak or rock elm for the piers and cedar for the abutments, but as may be seen by looking at the plans, there is no white or rock elm in the piers. According to the specification, the masonry was to be rock-faced ashlar, first-class in every respect. The stone must be limestone or granite, and from a quarry accepted by the engineer, and the abutments ashlar masonry. Now, I want to call the attention of the Minister to this. No estimates were to be paid during construction; the work was to be commenced as soon as possible after the signature of the contract and to be completed on or before the 15th of November, 1897. When was that work completed?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. On the 12th June, 1898.

Mr. DAVIN. There was to be a fine of \$50 for every day the work was uncompleted after the 15th November, 1897. Was any fine exacted?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. No fines have been collected.

Mr. DAVIN. So, that portion of the contract is a dead letter. Nevertheless, to my knowledge, those terms frightened away some contractors. If the contract is signed on the 17th August, there would be less than three months to complete the work. Is it not obvious that if one contractor knew that no penalties were to be proposed, he could tender with a light heart. As a matter of fact, this contractor did slightly underbid his competitors in the masonry, though he was not lower in some of the other details. The peculiar thing is, that the very day that the tenders were to have

gone into the Department of Public Works, the contract was signed in Montreal. A telegram is sent, asking which of these gentlemen is the lowest tenderer, and, on a reply being received, the contract is signed. There was never such a way of doing business as that. From the beginning there is something suspicious about this contract. Such a contract, as we know, is usually signed in the department. So, the Minister signed the contract without having seen it, merely on being told by telegram that a certain gentleman had put in the lowest tender. There were four tenders: one from Francis Lemoine, one from Mr. Bourque, one from Mr. Burns, and the other from Messrs. Rourke & Allison, and every one of the tenders arrived in the department on the same day. One contractor in Kingston telegraphed the department to ask whether all these conditions would be rigidly carried out, and receiving a telegram that they would be, was afraid to tender in consequence. Here are the dates: On the 7th Mr. Coste telegraphs from Montreal:

Am instructed by Minister to ask you immediately to notify lowest tenderer for Edmonton bridge masonry his tender is accepted. Minister goes to Quebec to-night. I return to Ottawa by late train to-night.

The tender from Montreal is dated the 6th of August. If sent by mail, it could not have reached Ottawa before the 7th; if personally delivered, not before the 6th. On the 9th Mr. Lemoine telegraphs:

I will be in Ottawa this evening.

The following day he sent a letter, saying he was ready to enter into contract for the building of the pier and abutments for the Edmonton bridge, and asked that he might be addressed at Montreal. On the 11th Auguste R. C. Durocher, assistant secretary, informs Mr. Lemoine by letter that the contract had been sent to Montreal for execution. The contract was dated the 17th August. I have examined the Canadian Pacific time-table, and I find that if a man left on that day, what we are told he did could not be accomplished. Let us suppose that as early as the following day after signing the contract, he leaves for Edmonton. He arrives at Edmonton on the 23rd. How long shall we give him to go 50 miles up the river and inspect the quarries? Let us give him a day to go, a day to inspect the quarry, and a day to return. This will bring him to the 26th. He would require at least five days to go back from Edmonton, provided he got the train at the moment he got back from the quarry. This would bring us to the 1st day of September, when he would arrive at Ottawa. You can test this by the almanac and the Canadian Pacific time-table. The 17th August was Tuesday. Let us suppose that he left that day, the very day the contract was signed. He could not make connection at Calgary be-

fore Monday, the 23rd, the trains leaving Wednesday and Monday. Let him leave on Monday and arrive at Edmonton on the 23rd at seven p.m. Could he have made any examination worth anything of a quarry 50 miles up the river, and leave Edmonton before Tuesday, the 26th, the trains leaving Edmonton on Tuesday and Thursday? This would bring him to Calgary on the 26th. Give him a day to examine the quarries and leave Calgary on the night of the 27th or 28th. Suppose we say the 27th, he would arrive at Ottawa on the 31st. But Mr. Coste's report implies that he was back in time. Mr. St. Laurent's report is dated the 30th of August, so that the report of Mr. Coste implies that Mr. St. Laurent had also made a trip—not necessarily from Ottawa, he may have been at Calgary, he may even have been at Edmonton. His report is dated the 30th of August; therefore, we have here solemn documents, archived in the department—well, I do not like to use a stronger expression, but they must be fabrications; they are not honest reports. So this gentleman seems to have signed the contract in Montreal on the 17th of August, to have gone to Edmonton, and to have come back with such celerity to Ottawa, and reported to the department that the stone at that quarry was useless, and the department had time to despatch Mr. St. Laurent, the engineer of the department, to examine the quarry, and to return by the 30th of August, which is impossible, and if impossible there must be some reason that will not bear the light of day for telling that impossible story. With that impossible story before us, we certainly cannot let that item pass at the present moment. Now, Mr. Coste's letter is dated the 22nd of September, 1897, and the next document which will be found in the return is an Order in Council dated the 20th of October. It is based on a memorandum of the Minister of Public Works, dated the 14th of October, and the memorandum is not given. The Order in Council provides for a change, although the letter excusing the change is dated the 22nd of September, one month beforehand. Can the Minister give us any explanation?

**THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I hope my hon. friend will not think me discourteous if I decline to travel over a question which was so fully threshed out a year ago, when the Minister of Public Works himself was here with all the facts, and much better acquainted with them than I am. As to the impossible story the hon. gentleman refers to, I suppose after all the main question is whether the contractor did go out there in the way described, and whether Mr. St. Laurent went out there. I do not suppose we are much concerned as to whether the contractor went out there or not. The question is simply this, whether, in consenting to this change of specification from ashlar

**Mr. DAVIN.**

masonry to concrete, which I understand to be the main question the hon. gentleman has been discussing—whether the engineer did go out there and make an examination of the quarry and certify that the change was in the public interest. That appears to be the main question. The public records show that the engineer has testified that he examined the quarries out there, and that he was satisfied that the stone was not as well adapted for building and repairs as concrete would be. It appears that when the first movement was made towards the construction of these piers, a small sample of the stone was sent in, which the engineers were satisfied with, but on examination of the quarries, as it may often happen when you compare a large bulk of anything with the small sample furnished, it was found by the engineer that the stone was not of a satisfactory character, and that the public interests would be more advanced by building these piers with concrete in accordance with the practice of the best engineers in dealing with large and important structures. It is also shown that the cost of the concrete is substantially as high as the cost of masonry would have been, and therefore, so far as the contractor was concerned, he had no advantage by the change, but the public did gain by the change, by having a more substantial piece of work done. The hon. gentleman seems flatly to deny that this engineer went out there and examined that stone. Now, if the hon. gentleman suspected that, he could have settled the whole matter by summoning the engineer and the contractor before the Public Accounts Committee, and ascertaining whether or not they made the journeys, or whether the story is impossible. I think that on all the points on which the public are concerned the information given in the discussion last year, and in the reports contained in various blue-books, is all that could be desired. The public only wanted a good job, they have got it, and they have got it at what the engineer certified a fair price. I think if that fact be clearly established my hon. friend has not much to complain of. He may fail to understand it, but as the facts strike me, the hon. gentleman has failed to make out a better case than he did a year ago, and he did not make a good one then.

**Mr. DAVIN.** The hon. gentleman takes a very easy view of a very important matter. Now, an hon. gentleman, a supporter of his, when he first began to give his explanation, interrupted by saying that the stone in this quarry is very thin. I suppose if we are to take this statement as evidence, we may conclude that the stone is thin. But I want the hon. gentleman to explain what is the meaning of the Department of Public Works having a specimen of that stone in the department and showing it to the various contractors, and telling

them that they are to build with that stone and to take it from a quarry fifty miles from Edmonton. What is the meaning of that? If my hon. friend, who is no expert, knows off-hand that that stone was unfit to build the piers, how much more would an expert of the Public Works Department know it to be unfit? What was the meaning of showing this stone?

Mr. DAVIS. They did not send their experts to examine it.

Mr. DAVIN. I am not dealing with the guffaw of the hon. gentleman. I am dealing with the Minister of the Crown, I am dealing with a matter that has not been explained, and I do not want the mere rude and meaningless interruptions of the hon. gentleman or of any other hon. gentleman. Now, the hon. gentleman asks why I did not go before the Public Accounts Committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I did not ask him that. I said if he had a good case, he would have gone there.

Mr. DAVIN. That is not the position. It was not necessary for me or for the public to go before the Public Accounts Committee and ask questions in regard to this matter, for the very reason that the figures are given by the department, and according to these figures an explanation is called for from the department. Therefore, after the case that was made out last year, if it is capable of being explained, the Government should have had an inquiry, they should have asked questions in the Public Accounts Committee, or they should have asked for further reports. But the thing remains as it remained last year, unexplained, because the hon. gentleman knows very well that there are the dates. Here is Mr. St. Laurent's report, dated the 30th of August, and the contract was signed on the 17th. Under these circumstances, it was not for me to go before the department, it was for the Minister of Public Works, or for the acting Minister, to go before the Public Accounts Committee, or to do what he would have done if there was any explanation possible, get a further report from the engineers. The fact is that no explanation is possible and the truth about this affair, on the face of it, is that the department was determined from the beginning that the contract should go into the hands of Lemoine. If we are to assume that the department is thoroughly informed, the stone shown in the department as a specimen of the quarry, was a part and parcel of these severe conditions in the specifications. Not one of these conditions was fulfilled, not one of the forfeitures enforced, no fine enforced, the bond was not estreated, nothing done, and when that stone was shown in the Public Works Department as representing the quarry it was part and parcel of the whole scheme to

throw the contract into the hands of a favourite contractor. That is the only conclusion one can come to, from the adoption of these extraordinary and onerous conditions. Lemoine accepts the contract; he does not fulfil one of the conditions, and although he does not fulfil one of the conditions, not a single penalty is enforced, not a single fine is exacted, not a single penalty that frightened the other contractors from tendering, and that, presumably, other contractors would have had to submit to. When my hon. friend (Mr. McGregor) who knows so much about everything, tells us that this stone was thin, that there was not enough to build piers and embankment, is it not a fair inference to say that this must have been known to the Public Works Department and that the showing of this stone from the quarry, fifty miles away from Edmonton, where it was said plenty of stone could be had, was part and parcel of the same designing arrangement whereby it was arranged that the contract should go into the hands of Francis Lemoine. Then it goes into his hands. He goes to Edmonton. He tells us that he came back and told the department that he could not get stone there from this quarry, and then we are told that Mr. St. Laurent, the engineer, went and examined the quarry. He presents a report dated at Ottawa, on the 30th of August. Now, I will concede that it may have been dated somewhere else; I will concede that it may have been a mistake of the copyist. Suppose I concede that that was done; it does not help them, because Mr. St. Laurent says that he went there. After the contractor had come back and told them in the department here at Ottawa that he could not get the stone that was needed at Edmonton or Calgary, Mr. St. Laurent tells us that acting on instructions from the department, he went up and examined it. I say the story is impossible, that the contract could have been signed at Montreal and that these two gentlemen could have performed that extraordinary feat of travel, that feat of legerdemain which they state they have performed. The hon. Minister of Finance makes an argument that is unworthy of him and unworthy of his high position, unworthy of a man who has held the position of a Prime Minister of his province, the position of editor of a great newspaper and who is the Minister of Finance of Canada? He tells us that if, on the face of it, some of the documents in the department are unverified, that is of no consequence whatever, that the only thing of importance is whether we are to come to the conclusion that concrete is as good as ashlar masonry. Suppose it were, would that relieve the department from the administrative sin of having changed a contract so completely without entering into a new contract, without calling for tenders and seeing whether or not the work could be done cheaper? I need not go into the calculations. The hon. member for Glen-

garry (Mr. McLennan) and I went into the calculations very fully last year, and we showed that it is not so that the cost of concrete at Edmonton at all approaches the cost of ashlar masonry, so that I say that the department was not at all justified in the course it took. Mr. Coste, in his report, which is a reasoned report, dated the 22nd of September, makes an argument to show that nothing was lost by a change from ashlar to concrete. He makes that argument, and we are told how Mr. Lemoine made these visits to the quarry and how Mr. St. Laurent was instructed to report. Mr. St. Laurent dates his report on the 30th of August, and confirms the statement that the stone could not be found. What is the explanation?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman, of course, is only going over the ground again, but for the fact that it might seem discourteous I would not deem it necessary to reply. The hon. gentleman states that the forfeitures expressed in the contract have not been enforced against the contractor, and, therefore, he assumes that there has been some great wrong in it. While it is the duty of the Government to put in these conditions respecting forfeiture and while they must always be free to enforce them, many cases arise where they are not able to enforce these forfeitures. For example, tenders were taken for the completion of the St. Lawrence canals, and there was a condition made that they should be completed within a given date. That condition was absolutely laid down, yet it was not complied with, and up to the present time, no forfeitures have been enforced against these contractors. The hon. gentleman says that the contractor telegraphed to the department asking if these forfeitures would be enforced. Could you expect the department to do anything else than to answer, yes. The object of putting in these conditions is to have the work pushed on as rapidly as possible, and the Government must be free to enforce these forfeitures, and no such inference as the hon. gentleman suggests is to be drawn from their non-enforcement. The next question is in regard to the inspection made by Mr. St. Laurent. The hon. gentleman undertakes to prove that Mr. St. Laurent did not go up there and examine the quarry before making his report, but he represents Mr. St. Laurent as being at Ottawa at a given date. The explanation made by the hon. Minister of Public Works was that Mr. St. Laurent used the paper bearing the headlines of the Ottawa department, and that the report was written at Edmonton and not at Ottawa.

Mr. DAVIN. Suppose I concede that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman concedes that it, of course, knocks the foundation out of his whole story.

Mr. DAVIN. It does not matter a pin.

Mr. DAVIN.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The main point is as to whether or not this change of specification was to the advantage of the public. When the Auditor General, as he has a right to, asked for an explanation of the change in the specification, the Department of Public Works dealt with the question, and this is Mr. St. Laurent's report, page 272 of the Auditor General's Report:

Department of Public Works,

Ottawa, July 26, 1898.

As requested, I have the honour to report herein on the relative cost of masonry and concrete, with reference to the Edmonton Bridge masonry contract, which formed the subject of a discussion in the House of Commons during the last session of Parliament.

Plans were first made for piers and abutments, to be built of ashlar masonry, on apparently reliable information that stone suitable for bridge piers could be found close to Edmonton.

After the contract had been awarded, it was found, after visiting the reported quarries, that these were only lost beds of sandstone, of such a nature that it could not be suitable for bridge work.

Subsequently, a change was allowed from masonry to concrete, the conviction being that good concrete would be better than any masonry of sandstone, which was only available at or near Calgary, and that the cost of the concrete would be about the same as masonry made under ordinary circumstances at Edmonton.

Then follows a close calculation, showing that the cost of concrete at Edmonton would be \$17.43 per yard, and in conclusion Mr. St. Laurent, who is a respected officer of the Public Works Department, writes:

I may state that I have no doubt that concrete, in this case, was much better than any masonry made of Calgary or Edmonton stone. It is a fact that this useful material is finding more and more favour every day, as it is better known among engineers and practical men for all kinds of important works.

Against that the one thing the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) sets up is that Mr. St. Laurent could not have gone there, because of the dates on these head lines. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) had a shadow of a belief that Mr. St. Laurent did not go there, or a shadow of a hope that he could prove by competent engineers that concrete was not as good as sandstone, he would have had Mr. St. Laurent and fifty other witnesses before the Public Accounts Committee last year. The fact that he did not do so, and that he brings the matter up in the House, shows that this is merely a dream of his that he wants to give Parliament once more.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) brings this up in the House simply to bolster up an old campaign speech he made in the territories, and he thinks it is necessary to save himself by talking about this matter in the House. He made a statement in my own town that the Minister of Public Works had stolen a certain amount of

money from this bridge, and it is evident that it is in order to try and justify himself in some way that he brings this matter up year after year. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) knew that the Minister of Public Works had stolen a certain amount of money out of this work, it was his duty on the floor of this House to make that assertion on his responsibility as a member and ask for an investigation. But he did not do so, for he knows there is no truth in his wild statement. The fact is that a party who owns the quarry at Edmonton sent a sample of this stone to the Department of Public Works, when he understood the contract was going to be let. This was a first-class sample of stone, and that gentleman informed the department that he had sufficient to build two bridges, and on the strength of that statement, the contractor, when he got the contract, went up there, and when he did so, he discovered that the stone was useless. He came back to Ottawa, and then the change was made from stone to concrete. There is no great difference between the two, as I understand it, and if the hon. member (Mr. Davin) knows anything about the price of stone in the west, he must know that you can build masonry even cheaper than you can build this kind of work. I know that is the case in my own town where we have stone. But surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) remembers that changes of this kind have been made in contracts under the late Government, which he supported. Does he not know that in Prince Albert the Conservative Government let a contract for a registry office. Some of the other contractors found that one man was getting the contracts all the time, and they made up their minds that they would tender low, so that if he got this contract he would make nothing out of it. Well, this same man got the contract again, and he proceeded to build the registry office, and when he got about a day's work done, he discovered that a different foundation was required. The Conservative Government changed the contract without calling for new tenders, and the consequence was that this contractor put in a foundation that you could build Windsor Castle on for the tu-penny-ha'-penny registry office which is built in that town. If you hunt up the records you will find that the foundations cost more than the superstructure, and the late Government did that, I believe, not only in the North-west Territories, but all through Canada.

Mr. CAMPBELL. And the hon. member for West Assinibola (Mr. Davin) consented to that.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, he occupied a seat in the House at the time, and he has never complained of it from that day to this.

Mr. DAVIN. It is quite clear that the Minister has given up all hope of explaining the situation in answer to the questions I

have put to him. To show how conscious the acting Minister (Mr. Fielding) is that he cannot explain this transaction, although my words must have been ringing in his ears when I conceded that it would not be necessary, that Ottawa was the head line of the report of St. Laurent, nevertheless; although I stated that did not make against my position, he reiterated it as a strong point in his favour. But, Sir, I need not concede it, because if I wished to insist on it I could easily prove my contention. Last year I said, and I say now, I do not mind where you date it, for here is the report of Mr. Coste:

Department of Public Works, Canada,  
(Chief Engineer.)

Ottawa, 22nd September, 1897.

On the 17th of August, 1897, a contract was entered into with Mr. Lemoine for the construction of the piers and abutments of the Edmonton Bridge for an amount of \$36,500; the specification calling for masonry of rock-faced ashlar from a limestone or granite quarry accepted by the engineer.

I concede, and, of course, it is conceding a great deal, that on the 17th of August stated there, Lemoine may have left Montreal—of course, it is most unlikely that the moment the contract was signed he rushed off and left Montreal—but pointed out that he could not have performed the feat he did, considering the Canadian Pacific Railway time table and calendar.

Tenders were invited for this work on the 22nd of July, and were received on the 6th of August, the lowest being that of Mr. Lemoine.

This report assumed, as it ought to assume, that the department was bound to call for tenders, where a contract was made; and yet the hon. gentleman is going to excuse the contract being given without tender.

I may say that I was personally under the impression that suitable stone could be found in the neighbourhood of Edmonton. As far back as September, 1894, I had caused an examination of the banks of the river to be made by C. J. Duggan, formerly in the employ of the Canadian Pacific Railway, who reported that he found a quarry fifty miles up the river from Edmonton, with a hard flinty stone, the ledge showing along the bank for about 600 feet, and from 8 to 10 feet thick, from which large pieces could be obtained.

Now, what is to be said of that? We have here two members supporting the Administration, both of whom say that this quarry was of no use whatever.

This opinion of Mr. Duggan was further corroborated by Mr. Alexis Degagné, who, on the 10th June, 1897, forwarded a sample of stone taken from this quarry, situated about fifty miles up the River Saskatchewan, stating that he could contract for any quantity that might be required, and that the stone existed in mass-like granite, and not in layers, and that blocks of any thickness could be obtained. He offered that stone for \$14 per cubic yard, dressed.

On the theory of justification put forward by the department, what are we to think

of these two paragraphs in the report of the engineer? It is perfectly clear that Mr. Duggan and Mr. Degagné were friends, and that there was a desire to be very kind to friends. I may add, and I say it on the authority of good contractors, that \$14 per cubic yard was an enormous price.

The sample was examined in my office, and found to be of excellent quality for bridge-building, and was shown to all contractors who inquired whether or not stone could be procured in the neighbourhood of Edmonton—nothing, however, being guaranteed.

As soon as the contract had been awarded, Mr. Lemoine proceeded to Edmonton, but came back at once and reported that he could not find stone of the dimensions or of the quality required by the specification. He was told to procure it elsewhere, but replied that he had also examined the stone found at Calgary, and was of the opinion that it would not be accepted.

It must have been the 17th at the earliest when the contractor left Montreal the day the contract was awarded. It might have been a day or two later, but we will take it as the 17th. Now, this is where my hon. friend the Minister of Finance sees what a broken reed he leans on, when trying to date the letter from Mr. St. Laurent at Edmonton.

Then Mr. Arthur St. Laurent, engineer of this department, was sent to examine the quarries, and he reported as follows, under date of August 30th, 1897.

Now, if you like, I will suppose that Mr. St. Laurent was at Edmonton, that a telegram was sent to him there, and that, in consequence of that, he went and examined the quarries at Edmonton, and then went and examined the quarries at Calgary. How long would that take? Everybody knows that it would take about a week. But suppose you say it would take two days. The date of the report of St. Laurent was the 30th of August. What was the date of the telegram sent to Mr. St. Laurent? What time will you give Mr. St. Laurent? Suppose he went 50 miles to Edmonton, then went to Calgary and examined the quarries there, then by the next train he went to Edmonton—because the trains did not run daily. Then, suppose he sent his report by telegram, though he does not do that; but I will take the most favourable supposition. Let us suppose he writes his report at Calgary. The very least he would take would be two days, which reduces the time and makes it from the 17th of August to the 28th of August. But that will not help you.

Mr. DAVIS. If the hon. gentleman is satisfied that there is something wrong in that transaction, why does he not have these parties before the committee, and get at the truth of the thing?

Mr. DAVIN. I am not dealing with the hon. gentleman, and I have not given him permission to interrupt me.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. DAVIS. I can do that without it.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman cannot do it without my permission. He has been long enough in Parliament to know that.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman often interrupts without permission.

Mr. DAVIN. I say, therefore, that on the face of these documents we have a statement made which is absolutely impossible, and therefore untrue; and if it is untrue, there must have been some reason for it. Now, the acting Minister of Public Works says that forfeitures are never enforced.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I never said that. I said it was often found difficult to enforce them.

Mr. DAVIN. There I rest my case in regard to this transaction on these dates. I say that there is palpable falsehood here, and if so, it must be to conceal some wrong. Now, in regard to the gentleman who is interrupting me, contrary to the usage of Parliament, I say that there is hardly a statement that gentleman has made in regard to my utterances outside of this House that I could not characterize in language that would not be parliamentary. For instance, he says that I said that the Minister of Public Works had stolen for his own purposes money in regard to this transaction. He also said that I said that I had put gyves upon his wrists. I said this last. I did not say that he had stolen for his own purposes money in regard to this transaction. If I did, I would say it in this House before the Minister of Public Works himself. Anything I would say outside in regard to any member of this House, I would say here. I would not say behind any man's back what I would not say to his face. A similar statement was made on another occasion by the hon. gentleman, and I may say—it is the strongest expression I can use—that it was incorrect. In regard to any statements that hon. gentleman makes here, I will say that they must be taken by the Government and his own party cum grano salis, because I can show that he is not believable in a court of justice in this country—I am speaking of the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis). If he presses me, I will prove it before this House rises.

Mr. DAVIS. All right, go ahead.

Mr. DAVIN. The report goes on to show that the stone was not suitable. But is it not extraordinary that when one of the engineers of the department reports in this manner on that quarry, the contractors tendering for the building of this bridge were told that they could get suitable stone from it. What is the meaning of that? It is one of the ear-marks of queerness that are over all this transaction. The engineer then goes into reasons to prove that concrete was as good and as dear as ashlar masonry.

But the moment it was found that these piers could not be built of ashlar masonry, that moment the Government were entering upon a perfectly new contract, and should have allowed the competitors of Mr. Lemoine an opportunity of tendering. The Government should not have placed themselves in the position of having engineers in their employ whom they could dismiss, coming forward and making the excuse that concrete was as good as ashlar and as dear. The proper way to ascertain that it was as dear was to call for tenders.

With regard to the price, we have the statements of these two gentlemen, who tell an utterly impossible story. Therefore, I attach no importance to what Mr. St. Laurent says. I have gone into the calculation with my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), who has experience in this matter, and I do not believe that concrete up there will cost the same as ashlar masonry. Mr. Coste's statement was as follows:—

Stone, dressed, delivered..... \$14 00  
Which, I may say, is an enormous price.

Cement mortar ..... \$ 2 60  
Laying scaffolding, &c..... 2 50

Or, in all ..... \$19 10

And for the backing the price would have been :

Stone delivered at the site of the bridge.. \$ 5 00  
Cement mortar ..... 6 00  
Laying ..... 2 00

Total ..... \$13 00

And as the proportion of ashlar and backing are two to one, the average price of the masonry would have been \$17.06.

The price of a cubic yard of concrete I estimate as follows:—

Broken stone, delivered on site of work. \$ 3 50  
Sand ..... 0 20  
Cement mortar ..... 10 80  
Laying and scaffolding ..... 2 50

Total ..... \$17 00

Which price would be augmented by about 80 cents per cubic yard, if the 80 cubic yards of pure mortar forming the 3-inch coating is taken into consideration, this bringing the estimated cost of the concrete work to a value of \$17.80 per cubic yard.

It appears to me, therefore, that owing to the high value of cement in Edmonton, which is \$6 per barrel, the prices of concrete and of masonry at that place are about the same; and I, therefore, recommend that the price of the contract be allowed to remain the same, namely, \$36,500.

Turn to page 34 of the report, and you will find that Mr. Coste reports :

Under the above circumstances, having ascertained that good clean gravel can be found on the banks of the Saskatchewan for concrete work, I have the honour to strongly recommend that the substitution of concrete for masonry be permitted.

Why, you can get any amount of good, clean gravel on the banks of the Saskatchewan. There is no place in the world where

good concrete can be made cheaper or better. It is absurd to suppose that we should have to pay the same price for concrete as for ashlar masonry.

I quoted last year, and my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) referred to the same sources of information and endorsed them, the prices of bridge masonry under contracts made by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the cost of cement. Here are the names of the contractors and the prices :

CONTRACT No. 37, CANADIAN PACIFIC  
RAILWAY.

Name of Contractor.	Bridge Masonry in Hydraulic Cement Mortar, per C. Yd.	Concrete made with Hydraulic Cement, per C. Yd.
McGreevy & Heney.....	\$13 00	\$ 7 00
C. Scripture .....	8 30	5 70
J. M. Rousseaux .....	11 00	5 00
Smith, Repley & Co.....	11 00	5 00
E. H. Lemay .....	12 00	6 00
Curran & Maletts .....	10 00	6 00
F. B. McNamee & Co.....	12 00	6 00
Starrs & O'Hanly .....	10 00	6 00
Murphy & Upper .....	9 25	6 00
John Ryan .....	11 00	6 00
D. B. McDonald .....	10 00	4 00
Maguire & Kimmert .....	.....	5 50
Charlebois, Shanly & Montly.	10 00	6 00
Law & Conmee .....	11 00	4 50
Lobb, Dawson & Murray....	.....	5 00
James Goodwin .....	10 00	6 50
J. D. Irwin .....	14 00	7 00
Worthington, McIntyre, Mc-		
Donald & Isbester .....	15 00	5 00
P. Larkin .....	10 00	5 00
D. O'Brien .....	18 00	7 00
Nagle, McDougall & McQuarrie	14 00	5 00
Loss & McRae.....	8 00	7 00
Falardeau & McDonald.....	11 00	6 00
Alex. Manning .....	.....	8 00
Davis & Stewart .....	15 00	7 50
Sullivan & Beemer .....	11 00	8 00

CONTRACT NO. 41.

Marks & Conmee.....	8 00	1 00
Charlebois & Shanly .....	14 00	2 50
Denis O'Brien .....	12 00	7 00
Wardrop & Ross .....	10 00	7 00
J. R. Macdonell .....	12 00	8 00
Jan Goodwin & Co.....	13 00	7 00
A. Laberge & Co.....	18 00	6 00
R. H. McGreevy.....	14 00	8 00
Hunter, Murray & Booth....	8 00	6 00
Manning, Macdonnell & Co..	12 00	8 00
Purcell, Ginty & Ryan.....	9 00	4 00
Macdonald & Falardeau.....	12 00	6 00
F. B. McNamee & Co.....	11 00	6 00
R. Nagle & Co.....	8 00	5 00
Walsh & McCarron .....	14 40	6 00
Pitblado, Fraser & Grant....	12 00	7 00
Stevens, Turner, Burns &		
Co.....	12 00	8 00
H. C. O'Reilly .....	11 00	6 00
Hurlburt, Grennell & Camp-		
bell .....	10 00	6 00
Wm. Hendrie .....	15 00	5 00
Esird & McLean .....	11 00	4 00
Ferguson, Symmes, Mitchell		
& Co.....	12 00	8 00

## CONTRACT No. 37—Continued.

Name of Contractor.	Bridge Masonry in Hydraulic Cement Mortar. per C. Yd.	Concrete made with Hydraulic Cement. per C. Yd.
Appendix No. 42—		
Morse, Nicholson & Marpole..	14 00	4 00
A. Laberge & Co.....	16 00	6 00
Andrews, Jones & Co.....	12 50	8 00
A. P. Macdonald & Falardeau.	12 00	6 00
Fraser, Grant & Pitblado....	11 00	6 00
Jas. Goodwin & Co.....	18 00	8 00
Wardrop & Ross.....	12 00	7 00
F. B. McNamee & Co.....	11 00	6 00
Joseph Whitehead .....	16 00	6 00
Ferguson, Symmes, Mitchell & Co.....	12 00	8 00
Loss & McRae.....	20 00	10 00
Denis O'Brien .....	15 00	8 00
Robert J. McGreevy .....	16 00	10 00
Hunter, Murray & Booth....	20 00	12 00
Hurlbert, Grennell & Camp- bell .....	10 00	6 00

Out of forty-eight tenders there is not a single tender that places concrete as of the same value as masonry, and in nearly every case there is a relationship running from more than double to something like two-thirds to one-third.

Under these circumstances, and taking the extraordinary features of this transaction, how can we avoid the conclusion that a wrong has been done to the public exchequer? I believe that money was taken out of the pockets of the people and that it went into the pocket of Lemoine. By giving him the same price for concrete that he was to get for ashlar masonry, he was enabled to get all the way from one-third to one-half more profit than he would otherwise. In the opinion of some, he would make double the profit he would have made if he had built it of ashlar masonry. And when I bring this before this committee, with the Minister of Finance present, who has been Prime Minister of his own province, and has had a life-training in dealing with questions of this sort, the only defence that can be made is in the first place to ask: Why did you not bring this before the Public Accounts Committee? And, in the second place, admitting that concrete is as good as masonry, what wrong was done? The bare fact that this impossible story is told as to these dates throws suspicion on the transaction. And when a man is allowed to put in comparatively cheap material when the contract called for a dear material, we cannot but come to the conclusion, which certainly will be imbedded in the public mind, that, in a calculated manner, the contract placed advantages in the hands of a public contractor contrary to the interests of the people and to the bona fides of public administration. Is it fair, when a transaction of this kind is brought before the House and no satisfactory explanation given, that it should be asked why we do not go before the Public Accounts Committ-

Mr. DAVIN.

tee? If the Department had been able to vindicate itself, it should have gone before the Public Accounts Committee, declaring that it would show that this impossible feat could be accomplished. How can they defend themselves? Unless they can show that Mr. Lemoine travelled by some more rapid means than the railway, that some miracle of science is known to him that is not known to us, there can be no explanation. I have shown the peculiar circumstances attending the granting of the contract—that the Minister of Public Works, presumably, never saw it, that on learning by telegraph who was the lowest tenderer, he gives the contract and allows his subordinates to go through the steps necessary for the signing of the contract. I say, Sir, the suspicious character of these early transactions, and this impossible story, and then the impudent demand that we should admit that concrete was of as much value as ashlar masonry and costs as much—all this stamps this as one of the worst transactions in the administration of the department under the present Minister. We have had certainly serious cases, cases to make us pause and wonder, cases to alarm the people of Canada and make this committee and this Parliament hang their heads in shame. But there is no case to compare with this Edmonton bridge scandal, which will remain as a monument to the ways that are dark and tricks that are vain, which belongs to the administration of the Public Works Department under the present Minister. I sympathize with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, the acting Minister of Public Works. Of course he is responsible for them. He has not only to shoulder them now in the way of his usual responsibility, but he has to come here and to defend them; and, Mr. Chairman, you, who must be familiar with the adroitness of my hon. friend, with his great experience, if he can do no more to defend these transactions than he did to-day, why, what must those transactions be? How impossible it must be to defend them when he can give no explanation, and when the only reply he has to make is: Why did you not go before the Public Accounts Committee? Sir, that is not an answer that will satisfy the people of Canada.

The CHAIRMAN. Carried.

Committee rose and reported progress.

### ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask my right hon. friend if he would be good enough to fix a day when we may expect the resolutions to be moved that he has given notice of with reference to the

Senate? As the hon. gentleman knows, it would be convenient to know a little in advance, and I thought, perhaps, Tuesday might do.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No, on Tuesday we want to take up the Pacific cable. However, I will arrange that matter with my hon. friend on Monday.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 6.00 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 24th July, 1899.

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER** took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### THE QUEEN VS. SKELTON.

Mr. **DAVIN**. In accordance with the notice I gave on Saturday, at the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), I beg to move :

That an Order of the House issue for a copy of the report of the hon. the Minister of Justice on which the Order in Council was passed discharging from prison J. M. Skelton and Thomas Dewan, tried for and convicted of perjury before the Hon. Mr. Justice Wetmore at Battleford, in October, 1897, and subsequently sentenced to a term of imprisonment; also copies of affidavits filed in the Department of Justice by those applying for the release of the prisoners.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I must take exception to this notice in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. My hon. friend may, perhaps, renew it, but if he insists on it now, I will have to take the point of order.

Mr. **DAVIN**. I may tell the right hon. gentleman that I make the motion at the suggestion of the hon. Minister.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. My hon. friend had better wait until he comes.

### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 174)—from the Senate—respecting Usury.—(Mr. Rinfret.)

### IMPORTS OF INDIAN CORN.

Mr. **CLANCY** asked :

How much Indian corn has been imported into Canada for home consumption during each of the fiscal years 1896, 1897, 1898 and 1899 respectively?

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Pater-son). The total quantity of Indian corn en-

tered at customs for home consumption during the fiscal years 1896, 1897 and 1898, as appears from the Trade and Navigation Returns, is as follows :—

	Dutiable.	Free Ensilage.	Total.
1896.....(bush)	2,763,999	253,631	3,017,630
1897.....(bush)	1,788,147	2,374,912	4,163,059
1898.....(bush)	204,787	19,771,314	19,976,101

I may say that since corn has been put upon the free list, it is all entered as imported for home consumption; but that does not necessarily imply that it is consumed in the country. There are millions of bushels of foreign corn exported, and I prepared the figures of those exports; but I have not read them, as the hon. gentleman's question did not cover that point.

Mr. **CLANCY**. The figures of the Trade and Navigation Returns in that respect are somewhat misleading, as all the corn appears to have been entered for home consumption, when a large portion of it is exported.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. That is the reason I make this explanation. When goods are entered free, as soon as they pass the customs, the department has no more care of them.

### IMPORTS OF BINDER TWINE.

Mr. **CLANCY** asked :

How much twine for harvest binders (or binder twine was imported into Canada for home consumption for the fiscal year ending the 30th June, 1899, and the value thereof?

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Pater-son). I regret to say that I cannot give the information at present, as the statistical returns in detail of importations during the past fiscal year have not yet been received from all ports of entry, and I am afraid they will not be received before the House rises.

### VALUATION OF VESSELS IN THE YUKON.

Mr. **PRIOR** asked :

Has the Government received any report from Mr. Oglivie, or any other official in the Yukon, in regard to the alleged undervaluation of the United States vessel "John C. Barr" for Canadian registry?

2. If so, what is the nature of the report?

3. Was the valuation of \$10,000 on that vessel a fair one?

4. Is the vessel registered in the name of one Steinhalt?

5. Has the Government been informed that the above vessel is running in Canadian waters under the flag of the North American Trading and Transportation Company, with "Port of St. Michaels" painted on her stern as the port of registry?

6. Has the Government any report of the truth of the alleged undervaluation of the steamers "Pingree" and "Lowe"?

7. Is it true that the collector at Dawson attempted to admit these vessels without any inspection and that the inspector of customs refused to consent to this?

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Pater-son). 1. The Government has received a report from Commissioner Ogilvie respecting the alleged undervaluation of the "J. C. Barr." 2. Mr. Ogilvie reports that he considers the hull of the "John C. Barr" worth at least \$7,500. The hull was entered at \$7,000. Mr. Ogilvie says nothing in respect to the value of the machinery of the vessel. 3. The question as to the fair valuation of the steamers "J. C. Barr," "Pingree" and "Lowe" remains undecided by the Customs Department, pending the report and action of S. W. McMichael, chief inspector of customs, who is investigating the valuation of all foreign-built steamers on the Yukon River, entered on application for registry at the port of Dawson—Mr. McMichael being authorized to deal with these matters under the provisions of the customs laws. 4. John Stinehoff, of Dawson is reported as the British owner of the "J. C. Barr." 5. The Government has not been informed that the "J. C. Barr" is running in Canadian waters under the flag of the North American Trading and Transportation Co., with "Port of St. Michaels" painted on her stern as the port of registry. 6. Commissioner Ogilvie reports, in effect, that he considers there is an undervaluation in the case both of the "Pingree" and "Lowe," but he does not wish to set his judgment up against that of Captain John S. Abbott, formerly of Nova Scotia, and Captain S. S. Danhier, of Dawson, who valued the vessels at the amount at which they were entered. 7. The Government is not aware that the collector at Dawson attempted to admit the "Pingree" and "Lowe" without any inspection and that the inspector of customs refused to consent to this.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Would the Minister be willing, without a formal motion to lay the report of Mr. Ogilvie on the Table?

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. Yes, I imagine there can be no objection to that.

#### THE LAKE ST. LOUIS CHANNEL.

Mr. **MONE** (by Mr. Bergeron) asked :

Is it the intention of the Government, in accordance with the prayer of the petition of the Royal St. Lawrence Yacht Club, to dredge the channel in Lake St. Louis, leading to the wharf of the said club at Dorval?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). That matter is under the consideration of the Public Works Department, but we are unable to give my hon. friend a definite statement at present.

#### INSPECTOR MOODY, N.W.T.

Mr. **DAVIS** asked :

Is Inspector Moody still a member of the North-west Mounted Police Force?

Mr. **PRIOR**.

Are the Government aware that serious charges were made against him in Battleford in 1895 or 1896?

Have said charges been investigated? If so, what action have the Government taken in regard to same?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) No, we have no information of that character.

#### B. C. PLACER MINING OR ALIEN ACT.

Mr. **PRIOR** asked :

Has the Government had any correspondence with the Provincial Government of British Columbia, or any other person, in regard to the Act passed by the Provincial Government, intitled: "An Act to amend the Placer Mining Act" (otherwise known as the Alien Act)?

If so, will the Government bring said correspondence down to the House before the end of the session?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will have to ask the hon. gentleman to let this stand.

Mr. **PRIOR**. If there is any correspondence will the hon. gentleman bring it down?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I have no objection, but do not think there is any.

#### INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. **MARCOTTE** (by Mr. Bergeron) asked :

1. Have the Government expended any portion of the \$48,000 voted on two several occasions for the improvement of the station of the Intercolonial Railway at Lévis?

2. What amount has been so expended?

3. What are the improvements effected at the said station out of the vote of \$48,000?

4. Were the said improvements done by day's work, or under contract?

5. If by day's work, who was the superintendent?

6. If the work was done under contract, who was the contractor, and what was the contract price?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Between \$30,000 and \$40,000 has been expended in the purchase of land but not in any works.

#### ESTATE DUTY.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of my right hon. friend to the fact that the return which he was kind enough to lay on the Table in response to a suggestion from myself with reference to the correspondence that had taken place with regard to the Estate Duty, which is a matter of considerable importance and which I think ought not only to be on the Table but published for the information of all the provinces, does not contain the most important part of the correspondence, and that is with regard to the action taken by the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the oc-

casation which settles what should be done. I shall send the correspondence over to my right hon. friend so that he can see for himself that this part has been omitted.

I would like also to draw the attention of my right hon. friend to the fact that at this period it is extremely inconvenient not to answer questions owing to the absence of Ministers. The Ministers should be in their places. Under the present arrangement, nearly all the time is in the hands of the Government, and I think that the slight privilege which remains should not be postponed at the last hours of the session.

I also wish to say to my hon. friend the Finance Minister that I hope he is able to lay on the Table any proposed railway subsidies or any further demands that are to be made on Parliament for grants of any kind. We are in the last hours of the session, and numbers of members are absolutely obliged to leave. We are nearly at the end of July, when it is impossible for hon. members to remain in this House, and I think, under the circumstances, not an hour should be lost in letting Parliament have all information as to any demands to be made upon it for appropriation of money.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is much in what my hon. friend says. With regard to the absence of Ministers, the reason is that they are engaged up stairs in an important committee.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Their answer should be placed in the hands of others.

The PRIME MINISTER. I believe the Ministers are not losing any time but are busily employed the whole 24 hours.

Mr. FOSTER. They should work forty-eight hours.

The PRIME MINISTER. We will be able to lay before the House the subsidies required to-morrow evening or Wednesday at the latest.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). We have no intention at the moment of submitting further estimates, except to supply any omission through error or for other reasons, and these will be so small as not to excite any debate.

#### SUPPLY—PREFERENTIAL TRADE.

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

Mr. McNEILL. I desire to make a motion which I think will meet with the unanimous approval of the House. It is a motion which I said last session I felt that I would have been justified in moving, but which I did not move because I knew positively that it would not be accepted by my right hon. friend and the Government. But having now, I am glad to say, the endorsement of my

right hon. friend himself, I can see no objection to my moving it. I therefore beg to move :

That it is the duty of the Government of Canada, by all means in its power and as soon as it can possibly do so, to get preferential trade in the markets of Great Britain for the produce of Canada.

These are 'ipsissima verba' of my right hon. friend which he made use of in the House when this question was being discussed on Wednesday last. I have taken the words from "Hansard," and have merely added "for the produce of Canada." The rest is exactly in the words of my right hon. friend.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I offer no comment at all upon the merits of the motion presented by my hon. friend, but I would have expected of him, before addressing such an important motion, to have given me notice and an opportunity to consult and look at the motion itself. I hope he will not persist in moving it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that I quite concur in the reasonableness of the request of the First Minister, and no doubt my hon. friend will at once consent to postpone making such a motion until the Government have an opportunity of looking at it. I regret that the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are not in their places. After the discussion which took place in the House and after the letter of His Grace the Duke of Devonshire, which was read to the House by the hon. Postmaster General—although I considered there was no conflict whatever in any statement I had made and the answer of His Grace the Duke of Devonshire, because I had never accused him of any protectionist heresies, but, on the other hand, I had taken the view of Lord Salisbury, that preferential trade could be given to the products of the country by the mother country without in any way conflicting with the doctrine of free trade. I do not intend to go into that, however. I went across the House to see the leader of the House. Unfortunately, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had been obliged to leave. There was no statement in the resolution that did anything more than affirm what His Grace has confirmed, and that was, that his views had been so accepted by a considerable portion of the press in England. But for the purpose of avoiding the slightest appearance of treating this great question as a party question, and if possible, of removing any difficulties, as I have shown my desire to do—as my right hon. friend knows—by the modification of the resolution, at the last moment I went over and consulted with hon. gentlemen who were leading the House, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the Minister of Marine and

Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), and suggested to them that I should drop the whole of the preamble and should strike out the references to advances having been made, and simply retain the expression of the hope that the Government would do all that was in their power to bring about preferential trade. But my hon. friends the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries felt that, in the absence of the leader of the Government, they would not be justified in adopting that course. I am quite sure, if my right hon. friend had been here, he would have concurred in the suggestion made, because it did away with all the objections that my right hon. friend had urged to the resolution, and would have enabled us to present a united front on this question. I wished to make that explanation and to say that I agree with my right hon. friend as to the propriety of deferring any action to another day.

Mr. McNEILL. I shall only be too glad to accept the suggestion of my right hon. friend. I think that, in justice to myself, it is only right that I should explain that I did not think it necessary to communicate this to my right hon. friend, because what I was proposing that my right hon. friend should accept was simply the absolute statement, the very statement in the very words, that he had made in the House of Commons, and I did not think it was necessary for me to ask him to accept the statement that he had solemnly made in this House. As my right hon. friend knows—and I am sure he will do me the justice of admitting so much—I did everything I could last session to keep this question clear of party politics—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Oh, oh.

Mr. McNEILL. One hon. gentleman sneers. I refer him to his leader.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No matter what he says, my opinion is the contrary of that expressed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill).

Mr. McNEILL. But the right hon. gentleman knows that I did everything in my power in this direction last session. I cannot repeat the private conversations, because they are sacred; but I mentioned to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that I thought I was justified in saying I had communicated with the Government over and over again, with a view to having this matter arranged. I was willing to accept any suggestions from the Government with regard to the matter, and did all I could to keep it clear of party politics, and have done so from the first. And if hon. gentlemen last session treated it from a party point of view—if we were virtually told across the floor of the House by the leader of the House at the time, that it was more

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

important that it should be declared that they, as a party, had been right, and that we, as a party, had been wrong—as the Minister of Trade and Commerce did though not in terms tells us—if they told us that that was more important than that we should send a united message to strengthen the hands of those who were fighting for this policy in England, it was not my fault. It seemed to me absolutely useless to press the matter further upon the Government. I consider that I humiliated myself in going to the Government as often as I did last session. But I was prepared to do even that for such a cause; and I say I am only too glad to give my right hon. friend until to-morrow to think over this matter. What he is asking time to consider is a resolution declaring exactly, word for word, what he himself declared in this House last Wednesday.

#### SUPPLY—INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the motion is carried. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) not to forget the two or three returns I have asked for.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have them here, and will lay them on the Table now.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics—  
Archives ..... \$8,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is this the usual vote, and to be disposed of in the usual way?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Is nothing more to be done about that building for the archives for this Washington of the North?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I hope that before long we shall be able to provide a suitable place for the archives.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) asks for more expenditure of money, and then, when we make it, he blames us for it.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to hold the Prime Minister to his promises, and that is a pretty hard job.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, and when I carry out the promises, to blame me for doing so.

Mr. BELCOURT. As one of the members who have taken an interest in this matter, I wish to say a word or two, not to make a speech, but merely to express the great disappointment I feel at not seeing in the supplementary Estimates any provision

for the erection at an approximate date of the Geological Museum in Ottawa. I think that the Government might well, even at this stage, include a sum of, say \$50,000, or \$70,000, or \$100,000, with a view to beginning the work. Fifty or seventy-five thousand is about the most which could properly be expended between now and next year. If no provision is made now, it means that there will be a whole year lost in getting the building ready for occupation. The construction of the building, as has often been pointed out by others as well as myself, is an immediate necessity. The work cannot be completed in less than three years, so that, before the end of that time, these valuable collections cannot, in any case, be put beyond danger. It is not necessary that the whole sum required for the building should be put in the Estimates this year; but I urgently ask the Government to consider the matter and put in the Estimates this year such a sum as I have mentioned. As I have said, I do not want to make a speech; but I ask leave to read the letter I have received from the Director of the Geological Survey, which I would like to have placed on record:

Rideau Club, Ottawa, July 19, 1899.

Dear Mr. Belcourt,—You will be as much disappointed as I am (having interested yourself so largely in the matter) to notice that no provision has been made in the supplementary Estimates for the new museum building.

I do not yet, however, altogether abandon the hope that a small sum may be obtained before the end of the session, if merely to affirm the principle and inaugurate the work.

As a matter of fact, the session is so late that a moderate amount might enable as much work as it would be profitable to undertake to be carried out before winter, after the final completion of the plans.

It should be remembered, I think, that about three years will be required after the building is begun, before it can be so far completed and fitted that it will be possible to house the collection in it. All this time we must remain, in any case, subject not only to the present great danger of loss by fire, but also to the disadvantage in opportunity for the adequate display of the mineral resources of the country, which, at a time when so much interest is being taken in their resources, seems to be especially unfortunate.

If the beginning of the work must be postponed for another session, it means another year lost at least.

Yours truly,

GEORGE M. DAWSON.

N. A. Belcourt, Esq., M.P.

I hope the Government will yet make some provision, at least, to begin work on the museum at once. I need not repeat what has been said before. I know the Government is prepared, sooner or later, to build a museum, and that it is only a matter of time when that will be done. I suppose the reason why no provision has been made this year is because of the large demands which have been made on the Government. But it seems to me a small sum of \$50,000, such as I have mentioned, might well be spared and

might well be employed between this period and next session, and I hope that it will yet be done.

Statistical Year Book..... \$3,000

Mr. BERGERON. What is the reason of the decrease in that item? I have always looked upon this book as a very important one.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). We have found that we can do the work at a less price than has been voted for it heretofore. This last year the expenditure has not amounted to \$3,000, and consequently we find that we can considerably increase the number of copies printed, and do it for \$3,000 instead of the \$4,000 or the \$5,000 which has been voted heretofore. It will be just as large a book, but a larger number of copies will be issued.

Mr. McNEILL. How is the saving to be effected? It is printed in the same way as before, I suppose?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The book now is not nearly as large as it was the first year I came into office. It had reached such a size that the object of its publication was prejudiced, and it has been compressed in size. A number of tables were being duplicated, for one thing, and after going carefully over it with Dr. Dawson we have been able to eliminate some of the statistics that were appearing more than once. I may say that as a matter of fact, the whole vote has hardly ever been spent. The highest amount spent in any one year was \$4,300, in 1897. In 1896 only \$3,000 was spent; and from the estimate which has been given this year by the Queen's Printer, I hope to publish the same number that we published last year for \$2,544.90. But in consequence of some complaints that enough copies were not issued, I propose to add to the number issued, and so we call for \$3,000.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Could not the Minister manage to get a little thinner paper, so as to make the book less heavy?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That might be done, though, perhaps, it would interfere some with the printing, which is already rather fine. Unless the paper was pretty good, the printing might not be sufficiently legible. However, I will discuss the suggestion with the Queen's Printer.

Mr. HENDERSON. How many copies were published last year?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Five thousand five hundred.

Mr. SEMPLE. I am pleased to know that an additional number of that book is to be published. I have received a few during this session, and have sent them out to ministers of the Gospel, high school teachers and inspectors of schools, and they have given

their opinion that it is an excellent book, containing nearly everything relating to this country in a convenient form. I think the book is very much appreciated.

**Mr. HENDERSON.** May I ask the Minister how many copies of this work does he intend to give each member of Parliament, because I can assure him that I have not received anything like the number of copies the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Semple) has received. I think a sufficient number should be printed to give each member a reasonable number of copies of this book, so that its useful information can be distributed among the people of the country. At any rate, there should be an equitable division to all the members; then, if there are any left, they may be given out to others.

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** I may say that this book is distributed to various public libraries, and mechanics' institutes, and organizations of that kind, according to a list which is held in the department. But that does not by any means exhaust all the copies that are printed, and the others are available to members. I forget whether they send two copies or more to every member the moment it is issued. An arrangement might be made by which each member should receive five, eight or ten copies.

**Mr. HENDERSON.** That would be much better, because, on account of the limited number of these books printed, I have felt a delicacy in asking the department for more. I have only received one or two copies, and now I find that others have been receiving a very much larger number. It would be well to have a definite understanding that each member should receive 20 or 30 copies, then, if there were any left, they could be divided up.

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** There are a good many members who do not make any use of the blue-books and documents that are sent to them. This is rather a valuable book, and rather an expensive book, and I think it would be pity if we sent them out in large numbers and they were stowed away, as is the case with many blue-books which are received by a good many members of the House. Therefore, it has been thought better that members should apply for such number as they wish to make use of. That is the reason why a larger number has not been sent indiscriminately to all the members. I do not think any member has applied for any without getting them.

**Mr. FOSTER.** That does not act fairly at all. For myself, I have only received one this year, and I only received one last year. When valuable information like this is being printed for distribution, it is not right that it should only be given to members who ask for it. I supposed that with respect to all these public documents there was a cer-

**Mr. SEMPLE.**

tain rule by which so many were distributed to each member, then if there were any left over, the distribution should take place accordingly. A modest man like myself only gets one of these, and my hon. friend from Centre Wellington gets a lot to send to ministers and school teachers. I do not think it should be made simply a matter of application. For my own part I do not propose to run around every year asking for these books. It is the people's money; I am one of the people's representatives, and a certain number should be given to each representative. To assume that a representative will not properly use a book of that kind is not a correct assumption, because it is a most valuable book, probably, of a non-party character that is made up by the Government. I imagine that every hon. member has the same right to it and it should be distributed according to a pro rata basis to hon. members. I do not believe in making a wholesale distribution of any of these books to members of Parliament; I do not believe in furnishing members with campaign literature out of public money because these books are at the Queen's Printer to be bought, and outside of a small number, by courtesy distributed, I think hon. members ought to buy these books if they want them, and the public ought to buy them if they want them. But when we have to print a certain number, and after you have got the non-official distribution completed, I think the remainder ought to be distributed pro rata.

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is somewhat mistaken in regard to the manner that blue-books are distributed. A certain number of all our blue-books are sent to each member, one or two to each member, and they apply for a further distribution if they want additional copies. The report of the Geological Survey is dealt with in this way, and other blue-books are dealt with in this way. I quite appreciate what the hon. gentleman says in regard to the public paying for these books if they want them. We have never sold any of these books; we have always distributed them free, but we try to distribute them to those who really want them, and if an hon. member of the House wants a larger number we try to give them.

**Mr. BERGERON.** I have never received more than one copy of the book. I have always appreciated it a great deal because it contains a lot of valuable information. I never knew that you could get more than one copy. I would be delighted to have twelve or fifteen copies to give to the people in my county who would be interested in reading the book. After what my hon. friend has said I will try and get as many as can be given to one individual member. It is the first time I have heard that more

than one copy can be got, and when I am passing the department of the hon. gentleman I will try and get more.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Not only in connection with this book but in connection with others, the Auditor General's Report, for instance, I think that a definite understanding should be arrived at as to the number of copies that each member may receive, so that when a constituent writes to you to get him a copy of one of these books, you will know whether you can comply with his request or not. I think there should be a definite number of these publications distributed to each member. At present there appears to be a maxim that the man who goes to the Distribution office first will have a greater advantage than anybody else, or, in other words, that the early bird gets the worm. Certainly the early bird gets these documents. I think it would be fairer to have an arrangement by which a member would get a certain number in proportion to the number of constituents he has. One member may have 20,000 constituents and another 40,000, and an arrangement should be made by which so many should be given to each.

Mr. BERGERON There should not be anything like that, under your Redistribution Bill.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). It should be so arranged that the distribution will take place in proportion to the number of voters in the different constituencies. So far as the Auditor General's Report is concerned it should not be distributed simply upon the basis of going and asking for additional copies. I only got two copies, and the one I have up-stairs, and when we go to the Distribution office to ask for more we are told that they are all gone. It is only the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Semple) who understood all about this. He supplied all the clergymen and other people in his county with this book, and they say: What an excellent member we have in Mr. Semple; he supplies us with all these documents—and when I cannot get them, the people in my county say: What a miserable member we have got; he cannot get us this Year-book. The hon. member who has just spoken says that we are supplied to our heart's content with these copies. I submit that, if there is to be a rule, it should apply to every hon. member so a certain number of copies would be guaranteed to each member whether he asked for them upon the first or the last day of the session. Then he would know how many he could get and he would distribute them to the best advantage. I must bear testimony to the value of this Year-book. It is one of the most important publications in Canada, if properly guarded in the statement of facts, if the facts contained in it are seen to be real facts, although sometimes I have seen that they

were a little coloured in a certain direction. I think that each hon. member should get as many as possible consistent with the rule, and that a definite and certain number should go to each hon. member.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Chairman, I entirely agree with what the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has said. I admit quite willingly that the Year-book is a very valuable production, but I can endorse what he has said to this extent, that I have known hon. members who have received these books and who have allowed them to lie in their offices until there was half a cord, or a cord of books, from which the twine had not even been removed.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). If there are a number of delinquents of that kind, is that a reason why hon. members who do not act in that way should not get them?

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the course the hon. Minister of Agriculture has taken is a proper one. I would suggest that when the Year-book is printed it be sent out with a blank order in the book with a notice that when an hon. member receives the first book each member is entitled to, say, 20 more and that if he will fill out the order and return it to the hon. Minister of Agriculture he will be supplied with that number. If you adopt this method, then hon. gentlemen who do not want them, will not fill out the order and books will not be sent to them to lie in their offices unused. If you send out that blank order each member who wants additional copies of the book will fill it in, return it to the hon. Minister—there is no postage to pay—and he will get the additional number of books. I think that would be a proper rule to follow, because those who do not want the books will not send the order, and money will not be lost in printing books that are not used. I quite agree with the desirability of distributing this book in considerable numbers, because I know a great many people who like to get it, and I think it would be well to place the book in the hands of those members who would distribute it to advantage.

Mr. HUGHES. A number of years ago I brought this matter before the House and I asked that an extra number of copies might be printed. I regret that that request was not complied with. It was at the time when our friends were in power. When I found that a large number of these books was not used I made an application each year for them, and was supplied with copies of them, but last year I was informed that there would not be a continuation of that distribution. There was substituted instead, however, the excellent Hand Book of the Interior Department, and this has been supplemented by the excellent little atlases also furnished by the Department of the Interior. I heartily endorse what has been said in

reference to the value of this work if placed in the various schools in the community, in mechanics' institutes and public libraries. I have supplied it to the schools so far as I could get copies, and I found that it was highly appreciated. I can scarcely believe that it is possible that any member of Parliament would allow books like these to lie undistributed in his office. I would be inclined to doubt the statement of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that these books have been "laying" around. I do not know what would be hatched from them if they were; but I would be inclined to doubt that they would be lying around without being used. If the Minister of Agriculture has any in stock, he has my address, and I can utilize anywhere from 75 to 150 to very great advantage. They are distributed non-politically. I believe, to the teachers of the country, and to reading rooms, and I would press upon the Minister the necessity of having a sufficient number printed for distribution to each reading room in the educational centres.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. For the information of the House I may say that in 1891 the late Government had 3,600 printed; in 1892 they reduced the number to 2,800, in 1893 to 2,400, in 1894 to 2,400, in 1895 to 2,400. In 1896 I increased the number to 3,000, in 1897 to 4,300, and last year to 5,300, double the number printed under my predecessor, and this year I hope to be able to distribute 6,000, and perhaps more.

Mr. HUGHES. I may say that in those years I got a large number, while at the present time I only get one.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that book translated into French?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly.

Mr. BERGERON. I have never seen it in French.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As soon as the proof sheets are printed, they are sent to the translator, and when the translation is completed the French edition is at once printed.

Mr. BERGERON. If I go to the department, will my hon. friend allow me to have some of those books in French and English?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly.

The PRIME MINISTER. Is it possible that my hon. friend never applied for any?

Mr. BERGERON. I do not need to ask for any favours from this Government.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be done about the distribution?

Mr. HUGHES.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the suggestion of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is a good one, that we should send to each member a slip asking him to state how many copies he requires.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose these applications are sent out, and one member says he wants 100, another 10, and another 75?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The suggestion was that they should be limited to a certain number.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that every man who represents a constituency knows how to make the best use of the five or six books he may get. I have been told that when application has been made by a member for these books, the department asks him to send the names of the parties to whom he wishes them to be sent, and the department will send them. That is not what is wanted. The member represents his constituency, and if the book is to be sent to a mechanics' institute or to a library or to any person in his constituency he wants to send it under his own hand. That is only fair to the constituency and to the member himself. The least you could do would be to give the member his ten copies, and I do not think there is a man in this House representing a constituency who is not able to dispose of ten copies to good advantage. If these books are to be distributed upon application, what will happen will be that some members who have more time than others to besiege the department will receive them as a matter of favour, and some who have not time or will to be continually haunting the department, will not receive them.

Mr. MOORE. I am glad that the Minister of Agriculture appreciates the importance of this work. I do not think a more important work is published by the Government than this Statistical Year-book, and I think it is in very good hands when it is under the supervision of Mr. Johnson. As the Minister has increased the number to 5,500 that would give 25 copies to each member.

Mr. FOSTER. There are a great many distributed unofficially, of course.

Mr. MOORE. If a member gets 25 copies, I think that would be quite sufficient. I have endeavoured for several years to get a bound copy, but have been unable to do so. I would suggest that enough be bound to give each member at least one bound copy.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A large number of these books are sent to mechanics' institutes and public libraries all over the country; and the only reason members are asked to whom they wish the books to be sent is to avoid duplicating

them. I value this book very highly myself, and I think it would be a pity to have it distributed indiscriminately. Mr. Johnson has a list of people specially interested in statistics to whom this book has been distributed for years, and it would be a hardship to these people if they were not to receive it. If the book were distributed wholly through the members, the members might or might not send it to these people; and it is very important to them that they should have the book for a series of years in order to be able to compare data from year to year. I do not think the House would wish to have the public libraries and mechanics' institutes cut off; and if we send it to all these and also supply each member with a certain number of copies, I shall have to ask for more money in order to get a larger number printed. We must also remember that the Senators have to receive these books as well as the members of this House.

Mr. HUGHES. Why?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Senate is a portion of the Parliament of Canada as well as the House of Commons, and we cannot well refuse them. That means that some 300 must be used as the multiplier for any fixed number which may be decided upon for distribution among the members.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I should think that a bound copy for each member and five for his constituency would be enough.

Mr. McMILLAN. Last year a friend wrote to me asking me to get him a copy of the Statistical Year-book, and I had to reply that I was unable to do so. Now, it is not right that one member should get five or six copies and others should only get one. I think we should know, before we distribute a book of this kind, how many copies we are going to get. Three thousand copies would give ten to each member of the Senate and the House of Commons, and that is not too many for distribution in a constituency. It is a very valuable book, giving more information than any other book issued by the Government, and we ought to have at least ten copies each. I think it should be clearly understood what number each member is to get, so that when we get them we shall know where to send them in order that they may do the most good in the community.

Mr. CLANCOY. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Agriculture could tell us how the distribution has been made in the past year. It has been said that certain numbers went to mechanics' institutes and public libraries, and the hon. gentleman intimated that a certain number went to persons who take a special interest in statistics. The balance,

I suppose, would be left for members. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could state the number reserved for each of these classes.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the figures under my hand.

Mr. CLANCOY. It is important that we should get that information before we settle the question of the distribution. With regard to the suggestion that some members are so busy or so indolent that they have not made use of the blue-books, including the Statistical Year-book, that is no answer to the proposal that they should be distributed to the members of this House. Each member must answer to his constituents, and to no one else; and if he has failed to send these books to his constituents, that is absolutely his own concern. It seems to me that as far as possible an inflexible rule should be laid down as to how many each member should receive. I do not think that should be left to hap-hazard, because there are not many as lucky as the hon. gentleman who made the disclosure that he was able to supply all the ministers in his constituency.

Mr. SEMPLE. Not all, only a few.

Mr. CLANCOY. Well, I was not so lucky; I only got one. I did not ask for any more. I think the Minister of Agriculture should tell the committee in a general way how many are distributed to mechanics' institutes, public libraries, and outside individuals, as well as to members.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would have to examine the list in the department, for I have not got the numbers in my mind, before I could give a definite answer to my hon. friend; but I can assure him that the discussion here will be borne in mind, and if this vote passes, I shall be very glad indeed to try and follow the suggestions made. I wish this book to go to those who are interested in it, and who will make good use of it, and I will see that a larger number shall be distributed to the members of Parliament in the way suggested.

Mr. CLANCOY. The hon. gentleman said that he concurred in the suggestion of the hon. member for North Wellington that each members of this House should be required to send a list. I think each member of this House must be left to consult his own inclinations or convenience as to those to whom he will send the book. I hope the Minister will not adopt the plan suggested by the hon. member for North Wellington at all, but that the number which each member is to receive shall be left entirely at his own disposal and that an equal number shall be given to every member, whatever that number may be.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend quite misunderstands my suggestion. It is that

as soon as the Year-book is issued, one copy should be sent to each member of Parliament, with a blank order in the first page, stating that copies of the book would be furnished to each member up to a certain number, and asking him to fill up the blank order and return it to the department stating the number he desired, and that number would be sent to his address. Then he could send them wherever he pleased. I would suggest further that the order should be left open for only three months, and that if the blank is not filled up and returned within that time the matter should be closed. That would leave the balance in hand entirely at the disposal of the Minister of Agriculture to send them to whoever might apply for them. In my humble opinion, that is the best course to pursue. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) seems to think that it is a little humiliating for an ex-Minister to fill up an order of that kind and send it to the department. I do not think that it is. The object of not sending ten or twenty copies to each member is to avoid their being wasted; as in some cases members may receive a parcel of the books and may never open it at all. The object is to have them placed in the hands of people who will use them, and to take care that the money spent for printing them is spent to some purpose.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not think we can undertake to direct just how these books shall be used, or what shall become of them after they are sent from the department. It seems to me absurd that we should undertake to see that every book is well read after it is sent, and whether a member distributes the books at once or does not do so for eleven months after receiving them is a matter of his own concern. This committee is not to be a judge of what use a member shall make of the books. It seems to me there is only one way of distributing them, that is, to give an equal number to every member.

Mr. HUGHES. I wish to suggest to the Minister that he should let each member know how many books are sent to mechanics' institutes and libraries in his riding, for I find that in some cases I have been duplicating them. I trust that the Minister, in communicating with members, will not do so by sticking a notice in the front leaf of the book, but will send a letter to each member direct.

Mr. TYRWHITT. The objection I see to the suggestion of the hon. member for North Wellington is that it does not make it compulsory on the Minister of Agriculture to send the books to the applicant. Applications which I have sent have not been complied with.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I agree with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. I had an  
Mr. McMULLEN.

application from a friend for one of these books, and I sent it to the department, with the request that if the book could be furnished it should be sent to the applicant; but I am without information whether the book has been sent or not, and I am unable to assure my friend that it will be sent. If I had the same privilege with respect to these books that I have with respect to other blue-books, of getting a certain number, addressed to myself, I could send copies to such of my friends as I thought most required them.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The rule has been that the names should be sent so as to avoid sending duplicates. I shall see that anybody else who writes for a book will be notified at once that the book has been sent.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not think that the department should exercise its own will with regard to sending those books to certain places in certain constituencies and not with regard to others. Why is there not a definite understanding what kind of institutions and what number shall receive those books?

Mr. McMILLAN. I have been notified the last two years that a copy of that book was forwarded to me by the Statistician. The Statistician should inform each member how many institutions in his riding gets copies, and how many copies he is entitled to.

Mr. MARTIN. Some years ago there were 2,400 copies of this book printed, and last year there were 5,500, or more than double. As far as the committee is aware, hon. members, with one or two exceptions, do not receive any more copies than they did previously, and I think the committee is entitled to the information as to what became of the additional 2,100 distributed this year.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were distributed to those who applied for them.

Mr. MARTIN. That is where the injustice comes in. It would be easy for the Minister of Agriculture to give this committee a list of all those to whom the book is sent, or at least the number. After you ascertain the number required for societies and private individuals, the number you have left over for distribution should be fairly distributed among the members.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will do that.

General statistics ..... \$3,000

Mr. FOSTER. How is this spent?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In paying certain clerks who assist Mr. Johnson in his statistical work, and also expenditure in obtaining information in different parts of the country. The ordinary salaries amount to \$2,600. Mr. Washington made various investigations, with regard to some

land values in different parts of the country. Mr. Macdonald was employed in making some investigations into the exports of agricultural products and was paid \$164. These are the only items I have here, except stationery and printing.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the hon. gentleman taken any steps to find out the suitability of the vast areas lying in the northern regions of the North-west for agriculture, for instance, the Peace River district, the Athabasca, Upper Saskatchewan districts ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no vote under which I could do work of that kind. There is a vote in the Estimates this year out of which, if the House grants, I might be able to do work of that kind.

Mr. FOSTER. General statistics and the Statistical Year-book ought really to go together.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Practically it is a supplementary vote for that purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. Better combine the vote.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Statistical Year-book vote is practically just the vote for payment of the Printing Bureau for the printing of that book. The other is a vote for the work.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend, another year, had better combine the votes, one for printing and the other for statistical work.

To aid Agricultural Societies..... \$7,000

Mr. CLANCY. On what plan is the distribution made ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A circular is sent to the agricultural societies setting forth that any societies having over fifty members will become eligible to receiving its proportion, which will be distributed on the following principle : Each society of fifty members will receive \$150, and will receive a dollar for every additional subscriber up to the number of 150. \$250 will be the largest amount paid to any one society. If applications are so numerous as not to allow of the distribution of this basis, a pro rata distribution will be adopted, each society getting a less sum. Each society shall furnish the Department of Agriculture with a statement, giving its name, where elected, the names of its officers, the copy of its list of members, and the subscriptions paid, and must furnish a certificate, in the form of a declaration before a magistrate, that this return is true and that all the subscriptions have been paid.

Experimental Farms..... \$80,000

Mr. CLANCY. This is an increase of \$5,000. I do not intend complaining of that, but I wish to draw attention to the fact that

the stock of cattle at the farm in Ottawa is below the mark in quality. This certainly should not be the case. I do not say that the number should be increased to an enormous rate, but that every animal should be of the highest grade. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has had communications from his own friends and those who may not be politically in accord with him, but it is commonly stated that it is a disgrace to Canada that the Central Experimental Farm should be so disappointing as regards stock. I do not know whether this increase of \$5,000 is for this purpose, but if so, it is a very small increase. But I do hope that the Minister will deem it his duty to make a radical change in the direction I have indicated ; and I think he will be supported by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. It will be a benefit to an institution that, I have no hesitation in saying, in the past as far back as my knowledge of it goes, has been starved. I am not able to discover why that should be the case. I am not going to criticise individually the stock there. There are reasons why we should not do so.

Mr. JOHN McMILLAN (South Huron). Before this item goes though, I wish to review the policy followed with regard to this Experimental Farm since it has been in existence. If the Experimental Farm is to be the benefit to the country that we desire to see, of course, the experimental portion can never pay, or anything like pay, expenses. I am glad to be able to say that the farmers have been very considerably benefited by the distribution of seed grain from the Experimental Farm. That is one of the benefits, and, let me say, one of the principal benefits derived by the farmers from this institution. But, in my opinion, there is far too much devoted to arbor-tum and forest work. There must be one hundred and fifty acres devoted to that branch. In my opinion, the giving up of so large a portion of an experimental farm to such a purpose is sheer nonsense. A great part of the farm is in such a condition that it will become an excellent park for the people of Ottawa, but it will not yield the benefit to the farmers that it should. I believe that the buildings should be beautified in the same way as a good farmer would beautify his own buildings, in the most effective but yet in an inexpensive way. But I believe that too much has been spent on mere ornament on the Experimental Farm, considering the way that other features are treated. The agriculture practice is carried on pretty well, but it is not as far advanced as it should be. The condition in which we find the farm, both in respect to stock and buildings, is, in my opinion, the results of gentlemen having the management of the agricultural department who were not thoroughly practical men. As a stock farm the buildings should be arranged in the most convenient manner, so that the work of feeding may be carried on with the least labour, and

so as to secure the best conditions on the part of the stock. I have also always held that a portion of the farm should be set apart and worked as a practical man would work it; and if that is not done, it is of little benefit to the farmers of this country. The farmers want a practical demonstration of how science and practice are combined so as to increase the crops while improving their quality and cheapening the cost of production. We need demonstrations of the different systems of feedings in vogue to-day, so as to show what can be done by the application of the most modern ideas. I was in a stable last year where steers were put in in December and kept there for one month. Some were tied. There were others put in loose in box stalls. All these animals were kept there for a month and had the same feeding and the same water. The animals that were in the boxes gained eighteen pounds per month more than those that were tied. That is something that is to the advantage of the farmer to know. There has never been anything of that kind done here. I hope that these ideas in feeding will be followed up. In the report of the farm, we have an account of a certain number of steers put on to be fattened. But we are not told what age they were or where they were purchased, or what was paid for them. There is a description of the manner in which they are fed, but nothing is said as to the price obtained for them when they were sold. All these things the farmers want to know from an experimental station, and it is only by giving such information that the farm in this respect can be made of any advantage to the farmers. It may seem a small matter to people not acquainted with this business, whether the age of the cattle is or is not given, but to me, as a feeder, it is of the utmost importance to know the age of every animal, because I find the younger you can get animals ready for the market, the cheaper is the cost of the production of the beef—and that is what we want to know from beginning to end.

Then, there is the dairy at the Experimental Farm. We want to know what is being done in this department. In the last two reports nothing has been said about the dairy herd. When Prof. Robertson was at the head, there was a dairy upon the farm, and it ought to have been the centre of the dairy interest in Canada and a means of showing the farmers of Canada how to get up a first-class herd of cows, how to rear them, how to feed them, how to manipulate them. At least a portion of the butter made on this farm should be sent to the old country market to show the farmers what really can be done. For, Mr. Chairman, Prof. Robertson was at the head of our dairying industry, and this should have been made the centre of the dairying of the Dominion of Canada. I hope that, in the future, we shall have something about the dairy herd. I hope they will show how a dairy

Mr. McMILLAN.

herd can be bred—taking the different breeds and their grades and showing those that are most profitable to the farmers. That is a thing that each farmer cannot do for himself and it was one of the points that an experimental dairy farm should take up. As to the fattening of steers, full information should be given, as to the steers that are bred on the farm and those that are bought and afterwards fattened, giving every point of interest from the time they are dropped from their mothers until they are ready for the block; so that the farmer may be ready to judge whether it is better to breed his own cattle and fatten them for the market or whether it is better to buy and feed. Let me say I have been disgusted every time I went to the farm. I am not going to use moderate language where it will not express my idea. I refer chiefly to the class of animals upon the farm. Only animals of the best description should be put there. When strangers come to Ottawa from distant parts of Canada or from the United States or Great Britain, they want to see what kind of cattle we have in Canada and what sort of example the Experimental Farm is setting, not only to the farmers of Canada, but to farmers of the other countries. We all feel proud of Canada and the progress she is making; but I must say this Experimental Farm has been a slander upon the farmers of the Dominion of Canada, particularly with regard to the kind of stock kept. If we keep stock upon the farm, it should be the best. I am aware that there have been misfortunes with regard to stock; and let me say—and I say it advisedly—a great deal of that has been due to not having practical men in the management of the farm. I excuse my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), because as soon as he took office in 1896, he advertised to get a thoroughly practical man to manage the farm. From my own knowledge of agriculture, I can say that it is not easy to get a thoroughly practical man who has practice both in agriculture as it is carried on and in the purchase and manipulation of stock. He was unable to get a practical individual until this spring. I know myself that he has done his best. He applied three different times to me to see if I could recommend him an individual who would be able to take charge of that farm. He has now got a young man in charge of it who, I hope, will make a great change for the better. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that it is a very hard matter indeed for any one to take hold of any institution that has been run in the extravagant manner that this farm has been run, as I will show before I take my seat. It is almost impossible to bring it down to a proper basis with the staff that has been there for years, and after it has been run so long in certain ruts. The individual who takes hold of that farm has a very hard work before him.

Now, with respect to the feeding of hogs,

I have said a good deal before the Agricultural Committee. That is another very important industry in Canada to-day. I have always held that instead of using grain and a large quantity of oats in the feeding of cattle and hogs, the farmers would derive more benefit by cheapening the cost of production and increasing the quality of the animals, and I am convinced that where nothing but grain is used that large industry does not pay in the manner it could be made to pay by mixing the grain with roots. Now I hope that all these things are at an end.

I am going to make a little statement now with respect to the management of the farm. I see on page 9 of this year's report, a statement that in 1889-90-91 oats produced per acre 32 bushels and 17 pounds; barley, 31 bushels and 6 pounds; wheat, 15 bushels and 9 pounds. In 1896-97-98 there was an increase in the yield. Oats produced 56 bushels and 6 pounds per acre; barley, 43 bushels and 13 pounds; wheat, 20 bushels and 9 pounds. These figures, therefore, show an increase in the latter period of 23 bushels and 13 pounds per acre for oats; 12 bushels and 7 pounds per acre for barley, and 4 bushels and 5 pounds per acre for wheat. Now, the report goes on to show that this result has been achieved by a moderate use of fertilizers, and the ploughing down of green crops, and good cultivation of the soil. Let me say that any farmer in the country could raise good crops if he was to spend the enormous sum of money that has been spent here in manure and fertilizers. No less than \$13,000 has been spent in manure put on that farm, money that has been taken out of the treasury of this country. Each year over \$1,100 has been spent in manure, besides the manure that was made upon the farm itself. I say it is not fair to the farmers of this country to tell them that it is by a moderate use of fertilizers and green manure that these results have been achieved when such an enormous sum of money has been spent in buying manure and fertilizers from outside. This farm would have been a greater benefit to the farmers if, when it was first started, we had had a practical individual to take hold of that portion of it that was partly run down, and if he had set himself to renew the fertility of that soil by the manure that was produced on the farm itself. We are told by the professors that that can be done. Why was it not done on this farm? I urged it long ago, but it has not been done. Now, we find this enormous amount of money, \$13,656 has been spent upon manure up to July, 1898. I say that the use of manure on that farm should cease except a little to experiment with, and a little quantity of fertilizers to experiment with. Let them take the manure that they make upon that farm, the same as every practical farmer in this country has got to do. But neither this farm nor any other farm run as an example to the farmers of this country, can be of any special benefit to

them unless it is run along the lines that a practical farmer runs his own farm. A majority of the farmers of this country have to depend entirely upon the manure that they make in their own stables and the ploughing down of green crops. I hope that from this time on that system will cease.

Now with respect to the number of men employed, and with respect to the taking care of the stock. I have been astonished at many things in going over the farm. I propose to show from the Auditor General's Report, the last one I had at home when I made the examination, a condition of things that I had no idea of, and which I think no other gentleman in this House has any idea of. In 1891 the sales of produce from that farm—and the reason I take 1891 is because I could not get the figures in any previous year—the sale of produce upon that farm amounted to \$1,848, and the care of the stock came to \$1,770, and the balance, \$78, represented the whole revenue from that farm; so that the labour and all other expenses had to come out of the treasury of the country. In 1892 the sales of produce amounted to \$2,311, and the care of stock to \$2,193, leaving a surplus of \$128. In 1893 the sale of produce amounted to \$2,040, and the care of stock to \$2,120, or \$80 more than the whole revenue from the farm. Now, some gentlemen may say: But you forget entirely the large amount of grain that was distributed amongst the farmers from that farm. Mr. Chairman, I do not forget that. Now, I have examined carefully the question of the quantity of grain that was distributed. Reducing all the packages to bushels, and putting it at the market price, and taking out the quantity of grain and bran that was purchased for feeding purposes, and also for seed. I find that they come within \$20 of balancing, so that the one goes against the other. When you come to 1894, I find that the revenue was \$1,982, and it cost \$2,628 to take care of the stock, or \$646 more than the whole revenue of the farm. In 1895 the revenue was \$2,613 and the care of the stock cost \$2,673, leaving a deficit of \$60 in that year.

Whenever I have visited that farm I have looked carefully at the stock, and I found that the stock were well cared for, but I must say that the buildings on that farm are in such a condition that no man can take care of stock in those stables as cheaply as a farmer can care for his stock on an ordinary farm. The roots are at some distance from the stable, and have got to be drawn into them. When those buildings were erected there was an excellent opportunity to put a root-house in the rear close to the stables, but that was not done. There are other things in the buildings that are not convenient. I found the stable floor made of blocks. That was the system, perhaps, when the barn was built, but it has since become obsolete, and the best farmers now make their stable floors with gravel and cement; such floors are perfectly level

and easily kept clean. The buildings on the whole are not creditable to the Dominion of Canada, and are not such as people would expect to find who come from a distance. Let me say that during the whole of last winter they had to water their cattle out of pails, as they had no proper system of watering the cattle in these stables. That, I say, shows the folly of putting a man who has no practical experience in the care of stock, in charge of an institution such as this. It has cost the country thousands of dollars. In 1896 there was a revenue of \$3,785, and the expense of caring for the stock was \$2,805, or a revenue of \$980 more than cared for the stock. I am going to speak plainly, because I care not who may be affected. Professor Robertson was in charge in 1885, and Professor Saunders took charge in 1896. In one case you have a deficit, in the other a revenue of \$980. In 1897 there was a revenue of \$3,182, and an expenditure of \$2,847, in caring for the stock, or a surplus of \$334. When we take the seven years, there is a surplus of \$732 of revenue over the cost of caring for the stock, or an annual average of \$104 during that period that the revenue exceeds the expenses.

Mr. CLANCY. What are the figures for 1898 ?

Mr. McMILLAN. I have not the figures for 1898, as I did not have the Auditor General's Report when I made up that statement, and I did not want to change the whole calculation.

Mr. McNEILL. What are the figures for 1897 ? I did not catch them.

Mr. McMILLAN. There was a revenue of \$3,182, and it cost \$2,847 to take care of the cattle, leaving a surplus of \$334. Let me explain that, in the list published in the Auditor General's Report of the names of those who are in charge of the cattle, the name of Mr. Elliott, foreman of stock, is not included, but I have included the name of Mr. Elliott and added his salary to those of the other stockmen for these years, because he is entirely engaged in connection with the care of the cattle.

There is an enormous number of people engaged upon this farm, and, to show the cost of the institution, I will just give a few figures. The price paid for the land originally was \$72,623. Then, I had a return brought down to the 1st of January, 1896, and it showed that, up to that time, \$47,147 had been expended for labour in improving the farm. The buildings, up to the 21st of September, 1896, cost \$176,000. The expense of draining has been \$10,129. Mr. Chairman, that is another evidence of the incapacity of the individuals who laid out these drains and managed their construction. I saw enough of such work, when I visited the farm two years ago, to con-

Mr. McMILLAN.

vince me that proper methods were not employed. Eleven dollars had been expended for an engineer to lay out these drains that were under construction then, and they were neither straight nor angular, but they were crooked. To go and spend money for an engineer to drain that piece of land, when these labourers were there to do that work was an unnecessary expenditure. To dig a drain that was 2½ feet at the top and very little narrower at the bottom, is to give an exhibition of ignorance in respect to the proper way of constructing drains the like of which I have never seen before in my life. I have had a great deal of experience in draining in the old country and also in this country, and the only proper plan is to make the bottom of the drain the exact size of the tile, so that it will fit in ; but in this case you have a 5 or 6-inch tile put in the bottom of a drain about 2 feet wide. It is an impossibility that a drain constructed in this manner could be constructed in a compact and workmanlike manner, such as would have been possible, if the proper course had been adopted. Although \$10,000 has been expended upon drainage, much of this money has been thrown away, because any hon. gentleman who will go to the farm, will see, especially after this wet weather, that there is a large amount of land still under water. I know that these drains should cost from 90 cents to \$1 a rod, with a 6-inch tile, from 2½ to 3 feet deep. A 3-inch tile should be put in for from 48 cents to 50 cents a rod, if laid by a practical man.

I find that \$10,514 have been spent for cattle on the farm. I took the Auditor General's Report, and I counted up all the sales of cattle and beef, and found that they amounted to \$4,275, that the value of cattle in 1897 was \$1,403, and that there was a loss upon the cattle up to 1897 of \$4,836. In horses, \$6,160 worth were purchased. According to the Auditor General's Report, I find the value of horses on the farm in 1897 was \$1,065 ; so that there was a loss of \$5,095 represented by horses, showing that \$9,931 was dropped in the transactions in horses and cattle. These are large amounts of money, and this statement only shows the necessity of placing this farm under proper agricultural management. I say that the farmers of the country have not been benefited by the policy that has been pursued upon this farm since its establishment, because many farmers in the country have excelled the results, using only the manure taken from their own stables, that have been achieved at the Experimental Farm. So that, except in the matter of seed grain, a great deal of the work of this farm has been utterly worthless to the farmers of Canada. The growing expense of this farm is a point that ought to be carefully looked into. I have gone very carefully over the salaries paid, and I find that there are 21 labourers, who have an average sal-

ary of \$306; there are six workmen who have an average of \$308. That would make 27 hands. Then, there are seven teamsters, with an average salary of \$321, and six cattlemen also with an average salary of \$474. Here is a herd of forty men getting an average of between \$300 and \$400 a year. I would just say this, in so far as these hands are concerned, that I do not think the farm is being run in a proper manner, because it is my belief that, instead of having these men working by the day, as they appear in the Auditor General's Report to be working—so many days, or half days, or three-quarters, or nine-tenths of a day—they should be hired permanently, so as to avoid a great deal of extra book-keeping. Then, there is a clerk, an accountant and assistant accountant, two clerks and two stenographers. Here is a whole herd of forty men on this experimental farm, and one thing which has struck me most forcibly is the large number of men they have employed there. There is one clerk at \$1,850, an accountant at \$1,000, an assistant accountant at \$541, another clerk, \$700, another clerk \$800, and two stenographers at \$600 each. All these individuals are engaged at book-keeping and correspondence. Now, Sir, I look to the report of the Agricultural College at Guelph to ascertain how many individuals were engaged by the Ontario Government to keep the accounts of that college. Remember that in that college there were 223 regular students that year, and 110 students taking the dairy course. It would require a large amount of book-keeping to keep the accounts of all these, especially when we remember they are all boarded at the college, and that supplies have to be bought for them and a strict account kept. I find at the Guelph college, the bursar gets \$1,000, and the shorthand writer \$700, making \$1,700 in all, to keep the accounts of that college, as against \$5,056 spent at the Experimental Farm at Ottawa to keep these accounts. It strikes me that there is something wrong here, and that a great many of these accounts ought to be kept by the individual at the head of each department. Now, I wish to repeat one thing which I have already stated in this House. While Mr. Fixter, the foreman, is a competent foreman, and I have gone over the farm with him, and I know he is a very careful and a very good man, and has done everything to carry out the instructions he gets and has done everything he can to keep the place neat and tidy, but what I want to mention is that he got over \$100 as an extra salary for an assistant to take care of bees.

It being One o'clock, the Deputy Speaker left the Chair.

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, when you left the Chair at one o'clock, I was speaking about the number of hands em-

ployed on the Central Experimental Farm, and, perhaps, I should have explained that the number I enumerated as keeping the accounts, looked after all the financial arrangements and correspondence in connection with the farm. As I have stated, there are three clerks, two accountants and two stenographers, and in 1897 there was an "extra clerk of the office," whatever that means. There is a staff of forty men engaged as labourers. There is the manager, Mr. Saunders, four foremen, the Horticulturist, the Botanist and Entomologist, and the manager of the poultry. There are also three gardeners, a bus driver, an engineer, and a certain sum of money is spent every year for carpentering work. That would give us a gang of sixty men engaged on that farm all the year round. I do not want to make any statement that is not entirely correct, but I will say that we have entirely too many foremen. We have a farm foreman, a cattle foreman and a stable foreman, and, in my opinion, the stable foreman should be one of the teamsters to see to feeding the horses, and to see that every man was ready to go out with his team in the morning. I have been on some of the best managed farms in the north of England and Scotland, within the last few years, and I have always found that the farm foreman had charge of the rest of the hands in the same field with him, and was in the field first in the morning. That is how they do on farms in England which are just as good as the Experimental Farm here. Now, I do not believe there has been any money spent on that farm that has not been given a full account of, and I believe that everything has been straightforward and honest, but I see from the Auditor General's Report that \$11,000 was spent upon drainage for that farm last year. There should be a practical drainer there to make the drains the exact size of the tile, for this is far better than putting the drains down in a large ditch and then piling the earth in around them. \$11,000 would be 11,000 rods at \$1 a rod, and yet that farm is not properly drained. It shows the folly of having run an establishment like that with a Minister of Agriculture who was not a practical farmer. We have had professional men up to the present as Ministers of Agriculture, and what do they know about farming? We have had some exhibitions in the House of what that leads to. If you wanted a brewery run, you would not take me as a farmer to run the brewery, nor would you take me into a lawyer's office as a lawyer. Yet, Sir, as farming goes to-day, it requires just as much brains, just as much care, just as much observation and ability, as does any other business in this country. No business to-day requires more mature judgment and keen observation than the business of a practical farmer, in order to enable him to handle stock properly. If this Experimental Farm at Ottawa is to be of any great benefit to the farmers of Canada, it has got to undergo a

revolution. While Prof. Saunders is a gentleman that is, perhaps, one of the best we could get to conduct the whole farm, yet, as I have stated to himself and I state it here now, seeing that he is present, he never was a practical farmer. I believe he did everything he could and that he concealed nothing about the operations of the farm, but the great trouble is that we did not get a practical man in the first place to run this farm. We have a young man there now, and I hope he is a practical man.

Mr. CLANCY. To whom does the hon. gentleman refer?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Grisdale. He is an entire stranger to me, but he was before the Agriculture Committee, and seemed to give very good satisfaction in his address, and in the answers he gave to the questions put to him. I hope he is a thoroughly practical individual. We have to-day the first farmer we ever had in charge of the department, and I hope he (Mr. Fisher) will pay strict attention to this farm. I think it is admitted on all hands that the lasting success of this country depends more upon agriculture, and more so than upon our forests, our gold fields, or our fisheries. That being the case, hon. gentlemen will see how important it is that we should pay the greatest attention to its development. While agriculture is the principal industry in the country, we must remember that agriculture, like everything else in this age, is undergoing rapid changes. The agriculturist of to-day is a very different individual from the agriculturist of twenty years ago. All over the country where the old lines are being followed; raising a little grain and a little stock, and selling the grain and selling the stock, the farmer is not successful. The farmer of to-day must be a thoroughly practical business man, up to the times, if he is to succeed. Now that we have a practical farmer as Minister of Agriculture, I hope he will turn his attention to that particular branch of industry in this country, and that he will make some great changes on the Experimental Farm. My own opinion is that the agriculture pursued at the Experimental Farm, while it might be considered an excellent system six or seven years ago, is not abreast of the times to-day. On a sandy farm like this, it must be to a great extent surface cultivation, and I was glad to hear that the young gentleman who now has charge of the farm is going to turn his attention to that. As it is late in the session, I shall not detain the House further. I have mentioned what I consider the principal shortcomings on this Experimental Farm, and I do hope that changes will take place, and especially that the accounts for each branch of the farm will be kept separate and apart. It appears to me there is no difficulty whatever in keeping the accounts of the experimental branch separate from the

Mr. McMILLAN.

accounts of the farm proper. That is done with the Agricultural College farm at Guelph, and there is no reason why it should not be done here.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman know when they commenced to keep their accounts in that form in the Guelph college?

Mr. McMILLAN. I cannot tell.

Mr. CLANCY. I can tell the hon. gentleman that it is very recently.

Mr. McMILLAN. I believe it is recently, and I will say that up to a few years ago, the farm at Guelph was not conducted upon proper principles, because they had not a practical man as Minister of Agriculture at the head of that farm. Neither had they practical men as managers. I trust the system pursued at the Guelph College will be followed at the Experimental Farm here, so that we as farmers may know what the farm proper costs, and what the experimental plots costs. I wish to state here, as a practical farmer, that the experimental plots, both in roots and grain, will necessitate a great amount of labour, and I admit that the experimental work never can pay expenses. However, if that experimental work is properly done, it will be a great benefit to the farmers all over Canada, and I am free to state, that the farmers have derived great benefit from the new seeds introduced and distributed amongst them. On the other hand, we have too large an orchard on that farm, because the experimental fruit trees here are only useful to this particular locality, and can be of no benefit to the fruit-growers of western Ontario, the lower provinces or the North-west Territories. Now, Sir, I have given a good deal of attention to this matter, and if I make a mistake about it it is unintentional. This Experimental Farm ought to be on such a footing that when a first-class farmer comes here from Great Britain and examines the farm, and the buildings, and the stock, and all the surroundings, any Canadian who might be present will feel proud that we have such an Experimental Farm. I say that the stock kept on this farm should be of the very best kind. We had some good stock there, and we were unfortunate in the losses we sustained, but now that there have been such improvements in veterinary science, it is to be hoped we shall not have such losses in future. One of the great blemishes on that farm is that the cattle buildings were not sufficiently well ventilated, and the barn there is built too low down, and is altogether very inconvenient. I could show you a dozen barns in which one man's work would equal almost two men's work in the barn on the Experimental Farm. That shows the foolishness of having a man as Minister of Agriculture when this farm was being inaugurated, who knew nothing about agriculture or about keeping stock. Let me say in conclusion, that this Experimental Farm here is

not a first-class farm, yet it is a farm that might be of some benefit to our farmers if it were properly conducted, as I hope to see it at no distant date. I hope that our present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), who is a practical man, will succeed in thoroughly reorganizing that farm and in placing it upon such a basis that the farming done there will serve as a model to the practical agriculturists of the Dominion of Canada.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Before this item passes, perhaps, it would be proper that I should make some explanation. My hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) has spoken at considerable length upon the various matters connected with the farm, and I want to take this opportunity of thanking him for the spirit in which he has criticised the work done there. The advice and criticism of a man of his experience in a work of this kind cannot fail to be of advantage to any farmer in charge of such an establishment. He has spoken of a number of things there, and in his remarks I can cordially agree. The explanations I would give with regard to some of the work have already been given by him to a great extent, but I cannot refrain from saying a few words on the details with which he has favoured the House.

As regards the experiments of feeding, I trust that he will find in this year's report the full details he has asked for. It is quite true that in the reports heretofore, the value and the character of the animals bought were not detailed and the prices obtained for those animals when sold were not given, but I gave instructions last winter that this information should be put into this year's report.

In justice to my predecessors I must say that in consequence of the discovery of tuberculosis in the herds of the Experimental Farm, the number of cattle there has been very much reduced in number and quality, and my predecessors were not able to obtain the votes which would enable them to replace the original herd that was destroyed by that fell disease some years ago. As time went on, they had been buying a few animals from time to time, but had not been spending such sums as were necessary to place the herds on a proper footing. It is because I wish to do this as rapidly as possible that I am asking for this increased vote. But even without this increased vote, I have been trying, the last year and a half or two years, to do a little in this direction. By my instructions, the officers have bought several thoroughbreds which I think will be found by those capable of judging of the highest quality, but nobody who understands the value of thoroughbred stock and the high prices at which they are held in this country will fail to understand that to at once go out and buy a large herd of thoroughbred animals would involve an investment and expenditure which I do not think

would be advisable or necessary in the best interests of the stock-raising people in this country. On the contrary, I think it would be better to show by experiment what an ordinary well-to-do farmer may himself carry on, that is to say, to buy the very best male animals which can possibly be found of any breed it is decided to deal with, and then try and build up, by the use of such an animal, as good a herd as can possibly be got for practical utility and profit. I know that many farmers, who have made the most out of agricultural operations, have done this, and there are instances of this all through the country, but unfortunately these instances are not open to the study and inspection of other farmers who would like to learn. Therefore, I thought an experiment of this kind at the farm in Ottawa would be of the greatest value to the agriculturists and dairymen especially of this country. With that object in view I have consulted with Mr. Grisdale, the agriculturist lately appointed, and have directed him to proceed in this way to buy the required stock, and propose, if this vote is given, to buy them next year.

The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has asked me about Mr. Grisdale. Let me, in the first place, endorse what the hon. member for Huron has said. Ever since I have been in charge of the department, I have desired to obtain a good, thoroughly trained and equipped agriculturist, a man who has been practically at work on a farm, who knows all about the details of farm work, which can only after all be acquired by a man who has lived on a farm a number of years, and who at the same time has thorough scientific training and is well educated and informed generally. I was fortunate enough to find, after a great deal of search and correspondence with those who I thought were able to inform me, a young man who seems to fill that bill, who seems to have those qualities, and I was very glad indeed to recommend to Council the appointment of Mr. Grisdale as agriculturist. He has now been in that position a few months, and I am glad to know that not only myself but the director of the farm and those who have come in contact with him are very well satisfied indeed with the knowledge and enthusiasm and the capacity he has shown in his work. I wish to say further that this is a very large work, one which means, perhaps, some changes in the management and methods of the farm, as indicated by my hon. friend from West Huron, and is a work that cannot be carried out at one stroke. The changes must be gradually introduced and carefully studied out before their first introduction. Mr. Grisdale has been and is doing this, and I hope that in the near future a thorough systematic treatment of the soil and stock of the farm will be put in force, which may reach the views and objects indicated by my hon. friend.

I would point out that in addition to our work with cattle, which I have just shortly alluded to, we are carrying on at present a very large experiment in the feeding of hogs. Hon. gentlemen will remember that during the last year or two, there has been a good deal of discussion in the press and at agricultural meetings about our bacon trade, some difficulties in the way of which have been found on account of soft bacon. After consulting with the Hogbreeders' Association and the great packers of this country, I have inaugurated an experiment which is now being conducted, in which about 200 hogs are being experimented with, and I hope to be able to throw some light on the question as to what the effect of different feeds is on the quality of bacon. This is an experiment which involves a great deal of labour, thought and care, and some considerable outlay and expense, but I think it is an experiment which the vast importance of the industry will justify; and if we can do anything that will help to guide our hog feeders throughout the country, that will be of the utmost value to our farmers.

With regard to what my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) has said about the bringing up of the condition of the farm by the purchase of large quantity of manure, let me say that, in the first place, that farm when purchased was decidedly a poor one. I am not casting any reflection upon the purchase or upon the judgment of those who bought it. It was probably as good a piece of land as they could have bought in the neighbourhood of Ottawa, but the land itself and the condition in which it was, when first taken over, was very bad indeed, and it has been turned, by labour and the application of manure, into what is at present a rich, cultivated and well-producing farm. This has been accomplished by the expenditure of large quantities of manure. I have lately instructed the director, Mr. Saunders, and Mr. Grisdale, the agriculturist, to set apart a portion of this farm for purely experimental work in experimental plots which will be divided as that kind of work requires. But that some large part of the farm, probably, speaking from memory, about 200 acres, should be set aside to be worked as a stock farm by the agriculturist to see what can be done in the conservation and improvement of the soil by a thorough systematic rotation of crops and the handling of the soil, and also by the feeding of these crops on the farm to the best advantage possible and the return of the manure made on the farm to the land to conserve and improve the fertility of the soil. I have directed Mr. Grisdale, for this purpose, that no further purchases of manure are to be made and no further purchases of feed except to replace any grain that is distributed to the farmers for seed grain, and then with feed that would cost the same amount. I am satisfied, from the ex-

Mr. FISHER.

perience I have had on my own farm and from what I have seen on other farms that by stock-feeding in Canada not only the fertility of the soil can be maintained, but that it can be increased without the purchase of one dollar's worth of manure or one dollar's worth of feed above what the farm produces. Believing this, and believing that the farm should be treated in this way, I am asking the agriculturist to carry on this work to show what can be done. I need hardly say that a work of this kind will take some years before it can be fairly judged; and I ask some little patience on the part of those who are criticising the farm that we may see the results.

I was struck with what my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) said as to the expenditure laid out entirely for the care of stock. I confess that I had not supposed—I have not gone into every detail of expenditure on the farm, having left that to the officers of the department—that such a large amount of money was being spent every year on the care of stock. I will look into that matter with the greatest care, and unless there is some explanation which I have not yet received, if I find that there is such a large amount spent, I must confess that I think it is an unjustifiable expenditure. But I want to remind my hon. friend from Huron and others who have listened to him, that the care of stock on our Experimental Farm and in experimental feeding is a very different thing from feeding a certain number of animals in the ordinary way. In experimental feeding, the feed for every animal must be specially prepared by itself apart from the others, and it must be weighed and every important fact with regard to it noted; and all this has to be done by the man carrying on the feeding. But where fifty or one hundred animals are to be fed all alike, one man can go along and throw in the feed for the animals without stopping. It can easily be seen that in the experimental feeding it will take three or four men to feed as many animals as could be fed by one man in the ordinary way. I would like to say, too, in explanation of this item, that what my hon. friend from Huron says is very true in regard to the arrangement of the Experimental Farm buildings. There is no doubt that the men there work at a disadvantage. I would like to change that and reorganize these barns; but to do so would require the expenditure of a very considerable sum of money—and while the interior pavements, partitions, are no more worn than at present, I have not felt like tackling the job. I have known that barn from its first building, and I have always felt that it was not well planned for convenience of work in the barn. In course of time, as I get the money to do it, and as I get the time to attend to it, I hope to be able to change that—gradually, as that

would be the more economical way to do it. To make the change at one stroke would be an expensive operation, and perhaps hardly justified in the present condition of affairs. I do not know that I need to go into other details, except to answer the question asked by hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) as to the reason for this increased expenditure. In the first place, there is the salary of the agriculturist—a new officer—

Mr. CLANCY. What is his salary?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He is to receive \$1,200 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. What are his duties?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. To manage the stock and field work on the Experimental Farm.

Mr. FOSTER. Under whose direction?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Under the direction of the director, Prof. Saunders, who manages all the work of the experimental farms. I may say that all the other officers commenced at \$1,200 or more, so that Mr. Grisdale is commencing at the lowest salary at which any other officer of the farm has commenced.

Mr. McMILLAN. Is he to have charge of the experimental plots also?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. Then, I want to buy some stock. We have had the misfortune to lose a large number of animals through the discovery of tuberculosis there, and these have not been replaced except to a very small extent—not by any means to the extent they should have been. I wish to purchase a few thoroughbred animals of the best and most useful breeds in this part of the country, the animals to be used in building up a herd of grade animals which would be used for profit and business on the farm. This can be done gradually. But even to buy a few thoroughbred animals—three or four of the leading breeds—will cost a considerable amount of money. At present, I am glad to say—and I congratulate the farmers of Canada on the fact—thoroughbred animals are high-priced, there is a great demand for them, and we are importing them constantly from abroad. Therefore, I shall not be able to buy the animals required at a cheap rate. To get the best animals, such as I think should be kept on the farm, some pretty good prices will have to be paid. I intend to get them as cheap as possible; but I do not think it would pay the country or be justified in me to buy second or third-class animals; I want to use the best advice of the agriculturist and stock manager in buying animals that will be a credit to the farm and the beginning of a good herd. Then, I want to buy a few sheep. Mr. Grisdale has bought a few. I want them

not only for the purpose of feeding, but having the sheep, to show, on a small piece of rough pasture, the effect of sheep pasturing on land, which, I think, is an important item in the agricultural economy of this country, and one in which work of this kind done would be very valuable to our farmers. I need not go into other items at present. If there are further explanations desired I shall be glad to give them. I think I have said enough to justify the extra vote proposed.

Mr. CLANCY. Where did Mr. Grisdale get his experience as a trained farmer and experimentalist?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Grisdale was born on a farm in the county of Vaudreuil, between here and Montreal. He lived there until he was a man grown. Then he went through the Normal school and got his teacher's certificate, and taught school for a year or two. He then went to the Guelph Agricultural College and took a course and passed the examinations. He afterwards went, for further investigation and study to the Ames College in Ohio. He was there when I first heard of him. I heard of him quite accidentally from the head of that institution, who was at a meeting at Western Ontario which I attended. He was speaking of the young Canadians studying at the university and told me that this man was one of their best men. I made inquiries and got from Principal Mills, of the Ontario Agricultural College, a most satisfactory report of his work there. I may say further that while at Ames, Mr. Grisdale took part in a competition in judging stock. Last year at Omaha, at the time of the Trans-Mississippi Exposition a prize was offered to young men who would come in and judge stock in the ring. Mr. Grisdale competed and was awarded first prize.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not desire to say anything to reflect upon Mr. Grisdale. He is now on trial, and it is fair to give him a chance. But I may say that Mr. Grisdale appeared before the Agriculture Committee, and I was a little surprised to find that he gave utterance to some sentiments that did not even satisfy my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) on the subject of deep ploughing as against shallow ploughing. When he was asked how he came to that conclusion, if he had tried both systems under the same conditions, he was forced to admit that he had not done so, but, nevertheless, he had come to the conclusion that one was infinitely better than the other. I only mention this to my hon. friend to show that Mr. Grisdale, although he may have learned a good deal in college, has yet a good deal to learn by experience. While speaking on that subject, I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to what I thought was a rather

unfortunate circumstance that took place in the Agriculture Committee, when two gentlemen, occupying very high positions, gave their evidence, namely, Mr. Robertson and Professor Saunders. If we are to have any benefit from the experiments made at that farm, we should know that both these high authorities agree upon the nature of, and the lesson taught by, those experiments. If that be not the case, it will show that the farm is being carried on in a somewhat hap-hazard manner. I am not prepared to say myself who is right. As a farmer myself, I am puzzled to know how much weight we ought to give to the testimony of these gentlemen, who speak in precisely opposite directions. One gentleman desires to show, and illustrates it by experiments year by year, that conditions alone are the overruling influence in the production of cereals, and that varieties have little or nothing to do with the yield—I am putting it on the ground of yield. He recognized fully the value of one variety over another, but, for the purpose of getting a yield, he thought one variety had no value over another, and it all depended upon conditions. Professor Saunders took the other ground, and thought that while conditions affected all varieties, there was an absolute and distinct problem worked out in favour of certain varieties. Now, I say that, so far as these gentlemen are concerned, one stands against the other, and the farmers in the House, as well as other, must be somewhat puzzled. That is something that I hope will not occur again. It was a contest of theory against experience, and I confess that I lean to the side of the gentleman who has come to his conclusions from experience. I only call attention to that circumstance because I think it is not in the interest of that great experimental farm that two of its leading officers should hold opposite opinions upon the same subject.

Now, the Minister of Agriculture was grateful to my hon. friend from Huron for the information he gave. I thought there was an implied censure on the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon, and I felt disposed to come to his defence. We have now for Minister of Agriculture a gentleman who is a farmer himself. I admit that is a most essential qualification for a gentleman presiding over the Department of Agriculture. But it seems to me, the bad state of things the hon. gentleman used to complain of, has not been changed, although the present Minister has been presiding over that department for three years. I listened with great anxiety to hear the hon. member for Huron point out some improvement in the administration of the present Minister, but he sat down without having done so, either because he could not point out any, or he forgot to do so. I think my hon. friend gave the Minister of Agriculture rather a severe castigation this afternoon

Mr. CLANCY.

—probably he did it unwittingly, because he always makes a political speech, when he can. I say that the lapses the hon. gentleman has pointed out with regard to that farm, reflect as severely upon the Minister of Agriculture to-day as they ever reflected upon any Minister of Agriculture in Canada, without exception. We find no change has been made except one, which is useless. The hon. gentleman makes a comparison of the care of stock with the receipts of the farm. Surely, my hon. friend knows that there is no sense in making a comparison of that kind. Here is the care of stock included in an item of \$33,000. He might as well take any other branch of that item. Why did he take the care of stock, rather than any other item?

Mr. McMILLAN. Because I believe that the amount that has been spent upon the care of that stock is an exorbitant amount, being engaged in stock-keeping myself. While I admit there is truth in what the Minister of Agriculture said, that they have to be more careful in finding the proper food, and being exact in regard to quantities, the expenditure is out of all proportion to the number of stock kept. At Guelph, during the same year, \$1,660 was all that was spent for the care of stock, and they had a little more stock than was kept at Ottawa.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, I can tell my hon. friend that if he is depending upon the reports of the Ontario Government, he cannot tell anything about it. I will send over to the hon. gentleman the last report, and ask him if he can tell this committee anything about the care of stock. I have the report of the Agricultural College of the province of Ontario for 1898, and the accounts are so mixed up that it is utterly impossible to separate them so as to tell what any particular service costs. The hon. gentleman made some reference to their being classified. They have nothing charged for implements; they have no charge for seed, and then they go into the feeding branch, and the one is either mixed up with the other, or improperly charged, so that you cannot tell what each service costs. This is not a new thing, and I have no hesitation in saying that they have cooked their system of accounts in order to show that the farm proper paid expenses. I tell the hon. gentleman that if he has no better data for making a comparison than the book-keeping of the agricultural farm of the province of Ontario, he is not able to come to a very correct conclusion. I see that here at Ottawa the salaries are classified; they have adopted a very different system of book-keeping here to what prevails at Guelph, because you can find out what any one service has cost.

But to come back to the hon. gentleman's selection of the item of feeding stock as an

indication of the great expense here, I tell him that it has no application. He might just as well take the dairy department as the care of the stock, because the one has no more relation to the revenue than the other, the one is no more an apt illustration than the other. I do not propose to continue this debate any longer on this item. I have only to say that I am glad to hear the hon. Minister say that he proposes to do something in regard to the stock. Of course, this cannot be done in a day, and it seems to me that it would be unwise to overload the farm with a great number of high-class animals at the outset. There is one thing that I want to call attention to, and it is the efforts of the hon. Minister to solve the very important question in regard to our bacon. I understand that the hon. gentleman has something like 200 hogs under experiment in the west.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the west and in the east.

Mr. CLANCY. I have been informed that this large number is confined to one or two breeds. I am told by pork packers that soft, fatty and undesirable pork arises as much from the breed as from the feeding of hogs. It seems to me that it would be worth the while of the hon. Minister to take hogs of as many breeds as possible and feed them on a class of food that is generally given, namely, a considerable quantity of corn with other grains of that kind and see whether the feed is the only cause of the difficulty that we have to contend with. There is nothing, so far as I understand, and so far as experiments have been made at the farm, to show definitely whether the class of food being used is the sole cause of soft pork, or whether it is the feed and the breed of the hogs combined. I am glad to know that the hon. gentleman has set about that experiment, and I think he could go with advantage a little further than he is going just now in that direction.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am sure I have no desire to unduly criticise the expenditure of the Experimental Farm. I am one of those who do not look for a positive return for every expenditure made on the farm in the shape of money. We get a return in the shape of the experience and the practical knowledge which we regard as being worth more than the money actually expended. I was somewhat amused, however, at the statement of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), who claims so much credit for the Government, for having selected a practical farmer to be at the head of the Agriculture Department. I can approve of a practical farmer being at the head of this department, but what I am surprised at is, that this should have been such a new condition of things. In looking back to the Administration of Mr. Mackenzie, in which

there were two Ministers of Agriculture, we find that no attempt was made in those days to secure a practical farmer to take the oversight of the Department of Agriculture. First, there was Mr. Letellier, who, I believe, was a lawyer, and then there was Senator Pelletier, who, I believe, was also a lawyer, at all events, neither of these gentlemen was a practical farmer. So that I think the idea of a practical farmer is a more recent one than would appear from the speech of the hon. member for South Huron. One of the things that surprises me is, that when you have a practical farmer at the head of the department, it becomes necessary to increase the staff and to employ a new expert, showing that, although we have a practical farmer additional expense is required in the way of expert knowledge that was not required when the head of the department was not a practical farmer. I do not wish to unduly criticise the expenditure on the farm here, but I think that it is unfair to make comparisons with another institution which we have in Ontario, which, to my mind, were not fairly made, with the view of showing how the Liberal party in Ontario can save so much more money in the Agriculture Department than he saved here. I think it is just as well that the House should know the facts in regard to the Agricultural College and Experimental Farm at Guelph. These have always been a source of expense to that province. I am not complaining about it because the object is to gain knowledge and experience, but I think it is unfair to make a statement which may lead the House to suppose that the Agricultural College and Experimental Farm at Guelph have been paying well and have been giving a good return to the country. I find that in the expenditure on college maintenance, according to the last returns, there was a loss of \$34,383.60; on the farm proper, a loss of \$3,860.68; on experimental plots and feeding, \$6,697.97; on experimental dairying, \$2,633.78; on dairy school, \$2,830.88; on the poultry department, \$752.95. Seven hundred dollars of that loss was paid in salary to the manager of the poultry department. The entire operations of the poultry department, including the salary of the manager, and costing \$1,008.21, entailed a loss to the province of \$752.95, or about three-quarters of the entire money expended on that department. Then in the horticultural department there was a clear loss financially of \$4,819.27, and in the mechanical department there was a loss of \$1,484.11. In not one single department in the operation of the college and the farm is there a favourable balance, but in every one there is an adverse balance the sum total being \$57,463.23. So that I do not think that if there has been a loss at the Experimental Farm at Ottawa we have anything to boast about by comparing it with the Experimental Farm and Agricultural College at Guelph. To my mind the operations are as economically and profitably

conducted at the Central Experimental Farm as they are at the Ontario Experimental Farm. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture to the poultry department of the Experimental Farm. I do not think we expend as much money here on the poultry department as the great utility or advantage that might accrue from that department might lead us profitably to expend. I know that there is a lack of what the farmers of the country want from that department. There is a demand from all over the country for eggs, of the very best quality and of the very best stock, for purpose of assisting the people to improve their stock of poultry. I think it is a fact well known to the hon. Minister that a sufficient quantity of eggs for improved breeding cannot be obtained at the farm. During last winter there was a demand, even at \$1 a dozen for such eggs, and I am quite sure that the Experimental Farm could afford to produce a great many eggs at that price, and the people of the country are willing to pay that price for these eggs. Even at that price, as the season advanced, the people could not get them. I would be glad if the hon. Minister would propose an increased appropriation for the purpose of assisting the gentleman in charge of that department to provide an additional number of eggs, and that there should not only be an increase of the number of eggs but in the variety of breeds as well, so that, not only the farmers of the country, but the people in the towns and villages, who are desirous of improving their breeds of poultry, and who look to the Experimental Farm to furnish them with eggs, may be provided with the very best stock. I think that some little addition should be made to the expenditure in that department so that the people may have what they want, and if such an expenditure is made I am perfectly satisfied that it will not be a burden on the revenue. As I have said, the price that these people are willing to pay for the eggs they get for hatching purposes, would be quite sufficient to recoup the department for the cost.

Mr. McMILLAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson), with his usual accuracy, made the statement that the farm proper at Guelph cost the province \$8,000. If he had made an honest statement, he would have shown that the revenue was \$6,345, so that it really cost the country only \$2,476. That is just the sample of the honest criticism that he gives to this House.

Mr. HENDERSON. If I make a statement, I make a statement that I can stand by, and no words that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) can put in your mouth, Mr. Chairman, or can put in my mouth, will contradict the report from which I am reading, namely, the report of Ontario legislature respecting the Agricultural College at Guelph. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMil-

Mr. HENDERSON.

lan) may get up and in his slang language tell me I am making false statements to this House. I tell him that when I speak in this House, I speak the truth, and I dare the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) to repeat the statement he has made. The facts mentioned by me are given in this report, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) has given figures that are not given in this report. He has nothing on which he can stand. I quoted the report, figure for figure, and word for word, and I defy the hon. gentleman to contradict me.

Mr. McMILLAN. I hold in my hand the report of the Agricultural College at Guelph, and here is what it says: Entire cost of farm proper, \$8,822; deduct the revenue from farm proper, \$6,345; balance, \$2,476.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read the whole particulars.

Mr. HENDERSON. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) looks at the public accounts for the province of Ontario, he will find that the statement I have made is correct. I hold in my hand the report for 1897-98, the last one to which we have access, and I do not know that he has access to any later report.

Mr. McMILLAN. I hold in my hand the report for the year 1898.

Mr. HENDERSON. This report tells me that on the farm proper the expenditure was \$8,156.23, but the revenue was \$4,295.55, making a net deficit over all the revenue of \$3,860.68. No contradiction of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) will change those figures.

Mr. McMILLAN. My contention is proven by the words of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson). He first stated that the cost of the farm to the people of Ontario was \$8,000, but now he deducts the revenue, and he finds that the actual cost was only \$3,800.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before we pass from this subject, I would like the Minister to say something with regard to the poultry department on the Experimental Farm.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I shall be very glad, if I can get a word in between hon. gentlemen in their discussion of the Guelph Agricultural College. The Experimental Farm does not undertake to raise poultry for distribution throughout the country.

Mr. HENDERSON. Why not? It is a part of the Experimental Farm work.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If we were to undertake that, we would interfere very much with the business of those who make a specialty of poultry raising. It is true that when we have eggs to spare, we sell them to any one who applies for them, and, as a fact, there are only one or

two breeds of which we have not been able to supply about all the eggs that have been asked for. We have to keep on the farm a number of different breeds, so as to show the comparison between these breeds. Some of these are popular, and are asked for very largely, while others are not so popular and are not in such demand. Still, we could not give up keeping these latter breeds. We have not enough hens on the farm of certain popular breeds to supply the eggs necessary for the demand. Anyway, I do not think it would be wise for us to make a business of supplying eggs all over the country in competition with private persons who make a livelihood out of it.

Mr. HENDERSON. You might as well not have a poultry branch at the Experimental Farm, unless it is going to be of some practical benefit. If you are only going to supply eggs in a limited way, one-tenth part of what is required, you might as well wipe out the expense in connection with it and allow private persons to do the whole business. Although it may be a fact that there are people outside who are able to supply eggs equal to those they have on the Experimental Farm, yet there is a feeling throughout the country that on the Experimental Farm they have the very best quality of eggs, and so the people desire to get them from the farm. My own experience is, that the eggs supplied by private parties, and very close to Ottawa, were not as good as the eggs obtained from the Experimental Farm. I know one person who last season did not get eggs at all, because he could not get them from the farm, but preferred to wait another year.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I appreciate the encomiums passed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) on the poultry stock kept at the farm, but I would not like him to forget the experimental nature of the work that has been carried on in the poultry department. The comparisons of experiments are really what attention is principally devoted to, rather than to supplying eggs.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) is so often astray, when he speaks in this House, that I want to set him right this time. If he will look at pages from 300 to 303 of the Ontario agricultural report in his hand, he will find that the expenditure at Guelph on what is called the farm proper was \$8,156.23, and the revenue \$4,295.51, leaving a deficit of \$3,860.68. But that is not all. Let him turn to pages from 304 to 308, under the heading of plots and feeding, which is just as much a part of the farm proper as the other, and he will find that the expenditure was \$7,830.19, and the revenue \$1,131.92, leaving a deficit of \$6,698.27; so, the two deficits put together which belong to the farm proper, amount to \$10,558.87.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have here the report of the Guelph farm for 1898, published in 1899.

Mr. CLANCY. But the hon. gentleman must take the public accounts to get the right figures. I do not wonder at all that he is astray.

Mr. COWAN. He has the departmental report.

Mr. CLANCY. But the hon. gentleman must know that the Public Accounts end there at the end of December, while the reports do not end at the same time, and therefore he must rely on the Public Accounts.

Mr. MOORE. I was about to say before I was interrupted, that it is very gratifying to see the interest which is displayed by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House in this very important subject of agriculture; and while we on this side of the House may be somewhat critical of the manner in which the public money is expended, I do not think the Minister of Agriculture will have occasion to question our liberality in regard to assisting that very important industry. When we take into consideration that 45 per cent of the population of this country are engaged in agriculture or are connected with it, that one-third of the traffic upon our railroads, one-third of the traffic upon our canals, and one-half the traffic upon our inland steamers, is furnished by the farmers of this country, it will be seen that that industry cannot take a second place in the affections of the patriotic men of this country. Therefore, we cannot have any objection to treating the farmers in the most liberal manner, and encouraging them to press forward the great work in which they are engaged, and upon the success of which depends the prosperity of the country. What I personally object to is the disparity between the appropriations which are being made. I object to the small appropriation of \$310,100 for the Minister of Agriculture, while we are asked to appropriate \$2,081,520 for the Minister of Militia. I think the agricultural interests are far more important to this country than the militia interests. When we bear in mind that in the last 150 years there have not been a thousand men lost in battle in Canada, that expenditure of over \$2,000,000 upon the militia looks to me like spending money in a foolish and unnecessary manner. I think it would be very much better to starve the soldier and stuff the farmer, than to starve the farmer and stuff the soldier, and when the appropriations for the militia are called up, I may have an opportunity of saying something further on that subject.

Mr. BERGERON. Before this item passes, I want to testify—and I am very glad to do so—to the kindness, politeness and courtesy of the employees of the Experimental

Farm. I have experienced myself, and farmers from my county who have come here have gone home feeling that they have been received and treated in the most courteous manner. It is my duty to say this to the Minister, and I hope it will continue. If the same could be said of every department of the Government, it would be a good thing for the country. It is the people who pay for the farm, and when they visit it and receive courteous treatment, it seems to come cheaper to them.

Mr. McNEILL. While I agree with a good deal of what fell from my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMILLAN), I think that perhaps he and I suffer somewhat from a similar complaint, a little too much of Keltic impetuosity, and he went a little further in his criticism than I liked to see him go. I agree entirely with his statement that it is a great pity that so many men are employed on the farm by the day. I think it would be very much better if an arrangement could be made to employ some of them by the year. They could, no doubt, be hired cheaper by the year than by the day. But when my hon. friend went so far as to say that the farmers of Canada derived no benefit from the Experimental Farm except in the matter of seed grain, I think he went altogether beyond the limit of accuracy. My hon. friend, in the Committee on Agriculture, has often moved for the printing, in large numbers, of the reports of the evidence given by gentlemen from the farm, because it was of such great benefit to the farmers. I know that my hon. friend would be the last to desire to put the country to needless expense, and if his opinion was that only in the matter of seed grain has the Experimental Farm been beneficial to the farmers, surely he would not put the country to the expense of having those reports printed in large numbers. I think my hon. friend also was a little ungenerous in regard to those who had first to do with the Experimental Farm. At the time Sir John Carling took hold of it and made a magnificent farm out of a wilderness, he had a great many difficulties to contend with, as my hon. friend very well understands, and I think he ought to have made greater allowances than he did for that fact. It is easy to criticise; but I agree with what has been said by my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), that while an institution of this kind must always be open to criticism, still, in very many respects, it is a most admirable institution, and is of the greatest benefit, not only in the matter of seed grain, but in many other respects, to the farmers of Canada.

Mr. BENNETT. I think it is really too bad that the Minister of Agriculture cannot avail himself of the services of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMILLAN), because in the province of Ontario he is

Mr. BERGERON.

regarded by the local government as a great authority on agriculture. I do not want my own words simply to go with that statement; but a reference to the Public Accounts of the province of Ontario will show that for travelling expenses and lecturing before farmers' institute meetings the hon. gentleman drew last year the fairly respectable sum of \$527. It, therefore, goes without saying that he must be an authority, and it is too bad that the Minister of Agriculture does not avail himself of the hon. gentleman's services.

Mr. McMILLAN. I was not from my own home last year, and did not attend agricultural institutes at all. I was asked to go, but refused.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, all I can say is that they have improperly placed the hon. gentleman's name in the report, as I will read: "J. McMILLAN, \$126."

Mr. McMILLAN. That was in the fall of 1897 and the beginning of 1898—not last year.

Mr. BENNETT. Then we find "T. McMILLAN, \$122.50." I assume that that is a typographical error—that the "T." should be a "J."

Mr. McMILLAN. No, that is another McMILLAN.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the hon. gentleman's son, as an hon. gentleman informs me. The hon. gentleman develops such a propensity for public money that when he cannot fulfil the engagement himself, he hands it over to his son.

Mr. McMILLAN. When hon. gentlemen have no better argument, I consider it one of the lowest forms of argument to turn round and upbraid a gentleman for any action of that kind. I was urged myself to go and refused. My son was urged for three years to go to the farmers' institutes, and refused. We have both been urged to go next year, and have refused.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask if the Minister calls for tenders when he is getting these lecturers?

Mr. MILLS. It is a tender subject.

Printing and distribution of reports and bulletins of farms ..... \$4,000

Mr. FOSTER. I notice that there were 12,000 dairy brochures bought from Mr. Lynch last year.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That was a vote in last year's Estimates to pay Mr. Lynch for some additional copies which were got several years ago. It has nothing whatever to do with this vote.

Mr. FOSTER. When were they distributed?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** Before I came into office. It is an old account between him and the Department of Agriculture.

Commissioner's Branch—

For Agriculture and Dairying..... \$40,000

**Mr. McMILLAN.** Will the hon. Minister define the duties of the Commissioner for Agriculture and Dairying?

**Mr. FOSTER.** Was there not an unfortunate disagreement between the director and the agriculturist on some question of high theory?

**Mr. SCRIVER.** Not the agriculturist, Prof. Robertson.

**Mr. FOSTER.** There was some great difference of opinion, and I do not know what we, practical farmer and dairying people, ought to think when the high authorities differ.

**Mr. McNEILL.** It would be well if my hon. friend could give us some information as to the respective spheres of action of the Dairy Commissioner and the Director, as my hon. friend from Huron has suggested. I have always understood until recently that Prof. Robertson was simply the Dairy Commissioner, and we ought to be informed whether the Dairy Commissioner has really any authority, so far as pure matters of agriculture are concerned, to lay down his views as an official of the farm. It seems to me that if we are to have contradictory statements from officers connected with the farm, some consultation should be had with the Minister of Agriculture before these statements are made public. Otherwise we may find ourselves in a very undesirable position. We may have one officer holding one view and another another view, and both published, which will have a tendency to lead the public to doubt the value of the statements.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** Prof. Robertson was appointed a good many years ago as one of the officers of the farm, and was called at the same time the Dairy Commissioner and Agriculturist of the farm. In the autumn of 1895 or spring of 1896, his work was entirely separated from that of the farm, and he has now nothing whatever to do with the farm staff or their work, but at the same time he was appointed not only Dairy Commissioner but Agriculturist and Dairy Commissioner. His work was not very clearly defined, probably, but since the last few years he has been separated from the farm work and has applied himself almost entirely to what I may call the commerce in agricultural products of this country and the development of dairying in different parts of the country, partly in the manufacture alone, but still very largely in questions relating particularly to the commercial aspect. I cannot pretend to define the exact sphere of his working, because he

is a man of exceptional ability and energy, and has been mixed up in this country with everything going on in the advancement of agriculture, and his work has been naturally applied to everything in which he thought he could benefit the agricultural interest. His work has been of such a value that anybody would be only too glad to listen to him in expressing his views on an agricultural subject. The difference of opinion with regard to a particular thing, which arose between him and Prof. Saunders in the Agriculture Committee is to be regretted, but anybody who has followed agricultural experiment and research knows well that scientists and experimentalists sometimes reach different conclusions from even the same experiment. It is, therefore, not surprising that such a thing may occur in this country as well as elsewhere. Had either of these gentlemen consulted with me before they spoke, perhaps, the occurrence would not have taken place, but I trust both sufficiently to believe that they will do what is in the interests of agriculture, and I have never required from them a consultation with myself before putting forth their views.

**Mr. McNEILL.** I quite agree in a great deal my hon. friend has said. Of course, we all understand that not only with regard to agriculture, but every other great and important question, differences of opinion arise among men deeply interested in the matter and of great ability also. I would be one of the first to bear testimony to the value of the work which Prof. Robertson has achieved. I think he has done a very great deal of valuable work for Canada, but my hon. friend will understand that what I refer to is not a mere ordinary case of scientists putting different views on a scientific question. That we are accustomed to always, but what I was referring to, and what I think my hon. friend from Huron was referring to, is the unfortunate circumstance that the work of the farm, which has been carried on by the director, was challenged openly in committee. My hon. friend shakes his head.

**Mr. BAIN.** My hon. friend is mistaken there.

**Mr. McNEILL.** I do not say that the statement was made that this work, which is being carried on by the director, is all wrong, but I say that what was said amounted to that. One of the great works Mr. Saunders has been carrying on at the farm has been the creating of new varieties, the breeding of new varieties, and Prof. Robertson's statement was that there was nothing in variety, so far as yield is concerned. If that is not a direct attack on the work carried on by Prof. Saunders, I do not know what the meaning of the language is. Such an occurrence is most unfortunate, because it is calculated to bring into disrepute the work that is being carried on. I do not wish at all to suggest that the

director of the farm should consult my hon. friend before making his yearly statement as to the work being conducted upon the farm; but what I did suggest was that any officer connected with the Department of Agriculture who was going to call in question the value of the work carried on by the director of the Experimental Farm should first communicate with the Minister and obtain leave, particularly before making such a startling statement as that I have referred to. I venture to say, as one brought up on a farm and interested in farming all his life, that the statements made with regard to the want of value of manure for grain crops, if I have understood those statements correctly, is, to say the least of it, astounding. I do not think there is any practical farmer in Canada who has ever laboured on a poor summer-fallow when he had not manure to put upon it, who does not know that he would get a precious small crop, much smaller than he would if he had the manure for it. It is something we have proved by experience when we had not manure for a whole field, and at harvest found the part that was manured bearing a good crop and that which was not manured yielding hardly anything at all. And, when that is the experience of every farmer in Canada, I think that the statement made that manure is of no value to grain crops, is an astounding statement. I think that while it is perfectly true that a great deal can be done to improve varieties by selection both in the case of vegetables and in the case of animals, the statement that there is nothing in varieties so far as the yield is concerned is almost as astounding a statement as the one to which I have just referred. If any one will take the facts as they are known to every farmer—take carrots, for an example, and consider what an enormous improvement has been made in the yield of carrots by the substitution in late years of new varieties for those we used to have in the old times—I think he will be thoroughly astonished at such a statement. We know also that Banner oats are among the twelve first varieties—curiously enough, all over the country this has been among the twelve first varieties—whereas others do not show among the twelve first varieties at all, proving how vital it is that the question of variety should be considered. It is not only in the matter of yield, but the variety is valuable as to the time of ripening, &c., we know that some varieties ripen earlier than others—a most important matter to the farmers. I think it is most unfortunate that statements of this kind should be made by gentlemen who have obtained—and justly obtained, because of valuable work they have done—to a great degree the confidence of the people; I say I think it is very unfortunate that statements of this disquieting kind should be made without the gentlemen who

Mr. McNEILL.

make them first having obtained leave to make them publicly.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I am glad to see that there is an increase in this vote, for the reason that the Minister of Agriculture gave me to understand last year that the dairying industry in Cape Breton would receive encouragement at his hands. I would like to ask whether the increase of \$10,000 in this vote is in part for the purpose of improving the dairying industries in that island?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am asking the increased vote partly for the purpose referred to by the hon. gentleman from Inverness (Mr. McLennan), and partly, also, because of some other work which the Dairy and Agricultural Commissioner is proposing to undertake. The vote has been one for \$30,000 a year for a number of years to provide for the expenditures connected with the branch of the Commissioner of Agriculture and Dairying. I ask this year for \$10,000 more, partly because we have had some expenditures in connection with this department which the \$30,000 appropriated has not sufficed to meet. Last year I had to ask a supplementary vote, and this year, up to the 1st July, we have not really paid all the expenditure in connection with the Dairy Commissioner's work. This extra expenditure has been largely due to the establishment of creameries in the North-west Territories. I got a special vote for the purpose of establishing these creameries, to be applied to what I might call the capital account—that is, to pay for establishing creameries. But, in consequence of establishing these creameries the Dairy Commissioner made an agreement to run them also. While some have paid expenses from the beginning, and have done even more than that of late, some of the smaller ones have not met the expenditure necessary, and we have had to spend a considerable sum to meet expenses of their operation, and of a system of inspection—as we have inspectors travelling about seeing to the establishment of these creameries. This has amounted, during the last two or three years, to nearly \$9,000 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought that the agreement was such that the department would not incur any financial responsibility?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The capital expenditure is being paid back under an assessment of 1 cent a pound on the butter turned out. But I have been discussing the expenditure in carrying on the creameries. We have made a charge on the manufacture which pays expenses in the case of the larger creameries, but not in connection with the smaller ones, and we have been spending on these smaller creameries more than we have received.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I thought you furnished a skilled man and that he took charge of the creamery, operated it and sold the products, giving the farmers a certain percentage before the matter was finally cleared up, and then divided amongst them what was left after paying expenses. On that basis, it would seem, there could not be any loss.

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has not understood one point. We charged a fixed amount for the manufacture of the butter—3 cents or 3½ cents, I think.

**Mr. CLANCY.** Four cents.

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** In the North-west that may be the figure. Where there is a large run of milk, as we call it, where the work is carried on upon a large scale, that charge covers all the expenses.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I can understand the point if that is your basis.

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** It is evident the hon. gentleman has misunderstood me. I do not think I ever gave the House to understand that the basis is other than I have just explained. At first I expected that the gain on the large creameries would offset the loss on the small ones. But when we came to discuss that with the men interested in the large ones, they asked to have the profit made in any individual creamery put to the credit of their sinking fund, so that one section of the country should not be charged unfairly for the loss incurred in another section. When I came to debate the matter with these people I thought that was a fair representation on their part.

**Mr. FOSTER.** That was fair.

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** So I did not take advantage of that. Now, for instance, there is a large creamery up in the North-west, in Alberta, at a place called Innisfail, which gave last year about \$600 or \$700 to the good, after paying all expenses. My first idea was to take that and use it to cover the losses on some of the smaller creameries, but when I came to consider the subject I saw the injustice of that.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Do you propose to pay the charges of inspection as well as of the making?

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** Yes, we have done that all along. I have had two inspectors, high class dairymen, who have been in charge of this business in the North-west, and inspecting these factories about the country. When I first took up the thing I thought the expenditure for these two men would be all I would have to meet; but since then I have found that we had a considerable deficit to meet every year, and the result was that last year I

spent over \$9,000 in that North-west development. I may say this is more than I expected, but at the same time I really think the expenditure is justified by the success of the creameries there. There are sixteen creameries and sixteen skimming stations, or outside subordinate stations. The result has been very satisfactory in every case, except that this last season, in the grain growing districts, the high price of wheat prevented the development of dairying. In the district of Alberta, and in some other parts of the North-west, the development of wheat raising has gone on steadily and rapidly; in the eastern parts of Assinibola, especially, wheat growing, the last couple of years, has been so profitable that dairying has not developed to the same extent, and consequently, this year we are closing down one of the factories there which the people did not care to carry on. Doubtless, whenever wheat is high in price and crops are good, the people will not keep up their dairying. But in that part of the country which is not specially devoted to wheat-growing, this has been a most decided help to the people, at the same time that it has been in no sense a detriment to the eastern dairymen by coming into competition with them, because this season and the last season all the product of those creameries has been consumed in the west, and none of it has gone to England; therefore, it has had no effect whatever upon the English market, where all our eastern dairy produce goes.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Is it proposed to make these self-sustaining?

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** Our arrangement was to run them for three years, and at the end of three years to carry on some of the weaker ones a little longer. There are several of them that we hope we may be able to give up at the end of three years, while others we shall have to keep on helping. There are some ten or a dozen which we are obliged to work for the next season, some perhaps longer. Last year we spent \$9,700 out of this vote. I dare say it will come to as much this year.

**Mr. CLANCY.** I think the hon. gentleman has spent more than \$9,000; as I understand it, he has spent \$25,000 last year.

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** The hon. gentleman is mistaken. That is what I call the capital account; I am speaking of the expenditure out of this vote of \$30,000. In addition, I may say that, as the House will remember, some years ago dairying was established in Prince Edward Island with great success, and the people of Nova Scotia, notably on the Island of Cape Breton, have been asking for something similar to be done there. I have felt that the development of agriculture in those eastern provinces was something that we ought to encourage, and that this dairy work was likely to be equally successful in Cape

Breton as it was in Prince Edward Island, as least we hope so, and that it would be only fair and wise to inaugurate this work there. That will give us a little more ground.

Then, very strong representations were made to me from various parts of the country and from a large number of organizations, asking for some work to be done in connection with our live stock interests and our live stock export trade, and I propose to devote the sum of \$5,000 out of this amount to work in that direction. I cannot say that the work is elaborated in all its details; but I wish to obtain the services of somebody who would work under Prof. Robertson to try and help on our live stock interests and trade. The salary for such an officer, and the expenditure in connection with printing and the distribution of information and so on, probably would amount to a sum in the neighbourhood of \$5,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was spent in Prince Edward Island last year, and how much this year?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Nothing last year, nor do we propose to expend anything this year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would my hon. friend state in a little more precise terms, what it is proposed to do in promoting the live stock trade? It has been indicated in such a general way that I am at a loss to know what is proposed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There has been a considerable amount of organization in connection with the live stock trade in the province of Ontario. We have there live stock associations which are dealing with different branches of live stock. This kind of organization does not spread over the country at all. But there is no doubt it has been the means of establishing the splendid record of the province of Ontario for live stock, not only in Canada, but all over this continent. I am satisfied that work can be carried on and developed in other parts of the country to the immense advantage of the live stock interests in those parts; while at the same time it will be an immense advantage to the live stock men of the province of Ontario. I will give an instance of a little work that has been done lately, partly through my own representations and partly through the work of another gentleman in Ontario, Mr. Hodson. We have been able to procure from the railroad companies great facilities for the distribution of live stock over the country; they have given special rates for the carriage of thoroughbred animals for the improvement of stock; and the result has been the sending from the province of Ontario, both east and west, but largely into Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and also, lately, in consequence of new arrangements made, into the eastern provinces, of a large number

Mr. FISHER.

of thoroughbred animals for the improvement of stock. That could not be done before those facilities were granted, and our live stock interests were languishing and were at a serious disadvantage. I instance this as one thing that can be done, and which, I think, ought to be carried on to a much greater extent than we have done already. But I confess that I think it necessary to have some competent man who will give his special time to this work, that is, the work of organizing the live stock interests of the country and helping them on the lines whereon they have been so successfully conducted in other countries as well as in the province of Ontario. This work is indeed very much needed in the other provinces, and I am quite satisfied that a small expenditure of money such as I have been speaking of, will result in great improvement to the live stock interests. My hon. friend, I think, knows very well the importance of those live stock interests in this country.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). The hon. gentleman has forgotten to answer the question I put him concerning the dairying interests on the Island of Cape Breton.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think I answered the hon. gentleman. I told the House that I proposed to try and repeat in Cape Breton, and, perhaps, in some other parts of Nova Scotia, the work that was done in Prince Edward Island a few years ago in helping on the development of the dairy interests. If the hon. gentleman wishes further details, I may say that in discussing this matter with some of the local authorities—when I say local I mean the provincial authorities in Nova Scotia—I found that the people in the Island of Cape Breton and other parts of Nova Scotia were not prepared to do what the people of Prince Edward Island did when this work was established among them, that is, to supply the factories and the machinery, while we undertook to run them. That is what was done in Prince Edward Island. What I had expected was, that something of this kind might have been done there, but the people were not prepared to supply the factories or the machinery to do this work. The local legislature of Nova Scotia last session made an arrangement by which the local authorities are going to advance a sum of money to the localities, who will themselves pay a certain amount to make up the sum necessary for the factories and machinery, and we propose to manage them for them, in the same manner as was done by Professor Robertson in Prince Edward Island, when the system was established there. That is the arrangement that has been made, and which I hope to carry out, if this vote is given to me.

Mr. FOSTER. What was spent in New Brunswick last year under this head?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Two thousand five hundred dollars. That was in assistance to the dairy school at Sussex, in addition to which, Mr. Hopkins has been going around the province lecturing for the local authorities at their farmers' meetings.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you propose to keep that on this year? How much was spent in Nova Scotia?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Nappan Dairy School was run in connection with—not exactly in connection, but adjacent to the experimental farm at Nappan. That dairy school has been very little availed of up to the present time, and I have not been satisfied with the result.

Mr. FOSTER. At what cost?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. At a very slight cost. They contribute the milk, in the same manner as is done in the North-west Territories at the creameries, and I think there is a small deficit on the working.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Then, do I understand the hon. Minister of Agriculture to state that in any instance in the Island of Cape Breton, or in any part of Nova Scotia, where the people are prepared to establish a creamery and to put up a building, and in any instance where the government of Nova Scotia provides the machinery, this Government will provide the manager?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would not like to say, in any instance, because, I suppose, there will be only one creamery in each county.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). That is satisfactory.

Mr. CLANCY. I think the hon. Minister should give us some definite information in regard to the working of the North-west creameries. I understood the hon. gentleman to say, when he introduced this plan, that there were some sixteen creameries, with an equal number of skimming or subsidiary stations, to be included in the scheme. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that they proposed to start seven new ones, and that they proposed taking over nine already in operation, the patrons of which were unable to carry them on. The hon. gentleman shakes his head.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Do you mean now?

Mr. CLANCY. No, that was two years ago.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes; I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I thought he meant now. They numbered sixteen.

Mr. CLANCY. Those that he proposed to start were at Moosomin, White Wood, Gren-

fell, Wolseley, Qu'Appelle, Maple Creek, Wetaskiwin. He proposed to take over those at Indian Head, Regina, Prince Albert, Moose Jaw, Calgary, Innisfail, Red Deer, Edmonton and Yorkton. The Government were to advance one-half, where new creameries were established, and, in the case of taking over the other creameries already established that were unable to run themselves, the Government were to come to their assistance, and in both cases the capital amount was to be repaid. I think the hon. gentleman, after launching a scheme like this, which is now two years old, ought to be in a position to tell us how these creameries stand, how much has been repaid in each case, and how the accounts stand, not at the end of the fiscal year, because the dairy season does not close with the fiscal year, but ought to be able to state how they stand at the end of the dairy season of 1898, and how much was paid up to that time.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the figures here, but I can get them very easily in the department, and I will lay them on the Table, if the hon. gentleman desires them.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman would take up another item, this one might stand, because this is an important matter until he can give us the information.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I hope the hon. gentleman will not ask that the item stand. I would be very glad to give him the figures. Speaking from memory, four or five of these creameries have already paid off their debt. The rest are at various stages of their arrears, and I think that perhaps two or three will not be able to pay it off in the three years. I can certainly supply the hon. gentleman with the actual figures, and I would be very glad to supply them, but it will take a clerk in my department one or two days to copy them.

Mr. CLANCY. We ought to have these figures from the hon. gentleman's own mouth. At this stage of the session laying them on the Table is not entirely satisfactory.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will give them to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CLANCY. It would be well to have a statement coming from the hon. gentleman himself.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will make a statement on concurrence, if the hon. gentleman wishes it.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman gives the information in detail in regard to each and every one of these creameries, we can take it up at a later stage.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. MARTIN. I am very sorry that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has withdrawn the encouragement which has been for some years extended to this industry in Prince Edward Island. Though a great deal of progress has been made there for a number of years, I can tell the hon. gentleman that there are sections still to which that great industry should be extended. He can readily understand that while the encouragement that has been already given, has been taken advantage of by some of the most prosperous sections, and while great progress has been made, there are sections, not so prosperous, that have not gone into this industry at all, and which must be at a great disadvantage if they have to go into the business now without Government assistance and supervision. The hon. Minister is going to extend this encouragement to Cape Breton and Nova Scotia, alongside of the province of Prince Edward Island. I think the hon. Minister would do well to consider whether or not this encouragement may not be continued in some sections of Prince Edward Island that have not taken advantage of it, a little longer. There are some sections which complain that this advantage has been given to the more prosperous sections, and that sections which might take advantage of it now, and which were not ready at the time the aid was given, are debarred from doing so. If the hon. Minister will do that, I think it will remove the prejudice that there is in the minds of a great many of the people in Prince Edward Island in regard to his action in withdrawing this assistance. The Minister will do a great deal to sustain himself in the opinion of the good people of the Island, if he will do that, and it will not involve a large expenditure, because, probably, the same men who look after these stations in Cape Breton, might look after the few that would be established in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What steps has the Minister taken towards establishing creameries in the Island of Cape Breton?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have explained that, but probably the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) was not in the House at the time. The legislature of Nova Scotia last session passed an Act under which, if the people in any locality provide buildings the local government will advance money to provide the equipment, and I have undertaken to run these creameries and supervise them and see to the business management of them for a term of years. We advance no money, but do something similar to what we did in the North-west Territories.

Mr. McDOUGALL: If any body of farmers want to establish a creamery, will they first have to apply to the local government, and then the local government apply to the Department of Agriculture here?

Mr. FISHER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Our duty only commences when the building is equipped, and when we are assured there are a sufficient number of cows in the neighbourhood to justify the undertaking of such an industry.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If any body of farmers anxious to establish a creamery must communicate with the local government, and suppose the local government refuses, then these farmers are helpless so far as the Department of Agriculture here is concerned.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Last year I tried to find localities in the province which would supply the buildings and equipment, and I was informed that they could not do that without some assistance in the way of capital advances. The local legislature has since made provision for this capital advance. If this vote is passed, I will be able to provide for the loss which would be likely to occur for a few years in the operation of those creameries.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The Minister will see the difficulty in the way of this proposal. The people have first to apply to the local government, and if the local government refuses the people are helpless.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They could provide the buildings and equipment themselves.

Mr. McDOUGALL. As representative of my constituency I heard nothing of any such arrangement between the two Governments, and I am surprised that the Minister made inquiries of other people in my constituency and did not consult me. If I had been informed of that matter, I could have drawn the attention of my constituents, regardless of politics, to it, but this is the first I have ever heard of it, except by hearsay.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. But I am not in a position to do anything until I get this vote.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Does the Minister say, that in advance of getting this vote he communicated with persons in my constituency?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. The question arose in this way. The Premier of Nova Scotia asked me what I could do to develop the dairy industry in the province, and I told Mr. Murray that I sent Mr. Hopkins and Mr. McFarlane to hold meetings in the province and their report to me was that the people did not seem to be prepared to invest the necessary capital to supply the buildings and equipments, and until something like that was done, as was done in Prince Edward Island, I was not prepared to run the creameries. Mr. Murray said: If I take steps to provide help to the people, for their buildings and equipment, will you run them? I said: I shall ask for a vote from Parliament, and if I can get it I will gladly do so. At the last ses-

sion of the local legislature an Act was passed authorizing the local government to make these advances.

**Mr. McDOUGALL.** What counties were visited by the officers of the department?

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** They were in the province for a couple of weeks. I believe they went to Cape Breton Island and held a number of meetings there, but I cannot give the names of the places to which they went.

**Mr. McDOUGALL.** Did these officials have authority to communicate with the representatives of other constituencies? I know I heard that there was such communication, but there certainly was no communication with me.

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** I do not remember that I gave them any special instructions except that they might consult Mr. Chipman, the Secretary of Agriculture of the province, who, I thought, knew the province better than I did.

**Mr. FOSTER.** How much is it proposed to spend in each of the provinces this year out of this vote?

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** Nova Scotia, \$3,500, including Cape Breton; Quebec, salary and travelling expenses of Mr. Chapais, Assistant Dairy Commissioner, \$3,000; Mr. Chapais's outlay is charged to Quebec, although occasionally he visits other parts to address French-speaking people. There is also \$2,000 for the Dairy School at St. Hyacinthe, making \$5,000 for Quebec.

**Mr. FOSTER.** How much in Ontario?

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** The Dairy Commissioner and his assistants do a considerable amount of work in the province of Ontario, and there is \$14,000 for that including the salary of Prof. Robertson. In reference to British Columbia, Mr. Marker's headquarters are at Calgary, and he and his assistants have spent two or three months for several years past lecturing in British Columbia. There is also \$300 for Prince Edward Island, which is given to the Dairymen's Association to aid them in employing an inspector. That with the \$5,000 provided for live stock makes \$40,000.

**Mr. FOSTER.** On what plan is the Minister proposing to expend \$5,000 for live stock? He has not given us any outline of the plan he proposes. He simply says that he is going to do something for live stock, but I think he ought to outline in principle what he proposes to do.

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** I do not think I can do that better than in the words which Prof. Robertson has put in this memorandum:

To promote live stock interests by collecting and spreading information to bring about a more

general use of thoroughbred male animals of the best sorts for the grading up of horses, cattle, swine and sheep, and for the diffusion of knowledge on the most profitable methods of breeding, feeding and marketing live stock.

I expect that perhaps as much as \$2,000, or perhaps more, of this \$5,000 will be required for the salary of an assistant to Professor Robertson, whose business will be to devote himself specially to that branch of the work. I have not yet fixed the salary. I suppose that will depend on whom I can get to do the work.

**Mr. FOSTER.** His work will be chiefly lecturing?

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** Lecturing and investigating the live stock interest, and trying to organize a live stock interest into associations all over the country, as it is now organized in the province of Ontario.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Is it not organized in the province of Ontario by Ontario mechanism?

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** To a certain extent, but not altogether. The live stock interest there was organized very largely by individual free association; but it is a question whether the same kind of work that was done for the dairy interest in the other parts of the Dominion cannot now be done for the live stock interest. When Prof. Robertson started his work as Dairy Commissioner, there was a pretty complete organization of the cheese interest in the province of Ontario, which was reaping great profit for that interest in that province. That organization has spread through all parts of the Dominion, and is now reaping similar profit for the dairy interest in other parts of the Dominion. I think that something similar can be done in organizing the live stock interest, with the view of making that interest as profitable in other parts of the country as it is in the province of Ontario.

**Mr. FOSTER.** If in the province of New Brunswick they propose to put up a factory and provide machinery, will the Minister be prepared to do the same for that province as he is doing for the province of Nova Scotia, and formerly did for the province of New Brunswick?

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** I have not a sufficient vote to cover other ground at present. I think that interest is further advanced in the province of New Brunswick than it is in the province of Nova Scotia.

**Mr. FOSTER.** In some portions it is, in other portions it is not. But it seems almost invidious to have a plan of work for one province unless the hon. gentleman proposes, to a certain extent, to apply it in some of the other more backward provinces; and New Brunswick is one of these. I think the

future of agriculture in New Brunswick depends largely upon dairying and stock-raising, and I think it is as necessary to give that province a helping hand in this respect as it is in Nova Scotia. Of course, co-operation between the Dominion and local government, where that can be had, is desirable; but there is a possible evil in that. If in the province of Nova Scotia the local government does not aid by a vote towards establishing a factory and providing machinery, and if the people themselves undertake to do it, I suppose my hon. friend will aid them just as readily as he would the local government.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly. It was only because the people said they could not do it.

Mr. FOSTER. Otherwise there might be a monopoly.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, I quite agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the hon. Minister give me a reply in regard to Prince Edward Island?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman sees that I am doing something for Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MARTIN. I mean in the way of encouraging more factories in that province. The hon. Minister is aware that though the late Government extended its encouragement to the industry in that province, it was almost, I think I might say altogether, self-sustaining.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. \$6,000 was spent in one year.

Mr. MARTIN. There were some other years which counterbalanced that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, a large amount was spent every year.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like the hon. gentleman to give us the figures of the loss.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not got them here, but I can give them. They are in my department.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman has not the figures, and is not speaking by the book. The loss of operating those factories was very infinitesimal. The same man who superintends the work in Cape Breton might do the same with regard to a few more factories in Prince Edward Island. The expenditure would not be very large, and a great many sections of the province which have not hitherto taken any advantage of the encouragement given by the late Government might be induced to do so. I would ask the Minister to give that matter his most serious consideration.

Illustration stations ..... \$20,000

Mr. FOSTER. What are these?

Mr. FOSTER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am asking the House to give me this vote in pursuance of a good deal of discussion which took place in the Committee on Agriculture last year. It is for the purpose of establishing in different parts of the country what are called illustration stations, and of course some explanation is called for. We have been carrying on experiments in the cultivation of the soil in the growing of crops for a number of years at our farms in different sections of the country, five of them; but these are not seen by a very large number of people, and it is proposed that we should establish eventually in every county in the Dominion what is called an illustration station. This vote would not nearly do that, but I hope I will get authority to establish a number of these stations as trial stations, and if the scheme is found to work satisfactorily, we shall go on providing other stations, as I have indicated. The system has been carried on very successfully and to a considerable extent in several countries of Europe, and has now been inaugurated to a certain extent in some of the states of the American Union. Our proposition is to secure the co-operation of some good, practical farmer in a chosen locality, one who would be willing to manage and work a small area under instructions, so as to illustrate the difference in results from different working of the soil and the growing of different crops. We are satisfied we can secure the co-operation of first-class farmers in any particular locality. The expenditure would not involve any investment; we will not buy the land, but only ask the individual owner to give up ten or twenty acres of his land on which to make these experiments, and which will illustrate to all those who see it the methods considered to be the best for the management of that soil and the growing of particular crops.

Mr. FOSTER. Who lays out the plan?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Agricultural Commissioner. The expense would be some little reimbursement to those farmers for the extra work required in managing a thing of that kind, and some little expenditure in the inspection and supervision of the work and the printing and distributing of reports of the results.

Mr. FOSTER. How much for the first?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The expectation is, that the work at each station, including the first year some little work in the establishing and improving of the station, and perhaps putting a wire fence around the land, so as to leave it visible, would be about \$250, including the expense of the farms. These farms would be chosen by the wayside in the most conspicuous locality to be found in the county, where the largest number of people would be expected to pass.

Mr. WALLACE. How could results be shown from ten or twenty acres ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Just as well as from a greater acreage. I do not propose to cultivate large fields, but simply to show the different methods in the cultivation, say one-half the field cultivated one way, and the other half cultivated another way. If we do that, and plant several crops in each particular place, that would give a good illustration of what is being discovered by our experimental work to be the best means of cultivation in that particular place of that particular land. We then expect to have to pay inspectors. The estimate Mr. Robertson has made for these expenditures for the ensuing year would be : thirty-three stations at \$250 each, \$8,250, and three inspectors, whose salaries and expenses would amount to \$4,800. It was proposed also to establish two stations especially for tobacco. I think I explained some little time ago that great efforts are being made to grow tobacco, and we propose to have one station in Quebec and one in western Ontario.

Mr. CLANCY. How much in each of these ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Robertson has put down \$2,000 each. I think that only is about one and a half, so to speak, because the one going on in the province of Quebec is being conducted by a gentleman who has given for many years a great deal of study to the growth and curing of tobacco, and is trying some experiments in the curing of tobacco more elaborate than are likely to be tried in any other place. We hope also to try the same experiment with tobacco-growing in western Ontario, and to carry on curing experiments also. Mr. Robertson has an item of \$4,950 for the extra expense of starting the scheme, and headquarters, and administration, showing that there will have to be a good deal of collaboration and work. It is a new departure and will require a good deal of careful thought, and working out, and explanations throughout the country.

Mr. FOSTER. Who chooses the farmers and an experimental supervisor ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The department.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose you had a good Grit and a good Tory farmer, which would you choose ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Other things being equal, I think I am human enough to take the Grit. I do not see really any other way of doing it.

Mr. FOSTER. I do. If you are going to have your inspector who is competent to do the work, just simply say to him : There are no politics in this at all ; get the most eligible place and man, no odds whether he

be a Quaker, Grit or Tory, and the department will never interfere or allow any political heelers to interfere.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The first thing to be done will be to lay down certain conditions, namely, that the farm must be of a certain character and in a suitable situation, and carried on by a man well enough educated to do this work, and who is carrying on the rest of his farm sufficiently well to justify a belief that he will do the work satisfactorily. These conditions being laid down, I do not know any other way except to let the Dairy Agricultural Commissioner and the inspector report, and when there are rival claims, they may have to be referred to me individually. But I do not propose to interfere unless absolutely required, for I have quite enough to do in the management of the department, without entering into any more details than is absolutely necessary.

With regard to the experience of other countries, in France this kind of work has been going on for a great many years. They have at present there over 4,000 such illustration stations scattered all over the country, carried on just about in this way, except that there they have a large staff of men who have passed through the agricultural colleges and schools, and, as a general rule, they place the stations under the control of the graduates of the various agricultural schools. We have not yet in this country that class of people in sufficient numbers to enable us to do that. But there these illustration stations have been conducted for a number of years on the lines I have indicated ; and when, last year, I was in Paris and met a number of leading agriculturists and a number of professors of the great agricultural school of Grignon, which is the centre of agricultural education in France, they told me that they considered that these illustration stations had been the most important factors in improving general agriculture in France of all the things they had inaugurated. I find also a most interesting report here of the Board of Agriculture in Great Britain, edited and managed by the secretary, Major Craige, whose name is well known, not only in Great Britain, but in this country as an eminent agricultural authority, in which are described a large number of similar stations in Great Britain, where the results of scientific experiments are shown to the farmers of the neighbourhood ; and in Great Britain also, though it is only two or, possibly, three years since this system was inaugurated, the results have been very satisfactory, and the report refers to this work with the greatest commendation and praise. Last year in England I talked the matter over with a considerable number of farmers and men who are interested in agricultural work there, and I am satisfied that, in this country as in that, the result will be eminently beneficial to agriculture. I am bound to add that,

while, in some parts of our country we have a number of excellently managed farms, where the practical farmer is doing as good work as any of his neighbours, and, perhaps, as good work as could be done under the circumstances, and in the conditions of the country, yet there are other parts of the country where our agricultural treatment of the soil is very far behind the best methods, and where a little help of this kind, to show people right before their eyes the practical work of the best methods as conducted in these better farms in parts of the country, I think will do a great deal of good. I trust that the expression of opinion given by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) last year, when we were discussing the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, will be endorsed and supported by every member of this House. He then said that he was sorry to see that an item of this kind had not been put in the Estimates of last year. I was sorry myself, but I confess that I had not at that time so thoroughly discussed the matter, and the matter had not been so fully brought to the attention of us all as it has been since. Everything I have been able to find out in regard to the success of this sort of work in the other counties since that time has confirmed what I then believed and what the hon. member for Haldimand expressed. So I trust the House will give me the opportunity to inaugurate this work, which, I am sure, if carried out thoroughly, will result in improved methods in the treatment of the soil of our country.

Mr. CLANCY. I have no hesitation in saying at the outset that this is a wholly visionary scheme, and one without foundation, and, as applied to Canadian agriculture, utterly worthless. What does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) propose to do? He proposes to establish what he calls illustration stations; but he forgets that the best farmers in our country are already carrying on illustration stations. If you go to the neighbourhood of the farm of my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) you will find that that hon. gentleman is carrying on an experimental farm and you need not establish one there. It is idle to suppose that men are going to these illustration stations. What does it mean that the farmers are to do? If we take the report of the Dairy Commissioner and consider some of the details with which he deals, you will find that he tells the farmer to keep his grain clean, to keep his corn clean, and things of that kind. It would be as sensible to try to teach people to come in out of the rain as to teach them such things. Everybody knows those things already; the only thing is to get them to act upon their knowledge. Every man who carries on his farm poorly has a near neighbour who is a better farmer. If he will not learn from his neighbour, he will not go ten or fifteen miles to learn from an illustration station. How are you going to provide

Mr. FISHER.

for those people, if they do go? Is a man to take his dinner with him? How will he get accommodation? It is impossible that any good can come out of this proposal. Consider how the hon. Minister proposes to expend this money, and that will show how worthless the proposal is. In the first place, \$4,800 is to go in salaries of men to put this thing in motion. Then he proposes to put \$4,950 into the pockets of certain parties—to find employment for men who are not farmers and who will have nothing to do with it. It looks far more like a scheme to help the hon. gentleman's friends than to assist agriculture in Canada. I will venture to say there is not a practical farmer in this House who will rise in his place and declare upon his reputation and experience his opinion that this will bring any good to the farmers. I never knew of a more visionary scheme. The hon. gentleman might as well throw so much money into the Ottawa River—it would do just as much good to the people of this country. I could point out to him where he could spend \$20,000 to the real advantage of the people. If he will devote this sum to slaughtering every diseased animal in the country and compensating the farmers whose animals are thus taken, and thus give us clean herds, as far as the money would go, he would do fully \$20,000 worth of good. It is idle to bring forward examples of what has been done in France. The conditions there may be very different from ours. We know very little of what is done in Great Britain or France, but we know from practical experience that schemes of this kind cannot work out in this country. He proposes, for instance, to establish illustration stations with regard to tobacco. I appeal to the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor), who lives in the tobacco district, what will be the advantage of this scheme alongside the experience of the farmers themselves. I have not had much practical experience in growing tobacco, but I did undertake to grow eight acres of it, and what did I find? The same common sense that would apply in growing a field of corn would apply to growing a field of tobacco. As to the curing, that is a different matter, and is a business with which the farmers, after the preliminary stage, have not necessarily, anything to do. The curing that has to be done in the farmers' barns is one to which the hon. gentleman cannot contribute one fraction. I say that private enterprise must find means to solve the difficulties of curing tobacco. I tell the hon. gentleman that I defy him to point out one service that is to be performed in an illustration station that is not being done every day in a common-sense way by practical farmers. There is nothing new in it beyond supplying the neglect of the man who fails to put in practice what he already knows. I venture to think that there is not a farmer in this House who will undertake to say that a station of that kind is of any general use to the farmer beyond pointing

out what he sees every day at his own door. You might as well throw the money into the river as to vote it for this purpose.

Mr. McMILLAN. I rise for the purpose of opposing the scheme of illustration stations. I have paid a considerable amount of attention to farming all over the country, and I quite endorse what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has said, that go where you will all over the province of Ontario, yes, and in parts of Quebec, you will find some first-class farmers in every locality. Those farmers are not going to be any better off by having illustration stations upon their farms. The examples they are showing each other to-day will be of more practical benefit to the farmers than they can receive from any man who is subsidized by the Government; because the moment the idea spreads that the movement is subsidized by the Government, the general farmer will conclude that it is no example for him. But who are to be the inspectors for these farms? Suppose the illustration stations are established, who is going to tell the farmers that they are all to be conducted upon a uniform system? There is not a thoroughly practical farmer in the province of Ontario to-day, and I have talked with hundreds of them during the last year, who will say that he would have an illustration station upon his farm. I believe that a very large amount of this money would be wasted, thrown away, on a lot of useless officials. I want to do everything I can for the agricultural community, but I am not going to be a party to anything. I care not though it may come from this side of the House, and though it be a Government scheme—I am not going to support anything that is not in the real interests of the agricultural community. I am convinced that all over the province of Ontario you can find within five or six miles of any of these experimental stations ten farms conducted as well as any experimental farm in Canada, and the results from their farming are equal to any results that have been obtained, so far as the yield per acre is concerned. Take, as an illustration, a farmer who cultivates five or six varieties of oats, the same of barley, the same of wheat, the same of spring wheat, and a great number of varieties of corn and of grass, cultivated under different conditions, and that farmer has to cultivate these during the summer, has to keep them apart, he has to weigh them, take them into his barn and thresh them, and if he does not do that, an illustration station is of no avail. We have a slight example of what it is going to cost in the two farms at Ottawa and Guelph, and if it is going to cost \$80 or \$90 per acre on these farms, can you expect a farmer that has not good barn accommodation to do it for less? That is a system that will never succeed in Ontario. I must say that since the question was up last year I have taken opportunity to converse with a

great number of intelligent farmers, and I have got their opinions, freely and intelligently given, and I have not found one yet that was in favour of an illustration station. The time has come when the farmers of this country have got to put forth every effort themselves. If the Government could send amongst them gentlemen who have had more experience, or who could produce more per acre than the farmers can do to-day, I admit that the average of the province might be increased, or the average of any township might be increased. I am opposed to illustration stations, and believe that the money that it is proposed to expend upon them could be used to much better advantage in other directions. That is my opinion, and if the question comes to a vote I shall vote against it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am glad for once to be able to agree with the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), and I feel that I make no mistake on this matter when I am supported by that hon. gentleman. I would say to the Minister of Agriculture that if he is open to conviction, if he is open to reason, if he is open to receive the opinion more especially of those representing the rural constituencies of western Ontario, he will not go hastily into this scheme. From my stand-point it will be of no material advantage to farmers. As has been so well pointed out by the member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), such a large sum will be required to pay the salaries of the men to look after these experimental stations, that I think the advantage would be more than counterbalanced by the large expenditure. I do not think it is popular in the country, I do not think it is called for. Where we have farmers of the high standing and high intelligence that we have throughout the province of Ontario—I do not know what may be the condition of agriculture in the lower provinces—but I do think that in the province of Ontario where there is so much rivalry among the farmers in the same neighbourhood to produce the very best crops, to get the very best results, experimental stations will not give any better results than the experiments of the farmers themselves are giving every day.

Mr. COWAN. I regret that I was not in the House to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) so far as tobacco experimental stages are concerned. In the early part of this session, at the request of the Tobacco Growers' Association of the counties of Essex and Kent, I was asked to impress upon the Minister of Agriculture the strong advisability of starting a tobacco illustration station in western Ontario. In the present year there have been between seven and eight million pounds of tobacco produced in the counties of Essex and Kent, and I know personally whereof I speak when I say that at least one-

third of that tobacco was almost or entirely spoiled by reason of the absence of knowledge on the part of the farmers in preparing it and curing it. If there had been an experimental tobacco station in the counties of Essex and Kent which the tobacco growers could have visited and where they could have learned how to cure and handle it after it was cut, it would have saved at least \$70,000 to the farmers of those two counties. I must congratulate the Minister of Agriculture on behalf of that particular industry in taking a step in the direction of establishing an experimental tobacco station for the purpose of showing how to prepare, hang properly, cure and handle tobacco after it is cut. If the hon. member for Bothwell has really said anything against the advisability of establishing an illustration tobacco station for the purpose of educating the farmers how to cure tobacco, he is certainly not voicing the sentiment of all his constituents who have, at all events, sent large petitions in connection with other matters concerning the tobacco trade. As for the remarks of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) although that hon. gentleman may not need any illustration how to feed cattle, but as he stated in an earlier portion of the debate what was the practical result of the station in Ottawa would not apply to all parts of the Dominion, so I say practical results would be likely to follow from having an illustration station in the counties of Essex and Kent, which is more of a tropical climate, and where they grow more of the finer products than can be grown in some of the more northern counties. I know that, as the result of the establishment of fruit stations, thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars have accrued to the farmers, and I think I am only endorsing the universal opinion, in my county and in other counties of western Ontario, when I say that the farmers are very strongly in favour of having money expended in this direction.

Mr. CLANCY. We have had a striking illustration of an hon. gentleman giving an exhibition of how little he knows about farming and about the wants of the people whom he represents. I think that the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) knows quite as much about farming as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) knows about law, and I would be inclined to say that he is a little better up in his profession. The hon. gentleman said that we should have money set apart to teach farmers how to hang tobacco. There is no one of common sense in the country who does not know how to hang tobacco. If he has not hung it right the first time he will not require a teacher to show him how to do it the second time, because his experience will teach him, and if it does not, I do not think such a vote as this will be of any use. I have had some slight experience in the growth of tobacco, and I

Mr. COWAN.

say that if I have hung tobacco too close one year and not enough of air was allowed to get around it, I will surely know that without having a teacher to tell me so. Some people seem to think that the farmers are such dull and stupid people that they must have a man standing over them all the time who has read books. These teachers are invariably men who have not gained their opinions and information in a practical way, but have derived them from books, and therefore they will not be in a position, from past experience, to teach the farmers anything in regard to the proper way of hanging tobacco. If the tobacco-growers of South Essex and North Essex and Kent, after their long experience cannot agree upon some line of action in regard to the growing and curing of tobacco, we had much better take some other course, because there is no sense in this. The hon. gentleman might have had a petition from the Tobacco Growers' Association, but that does not settle the question in any way. There was certainly some bad tobacco grown in that part of the country, but it is said that that came from not growing a good plant, and from planting it in poor soil. I have only this to say, that I am afraid the hon. gentleman, in speaking upon this question, is saying what he has heard rather than what he knows, and I am afraid that he will be unable to tell us what the Tobacco Growers' Association want to have done.

Mr. COWAN. I do not presume that the committee is particularly interested in what my professional standing may be, or how much I may know about law. I may say that I think my standing in my profession is quite as good as the hon. gentleman's standing in the business which he follows. I do not think that this House is particularly interested in that, but I do desire to say that he would not be an idiot who did not know how to hang tobacco. I am not an expert tobacco grower, although I have attended meetings of the Tobacco Growers' Association, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that some of the very best tobacco growers from Kent were present, that the tobacco growers of Essex and of Kent differ as to what is the best way of caring for tobacco, and these were men who had been in the industry for a number of years. If the hon. gentleman knows all about the curing and hanging of tobacco, he is far in advance of the gentlemen who are the leading tobacco growers in his constituency and members of the Tobacco Growers' Association. I am not posing as a tobacco expert. The hon. gentleman seems to pose as an expert farmer, but, if he is an expert farmer, gentlemen from the west have not discovered it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, I may be permitted to correct a little misapprehension on the part of the hon. gentle-

man (Mr. Cowan), who has just taken his seat. I heard what was said by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), and I understood him to say that he assumed that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) understood his profession, or the profession of the law, no better than the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) understood agriculture. All I can say is that I think he was paying him a great compliment, because after what we have heard from the hon. member for South Huron, we have come to the conclusion that he does understand farming thoroughly. Therefore, I think that the hon. member for Bothwell was paying the hon. member for South Essex a great compliment in saying that that hon. gentleman has as great knowledge of the law as the hon. member for South Huron has of farming. I am inclined to think that the hon. member for South Essex ought to have gone further. He says that he attended a meeting of gentlemen who are engaged in tobacco growing, and that there was a conflict between these gentlemen, who had devoted their lives to the raising of tobacco, as to which was the best mode of hanging tobacco, but the hon. gentleman sat down without giving us the information that we require, and so far as his argument goes, it is likely to end in smoke. He has not told us what we are all longing to learn, what was the decision arrived at, and how the hon. gentleman proposed that these young officials, that are to be sent all through the country, will be able to instruct one or other of these bodies of gentlemen who are engaged in raising tobacco, and who have not yet been able to settle the question as to how it should be hung. I do not understand very much about the subject myself, but I am sure the hon. Minister must have arrived at the conclusion, after the discussion which has taken place, that it would not be wise to press this vote in the committee. After so much difference of opinion amongst farmers on both sides of the House as to its inutility, I do not think it requires any great knowledge of tobacco raising to arrive at that conclusion. The amount of money is comparatively small and a large portion of it is going to be expended in the employment of officials, which may enable the Government to find places for a few hungry office-seekers, but I do not believe that the Minister of Agriculture has made out a case that would warrant this committee in voting money for any such purpose. When this land is acquired near the roadside and parties are allowed to go and look at it, it will do them no good. There will be no one to give information; there is no person in charge of the place and they will have to go a mile, or a couple of miles away, to hunt up the farmer and to bring him to explain the experiment to them. Well, he would say, I have got something

else to do; I have got to look after my own farm work. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) surely does not pretend that this farmer on whose land this illustration station is, is going to give up his time to explaining everything in connection with the operations. We have undertaken a large expenditure upon what may be called model farms in the various provinces of the Dominion; the Government have provided the best means of giving instructions to farmers, and I do not see what benefit is to be derived from the expenditure of this money for these illustration stations. For the time being I think we will have to be content with what we have done already. After the stringent criticism given to this vote by gentlemen on both sides of the House who understand the subject a great deal better than I do, and at least quite as well as the Minister (Mr. Fisher) does, I would respectfully suggest that this appropriation be withdrawn.

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

#### After Recess

Mr. SEMPLE. I wish to say a few words, Mr. Chairman, with regard to this vote for illustration stations. I remember that it was brought up in the Agricultural Committee last session, and I spoke my mind very freely in reference to it. I considered then that it was a needless waste of public money, and I consider the same thing now. It has been mentioned that these illustration stations have been very successful in France. That is probably true, but the conditions in France are quite different from the conditions in this country. In France everything they produce on the farm is dearer and labour is cheaper than here, and they can afford to enter into this business of illustration stations. I may say that if you take the western portion of Canada, you have not very far to go until you find a number of farmers who can teach the professor some things. They are practical farmers, starting at the occupation when boys and gaining experience continuously, some for 30 or 40 years and making good use of their time. They endeavour to get instructions on every point possible; they go to the fairs and Farmers' Institutes, they consult other farmers, and they use every means within their power to make farming a success. That success is in a great measure due to doing good work, and being as economical as possible. That is the true secret of success in farming. Where there is good farming to be done, give me the practical farmer every time. We may have some very good things in theory, but there is nothing succeeds like the practice. I believe that if this vote is passed, the most of it will be spent by the officials travelling around the country. I cannot conceive of a good farmer, who

has a large farm, bothering himself with this small remuneration and having part of his property divided into small sections, and having different variety of seeds sown to make an illustration. Besides, it will detract from the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa. To-day we voted \$80,000 for the Ottawa Experimental Farm, and the farms at Brandon, Agassiz, Nappan and Indian Head, and we ought to have illustrations enough from those farms. They are supposed to be practical men on those farms, and any information that is needed should be obtained there. It is not needed that we should have these little small affairs for illustration purposes in different parts of the country, and I think the Minister would do well to withdraw this item. The sum asked for is not large, it is true, but we have nothing definite stated as to how these experiments will be carried on. I believe that we will get no adequate return out of this \$20,000, if we expend it. I believe myself that on the Experimental Farm at Ottawa we could reap all the necessary advantages with a smaller number of men employed. We have illustrations in tree-growing on that farm, and about 150 acres set out in trees, when there is not one farmer in 10,000 who gets any benefit from that. It is only useful for the gentlemen farmers, and not for the thousands of farmers who have to work as hard as they can, and be as careful as they can, in order to make both ends meet. Although numbers of our farmers are improving and are able to settle their sons on farms, still they have very little time to indulge in any of this fancy kind of farming. I hope the Minister will see his way clear to withdraw this vote, and if he does not, I certainly will not uphold it.

Mr. STENSON. I certainly regret to see a farmer, as I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Semple) is, opposing this vote. It may be very true, that in certain parts of Canada, and perhaps in that part of the country whence my hon. friend (Mr. Semple) comes—that may be a regular garden of Paradise—there may be no necessity for these illustration stations. But, although every farmer may be perfect in that section of the country, I would respectfully remind the hon. gentleman that that is not the whole of Canada.

My experience in travelling through Canada, particularly through the province of Quebec, is that these illustration stations would be of immense benefit and would cost very little. My hon. friend says that such stations are very successful in France, but that the conditions there are different from what they are here—that labour is cheaper in France. I would take that as an argument in favour of the illustration stations. We want to produce as cheaply as possible and with the best results, and in order to do so we must have examples of how this is to be done. We want these stations in order to ascertain what results have been attained at the experimental farms, for

Mr. SEMPLE.

which we spend a large sum of money—and I believe it is money well spent—and to show those results to the people who have not the means of visiting the experimental farms and seeing for themselves. This is the only way in which those results can be brought to the knowledge of the farmers of the country. It is by ocular demonstration that we can convince them of the best methods to adopt. It is admitted without controversy that when a really good farmer goes into a district where the farmers are rather behind in the science of farming, he does a great deal of good. But we cannot have such men settling in every part of the country, and these illustration stations would represent these good farmers. My hon. friend says that in the western part of Canada there are good farmers who know more than the professors. I do not at all doubt that a really good farmer, who has spent all his life in farming, and who has studied as well as practised agriculture, knows a good deal more of the practical side of the business, in his own section, than most of our professors. But at these illustration stations some of the best farmers in each district would show to the surrounding farmers what can be done on a small piece of ground. Besides the instruction they would get from the Experimental Farm, they would also put into practice their own knowledge and experience. My hon. friend says we have our fairs and farmers' institutes. We have, but to perfect the system we need these illustration stations. At the fairs we show what our farmers have produced, and in the farmers' institutes we discuss methods of farming; but we have no means of showing how these things are done on the land; and the illustration stations would complete the system of which the fairs and farmers' institutes are a part. These illustration stations would be one of the best subjects for discussion at the meetings of the farmers' institutes. They would afford them an opportunity to criticise and to exchange opinions on what they had seen done there. By means of these illustration stations the grains and different cereals best adapted to the soil and climate of the district could be shown better than at a farmers' institute or by a professor or lecturer. My hon. friend says that a great deal of expense would be incurred in travelling around the country. There is no doubt that in order to establish those illustration stations somebody must do some travelling in order to find out where they should be placed. There will be some necessary expense for that purpose; but I believe my hon. friend thinks the expense will be more than it really will be. Once a station is established, the only expense of it will be the indemnity necessary for the farmer who takes care of it. That will be a very small expense, because the crop that will be taken off the station will go a great way towards indemnifying the farmer for taking care of it. My hon. friend says that no benefit has

been reaped from the experiment in planting trees at the Experimental farm. I cannot agree with my hon. friend there. But nobody would pretend to follow the example given by the planting of trees on the Experimental Farm. In fact, they are not planted as an example, but as an experiment to see what trees can be most profitably planted. But each farmer who has the advantage of seeing the trees planted at these experimental stations can choose those best suited to his soil and climate. I may say that I spoke of these illustration stations to the farmers of my two counties, and I did not meet with a dissentient voice. On the contrary, every farmer who attended the meetings was not only agreeable to having them established, but when I told them that the sum voted for the purpose would be a small one, and, perhaps, not sufficient to establish a station in each county, they declared that they thought there should be more than one in each county, so that they should be within the reach of every farmer. Therefore, I not only feel determined to vote for this appropriation, but I declare that if it is not granted, the farmers of the province of Quebec, at any rate of my section, will be sadly disappointed.

Mr. MAODONALD (King's, P.E.I.) The matter before us, I believe, is the proposal to establish illustration stations in the different portions of Canada. While there are arguments which can be brought against the proposal, I myself think a great deal of good will come from these stations if they are distributed throughout the different provinces and properly conducted. I understand that it is the intention of the Minister to take an ordinary piece of land, centrally situated, in the different counties, and under the guidance of a practical farmer, to have it cultivated as an object lesson to the farmers of the surrounding district. If that system is properly carried out and kept as free as possibly from political influences, I think it will tend to do much good to the farming population. We all know from observation that the placing of a good farmer in a poor section is sure to bring about good results as the people in his immediate neighbourhood will adopt his methods to a great extent, gradually anyhow, and so improve their farms. Even if these farms be not perhaps conducted better than certain farmers may conduct their operations, yet the fact of their being established by the Government for the purpose of illustrating certain methods of cultivation will attract the attention of farmers and bring more closely home to them facts in connection with their work that otherwise might escape their observation. I think that the step is one in the right direction. We all know that the farming interest is the largest in this country, that there are more depending on that industry than on any other, and that it contributes

more largely to the revenues of this country. I think, therefore, that the comparatively small amount of money which will require to be expended on these stations will be appreciated by the farmers. I think that if the Minister carries this out properly, free as far as possible from politics, it will be of practical benefit to the people in whose midst these stations will be situated. With regard to my own province of Prince Edward Island, we know that there was an illustration station established there by Prof. Robertson, under the late Government, for the manufacture of cheese and the result has been that that manufacture has grown into a very large industry, and is now so well established that it can support itself without any aid from the Government. The results have been more than the most sanguine estimated. I have no doubt also that when these stations are carried out by practical farmers, they will also be a means of education that will bring home to the farmers the best means of cultivation in a way you could not possibly hope to do by means of lectures or anything of that kind. If nothing else should come out of it, the fact, as has been stated by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, that such a system will lead the farmers to discuss the best methods of cultivation among themselves will in itself be of great value. Taking it all through, I very much favour the expenditure of this amount for that purpose.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). Nothing could give a better idea of the importance of those stations than what is taking place in connection with the cultivation of tobacco. Since Parliament imposed ten cents a pound on imported tobacco, there has been such an impulse given to that industry that last year from 8,000,000 to 10,000,000 pounds more or less have been cultivated, a very large quantity of which was grown in the province of Quebec. Two years ago, before that law was introduced, we passed only about 600,000 pounds of Canadian tobacco through our factories, whereas last year we passed through 1,900,000 pounds, and this year the quantity has amounted to 2,500,000 pounds. There is no limit to the amount that would be employed in our factories to the displacement of American tobacco, if we only knew how to cure it. But this is the great difficulty. So far as appearances are concerned, it is difficult to see anything finer than our plant, but we have not the remotest idea how to cure it. As the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has said, any idiot can hang tobacco, but if any man believes that any idiot can cure tobacco he has not the slightest idea of the care that has to be given to that plant, in order to make it fit for general use. Tobacco is a tropical plant, the cultivation of which and the curing of which has been studied for generations in the south, and there been brought

to the highest perfection. But we cannot expect our farmers to be able to go south, and there learn how to grow tobacco and especially how to cure it.

When we think of the hundreds of thousands of dollars that have been spent to show our farmers how to make the best use of their milk, how to best convert it into butter and cheese, and when we see the great results that have accrued from this expenditure, we can easily understand what magnificent results would be accomplished by a much smaller expenditure in educating our people how to cultivate and cure tobacco plant. There is no doubt that it can be grown in this country in our rapidly ripening heat, provided we use the right kind of seed and study the conditions of soil that are best calculated of its growth. Then comes the time when the tobacco must be gathered and cured. I say that it is perfectly impossible for our farmers to divine or to understand the mode of curing tobacco if they are not shown by those who have had practical experience. And it must not be forgotten that tobacco is one of the greatest sources of revenue for the farmers. As we have taught our farmers to make good butter and good cheese, so we must teach them to cure their tobacco, so that it will command a fair price. I would not ask that the same sum of money be devoted to teaching this part of the farmers' vocation as has been devoted to teaching dairying, but now that our farmers have learned to grow tobacco, it is important that they should learn how to cure it. My hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Cowan), a moment ago, spoke of the enormous amount of tobacco grown in his county, and referred to the difficulty of curing it and to the enormous loss of nearly one-half of the eight millions of tobacco owing to the imperfect way in which it was cured. He was asked if he could show how to cure it; I do not wonder that he said he could not. I do not pretend to be able to show how to cure tobacco. But I have devoted a certain study to the question, and I have learned enough of it to know that it is very difficult. Curing tobacco does not consist in merely hanging it up, which anybody could do. Curing hay does not merely consist in cutting it. Experience and knowledge is necessary in the curing of hay, and the curing of tobacco is infinitely more difficult than the curing of hay. Of all agricultural operations this curing of tobacco is one of the most difficult. Now that our people, with great good-will and great courage have rushed into this new industry, it has become more important than ever that we should teach them how to give such value to their tobacco as to secure to them some return for their labour. I sent samples of our tobacco to Europe, and I have the report here of Lord Strathcona with regard to those samples; and I am sorry to have to admit that the reports from Germany, Hamburg and

Sir HENRI JOLY DE LOTBINIERE.

Denmark show that at present that tobacco is considered on the continent to be perfectly worthless on account of the defective way in which it is cured. Is it not worth while to spend a few thousands—I have forgotten the exact amount of this vote; I think \$4,500—

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.  
Two thousand.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE.  
Only \$2,000? I am much disappointed, and I really think I must vote non-confidence in my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher). I thought it would have been a much larger amount. Considering the advantage to be gained by teaching our farmers how to take care of the immense quantity of tobacco in their storehouses as well as that which they are now growing, I think it would have been worth while to spend a larger sum.

The hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Semple), speaking of the western farmers, said that many of them could teach the professors in agriculture. I think that very possible—that they could, at all events, teach them from a practical point of view. But there is something more than the practical point of view, there is the scientific, the theoretical point of view. In Ontario the art of agriculture is much more advanced than in the province of Quebec. But let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, that in Quebec our farmers will gratefully accept any lessons given to them, and especially when given in the way that will be followed in these illustration stations. Many of the farmers are mistrustful of what they find in books and agricultural papers; but if they can see in practice before their eyes what they read in the agricultural papers, they will be ready to admit the advantage of adopting it. Moreover, many of our farmers, not only in Quebec, but in Ontario as well—if we are to believe the "Farmers' Advocate," the great agricultural paper—do not understand the great truth that what is worth doing is worth doing well. Many of them know how to do a thing, but will not take the trouble to do it, or do not think it worth while to take the trouble. To see a little patch cultivated to the highest perfection to which it can be brought will do more than any amount of lectures and agricultural items that they can read in the papers.

Another argument has been brought forward, one that I scarcely like to notice, because it is one of those painful arguments concerning which one does not know what to say. Some hon. members on the other side have said that the object of the Minister in making this organization is to have the opportunity of appointing some more officers and favouring, more or less, certain farmers. That argument will not have any weight on this side of the House, at all events. Hon. gentlemen on this side know

the devotion of the hon. Minister (Mr. Fisher) to the cause of agriculture, and also his thorough knowledge of the art. They know that his sole object is to benefit the agriculture of the Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the way you used to talk of Li Hung Chang.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Whatever I may have thought of Li Hung Chang, I think the same and more of my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher), and so far I have never had occasion to change my opinion, and I feel certain I never shall have. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) gave his opinion frankly and honestly. He lives in a part of the country where farmers really deserve the title of professors. He is a thorough farmer, and he says he does not want, and his neighbours who have the benefit of his example, do not want these illustration stations. But, in the province of Quebec, it is quite different, and in the rest of the Dominion it is different, and even in many parts of Ontario the farmers will receive very much benefit from the example they will get. I am sure that all the members on this side, and I believe that many on the other side, will be ready to render justice to the honesty of purpose of the Minister of Agriculture and his devotion to his duty as Minister and to the great cause of agriculture.

Mr. CLANCY. I think my hon. friend has not mastered the process of curing tobacco. Let me tell him that all there is in raising tobacco, after the plant is fully grown and ripened, is to hang it in a good and suitable building, and after it is properly hung, the farmer has no more control over the curing process. There always will be some inferior tobacco grown. I admit much can be done in the way of improving the growth of tobacco in Canada, but I warn my hon. friend that it is the easiest matter in the world for the farmers to grow ten times the quantity of leaf tobacco that will be required in Canada. Last year there was grown more tobacco than was required if we had not imported a pound of foreign leaf. Now, what happened? Why, much of the tobacco leaf was never taken down. I know men who have not touched their tobacco, they have simply left it hanging in the barns as it was put up in the first instance. If they had taken it down and stripped off the leaf, they would have had to put it in what is called hands, and then it has to be taken care of in an entirely different process from that the farmer has hitherto used. After it is cured it goes through the sweating process and then goes into the hands of the middlemen who handle it in all the phases it has to undergo after it leaves the farmer's hands. No farmer pretends to take hold of the tobacco and cure it in all stages. Would my hon. friend pretend to say that he intends to have a station with all its outfit, building

and everything required, for the purpose of teaching how to put up tobacco in the first instance? After it has been hung up properly in a building with plenty of room, the farmer has no more control over the quality of that tobacco. It is like growing wheat. When a farmer has harvested his wheat properly he has no more control over the quality of that wheat. But who is my hon. friend going to send to teach the farmers? He might find some one who knew more than the farmers generally. That is always the case. But a farmer can get information from his neighbour just as well, and a great deal better. The fact is that the culture of tobacco, like that of all other plants, is a matter of common sense, depending upon the conditions of the soil, the proper harvesting and hanging up of the plant, and no one can lay down any cast-iron rule to guide the farmer. The farmer must be his own judge, he must know his own land, and it would be impossible for a man one mile away who had experience under different conditions to teach him anything about it. There is no inflexible rule for farming, there is no science of farming standing alone by itself, there is no principle involved that will apply under all circumstances. It depends upon local conditions, upon good judgment and common sense, taking it for granted that the farmer always observes certain rules with regard to rotation, and always keeps his land in a good state of cultivation. The hon. gentleman points out that he is going to confer a boon upon the farmers. In the first place, he has to have a great outfit, but as I have pointed out, the farmers have no interest in their tobacco except to get it ready to go into the hands of the middleman, or possibly of the manufacturer in good condition. Tobacco that leaves the farmer in that stage must go through several other stages. I imagine my hon. friend does not want to take the place of private enterprise. I suppose he would not go further than to teach the farmers how to grow the plant and cure it. Common sense is all that is required for that, a man needs only to be told once. It is a kind of thing that does not require a system of teaching.

The hon. gentleman says that thousands and thousands of dollars have been spent in teaching the people how to make cheese. I tell the hon. gentleman there was not one dollar spent in the province of Ontario teaching the people how to make cheese, the farmers taught themselves, and to-day cheese stands in the English market at its highest point, and did stand at its highest point before anything was taught in the Ontario Agricultural College. So that whatever may have been done in the hon. gentleman's own province, in Ontario we did not have a dollar of assistance from either the province or the Dominion to teach people how to make cheese. As for butter making, the work is

going on now. The people are taught by the hard school of experience, and that is always the most useful. Whatever argument the hon. gentleman may make on behalf of his own province, I think I can safely say that in the province of Ontario such an expenditure would be of no value whatever. I am perfectly sure that the hon. gentleman is not well advised in going into this scheme. Gentlemen from his own side of the House are condemning it, gentlemen who are not disposed to take ground against the Government, but their sturdy common sense leads them to oppose it. Can any one imagine that the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) would rise in his place and oppose, upon any narrow grounds, any scheme that was really in the interests of the farmers? There is no man who knows the needs of the small farmer better than one who has passed through the experiences of a small farmer, and there is not an hon. gentleman in this House who knows better than the hon. member for South Huron what the needs of the small farmer are.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would not have risen again, but the hon. gentleman has brought up the question of cheese manufacturing in Ontario. I paid considerable attention to the progress of the manufacture of cheese in Ontario, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that what brought cheese to the condition that it was in, even before the Dominion Government had taken it up at all, was that the government of the province of Ontario engaged Professor Arnold, an American, to come to the province of Ontario. He collected the cheese-makers of as many of the surrounding factories as he could get together, and gave them practical lessons in the manufacture of cheese, and from that day to the present the cheese industry has been established on a solid basis. I admire the enthusiasm of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Sir Henry Joly de Lotbinière), and when he speaks about the honesty and enthusiasm of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, I believe he is perfectly honest; but enthusiasm often leads men astray and often leads them into lines that are not beneficial to the country. If it is a necessity that farmers should be taught how to raise tobacco, I am perfectly willing that the Government should employ one or two experts, who might go through the province of Ontario, or the Dominion of Canada, wherever the tobacco industry is to be established, who could go amongst the people and give them a far better training than could be imparted at illustration stations. You cannot hire an expert to give instruction in the curing of tobacco at every illustration station throughout the country, but you could employ one or two experts to go amongst the people and train them thoroughly in the curing of the weed, and I think that would be of greater advantage

Mr. CLANCY.

than would result from the establishment of illustration stations. You would require a practical man at every illustration station to make its work effective. With the amount that is proposed in this vote, the hon. Minister could get one or two practical men to go through the country and teach the people thoroughly. I am convinced that in Ontario—and I claim to be as well posted on the feelings of the people of that province as any hon. gentleman in this House, that there is not a majority of the farmers who believe in the establishment of any such illustration stations as these. I know the feeling is, that this would be money spent in vain.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to have taken part in this debate in reference to this small amount of money to be given to the farmers of the county which I have the honour to represent. This is a new county. A large number of the farmers there have not had the advantage that the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) has had, nor have they had the advantage of having a neighbour such as that hon. gentleman is. They are young men who are starting in life, many of whom have hewn out their own homes, and many of whom have purchased their farms from the sale of timber upon them. What we ask the Government to do is to help us to educate these young men and these middle-aged men, who have made their homes there, how best to make the most money out of their farms. The great object of the Government of the country is to teach the people how best to make the most of the products of the country. We want to fill the country with good people, and we want these people to make money as quickly as possible, because 45 per cent of the population are farmers, and unless the farmer makes money, it is impossible for others to make money, because, after all, agriculture is the source of wealth in Canada. We have in this country what few countries have: we have a fine soil, a fine climate, good water, cheap building material, and markets very near to every farm. That being the case, we have the satisfaction of knowing that if we learn the farmer how to make the best use of his farm, there is not the least doubt but what wealth will accrue rapidly in this country. To establish a small plot would not cost much, and the farmer who owns the land would be instructed how to cultivate it to the best advantage. I believe that instruction as to the cultivation of a farm at Ottawa would have but little effect in improving the cultivation of a farm in Essex. Our climate and our soil are entirely different. We have no objection to a large amount of money being expended here, but we feel that we should have a little more than that. While my hon. friend speaks so nobly of what was done for the cheese industry in his district,

when they hired men to go through the district and teach the farmers how to conduct factories, I would tell him that this is nothing more than we ask to have done in regard to the tobacco industry. What we want the Government to do is to have a plot of land set aside with good seed, specially adapted for use in each particular district, and so cultivated as to demonstrate what is best suited for the requirements of each district. I was pleased to hear the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) talk so nobly about tobacco. He had the opportunity of growing a lot of tobacco, but he has not told the committee how it turned out. He has not sold his tobacco yet, so that he does not know where he is at. As my young friend from South Essex (Mr. Cowan) said, we have taken from the soil of North and South Essex, and from a portion of Kent, over half a million dollars in tobacco alone. If we do not grow it in this country, the money of this country, Canada, goes to the south of us for the tobacco that is used. If we can grow that tobacco, it is just as good as that grown to the south of us, and I am satisfied that we can grow it and manufacture it in our own country to the best interests of our own people. If you can get 8,000 acres under crop in tobacco, it would mean the establishment of an industry which amounts to \$40 or \$50 worth of employment on each acre under crop. We do not want a lecture from the hon. member for Bothwell upon this subject, because he does not know where he is at. We want a man who can plant tobacco, take it from the plant, finish it, take it to the old country, and place it in the markets of the world, where it will compete against the product of the south, and put it up in such a shape as to displace a large amount of tobacco that now comes from the south. This is not asking very much from the Government. It is simply to give a very small amount, and it may not be necessary to spend the whole of this appropriation. Let us try it in a few fields. Let us plant 20 acres in a field under an arrangement by which a farmer takes charge of the field under the advice of the department, and which will result in the instruction of the people there. Last year the department appointed a young man named Labelle. He came amongst us and spoke about the packing and the curing of tobacco. He said: Farmers, had I been here, when the tobacco was being grown, before it was cut, and seen it cut and put into the house; if I had arranged the amount of air space, so as to dry the tobacco properly, instead of getting 5 cents, 6 cents or 7 cents a pound for your tobacco, you should have gotten 12 cents or 14 cents for it. This has been a great loss to us. We want these gentlemen to help us to grow better oats and corn, and to teach us how best to turn down green crops. My hon. friend from Bothwell says we have that now, but you can see on the

Experimental Farm that turning down at one date and turning down at another makes an important difference in the crop. We want the greatest advantage that it is possible to be given us in reference to these plots. I feel that the very small amount asked for is not very much to be given to the farmers of this country, when you consider that they are half the population of this country, and that, after all, Canada is bound to be an agricultural country before anything else.

Mr. CASEY. The question now before us seems to have caused a difference of opinion among the representatives of the farming community in the House. Permit me, Sir, to give one or two reasons for thinking that the proposal of the Minister of Agriculture to establish illustration stations, is a step in the right direction. We have long complained of the lack of practical results, from a considerable number of years of experimenting on the different experimental farms in Canada. Experiments have been made and the results have been published and circulated pretty widely; but nothing that can be printed is so convincing to the average farmer as the demonstration of an experiment carried out under his own eye. Then, again, there is the point referred to by my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. McGregor), that experiments carried on at the Ottawa farm are absolutely of no value, even to large portions of the province of Ontario; because the difference between the climate here and the climate in Essex, Kent and Elgin, and other Lake Erie counties, is as great as the difference between the climate of Ottawa and that of Virginia. The results that are obtained here—as I have often told whoever was Minister of Agriculture for the time being—are of absolutely no value to the part of the country in which I live. It therefore follows that the results of experiments here should be tested in different parts of the country, and that can only be done by such stations as my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) proposes to establish. I understand that there will not be an extensive establishment in each place, but that it is intended to enlist the services of enlightened farmers having good clean productive farms; farmers who will do the work under the inspection of the experimental staff who have tried the experiments here; the products of the crops themselves going to these farmers. There is no doubt at all that these practical illustrations of the results obtained, or thought to be obtained, here, must give a good deal of information to those who see the illustrations carried out. Not all the farmers of Canada, not all the farmers even near to these illustration plots can see them, but in what other way are you to bring the results of our costly experiments at Ottawa home to the farming community, except by establishing a number of such illustration plots throughout

the country, and thus giving the farmers a chance to see them? Of course, you cannot force the farmers to go, but you can give them an opportunity of doing so; you can have pic-nics two or three times during the season, and you can have a lecturer present at each of these pic-nics to explain the illustrations and the results obtained.

Something has been said about the production of tobacco in Canada, and in my opinion this is one of the most important questions before the agriculturists of this country to-day. Tobacco-growing has taken a great boom in the peninsula of Ontario generally, and the home market is now being largely filled up. Probably in another year the home market will be more than supplied so far as the demand for that kind of tobacco is concerned. The question will then arise as to whether tobacco growing must stop at that point, or whether there is any hope of making it a progressive industry, like cheese-making, or butter-making, or the raising of grain and fruits. My own idea is that it will follow the course of these other industries in all its phases. There will be first that degree of production that will overstock the home market, the surplus tobacco left on the grower's hands, the fall of price; and then the looking around for foreign markets for this tobacco, which, being obtained, will encourage improvement in manufacture, as in the case of the cheese industry and the butter industry, and some others.

To put it briefly, the only future for the tobacco-growing business in Ontario lies in our being able to export that tobacco in competition with Virginia tobacco in the markets of the world. For my part, I do not see why that result cannot be brought about. The climate of the Ontario peninsula, as I have said, very much resembles that of Virginia. The soil in many parts of Essex, Kent and Elgin is identical with the soil of Virginia; the seed can be imported from Virginia of the most popular kinds of tobacco, the tobacco will grow there, I believe, almost identically the same as it grows in Virginia, and at the time it is cut and the curing commences, no chemist or expert can distinguish between the tobacco grown in Kent, Essex or Elgin, and the tobacco grown in Virginia. But, it is in the curing that the valuable properties of the tobacco are brought out. For instance, you may have two samples of milk; one is made roughly and carelessly into cheese, and you obtain a product of no value; the other is made after the latest scientific methods, and you obtain an article for which as is the case with Canadian cheese, you get the highest price in the English market. The very same thing can be done with our tobacco. We have the soil and the climate, we can get the seed, and what we want is to learn how to cure the raw leaf. I regret that I did not hear the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) speak, for undoubtedly I would have got a lot of information, and I only

Mr. CASEY.

know enough at the present time to be aware that I am ignorant of how to cure tobacco, although I am a very good judge of the article after it is cured. I am satisfied that if properly cured, as good tobacco can be produced in Canada as we now import from Virginia or Kentucky, whence a large proportion of our supply comes. You will have to do with the tobacco industry as you did with the butter and cheese industry—you will have to spend public money in developing it.

I heard a few of the last remarks of the hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), and I believe he was astray when he said that cheese-making had reached its highest point, before any public money was spent in developing and improving its manufacture. I can tell him that Canadian cheese has only attained its present high quality within the last few years or so, and not until long after the Government of Ontario had commenced spending public money in teaching the farmers how to make good cheese. During the whole of the last fifteen years and more, public money has been spent continuously; first by the provincial Government, and then by the Dominion Government, in educating our people how to make cheese, and the result of the expenditure of that public money is that to-day Canada sends to the English market the best article of cheese that enters that market from any foreign country.

Mr. CLANCY. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) say that in the province of Ontario and on the Guelph farm, they ever pretended to teach dairying until the last seven or eight years? Is he not aware that even then they did not teach cheese-making at all?

Mr. CASEY. No, Mr. Chairman, I am not aware that there was no teaching of dairying at the Guelph college until the last seven or eight years. I am aware that there was teaching of dairying long before that.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman say what year?

Mr. CASEY. I cannot give the exact year in which it began, but I know that more than ten years ago they taught dairying, and I know as much about the Guelph College as my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) does. I know also that before the Guelph College was undertaken in Ontario, public money was spent in getting the cheese makers together and sending lecturers to instruct them on the best methods of making cheese. Of course, the cheese makers may have put up some money of their own at various times, but I am speaking now entirely of the expenditure of public money, which has been going on for fifteen years and more—the hon. member for Essex (Mr. McGregor) says twenty years, and I think he is probably correct—first, by the province of Ontario, and then by the Dominion copying the example first set by the provincial government.

The result has been to bring that trade to perfection.

I ask that the same thing should be done for the tobacco industry. I ask it in the interest of my own county, which is largely concerned in this industry, and in the interest of neighbouring counties. I urge that experts should be brought from Virginia; I urge that Virginia seed should be brought; I urge that Virginia leaf in the process of curing should be brought and experimented on to see if the Canadian leaf could be influenced by being cured along with the Virginia leaf. Our bacteriological experts at Guelph say that they have found it possible to produce the flavour of June butter at any other period of the year by keeping up the cultivation of the bacteria, so to speak, from the June churnings. The same principle has been proven in regard to the fermentation of wine. The flavour of the article does not depend so much on the nature of the raw material as on the nature of the fermentation produced. Tobacco curing involves a certain amount of fermentation of the leaf, and it is worth trying whether the Virginia fermentation could not be produced in the Canadian tobacco with the result of obtaining the Virginia flavour in the finished product. I think these experiments in tobacco culture should be tried at some central point. For that purpose we want not an illustration station, but an experimental station in the centre of the tobacco-growing part of Ontario. The results obtained by experimenting on our raw leaf at that station should be taught at the illustration stations throughout the district in which tobacco can be profitably grown. Of course, I am only speaking of my own district. I am aware that there are other parts of Canada where tobacco is successfully grown, but I claim that in our particular district the climate is most like that of Virginia. There is no doubt that good tobacco is grown in other parts of Canada. I have lately seen and smoked tobacco from the province of Quebec which is hardly distinguishable from the Virginia article. I think that is capable of improvement also, and I am urging that these experiments in regard to the growing and curing of tobacco should be carried on where tobacco is grown most successfully.

Mr. LOUIS E. DUGAS (Montcalm). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt, as stated in the course of this debate, that the tobacco growing industry is one of the most important industries in this country, and coming as I do from a rural constituency where the cultivation of tobacco is carried on on a very large scale, I think it my duty to congratulate the Government upon what they have done so far, that is to say, for having imposed 10 cents a pound on foreign tobacco.

Mr. CASEY. (Translation.) May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. DUGAS. When I am done, the honourable member will be at liberty to put his question in French if he likes. (Translation.) When the hon. gentleman interrupted me, I was saying that the Government deserved credit for having imposed a customs duty on foreign tobacco, but, on the other hand, I think they are open to censure for having replaced that duty by an excise duty, because, by so doing, they have reduced that duty from 10 cents to six cents and a half or seven cents. Of course, when a manufacturer buys a pound of American tobacco and he pays for it before taking it over the line; but now, he is allowed to keep that tobacco for two years without paying the duty, so long as he has not manufactured and sold it, thus realizing from three to three and a half per cent, owing to the interest accruing from his money in the bank.

The hon. gentlemen opposite who have referred to tobacco-growing in Canada, have spoken in high terms of the good work done by the present Government. I endorse to some extent what they have said in that respect, but I cannot help pointing out to the hon. gentlemen that they made a mistake, when cutting down the duty. Tobacco-growing is the most important industry in the county I have the honour of representing in this House; and that is the reason why I would urge upon the Government the desirability of encouraging still further the cultivation of tobacco. I congratulate the Government upon having established a model farm in my constituency; but I cannot say anything to the credit of that farm, as I do not know how it is run or whether the expert in charge is competent or not. All I can say is that he has not succeeded so far in growing tobacco. Whether that depends on the climate or not, I cannot say. He may have done his best in that regard, and the Government also may perhaps have done all that could reasonably be expected from them; but, be that as it may, they have at least succeeded in paying a salary to one of their friends, and that was no doubt their chief purpose. It would afford me pleasure to give full credit to the Government for what they have done in the interest of that industry, were it not for the fact that they have substituted an excise duty to the customs duty.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). (Translation.) It is almost past belief that I cannot succeed in making the hon. gentleman understand how matters stand in connection with that duty. What the hon. gentleman is complaining about is that we allow those who import foreign leaf tobacco to pay the duty imposed upon it at the very moment when they turn it into use in their factories. That is what was always done in connection with the duty levied on imported tobacco. The importer of tobacco brings in

that product from abroad, and then it is warehoused. He is then allowed to manufacture that tobacco and it is only when he is ready to sell that we collect the duty. It is perfectly fair to collect the duty from the manufacturer who imports large quantities of tobacco from abroad, say 10,000 or 20,000 and perhaps as much as 30,000 pounds, which he does not require for immediate use, only at the moment when he places his product upon the market and realizes such large sums as he may have invested in the same. He is allowed to put his tobacco in the bonded warehouses and to pay the excise duty, in proportion as he takes it out—

Mr. DUGAS. (Translation.) It is the interests of the manufacturer you are protecting, to the prejudice of the interests of the farmer.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman says that we are fostering the interests of the manufacturer, to the prejudice of the interests of the farming community, and therein he shows that he has not yet grasped the question. He forgets that foreign tobacco has to pay an excise duty of 10 cents a pound, in addition to the twenty-five cents levied on manufactured tobacco, or in all thirty-five cents, over and above an additional tax of 4 cents, when the manufacturer uses stemmed tobacco; that is to say, that the duty reaches 39 cents, while native manufactured tobacco only pays a duty of five cents a pound.

The hon. gentleman wants the Government to call upon the manufacturer to pay the duty before using in his factory the imported tobacco. Such a course would be inconsistent with every principle of justice and right; and ever since the Government have levied a duty on tobacco, they have invariably collected it at the moment when that product was placed upon the market.

Mr. DUGAS. (Translation.) Is it not true that, when you allow the manufacturer to warehouse his tobacco, you protect him?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. (Translation.) If the hon. gentleman is unwilling to admit the services the Government has rendered the farming community, I cannot help it.

Mr. DUGAS. (Translation.) Is it not true that the manufacturer pays the duty only when he offers his tobacco for sale, and that prior to that, the duty was paid, before crossing the line?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. (Translation.) We are not Jews, we are Christians, and we only require the manufacturer to pay the duty, when he realizes by his sales the large sums invested by him in imported tobacco, and that is only fair and reasonable.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). (Translation.) I would remind my  
SIR HENRI JOLY DE LOTBINIERE.

hon. friend from Montcalm that the rule followed as to the payment of the duty which is levied on tobacco does not differ at all from that carried out in connection with every other imported article. As my hon. friend knows very well, those who import iron, grain or any other commodity, are allowed to leave those products in the warehouses, and they are only called upon to pay the duty when those goods are offered for sale, and it is only when the goods are taken out of the warehouse to enter into use that the duty is levied.

Mr. DUGAS. (Translation.) I am well aware of what the right hon. gentleman has just stated. It is true that you thus give all the desirable facilities to the manufacturers and to the importers of tobacco. But is it not true that when that duty of ten cents was imposed, the same manufacturer, when importing his tobacco from abroad, had to pay to the customs so much a pound?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. (Translation.) Not at all; he could leave his tobacco in the customs warehouse as long as he pleased. It would remain there one, two or three years, until needed. I hope my hon. friend will explain the matter to his electors.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, after this discussion, must have arrived at the conclusion that he is without any real support in this House, so far as his proposal to establish illustration stations is concerned. There seems to be a different opinion with regard to tobacco growing. That is an important question, and I think the suggestion of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) is deserving of attention, and that is that it would be well to take such a portion of the appropriation as would be necessary to obtain the services of thoroughly skilled experts in tobacco. But so far as the farming stations are concerned, I have heard nothing in their favour approaching to an argument from anybody. The tobacco question is an important one, the model farm will have to do the other work, and the establishing of small illustration stations in various localities will simply mean the expenditure of some \$15,000 to \$20,000 a year, which will be very satisfactory to the officials appointed by the Government, and who will take the larger portion of the appropriation for their expenses and salaries, but will be of no general utility at all to the country. The speech of my hon. friend from South Huron, who speaks with a thorough knowledge of the subject, ought to be conclusive. He says the vote for such appropriation is altogether unwarranted, because the higher class of farmers afford, by their advanced means of cultivation, much better instruction than could be given by means of these stations, and all that the neighbouring farmers have to do is to go and see what these men are doing

and that will cost the country nothing. But the suggestion is well worthy of consideration of getting two or three, or whatever number may be found absolutely necessary, experts who would be able to give the best possible advice to people engaged in the cultivation of tobacco. I hope my hon. friend will see his way clear to drop the other portion of the vote, or else let the committee divide, so as to show who are in favour of and who are opposed to this large and absolutely useless expenditure.

**Mr. PRIOR.** This tobacco industry is of such great importance, that I do not like to let this discussion go without saying a few words on the subject. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) said he knew there was good tobacco grown in Quebec and Ontario, but he seems to have forgotten, if he ever knew, that there is another portion of the country which grows splendid tobacco, and that is British Columbia. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue will agree with me when I say that we are now growing as good tobacco in British Columbia as can be found anywhere else in the Dominion. There is the large district of Kelowna, at the south of Okanagan Lake, not very far from the boundary line, where tobacco is grown just as successfully as anywhere in Ontario. Some gentlemen there have taken great interest in this industry, and put a great deal of money into it. I do not know whether the curing there is better than anywhere else in Ontario, but I know that the tobacco is very highly appreciated by the Department of Inland Revenue. As the industry is of such importance and there is no end to the extent it may attain, because there is practically an unlimited demand for good tobacco, I should very much like to see the Government bring down a vote either to have experimental stations established for that purpose or getting the best advice procurable, so that our farmers may learn how best to grow and cure the plant. I think \$2,000 altogether too small a sum for the whole of Canada to be devoted to such a purpose, and I trust the Government will see its way clear to assist these men who are trying to do their best to advance this industry into the position it ought to attain.

**Mr. BRODER.** I question the advisability of starting farmers' kindergarten schools in this country. There is one thing the department ought to guard against, and that is being too quick to change their theories and practice. You cannot ask a farmer to change his conditions every year. You cannot expect him to adopt new means and systems of agriculture every year or two in order to follow the advice and suggestions of the Agriculture Department, because his conditions are more permanent than those of any other class, and he cannot change his buildings and surroundings without considerable expense.

Now, in the illustration stations suggested by the Minister of Agriculture, and foreshadowed before the Committee of Agriculture a year ago, if I mistake not, the intention, as I understand, is not to put the farmer under the instruction of some expert, but to get some farmer in the community who is a good farmer and get him to set apart not less than ten and not more than twenty acres of land for the purpose of showing the kind of grain which, in that locality, is most largely grown. For instance, we come to a locality where oats are most largely grown, and the intention is to get him to grow oats of different kinds, in order to show what kind of oats is better for that locality. But who is to give instructions as to the selection of the field or the kind of soil you are to sow this grain upon? If a man goes out and buys a new farm, one with which he has had no previous acquaintance, he can do very little until he learns the nature of the soil in every field of that farm. In arranging for this illustration station, are you going to send out a man from the Experimental Farm to make the inspection? If you do he will have to get information from the man who owns the farm when he gets there. But you must take care that the conditions are such that the experiment will not be a failure. One experiment attempted under the auspices of the Government resulting in failure will do harm that you cannot recover from for years. As suggested by the report of the Agriculture Committee a year ago, the proposal is not to keep that illustration station on one farm continually, but only for a year or two. But in order to make it a success, you have to make what may be called permanent improvements, and these permanent improvements must be abandoned when you move to some other farm. You can go to the farm of my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) and find all these conditions there, but in many sections of the country you can go through a whole township where you will not find a single farm tile drained so that you could raise a crop that would be a credit to the Government undertaking the experiment. If there were a failure, it would bring the Government control of the Experimental Farm at Ottawa into contempt. That is something the hon. Minister ought to think of before undertaking this enterprise. Then you are going to use the schoolhouse. Now, the school system of Ontario unfortunately is educating the young people away from the farm rather than toward it. Next to the schoolhouse which is educating the people away from the farm you are going to start an illustration station to educate them back to it. Is that the idea? You must begin at the foundation and teach the boys not to regard it as a disgrace to work in the fields with their father, to teach the girls that it is no disgrace to work in the kitchen with their mother. This will require something more

fundamental than an illustration station. The best educator in this country is the successful farmer, each in his own community. This man has done more than the Government, and he is the man that the people look to. If you ask such a man to appropriate twenty acres of his farm to the growth of certain crops, and to give his time to the care of them—for it will take great care to make sure of the experiment being a success—and to explain the work to the people who come, he cannot afford to do all this for \$100. If the people do not go there, no good will be done, and if they do go and are not attended to, they will not feel that they have been fairly treated. We all know that the French Government believe in paternal government, they expect the government to look after them. Is that the condition you want to bring about in Canada? I should say you want to teach the farmers to be more independent so they will be able to look after themselves. It is an absurd idea that the farmer must be kept in leading strings by the hon. Minister. The hon. gentleman will run across many hard-headed men, and he had better be careful what he attempts to teach. Many a young man goes out to teach theology, and if he gets into a schoolhouse in the back districts among a lot of hard-headed Scotchmen, he cannot teach bad doctrine and palm it off half as well as he can in the city. And in the same way, if a professor goes into a farming section and attempts to teach that bad farming doctrine, he will get into bad repute with his audience and will have to come back a sadder but a wiser man. We will have to look this matter squarely in the face. The conditions surrounding our Experimental Farm are such that that institution is of greatest use to the man who has time to read and the means to carry on experiments to adopt what he learns from the farm to the conditions that surround him. But the man who most needs help is the poor struggling farmer, perhaps, with a load of debt, with two or three cows and a very poor building to put them in. But where does he look for help? To the Experimental Farm or the illustration stations? No, he will go to his well-to-do neighbour whom he respects and whom he knows to be a successful man, and from him he will get a little help in the way of an advance of seed grain or a loan of farm implements. If we undertake these experiments and carry them out in every county, it means an enormous expenditure of money, with very little good resulting from it. It is better far to build up your centres, to make your experimental farms in Ontario and other provinces thoroughly successful. If it is necessary to spend more money to accomplish this, take the money. Better this than undertake these little experiments under the criticism of hard-headed farmers. There is lots of work for you to do in these Experimental Farms. It hardly

Mr. BRODER.

does for a woman who does not keep her own house well to start out to teach her neighbour woman how to keep hers. Apparently they do not care to have the people come and criticise the work at the Experimental Farm. A man who knows anything about trees and orchards can go out and find just about the worst orchard in the country on the Experimental Farm. If a man wants to find things out of order, he can find them out of order at the farm. These things should not be. Make your centres strong, make them that they ought to be a credit to this country and the means of impressing every critic who comes, and if you want to make these centres of use, if you want to spend money on the farmer, give him a free ride—of course I mean about election time—down to the Experimental Farm so that he may see what is going on. Instead of sending the Gospel to him, bring him to the gospel, and let him see the work of a farm in its entirety. What does he care about twenty acres of oats or of four or five different kinds. He will probably see 500 acres of better oats on the way in to look at those of the illustration station. He will pass five better farms on the way to see this. Bring him up where he can see the whole business under proper conditions. The very moment you undertake to show him this station, you discredit the respect he has for what is being done here at Ottawa. It is a kind of familiarity that will breed contempt. You will put this illustration into the hands of a man whom nobody in the community knows much about, and you will find twenty farmers all around that man who know a great deal more than he does. Will that do any good? Why, every one of these men that knows more than he does, will criticise him, and he will be discredited all over that community. The farmer is no novice. Men talk here as though he were not fit to go out into the daylight. You never made a bigger mistake. There is no more inquiring class in this country than the intelligent farmers. They can take an idea just as quickly as any other man, and if you want to find that out, just touch them on matters that interest them. As in this House, some members will get up and talk about something that nobody will listen to, but the moment you strike anything interesting, every man will hear you. So it is with the farming community. You go out into the farming community, and talk about a lot of things the farmers do not care a straw about, and they do not give you much of a hearing; but touch on anything that they are interested in, and you will get a hearing, and you will get criticism, too, perhaps, that will send you back a good deal wiser than when you left home.

There is no doubt the farmers of this country are realizing that they have to stand largely on their own resources, and use the best means within their reach, if

they are going to succeed. While they realize that there is a great deal of help given them through suggestions from our farm here, what the Government are now proposing to establish, unless these stations fall into the hands of intelligent men, men who are honest in carrying out the propositions laid down, they are going to be a failure. I was surprised at an idea I saw in the report, on page 45, I think it was. The hon. member for West Toronto made the suggestion that farmers' institutes, instead of holding the meeting up in the hall, should come down on this plot of ground and hold their meeting there. I think it was suggested by a member of the committee. But what if the plot has produced a bad crop? Prof. Robertson said: If it is a bad crop, it will show that there was something wrong either in the seed or in the conditions. But this year he, Prof. Robertson, has got away from that theory; there is nothing wrong in the seed; it is all in the conditions; only a year ago that statement was made. I want to say that we have got to stick to some sound theories and follow them out successfully, if we are going to lead the farmers forward. He cannot change his theories and his practice with a snap of the finger. You have got to pursue some consistent course, settle on the best that it is possible to get, and then attempt to carry it out. The individual farmer in the community who is successful, and whom the people know—he is the man that is influencing the public in reference to this business, he is the man that the people look to, he is the man whom they follow. I know myself men who are good farmers, and who have commenced to follow these new theories, and the whole community will wait three, or four, or five years to find out whether that man is wise or not, and if they find out he is wise, they will begin to follow him. That is the position things are in to-day. The farmers have object lessons all through this country in the successful farmer, and he is a better object lesson than anything that can be got up by this Government.

I think, if I mistake not, the number of these stations in France is said to be about 4,000. What is the cost of them in France? I think it was \$60 that each of these stations cost. Does any man pretend to say that you can carry out an illustration station in this country at a cost of \$60? No, nor \$300. Unless you make these illustration stations permanent in a sense, with proper drainage and all equipments, they will be a failure, they will hurt the whole business in this country. Now, I want to show you one thing. You ask a man to go and raise four or five different kinds of oats on this piece of ground. In order to see what the results are, he has to take them into the barn and thresh them. Are you going to ask a man to have four or five different compartments in his barn in order to store away these different kinds of grain,

or is he going to put them indiscriminately into his barn along with his other grain? He cannot do it; he must keep them separate; every kind must be kept separate in his barn. So you see, there will be an outlay necessary, and you will have to incur expenses that you do not foresee. It is all very well to talk about experimental stations all over a country the size of Canada, but the thing is not practicable. The money spent on that can be better used in the interest of the agricultural community in some other direction. As I said before, make your experimental farms a complete success and give the people the results of your experiments; and, if it is necessary to assist them to get to these farms and see what they are like, why, give them some help to go there. It is better than spending money to show them something they will not like. They will not travel across a township to see a few acres of oats; they want to see something bigger than that. The farmer will say to his neighbour: I have been up to Tom Jones to see his 20 acres of oats, and Nicholas Richards up here has a good deal better field of oats, with no money spent on it either, and no inspection from the Government or anybody else. This is the way they will talk; they will look upon these stations as all nonsense. The intelligent farmer will conclude, quite naturally, that if these stations are a failure, the big Experimental Farm must be no better; he will reason from the lesser to the greater, like all theologians do. It is like the boy whom the lady undertook to teach Scripture. She taught him the first day about the whale swallowing Jonah, which he was willing to believe. The next day she tried to make him believe that 5,000 men were fed on five loaves and two fishes. He rebelled at this and he told her: I believed your story yesterday, but now I don't believe either story. That is about the position of the farmer: he is believing your story now about this Experimental Farm up here, but, when he sees these illustration stations at his own door, he will not believe either of them. He is no fool. I tell the Minister of Agriculture that there is not a practical farmer in this House will speak in favour of his scheme. The strongest condemnation of the whole business is, that not a practical farmer in this House believes in the scheme. That is all I have to say about it, and I hope it will die a natural death.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Two Mountains). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I am not a farmer, but I live among farmers, and I have the honour of representing here the most essentially agricultural constituency in the province of Quebec.

I am really surprised to see that this vote has elicited so much discussion and that the opposition to this item emanates from hon. members on both sides of the House. The

hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) asks the House to give him this vote of \$20,000 for the purpose of establishing in different parts of the country what are called illustration stations. This is a new experiment that no Government, in this country had so far, attempted to carry out.

While extravagant expenditures are incurred every year for public works, in the interest of large centres of population, it is, unfortunately, too true that under former Governments, hardly anything was expended for promoting agriculture, and yet, if there is any department of industry which, more than any other, deserves a liberal appropriation, it is that of agriculture, which constitutes the chief source of national wealth.

If I understand aright, the intention of the Minister of Agriculture is that this item of \$20,000 be applied to create emulation among farmers in the different portions of the country. Considerable sums of money are voted every year for experimental farms, and in the Estimates under consideration, an appropriation of \$80,000 is made for the maintenance of five experimental farms. These institutions are certainly a credit to the country and they are deserving of all our encouragement. Still, I think it would be advisable to have such farms established on a smaller scale throughout the country, and such is the intention of the Minister of Agriculture in asking the House to give him this vote of \$20,000 for the establishment of illustration stations. As farmers in general are not able to come to our experimental farms at Ottawa or elsewhere, in order to see what is going on at those farms, a good many are inclined to carp at the expenditures as useless; but I believe that if we had illustration stations established throughout the different provinces, it would be a boon to the farming community.

The hon. member from Dundas (Mr. Broder) and the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) contend that those illustration stations would be of no practical utility to the farmers in their respective constituencies and that they are not needed. Well, Sir, speaking here in the name of the farmers of the province of Quebec, I may tell the hon. gentlemen that, if they are willing to give up their share of this appropriation, the farmers in the province of Quebec, and especially in the county of Two Mountains will only be too glad to benefit by it.

The hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Dugas), who represents a tobacco-growing district, spoke, a little while ago, of the cultivation of tobacco as a national industry. Let me tell him that this industry would be immensely benefited by the establishment of those illustration stations. In the county of Joliette, as well as in the county of Montcalm, tobacco-growing has become a well established and paying home industry. But, this year, I am sorry to say, the price of to-

Mr. ETHIER.

bacco has fallen, and I think I know why the cultivation of tobacco will not be profitable. It is because the farmers in the province of Quebec do not know how to cure tobacco. The parish of Saint-Jacques, in the county of Montcalm, is the chief tobacco-growing centre.

Mr. DUGAS (Montcalm). (Translation.) If the hon. gentleman will allow me to interrupt him, I did not criticise the establishment of model farms in the various counties of the province, but I did congratulate the Government upon having established one in the county of Montcalm.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) I agree that the hon. gentleman did not criticise the establishment of model farms; but I was referring to the establishment of illustration stations, and I said that it would be a great benefit to the farmers in the county of Two Mountains to have those stations, and we should, I think, all unite in favour of a scheme which would prove a boon to the farming community.

Improved methods of culture is what our farmers mostly need; and nothing would contribute more to their education than the establishment of illustration stations where farmers would get object lessons in farming. As a rule, our farmers are too busy and besides cannot afford to spend five or six dollars to come and visit the Experimental Farm at Ottawa, in order so that they may see the work that is done and find out how it is done. We are going to vote \$80,000 for these Experimental Farms and after all that expenditure may not prove as beneficial and useful to the farming community as the contemplated trial stations might prove. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is no doubt conferring a boon upon the farming community and is taking a step in advance, by introducing this measure. It may be said to the credit of the Government of the day that they have done a great deal for the agricultural classes. Under such circumstances, I hope no dissentient voice will be heard in this House against this measure which aims at benefiting the agricultural population.

This is a new proposition in the Estimates. Take, for instance, the district of Terrebonne, which is composed of the counties of Two Mountains, Terrebonne and Argenteuil; I do not think you would find there a single man disposed to offer any objection to this appropriation. Supposing a station were established at St. Scholastique, the county town of Two Mountains, where farmers have to go four or five times a year on judicial, municipal or other business, the Government might spend a thousand dollars at that place, out of this appropriation of \$20,000, for establishing an illustration station. Now, does it not stand to reason that such a station would prove a great benefit to the farmers, who would go and see the work

carried on at that station? They would go there to acquire some information such as is afforded by these stations, in order to improve their ideas of farming.

Possibly this new system might not result as favourably as is anticipated, but what harm is there in making the trial?

We ought to be thankful to the Government for offering the farming population a means of improving their methods of cultivation. This appropriation means a sum of \$20,000 offered by the Government to the farming community, and when we are voting away millions of dollars for wharfs and other public works in large centres, I fail to see why we should oppose this appropriation, which is calculated to benefit the agricultural population. It seems to me that all those who take an interest in the welfare of the agricultural industry should vote, without one dissentient vote, this appropriation, which the Minister of Agriculture asks the House to give him, in order to make this trial.

**Mr. GILMOUR.** Mr. Chairman, had the Government asked for \$20,000 for the purpose of establishing additional experimental stations throughout the country, I would have no objection, but when they go into the illustrating business they are going out of their proper latitude, and they are going where they should not go. This is going to be a very costly way of imparting information. I believe that experimental stations might have been established with profit in this country, because we have such a variety of climates and conditions of soil that experimental stations would serve a good purpose in the testing of seeds suited to different conditions and localities, but as for illustration stations, made up of twenty-acre plots on the roadside, established everywhere throughout the country, I cannot understand how they will be of any practical utility. At what stage would the farmer see them? He would have to see them at the time the crop is put in, and how many farmers could possibly spare the time to go and see them then? What would be the advantage even if it were possible for them to see them? If the farmers of Canada were a people who could not read, if there were no papers printed in this country for the dissemination of information, it might be necessary to carry these illustrations to them and place them before their noses in order to show the results of the experiments which have been carried on at the farms, but when you have the opportunity of testing the seeds and of making the information available through the press, you have the best means of illustrating the results to the farmers. Give them the seed and they will know how to put it in, grow it, and harvest it. This is going to be a very costly undertaking. It has been urged that \$20,000 is not much, and that, if you would make a grant, it will show our confidence in the Minister. This is

neither a question of \$20,000 nor of confidence in the Minister. It should be borne in mind that, while they are only asking for \$20,000 to-day, the intention of the Government is to extend this system to every county in the Dominion. It means a large expenditure, and if it were for any purpose that would benefit the farmers of the country, I would have no objection to offer, but no good can result from the establishment of illustration stations in every county in the Dominion. A county is probably forty miles square, and with a twenty-acre plot in the midst of each county, how many farmers are going to see it at the time it should be seen? A great deal has been said in regard to the tobacco industry. If it is necessary to teach the people how to cure and manufacture tobacco, I have no objection to sending experts to show them how to do these things, but I do not see any necessity of establishing an illustration plot in order to show them how to grow it. The farmers of Canada are not so dull as some hon. members would have them to be. They all understand without being shown in that kind of way. I object to this expenditure, and I do not hesitate, as representing an agricultural constituency, to move that the item be struck out.

**Mr. CARGILL.** Mr. Chairman, I have listened very attentively to the speeches which have been made in this committee upon this appropriation, which has been proposed in the interest of the agricultural community. I may say that there is no member of this committee who would rise with more pleasure to support an appropriation which was in the true interest of the agricultural community of this country, but, after listening to the speeches that have been made this afternoon, I am not yet convinced that the establishment of these illustration farms throughout the country would be likely to advance the welfare of the agricultural community. I happen to be a member of the Committee on Agriculture. This matter was brought up before that committee a year ago, or over a year ago. We had at that committee a gentleman than whom, I have no hesitation in saying, that if I had a proposal that I wished to carry to a successful issue, after having given him the details of it, there is no man in this country I would more readily engage as an advocate, and that gentleman is Prof. Robertson. But upon that occasion he failed to convince the Agricultural Committee that the proposition for the establishment of industrial farms throughout the length and breadth of this country would be in the interest of the farming community of the country. If my memory serves me aright I do not think there was any single member of that committee who approved of the proposition on that occasion. I may be mistaken, but that is my recollection at the present time. I believe that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has the interests of the farming community at heart. I believe that he is sincere in asking for this vote, but I do not

wonder at his action, because Prof. Robertson will succeed in convincing any man who listens to his persuasive voice, that any proposition which he has made would be about right. I do not say this to reflect upon Prof. Robertson; he is a very capable man; I have no doubt that he has thought this matter out carefully and has come to the conclusion that it would be in the interest of the farming community. But we know that Prof. Robertson has made a proposition to the Agricultural Committee, and that the results which he anticipated and led the people to believe that they would realize, have not materialized. I refer to the question of shipping frozen beef to the old country. The people were led to believe that the adoption of this proposal would bring such a revolution in the beef market that the farmers would be enabled to realize from \$8 to \$10 per head for each bullock more than they realize by shipping their cattle to the old country alive. The expenditure of this amount of money will not really initiate the matter, because it is proposed to establish illustration farms in every county in the Dominion of Canada, in which there are probably 200 counties, and this appropriation would only give each farm \$100. It is a mere trifle, and although the vote is small to commence operations, before we get through, as some of my hon. friends have said, it will be a failure and it will bring the experimental farms at Ottawa and Guelph into disrepute. Is there any necessity for this? We have an experimental farm at Ottawa, one at Guelph, one in each province in the Dominion, dairy reports, agricultural reports and bulletins published at the expense of the country and distributed broadcast. When the farmers of the country have an opportunity of getting hold of these reports and reading them carefully, in their own homes, they can carry out these experiments on their own farms, and I am satisfied that they will receive more benefit in that way than they possibly could by the establishment of these illustration farms in their own neighbourhood. In the county of Huron and the county of Bruce, I am prepared to say that you will find farmers who have a superior practical agricultural knowledge to that possessed by any professor we have at the head of any experimental farm; men who have a practical knowledge, and who are a model and pattern to their neighbours, and their neighbours may benefit by going and visiting them, which they do at present. The idea of a man giving up 20 or 25 acres of the best land he has on his farm to be devoted to experimental plots of different varieties of seed, is absurd. If these stations succeed and the farmer has a number of people coming to visit him his time and attention will be taken away from his own farming and must be devoted to this. No farmer could undertake to carry it out successfully without a remuneration of \$400 or \$500 a year. The more successful these

Mr. CARGILL.

stations are the more this farmer's neighbours will come to visit him, and he will have to provide stable accommodation for their horses, and probably to take half a dozen in and give them their dinner on the one day. At Ottawa you can take a street car and get to the Experimental Farm for 5 cents and return to your hotel, but in the rural sections there will be no such accommodation for these people, and the man owning this experimental station will have to entertain the visitors. This proposition is, in my opinion, not in the interests of the farming community. If the amount were five times what it is some good might possibly come of it, but I, as representing a rural constituency, feel it my duty to oppose this vote.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think this demands a little explanation from me before allowing the matter to go any further. I can see from the tenor of the discussion that a large number of the members of this House do not understand the proposition as well as I would like them to do before deciding upon it. While this is a new proposition in the Estimates, the principle of it has been adopted by us in other matters. As a matter of fact, the whole outside work of Prof. Robertson as Dairy Commissioner has been really a method of illustration so that the farmers of the country might be able to see what is actually done, and to put into practice the object lessons given them. When first Prof. Robertson was made Dairy Commissioner, he established cheese factories in certain parts of the country where the cheese industry had never been introduced. The people of the neighbourhood saw the successful operation of the cheese factories, and they themselves went to work to reap the advantages to be derived from adopting these methods. Later on, Prof. Robertson undertook in a similar way to demonstrate the advantage of winter dairying in Canada, and having established in the province of Ontario two or three factories, the people learned from them, and the winter dairying industry became an accomplished fact. For years before, the question of winter dairying had been discussed in farmers' institutes and favoured by these institutes, but until the farmers had the object lesson presented to them of successful winter dairying, they did not take up the industry which has now become so profitable. As a matter of fact, the object of this vote is to apply just the same system to the products of the soil. We know that there is no method by which the people will learn so well and so thoroughly as by seeing demonstrated before their eyes, the theories which have been preached to them. If in different sections of the country we are able to show a good crop grown under the new method, alongside a poor crop grown under the old, is it not proper to assume that the

farmers will adopt the new method. Although, as I have said, this is a new proposition in this particular application, the principle of it has been for years carried on in this country. I am correct in saying, I think, that in the different parts of the country, and notably in the North-west Territories and Manitoba, the farmers who live in close proximity to the experimental farms, are carrying on their agricultural operations better than in the more remote districts. I venture to say that the farmers in the counties of Wellington and Huron, the representatives of which have said this thing is not necessary, have reaped the advantages of seeing these illustrations worked out on the Guelph Farm. If to-day the farms in Wellington County and that neighbourhood are amongst the best in Ontario, it is, I believe, largely due to the object lessons which the farmers there have had an opportunity of witnessing at the Guelph Experimental Farm. Permit me to say that this is not entirely an experiment, because it has been successfully carried out in other countries. Hon. gentlemen have stated that the conditions existing in this country are different from those existing in France, and therefore that the example of France is of no use to us. It is true that the conditions in France are different, but they are different in the respect that they make these illustration stations of less value in France than they would be in Canada. France is a small country in comparison with this great expanse of the Dominion; in France the distances are small, the means of communication rapid and easy, and the French farmers can visit the agricultural schools and illustration stations with greater facility than can the people living in this vast extent of Canadian territory. But, Sir, it is not only in France that these illustration stations have been successfully carried on. As I said in my opening remarks, illustration stations of a similar character to those we propose have been adopted in England. For a number of years past agriculture has been in a depressed condition in Great Britain, but individual farming in England is the best in the world, and I say with great deference to some of my hon. friends that there is no part of the province of Ontario which is better farmed than the lowlands of Scotland and certain portions of England. Yet, in these districts of England and Scotland, there are illustration stations for the benefit of the best farmers in the world. Although the portion of Ontario which has been referred to contains the best farming land probably on the whole continent of America, yet I would not insult the farmers there by telling them that there is nothing they can learn in connection with their business. Even the best farmers in the province of Ontario can find new things from which they can learn, although I fancy that in that part of Ontario, these illustration stations are not as necessary as in

other portions of Canada. Still, I venture to say that in other parts of the country there might be a need of object lessons to show the people the advantages of certain methods and certain systems. I do not wish for a moment to imply or suggest that these illustration stations shall be carried on entirely by theorists or what are called scientific agriculturists. The object is to get practical men to carry on the work, but at the same time to apply to that work the results of the experiments at the experimental stations. If we can do that and show that one crop can be grown to greater advantage than another, or that by a certain method of treatment one field can be made to produce more than an adjoining field of the same character when treated in a different way, that would be of the utmost advantage to the farmers who see it. In this country we are to-day in a transition stage in regard to agriculture. We have been spending vast sums of money on agricultural development and study, as all the people of this continent have been doing. The day is past for any farmer to regard his own individual experience as the only teaching he requires. That was the case to a large extent in past days. It has ceased to be the case amongst farmers as it has in other professions or businesses. To-day the farmer who uses his intelligence and skill for the improvement of his farm and his methods of cultivation, must learn from the experience of other people as well as from his own. To give him the advantage of an object lesson derived from the experience of other people is one of the objects of these illustration stations.

Now, I would refer to one or two points that have been brought up in this discussion. I have been told that no good practical farmer would allow his farm to be used for this purpose. I can only say that since this item appeared first in the Estimates a couple of months ago, I have received a large number of applications from all parts of this country, suggesting localities where these farms might be established, showing that there is a large interest in the question and a large number of people who are willing and even eager to take advantage of this proposal. These applications have come specially from the province of Quebec, the maritime provinces and the great west. Some also have come from the eastern part of the province of Ontario. I do not remember at the moment whether any has come from the western part of Ontario; but even supposing there has not, these applications indicate that in a large portion of this country there is a feeling that this illustration work will aid the farmers to carry on their work better than they have been able to do in the past. Therefore, I think it can fairly be concluded that while there may be some people who think they know sufficient not to require any aid, or that their section of the country is adequately supplied with model farms,

there are other large areas where this work would do good and is demanded. One reason why I took up this proposition was in consequence of a large number of applications that were made to me for an extension of the experimental farm system. I have had applications from east and west, Prince Edward Island and from New Brunswick, asking that experimental farm branches should be established in those provinces, where to-day there are none; from the Island of Cape Breton, where the people said that the Nappan experiment did them little good, because the conditions were different; from the Lake St. John district, from the south shore of the St. Lawrence, from the Eastern Townships, and from the valley of the St. Lawrence, saying that the farmers of those sections were not able to come to the Experimental Farm at Ottawa, and see such improved methods as they would like to see, and, therefore, asking me to establish other branch farms; from Western Ontario, near the lakes, saying that the Experimental Farm was too far north to be of any advantage to them; from New Ontario, saying that the work was of no value to them and asking for an experimental farm there; from south-western and eastern Manitoba and from almost every section of the North-west Territories, asking for the establishment of other branches; from Vancouver Island, and the Kootenay country in British Columbia, showing a demand from all parts of the country for an extension of the system of branch farms. I saw that it was impossible to meet that demand by any expenditure which this Parliament would be likely to sanction; but I did feel that by the adoption of a proposition of this kind I would be able to meet it to a certain extent, and accomplish a certain amount of the good that was expected from the establishment of other branch farms; and if the system were found to be a success, it could be extended until there should be one such establishment in every county of the Dominion.

Mr. McDOUGALL. May I ask the hon. Minister a question? In what form were those applications for experimental stations at different points? The hon. gentleman referred to applications from Cape Breton and Prince Edward Island. Did they come from farmers?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In some instances they came from organizations of farmers and in some instances from localities.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I suppose from people who wanted offices and wanted to sell farms?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, I did not receive any such applications that I can remember. Some hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think that this work is proposed entirely to create offices.

Mr. FISHER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. leader of the Opposition says "hear, hear." I regret to see that spirit displayed by hon. gentlemen opposite, because I can assure them that there is nothing of the kind.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. About \$10,000 out of the \$20,000 is for offices.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can assure hon. gentlemen that Prof. Robertson has been carrying on work of a similar kind in the country, and that up to this time no suspicion has been suggested of his being a partisan. This work will be carried on in the same way as we have been carrying on the dairy work. I would ask my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island who spoke about the dairy work there, whether Prof. Robertson carried on that work for political purposes, or accomplished any political ends by it. I would point out, as that hon. member did, that this is simply a continuation of the illustration work in connection with the dairy industry, which was begun in Prince Edward Island. The establishment of the first cheese factory in Prince Edward Island was an illustration for dairy work just as these will be for working the land.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that when people wanted instructions at the dairy, there was no one there to give it to them, but that they found a barbed wire fence with crops growing inside of it, and no person about the place to give them an illustration? That is not the way the dairy work was carried on in Prince Edward Island.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman evidently does not quite understand the whole proposition. The dairy work is carried on in factories, and the people go there and see the work and find out how it is done. In the case of these illustration stations, they will see the crops and the results. If the hon. gentleman will listen, I will explain how the scheme will be worked. I provide for inspectors, who will go and see the work carried on at the different stations. When the inspector visits a station, notice will be given to the farmers of the neighbourhood beforehand that he will be there on a certain day, inviting them to come, and informing them that he will explain the system, with the object lesson of the results before them. These stations are to be situated along the sides of the highway, where people would naturally pass most freely. There would be placards put up, explaining what the crops are and the different treatment and methods, so that the individual farmer would be able to see at a glance the meaning of the illustration, whether the farmer in charge was present at the time or not. One

hon. gentleman opposite explained how efficient the illustration stations are to-day, provided by individual farmers in different parts of the country; how their neighbours could visit their farms at any time and find out for themselves how the work was done. But at the same time he said, in case of the illustration stations, the neighbouring farmers could not possibly find out anything, unless the farmers in charge were there to advise them. So that, in the same breath, he said that the thing that could be done in the case of a private farm could not be done in the case of an illustration station established by this Government. The hon. member for King's, P.E.I., explained the advantage of the illustration work done by the Government in dairying on his island, and how similar work in other branches could be carried on successfully. I value the opinion of this hon. gentleman as that of one who has seen the good effects of these illustration stations in the work of dairying carried on in the Island of Prince Edward. Some remarks have been made with regard to curing tobacco. That question is one which is pretty closely bound up with this illustration work. If it is desirable to give illustrations of the way in which tobacco ought to be grown and cured, it is equally desirable to give illustrations of the way in which other crops should be cultivated. Of course the one work can be done without the other, but at the same time the argument which applies to the one is equally applicable to the other. One gentleman has said that he would like to see experts brought in for the purpose of teaching us how we should cultivate and cure tobacco, but the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) tells us that these experts are not needed, because our farmers are able to find out for themselves by trying a few experiments. That is true, perhaps, with regard to all our farm work. It may be that each individual farmer can find out what he can do best. But we have been carrying on large experimental work at the public expense for the benefit of the individual, and I venture to say that the work begun by hon. gentlemen opposite by the establishment of experimental farms has been of great benefit, though if the hon. gentleman's ideas are correct the Government should never have established anything of the kind, but left it to private enterprise. I do not think that is good reasoning. I believe that our farmers have realized a good many millions more, owing to the establishment of these experimental farms, than if they had been left to their own devices. I believe it is a sound principle that any work which is going to be a public benefit, and which is experimental in its nature, ought to be carried on at the public expense. That principle was adopted years ago by the late Government, and to-day our work in agricultural lines at these

experimental farms is held up as an example to be followed, by the people of other countries. It is only yesterday that I read of the introduction in the Imperial House of Commons of a Bill to establish a Board of Agriculture for Ireland, a work which has been brought about by the persistent efforts of the Right Hon. Horace Plunkett, M.P., who came here two years ago and examined into the work which the Department of Agriculture is doing in Canada, and gave the success of that work as his chief argument to induce the Imperial Parliament to adopt the measure he introduced.

However, this vote has elicited very considerable discussion, and hon. gentlemen on both sides have shown some difference of opinion with regard to it. The hon. leader of the Opposition suggested that it be reduced and only applied to one branch of the work I have outlined, the cultivation and curing of tobacco. I am not prepared to accept the suggestion on the whole, but at the same time I can understand that it is possible I might be able to work out a certain reduction in the amount of the vote. I would not like to promise to do so now, but in view of the discussion, if the House will permit me, I shall let the item stand, in order to see if any change can be made, and bring it up at a later date.

Mr. McMILLAN. I wish to say that I disagree with the hon. Minister in his view of the illustration that has been given in establishing dairy stations. Early in my life I had a cheese factory of my own, where I made cheese, and a good many others did the same thing, but we found that we could not make a uniform article, and that our cheese would not go on the British market, unless it were made of a uniform character. The same remark applies to the making of his own butter by every farmer. It cannot be put on the English market and realize the price which butter will realize that is made in a creamery common to all. Every farmer almost in the country was ignorant of the principle of butter and cheese-making and of the advantage of making it on the co-operative principle. We realized that it was an absolute necessity that we should have co-operation, which would enable us to produce a uniform article. But every farmer has to be his own judge of the crops he will grow. Whether you go into a locality in which farming is well advanced, or one in which it lags behind, you have to choose one of the farmers of either locality to carry on your illustration station; and I ask if any reasonable man, whether any farmer in the particular locality is going to farm any better, when he has charge of an illustration station, than he did before. Let me say that these experimental stations which are now established, have benefited as much from the experience of practical farmers

as practical farmers have benefited by them. I have heard those high in authority, those who have had the greatest experience in respect to our experimental stations, admit the fact that, until the staff at Guelph turned out and met the farmers throughout the length and breadth of the land, they lagged behind many of the best farmers of the day. I want this clearly understood—I am not against the spending of money whereby, in my opinion, the farmers will be benefited. But I want to know by what system of going into a locality and taking up a small plot on a farm you are going to turn the farm into a better illustration station than it has been where the farmer has been doing his best. Many who have supported this resolution have spoken as though we were going to get some teachers whom we have never had before. I say that in the most forward portions of the Dominion—and I have been all over the southern portion of Ontario and part of the western portion of Quebec—we have farmers as far advanced as any of our experimental stations, and farmers going to these farms and examining them will be more benefited than by going to these experimental stations. One reason is that the grain in the illustration station will be grown in small patches. Any one who has attended our Agriculture Committee will know that when results have been laid before us, we have always asked whether they were secured in small plots or in fields. We know from experience and it is well understood that in small experimental plots better results can be obtained than in a field, because more care can be exercised and more work put on small plots than a farmer can afford to put on a field. For my part, when I go to the Experimental Farm, I do not go to the experimental plots, but go out to the farm proper and see what was going on.

Mr. MORRISON. But may I ask what the farmers outside of the province are to do? No doubt wisdom, agriculturally speaking, will die with the farmers of Ontario; but what about the people farming in British Columbia to-day?

Mr. McMILLAN. I am not acquainted with British Columbia. I have been in the North-west, and I know farmers in the North-west who are farming as successfully and on as advanced lines as the illustration stations. I have seen the crops in the experimental stations, and I have seen farms where they have grown crops equally good. As to British Columbia, I know little or nothing.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sorry to hear the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) throwing such discredit on the provinces outside of Ontario. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I can take him to farms in British Columbia that raise a larger amount of grain per acre than any farms in the province of Ontario.

Mr. McMILLAN.

Mr. MORRISON. I am amazed that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) should distort the interjection I made in regard to the remarks of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan). Ontario contains farmers who are second to none. But there are people going into British Columbia and taking up farming who are not farmers; and I say that these people ought to have the advantages which are afforded by the Department of Agriculture here at Ottawa. If the Government are going to expend money for the benefit of the farmers, I think it ill-becomes gentlemen on the other side to carp at such expenditure, particularly at such small expenditures as this. The only objection I have to the item is that it is not large enough. If it were ten-fold what it is, the agricultural interests would not be more than fairly treated. I know that the consensus of opinion in British Columbia is that these illustration stations are necessary and would be a boon to the majority of the young, new farmers going into that country, very few of whom have been there for more than a few years. Agriculturally speaking, British Columbia is comparatively new. We are trying to induce people to go in and take up our farming lands. British Columbia has been advertised more largely as a mining than as an agricultural country. There is great misapprehension concerning the agricultural capabilities of that province. The mineral country of British Columbia so vast, so rich and varied, that the agricultural capabilities of the country have been, apparently overlooked. Take the valley of the Fraser River alone. In a distance of fifty miles, from 150,000 to 200,000 acres of land are subject to the overflow of the river. They can afford to have this large area overflowed for it does not materially reduce the area available for agriculture. That gives one an idea of the acreage available in that valley alone for agricultural purposes. Many of the farmers who are there and many who are going in are comparatively inexperienced in agricultural matters; it would be a great benefit to these people to have these illustration stations, and they admit themselves that they require some information such as is afforded by these stations in order to improve their ideas of farming and dispel many of the fallacies under which farmers have been working—and I suppose there are cases of that kind even in the province of Ontario. I notice that the opposition to this item emanates, apparently, from gentlemen interested in farming in Ontario. I have not the presumption to attempt to controvert what has been said by the hon. member for South Huron, and other old and experienced farmers on this matter. But I venture to say that they are speaking altogether from a rather insular stand-point, from the stand-point of a farmer from the province of Ontario, where their great grandfathers have been farming, and where they have every advantage and every means to secure in-

formation right at their own doors. That does not apply to the rest of the Dominion, particularly to the western portions, and it is no discredit to the farmers of that portion of the Dominion to say that a great deal of knowledge is required on the part of those who attempt farming in that locality. I do not say there are not good farmers in British Columbia, but the majority of those living on lands which they have got from the Government do not understand farming and are especially in need of the advantages that this system would afford. We have an experimental farm in British Columbia—but the province is so vast and the agricultural portions of it so far apart that the farm is not of so much service to the remote parts as to those immediately contiguous to the farm.

So that the same feeling is there as the Minister said existed in the eastern portions. I know the locality in which that farm is situated in British Columbia, it is on the south side of the Fraser River, and considering the nature of the soil there, it is of no practical use at all, and unless there is an illustration station there the farmers will not have this advantage which they should be afforded by the Government. I contend that if there is any department of industry in Canada which, more than another, deserves a liberal appropriation, it is that of agriculture, and I assume that the object of the Minister in starting these stations is to benefit the agricultural population. Now, I contend that the experiment should be made, and the sum of \$20,000 is little enough to make the experiment. I think it is due to the provinces outside of Ontario, even although the scheme may not benefit the farmers of that province, that at least the Government should give some assistance to those who are trying to farm in other provinces of the Dominion. The leader of the Opposition has insinuated that \$10,000 will be taken up by the officials. Even if that be the case, I would say increase the vote and give enough to make a thorough experiment, and then we shall see whether the appropriation has been a wise one.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not know what the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) calls distortion. I think the hon. gentleman had better consider his position before he charges a member of this House with distortion. What did I do, Sir? The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) gave a full and lucid illustration of the uselessness of this proposal of the Minister of Agriculture, and he did it in a manner that carried conviction to every member of this House who knows anything of the subject. It carried conviction, it appears, to the mind of the member for New Westminster that, so far as Ontario was concerned, it was absolutely useless, because there were a great many farms carried on in that pro-

vince by men who have acquired such knowledge of farming operations that they could give better instructions to their neighbours who went and visited their farms, than could be afforded by these illustration stations. That was the argument of the member for South Huron. The member for New Westminster ought to be very much obliged to me for having drawn his attention to the position in which it placed British Columbia. He says: Oh, this is all very well for Ontario where they have good farmers, but not for the provinces outside Ontario. Then I felt there could be but one idea conveyed, and that was that in British Columbia they were so destitute of good farmers that they were in absolute need of instruction, and that this Parliament should vote public money to give illustrations for the purpose of instructing them. There is no other conclusion to which any person could arrive, from the hon. gentleman's language. Then I drew his attention to the fact—and he ought to be very much obliged to me for it, because it has relieved the House of the impression that I am sure was left upon everybody's mind as to the deplorable condition of British Columbia farming—I drew the attention of the hon. member to the fact that in British Columbia he could find farms which produced many kinds of cereals and hay in larger quantity per acre than you could find on any farm in the province of Ontario. I think my hon. friend ought to be very much obliged to me, instead of charging me with distortion.

Mr. CASEY. It is very amusing to see how, from time to time, the truth of the old saying is affirmed, that westward the Star of Empire takes its way. The Star of Empire, within the memory of some of us, used to talk about Nova Scotia being ahead of all the other provinces of the Dominion. But now, Sir, the Star of Empire finds it necessary to boom British Columbia and to defend her farmers against one of their own representatives in a wholly unnecessary and ill-humoured manner. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) could not see that he distorted the remarks of the member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison). Perhaps it would be more correct to say that he Tupperized those remarks in repeating them; perhaps he may appreciate the choice of one adjective instead of the other. As to the argument that the farmers of Ontario do not need any illustration stations, because they can see good illustrations on the farms of their neighbours, I beg to differ with my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan). There are excellent examples of farming to be found all over Ontario, and in different parts of almost every county of Ontario; but it is a different thing to have to go round to each one of these farms and see what you want to, from being able to see an

illustration of several different specialties all on one farm. Every man is a specialist who cultivates what suits his own taste on his own farm. Then, there is the other argument that the farmer who conducts an illustration station for the Government will do it no better than if he was doing it for himself. I do not think that is a sound theory. A man who takes an illustration station will do it under the direction of the department and for the purpose of illustrating the facts which have already been proven. The difference between the two things is very evident. In one case the man is farming to suit his own whim and in the other he is carrying out the directions of the department of Agriculture, and illustrating what has been shown by the experiments at the experimental farms.

Mr. WALLACE. I want to ask the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) a question, whether, at these illustrating stations, they are to have a threshing machine of the style that was used in West Elgin.

Mr. CASEY. There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that the process of using threshing machines will be taught at these illustrating stations, and there is no doubt that our friends on the other side will have, when they go before the people again, a further illustration of what it means to fall into a threshing machine, and a better illustration even than they had in 1896.

Mr. BAIN. Allow me to say one or two words on this important issue. I would like to remind the members that the conditions are different in the province of Ontario from what they are in the other provinces of this Dominion. There the Central Experimental Union is operated by Mr. Zavitts, from the Agricultural College at Guelph. He has a wide series of correspondents over the province of Ontario who are conducting experiments with varieties of grains, roots and other products, and they are bringing together the results of their aggregate labours carefully taken, tabulated and arranged so that these results will be of benefit to the farmers. I think that Ontario is alone in that system disseminating information in respect to the improved varieties of seeds and grains that are being tested there. I would like to remind hon. gentlemen that in the fruit-growing department, the necessity has been felt for a series of experiments scattered over the province in different districts, for the purpose of testing different fruits and varieties of fruits and ascertaining those that are best adapted to the wants of each locality. I am speaking from recollection, but I think that there are thirteen of these fruit experimental stations where different varieties of fruits are tested, from year to year, by competent parties for the purpose of securing these results. The money that we are spending on the experimental farms, as some hon. gentlemen said here to-day,

Mr. CASEY.

except by the few who live in the direct vicinity, is chiefly valuable from the samples of improved varieties of grain and seeds distributed from those centres, but it does seem to me that there is a good deal to be said in favour of widening and extending that work a little by having three or four or five samples of the very best varieties of the different classes of these grains tested in other localities distant from these farms, showing the culture of them and showing their growth side by side. I think it is a fair subject for the consideration of the committee, whether there is not a field for additional experiments in this direction, so that other parts of the Dominion that have not been able, as Ontario has been, to get the benefit of the existing organization for this purpose, may have an equal opportunity.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bain) seems to lose sight of the fact that we have in British Columbia, in the North-west Territories, in Nova Scotia, and other places, branch experimental farms for the testing grains for the information of the farmers in these various climates.

Mr. BAIN. I do not lose sight of the fact that there are branch farms. I have visited personally the farm at Nappan, but it is a far cry from the farm at Ottawa to the farm at Nappan, and a still further cry to the province of Prince Edward Island. Yet that one farm is all they have for the whole territory between here and there, as a whole, for these experiments. Quebec is admittedly a large province, and I think I am speaking within the knowledge of every hon. member in this House who has taken an interest in these matters, when I say that the efforts that have been put forth by the provincial government at Quebec, and by this Government here, in the one direction of improving the quality of their cheese has brought more money into the pockets of the farmers of that province than any expenditure or any series of experiments, in any series of years, has ever cost. In Ontario we recognize the fact that, while this instruction has helped to produce an article of uniform grade, it has had this additional effect, and every person interested in the making of cheese within range of my voice knows it, that the particular educational system that fits our cheese for the English market would never have been brought to maturity under any other system than under an educative system such as was adopted by Prof. Arnold and subsequently by the colleges.

Mr. CLANCY. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bain) will search in vain for any record of any experiment having been made at the Experimental Farm at Guelph in regard to cheese making.

Mr. BAIN. Unfortunately, probably, the hon. member (Mr. Clancy) has never visited the farm at Guelph and is not aware of the

fact that, for a long series of years, this industry was carried on there and that today during the winter season as well this educative process is being vigorously carried on. But these are matters aside from the question. I do not want to be understood as finding fault with the attitude that hon. gentlemen take, but I simply draw the attention of the committee to this series of facts in the progress and growth of this country, and I ask hon. gentlemen to reflect for a moment before they refuse a fair consideration for this proposal. If it is to be turned into a political engine, I say at once that we had better not enter upon it, but I think I can safely and fairly say, that in the Agriculture Committee of this House we have heretofore been pretty successful in steering clear of those questions that sometimes embitter discussion in this House, and that we have been able largely to lay aside our political views and look at these questions from a stand-point that would benefit the community at large. I give my hon. friends opposite as much credit for a desire to advance the cause of the farmers as I would claim for myself and my hon. friends here. But, I say, in order that we shall be in a better position to obtain the benefit of the expenditure we are making at the experimental farms, we want some process to broaden out the results and to bring them more in contact with our farmers.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Mr. Chairman, if the Government were to ask a larger amount for experimental purposes throughout the country, I have no doubt it would be of great use; but when there is only this amount in the Estimates to be distributed over the whole of the Dominion of Canada, I cannot see what use it will be. It was said a moment ago that it will make room for a larger number of officials. I must say that I believe there will be something in that, and I am in a position to prove to you that such will possibly be the case. There is a grant of \$25 made to the farmers' institutes in every county in Ontario, and it costs \$11,000 to spend \$2,350 amongst these institutions. I find in the Public Accounts of Ontario, page 267, the names of each of the officials who are connected with this service, and who are drawing pay from it. There are something over 75 officials connected with it who receive their pay, as well as travelling expenses and disbursements. Therefore, \$80 or \$100 expended in every county would certainly be of no use, and it would be a simple waste of money to divide it in this manner amongst the different counties in the Dominion. To give an average of \$80 or \$100 to each county certainly could be of no possible advantage to the people. I simply draw the attention of the House to the manner in which this money is expended in Ontario. I repeat that it cost \$11,000 to expend \$2,350. That is a sample of how everything is done by the

Government of the province of Ontario, and I hope this Government will not repeat it in the Dominion.

Mr. McMULLEN. I had hoped, from the remarks made by the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition this morning that there would be a disposition to hurry through the work of the session.

Mr. TAYLOR. It looks like it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I shall detain the House but for a few moments. My hon. friend (Mr. McLennan) is altogether mistaken when he says that it costs \$11,000 to spend \$2,350. There is no policy of the Ontario Government so much appreciated by the farmers as the aid given to these farmers' institutes. The Government pay the expenses of practical farmers at probably \$2 a day to give lectures throughout the country, and they procure the services of such able and experienced agriculturists as my esteemed friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan). I can testify that in my own county a great deal of good has resulted from these meetings, and I know the same applies to other constituencies in that province. As to this vote for establishing illustration stations, I am ready to take the risk of supporting it as an experiment. I have a great deal of confidence in any opinion expressed by my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan), but at the same time I am willing to support any vote for and support the appropriation which is intended to improve the general condition of the farming community, and in my opinion this experiment will be in that direction. I may say that so far as the hon. member for East Bruce (Mr. Cargill) is concerned, he has an experimental farm of his own, which is highly creditable to him, and the farmers of his section derive great benefit, I have no doubt, from the practical demonstration they have on his farm, both in the raising of crops and for the splendid stock which he keeps. Probably an illustration station would not be so necessary in his vicinity as in other districts. The same remarks would apply to my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan), but, as the hon. gentleman from Wentworth (Mr. Bain) has said, there are parts of the country which have not such excellent practical farmers as those two gentlemen. I am satisfied that much good may result from those experimental stations, and I hope that we will now get through with the work of the session and let us go home.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I have the records of the Ontario legislature here to prove that my statement is correct, and before the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) contradicts me he should know what he is talking about. I repeat that the Ontario Government gave \$2,350 to the farmers' institutes. I agree that was a good thing to do, but I will not agree that it was a

good thing to spend \$11,000 in applying that \$2,250, as is actually the case, and I repeat it. The exact amount expended was \$11,443 to apply this grant of \$2,350.

Mr. McMULLEN. The \$11,000 is expended in paying men to address meetings and giving them their expenses, and the \$2,350 was given to the different farmers' institutes as a contribution to enable them to keep up their organization. The \$11,000 is for a different purpose altogether.

Mr. L. A. CHAUVIN (Terrebonne). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I do not want to let this item pass without expressing my views about it.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) does not seem to be as enthusiastic in asking the House to give him this vote of \$20,000 as the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier) himself appears to be, as the Minister is willing, for the present, to let the item stand, in order to see if he might not be able to work out a certain reduction in the amount of the vote.

I have no objection to offer to the adoption of this vote for the establishment of illustration stations in the country, provided that they be established with as much economy as possible.

The Minister of Agriculture has stated in relation to the experience of other countries, that in France this kind of work had been going on for a great many years and that those illustration stations were scattered all over the country; and it is on these same lines, I think, though on a smaller scale, that the Minister of Agriculture wishes those illustration and trial plots to be conducted here.

Nothing should prevent those trial stations being managed with the strictest economy; and with that end in view, seeds could be sent to the farmers in a certain locality, or instructions might be forwarded by mail or given by Government experts, provided those employees do not spend too much of this vote travelling around the country. It seems to me, that under such economical conditions, the result of this vote would be eminently beneficial to agriculture and to the farming population, especially in the province of Quebec.

True, we have the Experimental Farm here, which is supposed to accommodate the province of Quebec and attend to the education of the farmers of that province; but, as stated by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, this farm is too far from the farmers of the province of Quebec to be of any great advantage to them, and when the farmers cannot spare the time to come to the farm, it is but fair that these stations be established for their education, as a substitute for the farms.

That is what the Minister hinted at when referring to the establishment of those illustration stations in the province of Quebec particularly. As a matter of fact, it would

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry).

be very desirable that the Experimental Farm at Ottawa should try to keep itself in closer touch with the agricultural population of the province of Quebec. And I will avail myself of this opportunity to tell the Minister of Agriculture that we would like, in the province of Quebec, that the French language should be a little more used in the communications and in the intercourse between the authorities of the farm and the farmers. And 'à fortiori' it is desirable that such information as can be afforded by the farm should be spread among the farming community of Quebec under the shape of trials such as proposed by the Minister of Agriculture. However, if the hon. Minister of Agriculture wishes the farming population of Quebec to share in the advantages offered to the country by the Experimental Farm, it follows as a matter of course that he should try to cut down the expenditure of that farm. And the saving thus effected could be utilised in creating the necessary stations for the improvement of agriculture in the province of Quebec. But it does not appear from the Estimates under consideration that the Minister has the intention of cutting down the expenditure in connection with the Experimental Farm. Let me tell him that this appropriation, which in his opinion, is perhaps too large, would be approved of by the province of Quebec, but only on condition it were coupled with a substantial reduction in the expenditure of the Experimental Farm, and under the further condition that the sums thus economised be applied to the improvement of agriculture in that province by the establishment of a system of illustration stations such as he is now proposing to the House.

The hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier) seems quite elated over the prospect of being able in the near future to handle the twenty thousand dollars which the hon. Minister is asking the House to vote. He said, a little while ago, that the farmers in his district would only be too glad to share in that appropriation.

I think the hon. member was reckless in giving utterance to those words, because his colleagues on the other side of the House will take umbrage at seeing him thus monopolizing the Government patronage for his district and chiefly for his constituency. It looks as if the general elections were near at hand. I know that the hon. member for Two Mountains has an insatiable appetite for patronage and it is even said that he has taken the lion's share. But that may be owing to the fact, as he candidly stated once on the floor of this House, that he is the spoiled child of the Government.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. (Translation.) That is not our way of distributing patronage.

Mr. CHAUVIN. (Translation.) I hope that this appropriation will be fairly distributed all over the province of Quebec.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** (Translation.) Yes, at the earliest opportunity, if the hon. gentleman supports my motion.

Mr. **CHAUVIN.** (Translation.) Well, the hon. gentleman can hardly expect me to pledge myself in that way, especially in view of the fact that he has just promised us a certain sum of money as that would amount to bribery; but, on the other hand, I cannot help telling him, that on all measures for the promotion of agricultural interests, especially in the province of Quebec, I promise him my entire support, without any hope of reward. But let me call his attention to the fact that the farmers are often heard to complain about the useless expenditure incurred for agricultural lectures, as they contend that those lecturers, who are party friends, are not practical agriculturists. I do not bring up those charges in order to throw them to the face of the hon. Minister, as I have often attended the lectures of those men sent by the Minister to preach their crusade in favour of agriculture throughout the province of Quebec.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** (Translation.) They were able and competent men.

Mr. **CHAUVIN.** (Translation.) Yes, they were competent, let it be said to their credit. I only want to add, before resuming my seat, that I hope the Minister will see his way clear to carrying out his scheme, as I have no doubt it would prove a good means of educating the farming population. I think this scheme would be endorsed by the farmers, who would reap the advantages resulting from such practical illustration work. I believe, moreover, that a good deal could be done in favour of the farming community, by distributing in a fair way, throughout the province of Quebec, the benefits of the Ottawa Experimental Farm. On those grounds I feel it my duty to endorse the proposition made by the Minister, without, however, pledging myself absolutely, and reserving also the privilege of expressing my views, if this item comes up at a later date.

To promote dairying interests by advances for milk and cream, and for making butter and cheese, to be recouped out of the proceeds of sales of such butter and cheese, to be placed to the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund ..... \$60,000

Mr. **FOSTER.** How did that work out last year?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** We found we did not require so much as we asked, for the reason that the butter and cheese made in the creameries in the North-west Territories was sold to British Columbia and the Yukon. The consequence was that the return of the money was so rapid that we did not require as much as

we did before, and we are able to reduce the amount this year by \$20,000.

Quarantine—

Salaries and contingencies of organized districts and public health in other districts ..... \$55,000

Mr. **PRIOR.** The Minister was not in the House the other night when I expressed the hope that he would take Dr. Montizambert with him when he visits British Columbia.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** I will take the matter into consideration.

Tracadie Lazaretto ..... \$5,000

Mr. **FOSTER.** How many patients are there in the lazaretto now; is the number decreasing?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** It has been about the same ever since I have been in office. At one time there were 16 or 17 patients, but a couple of other cases have gone there recently. Every now and then Dr. Smith persuades an afflicted person to enter the lazaretto, and just the other day I received a letter telling of a case and asking me to take him into the lazaretto, but of course we have no power unless the patients go willingly. Dr. Smith has for a long time been exercising a beneficial influence to induce those afflicted to go there.

Mr. **FOSTER.** When they once get in are they able to get out if they wish.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** We have no authority to keep them there, but as a matter of fact when they once go in their relatives will not take them back, and that influence has enabled Dr. Smith to be successful in inducing them to go there.

Mr. **PRIOR.** Has the Minister yet changed his mind with regard to the necessity of compelling the lepers in British Columbia to go to Tracadie?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** It is such a new departure and one of such an important character that I would not, on my own responsibility, like to do it.

Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals.... \$4,000

Mr. **FOSTER.** What is the principle on which this aid is given now?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** It has been given for years, because these hospitals are supposed to be utilized by incoming immigrants.

Mr. **FOSTER.** Are they?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** I doubt very much if they are. This aid has been given for years. The hon. gentleman knows that it was established under his own régime. This is the amount that was there when I came into office.

Mr. FOSTER. Do they give you any return as to the number of immigrants that they treat there?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, there is a regular return of the number of patients and the countries from which they come.

Mr. FOSTER. It might be well for the Minister to let us see that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will.

Cattle quarantine ..... \$30,000

Mr. CLANCY. I think the Minister should give us some information with regard to this item. I see in the Auditor General's Report, on page B-56, that three gentlemen have been receiving large sums—one \$1,204.80, another \$1,255.30, and another \$1,037.65—in connection with the cattle quarantine. One of these gentlemen is located at Chatham, another at Kingsville, and another at Wallaceburg.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What are their names?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman ought to know their names. One is Mr. Kime, who lives in the hon. gentleman's own locality, and the hon. gentleman must be personally aware that Mr. Kime has drawn a very large sum of money. He was employed by the day, and he made it convenient always to be at work for the Government. I do not care to go into any minute discussion of this, because I do not think the Minister will require that to become thoroughly convinced that it was a mistake to employ any person on the terms on which Mr. Kime was employed. I did not intend to mention his name, but since my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) was so anxious about it, I felt bound to give it to him. If my hon. friend wants me to go into the accounts in detail, hurried as this committee is, I think I could do so with a great deal of profit to the committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If you think it is in the public interest.

Mr. CLANCY. I think it is in the public interest to do so.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Would it not be better to take it up in the Public Accounts Committee?

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend knows that I can take it up there and here, too. We have the two places, and I thought it well to make the choice for myself, rather than let the hon. gentleman make it for me. I want to call the Minister's attention to the fact that these three gentlemen have been paid large sums of money, and, I think, without performing corresponding services. I find, from information brought down, that Mr. Kime is now employed at \$600 a year,

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. Thorne, of Wallaceburg, at \$600 a year, and Mr. Perdue, of Kingsville, at \$1,000 a year, expenses being allowed. Now, to employ three men in a locality where there are local veterinary surgeons to do the work at very moderate charges, is not needed. While we should be anxious to spare no pains or expense necessary to stamp out disease, I may say that at present it is pretty well stamped out, and to place men on salaries is throwing away so much money. These are the only places in the province of Ontario where that is done. I will give an instance in regard to Mr. Kime. He is supposed to go when called upon, or when he has knowledge that hog cholera is in some person's herd. He goes and examines the herd, and if he finds disease in it, he orders it to be slaughtered, and performs all the duties which would be expected of a veterinary surgeon under the circumstances. I will give you a specimen of the monstrous charges he makes. He drove out about a mile from Chatham, and charged \$5 for the day, \$3 for his team, and 75 cents or \$1.25 for his meals. I say that is an improper charge.

Hon. gentlemen will see that the inducement is great to make frequent visits and make up bills. Take the district of Dresden, where there is just as much hog cholera as at Wallaceburg, I find that W. H. Clapp, of that district, receives \$160, but when you go to Chatham, just south of there, I find that Mr. Kime receives \$1,204, and that at Wallaceburg, just west of there, Mr. Thorne receives \$1,037. I do not know why the Minister of Agriculture selected those particular places because it is a very small district. All that Mr. Thorne has is a portion of Bothwell, which constitutes the townships of Chatham and Sombra. Then take the gentleman who resides at Dresden, he takes in a part of two other counties, so that the territory over which these gentlemen travel is very small. I do not wish to make any political capital out of this, but desire to call attention to it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The reason that these three men were appointed on salaries was that we found a very large number of cases in these particular localities. In the case of Mr. Kime, from June 1st to September 30th, 1897, he was paid \$5 a day, for a period less than four months, and received nearly \$400, and it was thought better to put him on a salary of \$50 a month on condition that he was to treat any case of hog cholera that might arise. The county of Essex was also for a time very severely afflicted with hog cholera, and I think it was largely due to the energetic efforts of Mr. Perdue and the fact that he was specially detailed to do the work that this disease has almost entirely disappeared from that locality. Still cases do occasionally occur, and I thought I was quite justified in keeping up the employment of these gentlemen who had done such good work. I find

that quite recently there were several cases in Mr. Kime's district, and it is a question quite open to discussion as to whether the disease has been so thoroughly eradicated that I can put that district under similar arrangements to others, where a man is not specially employed.

Mr. CLANCY. I would not like to make any charge that would be unfair.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not understand the hon. gentleman to make any charge.

Mr. CLANCY. I would not dare to make a charge when the party concerned is not in a position to reply, but the hon. gentleman has only to look at the accounts to know that the inducement is very great to make visits, when these men are paid so much per day and their travelling expenses.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The possibility of such a charge was what induced me to pay a salary instead.

Mr. CLANCY. There is no politics in this, the farmers must have a man called in when they find any disease in their herd, and the department cannot be too vigorous in stamping it out. Every one knows there is a disposition to conceal the disease, because the farmer does not care to sacrifice his herd, and always feels that he is not fairly compensated. Every effort should be made to sustain the department in stamping the disease out vigorously, but there is no reason why there should be three salaried officers in these districts more than others. If the practice is justifiable there, it must be justifiable very generally throughout the western part of Ontario.

With regard to some of the complaints that have come to my knowledge, one man, who had his hogs inspected by Mr. Clapp, and who had taken them all the way to Chatham, was ordered to take them home again by Mr. Kime. It is as well that there should be as little friction as possible.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is but one explanation which may be alleged for this, and which is probably the right one. We have to quarantine townships in which cases of hog cholera have developed and in such cases no hogs are allowed to come in or go out of these townships. Mr. Clapp, in an adjoining township, would have no desire or authority to prevent these hogs moving, but Mr. Kime, who is in charge of the township closely quarantined, would be called upon to refuse to allow these hogs to be brought into the township. I do not know that this is the case, but I think this may be the explanation. If the hon. gentleman will give me the names I will look into the details of the case.

Mr. CLANCY. That may be the explanation; I am not prepared to say.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I have listened carefully to the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). I think the Minister is to be congratulated upon the appointment of these veterinary surgeons in our district. It must be remembered that corn is the important crop in the western districts. We have to feed the corn to our hogs, and if we cannot keep our hogs healthy it is hard for our farmers to do business. We had a gentleman on salary, but we found that did not pay, for he kept going up and down one township. We appointed Mr. Orchard, who has taken charge of our district for \$500 and small expenses. Mr. Orchard is a very worthy man, understands his business thoroughly, as well as the gentleman who was here before him, and has done us great good. We were very much troubled with people having sick hogs, with nobody to report them to, and when reported it generally cost the men who reported them something; so the farmers used to get along by destroying a few, and probably the rest would take the disease, or it would get among the neighbours' hogs. Within the last year or two we have almost completely stamped out the disease. In Iowa, it must be remembered, they lost \$15,000,000 worth of hogs in a single year. From North and South Essex, we ship something in the neighbourhood of one million dollars worth of hogs per year, so it will be seen that this is a very important industry with us and we cannot afford to trifle with the disease. As soon as I hear of anybody having a sick hog, I call up the veterinary surgeon and he goes out and looks up the case. When the disease strikes a locality, the veterinary surgeon may have to go there every day for a month before the disease is stamped out. Even though it may cost \$500 a year or more, we find it pays to be vigilant in this matter. The men we have appointed in South Essex and in North Essex are doing and have been doing excellent work, and earn every dollar they get from the Government—I know it. The gentleman in charge at Windsor does more than look after the hogs. He examines animals coming from the other side. Windsor is a very important point. We have three lines of railways crossing from the United States, and cattle that are to be distributed anywhere in that neighbourhood are properly examined for disease and held over. Cattle crossing on the ferry—we have a ferry every five minutes—are examined in the same way, and the cattle are put in the barn until the tubercle test is gone through with. Horses coming in must be examined also. So these men are busy in more ways than in examining the hogs. I am satisfied that the department deserves credit for the way they have handled the disease in our county, and our officers appointed deserve credit for the way they have performed their duties and kept the disease down.

Mr. CLANCY. I have been waiting to find out what the hon. gentleman's (Mr. McGre-

gor's) point of criticism was. I would like to know who has censured the department or said one word in criticism of the service? The hon. gentleman was so anxious to make an argument out of nothing that he left it to be inferred from his speech that I or somebody had been criticising this department. I made it clear that I thought good work had been done. If the hon. gentleman did not mean that, what could he mean? I have declared that this was a matter into which party politics should not come. But I pointed out that one man had received excessive sums, and I still contend that this is the case. Mr. Orchard, we find, does the work for \$500, and, besides, renders very important service at Windsor. I have no doubt that Mr. Orchard is a good man and earns every dollar of what he is paid. But when the hon. gentleman tries to convey the impression that I advocated a looser system or found fault with the department, he is not fair. I simply called attention to this case, and I have no doubt the Minister will look into it, and, if unnecessary sums have been paid he will see to it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. As to the accounts mentioned by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), I think they must have been incurred before the men were put on salary. Since then, the accounts have been much lighter. I think possibly some of these accounts have been a little excessive, and I have called the attention of the Minister to them. There is no doubt that Mr. Kime has a very large field there, and I think the hon. member for Bothwell was hardly fair to him. During last year there was hog cholera in a great many places. It is necessary that one man should give his whole time to it and I believe that the results will fully justify the appointments made. I do not think we could get a better man for this work than Mr. Kime. I am of opinion that it is better for the department to trust the work to one man and not to different men in different townships.

Mr. CLANCY. Why?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Because one man becomes conversant with the work and gives more attention to it and knows the cases occurring in different parts of the county.

Mr. CLANCY. Surely the hon. member (Mr. Campbell) must know, and if not, the Minister can tell him, that the veterinary surgeons on salary are at liberty to engage in the practice of their profession as before.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Certainly.

Mr. CLANCY. That shows that it is not necessary for them to give their whole time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Of course, I mean all the time that is necessary for the work. You could not expect a veterinary surgeon to give up his practice for \$50 a month.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not.

Mr. CLANCY.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The arrangement is satisfactory. I am sure the hon. member for Bothwell, like the rest of us, thinks that the best means should be taken to stamp out this disease, even if it does cost us a little money. It is most important to the counties of Kent, Bothwell, Essex and all that western district that there should be no blemish upon that industry. I believe the disease is stamped out, and that the result will fully justify the means taken.

Prevention of tuberculosis among cattle throughout the Dominion ..... \$15,000

Mr. BETHUNE. I would like the hon. Minister to explain how tuberculosis is spread among cattle.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bethune) asks me a question which would almost require a medical disquisition to answer, but I think, perhaps, I can answer it shortly. The disease is transmissible by microbes or bacteria, which are grown within the diseased animals. These are given out at various points, and if they come into the system of any animal, especially if that animal is what is called congenial soil, that is to say, if the animal is specially subject to disease, then it is communicated. The same things might, however, create disease in one animal that would not create it in another. It is found that the most frequent cause of tuberculosis passing from one animal to another is the saliva, much the same as in man. The microbes are in the saliva, and when that dries, they are carried in the air and inhaled, or drawn in with the food, by other animals. The consequence is, that when animals are kept in a small barn in the winter time, the liability is strongest of the passage of the disease from one animal to another. I think it is rare for the disease to be carried from one animal to another in the open air, but damp and dark stables seem peculiarly adapted for the growth of these microbes, and the disease is very easily carried under such circumstances. Wherever the disease is found, it is strongly recommended that the animal should be isolated. If the Government tests the animal and finds it is diseased, we oblige the owner to isolate him and keep him away from other animals. We also publish all the information we can, dealing with this disease, and advise men to whitewash their barns and ventilate them well, keep the animals clean, and in a dry place, and in a healthy condition, so that they may be more likely to throw off the disease. This is the advice which is given by medical men in regard to the human subject. There is no doubt that in some instances animals are cured, but just what causes the cure, medical men have not yet reached a conclusion.

Mr. CLANCY. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he has set his face against taking up the question of making

some compensation to farmers whose stock is diseased, but who are not disposed to slaughter their animals themselves. In a very profitable debate here the other day, it was declared by some medical gentlemen that diseased cattle were a fruitful source of consumption in man, and that, therefore, the necessity of slaughtering the diseased animal was greatly enhanced. Now, if that be the case, and if it be necessary, in the interests of the lives and health of the people, to stamp out that disease in cattle as far as possible, it seems to me we must make some appropriation to do that. The reasons the hon. gentleman gave on a former occasion for not slaughtering was, that the department would become liable and would incur a very heavy expense. If it is worth an expenditure of money for the purpose of preventing the spread of disease, it seems to me of sufficient consequence to take some steps towards stamping it out altogether. But you will never stamp it out by nursing it in certain localities. If you permit an animal known to be diseased to be put in a state of quarantine, does not that mean that the animal ought to be slaughtered? There are but few cases that recover, and then the tuberculin test when repeated several times has been shown to defeat the purpose of that test, and deceiving the purchaser as to the diseased state of the animal. The hon. gentleman might make a small beginning this year. I would not advocate that he should launch out in a large way to encourage parties to hope for undue compensation. To take the ground that you should pay for none, when you know that they are diseased, is to take extreme ground; to take the ground you should pay for every one that is found diseased, even slightly, and slaughter them, is taking the other extreme ground. I think there is a middle course, and I think the hon. gentleman would do himself credit, if he would set about at least compensating the owners of cattle that are already in a state of quarantine, and who slaughter the cattle themselves. Whether the compensation should be full or partial, might be a matter to consider; but I think there is no more important question to-day affecting the life and health of the people of this country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I fully appreciate the importance of the subject, and have considered it very carefully indeed. I appreciate the suggestions of the hon. gentleman, and would be glad if I could see my way to working them out. But, so far, I have not been able to find a method by which we could pay for some and not for others. Our experience in regard to hog slaughtering where we had to pay compensation, has not been a very happy one. We have had to take more and more money for compensation, and it is becoming a serious burden. Our experience in that direc-

tion is not such as to encourage us to give compensation in other cases. But I appreciate fully the importance of trying to minimize tuberculosis. We are doing what we can in every other way, and we think with some success. I would like to try present methods a little longer before plunging into what I fear would be a very large expenditure.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance what the Government intend to take up to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the right hon. Prime Minister intimated, a day or two ago, that to-morrow would be devoted to the Pacific cable, but he has not mentioned it to-day, and if not that, we will go on with the Estimates.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Tuesday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 25th July, 1899.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE QUEEN VS. SKELTON, ET AL.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if he will have the report of the Minister of Justice to Council in this matter brought down? A few days ago I asked for a copy of that report recommending the release from prison of Skelton and Dewan, who had been tried and convicted, in October, 1897, of perjury, and subsequently sentenced to a term in prison. The right hon. gentleman's colleagues, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, said he saw no objection, but suggested that I should make a motion. I replied that it was too late and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries then said: I am sure the Prime Minister will have no objection. I cannot say, however, whether the right hon. gentleman heard or not and probably he did not. If the right hon. gentleman would permit me, I will read the motion:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the report of the Minister of Justice on which an Order in Council was passed for the discharge from prison of J. K. Skelton and T. Dewan, tried and convicted of perjury before Mr.

Justice Wetmore, in October, 1897, and subsequently sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and also for copies of the affidavits supporting the application for the discharge of the aforesaid Skelton and Dewan.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If my hon. friend says that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries agreed to the motion I will let it pass.

Mr. DAVIN. Then I beg to put the motion Motion agreed to.

#### POACHING ON PACIFIC COAST.

Mr. PRIOR. I wish to call the attention of the Government to some information placed in my hands with regard to the poaching that is going on within the three-mile limit of Canadian territory in the Pacific Ocean. The American fishermen are catching halibut, and not only catching the fish against the law, but are throwing out large quantities of offal into the sea, which will have the effect of driving the halibut away. These fisheries are of magnificent proportion. Vessels go out from Vancouver and in a day or two bring in 80 or 90 tons of the finest quality of halibut. Application was made the last three or four years for a fast cruiser, which is the only means possible of putting a stop to this poaching. At present there is only the Government steamer, the "Quadra," a very good vessel, but which has so much to do looking after the buoys and lighthouses that she has not sufficient time to give attention to these poachers. I would ask the Government whether they could not possibly put in a vote before the session is over for a steamer to look after these fisheries. These fisheries are of enormous extent and value and the poaching going on is far greater than anybody not on the spot can imagine. I think that \$40,000 or \$50,000 would be sufficient to buy a steamer to look after this smuggling.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will call the attention of my hon. friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to the suggestion, but I am afraid that if we were to take an appropriation this year for building a steamer, we could not have it in time for this season.

#### PREFERENTIAL TRADE.

Mr. McNEILL. Might I ask my right hon. friend what conclusion he has arrived at with regard to my resolution concerning preferential trade?

The PRIME MINISTER. I asked my hon. friend to give me the favour of an interview to-day.

Mr. DAVIN.

#### CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT— REGISTRAR'S FEES.

Mr. CALVERT. I desire to draw attention to a question I submitted last year, and which I intended submitting this session after the return of the Solicitor General, but I am afraid that he will not return in time. I would like to know whether anything had been done with reference to amending the Dominion Controverted Elections Act in the direction I suggested last year. The Act empowers the judges to employ a stenographer in connection with election trials, and the expense is chargeable to the unsuccessful party. Section 43 provides that the trial judge shall forward a copy of the evidence to the Speaker of the House of Commons. Then by Order in Council, dated December, 1875, the registrar of the election court shall receive ten cents a folio for forwarding a copy of the evidence to the Speaker of the House of Commons. As an instance of the cost in these actions, in the London election trial last year the stenographer received for taking the evidence \$796.20, and he also received \$180.60 for twenty-one days, or a total of \$976.80. This amount was ordered to be paid and was paid out of the \$1,000 deposited by the petitioner. Then he made a number of copies, one of which he handed to the registrar of the court, who forwarded it to the Speaker of the House of Commons, and drew \$751.10 for simply forwarding a copy of the evidence. As we are likely to have elections within the next two years there may be protests again and similar costs exacted.

I would suggest to the right hon. leader of the House or to the Government that something should be done, either that this should be amended or that it should be wiped out entirely. I would ask my right hon. friend whether anything has been done with reference to it?

The PRIME MINISTER. I will call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Calvert). That is the only answer I can give him to-day.

#### THE PACIFIC CABLE.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:—

That for the purpose of establishing direct submarine telegraphic communication between Canada and Australasia, it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to enter into an agreement with such of the Governments of the United Kingdom and Her Majesty's Australasian possessions as desire to share in the undertaking, for the purpose on their behalf of securing the construction, acquisition, laying, maintenance and

operation of a cable between Canada and Australasia on the following conditions:—

(a) That a Board of Commissioners be created by or under the legislative authority of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, with all the powers requisite for the purpose aforesaid.

(b) That the proposed cable and all its branches, additions or extensions, and all property, real or personal at any time acquired for the purpose of the undertaking, shall vest and continue vested in such board in trust to carry out such undertaking for the benefit of the respective governments sharing in the undertaking, and in proportion in their respective interests therein.

(c) That for the purpose of obtaining money wherewith to carry out the undertaking, the board may issue debentures for such sums, payable at such dates not being less than years, nor more than years from the respective dates of issue, and bearing such rate of interest, and payable at such place as the board may determine, but the total amount of the principal money of such debentures at any time outstanding shall not exceed £ sterling.

(d) That, subject to the cost of operation, maintenance, management and the setting apart of such proper sinking fund as the board may deem advisable wherewith to provide for renewals, the said principal moneys and interest shall be a first charge on all the said property, real and personal, and earnings of the undertaking.

(e) That the cable shall be laid between Canada and Australasia via the Pacific Ocean, and may be in sections, but all points of its landing shall be on British territory.

(f) That the Commissioners shall have full power to administer the affairs of the board and the carrying on of the undertaking in trust for the benefit of said governments.

(g) That the total number of Commissioners and the nature of their tenure of office shall from time to time be determined by said governments, and each government, having regard to such total number, shall be entitled to appoint to such board, as near as may be, as many members thereof as represent the relative liability of such appointing government as guarantor, as hereinafter mentioned, and to fill vacancies, as same occur from time to time.

(h) That the respective governments joining in such agreement shall be interested in the profits and losses of the undertaking in proportion to the amount of their liability as aforesaid.

(i) That the Governor in Council is hereby authorized on behalf of the Dominion of Canada, to guarantee payment of five-eighteenth parts of the said total principal money of said debentures, limited as aforesaid, and interest as aforesaid on said five-eighteenth parts.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving this resolution, I feel that upon this subject, at least there will be no difference of opinion in this Parliament. The subject is not a new one. For many years it has engaged the attention of the Australasian colonies, of the mother country, of Canada—in fact of the whole British Empire. It has been discussed in the press, in public meetings, and at semi-official gatherings of representative men throughout the Empire, so that the British public are so familiar with the aims, and, I trust, now with the details, that little explanation and no argument is necessary to commend the resolution to the approval of this House. Before moving the House into committee, I

may, however, briefly refer to the features of the resolution, in case some hon. gentlemen may not have carefully read it. The subject of establishing cable communication between Canada and Australasia attracted public attention in the colonies many years ago. As far back as 1887 the Colonial Conference in London dealt with the subject. A resolution was passed in that conference approving of practically the scheme as is involved in the resolution now in your hands. That scheme means a state-owned cable between Australasia and Canada, owned and operated by the various British governments, a cable the points of landing of every section of which will be on British soil; and it contemplates, of course, the operation of such a cable not for the purpose of earning dividends for the contributing governments, but for the purpose of promoting trade and more effectually uniting the various portions of this great Empire in point of interest and as well as of sentiment. That resolution of the Colonial Conference of 1887 bore some fruit, because it set the cause in motion. It was followed, at a later period, by a resolution passed at the Colonial Conference held in Ottawa in 1894. The resolution passed on that occasion was practically an echo of that passed at the conference of 1887; and the resolution now in your hands is practically an embodiment of the principles, and even of the details involved in these two informal resolutions. But this is the first time, so far as I am aware that the subject has been so far advanced as to appeal to a British Parliament for legislative sanction. Up to the present time, public opinion has been expressed generally in a favourable way, so that now we may almost assume that the expediency of the proposal to establish a cable commencing in Canada and terminating in Australia is accepted almost as an axiom amongst all British subjects. I need not dwell, therefore, upon the importance of the subject itself; we may, perhaps, begin by assuming that that point is conceded.

It is important in connection with such a matter as this, to bear in mind the geographical relation of Canada to the rest of the world. We have an Empire in extent, but if Canada is to be developed, it appears to me, we should endeavour to promote facilities for trade upon our Pacific front as well as upon our Atlantic front—a double front for Canada on the two great oceans, the Atlantic and the Pacific, and Canada in touch with the trade of the whole world. It may be argued that the construction of a cable between Canada and Australia does not give us cable communication with the Orient. A few weeks ago the country appeared to be startled by the information that Great Britain had given a monopoly to the Eastern Extension Cable Company, so that no other cable company could land in Hong Kong within a period of 25 years after 1893. When you come to read that agreement, I see no-

thing in it to cause us to doubt for a moment that we establish cable communication with the Orient when we establish connection by cable with Australasia. That agreement provides that the Imperial Government can purchase the line of cable, the second cable constructed between Singapore and Hong Kong for the sum of £300,000, which, I presume, fairly represents its cost. Once the English Government acquires that cable there only remains the connecting link between the mainland and Australasia, and you have direct cable and telegraphic communication via Australia between Canada and Hong Kong, China and Japan. And it is inconceivable that if the two great colonies, Canada and Australasia, have united themselves by cable communication—particularly in view of the fact that the colonies of Australasia own the telegraph lines across the Island Continent of Australia—any power could prevent us forcing our way by telegraphic communication into China and Japan. Nor would it be necessary. I think, that Great Britain should exercise her power of pre-emption in regard to the cable between Singapore and Hong Kong, because the Eastern Extension Cable Company, which at present owns that line, would recognize the irresistible force of the Empire and would be prepared to give fair rates and thus make the duplication of a line unnecessary, unless the increase of business should make such a step necessary for business reasons. Therefore, I regard the proposition, though it nominally provides for communication only between Canada and Australasia as practically completing cable communication between Canada, China and Japan. If so, it is for us to contemplate the usefulness to the trade of Canada of such a development of cable communication.

We see the action of various nations of Europe, straining every effort to obtain an entry into the markets of China and Japan, with a population of perhaps 400,000,000, a population equal to that of all Europe; we see the trading nations of Europe exerting their best efforts to obtain access into this market for their wares; and we have only to look upon the map of the world to see the geographical advantage that Canada enjoys in seeking entrance into these same markets. It appears to me, therefore, that whatever may be the interests of other contributing countries to this scheme, Canada has direct and most important interest for her own commercial advancement. Putting it upon that ground alone, I regard the scheme as one calculated to be of great benefit to us commercially. I leave it to those who are more able, to sing the advantages of imperialism, the sentiment of which I thoroughly appreciate, and to dwell upon the imperialistic side of the question. There has been a great deal of literature written by those high in the affairs of the country, men engaged in the consideration of matters, of

Mr. MULOCK.

the defence and protection of our mercantile shipping of the great scattered colonies of the Empire—there has been much written and spoken as to the advantage to the Empire in having such a communication as this, so that at all times the mother country may be kept in touch with every part of the Empire, and be at all times prepared not by permission of foreign countries, but by arrangements under her own control, to know the influences and agencies at work endangering or threatening to endanger, any portions of the great Empire. So I say I leave it to others to dwell upon that feature of the situation. I am now only dealing with that portion of the resolution that is to be submitted to a committee dealing with the financial phase of it. In that view, it is proper, I think, that Parliament should have some idea of the extent to which this scheme involves Canada financially. Upon that point there may be differences of opinion, and we can have nothing but estimates, but estimates by capable men are a safe guide, and in a matter of this kind are the only possible guide.

The first question that arises, then, would be the feasibility of such a scheme. I think that we may assume that admitted. The subject has been thoroughly considered by the ablest men, and a partial survey has been made of the Pacific Ocean; and cable manufacturers in England are so thoroughly satisfied that they offer to build a cable, taking the possibilities of the bed of the ocean as satisfactory, and to guarantee the safety of the cable for at least three years. That is, to my mind, a powerful proof that the scheme, those men being prepared to risk their money in it, is a feasible one. As to the style of cable, I would say that that has been carefully considered by a commission that sat in London, England, beginning towards the end of the year 1896, and who made a report, bearing date 5th of January, 1897, signed by Lord Selborne and the other conferees. That the public may understand that this is different from some other reports, I may say that this report is generally referred to as the report of the Imperial Pacific Cable Commission. This report was made by Lord Selborne, chairman, as a result of a conference of the following gentlemen: Lord Strathcona, the Hon. A. G. Jones, Mr. Saul Samuel, Mr. D. Gillies, and Mr. Geo. H. Murray. The commission took expert evidence, and probably had before them the best authority upon telegraphy. I refer to Lord Kelvin, and their finding follows the advice of Lord Kelvin. Various cable plans were proposed, cables of varying weights, of varying proportions, of copper, gutta-percha and other material. The first point to be determined was the correct specification for a cable suitable for the work involved. Lord Kelvin gave his opinion upon various styles, and that opinion this Imperial Cable Commission has adopted,

Without troubling the House with figures, it will be sufficient to say that he finds, and the commission reports, that a cable in conformity with the specifications of Lord Kelvin, will be adequate for the purpose both of carrying messages and of standing the strain of laying. He also points out a very pleasing and gratifying circumstance, that although there is a depth of 3,000 fathoms in places, which exceeds the depth of any other cables at present in existence, still that circumstance is an advantage to the cable when once it is safely laid. Lord Kelvin's cable, then, will involve, according to the scheme that has been recommended, an initial capital expenditure of about £1,500,000 sterling. Hon. gentlemen will find the summary of their evidence on page 9 of the report. To be precise, they find that the cost of such a cable, guaranteed to remain in repair for six months, will be £1,422,000, allowing a margin of £78,000, call it a million and a half, and you have the cost of the cable as recommended by the commission in question. Since that time there has been an appreciation in the cost of manufacturing cables, and that appreciation, according to the opinion of Lord Strathcona, would amount to about £170,000. That added to the £1,422,000 would give us an estimated cost of the cable of £1,592,000. In the resolution which is in your hands I propose, when we are in committee, to move to fill up the blank with the figures £1,700,000, which would leave us a margin on the estimated cost, of £108,000.

Then, with reference to the financial result, hon. gentlemen will find, as I say, on page 9, a summary of the finding of the commission in question, which I may be permitted to read :

In consideration of the traffic estimated for the cable, and of the opinion expressed below, that a duplicate cable should be laid at the earliest possible moment, the commission have arrived at the conclusion that a core over the long section from Vancouver to Fanning Island of 542 lbs. copper and 368 lbs. gutta-percha, will be sufficient.

Those are Lord Kelvin's specifications.

On the assumption that this recommendation is adopted, and taking the total annual expenditure at £144,887, and the increase of business at 10 per cent per annum on 750,000 words in 1896, a Pacific cable would, if it came into actual work on the 1st of January, 1900, earn £178,437 in its first year of working, if the rate obtained by it per word were 3s. 6d.; thus leaving a credit balance on the first year's working of £33,550. If the rate per word were reduced to 2s., in the year 1900 it would earn £169,807; in 1901, £120,788; in 1902, £132,867, and in 1903, £146,153. It would thus become a paying concern during the fourth year of working.

That is upon the assumption that the rate was to be 2 shillings, instead of 3 shillings 3 pence, a word. I understand that the present cable rate between Great Britain and

Australasia is 4 shillings 9 pence. Of course cable communication between Australasia and Great Britain, via the Pacific, would have to bear the cost of telegraphing across the continent of Canada and of the cable across the Atlantic, so that you would have to allow 1 shilling and 6 pence per word for that. Lord Strathcona and Mr. Jones, the Canadian representatives, took a somewhat more favourable view of the financial result. Their findings as to the earnings of this cable from the beginning are as follows: They were deliberating in January, 1897, and they were estimating upon the cable going into operation in 1900, or in three years. Of course, we will have to put these three years forward now, so that, instead of assuming that it would be in operation in 1900, we would have to make it 1902, or three years from the present time. Hon. gentlemen will find the estimate of Lord Strathcona and Mr. Jones at page 14 of the Imperial commission's report. They estimate a surplus from the beginning, and taking the annual expenditure, which is for maintenance, repairs, sinking fund and interest at £144,886, they come to the conclusion that the cable will earn in the first year of its operation, over and above these charges, a surplus of £1,114; in the second year, £19,389; third year, £39,923; in the fourth year, £68,014; fifth year, £94,626, and the sixth year £124,565; so that these gentlemen see nothing but profit in the scheme from the beginning. However, profit or loss, the proposal in the resolution involves Canada being interested to the extent of five-eighteenthths. For some time the scheme was delayed, owing to the various governments interested not having been able to arrive at the proportion they would be willing to undertake; but it has now been arranged that Great Britain will assume five-eighteenthths; Canada, five-eighteenthths, and the colonies of New Zealand, Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria, two-eighteenthths each, making in all eighteen-eighteenthths. Subsection G of the resolution contemplates the various contributing governments being represented on the board in proportion to their interests. But to accomplish that literally and with mathematical accuracy would involve a board of eighteen members. If the interests are divided into eighteen parts, Canada would then have five, but if limited to eight it would not be possible to give Canada her proportionate number, or Great Britain either. If there are only eight members on the board, it would be impossible to arrange the representation in mathematical harmony with the shares of the various governments. The Australasians, taking eight-eighteenthths, would, if represented on the board with mathematical accuracy, be entitled to a representation of three and five-ninths, Canada to two and two-ninths, and Great Britain to two and two-ninths, making in all eight members. As this scheme will be largely centred in Great Britain, and as the British Govern-

ment will be largely interested in its management, it became necessary, in the first place, to arrange how the respective governments were to be represented. It was thought well, at the recent conference held between the Colonial Office, Mr. Chamberlain, the agents general of the various governments, and Mr. Tarte, the Minister of Public Works, who was present, to limit the number on the board to eight. That being the case, the question arose, how to deal with the fractional interest which each country would have over and above the number of representatives that each government might name. The Australasian colonies' interest in the scheme being three and five-ninths, they would be entitled to three and five-ninths members. Australasia has given over her five-ninths, and we our little surplus of two-ninths, and allowed Great Britain, which would also be entitled to two and two-ninths in the representation, the benefit of this surplus, so that Australia will have three representatives, Great Britain will have three, and Canada two, making eight in all. When we are in committee, therefore, I will ask the committee to amend one of these clauses to provide that the representation on the board shall consist of eight members, three to be chosen by the Imperial Government, two by the Canadian Government, and three by the Australian Governments. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I may be permitted to revert for one moment to the question of the earning prospects of such a scheme by reading a memorandum given to me by Sir Sandford Fleming a short time ago. Sir Sandford Fleming, as every one knows, has taken a deep and continuous interest in this scheme from the commencement, and perhaps there is no better authority in regard to its possibilities. When I observed in the press a statement to the effect, that cable communication cannot be assured between Australia and Hong Kong, because of the concession given to the Eastern Extension Cable Company, I was anxious to know whether the estimates of the Imperial commission as to the earning power of the cable included the earnings expected from Hong Kong or otherwise. And so, Sir Sandford Fleming in reply to my request has favoured me with the following memorandum:—

Memorandum for the Hon. William Mulock,  
re

The probable revenue of the Pacific Cable, &c.  
10th May, 1899.

The undersigned can state with absolute certainty that no estimate of revenue, yet made, that he has seen, includes any allowance for Asiatic business passing over the Pacific cable.

The estimates of the Pacific Cable Committee, Lord Selborne, chairman; those of the Canadian Commissioner, Lord Strathcona, and Hon. A. G. Jones; and his own Sir Sandford Fleming estimates are all based upon the existing business between Australasia and Europe. They do not even include, which they might very properly

Mr. MULOCK.

do, a considerable allowance for cable business which will most certainly be developed between Australasia and North America.

The exclusive landing rights at Hong Kong, which have been granted to the Eastern Extension Company, will, it is true, prevent Canada to Australasia establishing a branch cable to Hong Kong for twenty years. The Home Government can, however, as provided in the agreement of October 28th, 1893, by giving twelve months notice, and paying the Eastern Extension Company £300,000, take possession of the cable from Singapore to Labuan and Hong Kong, and a further expenditure of, possibly, £300,000 would connect that cable with the Pacific cable, and give Canada access through Australasia to the great trade centres of Asia. This telegraphic access can, however, only be secured through the Home Government in the manner described.

With respect to the probable revenue of the Pacific cable; the two great sources of telegraphic business are the United Kingdom and the Australasian colonies. In the course of a few years, after the laying of the cable, Canada and the United States will become a third sort of traffic; but for the present we may only consider the two first mentioned. It is obvious that all transatlantic cable companies would be interested in sending messages by the Pacific route, and not by the Eastern Extension route as every message from Great Britain passing by the Pacific would first have to cross the Atlantic. As a consequence the officers of the Atlantic cable companies, throughout the United Kingdom, would practically become collecting stations for the business of the Pacific cable.

Again, in Australia and New Zealand, as all the land telegraph lines are owned by the governments, and the post offices throughout the colonies are telegraph offices, each one of them would practically become an agency for the Pacific cable, and it would be in the power of the several governments, to a very large extent, to determine the route by which messages would be transmitted to Great Britain.

In view of these facts, there can be no doubt whatever that the Pacific cable as a state work, owned by government as proposed, would obtain a full share of all the Australia-European telegraph business. The undersigned obtained the written opinion of many Australian houses on this point. He would refer to parliamentary return of last session, No. 94, from pages 29 to 32 will be found the names of 24 of the best known mercantile firms of London, and the reply to questions placed before them. The general opinion of these merchants of the highest positions, and no men are better qualified to judge, is that the Pacific cable would be of immense public service; that it would be quite reasonable to count on the new line obtaining one-half the total business; and that it would be safe to reckon on the business continuing to increase at an average rate of 15 per cent per annum.

The estimates, based on this opinion, is that the revenue of the Pacific cable, after meeting all charges for working, renewal fund, interest, sinking fund to replace capital, &c., would leave a surplus profit as follows:—

In 1902, the first year, £114,157.  
1903, the second year, £153,031.  
1904, the third year, £197,735.  
1905, the fourth year, £249,144.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that surplus?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I so understand it.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you sure it is surplus ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, Mr. Speaker, it would seem from the opinions of those who have studied the subject carefully, that it has no terrors for contributing governments.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And as to Canada we have a special interest in it. For example, it is no mean thing to feel that a great public work of such Imperial importance as the Pacific cable is to have a terminus on Canadian soil. It is not unsatisfactory to know that it may be of some service to Canada in connection with our own inland telegraphic system. It will promote cable communication for Australasia across the Atlantic and through Canada. It will supply traffic for Canadian telegraph lines, and it will no doubt attract commerce to our Dominion and put us in a position to expand our trade abroad. We will become a carrying highway for trade from other countries, as well as being directly benefited ourselves. The part that electricity plays to-day in the promotion of trade is such, that we cannot judge of our interest in this scheme by a reference to the Canadian trade and navigation returns of the present time. It is true our exports to Australasia are greater than they ever were. It is true that for the year 1898 our exports to Australasia exceeded those of any other year, by, I think, about 25 per cent. I have seen the trade and navigations returns for the nine months of the fiscal year just closed, and I find there has been a marked increase in our trade with Australasia during these nine months, as compared with the corresponding nine months of last year, which were themselves the greatest we ever had before. But, Sir, I do not measure the advantage to Canada from this cable communication by our present trade with Australasia, because under modern methods of commerce, cable communication must precede trade ; not follow it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Therefore, I say, that we cannot form any conception of our commercial interests in this cable scheme by merely looking at our Australasia trade of to-day. Cable communication between Canada and Australia is now practically prohibited by the high rates. Owing to the roundabout route it would probably cost \$50 for the simplest message and reply, a rate practically prohibitory to Canadians establishing trade relations with Australasia. Our separation from the sister colonies by this great ocean, and the absence of direct communication by cable, has prevented that development of our trade with Australasia that would have taken place had we a direct cable system, and that will undoubtedly take place I believe when such facilities

are established as are proposed by this resolution now before the House. I do not intend to take up the time of the House at any further length, Mr. Speaker, but I shall be happy to give any information within my power.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, some time ago when the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) placed these resolutions on the Order paper, I had the great pleasure of congratulating the Government upon the conclusion at which they had arrived in relation to this matter, and I now beg to add my hearty congratulations to my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) for the very lucid, able, and clear manner in which he has put this very important question before the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This Pacific cable is a scheme to which from the outset I have attached the greatest importance, and I perhaps may on so important an occasion be permitted to occupy a few minutes in briefly recounting the history of the question as it stands before us to-day. In 1887 Her Majesty's Government invited a colonial conference to be held in London for the purpose of considering questions in which the Empire was interested. That conference was presided over by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and the representatives of Canada on that occasion were, the late Hon. Sir Alexander Campbell and Mr. Fleming, now Sir Sandford Fleming.

I may say in the outset that I heartily endorse everything that my hon. friend the Postmaster General has said in reference to Sir Sandford Fleming. From the very inception of this question that gentleman has devoted his great abilities—and they are very great—to a thorough, careful and exhaustive examination of the whole question in all its bearings. He made himself so completely a master of the whole subject that he has been regarded in England, in Australasia, and in Canada alike, as a thoroughly accomplished expert in regard to the question of cable communication ; and if we are to-day occupied with the very pleasant duty of bringing this great and important question to a satisfactory issue, and are witnessing the project established upon firm grounds, I believe the Empire owes it more to Sir Sandford Fleming than to any other man living. On the occasion to which I refer the question was presented by our representatives, Sir Alexander Campbell and Mr., now Sir Sandford Fleming, with very great ability. Subsequently the Government of Canada sent the present Sir Mackenzie Bowell, who was then, if I remember rightly, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and Mr. Fleming to Australia for the purpose of discussing the question of steam and cable communication with the governments of Australasia. I may say in passing that

these gentlemen were met at the outset there by what I regard as very hostile influences from the British Government. It would be almost impossible to overrate the enormous influence which the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company, then represented by the late Sir John Pender, as its president, was able to exercise in England. Its ramifications, its long arms, seemed to reach everybody. The Post Office Department, the Admiralty Department, the Colonial Office, in fact, all the departments, seemed to be, more or less, under the potent influence which that company was able to bring to bear; and no sooner had Sir Mackenzie Bowell and Sir Sandford Fleming reached Australia and engaged in their mission to promote this important work, than a communication was sent from the Colonial Office to the governments of Australasia, giving the views—most hostile and obstructive views—of the Post Office Department, and I think the Admiralty Department, in regard to the question. But very great effects were produced by that visit of Sir Mackenzie Bowell and Sir Sandford Fleming. It is well known to the House that that visit went far to bring about the great and never-to-be forgotten conference of 1894, held in the city of Ottawa, in which the Government of Canada, the Imperial Government, the governments of the colonies of Australasia, including New Zealand, and the Governments of South Africa, were all represented, and in which this question was taken up. In 1887, at the Colonial conference to which I have referred, the following resolution was passed:—

First,—That the connection recently formed through Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific by railway and telegraph opens a new alternative line of Imperial communication over the high seas and through British Possessions, which promises to be of great value alike in naval, military, commercial and political aspects.

Second,—That the connection of Canada with Australia by direct submarine telegraph across the Pacific is a project of high importance to the Empire, and every doubt as to its practicability should without delay be set at rest by a thorough and exhaustive survey.

Although this resolution was passed on that occasion, views hostile to the proposal were presented with great force by the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company. At the conference held in the city of Ottawa in 1894, the following resolutions were passed unanimously:—

1. That, in the opinion of this conference, immediate steps should be taken to provide telegraphic communications by cable, free from foreign control, between the Dominion of Canada and Australia.

2. That the Imperial Government be respectfully requested to undertake at the earliest possible moment, and to prosecute with all possible speed, a thorough survey of the proposed cable route between Canada and Australia, the expense to be borne in equal proportions by Great Britain, Canada and the Australian Colonies.

Sir CHARLES TOPPER

3. That it is for the interest of the Empire that, in case of the construction of a cable between Canada and Australasia, such a cable should be extended from Australia to the Cape of Good Hope; and that, for that purpose arrangements should be made between the Imperial and South African Governments for a survey of the latter route.

4. That in view of the desirability of having a choice of routes for a cable connection between Canada and Australasia, the Home Government be requested to take immediate steps to secure neutral landing-ground on some one of the Hawaiian Islands, in order that the cable may remain permanently under British control.

5. That the Canadian Government be requested after the rising of the conference to make all necessary inquiries, and generally to take such steps as may be expedient in order to ascertain the cost of the proposed Pacific cable, and promote the establishment of the undertaking in accordance with the views expressed in this conference.

I may say that before that conference was held, and after the return of Sir Mackenzie Bowell from Australia, I was instructed by the Canadian Government, as High Commissioner for Canada, to do all in my power to promote the two objects, the construction of the Pacific cable and the establishment of the fast Atlantic service between Great Britain and Canada, which was to be a part of that great scheme of communication between Great Britain and Canada, through Canada, and from our western coast to Australasia, both by ships and cable. In connection with the visit of Sir Mackenzie Bowell to Australia, a postal and telegraph conference was held at Wellington, in New Zealand; and that conference heartily endorsed the proposal for a cable from Vancouver to Australia, with the same unanimity that characterized the intercolonial conference held in London in 1887. This matter then began to assume an important position; and then the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company became alarmed. They went to the Colonial Office and entered a formal protest. They pointed out what they regarded as the fallacious calculations on which the project was based, and they took the ground that it was calculated to interfere with a private company which, unaided by public funds, had already established cable communication between London and Australasia. I felt it my duty, under these circumstances, to deliver an address before the Royal Colonial Institute, in which I urged, as well as I was able, the great importance of this direct cable communication which is now proposed, and also the establishment of a fast Atlantic service. I challenged on that occasion the statements made by Sir John Pender, controverting the position that had been taken by Sir Sandford Fleming and the telegraph and postal conference at Wellington in Australia. That led to the correspondence between Sir John Pender and myself in the "Times" newspaper, as I dare say hon. gentlemen opposite will remember. And I will draw attention to one single passage in that correspondence to show how it terminated. In

my letter to Sir John Pender, published in the "Times" newspaper, 9th June, 1894, I said :

I am quite satisfied to leave all the questions at issue to the judgment of the public. Your admission that the "existing service" has already received over £2,000,000 of Government subsidies, that the life of a cable may be fairly estimated at twenty years—instead of fourteen—and that you are responsible for the statement that the existing service to Australasia is a "monopoly," is very satisfactory to me. I am also glad that I have been able to induce you again to revise your estimate.

Thus the position I took was sustained by Sir John Pender's own evidence, who admitted that instead of the Eastern Telegraph Company having accomplished their great work unaided by public funds they had received £2,000,000 sterling of public money, that instead of their being a private enterprise and not a monopoly they were a monopoly, and that the life of a cable was much longer than he had estimated in his communication to the British Government as the grounds upon which they had attacked this enterprise.

Without detaining the House longer with that I may say that in accordance with the resolution which I have just read and which was passed at the Ottawa Conference in 1894, the Government of Canada, with the approval of that conference asked for tenders tentatively to ascertain and set at rest the question of cost, because it was represented by the Eastern Extension Company, which, of course, spoke with the authority of great experience, that the work would cost much higher than Sir Sandford Fleming's estimate. It was thought by the conference that the best test would be to ask for tenders from highly responsible parties. The result was that tenders were invited by the Government of Canada, and it was then proved that Sir Sandford Fleming, instead of having under-estimated the cost, had altogether over-estimated it. They obtained, as my hon. friend the Postmaster General has already informed the House, from one of the most able, enterprising and distinguished cable companies in the world, the India Rubber, Gutta Percha and Telegraph Works Company, a tender for the construction of the work, to construct it at their own cost and to guarantee its complete operation, to take all the risk and responsibility, in fact, to conduct its operations for three years, for a sum vastly below that which Mr. Fleming had estimated, and completely set at rest all question as to the character of his estimates.

I may say that under my instructions from the Canadian Government, I pressed this enterprise in every way I possibly could. I communicated with the Marquis of Ripon, and it is only right that I should say that I found the right hon. gentleman, who presided at that time over the Colonial Office, most friendly to the enterprise. But I need

not tell the House that the Government of which he was a member had a very small majority in the House of Commons, and were not in a position to grapple with great enterprises in the effective way in which governments supported by large majorities are able to grapple with them. No great progress therefore, was made with reference to either of these questions, the fast Atlantic service or the trans-Atlantic or Pacific cable, until the change of Government, when Lord Salisbury carried the country by a very large majority. When the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain became the Colonial Minister, I at once approached him and discussed the subject with him. He requested me to put in writing my communication on the subject of a fast Atlantic service and the cable, and I did so. He was just leaving for the continent. He wrote me a note from Grenada in Spain, saying he had put in motion both these questions before leaving London and immediately on his return would be prepared to take them up with me. On his return, I again waited upon him, and it was concluded that in the then state of public business it would be better to delay for a little the question of having an interview with the representatives of Canada, Australia and South Africa. That made a little delay, but as will be seen by the correspondence on the Table, Mr. Chamberlain changed his views shortly afterwards, and on the 11th November, 1895, Mr. Bramson, one of the Under Secretaries of State for the Colonies, wrote me saying that Mr. Chamberlain thought it was highly desirable no further time should be lost considering the subject, and some steps should be taken to dispossess foreign promoters of the idea that no competition was to be feared from the line recommended last year by the Ottawa Conference. That was in consequence of intimations given in the press of an attempt by other governments to take up this question of cable communication. We acted at once upon that, and I had the honour, in conjunction with the representatives of the colonies of Australasia—except those of West and South Australia, which had gone to such expense in connection with land lines and were so completely, therefore, identified with the Eastern Extension Company that we could hardly ask or expect their support—and the representatives of Natal and the Cape Colony, of waiting upon Mr. Chamberlain with a request from all the governments that we represented, asking for the appointment of a commission to take up this question of this cable communication, in order to arrange, first, the question of its practicability, and, second, the mode in which it should be undertaken. Nothing could be more satisfactory than the action of the hon. Minister. Mr. Chamberlain, who is known to be a man of great business attainments, said to the delegation that he had at all times satisfied himself

that no serious financial liability would devolve upon any person engaged upon this enterprise. I mention that because it confirms entirely the view that my hon. friend the Postmaster General has presented to the House, that in the light of all the evidence and the investigation of the persons best qualified to judge of its financial aspect, no serious liability can possibly be entailed. On the contrary, there is every reason to believe, looking at the history of telegraphic enterprise throughout the world, that this great object may be accomplished, and that, instead of its being a burden, it will, at an early day, become a source of direct revenue to all the countries interested.

The committee was at once appointed. Mr. Chamberlain proposed that Canada should be represented by two, Australasia by two, and Great Britain by two, in order that the Colonial Office and the Treasury might both take part in the matter. As is known to the House, immediately on my return to Canada, as soon as I was called upon to form an Administration, Sir Mackenzie Bowell and the then Sir Donald Smith, now Lord Strathcona, were appointed, together with Sir Sandford Fleming acting as expert, to proceed to England and take up that question. They did so. And I may say they were a good deal disappointed to find that, through some influence—I have already hinted at the enormous power the Eastern Extension Company were able to wield—there was not the same eagerness that they had anticipated and had a right to expect from some of the representatives of Australia to take up the matter. And in consequence of the representatives of Australasia having gone to a conference with reference to another subject on the continent, no material result was accomplished. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), however, upon succeeding to power, reappointed Lord Strathcona as one of the delegates, and appointed also a gentleman known to have very great financial ability, Hon. Alfred Jones, of Halifax, to proceed with Sir Sandford Fleming to London. My hon. friend the Postmaster General has already stated to the House the result of that conference. It was most satisfactory. The conference was presided over by Lord Selborne, Under Secretary of State for the Colonies; and after a full and exhaustive examination and hearing of the statements made by Sir Sandford Fleming with reference to the whole project, they arrived at the conclusion that I fully expected they would arrive at, the only satisfactory conclusion that, in my judgment, could be arrived at: First, that the matter was entirely practicable; second, that its financial aspect, instead of having any terrors for any of the parties engaged in it, were most favourable, as the Postmaster General has said, and that, so far as this aspect is concerned, the project could be entered upon without hesitation; third, that the best mode of dealing with the matter was with the construc-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

tion and operation of the work by the Imperial Government, the Australian Government and the Canadian Government. I may say that I felt that however important from an Imperial stand-point and from a number of other stand-points particularly from the point of view of having Canada used as the great thoroughfare of communication between the heart of the Empire and the Australasian colonies, the whole project was to Canada, yet the interests of Australia were undoubtedly greater than those of Canada. The instructions given to Sir Donald Smith and Sir Mackenzie Bowell, therefore, were that they should press for a larger contribution from Australasia than was given by Canada; but, failing to obtain it, Canada should not hesitate—rather than that the enterprise should fail—to become responsible for one-third of the expense connected with the undertaking. I always felt perfectly satisfied that if Australasia and Canada presented to the Imperial Government their willingness to shoulder two-thirds of the responsibility of this great Imperial enterprise, Her Majesty's Government could not possibly shrink from implementing the matter by contributing the other third; and I had every reason, from the communication with the Colonial Minister, to arrive at that conclusion. I may say, in passing, that it was very unfortunate, in my judgment—I am afraid we lost some time by it—that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), through his over-caution, for I can hardly term it anything else, threw a little cold water on this great Imperial undertaking on the important occasion of the Imperial Jubilee. The "Standard" newspaper, which gave a report of the interview between the Premier and the Colonial Minister, said:

The Conference left the Pacific cable scheme in mid-air, and it is very unlikely that anything more will be heard of it for a considerable time. The position of it was entirely changed by a proposal by the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company to lay an all-British line from Western Australia across the Indian Ocean to Mauritius, thence connecting with the Cape and St. Helena Ascension. Under any circumstances, Western Australia and South Australia were opposed to the Pacific cable, which would divert traffic from their land lines, and Victoria was indifferent.—

For the reasons I have already stated.

—New South Wales, Queensland and New Zealand were, by reason of their geographical position, prepared to subsidize the Pacific line, and if the Home and Canadian Governments had been willing to pay their share, no doubt the scheme would have been carried out. But the Conference soon discovered that the Imperial Treasury was very unwilling indeed to subsidize the line.—

I have already suggested what powerful influence the Eastern Extension Company have been able, in this matter, to wield; but this seems now, fortunately, to have lost its power—fortunately for the good of Canada, Australia and the Empire. It thought that by presenting this alternative project, which would not have accomplished what is

sought to be accomplished by this Pacific cable, they would throw the British Government, as it were, off the track, and, to a certain extent, render them less anxious than they had been.

—while Sir Wilfrid Laurier indicated that he mistrusted the estimates of cost, revenue and maintenance which had been submitted by the projector, and was not prepared to pledge Canada to bear a share of the burden.

If the Government in England have an organ, the "Standard" is, I suppose that organ. I do not hold my right hon. friend too closely to the terms of that report, because it has not the authority of the statement laid on the Table of the House of Commons by the Colonial Minister. But as the projector—as Sir Sandford Fleming may fairly be called—was the expert named by my right hon. friend himself, as well as by the Government preceding his, it was very unfortunate indeed that Canada should have shown the slightest hesitation or the slightest unwillingness. Had not this been done, I am inclined to think we should have had the Pacific cable in operation to-day. I am delighted to know, however, that my right hon. friend, who said he had not looked sufficiently into the subject to take decided action upon it, has become entirely satisfied from the calculations and that the evidence that no serious burden, no burden at all, is likely to rest upon the Dominion of Canada through this enterprise; but that, as stated to-day by the Postmaster General, who is the mouthpiece, and the very able mouthpiece of the Government on this question, there is every reason why Canada should view with supreme satisfaction the fact that this matter has been brought finally to a satisfactory conclusion.

I may say that after a notice of these resolutions had been given, I learned with great astonishment, and I may say with almost a feeling of humiliation, under the circumstances, that Her Majesty's Government seemed inclined to withdraw from the position which Lord Selborne, as chairman of that important committee, had reported in favour of, and which I had assumed thoroughly and satisfactorily closed all question as to what was the attitude of the Imperial Government. I was delighted, however, to read in the London press a report of an interview that took place when the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company, through their chairman, Lord Tweedsdale, made their last dying effort to obstruct this scheme. I was delighted to read the manner in which Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Chamberlain, Colonial Secretary, met those gentlemen and pointed out to them that it was too late for them to raise the question, pointed out to them the fact that while they had practically enjoyed a monopoly of this business, and had received two millions of public money, still, on a most

important occasion, England was unable to have any communication with Australia because existing cables were cut or had broken down. I say I read that with extreme satisfaction, because I felt it was the death-blow to the last despairing effort of an obstructive monopoly to defeat a great Imperial enterprise, as well as Canadian and Australasian enterprise. I am delighted to know that my right hon. friend, in his statement to the House, has not hesitated to speak in the most unqualified way of the value of this enterprise to Canada, because no person can doubt that if we are to build up a large trade, and carry it on as we are now doing, with this great island continent of Australasia, nothing will tend more to establish and accomplish that, than the rapid telegraphic communication that seems now to have become absolutely indispensable to successful commercial enterprise. From an Imperial point of view, I feel that England would have dishonoured herself if she had lost the opportunity that was presented of taking her share, and of implementing the action of Australia and of Canada in bringing this to a successful termination. Why, Sir, it is not too much to say that at no distant date, in view of a possible conflict of European nations with England, the absence of such a cable would find the island continent of Australia surrounded by a hostile fleet and captured before England could learn anything about it, because as matters now stand, a continental force could destroy all cable communication, and prevent any communication with that vast portion of our great Empire. I say, therefore, that the importance of this enterprise to the interests of the Empire cannot be over-estimated, for, assuming that this enterprise would not be a commercial success, assuming that the entire expense was sunk without any prospect of return, still England might at no distant day be called upon to expend treble the amount in order to repair a disaster that could not occur if this Pacific cable were in operation. To Australasia it is a matter of the most vital import, it is a matter upon which not only their trade, but the security of their country might, at no distant date, absolutely depend. I am only too glad to know that by this means the heart of the great Empire, in the city of London, will be able to communicate intelligence across British territory on this continent, without any foreign country being able to know what is the communication, and that is a fact of vast import to a great Empire like that of Britain. It is of immense consequence to her that she should be able to hold secret and confidential communications of the most important character between the seat of government in London and Canada and Australia, without the possibility of foreign intervention, or of cable communication being interfered with.

Now, Sir this matter has been put before the House so ably and so succinctly by my hon. friend the Postmaster General that I will not say more than that I am delighted to know that the Government find themselves in a position to take the stand they have taken, and to exercise a most potent influence in inducing Great Britain, at the last moment, to take up vigorously and to secure the complete accomplishment of this measure. I congratulate my hon. friend and the Government upon the conclusion at which they have arrived, and I have no doubt that it will be a source of gratification not only to them, but to the Canadian people for all time to come.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Before you leave the Chair, I desire to say a few words in connection with the proposition now before the House which, I imagine, from the fact that it has been presented by the Government and supported by the leader of the Opposition, does not stand any chance of defeat. I do not rise in the sense of opposing this project. The scheme is a meritorious one, the construction of a Pacific cable on the terms and on the route proposed, is perhaps desirable. But I wish, Mr. Speaker, to submit certain points to the Government for consideration, to be considered for what they are worth, probably the worth will not amount to much. This is, I may say, the growing time for the Dominion of Canada. Our prospects are improving, our population is increasing more rapidly than heretofore, our wealth is increasing, we begin to be aware of our great natural resources, we know that we have a country capable of supporting an immense population, and a great variety of schemes are being pressed upon the Government for the purpose of developing this great country which we possess. Now, our resources do not permit that all these schemes should receive aid. There are many schemes, meritorious in themselves and deserving of promotion, that must necessarily remain in abeyance at present because the Government does not command the resources that are necessary to meet all these requirements that are urged upon it. The question, to my mind, is whether there are not schemes that have been presented, or may be presented, to this Government asking for consideration and expenditure that do not promise to serve more effectively to increase the greatness and prosperity of this Dominion, than the scheme under consideration. It is not in the sense of opposing this scheme, but in the sense of placing before the Government and urging upon the Government certain considerations, that I rise to-day.

Now, we have, I think, primarily resting upon us as a necessity at this stage of our existence and progress, the development of this continent. Continental development is the one primary and important thing for this Government to attend to to-day. For

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

example, we have the necessity of securing an all-rail Canadian route to the Yukon. My hon. friends on this side of the House were fully aware of the necessity of doing that a year ago, and my hon. friend who has just spoken (Sir Charles Tupper), has lately awakened to the necessity of doing it. This is a scheme which is of primary importance, of pressing importance, and which will demand the expenditure of a large sum of money. Then there is the necessity of opening up communication with that great inland sea, the Hudson Bay, which has an area two or three times greater than the area of the North Sea. The North Sea furnishes fishery products to the value of \$125,000,000 a year. Hudson's Bay is richer in fisheries than the North Sea, in cod, salmon and whale fisheries, and it has enormous mineral resources along its shore. Yet these are undeveloped, there is no communication with them at the present time, and if we are to promote our national growth, here is a scheme for connecting our seaports and our commercial centres with Hudson Bay which is of primary importance, of pressing importance. These two schemes of establishing connection with Hudson Bay and of establishing connection with the Yukon are schemes which demand immediate attention. Then we have the project of a ship canal passing up the Ottawa valley. If what is claimed for that canal be true, I believe that the creation of that line of communication is a work which must have an important bearing upon the future of this Dominion, upon its development, upon its securing great commercial and national advantages. We have all these three schemes, that I have outlined briefly, and many other schemes equally meritorious, that are pressing upon the Government, that the Government do not feel themselves able to aid at the present moment because they come piling upon them in an avalanche, which would require an outlay of probably \$100,000,000. The business of the Government is to select from amongst these schemes those that are the most pressing, those that promise the greatest returns, to select them in the order of their importance and to aid them to the extent that the Government has means to promote them. The question as to which I have a little doubt, although my doubts may be shown to be unfounded, is whether the Pacific cable is a scheme so important and promising such returns, such national advantages as to take precedence over many other schemes that are pressing for attention. Our proportion of the cost of the Pacific cable will be five-eighteenths.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Our proportion of the liability.

Mr. CHARLTON. That will amount to \$2,500,000 in round numbers.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Of a liability; it may not cost us a farthing.

Mr. CHARLTON. It may be a very profitable investment, as the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) says, and we may make a great deal of money out of it. I notice that governments usually find such schemes as railroad building, canal construction, and such other projects extremely profitable, and this may be one of the number. What is the extent of the trade between Canada and Australia with which we desire to secure telegraphic communication. Our exports of farm products last year amounted to \$127,000, and of manufactures to \$1,119,000, the total exports being \$1,630,000. We imported from Australia \$149,000 worth, of which \$35,000 worth were dutiable goods, and \$113,000 worth free goods. The duty collected upon these goods was a little over \$9,000. That is not a very great trade and, in my opinion, it is not a trade susceptible of very great development. We have telegraphic communication with Australia today. We have two lines that afford communication with the Australasian colonies, and it would be interesting to see what amount of business these lines did last year. One line sent an average of about ten messages a month, and the other line did about the same amount of business. The total amount of business performed by these two lines, in communication between Canada and Australia, amounted to about \$5,000 per annum, or about one per cent of the estimated receipts from the enterprise. It strikes me that if we were to review this matter we would come to that conclusion that a business of \$5,000 a year was not a consideration sufficiently great to induce the Government to embark upon this enterprise when more important and more meritorious schemes are pressing upon their claims. That is what troubles me, not that I do not want to see the Pacific cable constructed, not that I do not suppose that this great Imperial work is important, but my belief is that we can employ the money to better advantage in promoting our own interests. I may be mistaken about this matter, but it seems to me that the securing of communication with the Yukon and with Hudson Bay, the building of the Ottawa Ship Canal and other schemes of that kind are entitled to greater consideration, that they promise greater results and should take precedence of the scheme we have under consideration. There is another consideration in connection with this matter. I suppose it is a foregone conclusion that the United States Government will build a line from San Francisco to the Sandwich Islands and from the Sandwich Islands to Manila, where they have communication with Hong Kong. We will be building a line to compete with another line that will be laid down almost simultaneously with the line that it is proposed to construct. These are the considerations that I deem it proper to present to the House. I know that my own constituents do not favour the Pacific cable;

they think that the money that will be expended in this enterprise might be expended to much better advantage nearer home in the development of the great resources of this country. In pressing these views for consideration I would not have it thought that I disapprove of the Pacific cable per se, but I think we can make a little better use of the money at present at home than by devoting it to this enterprise.

Mr. T. D. CRAIG (East Durham). Mr. Speaker, I just wish to occupy a few moments in replying to what the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has said. There is no doubt that some of the schemes he has mentioned are meritorious and a great many other schemes which were not mentioned are equally meritorious, but the point before us, at the present time, is as to whether this is a meritorious proposal. It commends itself to me. As I listened to the speech of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), in bringing this matter before the House, I was struck, as I have been for some time, with its great importance. The hon. member for North Norfolk has said that the United States will be building a cable that might take the place of this.

Mr. CHARLTON. No, but which would be a competitor with this.

Mr. CRAIG. The object of this Government is to have an all-British cable, which does not touch upon any foreign shore at all, but which is entirely confined to the limits of British territory. This has been the aim of Canadian statesmen for some years. This is not a matter which has been sprung suddenly on the people, but it is a matter which has occupied the attention of the leaders of different governments for a great many years. It is a matter which has occupied the attention of the statesmen of Great Britain who recognize its importance. And the leaders of different governments have not shrunk from the matter of the cost. In respect to what the hon. member for North Norfolk has said, we need not be afraid about the cost because the statements made by the hon. Postmaster General, and by the hon. leader of the Opposition, satisfy me, at any rate, that while, at first there may be some liability, in the long run there will be no liability at all. I believe that this will be a profitable enterprise. I think that the hon. leader of the Opposition said, at any rate it is my own belief, that suppose it were to involve Canada in some liability, we should support the proposal. We are not only here to develop this continent. I am proud to think, as I know the members of this House are, that we are not only Canadians but we are members of the British Empire. While the British Empire provides a navy, which may be our protection and which is our protection, she does not call upon us to contribute to its support.

Her army is at our service, if necessary, and we are called upon to do comparatively little in return. When we have an opportunity, as we have to-day, not only to benefit Canada—and I hold this cable will be of great benefit to Canada—but at the same time to benefit the Empire, we should not hesitate a moment; indeed, I do not believe we will hesitate a moment to embrace this opportunity. It is true, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) said, that our chief duty, as Canadians, is to develop our continent, but I hold that this Pacific cable scheme will prove a benefit to the continent. It may be that our trade with Australasia is small to-day, but when we have this cable built, I am quite satisfied that trade will increase largely. We know that in the present day, telegraphic communication is necessary to all that concerns commerce. This is an age of rapidity, and in order to carry on extensive operations, the telegraph must be employed. I hold that the comparatively small trade now done with Australasia does not give us any idea of what may be done when this cable is completed. But after all, while it is true that this will help to build up the continent and develop the resources of Canada, at the same time I am prepared to support it as an Imperial policy, because anything we do in this way must tend to bind the different parts of the Empire closer together. Sometimes we talk about ourselves as Canadians, and talk about the Empire as something outside ourselves, but I am proud to think we are part of the British Empire. We are becoming a more important part of that great Empire every day, and it is pleasant to think that this all-British cable will extend around the Empire, will bring the Empire closer together, will make us realize that we are not a separated community, but that we are in fact part and parcel of the greatest Empire the world has ever seen. I have no hesitation, Mr. Speaker, in giving my cordial support to this resolution.

Mr. OSLER. I congratulate the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) and the Government, and I do so without any reserve upon the successful conclusion of the negotiations for the building of this cable. The Postmaster General has had two opportunities within the last year or two to confer a benefit upon Canada and the Empire, and I am glad to know that he has taken advantage of both. The resolution submitted to the House to-day is in every way creditable to his ability in carrying out the negotiations which have been necessary in this matter. I have no hesitation whatever in saying that I believe the cable scheme, as proposed in this resolution, will entail no loss and no cost whatever upon Canada. The utmost liability we assume is to guarantee interest upon something under £500,000 sterling, and any one who looks at the marvellous development in telegraphic

Mr. CHARLTON.

and cable business, must be convinced that a cable company practically creates its own business. The rival cable companies across the Atlantic are to-day earning far more than it ever was contemplated it was possible could be earned in the cable business for many generations. In like manner, I believe that this Pacific cable will fulfil all the expectations of those who have brought it to a successful conclusion, and that it will not entail one dollar of expense upon Canada. I believe that its revenues will enable the various governments before long to substantially reduce the capital fund, even if they charge a reasonable rate per message. I again congratulate the Postmaster General and the Government.

Mr. BOSTOCK. This is a matter in which, of course, British Columbia is specially interested, for our merchants are looking forward to a great development of trade with Australia when we have this cable communication. The hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) has shown that the trade between Canada and Australia has increased very much in the last few years, but I believe that increase will be as nothing compared with the vast increase which we may expect when this cable is in operation. The difficulties in the way of the Canadian-Australasian trade are at present very great. The fact that a steamer leaves Vancouver for Australia, and nothing is heard of her until she reaches some port in Australia or New Zealand, is a great drawback to the development of the trade between the two countries. It is specially valuable to us in British Columbia that we should have a direct cable across the Pacific, before a cable is established by our neighbours to the south, as has been suggested by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). It is also most important, in the interest of the whole of this great continent and the Empire, that the cable communication between the different parts of the Empire should be in the hands of our own people. The great advantage we shall derive from the very fact that this cable comes to Vancouver is at the present time difficult to estimate. The people on the other side of the Pacific will be brought much more into touch with the people of Vancouver and the other cities on the coast, and they will be brought to look upon Canadian trade as a matter in which they are deeply concerned. The Government are to be congratulated on having brought this matter to such a satisfactory issue, and I believe that it will be found very shortly that the business transacted over the Pacific cable will be sufficient to pay all the expenses of operating it, together with the interest on the capital expended. It is practically impossible at the present day to carry on trade between two countries unless you have quick and cheap telegraphic communication, and the figures quoted by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton)

show that an ordinary message between Canada and Australia costs \$20, so that a merchant in Canada, in order to obtain a cable reply, would have to pay \$40. That, in the course of a year, amounts to a very heavy tax upon business, and the effect of the reduction of these rates must be to materially promote our commerce with Australasia. I am very pleased, indeed, and I am sorry that there are no other members for British Columbia here to express their satisfaction and gratification at the resolutions which have been introduced into the House to-day by the hon. Postmaster General.

Mr. PRIOR. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Bostock) stated that he was sorry there were no other members here from British Columbia to congratulate the Government on bringing forward this measure. The hon. gentleman made a little mistake in that remark, for there is one member from British Columbia here, who is only too glad to offer his hearty congratulations to the hon. Postmaster General for bringing this scheme forward in the way he has done. I hold that this scheme is one of the grandest that has been brought forward in this House since confederation. It is not only good for Canada, but good for the Empire as a whole. If this scheme is carried through, I think we shall find the prosperity of Canada very materially increased. The cost of it may be large. I do not know whether we can be sure of the figures which have been brought before the House; but even if the cost be large, I think the people of Canada can afford their share, for the sake of the honour of assisting in carrying through so great a project. I think we can congratulate ourselves also on the fact that Canada has been to all intents and purposes the principal promoter of the scheme. For a time the British Government appeared to be lukewarm in regard to it; but it has lately been stirred up by Canada, and now the scheme seems to be in a fair way of being brought to a satisfactory conclusion. I may here be allowed to call the attention of the House to the magnificent offer that was made by the province of British Columbia to assist in this work—an offer which every one must admit to have been a very large one indeed for a province of her resources. I believe that offer had the hearty endorsement of every person in British Columbia. I do not want to take up the time of the House further than to say that I am sure the people of British Columbia are in hearty accord with this scheme as brought forward by the hon. Postmaster General.

It being One o'clock, the Deputy Speaker left the Chair.

House resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. GEO. E. CASEY (West Elgin). Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair I was about to say a few words on the proposition under discussion—one of the most important

that has come before this House for many years. In speaking of it, I think I must use the same phrase as my hon. friend from Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior), who said he heartily congratulated the Government on the introduction of this measure. That phrase appears to me to be exactly appropriate. I think the Government deserve to be congratulated on the introduction of a measure which is statesmanlike, businesslike, and truly imperial. When I say Imperial, I mean that it is a measure thoroughly calculated to knit together the various members of that great British family which we, in a loose and general way, call the Empire—a family of nations which, I hope, we shall some day or other be able to speak of as a more organic unity than it is at present. When the British nations shall become organically united for development, and for defence, I think the day of peace for the world will have come, and a day of vaster prosperity for all of those peoples than they have yet dreamed of; and such proposals as the present are directly in the line of bringing about that grand and overwhelming consummation.

This is a proposal for which neither party in this country can claim the exclusive credit. The question became a subject of discussion and of preliminary action on the part of Canada under one regime. It is coming to perfection under the other. Hon. gentlemen now on the Treasury benches deserve congratulation that it is under their auspices that this, as well as some other matters of a like Imperial nature, have taken definite and successful form; but I do not think they desire or expect to be considered the sole originators of this idea. I think it is better that no such claim should be made, that no such idea should prevail. I think it better that it should go abroad to the world that the people of Canada, irrespective of party, are in favour of this great scheme, and are willing to lend it their aid. And it is due to the leader of the Opposition, and to such of his friends as I have yet heard speak on the subject, to say that their remarks bear out that idea. It is a grand thing to be able to say to the mother country, and to the other British nations, that the people of Canada are unanimous in supporting this great scheme for the development of the Empire, which has been proposed to them, which seems to be practicable, and which seems to be acceded to by the other parties to the contract.

The reasons why this scheme is a desirable one from an Imperial point of view, are not at all merely sentimental. Sentiment is a very good thing and a strong bond of union; but, after all, business advantage and cash profit are very serious factors in a proposal of this kind. It seems to me hardly open to argument whether or not a measure, which will open up direct telegraphic communication entirely through British territory, between nations so far apart as the Australia-

sian colonies and Canada, will be a benefit to commerce. It seems to me on the face of it an absolute certainty that that communication will be the means of increasing commerce between those countries.

We have been told that the present commerce between them is small—that the messages passing between Australasia and Canada over existing lines are trifling in number and value. There are a great many reasons for that. The business is small, largely because we have no direct telegraphic communication. We have a line of steamers going to Australia, but their business has been hampered and very nearly ruined, by the lack of telegraphic communication. We have people who would do business in Australasia if telegraphic communication could be had at a reasonable figure, but when it comes to paying 4s. 9d., considerably over a dollar a word, a great deal of business remains undone that would be done if we had telegraphic communication at a reasonable figure. For that enormously high rate, we have to thank two conditions. In the first place, the natural consequence of transmission over a long, roundabout route, over which the message has to be repeated at Gibraltar, Malta, Alexandria, Suez, Aden, Bombay, Madras, Penang, Singapore and Java before it gets to Australasia. When a message has to be repeated so often, going over different telegraph lines, it must necessarily be costly, and still more so when these lines and their connections are practically all controlled by one great monopoly, the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company. These two conditions of affairs, we have to thank for the enormously high and practically prohibitive rates at present existing between this country and Australasia, and the small amount of telegraphic and other business that is done. It seems to me evident, on the face of it, that commercial benefit would accrue directly to Canada by the completion of this line, in the increase of business between Canada itself and Australasia. Still more, by the construction of this line I am certain that Canada would secure a great part of the business which now passes between Europe and Australasia by other routes. With a telegraphic line passing through Canada to Australasia, with a freight and passenger route from Canada to Australasia, a great deal of business would come this way that now goes by longer and less convenient routes.

The benefit to the Empire I think also goes without saying. Apart from the strengthening of Imperial sentiment, there would be the great advantage of having a safe line for the transmission of messages between all parts of the Empire, no matter in what state of war the world might find itself, so long as Great Britain was able to control the sea, and consequently the points at which this cable would touch. When we see such unexpected events happening as

Mr. CASEY.

the seizure of the Philippine Islands by the United States, and the consequent control by that country of all the cable business going from there, this consideration must be a very important one from an Imperial point of view.

As regards the business advantage, from the Imperial stand-point, the chief advantage to other parts of the Empire besides Canada would arise from the competition in cable rates and the consequent cheapening of communication. The rate is now 4s. 9d. a word, and it is thought by the experts that with a new cable, operated so much more cheaply in comparison with the old one, the rate could be reduced to two shillings a word, or considerably less than one-half the present rate, and still pay a revenue.

From all points of view, then, the thing seems to be desirable. Now let us come to the actual scheme proposed by the Government. The first point that strikes me as admirable is the fact that it is not a subsidy to any company, that there is no private gain to be made out of the construction of this cable line, all possible profit going to the Government themselves who contribute their credit, though not their cash, to securing the money for its construction. The cable is to be constructed by trustees representing the mother country and the different colonies that come into the scheme. These trustees will raise the requisite money on bonds, guaranteed in the specified proportions by the different governments, so that no private party is going to make a cent out of this proposal. It therefore is not, and cannot, be made what is called a deal, and that of itself is a great recommendation, to my mind. I do not say that deserving enterprises should not be subsidized by this House, even though private parties make something out of them. I think that public benefit is secured by doing that in many cases, but an international affair of this kind can only be properly carried on in the way proposed.

Then, a great advantage will arise to the separate countries and the Empire at large from the mere co-operation of the different governments in the management of this cable. We will have a board composed of Australian, New Zealand, South African, Canadian and British representatives, managing a large business concern of this kind, and you will have a small kind of Imperial confederation or Imperial unity, which may lead to vastly greater and more important results than merely the satisfactory management of this particular cable. It will lead to a unity of feeling between the different colonies, and the interchange of views on business matters, and to the interchange of commodities, and the mutual making of profits, which no other conceivable arrangement probably could bring about.

On the purely financial aspect of the case, I would not have thought it necessary to

say anything, were it not for the remarks of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who assumed, in the first place, that this scheme is going to cost the country a lot of money, and who says that much more useful employment for that money could be found within the boundaries of this continent, than in seeking the enlargement of our trade and commerce outside the continent. He instanced several Canadian schemes that he thought were much more deserving, and he spoke as if it were impossible to assist those and do what the Government are now asking us to do. He spoke, for instance, of a railway to Hudson Bay as one on which money could be expended to greater advantage than in the construction of a Pacific cable. I am convinced that a railway to Hudson Bay is a desirable thing to secure, and I should endorse the Government in securing that connection by means of liberal assistance, but I do not see that the two things are at variance. I do not see why the granting of a subsidy to a road to Hudson Bay should interfere with the use of our credit in enabling the joint board of all the colonies to build this cable line. Then, he told us that this cable was not needed because the United States were probably going to build a cable to the Philippine Islands, connecting with Hong Kong, and at Hong Kong with somewhere else, and so on to Australasia, and that we could send our messages that way as well as by a cable of our own. But if we want to telegraph to Australasia via Hong Kong and the other places, we can do that now, and why should we go four-fifths around the world instead of one-fifth in order to get to Australasia? Why use four telegraph lines when one would suffice? So that, as a business proposition, the idea that the United States cable to the Philippine Islands and its connection with other places would take the place of this cable is a contention which is utterly absurd as a business proposal. That scheme would not give us any cheaper or readier or better communication than we have now, or one freer from foreign influence.

What struck me most in this proposition of my hon. friend from North Norfolk is the fact that he does not seem to have grasped the Canadian idea on the subject of telegraphic communication. That he should propose to this House a cable having its terminus in the United States, built by United States capital and controlled by the United States Government in substitution for an all-British route terminating in Canada, in the management of which Canada would have her share—all shows that he is not Canadian in sentiment. I cannot put it in any other way. I am sorry to have to say it, but it does not appear that the hon. gentleman has even yet acquired the faculty of looking at these matters from a Canadian, not to say an Imperial, point of view.

Then he objected to the financial aspect of the case on the ground that it was shown that only ten messages a month—I think that was the number—went by one cable route from Canada to Australasia at the present time. He did not give us the figures of the other cable route which he said existed; but he said that the sum total of cable business between Australasia and Canada only came to \$5,000 a year, and this was not a sound basis for the construction of an all-British line across the Pacific Ocean. Of course it is not. Nobody was so thoroughly absurd, so puerile, as to say that a cable should be built to accommodate the existing traffic between Australasia and Canada. The hon. gentleman simply set up his man of straw and then knocked him down. He forgot to tell us that the two routes that exist, part of the way at least, for telegraphing are now under one control, in the pool of the Eastern Extension monopoly, which has done its best to fight this project before the Colonial Minister and was at one time successful in obtaining great delay. But I am happy to know that the Colonial Minister has seen the object of the delay asked for by the monopoly and has given them what we call the cold shoulder, and has decided to go on with the scheme already agreed upon. Now, my hon. friend from North Norfolk tells us that his constituents do not approve of this scheme, but that they disapprove it on the grounds that he has given to this House. If his constituents have obtained their ideas of the scheme from the hon. gentleman, I do not wonder that they are opposed to it—any body of rational men would be. But the presentation of the scheme made by the hon. member for North Norfolk is utterly inconsistent with the facts and theories of the case: and so the opinion of himself and his constituents based on that presentation, is worth absolutely nothing.

Let us come at once to the true financial aspect of the case. We are told by the hon. gentleman and his friends, the Eastern Extension monopoly, that this cable would not pay. Now, there are some other people who know something about that. There was an Imperial Commission on this subject in 1896 in London, composed of Canadian, British and Australasian representatives. It prepared the figures up to the latest date previous to its own sitting and came to the following conclusion; I read from the report:

On the assumption that this recommendation is adopted, and taking the total annual expenditure at £144,887, and the increase of business at 10 per cent per annum, on 750,000 words in 1896,—

—which, I ought to say, was estimated to be one-third of the traffic of the present cables in that year—

—a Pacific cable would, if it came into actual work on the 1st of January, 1900, earn £178,437 in

its first year of working, if the rate obtained by it per word were 3s. 3d.,—

—which was a reduction from the existing rate—

—thus leaving a credit balance on the first year's working of £33,550. If the rate per word were reduced to 2s., in the year 1900 it would earn £109,807; in 1901, £120,788; in 1902, £132,867, and in 1903, £146,153. It would thus become a paying concern during the fourth year of working.

That was the estimate made in the summer of 1896. But since that time, two years have passed, and the business of existing cables between Australasia and other countries has increased even faster than the commission estimated that they would, having run up from 1,272,000 words in 1892 to 2,340,000 words in 1897, an increase of considerably over a million words, or more than 80 per cent in the five years—or at the rate of very much more than 10 per cent a year. Now, in reference to the figures put forward by that commission, it may be said that they are professedly extremely cautious figures. But it will be seen that the estimated profit is on the basis of the Pacific cable securing only one-third of the gross Australasian-European traffic, and including nothing for Australasian-American traffic. So that to sum up, the Imperial Commission in 1896, assuming that the Pacific cable got only one-third of the total business between Australasia and the rest of the world, and supposing we reduce the rates from 4s. 9d. to 2s., and suppose it did not get any trade between Australasia and America, estimated that it would become a paying concern in the fourth year of its operation. That does not look a very bad proposition on the face of it. But the estimates of the committee really go to show that, at 2s. a word, the actual expenses would be covered a year earlier than the time they set down as an absolutely sure thing.

The special report of Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal and Mr. A. G. Jones made out a little better case for the cable; and taking into account the rapid increase that had taken place since that time a still further reduction in the time before it would pay may be made. I may as well quote the figures showing the increase since 1892:

The number of words transmitted were—

In 1892 .....	1,275,191
1893 .....	1,303,336
1894 .....	1,381,400
1895 .....	1,450,446
1896 .....	2,110,917
1897 .....	2,349,901

It is not probable that the cable would be completed within three years from the present time; and assuming that the same rate of progress were to go on and that the cable were to get only one-third of the business that would be due to accrue by the year 1902, and if the rate were reduced to 2s. instead of 4s. 9d., it would appear

Mr. CRAIG.

that the cable would be a paying concern from the first year of its operation.

In the first place, it is not imperative to reduce the rate down to this very low figure; a somewhat higher rate would still be lower than the present figures, and would attract business to the cable, and make certain that it would pay expenses. In the second place, the assumption that they will only get one-third of the traffic between Australasia and the rest of the world is too low. The most important point in the whole negotiation is the fact that the land lines of the Australasian colonies belong to the governments and are operated by the Post Office Departments, and the land lines determine the route to be taken to Europe by the business which originates in these Australasian colonies. And, the Australian colonies being joint owners of this cable with Canada and with the Empire, you may surely rely on the promptings of business human nature to make it certain that they will despatch a sufficient quantity of their business over the new cable to make it pay from the day it is opened. One-half is Sir Sandford Fleming's estimate of the proportion of that business we should get. I do not think it necessary to go into particulars as to what percentage of it we may get, but I think we may safely assume that in self-interest, in order to save themselves from having to pay towards the guaranteed bonds of this line, the Australasian governments in whose jurisdiction and over whose lines this business originates, will send enough of it over this cable to make it a paying concern.

Now, we are asked by some people, though I have not heard it brought out to-day, why it is that if this thing is to be such a paying business, private capital does not take it up. In the first place, a private cable constructed from here to Australasia would not have the last great advantage that I have spoken of; it would not be sure of getting any definite share of the business originating in the Australian colonies; the governments there would have no inducement to send their business over that cable rather than over another. In the second place, private capitalists could not get money at a low enough rate to build this cable as a paying speculation. The opposition of the Eastern Extension Company, which is so powerful that it even seems to extend to the north riding of Norfolk, is extremely offensive in Great Britain in preventing a private company from getting capital at all for competing lines. If they did get it, they could not get it, probably, under 5 per cent at any rate, and the shareholders of that company would not be content with less than from 5 to 10 per cent profit on their investment. So that, taking all these considerations together, it does not seem at all possible, not to say probable, that private enterprise should build this route in such a way as to make it a paying speculation. But it is cer-

tain that the Government, borrowing money at 2½ or 2¼ per cent, and guaranteed sufficient business at the Australian end of the line, can build it, and that it will cover its expenses, and in a very few years pay a certain amount into the treasury of this country; or, if it is preferred, a reduction might be made after a certain number of years in the cable charges. I find that I have taken a great deal longer time by the clock than I intended to take in speaking on this subject, not being able to condense as well as I intended these statistics, which I have been picking up as I went along, out of the blue-book. I will close, then, reiterating only three points: In the first place, I think it is evident, from the tone of the discussion here to-day, that the people of Canada, looking at this question in a Canadian spirit, as distinct from a party spirit, are in favour of this proposal. In the second place, the proposal is a businesslike and workable one, and one certainly not involving a payment out of pocket of any money by the Government of this country. And thirdly, the scheme is one which, in its Imperial aspects, in its tendency to unite the Empire and promote intercolonial commerce, deserves that wide and general support which it appears to have.

Mr. A. McNEILL (North Bruce). This question has already been very ably discussed, and at this late period of the session I only wish to make one or two remarks. I will not refer to what fell from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), because my hon. friend who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Casey), has sufficiently dealt with that matter. I will only say, however, that I was not at all surprised at the course he took and the line of argument he pursued, because, since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, now seventeen years, the hon. member for North Norfolk has invariably taken a similar line. Whenever any great Canadian question arose, any question which could in any degree conflict, in his judgment, in the most remote degree with any American undertaking, he was always prepared to side with the American and oppose the Canadian interest, and still more has that been the case, when the question was one of an Imperial character. The hon. gentleman's mind seems necessarily opposed to all movements making for Imperial unity; therefore, what he said I only expected that he would say, when he rose to his feet; I was only surprised by the moderation of the hon. gentleman's remarks.

I do not like, Mr. Speaker, to allow this discussion to close without putting myself on record in regard to it, and saying that I am not prepared, with the information that is at present in my possession, to join in any condemnation of the course that has been pursued by the Imperial authorities in this regard. I have every reason to believe that

if this matter had been pressed upon the Imperial authorities during the Jubilee celebration, we would have by this time advanced far in the direction that we all wish to go. What the cause may have been for the course which was adopted by the Imperial authorities on a very recent occasion, I do not know; but I am not, as I have said, prepared to condemn them without knowing what motives actuated them. I think it is only fair, when blame is being apportioned, that we should state what we know, at all events, about the facts; and, just as I cannot absolve my right hon. friend from blame with regard to the preferential trade movement, neither can I absolve him from blame with regard to the Pacific cable in the course he took in England during the Jubilee celebration in 1897. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has referred to a statement made by the "Standard" newspaper. If it were only a statement made by the "Standard" newspaper that we had to go upon, I do not think that I should be inclined to refer further to the matter than to endorse the remarks made by the leader of the Opposition. But when I find a statement of this kind made in a document which has been laid on the Table of the House, I think it is only right, before blaming the authorities at home, that the people of Canada should understand just how this matter stood in 1897. The Prime Minister of Queensland writes to Sir Sandford Fleming a letter, which was laid on the Table of the House last year, in which he says:

The matter was, as you are aware, discussed at the conference between the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Premiers of the self-governing colonies held in London last year, and it was with some surprise that I heard Sir Wilfrid Laurier announce during the course of the proceedings that his Government was not yet prepared to give practical effect, so far as the Dominion of Canada was concerned, to the proposal that the colonies interested should guarantee their shares of the cost of the construction of the cable.

I do not at all wish to emphasize that matter, and I shall not say more than call attention to the fact. I want to say that I am delighted to find that better counsels prevail to-day, and I want to join with those who have already complimented the hon. Postmaster General on the course he has taken in this respect. Of course, I wish to include the Government in this, but I think the hon. Postmaster General especially, by the course he has taken, in reference to Imperial penny postage, and by his course in reference to the Pacific cable, has done solid work for the Empire, and I am glad to be able to bear testimony to that fact. I was glad to hear from him to-day the statement he has made and which shows that this great Canadian-Imperial work is in a fair way of becoming an accomplished fact.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee on the resolution.

(In the Committee.)

On the preamble,

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the hon. gentleman knows what governments are going into that agreement.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, the United Kingdom will go into it to the extent of five-eighteenths, New Zealand, to the extent of two-eighteenths, New South Wales two-eighteenths, Queensland two-eighteenths, Victoria two-eighteenths, and Canada five-eighteenths.

Mr. FOSTER. Tasmania does not come in?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No; the hon. gentleman will find the communications and all the information on the subject in the blue-book. Of course, we have nothing binding.

Mr. FOSTER. Then all this is practically agreed to?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We are so advised; we have a cable to that effect.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Your resolutions are based on the understanding and an intention, of course.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, that is in the return laid on the Table. There are one or two changes in the preamble that I desire to make. I do not think that the words "on their behalf," in the fifth line, are necessary. Therefore, I beg to move:

That the words "on their behalf" in the fifth line be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

On subsection (a),

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Since this resolution was laid on the Table, there has been the conference that I referred to a short time ago, between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and representatives of the various colonies, and they have agreed upon the number that should compose the board. Therefore, it is advisable to name the number, and for that reason I propose to put in the number eight in subsection (a), and to strike out subsection (g). However, we will come to subsection (g) in a short time. I beg to move:

That subsection (a) be amended by inserting after the word "commissioners" in the first line, the following words: "To be composed of eight members."

Subsection, as amended, agreed to.

On subsection (c),

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I beg to move:

That the blanks be filled in as follows:—In the third line, after the words "not being less than," by inserting the word "twenty-five," and in the fourth line by inserting the word "fifty"; that after the word "interest," in the fourth

Mr. McNEILL.

line, the following words be inserted: "not exceeding 3 per cent per annum"; and that the blank in the last line be filled in with the figures £1,700,000."

Subsection, as amended, agreed to.

On subsection (d),

Mr. FOSTER. There is no sinking fund set apart for extinguishing the capital.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In the estimate that I read this morning, a sinking fund is contemplated. In the annual expenditure of £144,000 is included a sinking fund, and that will renew the whole line in fifty years.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that, but it is renewal.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. But, in that, is included capital as well; it is covered by these figures.

Mr. FOSTER (reading):

Subject to the cost of operation, maintenance, management and the setting apart of such proper sinking fund, &c.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Imperial scheme already given to the House contemplates a sinking fund.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but there is no mention of it in this resolution. Why do you not provide in the resolution that there should be a sinking fund?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is covered by the word "renewal."

Mr. FOSTER. But that does not extinguish the debentures.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As long as you renew you do not have to pay off the debt.

Mr. FOSTER. But you are paying interest. If your profits were sufficient as on that last calculation they would be—a very florid calculation, I think—it will not take a great many years to extinguish the debentures and then you would not have to pay any interest. Here is your sinking fund for renewals and the profits ought do that according to that scale, and pay the original issue. Of course I suppose the commissioners would have power to do that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They might; I suppose it would be like an insurance company.

Mr. BRITTON. I suppose the commissioners would have power to purchase the debentures.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no power given them here.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think we will not be troubled for a while about that. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) intimated that the life of a cable is twenty years, but I think it is now estimated that the life of this cable in the Pacific

would be about 50 years, and, therefore, if you renew 2 per cent per year, in 50 years you would have the whole renewed. If the business over the line increases, no doubt any surplus earning for a good many years would go towards the reduction of the rate, or perhaps be invested in a larger scheme of duplicating the line.

Mr. FOSTER. It could be altered by legislation at any time.

On subsection (e),

Mr. FOSTER. Is the route fairly well defined now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We know nothing more about it than the report which says that the probable route will be from Vancouver to Fanning Islands, five degrees north of the meridian, then to Fiji, thence to Norfolk and then two branches, one to New Zealand and the other to some point in Queensland.

On section (g),

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I wish to substitute for section (g), as printed in the resolution, the following :—

The Governor in Council may pass regulations respecting the tenure of office of any members of the Board of Commissioners appointed by the Governor in Council, and shall be entitled to appoint two members of the Board of Commissioners and to fill up any vacancies arising by reason of the death, resignation or removal from the board of any commissioners so appointed.

The two commissioners so appointed by the Governor in Council and their successors shall, together with remaining six members to be appointed, three by the United Kingdom, and three by the other contributing governments and their successors, from time to time constitute the membership of the said board.

Mr. FOSTER. Has each Power a representative ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know how the Australians will divide their representatives because there are four contributing parties and they only have three representatives.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They will be federated by that time.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No doubt.

On section (i),

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think perhaps the best plan would be for the Imperial Government to guarantee the debentures, and then the other parties indemnify the Imperial Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. This clause will allow you to make a guarantee to the British Government ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. I do not wish of course to be understood as saying in the slightest degree that the Im-

perial Government intend to do that. They have no legislation yet.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no doubt they will ; the money could be raised cheaper than in any other way.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister (Mr. Mulock) is in a position to say that the policy of the Government would be to have it conducted on that line ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Oh, yes.

Mr. BELL (East Prince (P.E.I.) Is South Australia included amongst the contributing colonies ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have no advice that either South Australia or West Australia are contributing ; only the four I have named contribute.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) In what position is the claim of South Australia for damages on account of diversion of business from the line they built across the continent of Australia ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I only know from what has been stated here that such a claim has been advanced. It appears they have taken an interest in establishing a cable connection with the mainland and also in local telegraph lines, but the talk about a claim is an idea in the air. Moreover, it does not enter into the consideration of this question, because they are not as far as we know going to be parties to this scheme.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. For the information of my hon. friend (Mr. Bell), I may state that at the meeting between the representatives of all the colonies and Mr. Chamberlain, the question was asked : Whether there would be any compensation for the Eastern Telegraph Extension, or for South and West Australia in reference to the expenditure they had made, and the reply of Mr. Chamberlain was in the most emphatic terms, that there would be no question of compensation for anybody if the British Government were concerned in it.

Resolution reported ; read a second time.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 176) to provide for the establishment of direct submarine telegraphic communication between Canada and Australasia.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### SUPPLY—INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

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

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to call attention to the fact that a return which was order-

ed in reference to the dismissal of Messrs. Michaud and Belanger, of Trois Pistoles, has not been brought down. I also wish to call attention to the fact that none of the papers in reference to the Ryan claim have been brought down except simply the award of Mr. Shanley.

Mr. PRIOR. I wish to ask the Minister of Customs whether they have brought down Mr. Ogilvie's report in regard to the valuation of vessels, which was promised yesterday?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask whether Mr. Ogilvie's final report, together with the evidence taken by him, has yet been brought down. If not, I think no time should be lost in laying it on the Table and having it printed.

The PRIME MINISTER. That has been brought down, and a motion has been carried to have it printed.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Customs—

Nova Scotia ..... \$107,250

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). I want to call the attention of the House and of the Minister to some cases of fraud on the customs. As the Minister knows, the wholesale dry goods trade of the country has been very much exercised during the past year over frauds that have been perpetrated on the Customs Department. It appears that a New York firm of dry goods men have been in the habit of selling their goods to merchants in Toronto, Montreal and other places in Canada, and have been invoicing them at lower prices than the law permitted; and, not satisfied with that, they have been bringing them in under the preferential tariff, though they are goods not of British, but of German manufacture. The facts of the case were brought before the Customs Department, and a seizure was made. The facts have also been brought to the attention of the boards of trade, and the boards of trade have called the attention of the Minister of Customs and of the Government to the gross dishonesty practiced in these cases, and to the great injustice done to the honest trader in Canada. The honest trader in Canada has a reputation to sustain, he has his capital invested here, and he takes a risk if he does wrong; while these men in New York, having no capital here, and no reputation that they value very highly, have been fraudulently imposing on the Government in order to have their goods brought into Canada at a low rate of duty. The one case to which I shall specially call

Mr. FOSTER.

the attention of the House is the case of a dealer in Toronto, who is supposed to be the firm of John Macdonald & Co., an old and highly respected firm doing a large business in that city. The goods were sent to them invoiced at \$4,170, with a request to put them through the customs-house. When the firm looked at the customs entry they refused. The customs entry was only for \$2,100, whereas they were charged \$4,170. They called the attention of the importers to this fact, and the importers got a customs broker to do the work for them. These customs brokers can only act on the information that is given to them, and the customs officers are not bound to accept the information unless it complies with the law. This firm had sent their goods to New York. When they found that they could not get them in under the British preference, they had them sent back to Liverpool or London, and had them shipped from England to the firms in Canada to whom the goods were consigned; and the firm to whom the goods were consigned, I think, went to the Customs Department and made the necessary affidavits that the Customs Department requires for the obtaining of a British preference, and to my mind it shows how easily a wholesale defrauding of the customs is effected when these parties can come in and get a British preference for goods not of British manufacture at all, and which never would have been sent to Britain except for the purpose of obtaining that preference. I think that the hon. Minister would do well to inquire into those matters. In this case the invoice was for \$4,171, and the invoice used by the customs broker was only \$2,100, or at least an undervaluation of \$2,000. In this case there was a double fraud. There was first the undervaluation and then the representation that these were British goods. The Customs Department got on to the fraud and the officers made a seizure. The information that I have here, as set forth in the report of the Board of Trade of Toronto, is that these frauds have been compromised by the department for the sum of \$418. The honest traders in the country are naturally very indignant. The Board of Trade says:

The firm in question has no stake in the country beyond an office, and as it was their deliberate intention to defraud the revenue and enable them to make a profit out of such fraud to the detriment of regular trade, it is a matter of great regret to us that such a compromise has been made.

I think that the whole country will join in that regret. That statement of the Board of Trade was, I understand, not denied by the Minister of Customs in the correspondence which the Board of Trade had with him.

In the first place, the Customs Department should endeavour to build up the trade of this country and have the business of this country go into the hands of honest traders. That

is their duty. In this case, where two palpable frauds were perpetrated, the guilty parties should have been severely punished, and not let off with a penalty of \$418. It could not be pretended that it was a mistake on their part. The very fact that the attention of this firm was called to it by the firm of John Macdonald & Co., which, I think, is the firm, and that on the refusal of this firm to make the entry, they then got their broker to make an entry for them, and that when they found they could not send the goods from New York without paying full duty, as they had no proofs of British identity, it would be to their advantage to send them back to England and have them shipped to Canada from England, so as to get the British preference, they took this course—all this is proof positive of a most dishonest effort to defraud the Government.

The duty of the Government is to protect the revenue, in the first instance, to see that each one pays his share of tribute to the Government involved in customs duties, and to see that honest traders are protected. But if you give a premium to dishonesty, you destroy all legitimate business in the country, you drive business out of the hands of honest men, who will become ruined by such unfair and dishonest competition, and into the hands of rogues, scallawags and rascals. The Government should consider that they are bound in duty to protect the honest importer. It is no difference to the importer whether he pays 10 per cent, 20 per cent or 30 per cent, as long as the other importers pay the same duties on the same valuation for the same goods. These are the two things to which the Government should pay attention, but in this case, apparently, they violated both. They have disregarded the fact that honest importers should be protected, in the first place, in the valuation of their goods, and, in the second place, by not giving the 25 per cent preference on goods which are not entitled to it. In this case the penalty of \$418 imposed is a penalty not at all fitted to the crime. The Board of Trade of Toronto says further :

If aliens, having nothing at risk in the country, can pass entries to a broker, giving only two-thirds of the proper dutiable value, and escape the full penalty of the law, the extra profit to be thus made can only have the effect of encouraging others to do the same, and within a measurable time put all the importing into the hands of dishonest men, as the next time it will not be so easy of exposure, they taking care that the goods shall have passed the customs before the invoices are furnished to purchaser of the goods. It is, therefore, only in justice to ourselves, the revenue and all honest traders that we call upon the Government to let the law take its course and effect no compromise.

But, apparently, the Government failed to do their duty in this matter, and effected a compromise, if the statement of the Toronto Board of Trade is correct, and it has gone without public contradiction from the hon. Minister.

Here is another case in which the same parties, I presume, are implicated, taken from the Montreal "Herald" of October last :

Information is laid in the Exchequer Court against Michael Fitzgibbon and Frederick Schafheitlin, doing business in Montreal, for customs duties due the Government. It is alleged that between May, 1895, and February, 1896, the defendants imported into Canada goods to the value of \$59,286. There were duties to the extent of \$17,785 on the goods, and the firm only paid \$15,200, leaving a balance due the Government of \$2,584. Prior to 1895, it is said, that the firm imported \$59,284 on fraudulent invoices, thereby forfeiting to the Government double this amount, or \$118,568, and becoming liable to a penalty of \$200 in respect of each of said invoices, such penalties amounting in the aggregate to \$23,200, and defendants besides becoming liable in respect to each of said invoices to one year's term of imprisonment. The said forfeitures and penalties are incurred under section 192 of the Customs Act. The claims made by the Attorney General of Canada are as follows :—

Balance of customs duties .....	\$ 2,584
Value of goods forfeited .....	59,284
Additional value of goods forfeited..	59,284
Penalties .....	23,200
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$144,352</b>

#### Another Information.

Another information in the same case is taken against Thorrel, Fitzgibbon & Co., which, without penalties, may be summarized as follows :—Balance of duties payable on goods imported from the 1st of January, 1892, to 30th April, 1895, inclusive, \$9,694 ; duties payable on goods imported previous to 1892, \$34,272 ; making a total of \$43,921, with interest to be added from the respective dates of the importation of the goods.

So that these firms' robberies of the Government have been going on for an extended period. Perhaps I had better not refer to the matter further until we hear from the Minister of Customs what he has done about these cases to obtain justice for the people of Canada and the honest importer. The information I have is, that efforts have been made by the parties interested, and by very strong friends of the Government to get the matter settled. I would like to know from the Minister of Customs whether this has yet been settled or not ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Patterson). With reference to the last matter, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) mentioned, it is before the courts, and, of course, he will see that I can hardly be expected to say anything more on that point. The merits of the case will be determined by the courts.

Mr. WALLACE. What court is it before ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The matter was handed over by the Department of Customs to the Department of Justice, and they are taking steps in the matter, I suppose, before the Exchequer Court. At

any rate, it is wholly in the hands of the Department of Justice.

Mr. WALLACE. The statement I have does not corroborate that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I say it is in the hands of the Justice Department.

Mr. WALLACE. That is very indefinite.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You mean with reference to the courts?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; before which court is it now?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not prepared to say; it is in the hands of the Department of Justice, and they are attending to it. With reference to the other case the hon. gentleman has mentioned, and in which he has read—correctly, as far as my recollection goes—the communication of the board of trade, perhaps the hon. gentleman has already seen that the department replied to the board of trade, answering their question, and pointing out our desire to conserve the interest of the revenue, as is our bounden duty. I think I have seen in the press also that an action for libel has been entered by the gentlemen alluded to as having defrauded the revenue, against the parties who signed that letter. I suppose, if that action goes on, the facts in that case also will come before the courts. I do not know that it would be proper for me to say more than that, in that case, as in other cases, the department has followed the law as closely and as fully as their judgment would enable them to do. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) has administrated the department, and he knows that where it is charged that there is undervaluation, and so on, if a seizure is made, an officer under the Commissioner of Customs goes into all the facts and collects the evidence. That goes to the Commissioner of Customs, who must go carefully into it, weigh the evidence, and present his report to the Minister. The duty is then imposed upon the Minister of deciding the case, and also deciding what penalty shall be inflicted—whether a mitigated penalty or the full penalty. That has been done. I can say quite confidently, with a desire on the part of every officer to do what is just to all parties and to protect the interest of the revenue. As I stated, if the case is to go into the courts, I think the hon. gentleman will see it may be better to let it remain until a decision is given. I might venture to say this, however—as I said in the reply of the department to the representation of the board of trade—that, as to one of the main allegations in one of the cases the hon. gentleman mentioned, we had testimony in the other direction. With reference to the other matter, I think that if the hon. gentleman were in possession of all the facts, he would agree that the department had done what was substantially

Mr. PATERSON.

just. There might be a difference of opinion, of course; but I think, if he were in a position to weigh and to know all the facts, he would agree that the decision was not very widely wrong. The department are fully alive to their duty. Where cases of deliberate fraud are discovered, they are punished, and punished severely. But the hon. gentleman knows that if a case of undervaluation brings an importer within the scope of the law, and the Minister is convinced that the wrong is not intentional, but is due to ignorance of the law, it has been the custom, ever since there was a Customs Department, to impose only a mitigated penalty.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand the hon. gentleman is speaking of the Levison case. Perhaps he would give us some idea of the case and of the decision of the department.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I should have no objection, as Minister, to give the facts of the case; but the question arises in my mind as to whether it would be right for a Minister to open up a case for investigation here, in view of the action that has been entered, and is yet to be tried, in the courts.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As I understood the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), he made a statement and receded from it to a very considerable extent. Otherwise I could see more force in what he said. He said that the case was before the courts, that his department had sent it to the Department of Justice. But I wanted to ask whether the Department of Justice has taken proceedings against the parties, and my hon. friend was unable to say that they had. We have nothing to do with the fact that the parties have brought suits for libel against certain newspapers. That is an entirely different case, it has nothing to do with this question. Here is a matter which the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) has referred to the Department of Justice. With what report? Has the Minister of Justice reported, stating that he believed the law had been violated, and that he had taken the necessary steps to vindicate the law? If that were the case, then provided the Department of Justice had entered action, it would be before the courts, otherwise I do not think it is. I think it is a case concerning which the Minister is perfectly justified in stating all the facts, and the view he has taken upon it, and has submitted to the Justice Department.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Perhaps the hon. gentleman was not in all the time I was speaking. A little difficulty arose from the late Controller bringing up two separate cases. The first case he mentioned was in the position stated by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. WALLACE. Which case is under the libel?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That of Fitzgibbon, Shaftlein & Co., the case to which the leader of the Opposition has referred. That seemed to be a very involved case, running over a number of years; and instead of determining the penalty, as the statute gives me power to do, as Minister, upon the report of the commissioner, there is an alternative in the law providing that the case may be referred to the courts. As it was an involved case running over a number of years, and as the papers connected with it were very extended, I thought it was better to hand it over to the courts to deal with; so it was handed over to the Department of Justice, who have entered suit, and it is before the courts now. The other case transpired in Toronto. That is a case in which the dry goods section of the board of trade, through information, I suppose, furnished to them by one of their members, thought that the department had not fully secured the ends of justice, or had not sufficiently punished the parties for what the members of the board of trade thought to be a fraud. From knowledge which I suppose they possess, they seem to think it rather a gross fraud, which had not been punished to the extent the offenders deserved. After we had the statements that were made, and the defence that was put in, the department were unable to see, from all the information we had before us, and some of which the dry goods section of the board of trade could not have had before them—we were not able to see that the charges of fraud were sustained. That being the case, the view the department took was that there had been an irregularity, and that a penalty should be imposed for that irregularity. But we were unable to take the view, and did not take the view, that fraud had been perpetrated in the manner which was understood by the dry goods section of the board of trade. We did not think that was proved by all the evidence that was before us, at least as concerns one of the charges on which we had testimony. I have spoken thus freely so far, because the department have made that manifest in their reply to the board of trade, and it has become a matter of publication in the press. Manifestly the department cannot enter into a discussion with the public press, it would not be expected; we have just to do our duty as the law prescribes to the best of our ability and our judgment. Now, having referred to this matter, hon. gentlemen who sit opposite me and who have been Ministers themselves, know just how far we could go. I have seen in the press that these parties against whom charges of fraud are alleged feel that they have been wronged, and they have entered suit for libel therefor. If that suit goes on, I suppose the whole facts will be brought out in the courts. Whether it is my duty to state fully the facts or to make statements in reference to this matter now, I leave it in a measure to the hon. gentlemen

themselves to say, as I am in a little doubt about it. But so far as I myself am concerned, or any officers of the department are concerned, we would not have the slightest objection that all the papers should be laid upon the Table; it would be I think under the circumstances, especially as the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) has mentioned it, in the interest of the department so to do, but I question if it would be a proper thing for me to do it. I submit to the leader of the Opposition whether, under the circumstances, it should be done. These are not the only cases that have occurred, similar cases are coming before the department continually. I would not venture to say how many cases come up during a week or a month, involved cases, where questions of valuation are concerned, and where it is difficult to determine where the line of fraud has been passed, and where the Act contemplates that the department should exercise its discretion in fixing the penalties. All I can say to the hon. gentleman in reference to this matter is that the department did impose the penalty that it considered sufficient, that they considered these parties deserved to be visited with for the irregularity in the transaction. Now, if I do not say more, I beg to assure hon. gentlemen opposite in the most positive manner that it is not because the department have anything to conceal, because, owing to the action taken by the dry goods section of the Board of Trade, we would be placed in a light more favourable, perhaps than would otherwise be the case.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister has spoken quite a long time, but I do not know that he has said anything. He has multiplied words without giving us any information, and I presume that was the object of his repeating over and over again his desire to act fairly and honestly, and do justice to everybody, and so forth. But specific statements were made, and those statements have not been replied to. Specific statements were made that this firm, Levison Bros., had sold an invoice of goods to a firm in Toronto, John Macdonald & Co. I shall presume is the name, for \$4,170, that they presented the invoice to the customs and had it passed through for \$2,100. You add the duty, freights and profits, and it would not bring it up to \$3,000, a manifest fraud. Macdonald & Co. refused to enter the goods, then these parties took the manifest and passed the goods through the customs. Macdonald & Co. saw it was a fraud, and refused to pass them through the customs, and told them so. Then they took these goods—because this is only one of a number of cases—and brought them to New York where they have an agency, as well as in Portland. They shipped the goods back to London, Eng., and thence to Canada in order to make it appear they were British goods. Now, these were the facts alleged by

the board of trade, they were proved by the board of trade, and the Minister of Customs does not give us a particle of information. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs whether these goods were entered as British goods?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think so.

Mr. WALLACE. Duty was paid, a forethought, and it shows that the Government permit these Germans in New York to enter as goods of British manufacture what never have been British goods, were not manufactured in Britain, and were never owned there. The Minister has not a word to reply to that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. To what?

Mr. WALLACE. As to the fact, as I have charged, that these goods had been sent out to New York, that they had been taken back to England and shipped to Canada in order to be labelled as British goods and get the one-quarter preference, or as the hon. Minister calls it, the 25 per cent off.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Does the hon. gentleman say that they were not goods of British manufacture?

Mr. WALLACE. Certainly.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, then, the hon. gentleman is not in possession of the facts.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister himself just said a moment ago that these goods were not of British manufacture. I understood him to say so.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the hon. Minister say now that these goods were of British manufacture?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I say that they claimed to be goods of British manufacture, and as far as the evidence before the department went, they were goods of British manufacture.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister is not prepared to say that they were of British manufacture. All that he says is that they were claimed to be goods of British manufacture, and that, as far as the evidence before the department went, they were.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What more could I say?

Mr. WALLACE. What did the evidence of John Macdonald show?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In the case to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and that is one of the points that we must consider, a libel suit has been entered against the dry goods section of the

Mr. WALLACE.

board of trade. We have arrived at this point, that these parties have charged that there has been fraud committed. The hon. gentleman can do that with impunity in this House, but these other gentlemen must assume responsibility for their statements, and the information that may be given here may be used in that suit. It is a question whether I ought to give such information or not. I have gone so far as to state that the charge was that the goods were not of British origin, and that the department, on the evidence before them, thought they were of British origin.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend take the ground that he is not to give information to Parliament, because, either at the present time, or at some future time, a libel suit, or a suit of any kind, is, or may be, brought by the party who has been before the Customs Department, and because the information that is given here might be used in the suit one way or the other? I do not think my hon. friend will take that ground. I am afraid the hon. Minister's conscience is just now a little bit too tender. If it were as tender always we might not have some of the transactions coming before the House of such a doubtful character as we have had. The hon. Minister has had a customs case before him; he has investigated it, given his decision, and as far as the Customs Department is concerned, it is settled. Parliament has a right to know the rights of the case. The hon. Minister has only to give the facts; the facts cannot injure any innocent party, and can have no appreciable effect on the courts. In this case two charges have been made. One is that a preference on the goods of supposedly British manufacture has been given, and the other, which is a more patent conclusion, is that there was undervaluation. I would like to know, if that undervaluation was a patent conclusion, why the Minister let the parties off with a fine of \$418?

Mr. WALLACE. No fine at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Why do we not seem to be able to get the facts?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is just a point as to how far a person would be justified in bringing up matters and in speaking about transactions that are coming up before the courts.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister knows that this is not the first case under these very items. There is another libel suit.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), has taken the ground that there has been undervaluation. We had this charge before us. It was charged that there was fraudulent undervaluation, in effect, and there was also

the claim that these were not British goods. The department consider that the evidence they had before them justified them in believing that the goods were bona fide of British manufacture. The department also, from the evidence they had before them, felt that they could not come to any other conclusion than that there had not been a deliberate fraud or intent to defraud.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that all the hon. Minister has to give us?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What more do you want?

Mr. FOSTER. Cannot the hon. Minister give us the facts of the case? Is he going to close his mouth and take the ground that, because a libel suit is going on somewhere, he will not give us any information about it? Cannot the hon. Minister give a simple relation of the facts of the case. Perhaps there are some hon. gentlemen in this committee who have a little common sense which they may be able to bring to bear upon them. There is an idea prevalent in the country that there is a liability to gross frauds and unfair competition, in the matter of undervaluation, and in reference to the preferential clause, as to whether goods are really made in Great Britain or not. The Minister may refine, but he cannot refine that feeling away, and it is a feeling that should be allayed if it has no foundation. A simple recital of the facts of the case would give hon. members an idea of them, and they may be allowed to draw their own conclusions. Surely the tender conscience of the hon. Minister does not go so far as to refuse information to the committee because there may be a libel suit against the board of trade. The board of trade are big enough to take care of themselves. Anyway the facts of the case never can prejudice anybody.

Mr. WALLACE. Besides that I may say that Fitzgibbon, Shaftlein & Co. brought a libel suit against the editor of the "Shareholder." There was a good deal of investigation about it; the Government sent their man, Mr. Russell, apparently, to Berlin to see about it. But, the libel suit never was prosecuted; they knew better than to bring the editor of the "Shareholder," Mr. Smyth, into court. They dropped the suit, and they will not bring Mr. Macdonald into court. Men who have been thieving and stealing are not quite brazen enough to take an honest man into court because he exposes their thefts and dishonesty. Yet the hon. Minister of Customs says that he is not going to say anything about the case because he might be brought into court as a witness. Such an excuse will hardly stand water.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I did not take that ground.

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. gentleman has any evidence to give, the fact that he has made a statement in Parliament will not prevent him from being called as a witness because the parties to the suit know what he has done in connection with it. It will not protect him. Here is a statement of this case that I have received. It says:

That the amount of the invoice presented to them by Levison Bros. was \$4,179. This, of course, included duty and freight, and they also say that the invoice presented to the customs by W. C. Irwin, broker, was \$2,100. Assuming that the duty on the goods was 35 per cent, less  $\frac{1}{2}$ , or 26 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, as they were passed as British, and allowing 6 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent for freights and charges, which is about what it costs us, 26 $\frac{1}{2}$  plus 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ , or 32 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, you see that \$3,100 plus 32 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent is about \$4,179, so that \$3,100 would be about the proper amount for duty, i.e., the price at which the goods are sold in the country of export, so that those facts are about right.

If that is the case there was \$1,000 worth of goods which did not pay any duty at all. The Minister (Mr. Paterson) shakes his head, but I am reading the figures. At the preferential rate there would be \$262 duty unpaid on that one invoice. But this business extends all over the country, and has been for many years, and if these men have been doing wrong they have been doing wrong continually. The theory is that if you do wrong you do it knowingly, and that is truer with the customs law than with anything else. An ordinary man might plead he did not know such and such a law was passed, but it is the special duty and business of the importers to see what changes are made in the customs law. The great opening for fraud is that these men invoiced to themselves. This is a German-New York firm, and the invoice was made to them in this country, and there is always cause for suspicion in a matter of that kind. There is always suspicion of wrong-doing when a firm invoices to itself, and I remember several cases that arose in that way. This firm sends several hundreds of invoices into Canada; they invoice every one of these lots of goods to themselves, and the Minister is bound to make an investigation. In this case he made an investigation, and he fined or inflicted some sort of a penalty on this firm amounting to \$418, when he discovered they had committed wrong. Is that correct?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I can only speak from memory at this moment, but I dare say these figures are correct.

Mr. WALLACE. Was that a penalty or what was it?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. As far as I remember, the penalty was that they did not receive the preferential rate, and I think, perhaps, double that amount, because of the irregularity they committed, but which we did not view as a deliberate fraud. The department believes that they were British

goods, and it does not believe that they were fraudulently undervalued.

Mr. WALLACE. Were they undervalued at all?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We thought they were undervalued in this way. The goods were bought originally at an inland port and they were shipped from Liverpool to here, but they were valued at the cost in the inland port, and we added to the value the cost of the transport from the inland port to Liverpool. We held that the value of the goods should be taken at the port of shipment, and this being the irregularity, there was the penalty inflicted, that they did not get the benefit of the preferential tariff, and a mitigated penalty of an amount equal to the reduction on the preferential tariff was added to it. That is what I remember about it.

Mr. WALLACE. Was this the only penalty on Levison Bros.?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think that is all, speaking from memory. The department came to the conclusion that the goods were not fraudulently undervalued, and that they were of British origin. We held that the fraud alleged by the dry goods section of the board of trade did not exist, and the department came to that conclusion with all the evidence before them, and the defence that was put in. There was, as we thought, an irregularity not amounting to a fraudulent undervaluation at all, and this mitigated penalty was imposed.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister speaks of a fraudulent undervaluation. Was there any undervaluation?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. An undervaluation to the extent I have explained as to the difference between the freight from the inland point to the seaport.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot understand. Would the Minister give the House a brief recital of the circumstances of the Levison case.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have not the papers before me, but I will speak from memory, and I think I may be pretty nearly correct. Levison Bros. are a firm in New York having connections in Britain as well, I believe. It shipped over to the New York firm several cases of goods, perhaps eight or ten, and those goods were placed in bond in the United States. One, or perhaps two, cases, had been taken out of bond, and had been entered and duty paid in the United States. They re-shipped those goods from New York to Liverpool, and the American Government refunded the duty to them on the case or two of goods which they took out of bond. The fact that they had passed the customs in New York at the valuation at which they came in here, was, as I understand it, one of the proofs as to the correct

Mr. PATERSON.

valuation, for they are very particular about their valuation in the United States. These goods were sent back to Liverpool, and they were re-marked and then shipped from Liverpool over to John Macdonald & Co. I am not sure whether they were shipped to the address of John Macdonald & Co. or to Levison Bros. themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there a Levison Bros. in Toronto?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They are there now, I think, but I do not know if they had a firm there at that time. They were shipping there, at all events. I think what the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) says is correct, as far as I remember, that they asked John Macdonald & Co. to pay the duty and pass the goods. They had sold these goods to John Macdonald & Co., but they were to be delivered duty paid, and if John Macdonald & Co. paid the duty, that, I suppose, would be allowed when it came to a settlement between them. They had sold the goods to John Macdonald & Co. for very much more than the invoice that was presented at customs; the invoice to John Macdonald & Co. included the duty and the freight on the goods sold. As the hon. member (Mr. Wallace) says, I suppose the firm of John Macdonald & Co. thought there was too big a discrepancy.

Mr. WALLACE. A thousand dollars.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That left a thousand dollars difference between the invoice they presented at the customs and the invoice they had given to John Macdonald, and the Macdonald firm arrived at the conclusion in their own mind, I suppose, that there had been a fraud committed upon the customs to this extent of \$1,000. Now, the department, with the evidence they have before them, do not believe that to be correct. If you ask me how to explain it, I shall not say that they made \$1,000 profit out of John Macdonald & Co. on the transaction. I have no doubt that when Levison Bros. sold the goods to John Macdonald & Co., they did not sell them at what the goods cost them in England. They would have their profit on them. Whether they had a large or a small profit, I cannot tell. What the department had to satisfy ourselves of was, whether the goods were of British origin, and whether they were entered at the correct valuation; and upon both of these points the department were satisfied. Something should be added for freight from the inland town where the price was fixed, to Liverpool, where they were shipped.

Mr. FOSTER. And they came in under the preferential rate.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I forget at the moment whether they passed at the preferential rate or not; I believe they did. At any rate, in the penalty imposed upon

them, they were not allowed the preferential rate, because of this irregularity.

Mr. FOSTER. What irregularity?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We considered that it was an irregularity that the full price of the shipment was not stated. The price given was the price fixed at an inland town, whereas they were not shipped from there, but from Liverpool, and an amount should have been added for freight between those two points. We did not regard the valuation as fraudulent, but as irregular. There was a question, too, as to whether they might ship these goods from the United States, or whether, having taken them out of bond in New York and shipped them back to England, and then shipped them from England to Canada, they would be subject to a provision in the Customs Act which requires that goods lying in bond in a foreign country cannot be shipped to Canada without adding to the valuation the duty of the country in which they lie. But these goods were not shipped from the United States, but from England, and on that point the Department of Justice was consulted before a decision was arrived at.

Mr. WALLACE. If the Minister of Customs was as much mystified, when he was giving that decision, as he is to-day, I do not wonder at his giving this decision and practically exonerating these men from defrauding honest dealers in the country; because that is what it looks like from the admissions made. The Minister says that we are not to suppose that these men did without a little profit in the transaction, and he says: "I am not going to say what profit they received." Well, we can easily compute. They entered these goods at \$2,100. If you add 6½ per cent to the 26½ per cent which my correspondent says would cover freight and expenses, you have 32½ per cent on \$2,100, which is \$682.50, making a total of \$2,782.50. That \$2,100 includes Mr. Levison's profits. He is selling the goods at that price, and he has no right to add 5 cents for profit after making that entry. He is bound to enter the goods at the price at which he has sold them, which, I presume, is the selling price in the country from which they were exported. The goods were invoiced in Toronto at \$4,179, and we assume that they were worth that in Toronto, because Macdonald & Co., and all the other dry goods dealers who are buying goods in the English and German markets, and who know what the prices are, estimated the goods to be worth \$4,179 delivered in Toronto. That price was made up by the price in England and Germany, plus the freight, plus the duty. The man who sells to them does not sell without a profit; so that, if an honest entry had been made, \$3,100 would have been the price for duty. This writer says:

Assuming that the duty on the goods was 35 per cent, less one-fourth, or 26½ per

cent, as they were passed as British, and allowing 6½ per cent for freights and charges, which is about what it costs us, 26½ plus 6½, or 32½ per cent, you see that \$3,100 plus 32½ per cent is about \$4,179, so that \$3,100 would be about the proper amount for duty, i.e., the price at which the goods are sold in the country of export, so that those facts are about right.

Now, \$3,100 was the correct price for duty in England, if \$4,179 was the correct price for the goods delivered in Toronto, and \$3,100 is about the price at which they should have been entered in Toronto; but they were entered at \$2,100, so that there was a fraudulent attempt to defeat the customs out of the duties on \$1,000 worth of goods, which were practically imported free into Canada. The Minister says they have a right to have any profit they like. So they may; but the goods have to be entered for duty at the fair, open market value in England, or in the country from which they are imported. That was not done. The Minister says that these goods were in the city of New York, and were taken back to the old country. So that both the charges that have been made in this matter have been practically admitted to be true by the Minister: first, that these goods were taken to New York and then brought back to England in order to be shipped from England to get the benefit of the British preference. That was known, apparently, to the Minister, because he has stated it to the House. These were United States goods; they were in the warehouse in New York, and they should not have been allowed the British preference. But they got the British preference, and they were undervalued to the extent of \$1,000. So that the country was defrauded, in the first instance, by permitting these goods to come in 26½ per cent, and in the second place, by \$1,000 worth of goods being allowed to come in without paying any duty whatever.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose there were a lot of goods landed in New York, that they paid duty in New York, and that they were distributed to private warehouses there. Suppose those goods have been brought from the continent to New York and the importer, who had not been successful in making sale, ships them back to Great Britain, stores them in Liverpool, and then sends them from Liverpool to Toronto as British goods and claims the preferential rate. Do these goods lose the privilege of the manufacture of the country from which they come, when they are taken into New York and distributed there in private warehouses and the American duty paid?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the duty is paid in the States and the goods distributed there, they would not likely be sent back to England again and pay double freight.

Mr. FOSTER. If these goods were entered at New York for home consumption and

the duty paid on them, does the department recognize that they can be shipped back again to England and reshipped from England to this country and entered here at the preferential rate?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We took the advice of the Justice Department on that point, and the decision was that when the goods were of British manufacture and shipped direct from Great Britain to Canada, they had to be recognized as entitled to the preferential rate, even if they had been previously shipped to New York.

Mr. FOSTER. How does the hon. gentleman propose to make sure that these goods are or are not of British manufacture? The incentive of the reduction of one-quarter of the duty is a strong one, which did not previously exist, so that what was not customary, under the old tariff, might now become a matter of steady business. Supposing a lot of goods from the continent went into New York. The Customs Department there would know whence they come and apportion the duties accordingly. The duties are paid, but these men then reshipped the goods to England and got a refund of the duty from the United States. It does not matter how they got this refund but they did. They are then shipped from Liverpool to Canada, and there is nothing to show that they come from Germany or any particular place. What machinery has the hon. gentleman to make sure that he can decide whether those are of British origin or not?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Of course we have to take the declaration of the shipper from England as to whether there is 25 per cent of British labour in them or not. As a rule, we have no reason to believe that the shippers will make a false declaration. If they do, and it is proved, they come under the customs law.

Mr. FOSTER. All that my hon. friend requires is a statement that these are of British manufacture, and in 99 cases out of 100 his customs officer will not go behind that statement. Is it an affidavit or what is it?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is a declaration.

Mr. FOSTER. The customs officers accept the declaration?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the rule?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The appraiser may use his judgment.

Mr. FOSTER. We are not talking about the appraiser. We will suppose the value is correctly given. What these men are looking for is the reduction in duty on the preferential basis, and in 99 cases out of 100 the customs officer does not go back on the statement of the British shipper.

Mr. FOSTER.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We can go back in every case.

Mr. FOSTER. But in 99 cases out of 100 you accept that statement. It is only when some suspicious circumstances arise and your officers get on the scent of something wrong that an investigation takes place, but unless that happens there is no investigation. Consequently it amounts to this, that you can carry on the largest possible trade in continental goods by the simple device of sending them, first, to New York and then reshipping them to Liverpool, then getting in Liverpool a statement that they are of British manufacture, and then shipping them to this country and getting the advantage of the 25 per cent preferential reduction. In 99 cases out of 100 where there is no suspicion or surmise of anything wrong, these will come in to the detriment of the honest importers, who are at the mercy of that sort of thing. That is what makes the Toronto Board of Trade and almost every large Board of Trade in this country so emphatic with reference to those representations, and so indignant, when a man is caught making false representations, that a compromise should be arrived at instead of imposing on him the severest penalty possible under the law.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What did he do wrong? Were they not British goods?

Mr. FOSTER. What did he do wrong? In the case of which I am speaking—

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, in this case.

Mr. FOSTER. In the case of which I am speaking, we have gone on the assumption that they are German goods.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But they are not; they are British goods.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) is evidently determined not to accept the conclusion on the general subject to which his own argument leads, so I will go over the whole thing with him again. Now, assume that there is a firm unprincipled enough to profit by the 25 per cent reduction, and, to do so, is ready to carry on an operation of a kind that my hon. friend admitted could be carried on. He commences by making a shipment of German goods to New York—consigning them to his own firm or a firm allied with him in New York. By some means they do as my hon. friend admitted had been done in this case—they get the bulk broken and get goods re-shipped to Liverpool and get a refund of duty. In Liverpool the same firm puts upon them the statement that they are of British manufacture, and so they leave the warehouse in Liverpool and come to Toronto. Now, my hon. friend says that unless there is something apparently wrong

the customs officers do not go behind the simple declaration as to the origin of the goods. The goods are entered on the basis of the 25 per cent preference and are so sold in Canada, and every honest merchant and importer in the Dominion is liable to the unfair competition of those who carry on operations of that kind.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Could not that be done without sending the goods to New York?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose it could.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Why should they send them to New York, then?

Mr. FOSTER. There might be less likelihood of detection than if they are sent direct; the origin of the goods might be less easy to prove if they are exported to one country, re-imported into Great Britain, and then sent out to Canada—in such a process you necessarily lose trace of the goods.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). What then?

Mr. FOSTER. I rather thought my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) could see it. What takes place is that the honest importers are liable to competition of this kind, to take away 25 per cent of their profits by means of this manipulation of goods in relation to duties. That is what makes honest traders mad; and when a case of this kind comes up, they are angry and think they are not treated fairly if the utmost penalty is not exacted—and they claim that it has not been exacted in this case, but that there has been a compromise and a light compromise.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Let me ask my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) a question—

Mr. FOSTER. Wait a moment.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Where would they get—

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to ask you to keep my hon. friend quiet for a moment, and then we will answer his question. I call attention to this matter to show that this preference may be used to bring in foreign goods to almost any extent, and so to militate against the interests of the honest importers in that respect, and also to show that, in proportion as it does that, it is a fraud upon the face of it, and does not justify the claim that the 25 per cent reduction inures entirely to goods of British manufacture. It shows the hollowness of the claim that has been made that British trade is helped by this 25 per cent reduction. When the hon. gentleman himself says that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred there is no way by which you can detect foreign goods marked as British goods and brought into the country under this 25 per cent reduction.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman is departing from this case altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. So I am.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He is arguing that this 25 per cent preference may be claimed for goods which are not entitled to it. When this preference was proposed the hon. gentleman and his friends took strong ground and said it could not be worked. They demanded to know how we were going to know which were British goods, and seemed to think it was beyond the wit of man to devise any means by which this preference could be given only to those goods for which it was intended. I can only say that the department have used such intelligence as they have and have prepared rules and regulations which they believe secured to British goods and to British goods alone, the preference in this market to which, under the law, they are entitled, and which the hon. gentleman and his friends thought it was beyond human power to secure. Take the case the hon. gentleman has mentioned. What is the use of supposing that a man, if he is going to defraud the customs, will ship his goods to New York, then back to Liverpool and then to Canada? Why should he pay for freight to New York and back? Why not ship the goods from Great Britain at once? And if he sent German goods from New York to England and shipped them from there, how is he going to get his certificate of British manufacture? Who is going to make the declaration? We would not take the declaration of British manufacture from a man in New York or in Germany.

Mr. FOSTER. Where do you take it from?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. From the exporter in Great Britain, the manufacturer who is to certify that these goods are bona fide.

Mr. WALLACE. Allow me to call the hon. gentleman's attention—

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Allow me to finish.

Mr. WALLACE. The broker in Toronto put these goods through and the Government accept them.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, but on the declaration of the British exporter that they were British goods.

Mr. WALLACE. I thought it was the British manufacturer.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The exporter of these goods.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it the British exporter or the British manufacturer of these goods?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It must be the British exporter.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister said it must be the manufacturer.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They are shipped direct from the British manufacturer if he is the exporter.

Mr. FOSTER. But this man Levison is the exporter from Liverpool after the goods have come back from New York. Levison is in New York and he ships his goods to Levison at Liverpool—let us say Levison, but that does not make any difference. Levison in Liverpool ships them to Toronto. Whose statement as to origin is taken in that case? It is Levison's, is it not?

Mr. WALLACE. Anybody can be an exporter and take that kind of affidavit. It is only the manufacturer who can know of his own knowledge whether these are British goods.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have just consulted the Commissioner of Customs, who was up here to see me on another matter, and he tells me that in this case of Levison, the certificate declaring these to be goods of British origin was made by Mr. Labatt, the British manufacturer, from whom he bought the goods. The declaration is not made by Levison.

Mr. FOSTER. But that does not answer my question. I am asking for information. Suppose that a man in New York reshipped goods to Liverpool, to his own warehouse or any other person's, and they are shipped from there to Toronto, who makes the affidavit or statement that these are goods of British manufacture? Is it the exporter?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That answer makes it plain. Then my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) is entirely dependent on the honesty of the person who makes the declaration. As my hon. friend says, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the customs officer does not go behind the statement of the man who makes the declaration. It is possible, then, for any man to send his goods in.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend can suggest any way of preventing it—

Mr. FOSTER. That is just the difficulty that we pointed out when this preferential tariff was brought down. Now, I am not discussing this from any point of advantage to be gained, except that I want to see where we are, and if we really do have any safeguard against that kind of thing. I put this and that together, that the exporter from Liverpool, we will say, is the man who make the declaration, if he is unprincipled he will make an unprincipled and false declaration, and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred,

Mr. FOSTER.

when they come to the customs on this side, the Minister himself has said that the customs officers do not go behind the statement.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I say he can in every case.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not say that he could not, and what I said the Minister says was that as a matter of fact he did not, and that is the point I want to bring out, that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, he does not go behind the simple statement as it appears, and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred fraud is possible with reference to that. Therefore, the preferential tariff is one which is beset with the cardinal difficulty that you are at the mercy of people who can impose upon you with 99-100 of these imports.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is perfectly correct as to the possibility, yet he will, of course, bear in mind that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the exporter is a well-known and reputable British house. Nine-tenths of the business, I fancy, that comes in of that character comes from well-known established houses, and the presumption is that they are houses which will keep faith, and so their declaration should be received. I admit the possibility of what my hon. friend says, but he must recollect—he claims to be as much as we are, though in a somewhat different form, in favour of preferential trade—that he will have the very same difficulty under the system of trade that he recommends. His argument rather tends to the conclusion that preferential trade is an impossibility, because these difficulties might arise, and we might be the victims of fraud.

Mr. FOSTER. But in our case we get a quid pro quo.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But getting the quid pro quo will make no difference so far as concerns the fraud in entering goods in Canada; everything my hon. friend complains of would still remain. The very possibility that occurs under the present condition would occur if my hon. friend's views prevailed.

Mr. CLANCY. I would ask the hon. gentleman if the declaration that is made by the English manufacturer or exporter, as the case may be, requires him to state that the goods were of wholly British manufacture, or partly so, because there is a great deal of what may be raw material in one man's hands, while the finished article may be in another man's hands?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, the declaration requires that there shall be 25 per cent of English manufacture, that the goods shall be enhanced in value that much by British labour.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand the Minister to say that if 25 per cent of the value of the

goods exported was of British origin and 75 per cent of foreign origin, these goods would come to Canada from Great Britain and obtain the advantage of the preferential tariff; is that right?

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** They are to be enhanced at least 25 per cent in value by British labour.

**Mr. CLARKE.** Then, three-fourths of the value of these goods may be foreign, that is, if 75 per cent in value is German, or Belgian, or French, and 25 per cent is British, and these goods are imported into Canada from England, they obtain the advantage of the preferential tariff; is that right?

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** Yes.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** But the hon. gentleman must remember that Britain usually imports all the raw material, three-fourths of the value of that would probably be raw material imported from the wide world, and British labour entering into it makes it a British manufacture. If my hon. friend would make it more restrictive than that, then he would prevent the British preference amounting to anything at all.

**Mr. CLANCY.** I understand that there is a large volume of business done in England in making goods up partially, the goods are partly made by the very cheap labour on the continent, and these are put together and completed in England, and I wanted to know if even an additional value of 25 per cent was given to these foreign goods, they can then be imported into this country and obtain advantage of the preferential tariff?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Yes, they could, because the value of goods must settle the question, 25 per cent of British labour creates it a British manufacture; and while it is possible that the goods may be introduced in a half manufactured state, and then finished in Great Britain, unless the finishing process amounts to 25 per cent of the whole value, they could not get in under the preferential tariff.

**Mr. CLARKE.** Is it found from the experience of the department so far, that the certificate of the exporter of these goods is sufficient? Would it not be possible, where the goods are of British origin, to get the certificate of the manufacturer?

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** No, that might be a difficult matter. Now, I would say that we had a great deal of difficulty in adopting that 25 per cent which we thought was the proper figure to represent the enhanced value of the finished article by British labour. If an article comes partly from another country to be finished in Great Britain, at least 25 per cent of British labour must have gone into it to make it ready for export, and my conviction is that the goods that have been entered under our preferen-

tial tariff are goods that are entitled to it. You can go behind the declaration of the exporter, yet, in the great majority of cases, as you know, parties importing goods from reputable and well-known houses are men who would not do anything of that kind, there is no danger of it. With reference to the possibility of fraud that the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) pointed out, of course, I admit that fraud is possible, but it is just as possible without a British preferential tariff as under it. If parties will send goods in here at an undervaluation, designedly and fraudulently, we must detect that in the best way we can, and if we can, we punish them. But it would be too much to say that there never would have been any cases of that kind without this preferential tariff, because we have had such cases and they have been punished. And so with reference to the preference, if they make a declaration that is false, why, they are liable then to all the penalties under the Customs Act. We have just as good security I consider, under that clause with reference to the valuation as we can have for the honest payment of the revenue. Frauds are possible, but I think fewer frauds, perhaps, will be found in connection with goods bearing the declaration of the British exporter, than from any other country.

**Mr. CLANCY.** The hon. gentlemen have receded very much from the position they took when this resolution was introduced by the Minister of Finance. The position they took then was that the greater part of the article must be of British manufacture, but they have reduced it now to one-fourth in order to bring it within a rule that they think will protect the revenue of Canada. Now, it is a well-known fact, as the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has pointed out, that there are large quantities of foreign goods that are completed in England. Take the case of leather. Suppose the leather were exported from the United States, there is no duty on that entering into Great Britain, and it could be made up into boots and shoes there and brought back to Canada. Now, that would be infinitely cheaper for the American manufacturer who wants to get into Canada against the duty of 30 per cent or 35 per cent. He could get in much better that way than by paying the duty on direct importations into Canada. So that the hon. gentleman will see that, when you adopt the rule of 25 per cent, foreign goods will seek this back door for the purpose of getting the Canadian preference. It has been long enough in operation to enable the ingenuity of man to discover all the weaknesses in it. But the hon. gentleman will find that each year will bring these difficulties out, and that each year he will find more difficulty in carrying out the rule he has laid down of 25 per cent, which is only a very small proportion of it. It means

that on all goods produced in any foreign country in the world, coming to England under any pretense, or—I will not say a pretense—in reality will be enhanced by 25 cent, and that the whole goods of the world will come into Canada at a reduction of 25 per cent, which means, after all, only a real preference of one-quarter, or  $6\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. That is what it means, when it is figured out under the rule that the hon. gentleman has laid down.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to say to the hon. gentleman that when I asked him as to whether it would not be practicable or possible to get the certificate, or the affidavit, of the manufacturer, I did not mean to imply that the affidavit, or certificate, of the exporter, in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred, would not be just as reliable as that of the manufacturer. I asked the question for information, because I understood that if a manufacturer forwarded a certificate, there would be no likelihood of the certificate being challenged. It seems that attention has been drawn to this question of undervaluation more frequently and more repeatedly during the last few months, since this preferential tariff came into operation, than previously. Complaints of undervaluation are not confined to importers, because the Canadian Manufacturers' Association recently memorialized the Customs Department as to this question of the undervaluation, not only of goods entitled to the British preference, but of goods of foreign manufacture not entitled to the preference at all, and they made certain suggestions to the hon. Minister of Customs in a resolution which they adopted. A copy of their memorial was sent to me a few days ago, and if the committee will permit me, I would like to read three or four statements respecting undervaluation. At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, held June 12, 1899, this resolution was passed. The manufacturers of Canada seem to feel that their interests might be very seriously affected, if this system of undervaluation is permitted to go on. The resolution says:

They have had their attention called lately to the question of undervaluation of invoices, chiefly from foreign manufacturers having nothing at stake in this country, and consigning their wares at the lowest possible prices, they think they can get through the customs irrespective of the law, which says that the value of duty must be the price at which the goods are sold in the open market for consumption in the country of production. This has always been treated as a question affecting importers only, but it also affects in a very real manner the manufacturer also. If goods can be entered at two-thirds of the proper value, it is evident that only two-thirds of the duty will be paid, so that articles dutiable at 30 per cent will get through at only 20 per cent. This places the manufacturer in a false position before the public, for he gets only 20 per cent protection, while the public think he has 30 per cent.

Mr. CLANCY.

Then, the manufacturers go on to recommend to the Customs Department certain changes in the methods of valuation for duty:

They, therefore, call upon the Government to scrutinize most carefully all entries from foreign countries in which the goods are consigned to agents or brokers, who have no available assets which could be seized to satisfy any just claim the Government might have against them, and they further recommend that no entries of over \$200 shall be received from such persons unless they can furnish proper bonds and securities for the amounts of all their entries, and that on all such entries the signatures of the owners of the goods must be appended to the entries as well as those of the brokers.

They further recommend that some such penalty as is now enforced in the United States should be enacted and enforced here—to wit: that in addition to exacting the full duty in all cases of undervaluation (which is no penalty at all) the full amount of the undervaluation should be also exacted, so that if the undervaluation is 20 per cent, the penalty should be also 20 per cent, and so on. The only way to suppress fraud is to make it at once so expensive that it will not pay.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Customs if he has taken any action upon this memorial, and if so, what is the action that has been taken?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have received the memorial, and it has been answered in a courteous manner, for which the Department of Customs is noted. I took into consideration what was said in the concluding part. Where there is undervaluation, if it be fraudulent, the penalty is quite equal to what they mention. In reference to the undervaluation of goods, it is difficult to arrive at what are the proper values of the items, as to which we have to have evidence, and to search for it. It is no part of the duty of the Customs Department to add to the protection that is incident in the tariff, of the manufacturers of this country. This Parliament determines whether a tax shall be 20, or 25, or 30, or 35 per cent, and, as an incident of that, the manufacturer has protection to that extent. It is the right of Parliament to say what that tax shall be; the department have no right, as I understand it, to add to the protection on behalf of any manufacturers or to increase values beyond their fair limits, as laid down in the customs law. But in the interest of the revenue, the department is bound to see that the values put on goods from foreign countries and entered for customs, are the values at which these goods are sold in the markets of the country whence they were exported. The department has given a great deal of consideration to this question, and have initiated and put into operation rules and requirements that are securing a fair valuation of goods entering into this country, to a greater extent than ever before. I will give an instance of this fact. The Customs Act requires that the value

for duty shall be, not the value at which an hon. gentleman might go over to New York and buy a bill of goods for. The hon. gentleman might go over to New York, and a merchant there, finding that he was from Canada, might make to him what is called an export sale, and give him a reduction in the price of these goods of as much as 10 per cent. That would be a perfectly legitimate transaction between the hon. gentleman and the merchant, and the Customs Department would have no right to interfere with the price, even if it were reduced 50 per cent. But when the hon. gentleman comes to enter these goods at the customs-house, he cannot expect to have 50 per cent taken off the value, but he must pay duty on the value at which the New York merchant sells these goods in that country. Before I took office, all that was required with an invoice of foreign goods was a statement: "Certified correct." Well, the hon. gentleman can see, from the illustration I have given, that if he should go to New York, and buy a bill of goods, and receive 20 per cent discount off the regular selling price in the United States because the goods are coming into this country, we would get that New York merchant's statement: "Certified correct." It would be a correct and honest invoice, and there would be no question that he sold the goods for that price, but it would not be correct for customs purposes, because the regulations require that the goods must be valued at the price at which they are sold in that country. We found that parties would bring in their invoices, and that there would be undervaluation, as recognized by the customs law, and it would be found that these bills did not come under the requirements of the customs law for duties. It was easy for a man to make a case out under the old regulations. He could say: I bought these goods for the price stated; I do not know whether they were sold for a higher price over there or not. I took it for granted that this is the price at which they were sold in the United States. I present this invoice, and I think it fairly represents the value of the goods. That is not an unreasonable ground to take. The department took the matter into consideration, because we thought we could make an improvement in these regulations. The man who is buying goods in New York might not know what these goods sold for there, but the man selling these goods to a Canadian at a reduction of the price knows at what price these goods are selling at in that country. Therefore, we altered that certificate altogether, and we required on the foreign invoices that the man in the foreign country who sells the goods, and knows the prices, shall certify that the invoice is not only correct, but that the prices are the fair market value at which these goods are sold in like quantities and under similar conditions in

the foreign country. If there is any variation in these prices, it is noted on the margin of the invoice. By that precaution we have found that the revenue is largely augmented, and it has proven one of the best safeguards that was ever instituted against the undervaluation. In addition we have adopted other regulations for ascertaining through our officers the values that rule in certain countries, and though it placed extra work on the department we have not asked for extra help. We have provided that when this information is gained, bulletins are issued to all ports of the Dominion, showing what the ascertained value for customs duty on such and such an article is, thus securing to a far greater extent than ever before, uniformity in customs valuation. I am always pleased to receive suggestions from the importers and from the manufacturers, but I give these facts to the committee with the hope of showing that the department is fully alive to what its duty is in the matter; is doing its very best to safeguard the revenue, and incidentally to safeguard the interests of all those engaged in trade.

Mr. WALLACE. I have always noted with a great deal of interest, how voluble and eloquent the Minister (Mr. Paterson) can be when he is discussing some subject that is not pertinent to the question before the House.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Does not the hon. gentleman say that his hon. friend did not bring up that question?

Mr. WALLACE. I say that the reply of the Minister (Mr. Paterson) was away out in the fields, and I further say that the questions asked by the hon. member from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) were quite pertinent and were not answered. The Minister explained at great length how he had improved the law, but if you take the 59th section of the Customs Act of Canada, 46 Vic., chap. 12, passed in the year 1883, he will find that law provides for everything that the Minister says he has done, and that law was on the statute-book thirteen years before he became Minister of Customs.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The law is not a regulation.

Mr. WALLACE. It is a regulation, and it regulates everybody. The 59th section says:

Such market value shall be the fair market value of such goods in the usual and ordinary commercial acceptance of the term, at the usual and ordinary credit, and not the cash value of such goods.

The Minister takes great credit to himself now, for having carried out that law which has been carried out for the last sixteen years. Section 58 of the Customs Act, says:

Whenever any duty ad valorem is imposed on any goods imported into Canada, the value for duty shall be the fair market value thereof,

when sold for home consumption, in the principal markets of the country whence and at the time when the same were exported directly to Canada.

That law is sixteen years old, but to listen to the Minister (Mr. Paterson) to-night you would think that he had discovered some new law and some new regulations. He tells us that he sends certain officers to ascertain the value of goods in other countries, but surely he does not mean to lead the House to believe that that system was inaugurated since he became Minister. Long before he was in the department there were officers doing that work, to a limited extent before I was in charge of the department, and to a much greater extent when I left. He coolly takes credit for the whole of that in this House to-night.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I said we sent the information out by bulletins to the ports of the Dominion generally. That was not done before.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister told the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) that we have no right to add to the profit of the manufacturer by putting enhanced values on imported goods. In their memorial which has been read to the House the manufacturers of Canada never asked anything of the kind. What they asked was that the law be carried out and that they get the protection which the law declares they shall have. In this case they apparently did not receive any protection. The Minister of Customs tells us that nine-tenths of the exporters are reputable men. I am not so sure of that after the disclosures have been made. The system carried out by the Minister (Mr. Paterson) encourages dishonesty, and if he continues it you will find the 99 per cent who do right will decrease from year to year and the one per cent who do wrong will rapidly increase. I have a very interesting letter here, a portion of which I will read to the House. It bears on this subject, and is as follows:—

Sir,—The clause in the tariff conferring certain exclusive privileges on Great Britain is not the infallible instrument of preferential policy it was intended to be. If this were the millenium, and every London, Manchester and Glasgow trader a second edition of George Washington, the preferential clause might accomplish all that was expected of it; but, as this is not the millenium, but the wicked year of grace '99, and as a certain order of English traders are not Washingtons at all, but a pack of rascals, ready to sell their souls to Satan at a considerably less figure than the price Doctor Faust got for his, this clause may in more ways than one turn out not to be the universal benefaction it promised to be.

Even that charity which refuses to think evil, cannot resist evidence of the fact that in England, as elsewhere, there is a set of men who will traffic with the father of lies to get the start of customs officials, and imperil their eternal salvation for 8 per cent. The preferential clause was instituted in the interests of British production, and was the most delicate possible infringement of the Cobden Club. The clause

Mr. WALLACE.

does not imply any special guardianship of the interests of English exporters of foreign goods. It does not imply any special benefit even to merchants of British goods, beyond, of course, the legitimate profit on increased returns from the sale of these goods. Under the clause the London, Manchester or Glasgow merchant continues to have a perfect right to buy foreign goods if it suits him, and export these goods to Canada. The invoices of such goods, however, require to be accompanied with a sworn description of their character and origin—a condition with which all honourable British merchants religiously comply. A glance at the clause will make it manifest that it has opened a new door for the practice of deception and fraud.

It is every day getting harder and harder to tell in what market a particular article is made. In their eagerness to meet the demand for some specific kind of merchandise in wide and general use, the manufacturers of several countries will "get on" to a thing, and produce some article, or variety of articles, that will constitute a type whose market identification will nonplus the smartest buyers, and most competent and experienced customs appraisers. This applies in an especial manner to dry goods. If a dishonest London or Bradford trader find that Roubaix can produce a typical article at less than its counterpart can be made in Yorkshire, there is nothing to prevent him from changing the tickets, erasing the French marks, swearing to a lie, underselling his honest competitor at home, taking 8 or 12 per cent out of the revenue of the Dominion, and wrecking the trade of the honest merchants in Montreal and Toronto. It may be asked, are there not means of protection against this immoral and ruinous kind of competition, this flagrant breach of the moral and civil law? Positively, no effective means. To make it law to have stamped on both ends of a piece of goods the name of the country it was made in, would be but at most a further tax on the ingenuity of the thief. A party who had the nerve to change tickets and make a false oath, would cut off stamps and replace them by his own, provided there was enough in it to pay him for his trouble. This kind of cattle don't stick at trifles. Their theory is, as well be hanged for a sheep as a lamb.

The Toronto dry goods merchants have lately been exercised over some sort of "find" of the description indicated. A New York firm is named as giving countenance to practices that are far from being in accordance with the requirements of the eighth commandment. It is natural and proper for the Toronto men to be so exercised. It is a matter that concerns them intimately. It concerns every honest merchant in Great Britain and the Dominion; above all, it concerns the Canadian Government. It concerns the Government in a two-fold way. The Government is alike responsible for the national revenues and the reputation of the clause or "gift." The "gift" is a pet child. It must not be allowed to walk in the same path with men of unclean and slippery ways. It must be shielded from involuntary complicity with perjurers and thieves.

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

### After Recess.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs how it is that uncleaned rice and cleaned rice both come in under the preference from Great Britain?

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** The uncleaned rice is probably the product of British India, which is one of the preferential countries.

Mr. **CLANCY.** Will the hon. gentleman tell me what kind of declaration is made under circumstances of that kind?

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** The same declaration.

Mr. **CLANCY.** Will the hon. gentleman give the committee a copy of that declaration?

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** Certainly.

Mr. **CHARLTON.** I wish to address an inquiry to the hon. Minister of Customs as to the method of keeping our accounts in the Customs Department. The system is of many years' standing. Last year the entry of short returns amounts to \$4,154,342 for Ontario, and \$473,388 for Quebec, or a total of \$4,627,730. This item forms a very considerable portion of the exports to the United States, and is all in connection, I suppose, with the American trade. It has occurred to me, in investigating these trade returns, that this allowance unduly swells our exports to the United States, and that the sum given here as the total of short returns, or returns not made, is excessively large. No allowance, I suppose, is made for smuggling, but I have every reason to believe that the amount of goods smuggled from the United States to Canada is very nearly, if not quite equal, to the amount of exports to the United States, not covered by the returns, and entered in these trade and navigation accounts as short returns. How this amount is arrived at I am unable to say, and I ask information from the hon. Minister of Customs, and I again press my belief that, with no allowance made for smuggling from the United States inward, this allowance for short return makes our apparent exports to the United States greater than they actually are.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** My attention was called to these short returns, and a year or two ago I consulted with my deputy as to whether we would continue the entry or not and after considering the question from all points, we thought that as this had been going on for years, for purposes of comparing one year's trade with the other, it was perhaps well that we should continue it. The amount is arrived at by taking a percentage of the total exports to the United States. It is supposed that the commissions to make export entries at the different ports will amount to that much. As I understand, in conference with my statistical officers, they thought they were warranted in maintaining it from the fact that the United States return of imports from Canada would be more reliable

than our returns of exports into the United States, inasmuch as the United States charge a duty. If I remember right, the information they gave me was that the imports into the United States from Canada as given in the United States returns, would about correspond with the total exports from here with the short returns added, and it was for that reason and for the purposes of comparison that we determined to continue this entry.

I dare say goods are smuggled into Canada, but we have no means of ascertaining what amount is smuggled, and we are as vigilant as we can be to detect and prevent smuggling.

Mr. **CHARLTON.** My attention was first called to this matter last season by the fact that the amount of imports from Canada, as given in the United States returns last year, was somewhat less than the amount of exports to the United States, as given in our returns, without the short returns added. From this it appears that our returns of some \$36,454,000 exported, without the short returns added, are in excess of the American returns of imports from this country. I would recommend the hon. Finance Minister to give careful attention to this matter, for in the discussion of our trade affairs with the United States, it is not to our advantage to have it appear that our exports are larger than they really are. In discussing these questions with the United States, in order to obtain trade concessions, it is important to be able to show that our tariff is more liberal than theirs, and that consequently our imports from them are heavier than our exports to them, and being able to show this will give us a greater claim on them to diminish their duties and make their tariff more liberal. Although it has been the rule for many years to enter these short returns it might be well to discontinue it, if it is misleading, and adopt a system more in accord with the actual conditions of affairs.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** I am glad the hon. gentleman has called my attention to this matter. If he is not mistaken in his figures and if the United States returns of imports from this country show a less volume than our returns of exports to the United States with these short returns added, it would be well to revise the system. If his statement be correct, we must be making our export entries more closely now than heretofore.

Mr. **TAYLOR.** If I understood the hon. Minister correctly before recess, the preferential rate applies to all goods, whether manufactured in or outside of England, provided 25 per cent has been added to their value after they were imported into England. Is the hon. gentleman aware that manufacturers in other countries are now

establishing branch houses in England and manufacturing their goods at home, say Germany or Switzerland, to a certain extent, and then shipping them to England, where they are finished, after which they export them to Canada so as to get the benefit of the preferential tariff. If that be the case, then the preferential tariff is only one-quarter on the English manufacturer and three-quarters on the foreign manufacturer. I am informed that there are manufacturers in Germany who manufacture their goods to the value of 75 per cent, and then send them to England, where they are finished, so that 25 per cent is added to them in England, after which they are exported to Canada and given the benefit of the preferential tariff. This is done by Germany and some of the other foreign countries, particularly in corset goods and watches and clocks.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman is correct. If 25 per cent is added to their value in the finishing process in Great Britain, they would be entitled to come in here under the preferential rate.

Mr. WALLACE. With reference to the Levison Bros. transaction, the explanations made by the hon. Minister are not at all satisfactory. If the papers I have are correct, the penalty imposed was \$418. I have a statement here showing that there were two seizures of goods imported by Levison Bros., and that both were settled by the Government for \$418. This makes it still worse.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There was only one seizure made.

Mr. WALLACE. There were two according to this statement. I will send it over to the Minister. My information was, further than that—

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, there was only one seizure made.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to have the papers brought down. The information I have is that this firm were willing to pay \$4,000 to settle; that they engaged the legal firm of Blake & Co., of Toronto, and the arguments of this firm were so conclusive and satisfactory that instead of the \$4,000 they were willing to pay, this fraudulent concern were only asked to pay \$418.

There is another case I have referred to, and that is the Montreal case, of the firm of Fitzgibbon, Schafeltein & Co. In some features it is like the one to which I have just referred. The Minister tells us that in this Levison Bros. case a libel suit was entered. In this Montreal case also a libel suit was entered, but has been practically withdrawn. This firm sued the editor of the "Shareholder" for libel in making a statement of the case in his newspaper. The editor of

Mr. TAYLOR.

the "Shareholder" did not show the white feather, but was willing to go on with the suit and have the case tried in court. But these rascals took precious good care not to go into court—that is the place of all places that they were anxious to avoid. I am informed that the Minister in that case sent over to his legal agent, Mr. Russell, in London, Eng., to have the case adjudicated upon. Will the hon. Minister say if an offer of \$7,500 was made to settle that case?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The deputy tells me that a deposit of \$7,000 was made at the time of seizure, pending decision.

Mr. WALLACE. What was the decision of the department?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Referred it to the courts.

Mr. WALLACE. No, that is not the decision of the department; that could only be the decision when the decision of the department was not accepted.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the hon. gentleman knows more about it than I do, of course he has no use for the information I give him. I say the decision of the department was to refer it to the courts, and it is there now.

Mr. WALLACE. Did the department arrive at no other decision?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No; referred it to the courts.

Mr. WALLACE. A statement I have here is to the effect that charges were made in December, 1897, and a deposit of \$7,500 was made after investigating the matter. Mr. Newcombe, the Deputy Minister of Justice, was sent to England, and he arranged with Mr. Charles Russell, the lawyer of the Government, to go to Berlin and take evidence; and in an interview with Mr. Schafeltein, he asked Mr. Schafeltein to verify the statements made by his firm and to produce his check books, and so on. Mr. Schafeltein said that the books were destroyed, and asked Mr. Russell if he had authority to settle the matter. Mr. Russell replied: No. That case is still before the court, I assume.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. Minister give further information on the subject, or have I got to give the House information with regard to it?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know what information the hon. gentleman may wish to give. I know that the leader of the Opposition said that, if the case were in the courts, it should not be discussed now.

Mr. WALLACE. But the leader of the Opposition did not understand the position as the Minister now explains it. He could

not have known that the Minister put it in the courts himself and did not give a decision as to the seizure. Why did not he give a decision ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Because it was a very involved and intricate case, and I thought it better to have it decided by the courts.

Mr. WALLACE. What was so involved, the law or the facts ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The facts, principally.

Mr. WALLACE. Surely the Minister has machinery to ascertain the facts much better than the courts would have in this case. It is clear, the same fraud was practiced here as in the case of Levison Bros., and they have got off practically scot free ; because I presume that \$418 would very little more than pay the duty on one invoice and would not pay the duty on the hundreds of other invoices that were, as is claimed, fraudulently entered at the customs.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The cases are very distinct.

Mr. WALLACE. Are they not similar in this regard, that they were invoicing themselves ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. One runs over a number of years.

Mr. WALLACE. Levison Bros. was only one case that they exposed. Were other seizures made in the case of Levison Bros ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Not in our time.

Mr. WALLACE. The case of John Macdonald & Co. is the only case in which Levison Bros. were arrested. This one of Fitzgibbon and Shafeltein extends over a series of years, and their invoices amounted to tens of thousands of dollars, all fraudulent, so it is claimed. Seizures were made apparently in that matter of importations which amount to, I think, some hundreds of thousands of dollars, and they state they have no records of it, that their papers are all destroyed. The solicitor of the Minister who goes over to Germany to make an investigation is told that there are no papers to be had ; and yet these parties are permitted, I presume, to continue still their nefarious business of defrauding the customs. We are given no information about this matter to-day, and I think we are entitled to information. This House is the highest court we have, and there is no information which could be properly withheld from it, unless the department can show that the interests of the country or of the Government would be endangered thereby. I think we can clearly show, on the contrary, that the security of the public is greater when these frauds are disclosed to the public, and when it is shown that the operations

of these parties have been detected. But the Minister does not throw any light upon these matters. The country may be robbed, it may be gone through by a lot of thieves and rascals, and when we ask for information the Minister simply shuts up like a book. I do not think that is satisfactory.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I understand from the hon. Minister that under the regulations of the department a large quantity of goods the manufacture of countries outside of Britain, comes in under the preferential tariff. Is he in a position to tell the House what proportion of goods imported under the preferential tariff was manufactured in Britain, and what proportion was manufactured outside of Britain ? In other words, has he made any classification of the proportion of goods under those two heads that come into Canada ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, that would be impossible.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I cannot understand how it would be impossible. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he had a certain form of affidavit to be made by the British exporter as to the quantity of any particular article that was manufactured in Britain before it could come in under the preferential rate. As I understand him, the British exporter is subject to the same tariff as exporters from other countries, unless he accompanies his goods by an affidavit to the effect that a certain percentage of the value of the article was manufactured in Great Britain.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, the declaration is that not less than 25 per cent shall be so manufactured. I understand him to suggest that the exporter should be required to say whether 25 or 40 or 60 per cent of the value of the article was made in Great Britain. The declaration says that it shall be at least 25 per cent, and it will be impossible for the department to tell how much it had exceeded 25 per cent. There may be cases where the whole cost of the article was the product of British labour, in other cases, 50 per cent of it may be the product of British labour, while there may be cases where, of the finished article, the product of British labour would not be over 10 per cent, in which case it would not be entitled to the preference.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The manufacturer must have some knowledge of what percentage of value of the article has been put on it in England, if he has not got that knowledge he cannot make an honest declaration. Then, I do not see any difficulty in the way of the British exporter who makes that declaration, saying the proportion of British labour or British value that has been put on the article, and also the proportion of foreign labour. If the British manufacturer is in a position to make an affidavit that he has

put 25 per cent of the value on those goods, or if he is an exporter he must be able to do it with some knowledge, he must have the means of knowing. Take, for instance, a lady's mantle. He must know how many yards of silk imported from France, we will say, went into the manufacture of that mantle, he must also know how many yards of lace or velvet went into the trimmings of that mantle, and which were imported from the continent, he must have knowledge of the exact quantity of everything that went into the manufacture of that article. Then, he adds his labour, upon which he pays his price. Where is the difficulty on the part of the manufacturer giving in a statement, or a declaration, of the exact proportion of material imported that went into that piece of goods and the value of the work that he put on it?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What would be the advantage?

Mr. McDOUGALL. The advantage would be a very great one to Canada, because, if it be shown that a large proportion of the goods we import from Great Britain under the preferential tariff come from France, Belgium, Germany and other foreign countries it would be seen that the tariff is of very little advantage. Why should I go to France if some of my customers prefer French goods, or to Germany, if they prefer German goods, or to Belgium, if they prefer Belgian goods, and buy these goods in these countries and pay 35 per cent duty on them when I can get them from British dealers with a reduction of 25 per cent on 75 per cent of the whole purchase?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not quite grasp it yet.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Suppose I buy \$400 worth of French manufactures, why should I go to France to buy those goods and pay 35 per cent duty, when I have only to go to the English house and get three-quarters of the \$400 worth of the same goods, with \$100 of English labour added, and gain the reduction of 25 per cent on the duty?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is where the preference comes in for Great Britain.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But Great Britain does not get the benefit of the preference. Great Britain only gets 25 per cent of it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. According to the hon. gentleman, he wants these goods to be taxed at the rate of 50 per cent, and the Englishman would be shut out.

Mr. McDOUGALL. We pretend that we are giving this preference to British goods, when we are giving three-quarters of the preference to France.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Is the hon. gentleman opposed to allowing these

Mr. McDOUGALL.

goods in, with 25 per cent of British labour added?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am opposed to being dishonest about it. I want to have the facts. Nineteen-twentieths of the people of the country are not aware of this.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The merchants are.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I tell the hon. gentleman that they are not. I did not know it myself until I heard the explanation given by the hon. Minister. I was astonished, and I think the people will be astonished and will consider that it is very unfair. This matter applies almost entirely to an expensive class of goods that is worn by wealthy people. The greater portion of the goods that come to us from Great Britain are expensive goods, such as silks, velvets, plushes and laces, which are worn by the wealthy people, who get the benefit of the preference. The cheaper lines of goods are manufactured in Britain, but we get these, because they are manufactured at home as well. These are the classes of goods that, being manufactured at home, are within the reach of everybody, while the wealthy man gets the benefit of the reduction of the 25 per cent on 75 per cent of the goods that are imported from Great Britain, the poor people, who are unable to buy these expensive goods, are obliged to pay the full duty, if the goods they consume are imported, and if they are not imported, they also have to pay because there is a duty against such goods. They have to pay the amount that is caused to be added to the value of these goods by reason of the protection as against the outside manufacturers. What case will my hon. friend have to go with to the poor people of this country, and will explain this matter to them as he explained it here this afternoon? Can he explain how he gets the duty that he levies on tobacco? Here are the poor people, the labouring classes, that have not the luxuries, the fishermen, the farmers and the miners, who must have their tobacco. They cannot have their silks, they cannot get the big reduction on the importation of silks that the wealthy people get, and my hon. friend puts up the duty on tobacco. Another statement the hon. Minister made before six o'clock surprised me. As I understood the explanation given by the hon. Minister, he stated that the invoice price of goods coming from the United States would have to correspond with the prices at which these goods were sold to the consumers in the United States. Is that not the explanation of my hon. friend?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The price would have to be noted on the invoice. The invoice would come in to the party for the price which he bought at, but if he bought at a lower price than these goods regularly sold for in the country where they were

purchased, then the exporter would note on the invoice the home price, or the price in the United States, and duty would have to be levied on the price at which these goods were sold in the United States.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Suppose a dealer in New York bought \$5,000 worth of silk, on which he puts a price of 75 cents a yard to the trade. He sells a certain portion of these goods at that price. The hon. Minister knows that it is customary for dealers to reduce the prices of their goods after a certain time, and when they are not selling as fast as it is desired. Suppose a merchant reduces the price of this silk to 60 cents or 50 cents a yard, and I happened to go to him as a purchaser, and buy these goods at 50 cents because he was anxious to get clear of them. Fashion, or some other reason, may intervene to make it necessary that he should get rid of these goods. If I brought my invoice to this country, showing that I bought these goods at 50 cents, although the price had been 75 cents two or three weeks before, would the hon. Minister insist on the price at which the goods were originally sold, or would he accept the price at which I actually bought the goods?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. My hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) is supposing an extreme case. Now, supposing a man in the United States marked goods on the first of the month at 75 cents, and then when the stock had run down, or for some reason or other, my hon. friend went over to the United States and bought them at 60 cents, the invoice would be made out at 60 cents, and if the merchant were selling these goods to his customers at 60 cents at the time he sold to the hon. gentleman, that would be the value for duty here. But if that merchant were selling his goods at 75 cents to everybody in the United States, notwithstanding that he sold them to the hon. gentleman for 60 cents, it would have to be stated in the invoice, on the margin or elsewhere, that 75 cents was the home consumption price, and we would collect duty on the 75 cents, though my hon. friend honestly bought them for 60 cents.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) will look up his statement before six o'clock, he will find that the only construction that can be put upon it would be that the duty could be charged on the 75 cents, whether the dealer in New York reduced the price to his American customers or not. How is the Minister to determine as to the correctness of any information that comes to him with regard to the value of goods, contrary to the statement on the invoice. Suppose some one comes to the Minister and says: John Smith has goods invoiced at 60 cents a yard, but I bought the same line of goods in the United States for 75 cents. Then, the Minister would have to exact duty on 75 cents.

but according to the interpretation of the statute by the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace), John Smith would not be obliged to pay beyond what the goods were selling for to other customers on the day he bought them.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is right.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not understand how we can make the objection at the time of getting the invoice, because the man who sells the goods in the States can change his price from day to day as he has a right to. Because I was buying a larger quantity of goods or that the merchant wanted to get my custom, he might sell them at a few cents cheaper per yard to me, but I do not think that is a proper reason for the Minister to question the correctness of that invoice, and compel the importer to pay the duty upon a higher price. I do not see how it is possible to carry out that interpretation of the law without injustice somewhere.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The law is made by the Parliament, and not by the Customs Department.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I know that, but the Customs Department makes the regulations based on the law.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, but it is the law we are guided by in making the regulations.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Did this Parliament make the form of declaration?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Well, we all know that the Minister makes the form of declaration as he makes every regulation.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We have found that declaration to be a great improvement on the former system. While the law expressly declared that the duty shall be paid on the fair market value of the article in the country from whence it is exported the merchant there might see fit to reduce his price to a person coming from Canada, and we now require the importer who does know the prices prevailing, say in the United States, to declare that the prices at which he sold these goods for export are the fair average prices at which he sells them in his own country. He has a perfect right to sell them to a Canadian importer at a lower price if he wishes, but he must now state on the invoice what is the market price in the country of export. The law makes us charge the duty on that price, and the Customs Department simply administers the law. Under the old regulation, the manufacturer or merchant in the United States would simply state that the articles were sold for 60 cents. It would be a bona fide transaction, and that

would not be a false declaration. But that is not the value the law fixes for duty. The value for duty would be the 75 cents, the price at which the goods are ordinarily sold in the country of production, and under the new certificate the man who sells the goods in the foreign country must declare that. When that invoice goes to the customs officers, the duty is levied on the 75 cents, the market price in the country of export, as the law requires, and the new declaration has done away, to a large extent, with amended entries.

Mr. QUINN. Does the Minister pretend that this is a new law?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, but it is a new regulation.

Mr. QUINN. The law has been in existence for sixteen years.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I know that, but we are speaking of the new regulation which the department has adopted to carry out the law more effectually than it has been carried out.

Mr. QUINN. That regulation is in accordance with the law.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Certainly, with the intention that the law should be carried out.

Mr. WALLACE. We are simply asking a question and wanting an answer. The question is, supposing the invoice of the goods sold to the Canadian is the fair market value of the goods in the country where they are produced, what is required then?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have told the hon. gentleman, but he seems to think he knows better. The declaration is put on every invoice, whether the prices are the same that prevail in Canada and the States or not. If the price in Canada is the same as the price in the States, there is nothing else on the invoice, but if the prices in the two countries vary, that has to be noted on the invoice.

Mr. QUINN. As I understand, there is a regulation which requires the seller of the goods to certify that the invoice is a true invoice, and that the prices are the fair market value of the goods in the country of production. I think that is the regulation that has always been in force.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Supposing a trader in New York is clearing out \$1,000 worth of a line of goods, and his price is 70 cents a yard. Suppose he sells out the whole lot to three different parties, one buying \$400 worth at the original market price, 70 cents; another, say, in Boston, buying \$400 worth and getting 5 per cent discount; and a Canadian buying the remaining \$400 worth and getting the same rate of discount. What kind of a declaration would the hon. gentle-

Mr. PATERSON.

man expect the man to make with regard to the goods that came to Canada?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In like quantity and condition at the time of the exportation.

Mr. McDOUGALL. To my mind it is impossible to carry out the regulation of the Minister. It is not worth the paper it is written on.

Mr. ROSAMOND. I think the explanation given by the Minister is a very reasonable one, and the regulation a proper one. But what I would like to know is how the Minister arrives at the 25 per cent basis on the goods from England which are partly of foreign manufacture.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It was an arbitrary figure fixed under the law by the Governor in Council.

Mr. ROSAMOND. I am inclined to think that it is rather an unreasonable arrangement, because it allows such a large proportion of the goods imported from Germany or France or Belgium to come in at the same rate of duty as goods imported from England. Another objection to it is that it gives labour in England an advantage over labour in Canada. Suppose a Canadian imports the same goods from Germany, he has to pay the full amount of the duty, and labour has to be put upon them in Canada afterwards, but the English importer gets the German goods free of duty, puts on 25 per cent of labour, and sends them to Canada at 25 per cent less duty than the Canadian importer paid on the German goods, which gives English labour an advantage to that extent over Canadian labour.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is clear that the hon. gentleman is right in that. The English manufacturer imports the goods from Germany for the purpose of adding 25 per cent to their value. The Canadian manufacturer imports the same kind of goods from Germany. The English manufacturer can import those goods into Canada at a lower rate of duty than the Canadian manufacturer can, and, therefore, so far as the protection to the Canadian manufacturer is concerned, we must deduct the difference from 26½ per cent of duty.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I see the point the hon. gentleman makes. I did not quite grasp it before.

Mr. HENDERSON. In the case referred to by the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Rosamond), may I ask the Minister whether he considers that he is giving the 25 per cent preference to Great Britain alone, or is he giving part of that preference to Germany and part to Great Britain?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is a British preference.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me that there is a preference given to Germany as

well, because Germany is enabled to find a market in Canada for those goods at a reduced rate of duty. If 75 per cent of the value of the goods is of German origin, then Germany gets a preference to the extent of 75 per cent of the 25 per cent, and Britain only gets a preference on the remaining 25 per cent.

It seems to me that this preference is far more to the advantage of foreign countries than to Great Britain itself. I think this is a new revelation to the trade of the country. My impression is that it has not been generally understood. What the law says is that there must be a substantial portion of the labour British. It seems to me that 25 per cent would hardly be considered as a substantial portion of the labour in a great many instances. And if the smallest portion of the benefit by far is to be given to Britain, this is a revelation to the trade generally. The Canadian manufacturer has not so understood the law. The Canadian artisan certainly does not so understand it, but I hope he will better understand it before he has an opportunity of pronouncing his opinion upon it, because it is certainly very much against the interests of the Canadian working man that a preference should be given on goods coming in from Germany or from the United States to the extent of 75 per cent, and a preference given to the British manufacturer only to the extent of 25 per cent, and all these goods come into competition with the products of the Canadian artisan.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If it has not been understood, it is not for want of explanation. The idea that there is something new in this is entirely mistaken. The fact that the Government had to fix what might be regarded as a substantial portion was thoroughly understood, and that portion was 25 per cent has been thoroughly understood for a long time, and the hon. gentlemen are mistaken in assuming that there is anything new in it.

Mr. HENDERSON. It may be possible that in the House 25 per cent was mentioned, but I listened very carefully to the tariff discussion two years ago, and I have no recollection of ever having heard that the proportion was to be fixed at 25 per cent. When we were asked to enact a law providing that a substantial portion of the labour entering into any article of manufacture should be British, I do not think there were many hon. members who ever dreamed that 25 per cent was going to be considered by the Government as a substantial portion. The Government has fixed 25 per cent by Order in Council and not by statutory enactment. It is purely an administrative Act, and this House was not made cognizant of what the Government intended to do unless the hon. Minister's memory is better than mine, but I think that many members will agree with me that what proportion of labour would make a thing one of British manufacture

was not really discussed in this House, and that the percentage is certainly very much lower than ever the House contemplated it should be when they gave their sanction to this law.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am perfectly certain that the fact that 25 per cent was established as the proportion is known throughout the trade, and anybody who has a practical interest in the matter has become aware of it. The hon. member for Halton takes the ground that this is not a sufficient preference to Great Britain.

Mr. HENDERSON. I take the ground that you are admitting too large a proportion of foreign goods.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The best answer to it would be in the form of a question. Does the hon. gentleman think that the British manufacturers would regard it as a greater preference if we were to oblige them to have 50 per cent of British labour enter into their manufactures? England does not produce the raw material of her manufactures. In a large number of articles she has to import the raw material. Therefore, the higher you make the percentage of British labour entering into an article, the greater the danger of lessening the preference to the British manufacturer. If my hon. friend thinks that we should make the percentage 50 per cent instead of 25 per cent, the effect would be to shut out a very considerable portion of British manufactured goods that now come into the country.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is just what I would want. I am a friend of the Canadian workingman before the British workingman, and for the protection of the Canadian artisan I want to narrow the scope as much as possible and admit as little foreign goods into the country at a low rate of duty as possible. The hon. Minister of Finance may look at it differently. He has two points of view from which to look at it. He wants revenue, and if he can bring in a larger amount of goods at a lower rate of duty, he knows he will have more money to spend, but is that in the interests of the Canadian workingman and our consuming population who are largely workingmen?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Certainly.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think it is. So long as a protective policy is in force, our workingmen ought to get a fair share.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend asks, if it is in the interests of the Canadian artisan. Perhaps my hon. friend and I may differ, but I think that it is even in the Canadian artisan's interest. Then, he asks, is it in the interest of the Canadian consumer? Undoubtedly it is. For he gets his goods at lower rates of duty. My hon.

friend has been more frank and candid than most of his associates. He has been frank enough to say that he does not want a British preference at all.

Mr. HENDERSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARKE. No.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, he does. He says "hear, hear," and endorses it now. That is the position of hon. gentlemen opposite, only they are not all as candid as my hon. friend. He really wants to shut out the portion of British manufactured goods that now comes in. A number of hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to show that we are not getting many British goods under the preferential rate, and unfortunately, I must say, the increase has not been as large as many hoped for, but in principle, hon. gentlemen opposite, as represented by the hon. member for Halton, do not want British goods to come in at all. He is a protectionist, and he wants to keep the Canadian market entirely for Canadian manufactures. From his point of view, I do not complain of the position he takes, but I protest against hon. gentlemen opposite taking that ground while professing to be in favour of British preferential trade.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. Minister has, perhaps, not fairly stated my position. I am a protectionist, and I do not want British preference until we get preference from Britain.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Let that be the understanding. The hon. gentleman is against the preference we now give to Britain, and I presume he is not peculiar in his views, but represents his party generally, and we may understand that the position of hon. gentlemen opposite is that they are opposed to the preferential tariff, under which we agree to admit the goods of Britain at lower rates than those of foreign countries.

Mr. HENDERSON. Until we get a preference from Britain.

Mr. ROSAMOND. We may all be more or less in favour of a preferential tariff, so far as Britain is concerned, but what we object to is giving this preference to 75 per cent of goods imported from Germany and France. The Finance Minister said a moment ago that there might be 50 per cent of raw material in English manufactures. I do not think there is anything manufactured in England in which there is as much as 50 per cent raw material. And in this case there may be a portion of it manufactured in Germany, which would not be raw material exactly. There may be cloths or other things manufactured in Germany and sent to England, and finished, thus putting on the final 25 per cent of the value of the goods, and exported to Canada. What I object to is, that, under the guise of a preferential tariff, you are giving a preference

Mr. FIELDING.

to 75 per cent of these goods manufactured in Germany, France and Belgium, and I do not think that is in the interest of the Canadian workingman.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) said that the increase of trade with Great Britain was not as large as they had hoped for. The tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite was constructed for a purpose, and that purpose it has largely accomplished. Having reduced the duties on goods which we import largely from the United States, they may expect an increase in the imports. But having first increased the duties on goods which we mainly import from Great Britain, they cannot expect a large increase of trade merely because they cut off one-quarter of this increased duty. He wants to know what the opinion is on this side of the House, and says we are opposed to give a preferential duty to Great Britain. The hon. gentleman will find this side of the House united in favour of a declaration that we want to give Great Britain a preference, and we want Great Britain to give us a preference at the same time. The Government know that they could have secured that boon to the people of this country. But it could only be gained as the result of conferences and negotiations, and they felt that they had no time for that, that they had to meet Parliament with some kind of tariff, and so they said: We will spring this measure of preferential trade with Great Britain upon Parliament. But we say that if you can make reciprocal arrangements with the people of the United States, much more can you make reciprocal arrangements with the people of Great Britain with mutual advantage to both ourselves and them. But while gentlemen opposite profess to be in favour of that, they have not raised a finger to secure a preferential arrangement with the people of Great Britain; they have never attempted to make an arrangement which would be mutually advantageous to the two countries. Before the election of 1896, the Premier pledged himself, in his Toronto, London and other speeches, to try and make a preferential arrangement with Great Britain. But they have merely used this preference as a disguise—and it is a disguise that but poorly conceals their object—to strike down our Canadian manufacturers. With the worldwide prosperity, in which Canada shares, the artisans and manufacturers of this country are doing pretty well—no thanks to any legislation inaugurated by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) said that he did not know that when the tariff of 1897 was brought down, that the proportion of British manufacture in goods to entitle them to a preference should be 25 per cent. But the Minister of Finance says: You knew very well, for it was discussed in this House. Why, the percentage was not then

decided, so how could it be discussed? It was left with the Governor in Council, or, practically, the Minister of Customs. What is the date of that fixing of that 25 per cent?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It was the 14th July, 1898.

Mr. WALLACE. The tariff is dated 13th June, 1897, so it was a year and a month after the tariff. How could the member for Halton know what it was? Now, as to the merits of this 25 per cent. We will take the case of woollen goods. The wool has been produced in some foreign country, it has been made into yarn in some foreign country, it has been woven into cloth in some foreign country. Then it is taken to England, fulled and pressed, and perhaps dyed, altogether a small expenditure is made upon it. Thus it becomes "British goods," and when it is sent to Canada, Canadians say: We are delighted to receive these goods, because they are made in England, and we will take off 25 per cent of the duty. And as to that 25 per cent reduction, by the way, it is most misleading. If the rate of duty is 30 per cent, and 25 per cent is taken off, the general impression is, that the goods are entered at only 5 per cent. Instead of that, the 25 per cent means only one-quarter of the duty, or, in the case I have supposed, 7½ per cent to be taken off. That is doing an injustice to the Canadian artisan, as well as to the British artisan, for whose benefit this law was supposed to be made. The Canadian artisan does not feel it so much in time of prosperity, but he will feel it in the future, and he is beginning to feel it now, as the Trade and Navigation Returns show—a point to which I will call the attention of the House at a later period. But I call attention to this one point, that the 25 per cent labour provision in Great Britain is an injustice to the Canadian people, to the Canadian Government, to the Canadian treasury, and to the British artisan as well.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I was going to ask my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall), as we have discussed these matters very thoroughly now, if he will not give me this \$107,250 to pay salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in his province without any more discussion?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I will be glad to do that when my hon. friend will give me a little information about how his business is conducted in those ports. I want to know who had charge of the prosecution against a number of parties charged with smuggling goods at the port of North Sydney and neighbouring ports in the county of Cape Breton, in January, 1898. In order to assist my hon. friend in getting at the information, I call his attention to page T-77 of the Auditor General's Report. I want to know

who had charge of the prosecution of those cases for smuggling at North Sydney?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. My hon. friend was kind enough to send me a note saying that he would ask for information about this. I have not had time to get all the information he wants, but I will give him the rest on the supplementary Estimates. I may tell him that Mr. Mackenzie, of the Department of Justice, had to do with most of them.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It seems rather unfair. In the afternoon I sent a note across the floor to the hon. gentleman that I would bring this matter up.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, I admit that; and I handed the note to my deputy, but it was late and office hours were over, and he has not been able to get full information. But there is an item for \$3,000 in the supplementary Estimates upon which he can discuss the matter. I do not wish to put him off. In the meanwhile I will listen to my hon. friend, and answer him as well as I can.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I may not be able to be here when the hon. gentleman brings up his supplementary Estimates.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no doubt the hon. Minister will furnish the information to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I made an earnest effort to get it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Will my hon. friend allow me to discuss it to-morrow, if we are on the Estimates?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Do you want one of these items to stand?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Yes.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Would my hon. friend tell me the points of information that he wants?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I want to get the names of the lawyers, some of whom I find in the Auditor General's Report, and the amount of money received by them. There are certain payments in the Auditor General's Report, but the principal payment is not there at all. I want also to know how much money was recovered from the different parties against whom actions were taken, what was the final result of those actions, against how many parties actions were taken, how many actions were concluded and how many were dropped?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is another matter I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister. A duty is charged on business catalogues which come in by express, whereas no duty is charged when they come by mail. I believe the matter has been brought to the attention of the hon. gentleman by some of the Halifax merchants, they do not

understand why there should be any distinction. It has created some little annoyance.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. I understand that business catalogues are dutiable, and the custom has been, where not more than three come in by mail together, to let them in free, but where the quantity is larger they are charged according to the clause in the Customs Act.

Mr. **QUINN**. Before this item passes, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Customs if any progress has been made by the Government towards meeting the wishes of the different boards of trade in the Dominion with the view of establishing a customs court, or of providing some process by which the difficulties arising between merchants and the customs authorities may be tried in a summary manner and that the expenses which now attends the trial of a case of that kind may be avoided. I understand that, for some years, the boards of trade of Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton and other cities have been petitioning the department and the Government, asking that some commission or court, be established for the summary trial of these cases, in order to lessen the expense of the trial of difficulties arising between merchants and the Government as to the non-payment of duties and other matters. I brought the matter up last session, and the hon. Minister told me that it was under consideration at that time. I would like to know if any decision has been arrived at, and if it is the intention of the Government to establish such a court.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. I think it was more a board of experts that they wanted, for the purpose of uniform valuation. We have a board of experts, composed of the different Dominion appraisers, of which the Commissioner of Customs is chairman, and of which the chief check clerk in the department is a member. I do not think they asked for a court to deal with the question of under-valuation or the imposition of extra duties. That duty is imposed upon the department and upon the Minister, under the law. I think what my hon. friend alludes to is, that the boards of trade were anxious for a board of experts who might be possessed of expert knowledge and be able to deal with a question more rapidly than it is possible under the present method. We have not been able to carry out that suggestion fully, but we have practically brought about that condition. If we had a board of experts, and they had to examine all the cases that came before them at the different ports, it would, after all, come down to this, that we would have to rely upon the judgment of each expert in his line: that is, the hardware man would have to decide the case if the question were in

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax).

regard to an article of hardware, and a dry goods man if it were in regard to a question of dry goods, so that I do not think you would get any better judgment in that way than we can get at the present time. I think that, although our customs board might perhaps meet a little oftener, it still gives importers a fair valuation. What merchants complain of, perhaps, though not wholly, more than anything else is that there is a difficulty in securing a uniformity of valuation at different ports. At the large ports we have what we consider capable appraisers, in their different lines, such as hardware, dry goods, &c., but at the smaller ports, where there is just the collector, and perhaps a landing waiter, the collector has to use his judgment as to the value of an article entered for duty. We have tried to remedy that difficulty by applying, in a greater measure, the system that was in vogue in the time of the hon. gentleman who was administering the department before I took charge. We have supplemented that by providing that after the appraiser at Montreal has arrived at his decision, from his technical knowledge, as to what is a fair value of an article, bulletins shall be sent to the various ports informing the collectors of the decision that has been arrived at. I think we have made an improvement in regard to that matter, because it ensures a greater uniformity in valuation than was before possible.

Mr. **QUINN**. I understand that when the same system was adopted in the olden times the complaint existed. The great complaint made by the merchants of Montreal is that there is not a uniformity of valuation throughout the country. It is said, and I think with justice, that goods are brought in at Montreal and assessed at a higher value than they would be assessed at other ports. Of course, this places the Montreal merchants at a disadvantage. The hon. Minister says that he has improved the system in vogue under the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) when he was Controller of Customs. I think the hon. member for West York will bear me out in saying that every effort was made at that time to make the information known throughout the Dominion as to the valuation upon particular items, and that it was impossible to get the officers of the department to make the same valuation at different ports. The hon. Minister will find the same difficulty that was found then. What the Board of Trade of Montreal asked for was that a board of valuers should be established in the Dominion of Canada, and the plan laid down was that one member should be taken from the lower provinces, one from the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and one from the western provinces, that they should make a uniform rate on all goods imported into the country, and that

after they had adopted a uniform rate it should be notified to the collectors of customs, so that every collector would be bound to impose duty at the rate established by this board. In case of difficulty arising about an article coming in at any port, and in case the collector was not in a position to give a valuation to it, it would be his duty to refer the subject to the consideration of the board, which would establish a value for the article, and state under what head it came for the imposition of duty. I do not think the hon. Minister of Customs has done anything new by trying to apprise every collector of customs of the valuations that are given in Montreal, because the hon. member for West York tried the very same thing, and it did not work. I draw the attention of the Government to this condition of affairs and ask my hon. friend the Minister of Customs to look up the petitions that have been sent in from the Board of Trade of Montreal. I am sure he will find a great deal of information in this petition, because, I am informed by prominent members of the board of trade, that specific cases have been mentioned where under-valuation has been practiced at other ports as against Montreal. This is a great injustice and one that deserves attention.

Mr. WALLACE. I am obliged to differ, not only with my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Quinn), but with the hon. Minister of Customs as well. I think the Department of Customs may fairly congratulate themselves on the fact that all complaints in that regard have pretty well disappeared. I know it was so many years ago, and I assume, under the same officers, it is the same to-day. Of course, there is always a warm rivalry between Toronto and Montreal, and the complaint has been that goods were valued at a higher rate of duty in one city than in another. Toronto complains that goods were valued at a higher rate for duty there than they were in Montreal and Montreal merchants were making the same complaint as against Toronto. My recollection is, that a most capable officer of that department, Mr. Bredner, was detailed to compare the entries in Montreal and Toronto, with a view of making them uniform, and then all complaints practically ceased. When complaints of that kind came in afterwards from the cities of Montreal and Ottawa, I challenged the merchants to point to a single article on which the duty was higher in one place than another, or on which the duty was not uniform. This complaint of want of uniformity disappeared, I might say, and I believe that the checking branch of the department is most important. I call the attention of the Government to the fact that they should have in the Customs Department at Ottawa, not only the customs entry, but a copy of the invoice, as is required in the United States.

When an importer makes a copy of the invoice for the customs and another copy for the consignee, he should be obliged to make out a third copy, which would be sent to Ottawa, so that the checking clerk here could go over both the entry and the invoice. The exporters in England and the European countries have to do that for the United States, and it would be no hardship to make them furnish three invoices for Canada, one of which should be sent to the checking clerk at Ottawa.

Mr. QUINN. Notwithstanding the comfort that the hon. Minister may derive from the congratulations of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), I think it will be found that all complaints have not ceased in Montreal. The complaints may be smouldering, or the business people may think there is no use complaining, or that the Government in time will remedy the grievances, but there is no doubt that you can hear every day in Montreal complaints about the administration of the Customs Department, complaints which have existed for many years. They exist to-day, just as they did before, and I draw the attention of the Minister to that fact.

Mr. WALLACE. They exist since the new Government came in.

Mr. QUINN. They may have been created since the new Government came in, as my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) suggests, but at any rate they exist to-day, and if the Minister will read the petitions sent here by the board of trade, he will see what these complaints are.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Customs to what I consider a grave injustice done to an old and faithful servant of the Crown, in the person of Dr. F. B. McCormick, formerly customs officer at Pelee Island. He was an officer for a great many years, and after the general elections of 1896 it was anticipated that there might be complaints against him, and his son wrote a letter to the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and received a reply from the Prime Minister assuring him that in case there were any charges made against his father, he would have every opportunity of rebutting them. A short time after the right hon. the Prime Minister wrote that, a letter was sent from the Department of Customs dismissing this old and efficient officer. I will read the correspondence, and I will ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to explain the difference in their statements, because the letter of the Prime Minister is emphatic, that nothing will be done against Mr. McCormick without full and ample investigation. On March 3rd, 1897, Mr. H. M. McCormick wrote to the Prime Minister of Canada as follows:—

Detroit, Mich., March 3, 1897.

To the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier,  
Premier of Canada, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I come to you in the capacity of a son, of a former British subject, and a loyal Canadian.

My father, Dr. F. B. McCormick, of Pelee Island, Lake Erie, one of the old McCormick family, always loyal British partisans and staunch followers of the Crown, has been accused by personal and political enemies of many things falsely, and may by their machinations be in time deprived of his position as deputy collector of customs for the island.

You are a very busy man, but justice even in humble quarters should not cry in vain; and I most respectfully yet earnestly petition you to inquire into the real merits of this case, and I shall be glad to furnish you the fullest information from the most reliable sources at my command.

To you, the leader of a loyal and sturdy people, I appeal, without my father's knowledge, that justice may be done, and that an aging man may retain the position he has so justly earned and faithfully filled.

And in granting my request you will add another link—that of gratitude—to the many that already bind me to the motherland.

I have, Sir, the honour to be,

Your most obedient servant,

(Sgd.) H. M. McCORMICK.

To that letter the Prime Minister replied :

Ottawa, 5th March, 1897.

H. M. McCormick, Esq.,  
72 Home Bank Building,  
Detroit, Mich., U.S.A.

Dear Sir,—I have your favour of the 3rd inst. As you are aware, the Department of Customs is under the control of the Hon. Wm. Paterson, a most careful and upright man, and you may be sure that should any accusations be made against your father, they will be carefully considered, and your father will be allowed every opportunity of defending himself and of rebutting the charges made against him. I hand over your letter to Mr. Paterson, with the recommendation that he should give it his best attention.

Yours very sincerely,

(Sgd.) WILFRID LAURIER.

On the 3rd of April, 1897, a few weeks afterwards, Mr. McCormick received the following letter from Mr. McDougall, the Commissioner of Customs :—

Ottawa, 3rd April, 1897.

F. B. McCormick, Esq.,  
Southport, Pelee Island.

Sir,—I have it in command to acquaint you that His Excellency the Governor General in Council has been pleased to dispense with your services as a sub-collector in Her Majesty's customs at the outport of Southport, under survey of the port of Amherstburg, Ont., the Order in Council being dated the 8th January, 1897.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) JOHN McDOUGALD,

Commissioner.

Through Collector of Customs,  
Amherstburg, Ont.

On the 12th of April, 1897, another letter was addressed to the Prime Minister by Mr. F. B. McCormick, as follows :—

Mr. TAYLOR.

South Pelee P.O., Ont., Can.,

April 12th, 1897.

Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, M.P.,  
Premier, &c., Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—The letter written by you to my son, Hugh M. McCormick, of Detroit, Michigan, lies before me, dated "Ottawa, 6th March, 1897." Beside it lies a short note from the Commissioner of Customs, Mr. John McDougald, a copy of which I inclose. I cannot believe that you were cognizant of the statements made in this last letter when your letter was written. From it, it would appear that I was actually dismissed from the post of sub-collector of customs at this port by Order in Council two months before your letter was written. This too, without the slightest chance to defend myself, nay, even without an intimation that I was put upon trial. Nearly three months after, I am peremptorily dismissed.

Upon your promise in your letter contained, that I should have a fair trial if accused and opportunity for defence, I fully relied; for, Conservative though I am, I had entire faith in your word as a gentleman and man of honour, as well as in your directing power as Premier of the Dominion of Canada.

Granted, even for the sake of illustration, that I am, or was, guilty of all the offences contained in the catalogue of the civil service, would I not be entitled to defence?

It is the boast, as it is, thank God, the practice, that under British law no man shall be condemned until proven guilty of the offence as charged.

Is it possible that the civil service of Canada is the only station of life within the Empire in which no defence is allowed to those against whom error or crime is alleged?

I cannot, Sir, I again repeat, believe this of yourself, and ask, as a matter not only of public duty on your part, but also of common justice to myself, that you will look into the matter forthwith.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) F. B. McCORMICK.

To that letter the following reply was sent :

Ottawa, 15th April, 1897.

F. B. McCormick, Esq., M.D.,  
South Pelee, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I am requested by the Prime Minister to acknowledge the receipt of your favour of the 12th instant, and to inform you that he will call the immediate attention of Mr. Paterson to the matter therein referred to.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) RUDOLPH BOUDREAU.

To this Mr. McCormick replied :

Southport, Pelee Island, May 3, 1897.

Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, M.P.,  
Premier, &c., Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—At this date I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your reply to my note of the 12th ultimo, your reply bearing date the 15th ultimo.

The matter being referred to the hon. the Controller of Customs, I awaited his reply to your inquiry.

Permit me to again draw your attention to the matter, and to very respectfully solicit your early consideration of my case.

I have the honour to remain, sir,

Yours very sincerely,

(Sgd.) F. B. McCORMICK.

To this the following reply was sent to Mr. McCormick :—

Ottawa, 28th May, 1897.

F. B. McCormick, Esq., M.D.,  
South Pelee P. O., Ont.

Sir—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 12th ult. Owing to the press of work consequent upon the tariff revision, a reply to your letter has been overlooked.

The reason for your dismissal appears to be that the manner in which you have conducted the customs business on the island has not been considered satisfactory.

The chief inspector has reported to the effect that the public convenience will be best served by changing the outport from Southport to West Dock, as has been done.

The Order in Council directs that your services be dispensed with, and the notice sent you was in accordance with such direction.

Your salary will be paid to the time you received notice dispensing with your services.

I have the honour to be, sir,  
Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) JOHN McDOUGALD,  
Commissioner.

This is the correspondence that took place between the Prime Minister and Mr. McCormick's son, and with Mr. McCormick himself; and yet, without notice, this gentleman was dismissed, the reason assigned in one case being that he had not attended faithfully to his duties, and in the other case that it suited the public convenience to abolish his port and open a port at another place. I claim that a great injustice has been done to Mr. McCormick, particularly after he had received the assurance of the Prime Minister that if a complaint were made, it would be fully investigated, and that he would have every opportunity of refuting any charge made against him. I think the Prime Minister ought to redeem the promise he made, and have the case fully inquired into, and justice done to Mr. McCormick.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have just a word to say to my hon. friend. He will readily admit that it is not possible for me to give him any answer at all or any information on this matter, as it is two years old, and the hon. gentleman has not refreshed my memory. If he had informed me that he was going to bring the matter up, I would have conferred with the Minister of Customs; but being taken unawares, it is impossible for me to give him any answer at this moment.

Mr. CLANCY. It appears that the Minister of Customs failed to comply with the request of the Prime Minister. If the case is two years old, I am afraid that the Minister of Customs is the sinner. He either shut his eyes to the request of the First Minister, or in that case, as in most other cases, he turned a deaf ear to it. It is always better to ignore a matter of this kind than to bring the alleged culprits to the bar

and give them a trial. The only way to be sure of dismissing a man is never to give him a trial. I do not see the Postmaster General here, but I recall the fact that he dismissed two or three officials and gave them a trial afterwards, when it was found that they were not guilty; but I never heard of them being restored to office. In the face of the letter of the Prime Minister, declaring that Mr. McCormick should have a fair trial, and the other letter, stating that he would call the attention of the Minister of Customs to the matter, I think we ought to have an explanation from the Minister of Customs.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I would be very glad to give what information I could in respect to the matter; but, as the Prime Minister has said, it happened some two years ago, and I would be afraid to speak with any degree of confidence as to the merits of the case. I rather judge from the letter of the commissioner which has been read, that the chief inspector had visited the island, and reported with reference to the conduct of the officer and with reference to the office itself. I am only judging from what is stated in the letter, as I have not the facts distinctly before me. I do not wish, of course, to say anything that might prejudice the gentleman; but my impression and that of the commissioner is, that he had not been wholly satisfactory in the discharge of his duties before I took office at all—that he had been either under suspension—I had better not say that, if the hon. gentleman shakes his head, as I do not want to do the gentleman an injustice; but I fancy that if hon. gentlemen were conversant with the facts, they would admit that unjust action was not taken. It is not my desire to do injustice, and, as far as I am aware, I have not done so in this case.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Customs to the fact that he has not met the case at all. I will assume that we have all the facts in this correspondence.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I would not like to admit that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, we have all the correspondence before us, and the facts lie upon the surface. They are these. An application was made by the son of an office holder to the right hon. Prime Minister, stating that his father had reason to expect that charges would be made against him, and begging the right hon. gentleman to secure him a hearing in case any were made. That is undeniable. But the gravamen of the case is this, that the right hon. gentleman, in acknowledging the letter, over his own signature, assured the son:

You may be sure that should any accusations be made against your father, they will be carefully considered, and your father will be allowed every opportunity of defending himself and re-

butting the charges made against him. I shall hand over your letter to Mr. Paterson, with the recommendation to give it his best attention.

The right hon. Prime Minister also in that letter gave a very high character—I will not say too high—to the Minister of Customs as a very careful and upright man, and in this way gave the assurance to this gentleman that his father's case was in the hands of a man of that character. With such a certificate of character, the Minister of Customs should have been doubly careful not to forfeit that high character. The right hon. Minister followed that up by giving this gentleman the positive assurance that if any charges were made against the father, the father would be given the opportunity of meeting and rebutting them.

The PRIME MINISTER. How is it known that he was not?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. By the correspondence.

The PRIME MINISTER. Only one side of the correspondence is there.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is all here.

The PRIME MINISTER. Only one side of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my right hon. friend will examine the correspondence, he will find that it is continuous and complete, because when this man complained of the action taken by the Minister of Customs, the Minister did not say there had been any investigation, but rests the dismissal completely on report from the inspector of Customs that this man had not performed his duty in a satisfactory manner.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This official held in his hand the pledge of the Prime Minister that if any charges were made against him, he would be given the opportunity of rebutting them, and I have no doubt that the right hon. gentleman sent the Minister of Customs both Mr. McCormack's letter and his own reply to that letter. The Minister of Customs does not pretend that this man was ever given any opportunity to defend himself, but simply says that he was dismissed on the statement of the inspector of Customs that he did not perform his duties in a satisfactory manner. The question is not whether he performed his duties satisfactorily or otherwise, but it is that although he had the positive assurance from the Prime Minister that he would be given the opportunity to rebutt any charge brought against him, he never was given that opportunity, but was dismissed on the mere statement of the inspector of customs. We have, in addition, on the 8th February, 1897, an affidavit made by Hugh H. McCormack, that the inclosed are copies of the originals in his possession, and to the best of his knowledge and belief they are true copies.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

He gives the entire correspondence and swears to their accuracy, and this correspondence shows that the pledge of the Prime Minister was never carried out. I do not hold the right hon. gentleman responsible in the slightest degree, but the responsibility rests upon the Minister of Customs, and I doubt whether, in the face of these papers, the Prime Minister would be able to again give him a certificate of being such a careful and upright man, who would carry out the pledges, as he is bound to do, of the leader of the Government.

The PRIME MINISTER. I appeal to the sense of fairness of my hon. friend and the House as well, against the attitude which he has just taken. Nothing can be more unfair than this style of argument. Here is a transaction which took place two years ago. The hon. gentleman will not pretend to carry in his memory what took place in his office two years ago or even last year. If the hon. gentleman who brought the matter up had notified my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, my hon. friend would have looked up the record and been able to show the other side of the case. There is another side to the case. It is of record that the office of Mr. McCormack was visited by the inspector. I do not know whether the charges were brought to the attention of Mr. McCormack or whether he was asked to reply or not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The evidence is there over the signature of the commissioner of customs.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend presents the case from the side of the man who was dismissed, and who complains, of course, that he was wrongly dismissed. But there is another side to the case, the side of the department. Does my hon. friend pretend that it would not be well to have, not only the correspondence he read here, but also the report of the inspector on which this man was dismissed. When we have the two versions of the case, my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, will be ready to meet any charges which may be made. It is most unfair to hold the Minister of Customs responsible unless he was notified in advance, and prepared to meet any charge. The hon. gentleman complains that this man was dismissed without being heard, and blames my hon. friend for not having given him the opportunity of defending himself. When the case is brought up at a later day, and the report of the inspector laid before the House, it will be found that the Minister of Customs did give the matter every attention and that justice was done to Mr. McCormack.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend will find that this correspondence contains within itself absolute proof that it is full, complete and absolute proof that the pledge given by the Prime Minister was not carried out and that the man was dismissed in violation of that pledge without any hearing. I

hold in my hand a letter addressed by him to the Prime Minister, in which he says :

Upon your promise in your letter contained, that I should be given a fair trial, if accused of any offence, I fully rely, for, Conservative though I am, I had entire faith in your word as a gentleman and man of honour, as well as in your position of Premier of the Dominion. The letter written me by my son lies opposite dated Ottawa, 6th March, 1897, and opposite it lies a short note from you.

That was the letter declaring he should have the opportunity of rebutting any charges which might be brought against him. He said :

Opposite it lies a short note from the Commissioner of Customs, Mr. John McDougald, a copy of which I inclose. I cannot believe that you were cognizant of the statements made in this last letter when your letter was written. From it it would appear that I was actually dismissed from the post of sub-collector of customs at this port by Order in Council two months before your letter was written, this too, without the slightest chance to defend myself, nay, even without an intimation that I was upon trial.

In reply to the letter there is no statement: You were told what the charges against you were and had an opportunity to refute them; and in reply to the application as to the cause of the dismissal he is informed by the Commissioner of Customs that his letter of the 12th ult. was received, and the reason for his dismissal appears to be the manner in which he had conducted the customs business on the Island had not been considered satisfactory.

Mr. TAYLOR. Read the next paragraph.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (reading).

The chief inspector has reported to the effect that the public convenience will be best served by changing the outport from Southport to West Dock, as has been done.

The evidence is all here that though the inspector reported against him he had no information that such a report had been made nor did he have an opportunity to vindicate himself. I am not going into the question of what the position was; I am dealing with the statement that his case should be heard and he would have an opportunity to defend himself, which was not carried out by the Minister of Customs. There is something in what my right hon. friend says that there was no notice given of these matters. But there are no means of dealing with such questions when items of this kind come up. I know that this gentleman does not come here for the first time two years afterwards. He immediately sent forward his communication. But waiting for the opportunity afforded by the customs Estimates to deal with the matter, it was passed over and there was delay also because of the absence of the party to whom the papers were sent.

Mr. BENNETT. In connection with the dismissals in the province of Ontario—

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ellis). This item does not deal with Ontario.

Mr. BENNETT. But I understand that the discussion has been general and we have been talking about dismissals in Ontario. I desire to call attention to the case of John Galna, who was the landing waiter or occupied some other position in connection with the customs at Parry Sound. After the elections of June, 1896, complaints were made of the conduct of Mr. Galna, and it was said he had been active in the election contest. In the month of March, a considerable time elapsing, the intimation was made to Mr. Galna that an investigation would be held as to his case. But evidently the department did not feel that, with the evidence before them, the case was a very strong one, because it was not until the latter part of July that the investigation was commenced. I have in my hand a copy of the evidence taken on that occasion. A Mr. Woodyatt, who is the police magistrate, I believe, in Brantford, was appointed to conduct the investigation and about the 1st October he arrived at a decision which was communicated to the Minister of Customs; and on the strength of the report, I presume, the Minister of Customs dispensed with the services of Mr. Galna and he was accordingly apprised to that effect somewhere in the month of December, 1897. Mr. Galna having been notified of his dismissal placed himself in communication with the Minister in November, 1898. About the 11th January, 1898, he wrote to the Minister asking what the report of the investigating officer was, and on the 12th January the Minister's secretary wrote stating he had his request for the report, and in reply begged to say that "the Minister does not see his way clear to furnish" him a copy of the report. I submit that it is very unfair to Mr. Galna that the Minister refuses him a copy of this report. The evidence was heard in Parry Sound, and I am sure that, irrespective of politics, the people think the report could not have been averse to the officer owing to the contradictory evidence as to his acts of partisanship, and owing to the further fact that the things complained of were of a most trivial nature. I submit that in fairness to Mr. Galna, the Minister should now afford him the slight satisfaction of knowing what Mr. Woodyatt really did report. It would be unfair to have a man placed on trial and have the jury retire and then be sentenced by the judge without knowing what the jury had found. That is Mr. Galna's position to-day. The case is all the more remarkable in that neighbourhood owing to the fact that Mr. Watson, who was collector of customs at Collingwood, under whose review Mr. Galna was owing to his occupying a subordinate position, was a Liberal, and during all the eighteen years of Conservative Administration he had taken a strong part in the elections. I am told he went so far

as not only to attend public meetings but to attend conventions of the Liberal party. And when people see that he was allowed to perform such acts of citizenship as he saw fit and to take any part in politics he pleased, not only without being dismissed but without being reprimanded, they contrast that with the case of Mr. Galna, who knows that he has been dismissed and does not know what the finding of the commissioner has been. I think the Minister would be doing only tardy justice to Mr. Galna if he would afford him at least the poor satisfaction of knowing what the commissioner's finding was.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not remember that case very distinctly, but as the hon. gentleman states, it was an investigation by Mr. Woodyatt, of Brantford, who gave him a fair trial. I think there were two cases; one was the case of Mr. Galna, of Brantford, and the other of Mr. Hogg, of Collingwood. I think Mr. Hogg also wrote me, and wanted to get a copy of that letter, and I took the ground that I was not at liberty to give papers out of the office on the request of individuals, but if any motion was made in the House for those papers they would be brought down. The member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) gave notice of a motion for a return in the case of Mr. Hogg. I have it in my desk, and would have been glad to do the same with reference to Mr. Galna. I think Mr. Hogg took the ground that he thought there would be no report, and that the finding of the magistrate would not be against him. But I think the papers disclosed that he was mistaken. I am sure that if a report is brought down with reference to Mr. Galna, it will be found that the case was sufficiently established. However, I speak with some uncertainty, not having the papers before me. I would have no objection to the hon. gentleman moving for the papers.

Mr. BENNETT. I have to thank the Minister for recalling the case of Mr. Hogg, of Collingwood, for while I have not seen the evidence in that case, I have been assured that the principal witness against him was this Mr. Watson, who was collector at the port while Mr. Hogg was in the subordinate position of a landing waiter. The reports, if correct, go to show the style of man that Mr. Watson was, for during the 18 years he was there under a Conservative Administration, and while Mr. Hogg had been an officer under him, he had carefully kept tab on every movement of Mr. Hogg, and when the day came for a change in the Government, he then took the position of an informer against his subordinate. If that is the fact, it can only provoke reprisals when the whirligig of time brings its changes. In such case, doubtless the same justice will be dealt out to Mr. Watson

Mr. BENNETT.

that he has dealt out to others. I would ask the Minister if he would, in an informal manner, communicate with Mr. Galna and let him have a copy of the report, because to-day the opinion of Mr. Galna and his friends is that he has been harshly dealt with. Still, should the report of the commissioner be adverse to Mr. Galna, then the Minister will be justified in the stand that he has taken. I would ask him to have the report sent to Mr. Galna.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. member is under the same impression with reference to Mr. Hogg as to Mr. Galna. I have that return in my desk, and will lay it on the Table of the House as soon as the Speaker takes the Chair to-night. The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity of looking through it, and I think he will find that he is mistaken in that case. I feel positive that he is also mistaken in the case of Mr. Galna. The same magistrate investigated both cases, and the testimony is there. Mr. Watson did not make any complaint; he was only called as a witness.

Mr. BENNETT. I did not say that Mr. Watson was complainant, but that he was a witness against Mr. Hogg.

Mr. McDUGALL. I ask the committee to excuse me for referring again to the subject which we were discussing a few minutes ago. My attention was called to the discussion which took place on this subject a year ago, and which will be found on page 3732 of the "Hansard" of last year. It will be seen that that discussion was based upon the presumption that the preferential tariff would only apply to that portion which was the product of British manufacture, or which had entered into the make-up in England. Now, to make that clear to my hon. friend, I will read what took place:

Mr. McDUGALL. Referring to the point that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) speaks so lightly of, I would like to ask the hon. Finance Minister what there is in these resolutions that would prevent the exporting houses of Germany, Belgium or France from sending the cheap products that enter into the manufacture of certain lines of goods to England, putting them together in England, and then exporting them to this country, without paying the duty that would otherwise be imposed upon them. Take, for instance, the article of ladies' hats, which might consist of ribbons, feathers, velvets, laces and a number of other articles, all of which might be manufactured in foreign countries and be worked into hats in England. How can it be expected that the customs officers in this country will be able to tell where any of those articles come from that enter into the composition of a hat made in England. I am satisfied it would be impossible. The same argument might be applied to hundreds of other articles. Take, for instance, mantles, certain lines of dress goods, boots and shoes, woollen and silk goods, socks, stockings, ties, buttons, in all of which the cheap products that enter into

their manufacture may be made out of England, but put together in that country, and thence imported into Canada, under this reduction. In what way are the officers of customs going to be able to tell where any of these products were originally manufactured?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The hon. gentleman could not have been present when I previously answered the same question. It is difficult to tell exactly how it will be done, and that is the reason why we should not endeavour to do it. The object of the clause is to give the Minister of Customs power to deal with the cases as they present themselves. If, in the case of hats, it is apparent to the Minister of Customs that only a small part of the work was done in England, and that it was practically of foreign manufacture, sent to England to evade the law, the Minister would exclude it from the effect of this clause.

Well, now, what is that small portion?

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** Less than 25 per cent.

**Mr. McDOUGALL.** Well, the Minister should have given the House an idea of what the small portion was.

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** You have it now.

**Mr. McDOUGALL.** But it is very contradictory.

I do not see how by any words we can meet the difficulties, and I think it much better to leave the matter to the discretion of the Minister.

It is very strange that the Government, if they considered what was to be the effect of preferential tariff, were not able to come to some understanding as to what the effect of it would be:

I do not pretend that you can define the exact way in which this difficulty can be met, but everything possible for human intelligence to do will be done, and the object of the provision will be best carried out by leaving to the Minister the discretion we desire to leave him, rather than attempt to tie him down by any fast and hard line which hon. gentlemen opposite would have great difficulty in defining.

The understanding of the House was not that this discretion should be applied to 25 per cent, but to the whole value of the goods. The discretion that the House understood was a discretion as to how to distinguish the products of other countries outside of Great Britain from those that were of British manufacture:

**Mr. McDOUGALL.** The hon. gentleman must admit that it is impossible for the Minister of Customs or the officers of customs to make the distinction, and, therefore, why not put some other machinery in the hands of the hon. Minister.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** What would the hon. gentleman suggest?

**Mr. McDOUGALL.** I would suggest this. If it were my business, I would put such machinery as this in the hands of the customs. Let him exact from the manufacturers a declaration to the effect that the articles which enter chiefly

into the manufacture of any particular article are the product of British manufacture and not of foreign manufacture.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** That is a fair suggestion, and no doubt the Minister of Customs will adopt it.

Did he adopt it to the extent of one single sixpence, because there are lots of goods put together in England when the whole amount of the products that enter into the manufacture of them are the products of countries outside of England, and these come in under the preferential tariff.

**Mr. McDOUGALL.** I contend that it is Parliament that should give him the power to do so.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Parliament gives it by this resolution.

**Mr. McDOUGALL.** I speak subject to correction, but it seems to me that Parliament should specifically give this power to the Minister of Customs.

**Mr. WOOD (Hamilton).** That is largely done at present.

**Mr. McDOUGALL.** The power should be given by this resolution.

The House could not understand anything else from the discussion that went on at that time, than that this preferential tariff would not apply to the portion of the article that was made up of the products of other countries, but the intention was that that preferential tariff should only apply to that part representing the labour of the British workman and the material originally manufactured on British territory and not to products of outside countries that entered into the manufacture, especially when the chief portion of the manufacture was the product of outside countries. The hon. Minister of Finance finds fault with hon. gentlemen on this side of the House for taking the stand they have on this item. Every hon. member on this side of the House believes that a preference should be given, but it should not be given at the expense of the Canadian workman. The British people have no right to expect from us what we do not give to our own people, and we do not give to our own people the privilege of taking goods from France or Belgium or any of these foreign countries and putting them together in this country without paying duty on these products. We do not want to allow England to be made a dumping ground for the products of other countries, because we want to give a preference to England and because we want to give an equal chance to the English manufacturer with our own manufacturers when we are giving the English manufacturer, the English labourer and the English workman a preference on the value of their work we are going far enough, but when we go farther and give another preference to the British producer on not only what consists of the British part of the product but on what is not the manufacture of the British artisan but is a foreign product, I think we are going too far.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ellis). We have discussed for four or five hours this general question, and the rule of the House clearly is that each item should be discussed by itself. Of course, I am subject to the control of the committee, but I think it would be better to take up each item.

Mr. MILLS. I understand that we are on item 254 which admits of a general discussion in reference to the item.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ellis). The rule is :

Sometimes there are a number of items in a vote or resolution, and then these may be generally discussed as forming part of a single question. Each item may then, if the committee think proper, be taken up as a distinct question, and so discussed and amended. The debate in such a case must be confined to the item, and when it has been disposed of, no reference can again be made to it when the subsequent items are under discussion.

Mr. MILLS. I understand that the hon. Minister of Customs agreed to allow a general discussion. I wish to inquire of the Minister the rule of the department in reference to collectors of customs engaging in mercantile affairs. Have collectors of customs a right to engage in mercantile business ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Any one engaged in the importation of goods would not be eligible for a collector.

Mr. MILLS. I have to call the hon. Minister's attention to the fact, that I am informed is a fact, that in Wallace, Cumberland County, N.S., the former collector of customs, Mr. Charles H. Kars, was turned out of office for some cause or other.

Mr. TAYLOR. Offensive partisanship.

Mr. MILLS. Offensive partisanship, I presume. Mr. Drysdale was appointed in his place. I am credibly informed that Mr. Drysdale is now doing business in the name of Nelson & Drysdale, general merchants, in Wallace.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is an officer of the name of Drysdale at that place. Does the hon. gentleman say that he is engaged in any importing business ?

Mr. MILLS. He is doing a general retail business under the name of Nelson & Drysdale, and the business is registered under that name. It would be well for the Minister to inquire into this matter.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. A note has been made of it, and I will inquire into it.

Mr. MILLS. I would also bring the notice of the Minister to another matter. There is a rule in the department in reference to collectors of customs engaging in municipal politics. Are the same rules and regulations, that were enacted as far back as 1875, still in force in the Department of Customs ?

Mr. McDougall.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The department does not approve of officers of customs filling municipal offices.

Mr. MILLS. If I am correctly informed, and I think I am, there is a direct rule against that, enacted as far back as 1875, and which obtains still in the department.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think so.

Mr. MILLS. That being the case, I call the attention of the Minister to the fact that we have in the county of Annapolis a collector of customs for the port of Lower Granville named Edgar H. Porter, who has engaged actively in political matters, and has been elected municipal councillor for that district after a very rabid partisan political contention. The other night the Prime Minister, in replying to the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), with reference to Mr. McDonald, formerly of the Intercolonial Railway, stated that one of the charges against Mr. McDonald was that he was very much taken up with municipal politics, and that was one of the reasons why he was turned out of office. I ask the Minister of Customs to get a report from his inspector on this case in Annapolis county. I tell him the facts as they appear to me—and I have no doubt the inspector will endorse them—that Mr. Porter indulged in a violent partisan contest in the county of Annapolis, and consequently he, no doubt, does not control the confidence of quite a number of the inhabitants of Lower Granville.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will make a note of that.

Customs—  
Ontario ..... \$303,240

Mr. CLARKE. Would the Minister explain this increase of \$2,785, as compared with last year ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The business of Toronto having increased largely, we had to give them some extra officers and owing to the extension of business, the cartage and contingencies have increased.

Mr. CLARKE. Is any of that increase to be given to the permanent officers ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am trying to make provisions for a few whom I consider deserving and whose position in the service warrants it.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it be convenient for the Minister to give us the names of the officers who are to receive an increase ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I trust the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) will not press that, as it has not yet been fully determined upon, and we are endeavouring to do it on the question of merit, and where the circumstances will admit of it.

## Customs—

Manitoba ..... \$36,945

Mr. WALLACE. What is the explanation of the increase of \$4,000 here?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The business at Winnipeg has increased enormously, the revenue there amounting now to about \$1,000,000. When Mr. McMichael went up last year, they complained of not having enough officers, and the department empowered Mr. McMichael to have the service efficiently manned in that city. The contingencies there have also increased, as would necessarily be the case with the expansion of business.

Mr. TAYLOR. I suppose the increase in Manitoba would be from agricultural implements not made in Canada.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Not all, but I dare say that among other things.

## Customs—

North-west Territories ..... \$10,000

Mr. WALLACE. What is the explanation of this increase of \$1,450?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We have made Lethbridge a port of entry which was formerly an outport, and we pay the officer there \$1,000. We have increased sub-collector Osborne at Edmonton from \$250 to \$500. The collections at Edmonton went up very rapidly, being something like \$20,000, and it is only proper that the salary of the officer there should be advanced to \$500. There are other necessary items which would account for the increase. In that country, between sessions of Parliament, occasions may arise when another officer is required, and we like to have a little more than is absolutely required. Of course, it will not be expended if it is not needed.

## Customs—

British Columbia ..... \$95,000

Mr. WALLACE. There is a large increase here. What does it mean?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. A large amount of this increase is at the port of Vancouver, where the business has increased very greatly, and the office was not sufficiently manned. That is another case in which the chief inspector was requested to go out and thoroughly examine into the workings of the port, and to report what was necessary. It was found that eleven new officers were required, and the port is now, I believe, on an excellent footing.

Mr. COCHRANE. How many were there before?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. About twenty before. The revenue has about doubled within the last year or two.

Mr. COCHRANE. I cannot see how that argument works out. I know of my own knowledge, men who do not work half their

time in their office, and yet collect many thousands of dollars. I never heard anything about these men being overworked. Hon. gentlemen opposite were great sticklers for economy, when we were on the other side of the House, but I dare say some Grit heelers wanted to be appointed to office. Now, does it not strike any hon. gentleman as absurd, to say that at the port of Vancouver, where the officials were doing the business fairly well, eleven more men were required. When the Minister of Customs wants these increases, I notice that he talks very low. Generally, when he has a pretty good case, he will talk very loud and hammer two or three desks; but when he is telling the committee that he is doubling up the officials, he talks so low that you can hardly hear him. I think he ought to give us some better argument for doubling up the officials than that they are collecting a little more money. How much was collected there before these officers were appointed, and how much now?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the figures, but they are collecting very nearly double. At the port of Vancouver a great many men are required who are not collecting revenue at all. It is an immense transshipping port for the trade that is done with China and Japan, for goods going east and goods going west.

Mr. COCHRANE. Where are they transshipping from?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Cars coming in have to be sealed, and the goods seen on the ship; and all that work has to be accomplished by our officials. There is no desire at all to overload the port, and it was simply impossible to perform the work as it should be done, with the staff we had. Whatever may be the expense, it is necessary that the ports should be sufficiently manned. I grant that perhaps there are ports to be found in Canada where an officer's whole time is not taken up; but if you have the port, you must have the man to attend to it. Some of the salaries are very low indeed. We do not wish to boast. The expenditure has gone up somewhat; but if you take the expenditure for salaries and contingencies in 1894-95, the last year in which the department was administered by my predecessor, you will find that, though the Department of Customs was always considered one that was well and economically managed, yet the cost of management was a great deal more than it is now. If you take the receipts during this year and apply to them the cost of collection, you will find that the cost is now 25 per cent, or \$260,000 less than it was in 1894-95. In other words, the cost would have been 25 per cent more, if the same percentage cost of collection existed this past year as in 1894-95, though the department was econo-

mically administered at that time. In addition, the work at the ports and of the inside staff has been wonderfully increased by the preferential tariff. We require to keep two sets of books, but although that is the case, the inside service has not been increased, except the slight increase in the third-class clerks. At our ports there is considerably more work done. There is a larger business and a larger revenue, and the number of entries, which is the best test of the work, has been enormously increased. If you were to apply the percentage of the cost of collection in 1894-95, under the careful management of my predecessor, to the present year, the cost of collection would be \$260,000 more than we are asking for. With the expansion of trade and commerce, you must expect the charges to increase, but the only way to look at it is to take the percentage of the cost of collection now and compare that with what it was before, and you will find that there is a very great reduction indeed. The port of Vancouver, I consider, is properly manned now. Previously it was not, and the desire of the department and the merchants and this House, I am sure, is that, while looking carefully after the expenditure, we should have a sufficient number of officers to transact the business that requires to be done in such a way as to safeguard the revenue and give satisfaction to the business community.

Mr. COCHRANE. That is just one of the arguments in which there is no force at all—the argument that because of the importations or the business is expanding there should be an increase in the charges of management. There is no argument in talking of business increasing the cost, unless you mean importations. We might export millions of dollars' worth without entailing any additional work on the staff.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is importations I am alluding to.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then, do not talk of the business of the country. We might export millions of dollars' worth to Europe without interfering with the customs officers at all.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No? Ask your friends.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not need to ask anybody with reference to that. It is something new to say that you must have an official in every place from which you export to see that you export properly. There are hundreds of thousands of dollars shipped from ports that I know as well as I know the Minister of Customs, where there is no official attending to that work at all. There may be some regulations enforced in the case of exports to China and Japan, though I do not know why you should be

Mr. PATERSON.

so much interested, if I send a cargo to China and Japan, as to send an official to see that the cars are locked and my goods properly shipped. What argument is there in giving us the percentage which the cost of collection bears to the amount collected? I am not finding any fault, but the hon. gentleman knows that there are hundreds of officials who could to-day do as much work again as they are now doing and not be over-worked at all.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not putting an extra man on at all.

Mr. COCHRANE. I think you are, but I cannot bring you to account for your administration of those distant ports as those nearer home. When you must have a man, he is entitled to fair consideration for his time but he would just as soon work all the time as not. I have men in my riding who would just as soon be making entries if you call that work, as sitting in their offices doing nothing. Here is where the Minister is making a mistake. He totals up how many men he should have in the office for the business they do. Does he take into consideration the fact that before the business expanded—I think it would be better if he had said before the imports were increased—these men were not working all the time?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I did take that into consideration.

Mr. COCHRANE. Are you sure of that?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. All right.

Mr. WALLACE. I cannot let the statement of the hon. Minister go without challenge. He says the percentage is so much smaller now than it was some few years ago that there has been a saving of \$260,000 to the department. I totally deny that statement from start to finish. What are the facts? In the first place, in a period of depression, you cannot in any business reduce the expenses, because those men, we will assume, are engaged permanently, and you cannot well reduce the staff in years of depression to correspond with the depression. Yet what do we find? Take the last two years of the Conservative regime, and the expenditures have been practically, for every year but one, lower in percentage as regards the cost of collection than during the years this Government has been in power. In 1898 the percentage of the expense of collecting customs revenue was 4.37, or \$4.37 per \$100. In 1897 it was 4.75. In 1896, all under Conservative rule, it was 4.43. In 1895 it was 5.13. That was the year of the greatest depression, when the expenses could not be reduced corresponding with the reduced receipts. In 1894 it was 4.26. So that the average of

the four last years of Conservative rule was 4.64, as compared with an average of two years of Liberal rule of 4.86, or nearly the same figure.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. 4.10 for the year just closing.

Mr. WALLACE. I have pointed out that when the revenues have fallen off, you cannot easily reduce your permanent staff, and when the business increases the only difference is that the men are kept more busily employed and keeping them busily employed does them good. There should not be an increase in the public service because there are larger revenues, and when the Government state that in the port of Vancouver the increase has been from 20 to 31 clerks, or 11 at one time, that appears to me totally unjustifiable. The Minister says that the revenues have doubled. That is a mistake. I would like him to give the figures, and I presumed he would come here prepared with the figures, but it seems he has no figures or information before him, but gives his impressions or says he does not remember.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Not at all.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. gentleman give us the figures showing that the business of the port of Vancouver has doubled? Collections at the port of Toronto are more than six times as much as those at the port of Vancouver, but the officers at Toronto are not six times as numerous—not four times as numerous. There is no reason that I know of why the same number of officers could not do more business at Vancouver than they can at Toronto. The railway stations are fewer; the harbour is less in extent, and the business more concentrated in Vancouver than in Toronto or in Montreal. And yet the expenditure is larger in proportion, and the number of clerks is larger in proportion, than in either Toronto or Montreal. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) says that a lot of Liberal heeleders are asking for jobs, and the clamour by members for the appointment of these men to office has been so loud and long that the Minister of Customs had to appoint them. I suppose that is the explanation of the appointment of eleven customs officers at one time at the port of Vancouver. If business had increased, as no doubt it has, the officials, by more diligence, could do a greater amount of work, for the usual rule is, that Government officials are not overworked, and you could easily require a staff of customs officials to do a little more work during the rush of business, just as it is done in any trade or business, and so save this extra expenditure.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) says I have not given the figures. I think, when I have

given the figures, the committee will see the necessity for the increases in the staff. In 1897 the customs duties at the port of Vancouver were \$390,981, and in 1898 they have swollen to \$608,253, and my accountant tells me that for the eleven months of the year just closed there was over \$800,000.

Mr. WALLACE. What were they in 1894, 1895 and 1896?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I suppose they are not so much. I have not the figures. But the increase from 1897 is what I have shown.

Mr. TAYLOR. That might be, and not increase the work of the office.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But this office was undermanned before the business grew in this recent expansion. There was not an appraiser there at that point; the port was reported to be in such a condition that was not creditable to the Dominion, and not efficient, as safeguarding the revenue.

Mr. TAYLOR. The receipts of the Grand Trunk this year are double what they were a year ago, and the expenditure is less. Why could not this be the case in the customs.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think that rather a doubtful statement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) is astray in that statement. The Grand Trunk receipts are only \$600,000 more than they were last year.

Mr. TAYLOR. But what we have to compare with was three years ago, at the time of the depression. The expenditure is decreased nearly 25 per cent under Mr. Hayes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. gentleman must revise his statement. It cannot be that the expenses can be 25 per cent less.

Mr. TAYLOR. Very nearly.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I happen to know something about it in a general way, and I feel safe in saying the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not wish to make a speech, but I wish to call the hon. Minister's attention to another of his victims; I know he is pleased to have the list increased. I refer to Mr. Wm. Callwell, of Amherstburg, who was dismissed something over a year ago. I understand that Mr. Callwell has been in the service something more than ten years, and that he was dismissed without any investigation. I shall not set up any defence for Mr. Callwell; the proper time for that would be, when an investigation is instituted by the Minister of Customs. I understand that the department has not only refused an investigation, but has refused to

pay Mr. Callwell any compensation for the sums of money that he has paid into the superannuation fund. It seems to me that is a very unfair way of treating any person. I do not think that we should be told, as in another case, that this was two years old, and nothing could be done. I am going to ask the Minister whether he proposes to give Mr. Callwell his superannuation money or give him an investigation, or both.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I judge, from what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) says, that this gentleman was not dismissed for political partisanship. Where parties have been retired from the service for political partisanship, their contributions to the superannuation fund have been returned, with 5 per cent added. But where parties have been retired for cause other than political partisanship—for neglect of duty, or anything of that kind—it has not been the rule to return the amounts paid into the superannuation fund. Of course, as the hon. gentleman will understand, this is not a matter wholly within the department, but has to be dealt with by a power higher than the department.

Mr. CLANCY. That seems all the greater reason why there should be an investigation. I do not know anything that has thrown more light on the present methods than the few words the hon. Minister has just spoken. He makes the statement, that the man dismissed for cause shall not receive any return for the sums of money he has paid in.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Has not.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. Minister say that he will sit in his office, and will not give an officer dismissed for cause an investigation—that he will let him go in that manner?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, will he give Mr. Callwell an investigation before he cuts him off in that way?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The statute does not precisely say that it should be confined to such cases, but the statute was passed with the express intention, so stated to the House, to make payment to the gentlemen who were removed for political cause.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, in that case, before visiting such penalties, should not an investigation be held? Before visiting such penalties upon Mr. Callwell, is it not fair that he should have an investigation?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The investigation took place before the officer. The chief inspector of ports, whose duty it is, made a report, and that report is in the office.

Mr. CLANCY.

Mr. BERGERON. We are entitled to see the report.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You have not asked for it. I certainly could not bring all the reports in my office here.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the complaint against this man?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The office was in the most untidy state it was possible to imagine, and he was reported against by the inspector. My impression is that if any gentleman saw that report he would say it was my duty to retire that man from the service. The inspectors can have no object in reporting against a man, they simply do their duty in reporting as to the way in which he discharged his duties.

Mr. CLANCY. I think we should have the report. These cases have been coming up somewhat frequently. We had another example here to-night with regard to Mr. McCormack, and the report was so colourless that no person could conclude that the man ought to be dismissed. The report says: "The reason for your dismissal appears to be the manner in which you have conducted the customs business on the island." "Appears to be," he is not certain in his letter. If the other report is as colourless as that, I think it is a slipshod way of doing business. I ask the hon. gentleman to lay the report on the Table so that we may see it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Will you call at the office and see it? I would have to have it copied.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not think it is fair to ask me to go to the office; we should have it here.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will try and bring it down as soon as I can.

Mr. WALLACE. I had some knowledge of this case. I think Mr. Callwell wrote to me that he had asked the Minister for an investigation, and he complained that he had not had any. I do not think while I was in the department I ever failed to give British fair play to the man charged. Every officer should have an opportunity to defend himself before an impartial investigator; he can appeal from that investigator if he likes to the Minister. But I think it is dealing unfairly by the humblest officer in the Customs Department summarily to dismiss him without an opportunity of presenting his case.

Mr. MCGREGOR. My hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) says that customs house officers should have British fair play. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman made one visit to Windsor and cut off the head of Mr. John Watson and Mr. Samuel Chevallier, 52 years old, as able a man and much stronger man than the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) says that I made one visit to Windsor. I say that I cut off nobody's head and that I did not interfere with anybody on my visit to Windsor on that occasion.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Go on.

Mr. WALLACE. That is all.

Mr. BERGERON. Take it back.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Take nothing back. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) bellows there the whole time.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) is obliged to take back an expression when the hon. gentleman to whom he applies it makes a denial.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I live in Windsor, and I know the action that was taken by the hon. gentleman. He came there from Detroit, and I know that upon the occasion of this single visit, the heads of Samuel Chevalier and Mr. Baby were taken off. Hon. gentlemen said: We do not require them, but they appointed William Stokes, older than Mr. Chevalier, and a man who has not been a sober man for twenty-five years.

Mr. WALLACE. I never appointed the man.

Mr. CLANCY. I think it is most unfair to make such an attack upon Mr. Stokes. He is quite as respectable as the hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor), and that is saying a good deal. I am not going to reflect upon my hon. friend, but I say it is an unfair and cowardly thing to attack a gentleman like Mr. Stokes behind his back.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ellis). The hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) has not given way to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy).

Mr. CLANCY. I desired to correct the statement of the hon. member (Mr. McGregor), because I think it is uncalled for and unmanly.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Maybe that is true or not. The hon. gentleman knows that I am telling the truth. I am not going to say a mean thing to the hon. member, but he knows that this is the truth and nothing but the truth. I am sorry for Stokes myself, but we will have to call upon the Minister to have him dismissed, and then the hon. gentleman can find fault again because he is not doing his duty. It was owing to pure kind-heartedness towards himself and his family that he has been kept in his position. I have tried my best to keep him there as an old neighbour, but he cannot attend to his duties. Samuel Chevalier was not given an opportunity of being heard at a trial nor was John Watson who had been in the service for twenty-five years, given a trial. It is true that Mr. Baby was an old gentleman, but no finer man ever lived in Canada. Ho

filled the position that he occupied with honour and with dignity, yet he was dismissed at the same time. All that we are asking is fair-play. If hon. gentlemen opposite think that these men received fair-play I will tell them that their heads went off at one time without the opportunity of a trial being given them. There was no case against them; they were straightforward, honest, thoroughly industrious, always anxious to do their duty properly and to exhibit courtesy to the public. It was a shame that they should be dismissed and that older men should be put in their places without any trial ever being offered them. I should not say "dismissed," because they were superannuated, and their places were filled by men older than themselves.

Mr. BENNETT. What about Killackey's case? Did he have an investigation?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Killackey was only there five or six months.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not suppose that any member of this House has ever heard a larger number of misstatements made than have been made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) in the time that he occupied the attention of the committee. Every statement he has made is wrong and he cannot justify or confirm one of them. In fact, at the end of his speech he took occasion to deny the statements he had made at the beginning of it. He said that these men were not dismissed. His whole speech was a harangue against the dismissal of these men unjustly and improperly. He says that I appointed Stokes. I see by the official return that Stokes was appointed on the 1st of June, 1896. I had then ceased to be Controller of Customs.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Your Government appointed him; I did not say yourself.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, the hon. gentleman charged me directly and personally with the responsibility for this appointment. I had retired from the Government and I had no personal responsibility at that time. I was not supporting that Government to an alarming extent, as the hon. gentleman knows.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Yes, I know it.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman's charge was that I had dismissed these men while in the next sentence he said that they were all superannuated. Nobody regretted more than I did the necessity of superannuating our good old friend Mr. Baby, because I knew the history of that distinguished French Canadian. But I had to superannuate him as he was 88 years of age. Surely it will not be said that a man must not be superannuated when he is 88 years of age?

Mr. MCGREGOR. If you had known the case you would not have superannuated him.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). His age appears as 83 in the book.

Mr. **WALLACE**. Well, 83 years is a good age.

Mr. **McGREGOR**. He is just as strong as the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. **WALLACE**. I have no recollection of the other gentlemen named. Mr. William Stokes may have been appointed. I do not know as I had nothing to do with his appointment. I got up and denied that I had appointed Mr. William Stokes, but the hon. gentleman reiterated the statement.

Mr. **McGREGOR**. I forgot that you had left the Government.

Mr. **WALLACE**. No, no; "Hansard" will show that the hon. gentleman charged that I had appointed Mr. Stokes, and when I denied that I had any personal responsibility for it the hon. gentleman repeated his statement that I had appointed him, and when he was asked by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) to withdraw his statement, in the face of my denial, he abused the hon. member for Beauharnois for interrupting him. That disposes of the matter which the hon. member has brought to the attention of the committee. His object was to show that while I was stating what was a correct rule of procedure for the hon. Minister of Customs to follow, I had not regarded the rule which I laid down for his guidance, myself. I deny the statement of the hon. member for North Essex in toto. His statement was that when I made my visit to Windsor these three heads fell. My visit was made on my return from the Chicago Exhibition in June 1893. These superannuations occurred in the latter part of 1895, more than three years afterwards, and that shows what connection there was between my visit and the cutting off of heads.

Mr. **McGREGOR**. You made another visit.

Mr. **WALLACE**. I made the statement that I only made one visit, and I met the hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) when I was there.

Mr. **CLANCY**. The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) will only do himself justice if he withdraws the statement he made regarding Mr. Stokes. He says in one breath that Mr. Stokes has been drunk for ten years—

Mr. **BERGERON**. Twenty years.

Mr. **BENNETT**. That is nothing in Windsor.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) declares that although Mr. Stokes has been drunk all that time, he kept him in his position for the sake of his family

Mr. **McGREGOR**.

and because he was a near neighbour. Mr. Chairman, do you treat your near neighbours in that way? If they have failings of that kind, do you come to this House, where the man cannot defend himself, and availing yourself of your privileges as a member, do you make a statement that your friend is drunk for twenty years? It comes with bad grace from the hon. member (Mr. McGregor), especially when he says he is a friend and neighbour of Mr. Stokes, and he should withdraw it. I hope the hon. gentleman will have the manliness to withdraw it, or to amend it so as to make his one statement tally with the other. Now, we should have the report in the case of Mr. Callwell.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. A note has been taken of that.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Unless that report discloses some good reason why Mr. Callwell should not have an investigation—

Mr. **WALLACE**. Every man should have an investigation.

Mr. **CLANCY**. I go further and I say, that even the report of an officer of the department should not be taken as conclusive evidence to dismiss a man without investigation. It is a very serious thing to deprive a man of his means of living, and he should have no opportunity to justify his conduct. Personally, I do not know much about Mr. Callwell's case, but I do say that he should have fair play.

Mr. **McGREGOR**. Out of twenty officers in our district, the only two Liberals in the whole twenty, were the two men who were dismissed.

Mr. **WALLACE**. They must have been very bad.

Mr. **McGREGOR**. That is Mr. Watson and Mr. Chevalier.

The committee rose and reported.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 26th July, 1899.

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER** took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

**POSTMASTER AT BRANTFORD.**

Mr. **CLANCY** (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

1. What salary does the postmaster at Brantford receive?

2. If not paid by salary, what commission does he receive based upon the last complete quarter, and what will his fees or salary be per annum?

3. Is he paid the same as the late postmaster? If not, wherein is the difference?

4. Has a deputy postmaster been appointed? If so, what is his salary or fees?

5. Is the postmaster at Brantford engaged in any other business, mercantile or otherwise? If so, is it the intention of the Government to allow a postmaster to draw his pay as such and compete with others who are engaged in the same line of business?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). The late postmaster at Brantford was allowed a commission and proportion of box rents of the office, he paying thereout to the staff of the office such salaries as he fixed for them. The gross amount out of which the late postmaster paid his own salary and that of the staff amounted to \$5,262. In connection with the appointment of the present postmaster, a change was made whereby the salary of the postmaster was limited to a fixed sum of \$1,500 a year, leaving the balance of the allowance heretofore made for the maintenance of the post office applicable by the postmaster for the payment of the salaries of the rest of the staff in addition to the fixed sum of \$1,500 above mentioned, the postmaster to be entitled to retain the box rents, and, in consideration thereof, he to supply the office with all requirements except usual office equipment issued by the department to post offices such as Brantford. The department does not appoint any of the staff in the Brantford office other than the postmaster. I am not aware that the postmaster at Brantford is engaged in any business, mercantile or otherwise. Postmasters in positions of the importance of the office at Brantford are expected to withdraw from other business, and if so engaged at the time of appointment, they would be expected to do so within a reasonable time.

#### GOVERNMENT LEASE, NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C.

Mr. PRIOR (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

1. Has the Government granted a lease of a lot, or portion of a lot at the corner of Begbie and Columbia Streets in New Westminster, B.C.?

2. If so, to whom is the lease granted, on whose recommendation, and at what rental annually?

3. If this lease has been granted, did the Government call by public advertisement for tenders for said lease, or was it given privately?

4. Was not the said lot reserved by the Government of the late Right Honourable Sir John Macdonald as a site for a permanent exhibition, as shown by correspondence which took place in 1889 or thereabouts?

5. Will the Government bring down to the House all the above correspondence that can be found in connection with said lot?

6. Also, if lease has been granted, will the Government bring down to the House all papers, telegrams, letters, &c., that have passed between the Government and any person or persons in regard to said lease?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). 1. Yes; lot 1, block 13. 2. Lease granted to John Reid; rental, \$250 per annum. 3. Offer received without call for tenders and accepted, it not being usual to call for tenders for such leases and none having been called when the former Government leased the same property to John Wilson in 1893 and subsequently to David Diamond in January, 1896. 4. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. What about questions 5 and 6?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The correspondence should properly be moved for. I will look into it. I do not anticipate any difficulty about bringing it down, but I have not got it in hand.

#### BRITISH COLUMBIA ALIEN ACT.

Mr. PRIOR (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

1. Has the Government had any correspondence with the Provincial Government of British Columbia or any other person, in regard to the Act passed by the Provincial Government, intituled: "An Act to amend the Placer Mining Act" (otherwise known as the Alien Act)?

2. If so, will the Government bring said correspondence down to the House before the end of the session?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Yes, the Government have received some correspondence on this subject which will be brought down, probably to-day or tomorrow.

#### GALICIANS AND DOUKHOBORS.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. What number of Galicians, including Austrians and Doukhobors respectively, have arrived in Canada since July, 1897, and what has been paid per head for these?

2. What is the number expected to arrive during the remainder of the current year?

3. What officials of the Immigration Department have been employed in connection with the Austrians or Galicians and Doukhobors, and what portion of their time has been employed for that purpose?

4. What amount has been guaranteed by the Government or its officials to purveyors for the Doukhobors and Galicians?

5. What is the total amount which Mr. McDougall refers to in correspondence dated March 25th, 1898, and November 25th, 1898? (See Auditor's Report, Outlay for Emigrants.)

6. What is the amount of the fund (if any) provided or guaranteed on behalf of the Doukhobors for supplies, and how is it secured?

7. What is the cost of the interpreting staff at Winnipeg in connection with the Doukhobors and Galicians?

8. What amount of stock and materials, provisions, &c., and farm implements were bought in Manitoba and the North-west Territories for the Doukhobors or Galicians by C. W. Speers and other Government agents?

9. What Government agents have been employed to look after the Doukhobors and Galicians,

and what time has been spent by them in connection with the same, and the outlays therefor?

10. What has been paid for medical expenses in connection with the Doukhobors and Galicians?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). 1. The number of Austrians, including Galicians, arriving in Canada from July, 1897, to the 30th June, 1899, is about 11,560. The number of Doukhobors in the same period is about 7,300. The amount paid and to be paid is £1 per head for Doukhobors and \$5 for each adult ticket to Galicians. 2. The Government can give no estimate as to future immigration. 3. The officials of the Immigration Branch of the Department employed in connection with the Galicians and Doukhobors includes the regular staff maintained to receive and care for immigrants of all classes and nationalities at Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Montreal and Winnipeg. It would be impossible to make any division of the time of officials specially occupied with Galicians or Doukhobors. 4. No amount has been guaranteed by the Government to purveyors for Doukhobors or Galicians. 5. \$3,290.06. 6. There has been no fund provided or guaranteed on behalf of the Doukhobors, except the bonus of £1 per head to be paid to the committee, to be expended as the committee may deem advisable. 7. The total cost of interpreting staff, including permanent and temporary officials who are employed as well as land guides in locating settlers, is \$3,098.48. These officers deal with all immigrants who may require their services. 8. The department is not able to say at present what amount has been paid as full reports are not yet in and the amount of the purchases are paid for out of the Doukhobor fund by the committee at Winnipeg and not by the Government, though in some cases they have been paid by the Government and deducted from the bonus. 9. The regular staff at Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Montreal, Winnipeg and Ottawa, together with occasional extra assistance, have been employed as circumstances demanded in connection with these people, but it is impossible to say what time or money has been spent by them in connection with this particular phase of immigration work as distinguished from other work. 10. The total amount paid for medical expenses up to date, not including drugs, is \$1,395.85.

#### MOUNTED POLICE BUILDING, PRINCE ALBERT.

Mr. DAVIS (by Mr. Rutherford) asked :

1. What year was the Mounted Police building erected at Prince Albert?
2. What was the total expenditure upon same?
3. Were tenders called for?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). 1. The work was started in 1887 and finished in 1889. 2. \$76,492.69. 3. No.

Mr. TAYLOR.

#### REGISTRY OFFICE, PRINCE ALBERT.

Mr. DAVIS (by Mr. Rutherford) asked :

1. What year was the registry office built in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan?
2. Were tenders called for?
3. How many tenders were received?
4. What was the amount of each tender?
5. Was the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer?
6. Were specifications changed after signing of contract?
7. Was the contractor allowed to put in a different foundation than that specified in the contract? If so, what did the foundation cost?
8. What did the building above foundation cost?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). 1. It was completed in October, 1894. 2. Yes. 3. Five. 4. The figures are: \$6,854, \$8,290, \$9,885, \$9,975, \$10,960. 5. Yes. 6. No. 7. On reaching the depth called for by the contract quick sand was struck and in order to obtain a reliable foundation it was necessary to pile and fill in between the piles with cement concrete and to place over the piles and concrete stringers, and over these again a timber platform to carry the foundation walls which was done at a cost of \$2,348. 8. \$6,854.

#### POSTMISTRESS OF SINTULATA.

Mr. DAVIN (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

Whether Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe, of Sintulata, has been dismissed from the position of postmistress of Sintulata, North-west Territories?

How long has Mrs. Rowe held this position, and if dismissed, who recommended her dismissal? On what grounds was she dismissed?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mullock). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I would state that the late postmistress at Sintulata held office since the 1st of March, 1892, until her removal. A very numerous signed petition was sent to the department representing that the postmistress was the wife of a hotel-keeper, and that the office was unsatisfactorily managed, and there was a feeling of insecurity in the community. The feeling there was that the office should not be associated with the hotel business, and for these reasons she was removed.

#### PURCHASE OF LAND AT LEVIS.

Mr. MARCOTTE (by Mr. Foster) asked :

From whom has land been bought at Lévis in connection with the \$48,000 vote, as answered by the Prime Minister? What amount has been paid, and to whom?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). The land was bought from the estate of D. B. Young, and the estate of Colonel William Rose. The amounts paid were as follows:—Estate of D. B. Young, \$8,397.60; estate of Col. Rose, \$4,589.80.

## SECRETARY TO THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.

Mr. TYRWHITT asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to appoint Mr. Burns, of Halifax (Secretary to the Hon. the Finance Minister), to a position on the Permanent Force? Is he a graduate of the Kingston Military College?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). That question properly belongs to the Minister of Militia, who is not present, but as reference is made in it to my private secretary, I may be permitted to say that this is the first intimation that I have had of anything of the kind.

### THE "JOHN C. BARR."

Mr. PRIOR (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

1. Is the Government aware that one John Steinhalt, of Dawson, in whose name Mr. Ogilvie reports that the American vessel "John C. Barr" is now registered, is a brother-in-law of the Collector of Customs at Dawson?

2. If not aware of the same, will the Government ascertain the facts of the case?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Pater son). (1.) No. (2.) Mr. McMichael, the chief inspector of customs is on his way to Dawson to inspect the business that has been done at that port.

### PREFERENTIAL TRADE.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask my right hon. friend whether he has made up his mind with regard to the course to pursue with reference to the resolution on preferential trade which I showed him?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I do not think I can accept the motion of my hon. friend. I have prepared another which I will show him to see if he will accept it. Perhaps we may be able to agree upon it.

### THE VACANCY FOR WINNIPEG.

Mr. ROCHE. Before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, I would like to ask the First Minister when it is the intention of the Government to issue a writ for holding an election in the city of Winnipeg? I understand the lists have been completed and finally revised, and I do not see any reason for further delay.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot give an answer to my hon. friend at this moment, because this is the first intimation I have had that the lists have been revised and are now ready. I will look into the matter, and will answer my hon. friend at a later date.

## ROADS AND ROAD ALLOWANCES IN MANITOBA.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 175) further to amend the Act respecting roads and road allowances in the province of Manitoba.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. the Minister of the Interior will kindly and briefly explain just what the necessity for this is, and what the effect is?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Some years ago the city of Winnipeg experienced great difficulty in connection with the boundary lines of lots on account of the fact that a great number of miscellaneous plans had been made by different surveyors of land which ultimately became portions of the city. There was no complete plan for the city, but each person who owned a lot on the river which ran through the city, got a plan of the lot made according to his own ideas and filed in the registry office. Consequently there was great difficulty in connecting the plans so as to make a complete survey; and there was a special difficulty in connection with the question of the boundary lines between the streets and the lots. The matter was a subject of serious consideration for some years up there, and finally an Act was passed, which applied not only to the city of Winnipeg but to other incorporated places in Manitoba, permitting the municipal councils to have new plans made which should in reality be a consolidation of the plans which were filed in the registry offices, and the boundary lines as shown upon the new plans thus prepared should be binding, whether the measurement originally made corresponded with the new plans or not. Legislation was obtained from the province for the purpose of permitting municipal councils to have their new plans made in this way, and the city of Winnipeg, at great expense, had a set of plans made for the city of Winnipeg under that Act. There was a provision made in the Act that if any person was not satisfied with the boundary lines as shown upon the plans, he might appeal to the Attorney General of the province, and all parties might be heard, and the Attorney General should decide whether the objection was well taken or not; and if the party was not satisfied he had a right to appeal to the judge of the Court of Queen's Bench. Therefore every opportunity was given for protecting the rights of any person who might see fit to object. The object

of the whole proceeding was to get an accurate system of plans which should show the boundary lines, which could not be disputed and would be absolute, and upon which the people could rely in purchasing property. This was done in regard to the city of Winnipeg, and plans were got out in pieces, that is in sections, referring to certain portions of the city. Sectional plans Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 have been completed, and local legislation was quite sufficient to enable these plans to be made, and to be filed, and to become effective, except for this fact, that there were some portions of the city of Winnipeg in regard to the streets of which no patents had ever been issued, and no legislation had ever been passed transferring those streets from the Dominion to the province. Therefore the question arose as to the effect of these plans made under local legislation as affecting the basis of land that had never been patented by the Dominion Government. Of course that could only be settled by Dominion legislation. Some years ago these plans, with the exception of sectional plan No. 7, were confirmed, and at my instance legislation was passed. I think it was introduced into this House by Mr. Daly, the then Minister of the Interior. But I asked him to except this particular plan No. 7, because of the fact that the boundary line of a street known as Water Street was the subject of litigation which had been pending for some years past. The city of Winnipeg had undertaken to sell for taxes some of the property which was in dispute between the city, the mortgagees and various parties that were interested, and I did not think that legislation should be passed which might affect the title of the property. There were twelve feet of land in dispute, the owners of the adjoining lands alleging that this strip of twelve feet belonged to the lots adjoining, and the city of Winnipeg alleging that it belonged to the street. I did not think that it should be complicated by legislation before the parties had come to a settlement. Therefore I asked Mr. Daly to except section No. 7 from the Bill, and he did so. The result is that plan No. 7 has never been confirmed by Dominion legislation up to the present time and the property has up to the present remained under Federal jurisdiction. The parties have since come to a settlement and the solicitors of the city of Winnipeg, of the mortgagees and of the railway company have notified the department that the arrangement is satisfactory and that they are prepared to have the plan confirmed by this legislation.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** What I wanted to know particularly was whether this Bill would affect any existing controversy in the courts?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.**  
No. It was delayed when the original Bill  
**Mr. SIFTON.**

was brought in with the view that the whole of the dispute should be settled.

Bill reported.

#### ENCOURAGEMENT OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF DRY DOCKS.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding)** moved :

That the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :—  
“ That it is expedient to amend chap. 17 of 45 Vic., 1882, entitled : ‘ An Act to encourage the construction of dry docks by granting assistance on certain conditions to companies constructing them,’ by providing, in lieu of section 1 of said Act, that if any incorporated company approved by the Governor in Council as having the ability to perform the work, enters into an agreement with Her Majesty to construct a dry dock for the reception and repairing of vessels, at a place and according to a plan and specification providing for all proper and necessary equipment, machinery and plant, such plan and specification to be approved by the Governor in Council on a report by the Minister of Public Works as sufficient for the requirements of the public at such place, and to be completed within a time to be limited by such agreement, then, provided the company performs the work according to such agreement and to the satisfaction of the Minister of Public Works, under the supervision of whose department the work shall be done ; the Governor in Council may authorize the payment out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of a subsidy not exceeding two per centum per annum on the cost of the work, during twenty years from the time of its completion and acceptance by the said Minister : provided, that such subsidy shall not exceed \$20,000 per annum, and that the cost on which it shall be calculated shall not be greater than the value of the work as estimated by the said Minister ; and the subsidy shall not be payable for any portion of the said twenty years during which the dock shall not be in complete repair and working order ; and that it is expedient to further provide that if any incorporated company approved by the Governor in Council as having the ability to perform the work, enters into an agreement with Her Majesty to enlarge and extend any existing dock for the reception and repairing of vessels according to a plan and specification approved by the Governor in Council on a report by the Minister of Public Works as sufficient for the requirements of the public where the said existing dock is located, and to be completed within the time limited by such agreement, then, provided the company performs the work according to such agreement and to the satisfaction of the Minister of Public Works, under the supervision of whose department the work shall be done, the Governor in Council may authorize the payment out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, of a subsidy not exceeding two per centum per annum on the cost of the work during twenty years from the time of its acceptance by the said Minister : provided that such subsidy shall not exceed \$10,000, and that the cost on which it shall be calculated shall not be greater than the value of the work incident to such enlargement and extension as estimated by the said Minister, nor shall such subsidy be payable for any portion of the said twenty years,

during which the dock shall not be in complete repair and working order."

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee on the resolution.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Chairman, there is now on the statute-book an Act, passed in 1882, for the purpose of giving encouragement to the construction of dry docks in such places as they may seem to be required by the commerce of the country. It was under that Act that what was then a very large dock was constructed at Halifax. There are several docks constructed by the Dominion Government, but in this case the Government aided the enterprise by way of subsidy. At that time the dock at Halifax was constructed to a length of 595 feet, and it was considered quite a large dock. I need hardly remind the committee that since that time the size of the steamers on the ocean has very largely increased. Applications have recently been made to the Government with the view of ascertaining what the policy of the Government was in relation to the extension of this Act to other places, and it has been represented to us that the Act, in its present shape, is insufficient to meet the increasing requirements of commerce, inasmuch as, since that Act was passed, dry docks in other parts of the world have been built of a very much greater size and that there are a number of steamers being now built which could not be received into any dock in Canada. Having regard then to this manifest tendency to increase the size of steamers, already indicated by the launching of a number of very large vessels, and to the growing tendency in that direction, the Government have thought it wise to adapt the Act of 1882 to these changed conditions. By the Act of 1882 it was provided that 2 per cent might be paid on the cost of a dock, the amount, however, not to exceed \$10,000 per annum, on the basis of the dock costing \$500,000. With the increasing size of ships the necessarily increased size of dry docks would cost very much more money, so that we propose, by this amendment, to provide that the rate 2 per cent shall still continue to be paid, but that the amount to which it may be applied can be extended to \$1,000,000 so that the limit will practically be increased from \$10,000 per annum to \$20,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman propose to apply this encouragement to the extension of existing works?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The proposal will apply to new works, but if in any case, and that practically means one case, the Halifax people want to extend their dock, they would be entitled under the proposal to the privileges provided for under this resolution, but the suggestion for this

legislation does not emanate from them. It may be generally admitted that they are constantly increasing the size of steamers and if it is a wise thing to have this law upon the statute-book it should be adapted to the new conditions.

Mr. ELLIS. Do I understand the hon. Minister to say that there is only one dock that can take advantage of the increased subsidy?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. I say there is only one dock already constructed under it, and that is the dock at Halifax. This is a general Act, and any part of Canada would have the right to come in under it and take advantage of its provisions.

Mr. ELLIS. Of the existing Act or of the extension of its provisions?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, I had in my mind the extension of the provision to any dock already constructed under the Act, but we have not limited it to that. The general policy of the Act is that these docks, built to meet the changed conditions of commerce, should be encouraged within the limits of the statute.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend does not mean to extend it to docks built outside of the statute as well as to docks built under the former Act.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is nothing to prevent any part of Canada coming in under it.

Mr. FOSTER. We had an Act passed in 1882 to encourage the building of docks by which we went to the limit of \$10,000 per annum on the 2 per cent plan. You provide here, as I understand it, that if the owners of any dock built under the provisions of that Act now wish to extend their dock they will come in under the provisions of this Act. Could any private corporation which had built a dock previous to this Act, and which may now wish to extend their dock take advantage of this Act?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No such case has arisen, and we did not contemplate that.

Mr. FOSTER. And this does not authorize that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think not. It certainly was not contemplated.

Resolution reported, and read the second time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 177) to encourage the construction of dry docks.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

### THE PACIFIC CABLE.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mullock) moved second reading of Bill (No. 176) to provide for the establishment of direct submarine telegraphic communication between Canada and Australasia.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, considered in committee, read the third time, and passed.

### LOAN COMPANIES.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 164)—from the Senate—respecting Loan Companies.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. This is a Bill of a general character to permit loan companies to become incorporated by Letters Patent instead of obliging them to come to Parliament for charters. It has been found that when companies come for special charters, there is a great lack of uniformity, and the committee will agree that it is desirable as far as possible to have uniformity. The Bill was passed by the Senate a year ago and sent to this House but it was not reached. It has been again reviewed by the Senate and some changes made. When it came to this House it went to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, where it was again reviewed, and so I think the committee may assume that the Bill has been very carefully considered. The clauses in the Bill which it is proposed to make of a general character, are substantially the same as those to be found in the Loan Companies Acts at the present day. So that the simple effect of the Bill will be that a loan company may obtain a charter granting practically the same powers which other loan companies have by making the proper application, by way of letters patent. That is the whole purpose of the Bill.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Will that prevent them coming to Parliament. Must all these companies come under this Act?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. No. They can still come to Parliament, but this will discourage them. The presumption is that as this affords them all the facilities they require, they would not come for general legislation.

On section 15,

Mr. **FOSTER**. What is the idea of extending the period to two years? If the company means business, it should not take two years to decide after it has put in its application.

Mr. **FIELDING**.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. In the general Companies Act they are allowed three years to commence business after obtaining their charter. In this we shorten the term to two. It is necessary to fix a term.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Then, \$300,000 subscribed is the lowest capital a loan company can have to do business?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes, where it is receiving money on deposit.

On section 20, clause 1,

Mr. **FOSTER**. How does that compare with the general powers now had by these companies?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. These are almost exactly in line with the powers granted to a number of companies, some this session and some last session. It is quite in line with the latest legislation the House has approved.

On clause 2,

Mr. **FOSTER**. What will constitute a proof of market value?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The current market quotations.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Just a single quotation, or an actual sale?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The point has not arisen exactly, but we will have to take the best evidence we could get of actual sale. There has been no difficulty under that clause whatever.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Who decides that, a court of justice or the department?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. A court of justice. It would have to be challenged by somebody.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Are there penalties?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. No penalties are provided here. I am not sure that I understand what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) means.

Mr. **FOSTER**. You are providing here what the company are to do and not to do. Suppose they contravene this section, what will be the penalty—that the parties may have recourse in the courts, or what? If there are no penalties, they might defy it.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I think there is nothing but that a party could take action in court. It would be a breach of trust, of course, and whatever penalties follow breach of trust would follow in the case the hon. gentleman refers to.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). I apprehend that, if any officers committed any such illegality, they would be personally responsible.

Mr. FOSTER. At the suit of somebody ?  
The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

#### SUPPLY.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Speaker leaves the Chair, I think this is the last day on which the subsidies were to be brought down.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I think they will be ready to-day, perhaps this evening, but certainly to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) whether he is prepared to give me the information now that he promised me yesterday, or whether he prefers doing it at a later stage.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I cannot give it to the hon. gentleman now, but it is being looked up. I think there is an item for customs in the Yukon supplies. I do not know whether we will reach it to-day, but the information will be given at some convenient time.

Salaries of agents and employees in  
Canada, Great Britain and foreign  
countries ..... \$100,000

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) in respect to immigration. There are a great many of our people under the impression that something should be done for the older provinces of the Dominion in the way of getting skilled farmers to come into the country and settle upon some of those lands that have been abandoned by the people throughout these provinces for years past. They are of the opinion that much might be done to enlighten our own farmers upon the business of farming by bringing into the country people who are skilled and who would be more capable of making good use of some of the farm lands that are distributed over these provinces. We have, I admit, some good farmers of our own in some sections of our provinces, but we have some bad settlements, in which there are no good farmers, and in which there is really no good farming being done.

Mr. COWAN. Where ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. In various provinces.

Mr. COWAN. That is a little indefinite.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) had better go and see them for himself, and he will find it a little more definite.

Mr. COWAN. If the hon. gentleman will let me know where they are I will be able to find them.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish you would stop these interruptions, which are not made for any good. I would be much obliged to the hon. Minister of the Interior if he would inform me whether there are any existing regulations under which he could do anything in that line, whether he could not give instructions to his agents in the old country with a view of inducing farmers to come and settle on these lands, for instance in Nova Scotia, because I speak more particularly in regard to that province. A great many of the children of the old settlers on these lands have abandoned their farms, have gone to the mines, to the United States, and to other places, and I think it would be well if we could get skilled farmers to come and take up these farms.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The question which the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) has brought up is a very important one, and has already been brought to my attention. The difficulties of dealing with it have been considered by the officers of the department very frequently. I quite realize the fact that the old provinces very properly consider that they are entitled to whatever benefit can be given to them from the expenditure of the Government in connection with immigration. I also recognize the fact that it would be a very great advantage to the older provinces if we should be able to bring in a reasonable number of skilled farmers, men possessing a certain amount of capital, who would be able to take up improved properties, which, perhaps, are unoccupied at the present time, who would work them to better advantage and who would apply the necessary capital for the purpose of bringing them to a higher state of cultivation. The main difficulty is that the particular class of farmers that would fill the bill, to which the hon. gentleman refers, it is almost impossible for us to get. They compose a class of people that, in any considerable numbers we have practically not been able to touch at all. I have, upon various occasions, considered plans for the purpose of dealing with that question, and being perhaps more familiar with the province of Ontario than with any other of the older provinces, I had formulated a plan whereby we should get lists of farms with descriptions and statements of all the circumstances which we might put into the hands of our agents in the old country, so that a man that

was disposed to move and had a little capital might be able to make his arrangement for his place before he started, and would know what the circumstances were going to be and how he was going to be situated when he got here. I think a considerable amount could be done in that way, and I had it in my mind to endeavour to work out a plan of that kind as quickly as possible. I do not think it could be done in any other way, because the class of people that the hon. gentleman speaks of do not come here in the ordinary way as immigrants. They do not come with a ship-load of people without knowing where they are going to locate or what they are going to do. They do not pack up, realize on their property and come out here, except in small numbers, and they do not generally put themselves in the hands of the Government agents, so that we do not have any control over them. The only way by which the hon. gentleman's idea could be carried out would be by the co-operation of the provincial and municipal authorities in the various provinces in furnishing us with as full information in regard to different properties as might be available, the price, description, all the surrounding circumstances, so that we might be able, through our agents, to furnish this information in the old country. They could say to a man there who has a couple of thousand pounds, and is prepared to come out here: You may make your bargain for your farm before you come, you will be such and such a distance from a church, from a school-house, and the circumstances will be so and so when you get here. There is nothing in the regulations of the department which would prevent us from doing that, because we have a free hand, and to do our work effectually we must have a free hand, because we are changing our methods from time to time. I have a strong idea that a good deal could be done in the way the hon. gentleman suggests, and I can assure him that he has my entire sympathy in the idea he has expressed, and that so far as it is possible for us to accomplish it our purpose is to endeavour to do it.

**Mr. McDUGALL.** I am very glad that the hon. Minister has given some attention to the subject on this line. The illustration he has given us of what his views are coincide very strongly with my own. A few years ago I went to the trouble myself of ascertaining what number of farms could be got within a settlement that were ready for sale to the class of people that I suggest it would be to the advantage of the community to have settled amongst them, and who could give some knowledge to their neighbours in the line of skilled farming. I found myself confronted with the difficulty of having no Government authority or backing. I prepared a statement of the farms that were

**Mr. SIFTON.**

available with their locations, the distance they were from the railway stations, the distance from the towns, the means of communication by water, and the distance from churches and school-houses, but I found that I was not sufficiently fortified with inducements to give the people in order to take advantage of this. Then there should be some inducement in regard to the cost of examining these farms, and the cost of placing this information within the reach of people who might take advantage of it. I believe if the Minister (Mr. Sifton) would work on these lines he would meet with success. That is, if he gives such inducement to that class of people as he does to other immigrants.

**Mr. WILSON.** Mr. McInnes, who is now, I presume, our chief immigrant agent in the United States, was at work for the late Government under Mr. Holmes, known as Capt. Holmes. The highest salary Capt. Holmes ever got when he was chief immigrant agent was \$1,200 and expenses, but I find that Mr. McInnes gets \$1,500 a year, and in addition draws for board and lodging, \$801. It does seem to me that is a very high price for the board and lodging of any ordinary man. We have another gentleman, Mr. Benjamin Davies, who gets a salary of \$1,500, but he is much easier accommodated than Mr. McInnes, and his board and lodging only cost \$276.65. I do not know what other duties Mr. McInnes discharges that would cause him to pay about three times as much for his board and lodging as Mr. Davies does. Then, I find that the matter of office rent is quite an item. Mr. McInnes pays \$300, but Mr. Davies is more expensive in that respect for he pays \$450. I find also that Mr. McInnes has charged for fares \$751. I do not know whether that is for his own travel or what he has paid for other people. I find also that Mr. Davies pays for newspapers \$54.25, and I take it that these newspapers are for his own office, because I find that advertising and other like accounts are charged under different items in the Auditor General's Report. Now, I wish an explanation of these things from the Minister. There is another matter to which I draw the attention of the Minister, and that is with regard to the uniforms supplied to the agents and caretakers of the department at various places. In some ports these uniforms are supplied by the Government and in some they are not. However, as a rule, I find that the Government supplies these men with pretty good clothing and abundance of it. Most of them get two summer suits at \$46, and a winter suit at \$25, and overcoat, \$25, a fur cap anywhere from \$8.50 to \$10, and a cloth cap for about \$3.96. I want to know on what conditions the Government distributes these uniforms, and why they give them to immigrant agents in some ports and not in others. It may be all right, but it is not as I see it, and, therefore, I wish to have an explanation.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I am heartily in accord with the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) in his desire to attract to this country a better class of immigrants, and I am also of the opinion that if we are to have a better class of immigrants we must have a better class of immigrant agents. The present Government, on their advent to power removed from his position in Liverpool, Mr. John Dyke, so well and favourably known throughout the Dominion. Any person visiting England in any capacity had Mr. Dyke's services at their disposal immediately upon landing, and I have very great pleasure in testifying to the assistance given me on one occasion, at least, when I found it necessary to seek his aid. But we find Mr. Dyke now replaced by a labour agitator, formerly of the city of Toronto; a gentleman who may be described as a Grit heeler, and who is not the class of man to be approached by the small farmers, men with capital such as the hon. member from Cape Breton has described. I am of opinion that the men who have been sent there as agents lately are not the class of men calculated to promote a better class of immigration to this country. It is needless to particularize, but it appears to me that the men sent to the old country as agents, are most undesirable men themselves, and are calculated to promote the movement of a worse class of immigrants than those we have been receiving hitherto.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Before the Minister (Mr. Sifton) speaks on the question raised by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall), I would like to emphasize the importance of doing something in the direction indicated. Throughout all the older provinces the experience is the same. The farms are slowly but surely being abandoned, and land values are dropping. Farms that have been cleared and occupied for a long time can now probably be bought at a much lower price than they could a few years ago. I understand that the Minister (Mr. Sifton) expressed the hope that the provincial governments might take some action.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In the way of furnishing information?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). It must be remembered that the provincial governments have scarcely any interest in the matter. The population on the ground is expense to the local government, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) knows, whereas to the Dominion Government every bona fide settler and his family, if they are doing well, is a source of revenue. The same is the case with the municipal organizations in the country. The county council has a direct interest in preventing these farms from being abandoned, and having them re-occupied if they are abandoned. Therefore, both the Dominion Government and the municipalities have a direct monetary interest in seeing

the farms occupied, and their interests are consequently identical. I would suggest to the Minister that if the municipalities can be persuaded, as they can easily be, to make accurate lists of the unoccupied farms, giving the necessary particulars required by the intending purchaser, such as distance from school-house, market town, and railway, and so on, the Minister could undertake to print and distribute that information. I think there would be no great difficulty in persuading the municipalities and county organizations to embark in this enterprise. Some of them might hesitate about incurring any great outlay in the matter of publishing and distributing such information, but the hon. Minister has the machinery at his command for distributing it, and it would not affect the cost of his department very much if he also undertook the cost of printing such information as was collected by the municipality. I would like him to dwell on that point in his reply, so that I might go to the municipal council of my own county and urge them to take up this work in connection with the Dominion Government.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I understand that the hon. member for Victoria spoke of abandoned farms in New Brunswick. What has caused them to be abandoned, and when were they abandoned—to-day or in the past? I regret to notice a disposition on the other side of the House to belittle the province of New Brunswick. The other day some hon. gentlemen opposite tried to make out that property in St. John was of no value. Where are the abandoned farms—in Prince Edward Island or in New Brunswick? What caused them to be abandoned, and is property in New Brunswick less valuable or more valuable now than formerly? I think the leader of the Opposition would join with me in remonstrating with any one who tried to belittle the maritime provinces.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that I will join with him at any time in standing up in the strongest way for the maritime provinces; but I take it that the effort now being made is to promote the interests of the maritime provinces. The hon. gentleman knows—I know it is the case in Nova Scotia—that, owing to a variety of causes, the sentiment which the world has recognized, that westward the star of empire wends its way—the tendency to go west, which seems to be implanted in the human heart—has been a great disadvantage to the maritime provinces. People have been leaving Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for many years to go to the United States, with the expectation of bettering their fortunes, though in many cases they have found that they had better have stayed at home. There is no doubt that the great attractions of the north-western prairies have induced many people in the maritime provinces, where the making of new farms is attended with more

hardship than on the open prairies, to leave what energy and industry would have made very comfortable homes. These farms, having been left by their owners for the purpose of going west, could be acquired for a comparatively small sum; and I take it that the object of my hon. friends have in moving is not to throw any discredit on either Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, but to draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that there are many immigrants coming to this country with a little capital, who might be induced to take up these farms, and who, by industry and energy, could make of them very comfortable homes for themselves, and have advantages which perhaps would not be found in a great many other places. I am inclined to think that measures that have been taken this session are going to have a great effect in giving additional employment in the maritime provinces, and promoting enterprises that will hold the population to a larger extent than we have been able to do in the past. I do not think there is a disposition in any way to decry the maritime provinces, but an intention on the part of everybody to adopt such a course as would produce the best results, both in increasing the value of farm property there, and affording employment to our people. While on my feet, I want to say to the Minister of the Interior that he was good enough two years ago to promise me across the floor of the House that he and the Government would give their careful attention and consideration to the claims of a gentleman who has played a very important part in respect to immigration. I refer to Mr. John Dyke, who was formerly an agent of the immigration department at the port of Liverpool. I am not going to find any fault with the Government for having superseded Mr. Dyke; but I want to point out that when he was induced by the Government of the Dominion to take service under it, he occupied a very valuable and important position in connection with the government of Ontario, which he surrendered for that purpose. I brought the claims of Mr. Dyke again and again before more than one of the late Governments, and pressed upon them the importance of providing a superannuation allowance for him; because, although it certainly was not desirable to extend the superannuation system, the terms upon which Mr. Dyke entered the service, the undoubtedly great value of his services, both in England and on the continent, in promoting immigration to the Dominion, his great ability, and his long service made it, I think, the duty of the Government, when his health broke down, as unfortunately it did, to take some measures to relieve the hardship of the position in which he found himself placed. The Minister of Agriculture was good enough to say that he recognized the importance of Mr. Dyke's claims, and that they would re-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

ceive attention. I want to press that upon him now, because I happen to know that the position of Mr. Dyke and of his family is such that it is of great importance that he should receive some consideration at the hands of the Government for his many years of long and valuable service.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I am very glad to hear the hon. leader of the Opposition talk as he has done about the maritime provinces. I do not suppose that the hon. gentlemen opposite intended to be offensive in the remarks they made; but it was impossible for me to sit here and let the impression go abroad that the maritime provinces are not on a par with the rest of Canada.

Mr. McDOUGALL. May I ask the hon. gentleman to state who was it said anything he could so construe?

Mr. DOMVILLE. I refer to the remarks made the other night about the value of property in the city of St. John. I am sure that if the hon. leader of the Opposition had been here, knowing, as he does, the value of property in that city, he would have contradicted the statement made.

Mr. DAVIN. Nobody made any statement the other night about the undervaluation of properties in St. John, N.B.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I will make some statements about you if you do not keep quiet.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman can make all the statements he likes, within the boundless resources of his malignant tongue against me.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I do not wish to make any statement against you.

Mr. DAVIN. Then, what do you mean by saying you will make statements? There is not a man on that side dare make statements about me, from the Prime Minister down.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend must admit that we have been very lenient with him, not only last session, but the session before, and I do not think he ought to claim anything on that score.

Mr. DAVIN. Lenient?

Mr. DOMVILLE. Yes, why to listen to the hon. member's orations hour after hour is to be lenient. It would not be permitted anywhere else except here. I call that being lenient, but let that pass, it is not worth discussing. Perhaps we will have to use a little more leniency before we go. The country is looking to the expense incurred by delaying this session until this late hour, nearly five months, and I suppose some hon. members still think that they have something to say, though the House in general may not be of the opinion that they have. Judging by the time some members take up, we may be here until Christmas.

**Mr. ROSAMOND.** What are you doing now ?

**Mr. DOMVILLE.** I am taking up all the time I require and a little more. Speeches have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite decrying the maritime provinces, but the hon. leader of the Opposition has contradicted these now, and has done right. But what advertising ammunition could be made out of them by the agents of steamboats and railways who are endeavouring to attract everybody into the North-west and give the maritime provinces the go-by.

**Mr. WILSON.** You have not read the Minister's report.

**Mr. DOMVILLE.** When your party was in power, and you issued pamphlets all over Europe, you never called attention to New Brunswick at all, but to-day I am glad to have the explanation of the hon. leader of the Opposition, that he has some opinion of our provinces by the sea, that he knows them well and that they ought to get a fair measure of justice, if you choose to call it so, or of what is going. I believe that we have no finer territory in Canada than the lower provinces. We have the coal, the iron, the lumber, and good men too, as is evidenced on both sides of this House.

**Mr. COCHRANE.** You are giving us quite an illustration now.

**Mr. DOMVILLE.** What does the hon. gentleman say ?

**Mr. COCHRANE.** I am asking how long it is since you have been here.

**Mr. DOMVILLE.** The hon. gentleman must congratulate himself that we do not produce any men like him down there, whether for greatness or smallness.

**Mr. COCHRANE.** I am glad we have not many like you in Ontario.

It being One o'clock, the Deputy Speaker left the Chair.

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton).** A number of matters have been referred to by different members of the committee of which I desire to give some explanation. My hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) has referred to the question of expenses of immigration officers. The rule followed is this, that when these officers are at headquarters, they receive nothing for board or lodging, but are expected to pay their own expenses. But while they are travelling in the service of the Government, they are paid for board and lodging. Thus considerable difference will be found in the amounts allowed to different officers on account of expenses, because some travel more than others. Mr. Davies, the officer at St. Paul has, I presume, during the last year for which expense bills are shown in the

Auditor General's Report, been comparatively little away from his office, and his expenses have not been very large.

On the question of salaries, I do not know that I can say much more than I have already said, having discussed this question once or twice before. The committee will understand that when a man is specially selected for certain work, it is practically a question of making a bargain with him ; it is not the same transaction as where a man is taken into the service and is paid a salary according to the class in which he is. Some agents get \$75 a month, a few \$100, and one, Mr. McInnes, stationed at Detroit, gets \$125. His position is that of a general agent supervising the work in the state of Michigan and other work with which he is naturally connected. The exact limits are not defined, because it is impossible to define them. But, generally speaking, he watches what is going on, exercises a general control over the work, and advises the department as circumstances arise. He has been a very efficient and hard-working officer, and I think that the payments to him are fully justified by the results. The work in the western states since it was organized in March or April, 1897, has been far more successful than I expected.

With regard to Capt. Holmes, to whom the hon. member for Lennox has referred, I do not know that I can give the hon. gentleman any more information than I have given him privately and in the House. I did not know anything about Capt. Holmes, when I organized the service, except in a general way—I think, perhaps, before I became a member of the Government, I have seen his name in connection with the immigration service. When I asked the late Deputy Minister, Mr. Burgess, for a list of the officers that were in the service, the list was furnished me. I have that list in my possession now. When my hon. friend from Lennox spoke to me, I did not know that I had it. But it has since turned up, having been laid aside in a drawer. I was satisfied that this list did not show the name of Capt. Holmes, and I find that I am correct. I did not know at the time that he was, or claimed to be, in the service of the Government. As a matter of fact, he had been, but was not at the time referred to. This is why the name of Capt. Holmes does not appear in our list of employees.

**Mr. WILSON.** With regard to the question of expenses, I would like to know whether Mr. Davies and Mr. McInnes occupy relatively the same position in the service ? I see they both receive the same salary, although their payments for board and lodging are very different.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** These officers are not exactly graded ; but Mr. Davies and Mr. McInnes, if classified, would be put in the same class. Mr. Davies

has sort of general charge in St. Paul, and exercises a general supervision over the work in the north-western states. The only explanation I can give, or that the deputy can give, for difference in the charge for board and lodging is the reason I have given—that one man travelled more than the other. Generally speaking, Mr. Davies is not so much on the road as Mr. McInnes, for his duties confine him pretty well to his office. St. Paul is an exhibit office; we have an exhibit there of the products of Canada, so that any man going there can judge from that exhibit the resources of the country. We have an exhibit also in Detroit, but a comparatively small one. Then, again, a very important duty of the agent at St. Paul is to watch carefully the trains coming in from different parts of the country. St. Paul is a great railway centre for all the north-western states, and people travelling in all directions reach St. Paul. One of the most important duties entrusted to Mr. Davies is to learn the movement of population by watching the trains, and to see that everything is done to prevent people who are billed through to our North-west, being taken off and sent to any portion of the United States. He also gains in this way information which he reports, and which enables our agents to work more effectively.

Mr. WILSON. What do these people do in winter time? For instance, does Mr. McInnes travel during the winter?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The effective work in the way of advertising the resources of Canada, lecturing and hunting up prospective settlers is done during the winter. But the men who are employed in the North-west in locating settlers during the summer, we send down to parts of the western states to localities that we think most promising, to assist the permanent agents in that work. It is during the winter that the missionary work is really done to the greatest extent; during spring and summer the agents are principally employed in looking after the settlers and locating them.

Mr. WILSON. This matter of railway fare, is that for the agents or for the immigrants?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The railway fare as charged there would be for the agents themselves.

Mr. GUILLET. Has the hon. Minister received a list of names furnished him by the late Deputy Minister, Mr. Burgess?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, I have a list in my office.

Mr. GUILLET. Do you know if it contains the name of Charles Munson? He was one of the agents employed in that service under the late Government. It is singular

Mr. SIFTON.

that Mr. Burgess should have left off the names of the appointees of the late Government. Has the hon. gentleman any objection to bringing down that list?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not the least.

Mr. WILSON. Who fixes the rate allowed agents for travelling and hotel expenses? Have you placed any limit on them as to what they shall pay for their board and lodging?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The agents are allowed their actual outlay.

Mr. WILSON. My impression is that the old Government fixed a limit beyond which they should not go.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In some cases the late Government gave them an allowance of so much per day, and that was a source of profit to the officers, as they did not spend all they were allowed. But at present the expenses allowed to the officers and paid by the Government do not amount to as much as the old allowance given them. I know that to be the case particularly in the Indian Department, where we made the change.

Mr. WILSON. I presume the Minister insists on vouchers for all these expenses.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, everything is closely watched. There are one or two other matters I wish to mention. In reference to uniforms for the officers, the custom has been to give uniforms to the officers at Halifax, Quebec and Montreal. I think there were some uniforms given also at Winnipeg. I think we have extended a little the allowance at Winnipeg, because the staff has very much increased. That was the practice of my predecessors, and I approve it, because it is very desirable where there are a large number of people coming in and especially where the people are of miscellaneous nationalities that the officers of the Government should be in uniform. That secures them proper attention and obedience, and it makes all the difference in the world to have the officers in uniform in a service of that kind. That practice has been continued, but my Deputy Minister informs me that the allowance for uniforms is somewhat less than it was in former years, it has been cut down a little. The present practice is to allow one complete uniform, an extra pair of trousers, and an overcoat each year.

Mr. WILSON. The Auditor General's Report shows in many cases that you allow two summer suits at a cost of \$46 for both, and a winter suit at \$25, fur cap, \$10, a cloth cap at \$3.96. In one case I see a gentleman got two. You will find these items on pages H-8, 9, 10 and 11. On page 9, Halifax, I find a charge for summer uniforms, 2,

\$46.50; winter uniform, \$22. There are no less than seven such items at Halifax.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My deputy informs me that since he has been in charge he has not allowed two sets of uniforms to be given in one year. If the amounts appear as the hon. gentleman says, it must be an old account.

Mr. WILSON. Here is what I find on page H-11, Winnipeg: summer uniforms, 2, \$46; winter uniform, \$24; overcoat, \$25; fur cap, \$8.50; cloth cap, \$3.97. Just below that is another account for Mr. W. F. McCreary: summer uniforms, 2, \$62; winter uniform, \$30; overcoat, \$30; Chesterfield coat, \$14.50; fur cap, \$10. Now, why should they have three suits a year? They are better dressed than most of the members of this House, I fancy.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am bound to say that I am unable to explain these items. We will have to look up the accounts of the department. I think I am quite safe in saying that it is not at all correct that any one man has received three uniforms in the course of one year. I will try and get an explanation of it for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WILSON. I do not bring this up for the purpose of criticising the hon. gentleman I merely want information.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is quite right. I will have the matter looked up.

Mr. WILSON. There was another thing that struck me forcibly. I see that at the port of St. John they received 2,770 immigrants during the past year according to the report of the Minister of the Interior, and I do not see any account in the Auditor General's Report for a uniform at that port. I do not understand on what basis you do it. I would like if the hon. gentleman would lay down the basis on which the department distributes these uniforms.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Until a short time ago only one man was in the employ of the department at St. John, because immigrants did not come there in any numbers. It was only during last year that there were any considerable arrivals of immigrants at St. John, and we had to send other officers there for the purpose of doing special work at the time when they came. If this business continues at St. John we will have to increase the staff there and we will follow the same practice as we followed in regard to the others.

Mr. WILSON. I see at Brandon, where the clerk and caretaker of the building got a better suit of clothes than the agent. The clerk and caretaker got a suit of clothes that cost \$28, while the agent got a suit that cost \$25.50.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The person in charge of the buildings is also the agent.

Mr. WILSON. It does not appear in the Auditor General's Report. It just says, "clerk and caretaker." The clerk got a suit that cost \$2.50 more than the agent.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is only one man at Brandon. The other man to whom the hon. gentleman refers is a travelling agent. He is down under the head of Brandon because he is there at times, but there is really only one agent at Brandon. The hon. leader of the Opposition called my attention to the case of Mr. John Dyke. The hon. gentleman, I presume, understands that Mr. Dyke was not in a position a couple of years ago to do very much work for the department owing to the failure of his health. I said, when the hon. gentleman brought this matter to my attention, that I fully appreciated the value of his services to the Dominion of Canada. I understand that Mr. Dyke's services have been valuable, not only in the way of assisting immigration, but also in connection with commercial matters. Various gentlemen who have been engaged in business in the old country, have informed me that Mr. Dyke's services have been very valuable in that connection. I have had in my mind the idea of re-engaging Mr. Dyke and placing him in charge of the Liverpool office, and I am prepared to do that if his health will permit him to do the work. I do not think that he will be able to do the same amount of work that he did previously when he was receiving a salary of about \$3,000, but I might offer him a couple of thousand dollars a year to take charge of the office, and we will not expect him to do the same amount of work that he did in former years. This is a plan I have had in my mind and which I have had under consideration. I cannot speak positively as to the details but I have every confidence that we will be able to get Mr. Dyke back into the service and put him in charge of the Liverpool office. Since his retirement no person has occupied the same position. Mr. Jury is not an office man; he is in reality a lecturer. On account of the increase in the movement of people from the British Islands we require additional help in the Liverpool office, and I believe that Mr. Dyke's services would be of great value to the Government. That is a suggestion that I had under consideration for some time, and which, I believe, I may be able to carry out. I think the only thing that would prevent me from carrying it out would be Mr. Dyke's being physically unable to do the work.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am extremely glad to hear the statement made by the hon. Minister of the Interior. I think the suggestion he has made meets the case admir-

ably, but I am quite certain that he would only be doing an act of justice to a gentleman whose services in the past have been, as he says, of the most valuable character, both in regard to immigration and to commercial matters. When I last saw Mr. Dyke he had, in consequence of a very important surgical operation that had been performed on him, become greatly improved in his health, and although, perhaps, not equal to the same amount of work that he formerly did, I have no doubt that, in the position that the hon. Minister designs for him, he will render valuable service to the country.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to get through with this part of the immigration business in regard to which I have asked the hon. Minister some questions. I would like to have some explanation about the results which have been achieved in Ireland, and which are very small compared with the amount of money paid out. I see that the cost of the Dublin agency was \$6,233, and of the Londonderry agency \$2,888, making a total of \$9,121. The result was that during the whole year these agencies only reported 709 immigrants from Ireland. It does seem to me that you are paying too much for your agents in that country for the results you are getting, and if the hon. Minister can make some explanation why these agencies should be conducted on so extravagant a scale while sending such a small number of immigrants to Canada, I would like him to do so.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am prepared to admit at once that the results in Ireland, proportioned to the amount of money that has been spent, have not been anything like as satisfactory as I could have desired.

Mr. WILSON. Not so much so as in Scotland.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The work in Ireland was undertaken, as was stated here in the House two years ago, under very unfortunate auspices. When Mr. Devlin went there to take charge, he was met at once by the determined hostility of the Nationalist party. The Nationalist party, as the hon. gentleman knows, is practically supreme in Ireland, as far as public opinion is created, and they regarded the idea of encouraging people to go from Ireland as contrary to their political interests. Taking that view, they made a most violent attack upon Mr. Devlin, upon our service, and incidentally upon Canada. The Irish papers were teeming with articles attacking us and attacking Canada, and trying to make out that we were acting in unison with the landlord interest for the purpose of getting the people away. Of course, it was most ridiculous, but this inflammatory propaganda went on for some time, and Mr. Devlin, instead of being re-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

ceived with open arms, was received with a hostile volley. He had to attempt to change the attitude of the press before he could accomplish anything at all. I am bound to say that, under these extraordinary circumstances, I would not have been at all surprised if Mr. Devlin had lost heart and thrown the whole thing up on account of the position he found himself in. Notwithstanding that, he went on, displaying a great deal of courage, determination and tact, and he actually induced some of the leading papers which had been most pertinacious and most violent in their attacks upon him, to take back all they had said, and admit that, practically, to all intents and purposes, they had wronged him. Since that, he has been accomplishing something and the work there has a much more promising aspect than ever before. I am bound to say that for the amount of money we spend in Ireland we are getting less from there than from any other place, but I am not sure that it would be desirable to drop the work on that account.

Mr. WILSON. Would not it be possible to lessen the expenses in Dublin? The other agency only costs \$2,888, and \$6,233 for Dublin seems a very large amount. It is about \$12 a head for every immigrant, besides the bonus you give the steamers.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is not high.

Mr. WILSON. It is high compared with what you pay the Doukhobors. I think the expenses in Ireland could be reduced without impairing the efficiency of the service.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is there any other place you could send Mr. Devlin to?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. On consideration I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) would say that \$12 a head is out of the way.

Mr. WILSON. Not for Irishmen, I admit.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Looked upon in that way, the expenditure is not too much, but we are getting but few people, and it is much more than I would like to see.

Mr. WILSON. It is more than you are paying for Scotchmen.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister is not able to show that Mr. Devlin has secured a single settler in Canada for this \$6,000. These 709 immigrants of Irish extraction, have mostly come from Liverpool, or some English ports, and there is no information which would enable us to attribute them to Mr. Devlin. Has the Minister any reports from Mr. Devlin to show the work he has done? The Minister says that Mr. Devlin's presence in Dublin aroused hostilities to Canada, and that hostility would never have appeared had not Mr. Devlin been sent as agent. It, therefore, appears that it was a mistake to send

Mr. Devlin there at all ; but I suppose he had to be provided for. He was a member of this House, difficulties arose between him and the Government, and Mr. Devlin had to be sent out of the country, to the injury of Canadian immigration from Ireland, as stated by the Minister himself, and to the injury of Canada's fair name ; because they never would have thought of attacking Canada if Mr. Devlin had not appeared on the scene. Mr. Devlin's presence in Canada became very unacceptable to the Government, of which he was trying to become a member, and so he had to be got out of the way. The whole thing has been unfortunate as well as expensive.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is Mr. Benjamin Davies, the agent at St. Paul, a brother of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He is.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I suppose the fact that he is a brother of Sir Louis Davies accounts for his increased expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It, no doubt, accounts for the smallness of his expenses, as compared with the others.

Mr. McDOUGALL. His expenses, including salary, amounts to \$5,891.63, and he is the highest of the twenty or more agents in the United States. Mr. McInnes comes next with \$5,500, and all the rest run from \$1,000 to \$3,000. I see the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) in his seat, and I understand that it is hoped that he will be promoted to a knightly position. Before he receives the honour of knighthood, he would do well to inform the House whether or not he has any brothers or sisters that we will have to appoint to positions at the expense of the country after he is knighted. This class of officials are expensive.

Mr. COCHRANE. Speak now.

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not think it is a matter which would interest the House very much.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Of course, the only amounts received by these agents are the salaries, and as to the expenses, that is a matter for the Government to decide upon. I can tell the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) that not only would we be willing to print and distribute such information as the municipalities and county councils wish to provide, but if my hon. friend (Mr. Bell), or any other member of the House, wishes to indicate a particular municipality, I am willing not only to print and distribute the information, but to send an experienced officer there to collect it, without any cost to the municipality. Of course, our handbook is of a general character, referring to all parts of the Dominion, and it would be impossible to print such detailed information in it. I am in sympathy

with the idea of transplanting people of some means from the old country to the maritime provinces and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, where good farms may be available at reasonable prices. I have been unable to give attention to this phase of the question for want of time. I imagine that if I had been able to visit England myself, I would have been able to work out some plan with reference to this particular work. However, I expect, during the fall of this year, to give special attention to it, and although I do not expect any great results at once, still the work may be commenced.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) drew the attention of the Minister to some items on page H-11 of the Auditor General's Report, respecting uniforms for immigration officials, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) showed that the total amount paid to Mr. McCreary for uniforms and clothing amounts to \$146.50. Is it expected that when the Government pays for these uniforms, the officials who receive them shall have to wear them ? Is the Minister aware that Mr. McCreary wears this uniform for which the country pays ? I am advised that it is not his practice to wear it. I do not know the gentleman. I entirely agree with the policy of having these immigration agents clothed in uniform, but I think that the Minister should insist upon them wearing them.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The uniform was requisitioned for by Mr. McCreary, and I have not the least doubt that he wears it. It may be that the hon. gentleman's information arises from the fact that Mr. McCreary may wear his uniform when actually on duty in Winnipeg, and may not wear it when travelling. I have no doubt that he wears it when on duty. I do not want to be understood as making a positive statement that he does, because the matter has not been brought to my attention before ; but I will have it looked into.

Mr. HUGHES. I have seen Mr. McCreary on duty travelling without his uniform. I did not know he had a uniform. He is a good officer.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My deputy informs me that Mr. McCreary has not perhaps made the same display of brass buttons on his uniform that some of the other officers have, and that may explain the supposition that he was not in uniform.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the object of having a uniform ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have explained that at seaports and at Winnipeg, it has been found very desirable that our officers should be in uniform, as by that means they receive more attention than

they otherwise would, especially from foreigners.

Mr. FOSTER. The brass buttons are the essential feature.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. McCreary is not in the ordinary sense of the term an immigration agent.

Mr. COCHRANE. I think it is important that if the country pays for a uniform for this gentleman, and he is so fastidious about his appearance that he does not want to wear brass buttons, he should buy his own uniform. I understand from the Minister that the uniform is supposed to impress people with the fact that the man who wears it is a Government official, and to give him more influence with them than a man in citizen's clothing; but if this man is so nice that he does not like brass buttons, and does not want to be put in a position to be recognized by the immigrants as a Government official, he had better pay for his own clothes, and let the brass buttons be put on somebody else who will wear them.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I suppose the drift of the hon. gentleman's argument is that the officers should all have the same kind of buttons. I will take that into consideration.

Mr. CLARKE. I may say that I do not know Mr. McCreary. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) says he is a very efficient officer. If the hon. gentleman says so, I have no doubt he is. I had a communication informing me that Mr. McCreary did not wear the uniform, and asking me what this meant.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) says is perfectly correct, that if the Government pays for the uniform the officer ought to wear it.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the hon. Minister what was the cause of the comparative failure of Mr. Devlin at Dublin? I understood the hon. gentleman to say that when Mr. Devlin arrived at the Irish capital, he was assailed by the Nationalist press. What was he assailed for? How did the Nationalist press come to identify the Canadian Government with the landlord party? I am not clear on that point.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am bound to say I am not clear either. The attack on Mr. Devlin was not in any way justified. Mr. Devlin, very much to his credit, has, I think, been able to show that it was not. As the hon. gentleman is probably aware, there had formerly been at different times a movement got up by the landlord party and the friends of the landlords for the purpose of inducing emigration as a source of outlet for the agitation that took place on the land question. They

Mr. SIFTON.

jumped to the conclusion that this was part of the same scheme, and they immediately attacked Mr. Devlin, and it took upwards of a year of hard work on his part before these people could be got to see that there was nothing in it. Then they proceeded to attack Canada. It seemed to be a necessary and logical part of their argument that they should attack Canada as well. However, that is all over now. While it injured Mr. Devlin's usefulness very much during the first portion of his stay, I think, perhaps, it has not done him any harm, because it gave him a lot of advertising that he would not have otherwise got.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the Minister's authority for making the statement that the landlords and their friends were trying to carry out a scheme of immigration?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not say assisted emigration. I said that idea had been circulated by the landlord party.

Mr. HUGHES. Why did Mr. Devlin return to Canada a short time ago?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He returned on leave of absence.

Mr. HUGHES. Was his salary paid while on leave of absence?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. Was he on strike?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can assure the hon. gentleman that he was not.

Mr. WILSON. I did not hear the Minister's statement in regard to the number of suits of clothes of uniform allowed to each immigration agent each year?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Each officer who gets a uniform is allowed a complete suit, with an extra pair of trousers, an overcoat and a hat or cap.

Mr. BERGERON. Are they allowed two suits—one for the summer and one for the winter?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No. The present custom is to give them only one suit a year.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the regulations?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) pointed to something in the Auditor General's Report inconsistent with that, and I will look them up and inform the House later.

Mr. BERGERON. Were not the difficulties which Mr. Devlin met, when he arrived in Ireland, due to the fact that it was known over there that the school question had not been settled, and that it was looked upon

as something which would prevent immigrants coming to this country ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I never heard the suggestion.

Mr. BERGERON. He was asked to explain, and that took him a year.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the Auditor General's Report, page H-13, I see \$2,610.17 paid to a gentleman by the name of T. O. Currie, who is stationed at Stevens' Point, Wisconsin. Where is that ? They have agencies at Omaha, and Chicago, and other large centres, but I never heard of Stevens' Point. He was paid \$1,200 salary ; board and lodging. \$658, and other expenses, making a total of \$2,610. What were the results of his mission, and how many immigrants did he send to the North-west ? Was he not a defeated candidate at the last election in the interests of the Patrons, and was not his appointment a consideration to induce the remaining Patrons elected to this House to support the present Government ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot say. Mr. Currie was recommended to me as a suitable man for that particular class of work, such as calling meetings of farmers and speaking to them on the general resources of Canada, and I must say he has been a very good man indeed. The agent general, who overlooks his work, told me several times that Mr. Currie had done very good work. I cannot tell how many immigrants he sent, because it is only agents who are working on commission who keep an exact tally of the men they send and get certificates from them. It would be a great waste of the time for the others to do this.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was this appointment given him to induce him to retire as the Patron candidate ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No. I have never seen Mr. Currie, but from what I have heard, he is a very suitable man for the work.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the special work he is doing ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He is in the St. Paul office, working within a radius of a couple of hundred miles. He addresses meetings of farmers, gives them information about Canada, and acts as correspondent.

Mr. HUGHES. Has he made any report ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. I have sometimes to differ from the hon. Minister, and this is one of them. I think any man who would betray his party and his friends, by selling out to the Government for an office, is undeserving any office in the gift of the country.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to know whether the reconciliation between Mr. Devlin and the Nationalist party in Ireland is now complete. My opinion is, that all the energy of our energetic friend was required to effect a reconciliation, and we know that in this House he was most energetic. When he went over to Ireland, he got into difficulties with the Nationalist party, which no other agent prior to him experienced. Mr. Devlin had the reputation of being a Canadian politician with Nationalist leanings, and one of the doctrines dear to Nationalists in Ireland is that emigration from their country should not be encouraged, but repressed, and when they found that Mr. Devlin had voted, when a member of this House, against the Prime Minister, who was then leading the Opposition, because he felt very much aggrieved with the present Prime Minister on account of what he considered certain laches in carrying out his promises, and that, still, he went over to Ireland as a paid servant of the Government led by that same Prime Minister, a great many of the people of Ireland, and especially the National party, who are very sensitive on the point of a man taking office under a government with which he is no longer in accord, applied to him a very nasty word, which I shall not here use, because Mr. Devlin is not in the House. The consequence was, that a regular crusade was made against him, and wherever he went, he found the publications of this party in Ireland confronting him, and the first thing he had to do was to make his peace. That is one of the reasons, undoubtedly, why the results of his labours have been so exceedingly weak, and I would like to know whether he is now free to devote his entire energy to bringing out immigrants. Is he able to devote his entire energy to this work ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think so.

Mr. DAVIN. That is not a satisfactory answer ; it shows doubt on the part of the hon. Minister.

Mr. CASEY. A question has been raised about one T. O. Currie, who has an appointment under the immigration department, and the Whip of hon. gentlemen opposite has started the ingenious theory, that after this Government came into power they made Mr. Currie an immigration agent to induce him not to be a candidate at the election which preceded their coming into power. That is a mighty ingenious theory, and only conceivable by such an ingenious brain.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) will not say that Mr. Currie had not the promise of an appointment if he would withdraw ?

Mr. CASEY. As a matter of fact, he started a candidature in one of the western counties—

Mr. TAYLOR. Where ?

Mr. CASEY. West Middlesex. But he gave it up early in the campaign to fight the battles of the Patron candidates against both parties. I happened to run against a Patron myself, and no man was so active in favour of my opponent as Mr. T. O. Currie, showing that if the Liberal party tried to bribe him to keep him from opposing them, they were quite unsuccessful in doing it. In East Elgin, he supported the Patron against the Conservative candidate. In other places he went about supporting the Patron candidate consistently, no matter who might be opposing him. So, it is certain the Liberal party did not bribe Mr. Currie by promise of an appointment in case they should be successful.

Mr. TAYLOR. How about handing over the Patron party to the support of the Liberals ?

Mr. CASEY. That is something that only my hon. friend, the Opposition whp (Mr. Taylor), knows anything about, so, perhaps, he had better explain it. Nobody ever knew that the Patron party was handed over or was capable of being handed over to any other party. But the Patrons supported nearly the same lines of policy as ourselves, and when the Patron party became disorganized, the members of that party naturally fell into our ranks. As to Mr. Devlin and his troubles in Ireland, we know that the Nationalists object to all emigration and emigration agents. They would object to anybody, if they thought he was likely to secure emigration; but if they thought he was a useless man and not likely to do effective work, they would not say much against him. They saw that Mr. Devlin was a taking and popular man and likely to secure immigrants for Canada, that is why they spoke of him as they did. As to the alleged difficulties between Mr. Devlin and the leader of the Government, whatever mention of that matter was made in Ireland was made as the result of the efforts of our friends of the Opposition, who sent statements to Ireland hoping to lessen his usefulness and prevent the success which otherwise he might have gained. I cannot imagine any one better qualified by all natural gifts to secure immigration to Canada from Ireland, and to make Canada popular amongst Irishmen than the gentleman who was entrusted with this work.

Mr. BERGERON. How many agents has the department in the United States ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Eighteen agents who are paid a salary. We have also a large number who are paid a commission; they get the ordinary commission when they send a certificate showing that they have secured immigrants.

Mr. BERGERON. I have a report from the department, given by the authority of

Mr. CASEY.

my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton), showing that there are twenty-one agents in the United States. I will send it over to my hon. friend and he will be kind enough to give me the salaries of those named on the first page.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The names of the agents and their salaries are as follows :—

McInnes, Detroit, Mich.....	\$1,500
Caven, Bad Axe, Mich.....	1,200
Grieve, Mount Pleasant, Mich.....	1,200
Crawford, Kansas .....	900
Davies, St. Paul, Minn.....	1,500
Currie, Stevens' Point, Wis.....	1,200
Broughton, Chicago, Ill.....	900
Bennett, Omaha, Neb. ....	900
Rogers, Watertown, S. Dakota.....	900
Longworth, clerk, Detroit office.....	750
Rev. J. B. Morin.....	800
Rev. Mr. Gouin .....	500
Rev. Mr. Blais.....	500
W. J. White, inspector and general agent for United States.....	2,000

The next three men are not salaried—Messrs. Bartholomew, Parker and Reid.

Mr. BERGERON. I got that report from the department, and was depending upon it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Messrs. Reid and Bartholomew get \$50 a month and a commission on those they send, and Mr. Parker gets \$25 a month and a commission.

Holmes, St. Paul, Minn.....	\$1,200
Swanson, Eastern States.....	1,500

Rev. Mr. Burriss, of Port Arthur, is not a salaried officer, but we are paying something towards his expenses. He is working to get up a colony to settle in the Rainy River district. He has already brought one colony into that district, and we allowed him something for his expenses, and he is getting another small grant. I believe he comes from Bowmanville. He brings his settlers from the United States; my deputy says they principally come from Ohio. He wrote to me stating that he thought he could get up a colony, and asked if I would allow him something for expenses. We have so many offers of that kind that I hesitated about it, but finally I thought the scheme looked feasible and we gave him a small amount. He brought about 100 people, and the people of Port Arthur were pleased with his work, and told me he ought to be encouraged by getting an additional grant.

Mr. BERGERON. According to my hon. friend's report, there are 255 other agents in the United States; how are they paid ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When they send a settler and furnish us with the evidence that he is a bona fide settler, we pay them a commission.

Mr. BERGERON. What kind of immigrants do the Government accept and pay for in this way?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. None but agriculturists, we do not recognize the labourers at all. In fact all our agents are notified that labourers will not be permitted to come in, that is to say, that we keep them out under the Alien Labour Law. Our commissioner at Winnipeg is appointed under the authority of the Minister of Justice, to act as alien labour officer, and he has special instructions to prevent any labourers from coming in. There is no trouble about it, because they all understand perfectly that labouring men are not allowed to come in. The settlers are all agricultural settlers. The immigrant gets a certificate from the agent who sends him, and that certificate is presented to the commissioner at Winnipeg, who, upon his being satisfied that the certificate was signed by the agent, and that he is a bona fide settler, certifies that the agent is entitled to his commission.

Mr. BERGERON. How much do you pay?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The bonus is \$3 for an adult male, \$2 for an adult female, and \$1 for others than adults. It does not differ much from the bonus we pay the steamship companies.

Mr. BERGERON. These agents who are paid salaries and who were mentioned a moment ago, do they receive anything else for board and travelling expenses?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. These officers get nothing else, in any shape or form, which is of any benefit to them, that is to say, which adds to their salary. Our rule is that when an agent lives at home he gets no allowance for board or expenses, but when his duties call him away from home, then we pay his actual travelling expenses and board and lodging.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is the agent at Detroit?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. McInnis is the gentleman now in charge of that office.

Mr. BERGERON. Has my hon. friend received any petition, or has he been written to, on account of the agent at Detroit not being able to speak the French language?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Has my hon. friend taken any steps in regard to the matter?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not yet. During the session I have, to some extent, lost sight of it. The matter was brought to my attention before the

session, or at the beginning of it, or, at any rate, some months ago. I was not satisfied of the necessity of having a French agent appointed there. The hon. gentleman will understand that I cannot remove the man who is there. The number of French immigrants that we will be likely to get, will not justify us in removing the present agent, because he has been there from the beginning, and has worked up the business himself. I contemplate removing the clerk from the office by exchanging him, and putting a French-speaking officer in his place.

Mr. BERGERON. That will be in the place of Mr. — ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Longworth.

Mr. BERGERON. As a matter of fact, is my hon. friend satisfied that, for the amount of money we are paying to all these agents, there is a satisfactory result in the number of immigrants and in the kind of immigrants that come from the United States to Manitoba or the North-west Territories?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think that the work has been phenomenally successful and very much more successful than I had any idea it would be when we started it. As near as we can calculate from the returns, about 10,000 agricultural settlers came in last year. It is the universal testimony of the people amongst whom these immigrants have settled that they are the very best class of settlers. They are people who have learned farming, and who are nearly all from the western states.

Mr. BERGERON. How many agents are there in Europe? I would like to know their names and salaries.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have at Paris Mr. A. Bodard, who gets a salary of \$1,200 a year; in Belgium we have Mr. P. Foursin, who gets \$1,825 a year, and another agent in Belgium named Mr. Treau De Coeli. This last named gentleman was recommended by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). I believe he is a very capable man. These three, we have as permanent agents, and we have in addition to that Prof. Oleskow, of Vienna, who is our agent in Austria. He is not a permanent officer of the department, and he does not devote all his time to the work of the department, but he represents the department in that country. There was an arrangement by which the department was to pay him a bonus of \$250 for each settler that he sent, but that fell through owing to the difficulty that we experienced in tracing his work, and knowing whether people who came were sent by him or not. While he has been working for us he has received about £750, and we owe him now £250. That would make about £1,000 for

three years, and that includes certain expenses which he has paid in the way of credits. I suppose we pay him at the rate of \$1,200 a year. The rate of payment is difficult to put on a definite basis in his case, because, being a university professor, he cannot be treated like a clerk. We correspond with him and we have paid him about \$1,200 a year. He is the gentleman who recommended the Galician immigration. I may say that the first party of Galicians that came here were such a very undesirable lot of people that an arrangement was made by which some supervision should be exercised over this class of immigration, with the result that the parties which have come out subsequently have been better.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose that this is the gentleman who sent out the Doukhobors and the Galicians?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He had nothing to do with the Doukhobors.

Mr. BERGERON. How many has he sent out?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have something over 11,000 Galicians. I cannot say how many he has sent.

Mr. BERGERON. Did he get \$2.50 a head for them?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No; it was first arranged that he should get \$2.50 a head, but that arrangement was modified, and we have paid him £750, and we owe £200 or £250 now.

Mr. BERGERON. Who sent the Doukhobors?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The arrangement with regard to the Doukhobors was made originally with Mr. Aylmer Maude, an English gentleman who was formerly a merchant in Russia, who retired from business and who came back to England. I think he is a Quaker; anyway, he is associated with the English Society of Quakers, and the Doukhobors are Quakers. The sect of the Doukhobors was planted in Russia by an English Quaker. The English Society of Friends arranged for the settlement of the Doukhobors, or Russian Quakers, in Canada. It came about in this way: Prince Hilkoﬀ, who is a Quaker, was closely associated with these people in Russia; he had been banished from Russia on account of his refusal to comply with the military regulations. Prince Hilkoﬀ became filled with the idea that the Doukhobors could be planted successfully in the United States or Canada, and he entered into communication with the Society of Friends in England, and they sent out Mr. Ward to negotiate for their settlement. Mr. Ward came to see me in Winnipeg when I was there some time ago, and after a lengthy

Mr. SIFTON.

discussion with him, I came to the conclusion that these people were a desirable class of people to have in our North-west, and further inquiries confirmed me in that belief. After a considerable amount of negotiation we agreed that if they would transport the people and pay their passage from the Caucasus where they were then living to the point in Manitoba or the North-west where we meant to place them, instead of paying a bonus to the steamship agent as we usually do, we would increase the amount a little and make it £1 sterling per head, and would pay that amount to a committee to be named by them in conjunction with myself, that is, they named certain members and I named certain members. The committee was composed mostly of Winnipeg gentlemen, and we paid this bonus of £1 sterling per head to that committee, who expended the money for the benefit of the Doukhobors. I may say that from the nature of the case it is an impossibility to do everything of that kind with perfect system. The committee was not organized quite in time, and we had to pay a certain amount on behalf of the Doukhobors when they came, but that was charged up against the £1 sterling per head; so that the entire expenses we are at, outside the ordinary increased expenditure of the office on their account, is £1 sterling per head.

Mr. BERGERON. Could my hon. friend give me the names of the members of that committee?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They were Mr. Archer, an English gentleman, acting in the same capacity as Mr. Ward, as adviser and friend of these people, and a representative of the English Society of Friends who were assisting them; Prince Hilkoﬀ, Mr. McCaffrey, Manager of the Union Bank in Winnipeg, Mr. McCreary and Mr. Bole, Chairman of the School Board in Winnipeg.

Mr. BERGERON. How many Doukhobors have landed in Canada, and have gone up to their destination?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Seven thousand three hundred, for each one of whom we have paid the £1 sterling. Of course, the fact that the business of the department is increased by that much has increased the general outlay for the year a certain amount. We take care of these immigrants in precisely the same way as we do others. If we hear that 500 or 1,000 people are going to land at Halifax to-morrow, our officers are there to look after them, and to do whatever is necessary for their comfort, and to look after their conveyance to their destination. We treat the Doukhobors in precisely the same way. The only separate special outlay for them was the £1 sterling. Everything we bought, including the bread when they were going out, was char-

ged against that bonus. Perhaps the actual outlay was increased a little by reason of the fact that we had to hire a staff of extra interpreters. Every train-load that went up from Halifax was accompanied by an interpreter, which caused a little extra expense.

Mr. BERGERON. How many more of those immigrants are coming here?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. About 1,000 or 1,500 more may come this year.

Mr. BERGERON. When does the Minister expect that immigration to stop?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have nothing definite on that point.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it the policy of the Government to bring in all the Doukhobors and Galicians they can get?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I would not say that, without knowing how many we can get. If we got 10,000 more Doukhobors next year, I should be happy to have them come.

Mr. BERGERON. And the Galicians?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My belief is, that the Galicians are a very desirable class of settlers, but it requires a considerable amount of trouble on the part of the Government officials to get them started. We have had to supply them with provisions the first year to some extent, and I must say that they struggle hard to pay us back for them. We must take care, with settlers of that kind, not to take more than we can assimilate and attend to. I have no doubt we can handle five or six thousand Galicians a year for the next ten or fifteen years, and make good settlers of them. The Doukhobors are not as hard to take care of as the Galicians.

Mr. BERGERON. How much land have you at your disposal for such immigrants, and where is it located?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have got land enough to settle a million of them. The whole of the Saskatchewan valley is practically empty yet.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are these going that you brought in this year?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The entire tract of land for these 7,300 only comprises less than eighteen townships. Each male adult gets a quarter of a section, and eighteen townships would more than provide for that.

Mr. WALLACE. Are the conditions for homesteading the same for the Doukhobors as for other people?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Exactly the same.

Mr. McNEILL. How are these Galicians selected?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot give the hon. gentleman very much information about that. We have Professor Oleskow at the other end of the movement, and he has special authority from the Austrian Government. It is his duty, as far as possible, to prevent people of the pauper class from coming, and I think, with the exception of the first couple of parties, he has been fairly successful.

Mr. McNEILL. The reason I ask that question is, that I understand there is an impression abroad in the Territories that a good many of these people have been criminals in their own country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can assure my hon. friend there is no truth in that.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to this fact. I am not speaking off the book, but I am speaking from information which I have had from a person who would not have written to me on the subject unless he fully believed what he wrote. He tells me that there is very strong reason to suspect that some of these men who have been palmed off on us here, have been criminals in their own country. I call the attention of the Minister to that, so that he may take steps to investigate the matter, and if it is true, to see that nothing of the kind occurs again.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) will give me the name privately, or will state to me where his information comes from, I shall have special inquiries made, and the information may prove valuable. The report which I have seen in the newspapers, that the Galicians are of the criminal class in their own country, is an entire mistake.

Mr. McNEILL. My information would not go so far as that, but simply that some of them have been criminals, and I should suppose, from what I have heard, more than a few.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Out of 11,000 people, I suppose, it would be almost impossible to provide that some might not be of bad character.

Mr. McNEILL. From my information, I understand it is not merely a few who have been criminals.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can understand that perhaps the informant of my hon. friend would not like to have his name mentioned, but if I get the source of the information, I would have it followed up. I am perfectly satisfied there is no foundation for the report that there is more criminality among the Galicians who come

here, than there is among the ordinary population of Canada. On the contrary, I venture to say that there are no 11,000 people in the Dominion who will show a smaller record of crimes committed during the last three years than these Galicians. The report of those who know them is, that they are extremely good-living people in their ordinary relations. Of course, there are some things in connection with their social habits which are more or less distasteful to the Canadians, and that applied also to the Mennonites. I am perfectly satisfied that the record of the Galicians, so far as crime is concerned, is most creditable to them. Up to the present time I am only aware of one serious crime committed among the Galicians, the murder at Stuartburn and it appeared in that case that the man had been a criminal before he came here. Ordinarily speaking, the record of the Galicians for propriety of living is very good.

Mr. BERGERON. Are there in the older provinces any agents employed by my hon. friend, not under salary, but commission, to induce the people of the older provinces to settle in the North-west and in Manitoba? Are there any agents in the older provinces of the Dominion, similar to those we have in Europe and the United States?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have no salaried agents commissioned to do that; but some work of that kind is done by the two or three Roman Catholic clergymen whose names I have mentioned, though it has not been recognized by the department, and is not done under instructions from the department. We simply do not take any steps to prevent it.

Mr. BERGERON. As a matter of fact, any person from the older provinces wishing to go to Manitoba or the North-west would be treated in the same way as immigrants coming from Europe or the United States?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In just the same way—no difference in the world. Speaking about the Doukhobors, I may say that the last ship-load of them which came landed at Quebec, and some people there applied to me to allow some of them to settle in the Lake St. John district, they were so favourably impressed with them. I sent back word that there was no objection to their going anywhere they wished; but the Doukhobors themselves were so set on going to where the others had gone that no arrangement of that kind could be made.

Mr. BERGERON. In such cases I suppose it would be left to the local government to pay the expense?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I threw no obstacle in the way, but, on the contrary, said that I would be willing to assist them in any way I could. I do not know

Mr. SIFTON.

any reason why we should not spend our money for the purpose of settling people in the back portions of the province of Quebec or the province of Ontario, as well as in the North-west.

Mr. BERGERON. I am glad to hear that; I did not know it before. I thought the hon. gentleman could only pay out money for immigrants who were going to Manitoba or the North-west Territories.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not at all. For instance, our officers cooperate with the colonization societies at Montreal and Quebec, which do a very large amount of very valuable work; and a considerable number of people have settled in the province of Quebec owing to their efforts in that direction.

Mr. BERGERON. Then, would my hon. friend help, in the same way that he is doing in the case of the Doukhobors, any immigration from Belgium or France to settle in the province of Quebec?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Certainly.

Mr. BERGERON. Are the agents in the old country notified of that?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My deputy has just called my attention to a fact which I had forgotten, that the agent in Belgium, whose name I gave just now, is working altogether or almost altogether to get settlers for the province of Quebec.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the Minister if one of these shipments of Doukhobors who have come to Canada came from the Island of Cyprus?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. They are the last lot who have arrived.

Mr. CLARKE. Was the Minister's attention called to the fact that the death rate among those who had been in Cyprus was very high before they left, and has he inquired into that?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Our information was that the death rate was very high among them when they were in Cyprus, because of the unhealthiness of their situation there. Special attention and care has been given to the medical examination of the Doukhobors at the ports where they have landed.

Mr. FOSTER. Was anything done in that respect at the ports from which they started?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No. They started from Batoum. As a matter of fact, the small-pox which manifested itself on two occasions among them was caught at that place, and was not brought with them from the Caucasus. As my hon. friend knows, there is small-pox at certain

times of the year at southern Asiatic ports, and when a lot of people go there at those times, some of them are almost sure to catch the infection. Very careful attention is paid to the medical examination, and my hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture, tells me that Dr. Montizambert states that the Doukhobors who have landed have been, without exaggeration, as healthy and sound a lot of immigrants as have ever landed in Canada. I may say further that the people who came from Cyprus passed the medical examination all right: they did not have to be quarantined. It was the Doukhobors who came from Batoum who had to be quarantined for small-pox, and I am satisfied that they brought it from there and not from the Caucasus.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that where a medical examination should be held, if the circumstances at all favour it, is at the port of embarkation, so that idiots and persons afflicted with chronic diseases shall not get started on this immigration, but shall be sifted out at that end of the line. I would like to ask the Minister if there is any insuperable difficulty in the way of the medical examination being made at that point rather than at the point of debarkation here. Since we are on the subject of the Galician and Doukhobor immigration, I want to say a word or two on that subject. I have no doubt that those who are strongly opposed, either from prejudice or for better reasons, to Doukhobor and Galician or Hungarian immigration, have painted these people as being less desirable than they really are; and I dare say the immigration department paint them as being a little better than they really are. So far as I am concerned, I have no prejudice against these people. We have 11,000 of one kind, and 7,000 of the other kind, and shall probably have more. They have come here, and I hope they will be successful in this country, and make good citizens. Now that they are here, I do not want them to feel that there is any section of Canadians anywhere who do not bid them God-speed and all success possible in their new homes. We can do that, however, and still have our own views as to the multiplying of that kind of immigration in this country. There is some objection to that class of immigration. I am not going to say that the North-west is not big enough to absorb a certain portion of almost any healthy stock in the world, although the process may be longer in some cases than in others, ultimately assimilating them into a good type of citizenship. But I think we ought to be careful that we get good stock. It may not be the most intelligent in the world, but if it is good healthy stock, that is one necessary element in building up a good population in the North-west. That is one of the things that should be assured, and a careful medical examination would help the department to sift out all who do not reasonably fulfil this condition.

But you may get too many of the class of people whom it takes a large amount of time to assimilate into sympathetic citizenship with the people of our country; and I think it is possible that you may group these people together in large masses so as to make that a very much longer and more difficult process than might otherwise be the case. I think the Department of Agriculture ought to take these points into very careful consideration—how many we can absorb from time to time and whether we are putting them into aggregations which are too close and too numerous. I have heard of difficulties which arise, and I suppose my hon. friend has as well, and it is not necessary for me to take up time further alluding to it. But I think it is a proposition that many of us may accept, that while we welcome those people, now that they are here, and feel that we may absorb some more of them, if we do not get immigrants of the better kind—and there are immigrants better suited to our country and purposes—the thing to be kept in mind is how many we ought to take, and whether we are aggregating them too much and whether they should not be aggregated to a certain extent in order that the process of assimilation may be more rapid. They have much to learn as to the habits, thought and citizenship of the country, and they will learn these more quickly, if not too much tied together, so that they may breathe the atmosphere of other settlers more advanced and of our own people, and thus be stimulated in the progress they must make before they become equal to the best citizens in the country.

I have never thought that we should be too impatient about bringing in large immigration. Everybody knows that what we want is population, but everybody knows as well that the quality of population counts much more than the quantity, and that 5,000 first-class immigrants, who have some idea of our methods of Government and sympathy with our social and other ideas, and who have besides an advanced knowledge of agriculture, are much better than 50,000 of a class that it would take a generation or two to bring up to the required standard. So that we ought not to be too impatient as regards numbers, and should feel that we are doing the work well if the class that comes in is the best class possible to get.

I want to call my hon. friend's attention to another matter, which he does not seem to know as much about as he should, or else the information has not been brought out, and that illustrates the trend of the department to stand by all that is done as the best that could be done. I refer now to the Buriss settlement in the Rainy River. Has the hon. gentleman no information as to the absolute total failure of that attempt to colonize those townships in the Rainy River district? There must be reports that have reached him. I have occasion to pass up

and down, and have talked with the people there, and you cannot go up the Rainy River and talk with the people, whether Grit or Tory, without being told that a great mistake was made. You would be told this even by the strongest adherents of the Government, and you would be told by others that worse than a mistake was made. It is generally known there that Mr. Burriss' colony was an absolute failure, and its failure has had a most prejudicial effect on the settlement of that country.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** What was the mistake?

**Mr. FOSTER.** In the first place, the settlers were not of the right class for that kind of country. They were brought from Kentucky, Tennessee and Ohio, those southern latitudes, and did not know the kind of life or country to which they were going. They were not the kind of men who should have settled in a farming district like that, where everything is in the rough and in the new. Their resources, habits of life and previous experience did not fit them for that at all. Owing to the difference of clime and the totally different conditions from what they expected, these men were totally inadequate to cope with those conditions, and the result has been that every man of them who could get out by means of what he could earn or beg, did so, and those that remained are there simply because they are caged and cannot get out. Several people have told me that they have helped these settlers out of sheer sympathy and pity. I was surprised to hear that my hon. friend thought that the work of Mr. Burriss had been so successful in the past that he had added a bonus for future efforts in that direction, but I suppose there must be reports in the department that give this information. At any rate the failure of this scheme is a matter of common talk in that district.

It cannot be said that the Rainy River district is not good for farming, because it is. There is no better land, I believe, in Ontario than a strip of from ten to twenty miles wide along the Rainy River; I mean back from the river, and extending probably 60 or 90 miles. Everything seems to grow, the greatest crops of clover and timothy can be shown there, but the conditions in those townships are in the rough entirely, and in that district, differing from prairie land, it takes three or four years for a man to get his clearing made and reach a point when he can make a living for himself.

The main difficulty was, first, in the class of people sent in. They were not the hardy farmers who should have been sent in. In the second place, the conditions were different from what these people had, in some way or other, been led to expect. But that the colony was a failure and a bad one no one doubts who is conversant with the facts.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I have not any report in the department show-

**Mr. FOSTER.**

ing that Mr. Burriss' efforts have been a total failure, and I do not think that they have resulted in total failure. I have heard pretty nearly all that the hon. gentleman heard himself, stated by people who are very much prejudiced against Mr. Burriss, particularly in the neighbourhood of Rat Portage and along the Rainy River. There is a variety of explanations to be given. Mr. Burriss was met by a good deal of hostility of a religious character. Religious prejudice has something to do with that hostility. He is a reverend gentleman, a pastor of the Disciples. I asked a good many questions, and the information I got would lead me to believe that there was some foundation for what the hon. gentleman has heard. A proportion of the people were of a class who could not get on in that country, but some of them would succeed. The only official report I had was from Mr. Speers, who inspected the colony, and his report is favourable.

**Mr. FOSTER.** When did he inspect the colonies?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** In October last. I was there myself last summer, and I heard two stories. Some said that Mr. Burriss had been fairly successful—I did not hear anybody say he had been remarkably successful—while others apparently feeling strongly against him, said that his efforts had resulted in total failure. I think the truth lies between the two extremes—while his efforts did not result in complete success, they did not result in complete failure. A fair proportion of the settlers will remain and will be successful.

**Mr. WALLACE.** What about the hon. gentleman's information, stated here, that a large number of these settlers had gone back?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** If the hon. gentleman had been listening he would have heard me say that a number of these settlers turned out to be failures.

**Mr. WALLACE.** That is not the question. Have a large number of them gone out of the country?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I said so—I may not have put it in those exact words—

**Mr. WALLACE.** The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) said that the truth is between the two extremes, the question is, is the information that a large number of these people have gone out of the country correct?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I have no official information to that effect. I got a certain amount of general information when I was there.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Was the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) in the settlement?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. No. I was at Rat Portage and went down Rainy River to Fort Frances. I met a number of people who talked about this matter. Now, as to the advances made to Mr. Burriss, that was done at the urgent solicitation of the Port Arthur people, who, I presume, were more or less cognizant of his former efforts. That may not be a correct assumption. At first I refused, but after further representation and at their urgent request, I gave him a small contribution towards his expenses—I think, something like \$200 or \$300.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Before we leave this subject, I wish it understood that I do not allege anything against Mr. Burriss' good faith and earnestness. I simply give the information I gathered, having talked with people who had been through the settlement and who knew I was anxious to get the facts. No doubt, Mr. Burriss tried, in good faith, to do the best he could. But I think it will be worth while for my hon. friend, before he goes any further, to inform himself of the facts of the case. And I may tell him that he will not get them at Port Arthur or Rat Portage for these places are practically as far from the settlement as we are. That is a country which has a good future before it, but much depends upon getting the right class of men in as pioneers. This done, a large immigration can follow. The facilities for raising stuff are unbounded, while the sale of it is practically at their doors. So it is a very interesting country and a very eligible one to open up. But you can easily give it a bad name by making the mistake of encouraging people to go there who are not fitted for pioneer work.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I have no doubt that Mr. Burriss did get some people who were not good pioneers. But so far as there was any failure in this respect, it was not due to bad faith on his part.

Mr. **FOSTER**. And I may say I never heard of any religious difficulty.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I am sure there was a prejudice of that kind.

Mr. **MACKIE**. I think there must be some mistake about these people returning in any considerable number to the United States. I came down by the last boat that came down the Rainy River last fall. There were some fourteen or fifteen men on the boat who had come from the United States to settle in the Rainy River district and had taken up farms. They were going back to the United States. But what were they going for? They were going to get their families to bring them back to their new homes.

Mr. **LaRIVIERE**. On which side of the river have they settled, the Ontario side?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. On the Ontario side. There are no settlers on the other side. There are two other points that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) referred to. One of these was the medical examination in the case of foreign immigrants. It is extremely difficult to inaugurate any system of examination in a foreign country, where the rules and regulations are not made at our instance and do not conform to what we want. We cannot enforce any rules, and we should be liable to get into difficulty if we undertook to do anything of that kind without careful consultation with the authorities there. The greater number of our immigrants from Europe come from Hamburg. There, the port authorities undertake the examination, and my information is that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to get any arrangements made that would be satisfactory. So far as the Doukhobors are concerned, they had their own doctors on board, who, I believe, are quite competent. An examination made at the point of embarkation would not have enabled the physicians to prevent an outbreak of small-pox. The infection was, no doubt, taken at Batoum, while they were there. No physician could have detected it then, because it is only after the period of incubation that the disease manifests itself, and until then, no physician can detect it.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Of course, you cannot detect an incipient epidemic.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. They were all carefully examined and were found to be strictly healthy.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I am afraid that in some surreptitious way some others were smuggled in. I went through two or three trains filled with Galicians—

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) does not understand me. I am speaking of the Doukhobors, not the Galicians.

Mr. **FOSTER**. While I am on my feet, I may say, with reference to these Galicians, that I went through some of the trains conveying them, and it was evident that some of them should never have left the other shore, and would not have left it for Canada if there had been some good supervision. The steamship companies should have been told: If you bring these people out, you will have to take them back again.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I am glad the hon. gentleman has made that explanation, because I am sure his complaints must have applied to the Galicians. But so far as the Doukhobors are concerned, there was a great deal of care exercised. I do not mean to say that there was no dis-

ease among them, and that all were in absolutely perfect health. But there was nothing of a kind that a medical examination would have caused them to be excluded from the ship. So far as the general question is concerned, I am free to say it is one that we shall have to consider seriously, and we have been considering it for some months past. It is a difficult subject to deal with. It is extremely desirable that some method should be devised that will enable us to exercise a little more authority than we have in regard to foreign immigrants. At the present time there is nothing in the law that authorizes me to stop them at all; the law would have to be amended in order to confer authority upon me to do so. Up to the present time there has been no special occasion for drastic measures, and I would not propose drastic measures unless the indications were very strong that serious difficulty was likely to arise. As I told the House the other day, I stopped the bonus for the Galicians altogether from the 1st of June last. I may say that I was strongly remonstrated with upon that subject from the High Commissioner's office, but we decided that we were likely to receive as many from that country as we wished this year without any additional pay, and so the bonus was stopped. We have taken steps for the purpose of cutting off that immigration for this year; as for next year, that will be a matter we shall have to consider.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am not going to find any fault with this expenditure for immigration; I have always been prepared to vote any money that was necessary for the purpose of peopling our North-west Territories, or any other part of Canada, so long as the money was judiciously expended. Now, a thought struck me with reference to the percentage these reverend gentlemen are getting, or so much per head for the immigrants they induce to come into this country. I think that is a mistake. But a more important point is this: For instance, you have got several agents in the United States who are paid by salaries, and a certain number of men who are paid a percentage; now, is there not a possibility that while you have a paid agent, and he has territory to work over, you may have a percentage man who is reaping the benefit of the work of the salaried agent? Here is a man working on a percentage, and you have an agent, I understand, who is getting \$5,000 a year, at least he is costing the country that much. Now, it struck me that one of these percentage gentlemen, whom I do not believe in at all, may be right in the territory of your salaried agent, and he is receiving so much per head for the same immigrants whom you pay this man \$5,000 to bring out. I do not know anything about this reverend gentleman, but it appears to me he cannot have the same interest in bringing the right

Mr. SIFTON.

class of settlers into the country as a man who is working for a salary. Another point: I think it is an utter impossibility for a man from the southern states to come up into our northern latitude and carve out a home for himself and become a successful settler. I can understand a man from the southern states going on the prairie in a northern climate and making a living for himself; but I confess, as a man that was brought up on a farm, and who has cleared a good deal of land myself, that I am at a loss to know how you can take a man from the southern states, and put him into the forests of Canada, and make a successful settler out of him.

Mr. ROGERS. I am sure that both sides of the House will agree that anything that can be done in the line of bringing in immigrants to fill up our North-west should be approved of, if the money is expended judiciously. We are all anxious to see this country filled up as fast as possible with the proper kind of immigrants. We have not had as good results in the past as we could have wished, for the money expended, whatever the reason may be. It is evident that the present Government have made a little extra attempt to bring in settlers from Europe, although some people may not think them desirable. But my opinion is, that the Government are justified in bringing them in, in view of the great need that there is of filling up our North-west. As regards the Doukhobors, some reasonable objection has been taken to living them up in settlements; that is about the only objection that I have heard in regard to them. Some people complain because they will not take up arms and fight for their country, the same as others; but I have no fear that in our lifetime we shall ever have any trouble of that kind. With regard to the Galicians, I feel that there is good in them also, although perhaps they are not the best class of immigrants that we could get. I have heard the complaint made that the Doukhobors are averse to going out and working as servants for other people, while the Galicians are all anxious to hire out to the farmers and others. Of course, they work for low wages, but they do not come into competition with the artisan or the mechanic, because they are all agriculturists. I am pleased to hear that many of the Galician women go into domestic service, and in some instances have proved themselves very satisfactory. That is a kind of service that is very much needed in our country. We want cheap agricultural labourers. We have to compete in the foreign markets with very cheap agricultural labour in other countries, and, in order to do so successfully, we must have cheap agricultural labour at home. That is the only means by which we can increase our agricultural products, and by which men who have money invested in agricultural enterprises, can get a good

return from it. It is quite evident, even in Ontario, that if we could get cheaper labour, such as they have in the old country, we would be able to increase our output 50 or perhaps 100 per cent. It is an acknowledged fact that farming does not pay and farmers cannot afford to pay the wages that are demanded for labour on the farm, and which labour should receive, having regard to the prices that they get for their products. The question is frequently asked: Why do the young men leave the farm? One of the reasons, and the principal reason, is, that they cannot get an adequate reward for their labours on the farm. They do not like to leave the old homesteads, but when they see other young men, whose capabilities are no better than their own, getting twice the remuneration that they can earn on the farm, they will not stay at home. If we could get cheaper agricultural labour young men would be more disposed to stay on the farm, because, in that case, they would not be compelled to work like slaves to hold their property. What I say must apply to the North-west Territories as well as to other parts of the country, because, I am sorry to see, that in the little pamphlet issued by the department here, Mr. Septimus Field says:

I have known several men who dated their downfall from the time they began to hire labour.—

He speaks of Manitoba.

Mr. CLARKE. Who says that?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Septimus Field.

—So long as they confined themselves to a certain number of cattle and a limited acreage of grain, they did well, but when they began to increase them and outside labour was necessary, it soon ate up both cattle and profit, until the time came when the servant hired the employer. Instances of this have come under my own observation. Many of the now-thriving settlers owe their position to the wages earned from others, coupled with their own thrift, gaining capital and experience at the same time. Many others, starting with capital and no experience, hired men to do the work they should have done themselves, and came to grief as above indicated.

That is very poor encouragement to English capitalists to come to this country.

Mr. CLARKE. What is that document the hon. gentleman is reading from?

Mr. ROGERS. It is a pamphlet issued by the department to encourage immigration.

Mr. CLARKE. What department?

Mr. ROGERS. The Department of the Interior, I suppose, or it may have been the Department of Agriculture. It is headed "Western Canada; Timely Remarks by Septimus Field." However, if Mr. Field never had said so, it is true all the same. Some good may come out of it in that line. As regards these American agents, when we

first sent them over to the United States to bring back immigrants from that country, I had very little faith that they would accomplish anything, because many of our own people had left Canada to go to that country, but the results have been very much more satisfactory than I anticipated. I happened to be out of the House for a few minutes, but I understand that some remarks were made about Mr. Currie leaving our Patron organization, and taking a position under the Government. If Mr. Currie does as good work and creates as much enthusiasm in the minds of the people there, as to the possibilities of our great Dominion, as he did in awakening the farmers of this country from the lethargy into which they had relapsed, as regards party thralldom, he will accomplish a great work. I think there is no man who could be selected, in this House, or in this country, who is better fitted to picture, in glowing terms, the beauties, the grandeurs and the possibilities of this great Dominion than Mr. Currie. I will say this, that if Mr. Currie did leave the Patrons he never left them until the Patrons had, unfortunately, disbanded, they did not stick to him or he would never have left them. Canada could not have a better agent or one who could more effectively describe the beauties and grandeurs and possibilities of our great Dominion than Mr. Currie. I am glad to see that good results have come out of this movement. I wish to refer to an article that is published in a paper called the "Farm and Home," which has an American and also a Canadian edition. The paper has headquarters at Boston and Chicago. I will read an article from it that will be very encouraging to the hon. members of this committee and to the Department of the Interior, because it indicates the good work that is being done in the United States by the agents there, and it shows that Mr. Currie, or somebody else, must be exerting an influence upon the minds of the Americans favourable to the movement in which he has engaged.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it the Canadian edition the hon. gentleman is quoting from?

Mr. ROGERS. It is the Canadian edition.

Mr. CLARKE. Where is it published?

Mr. ROGERS. It has two headquarters, one at Boston and another at Chicago. It says:

Mr. FOSTER. Easy.

Mr. ROGERS. I am not slapping my hands and jumping about as the hon. member does; I am keeping quite cool this time. He says:

I have read with interest the first article in "Farm and Home" for June 1st, "The Boom in the North-west," and think that an exodus of 5,000 of our citizens in one day for Canada must show to our Government daddies that something is going wrong, or that many of our citizens must have more confidence or security in other

lands and under other governments than our own. I am constantly receiving letters and reports from truthful friends in the North-west, who prefer that country. I intend going there myself, though I prefer not to sell my home, or give up my citizenship.

Millions will leave United States for the north and north-west—

Mr. FOSTER. Millions ?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes ; if they do we do not want many Doukhobors—

—inside of two years, and the population of Canada may far exceed the population of the United States.

This shows what this man thinks about protection.

Trusts, combines, monopolies, corporations, corrupt legislation, billion dollar congresses, pensions for soldiers from whom our country never received just service, rotten beef contracts, expansion in foreign and worthless lands to the neglect of our own, maintaining large armies and navies in order to force our modes, manners and institutions down the very throats of Filipino niggers, who have no more use for them than our forefathers had for taxation without just compensation from overburdened Englishmen more than a century ago ; the burden of all, or nearly all, this falls heavily on those least able to bear it—the farmers, the bankers by usurious interests forcing them from their farms.

He is not only writing to this paper, but he has written to his own Government as well.

I have just written a statement of facts and figures from my farm journal, which I have kept during 18 years of farming in Gallatin Co., Mont., and sent it to Washington, showing how prices have declined and how deceptive the income of the farmer is to an unobserving eye. Our papers often give glowing accounts of Montana. So high are they that I cannot attain thereto. But it is easier to farm on paper than on untutored soil.

WILLIAM NORWOOD,  
Montana.

I am sure that every member of this House will receive that statement with pleasure. It may be a little exaggerated as to the millions, but the other statement, I believe, is correct, as to the immigration that we shall have from the United States. If our Government take a little lesson from this and seek to check the power of the monopolies, combines and trusts formed through the curse of protection, I am sure our country will prosper.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. ROGERS. I am only giving the experience of that man who signs his own name to his statement. I hope that good results will flow, and that the Minister will see that there is no money needlessly expended. Experience has shown us that we cannot get as large immigration from Great Britain as we got formerly. The country is prosperous, the agricultural labourers are being paid higher wages, we are sending them abundance of our products so that they have cheaper food, and they are less anxious to emi-

Mr. ROGERS.

grate than they were formerly. If we can get the small capitalists to come to Canada, then we would have the best class of settlers, and we should endeavour to get that class by showing them that they will have some return for the money they invest. I believe that the immigration agents in England, Ireland and Scotland do their best, but we must remember that they have great difficulties to labour under. I am British and loyal enough to believe that the Canadian Government should encourage by every possible means, English-speaking emigrants. I believe that they should have these agents in Great Britain, and we know very well that if the Government had no agents there a cry would be at once raised against them, although they say too much money is being spent in that line.

Mr. OLIVER. As representing probably one-sixth of the area which is affected by the immigration vote, and as representing the part of the country to which most of the immigration is now tending, I would ask the indulgence of the House for a short while. I shall speak on this subject in a somewhat general manner at the beginning, and call the attention of the House to the large vote for immigration, and the consequent necessity for understanding what results we are striving to obtain by the expenditure of that money. To begin with, it would be well to divide our immigration efforts into two parts, first, that part which we consider valuable enough to warrant us in paying out a large amount of money for ; and second, that part which we do not consider sufficiently desirable to warrant us in expending money to encourage. It is, I believe, thoroughly understood, that there are these two divisions of our immigration service. We send a large number of agents to Great Britain and to the United States and we pay them considerable salaries, because we believe it to be in the highest degree desirable to get immigrants from these countries. We, therefore, spend a large amount of money, not only for the purpose of getting immigrants, but for the purpose of getting desirable and valuable immigrants. But, Sir, the results we have achieved from that expenditure in actual heads of population received, is not very much greater than that per head which we have received without, so it appears, any serious expenditure of money. There is a flow of immigration towards us without any considerable expenditure, and it is that phase of the immigration business which I propose particularly to discuss. I take the liberty of doing so, because the district which I represent, and close to the place at which I reside, has been most favoured by this particular class of immigrants. I am probably more familiar personally with it than any other member of the House, and, therefore, I may be excused for speaking with special reference to that subject.

It does not seem to me to be fair to say : We have received, say, 10,000 immigrants in a year, and we have spent \$200,000 or \$300,000 to get these immigrants ; when half of these immigrants came of their own volition and without any serious expenditure on our part to get them. There is a question as to the desirability of these people coming here at all, and I shall speak on that point. I wish to speak, not from the point of view of the Government of the day, nor from the point of view of the Opposition of the day. I wish to be understood, not as making a political harangue, nor questioning any motive or policy in any way, shape or manner, but I stand here as the representative of the people of a large part of the North-west Territories, and I wish to place before this House the views of those people in regard to this question which so intimately concerns them. I speak from that stand-point and not from any other. Now, in arriving at that stand-point, or in attempting to arrive at it, whether theirs is the correct stand-point or not, I will ask the House, what is the primary object of inducing immigration ? I believe I am in accord with a large majority of the settlers throughout the North-west when I say, that the primary object of inducing immigration is not simply to produce railroad traffic, but for the purpose of building up a kindred, and as far as possible, a higher, and a better civilization in that country. This may not sound practical to some members of this House. We have heard other reasons given, but speaking for the people who are on the ground, I say, that the settler of the North-west has an ambition other than simply to raise so many thousands of bushels of grain that a railway company may get freight on, or that a merchant may make a profit in handling. The ambition of the settlers of the North-west Territories is not to be hewers of wood or drawers of water for any corporation, or association, or class of the community. They are there as individual citizens of this country, with ambitions just as high and with feelings just as delicate as those of any other class of the community, and perhaps a little more so. The settler who goes into the North-west Territories has the ambition to build up there a pleasant and satisfactory home for himself and for his children after him ; to build up a civilization and to take part in the general progress of the community. He raises the wheat, not as an end but as a means, and he depends for his success in achieving progress and civilization upon the efforts of his neighbours as well as upon his own efforts. If his neighbours are not like-minded with himself, if his neighbours are not of a progressive instinct, if they are not of a civilized tendency, then the progressive and advancing and prosperous settler of the North-west Territories is handicapped by association with those who are not progressive, and, therefore, are not prosperous.

I say that by putting into the North-west a class of people who are not progressive, whose ambition is not civilization, you are handicapping the settlers who are there, and whose ambition is to build up a civilized and prosperous country, such as you see around you to-day—the result, not of accident, or chance, or the force of circumstances, by any means, but the result of the application of energy, intelligence, enterprise and every other quality that goes to make a man or a nation ; and you cannot have the establishment of a progressive civilization in the North-west without these qualities in the men who are there, any more than you could have had it here. This country is civilized, is progressive, is great, by reason of the people who inhabit it. There are other countries which are far ahead of Canada in natural advantages, but which are not the equals of Canada, and are not in sight of Canada in civilization, or progress, or in anything that goes to make the greatness and blessedness of a nation. It is the people who make the country—who are the country. Now, transplant in the North-west people from such a country—a country that is ahead of Canada in natural resources, but is far behind it in civilization and prosperity—for the one goes with the other—and you put them as a collar around the neck of your civilized and progressive settlers ; you cannot expect to see that progress which you would have, if the country were inhabited entirely by civilized people. The mere fact of transplanting a man from one location to another does not change his nature. You see all the difference between one settlement here and another settlement there, simply because there is a different class of people in the one from what there is in the other. Therefore, if you transplant people who are behind in civilization, who have no ideas in regard to our system of government or our social life, who have no ambitions such as we have, who are aliens in race and in every other respect, can you expect your country to be built up as it would be, if you had better men in it ? I say you cannot reasonably expect it ; and you are handicapping the good men you have there by putting such a class of settlers among them.

One hon. gentleman says that they will be labourers for the other settlers. If there is a field for the employment of the labour of these men, let those who represent that field speak for it ; let them demand that the efforts of the immigration department be put forth in order to supply the demand. If Ontario wants these people, by all means let Ontario have them. I am not speaking for Ontario ; but I do claim to speak for the part of the North-west which I have the honour to represent, and I say that we have not a sufficient field for the employment of their labour there—that they stand there, not as labourers for the rest of the community, but as a danger to our social system, our muni-

cial institutions and our general progress. That is why we desire to call the attention of the Government and of the House to the undesirability of allowing this immigration to continue.

It is quite common to hear it said: Oh, there are millions of acres in the North-west; there is plenty of room there for everybody. Let me tell the House that the North-west is not illimitable. It is very nearly as far from Quebec to Windsor as it is from Winnipeg to Calgary, which is the length of the North-west. But the question is not one of area altogether. It is a question of population. There is in the North-west Territories to-day a population of possibly 200,000; and the success of your institutions in that country and its general prosperity depend upon the maintenance of the supremacy of a civilizing and directing influence in that country. Now, it would be a very simple matter to overcome any particular settlement in the North-west by a foreign population. Every settlement in that country stands in danger from that influx of population, if it is not checked. The whole of the North-west Territories stands in danger; and if that element once gets control, as it necessarily must, if it is a majority, then where is your control of those North-west Territories, and where is your hope for the progress and prosperity of that country? Remember, these people have to be considered as more than merely beasts of burden. When they come to this country, they become citizens; they have just the same rights as you or any one else, and they have to be considered as a power in the body politic. They are something more than merely raisers of wheat. They are our governors and rulers; they must necessarily be so; it is only right that they should be. Therefore, I say we should view this matter with a careful eye, and see that we do not get too much even of a good thing, if it is a good thing.

It is said: Look at the example of the United States; there is a country which has grown great by reason of opening its doors wide to the world. Well, let us see. The United States had a population of over 30,000,000 before the general influx of European population began. We, in Canada, have a population of possibly 5,000,000. There was no possibility of the original population of the United States being overwhelmed by the influx of foreigners from Europe. But there is every possibility of the population of north-western Canada being overwhelmed. We must not forget the difference in our situations; and we must not forget that, after an experience of many years of the open door to the world-wide immigration, the United States years ago saw their mistake, and to a very great extent shut the door. Now, if the example of the United States was good at one time, why is it not good now? Surely, the more mature judgment of the United States is as

Mr. OLIVER.

valuable to us as the less mature. If a nation of sixty or seventy millions finds it necessary to shut the door to indiscriminate immigration, is it not more necessary for a country of five millions, especially when the part of the country affected, in which these people will have almost sovereign powers, numbers only half a million, or scarcely that?

"But," you may say, "these people will not come in large numbers." Let me inform the House on that point. The Galician population—that is, the class of people who belong to the Little Russian race, from whom these immigrants come—numbers about three millions in the province of Galicia in Austria. The rest of the population are Poles, Germans and Jews. The Galicians are the servile, or lower, stratum of the country. They are the subject race, and they are being crowded out by the Germans. It became a question whether the Germans or the Galicians should get out. The paramount authority in that country is the Government of Austria, and the paramount authority in the Government of Austria is German. It does not need, then, much figuring to show that, when it came to be a question of the German or the Galician getting out, the backing of the Austrian Government was to retain the German and send out the Galician. That is how we get the Galician immigration so easily, because the government of that country is not only willing, but anxious, that a considerable number of Galicians should leave, in order to make room for the increase of German population. With a population of something like 3,000,000 people to draw from, the government of whom is anxious that most, if not all, of them should leave, we stand in danger of having such an influx of population from that country that our North-west civilization will be overwhelmed; and I stand here to-day to call the attention of the Government and the House to that fact. There is not only a population of 3,000,000 of this race in Galicia, but a large part of the population of southern Russia is of the same race, what is called the Little Russian, and we have no reason to believe that if the immigration from Galicia becomes very large, there will not be an immigration from southern Russia, where the conditions are very similar. So that we stand in danger of having a greater number of these people than we can handle and assimilate and who will control us instead of our controlling them. We have not reached that pitch yet, and have not suffered any serious loss in the main. But there is no use in waiting until we do suffer serious loss. It is desirable that we should recognize the position in which we stand and take our measures accordingly. We have not suffered serious loss, but have suffered loss. It is said that these people settle where other people will not, but in my part of the country they settle where other peo-

ple have settled and where other people would settle in larger numbers, were it not for these Galicians. In fact, where these Galicians have settled, some of the others have moved away.

An hon. MEMBER. Why?

Mr. OLIVER. Because they are not desirable neighbours. I am sorry I cannot agree in all that has been said favourably of these people and do not wish to paint them in unduly dark colours, but feel bound to state the facts as they exist in my part of the country, at all events. I have inquired whether any settlers have moved away on account of the proximity of these people, and have the best authority for saying that they have. People who were on the lands before the Galicians came, when the Galicians did come, and they saw no prospect of other settlers of their own race, nationality, ideas, civilization and progress coming, left their places, some went to the States, and some to other settlements. That occurred in two Galician settlements in that part of the country. One swallow does not make a summer and one instance does not make a general case, and on the other hand you may say that a generality does not prove anything. But I give you the actual facts which speak for themselves. People have left their places because the Galicians came in and settled near them. These other people are the pioneers and not the Galicians. The latter came in and had the advantage of the experience of the others, and they settled in places which would be considered desirable for settlement by other people were it not for the fact that these Galicians came there. It is not necessary that they should occupy every quarter-section in order to keep other people out, because they have taken up a tract of country about 25 miles in length, and there no other settlers will go, although the Galicians have not occupied every other quarter-section. On the face of it, it is plain that this is a very serious question. While we have not suffered any very serious loss so far, I would not be doing justice to the district I represent were I not to place before this House and Government the fact that there is danger, very serious, to the settlement of the North-west, and particularly that part of the country, from the influence of these Galicians. I say so particularly because I think I have the honour of the largest share of the settlement of these people. They seem to think that we have the most desirable country, for they are coming in there in increasing numbers. I understand that there are other members from other sections who hold different views. There are members from Ontario and the maritime provinces who hold different views. Well, I am willing to let everybody speak for himself, but I would respectfully suggest to

the Government that in northern Alberta we have all the Galicians we can satisfactorily assimilate at present, and if the hon. Minister of the Interior can suggest any policy whereby these people can be directed to the localities represented by these other gentlemen who desire them so much, I have no objection to that being done. But do not send them to northern Alberta, for we have all we can successfully deal with at present. In fact, I feel that we have a little more than we can successfully deal with, and I would be very glad to have them sent to the county of Frontenac or the city of St. John or the district of Saskatchewan, or any other place where their presence is desired, where there is a field for them and where they will fill a long-felt want. But we do not want them at Edmonton for we are already fully supplied. You ask where are we to get people to fill up the North-west? I looked over the United States census a few minutes ago, and I found that in 1890 there were in the United States 980,938 native-born Canadians. Of these 678,442 were English and 302,496 French. There were of Canadian descent in the United States at that time 1,700,943 people. If it is true that there were in 1890 about 1,000,000 native-born Canadians in the United States, if my calculation is good for anything, it means that there has been an overflow of population from Canada to the United States of not less than 30,000 people a year for 30 years. Where, then, can we find a better field for immigration to the North-west than right in Canada itself, right in the older provinces? I know that that was contrary to the policy of the late Government, as it is the policy of the present Government, but is it not worth trying to get some of that 30,000 a year to go to the North-west. You may say that it is just as easy for Canadians to go to the North-west as people from the United States. Unfortunately, that is not the case. A man from the United States gets his passenger fare at a cent a mile over the railways and lower rates of freight. The Canadian pays more for his passage to the North-west and more for freight on his goods and effects than men from the United States, so that there is discrimination against the Canadian going to his own country. That is one reason which accounts for the overflow of 30,000 a year from Canada to the United States. These Canadians are the people who will settle the North-west better than any other people, who will make more out of the resources of the country, who will furnish the most freight for the railways, who will do most to build up and strengthen our civilization and nation, and instead of the people of the eastern country setting their faces against the immigration of their own countrymen to the North-west, it is in the last degree to their interest to do everything they can to send them there because if they

do not go there, the records show they go to the United States.

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

### After Recess.

Mr. MONK. I desire to make a few remarks concerning the province of Quebec, and the capabilities of that province, of which, to my mind, the Government has not availed itself sufficiently, to promote the settlement of the great tract of territory which has formed the subject of discussion this afternoon and which is known as the North-west Territories of Canada. It is a matter of regret to me that the subject of immigration has been brought before this committee at such a late period of the session. I have no desire—far from it—to prolong the session, for I belong to what I believe to be the rapidly-increasing majority in this House who desire the session to reach its end as soon as possible. I had not the advantage of hearing in full the remarks of my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall); but, from what I heard, I take it that he raises a similar point with regard to his own province that I do with regard to mine. It seems to me that this is a matter that we can fairly discuss outside of all political tendencies or exigencies. I was fortunate in being forestalled in this discussion—through an accident—by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), whose district is particularly interested in the immigration of Doukhobors and Galicians, which has been referred to more than once during the present discussion. It seems to me that our policy of immigration is becoming obsolete; and it seems to me high time, with the present development of the country and the experience of our neighbours to the south of us, that we should radically change that policy. The principle underlying immigration in this country and which, in the beginning, obtained with singular favour in the United States, was to bring to the country as many immigrants as possible, irrespective of the qualification of those immigrants to fulfil properly the role which pertains to them in the new territory they were called upon to occupy—in other words, let us have as many people as possible without serious examination of the qualifications of those people for settlement; let us increase the population at any cost; That is the principle that has governed us for years. I do not wish particularly to animadvert upon the policy of the present Minister of the Interior, for, so far as I can see, he has only continued the system inaugurated in this country years ago and which, to my mind, it is highly desirable to change. The proper principle, and that which now obtains in the United States, is a very different one—it is that we should, as far as possible, secure a proper kind of immigrants; far from soliciting immigration,

Mr. OLIVER.

we should control it; we should examine the class of people who come to the country with the most critical eye and give them to understand that, in coming to this country under our system of Immigration they secure exceptional favours; and unless they possess what are, in our opinion, absolutely proper qualifications for forming part of our body politic, of entering, if I may use that expression, into our national entity, they will be refused. That is a very different principle from that which the Government of this country has acted upon for many years. A discussion of a matter of this kind would make it necessary for me to speak at what I consider unwarrantable length; but I hope, at some future day, and during the duration of this Parliament, to bring the matter to the attention of this House and to provoke such a discussion as will enable us to become more enlightened than we are at the present moment upon a subject of such vital national importance.

To return to the discussion of my own province, what is the position? If I understand it aright, the existence of such a boundless and fertile territory in the North-west, which we desire to fill up as much as possible with a suitable population, is a fact for which the older provinces of this Dominion must be given exclusive credit. It is we who have opened up that magnificent territory, at the price of sacrifices which astonish those who come to this country or become acquainted with the conditions under which that territory has been opened up. It is, therefore, in my opinion, to us primarily that the country belongs. It is we who have the first claim upon that country; and all our endeavours at the present moment ought to be directed to finding among our own people suitable settlers; and only after having exhausted in that respect every resource which the older provinces afford, may we properly turn to European and to foreign countries in general to seek, with every precaution imaginable, proper settlers for our country. But not before we had exhausted every means of finding among our own people those who have an unquestionable right to settle up that country before strangers are invited.

Now, Sir, what are the conditions which prevail in the province of Quebec? It is well known that there is in that province, in a certain sense, a large surplus of population, that is to say, among the agricultural classes there are a large number of people who, if proper means were taken to instruct and assist them in availing themselves of the boundless opportunities the North-west offers, would go and settle up that country, and in their case there would be no need of that process of assimilation which the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has alluded to in such proper terms; they would be ready at once to take their place and to help in a most material degree in the proper development of the North-west Territories. It is well known that in the province of

Quebec—and I speak particularly for that province, though I have no doubt somewhat similar conditions exist in the other provinces—in the province of Quebec, I say, we are blessed with large families. As a rule, in my county and in the surrounding counties, so far as I am aware, you will find the farmer with five, six and seven sons in many instances, and that farmer is the proprietor of a farm, often of from 115 to 160 acres. He is prosperous, he does well, but he has not the means of establishing his children upon homes with the opportunities which that extent of land affords to him. Therefore, I say that in our own province, if agents of this Government were established who would be in a position fully to inform the people who are situated in the manner I have described, many of those families would send a certain number of their members to the North-west, and we would find in them the most desirable class of immigrants. I could give in my own county a number of instances of families who would be in a position, with some small assistance from the Government, to send some of their members to settle in that part of the country. As a rule, these young men are familiar with our political institutions, they are satisfied with those institutions, they are accustomed to our manner of living, they are acquainted, so to speak, with the civic institutions which exist in this country, and, therefore, they do not need to pass through a process of assimilation. They are already in a condition to take possession of that territory, and all they require is sufficient information in addition to a certain amount of assistance from the Government, that very assistance which we so generously give to foreigners, and if this were given them, I am satisfied they would immigrate in considerable numbers to the North-west.

I listened with attention this afternoon to the Minister of the Interior, and I heard him admit that in the province of Quebec as well as in the other provinces of the Dominion, there were no agents at this moment for the purpose of furthering that work which is so eminently patriotic, and which can only turn to the greatest advantage of our country. He went so far as to say, for I noted his words, that in the province of Quebec there were two or three gentlemen, clerical gentlemen, I think he said, who took an interest in this work, but the Government had done nothing to hinder or to help them. Now, Sir, we find that we are spending an immense amount of money to bring people here of whom, in the language of the hon. member for Alberta, we know little, and a priori I would be prepared to say that they are the people least suited to form a desirable class of immigrants. Why should we spend such a large amount of money in seeking immigrants away in the eastern portions of Europe, in Austria and in the Caucasus, when we can with a proper method of spending that money find a much better class of

settlers here in our own country, and in countries whose institutions more nearly resemble our own, and, therefore, who would not be obliged to go through that process of assimilation already referred to? No more cogent way of putting the question could be imagined than that in which the hon. member for Alberta put it, when he said that if there were members of this House who desired a large number of Doukhobors or Galicians in their own counties, they were quite free to say so; but for his own part he viewed with excessive diffidence the arrival of such a large number of strange people in his own territory. Well, Sir, for my own part I am prepared to say this, that in the province of Quebec, although we are most willing to welcome desirable immigrants, we would view with considerable dismay the arrival among us of such a large number of people about whom we know nothing, and in regard to whom we must absolutely make an experiment before we can know them. Now, Sir, why should we treat the people of our own provinces with less consideration than we treat the courageous pioneers of our own North-west? It seems to me that the circumstances in which we find them should cause us to look with distrust upon them. We know that the Austrian Government seem anxious to get rid of those people, and that fact should warn us to be on our guard about bringing them here, except in a very moderate number. In regard to the Doukhobors, we see the autocratic Government of Russia apparently heedless of the departure of such a large population, anxious, in other words, to send that population to our shores. Is the Minister of the Interior able to tell us in a positive manner that these people, upon whom we are spending such large sums of money, are really a desirable class of immigrants for our North-west Territories? Of one thing I am quite sure, that they are a people who repudiate one of the fundamental principles of Canadian citizenship, indeed of citizenship in any civilized country; they are a people who would refuse to take up arms in case of necessity for the defence of our country.

I feel convinced that before long we will find out that we might have chosen better people, and that this is not the best class of people upon whose settlement in the North-west Territories we could have spent our money. Without going at any length into the general principles which ought to govern our system of immigration, I would say that our first attention should be turned to our own people. They are the people who have the right to all the advantages in the way of settlement in our own territory, and after we have exhausted every possible means of settling these people in our own country, who are in a position to leave the older provinces, to take up land in that great fertile tract, then, and then only, ought we to turn our attention to the European countries.

I would limit the area in which we should exercise our zeal in securing immigrants. It seems to me that, for many years to come, we can find all the immigrants we require to settle in the North-west Territories in the British Isles, France and Belgium. We ought not to go beyond those countries. We ought not to give large sums of money and to pay large salaries to the people who are employed in these countries, without any definite and clear results, for soliciting people to come to Canada. The roll of these agents ought to be strictly limited to making known what are the conditions required by the Government of this country, of immigrants coming to the North-west Territories and becoming, so to speak, a part of our national family. An examination of these immigrants, before they leave foreign shores and come to our country, should be made. The system of paying a commission is one that is abandoned in the United States; it is an obsolete system and one calculated to produce the worst results. We should examine every intending immigrant; we should make sure that each is a proper person to settle in our country; we should make sure of his character, and when he comes we should settle him, and after he is settled follow him up and help him to become a good citizen. If we adopted such a system as that, under proper regulations, I am convinced that, before many years, very far from increasing our grant for immigration, we would be in a position to diminish it, because every one of those families brought to this country under conditions of that kind, would become an immigration agent and the means of securing, without any expenditure to the country, the best class of settlers for our own territory. We have in Montreal an immigration agent who has had long experience. I have no objection to mentioning his name. It is Mr. Marquette, who, for years, has busied himself with immigration work, and he told me that the only way of securing proper settlers for this country was to investigate and follow up the character of the intending immigrant before he left Europe, to ascertain his recommendations, and to find out his qualifications for becoming a settler in this country. The moment he arrives in this country we must apply ourselves to helping him. He must be taken in hand; he must be settled in the part of the country where his settlement will be the most advantageous to himself and to the country, and he must be followed up for one or two years, made acquainted with the system of government, with our municipal institutions; in short, with the manners of our people, and kept in view until he is in a position to assume the quality of a citizen. Returning to the province of Quebec, and when I speak of the province of Quebec, I do not merely speak of our fellow-citizens of French origin, but of all those who inhabit that province, I would say that very few of them are fully ware of the advantages

Mr. MONK.

that the North-west Territories offer, and a very large number of them, I regret to say, yearly leave our province and go to the United States, because they know of no better place to go to, and they are lost to us for good. These are young men who have been brought up on our farms, who are inured to our climate, who are happy to live under our flag, who are familiar with our constitution, and who have received an agricultural education in their own homes such as fits them pre-eminently to become settlers in the North-west Territories. Let me quote for the benefit of this committee what was stated, in April last, in one of our leading French-Canadian papers in Montreal, in regard to this exodus to the United States which prevails, as it did in April, and which, it seems to me, it is quite in the power of the Government to diminish. "La Presse" of April 2nd, 1899, says:

Some six months ago two French Canadian families, in all thirteen persons, left Montreal for Wisconsin by the Grand Trunk. The fathers, on purchasing their tickets, were each asked the following question: "Why are you leaving Canada?" The answer in each case being: "I am going because there is no work for me in this country" or "I am going abroad to get employment and provide for my family."

Since then the exodus has taken such vast proportions that on every side you hear the question: What does it all mean? It is felt to be a calamity by every one.

For the last four weeks the number of our people who have left the Windsor and Bonaventure depots for the States, there to earn their bread, has averaged 120 each evening. On Wednesday, 80 French Canadians left by the Grand Trunk alone, and some 30 others by the Boston and Maine, all for New England manufacturing towns. Last evening 150 more set out. One evening of last week over 120 Canadians left the Windsor station for the United States. They all stated that they were going because they could get better wages across the line. They said that the prosperity spoken of by the papers was, as far as they were concerned, a myth, and that they were leaving their country, not because they wished to go, but through necessity, and to improve their position in life.

The same newspaper had taken the trouble to collect testimony from men able to give disinterested evidence in regard to this exodus, and what was the result:

A reporter for "La Presse" interviewed a number of persons this morning in relation to the exodus, with the following result:—

N. F. Mortimer, baggagemaster, said: "For three weeks past the exodus of French Canadians to the United States has been unprecedented. The number of Canadian emigrants has never been so high as this year. The number of French Canadians leaving from this station alone has been over 600 in excess of previous years. The great majority come from Joliette, St. Jérôme and Three Rivers, and most of them go to Lowell, Concord and Boston, where there are great brick-yards. They all belong to a most respectable class, and it is a great loss to Canada."

Mr. James Miller (Morey Transfer Co.) said the number of French Canadians who have left the country this year is over one-third greater than in previous years. The exodus began about three

weeks ago ; the increased number who have left the Windsor station is over 500 in all, appearing to belong to an intelligent class of the population, and who might have been kept at home with benefit to the country.

An American customs officer, with an office at the Windsor, said : " The average number of French Canadians leaving this station each evening for the United States has been sixty. I speak here only of those leaving by the Boston and Maine Railway, and say nothing of those taking train at Montreal Junction. The French Canadians get better wages in the United States than here."

Mr. George Richards, constable at same station, said : " I never saw anything like it. One would think all the French Canadians were going to emigrate to the States. The number of French Canadians who have left this year is more than double that of any previous year."

Inquiry made by our reporter at Bonaventure station revealed a state of things equally alarming. All the Grand Trunk officials, who have been in a position to witness this emigration " en masse," declare that the number of French Canadians who have left, this spring, for the United States is more than double that of last year. One official of the Grand Trunk declares that the increase is over 100 per cent. Most of the emigrants come from the district of Little Métis and the parishes along the St. Lawrence. He attributes the exodus to the resumption of business in the United States, while Canada remains stationary.

The Government Railway, the Intercolonial Railway, has brought to Montreal the bulk of the French Canadians going to the United States.

Mr. Hoolahan, Dominion Government immigration agent, says that the exodus question is not within the sphere of his department. His sole duty is to see to the locating of new-comers. " Doubtless," he said, " the immigration agents do their best to dissuade people from leaving Canada, but, generally speaking, with little effect." He thinks that very many of these Canadians who are now leaving Canada will come back to us in the fall.

Mr. Marquette, provincial immigration agent, when asked the cause of the growing exodus, said : " There are two reasons—the first is that this is the season of the yearly habitual start of the French Canadians for the United States, the second is that those who leave Canada belong to no definite class. They may be in the United States this year and in Canada next year. There is certainly an increase in the number leaving the country, but the matter is not so alarming as they say. The advance in wages in the American factories, while wages remain stationary in Canada, contributes largely to drive our people out of the country."

Our reporter met on St. James Street a Canadian customs official, and asked him whether the increase in the number of our people going away to the United States is as great as people say ?

" I believe you," said that officer, " the number of Canadians who have left is over double that of past years ; and the worst of it is that these Canadians are leaving us for good, in fact, most of them will never return to Canada. It is a great loss to the country. As to the cause of this exodus, it is not for me to speak of it."

The general opinion in railway and transportation circles, in so far as our reporter could ascertain, is that while the traffic has been excellent for the American companies, it has been disastrous for Canada. The following remark was made by a man holding a high position in business circles, on seeing on the one hand a group

of Galicians who had just reached the station by train, and beside them a group of French Canadians on the point of leaving for the United States :—" I cannot understand the policy which consists in peopling the country with foreigners while depleting it of its own inhabitants. We are bringing in immigrants at great expense, and no effort is being made to keep our own people at home. There is certainly something wrong in the system followed by the powers that be." Our reporter also visited, last evening, the Windsor and Bonaventure stations, in order to see whether the French Canadian exodus still continued. Now he found 65 of our people about to start by the Vermont Central from the Bonaventure station, and over 100 more by the Boston and Maine Railway from the Windsor station. Most of these are young men and young women, all intending to settle in the United States. It would not be so bad were these French Canadians who are leaving us in the flower of their youth were merely the refuse of our people ; but, unfortunately, they are all respectable, worthy citizens, inured to toil, sober and industrious. One family in particular attracted the notice of many persons at the Windsor station. The family consists of the father and mother, both still in the prime of life, with four fine growing girls and three boys. They are bound for Providence, Rhode Island.

I do not wish to detain the committee by giving further evidence on this point, although I have it in my possession, but I would like to quote the opinion of a man in our province who for years has taken an intense interest in the settlement of our own country by our own people. I speak of Dr. Erisson, who is prominently connected with one of our colonization societies :

The great remedy for the national misfortune is education. Our people should first be led to see the dignity of the farmer's work, and be convinced of the advantages it presents ; this task must be discharged by the educators of our youth. Hence the need of a good programme of studies, wherein the teaching of agriculture, especially in the country districts, should hold the first rank. It takes the work of twenty years to farm one generation, and that of a whole century to transform a country. It would be an excellent thing to get our farmers to beautify their homes and all their surroundings ; in that way they would make their children love the place of their birth, and render them loath to abandon their happy homes. The improvement of the highways should also be pushed on. The establishment of domestic industries, so fertile in the production of wealth of every kind in European countries, would also do great good amongst us. Lastly, our rural districts would require to be ably directed by the clergy and the well-to-do class in general, if we are to hope even for a partial arresting of this deplorable emigration of our people. We notice that many of those who are leaving our province are absolutely unaware of the existence of lands fit for settlement, and of the means of securing them. The governments have a large share of responsibility in this matter. On several occasions the society has pointed out the remedies needed in the system of colonization, so that it is useless to recur to them. The trade crisis so severely felt in the United States in the years 1896 and 1897 had forced a large number of our people to return to us. The American crisis being at an end, these same countrymen of ours, not finding in

their own country the equivalent of what they earned on the other side of the line, are now going back to their former employment."

Now, Sir, if in the presence of such a state of things, we had here a Government which was anxious to enlighten the people of our own province as to the advantages offered by the North-west, devoting its principal energies in that direction, and not only enlightening the people, but affording them at least the same advantages for settling in the North-west as are afforded to these strangers—I say, "at least," for in my opinion we should devote far more money to settling our own country with our own people than to bringing strangers to our shores—if we have a Government performing that task in the present conditions, such as I have brought to the attention of this committee, then we could not complain. But, Sir, we have not. We have the admission of the Minister of the Interior himself that the principal energies of his department, and the largest expenditures, have been devoted during the past year in a totally different direction. That is where, not only this Government and this Minister of the Interior, as well as past Governments and past Ministers of the Interior have made a mistake. If in the past there has been some excuse, because the result of that indiscriminate system of immigration had not yet become apparent, there is no excuse now. We know, from the experience of the Americans, and from our own experience we know, that that indiscriminate system is not a good system. We must change it completely; we must adopt another immigration policy, and if a similar condition of affairs exists in the other provinces as exists in my province, then we are without any excuse, if we do not make an effort to keep our own people at home.

We should devote our energies principally to keeping our own people in this country. They make by far the best settlers. They meet exactly those conditions which the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) pointed out so clearly this afternoon; and they are the people who have a right to settle up that country, and whom we ought to engage in the first instance in that patriotic work. Afterwards we might turn to other nations, but with great care. I believe myself that our system of immigration ought to be changed completely. We ought to proceed with the utmost care to the great work of settling up our own country. It has been said that we have a magnificent country, but that it is a pity we have not twenty or thirty millions more people in it. Well, Sir, that statement must be accepted with much qualification. We require population to settle our vast tracts of country; but in that work we must proceed cautiously, and it is better for us to secure ten or fifteen proper immigrants than

Mr. MONK.

to bring in thousands of people about whom we know nothing, and in regard to whose future in this country I, for my part, entertain the greatest doubts. I do not believe that the people of Slav origin brought from Europe to this country will ever benefit us to the extent of the trouble and expense which we have incurred in bringing them here. We must proceed by a system of selection, giving the first place to our own people; and in regard to bringing in strangers, we must proceed exactly in the way in which a man proceeds when he brings strangers into his own family. We are engaged in the great work of founding a great colonial nation; and it is not by bringing people from the extreme east of Europe, about whom we know very little, that we shall establish here the nation which we expect to have in the future. I say this, Sir, without any reference to politics. The present Minister of the Interior has proceeded along beaten paths; but I believe that the members of this House who consider the question seriously, and who examine the experience of our neighbours to the south of us in regard to an indiscriminate system of immigration, will inevitably come to the conclusion that that system requires to be changed. I believe, Sir, that if we had proceeded with similar caution and prudence in regard to the opening up of that part of our North-west Territories where rich gold deposits exist, we would be better off to-day. We would have spent less money, and we would have kept more of the gold-bearing regions for our own people. But that is past. The errors, if errors they have been, in connection with the opening up of the Yukon country, are to-day irreparable. It is not so in regard to immigration; and if we wish to do a wise thing, we should stop here, as the hon. member for Alberta has suggested, with the Mennonites, the Galicians and the Doukhobors. They may be successful or they may not be; it is an experiment; and we have no right to experiment on a larger scale than we have done thus far. We should stop and see how that experiment succeeds before we go further. Above all, we should turn our attention to our own provinces. If anything like the condition of things that exists in the province of Quebec exists in Ontario and in the maritime provinces, we are absolutely neglecting one of our principal duties in not attending first of all to our own people, and not reserving for them that land which they have at such great sacrifice built up for the benefit of themselves and their descendants.

Mr. DAVIN. I think that the hon. Minister of the Interior will agree with me that the masterly speech to which we have just listened from the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) contains a terrible indictment against the immigration policy of his department. I want to call

the Minister's attention to a speech which he made in Toronto soon after he took the office he now holds. This is what he said :

We found that the Government which came into office avowedly for the purpose of stopping the exodus of people to the United States had not been able to stop that exodus, had not been able to keep within the borders of Canada the natural increase of population, while the hundreds of thousands of immigrants from foreign countries had passed in and out again and had not added to our population. I found, when I took charge of the department of immigration that the pall of death seemed to have fallen over the officials.

And so on. What a satire does that sound to-day ! At the close of his speech the hon. member for Jacques Cartier said that if there was anything in the lower provinces like what he had described as existing in the province of Quebec, our position would be very calamitous. Unfortunately, the condition of things in the lower provinces is very much the same as that in Quebec. I have here an extract from the "Casket," an independent newspaper, of April 26th, 1899, published in Antigonish County, N.S. ; and this is what it says:

Thursday's western express train had on board 120 persons who were leaving their Nova Scotia homes for different points in the United States and British Columbia. Twenty-five tickets were purchased at Antigonish, twenty-two being for Boston.

The Richmond "Record," of April 17th, 1899, a Liberal newspaper, published in Cape Breton, says:

Thirty or forty left here one day recently for Boston, via steamship "Halifax."

And the Hawkesbury "Bulletin," of December, 1898, has the following :—

"It is not an exaggeration to state," says the Sydney "Daily Recorder," "that 200 Cape Bretonians boarded the Intercolonial Railway train at Sydney within the last week or two, all bound abroad, with the intention of bettering their fortunes. Nine young women left together on Wednesday last. Several more took their departure next morning. How many have left other districts of Cape Breton would not be agreeable to conjecture. The objective point of all the young women is Boston. Whither are we drifting ? To Boston, evidently, and Boston seems to be the real metropolis of the maritime provinces. We may deplore it, but we cannot close our eyes to the fact. Our best blood is being absorbed by the cities of the United States. In the state of Massachusetts alone there are upwards of 200,000 Canadians, the great majority of whom are Nova Scotians. There are probably as many Cape Bretonians in and around Boston as there are in Richmond county. And consider the children and descendants of those expatriated Canadians that are lost to the country. Our money is being spent in bringing into the country and laying out homes for Doukhoborts, Galicians, Menonites, Icelanders, Jews and other variegated assortments of old-world population, while the choicest elements of our people are drifting to a foreign country. Surely the game is not worth the candle."

I heartily agree with my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier in the appeal he has made to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier said that if we were to spend as much money in getting our young men, who are now going across the line from Cape Breton, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Ontario, to go into the North-west, it would be to the greatest advantage to our country, for I need hardly tell you that a young Canadian is as good as any foreigner. But it is not merely that I would direct the energy of the immigration department to Ontario, or New Brunswick, or any other of our provinces, but I would also have it throw more energy into bringing immigrants from England, Ireland and Scotland into the North-west. Mr. McCreary, the agent of the Department of the Interior at Winnipeg, stated recently to a friend of mine, whose name I am not at liberty to give, but who is well known to Mr. Smart, the Deputy Minister, and to the Minister himself, that the immigration from England, Ireland and Scotland into Manitoba and the North-west has practically stopped. I think it right to bring this before the hon. Minister, not merely for the purpose of exposing the fact to the House, but to ascertain whether there is any truth in it. Mr. McCreary told this gentleman that the influx of immigrants from the United Kingdom was being stopped. I do not suppose he meant stopped by any active agency on the part of the immigration department, but that the intending emigrants from England, Ireland and Scotland were now being turned away from Manitoba and the North-west Territories. I can hardly believe that there is any good foundation for that statement, although I know, from the return, that the number of immigrants coming in from the United Kingdom is insignificant ; but if that insignificant number is being still more diminished, and there is a prospect of the stream of immigration from those islands, whence we draw our life, being diverted from our country, that is a very serious matter indeed. However, I do not know what answer my hon. friend can make to the indictment contained in the facts which my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) brought before the House, and which I have supplemented by extracts from the papers to which I have referred.

Mr. BOURASSA. I was just going, before the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) took the floor, to reply to some of the statements of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier. I acknowledge that the hon. gentleman was certainly actuated in the remarks he made by a true spirit of patriotism, but at the same time he gave us evidence that he has a greater knowledge of his summer residence in the county of Jacques Cartier than of the province of Quebec at large, and especially of those portions of that province which are still unsettled,

and which the governments of Quebec, both Conservative and Liberal, have been making such sacrifices to settle with our own population. There is one statement—especially in my hon. friend's speech against which I desire to put on record my strenuous protest, and that is the statement that the province of Quebec is already filled up, and that this Government should take means to bring our surplus population to the North-west Territories.

Mr. MONK. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I did not say that. I never said that the province of Quebec was filled up. On the contrary, I spoke of the surplus population consisting of our compatriots who are leaving the province, and not in the sense of meaning that the province is filled up.

Mr. BOURASSA. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I understood him to say that the province of Quebec—and I think that "Hansard" will bear me out—was, to a certain extent, filled up. Of course, I understand that the sections around Montreal and a very small section around the city of Quebec are perhaps filled up with population. But at the same time, if the hon. gentleman really wants to see the population of Quebec, not only increase in number—and I think the population can take care of itself in that respect—but at the same time live happily and in prosperity, I will tell him what should be done. It is not that our people should go to the North-west or Manitoba, not that we should spend money to take people from one part of Canada to another, but that we should, in the first place, teach our farmers of the province of Quebec that a large proportion of them could live much more easily on half the area of farm lands they have now than they do at present. One of the great objects of the government of the province of Quebec is to teach, through its Council of Agriculture, its agricultural societies and its farmers' clubs—organizations that have been helped very successfully by the present Minister of Agriculture—to do as much as they can on the smallest possible area of land, and I have no doubt the same effort is being made in the other provinces. The second means which our provincial government is taking to improve the condition of the people is to open up those vast areas still unsettled, which are very fertile and covered to a great extent with forests, and have them cultivated by our own people. The people from Europe, and to a certain extent that portion of the people of Quebec and Ontario who have been living on settled land for years, are not the best kind of people to open up these unsettled areas. It takes the young men accustomed to work in the bush, the men who go out in the shanties, to clear and open up these lands; and I think I can say, without boasting, that the young French Canadian is the best "défricheur," or pioneer, in the world.

Mr. BOURASSA.

There are many districts in Quebec eminently suitable for settlement. Take, for example, the valley of the Metapedia, in the counties of Bonaventure and Gaspé, the immense valley of the Lake St. John district, where this Government and the government of Quebec have spent so much money building railways, roads and bridges; take the valley of the Gatineau, in Wright County; the valleys of the Lièvre and Rouge rivers, in my own county; the immense valley of the Temiscamingue—all those valleys are covered with splendid forests, that will give to the settler the opportunity of earning a little money by making lumber before cultivating the land. Therefore, I think there is no use in speaking any more about there being no room in the province of Quebec, or in any part of it. The hon. gentleman quoted at length a report from "La Presse," of Montreal, about the exodus of French Canadians and the people of the province of Quebec at large to the United States; and both he and the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) referred to the exodus from the other provinces as well. Let me tell these hon. gentlemen that the exodus to the United States is no new thing. It is one of those evils from which all countries with small populations have to suffer, when situated in the neighbourhood of an extensive populated country, where there is much larger capital invested in industrial enterprises, more trade, more activity, more work. As a rule, those people who leave the province of Quebec for the United States would not go to Manitoba and the North-west. They do not leave for the purpose of farming in the United States, but for the purpose of obtaining employment in the large manufacturing centres, where all the members of their family can obtain work, and where they consequently can earn money more easily than at home on their lands. The exodus was particularly strong from 1834 up to three or four years ago. Of course the hon. gentleman has not put any political animus in his speech, and I do not wish to put any in mine. I do not wish to say that the exodus was due to the policy followed by the leaders of the hon. gentleman, nor exactly to say that because this Government is in power the exodus is smaller. But as a matter of fact, within the last two or three years, especially since the closing of the great cotton mills in the cities of New England, the exodus has been much less than it was before. Moreover, a fair proportion—not a very large but a fair proportion—of the people who left the province of Quebec within the last ten years to go to the United States have been returning during the last two or three years. But still later, within the last year or two some of these big factories have been opened up, better wages have been offered, and as the agent of the Government, Mr. Marquette, well says, according to the report read by the hon. gentleman, when the prices are better

our people go there in larger number. But they are not going in the same proportion as they did ten years ago. I do not know how it is in the neighbourhood of the county in which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) lives, but I know that in my county and also in the counties of Wright, Pontiac, Argenteuil, Terrebonne, Two Mountains, L'Assomption—in fact all the northern half of the St. Lawrence and Ottawa valleys, except, perhaps, along the St. Maurice, the exodus has been smaller in the last two years than in previous years. There is another point to be considered. We must not forget that the alien labour laws, during a certain time were very strictly enforced, and our people on crossing the line were expected to come in as settlers and to remain in the United States. But these laws are not now enforced with the same strictness. Therefore, more of our people cross the line. There is no doubt that trains have started loaded from Bonaventure and Windsor stations, in Montreal, as well as from Quebec and other centres of the province. But I know, as a matter of fact, that a good many young men from my county left last year for the United States, and after having worked five or six months, they came back, and they intended to come back when they left. On the other hand, those who left the province of Quebec five, eight or ten years ago left with the full intention of abandoning this country entirely and settling in the United States. So this already makes a big difference.

Now, as representing one of the constituencies in the province of Quebec, and especially one of those where both the provincial and Federal Governments have made great sacrifices to keep our population and to induce the sons of our farmers of the older parts of the provinces to come and settle, I protest strongly against the idea of sending agents of the Federal Government to induce our farmers to settle in the North-west. I say that the policy of the Government should be to keep our people where they naturally belong, to keep the sons where the fathers have settled, to try to induce them to remain in the same province where they were born and brought up, with their own people, under usages and laws with which they are familiar. So far as concerns our compatriots who live in the United States, our policy should be—and I am glad that the Government has done something in this direction—to seek to bring back those who wish to come and who have not lost altogether their old habits of life in our province. I am glad to say that this Government has made sacrifices to that end, sending agents to the farming districts of the United States where some Canadians have settled. I am sure my hon. friends from the North-west will bear me out in saying, at any rate I know as a fact, that several families have come back from the Western States and settled in the Saskatchewan val-

ley. I know also that several French Canadians who left the province of Quebec within the last few years for the United States have been induced by this Government to come back and settle in the Lake St. John district. So far as foreign immigration is concerned, I leave that to the Minister of the Interior. But, for myself, I desire to say that I approve heartily of the policy of the Government, which is to keep our people where they are settled; to bring back our Canadian compatriots from the United States when they may be brought back, and to induce as many honest people from Europe, whatever their origin may be, to come in and fill the North-west. It is very well to talk of a change of policy on the part of the United States now. The United States have changed their mind after they had a population of sixty millions of people. I do not say that we should seek to induce all kinds of people to come to Canada from Europe. But we must not forget that one cause why a bad class of people were induced to go to the United States was that several Socialist leaders in France, Germany, Russia, Austria and Italy represented the Government of the United States to their followers as being the ideal Government for Socialists, declaring that the United States was the land of the free, and that they should go to United States in preference to Canada. Thank Heaven, they have not come here. For myself, I am confident that the Minister of the Interior has followed the proper policy as far as foreign immigration is concerned.

I close my remarks by repeating—because I wish to insist particularly on this point—that the members for the province of Quebec and the Government of the province of Quebec would resent strongly the sending of agents of the Federal Government in our province to induce our people to go to other provinces. We have the best feelings toward our friends in the North-west, and are ready to vote money to assist in filling their country, but we are not ready to give them the best of our population.

Mr. MONK. I wish to set myself right concerning the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) that I spoke of the province of Quebec as being completely filled up and having no more room for settlers. I think my hon. friend wishes to give to my observations more political import than I intended they should have. I never spoke in any sense of the province of Quebec having no more room. Any man would be a fool who, knowing anything of the province of Quebec, did not know that we have large tracts of land unsettled. Nor did I say that the Government of the province of Quebec had not done its best to assist its population to settle those parts of the province which are not at the present time taken up. But the question is whether the efforts of the province of Quebec, the means at its disposal

for this purpose being limited, are sufficient to keep our population in Canada. And does the fact of the provincial government doing its best in its own modest way towards the settlement of our province absolve the Dominion Government from doing its own fair share toward keeping our people here? What is the fact, notwithstanding all these efforts that are being made in the province of Quebec as my hon. friend was not able to deny or gainsay? The fact is that we are slowly settling up our unsettled portion of the province—for everybody knows that each of these older provinces has unsettled tracts—but we are not preventing our population going away to an alien country. And in regard to the representation of my hon. friend that the province of Quebec would look upon it as an insult if this Government placed in the province an agent to instruct our people in the best way to obtain lands in the North-west, there is no such feeling in the province of Quebec—very far from it. The French portion of the population in the province of Quebec consider that they have a share in the North-west, just like every other portion of the population. We consider that if there are good lands there—and according to the information I have those lands are far more profitable than the unsettled portions of Quebec—we consider that we are entitled to our share of them, and we consider that the Government is only doing its duty if it brings to our knowledge the portions of that North-west which are fit for settlement, so that we may have our share of those lands, and partake of the advantages which accrue to the settlers of that country. But to stand up in this House and to say that the population of the province of Quebec desires to remain at home, and desires to renounce any share in the vast prairies of the North-west, is to portray in a most unfair and untruthful manner the sentiment of the people of that province. We do not want more than others, but we want to be accorded the same opportunities as the other provinces.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The reference made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) to the lower provinces, is my justification for saying a few words. I cannot help feeling that the remarks made so vigorously by that hon. gentleman do not give a true conception of the French Canadians. One would think that he knows nothing about the outer world, not even about his own country. Does the hon. gentleman forget that it was the French Canadian voyageurs who first went into that country? And does he mean to tell us that they are so ignorant now that they do not know anything about that country which their fathers first discovered nearly 200 years ago? I assume that the people of Quebec, like the people of the other provinces, know a good deal about the North-west just now, and particularly have the people of Quebec

Mr. MONK.

heard a good deal about it during the last two years in connection with the school question. I venture to think that the hon. gentleman is not correct when he says that the people of Quebec do not know as much about the North-west and about how lands were obtained, as the people of any other province. I know that from the province of Nova Scotia a good many people are going there. The reference made by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) to the lower provinces, demands this remark: Even if it were true that 200 people left Cape Breton, that is not a large exodus when you consider that there are 80,000 people in the Island of Cape Breton.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman did not say that 200 went in one year.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he had better permit other members to look after themselves. So far as the lower provinces are concerned, it is a fact that quite a number of our people go every year to the United States. For instance, from the county I represent, a number go as fishermen, and many go who return home again. That has always been the case. But I venture to say that fewer people have gone from Nova Scotia this last year or two than went formerly, although I do not deny that quite a number go now.

Now, coming to the general principle of immigration, I want to emphasize what was said by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), that if you are going to people up the North-west by taking men out of the older provinces, you might just as well expect to make a fortune by changing jack knives from one pocket into the other. Every man who leaves Quebec or any other province and goes into the North-west, lessens the population of his native province, and lessens its productive powers. But are we to wait through all the ages until such time as we can get from the older provinces a sufficient number of people to go out and settle that country in the North-west? We cannot do it. I think there are a good number of young men who will leave the older provinces for the North-west, thinking to better their condition, and they will do it voluntarily, without our having to send agents among them. I know from the province of Nova Scotia there are always a number of young men who are going to the North-west, to Manitoba, to British Columbia, to the Yukon. They are there now by the dozen. But they do not require an agent to tell them to go there. It is the natural disposition of the Canadian who wants to benefit his position, to move from one part of the Dominion to another, and he will do it without the promptings of an agent. But what we want is to get in settlers from the outside.

Now, the whole question is this: Are the settlers we are getting in from foreign coun-

tries the best settlers? Are they good settlers? I admit that there are not so many people coming now from Great Britain into this country as formerly, and the reason is that times are so busy in Great Britain that the people all have employment. You cannot force the people away. It is when times are poor that people migrate. It is easy for our young men to go to the North-west during harvest time, they can go for \$16 or \$20, and if they like the country they can stay there. A young man can make his way anywhere if he has energy. Now, the first condition of citizenship is to have men of good character; and the next condition, very near to it, is that settlers who go into a country should know something about the methods of carrying on the business which prevails there. For example, I was talking to a gentleman the other day about certain people down in Anticosti who wished to emigrate because they felt they could not stay there any longer. I suggested, Why not go to the North-west? What was the reply? The reply was: Why, they know nothing about farming; they must go where they can employ their time in fishing. Now, what would be the use of talking to the North-west people who know nothing about farming in the country from which they emigrate? I have it on good authority that the Doukhobors and the Galicians do know something about farming, and when they go to the North-west they know something about the business to be carried on. That is the prime condition of citizenship. I venture the statement that the parties to whom the hon. gentleman referred as leaving Quebec, were just of the character of those described by the hon. member for Labelle, namely, young men who like to work in factories, and who prefer that. It is true that farming in the older provinces is not as popular as it used to be, and there are large numbers of young men who think they can make a better living and have less drudgery if they go and work in factories. You cannot compel these men to go on to farms, they would not make good farmers if they did. I should like to see every boy and every girl who were raised on a farm remain at home and farm or go and settle in the North-west, but you cannot compel them to do so if they are not willing.

Now, many fear that the Doukhobors will not make good citizens. I have no such fear. They have left a country where they were oppressed, and I am sure that if they refused to take up arms in the country where they were oppressed, it was because they felt in their conscience that they would not be doing right to support such an oppressive government as they were living under. Now, suppose there are 10,000 Doukhobors settled there, are we less able to defend ourselves in case of war because these people are following peaceful avocations there? Is not every other man in this country ready to go to the front if need be, and even

taking the hon. gentleman's argument, would it not be a good thing for the people of Canada to know that, if our young men were to leave the farms and the workshops to go and fight in defence of their country, there are thousands of people cultivating the fields and making all necessary provision to feed them. Our country is made up of all kinds of people, and I am sure these Doukhobors and Galicians, although they might not have all the virtues that we would like, will still make good settlers and good citizens. The hon. gentleman spoke about settlers as if he wanted them to be perfect angels when they came to this country. This is a young country, and it is ready to welcome any good man who is willing to work, and not only to give him an opportunity of making a living, but to teach him what is best and highest in good citizenship. If our people are not ready to do that, and if we insist that every man who comes in must be as good a citizen as the people who are here, I think it says very little for the manhood of our people and for our idea of true citizenship. The hon. gentleman said: Let us have immigrants from Belgium, from France and from Great Britain. He would have no Germans, no Hollanders, no Norwegians, no Swedes, no Finlanders, no Icelanders, nobody at all except from those three countries. He could not keep out the Scotch, because they will come, and if the hon. gentleman tries to keep them out they will get in and he will get out. Why confine settlers to these three nations? I would rather have settlers from Great Britain than from any other country in the world for the North-west Territories. But I say that Doukhobors, or any other people who have been accustomed to the pursuit of agriculture, are better than people who have been brought up in the large cities of England and who have been engaged in manufacturing all their lives. The hon. gentleman shakes his head; that is to say, that he thinks a man who has worked in a shop for thirty years is going to make a better farmer than a Doukhobor, who is honest and who has spent all his life upon the farm. All the facts are against the hon. gentleman. I know the Scotch Highlanders who, when he came to the province from which I come myself, did not know very much about farming, but he did know something, because he had cultivated a small patch of land in the Highlands of Scotland, and although he did not make as good a farmer as the Lowlander, who had a larger farm at home, still the experience which he had had on his little patch of ground enabled him to become a much better farmer and a much better citizen than if he had had no knowledge of farming. A man who has cultivated a small patch of land in the old country is better able to succeed upon a farm in this country than a man

who comes out of a workshop. Therefore, a condition of all immigration should be that a man coming to settle on our land should know something about farming in the country from which he comes. The climate of the North-west is much the same as the climate in the northern countries of Europe, and I would rather that men from these northern countries should settle in Canada than that they should come from the vine-clad hills of France and Italy. One of the great difficulties encountered by an immigrant coming from a foreign land is the climate for the first few years. But, if immigrants come here perfectly acclimated, they will be ready to go to work upon the land, and I venture to say that they will make good settlers. This cry has been raised against foreigners again and again. When the late lamented Hon. Alexander Mackenzie used the money of this Dominion to bring a class of settlers into Manitoba, he was jeered at and it was said that he was bringing in a class of people who would be a disgrace to this country. I went through the district occupied by these people, and I found that they had paid off every portion of the money advanced to them, with interest, that they made as good settlers as could be found in Manitoba, and that they are now beginning to understand what the duties of citizenship are. I am not afraid that these men are going into politics at once; I am not afraid that these men are going at once to walk out and kill the men about them. If I understood the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) correctly, he said that they were a menace to those settlers about them. He knows a great deal more about that country than I do, but on general principles, I venture to state that, if there are good settlers in the country now, they can stand all the Doukhobors who have gone into that country, whose character is of the very best. When these people come to Canada, I believe that we should not only give them a warm reception, but we should afford them every opportunity of succeeding. Where are we going to get our settlers? The country is open. We have agents all over Great Britain, France and Belgium, and the people know all about us. How are we going to get them, because men will not come from these countries if the conditions are made onerous; they will not pass the inspection as to their morals or the high test that the hon. gentleman would insist upon. Having these lands to be occupied, we must be ready to invite citizens if we want them to come from the northern portion of Europe, or from the centre of Europe, or from any other country in which they have lived as industrious, honest people, willing to work for their living. This is the condition of affairs, and I am sure that the hon. Minister of the Interior should have the assistance and sympathy of this House in his effort to secure such people. I believe

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough).

that every hon. member who helps to bring a good citizen into this country, to get people to fill up the old lands and people to fill up the new lands and to engage in profitable occupations, will be doing much to promote the best interests of the country. I do not think that we should insist upon nice discriminations, as to appearances or inquire into a man's past history, or demand a certificate from a well-known man as to his character, because if a man is able and willing to work, if he is well-behaved, we must take our risks. There are settlers who may not be of as good a class as we might desire, but for myself, I do not feel any misgivings. If the settler is willing to work, we have unlimited land lying waste, and I think we should give him every opportunity without insisting upon nice discriminations of that kind. I am in sympathy with any movement that will bring the best people to this country, but I have no fear that the assimilative process which is going on, and perhaps which may take two or three generations to complete its work, will not make these people into good citizens. We ourselves cannot look back two or three generations without finding our fathers had to learn a great deal from our grandfathers, and we know that we had to learn a great deal from our fathers. Our children learn from us, and so it is that the process of development goes on. Dr. Robertson was speaking in a church the other day, and he made one statement that struck me as being rather remarkable about the Galicians. He said that some people might think that the Galicians were not the best class of settlers. He told of a little incident that struck him as being significant. He said: I was passing a school-house a short time ago in a Galician settlement and I saw a nice little girl. I spoke to her and asked her name. She gave her name, and it was a Galician name. I said: "You are a Galician." "No," she said, "I am a Canadian." That does not prove a great deal, but it is something as indicating what has been going on in this country. It does not take them very long to know where they are and it shows their desire to feel that they are citizens of the country.

I am in full favour of any outlay that is legitimate to bring Doukhobors, or any good class of citizens, as they are, into this country. The older inhabitants can look after themselves. If we have no power to assimilate these foreigners and make them good Canadian citizens, then we had better haul down our flag as a nation, and say that we are a failure.

Mr. DAVIS. My hon. colleague from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has spoken on this subject at some length, and, as he has alluded to the district which I have the honour to represent in this House, I think I should say a few words. The hon. gen-

tleman (Mr. Oliver) stated that while I and others from the North-west Territories and Manitoba might be pleased at getting this class of immigrants which the Minister of the Interior is sending in, he did not want them. Well, I know what the people in my district think, and I can tell the House that they do not propose to erect a Chinese wall around Saskatchewan. I believe that if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) consulted his own constituents more generally on this matter, he would discover they hold the same views. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) to talk of building up a new civilization; his people will be pleased to know that a new lawgiver has arrived among them; but what, after all, we want is population in that country. For the twenty years that I have been there, we have been vainly hoping for an influx of settlers, but, notwithstanding that millions of dollars were expended by the late Government on immigration, their policy failed to help us. I represent a district which covers 108,000 square miles, and Alberta and Assiniboia have about the same extent of territory. When the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, the people scattered all over the Territories, some of them going 300 miles from a railway, and they remain there to-day. It cannot be expected that we will build railway lines to all these small settlements, and if population does not go into that country, the people who are there now, mostly Canadians, will leave. My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) said that the people did not want to raise grain simply to pay freight to railways, but on behalf of the people whom I represent, I say that we do want people in there, so that they may raise plenty of grain, and so that, in consequence, the railway companies may be able to reduce their rates. Here is the expenditure made by the Conservative Government for immigration. I give the figures in round numbers:

1881 .....	\$214,000
1882 .....	215,000
1883 .....	373,000
1884 .....	511,000
1885 .....	423,000
1886 .....	257,000
1887 .....	341,000
1888 .....	244,000
1889 .....	250,000
1890 .....	110,000
1891 .....	181,000
1892 .....	177,000
1893 .....	180,000
1894 .....	202,000
1895 .....	195,000
1896 .....	126,000

\$3,953,000

The late Government spent nearly \$4,000,000, and they only claim to have placed 75,000 people in the Territories. I say, Sir, that the Minister of the Interior deserves credit that, with \$260,000 last year, he induced 30,000 settlers to go in there. I be-

lieve that it is claimed that in the district of Alberta there are 110,000 people, out of which there are not more than 3,000 Galicians; and does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) wish the people of Canada to believe that 110,000 Canadians—I presume, from what he said this afternoon, they are all Canadians—cannot assimilate 3,000 Galicians? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) objects to these immigrants from the social point of view, but if you go to any city in this Dominion, you will find people you do not care to associate with, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) does not have to associate with the Galicians, unless he wants to. When he says that he would rather have gophers and groundhogs than green fields waving with corn, and cattle roaming over the prairies, he goes too far. What I say is, that we want population in there, and we cannot be too particular about the class of people who immigrate. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) told us that they had 30,000,000 people in the United States before they opened the door for foreign immigrants. Well, we would have to go back about forty years to find the United States with a population of 30,000,000, and, as they started fifty years previously with a population of only five millions, they must have got a large foreign immigration in the meanwhile, because the natural increase would never give them that population. Well, when they had thirty millions in the United States, their foreign immigration was at the rate of 2,000,000 a year, and if we consider that with five and six millions of people in Canada our foreign immigration is not more than 5,000 a year, surely the percentage of immigration was greater in the United States than in Canada; and yet we know that in the United States they assimilated the foreign element. Now, Sir, we have some of those foreign immigrants in my district, and I have been amongst them, and I can assure the House that they are going to make first-class settlers. We do not expect that they are going to adopt the manners and customs of the Canadians right off, but we expect them to learn, and we know that they are of about the same class as the Mennonites were, when they came to this country. The Mennonites have adopted our school system and our language, and they are a progressive people. Wherever they have established themselves, they have built towns and mills and elevators, and have become very much like Canadians. There was just as much said against the Mennonites, when they first came to Canada, as is said against the Galicians to-day, and they certainly were higher in the scale of civilization than are the Galicians now. The hon. member for Alberta said that all the Galicians were going to his part of the country. I suppose because the soil and climate there are better than elsewhere; but such is not the fact. The first consignment of those people sent into the country were

sent to Alberta, and it is well known that people coming from the old country wish to follow their friends, and for that reason a great many of these people have gone to that district. But there are also some in my district, and I ask the Minister of the Interior to send us more. If Alberta does not want them, we shall be glad to take them. We have room in our district for twenty million people; yet in the past eighteen years, nearly half a man's lifetime, we have not got more than 200,000 people in the whole Territories. At that rate, how long would it take to settle up the North-west Territories? I would like to see people come there from Ontario and Quebec; but that is not the kind of immigration that is going to make us rich. We are not going to get rich by taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another. Some hon. gentlemen say that our own people go to the United States. The hon. member for Alberta took up the census, and showed us that there are about a million Canadians in the United States. That is because our people are of a roving disposition. Those who go to the United States are not farmers, but go there to work in the mills. The same thing is true with regard to the people of the United States. You will find Americans in every country in the world, and if you figured them all up, you would find them to number many millions. So that the fact that there are some thousands of Canadians in the United States does not go to prove anything to my mind. The Government of Manitoba have, I believe, immigration agents in Ontario trying to get immigration from there; I fancy they are also working in the province of Quebec, and the North-west Territories are doing the same. But I lay it down as a principle that we cannot expect to increase the population or the production or the consumption or the wealth of the country by taking people from one part of this Dominion and transplanting them in another part. If we are going to increase our population to any great extent, we must get people from outside. We would like to get them from the United States, and we are getting them in large numbers from that country now. While we would like also to get English people and Irish people, we can at the same time afford to take in a few, more of these foreigners. As to the Doukhobors, there are 2,500 of them in my district, and I hope the Minister will bring more. We have also Icelanders and Swedes in the west. All these people from northern Europe are all right. They are used to a cold country such as ours, and they are used to farming under the same conditions. The late Government brought in a lot of people from Paris, such as notaries and lawyers, who, after remaining two or three years and spending all their money, had to go back, because they knew nothing about farming, while the people who have a knowledge of agriculture remain and are doing well.

Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I propose to offer only a very few remarks on this question; but as a representative of a Manitoba constituency, I feel bound to say that so far as my observations go, I think that country can very well absorb a reasonable number of Galicians and Doukhobors. There are none of these people in the constituency I represent, but in that constituency are all the Mennonites who came to the country eighteen or twenty years ago, and my fellow-members from the west, as well as all who have been through that country, will bear me out in saying that a better class of settlers do not exist in the province of Manitoba than those very Mennonites. I was not familiar with the conditions existing among those people at the time they came; but gentlemen who did visit their settlement at that time tell me that they certainly were no better a class of people than the Doukhobors and possibly the Galicians who have been brought into the North-west. Though I have not been able to observe personally the habits of those people to any extent, I may say that, being connected with a newspaper in Manitoba, I am in an excellent position to obtain information, and the information that has reached me in regard to them is of a very satisfactory character. Those who visit among the Galicians and the Doukhobors tell me that they are making excellent progress. I know, from my slight observation of them, that the Galician men make excellent farm hands, while the young girls are becoming familiar with the conditions of the country and make excellent domestic servants. While saying this, I do not wish to give the impression that I would like to see a very large immigration from the province of Galicia into the North-west country. But I have the very greatest sympathy with the position the Minister of the Interior takes, that these lands of the North-west have lain vacant for years and years, notwithstanding the efforts of both Governments to get them settled upon; and, as the Minister says, are we not very much better off with these Doukhobors and Galicians tilling those lands than seeing them decade after decade lying vacant. Such a vast country as the North-west can absorb a reasonable proportion of that immigration. The Doukhobors especially will, I believe, make a very good element in our population. They are certainly a religious people, clean and well-behaved, and of good physique; and even if they do become absorbed in our civilization, I think we shall have no reason to regret that they have been brought into the country even in considerable numbers.

Mr. CRAIG. I have a word or two to say on this subject, and as there seems to be no hurry at all, judging by the speeches on the other side of the House, I will occupy a few moments. I was especially struck with the speech of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), whom I do not see in the

House just now. That hon. gentleman did not seem to be in much hurry, because he gave us a general speech on the subject of immigration, making a great many statements with which everybody would agree. This discussion arose largely from the remarks made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I was very much impressed with that hon. gentleman's argument with reference to giving young men in the province of Quebec information as to the province of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, showing them what inducements there are for them to go and settle there instead of going to the United States. I thought that was a very good argument, and was impressed with the fact that he did not attempt to make any political capital out of anything he said. Some speakers on the other side did try to make some political capital out of it. I listened to the hon. member for Labelle speaking about the exodus, and to some of the other hon. members speaking on the same subject, and was only wishing that we had had them in this House to make similar speeches when the Conservative party was in power, because they used arguments exactly similar to those then used by the Conservatives. The hon. member for Labelle used the same arguments which I myself was accustomed to use in speaking on that question, and naturally I thought they were very good ones?

Mr. LANDERKIN. What do you think of them now?

Mr. CRAIG. I think they are very good now, just as good as they were then, and the conclusion reached by members of the Liberal party is that the exodus is going on all the time, no matter what the conditions may be. I agree in that opinion. There is an exodus going on. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) said that was one of the things which a country like Canada, with a comparatively small population, lying alongside a great country like the United States, must expect. I am reminded that the speech from the Throne informed us that the exodus had stopped, and I think that the hon. members on the Cabinet benches will have to read that part of the Speech over to some of their supporters, who not only do not think it has stopped but that it will never stop.

With reference to the Galicians, I do not pretend to know anything about them from personal observation. I listened to the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) and others who spoke, and who arrived at different conclusions. There is a great difference of opinion concerning these people. Some hon. members say they are unsuitable and others are quite satisfied to have them, because they say the country must be built up, and it is better to have any kind of settlers than none at all. I am not prepared to admit that view and I think there is a great deal of force in what the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has said that we should take

time to work out the experiment before bringing in any others. I was prompted to say a few words on this question for this reason. I take the "Canadian Baptist." The parties who write in this paper, as a rule, belong to the Liberal party. I do not know whether the gentleman who wrote the letter, a part of which I am about to quote, belongs to that party or not, but that is a matter of no importance. His letter is headed the "The Strathcona Letter." Strathcona was part of the town of Edmonton, but is now, it seems a town by itself. The writer, in the latter part of his letter, goes on to say:

Our town, during the past year, as well as the whole district, has made marked progress, notwithstanding the grievous infliction, by a sadly mistaken policy, of thousands of a class of people being forced upon our territory, which must prove, for many years to come, a clog on the wheels of progress in anything and everything high and noble.

I am not going to endorse that opinion, but I have no doubt that the writer did not give expression to it because of any political feeling. He was writing about the church, and, no doubt, is a minister of that church, and in that letter is merely expressing his opinion about the Galicians, in which he seems to agree entirely with the hon. member for Alberta. As this matters seems to be an experiment, and will be for some time in the experimental stage, I think that while we are not prepared to pronounce any decided opinion at present, we should decide that until it is shown that these people are desirable, no more should be brought into the country. It is very well to say, as the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) has said, that it is better to have men who know something about farming, even if they only know how to handle a hoe than to have those who know nothing about it. I am not so sure of that. A great many successful farmers in Ontario were not farmers at all when they went on the farm. I know many who were shoemakers and engaged in other occupations that have nothing to do with farms, but yet who went on farms and made farming a success. I know these men personally. It depends a great deal on the men themselves. While we require settlers, it is important that we should not forget that quality is a very important consideration. We do want the country filled up, but filled up with the right kind of people, and whether the Galicians are the right kind of people we will not know for some time.

Mr. ELLIS. I gave expression to my opinion on a previous occasion on this question, and, generally speaking, I am in favour of the hon. Minister's policy. I have not heard anything in this debate to change my mind. I am quite satisfied that as time goes on, these people will become excellent settlers, and adapt themselves to our ways. I quite agree that we should get the very best settlers we can, but nobody has yet shown that the Minister has not done

that. The conditions in the English-speaking portion of Europe are so completely changed in the last ten, fifteen or twenty years, that we cannot count on British settlers to the extent we once did. I only rose to endorse, as far as I could, the observations made by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) with regard to the vacant farms in the maritime provinces. I think, perhaps, it will be a good policy for the Minister to detail some person belonging to his department, and a man of experience, to look over the whole situation there and see what can be done. I am quite of the opinion that it would be very unpopular now for the Minister to establish agencies in the maritime provinces for the purposes of removing people to the North-west. Even if agents were put there merely for the purpose of giving instructions, it would be impossible to keep them to that line of policy alone. They would become advertising agents and canvassers to remove the people, and the consequence would be a greater distrust and ill feeling towards Ontario and western Canada than exists at present. No doubt at all, it is most unfortunate for us that our population goes away from us to the extent that it does. The province from which I come, in the ten years between the two last censuses, made no increase in population at all. Our people go away; it is natural, perhaps, for them to go to the United States. There are a great many reasons for this. In the first place, the country itself was settled by people from the United States. The family quarrels which caused them to come here long since subsided, and they return naturally to the eastern states, and the United States afford them greater opportunities for progress. The fisherman goes, as a matter of course, because his business is there, a great many go and earn a good deal of money, a great portion of which they return again to the maritime provinces, and the money which comes in in that way is considerable. True, we lose their labour, and it is a great disadvantage. Some of the very best men whom our country has produced have gained high positions in the United States. The gentleman who was sent out by President McKinley to the Philippine Islands as head of the United States Commission, is a Prince Edward Islander. And there are many others who have attained success in the United States, and their example is an attraction to others. I do not know, for my part, what should be done, but I ask the Minister of the Interior to take this matter into consideration, and see if something cannot be done to grapple with the situation in the maritime provinces. I do not wish to rise again, so while I am on my feet I may be allowed to make one further remark. I witnessed the debarkation of the Doukhobors, and I have to compliment the Minister of the Interior, the officers of the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway on the excellent arrangements made with regard to

Mr. ELLIS.

these people. I have seen many movements of large masses of men from the time the troops were landed in the Trent affair, and including large numbers despatched on various occasions to the upper provinces, but I never saw anything better or more ably managed, never saw any arrangements of the kind more effective or carried out with greater skill. I do not know the names of the gentlemen who represented the department on that occasion, but I can bear testimony to the ability with which they performed the work entrusted to them.

Mr. KLOEPFER. I do not wish to take up much time in discussing this matter. It seems strange to me that this country should have to spend so much money in inducing immigration. We practically drive our own people out of this country, because our trade policy for the last ten or fifteen years has not been up to the mark. Why should we have a tariff 25 per cent less than that of the United States? The reason why our young men go to the United States is because we have not enough trade. Our farmers' boys cannot all be farmers. A good many of them wish to go into the cities, but there is no room for them, because our manufacturers are hampered with the immense importations of manufactured goods from the United States. Even within the last two years we imported \$78,000,000 worth, and in the last two years about \$20,000,000 worth more than usual. That money has gone to the United States and we shall never see a cent of it back. It is gone for ever. If we had that money among our own population, our population would be a good deal more than it is. We should be a good deal better off if we kept that money in our own country and did not spend a cent for immigration. Take Detroit, Cleveland and Buffalo and other similar cities, and about one-third of their people are Canadians, and the Canadians are the best business men they have. If we protected our manufacturers, we should have the making of the goods that we now import, and we should be able to afford employment here for our farmers' sons. And, with this increase of manufacturing population, our farmers would also be benefited by the increased market for their products. We should not then need to pay so much money to immigration agents, nor should we have to go about offering so much a head to have people brought here. We have spent a great deal for years in the North-west, on railways and for other means of developing that country, and we find that in this House the members from that country do more talking than those of all the rest of Canada put together. We lend them the money to open up their country, we build their railways for them, and yet they import almost everything from the other side. But though they get their goods from the United States, they look to

Ontario for money, and they never want to give us a return for it. They should be more ready to help the people who help them. Even if they paid a little more for their goods, it would pay them better in the end. Last year forty thousand barrels of flour were imported into Canada from the United States. That would not have been the case if our manufacturers had been better protected. The way to increase the population is to retain our own people, and the way to do that is to give us a better trade policy for the country.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to say a few words with reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall), in case it might be inferred that in the province of Ontario we have what are known as abandoned farms. I am proud to say that throughout the province, from one end to the other, there are no such things as abandoned farms. There can be no doubt that our young people are drifting away from the farms and going into industrial pursuits, seeking employment in the towns and villages away from the farms. I think the suggestion of the hon. member for Cape Breton was a very good one. If the hon. Minister of the Interior could induce the better class of farmers from the British Islands to come to Canada, men who have means to buy improved farms, I have no doubt that they would find in the province of Ontario an excellent opportunity of investing their money. We have some people of that class, and from my knowledge of them, they have proved a very acceptable class indeed. These men would buy the farms now owned by farmers who have large families and who are desirous of securing more land than they have in Ontario, but are unable to do so on account of the cost. There are plenty of farmers in Ontario, I believe, who would gladly dispose of their farms to such men as the hon. member for Cape Breton referred to, and remove to the North-west, taking their families with them, and securing for each member of the family a good farm. In that way the North-west and Manitoba would have the very best class of settlers that could go into that country—people accustomed to farming, accustomed to the climate, people of good character, good health and good reputation, the very best class of settlers that could be found anywhere. The country would lose nothing by inducing such men as I have referred to, men of means and experience in farming in the old country, who desire to secure an improved farm in Ontario, to come here, because if we lose a man in Ontario we would get another in his place. I hope that the hon. Minister will give some attention to that feature of the immigration question. It will be better than allowing our young men to drift away from the farm, it will enable them to be transplanted to another part of

our country where there is abundance of land, and yet the population of our province will not be depleted. I desire to ask the hon. Minister one question on behalf of an hon. gentleman who is not able to be present. Where are the Doukhobors and Galicians located, and what are the numbers in each location or settlement?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The Doukhobors are located as follows:—There is one settlement west of the Swan River valley—the Swan River valley is about 200 miles a little west of north of Portage la Prairie—and there are about 1,000 Doukhobors there. North of Yorkton there are about 2,000; a little west of Yorkton there are about 2,000. In the Saskatchewan district, not yet finally located, but to locate there, there will be 2,300; they are the last lot that came out. Those are Doukhobors. The Galicians are located in different settlements; they are very much scattered. These people will not settle individually, but if they are put in colonies of 100, or 200, or anywhere up to 600 or 700 they are satisfied. At Stuartburn, which is the original Galician settlement, there are about 400; at Brokenhead, on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, 20 miles east of the Red River, there are 150; at Pleasant Home there are 600; in the neighbourhood of Swan River and Dauphin there are about 1,500; at Shoal Lake there are 500; at Strathclair, 400; at Saltcoats, 200; at Yorkton, 550; at Rosthern and Duck Lake there are something over 1,000. In the Alberta district, around Edmonton and Fort Saskatchewan, there are about 2,500; at Whitewood, on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, there are 50; at Huns Valley there are 60; at St. Norbert, 20; at Cook's Creek, 30; at Grenfell, 30; at Crooked Lake, north of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, there are about 800. In addition to these, there are 2,500 to 3,000 who are at present engaged in various occupations, but are not yet finally located. They will soon scatter into all these settlements, where they have friends already.

While I am on my feet, I want to say a word or two about the people we brought in during last year; and I want to remove an evident misapprehension among members of the House who have spoken, who are evidently under the impression that the work of the immigration branch, and the money we have spent, have been devoted to the purpose of bringing in Doukhobors and Galicians. That is an entire mistake. We are practically expending no money at all in the way of inducing that class of immigration. We are spending money in the United States and in the British Isles chiefly, and to a small extent, comparatively, in France and Belgium. The immigration of the last calendar year shows the following results:—

## IMMIGRANT ARRIVALS.

The total number of declared settlers arriving during the year is as follows:—

Via Ocean Ports.	
English .....	9,475
Irish .....	733
Scotch .....	1,400
German .....	563
Scandinavian .....	724
French and Belgian .....	545
Galicians .....	5,509
Miscellaneous nationalities .....	3,634
	22,583
From the United States .....	9,119
	31,702
Total .....	31,702
Increase over arrivals during 1897.	9,986

Hon. gentlemen will see that last year the vast proportion of our immigrants were British, counting those from the United States as of British origin, and but a comparatively small proportion were Galicians. During the present year we will have, perhaps, a larger proportion of Doukhobors and Galicians, but they will still remain a comparatively small proportion of the total.

Hon. gentlemen speak as if the people of eastern Canada were all going to the United States. That is not at all the case. In 1898 there were 13,000 Canadians from eastern Canada who landed in Winnipeg and declared their intention to settle in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. I am not going to discuss the so-called exodus, which has been discussed by other members who are more familiar with the facts in eastern Canada than I am, and which has been particularly well dealt with by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). But I want to say to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that I did not consider that he was pronouncing an indictment against the administration of my department in the same way that the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) did; I did not attribute my hon. friend's remarks as made at all in a political sense, and I am prepared to give his suggestions my best consideration. I understood that the hon. gentleman was expressing his dissent from the general policy of spending money to encourage this kind of immigration from European countries, and I gather from his remarks that he did not approve of any strong efforts to induce any such immigration. Now, as to the people who emigrate from eastern Canada to the United States in the early summer months, I venture to think that they are, for the most part, people who desire to spend some time in industrial occupations; they do not want to go to farming; and I do not believe that anything the Government could do would have any substantial effect in preventing this particular class of people from going where they are going. I certainly think that the effect of sending any considerable number of agents into the province of Quebec for the purpose of inducing the peo-

Mr. SIFTON.

ple to go to the west, would not decrease the number of people that go to the United States. I do not regard it as a function of the immigration branch of the Government to spend money for the purpose of preventing people from leaving Canada. It is, no doubt, the duty of the Government to pursue such a general policy, so far as it is able, as will result in making it to the interest of people to stay in Canada, but I do not regard it as a function of the immigration branch to spend money in that direction, except in a somewhat general way.

Now, so far as the province of Quebec is concerned, I have done what I could for the purpose of encouraging repatriation, and for the purpose of helping those who are engaged in the effort to take people from one part of Quebec to another part of Quebec. I have assisted the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, which is most active in that direction at the present time, and I have assisted liberally the Quebec Repatriation and Colonization Society. My hon. friend will find the operations of that society in the report of the department for the year. It shows that a very substantial work has been carried on; it shows some 2,226 people repatriated during the year 1898. A constant work has been going on in that direction, and, so far as the department was able to do anything to assist in that work, we have done it, and we are extremely desirous to render any assistance that can be given in that direction.

Mr. CHAUVIN. Is there any agent paid by this Government for the purpose of repatriation?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, there are three agents, clergymen of the Roman Catholic Church, who are specially engaged in that work. They sometimes take small parties to the North-west from the province of Quebec; but their real occupation is working in the United States to get people to come back to Quebec who have formerly lived in that province. I am speaking of Father Morin, Father Gouin and Father Blais. In addition to that, we give assistance to the Repatriation Society, and I am quite prepared to go further in that direction, provided I can see that the result will be satisfactory, on the lines the hon. gentleman has spoken of. I desire particularly to say that there is an evident misapprehension as to the manner in which immigration money is being spent. This money is being spent altogether for the purpose of getting British immigrants from Great Britain, and men who are practically British immigrants from the United States. The people we get from Europe, the Doukhobors and Galicians, we get practically without any expenditure, except that which we pay in the shape of bonus.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what assistance he has given to these 13,000 Canadians?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** We have not given any. These people have removed themselves. They have asked for no assistance. They are not the class of people to whom assistance would be of any moment, such as it is to people like the Doukhobors and Galicians. When I say that no assistance was given them, I mean no assistance in the shape of money payments. But the staff, the accommodation and the immigration shed have been at their disposal, and they make use of them. All these people reported at the Immigration Office at Winnipeg, and most of them received assistance in the way of direction and information. They made use of the services of the officers of the department particularly in the location of land. The only direct money payment that has been made in connection with the Doukhobors, has been the payment of one pound sterling per head to their committee, which they themselves created by appointment, they naming some of the members and I naming some of the members. That money was only used, practically, for the purpose of furnishing subsistence for a portion of the Doukhobors who were comparatively destitute. They were not all in that condition, because many of them were in fairly good circumstances. But the money was practically used for the purpose of furnishing subsistence during the two or three months that intervened before they could get on the land. While I do not suppose there will be any special objection to offering a bonus, or a payment of \$5 per head in the way of assistance to Canadians, the average Canadian would not regard it as being of any value whatever. I think he would rather laugh at it if we were to offer a Canadian farmer's son \$5 to go to the North-west. As to the Doukhobors and Galicians they are agriculturists; there are no labouring people amongst them in the ordinary sense of the word. This is a matter in regard to which our agents had definite instructions that none but people who are agriculturists are to be sent to Canada under the auspices of the department.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** Some of these people are not engaged in agriculture, but are engaged in the city.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I do not think so more than this: I gave most positive instructions when the Doukhobors went up—of course they were in the country and we could not lock them up or control them absolutely—that while occupying the Government buildings, they were not to be permitted to compete in the labour market with labouring men, that they were not to be permitted to go out and do any work for wages while they were there. I supposed that my instructions had been carried out, and substantially they were. But the position of having several hundred men in a building in the city, having nothing to

do, proved rather a difficult one, and some of them got out and engaged in cutting wood and work of that sort. As soon as I heard of it, I gave peremptory orders to put a stop to it. That is one of those things that is likely to happen in any large department where there are a great many men to be dealt with.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** When I was in Winnipeg, only a short time ago, I heard it generally complained of that these people were competing in the labour market in Winnipeg and doing work for about one-half of the remuneration it would be done for by local people.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** That just happened in the way I spoke of. There was a complaint about it at once. I got a letter from the Trades and Labour Council in Winnipeg in regard to it, and I answered the letter explaining the situation. I do not think that the people who really knew the circumstances complained that any substantial amount of work had been done because they had done nothing at all except what I have mentioned. It was done contrary to my orders, and as soon as I heard that my orders had not been fully carried out, I telegraphed to the Commissioner at Winnipeg and gave him very strict instructions not to permit these men to work for wages.

**Mr. DAVIN.** Could the hon. gentleman say what is the character of the immigration that has been coming in since January to the present time?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I cannot give the figures now.

**Mr. DAVIN.** I would like to ask the hon. Minister what about the statement that was made to me by a thoroughly reliable person to the effect that Mr. McCreary had said that British immigration is falling off, so much so, that it may almost be described as having stopped.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I do not believe that Mr. McCreary ever made such a statement. I do not desire to throw any doubt upon the hon. gentleman's statement, but I think he has been misinformed. I have been told, time and again, and letters have been written to me about statements Mr. McCreary was alleged to have made and things he was said to have done, and it has been found, in nearly every case, that he has not said or done these things. The commissioner is a man who is extremely busy. He is meeting all kinds of people at all hours of the day and night and he is asked all kinds of questions. It would be very easy to misconstrue some of the answers that he might make. He might casually say, on a railway platform, to some one that British immigration is falling off, without in the least intending to convey the idea that in a general way British immigra-

tion is falling off. He might have meant that there had not been as many British immigrants arriving in the past week as previously. He could not have said what is attributed to him because the facts of the case are to the contrary. Although I cannot give the exact figures I am satisfied that during the last six months we have had a larger proportion of British immigration than previously.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. Minister read a statement of the number of immigrants who had come to Canada during the year ended December 31st last. He did not include in that list the number of Doukhobors that have arrived. May I ask him for those figures?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Doukhobors did not come until after the 1st of January this year, so that they do not appear in the blue-book for last year.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he knows that these Doukhobors would not be prepared to submit to the provisions of the Militia Act; that in other words, according to their religious tenets, they would not submit to military service?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is part of the agreement under which they came, the same as the Mennonites.

Mr. CLARKE. I notice in the "Citizen" to-day, a statement from a gentleman who is the Hungarian immigration agent employed by the Government, whose name I cannot pronounce. It is as follows:

Zoltaire Van Rajis, the Hungarian emigration agent employed by the Dominion Government, has returned to the city from Prince Albert, N.W.T., where he has been engaged settling a colony of his fellow-countrymen. To a "Citizen" reporter he stated last evening that the new settlers had erected houses and broken considerable land, and were making good headway. The agent states that about forty families will come out to Canada from Hungary in about a month, and next spring a still larger colony would follow. Those settlers were well-to-do, and, being thrifty, should make a success of mixed farming.

Are these immigrants being helped by the Government, and to what extent? Are any special facilities being offered them to come here? Does the Minister know of what character they are?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Hungarians?

Mr. CLARKE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no special information about these particular people. They have just come along with the other European immigrants, and there was no special inducement offered to them. Of course, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) is aware that we have no provision in the law at present to enable me to exclude certain people from the country. They have

Mr. SIFTON.

a right to come and they do come, but no special steps were taken by us to get these people here. If forty or fifty Hungarians came to Winnipeg and wanted to locate upon land, it would be the duty of Mr. McCreary, the immigration commissioner, to employ an interpreter and endeavour to locate them, and I have no doubt that has been done.

Mr. CLARKE. Then, there is an officer appointed by the department to look after Hungarian immigrants?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There has been no officer appointed to procure the immigrants, but if they came and desired to be located it would be the duty of the officers of the department there to see that they were located.

Mr. CLARKE. The Minister is probably aware that the allegation has been made again and again, that in addition to paying a bonus for the procuring of these immigrants, the Dominion Government has given the Galicians, at least, special advantages and privileges—

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is not true.

Mr. CLARKE. When the matter was before the House, on the motion of the hon. member from Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior), I drew the attention of the Minister to it, to give him an opportunity to deny the statement made in the Neepawa "Free Press." The statement is as follows, and had reference to the Galicians:

Whatever may be said for or against Galician immigration as a matter of public policy, there can be no two opinions that these foreigners should not be given privileges that are denied to Canadians or other English-speaking people. We are, therefore, at a loss to understand why Galicians are permitted to make homestead entry in the Minnedosa land office for timbered land in the Riding Mountain for which Canadian settlers in this district have been refused entry. It cannot be because these Galicians do not understand the nature of the oath they are required to take in order to make entry; for the agent must have known the lands were not open for homestead entry. And why are these Galicians permitted to go into the Riding Mountains in violation of the Dominion Lands Act, and deprive the settlers of this district of their only timber supply? These are questions that the Department of the Interior will be called upon to answer. There is room in western Canada for the Galicians, and they may make good settlers; but there is no reason why they should be given the special favours mentioned.

This is the paragraph to which I drew the attention of the Minister a few weeks ago, but I did not have the opportunity of bringing it more definitely before him, as the debate lasted until late at night. I now ask the Minister if there is any truth in the allegation made, that these Galician settlers were given special privileges?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no foundation whatever for the

statement. I have already stated in the House, that I sent the chief officer of the Dominion Lands Branch to Neepawa for the purpose of investigating that statement. He has not yet returned, and I have not his report, but my hon. friend from McDonald (Mr. Rutherford), in whose constituency Neepawa is, tells me he saw the commissioner of Dominion Lands out there, after he had investigated the matter, and the commissioner told him there was no foundation whatever for the statement. I repeatedly gave express orders that no distinction whatever should be made, and I sent the commissioner for the purpose of seeing if my instructions were carried out. As the law now stands, it places the people of every nationality upon the same basis precisely; and there is no legal authority for me to treat one class in respect to homestead entries, different from any other class—except it be done under special provisions of the law, and these provisions make no distinction in respect to nationality. The report, I fancy, arose in this way. Some of the Galicians went upon certain lands that were pretty well removed from the settlement up towards the Riding Mountains. They squatted there temporarily, but they received no interest from the Government, and just like other people who squat upon land that was not open for entry, they were notified they would have to get out. They did not get out at the time they were notified, but they received no entries, and will not.

Mr. CLARKE. I suppose the report of the officer appointed by the Minister to make the investigation will be published?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Certainly; he will make his report.

Mr. CLARKE. There is another matter to which I wish to call the attention of the Minister. I have had two letters from a gentleman in Nelson, B.C., referring to a matter which I mentioned to the Minister on a previous occasion, and I have been asked to bring it before the House. A gentleman named Johnsen writes to me as follows, under date June 3rd:

In the "Manitoba Free Press" I note Mr. Sifton's answer to your query on May 15th, re bonus allowed to Doukhobors. I take exception to Mr. Sifton's remark as follows:—"The Government is prepared at any time to make a similar arrangement with any person who may be in a position to furnish a large body of desirable agricultural immigrants from Britain."

I have made Mr. Sifton numerous offers within the past year, to obtain agriculturists, not only Englishmen, but Scandinavians. The latter are admittedly the best settlers Canada has. Mr. Sifton came to see me last year in Fernie. At his request I called upon him at Ottawa in November last, but without any result.

I am prepared to get the Government as many sound men, and men with cash, for the agricultural districts as the Government can find room for. What Mr. Sifton's idea is in importing Doukhobors passes all my understanding, as they are the laziest, dirtiest breed under the sun, and

mentally weak through intermarriage. I have lived among them, the same as I have lived amongst most of the nations in the old world. My offers to Mr. Sifton were not based upon profits, as all my work would have been gratuitously performed. I am backed up by my brother, who is consulting agent to the Norwegian Government in all matters having reference to agriculture, he being resident in England.

I do not know who this gentleman is, but he has written to me twice. Until I received that letter I had formed a very favourable opinion of the Doukhobors, both as to their habits, and their qualifications to eventually become good settlers. But, if statements of this kind are being made by persons who allege they have had practical experience of these persons from living amongst them, I think it is well they should be presented to the House, so that if they are not well founded, they can be given official contradiction. It is pretty plain now to the House, that if these are desirable immigrants—and I hope they will turn out to be the most desirable immigrants we have had from the continent of Europe—there is no special credit due to the Department of the Interior for their advent to Canada; because if I understood the Minister correctly this afternoon, we are indebted to some gentlemen identified with the Society of Friends, who presented these Doukhobors to the department as eligible immigrants, and who are really entitled to all the credit, if credit there be, of having sent them here from their native land.

If the allegations made by my correspondent are correct, that these Doukhobors are not desirable settlers, we should be advised of that fact, and steps should be taken not to allow any more to come into the country. If, on the contrary, they are a desirable class of immigrants, I think statements of this kind should be contradicted specifically and authoritatively at the earliest moment. That is the reason I bring this communication before the House. While on my feet, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he would give us more definite and detailed information as to the duties performed by the very large staff of immigration officers and agents now stationed in the old country—what the special duties of the agent at Liverpool, Mr. Jury, are; what are the special duties of Mr. W. T. R. Preston, who was sent to England five or six months ago, where he is stationed, how much he has received for the discharge of those duties, and where he has been since he was sent by the department to England. I would also like to know the number of immigration agents we have in Ireland. If I read the reports correctly—I have only read them hurriedly—we have only two agencies in Ireland, one at Dublin and the other at Londonderry; whereas, according to the statement of the hon. Minister this afternoon, in reply to the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), we have 276 agents in the United States. I would like to have

more particulars than the Minister has yet given us as to the plan adopted to secure British immigrants, and as to the nature of the work engaged in by those officers who have been sent recently from this country to the old country to engage in that work. I do not think the Minister has yet given us that information, and that is the reason I ask for it. There is another matter to which I would like to draw the attention of the Minister. This afternoon, when the subject of the medical examination of the immigrants was under consideration, the hon. member for York, N.E. (Mr. Foster), expressed the opinion—and I think it is one in which we all concur—that it was eminently desirable that the closest and most rigid examination should be made of the immigrants at the port of embarkation; and I understood from the Minister that wherever practicable this was done. I would like to draw his attention to a statement which appears in yesterday's "Star" with reference to a meeting of a congressional sub-committee investigating immigration matters, which was held at New York on Monday, and to allegations which were made at that meeting and subsequently by Col. Laird, United States Commissioner of Immigration at Quebec, as to the character and quality of some of the immigrants who reached Canada at that port. If those allegations are correct it would appear as if the medical examination of the immigrants who reach that port was not as strict as it ought to be. Col. Laird is alleged in the report of the "Star" to say that, believing that the Dominion of Canada is no more desirous than the United States of harbouring paupers and permanently-diseased people, it is not without surprise that he finds how seldom the Canadian immigration officials will turn back undesirable immigrants. The view entertained by the people of Quebec appears to be that this allegation that pauper immigrants, unsound in mind and body, are permitted to land at Quebec, is a scare gotten up by New York steamship agents. But it appears from the statement of the United States Commissioner of Immigration at Quebec, that there is a laxity on the part of the Canadian officials in keeping out these undesirable immigrants who are brought to Quebec by steamships from different parts of the old land. The allegation is that the great majority of these undesirable immigrants are shipped at Liverpool, and I would like to ask the Minister what steps are taken there to prevent these people embarking for Canada; and if they escape the vigilance of his officers on the other side of the water, what is to prevent them being dumped on our shores?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I presume that the hon. gentleman is aware that there is no Exclusion Act in the Dominion of Canada at the present time, and

Mr. CLARKE.

there never has been, so far as I am aware. Therefore, it is no part of the duty of the Government, under the law to appoint agents for the purpose of keeping people from coming to Canada.

Mr. CLARKE. But I take it that these references are to immigrants who are assisted to come to Canada, for whom a bonus is paid to the steamship agents.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The persons who are assisted to come are reported to our agents here, and they are passed upon by our agents at the ports at which they land, and are subjected to a careful and thorough medical examination. That particular quarantine work is not done under the charge of my department, but under the Department of Agriculture; but I have no reason to doubt that it is done as thoroughly and carefully as it is possible to have it done. The embarkation of these people is carried on under the rules and regulations of the ports from which they embark, and it is not possible for us to change those rules or to affect them by anything we can do. We can only decide what we shall do with respect to the payment of the bonus. So far as the Gallicians are concerned, we have stopped the payment of the bonus from the 1st of June, as I have informed the House a number of times. I do not fancy that there can be any great improvement on the method of the medical examination. It is under the consideration of both the Department of Agriculture and my department, and if any improvement can be suggested by the special officers engaged in looking after that work, both the Minister of Agriculture and myself will be most happy to carry out any feasible suggestions that may be made. With regard to the letter which the hon. gentleman has read, I may say that it is just the ordinary letter which a man who has been pestering the department for years to get work and has not got it, would write. It is just the sort of letter we often receive as the result of not entertaining all kinds of propositions made to us from time to time by people who promise things which, I think, they are not able to carry out. In the first year that I was in office, the heaviest task I had to perform was to answer letters from people who declared their ability to get immigrants from various countries. They were the most complete humbugs that the department had anything to do with. I do not mean to say that the gentleman who wrote the letter which my hon. friend has read is in every sense a humbug; but if all his statements are on a par with those in regard to matters with which I am acquainted, I would not advise the hon. gentleman to rely on much what he says. He says that I called to see him at Fernie last year. I have not the least recollection of anything connected with the

matter, except that when the train stopped at Fernie a person, who I suppose was the same man, came in and suggested that he would be a good immigrant agent if I could find a place for him. I terminated the conversation as soon as I could, and that is all I know about it. His statement respecting the Doukhobors is absurd on the face of it. He cannot even know what class of people the Doukhobors are, or he would not have made that statement. He is probably referring to the Galicians. The inaccuracy of his knowledge is evidenced by the fact that he talks of the Doukhobors as being dirty. Why, the one thing that everybody who had anything to do with them practically, noticed is, that they were the cleanest class of people that ever travelled as immigrants into Canada. The report of the people who had charge of them on the steamer, those in charge of the immigration sheds, the railway conductors and trainmen, and every visitor who went to see them, was, that they had never seen as clean a lot of immigrants. It is evident that this man does not know what he is talking about, when he says that they are a dirty people. But, no doubt, he is one of a large number who do not profess any great admiration for my policy.

The hon. gentleman asks for the names of the immigration agents in England. Mr. W. T. R. Preston is one—

Mr. CLARKE. What position has he ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Inspector of Agencies. Upon three occasions the High Commissioner, when in this country, impressed very strongly upon me the fact that the work was seriously injured in the old country because we did not have a travelling inspector of the immigration agencies. We had a considerable number of officers, but not one who could take the position of inspector, and I was for some time anxious that the department should get a good man for the position. I gave the position to Mr. Preston, because I considered him qualified for the work better than any other available man.

Mr. CLARKE. What salary does he get ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Three thousand dollars. Mr. C. R. Devlin, the agent at Dublin, gets \$2,000. Mr. O'Kelly is the agent at Londonderry, and his salary is \$1,800. Mr. Webster is the sub-agent at Dublin, with a salary of \$900. Mr. Griffith is the agent in Wales, and he has been fairly successful, although he had great difficulty at first. He has succeeded in accomplishing a considerable amount of work, and his salary is \$1,200. Mr. Jury is agent at Liverpool, with a salary of \$1,800. He travels and lectures, largely through the northern portion of England. Mr. Mitchell is clerk and book-keeper in charge of the Liverpool office, at \$1,200. Mr. Thomas

Duncan, Scotland, salary, \$1,500 ; Mr. Murray, agent at Glasgow. I secured him from the steamship service ; he was steamship agent at Glasgow, travelling agent and booking agent. He took charge of our work at \$2,000. Mr. Grant, at Dumfries, gets a salary of \$1,200.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the total number of Great Britain and Ireland ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Fifteen, besides the office boy.

Mr. CLARKE. Does that include typewriters, assistants and interpreters ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. There are two agencies in Ireland, Dublin and Londonderry ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. What are Mr. Devlin's duties ? Does he go out lecturing upon the conditions of Canada ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the agent at Londonderry ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Has he a record of the number of meetings that he addressed and the number of people that he came in contact with ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I presume his report shows the number of meetings he addressed.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Devlin's report is very general.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How many agencies in Great Britain and Ireland ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Nine.

Mr. MONTAGUE. For the inspection of nine agencies you employ an official at \$3,000. What are his duties ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. To inspect the agencies and report generally on the work. He has to report on the whole European work, and perform any duty assigned to him by the High Commissioner.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What are his special qualifications ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He is a man of good ability, and I thought that the occupation he has been following for many years fitted him particularly for organization work, canvassing, and work of that kind. So far as I am able to judge, he is thoroughly well qualified.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. Minister admits that he never had any experience in immigration matters ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is rather strange to pick up a man without experience at all, and make him inspector of all the other men who have been for years engaged in that work. So far as his work as political organizer is concerned, I doubt very much whether the House will consider that that fitted him to be an inspector of immigration agencies. No impartial tribunal would decide that a man, absolutely without experience, absolutely inattentive for years to the question of immigration, would be the best man to place over a lot of agents who have been engaged in that work for years, and give him a larger salary than any of them. Had he ever been in England before?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not know.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is extraordinary. The hon. gentleman appoints a man to superintend European immigration who knows nothing about Europe or the work. Does the hon. gentleman know whether Preston is acquainted with any other language than his own ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think he is.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Here is a man put in charge of European work who knows no other language than English.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He has an interpreter.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Necessarily, he must have one ; but there is a difference always in getting what a man says through an interpreter and understanding it yourself. There is no excuse. There is no use in the Minister trying to say that Mr. Preston was the man of all others fitted for this work. It was a political appointment. The place was needed for Mr. Preston, and I suppose he was recommended by politicians, and the Minister, in the generosity of his heart, found the place and gave him a good salary. I, for my part, should much prefer that he should say so than that he should say that Preston's eminent qualifications fitted him for that appointment.

Mr. DAVIN. Not only that, but what possible object could there be in having these agencies inspected ? He knows very well that in his own department he has an illustration of the utter uselessness of these inspectors. He knows that in the Lands Department he has, as I believe, abolished the position of inspector—

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is quite mis-

Mr. SIFTON.

taken. I have not abolished the inspector's office at all.

Mr. DAVIN. Who inspects now ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Stevens.

Mr. DAVIN. I have never seen anything of him ; I used to see something of the other inspectors as they went around. I say here that the position, Inspector of Immigration Agencies in Europe, when given to a man like Preston who knows nothing of Germany, who knows nothing of France, has never been in England, speaks no other language than English—it is palpably a contrived position just to fit a man that, for the time being, wanted a nice, soft thing, and he, probably, wanted to be taken out of Canada. Sir, it seems to me, I confess, that appointing Preston at such a time with the scandals of West Elgin ringing in our ears, scandals in which he was the principal figure—why if the truth were known about his conduct in West Elgin—

Mr. BRITTON. What was his conduct in West Elgin ? What do you know about it ? State now, if you please, what you know.

Mr. DAVIN. I will tell what I know. Are we going to have at the hands of my hon. and learned friend—

Mr. BRITTON. State what you know about Preston's conduct in West Elgin.

Mr. DAVIN. I hope the Chairman will protect me from the interruption of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BRITTON. Why do not you state it ?

Mr. DAVIN. I will tell you what his conduct was, Sir. The conduct of Preston in West Elgin was hugging the machine. And before he went to meet his acolytes and heelers, to contrive the villanies that were perpetrated in West Elgin, with the hypocrisy that belong to a man, he went to a Sunday school and asked the Sunday school children to sing his favourite hymn : "My soul is full of sunshine to-day." And with his soul full of sunshine, he went to meet his brother hypocrites to contrive the hugging of the machine. Why, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) wants to know what he did ?

Mr. BRITTON. So I do ; you have not told us yet. You have told us about his singing a hymn ; but you have not told us what he did in West Elgin.

Mr. DAVIN. He has revealed to us what he did, because there is a letter of his own record.

Mr. BRITTON. Is that all.

Mr. DAVIN. Is not that enough ?

Mr. BRITTON. I do not see anything wrong in that letter.

Mr. DAVIN. I know it will be hard to convince my hon. friend, because I have his conduct and the conduct of other hon. gentlemen vividly before my mind, as in another place here they are trying to do everything they can to burk inquiry—

Mr. BRITTON. Not at all correct.

Mr. DAVIN—and in the face of evidence open, palpable, that wrong has been done, they are trying to throw dust in the eyes of Canada, trying to prevent the truth from coming out.

Mr. BRITTON. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if it is in order for the hon. gentleman to refer—

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) did not refer to the committee. He said: "in another place."

Mr. BRITTON. The hon. gentleman is pretending to state what took place in a committee of this House, though he is incorrectly stating it. He has not the right to refer to what took place in a committee.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not do anything of the kind, and if I thought it worth while to waste any moments or words on my hon. friend, I would have him called to order for using the word "pretend." I did not refer to any committee. I said that we have had before us in another place conduct such as I have described. If the description was not correct, how does the hon. gentleman know that I referred to the committee?

Mr. BRITTON. Then you are stating something you do not know anything about yourself.

Mr. DAVIN. I know very well how the hon. gentleman has fought and wriggled in many a court of justice defending criminals not half as vile as this Preston. I want to put on record the exclamations of horror of the brother of a distinguished Liberal leader in regard to this man Preston. Why, Sir, it is stated now that Mr. Samuel Blake will probably be the leader of the Liberal party in the local House—probably Premier of Ontario. Nevertheless, that hon. gentleman in the face of the iniquities respecting which this man Preston was the chief hero, lifted up his hands in holy horror and declared, as I remember it, that these people should be decapitated or something to that effect. Hon. Samuel Blake, ex-Vice-Chancellor, wants to have a block set up on Parliament hill and from that block he wishes to see roll the heads of such men as Preston. This man Preston who, according to his own profession is contriving to crush the life out of the electorate of Canada—this man, his hands reeking from this crime, the man the Minister of the Interior makes a position for with \$3,000 a year to gallivant through Europe. And he must have his interpreter with him. I suppose he has a courier also.

He probably not only travels with the machine but has a trumpeter to go before him and herald his approach. This is the great man; this is he who has done such great things for the Liberal party in Ontario; way for the author of the machine! In his letter he paints his own character. I suppose the hon. Minister could tell what is meant by hugging the machine.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) evidently knows more about it than I do.

Mr. DAVIN. No, no, it is not my character to hug machines. The hon. gentleman is, I am afraid, closer to the machine than I am when he can make a position for him and give him \$3,000 a year to go about here and there. I suppose he is paid his expenses. How much is he allowed for expenses?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. His actual outlay.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, his actual outlay on the continent of Europe, stopping at the Grand Hotel in Paris, going to Berlin, going to Vienna, having an interpreter at each place—why, his expenses must be very great, I suppose they will be \$3,000 a year more. But that is not all. While travelling about he will live on the fat of the land, he will have everything that heart could wish, and he can lay by \$3,000 a year. And what won't he do for the people of Canada? He would call on this agent, and that agent. We can fancy him calling on his brother Devlin, in Dublin, and saying: Hello, Devlin, how have you been? And Devlin would say: Hail Preston, great creator of the machine, great fighter for the Liberal party of Ontario! Thou art a great man for what thou didst accomplish for that great party in the province of Ontario. Welcome to my bureau. And down they would sit, and you can fancy the delight which Mr. Devlin, who is a strong party man, would listen to the stories of political corruption which this man Preston could tell. Now I want to give the opinion of an ex-judge, the opinion of probably one of the ablest men in the Liberal party.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Where is it found?

Mr. DAVIN. It is printed in the "Montreal Daily Star."

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Does my hon. friend think it very likely that he would give that interview to the "Montreal Star"?

Mr. DAVIN. I think it appeared originally in one of the Toronto papers. Now this is what Mr. Blake says:

If I were in office, Preston's head, as well as all others who took part in those disgraceful acts, would fall just as quickly as I could write down their names on paper.

That is what he says, and my hon. friend near me reminds me that although it has appeared in the "World," and appeared in the "Star," Mr. Blake has never repudiated the interview. And why should we doubt that the hon. Sam. Blake would say that? He and his brother have always posed as politicians of a somewhat higher class than the men who are now at the head of the Liberal party. In fact Edward Blake shook the dust of the Liberal party off his feet because they were truckling with the United States, and we know very well that there was much in that party that was offensive to him. We know he is a gentleman of elevated ideas, and the blood in his veins is the blood of a high minded race of men. The late Chancellor Blake who served his country well as a statesman before he went on the bench was the father of these men. Mr. Samuel Blake is, as well as his brother, a man of superior talent, and we need not be surprised to find the Hon. Samuel Blake speaking in that way. Now, Sir, what does the Minister of the Interior do with this man Preston? When Canada gets too hot for him, when they don't want to have him here where we could examine him, and ask him some questions about this machine, the Minister says to him: "Here, I will make a position for you, I will make you inspector of agencies, and I will send you to England and to Europe, to go everywhere at the country's expense, and you can pocket the \$3,000." Sir, I say that, in the sum of discreditable transactions that this Government has perpetrated, this employment of Sifton and sending him over there—

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Of who?

Mr. DAVIN. Well, of Preston. However, they are arcades ambo. This employment of Preston is one of the worst; and the hon. gentleman's excuse that, owing to the position that Preston had filled in the past, he knew all about immigration. Why, it is lameness itself; and I do not think that this committee or this country will acquit the Minister of the Interior of this last foolish, this last wicked act that he has perpetrated in sending Preston over to Europe to fill a purely contrived position, at a salary of \$3,000 a year and his expenses.

Mr. BRITTON. I do not, of course, appear as the apologist of Mr. Preston, I do not hold any brief for him. But I want to call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman has made an attack upon Mr. Preston and charged him with all sorts of things, and in answer to my request that he should name what he did at West Elgin, he has failed to name a single thing he did there. He has picked up what newspapers have said about him, and has quoted a telegram that Mr. Preston himself sent to somebody in West Elgin, I think it was to the

Mr. DAVIN.

Liberal candidate. The hon. gentleman puts that forward as a reason for attacking in this House, a man against whom no one has been able to specify any particular thing that he did in West Elgin. We know what has been said in reference to West Elgin and in reference to Brockville, and we know that newspapers, and individuals in the House and out of it, have seized upon certain matters and attempted to prejudge the case, without a particle of evidence.

Mr. BENNETT. It is refreshing to hear the member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) stand up here and, while not trying to palliate the conduct of Mr. Preston and the gang with whom he has been associated in the province of Ontario, he endeavours at least to break his fall a little. Now what has been the history of the past six months in the election contests in the province of Ontario? Starting off from one riding to another, we have seen the gang move about under the direction of this same Mr. Preston, and the climax of all the wrongdoing was brought about in the riding of West Elgin. Now what was the result? A day was fixed for the trial, and efforts were made on behalf of the Liberal party to have a settlement arrived at, and at the last moment, when the Liberal party in that riding were afraid to go into court, the candidate Mr. McNish signed a document that I am bound to say the history of no country—

Mr. BRITTON. Now is it fair to bring that into this question about immigration?

Mr. COCHRANE. What have you been doing?

Mr. BRITTON. I asked the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), before he attacked Mr. Preston, to specify his charges, that is all. In answer to that, the hon. gentleman failed to do that, and I simply called the attention of the committee to the fact that he had failed to do it. Then, my hon. friend is going into something that may have been said about some local elections.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) will allow me to proceed, I was referring to this document that was signed by Mr. McNish. What was the nature of it? What does he state publicly as to that election? He says:

That a large number of persons were specially sent into the constituency by men working on behalf of the Liberal party for the express purpose of taking part, on Mr. McNish's behalf, in the election held January 12th, 1899; and we believe that fraudulent and corrupt means were used by some of such persons to secure his election.

Then, in the following paragraphs, Mr. McNish says:

That in many of the polling subdivisions of the riding there were grave irregularities connected with the return of the ballot-boxes.

And so on. I might go on and illustrate all the irregularities that were carried on in that riding. Who conducted this election? who carried it on?

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. Is this discussion in order? Does it refer to the item before us or not? If not, we want it shut off, that we may be allowed to go on with the business. If it is in order, let it be known, and let it go on.

Mr. COCHRANE. Order, order.

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). I am in perfect order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). The item under discussion is for immigration, as follows:—

Salaries of agents and employees in Canada, Great Britain and foreign countries ..... \$100,000

While I think that it may be permissible to discuss the position of Mr. Preston, as he is an immigration agent in the old country, still I certainly think that anything connected with the local election, either in West Elgin or anywhere else, does not come under this item.

Mr. BENNETT. As I understand it, the hon. Minister stated a little time ago that one of the officials in the employ of the Dominion Government was Mr. W. T. R. Preston. In a few moments I will be able to show to the committee that Mr. McNish, in his sworn testimony, made a statement as to the manner in which that election was carried on, and in that examination this same Mr. McNish swears that Mr. W. T. R. Preston was introduced to him in St. Thomas, and that he was there throughout the whole of the campaign. Will the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) deny that?

Mr. BRITTON. I do not remember it; I cannot deny it.

Mr. BENNETT. What does it go to show? If Mr. McNish's evidence is to be taken for aught—and I presume it is to be, because, although all the villainies were conducted and carried on in that riding, I venture to say that no one will suggest that Mr. McNish's sworn testimony is not entitled to credence. Mr. McNish was examined in connection with the petition, for the purpose of discovery, before the trial, and he admitted there that he knew Mr. Preston, that Mr. Preston was in that fight, and that Mr. Preston was practically given control of the campaign. What further was proved? It was proved that all these irregularities were conducted and carried on by men who were under the control of Preston. Now, it comes down to this: If Preston is a gentleman of this style and stamp, then I say that it is utterly unworthy of Canada that it should continue to retain a man of that

stamp in its employ. Preston has been assailed in the Toronto "World," and in every public newspaper in Canada. Where is Preston to-day? At a very respectable distance. He is threatening actions, but he does not come over to this country and proceed with actions against the editors and proprietors of any of these newspapers. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) knows what any legal adviser does under such circumstances. If a man came to his office, and asked his advice as counsel, and that man assured him that he had been slandered, or that he had been libelled in the public press, the hon. gentleman would not threaten an action, but he would proceed with an action. Preston does not proceed with an action. Although he claims to be an innocent man and injured man, and although the hon. Minister of the Interior thinks he is an injured and innocent man, it remains to be seen, before this item goes through, whether hon. gentlemen think he is that stamp of a man whose services should be dispensed with. What did we see in this House a few years ago? When clerks were charged with claiming money for overtime and work done in the different departments, their cases were investigated by a committee of this House, and the hon. gentleman who to-day sit on the right, were the loudest in their denunciation of some poor official who had perhaps obtained a few dollars for work that he had done, but which he could not properly receive, and which should not have been paid to him. These hon. gentlemen, though loud in their denunciations, will vote to continue in the employ of the public of Canada this Mr. Preston, who, if he to-day were in this country, would be with Cahill, and Bole, and those other men who are now facing criminal prosecutions. Yet this man is retained in the public service. I say it would have been proper for the Government to have dispensed with his services until an investigation was had, and until it was shown whether Mr. Preston was the innocent man he claimed to be; and it was due to Mr. Preston himself, if they thought he was the innocent man that he professed to be, that there should have been an inquiry made in the courts into his conduct. I do not think that honest Liberals in the country are in favour of keeping men of the sort of Mr. Preston in the employ of the Government, and, in order to test the feeling of this committee as to whether or not Mr. Preston's services should be longer retained, I beg to move:

That the services of Mr. W. T. R. Preston should, in the opinion of this House, be dispensed with, and that item 92 be reduced by \$3,000 and expenses.

Mr. WALLACE. I think there should be no dissenting voice to the adoption of that resolution. I am aware that the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), who sees a

judgeship dangling up in the air, just a little beyond his reach, may, in his anxiety for the judgeship, vote that black is white and that white is black, or anything that may be required of him, and that the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) will follow suit. He is ready for any job of this character that may be required of him.

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) mentioned the hon. member for East Huron. Would he be kind enough to repeat what he said, as I did not understand him?

Mr. WALLACE. I said the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) seems to view the matter in the same light as the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), and is ready to vote with marked alacrity—

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). How do you know that?

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), in the innocence of his heart, asks: What has Preston done? Why, every newspaper in this country is ringing with denunciations of Preston for his conduct in the West Elgin election. But you do not need to confine it to West Elgin; go to Lennox, go to Northumberland, go all over the country, and you find the same machine at work and the same nefarious transactions perpetrated, and yet they are condoned by the hon. member for Kingston. I will tell him what Preston has done. Preston wrote this telegram, dated Toronto, January 12th, 1899, to Donald McNish, St. Thomas:

Heartiest congratulations. Sorry to the bottom of my heart cannot be with you to-night. To be supported by such a noble army of workers should make you the proudest man in Ontario.

Who brought this noble army of workers to West Elgin?—W. T. R. Preston, or those behind him did. Those who are higher in position than Preston used him as a tool to bring those men into West Elgin. Such a noble army of workers! What does Donald McNish say about it? Over his own signature, written by himself, he has made the blackest confession ever made by a public man in Canada, and he has pronounced guilty Mr. W. T. R. Preston and the noble army of workers he brought into that riding. Mr. McNish was the Liberal candidate of the Liberal party in the county of West Elgin. He says he had no knowledge of wrong-doing but since the election it had come to his knowledge, and here is his statement that he presented to the judges in open court:

1. That a large number of persons were specially sent into the constituency by men working on behalf of the Liberal party for the express purpose of taking part, on Mr. McNish's behalf, in the election held January 12th, 1899, and we believe that fraudulent and corrupt means were used by some of such persons to secure his election.

Mr. WALLACE.

The member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) has read that statement time and again, and yet with his assumption of innocence, he gets up in this House and he wants to know what Preston has done. Does he think the people of Canada are fools, and that they do not know what has transpired in the West Elgin election? And who were these corrupt means used by? They were used by the persons that Mr. Manager Preston of the whole concern, Mr. organizer, schemer, planner, Preston, brought into the riding. What else did the noble army do, according to that prominent Liberal, Mr. McNish:

2. That several of the said persons illegally and without authority acted as deputy returning officers at the said election,—

The noble army of workers again!

2. That several of the said persons illegally and without authority acted as deputy returning officers at the said election, and in at least three cases so acted in the names of reputable local men, having, under assumed names, been introduced to the returning officer by local agents of Mr. McNish.

Another specimen of the work of the noble army under the manipulation and management of Mr. Preston. Mr. McNish says that these things were done without his knowledge, but they were not done without the knowledge of Mr. W. T. R. Preston.

3. That in many of the polling subdivisions of the riding there were grave irregularities connected with the return of ballot-boxes and their contents, the voting, and the counting of the ballots thereat.

Did these men drop down from Heaven?

An hon. MEMBER. Not much.

Mr. WALLACE. Did they come into that constituency of their own accord, or were they not brought in by somebody, who knew the scallawags from London, from Brantford from Nipissing, from Sault Ste. Marie, and from all over this country. W. T. R. Preston knew them. W. T. R. Preston had been in company with them in other ridings, and he marshalled them and manipulated them and got them to do his nefarious work. And yet, Sir, this patriarchal Santa Claus gets up in this House and asks in his innocence what did W. T. R. Preston do?

Mr. BRITTON. That is nice parliamentary language.

Mr. WALLACE. Is there any one in this country to-day who does not know the history of this nefarious transaction, and yet we are asked by the hon. member for Kingston—

Mr. BRITTON. Use your own words again like a good man; the patriarchal Santa Claus. Please use that phrase again. It is nice language for a man who sets himself up as the leader of a great party.

Mr. WALLACE. I have no desire to be personally offensive.

Mr. BRITTON. You succeeded admirably.

Mr. WALLACE. I withdraw any expression that may be offensive to the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), but it just struck my mind, when there was such an appearance of innocence, that it did not come with good grace from a man with gray hairs in this House. Sir, this statement of Mr. McNish makes a confession of the greatest villainies that have ever been discovered in an election trial in the history of this country. The judges have declared so, and yet these gentlemen opposite pretend to be innocent of any wrong-doing by Mr. W. T. R. Preston.

That there were a large number of ballots cast of Mr. McDiarmid in some nefarious and corrupt manner manipulated.

Who manipulated them? It was the noble army of workers who endeavoured to destroy the sacredness of the ballot in this country.

4. That there were large numbers of persons brought into the riding for the express purpose of personating legitimate voters, and, assisted by some of Mr. McNish's local supporters, such persons did personate qualified voters in voting for Mr. McNish.

5. That the declared number of votes for Mr. McNish largely exceeded the number of bona fide votes cast for him.

6. That a large number of ballots cast for Mr. McDiarmid were in some nefarious and corrupt manner manipulated, whereby the result of the election was rendered doubtful, and that in this connection the voting at Shedden and Middlemarch, and in several divisions in St. Thomas, where said strangers so acted as deputy returning officers, merits special mention.

These workers were brought into that riding by somebody. Was it by Mr. Hardy or was it by any other member of the local government, or was it by their organizer and manager, Mr. W. T. R. Preston, whom this Government has delighted to honour by placing him in a position for which his training or his qualifications never fitted him.

Mr. W. T. R. Preston, Sir, came down to this Government and put a pistol to their head. It was not a case of asking Mr. Preston to accept this position, as the Minister of the Interior tells us. Does anybody believe it? We may be bound to believe it by the rules of Parliament; but we know that positions of that kind do not go begging. We know that if the department wanted a man, they could easily have secured hundreds of competent and capable men in whom the people of the country would have confidence. Why did they select a scallawag and scoundrel of this character? Because, Sir, he compelled them to select it by the rules of Parliament; but we know their secrets; he knew that what he had done for the local government he had done for the Dominion Government as well. That was the secret of it. Did he confine all his rascality and his villainy to acts for the local government? No, Sir, not a bit

of it. The man who did that work for the local government was doing equally villainous work for his other employers; and we shall get the disclosures, as we shall in the other cases. Though attempts have been made from day to day to burk investigation, those attempts shall surely utterly fall. Those who are making them are being watched day by day, because the people of this country are not going to submit to any humbug of that kind, but are going to have a thorough investigation of all these matters. They will find that Mr. W. T. R. Preston, who committed such infamous acts on behalf of the Ontario Government was quite as willing to perform the same acts of infamy for his other employers. That is the reason Mr. Preston came down here and was asked by the Minister of the Interior if he would be so kind and condescending as to accept a position in Europe at \$3,000 a year, with unlimited expenses, travelling where and how he pleased, and doing what he pleased when he got there; and he has done it. He has gone off. It was necessary, Sir, that he should leave this country. The trials were being held, the investigations were being made, and it was absolutely necessary for the safety of Mr. Preston, and the safety of his employers as well, that he should get out of this country; and out of it he had to go. Under what better conditions could he go than with \$3,000 a year and unlimited funds for expenses, with the privilege of travelling when and where he pleased? He was not confined to any specific duties. The Minister of the Interior tells us that he was to be inspector of all the agencies. He was to lord it over Mr. Devlin, who was at one time a member of this House of Commons, and over those who had years of experience and training and fitness for the position. But Mr. W. T. R. Preston was not sent there for any such purpose. That was only the pretense. He was sent there for the reasons I have stated—reasons which I am afraid will prevent the Government from accepting the resolution proposed by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). What is that resolution? That the Estimates for immigration be cut down by the amount of Mr. Preston's salary and expenses. Suppose the Government acquiesce in that resolution, and say that they think Mr. Preston should be dismissed from the public service—a man who, from his record, from the admissions of Mr. McNish, his friend, and from the knowledge which the whole public have of him should be dismissed from the public service without an hour's delay. Suppose they did, and suppose Mr. Preston said: "Well, if you do that, I will peach on you; I will let out what I know." Then, where would the Government be? Where would the Government of Ontario be if they permitted that? Where would the Government of the Dominion be? Just im-

agine the dismay that there would be in the Cabinet and in the ranks of the ministerialists. They would say: "Mr. Preston is going to tell the whole story of his connection with all these frauds and rascalities;" and Mr. Preston, I am quite sure, would be quite equal to the job, if the Government would dare to dismiss him. Nobody knows it better than Mr. Preston, and nobody knows it better than the Government. They are not going to dismiss him, because they dare not do it; that is the explanation. They find themselves today between the devil and the deep sea. If they dismissed Mr. Preston they would have exposures from him which would wreck the Government. If they do not dismiss Mr. Preston, they will have the condemnation of every honest man in this country, be he Grit or Tory, who wants to see this country governed honestly, fairly and well, no matter who has the reins of power. Therefore, I presume that Mr. Preston, notwithstanding the resolution of the hon. member for East Simcoe, is quite safe. He will not be interfered with; the Government dare not interfere with him, notwithstanding the condemnation of such men as Mr. Sam. Blake, who was never known before, to my knowledge, to utter a word in condemnation of the acts of the Liberal party, but who has been a thick-and-thin supporter of that party, failing to condemn them for acts for which other men condemned them. But the last straw has broken the camel's back. Mr. Blake refuses to condone these acts, and he says that Mr. Preston should be dismissed as fast as the Minister of the Interior can write out his dismissal. But the Minister of the Interior is not going to perform such an act. He could not think of doing it; and Mr. Preston will go on drawing his \$3,000 a year and travelling all over the countries of Europe wherever he chooses, and disgracing the Dominion of Canada so long as he holds any office under this Government. Hon. gentlemen opposite think it is a great joke; but the people of the country will view it otherwise. They will say that a Government who are afraid to punish an officer who does wrong or to investigate his conduct, just as they have been afraid to investigate the Yukon affairs, is not entitled to the confidence of the people of this country, and the moment the people get the opportunity to pronounce their condemnation, they will not be slow to relegate them to the cool shades of Opposition.

**THE MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** A gentleman who has made the statements and insinuations which have been made by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, with no evidence whatever to support them, will not be expected to be repelled to in the ordinary way of gentlemen engaged in debate. The hon. gentleman's

Mr. WALLACE.

statements and insinuations are of such a character that the only conclusion which any person listening to him can arrive at is that he is quite oblivious to the necessity of substantiating his statements by any facts. I want to say, in the first place, that Mr. Preston's appointment was made precisely for the reason I gave when I was asked by some members of the committee. For the last two years the High Commissioner, Lord Strathcona, has been pressing upon me the necessity of appointing an officer to do this work. Members of the committee will probably be aware that he has not gone there to take charge of an office which is not organized and in which there are no officials at the present time. The work is thoroughly systematized and Mr. Preston will carry on the system, making such improvements as suggest themselves to him, from time to time. I believe him to be a capable man for the position.

But that is a different question from the one hon. gentlemen opposite have raised, and that is the question of his connection with the West Elgin election trial. I desire to say for myself and my colleagues that we have nothing to say in explanation or extenuation of any frauds alleged or admitted. We do not in the slightest degree condone what is alleged to have taken place in that election, and I desire to be freely understood as not presenting in any sense at all the argument that two blacks make a white or that any wrong-doing on the part of one condones wrong-doing on the part of another. But what I say is this, that Mr. Preston was appointed to the service at a time when nothing was known with regard to the West Elgin election, and the hon. member for West Assinibola (Mr. Davin) loses all control of his imagination when he intimates that Mr. Preston's appointment was due to his connection with that election. In so intimating, he shows that the chronology of events has passed completely out of his mind. Mr. Preston was appointed before anything was said about the West Elgin election whatever, or before anything occurred to indicate that Mr. Preston had anything whatever to do with any impropriety committed at that election. The question is not whether the Government are to blame for having appointed a man who was charged with corrupt practices in an election, because there was no charge against Mr. Preston at the time he was appointed. But the question is whether the Government is to blame for not having dispensed with his services since. Well, all I can say is that when anything is proved against Mr. Preston, when it is shown that he has been guilty of any misconduct which renders him unworthy to be in the service of the Government, then the Government will dismiss but not until then. This Government is not going to dismiss any public servant because he happens to be abused by the Tory party. Something else will have to happen besides

his being slandered in the "Mail and Empire"—I myself have endured that kind of thing with considerable equanimity for a considerable length of time—before this Government will dismiss any man which it considers fit for the office to which he was appointed.

I am somewhat surprised at hon. gentlemen opposite. Their awakening in connection with election frauds seems to have come a little too late. What have we had for the last year? We have had the entire Conservative party and press hounding me, and for what reason? Because when Attorney General of Manitoba I asked that the public money of the Dominion of Canada should be spent in order to send to the penitentiary a man who had been guilty of systematically stuffing ballot-boxes. We have seen the time in this House taken up, day after day and hour after hour, with heaping abuse upon my head because I desired, in my capacity as law officer of the Manitoba Government, to send to penitentiary, not a man merely charged in a newspaper with having committed an offence, but a man who was charged in the criminal dock before the courts and ultimately convicted and sent to jail. They could not say anything too violent and too abusive about me because I initiated the proceedings which resulted in the conviction of the criminal.

These gentlemen now so anxious for the purity and good conduct of election proceedings, and who cannot say anything too high-flown about the good name and the fair fame of Canada, could not abuse me too strongly a couple of months ago because I desired that the public money of Canada should be used for the purpose of convicting a criminal. I say that the awakening of the great Conservative party on the subject of election purity comes a little late. Why, they are pastmasters in the arts of corruption. Do not we all remember the by-elections of 1891, when these hon. gentlemen put a gang of pluggers and ballot-box stuffers and ballot stealers from one end of the constituencies to the other and carried the elections by bribery and corruption of all kinds. Is it not notorious that not only did they do that and do it constantly, but they came into this House and by the force of their majority did what is just as bad—stole the seats to which the Liberals were honestly entitled.

Mr. HUGHES. Might I interrupt to ask how many Liberals were unseated, after the elections of 1891 and how many Conservatives?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not time to go into the arithmetic of the question, but the hon. gentleman knows that my statement is true and it is for that reason he stood up to interrupt me. I say that this awakening of these hon. gentlemen on a question of electoral purity comes a little too late. What I have to say now is

simply this, that so far as this Government is concerned, we have a record of which we need not be ashamed. When the Liberal party in this House asked, time and again, that an investigation should be held, when they charged that they had not received fair-play at the hands of the election officers and asked for a proper investigation before a committee, they were refused, the majority of hon. gentlemen opposite voted down the resolution. We had a similar motion made the other day. One of the hon. members for Halifax (Mr. Borden) asked for an investigation, and my right hon. friend the leader of the Government, without waiting a moment for a consultation, said he would grant that investigation, and it is now going on. The statement has been made that an attempt is being made to burk that investigation. I say that a fairer, freer, more complete investigation was never known in any Parliament. These gentlemen have been permitted to call evidence that never was admitted before in any similar investigation. The legal rules of evidence have been swept to one side. We have allowed hon. gentlemen to pass in a list of names, without even telling us what the men on that list were expected to swear to. Witnesses have been summoned who never had anything to do with the election. The committee have permitted men to be called and asked how they voted, and all and every kind of evidence to be given for the purpose of having a full and thorough investigation. Yet in the face of the fact that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister consented to that investigation immediately upon the motion being made, and in face of the fact that the committee has not sought, in the slightest way, to restrict or narrow the investigation and has given every reasonable facility, we are met with the charge that we are burking that inquiry. Such a charge simply shows that these hon. gentlemen have not the first conception of fair-play and honour and do not know when they are generously treated. I have nothing to say in extenuation of any wrong-doing at the West Elgin election. I have no reason to defend Mr. Preston or any other man, except in so far as he is entitled, as an officer of my department, to receive that fair-play and protection which every Minister is bound in practice to see that his officers get and which it is my duty, as head of the department in which Mr. Preston is employed, to see that he gets, but as soon as he is found guilty of any wrong-doing, which renders him unfit for the service, his employment in the department from that moment will cease. But again I say that I want my hon. friends opposite to understand that there are not enough Tories in Canada to get that gentleman dismissed without anything being proved against him.

Mr. BENNETT. Fully conscious of the fact that it would elicit a response from those behind him, the hon. Minister has

made the pleasurable announcement that no official would be dismissed on account of the complaints of the Tories. That pleases the hon. gentlemen behind. It is an incentive to them to follow on in the hope that they too may get positions, and they may, if the positions are not all taken up by the Minister's relatives. The hon. Minister indulged in a great deal of desk-slamming, a great deal of noise, and declared that from one end of the Dominion to the other, after the election of 1891, there were charges against the Tories that they could not possibly reply to, of ballot-stuffing and fraud of every kind in connection with the elections. I tell the hon. Minister that that is not the case and I dare him to name a case such as he speaks of after 1891; and I will sit down and give him a chance to speak. Why, it is the old story of bluff and bluster on the part of the Minister; and when he tells us that there are not enough Tories to frighten him out of his position, let me tell him that we need not depend upon the Tories to turn him out of his position. We know that they will assist and gladly; but it is to the great body of honest Liberals in the country, the men who are disgusted with the gang that sit to the right of the Speaker that we make our appeal. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) does not smile at the rebuff his party got in Prince Edward Island yesterday, where they lost a seat, notwithstanding that their candidate had the influence of two Governments in his favour. The Minister does not smile at that because he sees the handwriting on the wall. And as for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), I suppose he feels that the wave will sweep from one province to the other. Now, the question before this committee is not one of bluff and bluster; the question is whether or not this man should be retained in the service of the Dominion of Canada. And what proposition does the Minister of the Interior lay down? He lays down the proposition that until some person shows that a public official is guilty of wrong-doing, the service of that official will be retained. Has it come to this, that a public official in this country can do as he pleases? Has it come to this, that a public official may have a reputation of the blackest kind, and yet, because no private party will prosecute and cause an exposure of his wrong-doing, the Government will condone it all. He says: I do not care what Preston has done; I care not whether Preston is the biggest ruffian and scoundrel in the country; I care not what charges are laid to his door, until some party proves it all there will be no interference with him on the part of the Government. I contend that it is the duty of the Minister, now that the case has been made out against Mr. Preston, of complicity in the West Elgin frauds, to inquire into the matter. Either Mr. Preston has been libelled or the truth has been spoken about him in the press. The Toronto "World," and other papers, have invited him

Mr. BENNETT.

to bring on his libel action. The hon. Minister has—

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) permit me? Mr. Preston has written a letter to the Toronto "Mail and Empire," I think, in which he has challenged proof of any impropriety on his part; and he has notified the Prime Minister that he positively denies the statements made with regard to him, and he has instructed his solicitor to take action for libel. The hon. gentleman said in his former remarks that Mr. Preston was not proceeding with the action. I venture to say the hon. gentleman will not say that he has information that Mr. Preston is not prosecuting the action in the proper way. There has not been time enough for him to be guilty of any neglect or delay so far, because communication would have to take place by letter, so that he and his solicitor should reach an understanding as to what is to be done. There must be, therefore, a certain delay. But, if Mr. Preston, after stating to the Government that he has instructed proceedings to be taken, fails to prosecute his case, I am prepared to say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) will have ground to find fault, unless we demand explanation.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, the hon. Minister has laid down the startling proposition that if a newspaper has made slanderous statements against a man in any capacity in life, it is not the duty of the man to bring an action, but it is the duty of the newspaper to prove the truth of what it said.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not say that, the hon. gentleman is mistaken. I say that Mr. Preston has written this letter notifying the Prime Minister that he denied the statements made against him and had instructed action to be taken. I did not say it was the duty of the newspaper to prove its statements. Under the circumstances, which are somewhat peculiar it is Mr. Preston's duty to vindicate himself; and he tells us he has taken the only steps open to him for that purpose. And I say that the time has not elapsed within which the hon. gentleman can say that Mr. Preston has been guilty of any neglect. When he has been guilty of any neglect, it is time to find fault.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. Minister laid down the proposition quite plainly that it was the duty of the newspaper to go on and prove its statements. Now, here is the position: Mr. Preston started off with a threat of instituting a suit of criminal libel, knowing full well that when he was not in the country, such an action would not lie. But, if he has an action against these newspapers—and he certainly has if the statements published are not true—he is not doing what an aggrieved and innocent man would do in staying on the other side; but he should commence action

by coming himself, or having a writ issued against the Toronto "World" and other newspapers, that he has not done up to the present time. The hon. Minister goes on and talks about West Huron and about the investigation taking place in another part of the House. He says there never was such an impartial tribunal. Does he not know that his own chairman told Mr. Russell that he was practically killing time in that committee? Why, it is apparent to any man who has visited that committee, that for days and days the prayer has been going up from hon. gentlemen on that side that prorogation may be reached before the conclusion of that inquiry. Now, there is a motion before the committee that the services of Mr. Preston should be dispensed with. It remains to be seen whether or not hon. gentlemen on your right, Mr. Chairman, believe that Mr. Preston's services should be retained. For the purpose of testing that and seeing whether there is any feeling of fair play in this assembly, and to give hon. gentlemen an opportunity to declare that this gentleman's services should be dispensed with until his reputation and character are clear. I make this motion now before the Chair.

Mr. DAVIN. Will the hon. Minister tell us the date of Preston's appointment?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The 30th of January last.

Mr. DAVIN. Has the Minister caused him to be written to saying that he would be called upon for an explanation?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He has telegraphed the First Minister voluntarily.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, what was the tenor of it?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The telegram I have not got here, but it was briefly to this effect: that he denied the statement which was made with regard to his character, and that he had instructed legal action to be taken.

Mr. GUILLET. I have had some experience of Preston's conduct, and I desire to say a word or two which probably some hon. members opposite would prefer not to hear. They will not be disposed to laugh after I have related some of his doings in my county in 1892. He came down there as an organizer of a gang of ruffians to do the desperate work he had done in other counties all over this province. It was an extraordinary thing, under the circumstances, that he was retired from the position of librarian in the Ontario House, and for what purpose? Surely, there were other Liberal organizers for the Reform party; there was Mr. Smith still living; there was Mr. Pedley still available, and Mr. Dawson was still moving about the country. But

they wanted a man who knew how to manipulate this gang of ruffians, and he was the man who had originated the gang, and who had the confidence of these desperadoes throughout the country; and the Liberal leaders knew that they would come at his call, just as Robin Hood's men sprung up from the earth at his call. They knew that these men would spring up in that riding on the morning of polling day. But Robin Hood's men were gentlemen, compared to these ruffians. They fought in a chivalrous cause, in the defence of the weak and oppressed. I want to point out that in 1892 Mr. Smith was in that county when the election was being held in which I was a candidate; Mr. Pedley was there also, addressing meetings, and Mr. Preston appeared on the scene at the last minute, followed on the morning of election day by this gang of ruffians, for the purpose of personating. He distributed them all over the riding, and they were known as the horseshoe brigade. Each one had a horseshoe pin attached to his scarf, and they were recognized by the scrutineers of the Liberal party in the polling booth by this horseshoe pin, when they came to personate the men whose names were given them by the Liberal scrutineers. The whole thing was denounced by respectable Reformers. It was well known that Preston was the organizer and manager of that gang. Now, it is significant that he was retired at a time when the fate of the local government hung in the balance, and when it was necessary that desperate work should be done by somebody, and nobody else was available. There were no other organizers of the Reform party who could handle this gang, and he was induced by some means to retire from the valuable position of librarian, which gave him a salary with which he could live in comfort, and he was given the charge of this gang of desperadoes, with a prospect of getting a more valuable position and a larger salary, if he did his work successfully. In fact, before his work was quite completed, he was appointed to this position. The circumstances are all suspicious, and they show that hon. gentlemen opposite, in spite of their affected simplicity and innocence, knew very well who the man was, and what kind of work he had been doing in the province of Ontario for ten years, and that was just such work as he has been recently doing in West Huron and Brockville.

Mr. DAVIN. I want to call the attention of the committee to certain dates. On the 13th of January Mr. Preston was appointed, and on the 12th of January he sent this telegram to Mr. McNish:

Toronto, January 12, '99.

Donald McNish, St. Thomas.

Heartiest congratulations. Sorry to the bottom of my heart I cannot be with you to-night. To be supported by such a noble army of work-

ers should make you the proudest man in Ontario. Shake hands with the boys for me, and hug the members of the much-abused threshing machine for "auld lang syne."

PRESTON.

I see my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine) cheering loudly at that. I suppose he has a vision of the subsidy that will be down to-morrow for his railway. The Minister of the Interior has to admit that the conduct of this man is such that he has to say to the committee that if it be proved to him that he has been guilty of such conduct, then he will call him to account; he does not say that he will dismiss him, but he says that he will have an explanation. Now, Mr. Chairman, the question is, whether this committee knows enough of Preston in this matter to make it incumbent upon us to say that the Minister is already seized of enough concerning him to relieve the people of Canada of the disgrace of having him in so high a position, with \$3,000 a year and travelling expenses. We have the fact that, after contributing to the defeat of the Conservative party in one of the most corrupt elections that ever took place in Ontario, the very next day he is given an appointment by the Minister of the Interior. Sir, is it not a very extraordinary thing that it should be the very next day after he writes that letter? I say the inference is not a forced one, that Preston was in communication with some one connected with the Government, who told them what had taken place, and told them that undoubtedly there would be an inquiry, and the sooner he was got out of the country, the better. I say that is a fair inference. Now, the Minister of the Interior flaunts the virtue of the Liberal party before us, and declares that our zeal for purity is new-found. Why, Sir, the records of the courts of this country show that—

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They show that I had to send a couple of the hon. gentleman's political friends to the penitentiary.

Mr. DAVIN. Does the hon. gentleman refer to the Portage la Prairie trial?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I allude, for one, to Mr. Charles Chamberlain, and if the hon. gentleman does not know who he is, I think the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) can tell him all about him.

Mr. DAVIN. I know it was one of his own friends that was convicted at Portage la Prairie. Now, the Minister says that he has been hounded by the Tory party because he prosecuted these cases at Portage la Prairie. Not at all. The Tory party have not complained that any persons charged with crime should be prosecuted.

Mr. DAVIN.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Tory party found a great deal of fault with me for prosecuting them.

Mr. DAVIN. Not for prosecuting them, but for the way that the hon. gentleman did it. It was for putting his hands improperly into the treasury of the Dominion.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The way I did it was to convict them and that is what the hon. gentleman objects to.

Mr. DAVIN. No, no; what was objected to was that the Attorney General of the province put his hand improperly into the treasury of the Dominion of Canada, and he has not been able to account for thousands of dollars which are unaccounted for to this day. The hon. gentleman had great temerity to refer to that because he is not in a very innocent position in regard to it before the people of Canada. What we are concerned with now is the case of Preston, as to whether a man who has been the organizer, and who has been, it has been admitted, a corrupt organizer, who has been guilty of practices such as my hon. friend behind me has described—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Admitted by whom?

Mr. DAVIN. By himself; take this letter that I have read. The hon. Minister of Railways was not in when I read what the Hon. Samuel Blake said about this man. Samuel Blake said that if he occupied the position of Minister, the head of Preston would fall precious quick. The hon. Minister of Railways was not in when I read that, and that is the language of a man who is not merely a strong Liberal, but who has been, in the past, an eminent judge, and who is an eminent lawyer. What he says is, therefore, that there is proof enough of the misconduct of Preston to cause his head to fall. I hope, notwithstanding some of those interested cheers we have listened to, that there will be found, in the committee, some Liberals who will—

An hon. MEMBER. You will be deceived.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend need not imagine that he represents all the Liberalism in Canada, because I think he does not. We had a sample, a few days ago, of independent Liberalism when we saw three Liberals vote against the Government of Canada. Why should we not expect more than three gentlemen to vote against the Government now, because the Government to-day are not in the position they were in four or five days ago. They are not in the position they were in four or five weeks ago, because, in the last four or five weeks they have been going down the slide on the run, and no Government in Canada have ever been so low in public estimation as

this Government are to-day. An examination of the records of a transaction like this, and their apparent recklessness in using public funds for political ends have produced such an effect upon the public mind that, in the public estimation, this Government have not a shred of character left. The people have lost all confidence in them.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman will find out differently in a little while.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman will find that out, that the people have lost all confidence in them since these revelations in West Elgin and these revelations elsewhere, and especially since what has been said in evidence in a place I cannot refer to here, but which the hon. gentleman has referred to and which the hon. gentleman has improperly described. I have been in committees of the House of Commons in England, and I have seen committees here: I am accustomed to attending courts, and I say that no such pettifogging attempts to burk an inquiry as those which have been made by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), and other members, to prevent the damning facts coming to light, that would show the people what are the means by which this Government have won election after election, since this country has been unhappy enough to have them at its head, have ever been witnessed before. That, within the last six or seven days, has so affected the public mind that the Government are shaking in their boots, and we will see, probably to-morrow, when these subsidies come down, how it is that desperate means have to be resorted to in order to get men to vote for the Government with a transaction like this before them.

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). I shall only discuss this matter briefly. I hope that this excitement will pass away, and that we will come down to the question of the resolution which was moved by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). He asks this House to decide upon the dismissal of an officer against whom there has not been a tittle of evidence adduced to show that he is guilty. In the statement made by Mr. McNish, Mr. McNish does not even hint that Preston did anything wrong. He says that he was in the riding during the election. Is it to be supposed that every man who was in the riding during the election was guilty of crime? If that is the only inference that is to be drawn, it is a poor one indeed. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Guillet) did not point to one single bit of evidence to show that Mr. Preston was guilty. He called them a crowd of hoodlums that went into this riding, but did he show that Mr. Preston

was the leader of the crowd, or that he was guilty of doing anything improper?

Mr. GUILLET. They came with him.

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). Suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guillet) was accused of any transaction that was wrong or criminal would he be satisfied to be condemned without having a trial to show that he was innocent? Mr. Preston writes to the Premier a letter in which he states that he is perfectly innocent of these charges that have been brought against him by the press of the country, and that he is prepared to take steps to vindicate his character from these accusations.

Mr. GUILLET. His uncle swore that he would not believe him on oath.

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). Mr. Preston has denied to the Premier that he was guilty of any wrong-doing charged against him, and he has taken the action necessary to prosecute those parties who have written against him in the papers. I ask any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, if it is not the duty of this committee and of every hon. member, to give Mr. Preston an opportunity before we judge him, to vindicate his character as he proposes to vindicate it. Would it be right and just, under the present circumstances, and with the present knowledge, for the committee to pass a resolution dismissing a man against whom there is not a scintilla of evidence that we can depend upon? I hold that Mr. Samuel Blake did not say that he would dismiss Preston unless Preston was guilty, and he is the very last man in this country that would say Preston was guilty until it was shown to be a fact, by sufficient evidence. I challenge the statement of the hon. gentleman who read Mr. Blake's statement to show that Mr. Blake meant that Mr. Preston and the other parties should be dismissed before they were proven to be guilty of the charges made against them. Did Mr. Blake say so? I ask the hon. gentleman, did Mr. Blake say that under the present conditions, without further evidence, he would cut off Preston's head, and the heads of the others, before it was satisfactorily shown to him that these parties were guilty? I think I am correct in saying that Mr. Blake is a man who would not condemn any person without sufficient evidence and therefore he would not say that he would condemn Preston without evidence. Mr. Blake is a man who would not condemn any one without evidence, and therefore we are safe in saying that he did not condemn Mr. Preston.

Mr. GUILLET. I wish to answer the question asked me by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; sit down.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. member for East Huron asked a question, and my hon. friend (Mr. Guillet) wishes to answer.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). Unless the hon. member (Mr. Macdonald) wishes to give way, the hon. member (Mr. Guillet) cannot interrupt.

Mr. WALLACE. He must expect to have his question answered.

Mr. GUILLET. I do not know what Mr. Blake says, except what I see in the public press, and it has been distinctly stated in the public press that Mr. Blake said that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What press?

Mr. GUILLET. In several of the journals in this country, and the Montreal "Witness" is one of them, and the Toronto "Mail" is another. They distinctly state that Mr. Blake said that if he had his way it would take him no longer than it took him to write their names, to have Mr. Preston and the others dismissed.

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). Sit down now. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guillet) were on his trial, would he be satisfied to be condemned by what the "Mail" or the "Empire," or the "Globe" said, or by what Mr. Samuel Blake or anybody else said? I do not think he would. If Mr. Preston can be shown to be guilty of the accusations brought against him, I would not defend him for a single moment or any person who acted with him in committing the irregularities and crimes in West Elgin or elsewhere. But there is not a single member here to-night who would in his heart condemn Mr. Preston merely on the statement made by the member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). Every one of these gentlemen opposite know that the evidence against Mr. Preston would not justify his being discharged from the public service.

Mr. McCLURE. I have no personal knowledge whatever of Mr. Preston or his methods, and I know very little about the West Elgin election or any Ontario election. For that reason I think I can look at the question dispassionately. I am afraid there has been a large amount of heat imported in this discussion which is not conducive to calm judgment, and as the last speaker (Mr. Macdonald) has said, it might be well for us to get down to facts and find what we have to vote for. I do not want to give a vote on this question that cannot be justified. I do not know how much or how little there may be in the charges made against Mr. Preston, and I am not going to decide this question upon the outside issues that have been dragged in here. I am not going to decide this question upon my convictions of what the Tory party has been in the past, nor upon the predictions of the hon. member (Mr. Davin) about what is going to happen in the future. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin)

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

is the last one who should talk to any members in this House about trembling in their shoes. He does not hold his own seat in this House by such a very secure and certain tenure that he can afford to fling stones at any one else. But what is the charge against Mr. Preston? Remember we are not trying the West Huron election case here, and I must deprecate very strongly the language that has been used in this House to-night in reference to that investigation. As one member of that committee, I shall not express any opinion upon it at the present time. I am prepared to express my judgment as an independent member of this House and to decide that case according to the evidence when it is heard, but so far as I am personally concerned any charge made in this House in reference to burking the investigation, is made without the slightest shadow of foundation. Now, what is the charge made against Mr. Preston? First, I am told that he has been a Liberal organizer. Is that a crime? If it is there are lots of criminals in this country. I have heard of the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) going about from one section of the country to the other, and I read in the press that when he visits a place he has appointed a Tory organizer in that district. Although perhaps from my knowledge of Tory methods I would not have a high opinion of a man appointed to that position, yet I will not condemn him because he is a Tory organizer. I endorse heartily the statement of the Minister of the Interior, and I will condemn no man because the Tory press says he is a scoundrel, nor will I condemn him because the Liberal press says he is a scoundrel. Unfortunately the press of this country does not possess that independence of spirit—I speak respectfully of the press—but unfortunately the press of this country is intensely partisan and it does not become any member of Parliament, or any man who desires to form a perfect judgment on any question, to be swayed too strongly by what is said in the press, especially it does not become him to condemn any man because that man is condemned by organs like the Toronto "Mail" or the Toronto "World," which long since parted with any character or reputation they ever had. But we are told that we have had the sworn statement of Mr. McNish read here to-night.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. McCLURE. Well, a statement under oath of some kind. Assuming it is true, I challenge any gentleman in this House to show me that the name of Mr. Preston is mentioned in that statement. We have nothing further than the fact that he was in the riding where this rascality went on. Well, some of these gentlemen opposite were in that riding, and surely we are not to condemn them because of that. Now, as to the language attributed to Mr. Blake. I am not here to-night to justify my conduct by what

Mr. Blake or any other man in Ontario says. Although my own judgment may not be as good as Mr. Sam. Blake's, it is the best I have got, and I will not take his judgment in preference to mine. Then we have the statement that the Tory press charges Mr. Preston with these crimes, but on the other hand Mr. Preston flatly denies them, and he takes the only course open to him and commences an action for libel. These gentlemen opposite cannot deny that Mr. Preston has commenced his action, and until he fails to press it, or does not succeed in it we have got to suspend our judgment. Some of these gentlemen opposite are lawyers, or they pretend to be lawyers in their way, and yet they would stand in this position that if a man has a charge made against him in the public press and he denies it, and brings an action for slander, then before that man has a chance of having his side of the case heard, they would say that he is guilty. Even though Mr. Preston be as bad as these gentlemen opposite say he is, I will give him the benefit of that sound principle of British law, and hold him innocent until he is proven guilty.

Mr. WALLACE. It has been stated in this House to-night that the Hon. Samuel Blake has made his statement with so many provisos that it was no condemnation of the acts of Mr. Preston. So I understood the statement of the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), among others. If the hon. gentleman had only read the statement of Mr. Blake, he would not have made that statement.

Mr. HEYD. What paper is it in ?

Mr. WALLACE. I am not quoting a paper. I am quoting Mr. Sam. Blake.

Mr. HEYD. Who prints it ?

Mr. WALLACE. It does not matter who prints it. Let somebody get up and deny that Mr. Blake made this statement. An hon. gentleman says that this paper is not entitled to any credence, because it is not a Liberal paper. I do not know whether the statement appeared in the Liberal journals of the country or not ; but it appeared in the Conservative and independent papers, and Mr. Blake has never denied it, though many days have elapsed since it appeared. Now, what is the statement. He said :

If I were in office, Preston's head, and all others who took part in these disgraceful acts, would fall just as quickly as I could write down their names on paper.

That is the statement ; there is no proviso about it.

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). I would just say in connection with that—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Chairman, I ask you to give me the rights of the floor. We

do not want any partisan chairmen in this House.

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). I was just going to interject a statement.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). Unless the hon. member who has the floor will give way, he cannot be interrupted.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Chairman, I would ask you to give me the floor.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw that expression, because it clearly implied the charge against the Chairman that he was a partisan chairman.

Mr. WALLACE. I had a right to the floor, I appealed to the Chairman to give it to me, and he did not move from his seat or take any steps to give me my right. I have no desire to say anything offensive to the Chairman, but I have certain rights in this House, and I am not going to permit any person who occupies the position of Chairman to deprive me of those rights. I say that the Hon. Samuel Blake, a prominent Liberal, one who has fought the battles of the Liberal party, and has condoned acts which many of us thought it strange that a man of his standing could justify, condemns an act which one gentleman after another on the Government side has to-night got up to justify ; and nobody with stronger or more vehement language than the Minister of the Interior. What does he say ? " No man will be dismissed because he is charged by the Tories." He says again : " There are not enough Tories in Canada to get that man dismissed." Well, Sir, we shall see whether there are enough Grits who will be able to retain him in office after the exposure that has been made. The hon. Minister of the Interior was forced to admit that Mr. Preston must clear himself. What steps has he taken to demand a justification from Mr. Preston ? Has he sent a cablegram to him saying : " Most serious charges have been made against you." Not a line ; he has done nothing. He said that Preston wrote or cabled back to the Premier ; but he did not do that until within the last few days, after the newspapers had gone over there with the report of the proceedings. Preston saw that report, and saw that his head was in danger, and, therefore, cabled to the Premier. Why did not the Minister of the Interior take some steps ? Why did he not cable to Preston : " Serious charges are made against your integrity, against your honour, against the fair fame of the Liberal party as conducted by you, and you will have either to resign your position at once or come across the Atlantic and face your accusers and defend yourself against the charges made." By whom were those charges made ? In the first instance, by the Conservative party, but, in the second instance, by Mr. Donald McNish, a Liberal member of Par-

liament, who was declared elected by the most atrocious acts ever disclosed in the political history of this country; and yet the Minister of the Interior gets up and says: "We will defy any Tories to have this man dismissed."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He did not say that. He said he would defy any Tories in Canada to have him dismissed without evidence.

Mr. WALLACE. He did not say anything of the kind. I took down his words, and he said: "There are not enough Tories in Canada to have that man dismissed."

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman will surely be fair enough to say that what the Minister of the Interior stated was that he would not dismiss him simply because he was charged.

Mr. WALLACE. I quoted his very words, which he repeated twice in his speech; it was the closing sentence of his speech. He stated also that he had sent to the penitentiary a couple of Tories who had done wrong in election trials in the North-west. What are the facts in connection with that? That the only man condemned in the North-west in connection with the election of 1896, and in connection with the expenditure of \$10,000, was one of his own political friends. There were no men sent to the penitentiary. The hon. gentleman referred to Mr. Chas. Chamberlain, whose offences, whatever they were, occurred in 1881, and he said that if the hon. member for West Assiniboia did not know who he was, he might refer to the member for West York. I would like to know what the hon. gentleman means by that insinuation? If he means to insinuate that I had any knowledge of any wrong-doing by Chas. Chamberlain, or any one else, I pronounce it a foul slander without any mitigation; I challenge him to produce a particle of proof of any wrong-doing of any kind connected with myself, or any improper connection with any man who has had wrong-doing charged against him. The hon. gentleman tells us that we stole seats in 1891, and went with a band of blackguards from one constituency after another throughout this country; and he was offensive enough to say to the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) that the reason he interrupted him was that he knew it was true.

Mr. HUGHES. I did not hear that.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) challenged him, and I repeat the challenge, to state one case of the kind he mentions in connection with the elections of 1891. I took an active part myself in connection with the by-elections that followed the elections of 1891. I was in several constituencies in the elections of 1891, and I can say that I knew of no single case of wrong-doing, but that the election was conducted as fairly and honestly as I ever

Mr. WALLACE.

knew an election to be conducted in this country. I say that the statement of the Minister of the Interior was a foul slander against the Conservative party, and I defy him to produce any proof of his statement. I challenge him to produce a particle of evidence to justify the statement he made that a party of personators and pluggers had gone there, in the interest of the Conservative party, in 1891.

What are the facts? They are, that the personators and pluggers had gone through this country in the year 1892, in the by-elections. There was a political organizer for the Liberal party, Mr. Alex. Smith. He was in the riding, and we will presume that he was doing his work honestly and fairly on behalf of the Liberal party; but the night before the election a gang of pluggers and personators came in on the same train with Mr. Preston, under his guidance and management, and spread themselves all over the riding.

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). That is not so.

Mr. WALLACE. Here is their scheme, as detailed by the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. Guillet), whose statement will be accepted where that of the hon. gentleman will be repudiated.

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). That is no proof.

Mr. WALLACE. I have known the hon. member for West Northumberland for nearly twenty years, and this is the first time any statement of his has been called in question, and it cannot be successfully called in question in this committee or out of it. According to that hon. gentleman, these pluggers are under the direction and management of Preston, and came into the riding with him. They wore a horseshoe pin in their necktie, so that the returning officer and Grit scrutineer would recognize them. The Grit scrutineer wore a certain badge, which was to disclose his identity.

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). How do you know that?

Mr. WALLACE. I am stating facts which were disclosed in court. Two men were arrested, and both jumped their bail, and cleared the country, and the trial became a farce through the manipulations of the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. The proof of this is, that the personators and the pluggers were in the Liberal party after the trial in 1892 of this same man. We talk about "Auld Lang Syne." Of course, he had been operating these rascalities for years. Do not we know his history? Do we not know that his uncle, John Rochester, who was a member of this House, swore that he would not believe him on oath in any business transaction? Do we not know that twelve good men and true pronounced him a rogue and a rascal? Do

we not know that is his whole record? Yet these gentlemen hug to their bosoms men of that character, and give them high offices.

The hon. Minister of the Interior also said that the present Tory majority voted down a resolution in this Parliament demanding an investigation into election frauds. They did not. They quoted the very words in an amendment that had been brought in by hon. gentlemen opposite in a similar case, a resolution that had been brought before this House by these hon. gentlemen themselves, and they could not find fault with that resolution, if they look back to their own records and votes.

The hon. gentleman said that, in the cases of West Huron and Brockville, we promptly gave the committee asked for. Yes, after the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) had proved to this House successfully that rascality had been perpetrated in the West riding of Huron, and that men had been robbed of their most sacred right, the right of voting by ballot and having his votes recorded. The hon. gentleman claims credit for a virtue his party do not possess. They dared not refuse the demand, because the cry would have gone forth that the West Huron election and the Yukon scandal the Government were afraid to investigate, implicating, as they did, three Cabinet Ministers and a whole herd of officials, who participated in the rascality, and public opinion had been so aroused that these hon. gentlemen dare not refuse the investigation. Yet they claim it as a virtue that they did not refuse an investigation into the West Huron election.

I can only repeat that Preston, not by hearsay, but by his own telegram, is shown to have taken a conspicuous part in this election. It is proved that he was the organizer who supplanted Mr. Smith, and took the control and management in his own hands. And we have the confession of Mr. McNish, which cannot be disputed, in which he admitted that there had been wrong-doing committed by his own party. Preston was the organizer; he took the management out of the hands of Mr. Alex. Smith.

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). How do you know?

Mr. WALLACE. I am stating facts, to which Mr. McNish swore in court.

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). He did not.

Mr. WALLACE. We have the evidence taken in the court, in which Mr. McNish said that Preston was the organizer. What does Preston's telegram mean? If it means anything, it means that he was in West Elgin, and had left in post haste for Ottawa to get the reward of his rascality. The whole facts are, that Mr. Preston was there; and as the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) knows as well as I do,

when Mr. Preston appears in a riding, he takes charge on behalf of the Liberal party.

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). He was never in my riding.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not say he was.

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). If he was not in my riding, how do I know whether he takes charge or not?

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. gentleman knows anything about it, he knows that what I say is correct; and if he knows nothing about it, he is talking and interrupting a great deal too much. I say Mr. Preston was the manager of the iniquities in West Elgin. Nobody has disputed that. He has claimed all the credit for it. He is the chief pusher, and wants to have his subordinates of the machine, the "much-abused threshing machine," hugged for him for the sake of Auld Lang Syne. And in many other places we have the same iniquities of the same gang, led by the same scoundrel, W. T. R. Preston.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) challenged the Minister of the Interior to show one case of corruption on the part of the Conservatives in the election of 1891 or any by-elections?

Mr. WALLACE. I read what the Minister said. He said that in the province of Ontario the Conservatives stole seats in 1891, and charged that a band of pluggers went from one constituency to another.

Mr. DAVIS. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) also said he defied the Minister of the Interior to prove one case of corruption on the part of the Conservatives in 1891 or any by-election.

Mr. WALLACE. I said nothing of the kind. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman. I read what the Minister had said and challenged him to give a single instance of the elections in 1891, or the by-elections of 1892 in the province of Ontario. I was not referring to the North-west; I do not know what occurred in the North-west.

Mr. DAVIS. I can certainly be allowed to understand a thing when I hear it. I think I heard the hon. gentleman make the statement that I have given with respect to by-elections. The hon. gentleman must have forgotten that there was a by-election in 1892 in Winnipeg. There was a gentleman named Chamberlain, from the county of York, who came up to Winnipeg in the interest of the Conservative party with a band of pluggers behind him, to carry the election. The hon. gentleman has probably forgotten that Mr. Chamberlain and a gentleman named Haidane were prosecuted for these election frauds; and if I remember well, one of them was sent to jail and the other was fined \$1,000, which, no doubt, the friends of the hon. gentleman had to raise. He has for-

gotten that the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) was deprived of his seat by ballot-box stuffing on the part of the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite in the last general election. The hon. gentleman has, perhaps, forgotten the evidence which went to show that they actually opened a school in Winnipeg for the education of deputy returning officers in the art of manipulating the ballots so as to deprive the people of their franchise. The first question asked the pupils of this school was: "Can you play cards?" And the jar was put on the table—that is not new, it all came out in the evidence—and these deputy returning officers who were shown how to steal the people's ballots. And when their education was completed they were sent to the constituencies of Manitoba and the North-west to manipulate the ballots. One of them told it as a good joke how, in a certain township he had made the reeve, a well known Liberal vote Conservative. And in my own riding, some years ago, the most monstrous things were done. I remember when the whole Mounted Police force was drawn up before the barracks and a telegram was read, purporting to come from Sir John Macdonald, telling them if they would vote for the Conservative party they would get scrip and medals. And yet the hon. gentleman accused the Liberals of election frauds.

Mr. HUGHES. I desire to ask, Sir, if the Minister made the statement, in answer to an interruption I made, that I knew that his statement was true, and that that was the reason of my interruption?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not quite understand the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Hughes's) question.

Mr. HUGHES. When the Minister was addressing the House, I rose to draw attention to the fact that, in the election trials after the elections of 1891, there were two Liberals unseated for one Conservative. That was in response to a statement by the hon. Minister that bands of pluggers had gone from riding to riding in the province of Ontario in the interest of the Conservatives. And I am told that the Minister made the remark that I knew that it was true and that was why I interrupted him. I ask if that was the hon. Minister's statement?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It was.

Mr. HUGHES. Then, all I have to say is that the Minister of the Interior has stated a deliberate falsehood to this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) is within parliamentary rules in using such language as that.

Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. HUGHES. I demand that the Minister withdraw that statement. I will take that from no Minister or anybody else.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I leave it to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) and to hon. members if such language as used by the hon. gentleman is at all permissible.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No doubt the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Hughes's) expression is a strong one—

Mr. TALBOT. Let him withdraw it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) has no right to interrupt a gentleman in this House. His interruptions are quite out of keeping with the spirit of the House and should not be permitted. The member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) has made a strong statement, but I think that the statement of the hon. Minister of the Interior is quite as unparliamentary. His statement is that fraud was being perpetrated, and that the hon. member for North Victoria knew of it, and that that is why the hon. gentleman took a certain position.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If exception were to be taken, I think my hon. friend (Mr. Montague) has hardly stated fairly the position of the hon. Minister of the Interior. Exception not having been taken at the time, there is no point of order with regard to what the hon. Minister of the Interior said. But surely the hon. member for North Victoria is not going to hesitate to withdraw the unhappy word he used, which he knows is not within a thousand miles of being in accordance with parliamentary rules.

Mr. WALLACE. I would call the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to the fact that if the hon. member for North Victoria did not call attention at once to what the Minister of the Interior said, it was because he did not hear it. But the Minister of the Interior has this moment stated to the House that he did make such a statement.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The question is as to what I said about the interruption.

Mr. WALLACE. That is what I am talking about. The hon. Minister of the Interior said that seats were stolen and that a band of pluggers went from one constituency to another in the interest of the Conservative party. The hon. member for North Victoria interrupted him, and the Minister said that the hon. member knew it was true and that was why he interrupted him. He admits now that he did make that statement, but it was not heard at the time by the member for North Victoria.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The statement I made was that it was no—

torious that a band of pluggers went from one constituency to another in the interest of the Conservative party, and that it was openly charged in the press, and I am satisfied it was true, and that hon. gentlemen opposite knew it to be true. As to this particular statement I made with regard to the member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), he interrupted me when I was making it; and I thought it was a fair inference, knowing him to be an experienced parliamentarian, that he did it for the purpose of turning my attention to something else. If the hon. gentleman had asked me to withdraw the statement I would have done so, but he has not asked me to withdraw it. He asks me now if I made the statement. I did make the statement. But the hon. gentleman has put himself out of court. What I said, I said it in answer to his interruption, and if he had asked me at the time to withdraw, the chances are that I would have withdrawn it.

Mr. HUGHES. I did not hear the statement of the hon. gentleman at the time.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Then the hon. gentleman should have asked me to withdraw it

Mr. HUGHES. I did not hear you; you did not speak loud enough.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman should have asked if I made that statement. If he had objected to it then, he should have asked me to withdraw it, but he did not do it.

Mr. HUGHES. I withdraw the word falsehood, and I state that any man who says that I knew or was a party to any plugging—

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not say he was a party to it at all.

Mr. HUGHES. What did the Minister say?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I withdraw my statement with regard to my hon. friend. I had no idea of charging that he was guilty of fraud.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) has thrown out a challenge that no person can find that they did anything wrong in the elections of 1891 and 1892. Now, I will refer to a meeting he addressed in the county of Peel at Springfield. I was a candidate in the by-election in 1892, as my election in 1891 was protested. After five days' trial they found one case on which we abandoned the seat. I believe I could have got out of it all right, but the other party was a little afraid their candidate might be disqualified, and they made an offer to pay all the costs, and I would rather pay the expenses of another election than take the risk of paying all the costs of that trial. The member for West York was at a meeting in Springfield, and he was

painting me as black as a crow, as being one of the most corrupt men that ever ran in Peel. One of their own supporters, a respectable man, I suppose, got up and said: "Gentlemen, I am no hypocrite. I do not believe in one party preaching that they are so pure and so good, when I know myself that they are just as black as Featherston is, and ten times blacker." Well, they tried to stop that man from speaking and from saying what he wanted to, but they could not. They went back to the hotel and quarrelled with him, and the result was that that man supported me in the election, and admitted that he had paid \$5 to the fund to have me unseated. That man got some of his friends of the Conservative party to go with him, and the result was that I had gained 20 votes in that polling subdivision in that election. Now, the hon. member for North Victoria asked the question: How many Grits and how many Conservatives were unseated in 1892? Well, I know that he had no chance to be unseated. He was protested, and he got frightened, and he wanted to get a pair with the member for the county of Peel.

Mr. HUGHES. Did the hon. gentleman say that I wanted to pair with him in 1892?

Mr. FEATHERSTON. Yes, Sir. He was a little premature, as his friends let him out of the trouble by substituting a man of straw who accepted service instead of Mr. Hughes. The hon. member himself was not served at all. Some weeks afterwards when he was called into court, he put in a defence that he had never been served. That is how he was saved from being unseated in 1892. Now, I will tell you another story. There was a by-election in the county of Pontiac, in 1892, and all the Conservative forces from Toronto were there. They stopped at the hotel where I did, and I saw what was going on. There was one little fellow there they called little Johnnie, as I learned afterwards. I spotted him, because I thought he was doing a pretty good business for the party. I met that young man in Toronto in 1896. He looked at me and thought he knew me. He said to me: "I think I have seen you before." I said: "Do you remember the big fight we had in Pontiac in the by-election of 1892?" He took me for a Tory, of course, then. He told me all about the election in Pontiac. I said: "You played a good part in Halton, didn't you?" He said: "Yes," and he told me all about how he went to Halton, and of the sharp practices that he had committed there fixing up the voters. Well, Sir, this little fellow was appointed by the late Government in the custom-house at Toronto. I do not think he should be there any longer.

Mr. HUGHES. I regret that I have to state in answer to the hon. gentleman from Peel (Mr. Featherston) that he has made a statement which, if he had made it outside, I should call a deliberate lie; inside the

House I call it an untruth. What occurred in 1892 was this: He was elected and protested. He came to me and proposed to saw-off, and I refused to do it; I got Mr. Archer Miller to saw-off with the hon. gentleman, but I refused to do it for myself. I knew where I stood. I knew if I was unseated I could carry the riding again hands down, and I declined the offer. The hon. gentleman came to me and hung round me to saw-off with him. More than that, he actually proposed that we should hide round this House and dodge the men who were serving us; and for more than a week I was the only one of half a dozen gentlemen, who walked out freely and down into the city to get my dinner, while that hon. gentleman, Sir, was dodging around the House. He came to me and made a proposition and I repudiated it; I would have nothing to do with it; and he must remember that I went to Mr. Archer Miller, of Prince Edward County, and arranged a saw-off between the two of them.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I remember what occurred; I was sitting on that side of the House. It happened on that side of the House. I never spoke with him anywhere else that I remember. He has made the case all the worse, as I was served before that time. I was in the hotel when I was served. I walked to the dining room door and accepted service like a man.

Mr. HENDERSON. I regret one of the statements that the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Featherston) has made, because I respect that gentleman very highly. He represents a county adjoining my own, but as he made a reference to a town in my county, and intended to cast a reflection upon me, I simply make the statement that I am now making. The hon. gentleman got up and told how he deliberately misrepresented himself as being another man in order to deceive the person he was talking with, and then he comes here and asks us to absolutely believe what he is saying now.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I got the information all right.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not propose to detain the House more than two or three minutes.

An hon. MEMBER. Time him.

Mr. CLANCY. I see some hon. gentlemen sitting under the gallery who, I think, do not pay much attention to what goes on in Ontario. I would not like to form the standard of public morals upon what I observe as being their conduct this evening, and if the hon. gentlemen will do themselves the justice that they are not disposed to do me, they will keep silent for a moment. I think it would be a meaningless thing to pretend to strike out the vote for Mr. Preston if we

Mr. HUGHES.

had no substantial reasons for it. What are the facts?

Mr. HEYD. They have been stated a dozen times.

Mr. CLANCY. If my hon. friend (Mr. Heyd) has a good case he can afford to listen, but if he has a bad one, he can afford to interrupt. What are the facts of the case? They are that Mr. Preston has been associated with a class of men who are well-known from one end of the province of Ontario to the other to be utterly characterless. These men are known from one end of the country to the other, and we must endeavour to realize the effect it will have upon the English people and the estimation that will be placed upon Preston and the Government that retains him under such circumstances. If the Government are not disposed to dismiss Preston summarily—

Mr. LANDERKIN. Your friends are not anxious to hear you.

Mr. CLANCY. It seems not. If the Government are not disposed to dismiss Preston summarily, would it not be a proper thing to suspend him until it was made perfectly clear that the charges were untrue and unfounded? Preston has been given a high position in England. He has been put over all the other men, and he occupies a position that demands that he should be free from charges of misconduct. It is not a matter of \$3,000, it is a matter of seeking to ensure the greatest usefulness of this officer of the Government, who is placed over other officers in England that is the material concern of Canada. There is not an hon. gentleman who doubts that Preston knew these men, or that he has trained them because he was associated with them in all these contests. They are a class of men who are utterly without character, men who are ready to perjure themselves when necessary, to plug and to misrepresent, and there is not a Liberal, who is not decent enough, to repudiate a list made up of Cap Sullivan, Tom Lewis, Jack O'Gorman, Bill Mayloy, Dan Ferguson and Duncan Bole. I ask if hon. gentlemen would associate themselves with a single act of these men. Preston was associated with these men, and these men have been guilty of wrong-doing. What is the inference to be drawn from that? Is it not that Preston was aware of it? I do think that the credit of Canada demands—

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) state what these people are guilty of?

Mr. CLANCY. I am going to ask my hon. friend to be reasonable. What was the case of Cap Sullivan? Does he not know that he was reported by the judges for misconduct in the South Ontario election? Is it not known to the hon. gentleman that these men are without character?

Mr. LANDERKIN. What had they done?

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman say that these are reputable citizens ?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not know them at all.

Mr. CLANCY. He says that—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) must address the Chair.

Mr. CLANCY. I have never refused to address the Chair. I have not been guilty of any misconduct that I know of. I have addressed the Chair in every instance, and I think my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) is just a little more anxious about me than he is about others, and I warn him—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CLANCY. I say I have not been guilty of any infraction because I defy the Chairman, or any one else, to say that I ever addressed an hon. gentleman in the first person.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) was wrong in cross-firing across the floor of the House with the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), and I called his attention to the fact that it is necessary to address the Chair.

Mr. CLANCY. I tell the hon. gentleman that it was to the Chair that I addressed myself, and he has no right to tell me to address the Chair when I am doing so. An hon. member surely has a right to discuss a question with another hon. member through the Chair just as he pleases, so long as he is not guilty of any infraction of the rules. I am just as anxious as any hon. gentleman to maintain the rules.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Chairman is quite wrong in saying that the hon. member for Bothwell was carrying on a conversation across the House. The hon. member for Bothwell addressed himself to the Chairman. The hon. member for Bothwell said : " Will the hon. gentleman do so-and-so." That is the third person, and that is the rule of the Speaker. I am sorry to say that if any person was breaking the rule it was the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), who directly addressed himself to the hon. member for Bothwell.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was only asking the hon. member for Bothwell a question, and he did not deem it out of the way that I should do so, whether he violated the rule in answering it I do not know. I did not know that I violated the rule because I seldom ever do it.

Mr. CLANCY. I have no complaint to make against the hon. member for South Grey. What I was complaining of was that I was called to order when I was not disorderly at all. The answer that the hon. member for South Grey gave me to the question that I put to him, was that he did not

know these men and I would venture to say that that is the answer that would come generally from that side of the House. I thought that the hon. gentleman would not know the persons on the list I have mentioned here to-night.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question. Does he know the fourteen persons who were disqualified in South Ontario ?

Mr. CLANCY. I do not know that there were fourteen persons disqualified. I have heard that certain men were reported by the judges for misconduct. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I have no knowledge, personally, of these persons, as he knows very well.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Only Cap Sullivan ?

Mr. CLANCY. Cap Sullivan is a notorious character.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Cap Sullivan is an Irishman.

Mr. CLANCY. Everybody knows Cap Sullivan in this country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not like to hear them cried down without trial.

Mr. CLANCY. He is so notorious that every person knows of him in every Ontario constituency. He is a gentleman with so unsavoury a reputation that hon. gentlemen opposite do not care to know him. I say that Mr. Preston is known to have associated with disreputable men in this country, and Mr. Preston must take the consequence of his associations with him. If the Liberal Government of to-day defends Mr. Preston, they must defend Cap Sullivan and his associates. Every right-thinking person in Canada to-day admits that Mr. Preston should be suspended ; but, notwithstanding that he is discredited in this country as a man of no character and no prestige, he is retained at the head of the immigration service in Great Britain. The Minister of the Interior was not ashamed to tell us to-night that there were not enough Tories in Canada to bring about Preston's dismissal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Without evidence.

Mr. CLANCY. The Minister of Finance now recognizes the gravity of the statement, and tries to lessen its effect.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Was not the whole tenor of the statement of the Minister of the Interior, not that the man should not be dismissed, but that he should not be dismissed without evidence ?

Mr. CLANCY. I will answer my hon. friend perfectly frankly. The hon. Minister said that he had been belaboured and hounded by the Tory press and by the Tory party for certain acts of his own, and that

it was not true he committed these acts. He gave examples of his own to show they were not true, but he went still further, and said that, for that reason, there were not Tories enough in Canada to bring about the dismissal of Mr. Preston.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I stated quite distinctly that there were not Tories enough in the Dominion to bring about the dismissal of Mr. Preston without any evidence of impropriety against him.

Mr. HUGHES. That was an afterthought.

Mr. CLANCY. The Minister (Mr. Sifton) now recoils from his rashness in making that statement, but I venture to say that "Hansard" will show to-morrow that without any qualification and after considerable discussion, the Minister made the statement I have attributed to him.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The sentence was used at the close of the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Sifton's) speech. There was applause from this side of the House, and perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) failed to hear the closing words.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. HEYD. I am as anxious as all of you that this discussion should close, and I am exceedingly glad that it is two o'clock in the morning, and that the newspaper reporters have got their newspapers full, so that what has taken place within the last two or three hours will not appear in the press to-morrow, because it just strikes me that my hon. friends opposite have been trying to amuse themselves to-night. Assuming that the charges against Mr. Preston are true, which I, for one, am not prepared to admit; but, assuming that Mr. Preston is just as bad as he is represented to be, then the only consistent course for our friends on the other side is to move an amendment that his salary be increased to \$6,000.

Mr. DAVIN. Clever.

Mr. HEYD. It is not clever, but it would be consistent on your side. The feeling that would pervade the breast of an ordinary man at witnessing the protests of purity from the other side of the House, is enough to take away his breath. For a party who have for twenty years existed owing to the corruption of the constituencies of this country, to get up here to-night, and plead purity, and to condemn poor Preston and Cap Sullivan, when they have been elected for the last twenty years by the very practices these men have been accused of—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Poor Preston.

Other hon. MEMBERS. Poor fellow.

Mr. HEYD. Not poor Preston, but poor representatives of that purist party that have been for twenty-five years corrupting

Mr. CLANCY.

this country, and now find fault because they think the country is at last corrupt. Go back to the time of the Pacific scandal.

Mr. BENNETT. Go back to the Yukon.

Mr. HEYD. Why was that \$500,000 paid by Sir Hugh Allan, and what was done with that \$500,000, and what has been done ever since with the contributions from the Red Parlour, in Toronto? Corruption was rampant in this country for the last twenty years at the instigation of the late Conservative Government, and now these gentlemen opposite get up here, and profess to be pure and holy, and condemn Cap Sullivan and Mr. Preston.

Mr. WALLACE. Poor Preston.

Mr. HEYD. Let us go to Winnipeg; let us go to London; let us go to Brantford, if you like—

Mr. CLANCY. What became of the man who was arrested in your constituency?

Mr. HEYD. Why, Mr. Chairman, I sit here to-night, the representative of Brant because of Tory corruption. If the Conservative party had not been corrupt, Mr. Pater-son would have been in the position I now occupy. But because Conservative heelers just did what Mr. Preston is accused of doing, the late representative for South Brant, Mr. Henry, was unseated, and I happen to be elected. There is one of the best evidences of the corruption that existed in 1896.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HEYD. You appear to smile.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. They want to know what about the man arrested in your constituency.

Mr. HEYD. I do not know anything about the man arrested, but I know my late Conservative opponent was unseated because of corruption. I do not know that there was any corruption in my election. I do not believe there was. It was not proven in the courts, at any rate, and we have a right to assume that, unless it is proven in the courts the election was free from corruption. It strikes me as peculiar that these gentlemen opposite do not respect the British principle of fair play, but they are ready to assume that every Liberal is guilty, and on mere hearsay to brand a man as a scoundrel, in order to advance their own political ends. That is not fair-play. While I am not a sympathiser with the methods which Mr. Preston has been charged with pursuing, I say that until Mr. Preston is proved to be guilty, we have the right to assume that he is innocent. These gentlemen opposite have no right to brand him as a scoundrel; they have no right to use the language they did in connection with him to-night, until they have some better foundation. When the Minister of the Interior says there are

not enough Conservatives in this country to secure his dismissal without evidence, he announced a doctrine which will be supported by Conservatives in this country, as well as by Liberals. We are told by these gentlemen opposite that there are enough honest men in this country to turn this Government out. Do our friends on the other side think that the people of Canada have become so imbecile that they are going to turn out the present Government, and put in—what? A thing that was ignominiously defeated some three years ago.

Do not hug that delusion; do not suppose that you are going to derive much satisfaction from that. It must have been a matter of surprise, I will not say of satisfaction, to see our friends hanging around the corridors during the last few days, and manifesting so much interest in the West Huron investigation. This is the first time our friends have really had a chance, if the statement is true, to pay back the Liberal party in their own coin. I trust that our friends will not regard this matter from a partisan standpoint, but will give these men who are accused the benefit of the doubt, at least, until they are convicted. Now, as our hon. friends opposite appear to be willing to come to a vote, I will not say anything further.

Mr. BEATTIE. I am not at all surprised at the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) making the remarks he has made about the gang. I happen to have been in that gentleman's constituency on the day of his election, and the gang were all there, and by half-past ten in the morning we had one of them under arrest and placed behind the bars. He was, however, granted bail by the magistrate, and he fled the country and has not been brought to justice yet. The hon. gentleman made a remark about London. If he can take any comfort out of London, he must be ignorant of the state of affairs there. We have had three election protests in London, and I will inform the hon. gentleman what they were. The first was between the Hon. John Carling and Major Walker. At the trial it was proven that Major Walker spent over \$30,000 to corrupt the electors of London, and he was not only unseated but I think he was disqualified. The next protest was between Mr. Hyman and Sir John Carling, and it ended by Mr. Hyman throwing up the sponge. It was proven that people were kept in a hall, and were in such a state that they could not walk, and had to be led up to vote. The next protest was my own. My opponents made 2,750 charges against me and my friends, not one of which they proved, although the court sat over three weeks, and half the gang who were pressing the trial against me were summoned one morning to go to Brantford to answer for deeds committed in my hon. friend's election. In the case against me, I believe that in one instance a poor old man had been hired to cut

a lawn, and the gentleman for whom he did the work, instead of giving him 75 cents, thought it was worth more and gave him \$1.25; and it was proven that he had paid the man 50 cents too much, but it turned out that the man was a tenant of the lawyer who was pressing the charge against me, and had paid no rent for nearly a year. That was the only charge that was proven true, and if the hon. gentlemen can take any comfort out of the protests in London, he is welcome to do it.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has made a very serious charge against Captain Sullivan. I want to inform that hon. gentleman that Captain Sullivan comes of one of the best families in the Niagara Peninsula. He has a brother who is a priest at Thorold, and another brother who is a captain on the inland waters and a highly-respected man; and Captain Sullivan has the respect of the people of St. Catharines among whom he lives. I think it was very unfair for the hon. member for Bothwell to single him out and forget all the fourteen Tories who were mentioned by the judge as having been guilty of corrupt acts in the South Ontario election. Because Captain Sullivan was reported by the judge, I think it is very unfair that an attack should be made on his personal character rather than on his political character: and I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw the charge he made. Where Captain Sullivan is best known his word would be taken in a business transaction as quickly as that of any gentleman in this House. I have known Captain Sullivan for a great many years, and I believe this is the first time that he has ever been reported by a judge as having done anything wrong. I suppose it was only in the political sense that he did anything wrong. In his personal character, for honesty and integrity, he is a gentleman who would be believed in any society in the province of Ontario where he is known.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I would just like to read from "Hansard" a little extract of what took place last night, as affecting the judgment in this case of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy).

Mr. DAVIN. Order.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is quite in order.

Mr. DAVIN. Is the hon. gentleman going to read from a past debate?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am going to read what was said last night in reference to the dismissal of public servants.

Mr. DAVIN. That is out of order.

Mr. WALLACE. I rise to a point of order. I think the hon. gentleman knows the rules of the House. I do not wish to prevent him reading from "Hansard" the speeches that were made by the hon. member for Bothwell and myself, because I think a careful perusal of them would do him good.

Mr. COWAN. Is that the point of order ?

Mr. WALLACE. The point of order is whether an hon. member of this House can read an extract from a former debate.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I would say that last night I was asked—

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is not discussing the point of order.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. Minister knows that a point of order has been raised.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have accepted the point of order, and I am not proposing to read ; but last night, while the discussion was going on—

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman is still out of order.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman cannot raise the point of order without knowing what I am going to say.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman has already put himself out of order by referring to what took place last night. He is referring to a past debate, and I ask the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). The hon. Minister of Customs, I understood, was going to read from "Hansard" certain speeches which were made last night, but the point of order was immediately raised by the hon. member for West York. Before a decision was given by the Chair, the Minister of Customs ceased to continue. Therefore, I think there is no point of order now.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I quite understood that the first point of order had been disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). No, you misunderstood me. I was looking up Dr. Bourinot's work, and was not prepared to give a decision at the moment, and I supposed that the Minister of Customs was going to discuss the point of order as he had the right to do, but he did not, nor did he resume his remarks.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Quite so, he quite understood he was out of order.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You are out of order.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No I am not.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, it is a wonder.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I thought the hon. Minister—

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Would it not be quite as well if the hon. gentleman should not state what he thought.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I take what the hon. gentleman said.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The point of order was not taken on what I thought.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, on what you said.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What did I say ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The point of order was that the hon. gentleman started to relate the circumstances of the last night's debate.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I did not. I was about to make another statement with reference to what I was asked to do to-day, namely, to bring down certain papers, even though the items were disposed of, and I was about to say that I had the papers in my desk—some of them. I was blamed because of my action in certain cases. I cannot refer to what the hon. member for Bothwell and the hon. member for West York said, but if the hon. gentleman had been here, he would have heard that the hon. member for West York took the ground that no officer should be dismissed without an investigation no matter how low he might be.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That being the case, I shall be pleased to lay the papers on the Table and show that there was an investigation.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am quite prepared to leave to the hon. gentleman's colleagues to decide whether he is justified in declaring, in his angry and loud voice, that I stated what was not correct. I have been in this House about twelve years, and never yet knew a Minister who persisted in putting and keeping himself out of order to such an extent as the Minister of Customs has done to-night. He openly, defiantly and intentionally continued his speech although he knew and every one of his colleagues knew that he was out of order. Instead of reading the statement, which this House knew to be out of order, he took another way about it to accomplish the same purpose, by making the statement instead of reading it as made in "Hansard."

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have not made a statement at all.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He misled the House by pretending that he rose to show that the point of order was not correct, when he had no intention of referring to it, but wished to touch upon another question. That is a quibble, Sir, of which any Minister of the Crown should not be guilty in this House. His colleagues, the hon. Minister of Finance, knew he was out of order. There is not one of his colleagues who will say he is attempting to evade the rules of the House when making that statement, and I say that the most insolent manner in

which he raised his voice and began to shout to me, when I had decently and fairly raised the point of order, was unworthy a Minister of the Crown.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). I do not propose to be lectured by the hon. member for Haldimand. I have had a seat in this House before him and understand the rules quite as well. His position in this House does not authorize him to assume the tone of lecturing me in reference to these matters. If I were out of order, he had the opportunity of calling your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the point.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. I tried to but the hon. gentleman's voice drowned mine.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. The hon. gentleman sat down, and when I rose, he did not ask you, Mr. Chairman, to rule on the point of order at all.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. I did.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. You did not. He resumed his seat without asking for a ruling as to whether I was out of order or not. I simply stated to the hon. member for Bothwell and the hon. member for East Simcoe that with reference to these papers which they had asked me to produce some time ago, and which I had not with me last night, that I had these papers now. Fault had been found with me because, without sufficient investigation, I had dismissed a public servant, and I have here the record of the investigation made by the stipendiary magistrate at Brantford who investigated in the one case, and the report of the Inspector of Customs in the case mentioned by the hon. member for Bothwell, and I said I would lay them on the Table. Will the hon. gentleman tell me where I was out of order. He says that the hon. Minister of Finance knew I was out of order, but I tell him that the Minister of Finance has not said so or any other gentleman, and the Chairman of the committee has not. If the Chairman of the committee thought I was out of order, then the Chair would have ruled. The hon. member for Haldimand is not the ruler of this House.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. The hon. gentleman is quite in error. I did ask the Chairman to rule and every hon. gentleman here knows I did.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. The Chairman had ruled on the first question raised but not on the second point.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. The Chairman never ruled at all. He had said that he never did.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. If he did not, it is because I yielded to the point and did not continue to read the extract I was about to read.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Then the hon. gentleman was again violating the rule by referring to a past debate, and I asked the Chairman explicitly a number of times to rule but the hon. gentleman would not cease talking.

Mr. **CLANCY**. I think the Minister of Customs will agree with me that when he rose to make a statement what he desired to say had reference to what appeared to him the inconsistency on my part and on the part of other hon. gentlemen in demanding the dismissal of Mr. Preston without an investigation, while finding fault with the Government for dismissing other officials without an investigation. That is the impression that what he said left upon my mind. In that case—and I do not think the hon. gentleman will deny that I have inferred correctly what he wished to say—he was clearly out of order. Now, just a word with regard to Capt. Sullivan. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) thinks I should apologize, because, as he says, this was an election matter. But before he demands an apology of me, I would ask him if he condones the wrong done by this man because it was an election matter. I say that Capt. Sullivan is notorious from one end of this province to the other for having gone into constituency after constituency for the purpose of bribing and other misconduct. I have no doubt his connections may be respectable. I can only say that he has disgraced his respectable relatives. Does the hon. member (Mr. Gibson) uphold him for his conduct because it is done in the interest of a political party? That seems a very strange code of morals. I have no charge against Capt. Sullivan except that he has been guilty of wrong-doing in connection with the elections. I regret to hear that he is of respectable family. He has not added anything to the respectability of his family.

Mr. **GIBSON**. What I wanted to point out was that the hon. gentleman could remember the name of Capt. Sullivan, but he could not remember the names of the Conservatives. There was no evidence that Capt. Sullivan was there.

Amendment (Mr. Bennett) negatived—yeas 15, nays 57.

Mr. **WILSON**. Will the hon. Minister tell me how many agencies there are in Great Britain and Ireland and how many on the continent of Europe?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. In Great Britain there is, first, the High Commissioner's office, Mr. Devlin's office in Dublin, Mr. O'Kelly's office in Londonderry, Mr. Griffiths' office in Wales, the Liverpool office, the Glasgow office, and the agency in Forfarshire, where Mr. Duncan is the agent. On the continent there are three

agencies—that is, seven in Great Britain and Ireland and three on the continent.

Mr. CLARKE. On page 176 of the annual report of the Department of the Interior there is a tabulated statement showing “the number of male and female adults, and the sexes of children and infants of each nationality arrived in 1898.” It gives the total Irish as 709, of whom there were male adults 375, female adults 241, male children 39, female children 40, and infants 14. I would like to know how that classification is made. Were these immigrants who are reported to have sailed from Irish ports sent out by the officers of the department in Ireland, or were they persons of Irish extraction who sailed from any port of the British Isles?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The total number that is given is the total number of persons coming from Ireland, but not necessarily directly from Ireland. A considerable number of them come by way of Liverpool.

Mr. CLARKE. As a matter of fact, some of these may be sent out as the results of the agents in England or in Scotland.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think so. There is possibly some discrepancy. But I think the records show with reasonable accuracy the number of immigrants who come from Ireland.

Mr. CLARKE. I draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that steamers leaving Liverpool for Canada call either at Queenstown or Londonderry. I wanted to get information whether these 709 who are reputed to have left Ireland, were immigrants who were sent out as the results of the efforts of the salaried agents in Ireland.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am bound to say that as the records are kept, it is not possible to say positively that that is the case.

Mr. CLARKE. I would ask the Minister if, since Mr. Preston has been appointed superintendent of agencies, he has made a journey to Finland and entered into communication with the Finlanders for the purpose of getting them to immigrate to Canada.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. I do not think he was actually in Finland, because, as the hon. gentleman is aware, the Russian laws condemn such agents to jail. But Mr. Preston visited Copenhagen, I think, where he met parties from Finland and discussed the matter with them there. That is my impression, that was the idea in the first place.

Mr. CLARKE. Has he made any report about his mission to try and secure these Finlanders?

Mr. SIFTON.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Would the Minister bring down the correspondence when the supplementaries are being discussed?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will bring down all the correspondence.

Mr. WILSON. I think the Minister has made a mistake about the number of agencies in Scotland. I think there are 4. By turning to pages H—15 and 16, he will find that the agencies ought to be 9 instead of 7.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There were 4 agents, one of them, Mr. Stewart, died not long ago in Inverness, and no one has been appointed in his place. The extra one the hon. gentleman is referring to, is the one at Dumfries. I had considered him as attached to the Glasgow office. He works under the direction of Mr. Murray.

Mr. HUGHES. The Minister of the Interior gave only 2 from Ireland. I understood there were 3 in Ireland.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is an officer at Londonderry, there are 2 in Dublin, Mr. Devlin and Mr. Webster, his clerk. Mr. Webster gets \$900, Mr. Devlin gets \$2,000, and the Londonderry agent gets \$1,300.

Mr. CLARKE. I think the Minister has given us information as to the number of agencies in the United States.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I gave them this afternoon. I did not read all the names of the commissioners, there are about 100 of them.

Mr. CLARKE. I wanted to get the number of agencies.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman will find in the “Hansard” the names of all the salaried agents which I read this afternoon. I did not read the names of those who are acting on commission.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to call the attention of the committee to some matters about these agencies in the old country where enormous amounts of money are spent, and where scarcely any results are visible. It has not been demonstrated that the two Irish agencies have been the cause of a single settler coming to this country. Now take the case at Liverpool, A. F. Jury is the agent there. The expenses of the agency will alone amount to more than \$8,000. Mr. Jury himself is not qualified by experience or by education to perform the duties which we are told he does perform there. We asked the question: What did Mr. Jury do? And we are told that he went out lecturing. How many places has he gone to? There is a list of thirteen places that he has gone to during the year.

Surely that is not the whole business of Mr. Jury if he has attended thirteen fairs during the year. But I can say Mr. Jury is utterly unsuited to bring immigrants to this country. We are told that the business of the immigration department is not to bring mechanics here, but farmers. The man therefore who seeks farmers should have some knowledge of farming, but Mr. Jury has always lived in the city, he has no knowledge, theoretical or otherwise, of farming, and does not pretend to have. When he was in this country he was opposed to immigration, particularly of mechanics, of whom he said the Canadian cities were overcrowded. Now, this man is sent to the old country, he is put at the head of the agency there, which costs \$8,000. He makes a report to the High Commissioner and this is what he says :

My work during the past year has consisted in attending agricultural shows and lecturing.

Just imagine Alfred Jury lecturing before an intelligent audience. Why, he cannot speak a sentence of good English. He is utterly unfitted by his training, and he has the cheek of a canal horse, going to public gatherings and thrusting himself in various ways on audiences of every description. So far as any suitable or capable training is concerned, he has never had any, and I do not think, at his time of life, he will ever acquire the qualifications for that position. He tells us of meetings that he attended :

My work during the past year has consisted in attending agricultural shows, lecturing, visiting steamship agents, interviewing intending emigrants at their homes and at the office, watching Canadian affairs as reported by the Canadian press, in order to keep myself abreast of the times as to the development taking place there.

Then he says :

Last July I received several stalks of corn, which I exhibited at all the shows that took place after its arrival ; it was also exhibited by Mr. Devlin at the Dublin show, and everywhere created a great amount of interest.

All through his report he complains that he has not received samples, that he has not proper literature, and that he has not proper illustrations in order to induce immigrants to come here. He does not do anything because he had only a few stalks of corn. None of the illustrations were of a suitable description :

If plentiful supplies of the right quality were given to me, I could arrange with the steamship agents of the district after each show to put specimens in their windows, and the more or less permanent exhibitions thus formed would prove of great advertising value.

I should like to say a word about our literature and posters. In some respects the former is too meagre in detail ; the latter are too flimsy and frail to be of use for any length of time. In regard to the literature, I would respectfully suggest that in all pamphlets dealing with settlement in Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia, more detailed information be

given in reference to the commencement of farming operations by the settler ; for instance, in what time and at what cost he can get a house built, and the kind it would be when finished.

This gentleman went on a week's trip across the continent before he went over there. He has no practical knowledge of life on the prairies or in the back woods. He has been a resident of Toronto from the time he first struck Canada until he went on this mission, and he was working in a tailor shop. He has no knowledge of the requirements of settlement outside of the mechanic class, and he has always denounced the importation of mechanics into this country, so that he could not consistently advise mechanics to come here.

With reference to the posters or show bills that have been sent here with the brass strips along the top and bottom, the paper is so relatively weak, compared with the metal, that in many cases they are partly destroyed before reaching their destination, and when hung up, a very slight touch will tear them and they are cast away as unsightly.

In regard to emigration, I do not think there will be any great movement during the ensuing year, or while the present prosperity in this country lasts, but the present agents in the United Kingdom have the advantage of their predecessors in so far as they have a prosperous Canada to send emigrants to.

None coming, either, according to this account :

The ordinary tenant farmer thinks too much of his home and clings too closely to his past to be easily moved to another country, and the agricultural labourer and the agricultural domestic are too poor to pay their own passage, so that under present circumstances a large emigration of these classes cannot be looked for, though no effort will be spared to get them if they can be got.

The statement of this commissioner shows that he has not got supplies that would give him an opportunity of exhibiting the country in its right light, that he has not received any encouragement to go on promoting emigration from the old country, but he and his staff have cost \$8,091. He has an office and a staff of officers, and there is a charge for hiring a lantern ; I suppose, for showing the pictures on the wall. He has been attending shows at these thirteen places I have mentioned, and the results we have from his work are of a very unsatisfactory character. I think we should curtail expenditures that are only, apparently, for the purpose of giving employment to needy individuals and clamorous politicians, because it could not be pretended by any person who knows him, that Mr. Alfred Jury would be a capable immigration agent. For the last twenty years, during which he has been in Canada, he has been running down this country, and he now undertakes to praise it up, and set forth its advantages to the intending settler. In the first place, he does not know about the country. He has spent no time in the agricultural districts ;

in fact, he has spent no time outside of Toronto. He has not been through the Northwest Territories, except on a hurried trip, after he received his appointment, and then only along the line of railway. I think the expenditure is quite unjustifiable. We had a statement here this afternoon from the hon. Minister of the Interior, in which he eulogized the excellent work being done by the Rev. Mr. Burrows in bringing settlers into the Rainy River district. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) told us that he had been through that country, that the stories that had been told us by the hon. Minister of the Interior were simply fables, that there was no settlement made that was satisfactory, that those Mr. Burrows had brought in from the United States had gone away, and that the whole country recognized his attempts to settle that part of the country had resulted in a total failure. Under the circumstances, the hon. Minister may be deluded into the idea, and he may try to delude others, that these results are being achieved under his excellent management, but so far as we know, and so far as accurate information goes, we are not making the progress in that direction that, having regard to the enormous expenditures and to the increased expenditures that we are asked to sanction, we should make.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) to say that his objection to Mr. Jury was his lack of education and his lack of being able to address himself acceptably to an audience. Then he proceeded to read an extract from Mr. Jury's report, and, as he read that, I failed to find in it any evidence of lack of education or the proper use of English.

Mr. WALLACE. I never accused Mr. Jury of writing that report.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman read it as Mr. Jury's report, and if he did not wish it to be understood as Mr. Jury's report, then he attempted to mislead the House.

Mr. WALLACE. Do not be too fast. I never accused Mr. Jury of writing that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not see any lack of ability in that report. There may be a difference of opinion with regard to the views Mr. Jury may have advocated, but let me ask, does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) think he could make any more creditable appearance on the public platform speaking on public questions, than Mr. Jury can?

Mr. WALLACE. I am not comparing myself with Mr. Jury. I will compare myself with the Minister (Mr. Paterson), and say I can do as well as he can. The Minister can compare himself with Mr. Jury if he wishes.

Mr. WALLACE.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But the hon. gentleman has been offering a criticism, and I suggest that Mr. Jury can discuss public questions quite as intelligently and in as good English and with as much acceptance as the hon. gentleman himself. The hon. gentleman spoke about Mr. Jury being always a resident of the city of Toronto; but I do not think that the member for the city (Mr. Clarke) would admit that that has dwarfed his intellect in any way.

Mr. CLARKE. I think it would be a great advantage, but at the same time I must say that farming in the city is not very good just now.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. And yet the hon. gentleman will attempt to discuss, and discuss intelligently, farming subjects in this House. I believe that Mr. Jury, on the public platform, can present a case in a very pleasant, a very intelligent and a very acceptable manner. When I said that Mr. Jury could express himself in as good English and in as able a manner as the hon. member for West York himself, I did not mean that as any reflection on the hon. gentleman, because I believe that Mr. Jury can do that very well indeed, and I understand that he was always regarded as a very effective and a very pleasing speaker.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As members of the Government seem anxious to continue the discussion of this item, it is just as well for us to take all the time we want. I was anxious the item should pass quite a while ago, but hon. gentlemen opposite were bound to bring up matters entirely irrelevant, and so we may continue the debate. I have been long enough in the House to remember that when Mr. Daly was Minister of the Interior and doing his best to get good men for immigration work, hon. gentlemen opposite made a pitched battle always to show that the money of Canada was being wasted in connection with immigration work, and one of their chief charges was that political heelers were being employed. Never in the history of the department were so pronounced politicians placed in charge of that work as has been the case under the present Minister. I do not object to men being selected because of party services, but they certainly should be qualified to fill their places and it should be watched as to whether they are doing their work or depending upon past political work for maintenance in their positions. As for Mr. Jury, I am here to say that I think if Canada had been raked over from Halifax to Vancouver with a fine-tooth comb, and the man selected that was least fitted among those who might aspire to the position of immigration agent at Liverpool, that man would be Mr. Alfred Jury. Mr. Jury was a man who had attacked Canada in many ways. He was well known as a fault-finder with the condition of affairs in

Canada generally. He knew nothing in the world about Canada. He was a labour agitator, and the chief point he used to urge was that immigration should be restricted, that no mechanics should be brought into Canada. The Minister admits that now, but yet the mechanics of Great Britain are the only men that Mr. Jury has the slightest sort of qualification to talk to. He knew something about the condition of workmen in this country, and therefore he could speak with some intelligence upon that question, but he himself contended that they should not be brought to Canada. Therefore he opposed the immigration of the only class he could be supposed to influence. The only other classes are the agriculturists and the higher educated classes of Great Britain, who might have influence in sending out agriculturists to this country. As regards the higher educated classes, notwithstanding the compliments which have been paid Mr. Jury by the Minister of Customs, I am here to say that those who know Mr. Jury's manner of speech and Mr. Jury's qualifications upon the platform, intellectually or otherwise, would not think that he was the right man to appeal to the higher intellectual classes of the English public. As to the agricultural classes, Mr. Jury, before a British audience of tenant farmers or farm labourers, would be as much at sea as a hen would be in her attempt to navigate a boat. He knows nothing in the world of the requirements of Canadian agriculture. I am prepared to give the Minister of the Interior privately the name of the gentleman who told me, and who knows whereof he speaks, that Mr. Jury, as the Government agent in Liverpool, is the laughing-stock of people who know the business of the Government in that part of the country. Is there a member of this House, from Ontario or anywhere else, who knows Mr. Jury, who will say that his services are worth \$2,000, or whatever his salary is, to the Dominion of Canada? The Minister of Customs has referred to his report as a cleverly written document. If there ever was an asinine report, that is one.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is couched in good English.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Bad English is not allowed to appear in any of the report. If any bad English were written, the Queen's Printer, or the proof readers, would see that it was put into good English. The Minister of the Interior knows that that report does not display any grasp of the situation such as could be shown by a Canadian immigration agent in such an important centre as Liverpool. It is true, as the hon. gentleman states, that Mr. Jury has delivered a certain number of lectures. I want to ask him how many people he believes Mr. Jury has sent to this country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is absolutely impossible to distinguish the

persons sent by one agent or another in England. They work at large, and in the case of a man who works in Liverpool, it would be impossible to distinguish.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I venture to say that if the hon. Minister would investigate, he would find that Mr. Jury's services are of exceedingly little value to the Dominion of Canada. The office is simply a political reward for Mr. Jury, and while I do not object to him or any other man getting a political reward, I object to it being continued as a political reward; I object to a man not being required to perform services in return for his salary; and I object to a man being put in a place which he is utterly unfitted to fill. There is no question that Mr. Jury is unfitted for his position. He was simply put there because he had been of service to the Liberal party in Ontario as a labour agitator, and had tried to mislead the labouring men of that province, as he did many times in connection with election campaigns; and in return for that service for the Liberal party, he is given one of the principal appointments in the United Kingdom, a place which he is utterly unfitted to fill, and from which he should be removed.

Mr. HUGHES. I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior if he has taken any steps in order to induce honourably discharged British soldiers to settle in Canada.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. HUGHES. I know there is a great trouble in the old country to get proper situations for men who have served with the colours for ten or twelve years; and a great many of these men, not finding useful occupations, drift into other armies. It is well-known that in the recent war between the United States and Spain a large number of discharged British soldiers were in the American ranks. Those men would much rather, I am satisfied, settle in Canada than in the United States, and I would suggest to the hon. Minister that he might, through the High Commissioner's Office, in London, take up this matter with a view of having these honourably discharged soldiers brought out and placed on farms in this country. I am satisfied that one such man would be worth a great deal more than the classes that are being brought into the country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think the suggestion of the hon. gentleman is a good one. I am bound to say it had not occurred to me before, and I think it had not been suggested; but I will endeavour to see what can be done in that direction.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the hon. Minister if Mr. Jury devotes a portion of his time to endeavouring to induce mechanics to come from the old country to Canada, or if his efforts are directed entirely to bringing out agriculturists.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. Mr Jury, like all other agents in Great Britain and Ireland, has express instructions not to send out mechanics or labouring men.

Mr. **CLARKE**. I would draw the attention of the Minister to the second paragraph of Mr. Jury's report, which states :

The conditions of trade in the north of England during 1898 have been booming in most branches, and have, consequently, been unfavourable to a large emigration ; but I have not lost an opportunity nor spared an effort to bring the claims and the advantages of Canada as a field for emigration or trade before the people of this part of England.

I take it that it is largely the manufacturing centres he refers to.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. The hon. gentleman is putting altogether too technical a construction upon the report. The instructions are to work among the agricultural population alone. If the hon. gentleman looks at the third paragraph, he will see that the work is among the agricultural population.

Mr. **CLARKE**. This paragraph seems to me to be conclusive that Mr. Jury has been devoting special attention to induce people engaged in manufacturing to come to Canada. I notice that there is an increase of \$100,000 in the appropriation for Immigration for this year. May I ask the Minister if he has received any complaints or remonstrances from any trade and labour organizations or trades' councils in the cities of the Dominion respecting this large sum ?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I have no correspondence of the kind the hon. gentleman refers to that I can remember at present. I have no recollection of receiving any such correspondence. It may be possible that a letter has come to the department and not been brought to my attention, but I do not think so. A letter of that kind would, in all probability, have been brought to my attention immediately.

Mr. **WALLACE**. With regard to the clause to which the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) called attention, Mr. Jury says :

The conditions of trade in the north of England during 1898 have been booming in most branches, and have, consequently, been unfavourable to a large emigration ; but I have not lost an opportunity nor spared an effort to bring the claims and the advantages of Canada as a field for emigration or trade before the people of this part of England.

Mr. Jury speaks here of the conditions of trade being unfavourable to a large immigration. If this paragraph means anything, it means that this man who, in this country, was denouncing any Government that would attempt to bring in mechanics to compete with our own, who, he claims, are too numerous already, is now endeavouring to bring that very same class into this country.

Mr. **CLARKE**.

Mr. **CLARKE**. And he is apologizing for his failure because of the briskness of trade in England.

Mr. **WALLACE**. He admits that he has failed in the work he has undertaken. He says further :

I should like to say a word about our literature and posters. In some respects the former is too meagre in detail ; the latter are too flimsy and frail to be of use for any length of time. In regard to the literature, I would respectfully suggest that in all pamphlets dealing with settlement in Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia, more detailed information be given in reference to the commencement of farming operations by the settler ; for instance, in what time and at what cost he can get a house built, and the kind it would be when finished ; how soon a man can get a crop who arrives there about the end of March, and how he would go to work to get it ; the cost of equipping a farm and the price fetched by the products ; how lands can be leased or bought for ranching, how ranching is carried on, the cost of yearlings or stockers and the age at which they are ready for the market, also the price they fetch ; where the ranching lands of British Columbia are situated and their proximity to means of transportation. These are some of the questions I am being continually asked.

Of course Mr. Jury knows nothing about these matters himself, and he acknowledges that the literature does not give the desired information. What then is the Government doing ? It is employing a whole staff of men over there, typewriters, stenographers, clerks, book-keepers, foreign correspondence clerks, every class of officials, and they have no kind of literature which will give the information required by the very class of people that we desire to get. It would seem to me that the best course for the Government to take would be either to close up the offices or properly equip them. The showing of several stalks of corn in some shop window or other exposed place is not likely to attract much attention. I am surprised that the hon. Minister, with his practical business acumen, does not put things in better shape, so that something can be done to promote immigration of the proper kind to Canada, namely, that of tenant farmers, with a little capital, farm labourers and domestic servants.

Women's Protective Immigration Society  
of Montreal..... \$1,000

Mr. **WALLACE**. I think we have gone far enough for to-night.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. The discussion has ranged over the whole question, and we ought to get through with these votes.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Vote No. 95 shows an increase of \$90,000 and will require some discussion.

Mr. **WALLACE**. If you let the other items pass, and let the House adjourn, we could pass vote 95, with much less discussion in the morning than we can at present.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I have been putting through these estimates for the last four years, and the whole discussion has never taken more than two hours; yet we have discussed these items since half-past eleven o'clock this morning. I certainly think that the hon. gentlemen ought, in all fairness, to consent to the business going through.

Mr. **WALLACE**. It would not prolong the debate any to let the item stand. It is not to reopen any debate, but to get information which we cannot very well carefully consider at this time. I think that in a few minutes to-morrow morning we can dispose of that more satisfactorily than we could by spending a good deal longer time over it to-night.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. If the hon. gentleman will agree that it shall go through to-morrow morning before one o'clock, I am satisfied.

Mr. **WALLACE**. I think we can easily promise that.

Committee rose and reported.

#### RETURNS.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). I promised some members on the committee last evening that certain papers would be brought down, if possible. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) asked that the report of the commissioner to investigate the case of John Galna should be laid on the Table; and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) desired the report of the inspector with respect to Mr. Callwell. I have these papers here, and I move that an Order of the House do issue for the return of these papers, when I shall be prepared to lay them on the Table.

Motion agreed to.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 3.05 a.m. (Thursday.)

### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 27th July, 1899.

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER** took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### GENERAL SERVICE MEDALS.

Mr. **CLARKE** (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

1. What is the date of the Royal Warrants, published in the London "Gazette," authorizing

the long service decoration for officers and the long service medal for non-commissioned officers and men of the Canadian auxiliary forces ?

2. What action, if any, has since been taken by the Department of Militia and Defence to carry out the terms and conditions set forth in the above-named Royal Warrants ?

3. What is the period of service required to ensure the granting of said decorations or medals, and is it necessary that such service should be continuous ?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE** (Mr. Borden). 1. London "Gazette," of the 2nd June, 1899. Warrants dated War Office, same day. 2. None yet. 3. Twenty years. Continuous service.

#### MEDICAL ATTENDANCE TO INDIANS IN YALE AND CARIBOO.

Mr. **PRIOR** asked :

1. What amounts have been paid by the Government during the years 1896-97, 1897-98 and 1898-99 in the electoral district of Yale and Cariboo for medical attendance and medicines ?

2. To whom were these payments made, and how much to each medical man ?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). The question is not clear. To whom does the question refer ?

Mr. **PRIOR**. To Indians.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. As the question does not mention the Indians, I did not know that it referred to them. The hon. gentleman will see that the items do not show anything paid for medical attendance or medical service for Indians.

#### DOMINION DREDGE "CANADA."

Mr. **FOSTER** asked :

How long was Harry W. Clark engineer on board the Dominion dredge "Canada" ? Were his services satisfactory ? Is Mr. Clark now on the dredge "Canada" ? If not, when was he dismissed ; on what charges, and was there any investigation ? Who has been appointed to the position ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). Harry Clark was engineer on the Dominion dredge two seasons. Mr. Clark and the captain of the vessel did not get along very well, and in that sense his services were not satisfactory, though no particular charge was made against Mr. Clark. Mr. Clark was not dismissed. The officers of the dredges are not permanently appointed ; they are engaged from season to season, and Mr. Clark was not re-employed at the beginning of the present season in consequence of the fact that he and the captain did not get along very well together. It was also deemed desirable that the engineer should be a diver. Mr. Clark was not able to do that kind of work, while Mr. George Burrows, the man selected for the position is a diver.

## BI-LINGUAL OFFICERS OF THE MILITIA.

Mr. TYRWHITT asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to enforce the regulation suggested by General Hutten, that officers and non-commissioned officers, acting as instructors, understand and be able to instruct recruits in both English and French ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). In order to show the exact position of matters, I propose to read the militia orders which have been issued by the General Officer Commanding. On Tuesday, the 14th February, the General Officer Commanding issued the following :—

The Major General Commanding desires to remind the officers and staff of the permanent or instructional corps, and all others who aspire to high command in the future, or to positions of responsibility upon the general staff, that a considerable portion of the military forces of the Dominion consist of French-Canadian regiments. It is, in the Major General's opinion, essential that all officers who now hold, or aspire to hold in the future, responsible positions on the staff, should be able to convey their instructions to the French-Canadian troops, in their own language. All officers of the staff, of the permanent corps, and of the instructional staff (including non-commissioned officers) should more especially acquire a practical as well as a theoretical knowledge of the French language, and the Major General suggests that all those who are unable to read or speak French with fair facility should take an early opportunity of making good this defect.

This was followed on the 5th of May by the following order :—

In order to encourage the study of French by the Anglo-Canadian officers, and non-commissioned officers ; and the study of English by French-Canadian officers and non-commissioned officers of the permanent force, it is proposed to hold examinations at a date which will be hereafter named.

The maximum number of marks will be as follows :—

Dictation .....	100
Translation for Anglo-Canadian officers— French into English,—for French-Canadian officers,—English into French....	100
Translation for Anglo-Canadian officers— English into French,—for French-Canadian officers,—French into English....	200
Writing an essay or letter and copying manuscript .....	100
Oral Examination—conversation, including reading manuscript at sight, and translation in writing from one language into the other, from extempore reading .....	200

Total obtainable..... 700

The result of this examination will be notified in militia orders, and officers and non-commissioned officers who obtain 5 of the total marks will be noted in their record of service as "passed," and those who obtain 8 will be noted as "Interpreters."

The examination will be conducted under arrangements which will be made by the commandant of the Royal Military College in conjunction with the professor of the French and English

Mr. FIELDING.

languages at the college. Special regulations on this head have been drawn up for the information of those concerned.

Officers and N. C. Officers noted as Interpreters will be called up for examination once in every five years.

In addition, I may say that I approve of those suggestions, and they are approved by the Government. I may add that in the English army, French is obligatory, every officer requires to possess a thorough knowledge of the French language.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I did not exactly understand the answer to my question. I particularly wanted to know whether this order would be enforced in the case of the non-commissioned officers as well as inspectors.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have only to add to what I have stated that so far as possible it will be encouraged, but I do not mean to say it will be enforced.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I be allowed to ask if it is contemplated by the Major General Commanding that the Minister of Militia and Defence should be required to understand French so as to be able to speak the French language ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I may say to my hon. friend that that is a defect which I shall endeavour to repair as rapidly as possible.

## QUALIFYING EXAMINATION OF OFFICERS.

Mr. TYRWHITT asked :

What percentage of regimental officers who attended the late camp at Lévis, had passed the qualifying examination ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The district officer of military district No. 7 has been asked to furnish the information ; perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow the question to remain on the paper.

## IMPORTATION OF INDIAN CORN.

Mr. CLANCY asked :

How much Indian corn has been imported into Canada for home consumption for the eleven months ending the 31st May for the fiscal year 1899 ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Pater-son). In reference to this and the next question, I am afraid I will not be able to get my hon. friend this information. Perhaps it would answer his purpose if I were able to bring him down a statement for the nine months, as these are quarterly returns. If I can get the eleven months I will try to do so, but if not, I will bring down the return for three quarters.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to bring them down at once?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will have them prepared as early as possible.

#### PREFERENTIAL TRADE.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask my right hon. friend if he will be kind enough to furnish me with the terms of the resolution which he desires to substitute for the resolution on which I spoke a day or two ago in reference to preferential trade. I have a resolution in my hands, and I would ask my right hon. friend if I may accept it as in the terms he proposes.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Yes.

#### HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS AT PORT COLBORNE AND PORT MAITLAND.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), acting for the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), was good enough to show me the report in connection with Port Colborne harbour. May I ask him if he will do the same about Port Maitland harbour?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At the time I sent to the department for the information I was informed that the papers relating to Port Maitland were not ready. I will make inquiry, and if the report is ready to give to the hon. gentleman he will get it.

#### RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), if he has laid on the Table of the House the railway subsidies to be proposed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No; the railway subsidies, of course, will be laid on the Table of the House by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), at some time during to-day. I cannot say whether they will be placed on the Table this morning or not. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), suggested that he thought they should be here this morning, but I expect that sometime during this session, or to-day, they will be laid on the Table of the House.

#### SEIZURE OF BOATS AND NETS BELONGING TO CANADIAN FISHERMEN.

Mr. PRIOR. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir

Wilfrid Laurier), whether he is aware of the fact that some boats and nets belonging to Canadian fishermen have been seized by the Americans. I see in the Victoria "Daily Colonist," of July 22nd, the following item:—

Vancouver, July 21.—Several Canadian fishermen drifted over to the American line with their nets yesterday. The Yankees seized nets, boats and all, and will sell the boats and nets at auction. The men were ignorant that they were in United States territory, but telegraphic dispatches to Washington and Ottawa have so far failed to make the Yankees give up the nets and boats.

I would ask the right hon. leader of the Government whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to this matter, and if so, whether the Government is looking into it?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am not aware that the Government has any information on the subject of what is contained in these despatches, which, as my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) knows, are not always accurate. I hope there is exaggeration in that report. I have reason to believe that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) is looking into the matter, but I cannot speak positively as to that.

#### SUPPLY—PREFERENTIAL TRADE.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER McNEILL (North Bruce). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would like to call the attention of the House, for a moment, to the position in which we stand in regard to the statement made by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on a very solemn occasion, in a carefully prepared speech, on Wednesday of last week. The right hon. gentleman at that time stated that:

It is the duty of Canada by all means in its power, as soon as it is possible to do so, to get preferential treatment in the markets of Great Britain.

I moved a resolution in these express terms on the Monday following, and my right hon. friend expressed disappointment that I had not consulted him before moving such a resolution. I wish to make it quite clear in reference to that matter, that I, personally, would have thought it was a very left-handed compliment if any one had come to me and asked me if I was prepared to support a carefully considered statement I had made on the floor of this House, a few days before. I did not think it was necessary to consult the hon. gentleman on that matter. Last session, over and over again, I approached the right hon. gentleman and members of his Cabinet in the

hope that we might be able to reach a conclusion—reach a proposition which would commend itself to both sides of the House in reference to this great question. I found it absolutely impossible to do this. I found that the attitude taken by these hon. gentlemen was such that it was quite hopeless to proceed further in these negotiations. I stated here, the other day, and I repeat the statement, that I went so often to the Government, in reference to this matter that I felt I had almost humiliated myself by my importunity. But, as I said before, in reference to a question of this kind, I was prepared to go even so far as that. However, as I have said, there was no use in pressing the matter farther privately during that session. That seemed quite clear. I brought the matter before the House in a resolution simply affirming that it was advisable that the people of Canada should have preferential treatment for their products in the markets of the mother country. Although that was a proposal accepted at the great Colonial Conference in 1894, the Government could not allow their followers to support it. They could not allow their supporters to say that it was desirable that the people of Canada should have a preference in the markets of England over their foreign competitors. The statement which the right hon. gentleman had made on Wednesday of last week seemed to me so correct and so pointed that, if we could have adopted it in the form of a resolution, there can be no doubt that it would have enormously strengthened the hands of those in the mother country who are labouring to secure this great boon for Canada. Why the right hon. gentleman made that statement, in his carefully considered speech on a solemn occasion of this kind, when he did not intend to support it, I am at a loss to understand. We are now in the extraordinary, I will venture to say humiliating position, of finding that the Prime Minister of Canada, after having made a statement in a carefully considered speech, in reference to a question, which Mr. Chamberlain has declared to be the greatest of all Imperial questions, refuses to allow this House to say that the statement he made was a correct or sound statement. The position is extraordinary and humiliating, and I should like to understand from the right hon. gentleman the reasons for the course he has pursued; I should like to know what the right hon. gentleman meant by making that statement if he was not prepared to support it. Did he mean to lead the people of Canada to believe that he was in favour of preferential trade? Did he mean to lead the people of Canada to believe he considered it was the duty of the Government, by all means in its power, and as soon as possible, to get preferential treatment in the markets of Great Britain? If he meant that the people of Canada should under-

Mr. McNEILL.

stand that that is his policy and his view, why is it that, to-day, he refuses to accept the statement, his own statement, made in this House? The statement which the right hon. gentleman made the other day will be very good to go to the country with. It will be very useful to his supporters by enabling them to go to the people, in the approaching election, and to say: "We are as much in favour of preferential trade as our opponents are; see what the Prime Minister has said. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has said distinctly that he considers it his duty to get this preference for your goods as soon as possible and by every means possible; can you ask for anything more direct or pointed than that? That is all right for the country; but the hon. gentleman understands very well that he is not going to promote preferential trade in England by that mere statement in Canada. But he knows very well that if this resolution is passed formally in this House, it will enormously promote preferential trade in England, and because he knows that it will, I presume—for I can imagine no other reason—he refuses to allow the resolution to pass. But as he has made that statement in Canada, that statement will go to England. I shall take very good care that the Colonial Secretary, the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain knows that that statement has been made in this House, because it will have the effect, at all events, when it is brought to his notice in that way, of letting him understand that my right hon. friend does not feel safe in opposing this policy in Canada. But at the very time my right hon. friend was making that statement in the House, and telling the House and the people that he was entirely in favour of preferential trade, and that it would be the duty of the Government, by every means in its power, and as soon as possible, to get preferential trade, he was stabbing preferential trade by voting down the resolution which he knew, if it passed this House, would immensely promote the cause of preferential trade on the other side of the Atlantic. I do not intend to take up the time of the House. I want to hear what the right hon. gentleman has to say with regard to the extraordinary position in which he stands before the country. I want to hear his explanation of this resolution. The resolution, which the right hon. gentleman has been good enough to hand to me, is this:

That this House expresses its belief that it is expedient, by all reasonable means, to develop and promote inter-Imperial trade, and that such an object ought to be reached by mutual concessions and preferences, and reaffirms its approval of the features of the Canadian tariff, whereby Great Britain enjoys preferences in the markets of Canada.

Now, I was prepared to accept that resolution, as I told my right hon. friend, if he

would only allow me to make it clear that it was preferential trade that he meant. But that he will not do. If he had allowed me to make it, say, "by mutual concessions and trade preferences or tariff preferences," I would have been quite willing to accept that resolution; but this the right hon. gentleman at once objected to. Preferences may mean postal preferences. I believe the action taken by the hon. Postmaster General will promote inter-Imperial trade very much. Preferences may mean cable preferences. I believe the grant which has been made by the Imperial Government to the Pacific cable will promote inter-Imperial trade. Preferences may mean subsidies to steamship lines, which will also promote inter-Imperial trade. I wanted this thing made clear; and just as soon as I proposed to make it clear the right hon. gentleman closed down on the proposal, and said he would not accept the amendment I offered, namely, "Tariff preferences." I just wish to make this explanation in order that it may be understood why I have not accepted this resolution of my right hon. friend. It is a resolution which seems to be in favour of preferential trade, just as my right hon. friend seemed to be in favour of preferential trade when he said that it was the duty of the Government by every means in its power to obtain preferential trade. But he refuses to allow me to make the resolution clearly in favour of preferential trade, and, therefore, I object to it. I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Sir Charles Tupper:

That it is the duty of the Government of Canada, by all means in its power, and as soon as it is possible to do so, to get preferential treatment in the markets of Great Britain for the produce of Canada.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the good relations which have hitherto existed between my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) and myself are getting strained, perhaps almost to the point of breaking. If they break, I am sure it will not be through any fault of mine, but through the fault of the hon. gentleman himself. My hon. friend's honour is altogether too sensitive, in so far as I am concerned. So far as he regards his own honour or virtue, I have nothing to say. The hon. gentleman said that he had almost humiliated himself last year in attempting to negotiate with me, and getting me to yield to his views. There was no humiliation so far as I could see, because we attempted to reach a common ground on that question and failed to do so. My hon. friend has his views on this question and I have mine. I would have been happy if we could have reconciled our views. I went a great length, I think, to meet his views and to stand on his level. But if at the last moment we could not attain that very desirable object, I see no humiliation in that fact for him, and none for me.

Mr. McNEILL. Will my right hon. friend allow me to explain? When I said I felt humiliated, it was because I had so often to run after the members of the Government in regard to this matter.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend did not come by invitation.

Mr. McNEILL. Quite so, and that is just why I felt humiliated.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is my hon. friend's own fault. I am sorry my hon. friend should have looked on the matter in that way. I am always anxious to meet the views of my hon. friend, and I would be happy on this occasion if I could do so; but my hon. friend has some views which perhaps are peculiar to himself, and he cannot think it extraordinary if he finds that other members of the House who are anxious to treat him courteously are yet not able to stand on the high level that he has built up for himself. He must allow something for the frailties of human nature, and if we cannot be all as good, as patriotic, and as British as he is, he must take us with our delinquencies. For my part, I am only dust and ashes; I do not pretend to be at all as good as my hon. friend is. I have only to say that so far as my own conduct in this matter is concerned, I feel no humiliation if I do not always see the way to put a speech into a resolution. If my hon. friend always finds a way of expressing in a resolution the views he has expressed in his speech, without any trouble or hesitation, he is endowed with a gift which very few men are blessed with, because there is nothing more difficult than to express concisely and lucidly in a resolution the ideas expressed in an hour's speech. I objected to the motion which my hon. friend offered the other day, and which he moves again to-day, because it implies a censure upon the Government. It says: "That it is the duty of the Government of Canada by all means in its power and as soon as possible" to do so and so. That implies a censure on the Government as not having done its duty in this matter, or done whatever it was possible for it to do. To this I altogether object. I believe we have done as much and more for the very idea my hon. friend has in view as has been done by any other Government in Canada. I take the view which my hon. friend has expounded himself a moment ago. He objects to the motion which I have put into his hands as an alternative. If I had wanted to move it as a party motion, I would have made it much stronger than it is; but in order, if possible, to meet the views of my hon. friend, to overcome his scruples, and to have unanimous action on the subject, I put into the hands of my hon. friend the motion which reads as follows:—

That this House expresses its belief that it is expedient, by all reasonable means, to develop and promote inter-Imperial trade, and that such

an object ought to be reached by mutual concessions and preferences, and reaffirms its approval of the features of the Canadian tariff, whereby Great Britain enjoys preferences in the markets of Canada.

Now, my hon. friend objects to this. He wants to limit the range within which we can obtain a preference and concessions from England. He does not want to have the question left open, but to limit it to one idea, and one alone. He wants to limit it simply to the words, "Trade or tariff." My hon. friend said a moment ago that the resolution I have suggested includes preference in mail service. Does he object to that? He said that it includes also preference in postal service. Does he object to that? He said also that it might mean preference in cable service. Does he object to that? But he says: I want to restrict it to one thing, and that alone. Well, Mr. Speaker, the idea I have is to make it broad, so as to include everything possible. My hon. friend must know that there are two sides to this question, and that if you attempt to force public opinion upon this question in England, you will miss everything. He referred a moment ago to the conference in Ottawa in 1894, and to the resolutions passed by that Colonial Conference, which sat in this city. Is he not not aware that the resolutions of this conference have not been accepted by the Imperial authorities? What is the use, therefore, of trying to force the British Government to do a thing which they have refused to do? The only sensible course followed upon this question by any government is that which we followed when we made an offer and gave an actual preference to the British people, well knowing that, as soon as it was possible, the British Government would follow in that path. But my hon. friend is not content to wait; he wants to force events. He reminds me of Peter the Hermit, who preached the first crusade, but who, although he preached very well, could not lead at all, and was the worst enemy of the movement he had so much at heart. I accept my hon. friend's good intentions, but I am sorry I cannot follow his leadership in this matter, so that nothing remains for me to do but to ask the House to reject his resolution, and we will take the opportunity later on of placing on record our own views on this matter. My hon. friend knows that I cannot move any amendment to his resolution, but must either accept it or vote it down. Therefore, there remains to me no alternative but to vote it down. I am sorry that he will not accept the olive branch which I have tendered him, and which without humiliation he could accept. But since he does not choose to do so, I leave it to him whether or not he is serving the cause he has so much at heart.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I rise for the purpose of meeting the case—which I have not had the opportunity of discussing with Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

my hon. friend who moved the resolution I have great pleasure in seconding—of tendering an olive branch to my right hon. friend opposite, and I think I can, by the addition of a single word, meet his views entirely. I may say that my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), who has taken such a prominent part on this great question of preferential trade, has shown the utmost anxiety, but not an anxiety greater than I have shown and have always felt, to endeavour to obtain the unanimous action of this House on a question that I have no hesitation in saying to-day is the most important ever submitted for the consideration of the people of Canada. At this period of the session, discussed, as this subject has been, and anxious as every member on both sides is to bring the session to a close at the earliest possible moment, I have no idea of occupying but a few moments the attention of the House.

The right hon. leader of the House states that this motion is a censure on himself. The hon. gentleman can hardly be serious in saying that to embody a statement of his own on a most important question—embodying it verbatim, as it fell from his own lips on the floor of the House a few days ago, in discussing this question—is a censure. If it is, then all I can say is, that my hon. friend is his own censor, because he declares to this House that his own utterance on a most important question is a strong censure on himself and his Government. I have no other object than I have had throughout, and that is, in every possible way and by every possible concession, to obtain such a unanimous vote of this House as I feel would be of immense importance in the promotion of preferential trade, to which all parties and all persons in this House, and none more strongly or more emphatically than my right hon. friend, are committed.

What is the position? My right hon. friend, when appealing to the country for power, pledged himself most solemnly that he was at one with me, that I was not a more ardent supporter of this inter-Imperial trade, promoted by tariff preference on both sides, than he was. And he went further. He took up the question as it stood then. He says that the British Government repudiated the action on this question of the Ottawa Conference. But that is scarcely candid. My hon. friend knows that it was the Marquis of Ripon who was in power, when the resolutions of that conference went home, that the Marquis of Ripon was an inveterate free trader, and, therefore, took exception to the proposal made by the Ottawa Conference. But a good deal was heard after that. After that, the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain delivered his views on this question of inter-Imperial preferential trade, not a one-sided trade, but a trade in which each side would have the preference, and he discussed it entirely from the stand-point that there should

be a *quid pro quo* on both sides. With that declaration of the right hon. the present Colonial Minister in his hands, my right hon. friend publicly, when appealing for power, committed himself to that view, and stated that he approved of Mr. Chamberlain's statement. Mr. Chamberlain has never receded to this hour, for an instant, from the position he then took. My hon. friend quoted Mr. Chamberlain's language, and went on to state succinctly that he was prepared to support that policy, that he saw in Mr. Chamberlain's declaration a message of great good for Canada, and declared that if returned to power, he would himself immediately send a commission to the British Government to negotiate preferential trade on those terms. I do not intend to follow the thing further than to say that for some reason, never explained to this day, my right hon. friend changed his mind, and, when he went to England, at the most auspicious time to accomplish the object to which he had so solemnly pledged himself, he took an entirely different attitude. I do not intend to follow that up either, but I draw his attention to the fact that in Toronto, after he returned, he still reiterated his declaration in favour of tariff preference on both sides. He stated that he would have been an idiot if he could have obtained such a thing and had not obtained it; and he explained to the people at that banquet that what he had done was to endeavour to take one step at a time and get the treaties abrogated that stood in the way of England giving a preference to the colonies and the colonies giving a preference to England, and these being removed the subject was open to discussion, and he was prepared to discuss it. Now he is asked to reaffirm on the floor of this House that last declaration that he made to the people of Canada, that he still was determined to use every means in his power to accomplish that preferential trade which he declared was so important to Canada; and I ask my right hon. friend if he is not placing himself in a very unfortunate position when he asks this House to negative a simple statement of his policy as made by himself on the floor of this House on this question. I shall not follow that further than to treat the objection he now makes when he says we are introducing a difficulty in the way of unanimous action in this House by not accepting the resolution that he has drafted. I have no hesitation in saying that, with a view to preventing this being a party question, with a view of having the weight and influence of the whole Parliament of Canada, which I know is of great consequence, in support of this policy, I am prepared to go any length that any man can possibly go to secure an expression of unanimity in this House that I know will only reflect the unanimous sentiment of the people of

Canada. I will tell my right hon. friend how I propose to do it. I will ask my right hon. friend to accept his own resolution, with the addition only of a couple of words that will carry out precisely what he has stated. The resolution reads:

This House expresses its belief that it is expedient, by all reasonable means, to develop and promote inter-imperial trade, and that such an object ought to be reached by mutual concessions and preferences.

The right hon. Premier asks my hon. friend from North Bruce if he objected to cable preferences and postal preferences. Not at all; but what my hon. friend from North Bruce wants is that there should be no mistake that, in addition to any other thing, this is to include tariff preference, to which my right hon. friend had pledged himself solemnly before the country previous to the last struggle in this country, declaring that if he obtained power he would seek to secure it, an assurance he reiterated in the city of Toronto and declared, now that the great obstacle had been removed he was prepared to follow it up. I ask my right hon. friend, consistently with his own declarations, to allow my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) to substitute this resolution which my right hon. friend has introduced, but allowing it to be amended so as to end with the words: concessions and preference by tariff and otherwise."

Now, if my right hon. friend takes the attitude in the face of the world: I will resist any tariff preference being given by the Imperial Parliament to this country—of course, he cannot accept my proposition. But if he will accept my proposition we can have a unanimous resolution here and the matter will be in the hands of the Government to be dealt with by them in the most judicious manner they can. I submit to my right hon. friend whether the suggestion I have made is not one that ought to remove any difference of opinion, and, instead of being regarded as a censure, should be regarded as an expression of the unanimous sentiment of this House, and by resolution proposed by my right hon. friend himself.

**THE PRIME MINISTER.** The views expressed by my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) are worthy of consideration. I am sure he will not think it extraordinary if I ask time to consider what he says and to consult my colleagues. I will give him an answer this afternoon.

**SIR CHARLES TUPPER.** I am sure my hon. friend from North Bruce will be ready to withdraw his motion on that understanding, a course in which I shall cordially agree. This is an important question and one on which we should have a unanimous declaration in this House.

**MR. MCNEILL.** I shall be glad to let the motion stand over.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. It will be necessary for my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) to withdraw his motion. This is in amendment to a motion for Supply, the hon. gentleman can bring it up later.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER**. Shall the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) have leave to withdraw his motion?

**Mr. EDWARDS**. As I may not be here when this question is taken up on a future occasion by the House, I desire to say a few words upon it now. Representing, as I do, an agricultural county, and knowing well as I do, that the agricultural interests are the greatest interests of this country, it can be very readily understood that any practical measure which would advance the interests of the farmers of Canada would receive my heartiest support. But I believe in dealing with questions practically; I believe in attempting that which we have some chance of accomplishing. In my opinion, this proposal is simply protection run mad. Hon. gentlemen opposite years ago, introduced a system under which the farmers of Canada have been great sufferers, under which they have been burdened as no other class have been burdened by unjust and improper taxation.

**Mr. COCHRANE**. You have bettered it now.

**Mr. EDWARDS**. Mr. Speaker, when a patient is suffering from a terrible disease under which he has suffered for many years, you would not apply the antidote in such a way as to immediately kill the patient. The cure of this evil of taxation under which the farmers of Canada suffer must be brought about by degrees. But what is proposed, instead of a reduction of the burden under which our farmers suffer? The proposition is to tax the artisans and mechanics of Great Britain for the benefit of the farmers of Canada. And with what results? With the result of making the produce which Canada buys from England dearer than it is to-day. The time may come in the history of the world when it will be absolutely necessary for Great Britain and her colonies to unite commercially and otherwise against the rest of the world.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER**. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards), who is addressing the House with so much ability, allow me to call his attention to the fact that there is no question before the House, the resolution having been withdrawn at the request of the Prime Minister. And the matter will be brought up again at three o'clock. I think my hon. friend is not aware of the position, or he would not interpose between the Government and Supply under the circumstances.

**Mr. EDWARDS**. I may be wrong, Mr. Speaker, and if so, I submit to your dictum.

**Mr. McNEILL**.

But, as I understand it, the mover and seconder have offered to withdraw the resolution but the House has not given leave for its withdrawal.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER**. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) has the right to speak. The motion is to go into Supply, to which an amendment was proposed, which amendment it is proposed to withdraw. I put the motion that the hon. gentleman have leave to withdraw his motion, and, on that, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) rose.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER**. I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) if, at this period of the session, he proposes to anticipate what may be arrived at by the leader of the House on this question, the offer to withdraw the resolution having been made at the Premier's suggestion.

**Mr. EDWARDS**. Mr. Speaker, if the leader of the House desires I should say nothing upon the subject, I will discontinue; but, Sir, I have views upon questions of this kind that are entirely my own, and as the hon. member for North Bruce has stated that at some previous time members on this side were ordered not to vote for his resolution, I may say that I would not vote for his resolution if I were asked by all the Prime Ministers in the world to support it. I hope that at no distant day the duties will be still further reduced in aid of the farmers of Canada, materially reduced, not only in the interest of the farmers, but in the interest of every individual in Canada, manufacturers as well as farmers, because, if the great agricultural industry is prosperous all other industries in this country will prosper. Agriculture is the foundation of the prosperity of Canada, and if our farmers are unduly burdened and taxed, how can manufacturers prosper? Now, what is suggested? Hon. gentlemen who are protectionists are not satisfied with burdening the people of Canada, that is to say, with burdening the farmers as one class in favour of another class in Canada; but now it is suggested to tax the British artisan and mechanic to aid the farmers of Canada. Are the farmers of Canada such cowards that they want to be spoon-fed in this way? No, Sir, the farmers of Canada only want even-handed justice and fair-play, and no favour. Let them have that, and the day will never come when the farmers of Canada will ask that the British artisan and mechanic shall be taxed to aid them. No, Mr. Speaker, let us do what we can, let us do justice to the farmer in the matter of taxation in our own country, and in the next place, let us do everything we can for the advancement and improvement of agriculture in our country. It has been previously stated in this House that farms in the lower provinces were being abandoned.

Mr. DOMVILLE. That is not true, they are not abandoned.

Mr. EDWARDS. Never mind the statement was made, and what was the remedy suggested. That some sort of arrangement should be made so that British and other agriculturists coming to this country should settle on the farms of Canada abandoned by our farmers. What sense is there in that? If our farmers cannot live upon their farms, why should we try to induce immigrants from foreign countries to settle upon them? The true remedy is for these hon. gentlemen in the lower provinces to improve the agricultural conditions within their provinces. It is quite true that on the western prairies there are settlers who have left their farms in the eastern provinces of Canada; but it is only a question of time when, under improved conditions of agriculture, this eastern portion of Canada will shine as well as the west will ever shine.

Now, Sir, I want to show you the contradictory statement that has been made when this question was previously discussed in this House. It was said that the Government gave away its case when it lowered the tariff against British goods, and did not at that time avail themselves of the opportunity of getting a preference in the British market. In the same breath it was said that the preferential clause of the tariff is not at all in favour of England, but that it has increased trade with the United States. Well, Sir, I do not think that any man living can go into that question and arrive at an accurate conclusion upon it, but I claim that the reduction of 25 per cent on British goods coming into Canada, has produced this beneficial result at least, that it has reduced the taxation upon our own people, it has reduced the protection on goods produced in our own country just to that extent; and in that respect it has been a great benefit to the farmers and producers of our country. But how can any man say that the imports from England would not be less to-day than they are but for that preference? I think they would be less. It is quite true that our imports from the United States have increased very largely, but there is a very natural reason for that in the impetus which trade of every kind has enjoyed in Canada. The importations of raw material have increased very largely to this country, as well also as many manufactured articles. Now, I want to make one plain proposition. Canada, for nearly 4,000 miles, lies along the border of the United States, and the United States produces all kinds of machinery of the exact kind that we require in Canada, and as a consequence of our development in every direction, there has arisen in Canada a large demand for machinery of various kinds that is manufactured in the United States, and which England does not manufacture. For instance, if I wanted to-day in the lumber trade, which is the next largest industry to

agriculture a saw gate, or a gang for sawing lumber where would I have to go to get it? I would be compelled to go to the United States, because no other country, not even England, manufactures them. From the fact that they are made more cheaply in the United States, because they are manufactured as a specialty, than they can be made in Canada, and they are imported into this country. Therefore, it is the most natural thing in the world that our trade with the United States should increase very largely under existing conditions. In my view that is the cause of our growing trade with the United States, and not because of any tariff conditions whatever. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a wide subject, and it is well known that I am an out-and-out free trader, and it is inevitable that on some occasions at least I should desire to give expression to my views. But my hon. friend from North Bruce may say on this occasion: Oh, but you are disloyal.

Mr. McNEILL. No, I would not say that.

Mr. EDWARDS. He might say so, Mr. Speaker, but just as long as Canada lies for 4,000 miles along the northern boundary of the United States it is desirable in the interests of both countries that the very freest trade relations should exist between the two countries. But, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I take no second place as to my faith in British institutions. If I am a radical I am a constitutional radical, and I believe firmly in British institutions. Let me say this, that, looking at the United States and the greatness of that grand country, I say that the country has made the people rather than that the people have made the country. It is impossible that a country such as the United States, with all its different climates and its enormous resources, should not be a great country. North of that great country, with our vigorous climate, and with our geographical conditions the task ahead of us may be more difficult, but we are equal to the occasion, the northern people are equal to the occasion, and although the work must be a more difficult one, we will accomplish the great object we have in view of making Canada a grand country also. Understanding as I do the great advantage of British institutions over American institutions, I say it here, Mr. Speaker, frankly and candidly, that I would rather eat dry bread in Canada than buttered bread in the United States. There is no question as to my views upon the subject, and to the position I take and will always take. We have heard very little in this House this session as to the desirability of trade with the United States. Still, I say, that trade with the United States will aid in developing this country as it can be developed in no other way. No sane man, having any understanding of the conditions that exist between Canada and the United States, of the geographical conditions, of the great

carriage east and west, can come to any other conclusion than the best trade relations available with that country will be in the best interest of Canada as well as of the United States. But I hold this view and have always held it: We cannot fight the United States with high tariffs. It is perfectly impossible that any country with 5,000,000 of a population can combat a country with 80,000,000 of a population by means of high tariffs, but there is a way we can do it, and that is by a material lowering of our tariffs. If we levied a 10 per cent tariff to-day, a purely revenue tariff, we would bring the United States, great and strong as she is, to her very knees. And she would have to adopt the same programme herself. The result would be that the channels of the St. Lawrence would float the commerce of this northern portion of the continent. I hold very strong views upon this subject, and just so long as I entertain the views I do I will express them. Canada will never make her best prosperity, Canada will never advance as she should until we come as near as possible to free trade, and when this is attained, I think visionary dreams of asking England to do what would be a wrong to England for the benefit of Canada will vanish. This is a visionary dream; it is useless and a waste of the time of Parliament to discuss it. If England, for the benefit of the English people, desires to give a preference to Canadian goods, it will be time to advance this proposition, but it is futile, silly and nonsensical and a waste of time to discuss any such question now.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I only want to say a few words to the point. I have not very much faith in this preferential business; I have not very much faith in this Imperial federation. There may be a good many people in England who have got Imperial honours out of the advocacy of the question, but I think that Canada should look after herself and do her own business. All we want is our market. We can give the Imperialists in the mother country a few positions over here by putting out some of our own people. But if there is to be a preferential tariff, it must be according to the motion that I have put on the Paper. I shall not have a chance of reaching it this session, but I shall read it, and put it on "Hansard," without bothering anybody. The principle involved is that goods that come into Canada under the preferential tariff must come direct through a Canadian port. I am here as a representative of the maritime provinces, where we are progressing in the direction of building up this country. I am not going to sit still and see goods coming to Boston, Portland and New York under the preferential tariff. If the English people want to send their goods to this country and they want to buy our cereals, then, we ought to have some protection in England, and if

Mr. EDWARDS.

we get such protection for our cereals we ought to give them a preference, and I am prepared to do that. I shall read this notice of motion that I may put it on "Hansard," and then I shall have nothing more to say on the subject. I propose to move:

That inasmuch as the Parliament of Canada by the Act 61 Victoria, chap. 37, with a view to encourage the extension of trade between the Dominion and mother country and the British West Indies, provided that a preferential tariff should be applied to manufactures and products of those countries respectively; and inasmuch as vast quantities of goods entitled to such preference are now imported into Canada, by way of foreign ports, greatly to the disadvantage of our own seaports and consequent loss to our own people, and it is desirable as far as possible to encourage the carrying on of the import trade of the country through Canadian ports: It is for the reason herein set forth, in the opinion of this House, that it would be a wise policy and one in the best interests of the Dominion, to provide that the preference granted by said Act should only apply to articles imported by sea from the country of manufacture or production into Canada through a Canadian port.

Amendment (Mr. McNeill) withdrawn and motion agreed to.

(In the Committee.)

Contingencies—

In Canadian, British and foreign agencies, and general immigration expenses, including salaries of extra clerks at head office ..... \$257,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is an increase of \$90,000. Would the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) tell us the cause of that increase?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The \$257,000 is made up by the following estimates:—The estimate of the High Commissioner's office for European work is \$57,299. We are asking for \$60,000 in round numbers. For travelling expenses, advertising and general expenses in the United States, we ask for \$60,000. For travelling expenses in connection with the Canadian agencies, and all Canadian officers, we ask \$30,000; for the expenses of locating settlers, \$20,000; grant respecting the Lake St. John Railway, \$8,000; advertising and printing in Canada, \$30,000; bookings paid on account of Doukhobors, \$20,000; bonuses to be paid on children's immigration, \$5,000; commissions to booking agents, other than the amount I mentioned as being estimated for the Doukhobors, \$10,000; and a number of miscellaneous items, \$14,000. That makes altogether \$257,000. The hon. gentleman asked me about the expenses in the United States. The general expenses of the United States agents this year will be \$27,623.34, besides \$7,881 for advertising.

Mr. FOSTER. There are two or three points on which I want information. One has reference to the maintenance of immigrants in hospitals. I find that immigrants are maintained at the rate of 90 cents a day in the Calgary General Hospital and in the Holy Cross Hospital. I would like to

have an explanation of what the policy is with reference to that. The same thing seems to be done at Medicine Hat Hospital, and generally along the line. With reference to the uniforms, there does not seem to be much uniformity. For instance, I find that some get two summer uniforms and a winter uniform, others get one of each and others only one of any kind. Then with reference to the persons who get the uniforms, some appear to get them who are not permanent men at all, but simply casuals. For instance, an interpreter who did two months' work gets a uniform suit and a uniform cap. Another man gets a uniform suit, an overcoat, a pair of trousers, a fur cap, a cloth cap and a lot of buttons. Another man gets two summer uniforms, a winter uniform, an overcoat at \$30, and a Chesterfield at \$14.50, and this, singularly, is all given to the man who does not wear his uniform, Mr. McCreary. Then I find a very large item, under Winnipeg, for all kinds of provisions. What is the principle followed with reference to that? Then there is a sum for the relief of prairie fire sufferers. It is a small item, but how do you give that out of an immigration vote?

Then there is fare advanced to emigrants, \$73.85. Then, there is an odd item here, expenses for securing labourers for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, \$109.82. What in the world have we to do, as an immigration agency, with getting labourers for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway? Then, there is a small item of whisky, six bottles, at \$1, 50. I suppose that is to be used on the cattle that the immigrants are taking out to stock their farms. There is an item here, W. F. McCreary, Yorkton, for livery. I thought that was, perhaps, another suit of clothes, but, no doubt, it is for the hire of horses, and I suppose it is all right. When you come to these immigration agents in the United States, the salaries do not amount to much, comparatively, but when you come to consider the whole expenses of their offices, the amount is nearly \$40,000. That is very high, and I do not think the hon. Minister has any right to plead that all the immigrants that come in from the United States come in by virtue of the work and the expenses of these immigration agents. There is a set and trend of immigration, the best you can possibly get, which results from the information given by settlers, and which forces its impression on the public mind that our Northwest is a good place to go to. That is altogether independent of the services of these agents, and if in proportion as the Northwest and Manitoba has recovered from the old difficulties of frost and other difficulties, and a succession of good years and good crops follows, that persuasive power is having its effect all through the countries from which immigrants come, and in no other country more than the border states of the Union, especially on Canadians who have gone there.

I think that those expenses are in many cases excessive. The amount of advertising that is done is simply tremendous. I would like to have an idea as to what is the end of advertising, and as to whether the hon. Minister thinks that that end is being secured now, and the amount properly expended. Mr. McInnes' office costs the country \$5,500, the large items being outside his salary and being for the expenses of the office, rents and the fares of delegates, advertising, and the like. Mr. Davies' office costs \$5,891, which is very large. Outside of his own salary, there are his board and lodging, and other incidental expenses, none of which include the large items for advertising. We find that afterwards, and I will come to it a little later on, but on the whole the sum of \$40,000 was expended on United States immigration agencies. That is a very large amount, and I doubt whether we get an adequate return.

With regard to European agencies, the expenses in Dublin are very large. I think the hon. Minister must be convinced himself that the return from that country has not been and hardly can be expected to be anything very great in the way of immigration to this country. I find an item "to the Royal Dublin Society Horse Show, \$98.31," and I am sure I do not know how that is brought about. In Liverpool, we have Mr. A. F. Jury, the agent, and Mr. W. Jury, office boy and messenger. I suppose he is a son of the agent. We have subscriptions to newspapers there, \$108.12, which is a large item. The living expenses of Mr. Jury, and travelling, amount to about \$1,000. Altogether, the expense of that office amounts to \$8,091, including Mr. Jury himself and his clerks. I do not want to say anything particularly with reference to Mr. Jury, but I do not believe that in him the hon. Minister has the best agent he ought to have for the district of which Liverpool is the centre, and in which he has to follow so competent and well-known a man as Mr. Dyke. The Minister very likely may have a different opinion. In the immigration general expenditures, I find that there was paid to Prof. Oleskow, expenses re immigration of Galicians, \$2,582. Is that the professor about whose pay the hon. Minister gave an explanation yesterday?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.  
Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. When we come to printing, we find very large expenditures. The system has grown up of giving bonuses to the party newspapers for special editions. Now, occasionally you may get some good service in that respect, but I believe that when you give a large subsidy to the Toronto "Globe," for instance, for a Christmas or Jubilee edition, or anything like that, you are not making the best use possible of immigration money. Altogether, for printing and advertising, in Canada, \$9,000 has been

expended, and a large proportion given to newspapers for special and advertising editions, as they are called. But when you go to the United States, you find that it is there the advertising and printing gets in its fine work. In the United States last year, in advertising and printing, there were some \$18,000 expended. Some of these sums have been expended in pure advertising, which, I suppose would be advertising the fact that there are homes in Canada for settlers, and giving the settlers an idea of the regulations, but a good deal of the money has been spent on newspaper items, and there are many papers willing to give you a "write up" if you pay a good subsidy, and it is doubtful whether we are getting the worth of our money. There is no political service that can be gained by any return from these papers, because they are not Canadian papers. The "Canadian-American" got \$1,900 for 200,000 copies of a special edition. In what way were these copies distributed, and are you sure we got the benefit of the distribution? There must be some method by which the Minister assured himself that that went to our interest in foreign countries, or particular places in the United States. The Chicago Newspaper Union got for advertising, \$2,879.64. What was the kind of advertising done for that very large amount? Then, Lord & Thomas, of Chicago, got \$1,356.70, and the A. N. Kellogg Newspaper Company got \$3,156.75, and the Western Newspaper Union, \$6,095.50 for advertising alone.

Now, these are generous expenditures, and they are expenditures for papers in the United States. I think that, before we spend \$10,000 or \$20,000 on advertising in these newspapers, we ought to have full explanation of what we are getting for the money. It is an easy thing to spend \$340,000, but it is an immense amount to take from the contributors to taxes in this country. We spend this amount in immigration. One-third of it, perhaps one-half, was spent on what you may call these mechanical appliances; a great deal goes to pay for the general official work of the department, while comparatively little reaches the objective point of securing would-be immigrants. I submit these points, not in the spirit of carping criticism, but desiring to understand what we are getting for the money spent.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The first question the hon. gentleman asked was, as to the policy respecting hospitals. We have followed the policy of the previous Government, that is, we regard any person who has not been in Manitoba and the North-west a year, who goes into hospital as an immigrant patient, and for his maintenance the department pays 90 cents a day. Last year we paid Calgary Hospital \$459; Medicine Hat, \$1,211.40, and Edmonton General Hospital, \$614.20.

As to uniforms, when I took charge of the department, each officer was allowed a sum-

Mr. FOSTER.

mer and a winter uniform. My deputy tells me that that policy was followed until the 1st July, 1898. Thinking the allowance too liberal, it was cut down at that time. Since the 1st July, then, the rule has been to allow a suit of clothes, with an extra pair of trousers, an overcoat and a hat or cap. The fact that two or three sets of articles are charged against one individual is due to the fact that the accounts did not come in, and so the accounts for more than one year appear in one Report of the Auditor General. I am satisfied there has been no violation of the rule.

Mr. FOSTER. But this Chesterfield seems to be a violation of the rule. I object to the Chesterfield.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman's acquaintance with the fashions will inform him that a Chesterfield is an ordinary overcoat. It was a stylish garment many years ago, but is a very ordinary one now.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood the hon. Minister to say that an overcoat was not allowed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No; an overcoat is included.

Mr. FOSTER. There is just this objection—that in Winnipeg, as the oldest, or the youngest, inhabitants will tell you, no one wears an overcoat; the climate does not make it necessary.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman mentions also the case of provisions. We cannot have an absolute rule with regard to that, but must allow the Immigration Commissioner considerable discretion. If there are people in the immigrant building for whom it is necessary to buy provisions, he is allowed to buy a small quantity to meet their wants. Nineteen-twentieths of the people who go to the immigrant building are able to buy their own provisions. In the case of the Doukhobors, the provisions were charged up against the committee's fund. The object we seek to gain is to prevent dissatisfaction and avoid having people send out reports that they are in Canada and in destitute circumstances.

As for the item regarding relief in connection with prairie fires, the only explanation I can give is, I suppose, that the Immigration Commissioner has employed some new settlers in connection with the prairie fires, and has paid them. The Auditor General's summary of the nature of a bill is sometimes misleading. The Immigration Commissioner could not obtain payment for relief for prairie fires in the ordinary way, so I fancy the explanation must be what I have suggested. If the hon. gentleman desires, I will look into the matter and get the details.

Another item was with regard to expenses of getting labourers for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. We made a special offer to place a lot of incoming Welsh people. They

were farmers in Wales, and they left there on the undertaking, on the part of our agent, that they would be placed on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and should have work for a certain length of time. At the same time there were some Canadians in Duluth who wrote and asked if an effort could not be made to get them, and an agent was appointed in Duluth for the purpose of going around amongst the Canadians and making arrangements to get them to come up, and a number of them were sent up to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and some of them afterwards took up land. Some expense was incurred in connection with that, to which this item refers. The whisky the hon. gentleman refers to was purchased for quarantine.

Mr. FOSTER. As a germ-killer ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, it is said to be very effective for that purpose. In regard to the general question of expenditure in the United States, I may say that a good deal of it has gone for advertising in the United States papers, but we have not done so for the purpose of subsidizing American papers for the Liberal party. Nor have we spent money for that purpose in advertising in Canada, though I am free to confess that, other things being equal, I would be disposed to give our own friends the preference. I want to say this, that, in my judgment, and as a result of my observations in regard to this subject, of all the money we have spent on this branch of immigration the best results have been obtained from advertising. The money that has been spent in advertising in the United States has largely been expended in the purchase of the patent inside of newspapers with large circulations, or in the purchase of space, which we buy from such institutions as the Chicago Newspapers' Union. I need not go into lengthy explanations on that subject, because I discussed it fully last session. We have found that class of advertising extremely useful. In the case of the Chicago Newspapers' Union, we bought a certain amount of space and we changed the plan of the advertisement as often as we liked, giving them so much an inch. Of course the papers containing the advertisement were addressed to the agents, and our experience has been that of the ordinary advertiser in any commercial business, that as soon as we stopped issuing those advertisements, almost immediately letters of inquiry addressed to our agents began to fall off. The letters of inquiry that come to our agents are in almost exact proportion to the amount of advertising that we do of various kinds. I think the most effective advertising, according to the reports of our officers is the patent inside. In the case of one Chicago paper, the Chicago "American," we bought 200,000 copies, and our officers sent a large number of these papers to seedsmen through-

out the North-west, and I think they did a vast amount of good. This matter of sending out literature is very much like firing off bullets, only one bullet in ten is going to kill anybody; but if you do not fire off any you will not kill anybody. We have kept on following various lines of propaganda for the purpose of keeping information before the public.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. The hon. gentleman states that 200,000 copies of the Chicago "American" were circulated. Do I understand that these copies were circulated to single individuals, that is to 200,000 different addresses, or were they sent in bulk to certain sections of the North-western portion of the United States ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The 200,000 were mailed from the office of publication. The postage was paid by the publishers of the paper, and they were mailed to addresses that we furnished. They did the mailing.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. You furnished the 200,000 addresses ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, we furnished 200,000 addresses. Our officers and the publishers worked together in the business of getting the addresses, but our officers did most of the work in that direction. The office of publication sent the papers to the addresses we furnished. We have the list of addresses now somewhere in the department.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. In that case I think the money was well expended.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am going to say this with regard to the general question of immigration from the United States. When I organized the staff and took charge of it in the spring of 1897, there was no movement whatever of population from the United States to Canada. If there was any movement at all it was the other way, more were leaving than were coming in. There had been some slight movement a few years before, but it had died out. Now, the fact is that the movement of population from the United States has grown from the time that work was begun until last year we had nearly 10,000 agricultural settlers from Michigan and the north-western states. We trace those settlers almost altogether to the places where our agents had been working, and I am bound to say that I have not the least doubt that we would not have had more than one or two thousand such immigrants were it not for that kind of work. I would not go so far as to say that we might not have got some people from the western states, but we would not have got one-third or one-quarter as many. In my judgment, and in the judgment of my officers, the immigration work has to be carried on in the same manner as the sale of any commo-

dity ; just as soon as you stop advertising and missionary work the movement is going to stop. Last year, for instance, we introduced a new scheme. We secured the State Editorial Association in two or three states to go west over the Canadian Pacific Railway. We had them entertained and carefully looked after all the way, they were in charge of the officers of the department, and practically all the country editors went away with a very excellent idea of Canada, and a large amount of information they never possessed before. They went back and wrote up Canada in glowing style in all their papers.

That happened in two or three states last year. This year we have taken the National Editorial Association. They have been at the coast and they have just got back now, having been in charge of one of our agents and they will go back to their homes and give favourable reports of what they have seen. Of course, this is the very best kind of advertising. It does not cost much, and it is the very best kind of advertising that we can get, because when the editors are writing from the result of their own personal observations, they are more likely to impress the people than if ordinary advertising matter were presented to them. They have been disposed to treat us in a friendly way. That may somewhat arise from the fact that we entertain them to some extent, but the amounts that are expended in such entertainments are only trifling. I am quite aware that some of the office expenses in the north-western states are large. We have attempted to cut them down, but they cannot be reduced very much without curtailing the amount of work that we are doing. It must be a question for the committee to decide as to whether we should reduce the sum devoted to this work or not. If we reduce the expenditure we will get fewer settlers, and the number of settlers we are getting is pretty largely in proportion to the amount of work we do. We have an excellent lot of officers in the western states who are well qualified for the work and industrious. The work, as I pointed out yesterday, has been much more successful than I had any idea it would be when we started it. We have succeeded in getting a most desirable lot of people from the north-western states, and I think it would be a serious mistake if this work were cut down at the present time. We have practically inaugurated the movement, and people are very much in the habit of getting into the idea of going to certain places, one person following another, and having inaugurated this movement, having worked it up to such proportions that we got nearly 10,000 people last year, and I think we will get 12,000 or 14,000 this year I think it would be a serious mistake to take any chances in the way of destroying the movement at this stage. I think it should be kept up for some time, although I

Mr. SIFTON.

do not say that it should be kept up permanently. I do not think that immigration work, or the carrying on of a propaganda in foreign countries is to be regarded as permanent feature of our institutions, but until we have succeeded in establishing a movement which is securing for us a class of people, as to whose desirability there can be no question, I think it would be a mistake to allow that work to fall off. I think we should keep up the pace we have set to-day, and if possible, increase the movement, so that perhaps in a few years the movement will become permanent. There is no doubt that at the present time we have a favourable opportunity for carrying on this work amongst the people of the western states, because the idea is prevalent now, that their public lands are exhausted and information is being disseminated through the western and north-western states that we have large areas in the North-west Territories where free grant land can be obtained. Hon. gentlemen would think that everybody in the western states would know that we have free grant lands in the North-west Territories, but there seems to be an absolute and dense ignorance amongst the farming population of the western states in regard to Canada. No farther south than the southern portion of Minnesota our agents have come across communities that did not know that we could raise wheat in the North-west Territories. They thought that we were in the ice line and that it was absolutely impossible to carry on farming operations such as they were accustomed to. Our first work consisted in getting men, well known in certain communities, to come to Canada, travel through the country and go back and tell their neighbours what kind of a country they saw. They have been astounded at what they have seen and they have been the means of disseminating a great deal of information amongst the people in those communities. I have no doubt that for some years to come it will be a good investment for the Dominion of Canada to keep on disseminating that kind of information amongst the people of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Montana, and that group of states in which there is a population of the class that is likely to make the most successful settlers in the Canadian North-west.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the hon. gentleman sits down I want to ask him to explain an item in the Auditor General's Report :

H. Walton-Jones, Scandinavian agent—  
Accounts, &c., paid on account of salary and expenditure ..... \$1,435 82

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is a gentleman that I sent to Stockholm to report on the possibility of doing successful immigration work in Sweden. As the hon. gentleman is aware, there are certain of the north-western states that have been largely settled by Swedes and Norwe-

gians, especially Swedes, who have been most excellent settlers. They have been, perhaps, the best of all the European settlers, outside of settlers from the British Isles, who have gone into the western states, Minnesota was largely settled by Norwegians and Swedes, and I thought it was desirable to get some definite and reliable information as to what could be done in Sweden in the way of inaugurating a movement of population to our west. I found great difficulty in getting anybody who would be competent and who was familiar with the language.

Mr. DAVIN. Is this gentleman familiar with the language?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, quite. He holds the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the Swedish University and is perfectly familiar with the Swedish and also the Finnish language. He is a linguist of exceptional ability. He was recommended to me by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), with whom I consulted upon the question. He was recommended as being the best man that could be found for that purpose; he was sent over to Sweden, he made his report and these accounts are for his expenses.

Mr. DAVIN. Is he still in the employ of the department?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

It being One o'clock, the Deputy Speaker left the Chair.

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As it is understood that there is other business for this afternoon, I beg to move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose that the other business my hon. friend refers to is the prohibition resolution?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not know that was to be brought on this afternoon. Would it make any difference to the Government to go on with Supply this afternoon, and take that to-morrow afternoon, if that is agreeable all round? I think the hon. gentleman who is to move the resolution should let us have his views as to that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it may be agreed that the resolution will stand until to-morrow.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. To-morrow is Friday, when a number of gentlemen leave.

The PRIME MINISTER. As we are in the last days of the session, I think it is not

too much to ask members to be here on Friday and Saturday.

Mr. FOSTER. Would it not be well to have it understood that the resolution shall be moved at eleven o'clock to-morrow? That would be for the convenience of most of the members, some of whom might want to go away.

The PRIME MINISTER. That might interfere with the committees, which sit in the morning. I will tell my hon. friend later.

Salaries and expenses in connection with the administration of the Yukon district ..... \$100,000

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Customs whether he has brought down Mr. Ogilvie's report with regard to the undervaluation of vessels?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think I have not brought that yet.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the reason of the increase in this item?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is a vote for administration of the Yukon district under the control of the Department of the Interior. I may say that this amount was made up before I had received Mr. Ogilvie's estimate. Mr. Ogilvie's instructions were to forward at as early a date as possible an estimate of the requirements of the service in the district for the coming year, so that it could be laid before Parliament; but his estimate did not reach here before the main Estimates were made up and distributed, and I had to make up an estimate from the information which I had at my disposal, and I put it at \$100,000. But when I got Mr. Ogilvie's estimate, I found that my estimate was not sufficient; so that there is a supplementary estimate to follow this, increasing the estimate to \$110,000 or \$115,000. The total will be \$215,000. I will read the portions of Mr. Ogilvie's letter which have reference to his estimate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As that has not yet been laid on the Table of the House, I think it would be desirable for the hon. gentleman to read the whole letter.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The letter does not make much reference to the estimates, but it refers to other things which will afford information to the committee.

Commissioner's Office,  
Dawson, Y.T., Feb. 28th, 1899.

Hon. Clifford Sifton,  
Minister of Interior, Ottawa.

Sir,—I inclose herewith an estimate of the revenue of the Yukon Territory from 30th June, 1899, to June 30th, 1900, amounting to \$1,507,500. This amount Mr. Lithgow and myself arrived at after going over, as nearly as we could, the previous year's revenue. This does not include, of course, the local revenue, receipts from liquors, &c., but simply that pertaining to the Dominion.

I also inclose an estimate of the probable expenditure for the next year, which consists, as you will see, to a large extent, of funds necessary for the requisite buildings. This we have placed at \$100,000. I think we may assume, with reasonable certainty that this will cover all the buildings necessary in the country, and it may be that there will be a surplus. This does not include expense connected with the North-west Mounted Police, of which Mr. White will inform you. In case you decide to abandon the present system of rationing officials and giving them a living allowance, I have included an estimate on that head showing that it will require some \$48,500. The estimate on account of expenditure amounts to \$162,200, in all \$310,700. Taking this out of the estimated revenue, we have a balance of \$1,296,800, or say practically one and one-quarter millions of dollars in favour of the territory.

Of course, you can readily understand that much of the expenditure, more particularly that of buildings, will be more or less permanent, and will not be required at any future time. If the militia leave the country, it is just possible that the buildings erected for their accommodation at Selkirk will meet every requirement of the Government service at that point for years to come. They are large and commodious, and I think will suit every purpose.

The buildings erected for militia accommodation at Dawson will be required for police accommodation. The police at present are hampered for room.

In connection with this, I may say that it is not at all desirable to use the wood of this country in finishing buildings. I have written to you on this subject, however, and I will content myself by simply calling your attention to my former communication.

The A. C. Co. will bring red-wood from California at about \$150 per thousand feet. Lumber, even at this cost of transport, with the original cost at the point of purchase added, I think will be cheaper in the end than the native lumber. I will advise with the agent of the A. C. Co. here, and try to secure an option on the amount necessary for the finishing of our buildings, as I understand they intend bringing a ship-load of red-wood and other good lumber from San Francisco.

I suppose what we require for Government use will be admitted free of duty. Would you kindly let me know this as soon as convenient.

It is hardly possible the lumber will reach here before the 1st of July.

I have the honour to be, sir,  
Your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) WILLIAM OGILVIE,  
Commissioner.

Mr. Ogilvie's estimate of the amount required to be voted for expenditure from 30th June, 1899, to 30th June, 1900, in the Yukon territory, is as follows:—

#### SALARIES.

No.	Rank.	Amount.
		\$
1	Commissioner .....	5,000
1	Private Secretary .....	1,200
1	Messenger .....	720
2	Stenographers at \$1,200.....	2,400
1	Comptroller .....	2,000
1	Clerk to Comptroller.....	1,200
1	Legal Adviser .....	2,500
1	Stenographer to Council and Legal Adviser .....	1,200
Mr. SIFTON.		

#### SALARIES—Continued.

No.	Rank.	Amount.
		\$
1	Gold Commissioner .....	4,000
1	Stenographer for Gold Commissioner .....	1,200
4	Mining Inspectors at \$1,500....	6,000
1	Accountant, Gold Commissioner's office .....	1,200
3	Mining Recorders at \$1,100.....	3,300
10	Clerks at \$900.....	9,000
3	Clerks at \$720.....	2,160
3	Recorders, outside Dawson, at \$900 .....	2,700
1	Janitor, Gold Commissioner's office .....	720
1	Crown Timber and Land Agent.	1,800
1	Chief Clerk and Accountant....	1,200
1	Clerk .....	900
1	Timber Inspector .....	1,500
2	Timber Inspectors at \$1,200.....	2,400
1	Timber Agent, Selkirk .....	1,200
1	Timber Agent, Tagish .....	1,000
3	Cooks at \$720.....	2,160
3	Servants at \$720.....	2,160
3	Labourers at \$720.....	2,160
1	Carpenter .....	720
		63,700

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

Travelling expenses and cost of board, Mining Inspectors at Grand Forks, Dominion, Stewart River and Selkirk .....	10,000
Travelling expenses generally.....	3,000
Travelling expenses, Timber Inspectors .....	3,000
Printing work required in Dawson.	1,000
Stationery and books purchased in Dawson .....	1,000
Contingencies .....	10,000
Freight to St. Michael's (to be arranged at Ottawa), towing up Yukon .....	1,000
To assist sick and destitute.....	15,000
44,000	
107,700	

Estimated amount required in lieu of rations for officials—

Per annum—	
Commissioner .....	2,000
Gold Commissioner .....	1,200
Comptroller .....	1,200
Legal Adviser .....	1,200
Registrar .....	1,200
Crown Timber and Land Agent.	1,200
45 officials at \$900 per annum..	40,500
Extra rations, per annum.....	10,000
58,500	
166,200	

Note.—In addition to the above, Mr. Ogilvie estimated \$7,400 for two alco-vapour launches, and \$2,400 for two engineers for boats, their services to be used in other capacities during the winter, at \$1,200 each .....

9,800

\$176,000

These launches are particularly well adapted for that country, because they are run with alcohol and coal oil. A comparatively small quantity of coal oil will run one of these launches a long while. They do not have to carry any fuel, and are, consequently, the

best kind of small boats for the police force. We purchased one last year and require to purchase two this year.

Mr. HAGGART. How do you keep the motive power?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is coal oil and alcohol. The coal oil furnishes the heat and the alcohol is vaporized and condensed over and over, so that very little is required. The great advantage of vessels of that kind is that they can catch up to any other boat which has to stop for fuel.

In addition to this \$176,000, I have asked in the supplementary Estimates for \$35,000, general vote for unforeseen expenditure. Last year we had to issue special warrants for a very large amount. I thought it advisable to ask this general vote, which would be available in case of unforeseen and pressing expenditure or of the expenses over-running the estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see how utterly impossible it is for the House to pass a vote of that kind. He comes down and asks for a lump sum, and then reads over a mass of details which the House cannot follow at all. These details should be in the Estimates themselves. I would ask him to let the item stand until we can see these details to-morrow in "Hansard." That is the best we can do under the circumstances, but what my hon. friend ought to have done was to give these details in the Estimates.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think the suggestion of the hon. gentleman is reasonable, and that the item should stand.

Item allowed to stand.

For Ocean and Mail Service between  
Great Britain and Canada..... \$126,533 33

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) explain the position of the fast line service?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I may say that at present the position is this: As he knows perfectly well, no doubt, the negotiations which were carried on with the firm of Petersen, Tate & Co. proved unsuccessful. We have not considered it expedient, at the present moment, to advertise for tenders, for reasons which, I think, the hon. gentleman himself stated and which he will well understand. There has been an enormous increase, as he knows, in the price of the material of which these vessels are composed. Moreover, after making careful inquiry, we found the various English ship-yards were so crowded that it was practically impossible to find a suitable firm able to undertake such a project; and, even if we did conclude an agreement, we could have had no hope of the immediate undertaking of the work of construction. Therefore, for the present, the matter must be considered in abeyance.

Mr. FOSTER. What is it proposed to do with this vote?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is aware that this is the same vote which has been given for a great number of years to provide a weekly mail service between Great Britain and Canada. He is also aware, because, I think, the same state of things occurred during his own time, that we have not, for a considerable number of years, been very successful in obtaining such a service as, I think, Canada ought to have. The arrangement with the Allans and Torrances terminated. It is extended, if I remember aright, until the first of next month, or thereabouts. For the next few months, that is, until the close of the season of navigation, we propose to carry on the service with the Elder-Dempster line. But I am carrying on negotiations at this moment with several steamship companies, the Allans and Torrances among the number, and I hope to be able to report to the House—but, I fear, not before the close of the present session—some more satisfactory proposition for the service than we now have. Of course, the hon. gentleman is well aware of the contention that has been put forward by these steamship companies. They allege that the subsidy is wholly and entirely inadequate, that no service such as I mention, and such as I think we ought to have, can be obtained for the money. In that contention there may be some considerable truth, I am bound to say; and it is possible, although, of course, I do not want to commit myself on the point, that we may have to enlarge our ideas on that subject after we have received replies from several steamships companies that I am, as I have said, in communication with. I do not think it would serve the interest of the public to go into minute details on that point, nor to express any opinion as to what the sum should be. For the present, as I say, the service is about to be taken up by the Elder-Dempster line.

Mr. FOSTER. On what terms?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. On the same terms—£500 for the round trip.

Mr. FOSTER. Sailing from Quebec?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, from Quebec and Montreal during the remainder of the season.

Mr. FOSTER. Why did you change from the old steamships to these?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Because, I am sorry to say, the service they rendered was not a satisfactory one.

Mr. FOSTER. In point of speed?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What speed do these people give?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They propose to do somewhat better than the other line, and I think they will probably attain it. If the hon. gentleman desires it, I will give the last details supplied me of the west bound sailings of the Allan line. This is corrected for mean time:

Name of Vessel.	Left Merville.	Net time.
Parisian ....	Nov. 20	8 days 3 hours 15 minutes.
Laurentian ..	Dec. 4	9 " 20 " 15 "
Parisian ....	Dec. 23	10 " 23 " 10 "
Californian..	Jan. 7	8 " 9 " 45 "
Numidian ..	Jan. 27	13 " 6 " 45 "
Californian..	Feb. 10	8 " 23 " 33 "
Laurentian ..	Mar. 3	9 " 16 " 30 "
Californian..	Mar. 18	8 " 1 " 25 "
Mongolian ..	April 7	10 " 0 " 55 "

I may mention that the understanding with them was that from Merville to Halifax the service should average about 8 days. These figures show an average of 9 days, 17 hours, 17 minutes—close upon ten days. I think we could hardly describe that as a fast mail service. I do not wish to make undue reflections on these gentlemen—they may have had trouble, stress of weather and so on; but 9 days, 17 hours, from Merville to Halifax which is considerably under ten knots an hour, I think, the hon. gentleman will agree with me, can hardly be described as a fast mail service.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the average time under the new arrangement?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The average in each case is to be the same—eight days. The average time, east-bound, that we have had is a trifle better—9 days, 3 hours and 11 minutes. I suppose the hon. gentleman does not care about the details. I have made inquiries regarding the Elder-Dempster Line, and all I have heard is in their favour. Their steamers average 8,500 tons, and they are new vessels, whereas nearly all these others, as the hon. gentleman knows, are old vessels. The "Parisian," if my memory serves me well, is twenty years old. She has been refitted. The others are old vessels. The Elder-Dempster vessels are the finest freight craft coming into Montreal. Two of them were built in 1898, and two of them were finished only this year. I believe they are likely to perform a very fair average rate.

Mr. WALLACE. How many knots an hour would they make accomplishing the trip in eight days?

Mr. FOSTER.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. About 12½ knots an hour. The average speed, under the figures I have given, the hon. gentleman will see, is about 9½ knots an hour, speed which will hardly serve our purpose. As I say, the steamship company allege the amount is too small. We, of course, maintain, and I think with some reason, that \$126,000 is a substantial solatium and the volume of passenger trade and so on ought to induce them to put on a better class of boats. They have not seen their way clear to do that.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the average tonnage of the mail matter carried?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That belongs, of course, to the Post Office Department. But we only send out one-seventh of our mail as the service is only once in seven days. At present the vast bulk of the mail business west of Montreal is perfectly certain to go by other routes. Almost invariably, the post office authorities state, letters requiring speed are marked to go via New York. If they are not so marked, the bulk of them would probably go by our own line. I think that letters posted the later days of the week would go via our own line, but up to Wednesday they would be sent by other steamers.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. A letter would not be held over for the Canadian line—

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman will understand this belongs to the Postmaster General's Department; I am only speaking from recollection. My deputy tells me that as a rule they are sent up to Wednesday by other lines, and those that are not marked via New York, after Wednesday, would go by the Canadian line. Parcel post, of course, goes by our own line.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. We could hardly hope that people would keep letters up to Wednesday for the Canadian line, when they can get the Cunard on Thursday.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, I say those that go into hands after Wednesday go by the Canadian line unless marked otherwise.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. A letter sent by the Canadian line would not be mailed till Thursday.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Exactly.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. And letters that are mailed up till Thursday go via New York, because the last letters for England via New York, after the White Star mail of Wednesday, leave on Thursday afternoon or Thursday night to catch the Cunard mail.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I do not think the Government ought to hold the letters over to go by the Canadian line unless they were marked "go slow." If parties wish communications to take plenty of time, I think they might send them by the Canadian line, otherwise they would send them by the first mail they can reach. I want to ask what is the meaning of item 189, "steam communication between Halifax and Newfoundland, via Cape Breton ports, \$2,000"?

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** This service for some years was run by Pickford & Black as a fortnightly service. It stops at several ports on the west and south shores of Newfoundland, and calls at Grand Narrows, North Sydney, Antigonish in Nova Scotia.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Some time ago I drew the attention of my hon. friend's department to the importance of providing a subvention for the "Bruce" steamer running between Cape Breton and Newfoundland, and I understood that it was receiving the attention of the Government. I am sorry to see that there is no appropriation for it this year among these votes. If there is a single steam service entitled to the favourable consideration of the Government it is that one. An inestimable service has been afforded to Canada by that steamer in providing for a regular communication between Newfoundland and Cape Breton. The service is very efficient, and I happen to know that the winter before last they performed the service throughout the winter and throughout the year, with the omission of only one trip—the trips are weekly. I need not remind the committee that this service has led to a large amount of additional revenue being received by the Government on the Intercolonial Railway. A regular and efficient line of steam communication between Cape Breton and Newfoundland would only occupy a few hours and lead to a large amount of communication both of passengers and of traffic. A railway on the Island of Newfoundland now carries beyond St. John and to various other portions, all the products of Canada and I can hardly understand why this matter has not been provided for in these Estimates.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** As I mentioned to the hon. gentleman, negotiations were going on, and are now going on, but they have not reached such a point as would justify us in taking a vote in this House.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** As this service has really been in operation for a considerable time without any aid, I think it would be well for my hon. friend to take an appropriation, subject to the Government making satisfactory arrangements with the parties. If no appropriation is made, the Gov-

ernment will be powerless to provide for it, even though they may succeed in completing the negotiations.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** I am afraid my hon. friend's desk-mate (Mr. Foster) would consider that rather unconstitutional, to take a vote before we were able to give reasonable details. But I think, after the expression of opinion made by the leader of the Opposition, that probably all parties concerned would be satisfied with a promise that we will continue the negotiations with a view of arriving at a conclusion. It has not escaped our observation that since the completion of the Newfoundland Railway there is a chance for carrying on a considerable traffic with Newfoundland, much more than we have done heretofore the hon. gentleman is perfectly right about that. It is of interest to us in two ways, because, as owners of the Intercolonial Railway, we derive a possible profit. But he knows also that in dealing with our sister colonies we are obliged sometimes to wait a considerable time before we can bring them to the exact point where we would like to conclude a bargain.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I did not succeed in getting an answer as to the speed that the Elder-Dempster vessels would make.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** I hope the Elder-Dempsters will be able to give us a uniform speed of about 12½ knots, not an excessive speed, I am bound to say, but probably as much as we can hope to get for the money, and considerably in excess of what we have been getting. But I may say, to prevent misapprehension, that this is purely a temporary arrangement. I am now carrying on negotiations with other steamship companies, and am in hopes to get a service which will commend itself to both sides of the House. I think we are all agreed that the present service cannot be considered satisfactory. The leader of the Opposition has frequently stated in his place that the service has been a very slow service during all these years. I felt reluctant to terminate our connection with those who have served us so long, but I really must ask for better service before I submit this vote again to the House, and I hope to get one. It is fair to say that we may have to consider the possibility of the question of recommending some larger appropriation, but that can wait until we see what bargain can be made with these parties.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I could not help but be a little surprised at the concluding remark made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. In speaking of the exceeding slowness of the fast service he came to the conclusion that he thought that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House would agree

with him that it was time to have a faster service. My hon. friend must think that we are very much asleep indeed if we do not appreciate the humour of that remark. The trouble has been just the other way. It has taken some ten or twelve years for hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to get their hon. friends on the other side of the House up to the mark of acknowledging that something effective should be done towards getting a faster service. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has given to-day certain reasons which throw a very instructive light on the costly nature of the delay which was made by hon. gentlemen themselves in not pursuing this fast Atlantic service with more reasonable speed and in a more businesslike way. They have torn up a contract which would have placed a fast Atlantic service in operation a year ago, and after all these years of delay, they come down to the House and say that the conditions have so changed that any attempt now to get a fast Atlantic service would be attained with very much greater expense, in fact that such is the crowded state of the shipyards that it would be almost impossible to ask the companies to commence the construction of a fast line of vessels with the idea of getting them within a reasonable time. This is rather instructive and I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen will read the lesson which has been given to the House by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce this afternoon. Does the hon. gentleman know what proportion of the mail goes by these vessels? I am afraid that an infinitely small portion, comparatively, of our mails goes by these slow vessels. It is not worth considering whether we are not wasting our money entirely by giving any amount like this to freight vessels? There may be a few individuals of the political persuasion of my hon. friend who mark their letters to go slow, and they will go by these freight vessels, but I apprehend that almost all of our business mail goes by way of the United States. Still we are in the position that we are paying \$126,000 in the way of subsidy to these freight vessels.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am not at all disposed to deny the justice of the criticism made by the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), and it is a very questionable point if we cannot do better. It is a question whether we are justified in paying this \$126,000, but I will call the attention of the hon. member for York and the hon. leader of the Opposition to the fact that while commercial reasons are wanting, they must bear in mind that Canada, at their instance, as well as ours, has been trying very hard to provide a winter service, and it is largely in regard to keeping up our winter service that this money is required. There is a difficulty in providing a service from St. John and Halifax in the winter, and it is more for that

Mr. FOSTER.

purpose than any other, although it is open to the criticism that a very small proportion of our mails go by these vessels. I had a statement prepared, and it showed that about five or six hundred pounds went by each of these craft.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be, what proportion?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. One-eighth or one-tenth—quite an insignificant proportion; there is no doubt about that. Business men, except possibly during the winter when the service is supplied from Halifax and St. John, will mark their letters "via New York."

Mr. BERGERON. As far as Montreal is concerned, I believe that nine-tenths of the letters go by way of New York. They are not always marked "via New York." The newspapers publish the time of the departure of the mail trains for New York during the whole week, so that persons, writing letters for the old country, are advised of the times at which they can post their letters in order to catch the mails by way of New York. There is only a very small proportion that goes by way of the Canadian lines.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is the case during five days in the week.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Do I understand, from the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, that these steamers stop at Queens-town or Moville.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The Elder-Dempster steamers stop at Queenstown.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. And the mails will be delivered there, the same as they are by the Cunard liners?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, just the same.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. And forwarded in the same way?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce to a statement made by Sir William Van Horne. I want to ask the hon. Minister if, when this bonus is given to freight boats to carry the mails, he will have any control over freight rates? Canadians are in a very humiliating position to-day. If I recollect rightly, Sir William Van Horne stated at a public meeting at Quebec that it cost ninepence, more than double, to take a ton of butter from Canada across the ocean than from the United States, and double to take a ton of cheese across. It seems to me when we give these large subventions to carry the mails and

when we do not expect that they will make fast time or that they will carry a large proportion of the mails, the hon. Minister should have something to say in reference to freight rates and not have a lot of money taken out of the pockets of the farmers by the extortionate freights that are charged by these steamship companies.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. We have no control over freight rates.

**Mr. COCHRANE**. I think the Government should have some control when these boats receive these large subsidies for carrying the mails.

**Mr. WALLACE**. It looks to me as if the whole of this business was not satisfactory to Canadians. We are paying \$120,000 a year for carrying one-seventh, presumably of the Canadian mails to the old country. That is £500 per round trip, and what service do we get from them? The steamship companies are put to no extra expense; it does not cost them a dollar more, because while the agreement with the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is that they are to make a trip in about eight days, or at the rate of about 12½ or 13 knots an hour, the distance being a little less than 2,400 miles from Halifax to Moville, it is not a very high rate of speed when it takes them nine days and seventeen hours, or forty-one hours longer than they should according to the understanding with the Government to make the trip. The steamship companies have not put themselves to one dollar's extra expense or trouble, apparently, in order to carry the mails promptly. The Minister could not tell us the exact weight of the mails carried by the steamship; but we all know that it is quite small, and that if paid for as freight, it would not cost £100, or anything like it; yet the company receives £500 for the services it renders. The steamship has to call at Moville, going and coming; but I presume that it would do that in any case for the convenience of its own business. I could understand this large subsidy, if the Government had an understanding with the company by which they would run their vessels, say, 18 knots an hour, and deliver the mails in six or seven days between ports; but the Government have, apparently, received no compensation from the company in the form of prompt service. I think the Government must look for a prompter service. New York companies are giving a service of from 20 to 22 knots an hour, so that our Canadian service at 12½ knots an hour leaves us completely in the shade. For the carrying of the mails, as well as for passengers and freight, a fast service is equally necessary, and these will naturally follow the fast routes, even if the cost is a little more. Therefore, to my mind it becomes the more important that the Government should pay greater attention to the neces-

sity of a fast Atlantic service. I remember, two years ago going over on the steamship "Canada," of the Dominion line, sailing from Boston. That steamer made the passage at about 16 knots an hour, the fastest passage ever made from the city of Boston; and the Bostonians who travelled on the vessel, though it was a Canadian vessel, were exceedingly proud to have a vessel running from their port that made that speed. If the Government are unable to get a steamship service of 20 or 22 knots an hour, which I think it would be exceedingly desirable to have, they should attempt something at a lower rate, say at 18 knots an hour, which would be 50 per cent increase on the speed which we have to-day. It is very unsatisfactory to find the Canadian route getting behind the times. Many members of this House will remember when the Canadian route was the fastest on the Atlantic Ocean, when the business and reputation of Canada were built up by a subsidy, if I remember rightly, of \$8,000 a week, or \$416,000 a year. That was denounced at the time by Opposition journals as a suicidal policy for Canada; but in its results it was most satisfactory, because it built up our Canadian route. It started up other steamers; it made the St. Lawrence route the favourite route across the ocean; and it was beneficial to Canada in a hundred different ways. Therefore, if we cannot secure a fast Atlantic service except at a considerable increased cost, we should bend every effort to secure such a service, taking care at the same time to have the most improved cold-storage arrangements in the ships. You cannot fit an old ship with cold-storage facilities which will be advantageous to the business. You must get these cold-storage arrangements put in new vessels, and you must take advantage of all modern improvements in that respect. By that means you will have fast mails carried to and from Canada, a fast passenger service, and, what is perhaps more important, a cold storage service for the rapid transit of perishable goods, which will reach the British markets promptly and in excellent condition. Nothing can be more promotive of the best interests of Canada than such a scheme, properly carried out.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). I have nothing to say in contradiction to what the hon. gentleman has stated. I quite agree with him as to the extreme importance of having cold-storage arrangements. These vessels, which are of the most modern construction, two of which were built last year and two this year, are reported to us as having all the cold-storage facilities that the interests of the trade require. As for the rest, we shall lay to heart the suggestions of my hon. friend; but he must not complain if we have to ask for a little more money to carry them out.

Steam service, fortnightly between St. John and Liverpool, G.B., during the winter season of 1889-1900, not less than ten round trips ..... \$20,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose this is really a part of the project for which a large expenditure is being made by the Minister of Railways at St. John, for the building of wharfs and elevators with the purpose of carrying wheat around by the Intercolonial Railway to the steamers at St. John?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman knows, I presume, that when this subsidy was originally granted, St. John was not our terminal port. I had left this in so as to have a somewhat freer hand in dealing with the question of winter service, but it is only fair to say that I may or may not require it. It will depend somewhat on the arrangements made. It will be as well to leave it in, in the interests of the port of St. John, the trade of which, I am glad to say, is developing very rapidly. The money was not used last year inasmuch as we had a weekly service from St. John to Liverpool all the time. The item itself is for a fortnightly service during the winter season between St. John and Liverpool, not less than ten round trips. None of the money was used last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Out of what vote was the service paid last year?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This was not required last year, because we had a regular weekly mail service.

Mr. FOSTER. It was paid out of the vote for ocean and mail service between Great Britain and Canada?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Partly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The point I was speaking on, perhaps, does not come up particularly in connection with this vote, but I understand that the policy of the Government, as enunciated by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, to endeavour to export wheat by St. John, carrying it round by the Intercolonial Railway, and using the facilities for which money was voted this session. I have no hesitation in saying that any man who ever looked at the routes knows this is utter nonsense. The Grand Trunk Railway uses Portland, the Canadian Pacific Railway has its short line from St. John; and if the Intercolonial Railway is to carry wheat to St. John for export, it will have to enter into competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, and I am told by those who know the trade thoroughly, who know every inch of the ground, who are engaged in business with the Canadian Pacific Railway, that its short line, hundreds of miles shorter than the Intercolonial Railway, never carried a pound of

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

wheat to St. John except at a loss, by reason of the competition of the Grand Trunk Railway. And if the Canadian Pacific Railway carries that wheat at a loss over a road hundreds of miles shorter than the Intercolonial Railway, I think the House will see that it is utter folly for the Intercolonial Railway to attempt to compete and to make that competition a paying investment for the people of Canada, or even a profitable investment in the way of trade. I am told that the Canadian Pacific Railway would not carry wheat to St. John to-day over its line were it not for the purpose of encouraging the steamers whose return cargoes they get.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that I do not quite agree with my hon. friend who has just spoken. This country went to a very large expense in the construction of what is called the Short Line Railway from Montreal to the harbour of St. John, in the hopes of competing with the shorter distance via Portland, and my information is entirely different from that of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. Sir William Van Horne told me that he was very much delighted to find that by a combination between the steamships from the harbour of St. John and the railway, they were enabled to compete in the carriage of wheat with the line to Portland, and he saw no reason why St. John, at all events, might not be made a very important winter port of Canada.

For steam service between Halifax, St. John, Nfld., and Liverpool, from 1st July, 1899, to 30th June, 1900..... \$20,000

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is the estimate made for several years. The only thing of note about it is that the service is now performed by the Furniss Withy Company.

Mr. FOSTER. Under contract?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Year by year. They have no permanent contract.

For steam service between St. John and Glasgow during the winter of 1899-1900 \$7,500

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is carried on by Donaldson Bros., of whom Reford & Co. are the agents. Ten round trips during the winter. We continue the contract with the same firm. I believe the service has been very reasonably satisfactory, all things considered, and there is this advantage, that going into Glasgow you go into a great consuming centre of population.

For steam service between St. John, Dublin and Belfast during the winter of 1899-1900 ..... \$7,500

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is carried on by the Head line, the Ulster Steamship Company, McLean & Co. being the agents. This service did not give quite the full number of trips last year, owing to alleged tempestuous wea-

ther, but apparently the service is reasonably well performed, and I think we might renew it. If they do not give the service, they do not get the pay. This is to Dublin and Belfast, both ports.

For lines of steamers to run during the summer months between St. John, Halifax and London; and during the winter months between St. John and London direct, and Halifax and London direct ..... \$36,000

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We have divided these two items. The hon. gentleman, some years ago, had this same vote, but combined it in one for \$40,000, and made it read in this fashion:

For a line of steamers to run during the summer months between St. John, Halifax and London, and during the winter months between St. John and London direct and Halifax and London direct.

If there is no objection, I will restore the vote to the way in which it originally stood.

Mr. FOSTER. Will that make any difference at all in the running of the steamers in the current year as compared with the running of the steamers during the past year?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I understand not, they will be run in the same fashion.

Mr. FOSTER. From Halifax to London direct during the winter, and St. John to London direct?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. It makes no matter which it is.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not think so.

Steam communication between St. John and Digby from 1st July, 1899, to 30th June, 1900 ..... \$12,500

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This, the hon. gentleman knows, is conducted by the "Prince Rupert," as heretofore.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to a petition, a copy of which I have, and which was received some days ago. No doubt, other hon. gentlemen have received copies of the same. This is from the millers throughout the province of Ontario, and I suppose, in the province of Quebec as well. It is signed by W. W. Ogilvie, Montreal; the James Goldie Co., Limited, of Guelph; the Lake of the Woods Milling Company, Limited, of Montreal; the McKay Milling Company, Limited, of Ottawa; the Goldie Milling Company, Limited, of Ayr, Ont.; David Plewes, of Toronto; Robert Noble, of Norval, Ont., and others. The petition reads as follows:—

July, 1899.

To the Honourable Sir Louis H. Davies, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Ottawa.

The memorial of the undersigned millers and grain dealers of Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba humbly sheweth:

That if top wharfage is charged at Digby Pier, on flour and grain products destined to Digby and points on the Dominion Atlantic Railway, we cannot send our shipments via the Intercolonial and Canadian Pacific Railways through the port of St. John as against lower rail and water rates made through the United States port of Boston, which route has for years past controlled Canadian flour traffic in that section of Nova Scotia.

That our desire is to patronize the Canadian routes at all times, and in our opinion cancelling the top wharfage at Digby would be a move in the right direction; nor would it, in our opinion, be taken as a precedent that because top wharfage was taken off at Digby, it should also be taken off at other points where top wharfage is demanded—the cancelling of top wharfage at Digby not being for local interest, but a general benefit to the whole country at large.

Your memorialists, therefore, humbly pray that flour, grain and grain products, in car-loads from Quebec, Ontario and the West, for Digby and points on the Dominion Atlantic Railway, may be free of top wharfage charges at Digby Pier.

I confess that this is a matter with which I am not very familiar, but I know the high standing of the memorialists, and I am sure that if the representations they make are consented to by the Government, it will be advantageous to the shipping interests. I address the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), to whom this memorial is addressed, and I trust he will take the matter into consideration and confer with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to see what can be done. It seems to me, from the nature of the petition, that a very great interest is involved, more especially as, accompanying this petition, there is another, signed by dealers in flour, as I understand it, in the lower provinces, who seem to agree with the shippers of flour as to the propriety of the course which is petitioned for.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to second what my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) has said. I have received petitions of a like nature with those he mentions. Being, perhaps, somewhat better acquainted with the lower provinces and with these memorialists than my hon. friend, I may be permitted to call attention to the names of some of them particularly known to me: Geo. Armstrong, Frank L. Roop, John H. Charlton, of Middleton; H. T. Warne, of Digby; S. F. Jefferson, Shaffner, Bros., H. H. Whitman and E. Young, of Lawrencetown; L. D. Shafner, Shafner & Piggott, H. R. Shaw, J. E. Lloyd, Joseph I. Foster, W. W. Chesley, John Lockett & Son, James E. Burns, Runciman, Randolph & Co., T. A. Foster, W. A. Kinney and J. W. Forsyth, of Bridgetown; W. J.

Shannon, John L. Clark, Geo. E. Corbitt and W. McCormick & Son, of Annapolis. All these are well known to me as names of important dealers in flour from the lower provinces. I desire to press upon the attention of the Government the prayer of this petition.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Of course, the hon. gentleman is aware that this is not in my department, but in that of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. If he will send me the petitions, I will take care that they are transmitted to the hon. gentleman. This, I may say, is the first I have heard of the matter, though probably, in my absence, a communication may have been addressed to the department.

Mr. MILLS. I was aware that this was in the department of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but as my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) had brought the matter up, I rose to second him.

Mr. HENDERSON. My excuse for bringing it to the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce is the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the lateness of the time when this opportunity offers to bring it forward. I thought it appropriate to bring it forward now, as the item we are discussing relates to Digby.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) is aware that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not absent, but is on duty in the committee upstairs.

Mr. HENDERSON. I had forgotten that for the moment, I am not reflecting on him for his absence.

For a line or lines of steamers to run between St. John and Halifax, or either, and the West Indies and South America ..... \$78,000

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I desire to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to this item. As they are aware, for a considerable time there has been a monthly service between these ports performed by Pickford & Black. Very recently, the British Government have applied to us to know whether, if the service were doubled, and they paid half, we would consent to continue our present subsidy, or perhaps give \$2,000 or \$3,000 more. They propose, substantially, to continue the present service, which, as gentlemen are aware, touches at a number of West Indian Islands, beginning at Bermuda and going on to St. Kitts, Antigua, Montserrat, Martinique, St. Lucia, Trinidad and Demerara. This service they propose to continue, but to make it fortnightly, instead of monthly.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the regular service touch at Bermuda?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I believe it does. There are two

Mr. MILLS.

services bound up 'n this. One is from Jamaica to Halifax.

Mr. WALLACE. Does this go as far as the Windward Islands?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It goes to Trinidad and British Guiana. It will practically double the service without appreciable cost to us, and the Imperial Government were very anxious that we should agree to it. I propose to lay a resolution on the Table, after the explanation that this service should be made for the term of five years, which is, I think, the term the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) originally made the contract for.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We have obtained somewhat more favourable terms in the matter of speed, which is a matter of great importance, as I am advised by the merchants of St. John and Halifax. One voyage, at any rate, will be made several days shorter.

Mr. FOSTER. How often?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Each alternate voyage would be made considerably shorter than it is at present. The hon. gentleman will see there is a great number of places to call at, and when they make a swifter voyage they have to drop some of these, and touch them on their return voyage. We are told it would be a great advantage to the merchants of the maritime provinces if they could communicate with Trinidad and British Guiana more frequently than at present when the voyage consumes 11 or 14 days, and this Pickford & Black promise to do, if the House consents to the arrangement which the British Government promised to make.

Mr. FOSTER. With the same boats?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, they promise to give us somewhat better boats. The present service is performed by the "Taymouth Castle," the "Duart Castle" and the "Beta." They promise to build new boats for this service, but they cannot do it instantaneously. They promise to give them the early part of next year, though I will not pledge myself to their performance.

Mr. FOSTER. In the meantime will they put on a fast boat?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They say so; and they will also re-engine the "Taymouth Castle" and the "Duart Castle" for the present service. I may say that the "Bet" is engaged in the Jamaica service. The parties have stipulated with the British Government that the service to Trinidad and British Guiana shall touch at Bermuda.

Mr. FOSTER. My impression was that at first the service did not touch at Bermuda, but that the Jamaica service did.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The memorandum I have states that the usual service, that is the service for the West India Islands is from St. John by way of Halifax to Demerara, touching at the British Islands on the route, commencing at Bermuda and then going on through St. Kitts down to Trinidad and Demerara.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the object of the British Government in giving the subsidy? I should imagine it would only be justified on the ground of greater speed and better vessels. Is it not proposed that as soon as possible better speed and regular vessels shall be given?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. I know the difficulties of that route, because I had a good deal to do with the inception of it, but those difficulties ought not to be made any longer an excuse for the present service. The present contractors, I think, have done well, they did in my time. But it is complained, both in the West Indies and by our own merchants, that the time taken is a little too long, and that the vessels might be better than they are. Now, if the two governments are going to give a substantial subsidy, I think the service ought to be improved.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I quite agree with my hon. friend. I may say that the moment the proposition was mooted I insisted on these two conditions, and obtained a considerable modification in our favour. Of course, we are getting a double service. The present service is only monthly, and we are now to get a fortnightly service, which would be of considerable advantage to St. John and Halifax. As to the object of the British Government, the hon. gentleman is aware that the condition of the West India Islands for a long time past has appealed strongly to the consideration of the Imperial authorities, and this is one of the means which they have adopted—and I may say that they were very pressing upon us to join with them in this matter—this is one of the means they have adopted for the purpose of helping out the British Islands from the depression under which they are labouring.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to these new reciprocal treaties made with the United States, I understand that Canada is not at all discriminated against.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. So they assure us.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend able to communicate these treaties to the House?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not yet.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No doubt the Government are in possession of information which these gentlemen when here did not hesitate to give me. They stated that they had made no arrangement with the United States that would discriminate against either British or colonial products.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We had the assurance of that in ample time as the result of negotiations between the Imperial Government and the Canadian Government.

Steam communication during the season of 1899, from the opening to the close of navigation, between the mainland and the Magdalen Islands ..... \$9,000

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). This service is also connected with the Island of Cape Breton. I have had several communications from business men in the county I have the honour to represent, complaining that the service rendered by the present boat is not at all in keeping with the service which has been rendered by its predecessor. It may be remembered that a contract was made with a different firm who, I am informed, promised the Government to put a very excellent new steamer on the route. From what I can gather this has not been done, and from information, the source of which I cannot question, I am convinced that the present steamer is not at all equal to the one it superseded. One thing is certain that so far as its connection with the Island of Cape Breton is concerned, it has not at all served the people of that island as well as its predecessor on that route. I have in my possession letters received from business firms which declare that freight which reached the station at Pictou in April remained there until June, although this boat is supposed to be running between those two points. I have the letters in my desk. One of them was from a gentleman whose veracity I could not question, and who has been doing business on that coast for a long time. He says he is conducting a lobster factory along the coast of Inverness, and he tells me that the material that was necessary for conducting the factory remained in the railway station at Pictou for several weeks, although this material was very necessary to the business in which he was engaged. I would ask the hon. Minister to make inquiry and see if this new firm could not place a better boat on that route, or at least, a boat equal to its predecessor, or whether the managers of that boat would not see to it that the freight, between the points indicated, is properly attended to.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I shall take careful note of my hon. friend's remark. If he will kindly give me some little further particulars I will cause immediate inquiry to be made. In

dealing with freight there is sometimes this difficulty : During the winter a great deal of freight accumulates and cannot be removed at once. It requires a considerable number of trips to take it all, and that, I am informed, was the cause of the delay the hon. gentleman complains of in handling freight. But if the service is not performed in a satisfactory way. I will consider it a favour if the hon. gentleman will acquaint us with the facts, and we will lose no time in endeavouring to provide a remedy.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I will place these letters in the hands of the hon. Minister, and he will see for himself that the complaint I have made is well grounded. In regard to freight accumulating during winter, shippers scarcely ever ship anything by that route after the close of navigation. So that it must have accumulated after that time.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I happen to be acquainted with the service in question. This service is performed between Pictou and the Magdalen Islands. I am much surprised to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan), because shippers from the Magdalen Islands are simply jubilant over the new service. Only the other day I received letters from lobster packers showing that they were satisfied with this service. In addition to providing communication with the Magdalen Islands, the steamer performs a new service by going to Bryon Island, which is ten miles away from the main group of islands, and by stopping at many more ports. Tenders were called early this spring for this service, and Messrs. Hart & Leslie, of Halifax, who are well known in the maritime provinces, got the contract at a very late period this spring. Now, my hon. friend is well aware that, as soon as they got the contract from the Government, Mr. Leslie went to England for the purpose of getting a new vessel of size, speed and good freight accommodation. Unfortunately, he did not succeed, and he came back and bought, at once, at Halifax, the steamer "Lunenburg," which gives ample space. I am aware that the complaints which are made now from Cape Breton are made by the people who wanted to get the contract themselves, and I can give their names if necessary.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). That is not the case at all.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce whether tenders were called for this service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) And was the contract given at an increased figure ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The memorandum I have is that

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT

tenders were advertised for, but the remuneration demanded by the tenderers was so much in excess of what it was considered expedient to pay that none of these tenders were accepted, and after that we made an arrangement with Mr. Leslie.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) With tender ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Without further tender.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) For the same service ? My information is that it was for a different service entirely.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think not.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The service is much better than it was last year. I happen to know something about this question. The steamer which ran between Pictou and the Magdalen Islands last year, would not go to Bryon Island, would not stop at certain other ports, and there were difficulties in regard to the mail service. Now much better accommodation is provided. For instance, the steamer stops at Point Basse, and it goes, once a month, to Bryon Island, which is inhabited by about 300 fishermen during the summer. Both the accommodation and the mail service are improved.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I am not acquainted with the service given at present by the boat, but my information is that the service is not carried out under the conditions contemplated by the original tenders, and that a new arrangement was made privately with the party who is now performing the service. My information is, that if new tenders had been called for on the basis of the arrangement as now made, other parties would have tendered for it on the basis of the arrangement made with the present contractors.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I was just going to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that Mr. Leslie has the contract, not as the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) has said, according to his tender, because Mr. Leslie has not his contract according to any tender. As has been remarked, tenders were asked for under a different arrangement entirely, and I repeat that I know business men along the western coast of Cape Breton, who had no intention whatsoever, and never had, of tendering, or of engaging in any business of this kind, complained, and justly complained, to my personal knowledge, that their freight was not properly attended to. It is quite true, however, that the approval of the hon. member for Gaspé is explained by the fact that the additional service that this boat renders is rendered to the lobster factories on Magdalen Islands, the owner of which is Mr. Leslie.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He has no factory there.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Will the hon. gentleman tell me that Robert Leslie does not operate several factories on the Magdalen Islands ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not on Bryon Island.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I know that Mr. Leslie is a very extensive lobster packer on the Magdalen Islands, that he owns this steamer, and that he got the contract outside of the tenders, and having got the contract, I feel that the interests of these people should not be neglected without protest. I shall take the opportunity at once of placing in the hands of the hon. Minister the complaints that have reached me, and I will say to the hon. Minister also that, to my personal knowledge, this boat has not given satisfaction to the Island of Cape Breton, where it is supposed to touch.

Mr. FOSTER. What boat is now being used ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The "Lunenburg."

Mr. FOSTER. What boat was on the route last year ?

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). The "St. Olaf."

Mr. FOSTER. What are the comparative merits of these two boats ? Have they the same tonnage ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. About the same.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) The old boat was much better.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think the "St. Olaf" was somewhat larger.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). She was much larger—a splendid boat.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. She was somewhat larger, I understand, but, I believe, the "Lunenburg" is considerably the faster boat of the two.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to be rather an interesting situation, and naturally the difference becomes a little remarkable. I think that the "St. Olaf" was a good vessel, and that her size and capacity made her fit for the work. When the "Lunenburg" is a smaller vessel, the fact that freight is being accumulated can be easily explained. She had not the capacity for removing the freight. I do not think my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce is able to say that Mr. Leslie got his business by tender, because it appears that the conditions were changed, and that the service which the "Lunenburg" is doing a different service in many respects from what was called for in the advertisement for tenders, and that consequently, those who tendered on the old basis have not had a fair chance of tendering on the new basis. This may be

partially explained by the fact that Mr. Leslie is, I believe, a very strong friend of the Administration, and that he believes that personal nearness and a certain approximation of kindred hearts has something to do with getting a contract and that he made the best use of that belief in coming to Ottawa and remaining here, and diligently pulling the wires for a considerable length of time.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not know what Mr. Leslie's politics are.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend, in so many cases does as he is bid. I think a quiet gentleman sitting near him felt the wires tingle when they were pulled by Mr. Leslie ; but you have a smaller boat, and a service that is not so good, given without tender by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, of all men in the Government, and you have the further fact brought out that the man who has the contract is a man who is diligently looking after the freights of his own lobster factories.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is a larger service.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) In the first place, there were tenders in for as low an amount as the previous contract, or else I am misinformed.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be well if the Minister would bring down a statement of the tenders.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My deputy informs me that the correspondence has already been laid on the Table of the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that the "St. Olaf," which is placed in comparison with the "Lunenburg," was not available, because it had to leave the route to go on another service where the owners found a more profitable employment. As to the "Lunenburg," I was not aware, until this moment, that it performed this service. I know that it sailed out of Halifax some years ago, and that it was a very substantial vessel, and the fastest local steamer trading out of that port.

Mr. FOSTER. I happen to have information that the "St. Olaf" was available, and that one of the tenderers had offered her for the service.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Yes, there was a tender from the "St. Olaf."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The owner of the "St. Olaf" stated to the department that she was not available for that service because she was otherwise employed.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) That was later.

Steam communication during the season of 1899, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation, between Prince Edward Island and the mainland..... \$10,000

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is the Charlottetown Steam Navigation Company.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it the same vessel?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I believe so.

Mr. MARTIN. This service is performed under contract between the Steam Navigation Company of Prince Edward Island and the Government of Canada. I would like to ask the Minister when that contract expires?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. At the close of navigation of the present year.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that the trade between Prince Edward Island and the mainland has very much outgrown the service which this contract calls for. I suppose that the Minister is aware that the capacity of the boats required under the present contract is very low indeed; and that the present company have, at considerable expense and loss to themselves, placed much larger boats on this route. The province is rapidly becoming known as a summer resort, and on that account during the summer season travel between points on the mainland and the island is very large. I understand that the specifications under the existing contract only called for a boat to cost about \$60,000, whereas the present company are performing the service with boats, one of which has cost \$180,000; so that they are giving the Government of Canada a much better service than the contract required them to do. In the interest of the travelling public and of the people of the province, and, as I said, at a serious loss to themselves. So much progress is being made, and so much larger sums are being voted for subsidies all over Canada, that as Canada is obliged by the terms of union to give Prince Edward Island steam communication between the island and the mainland, I hope the hon. Minister, when he again calls for tenders for this service, will call for steamers having a much larger capacity than the old contract called for. As the present company are performing a satisfactory service, I am sorry that the Government have not seen their way clear to increase the subsidy, even though the old contract has not expired.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Does my hon. friend state that this is a part of the service required under the Confederation Act? I hardly think that is correct. My recollection is that the winter service is the only one stipulated for in the terms of union.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's).

Mr. MARTIN. I think the hon. Minister will find that the stipulation is both for winter and summer.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) The winter and summer service is stipulated for under the terms of union; at the time of confederation, the mail service between the island and the mainland was taken over by the Dominion Government, as stipulated in the terms of union. The company are not only carrying out the terms of the service in that respect, but they have put on two of the finest boats in the Dominion of Canada. They are first-class boats in every respect and their accommodation is everything that can be desired. In calling for new tenders, I think the only thing the Government should stipulate for is that the boats should be up to the requirements of the present boats; I think that would cover the ground fully. The present boats are, I think, all that is necessary for carrying the mails and passengers on the summer routes, and they are performing every service required of them.

Mr. MARTIN. I am sorry the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald) misunderstood me. What I did say was that I hoped that if a new contract was to be entered into, it would provide for larger boats than the old contract called for. As the hon. gentleman has said, and as I said also, the Steam Navigation Company have boats on the route at present of much larger capacity than the old contract called for. What I do contend is that when new tenders are called for, boats will be placed on the route suitable to the changed conditions. With regard to the statement that this is not provided for in the terms of the union, I think the hon. Minister will find that these terms provide for "continuous steam communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, both in summer and in winter," and I am astonished that he is not aware of it. I think that if he will look up the British North America Act or the Act admitting Prince Edward Island into the union, he will find the words I quoted.

Steam communication from 1st July, 1899, to 30th June, 1900, between Grand Manan and the mainland ..... \$4,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is this the same vessel the "Flushing"?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, the owner told us "The Flushing" is worn out and no longer able to perform the service. The service at present is for one trip each week between Grand Manan and St. John, calling at some other ports during the months of June, July, August and September. There is this difficulty. We find that the parties want more money than we are voting, and I do not know how I will be able to arrange it, but am trying to negotiate as best I can.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope the hon. gentleman will appreciate the absolute necessity of that service. Its geographical position is well known. There is a large population on the island of Grand Manan, and St. John is its port. And the maintenance of this steamer gives not only the mail communication absolutely necessary, but also brings the trade of that island very largely to our own merchants and business men in the city of St. John. The "Flushing" ought to be worn out by this time.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They are building a new vessel.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope my hon. friend will be as lenient in the meantime as he can with regard to the temporary vessel, as the importance of the service is very great.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I believe it is a perfectly necessary service.

Steam communication during the season of 1899, that is to say, from the opening to the closing of navigation, between Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie ..... \$11,500

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is now conducted by the same parties as before, the North American Transportation Company, with their old steamer the "Admiral." We had the "City of Monticello" last summer.

Mr. FOSTER. Were tenders called for ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, I think the papers were brought down, but the tenders were not accepted, and under authority of an Order in Council this arrangement was made.

Mr. FOSTER. What do you give "The Admiral" ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. \$12,500. There is a supplementary vote of \$1,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Why could not a better vessel be got ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They wanted more money, and "The Admiral," I believe, is a pretty satisfactory boat, though of a somewhat antiquated pattern.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Though "The Admiral" is not a modern boat, she gives satisfaction in the Baie des Chaleurs. The reason for the increase of \$1,000 in the subsidy is because at the special request of the Board of Trade of Gaspé, the Government will force the North American Transportation Company to run their boat, whether it be "The Admiral" or any other, a month later in the season, or up to the first of January, in order to give more facilities to shippers.

Steam communication during the season of 1899, that is to say, for not less than 32 full round trips between St. John and Halifax, via Yarmouth and other way ports..... \$7,000

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The steamer "City of Monticello" will be employed on this service.

Mr. FOSTER. Will she break bulk at Yarmouth or make the whole trip ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am told that she runs the whole trip.

Mr. FOSTER. And the arrangement is made for \$5,500 ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. You have a very superior boat for that.

Steam communication during the season of 1899, that is to say, from the opening to the closing of navigation, between St. John and Minas Basin ports..... \$3,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is that poetical boat still the one used ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, the "Beaver" is the boat now employed.

Mr. FOSTER. What has become of the "Hiawatha" ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. She was sold.

Mr. FOSTER. With whom is the contract made ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. With Mr. W. R. Potter, of Canning. There is some difference in the ports of call. One or two old ports are abandoned and others are substituted. She stops now at Bass River and Chevreienne.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the trips monthly ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I believe these are weekly trips.

Steam communication from 1st July, 1899, to 30th June, 1900, between Pictou, Murray Harbour, Georgetown and Montague Bridge ..... \$1,200

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is just in all respects as before.

Steam communication from 1st July, 1899, to 30th June, 1900, between Quebec and Gaspé Basin, touching at intermediate ports ..... \$5,000

Mr. FOSTER. How often does this run ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Every ten days.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) will see that we have been very lenient. What we should have asked was

a statement of trade, showing increase or prospects of increase, and so on, so as to justify the votes.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. The reports made to me show that in most cases there is a very great freedom from any variableness or shadow of turning in that respect. They are pretty much the same one year as another.

Mr. **FOSTER**. How is this service progressing?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I am informed that it has been of great service to the inhabitants on that long line of coast. The people have no communication, except by water, as the hon. gentleman knows, and it is arranged that the vessel shall touch at a large number of ports, including the smaller fishing ports.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What is the vessel?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. The "City of London," of the North American Transportation Company.

Steam communication between a port or ports in Prince Edward Island and a port or ports in Great Britain..... \$5,000

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Of course, hon. gentlemen will understand that this is an experimental service, earnestly applied for by the people of Prince Edward Island. Two trips were run last season by the Beaver line steamer "Lake Huron," and a third by the "Gaspesia." We thought to make arrangement for five trips before the close of navigation this year, but I do not know how we shall succeed.

Mr. **MARTIN**. I have several times asked for information concerning this service, and the answers I have received were always unsatisfactory. I think what we have just heard from the hon. Minister is unsatisfactory also. Nothing definite, it appears, has been arrived at regarding Prince Edward Island. Cold storage has been provided on the steamers for ports in all parts of Canada for three seasons. The first season Prince Edward Island was left out in the cold. When I asked about the service last year, I was told by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) that he was in communication with the owners of steamers. It appeared at that time that he had been in correspondence as in year before, and the result was, that the season passed away with only two trips and one of the trip of the "Gaspesia."

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. There were three trips in all.

Mr. **MARTIN**. Two trips and one trip of the "Gaspesia." Cold storage, in the proper sense of the term, was not provided on that boat. Consequently, there was a great loss to shippers and a large death rate among

Mr. **FOSTER**.

animals shipped from Prince Edward Island to Great Britain. One would think that, with the experience of two years before the Minister, he would have called for tenders in the early part of the season. The people of Prince Edward Island were given to understand that the service would begin this year in June. And farmers and business men made their calculations accordingly. But the service has not yet begun, so that the people of Prince Edward Island have suffered very considerable loss. A good deal has been done in the way of cattle-feeding, and the delay will cause loss and inconvenience. I do not know whether the Minister has called for tenders yet.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. We have called for tenders, but have had no response.

Mr. **MARTIN**. The hon. Minister did not say when tenders were called for.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I believe they were called for in May.

Mr. **MARTIN**. According to the information I have, they were called for in June. That is when the service should have begun. The Government had evidently been writing to ship-owners, friends of theirs, just as in the case of the steamer between Magdalen and Gaspé, but they have not yet found a friend who has a boat; so, Prince Edward Island must be left out in the cold. We have heard statistics quoted in this House to show that Prince Edward Island is not importing goods from other countries to the same extent as other provinces of Canada are. How could the figures show otherwise, when goods are taken in subsidized steamers to every port in Canada, but for Prince Edward Island steam communication is not provided at all? Goods for the people of Prince Edward Island must be imported by Halifax and Montreal, and be entered there, as though for local consumption. I can tell the hon. gentleman that on not one of the three trips could the vessel carry all the freight offered. When the "Gaspesia" made her trip last season, a large amount of freight was left behind. I think it most unfair that, because Prince Edward Island is small, it should be neglected.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. At least we deserve this credit—that Prince Edward Island got nothing before, while we have taken the matter up, and hope to provide an efficient service.

Mr. **MARTIN**. I may remind the hon. Minister that cold storage does not date very far back. He knows that he is putting in a plea that is no good.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. But steam communication has been in existence for some time, and some

of these subsidies have been voted for twenty-five years; yet in all that time Prince Edward Island got nothing.

Mr. MARTIN. Over and over again credit has been claimed for the Minister of Agriculture for introducing cold storage. Now, when it suits his purpose, the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) seeks to show that cold storage existed long ago.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. MARTIN. In any case, I think the province of Prince Edward Island is being treated very shabbily.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). While it is true that Prince Edward Island has not had as much advantage from steamship communication direct with the old country, nor from cold storage, as other parts of the Dominion, that is not the fault of the Government, or of my department, or the Department of Trade and Commerce. We thought we had good grounds for believing that a subsidy of \$5,000 would secure a vessel to go backward and forward between Prince Edward Island and the old country at least five times in the year—at the rate of \$1,000 a trip. It is true, that the year before, this was not accomplished; but the discussion which then arose between certain steamship companies and ourselves indicated that it might be brought about last year; and, as a matter of fact, that subsidy, with an amount added from the vote for cold storage, enabled us to get an arrangement which was made with the Beaver Line—I think it was the Beaver Line; the “Lake Winnipeg” was the vessel—which would accomplish some four or five trips during the season. That was not successful. However, they did start and run two trips, and then they declined to go on, and we were forced to take up the “Gaspesia,” who offered to go on and do the rest of the season. Tenders were asked for this service in the early part of the season, but no tender was made, and we were able to make an arrangement with the Beaver Line. In respect to the complaint that there was no effective cold storage; it is true there was not what is called a mechanical cold storage in these vessels. It was not by any means sure that the same vessel would continue in that trade. Mechanical cold storage plant involves a considerable investment on board the vessel, and can only be undertaken when the vessel is destined to that class of work. I tried to get a company to do this, but they would not enter into an arrangement until they had made a trial to see what would be the course of trade from Prince Edward Island, and whether they would continue this work for a term of years. Every effort was made to that end, but they would not undertake it. In default of that, I had to make an arrange-

ment with them by which an insulated chamber was put in, and while that is not as effective nor as permanent, still the proper temperature was maintained on those vessels for the goods. The carriage of cold storage products in these chambers was successful, and they arrived in good condition on the other side of the Atlantic. When the “Gaspesia” took hold, the same kind of arrangement was made with her. Unfortunately, her second trip was unsuccessful, as everybody knows, and the thing has dropped to the ground. We think this vote of \$5,000 for the Prince Edward Island service, which I am now asking, will enable us to make an arrangement with some steamship company which can be persuaded that there is enough trade to justify them in devoting a vessel to the Prince Edward Island trade. That has been a difficulty we have had to overcome. I think the steamship companies are mistaken in declining to go into this business, because, from the experience of last year, I am satisfied that they would get sufficient freight. I know that freight was left on the wharf at Charlottetown, and they were not able to take all that was offered. I am satisfied that any company that would devote a vessel to that trade would make a profitable transaction. I am surprised they do not do it, but so far we have not been able to induce any steamship company to take up this work, and devote a vessel specially to that trade. There are some difficulties in the way from the fact that in the early part of the season there is not much goods ready to leave Prince Edward Island. As a matter of fact, last year there was very little ready for shipment until about the 1st of July which would justify a vessel going there. The agricultural products which are to be sent in these vessels are butter, cheese, cattle and grain; these are not ready for shipment, as a general rule, until about mid-summer. My hon. friend shakes his head, perhaps I should say a little earlier in the summer, but I think I am safe in saying the 1st of July. Therefore, the season is a short one, and the steamship companies say that four trips are all they will be able to make with any profit. This is unfortunate, but I think it is something that will be remedied as time goes on. The period for the shipment of these agricultural products from Prince Edward Island will be prolonged, as it has been from other ports in the country. But at the first inception, there is, no doubt, a difficulty, and I am sure the hon. gentleman recognizes that. But we are trying to overcome these difficulties, and are doing our best to get a more satisfactory and a more durable arrangement for this season.

Mr. MARTIN. I think the hon. gentleman has failed to give this committee any reason why this delay has occurred. He says that tenders were called for last year and tenders were called for this year. But last year tenders were called for in June, after the

prorogation of this House. This year again, not benefiting by the experience of last year, tenders are delayed until June again. Now, cannot the Minister see that a service that is to begun in June tenders should not be delayed till the service is to begin? He must be aware that owners of steamers must know what service they are to be engaged in long before the summer season opens, and therefore it is necessary that tenders should be called for in March or in April. When these boats are engaged in other services it is not easy for the companies to take them off and put them upon another service. The hon. gentleman has tried to explain why there was no real cold-storage on these boats and he has failed. The loss to shippers in Prince Edward Island on fruit and apples has been very serious indeed on account of that neglect. Last year they understood they were going to have a boat with improved cold-storage, but they did not get one, and the result was that they lost very heavily. The hon. gentleman says that he was afraid there would not be sufficient freight, and he said there was not sufficient freight the first year it was proposed to give this service. The reason there was not sufficient freight then was that the people had not prepared. It was not said whether a trip of this boat would be made or not, but during this present season the people were given to understand that there would be some trips of the boat in June. Business men and farmers prepared for it, the farmers by feeding cattle, but when they expected the boat to arrive it did not arrive. I questioned the hon. Minister, across the floor of the House, and he told me that there was nothing done in June. The farmers told me when I was down there that they would have to let these cattle out on the grass again. They said: We are ready to ship but it appears there is no steamer. If the hon. Minister wishes to remedy this state of affairs next year he must call for his tenders earlier in the season. If he expects this service to begin in June he should call for tenders in March or April. But to say that the service should begin in June, and to call for tenders in June is to make the thing ridiculous.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Mr. Chairman, this is a very important matter to the province of Prince Edward Island. We, as my hon. friend has just said, are preparing very largely to take advantage of that trade, and I do trust that the Government will spare no exertion in procuring a steamer. There is the prospect of a bountiful harvest; we never had a better output from our cheese factories, which is likely to exceed even that of last year; our lobster fisheries have been fairly good, and the outlook for fruit is also promising. Under these circumstances it will be a matter of necessity that the province should be provided with an outlet for these productions and with cold-storage facilities for the export of freight in

Mr. MARTIN.

order to place them on the market to the best advantage. That little province is paying a good deal of attention to fruit. For the last few years the production has been increasing very rapidly and the shipments made last year to England, on the whole, proved successful. Pains were taken by the shippers to see that shipments were put up in an honest manner and the fruit turned out satisfactorily in the English market. As the service was not commenced earlier in the season there will be less trips than have been called for, and as the estimate is \$1,000 a trip, I would suggest that the whole sum should be expended in procuring a boat should the Government fail to get a boat for \$1,000 a trip as is set forth in the estimate. I do not want to say anything about the service that was provided last year. The boats furnished were of considerable service to the province. Three trips were made. The boats could not take the amount of freight that was offered. If a service was provided from season's end to season's end there is no doubt sufficient freight would be furnished by the province.

To promote direct communication and trade between Canada and South Africa \$5,000

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The committee will understand that this was purely an experimental vote taken last year in view of the exhibition which took place at Grahamstown. A sailing vessel, the "Arcadia," was chartered, but unfortunately she was rather slow and on her voyage she was becalmed under the tropics, so that her trip was not as successful as I could have wished. We deem it best, with the view of doing something to develop a little trade with South Africa, to repeat the vote in the hope that we may have better success this year if another opportunity comes.

Mr. WALLACE. What point did this steamer go to?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. To Capetown. She was a sailing vessel; we were not able to get a steamer.

Steam communication daily during the season of 1899, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation, between Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona, and one trip each fortnight to Big Pond and East Bay..... \$4,000

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This service was carried on by the Bras d'Or Steamship Company, which has gone out of business. It has been now divided, and the contract has been given to two companies. This service has been given to the Victoria Steamship Company, and the steamer "Blue Hill" is employed.

Steam communication daily during the season of 1899, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation, between Port Mulgrave and St. Peter's, to extend twice each week to Irish Cove and Marble Mountain ..... \$4,000

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is a division of the vote that used to be combined in one. The service is now performed by the steamer "Vega."

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does this boat run to St. Pierre and Miquelon ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not understand that it goes to St. Pierre and Miquelon.

Mr. McDUGALL. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce to the fact that complaints have been made by the owners of these steamship lines, last year especially, and if I am not mistaken, the year before, because of the delay in paying them their subsidies. They suffered, last year, a great deal of inconvenience from this delay. As the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce will understand, these people, who have recently bought these steamers and who are new in the business, have not got much spare money, and they run large bills in connection with operating their steamers, for their staff, coal and other expenses. If they do not get their subsidy promptly it places, not only themselves at an inconvenience, but it also inflicts an inconvenience on those who supply them. It causes the men they employ a great deal of inconvenience, and I take this opportunity to bring the matter to the attention of the hon. Minister. I understand that the reason given is that there was some dispute in regard to calling at some of these points. This dispute arises from the fact that no proper arrangement is entered into between the department and these steamboat companies until after the subsidy is passed by this House. I do not think that is the case with regard to other steamship subsidies. I may be wrong, but my impression is that the steamship subsidies in respect to other services go on in the same way from year to year, but that a new arrangement is entered into between the steamboat owners and the Government, which is not finally completed until the subsidy has passed this House. For instance, at this date some of these steamers have been performing the service for nearly four months. I do not know whether there is an agreement existing or not; but whether there is or not, there should be a distinct understanding, so that when the vessel-owners comply with their agreement there should be no delay in paying them. I understand that the places mentioned in connection with this service are Irish Cove and Marble Mountain. It appears that the steamboat people found it difficult, in passing from Canso and the St. Peter's Canal to Sydney, to call at Irish Cove on one side of the lake, and then to cross to Marble Mountain on the other side, a distance of twelve or fifteen miles, be-

fore proceeding towards Sydney. That is the only reason I can find for the delay in paying these people their subsidy. What I would recommend is that some plan should be adopted which would enable the department to pay the subsidies when they become due to these people, who have not much more capital than is necessary to run the service.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We have no desire to delay these matters in the department; but my hon. friend knows that certain formalities have to be complied with before the Auditor General will pass our cheque; and until that is done, we are powerless to help these people. But we will do our best to see that no unnecessary delay is incurred. The real difficulty, I am informed, was on account of the company's not furnishing the full vouchers which the Audit Office requires.

Mr. McDUGALL. What I would recommend, if it is possible to carry it out, in cases where the payment amounts to, say, \$3,000, and there is a dispute because a certain portion of the service was not performed, is that a portion of the \$3,000 should be paid to the company, and the balance held back until such time as the department is satisfied in regard to the disputed point. But what I insist on is that the whole amount due to the company should not be kept back until a settlement is arrived at in regard to a small portion of the amount.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I can certainly bear testimony to the correctness of the statement made by the Minister. I for my part, protested against one of these companies, at least being paid their subsidy until such time as they agreed to perform the full service, which includes Marble Mountain in the county of Inverness; and until the company consented to do this, I appealed to the Minister not to pay them their subsidy. I can only say that for the delay in this instance, the company had themselves very greatly to blame.

Mr. McDUGALL. I do not think the company can conveniently carry out the service without dropping one call, either that at Irish Cove or that at Marble Mountain. I do not think there is very much difference in the distance of these two points from the direct route. I think the course between St. Peter's and Grand Narrows would be about midway between the two.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We will endeavour to meet the hon. gentleman's views as far as the rules of the service will permit us.

Direct fortnightly steam service between Montreal, Que., and Manchester, Eng., during the summer season, and between St. John, Halifax and Manchester during the winter season ..... \$38,933 33

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. It was agreed with the ex-Minister of Finance that we should take these other items first, but that he should have the opportunity, either on this vote or on some other, to make some remarks on this Manchester service, to which I have no objection. The House is aware that a contract has been entered into with the Manchester people for this service. It was agreed that it should be performed by steamers of not less than 8,000 tons. The vessels were commenced in July, 1898, but the company represented to us that on account of the engineer's strike, the vessels, which were on the stocks could not be got ready in time. Therefore, only one of those steamers was put into commission, and they performed the traffic with smaller steamers, which gave us a greater number of trips, though, of course, we do not pay them more than a proportionate sum for the service. I may add that, making allowance for these circumstances, the service has been a good service, and has been of material use to our people in enabling them to introduce our goods directly into the city of Manchester, which is the centre of the greatest consuming population of the United Kingdom. With in a radius of 25 miles from Manchester, we are informed, there is a consuming population—almost entirely a manufacturing population—amounting to between seven and eight millions of people. So far we have every reason to think that our money has not been wasted in bringing our goods directly into view of that large population, more especially as the Manchester people have erected, at great cost, very complete cold storage apparatus for preserving the more or less perishable commodities in which we deal.

**Mr. WALLACE**. Were the ships from Canada pretty well laden?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I am told that they were very well laden, particularly those from the St. Lawrence. The ships from the maritime provinces were not so well laden.

**Mr. WALLACE**. What about the return cargo?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. We do not get anything like the quantity of return cargo which we would like to get, nor do I see how, in the nature of the case, that can be avoided. We send raw produce largely, while the British returns are composed largely of manufactured goods, which probably occupy not one-tenth or one-twentieth of the space in proportion to the value that the produce which we

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

send occupies. There is another consideration, that whereas in former times we used to bring in a considerable quantity of iron goods from Great Britain, of late years the character of the trade has set the other way. We have lost that return freight, and my impression is that it is not impossible that we shall be sending iron to England within a moderate time. That is, I know, in the future, and I will make no predictions or promises in that respect.

**Mr. WALLACE**. You are proposing to continue the subsidy under the same conditions as before?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Yes, but with much better steamers.

**Mr. WALLACE**. Are the new steamers ready now?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. They are coming out now.

**Mr. WALLACE**. Is this contract for a term of years?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. It is for three years, and it was expressly understood that it was not for more than three years. They only asked for this encouragement for that term. Whether they will come back to us again and ask for more is an open question, but it was most distinctly understood between us that if we gave it for three years that was all they wanted, just to encourage them at the start.

**Mr. WALLACE**. There is no obligation for any further assistance?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. No, but, on the contrary, there is the express statement that they were not to ask for more. The steamers have been launched and will be ready for service this year, I am advised. The "City of Manchester" is already under operation.

**Mr. WALLACE**. What is the length of the trip from Montreal to Manchester, and in the winter months from the other ports?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. From Montreal to Manchester the trip occupies eleven days. We only had one steamer, the "Manchester," which was up to the standard. The others were inferior vessels. The "Manchester" makes twelve knots an hour, but she is capable of doing considerably better.

**Mr. WALLACE**. Are they suitable for passengers as well as freight?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. They have a small passenger capacity, but the service is essentially a freight service, pure and simple. They are freight vessels of about the largest size that the St. Lawrence navigation can conveniently accommodate. 8,000 tons is a very respectable size, although much larger is used

on some other routes ; but having regard to the amount of freight generally offered at Montreal, 8,000 tons will be found in practice very near our maximum.

Mr. WALLACE. They are principally engaged, I presume, in carrying the products of Canadian farms ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, they have cold storage accommodation.

Mr. WALLACE. At such a great distributing point as Manchester, no doubt it is very desirable we should have direct communication. Have they accommodation for cattle ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, they have both cattle accommodation and cold storage. The point we have been aiming at is to bring ourselves into direct contact with the great centres as far as we can. While Liverpool in some respects is a fine point of distribution, it is not to be compared with Manchester, and in a lesser degree it is, perhaps, inferior to Glasgow, and certainly to London. If we have direct communication with the great centres of population, such as London, Glasgow and Manchester, we practically come into direct contact with nearly half the population of the United Kingdom.

Mr. WALLACE. The statement made by the hon. Minister is very satisfactory. Manchester is the greatest distributing point in the world, perhaps, for a radius of twenty miles around it, so enormous is the population. Manchester is making tremendous strides to get the commerce of the world in conjunction with its ship canal, and I have no doubt that those countries which go in first, as Canada is doing now, will reap the benefit in a few years. It is a wise provision to make.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I would just say one thing, and it is one in which hon. gentlemen opposite will heartily agree. I would hope that all our Canadian producers will lay carefully to heart this lesson, that if you want to trade with England you must play no tricks in the quality of goods. If you give a first-rate article to the English consumer and establish your reputation, you may practically charge anything in reason you please. I trust all our producers will bear in mind that important fact, that to maintain the English market you must give a good article, and that any suspicion of playing tricks, in any shape or way, will inevitably destroy your trade.

Administration of the Chinese Immigration Act, including remuneration to Trade and Commerce and Customs officers .....	\$ 3,500
Canada's proportion of expenditure in connection with the International Customs Tariff Bureau .....	600

Commercial agencies, including expenses in connection with negotiation of treaties or in extension of commercial relations .....	20,000
	<u>\$24,100</u>

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. These are absolutely the votes we have been taking for some years, and distributed in the same fashion. There is very little change, except in one or two cases we have obtained some new officers.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the hon. gentleman give some explanation of the expenditure on commercial agencies ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have not spent all that money. You will see that a vote is taken for expenses in connection with the negotiation of treaties, or in extension of commercial relations. I expect that we shall have to spend some more money on that subject ; but have not been called on to do so, though I may at any moment. This goes to defray such items as the salary of Mr. Larke, in Australia, and the various salaries paid to our agents in a great variety of places, such as the West Indies and Cape Town.

Mr. WALLACE. Have you an agent in Cape Town ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, but we do not pay these agents very much. Mr. Larke is the most expensive of the lot. He receives \$3,000 a year and expenses, but I am bound to say that he has sent out a number of very carefully prepared reports, and that our trade with Australia has increased and is increasing in a reasonably rapid ratio, particularly in such articles as agricultural implements. It is a gratifying fact for me to be able to inform the House that while I would not venture to promise that we will derive a very large trade in it, the quality of our Canadian flour is so superior that it has been selling in the Australian market at a very large sum in excess of the native product. I think it is selling at about £10 6s. per ton, while the price of the native article is only £6 6s. Of course, that is Manitoba flour of very high grade, but it is very satisfactory to find that it has established so good a reputation and a considerable trade in that article may be developed.

Mr. WALLACE. That would be £10 10s. per ton.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, £10 6s. per ton for our flour, whereas the native article sells for £6 6s.

Mr. WALLACE. Do they use the long ton or the short ton ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am not sure which, but in either case it shows the great superiority of the Canadian article. The hon. gentleman has

asked me about these agents. The names are as follows:—Robert Bryson, Antigua; Geo. Eustace Burke, Kingston, Jamaica; S. L. Horsford, St. Kitts; C. E. Sontum, Christiana, Sweden; Edgar Tripp, Trinidad; and M. Moffatt, Cape Town.

Mr. WALLACE. What salary does Mr. Moffatt receive?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We do not pay him any direct salary, but pay his rent and certain allowances. The amount last year was between \$1,200 and \$1,500. How much he will be able to do in the direction of opening up trade I am not in a position to say. Bearing in mind that there is a very large mining population there, we should be able to develop a considerable trade. At present, it is largely monopolized by the Americans. Mr. Moffatt holds out considerable encouragement of trade in several lines. The great difficulty is that we have no direct communication with Cape Town, but must send our goods by way of New York to be carried by American lines, or by way of England. We have found great difficulty in obtaining the services of even one ship. Hardly any ships go direct.

Mr. WALLACE. I am told that a number of cargoes of lumber go from Vancouver to Cape Town.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is a trade beginning to spring up in that way, but the sailings of vessels are necessarily irregular. And so far as this portion of Canada is concerned, even the establishment of trade between Vancouver and Cape Town would be a little assistance—it would be cheaper to ship by New York or Liverpool.

Mr. WALLACE. It seems to me there are large possibilities of trade with South Africa. The population there is of a character to call for many kinds of goods produced in Canada. I think this Government would be justified in making greater efforts than they have made to promote this trade. Mr. Moffatt, apparently, devotes only a portion of his time to this work for the remuneration the Government give him would not pay him for his whole time. The Government would be justified in making greater efforts, and if the trade increases, it might justify the establishment of a direct line from some point in Canada to South Africa to carry our Canadian products.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We will take that into consideration. It might be a rather costly business to subsidize steamers for that service.

Mr. WALLACE. Even so, the increase of trade might justify it. I think also that the Government should make greater efforts than they appear to be doing to promote trade with the West India Islands.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am in hopes that the agreement we have recently made with the British Government and which I mentioned a few moments ago will afford the foundation for a considerable exchange of trade.

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

### After Recess.

For a survey to ascertain the most practicable route for an all-Canadian railway from some point on an existing railway into the Klondike district, and to an ocean port in British Columbia.. \$40,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is this for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). This is to cover the balance which we think will likely be incurred in completing the surveys which were authorized at the last session of Parliament. It was the general feeling, I think, that it would be very proper to make an exploratory survey from Edmonton through the Rockies, towards the Pacific, and in the direction of the Yukon, and this amount is expected to enable us practically to complete that survey. Pretty near the whole of the grant made last year has been expended. We have a large party in the country now completing the survey. We do not know exactly what the whole survey will cost, but I think we have a sufficient appropriation for the purpose.

Mr. CLANCY. Have the surveys so far been made both from Edmonton and the Pacific coast?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman had any report?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. There were three parties making explorations last year. They started at a point 8 or 10 miles to the east of the British Columbia boundary on the Peace River. The first party struck in to a point at the junction of the Parsnip and Finlay rivers. That survey covered 201 miles. Another party started from Edmonton. There was no particular need of their surveying until they got into the mountains. The two parties being together, they went through to the junction of the Finlay and Parsnip rivers, where they separated, one of the parties coming east, and the other going west. The eastern party surveyed a distance of 210 miles to some 10 or 12 miles east of the British Columbia boundary. The other party continued west to near Fort Connolly on the Osalinqua River, covering 202 miles. The third party crossed the Skeena River, going north all the way to the Dees Lake, and surveyed back, a distance of 210 miles. So

that there was covered by the three surveys about 615 or 620 miles.

Mr. CLANCY. Are they all consecutive surveys?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, there is a broken stretch which was not surveyed, but which was covered by the party, and is intended to be part of the same line. They are satisfied that a practicable route can be found from Edmonton through a pass of the Rockies, up Peace River, crossing the Skeena River and going to the foot of Dease Lake. You there come very near to the point which would be intersected if you were building a line from the Stikine River a little to the west of Glenora or Telegraph Creek and going north to Lake Teslin. One of the parties are now completing the survey, and intend, before their work is finished, to follow a route down to the coast within Canadian territory. The expectation is, that they will be able to find a practicable route which is not enormously expensive, leading to a port called Port Essington, near the mouth of the Skeena River.

Mr. CLANCY. How great will the distance be from the contemplated junction to the Pacific coast?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Though the mileage has not been accurately ascertained, it is estimated at 230 miles from Port Essington to a point where you would intersect the route which I have described.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the total mileage from Edmonton to the extreme point?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If your extreme point is the Pacific coast, at the termination of one of the contemplated surveys, the mileage would be 1.175 miles.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the hon. gentleman any report on the country?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I have very full reports.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They will be laid on the Table?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I have reports from two of the parties, but the report of the other party is not yet complete. When it is complete, I propose laying them on the Table.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the line go by way of the Great Slave Lake?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it crosses the Rockies along the valley of the Peace River. It does not cross the Peace River at all, but keeps to the south of the Peace River and crosses the mountains in a wide opening, which, I understand, there is formed by the valley of the Peace.

Cost of arbitration respecting the accounts between the Dominion of Canada and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec (payments on account of services rendered may be made to members of the civil service, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act)..... \$4,000

Mr. CLANCY. What progress has been made?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hon. gentlemen will have observed that there is a reduction of \$1,000 in the item, which I think is a wholesome sign, indicating that the end is drawing nearer. The matter has been dragging along for many years, and I am glad to say that it is now approaching completion and I hope that, by next year, it will be entirely cleared up. Only two or three matters remain for consideration.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who is this money for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It goes to pay the legal expenses of the gentlemen who are conducting the arbitration, Mr. O'Connor, of Ottawa, and Mr. Robinson, of Toronto.

Classification of old records of Canada in the office of the Privy Council (payments on account of this service may be made notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act)..... \$1,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has any step been taken to consolidate all these record offices into one? There is one in the Privy Council, one in the Secretary of State's Department, and one in the Department of Agriculture. Before the late Government went out of office they had gone very carefully into the question of consolidating these record offices with the view of improving the work and reducing the cost.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have to inform the hon. gentleman that there has been nothing done.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I quite recognize that Mr. McGee is in the habit of doing good work in connection with it but does it not strike the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that it would be advantageous, as a mere matter of convenience, to consolidate all these archives and record departments?

The PRIME MINISTER. I quite agree.

To assist in defraying the cost in the publication of documents issued by the Canadian Mining Institute ..... \$1,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is an allowance similar to the one made last year to an important society which represents the mining interests of Canada pretty fully and I have reason to believe that it is doing very excellent work.

"Canada Gazette" ..... \$6,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. This is more a matter of book-keeping than anything else, as it is self-sustaining, is it not?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the Queen's Printer informs me that there is a profit on the "Canada Gazette" so that the vote is more than covered by the receipts.

Miscellaneous printing ..... \$27,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is an increase of \$2,000 here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a matter which we discussed somewhat on the supplementary Estimates. It is due to the fact, as the Queen's Printer reports, of an increase in the amount of published matter. The Experimental Farm reports, for example, are 40,000 in number, and the Auditor General's Report is larger than ever. Generally, the expense of printing is somewhat increased.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who have the paper contracts now, in connection with the Printing Bureau?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will have to get the information later on, as I do not have it now.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman find whether contracts have been let during the last three years, and if so, will he bring down the figures?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will bring down the information.

Plant for Printing Bureau, including web perfecting press, \$19,000, and additional Linotype machines, \$14,000.. ..... \$38,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. This is a very large increase.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is due to the proposal to purchase additional plant, it is not for maintenance. In the report of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, which has been laid on the Table, hon. gentlemen will find a statement of what the proposed improvements are:

1. A fast perfecting press, feeding from the web and folding its own work, capable of turning out from 18,000 to 24,000 sheets of 16 pages per hour.

2. The amount of four Linotype machines and the exchange of two of those now in the office for others of the latest improved make.

3. The extension to the rear of the western wing to provide increased space for the bindery and for the press-room.

This third proposal we are not now contemplating.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where are you purchasing the printing presses?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no special information upon that, but, I

Mr. FIELDING.

suppose, the printing presses will be American. The linotype machines will be purchased in Montreal, where they are being manufactured.

Commutation in lieu of remission of duties on articles imported for the use of the army and navy ..... \$2,250

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think that under the law a consul coming from another country is permitted to bring in his uniform and articles connected with his office free of duty, providing he is born in the country he represents, but a Canadian appointed a consul is not allowed to bring in these articles free of duty. That seems to me to be a discrimination. I do not see why a native-born Canadian, appointed consul to a foreign country, should be taxed any more than a native of that country given the same appointment.

Mr. WALLACE. The clause of the Act is as follows:—

Articles for the personal or the official use of Consuls General, who are natives or citizens of the country they represent, and are not engaged in any other business or profession, have the right of free entry.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I ask my right hon. friend and the hon. Finance Minister if they have laid the railway subsidies on the Table?

The PRIME MINISTER. They are in the hands of the Clerk, or if not they will be immediately.

Salaries and contingencies of the office of the Paris Agency ..... \$3,500

Mr. WALLACE. What were the results from this agency? What does the agent do?

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend knows that the agent sends out immigrants to this country. I admit they do not come in very large numbers, but he also looks after the general business of the country in Paris. A number of Canadians visit Paris, his office is always open to all coming there, and I am sure all those who have visited Paris must acknowledge that he is doing very valuable service to the public at large.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to say a word on this subject, because I gave very special attention to it when in London, and I came to the conclusion that it was an absolute necessity to have a competent representative of the Government in Paris. I am bound also to say that after years of intimate acquaintance with the present representative of Canada. I do not believe he could be replaced by a better man. He is a gentleman of high culture, who is extremely popular in Paris, who has the ear of the Government of France, and is on very friendly relations with the leading men of the press, and I found on a very important occasion, he was able to render in that way very substantial service to Canadian inter-

ests. In my judgment, the services of Mr. Fabre could not be dispensed with without doing very great injury to the country, and I do not believe it would be easy to replace him with an equally efficient man.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** I am sure the House is delighted to hear the testimony which the right hon. Prime Minister has just given to the mistakes that some of his friends and I think himself also made while on this side. Perhaps not the Prime Minister, but certainly within his hearing and without any protest having been made by him. I remember a very serious attack being made on this item by hon. gentlemen, when on this side, which can be very easily referred to in "Hansard," and in which it was said by the right hon. gentleman's supporters that the money was wasted. I am very glad that the right hon. gentleman has come to see his duty and to acknowledge that the Opposition to this vote on this side in former days was wrong.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** I would be very sorry to think that as I am growing older, I am not growing better and more informed and educated.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** The hon. gentleman is evidently not a Bourbon.

Payments of extra clerks for services rendered in preparation of returns ordered by Parliament ..... \$2,000

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** There is a decrease there.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** We do not ask for so many returns.

Academy of Arts ..... \$2,000

**Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON.** On page 35, there is an item for a National Art Gallery, Ottawa, \$2,000. Do I understand that that item refers to the expenditure of the National Art Gallery, and this one for the purchase of pictures for that gallery?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I am unable to give the hon. gentleman that information. If he consents to the item passing, I will procure it for him later.

To assist in the publication of the proceedings of the Royal Society ..... \$5,000

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** I do not know whether many members have read these reports, but I have read a good number of them, and if the Minister of Finance would look into this subject I am sure he will become convinced that a little larger grant could well be given with great advantage; though I am not aware that the society has asked for any more assistance. There is no subject of Canadian interest, of Canadian history, of Canadian literature or science, that is not fully treated in the splendid articles which appear in these reports of the Royal Society. No doubt the wider distribution of its transactions must be to encourage a better Can-

adian sentiment and to spread abroad a wider knowledge of Canadian resources. I have nothing to do with the society, except that I am acquainted with many of their reports, and I think it would be advantageous to give them a larger grant.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I believe there has been no application, but it is certain that there will be after the good words my hon. friend has spoken.

**Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON.** It seems to me \$5,000 is a very handsome grant to the Royal Society. I think they ought to be able to turn out quite a number of volumes for that sum. I appreciate all the member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) has stated with regard to the merits of the society, but it seems to me \$5,000 is a very ample sum. Is the printing done by the Queen's Printer or by a private printer for the society?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I think we have nothing to do with the printing. The society do with this grant as in their judgment they think best.

For cold storage on steamships, on railways, at warehouses and at creameries, and for expenses in connection with trial shipments of products, and for securing recognition of the quality of Canadian farm products ..... \$70,000

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher).** This item is smaller than it was last year because we have found that we could get off with less in the ensuing year. A number of the steamship companies have received their third payment, and, therefore, the account with them is closed. I am making practically no change in the disposition of this vote, but in consequence of the fact I have just mentioned, I found that we would be able to do all the work we have been doing with \$15,000 less.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** What is the result with regard to shipment of fruit?

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** We have been making some trial shipments of fruit from Grimsby in the Niagara peninsula, where we have a small cold storage building for the purpose of cooling fruit before it is shipped. We found last year that the shipments of pears were very profitable, and I think it is a trade that can be well built up. We also hope this year to make a good deal more of an experiment with early and delicate apples, if the crop this year is such as will enable people to make shipments. The shipments we made last year of these early apples were successful, but the experiment was not extensive, and we would like to send over more this year. The shipments of peaches have been very unsuccessful as a general rule, chiefly because the peaches here are delicate in flesh and skin, and do not seem to be able to stand shipment. But I have myself formed the opinion that the bruising of peaches is the trouble, and that is done in picking and handling. I believe if special

precautions were taken by the men who pick and pack this fruit, a profitable trade could be built up in the choicest varieties. Only the other day I got information of the fact that peaches are sent from South Africa to the London market, but these peaches are never touched by the hands of pickers or the packers. They are clipped off the stem by little pairs of scissors made on purpose, and placed directly in the boxes in which they are sent in cork shavings. The result is that when they reach the London market they are perfectly sound, and have realized very good prices. I am going to try some experiment of that kind this year, if the peach crop is a satisfactory one. I may say, though, that it took five or six years for the South African packers to find out how to do it successfully, and at last they have succeeded. We hope to derive a profit from their experience.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sorry to see that the vote for this service has been diminished. If there is a service that the Government would have been warranted in making a large addition to, it is this service. If any person were to search these Estimates—these enormous Estimates—for a case in which it was not wise to diminish the grant, he could not find, in my judgment, anything more important than this question of cold storage. Before the late Government went out of power, they had grappled vigorously with this question. It was in its infancy then, but it was commended to Parliament as one of the most important questions that could be dealt with by the representatives of the Canadian people. One of the strong reasons why the late Government pressed the fast Atlantic service upon the country was not only that it provided a means of carrying passengers in the shortest time from one continent to another, not only that it afforded a means of transporting letters more rapidly than by any other means, but its greatest merit, in my judgment, was, that under this contract the Messrs. Allan were bound to furnish whatever facilities for cold storage were demanded by the trade. You have only to look to the United States, or, a still more striking example, to Australasia, to see the advantage of the cold storage. If my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has given this subject any attention, he knows that the cold-storage system of Canada to-day is utterly insignificant, as compared with that of the United States or Australasia. He knows that the Australian colonies succeeded, in the face of climatic difficulties far greater than ours, as they must cross the torrid zone, to capture, to a large extent, the market in even such an article as butter, which is more susceptible to climatic influence than any other. He knows also that, by means of an admirable system of cold storage, peaches can be shipped to England from South Africa and land-

Mr. FISHER.

ed in as good condition as if they had been picked in England that very morning. There is nothing, outside of preferential trade, in which the Government can do so much more for the agricultural interest, as in this matter of cold storage. In the United States parties are spending large capital, not only to accommodate the trade of the United States, but in the hope of capturing the Canadian trade and sending it through American channels. There is large expenditure for local cold-storage establishments, for cold-storage cars and depots, as well as for the most perfect appliances on board the ships which are to carry these products to the unlimited market of Great Britain. I read, without surprise, that the Fruit-Growers Association in Nova Scotia had presented an address to my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher), drawing his attention to the fact that his cold-storage system had utterly failed, and broken down, and had not accomplished anything for the trade. Recent improvements have taken account of the fact that you cannot send two articles in the same compartment without damaging one of them. Fruit, for instance, requires one temperature, and butter another. You cannot send these two articles in the same compartment without spoiling both. If the Australasian colonies, by means of an admirable system of cold storage, not only in the steamers, but in the colonies themselves, can outrival and outdistance us in the markets of Great Britain, that certainly shows that our system of cold storage is very faulty indeed. In connection with the appropriation that is made to-day of \$126,000 for steamer subsidies across the Atlantic, the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Government are bound to admit that there is practically no value in the appropriation, so far as mail matter is concerned. The Government have the means of bringing into operation a good system of cold storage, by making a condition of the mail subsidy being given, that the greatest improvements in cold storage should be made, at all events in those vessels which receive the subsidy. We have been paying a considerable amount, and paying to very little purpose, because it is expended in very inefficient appliances for producing cold storage in the ships. And so far as cold-storage cars and means of communication on land, and cold-storage depots throughout the country are concerned, there is practically very little of any value being done. I draw the attention of the committee to this matter, and express my complete dissent and utter disapproval of the cutting down of this cold-storage vote. It ought to have been doubled at least, in order to make it as efficient as necessary. One of the most important shippers asked me the other day what was the matter with the cold storage. They were instructed to receive at the city of Quebec a very large quantity of cheese and butter, to be sent by cold storage, and ultimately it all dwindled down until there

were only a few tubs of butter to be had. The matter needs to be taken up systematically, and if it is conducted as it has been conducted in the United States and in the Australasian colonies the result will be that you will add sensibly to the value of every pound of butter and cheese, to the value of fruit and all kinds of perishable goods that the Canadian agriculturist has to send to the foreign markets; and you will give to the agricultural interests what they are entitled to receive at the hands of the Government who are to-day protecting the manufacturing interests of this country by their tariff, as the late Government did. In this way you can give some protection to the farmers without costing the country beyond a comparatively insignificant sum. By adopting such a course you will show to the farmers that their vital and supremely important interests are engaging the attention of the Government, and that the Government intend to take advantage of the favourable situation in which nature has placed us over every other part of the world. We have an advantage over the United States because we have a shorter line of communication between Canada and Great Britain, and with vessels of the same speed we can deliver these perishable goods 24 hours earlier in the markets of England than can be done from any port in the United States. We have also the overwhelming advantage of having the best climate in the world for fruit. The apples of Canada have taken the gold medal in London in competition with the whole world, because it has been found that no other fruit can rival the excellence of Canadian fruit. The Government should adopt the policy, instead of cutting down the small vote of last year, of increasing it to \$100,000, and that \$100,000 could be spent in a way that would bring a ten-fold return to the agricultural interests of this country. There are no interests better entitled to protection than the agricultural interest. To capture the markets of the United Kingdom for our agricultural products means untold wealth to the people of Canada. We have got the climate, we have got the soil, we have got the industry, we have got everything that is required except the fostering care of the Government, which should come to their aid by the adoption of the same means that other countries have adopted. What we have done in cheese may be done in butter, and every person knows what that means to the agriculturist of Canada. You have the pasturage, you have the climate, you have healthy cattle, you have everything to enable you to compete in the markets of England with all other countries of the world. We know what was done with respect to cheese by the fostering aid given by the province of Ontario; cheese ranged steadily forward until within a comparatively few years we have surpassed the United States in the quantity of our export

of cheese to Great Britain. Precisely the same thing can be done in regard to butter, poultry, eggs and everything of a perishable character. I regret extremely that the Minister of Agriculture has cut down this appropriation by \$15,000 when I think he should, on the contrary, largely have increased it. The course pursued by the Government demands the severe condemnation of this committee.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE** (Mr. Fisher). The speech with which we have been treated by the hon. leader of the Opposition has been rather amusing to myself, as I think it must have been to this House who have followed the course of events upon which the hon. gentleman has been dilating. I am afraid the hon. gentleman must have been asleep for the last couple of years, or that he is living in the past in this matter, as he is largely in others. The hon. gentleman has drawn a glowing picture of what could be done by means of cold storage, but he does not seem to be aware of the fact that to a large extent Canada in the last two years has done what he has been outlining. As a matter of fact, three years ago when he and his friends were in office, Canadian butter stood away below Australian butter in the English market, and to-day it stands away above Australian butter, and that is due to the cold storage accommodation which has been supplied by this Government. The hon. gentleman has also forgotten that while a few years ago when his friends were in office, Canadian butter stood at 20 shillings per hundred weight lower than the highest price given for Danish butter in England, by reason of the cold storage accommodation which has been supplied for Canadian butter carried to the English market, to-day Canadian butter, instead of being 20 shillings per 100 below Danish, is almost on a par, being only 5 or 6 shillings per 100 less at most. Last summer when I was in England watching the market quotations, I was proud to see, on several occasions, that Canadian butter was on a level with the best Danish butter. The hon. gentleman says that our cold storage system has been inefficient, that we are not supplying the proper kind of cold storage to carry these goods to the English market, and that we ought to have followed the example of Australia and the United States. The hon. gentleman seems not to be aware that we are following the same system of mechanical cold storage which is used on the Australian, the New Zealand and the Cape Colony steamships, and on the United States lines; and we now have 24 or 25 steamships constantly leaving our ports equipped with the same mechanical cold storage apparatus which is used by the other countries the hon. gentleman has mentioned. There cannot be much difference, therefore, in the accommodation which we are supplying and that they are supplying, as it

is done by the same firms, the same machinery being used, and the same system being adopted.

The hon. gentleman said that we ought to have a thorough system of cold storage cars on the railways in the country. He does not seem to have taken the trouble to inform himself so as to know that we have a system of cold storage cars; that there are, on all the leading lines of railway, cold storage equipments supplying the needs of the people in sending their perishable articles to Montreal, to Halifax and St. John; that, as a matter of fact, butter is taken from the creameries where, in the first place, it is put into cold storage chambers, subsidized by the department, which I am managing, that after having put that butter into these cold storage chambers, at the creameries, it is put into cold storage cars for conveyance on the lines of railway to the ports of shipment, that it is there held in cold storage accommodation until it is put on the steamer and that it is then carried in cold storage on the steamer to Great Britain. The hon. gentleman says that the American steamship lines are equipping their vessels better than we are, and that they are attracting the trade in Canadian products to their lines. The hon. gentleman does not appear to know that a large amount of products, which require to go in cold storage from Chicago and the west, are being shipped from Montreal in vessels equipped by the bonus which we have given for cold storage, and that these products are being sent over to England in our ships. We do not allow these products to be put into cold storage chambers on ships, bonused by the department if there are any Canadian products ready to occupy the place on these ships, and it is only when there is unoccupied space that they are allowed to take the produce of the American states. I might tell the hon. gentleman what he does not seem to be aware of, that while at first we were obliged to subsidize vessels to get them to put in cold storage equipments, and while three years ago some of these companies required a bonus to induce them to put in that accommodation into their vessels, they are to-day putting into their new vessels, cold storage accommodation without any bonus at all. Having attained our object the hon. gentleman wants us to go on spending the people's money. I believe that, when we have once attained our object it is a matter of wisdom and economy to cease expending money upon that particular line of work when we can get more accommodation from the people who are engaged in that business without the necessity of our money being spent to get it. The hon. gentleman alluded to one or two points in which he said that our cold storage arrangements were deficient. He spoke of a meeting which took place in Nova Scotia

Mr. FISHER.

last winter where the fruit-growers made certain representations to me. That meeting was a large, influential and representative one, and the whole question was very thoroughly threshed out. When I came to inquire into the matter, I found that hardly anybody had taken advantage of the cold storage that was provided, and that the fruit-growers had been under the impression that cold storage was not suitable for the carriage of fruit. They were demanding from me that instead of cold storage, we should make arrangements to see that the steamship companies properly ventilated the holds of their vessels by putting in ventilators and electric fanning machines, so that the air should be changed and kept cool. When in England last summer, I took upon myself to interview the heads of the steamship companies upon the trade of this country, I pointed out what was necessary in that respect: that while in the hot weather in summer, cold storage accommodation was necessary our fruit-growers had found that the hardier winter varieties of apples would do perfectly well in the ordinary hold of the vessel, provided the hold was properly ventilated and equipped with electric fans, so as to change the air in it. As a matter of fact, cold products going forward in cold storage chambers had to pay a little extra freightage. Under the arrangement which we have made, cold storage steamers receiving the bonus are only allowed to charge 10 shillings a ton of 70 cubic feet capacity over the ordinary freight charge. While in the steamers sailing from American ports, 20 shillings a ton of 40 cubic feet capacity, which is the ordinary shipping ton, is charged, while on everything going from Montreal, St. John or Halifax, steamship companies are only allowed to charge 10 shillings extra per ton of 70 cubic feet capacity. This is another advantage that shippers possess in sending forward goods in cold storage by our lines. The contention of the fruit-growers was that their hard winter apples would not bear the extra charge, and they could send them forward, provided ventilation was supplied in the hold of the vessel. I interviewed the head officers of several of these lines, and was successful in getting them to lay out a small amount of money on their ships with the result that we have a considerable number of vessels leaving Canadian ports properly equipped with ventilating shafts and electric fans. The consequence was that these apples arrived in England in far better condition than they ever did before. I am glad to be able to say that these steamship companies have promised me, without any bonus, without spending any more public money, without offering any inducements to them, as the hon. gentleman appears to want me to do, but at their own risk and at their own expense, simply on the representation of what is

necessary for the trade, that this fall they will have all their ships ventilated to carry our apples to England. Up to the present time, with perhaps an occasional period in the autumn, when large amounts of butter are going forward, when there is a large quantity of fruit going forward, and when there are also poultry and meat shipments going forward, everybody has been able to get cold storage accommodation in ships going forward from our ports. There has been no lack of cold storage accommodation for our perishable food products going forward, and I cannot see why the hon. gentleman should demand of me that I should waste public money when there is no necessity for it to accomplish the end in view. The hon. gentleman has spoken of other things which have been done. He has alluded to poultry meat shipments. As a matter of fact, last fall we took occasion to make some small poultry meat shipments, and we succeeded well in the prices we got for them. We have made arrangements under which we will be able to induce our people themselves this fall to send forward a large amount of poultry meat to the English market. I am satisfied, from the results we attained last year, that these poultry meat shipments can be made profitable and successful, but the hon. gentleman is urging me to go and do that which I have already done. The hon. gentleman spoke a few minutes ago about ships not stopping at Quebec. In every contract made there is a provision that ships going from Montreal shall stop at Quebec, provided there is enough freight offering to make it worth the stoppage. I do not exactly remember the amount, but I think that it is provided that if 500 packages are offering, the ship is obliged to stop at Quebec, and is obliged to reserve the space necessary in its cold storage accommodation for that amount of freight. The hon. gentleman will see that the majority of the things which he has alluded to have already been accomplished, and if to-day I am able to cut down this expenditure and ask for \$15,000 less than I asked for a year ago, it is simply because the expenditure, wisely laid out, well arranged and well managed, has accomplished the objects. So I do not see why the hon. gentleman should expect that we should waste public money and go in for a more extravagant expenditure. In addition to cold storage accommodation on ships, to cold storage on railways to cold storage chambers at creameries, we have been able to make provision for fruit shipments and for poultry meat shipments, which we hope will lead to a large increase in these shipments. We have been able to accomplish everything that the hon. gentleman has alluded to. Under these circumstances, I do not think the hon. gentleman's speech is justified, and I trust that having had this explanation,

he will be satisfied with the amount I ask for.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sorry that the duties of the Minister of Agriculture have unfortunately been devolved upon one who enters on the discharge of his duties with the impression that there is nothing in the world that he can learn. The hon. gentleman is one of those dilettante farmers who imagines that he has got all the agricultural knowledge in the world stored in his cranium. That is very unfortunate for Canada. The only way in which a Minister can be useful is by being willing to learn; and by the time a man reaches that cranial proportion which the hon. gentleman has reached, when there is nothing in the wide world that any one can teach him, and when all he can do is to stand on his feet and talk by the hour of what he had done and is doing, he has become of very little use. The hon. gentleman wants to know if I have been asleep for the last two years. No; I have been wide awake enough to know that all that the hon. gentlemen have done for the country has been done where they had meekly and modestly followed in the footsteps of their predecessors; and they have failed where they believed they could improve on what their predecessors did. The cold storage was in its infancy when the late Government went out of power; but we were grappling with it, in the face of a good deal of hostile criticism on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, who were disposed to obstruct what the Government were doing for the agricultural interests of this country. The hon. gentleman has sat down without dealing with the gravamen of my charge, and that is, the crime which hon. gentlemen opposite committed when they struck down the fast Atlantic service. What was the position of that question, with the very foundation of which this cold storage was identified? Hon. gentlemen found ready for signature the contract with the Messrs. Allan, who, with the enormous capital they were able to command on both sides of the Atlantic, and the great experience they could bring, were ready to take up the project. I wrote a letter to my successor, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, when the Government changed hands, pointing out to him that by inducing the Governor General to do that which he had refused to do, to allow the contract to be signed promptly, under an Order in Council passed by the late Government, they would save two years. They refused to do that, and consequently not only lost two years, but we have to-day had the humiliating confession made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) on the floor of this House, that they have lost all chance of accomplishing that which they had declared was a service of the greatest importance to Canada. So important did they admit that that fast Atlantic service, with its provision for cold storage, was to Canada, that when

we were powerless, owing to obstruction, to pass anything in this House, they agreed to pass unanimously a Bill to secure a fast Atlantic service by the contribution of a million dollars a year, with the provision that the contract must be subject to the approval of Parliament when it met. When the late Government were prevented by the Governor General, in violation of the constitution of the country, from having the fast Atlantic contract signed and closed, when Parliament was to meet in a fortnight, and when, if Parliament did not approve of the contract they could repudiate it, hon. gentlemen not only did not take action, but, under the same impression which the Minister of Agriculture has exhibited to-night, that they knew much better and had more information than all the rest of the world, they discarded all the information that had been obtained on this important question, and undertook to delude themselves, as I told them in 1897, and to delude themselves again, as I told them in 1898, with the idea that they could do something better than their predecessors. And now where are they? Why, Sir, not only does the Minister of Trade and Commerce admit that a great wrong was done to the people of Canada—that Canada has lost this service, which would have been in operation a year ago last May—but he gives us no hope. He says that the ship yards are all full, and that we could not get a ship built to-day on any terms, even if we could now make a contract for the amount that Parliament provided. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I have been wide enough awake to see that just as in that matter Canada has been thrown down, I do not know how long—whether five years or ten years—and that this important service has been ruined and made hopeless by them, a service that would have brought the capitalists of the United States to Canada, owing to the natural advantages we possess, a service that would have enabled us to control the whole mail matter between the two continents to as great an extent as a weekly service could control it, a service by which New York would have got her mails twenty-four hours earlier than in any other way—just as that service, with all these advantages has been thrown away and lost because hon. gentlemen themselves have been asleep to the advantages of Canada, in the same way the hon. Minister of Agriculture is crippling this service by claiming that he has saved a paltry \$15,000. I will take up these estimates and will show him where his \$15,000 has been corruptly spent by his Government in building a wharf where there was no water to get to it. If he wants to save money, let him go through these estimates, and he will find many ways, instead of robbing the honest, industrious agriculturists of this country, who are the very foundation of its prosperity. Hon. gentlemen laugh when we tell them that the agriculturists are men of standing and character, and im-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

portant to the best interests of Canada, and that they should be largely protected, and their greatest industry fostered, as to-day the Government fosters the manufacturing and other industries. But when they stand face to face with the intelligent agriculturists, my hon. friends will find they will have to make a better case than they have to-night, before they can convince the people that they deserve credit for robbing the agriculturists of the sum of \$15,000, which is to be expended on a wharf at a place where there is no water.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture, when I point to Australia, says: We are doing exactly the same thing; we are copying Australia and the United States. Let me ask the House whether he was stating what was true or false, when, a few moments ago, he said that under the cold-storage system of Australia the Australians were able to put peaches on the markets of England as fresh and well-flavoured as if picked in London. Contrast that statement with the wail of the fruit-growers of Canada, who tell him that his cold storage is of no value, and it would be better for him to adopt some new system.

If we have any hope of ever getting the session to an end, we must adopt some means of preventing the Minister of Agriculture from getting on his feet, because, unfortunately, when he does, he never knows when to sit down. He reminds me of a certain divine who, after he had preached a long sermon, asked one of his clerical brethren what he thought of it. "Well," said his friend, "it was a good sermon, but I think you passed some very admirable places in it where you might have stopped."

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not at all want to prolong the discussion, but the hon. gentleman has accused me of having neglected what he calls the gravamen of the charge against me with regard to cold storage, and that is the fast line. I thought that when I was dealing with the cold-storage equipment, I was dealing with what ought to be the gravamen of the charge. But the hon. gentleman is more at home in dealing with the fast line and other subjects of that kind, and prefers talking about them to discussing cold storage. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the contract he boasts about was one of the most gigantic frauds ever perpetrated on the Canadian people, that the contract which he says he concluded with the Allan people, was one which bound the Government to pay the Allan people \$750,000 a year, if they chose to take it up, but which left them free to take it up or not at their own will and pleasure, and that there was nothing binding in that contract on them, while Canada was tightly bound. If that is the kind of contract which the hon. gentleman wants to boast of, he is welcome to his boasting. We

have done this at all events: we have prevented the people of Canada from being saddled with a burden of three-quarters of a million dollars per year for a steam service which never could have been up to the mark, under the conditions and terms of the contract the hon. gentleman made, and which left us absolutely at the mercy of the steamship company, without protection for Canada.

The hon. gentleman says that this was the great thing they did for cold storage. They provided a contract which was going to give four steamships running per year from Canada to Great Britain, and that was a great thing for the farmers. Well, as a matter of fact, for less than \$70,000, I have provided with cold-storage twenty-three steamships going to England, while he was going to spend \$750,000 a year in order to get four steamships only equipped with this system.

He says that I have convicted myself out of my own mouth because I stated that the South African people were able to send peaches to England in cold storage. But he did not take into the slightest account what the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) understood perfectly well, namely, that the reason was, the South Africans had adopted a system by which the peaches were not handled or touched at all, and, of course, were not bruised, and consequently could be carried in perfect safety. The hon. gentleman laughs; but, as a matter of fact, we have carried peaches in cold storage to London, and marketed and sold them at as good prices as the South African and Californian peaches. But unfortunately, when they have been handled and bruised by the pickers and handlers, as has been generally the case, our peaches have not reached the English market in good order, but when they have not been bruised, and have been carefully handled, they have arrived in perfect order by the system we have adopted and carried into effect.

The hon. gentleman says that when I go before the farmers, I shall have to provide a different defence, and that he is quite ready to leave the decision with the farmers. Well, I am equally willing to leave it in their hands, and prefer doing that to arguing the point with him.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I cannot allow the hon. gentleman to make a statement calculated to mislead the committee on a very important question, and that is the Allan contract, of which he speaks with supreme contempt, as he talks of the Allan people. He says that the contract was a most wretched and improper one. Has anybody suffered anything by it—

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.**  
Thanks to us.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER**—except through the failure of this Government to adopt it? What is the fact? It is, that the clause allowing the Messrs. Allan four months, was

put in at their request for the purpose of enabling them to negotiate with the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway lines, at whose mercy they said they would be largely, unless they could make a contract with them before absolutely closing one with us. But the agents of the Messrs. Allan in Glasgow, a house of enormous wealth, called on the right hon. Secretary of State for the Colonies, and communicated the fact that they were ready to carry out the contract at once. What then happened? When it was found that the \$750,000 for a fast Atlantic service which was voted, and to authorize the Government to pay which an Act was passed, failed to accomplish the object, I was enabled to obtain from Her Majesty's Government the implementing of that by a grant of £75,000 sterling, added to our subsidy, for the purpose of completing that important service, on account of its value from an Imperial and national point of view. And when all this was done, when all the means were provided and the Colonial Office was communicated with by Lord Strathcona, then Sir Donald Smith, and when that everything was arranged satisfactorily, unfortunately for Canada this Government obtained power and interfered with the success of that project. My hon. friend now boasts to the people that they have saved \$750,000 a year, and have got for \$70,000 what would have been done by the fast Atlantic steamers. If he thinks such a monstrous misstatement of the facts, such a gigantic delusion as that, can be palmed off upon the intelligent electorate of Canada, he will find himself completely deluded, as when he went down to Brome the other day with such confidence as to what his constituents would do on the temperance question, and came back with his tail behind him.—in fact, without his tail behind him, for he had lost his tail in the struggle in Brome. The hon. gentleman boasts that they have saved \$750,000 a year. Was it done in an open, manly way? Did not the Premier declare to his constituents in Quebec that this fast service was one of the most important things that could be done for Quebec or for Canada? Was he seeking to delude the people when he said that? This matter was turned over to the charge of the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), who had publicly declared that seventeen knots was quite enough for a Canadian service. And the result of his management is that the whole thing is broken down and destroyed. If the hon. Minister (Mr. Fisher) thinks that the action of the Government of which he is a member in this respect affords grounds for boasting, let him hug that delusion as his friends in West Elgin were told to hug their beloved machine.

**Mr. WALLACE.** The second speech of the Minister of Agriculture was devoid of those insulting remarks that characterized the first. He apparently profited by the cas-

tigation given him by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper). I have listened at various times to the Minister of Agriculture, but I have never heard him observe the courtesies and civilities due to every member, but due above every member on this side to the leader of the Opposition. There is no more flagrant sinner in that respect than the uncultivated Minister of Agriculture. He remarked that the leader of the Opposition must have been asleep on this as on other matters. He speaks of the leader of the Opposition living in the past. I am in the judgment of the House that there is not now nor has there been, in my recollection, any member of this House who has given more active and intelligent interest to every business proposal and every legislative matter brought before the House than the leader of the Opposition. Why, Sir, he is a marvel. He has none of the characteristics of an old man. He is here to-day with energies unimpaired, watching every question, giving intelligent discussions to everything of importance before the House, and the language used by the Minister of Agriculture is a piece of impertinence—perhaps that is not parliamentary, but if I could find a stronger term that would express my meaning, I would be glad to use it. The Minister of Agriculture says: The hon. gentleman may not know it, but I have already done all this without the necessity of his giving advice. I do not know that there is any member of this House who would be the worse of advice given to him. Other Ministers, I know, are glad to have the mature views and sage counsel of the leader of the Opposition on important matters. But this self-sufficient over-wise Minister of Agriculture, this gentleman who parades with his valet paid for by the country, instead of by himself, as should be if he choses to have that luxury, tells us he has done all these things and has done them well. He tells us: We have laid out everything well, arranged everything well, managed everything well—

Mr. FOSTER. Does he say "we"?

Mr. WALLACE. No, that is right; there was no "we" in it; it was "I." But the country has not discovered these great abilities in the Minister of Agriculture. If he had one-tenth of the mental vigour of the leader of the Opposition, he might thank Providence that he had ten times the intellectual power he has to-day. With regard to the tremendous results of his business arrangements, what do they amount to. He said: We have provided cold storage sufficient in every direction. Why, as I understand it, the most important point where cold storage should have been given is for our trade with the British West Indies. But that has been entirely neglected. He boasts about his exports of butter. But let us take a specimen or two. To British Guiana,

Mr. WALLACE.

last year, we exported \$71 worth of butter. They want the butter and we are producing it in enormous quantities; yet all we sent to them was \$71 worth. Then consider our shipments in this line to Hong Kong. We have a line of steamers running there regularly; a line of steamers that are the pride of this country for their splendid equipment. We ought to have sent hundreds of dollars worth of butter to Hong Kong. How much did we send? Just \$250 worth. Our ships call at Japan also, yet of Canadian butter we sent to Japan only \$576 worth. Have the Government provided cold storage on these ships; have they looked after our business in respect of this cold storage question? I claim that they have utterly neglected it. Take the Danish West India Islands—we sent them only \$9,000 worth of butter. To the South-western West India Islands, which we should have sent tens of thousands of dollars worth, we sent \$75 worth. The hon. gentleman has neglected the most important points, and in his self-sufficient and insolent manner he lectures everybody who does not fall down and worship our sapient Minister of Agriculture. He has boasted in this House and elsewhere: Look at the enormous trade we are doing with the United States—\$7,000 head of cattle exported, where only a few years ago we sent a much smaller number. Why, these cattle netted to the Canadian farmer only \$14 per head. They should have been kept here and fed in this country, where we have the products to feed them. We send cattle to Great Britain, and have done so for many years. These bring more than \$61 per head to the Canadian dealer.

Yet the Minister of Agriculture boasts of the enormous trade that he says he has built up with the United States by abolishing the quarantine regulations. I say in that regard he has done an injury to the Canadian trade, because the whole of that wealth should have been retained for the Canadian farmer. We have the material to feed the cattle here, but he thinks it is a good thing to send them to the United States at \$14 a head instead of feeding them and exporting them to Great Britain. As has been pointed out by the leader of the Opposition, these gentlemen are too anxious to indulge in deals to prepare for the next election. They have got their supplementary Estimates and their subsidies down already for an election. To-day they dare not face the people, because they know that the people will refuse to be hoodwinked any longer, will refuse to be purchased by their own money. There have been a series of extraordinary scandals in this country, the Yukon scandal, the West Elgin scandal, and now we have the West Huron scandal, the iniquities of which are being disclosed day by day. Let me tell them that they must soon go before the great jury of the electorate of Canada, who will pronounce a verdict against them which they richly deserve.

Mr. OSLER. I am sorry to see the reduction in this item. I think the speech of the Minister of Agriculture justified entirely the criticism made by the leader of the Opposition. I look upon this item in the Estimates as the most valuable contribution to the progress of the country in the whole blue-book. Yet the Minister of Agriculture, having simply touched the fringe of this enterprise, having shown only a few of the results of the expenditure of \$85,000 last year, is now afraid to go any further, and he reduces it to \$70,000. We have not begun yet even to scratch the ground as to the possibilities of our development in this regard. For many years I have considered this question; long before I was in Parliament I wrote about it, and thought that the Government of Canada should devote \$100,000 or \$200,000 a year for the development of this very branch of business we are now discussing. I do not believe any money can be so profitably expended in Canada as money expended in this direction. Last year's expenditure, following out absolutely the policy of the Conservative Government, was successful; and I am sorry now that the hon. gentleman has got frightened and dare not tackle an expenditure of more than \$70,000. \$100,000, properly spent in this way, would bring in better results than all the railway subsidies we have proposed this year. It will bring in great results to those men who are so often wept over, the poor farmers of this country. This is the way to help the farmer to develop his cheese, his butter and his poultry industry. If this Government had adopted a plan whereby \$100,000 or \$200,000 a year should be spent among the different provinces in the development of agriculture, I would have supported them.

Mr. REID. I wish to enter my protest against the reduction the Minister is making in this vote. For many years before the last election, hon. gentlemen opposite were telling the farmers that they were being badly treated by the Conservative Government, and they promised that if they got into power they would take the burdens off the farmers and better their condition. Well, we find that in 1896, the Conservative Government brought down estimates to the extent of \$39,000,000, and this session the Estimates are over \$50,000,000. In every department of Government the Estimates have been increased except in the Department of Agriculture. There is no branch of industry in this country that needs more to be fostered than agriculture. The farmers of this country are its backbone. Last year I asked the Minister if he would place a small amount in the Estimates for the development of the butter industry; he told me that, as he was doing something for cold storage, he could not do anything to help the butter industry. Now we find he is reducing the amount for cold storage. He tells us that the butter in the British market is now equal to Danish

butter, and he attributes that to his cold storage system. Now, the hon. gentleman must know that he is comparing Danish creamery-made butter with butter that was made in this country prior to creameries being established, there is no comparison between them. The first time Canadian butter was on a par with Danish butter was when the Quebec Government gave the Quebec farmers a bonus of 3 cents a pound if they would go into creamery butter; and immediately that creamery butter was placed on the British market it was found to be equal to Danish butter. If you turn to the exports of last year you will see that the export of butter from Quebec has been steadily growing. Last year that province exported 8,873,000 pounds, while Ontario exported 1,445,000 pounds. The Ontario Government does not give a bonus to the farmers for creamery butter, and, therefore, that export has not grown in Ontario.

Mr. McMULLEN. Of the butter exported from Montreal, a very large proportion comes from Ontario.

Mr. REID. The reports from the province of Quebec of the hon. Minister of Agriculture show that the creameries in Quebec have been rapidly increasing their output, while in Ontario there is hardly any increase whatever. This is evidence of the fact that this butter which is exported is manufactured in Quebec, and therefore the trade reports are practically correct. I find that, even in my own county, the creameries are not extending as they should, and cheese factories have not been made into butter factories as rapidly as we would like to see them. I believe, if the Government would give the farmers some encouragement in the way of a bonus the amount of butter that would be exported would be largely increased and the country would be recouped a dozen times over. During the campaign it was held up to us that the Liberal party, when they came in, would name a practical farmer to be Minister of Agriculture. While the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is a practical farmer, I fail to see where he has placed one item in the Estimates, or done one thing in addition to what the Conservative party did when in power, to help the farmers of this country. I believe the farmers need protection more than any other class in this country, and I would like to see the Liberal party do something to protect them. I for one, even though I am on this side of the House, would support any vote that is placed in the agricultural Estimates in the interests of the farmer. When we turn over the next page in the Estimates we find that there is an increase of \$108,000 in the immigration vote, for increases in the salaries of officials who are sent over to the old country. If that \$108,000 had been expended in assisting the farmers it would have done ten times more good than

It will do in the way in which it is to be spent. I appeal to the Government, in the interests of the farmers of my county, in the interest of the farmers of the whole Dominion, to do more for them than they have been doing. If the Conservative party did not do enough when they were in power let the present Government do ten times more. When they allow all the other departments to increase their expenditures, the Justice, Railways and Canals and Public Works Departments, and when they do nothing for the backbone of the country, the farmers of the country, I do not know what the result will be.

Mr. ROGERS. I agree with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and I am very sorry to see the reduction that is being made in the agricultural estimates. While the hon. Minister says that he does not see why we should go on expending any more money on cold-storage at present, I am of the belief that there are many other ways in which that money could be judiciously expended for the benefit of the farmer, if we have all the cold storage we require. I was not here on Monday evening when the item was under discussion for experimental stations. It was a great surprise to me to find that there was any opposition to that scheme. When we see what other countries are doing in the shape of agricultural education, it should be an encouragement to us to try to follow them along that line. It has long been my feeling that the Government of the day, and past Governments, have not done enough for the agriculturists of this country. One of the reasons why I left my old friends was because I thought they were not doing sufficient for the agriculturists. It is not an easy thing for a man to leave his party and to separate himself from his old friends: it is a hardship for him to do it. But if he conscientiously does it, as I did in that case, I feel that there is no case for pronouncing censure upon him. I thought that the Conservative party were doing too much for the manufacturers, too much to build up the cities and towns, and that they were neglecting the agricultural population. My idea, in regard to preferential trade, was that anything that could be done in that direction would be in the direction of breaking up the spirit of protection and of giving freer trade to this country. I hope that the hon. Minister of Agriculture will bring the item for illustration stations before the House again and divide the House upon it, and, as I have said, I am surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite should have objected to it. It is too small an amount to vote down. In regard to agricultural education, to show what other countries are doing, I may be permitted to read an extract from a pamphlet published by Mr. Bryant, of Toronto, in the interest of agricultural education in the public schools. The writer dwells

Mr. REID.

at great length upon the importance of encouraging agricultural education in the schools. He finishes up by showing how little our Government are doing in that line, and he contrasts what is being done in this country with what is being done in other countries. He says:

However, notwithstanding this risk, let us see what a few of the smaller states of Europe are doing in the way of agricultural education. Bavaria, which has about twice the population of Ontario, maintains 26 agricultural colleges, besides keeping up an agricultural department at its famous Polytechnic School at Munich, Wurtemberg, which has about four-fifths the population of Ontario, has 16 agricultural colleges. Saxony, with a population only very little larger than that of Ontario, and with an area only one-fortieth that of Ontario, maintains at Leipzig an agricultural department in the university with 20 professional chairs, and, besides, four agricultural colleges of the highest class, 20 other agricultural colleges, and one veterinary college. Baden, with a population about one-half that of Ontario, although it is not larger than five or six of our counties, has one agricultural college of the highest class, 13 other agricultural colleges, four schools of gardening and forestry, one school for horse-shoeing, and one for irrigation and draining. Hesse-Darmstadt, whose population is less than one-half that of Ontario, maintains one agricultural college of the highest class, and eight other agricultural colleges. But in Hesse-Darmstadt they never have a yield of wheat of an average over the whole country of less than 37 bushels to the acre, while we are satisfied in Ontario with an average of less than 15. Saxe-Weimar, with a population less than one-eighth that of Ontario, maintains an agricultural department in its University of Jena with 15 professorships, and provides for several travelling professorships in the subject as well. And if I were to go beyond the smaller states, and mention what is done for higher scientific agricultural education in the larger state of Prussia, you would be worried with the mere description of the various schools, colleges and special institutions which have been erected in that behalf. However, at the risk of tiring you, I will briefly enumerate them: Four agricultural colleges of the highest class, with about 80 professorships; 40 lesser colleges, all connected with model farms; five special schools for the cultivation of meadows and the scientific study of irrigation; one special school for the reclamation of swamp lands; two special schools for industrial agriculture; one school for horse-shoeing; one school for the raising of trees; one school for silk raising; one school for fish culture; 20 special laboratories and conservatories for the education of gardeners; and three higher schools and 12 secondary schools in which instruction in the culture of the grape vine is made a specialty. And it must be remembered that these schools, as well as the higher colleges, all have model farms attached to them for the practical instruction of their students. Moreover, in addition to all this, there must be taken into account the provision that is made for elementary agricultural instruction, not only in the ordinary primary and higher schools for these various states, but in the special schools as well. And what is true of the German states is true, with but little variation, of every other progressive European nation—France, Austria, Denmark, Belgium, Sweden and the rest.

Mr. DAVIN. Who is the writer of that very interesting letter ?

Mr. ROGERS. J. E. Bryant, M.A., editor of one of the agricultural papers of Toronto. Then I have a clipping from an article entitled "Agricultural education in the Empire of the Czar," showing what they are doing in Russia, that agricultural country which we are accustomed to despise, for agricultural education. It says :

The scheme outlined provides for higher education, furnished by independent agricultural institutes located in the chief agricultural zones of Russia, and by chairs of agricultural and allied sciences in the universities ; agricultural high schools, which are in the nature of technical schools and schools with courses in agriculture ; lower agricultural schools, and the diffusion of general agricultural information. The schools for the so-called lower education include secondary agricultural schools, primary agricultural schools, agricultural classes and practical agricultural courses. These lower schools are to be under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Agricultural and Imperial Domains. They are to be maintained at the expense of municipalities, local communities, associations, &c., but may receive a part of their support from the Government. The course of instruction covers four years, and includes, in addition to the general studies, the elements of the natural sciences, agricultural and rural economy, cattle raising, veterinary, agricultural law, horticulture, gardening, &c., together with carpentry and blacksmithing in their application to agricultural machinery. The primary agricultural schools are open to all who can read and write, and have a knowledge of arithmetic as far as fractions. The courses last from one to three years. They include, aside from general studies, instruction in the elements of agriculture, with practical exercises. The diffusion of general agricultural information is to be provided for by the organization of public readings or lectures on agricultural questions, for the benefit of different classes of the population ; instruction of the teachers in the public schools in agriculture, horticulture, gardening, apiculture, &c., and providing the public schools with small plots of land and means for cultivating the same ; the teaching of agriculture in the normal schools, and the introduction of supplementary courses in agriculture in the village schools. There are now in Russia three schools for higher agricultural instruction, nine agricultural high schools, 83 lower schools, and 59 special courses. Steps have already been taken for the establishment of about 50 additional agricultural schools.

Mr. DAVIN. From whom is the hon. gentleman quoting ?

Mr. ROGERS. I am quoting an extract taken from the "Farmers' Sun," of Toronto. Then I will show what the little country of Finland is doing, a country in the far north of Europe, from which we are hoping to get some immigrants. I met a young man from there last winter, and he gave me such an interesting account of the country and its people that I felt that we might well try to get some of them to come to this country :

An Englishman, who has lived in Finland for 20 years, gives an interesting account of the superior condition of the agricultural Finns, as compared with the Russian peasantry. Within

the last century, he says, their country has undergone a complete transformation, in spite of the rigours of the climate. It appears that there are government agricultural advisers, called agronomes, whose services are available for every farmer at the small cost of entertaining one of them and his horse, so long as he stays on the farm. These officials, who must have passed through the Government agricultural schools, advise the farmer as to the draining, manuring, &c., of his bogs and fields. Certificated dairymaids are also provided to teach him how to feed his cows rationally and to make butter, which is one of the chief articles of export. Education is at a high standard, in fact, and schools are plentiful and well supplied with high-class and well-paid teachers. Nearly all peasants can read and write.

I make these quotations to show what other countries are doing for agricultural education. I have always thought that agriculture should be taught in our schools, and that it should be made compulsory, and I am very glad to see that we are coming to that. It is a surprise to me that objection has been raised to the item before the committee. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) is an authority on agriculture. Every one in this House is not possessed of the same agricultural genius that he possesses, and he must make allowance for those who are not so far advanced as himself. I felt that the Minister of Agriculture, in making this attempt, was assuming a considerable burden. I am not sure that it would be a success, but I think some good would come of it. It is an experiment, and the only objection I have is that the vote is not large enough, but I hope that the hon. gentleman will insist upon this item to give it a trial. Speaking of cold-storage and the expenditure of public money in the interest of agriculture, when I read the resolutions that were passed by the Butter and Cheese Association and the shippers of other perishable articles at that large meeting held in the fall of 1896, I felt that there must have been some radical need to call forth those resolutions. As regards the fast Atlantic service, why does the hon. leader of the Opposition have such faith in the importance of that project ? I heard the hon. gentleman, the other day, speak of Sir Sandford Fleming with the greatest respect, as an authority of the highest standing. But is he not aware that Sir Sandford Fleming condemned that fast Atlantic scheme in the strongest possible terms and even went to the length of writing a pamphlet against it ? Surely, the opinion of a man of that kind ought to have some weight with the hon. gentleman. I can tell the hon. gentleman that it certainly has with the country, and that the people are not sorry that his scheme was frustrated. We have in its stead a system much more beneficial to the agriculturists, and of which I am sure the results will be much more profitable. In the future we may be in a position to discuss a fast line service, but at

present what we require is better and cheaper freight accommodation, and that we know we cannot have and at the same time have vessels of great speed. The greater freight accommodation must be obtained at the expense of speed. When we have such improved accommodation for freight, when we have a well-equipped storage system, when our products have obtained entry under the most favourable circumstances on the British market, then we may consider the project of a fast line, and then such a project will not cost nearly so much, with our increased knowledge and advanced scientific improvement, and our increased commerce will warrant such an expenditure.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Can the hon. Minister inform the House what cold storage has been provided on the Intercolonial Railway in Nova Scotia?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are cold-storage cars running on the Intercolonial Railway, the same as on other lines. These cars run to Halifax, Lévis and Montreal.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But what about that portion of the Intercolonial Railway from Truro to Sydney?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No desire has been expressed for any there. I have not been asked to provide cold storage to those points for any fruit products such as would require cold storage.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It is perfectly true that there is no desire, apparently, on the part of the Government to provide that part of the Intercolonial Railway system with cold storage, but I know that the people who are engaged in the fisheries along the coast of eastern Nova Scotia, have a very strong desire to have their fish shipped in cold storage. The hon. gentleman ought to be aware that the people along the eastern coast of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton are shipping fish by express, without the assistance of cold storage, and paying high rates, and getting an efficient service at the same time. He ought to be aware of these facts before lecturing members of this House and telling them it would be waste of money to provide a larger amount than is provided in the Estimates now. He ought to be aware of the fact that there are millions of dollars' worth of fish caught around the eastern part of the province of Nova Scotia, between the months of April and August, and that the people are without any facilities for sending in cold storage over the Intercolonial Railway the fish caught in these waters.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No request has been sent to me for cold-storage accommodation on that part of the Intercolonial Railway. Wherever there has been any request for it, cold-storage accommodation has been provided. It is published in

Mr. ROGERS.

the press, and in the reports of the department, and our bulletins, that, wherever cold storage is required, the department are ready to make arrangements with the railway companies for that purpose.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Does the hon. gentleman not know that a sum of money was voted last year to pay the expenses of a trip to England of a gentleman from eastern Nova Scotia, who went to seek a market there for our fresh fish, and to see what facilities could be provided for cold storage? How does he suppose the fish could be brought to the English market, unless cold storage is provided for bringing them from the counties along the eastern coast of Nova Scotia, where they are caught? I am really surprised the hon. gentleman refuses to give an answer.

Mr. CASEY. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is trying to draw, not a red herring, but a fresh herring, across the path. I do not know that it is the business of the Minister of Agriculture to be conversant about the fisheries of Nova Scotia. It may be, but that is a new branch of agriculture, to my mind. I have no doubt, however, that if the cold-storage system is entirely under his charge, and this matter is brought before him, he will see that cold storage is provided. But I rose, not to speak to the fishermen, because I understood that this is an agricultural debate, and I want to say a few words with reference to cold storage, as provided for agricultural products. I find that hon. gentlemen opposite are very ready to play the part of the farmers' friend while in Opposition, but they do not quite know how. They did not always play that part, when in power, but were much more accustomed to play to the other gallery—what I may describe, perhaps, as the Red Parlour gallery. It is not a great many years ago—I think, in 1895 or 1896—when an election was thought possible, that the then Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) took occasion to claim credit for the Conservative régime because the farming population of Canada had not increased during the previous decade. The increase, he said, from 1881 to 1891 had been half a million, and this had been altogether amongst the non-rural population. This was, he argued, a great thing for the farmers, because the competition among farmers was lessened, and there were half a million more mouths to eat their products. That was the conception which the Conservative Government entertained of what was good for the farming community—increase all other classes of the population at the expense of the farming community, and tell the farmers that they were ever so much better off, because they were not increasing in numbers. It is a very sharp curve for these hon. gentlemen to take now, to have to turn round and speak as the farmers' advocate, and try to urge the Government

to take measures which will increase the number of farmers in the country and the prosperity of their industry. I understand that hon. gentlemen opposite are objecting to the reduction of the amount asked for cold storage this year, and will not be content with the business-like explanation given by the hon. Minister.

As I understand the matter, the money already voted and the payments already made to the steamship companies have been sufficient to pay for the installation of the plant required for cold storage. This was not to be an annual subsidy to these people for keeping the cold storage system in operation, but a payment to cover the cost of introducing the plant, and after that, they were to look to the trade for their profits. In other words, the Government are in the position, so far as cold storage is concerned, of a farmer who has put up all the barns and stables and has bought all the farm machinery he needs and is not obliged to draw on his resources for annual payments on account of such plant for the purpose of carrying on his farming operations. They are in the same position as a dairy company that has got its factory built, its vats and presses and other things in position to manufacture. In short, Sir, the Opposition are complaining not because there is any diminution of the service obtained in virtue of this grant, but because the Government is not asking for a new grant this year and every year to pay for plant which is already paid for, which is in operation and of which we are getting the benefit. The contention is so hollow that I can only imagine that they are bringing it forward not to impress the farmer but to occupy a certain amount of time. It is a mistake on their part if they imagine the farmers are not posted on these matters. The speech of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) show how the farmers of Canada, the practical working farmer, is taking an interest in and is posting himself in all matters connected with his profession, and shows that there is no use of their talking to independent men as they are doing with regard to this vote.

Mr. DAVIN. Will my hon. friend allow me? Is it not clear that the hon. member for Frontenac feels that if other interests are to be protected, the farmer should get his share?

Mr. CASEY. I did not hear all the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rogers), but I say the part I did hear showed that he had posted himself thoroughly with regard to matters connected with his profession and sees the point in connection with this vote as clearly as any of us do. My hon. friend from Frontenac made a good point when he spoke of cold storage versus rapid transit on the Atlantic. I agree with him and with Sir Sandford Fleming that you cannot expect to have large accommodation for cold storage and also rapid transit in the same

class of vessels. The ideal fast line must be a purely passenger line, built for purposes of speed. To have an ideal freight line, especially one with facilities for cold storage, it is not necessary to have the same speed required in the other class of vessel. I think it is highly probable, from the shape things are taking, that in the near future the Government will succeed in establishing a rapid passenger line and at the same time a most efficient freight line.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I desire to ask the Minister of Agriculture again if he will promise that he will be able to provide anything out of this vote for putting cold storage on that portion of the Intercolonial Railway east of Truro to Sydney.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, if it is wanted—certainly.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Also to provide for some boats around the coast of eastern Nova Scotia that would bring fish from the fishing port to the Intercolonial Railway. As I have said before there are millions of dollars worth of fish caught on that coast all within three or four months of the year, and the people are obliged, for want of these facilities, to salt down these fish and to accept but a fraction of the value they would bring in the markets of the western provinces, or, as we say, the upper provinces. If these people could send their fish fresh to the upper provinces, as they could do if the same facilities for transporting fish were provided as exist in other countries and in other parts of this country, they would get a far better price. These fishermen consume the products of the farmers, the artisans and manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec very largely, and they have a right to have facilities placed at their disposal by which the product of their hard labour can be sent to the best markets in their own country. It is strange that in the cities of Ottawa, Montreal, Quebec and Toronto, the principal part of the fish they consume comes from Portland or Boston, when we have large quantities of fresh fish landed every day on our own shores. It seems now that the Minister of Agriculture thinks it a waste of money to put any more in this estimate for advancing the interests of our people in this industry. He cannot see any necessity for putting facilities at the disposal of our fishermen, but he sees a necessity for voting hundreds of thousands of dollars for luxurious cars for the Intercolonial Railway. I hope the Minister will give this matter his attention, and I also hope that the Minister of Railways and Canals will provide better railway facilities for the transportation of fish.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not regret that the hon. gentleman has brought this matter up, as it is one of the greatest importance, though it is not strictly related to the business of the Minister of Agricul-

ture. I think he will find that the providing of cold storage through the Department of Agriculture has hitherto been confined entirely to the export trade.

**Mr. McDOUGALL.** Is there any grant for cold storage ?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** There is, and it is proposed to provide refrigerator cars on the Intercolonial Railway, which is a form of cold storage, and that which, I think, my hon. friend is most interested in. I think the question of supplying the markets of Ottawa and the cities of the upper provinces with fish from the lower provinces is a very important question indeed, and I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought it before the House. The Minister of Railways and Canals, I know, has had his attention drawn to it, and in the new equipment of the Intercolonial Railway it is in contemplation that there should be additional refrigerator cars, and I do not know any service to which those cars could be applied with more prospect of increasing our trade, and with better results generally, than in the development of the fish trade of the lower provinces. I can assure the hon. gentleman that he will find the Government most sympathetic in that respect. It is not correctly the business of the Minister of Agriculture, but I know that the Minister of Railways and Canals has been giving it his consideration. With regard to the second part of his question, as to whether the department could afford to put cold storage in small steamers around the coast, that is another phase of the question well worthy of attention. That is also somewhat outside the line of the Minister of Agriculture, but no matter whose department it is in, it is a question of very large importance, and I agree that the Government should give it their attention. There is already a considerable trade in fresh fish going on from Port Mulgrave, on the Strait of Canso, up to Montreal and west to Chicago.

**Mr. McDOUGALL.** At great expense.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** It is carried by the express companies, and I think they have refrigerator compartments in their cars, but the hon. gentleman, who is a resident of the eastern part of the province, may know that better than I do. I quite agree that the cost of handling these goods by the express companies must make the fish somewhat expensive, and we ought to look forward to improving the trade in that line. What is needed, of course, is not only cold storage facilities, but that some enterprising business men, interested in the fish trade, should undertake its management, and I am quite satisfied that there will be no lack of will on the part of the Government to supply all the cold storage facilities which are necessary. I sympathize entirely with the views of the hon. gentle-

**Mr. FIELDING.**

man takes, and I promise that so far as I am concerned, I will do my utmost to see that assistance is granted to the fish trade of the lower provinces.

**Mr. McDOUGALL.** The Minister will see that even if facilities are provided by the Intercolonial Railway, it will not meet one-half the requirements. In the Canso district which is a large fishing station, they are under the necessity now of sending fish by steamer and by express. I have seen these people obliged to send their fish from Canso in open boats in order to connect with express trains. All along the coast there are many places where facilities are needed to enable them to get their fish to market in Canada and the United States. Take for instance, in the County of Richmond, Arichat, Descouse, River Bourgeois, Lardoise and Fourchie, and in the county of Cape-Breton, Gabarus, Louisburg, Mainadieu, Sydney and Bras d'Or, and in the county of Victoria, North Shore, Ingonish and other points to Cape North and many other centres around the island, from which steamers with cold storage would gather up the fish from the fishermen and have it brought to the railway.

**Mr. McNEILL.** I still have faith in the desire of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to advance the interests of the farmers of Canada. I agree with all those who have urged the enormous importance to Canada of the development of this cold storage system. I think there is nothing in connection with the Department of Agriculture which may be made a greater engine for good to the agricultural interests of Canada, and what my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) has said, shows that it is not necessarily confined to the farming interests, but it reaches even to the fishing interests. I am very sorry my hon. friend has reduced this amount asked for this service. I much regret to learn that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has given it to be understood that for the present at least we must abandon our hopes of having a fast service across the Atlantic. I do not at all agree with the Minister of Agriculture in what he said with regard to that service, so far as cold storage is concerned. The leader of the Opposition says he would have had four vessels which would give a much faster service than any vessels my hon. friend has secured. If these vessels could make the passage in five days, I presume, my hon. friend will not dispute that they could be made of enormous importance to some of the agricultural industries of Canada. Take, for instance, fruit. It would be of incalculable importance to us if we could get our peaches, for example, delivered on the English market a few days sooner than they are delivered now; and it would be of incalculable importance to have our pears and our grapes delivered earlier, as well as our poultry, and many other articles

I could name. Therefore, the cold storage which would have been supplied by the fast Atlantic service is one which is not supplied now, and the country is deprived of that cold storage as long as we have not got the fast Atlantic service.

Now, Sir, when I was sitting on the Government side of the House I was in the habit of criticising my own friends when I thought they were pursuing a policy of which I did not approve, and it is my intention to criticise my friends on the other side of the House just as freely, at least, as I did my own friends. Now, the First Minister to-day did me the favour to tell me that his friendship and mine had about reached the point when they would part company. I should be very sorry, indeed, to lose the friendship of the right hon. gentleman, or to lose the friendship of any of my friends on the other side of the House; but I wish it to be understood by the right hon. gentleman, who, I am sorry to see, is not in his place just now, though he was a moment ago, that I do not want the friendship of the right hon. gentleman, or any other man for one second longer, for one-tenth part of a second longer than he desires to give it to me. I regret very much that the course which the Government has pursued with regard to the fast line service has had the effect of depriving this country so long of that service. I have not been unjust to the Government with regard to this question, because on each occasion when it has come up I have given them credit for desiring to save money.

I believed that the hon. member for Quebec West was earnestly desirous of promoting this fast Atlantic service, and I think so still, but I think that there has been some error of judgment somewhere, there has been failure, for we have been deprived of this fast Atlantic service. I do not believe now, any more than I believed before, that the hon. member for Quebec West has not been trying to do the best he could to supply us with this service. I know the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has likened him to the Old Man of the Sea, sitting on the shoulders of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I am not at all sure whether it is not the other way, whether it is not the hon. gentleman who has control of the purse-strings who has been like the Old Man of the Sea, sitting on the shoulders of the hon. member for Quebec West. I daresay, when the matter is probed to the bottom, it may be discovered that it was just as much the fault of the hon. Minister of Finance and some of his colleagues perhaps, as of the hon. member for Quebec West. I do not know what the cause is, but whatever it may be we have the fact that we have been deprived of the fast service, which, had the Allan contract been accepted by the Government, would no doubt have been in operation some time ago, and a very serious loss to

the country would have been avoided. I cannot help being very much struck by the fact that there are three great lines of Imperial policy which have been delayed by this Government since they came into power, lines of policy which were then, I think, at the point of fruition—preferential trade, the fast Atlantic service and the Pacific cable. All of these, for some curious and unexplained reason, were delayed. I gave the Government credit for the most absolute good faith in connection with the fast service. I do not say that there has been bad faith in connection with it, but I do say that it strikes me as being very remarkable that all these three lines of Imperial policy, to which I have referred, are each one of them, lines of Imperial policy that might fairly have been expected to be unfavourably viewed by our friends on the south of the line. It is a very curious thing that every one of the lines of Imperial policy which have been advanced by the present Government are lines of policy as to which no exception would be likely to be taken by our friends to the south. It is a curious fact. We have got the Pacific cable now, and I am very glad indeed we have got it, and I give the greatest possible credit to the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) for the energy he has displayed in connection with this matter. But we have the fact also that it was blocked in England by the right hon. Prime Minister; we have the fact also that last session the Government showed the most extraordinary reluctance to help on the work; we have the fact that a very strong feeling arose in this country in favour of the Pacific cable, and that when that feeling was displayed, the Government gave way and favoured the cable. We have got it, but we have not got preferential trade with the mother country, and we know what occurred in regard to that the other day. We have not got the fast line for some reason or other, which our friends all very much desired to have carried out. I am very much impressed with the fact which stands strongly out before us, that these three great lines of Imperial policy have, every one of them, been delayed by these hon. gentlemen.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) asked the question, what the Conservative party have ever done for the benefit of the farmer, and he said that now they were claiming that they were the farmers' friends. I would like to say to him that the Conservative party, while in power, did something for the farmer by protecting every article that the farmer grows. They maintained a protective tariff for the benefit of the farmer, for the protection of his pork, his butter, his cheese, and everything that he grows. The farmers have recognized in the Conservative party, the party that have benefited them by protecting all the articles they produce. The

Liberal party have interfered with this protection by abolishing the duty on corn and by lowering the duty on flour and wheat. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) made a reference to cold storage. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture to give an explanation of the expenditure of \$70,000, which I find in the Auditor General's Report, as charged to cold storage. While that amount of money appears under the head of cold storage, I see that only a few hundred dollars went to the province of Ontario for cold storage. I find that several hundred dollars were paid in the province of Quebec for maple sugar and syrup to be distributed in England. It is charged under the head of cold storage. What benefit are the farmers of the country getting from the purchase of maple sugar to be distributed in England? The Government paid \$7,614 for fruit to be shipped to the old country by way of experiment. There must have been a very bad system of cold storage, because all they got in England for that fruit was \$935. It was the intention of the late Government to establish cold storage centres in various parts of the country. Brockville is the centre of one of the best dairying districts in Canada. Its reputation for butter and cheese stands high, and it should have been made a centre in accordance with the policy of the Conservative party, which was to establish cold storage warehouses for the purpose of receiving supplies from the districts surrounding these points. Had the Government erected a cold storage warehouse at Brockville, which has four miles of railways running into it, the farmers, for several counties around, could have gathered their products there, butter, cheese, vegetables and eggs, and could have them shipped in bulk, in refrigerator cars, to Montreal or Quebec, where they would have been placed on board cold storage steamers and transported to the old country. Had Kingston been selected, as another cold storage centre, farmers from the surrounding district could have forwarded their produce which would have been placed in this refrigerating warehouse and sent in cold storage to the old country. I regret that the hon. Minister has seen fit to reduce this amount, simply to the expenditure of last year. Let anybody go through the Auditor General's Report, pages B-41 to B-45, and he will find the items of expenditure. We find that in Quebec the Cold Storage Warehouse Company were paid \$3,725, the difference between their earnings and the Government guarantee for cold storage there. This is where the main expenditure went. But Ontario gets a few bonuses of \$50 each for some half-dozen butter factories—less than \$1,000 altogether paid out in bonuses in the whole province, for putting up an ice-house or something of that kind here and there to keep the butter cool. But no pro-

Mr. TAYLOR.

vision is made to ship the butter from the factories to the cars. If cold storage depots were put at different centres, such as Brockville, Belleville, Toronto, and one at Niagara for fruit, then some practical benefit would be received by the farmers from this expenditure; but as it is now, it is to a certain extent so much money wasted. The steamships have been fitted up, and the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway have fitted up their cars; but the Government have failed to establish these depots, which are necessary to complete the system. I regret that this item has not been increased at least \$100,000, and that one at least of these depots has not been started in each province, with the intention of extending them year by year. That would be of some practicable benefit to the farmers; but as the money is dribbled out to-day, it is of very little benefit to them. A few butter factories near the line of railway may be able to ship their butter in refrigerator cars, but the factories which are not near a line of railway are not benefited. I thought the Government were going to undertake this work for the farmers of this country; but I see no signs of that yet. I see that \$1,000 of that vote were taken for the travelling expenses of the Minister himself to England, and the money has been spent on officers here and there, while less than \$1,000 altogether has been spent in the province of Ontario.

Mr. McMILLAN. I wish to say a word or two on this cold storage question, to which I have given considerable attention. It is only as yet in the experimental stage, and I consider that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is going ahead just as rapidly as the short experience we have had justifies. The hon. leader of the Opposition tells us that it was not the Minister of Agriculture who established cold storage. If it was not, it was he who established it at the creameries. I am astonished at the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) finding fault with the Minister for not providing means of carrying butter from the factories all over the country to the railways. The farmers do not expect to have this cold storage brought to every farmer's door, but they are notified of the days and times when the railway trains with cold storage will be at the railway stations, and I am convinced that a very large amount of benefit has been derived by the creameries all over the country in consequence. I heard one manager say last summer that his butter realized from two and a half to three cents a pound more on account of his having a cold storage building, for which the Government granted the \$50 promised for the first year. The hon. member for South Leeds told us that the farmers of this country have been protected in their beef, mutton, cheese, wheat and flour. As one who has farmed in Canada for 53 years, I would say that it would have

been better for the farmers of this country if we had never had protection on our grains. I have shown in this House that both oats and wheat are higher in the United States than in Canada, and that a large quantity of our grain went from this country to the United States. The farmers of this country know that they have not been benefited by protection, and they are not calling for it to-day. What the farmers want is the Government to provide cheap means of transportation and cold storage. The cold storage put in the vessels in the first instance has been found to be very defective. At one period we shipped over \$2,000,000 of eggs out of Canada; but it was found that the cold storage facilities were not suitable. It has been found that refrigerator compartments are far better for both eggs and apples than cold storage compartments. When these articles were taken from a cold storage compartment at from 35 to 45 degrees of temperature, and were then taken into an atmosphere of 60 or 70 degrees, the eggs and fruit were found to get damp and to sweat, whereas when they are carried in cold ventilated compartments, and the cold ventilation is taken off a couple of days before the ship reaches its destination, the produce goes ashore in the most perfect condition. At the stage which our cold storage experiment has reached, the Minister is justified in cutting down the vote and proceeding slowly until the system is perfected. We want cold storage and cold ventilated compartments put into the vessels as they are built, because existing vessels are not suited for cold storage, as the heat of the boilers reaches the goods and injures or destroys them. On the vessels now being constructed cold storage is put in on improved principles, and I have no doubt that a great improvement will be made from this time forward. I believe the Minister has been doing everything he could for the province of Ontario.

They can take butter in the cool of the night to a railway station, and it will be impossible for the Government to do what the hon. member for Leeds asks, namely, go all over the country and build storehouses. That hon. gentleman and his friends have awakened very much during the last three years to the interests of the farmer. They never felt any interest in him, when in power. It is only now, when in Opposition, that they find the farmer requires all these things. The present Government has been doing everything that could possibly be done. They have cheapened transportation, and furnished us with cold storage, and assisted us by every means to get our goods out of the country.

I have also given considerable attention to the fast line steamship scheme, and I say advisedly that the greater quantity of goods will never be shipped on a fast line, if for no other reason than that the rates would

be too high. When a vessel goes 22 knots an hour, she requires a higher rate on freight than one that runs only 15 knots, and it is impossible for us to get a line of steamships on the St. Lawrence route that will run 20 or 22 knots an hour. I have been twice nearly wrecked on the St. Lawrence, when crossing on a steamer that was making only 8 knots an hour, and I had a son wrecked a year ago last spring, when the steamer on which he was struck an iceberg on a clear day, and when she was running only 8 knots an hour. It is impossible to have a fast line on the St. Lawrence on account of the fogs and icebergs, that will compete with vessels going to New York, where no such obstacles are encountered. I do not believe that we would get the advantage which hon. gentlemen opposite have described, by having cold storage on a fast line. True, a few of the more perishable articles may be shipped on a fast line, but the freights would be very high. Our farmers are better satisfied with their conditions to-day and the efforts the Government are putting forward in their behalf, than they have been for many years. They know that freight rates have been cheapened, and not that an arrangement has been entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway, although that will not affect to such an extent the farmers of eastern Canada, it will bring about a reduction in rates to the western portion. I have not the least doubt that we will get cheaper freight rates in the future, and one great benefit that the Government could confer upon us would be in giving bonuses to lines of steamships, so as to enable them to carry our goods at lower rates. I was astonished to hear a farmer, the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) stand up and say that the farmers require protection. I am a farmer, and I do not ask for protection, because it is impossible for the Government to give it to me. We have to compete in the markets of the world with our products against all other countries, and I want the Government to cheapen transportation as much as possible, and provide the most valuable means of putting our goods on the British market in the best condition possible. That the Government has been doing, and I think it would be a great mistake to increase this item by the large amount demanded with regard to cold storage, until such time as that system becomes more improved than at present. It is the duty of the Government to go slowly and experiment steadily and just as rapidly as the requirements of the country demand. We all know that great changes have taken place in cold storage, and the Government should be careful to see that this system is established on the most approved principles. I know that the farmers of the country are satisfied, notwithstanding the feeling which hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to excite

amongst them. They are watching keenly every step the Government takes, and are perfectly satisfied that the Government has cheapened agricultural implements.

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. McMILLAN. They are satisfied that the Government has cheapened a great deal of what the farmers consume, notwithstanding the denial of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia, who will find out, when another election comes on, that all his preaching in this House will be of no avail amongst the farmers of that district. They know what he has been doing; they know how he has spoken in favour of a resolution to benefit the farmers, and then left the House without voting, and they know that it is not the interest of the farmers, but his own, that he is looking after.

Mr. DAVIN. I am glad to find my hon. friend takes such an interest in West Assiniboia and its representative.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have a large number of friends there, with whom I am in communication.

Mr. DAVIN. I am probably as well informed as to the sentiment that prevails there as my hon. friend is, and I can assure him that the sentiment of the farmers and ranchers of West Assiniboia is one of discontent with the Government for not having carried out their pledges, and for having failed to redeem one promise of economy. They pledged themselves against railway subsidies, and have utterly failed to keep it. They pledged themselves not to have thirteen Ministers, but now we are going to have fourteen on full pay. There is not a single pledge of theirs that they have not broken. Does the hon. gentleman think that the farmers, who are intelligent men, will allow themselves to be bamboozled in this manner?

I listened with great pleasure to the speech made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, in which that distinguished statesman showed that he is fully alive to the important interests of the agricultural community. I think that, according to his lights, the present Minister of Agriculture has been a faithful administrator of his department. But I cannot help thinking of those Estimates now before us, in which large sums are lavished in quarters, and directions, and on interests where it is palpable to any clear-sighted person that they are not needed, while the greatest parsimony is displayed as regards the interests of the farmers. I have in my hand a list of the railway subsidies, amounting to \$8,500,000, which brings up the expenditure in this country to over \$60,000,000. And yet we find the Minister of Agriculture practising and advocating a small parsimony, where the interests of the farmer are concerned. I cannot but look upon his conduct with a great deal of disgust, because, if

Mr. McMILLAN.

there is an interest on which we ought, more than any other, to be liberal, it is the agricultural. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, has spoken of me as trimming my sails. Why, from the moment I entered this House, those sails have been spread to breezes which blow in the interest of the agricultural class of the North-west Territories. If any person takes an interest in my fate in that constituency, which seems to trouble the hon. gentleman, it happens that only to-day I have received a letter which may be an indication of the future. This is dated Maple Creek, July 22, and, in the course of it, the writer says:

I have seen quite a lot of ranchers, and especially those who voted for the Government,—

That is, this Government.

—and they are a disappointed lot.

I am told that that is the feeling everywhere and how could any other sentiment be entertained by the farmers if they are the intelligent men my hon. friend proclaims them to be?

Mr. McMILLAN. You say the farmers are not intelligent men.

Mr. DAVIN. I say they are, and my hon. friend (Mr. McMillan) is a very intelligent man. But he has dared to speak of me as trimming my sails, when he knows very well that there is not a single thing he used to condemn when he sat on this side, but when it is done by the present Government he rises and supports it. There is nothing this Government can do that the hon. gentleman would not defend. I hope he will not be disappointed; I know he is looking for a position—

Mr. McMILLAN. Do not measure my corn in your bushel. I never looked for a position. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) spread the report in West Assiniboia that he had been offered a seat in a Cabinet.

Mr. DAVIN. I never looked for a position. I say now as I said when my friends were in power, that there was not a Minister with whom I ever conversed on any personal interest, and Sir John Thompson, who sat near where the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) is sitting, said "hear, hear." The other night some hon. gentleman had the unblushing effrontery to say that he would make some statement about me. I then threw out the defiance, and I repeat it here, that there is not a chapter, not a sentence in a chapter, not a word in a chapter of my life, private or public, in which I should be afraid to have the scrutiny of the public directed. Hon. gentlemen could not make any attempt to show on any platform in West Assiniboia that I had tried to trim my sails—he would be laughed off the platform. Now, the hon. Minister of Agriculture undoubtedly has in his possession a copy of a pamphlet issued from his department containing the evidence of

Mr. Robertson and Mr. Grisdale. I am not going to read it, because it is in the hands of the farmers of Canada. But you have here in the statement of Mr. Grisdale and in that of Mr. Robertson the evidence that more might be done by the Government for the trade in perishable articles than is being done, and, in the face of that, the hon. gentleman is diminishing the vote for cold storage, in other words, the vote in the interest of the farmers. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) made a speech that was misunderstood by the hon. gentleman from West Elgin (Mr. Casey). The trend of that speech was that the hon. gentleman declared himself a disbeliever in protection; but he said: If protection is going, I want my class to have its share. The position that we took was: Let us do as much for the farmers as we do for any other class; if we protect the lumberers, if we protect the implement manufacturers, let us also protect the farmers. My hon. friend who has lately taken his seat has had the audacity to say that this Government has cheapened implements, though we have the same duty on implements we had before the Government came into power, and they have actually increased the manufacturers' protection by lowering the duty on the raw material. There is not a constituency in Canada, above all there is not one in the North-west, where there are farmers, but you find people who have it in their bosoms as a grievance against this Government, and one that they will not forget, this promise in regard to agricultural implements which has been falsified. I do not know whether the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches saw it; but the other day there was a town councillor in one of the lower provincial towns and who moved a resolution to borrow \$17,000, and when his fellow-councillors said: The town cannot afford that, his answer was: I want to raise the credit of the town; what I would like to do would be to borrow \$17,000,000, in order that we might follow something like the same line of policy as that pursued at Ottawa; we are told to admire the statesmen at Ottawa, and I am trying to imitate them. The other town councillors laughed, but the sentiments of that councillor who wanted to borrow are being embodied every day in the acts passed by the majority of this House. And we do not laugh at it. And we may be sure that the people throughout the country are not laughing at it; but the people are amazed at the consistency with which, as time goes on, this Government has covered every spot where it was possible to put one's finger on a promise fulfilled. The last thing that has been done is to raise the salaries of two Ministers to the level of the others, giving us fourteen Ministers with full salaries, in the face of the promises of hon. gentlemen opposite to reduce the number of Ministers in the interests of the farmers. There is not a promise now left; the consistency of

their inconsistency is complete, and the betrayal of the farmer is perfect.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. This question of cold storage has taken a very wide range to-night, and I desire to reply to some remarks made by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). He says that we have been selling our steers to the United States at \$14 a piece. Now, the average steer we have sent to Buffalo this spring weighs about 1,000 pounds, and at \$4.60 a hundred, he will bring \$46. From that you take off the duty, freight and expenses, and you will still have left nearly three times \$14. Yearling steers going from this country to the United States are entered as calves, they do not have to pay the 20 per cent duty. An ordinary lot of yearling steers from Ontario will weigh in the neighbourhood of 600 pounds, and at \$4.25 a hundred, which is the price in Toronto, it will bring them up to \$26.50, and in Buffalo \$4.75 or more, which will bring them up to \$28.50 each. The duty on them is \$2 each; take off another dollar for freight and expenses, and you have a net return for these yearling steers of about \$25 a piece. Now, Sir, I myself have been interested in this trade. I bought some this winter myself for feeding, the average weight was 1,025 pounds, and the average price was \$4.23 a hundred. Of course, they were a good class of cattle, and those cattle cost me \$43.56. I could have bought those cattle from the farmers in 1896 for \$30 a piece. Now, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who got the benefit of the increased price of these cattle. It must be the farmers who raised those cattle from infancy. The hon. member for West York said that instead of selling those steers at \$14 we should have fed them, and we could have got \$61 a piece. Take that as a basis, and take the price that a bullock was fetching this year. The same bullock in 1896 would bring \$43, according to the market then, so there is a net gain of \$18 caused by the competition we have got now in our own market.

The member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) said that we were not exporting as much dairy produce from Ontario as the people of Quebec. I know that in the province of Ontario, from Essex down to Toronto and from there to Belleville, and the Brockville district to Quebec boundary there is one of the greatest dairying sections in any country. I think there must be some mistake in these entries in the province of Quebec, and that they must have represented exports from Ontario.

Mr. WALLACE. Do I understand the member for Peel to say that the figures I gave are wrong?

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I am giving you figures of what cattle are worth. I do not know where you can get cattle of any size

at \$14 apiece, when yearlings that will weigh 600 pounds will fetch \$4.25 a hundred in Toronto.

Mr. WALLACE. This was a year ago. I was quoting from the Trade and Navigation Returns ending 1st of July, 1898.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. Probably the hon. gentleman was guided considerably by what he saw in Toronto. He will remember looking at some cattle in Toronto one day when I was there. These cattle sold for \$14 each; they were steers bred from dairy herds in the province of Quebec, little half-breed Jerseys and Ayrshires, and French breeds of cattle which are only fit for dairying purposes. I would not take these cattle home for nothing and feed them all winter, when I can buy other cattle such as I bought last winter for feeding purposes.

Mr. WALLACE. What time of the year was it?

Mr. FEATHERSTON. This spring. I met the hon. gentleman there one day, and I was talking to the gentleman that showed him the cattle. That gentleman told me that he told the member for West York that these cattle two years ago were worth \$5 apiece. Now, I will quote you a few prices of cattle to-day compared with what they were two years ago. In 1897 shipping cattle were bringing 3½ to 3¾ cents per pound; in 1898, 4¼ to 4½ cents; in 1899, 4¾ to 5½ cents, a net difference on those cattle in two years of \$18 per head. I would ask any one, who is getting that benefit? It is not the speculator, it must be the farmer who is getting the full benefit of that increase in the price. In 1897 butchers' cattle were bringing 2½ to 3 cents per pound; in 1898, 3¼ to 3½ cents; and this spring, 4 to 4½ cents a pound. I sold a bunch of butcher's cattle, the average weight of which was 1,100 pounds on the 23rd of June for 5 cents a pound. They were above the average run of butcher cattle. That is a gain on these cattle, between 1897 and 1899, of \$15 a piece. The hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Reid) said that when his party were in power they protected the pork interest of the country, and stated that we ruined the pork interest by allowing American hogs to come in here. I do not know of any American hogs coming in, but I do know that an Order in Council was passed by the late Government allowing packers to bring in all the hogs they wanted to kill in bond and ship them out. This was done until such time as our farmers had become educated up to the point of being able to feed their own stock. No American hogs are killed to-day, because they are not suitable for the English market. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), has stated that the ranchers are very much displeased with this Govern-

Mr. FEATHERSTON,

ment. The rancher is very much in the same position as that occupied by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) and by myself. They are purchasers of stock; they buy a great deal of stock and while this arrangement is no doubt against their interest it is in the interest of the mass of the people. The ranchers of the west are one to one hundred of the farmers in that country. There are one hundred farmers who are getting the benefit from the sales of these stock cattle to one man who has to pay an increased price. The hon. gentlemen have asked the hon. Minister of Agriculture to propose a larger expenditure for cold storage. Last year \$40,000 was spent under the head of cold storage. The experiment has been put in successful operation, and instead of demanding a bonus, steamship companies are putting cold storage in their vessels to compete for the trade with vessels that have received the bonus. I am satisfied that while at the inception of this system, encouragement was necessary, steamship companies will on their own account provide all necessary equipment to meet the demands of the trade. I would like to refer for a moment to another question that has been spoken of here, that is the question of feeding our stock.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman goes into the question of feeding of stock we will never get through.

Mr. DUGAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The item before us is for cold storage, and I ask if it is in order, upon that item, to discuss the question of the feeding of cattle?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ellis). I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that the discussion which was commenced by the hon. leader of the Opposition has taken an exceedingly wide range. I do not wish to shut any hon. gentleman off from saying anything that he may wish to say. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) covered a very wide range in his remarks, and I do not wish to shut my hon. friend (Mr. Featherston) off.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dugas) does not understand that the beef that goes into these refrigerator vessels and cars comes from cattle. I would like to say a word in regard to the question of feeding of cattle as bearing upon the action of the Government in removing the duties from corn. Pease are worth \$23 per ton for export and oats \$20 per ton, while we can put in corn at \$15 a ton. That must be a great advantage to the farmers of Canada who are feeding stock. In reference to cold storage for cheese, butter, eggs and fruit I would say that adequate provision has been made. The fruit business has been well looked after and it has been put upon a good, sound basis.

Mr. WALLACE. The point I wish to make is in reference to the price of cattle. As I understood it, the statement of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Featherston) was that the prices of cattle were not as I had given them to the committee. I have here the Trade and Navigation Returns for the year ending 1st July, 1898. There were exported to the United States during that year cattle to the value of \$1,240,000, numbering in round figures 88,000 head. The average price was \$13.75 per head. The exports of cattle to Great Britain in the same year were 192,091 head at a valuation of \$7,403,915, or an average valuation of \$60.60 per head, while the average value per head of cattle exported to the United States was \$13.25. Hon. gentlemen may make what use they like of these figures, but they show that the proper business of the farmers is to feed their cattle and send them to Great Britain and get \$60.60 a head rather than send them to the United States and get \$13.25 a head.

Illustration stations ..... \$20,000

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have to say that in consequence of the representations which have been made to me, and in consequence of the fact that this scheme, which I had proposed in connection with this item, could only be carried out successfully with the hearty co-operation of the farmers who have been incited not to support it. I beg to move that this item be struck out.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the country will view with a good deal of satisfaction the fact that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has decided to strike out this item. A more crude, or ill-digested, or ill-considered proposition, though the expenditure is not very large, never was presented to this House by any Minister, and we have had a good many crude suggestions made; and the hon. gentleman has done wisely and well in withdrawing it from the consideration of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. I intended to move an amendment to this vote, which would have read as follows:—

That this item be reduced to \$5,000, that sum to be expended in sending experts to tobacco-growing districts to instruct tobacco-growers as to the best methods of growing and curing tobacco.

There was a good deal of discussion on tobacco the other night, and I thought that something in this direction should be done; but, as the Minister intends to drop the item and not to assist either the farmers or the tobacco-growers, I will not have a chance to move the motion.

Mr. WALLACE. While illustration stations, which were proposed for the tobacco industry, are, I think, open to the same ob-

jection as the other illustration stations, a great deal is to be said for the proposal to engage expert tobacco men to instruct the tobacco-growers. Tobacco undergoes various processes of sweating, drying and curing, from week to week, for a year and a half. I am told that the crop of 1899 will not be ready to put on the market until the 1st of January, 1901. If you have an illustration station, say in the county of Essex, you cannot get the farmers of that county to visit that station from day to day, or from week to week, to find out the various changes through which the tobacco passes; whereas an expert can visit the farmers at one place, here or there, and demonstrate to them the various processes, and tell them what to do with the tobacco, what temperature it is to have, when to hang it up, when to put it down, and what to do with it in its various stages in order to get it cured and ready for the manufacturer.

North-west Mounted Police..... \$353,750

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). On a former occasion I gave to the House a very full explanation as to the condition of the North-west Mounted Police. Last year we took the same appropriation that we are taking this year; but for the year just expired we were obliged to ask for an increased vote of \$50,000. This year we have full confidence, even a reasonable certainty, that we shall be able to keep the appropriation within the figures. I stated to the House, and I repeat now, that the reason which compelled us to ask for the increase of \$50,000 for the year just past was, that we had not been able to decrease the force so rapidly as we intended. When we took office, the force had been reduced to 750 men. We undertook to reduce it to 500, and we thought we could do it within a reasonable time; but the demands made on the force for different services prevented us from doing so. For instance, we were obliged to keep a certain number of the best men available for service in the Yukon; we were obliged to keep a certain number on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway during its construction; and we had a certain number on patrol, and we intend to keep them on patrol, in the districts north of the Saskatchewan River and the Mackenzie River where immigrants are now coming in and where travellers pass to and fro.

Mr. FOSTER. What does this vote provide for?

The PRIME MINISTER. It provides for 500 men, at the rate of \$700 each.

Customs—

Yukon district and frontier..... \$25,000

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The explanation with reference to this is, that for

Dawson \$10,400 is required, made up as follows :—

Salary of D. W. Davies, collector.....	\$ 3,000
Salary of F. Charman, assistant officer...	1,500
Living expenses of F. Charman, \$60 per month .....	720
To provide for contingencies at Dawson..	4,880

This amount is largely made up of rent, the rent being \$325 per month, or equal to \$3,900 per annum. The amount for rent includes heating and the services of a janitor. The balance of \$980 is required to pay other contingent expenses.

To provide for payment of commission on collections at Fort Cudahy.....	300
---	-----

This amount is approximate, as no data can at present be given.

	\$10,400
Yukon Passes.....	\$14,600

This amount is made up as follows :—

Salary of P. R. Peel, supervising officer at Log Cabin, White Pass.....	\$ 1,500
Living expenses of Mr. Peel, at \$60 per month .....	720
Salary of D. Stevens at Bennett.....	1,200
Living expenses of Mr. Stevens, at \$60 per month .....	720
Salary of D. Menzies, officer at Atlin....	1,200
Living expenses of Officer Menzies at \$60 per month .....	720
Salary of W. N. Carmichael at Chilcoot Pass .....	1,200
Living expenses of Officer Carmichael at \$60 per month .....	720
Salary of Mr. J. A. McMartin, assistant inspector at Bennett .....	1,500
Living and other expenses of Mr. McMartin .....	1,200
	\$10,680

Mr. McMartin's expenses will be more than any of the other officers, for the reason that he will have to travel on inspection.

To provide for an officer at Dalton Trail, at a salary of \$100 per month and living expenses at \$60 per month .....	1,920
Amount required to pay contingent expenses at the Passes, including rent of office at Bennett .....	2,000

This latter amount is an approximate estimate, as it not as yet known what the rent at Bennett will be.

	\$14,600
Dawson .....	10,400
Total.....	\$25,000

Mr. WALLACE. Is this McMartin a new officer ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, he was formerly at Huntingdon, New Westminster.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to call attention to the way in which these Estimates are brought so that a change may be made in other years. These Customs estimates in the Yukon ought not to be treated differently from those in Ontario and Nova Scotia. We ought to have the details in the Esti-

Mr. PATERSON.

mates so that we will see what we are doing but here we have just a lump sum, and then these explanations are read out to us.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We will be able to do that better in other years, but could not do that very well this year.

Contingencies, rent and insurance on office, income tax, fuel, light, stationery, &c., and the amount \$2,000 required towards the contingent expenses (water, light, fuel, carriage-hire and railway fare) of the High Commissioner, and \$1,200 for contingencies (rates, taxes, ground rent, insurance, &c.) of the official residence, including the income tax on the salary of the High Commissioner. \$11,700

Mr. WALLACE. It was pointed out last year that the office of High Commissioner was very important and a place where all Canadians could go when they visited London. That is very true, it was pointed out also that it is a very important office, as the High Commissioner was performing high official duties, that he was the intermediary between the Canadian and the British Government in many important matters. No doubt that is very true, but the office of High Commissioner is wanting in one respect. We want settlers to come from Great Britain to this country and we want some office in London, England, where men could go and get the necessary information. I am sorry to have to say that the office of the High Commissioner is not an office where those intending to come to this country can get the full and satisfactory information required, and is utterly unsatisfactory in that respect. It is also unsatisfactory as a place where the British people could find out what opportunities there are for doing business in Canada. I remember reading an article in the "Globe" a year ago, written by one of the staff, I think it was Mr. Willison, the editor-in-chief, who had been visiting London, and was struck with the same opinion. Last year the attention of the Government was called to the necessity of establishing a business branch of the High Commissioner's Office, either in the office of the High Commissioner, if that might be found suitable, or some business part of the city of London, where opportunity would be given for promoting Canadian trade. That has not been done. I remember seeing, a short time ago, in the newspapers, that in England they block paved the streets and that certain blocks were required. One of these blocks was sent to the Canadian Government here as a sample. Why, the High Commissioner's Office should have sent out a load of them, sufficient to supply every dealer in Canada with a sample, and they should also have sent out the prices and the names of the men who were dealing in that article, so that they might be communicated with. But all they did was to send out one block. And yet here was a contract amounting to millions of dollars per annum. Why did they not send out a thousand blocks ?

We should have had a business statement of the case, so that the Canadians who desire to compete would know who to write to and what quantity of material was desired. But none of these things were given. In that regard, our business in England is utterly neglected. Where so many millions of dollars of Canadian products of every description could be sold in England there should be a Canadian agency for the promotion of that trade which is utterly neglected to-day; and I think we might fairly call upon the Government to give some attention to this matter, which means so much to the trade of Canada.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. While I can hardly agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) that the business is entirely neglected, I know that there has been some discussion in the press, to which the hon. gentleman has referred, with regard to the advisability of establishing a Canadian business agency separate from the High Commissioner's Office. The suggestion never took very practical form, and I find some differences of opinion with regard to the precise purpose for which it should be established. Some persons, I do not say in this House, but outsiders, had the impression that the Government ought to establish an agency to which goods could be consigned for sale. That, I think, would be impracticable.

Mr. **WALLACE**. I think so too; I did not advocate such a thing.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. No, I say this was the view held by some outside. I think that the hon. gentleman will find that the business side of the High Commissioner's Office, though perhaps not all that is desired, has been more active during the past year than before. Very considerable attention has been paid to inquiries regarding Canadian business interests, and a large correspondence has been carried on by the High Commissioner's Office with regard to it. There may still be room for improvement in that direction, but the hon. gentleman may have seen that there is a considerable increase in activity in the business side of the High Commissioner's Office. One view is that the office should be removed to a more central part of London. There are difficulties in the way of making such a change.

Mr. **WALLACE**. I do not think they should move the office.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The office is certainly well situated for a large class of its business, but it is not in the business centre of London. This general question is one which has engaged the attention of the Government, but we have not thought it expedient to carry out the project for a commercial agency.

#### Penitentiaries—

General ..... \$3,400

Mr. **TAYLOR**. This was reserved to discuss the question of the binder twine in the Kingston Penitentiary. But I will take an opportunity of discussing that on going into Supply, and perhaps may move a motion.

#### Legislation—

Contingent expenses in connection with the voters' list..... \$2,500

Mr. **FOSTER**. What is the decision of the Government about that? The law requires that the voters' list shall be printed, but the law was rendered nugatory by some member of the Government interposing between the law and the performance of it, so that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery could not carry it out, and thus the hon. members did not get the list that Parliament had said they should get. I do not think the Government is the judge whether a law should be carried out or not.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), and he will find in the supplementary Estimates a vote for \$34,000 or \$35,000 for the printing of the lists, and we intend to have them printed.

#### Pensions—

Payable on account of the Fenian Raid. \$3,500

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. There is a slight apparent increase, but it is due only to change in the date of payment. There is no real increase.

Mr. **REID**. Are all those who took part in repelling the Fenian raid entitled to pensions?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. This is an item that has been on the list for many years.

Mr. **REID**. There are men in my county who claim that some are getting pensions who took part in repelling the Fenian raid, and I would like to know.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. This is a very old vote, and has appeared every year for 20 years. It is for those who received injuries during the raid. Those who served and were not injured will be entitled to medals.

#### Pensions—

Payable to militiamen on account of the rebellion in 1835 and active service generally ..... \$19,000

Mr. **McLENNAN** (Glengarry). When will the medals be presented to the men who served during the rebellion of 1835?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I cannot at the moment give my hon. friend a definite answer, but I understand that it will be at an early day.

Alterations and repairs to Governor General's car "Victoria"..... \$2,500

Mr. FOSTER. Is that a charge on the capital fund?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the usual course. My recollection is that they repair the car, and the interest is a charge upon the Governor General.

Committee rose and reported progress.

#### YUKON—REPORT OF MR. OGILVIE.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson) moved that an Order of the House do issue for copies of the report of Mr. Ogilvie respecting the valuation of a steamship.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the leader of the Government say what will be the business to-morrow?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We will take one or two Bills of minor importance; then, if convenient to the House and to my hon. friend, we will take the prohibition question.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned 12.15 a.m. (Friday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 28th July, 1899.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

#### PRAYERS.

#### PRIVATE BILLS—MEETINGS OF COMMITTEE.

Mr. SCRIVER moved:

That the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills have leave to sit during the sittings of the House.

Motion agreed to.

#### QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) (by Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 178) in reference to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners. He said: This Bill is merely to authorize the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec to guarantee bonds

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

for the construction of an elevator by the Great Northern Railway Company to the extent of \$200,000. The object of this Bill is to give to those boards a preference over our own mortgage, following the precedent of last year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As I understand it involves no responsibility on the part of the Government.

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS OF MONTREAL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) (by Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 179) respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. He said: The object of this Bill is to transfer a certain amount of the appropriation, made last year, for certain works on the eastern side of the harbour to the western side. The whole subject will be discussed when we take up the supplementary estimates for the expenditures at Montreal.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### CONSTITUTION OF THE SENATE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, in regard to the resolution, of which I have given notice, for the amendment of the Senate, after a conference with the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) yesterday, as my hon. friend has to leave for England in the early days of next week, and as it is pretty reasonably understood between my hon. friend and myself that we may prorogue, I think, within next week, I intend, in order to facilitate this and to bring prorogation in the course of next week, to drop this resolution for this year, and also Order 24, a Bill further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In regard to the remarks that have fallen from the right hon. leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), I am quite ready to do everything in my power to facilitate prorogation by the end of next week, and I do not see any reason why it should not be accomplished. I am glad that these two measures are to be dropped this year. The Bill in reference to the Criminal Code, I am quite sure, the right hon. gentleman feels, is one that demands more careful consideration on the part of the House, than could be given to it at the period of the session. As to the other measure, I am quite sure we are all agreed that it can well afford to wait.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will not controvert the hon. gentleman's statement.

### SALARIES OF THE MINISTERS OF CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved :

That to-morrow the House do take into consideration the following resolution :—“ Resolved, that it is expedient to repeal subsection 2 of section 2 of chapter 18 of the statutes of 1897, and to enact in lieu thereof that the salaries of the Minister of Customs and Minister of Inland Revenue shall be seven thousand dollars a year each, and further to provide that authority be given for the payment of the salaries of the present Minister of Customs and of the present Minister of Inland Revenue at that rate from the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight.”

He said : I beg to announce that His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject-matter of this resolution, recommends it to the House.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that to increase the salaries ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. This is merely the first stage whereby it is brought down and it will be open for discussion later on.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, as I shall not have an opportunity of being present when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) brings that matter up, I beg to say that I was, myself, committed to the same policy in case the Government had not changed. I always felt that, as these two Ministers held important portfolios, involving a great deal of responsibility, there was no reason why their salaries should not be put upon the same footing as those of other Ministers, or why they should not be made Ministers instead of controllers, as has already been done.

### INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to mention that, on the 19th of June, I moved for copies of the Orders in Council passed since June, 1896, respecting contracts let without tender. The order was made, and I would like to know when we shall be able to have the return.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I think the return has reference to several departments. I have the return so far as my department is concerned, and I will bring it down to-morrow.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish to draw the attention of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to an omission in the return which he laid on the Table of the House in reference to death duties. I think it is important and I would be glad to have it brought down so that it may be given to the Printing Committee.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have given instructions to Mr. Moore to search the records and to bring whatever he has. I will show my hon. friend what we have this afternoon.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved :

That, when these papers are laid on the Table of the House, they be referred to the Committee on Printing, notwithstanding anything in the rule to the contrary.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. I would call the attention of the Government to the Michaud and Belanger papers that have not been brought down, and I would ask that the Government bring the supplementary letters in the liquor permit correspondence.

### PREFERENTIAL TRADE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the proposal which I made to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) with the view of securing the unanimous vote of this House in favour of preferential trade to which I attach great importance. It is fair to say, before my right hon. friend states what decision he has arrived at in reference to it, that I am afraid the object I had in view would not be reached, even if my right hon. friend were to consent to the modification of the resolution that I submitted, and under these circumstances, so far as this side of the House is concerned, we do not propose to deal with that question further in any event.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before any action of this House is taken with reference to the motion presented by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) which I suppose is still under consideration and not yet disposed of—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may state to my hon. friend that this resolution was withdrawn with the consent of the House yesterday, and it is not proposed to bring forward any motion on that subject from this side, this session.

Mr. CHARLTON. The consent of the House has not been given to the withdrawal of this motion, and I desire to say something upon it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend is mistaken. I can assure him that the motion is absolutely withdrawn.

Mr. CHARLTON. The consent of the House to this has not been formally taken to the withdrawal.

The PRIME MINISTER. The motion was withdrawn yesterday with the consent of the House, and there is nothing now before the House.

## RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask when the railway subsidies will be taken up? There are a number of gentlemen interested who would like to be present.

The PRIME MINISTER. The first stage will take place to-morrow and the discussion will take place on Monday.

## PREFERENTIAL TRADE.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before we proceed any further I rise to a point of order and I do it in my own interests as a private member of this House—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

The PRIME MINISTER. I must call my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) to order.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to state my point of order.

The PRIME MINISTER. We have nothing before the House. My hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) may have an opportunity of speaking on the question in Supply. It was understood that the Order of the Day would be to take some few little bills at first and then proceed with the prohibition discussion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. I wish to point out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) that the votes and proceedings state, that with the leave of the House the amendment of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) was withdrawn yesterday.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We could not get into Supply unless it were withdrawn.

## SUSPENSION OF THE VILLE MARIE BANK.

Mr. BOURASSA. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to some articles published in "La Patrie" in reference to the suspension of the Ville Marie Bank. I do not speak of this because, as same papers have stated, I am interested in the matter, but I do so in the general interests of the community. The Bank Ville Marie in Montreal suspended this week, and as hon. gentlemen know the Bank Ville Marie probably draws more small capital from the farming community of the province of Quebec than any other bank. It had about twenty branch offices throughout the province. Out of the one and a half million dollars of deposits, it may be estimated that four-fifths of that amount came from—not exactly the poor farming class—but what I might call the middle farming class of the province of Quebec. Of course up to this time I have no suspicion whatever against the integrity of the directors of the bank, but at the same time some statements

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

have been published in the Montreal newspapers, especially "La Patrie," and "La Presse," which would indicate that the Government should take some action. I translate the following from "La Patrie" of Wednesday last:—

We ask that the Ottawa Government in order to protect the depositors and the public to send one of its inspectors who would take charge of the bank during the 90 days (of suspension of business) so that we may see clearly through the dark affairs that were transacted.

The following appeared on Thursday:—

The whole district of Montreal demands loudly the appointment of an official inspector from the Ottawa Government to take charge of the Ville Marie Bank. Light must be thrown on the transactions of the bank and this is the only means to have it.

I wish to ask if it is the intention of the Government, or if the Government has any power to comply with the request stated in that article.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The Banking Act, which, of course, must control the Government as well as banks, makes no provision for the placing of an officer of the Finance Department in charge of a bank under such circumstances. The Banking Act provides that we can call for returns and exact penalties for the banks failing to comply with any conditions of the Act, but no provision of the Banking Act permits us to carry out the suggestion which my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) has read from the press.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Minister of Finance will recognize that the Government have considerable responsibility to the depositors, because under the law as I understand it, they have the power of inspection.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It has not been deemed so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I thought the Government had the power to send an officer to make an inspection of a bank and get returns whenever there was the least doubt as to the solvency of the bank in order to protect the depositors in it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is quite correct that we have the power to call for special returns, and that if these returns disclose anything improper the Government could of course communicate them to the public. We have no power to appoint an inspector. All we can do is to ask for returns and unless these returns disclose some impropriety nothing remains for us to do. The management of the affairs of the bank must be left with the board of directors, and the courts. It is not in the power of the Government to interfere in this matter, to the extent that some hon. gentlemen desire. Of course in regard to the returns we shall take every step necessary to get these returns at once.

That is within our power and that will be promptly attended to.

#### BRITISH COLUMBIA ALIEN ACT.

Mr. PRIOR. Is the Prime Minister able to state now if he can bring down the correspondence with reference to the Alien Act of British Columbia?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have looked into the matter and all the correspondence that has come to us is from the Colonial Office, and we have to communicate with the Colonial Office before we can bring it down. I am sorry we cannot bring it down at once.

Mr. PRIOR. There has been no correspondence with the provincial government.

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

#### MR. A. R. McDONALD.

Mr. BERGERON. I wish to ask for the correspondence between Mr. A. R. McDonald and the Department of Railways and Canals, or any other correspondence relating to Mr. McDonald.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had it ready here the other night but the hon. gentleman was not present. I shall bring it down again.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF DRY DOCKS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved second reading of Bill (No. 177) to encourage the construction of dry docks.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself in committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman did not say on the second reading, what was the object of this Bill. I see that it provides that under certain conditions the Government may aid in the construction of dry docks. The Government, I suppose, has in its mind some place where dry docks are about to be constructed. What is the object of the Bill?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The bill is a general one. It particularly arose in consequence of an application from some parties interested in the construction of a dry dock at St. John. It was pointed out to us that the provisions of the existing law would not enable that dock to be constructed of sufficient size to meet the growing needs of the larger steamers, and it is thought best to deal with the matter in a general way.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the same principle will apply to dry docks all over the

country, provided they meet the conditions laid down in the Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, that is the provision. It was thought better to deal with the matter on general principles that would apply to any part of Canada than by a special Act.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the meaning of the phrase, "that the cost on which it shall be calculated shall not be greater than the value of the work as estimated by the said Minister"? Should not the subsidy be estimated on the actual reasonable cost of the work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the object is just to guard against what my hon. friend is afraid of. It is just possible that the cost of the work might be excessive or extravagant, arising from mismanagement. The intention is that we should only pay on the fair cost, and, if for any reason the cost appeared to be excessive, that the payment should be only on the fair value of the work. This is from the old Act, if I remember rightly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The words are identical with those contained in the original Act.

Mr. BERGERON. How many of these Government docks are there in Canada?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have Government dry docks at Esquimalt, Lévis and Kingston, that is docks owned by the Dominion. There is also a dock at Halifax, owned by a company, constructed under the provisions of the Act now to be amended. I think these are all.

Mr. BERGERON. In what condition is the dry dock, of which we heard so much last year, which was to be built at Hochelaga?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it is still very dry.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there anything in this Bill for putting some water into that dock?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. We shall have the prohibition question later in the day. This does not touch that question at all.

Mr. SPROULE. The Bill provides that a dry dock must be "sufficient for the requirements of the public at such place." It is not the intention that all dry docks should be the same size?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. I should think the dry dock ought to be adapted to the condition of the commerce in its immediate vicinity.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does not the Imperial Government contribute to these docks?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The Imperial Government contributes to the Halifax dock.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. I think there is a standing regulation by which docks which are sufficiently large to dock ships of Her Majesty's navy have a claim to a certain amount.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think there is no standing regulation on the subject. It is a matter that is considered by the Imperial Government as each case arises.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. In the cases of dry docks at places like St. John or Montreal, where Her Majesty's ships are accustomed to go, if a representation is made to the Imperial Government, I feel quite certain that under the policy they have uniformly followed, they would give substantial aid.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I attach a great deal of importance to the discussion we had last year in regard to the dock at Hochelaga, and I want to know whether it will be built or not. I see in the supplementary Estimates a sum of \$750,000 for work below the St. Mary's current at Montreal, which means the very same place where it was proposed to build that dock. I want to ask my hon. friend seriously, whether there is any prospect of any work being done there, how it is going to be done, and whether it is going to be done by the Government of Canada, or by the machinery provided in this Bill?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. This Bill does not touch the question of the dry dock to which my hon. friend refers. His question relates to the Act of last session, whereby out of the moneys advanced to the Montreal Harbour Commissioners as a loan, they were obliged to set apart certain sums for improvements, including a dry dock below St. Mary's current. We have introduced a Bill to amend the Act of last session with respect to the Montreal Harbour Commissioners, so that instead of reserving the sum of \$750,000 for these improvements, \$500,000 of the sum may be released and applied to improvements at the Windmill Basin, leaving \$250,000 still in the reserve for the purposes of a dry dock or other improvements below St. Mary's current. The appropriation in the supplementary Estimates touches the same question—not the particular question of the dry dock, but the improvements in the harbour of Montreal. If I am to answer my hon. friend's question directly, this Bill does not touch the question of the dry dock, and in the legislation to which I have referred, we do not go further than to provide that the Montreal Harbour Commissioners shall set apart a sum, not more than \$250,000, for certain improvements below St. Mary's current, including the dry dock.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Then, if I understand the hon. gentleman, out of the \$750,000 which were appropriated last year for a dry dock in the eastern harbour of Montreal—

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Not altogether.

Mr. **BERGERON**. \$500,000 of that amount will be appropriated for the Windmill Point, that is to say, above the harbour of Montreal, leaving a balance of \$250,000 for the object which the vote had in view last year. The \$750,000 for improvements in the harbour below the current which are in the supplementary Estimates for 1900 added to the \$250,000 last year, will make \$1,000,000 devoted to the dry dock in the eastern part of the harbour at Montreal, and half a million dollars for the Windmill Point.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I would prefer to discuss that on the supplementary Estimates. The present resolution does not touch the question of the dry dock at Montreal at all. That is dealt with by a Bill introduced in my name by the right hon. First Minister, relating to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. For the present this Bill does not touch dry docks at all.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I do not understand it that way. The Bill under consideration is a revival of the old law which gave \$10,000 to companies in the building of dry docks. That is to say, the Government would not pay more than \$10,000, but this is to double the amount. My reason for talking about the dry dock is this. My impression is that there will be \$1,000,000 devoted to the construction of a dry dock in the eastern part of Montreal. If there is, the work might be given to a company instead of being built by the Government, and this \$20,000 will go towards helping that company. That is why I say there is a connection between the Montreal dry dock and this Bill.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. There is no connection whatever between the two subjects. When we come to the supplementary Estimates and give the explanation, it will be seen that the proposal has no connection with the dry dock at Montreal.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I do not suppose this measure would have been introduced unless there had been some antecedent negotiations. Will the hon. Minister inform us whether negotiations have made any progress?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). Perhaps I may be a little more fully informed than the Minister of Finance on the subject. The Bill, will have, no doubt, direct bearing upon the proposed dry dock for the city of St. John, owing to the probability of that work being entered upon at an early date, it was considered expedient to introduce this Bill at the present session.

Some parties in St. John have been interesting themselves for some months on the subject of a dry dock for that port. The ex-mayor, Mr. Robertson, has taken an active interest in the matter, and studied the question from various points of view. He has examined dry docks in England and this continent, and been in direct communication with the Imperial Government on the question. He has also been in negotiation with the Government of the province of New Brunswick and the corporation of the city of St. John, and has from all these different sources not only assurances, but from the majority of them guarantees that substantial aid will be forthcoming in the event of this work being constructed. He has from the city of St. John an engagement to give him over a site for the dock, and has the choice of two or three localities in the city, where to place his dock, and also a guarantee of \$2,500 a year extending over a period, I think, of 40 years. He also has from the provincial Government an engagement to subsidize his work to the extent of \$5,000 a year for a period of 40 years. In the course of this negotiation with the home Government, he has had from the First Lord of the Admiralty assurance that the work will be assisted by the Imperial Government at least to the extent of £2,000 sterling a year. He is hoping for, I think, something in addition to that amount. But taking altogether the promises he has received of contributions in aid of this work from various sources, there is no reason to doubt that a dock sufficient to answer the requirements of the trade can be constructed with this assistance.

Mr. FOSTER. That of course could not have gone on without some idea as to the capacity of the dock which it is proposed to erect there?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The dock is to be 800 feet long, long enough to take in the largest steamers now crossing the Atlantic. It is expected that it will be 80 feet at least in width, and probably, under ordinary circumstances, will take in two steamers at a time.

Mr. DAVIN. Has the hon. gentleman received a scientific opinion on the question whether the rise and fall of the tide in St. John Harbour will be helpful or the reverse to the work which a dry dock of this kind has to carry on.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot say what the hon. gentleman would consider a scientific opinion, but the engineer's opinion is that the rise in the tide of the St. John will be very helpful rather than hurtful. I may add that the dock which it is proposed to build will be of stone.

Mr. FOSTER. Has any company been formed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I believe that a company has been incorporated but I do not know the details. I know that Mr. Robertson was seeking to interest, and I think succeeded in interesting, the representatives of the different lines of steamship companies. The Allan, the Elder Dempster and the Dominion Lines, express their willingness to associate themselves in the enterprise, and I believe an incorporation has taken place, though not quite sure.

Mr. ELLIS. I saw stated in the newspapers the other day that a very eminent English engineer in that business is coming out to make plans, and of course the plans will have to be satisfactory to the Imperial Government before any aid of that kind can be given.

Mr. DAVIN. Suppose the Government were to give \$1,000,000 for the construction of a dock in Montreal, and the Government subsequently under this Act, give to a private company the aid that is provided in the first section?

The PRIME MINISTER. The Government does not propose to give any aid to a private company. Whatever work is to be done in Montreal will be done either by the Government or the harbour engineers, and this Act will not apply.

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My attention was called the other day in the House to the question whether this was sufficiently clear. Before you read section 2, Mr. Chairman, I ask to be allowed to read in a few words. In the 4th line, after the word "dry dock," I move to add "which has been subsidized by Canada," so as to make it clear that this applies to an enlargement of dry docks constructed under the Act.

Mr. FOSTER. Or under the Act and this amendment.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We assume that any new construction will not be enlarged.

Mr. FOSTER. Better make it "under the Act."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To make it definite, I propose that the words should be "subsidized by Canada under chapter 17 of the statutes of 1882." Then, on the second page, third line, after the words "ten thousand dollars" add "per annum."

Motion agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported, read the third time and passed.

#### PENITENTIARY ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 173)—from the Senate—further to amend the Penitentiary Act, was read the

second time and the House resolved itself into Committee on the said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. DAVIN. Why is this change made ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This change is made in order to have a scale of gradation of salaries based on the importance of the different penitentiaries. If my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) will look at the schedule, he will see that Kingston penitentiary comes first, and the salary of the warden is \$2,600; St. Vincent de Paul comes next, the salary of the warden being \$2,400; and so on down. That is the only object.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the differences as regards present salaries ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think there is any difference now. This is simply to enable the Government to make regulations from time to time to increase salaries as the work of the penitentiaries increased. I ask my hon. friend to look at this section :

The Governor in Council may, from time to time, fix the sums to be annually paid to the warden and the other officers and servants of any penitentiary established under the provisions of this Act; but such salaries shall not exceed the sums specified in the schedule of this Act.

They are limited to a certain maximum. Should the Governor in Council deem it advisable, because of an increase of the work, say, in the Manitoba penitentiary, it may increase that salary, but limiting it to the maximum that is laid down in the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a new principle, and, at first sight, I must say I do not like it. It means to hand over to the Governor in Council the power to increase salaries without the sanction of Parliament. In no other case do we do that. The civil servant or employee of the Government has a salary which is fixed here in Parliament, and we understand that he is getting that salary. If it is proposed that that officer should get more, the only way in which it can be done is to come down to Parliament and to propose a vote in the Estimates, and have that increase made. This is a new principle entirely, that the Governor in Council for the time being may dispense with that salutary rule. Having once fixed a maximum salary in the schedule to which an officer may advance, all power is then taken out of the hands of Parliament, and the Governor in Council may make any increases that he chooses inside that schedule. For instance, in this case, the maximum salary of the warden of the Kingston penitentiary is \$2,600. You appoint your warden this year at \$2,000. Parliament understands that you are appointing such a person as warden and that you propose to pay him \$2,000. Parliament agrees that that should be done, but after Parliament is prorogued, this gives authority to the Governor in Council, without consulting Parliament again, to make any

Mr. FIELDING.

gradations in advancing the salary from \$2,000 up to \$2,400, when they please, and in what manner they please, and Parliament has no supervision of it. What is the reason for this? Why should an officer of the penitentiary be treated any differently from an officer in the customs, or any other civil servant of the Government? Why is it that the Government are continually taking from itself these powers of appropriation to increase salaries and all that kind of thing? I should think that a Government would not want to do it for its own peace of mind.

Mr. BRITTON. My hon. friend has overlooked the fact that this has been the law for a long time. Under section 33 of the Revised Statutes of 1886, there is a much wider range than is permitted by the present Act; and there is this important difference, that while the old law made the salary dependent on the number of convicts, the present Act leaves that out, which I think will commend itself to the committee. The number of convicts is variable, while the importance of the penitentiary remains practically the same. Now, section 33, before referred to, which this Act amends, is as follows:—

The Governor in Council may, from time to time, fix the sums to be actually paid to the warden and the other officers and servants of any penitentiary established under the provisions of this Act, regard being had to the number of convicts confined therein, and the consequent responsibility attaching to the offices respectively, and to the length of service and amount of labour devolving upon them; but such salary shall not exceed the sums specified in the schedule to this Act.

The schedule to the Act in reference to the warden put \$3,000 as a maximum. This amendment establishes the maximum at \$2,600 and the minimum at \$1,000, leaving a very wide range, and it applies to all the penitentiaries of the Dominion. Now this Act wisely schedules the salaries for the different penitentiaries, so that we know precisely how far the Government can go in changing the salaries of officers in those places. It was applied by the late Government, and I think properly, to the Kingston penitentiary. The salary of the old warden was \$2,400, with certain allowances, and I think it was raised to \$2,800. When the new warden was appointed, superseding Mr. Metcalfe, his salary was reduced to \$2,000, with the ordinary perquisites that belong to that office. So that no principle has been changed, and I submit that the schedule attached to this Act is a better schedule than the one attached to the old Act.

Mr. FOSTER. I wanted to know whether this Act, as it exists in its new form, contemplates fixing the salaries without the presentation to Parliament of any estimate each year, because I find these sums were brought down each year in the Estimates. When this was read I had not looked up the old Act, and I thought it meant to make the appropriations entirely by the Governor in

Council. But if it means that the Governor in Council fixes what shall be the salary, and then they are voted as at present, that takes away my objection.

Mr. DAVIN. The remarks of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) would unintentionally give an incorrect impression to the committee. At present, under chapter 42 of the statute of 1895, it is provided that the warden shall get \$2,000. Now, why is it that under this schedule of the present Act, he is to get \$2,600? I find the warden is to get \$2,600, as compared with \$2,000 provided in 1895; and the deputy warden is to get \$1,500, as compared with \$1,200 for the accountant.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is the maximum. The Act provided the maximum under which we could then act. But it is explained by the hon. member for Kingston, and admitted by the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), that if the Governor in Council passes an Order to raise any salary to this maximum, of course, the appropriation must be asked for from Parliament in the following session and be voted.

Mr. DAVIN. That is not the point that I wanted to make. I see there is a higher maximum provided in this legislation than in the legislation of 1895, the maximum for warden is higher.

The PRIME MINISTER. That may be.

Mr. DAVIN. The maximum in 1895 is \$800 for a chaplain, and \$1,200 is the figure for two chaplains in the present Act. Then the maximum for surgeons under the Act of 1895 would be \$1,500, whereas, under the present Act, it shall be \$1,800. The steward, under the Act of 1895, could get \$700; under the present Act, \$900. There is an increase along the whole line. The hospital keeper under the old Act got \$750. I see the chief keeper, under the Act of 1895, got \$800, and the chief keeper under the present Act, \$1,200.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) is mistaken. The hon. gentleman is aware that the warden of Kingston Penitentiary for twenty-five years never received less than \$2,400. Under this Act he would receive \$2,000, but there was a later Act. This Act was only to provide a general rule where there was no special statutes applying to the case, but I know that the warden of Kingston Penitentiary always received more than \$2,400. This would be in apparent conflict with the Act which provided for a salary of \$2,000 a year but this was, as I understand it, a general statute making provision for the salaries to be paid in the penitentiaries at Dorchester, Manitoba, St. Vincent de Paul and in British Columbia where there is not the same condition of things existing. If my hon. friend looks at the Bill now before

us, and if he will compare it with the schedules, it is true that the schedule differs in regard to the other penitentiaries, but he will find that while there are some increases in some instances, the schedule is the same.

Mr. DAVIN. I have sent for the Act of 1887, but I think if the right hon. gentleman will look he will see that there is provision here for great increases all along the line.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not see that. There is an increase for the chaplains who are to be paid \$1,200.

Mr. DAVIN. Is there not an increase for the surgeon?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think so. Perhaps there is in the larger penitentiaries.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman must have the former list there, and it would be very easy to compare them.

Mr. BRITTON. I have the list for 1886.

Mr. DAVIN. I have the list for 1886.

Mr. BRITTON. There seems to be a very considerable difference compared with the Act of 1895.

Mr. DAVIN. There is considerable difference between this and the Act of 1895. Hon. gentlemen will find that there is a great increase which certainly deserves attention on the part of this committee. While the right hon. gentleman is informing himself on this subject, I should like, when he comes to explain these considerable increases, that he would also let us know what changes in the office rate of the Kingston Penitentiary have taken place.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) may probably be able to inform my hon. friend more correctly upon this subject than I can. The only important change I know of is the change in the wardenship. Mr. Metcalfe, and I am sorry to say it, is unfortunately in such a condition that he had to be superannuated, and Dr. Platt, a former member of this House, has been appointed in his place.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As far as that matter is concerned I think that we all, on both sides of this House, regretted very deeply to learn that an old colleague had lost his health and was not equal to his duties. I am glad to say that I think the Government did all under the circumstances they could do to meet the justice of the case.

Mr. BRITTON. The only other changes that have taken place since this Government came in are those of the surgeon, Dr. Strange having been superannuated and Dr. Phelan appointed, and some retirements

which have taken place owing to advanced age and ill-health.

Mr. DAVIN. What are these ?

Mr. BRITTON. The tailor instructor and his assistant, four keepers and a number of guards have been retired.

Mr. WALLACE. How many guards have been removed ?

Mr. BRITTON. I am not able, in the meantime, to say exactly.

Mr. FOSTER. As to the actual salaries paid at Kingston last year, I see that the warden got \$2,000. Is it proposed to pay the incoming warden a larger salary at the commencement ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Two thousand dollars at Kingston. He had more than that.

Mr. FOSTER. No. Here it is in the Auditor General's Report :

Paid to J. H. Metcalfe, warden, 12 months to June 30..... \$2,000

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, that is what the new man gets.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the deputy warden got \$1,500, and I see the schedule puts him at \$1,500. The surgeon had \$1,365, but that was for a part of the year, so that evidently \$1,500 was the salary of the surgeon. It is now made \$1,800. What is the reason that the surgeon's salary, which has been \$1,500 has been raised to a maximum of \$1,800 ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). In former times the salary of the surgeon was \$1,800. That is what Dr. Strange received, and he was allowed besides to carry on his private practice. Under the present regulation the surgeon is not to have any private practice, but is to give his whole attention to the prison.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Dr. Phelan the surgeon ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Does he give his whole attention to the prison ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I believe he does.

Mr. FOSTER. He gets \$1,500. Is it proposed to pay him more, or is this the maximum to which he might be raised ?

The PRIME MINISTER. This is the maximum to which he may be raised.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. His predecessor received \$1,800 and was allowed to practice, but now it is proposed that the surgeon shall not have the right to practice.

Mr. BRITTON.

Mr. FOSTER. The surgeon did not keep up his private practice of late.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, I am certain, to my own knowledge, that Dr. Strange was keeping up his private practice.

Mr. FOSTER. How long has Dr. Strange been out ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. About a year and a half.

Mr. FOSTER. Do they require two chaplains at the penitentiary to pray for them ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is the largest penitentiary in the Dominion, and the Roman Catholic element represents, I think, about one-third. It is precisely the same system as obtains at St. Vincent de Paul where there are two chaplains, one a Roman Catholic and the other a Protestant.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that in the Auditor General's Report they are paid \$1,200. The chief instructor of industry gets \$1,200. There does not appear to be very much increase as to actual salaries.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is not the intention that there shall be any increases of salaries, so far as I know.

On section 3,

The PRIME MINISTER. There is a slight change. Under the law as at present, a man convicted in Quebec has to be sentenced to St. Vincent de Paul, a man convicted in Ontario to Kingston, and there is no authority to transfer a man in Montreal to the Kingston Penitentiary. There is a case of the celebrated Viau, whom it was necessary to transfer to Kingston. This section gives us power to send a convict from the jail direct to any penitentiary we wish.

On section 5,

The PRIME MINISTER. This section requires a little explanation. It was intended to remove a somewhat awkward provision in the present law. Section 62 of the present law says :

62. No spirituous or fermented liquors shall be brought into the penitentiary for the use of any officer or person therein (except the warden or deputy warden, if the latter is resident therein), or for the use of any convict confined therein, except under the rules of penitentiary ; and any person who gives any spirituous or fermented liquor, tobacco, snuff or cigars, to any convict, except under the rules of the penitentiary, or conveys the same to any convict, shall incur a penalty of forty dollars, which shall be recoverable by the warden before any court of competent jurisdiction, and placed to the credit of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General. 45 V., c. 37, s. 64.

That is a very wise provision indeed, but if you look at section 59, we have almost the

same provision identically. It is as follows :—

59. Every officer, guard or servant of any penitentiary, or other person, who brings in or carries out, or endeavours to bring in or carry out, or knowingly allows to be brought in or carried out, to or from any convict, or carries to any convict when employed outside the prison walls, any money, clothing, provisions, tobacco, spirits, letters, papers or other articles whatsoever, not allowed by the rules of the penitentiary shall, on summary conviction, be liable to a penalty not exceeding one hundred dollars, or to imprisonment with hard labour, for a term not exceeding three months. 46 V., c. 37, s. 59.

We propose to re-enact this section and leave out section 62.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The objection I have to the Bill is that it permits the warden and the assistant to take in liquor. It appears to me that it would be more important for them to be sober than any one else.

The PRIME MINISTER. On the contrary they are prohibited under the section we are re-enacting. Section 62 would allow the warden to take in liquor, but section 59 which prohibits him from taking in liquor is re-enacted.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). It is a great pity that it is not made obligatory as a qualification for a Minister of Justice that he should be a smoker; because if he were a smoker, he would understand what useless cruelty it is to deprive prisoners of the use of tobacco to which they have been accustomed and to which they attach more value than any other comfort. Formerly a certain amount of tobacco was allowed to prisoners, but men who are non-smokers are so hard-hearted that it is impossible to make them understand what a hold the habit of smoking takes of a man.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is my hon. friend (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) a smoker?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, but I will never advise the leader of the Opposition to become a smoker unless he is one already. A good many of these men detained in our penitentiaries are ready to admit that they are justly imprisoned and detained, but, when you deprive them of their liberty, why add vexatious regulations such as preventing them having a moderate supply of tobacco. One of the officers told me at one of the great prisons in England, that the management of the prisoners would be very much easier if they were allowed a moderate use of tobacco. I appeal to those who are smokers, would it not be better to supply a moderate quantity of tobacco to prisoners, given as a reward for good conduct, and withhold it as a punishment.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) has made a very affect-

ing appeal, but I cannot help but ask myself why he did not make this appeal to his colleagues in Council. This is a Government measure, I believe, and the Government must be united upon it.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. What is the use of appealing to the Council when they won't make it a condition that the Minister of Justice should be a smoker.

Mr. FOSTER. We find that his colleagues were so hard-hearted that they would not listen to his appeal. Does the hon. gentleman wish us on this side of the House to make cause with him against his colleagues, and try to bring them to a reasonable frame of mind?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, this is an appeal from Philip non-smoking to Philip smoking.

Mr. DAVIN. I suppose this is only to avoid passing an Order in Council when a change is made?

The PRIME MINISTER. No. Sometimes we are obliged to send an officer from one penitentiary to another, where he may be obliged to perform work of a character inferior to what he did before, and we want to be able to continue his salary.

Mr. DAVIN. Under the section at present, if the hon. gentleman changed an officer, say from Kingston to St. Vincent de Paul, I think he would have to pass an Order in Council appointing him; but under this you would not have to do it?

The PRIME MINISTER. We would have to pass an Order in Council just the same.

On section 7,

The PRIME MINISTER. This section is of not very great but of some importance. It has been found that convicts are sometimes sent to the penitentiary who are insane at the time, and who ought to have been sent to an asylum. We take power under such circumstances to say that the Minister of Justice may inquire, and when he has satisfied himself that the convict was insane at the time of his conviction, he may, after a medical examination, send him back to the provincial authorities to be kept in an asylum.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the meaning of the words "or otherwise"? What other proof of insanity would be necessary?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know. But perhaps the Minister of Justice thought it advisable in some cases to have a second medical man confirm the opinion of the surgeon of the penitentiary.

On section 8,

The PRIME MINISTER. This section requires some explanation. It is to amend section 4 of chapter 52 of the Statutes of 1887, which is as follows :—

To any officer—

(a) Whose conduct has been good, and who has been faithful in the discharge of his duties ;

(b) Who is compelled to retire from the service on account of some mental or physical infirmity which unfits him for the performance of his duty ; and

(c) Who is not entitled to a superannuation allowance under the rules in that behalf in force,

A gratuity or retiring allowance may be given, calculated at the rate of half a month's salary for each year of his service, up to five years, and a month's salary for each year of service in excess of five years, based on the salary that such officer was in receipt of at the time of his retirement.

There may be cases where a man has been performing the duties of a guard in the penitentiary, or some other service which requires more physical than mental exercise ; and if he becomes disabled, he has the option of retiring with a gratuity. But such a man, having been for a long time in the service of the penitentiary, can hardly perform equally good work elsewhere ; but he may be qualified to become a clerk or to take some other position in the penitentiary. If he does, he becomes entitled under the law to superannuation ; but in case of his superannuation, he would lose all the time he had served in the other capacity. The object of this section is to allow him under such circumstances to take his gratuity, and to provide that this fact should not act as a bar to his receiving a superannuation allowance estimated from the time he has been in the service.

Mr. FOSTER. But the two do not overlap ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. DAVIN. I think that is quite right, and I would like to impress on my right hon. friend that the principle which he is here adopting is the principle which I have urged again and again to be applied to the officers of the Mounted Police. At the present time, if an officer of the force becomes an inspector, say for one or two years. He is not based on the time that he has been an inspector, say for one or two years. He is not allowed to count the ten or fifteen years of his service as a non-commissioned officer. Now that the right hon. gentleman is adopting that principle in this case, I hope, should he be happy enough to be here next session, that he will embody it in a measure in regard to the officers of the North-west Mounted Police.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am quite happy to take a good idea from any one.

On the schedule,

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to draw attention to the schedule. I think it is quite clear that there are changes made.

Mr. BRITTON. Hon. gentlemen know of the changes in the warden and surgeon, which occurred some time ago. The only

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

other changes that have been actually made recently are these : Michael Brennan, James Evans, William Hurst, Edward Mooney, John Mills and James Mathewson have been retired, and the following have been promoted as keepers in their places : Messrs. Bostridge, Bannister, Rutherford, Madden, Beaupré and Doyle. There are other changes in contemplation, I believe, owing to a medical certificate that some of the men are not in good health, but they have not actually taken place yet.

Mr. COCHRANE. What were those men retired for ?

Mr. BRITTON. On account of ill-health. Michael Brennan suffers from chronic lumbago and is unable at times to stoop, and walks with difficulty ; has also palpitation of the heart. James Evans is quite feeble, afraid of convicts, and is in failing health.

Mr. CLARKE. What age is he ?

Mr. BRITTON. He is an elderly man, but I have not his age.

Mr. CLARKE. Fifty ?

Mr. BRITTON. Yes, more. William Hurst is quite deaf ; suffers from rheumatism ; is inactive in consequence ; has palpitation of the heart, and is breathless comparatively on exertion. Edward Mooney is ruptured ; unfit for duty. John Mills is ruptured ; unfit for duty. James Mathewson is quite feeble ; very inactive ; eyesight poor.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do they get an allowance on their retirement ?

Mr. BRITTON. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Who made an examination of these men ?

Mr. BRITTON. The surgeon of the penitentiary, Dr. Phelan. I may say, with regard to Michael Brennan, that on his application, a second medical examination was allowed him. I understand that he was reported as being in worse health than he thought he really was, and he was granted another examination. Whether it took place or not I cannot say.

Mr. CLARKE. How long has Dr. Phelan been in the employment of the Government as surgeon of the penitentiary ?

Mr. BRITTON. In round figures, two years.

Mr. DAVIN. Take, for instance, the chief keeper, the maximum, under existing law which can be paid is \$900. Under this legislation he may be paid \$1,200. Take the hospital overseer, the present maximum is \$900, but under the proposed legislation the maximum will be \$1,200. Then, the engineer, the present maximum is \$1,000, but under the proposed schedule it will be \$1,200. Do these men get rations ?

Mr. BRITTON. They only get dinner.

Mr. DAVIN. The maximum for the chief trade instructor is at present \$1,000, but in this Bill it is \$1,200. These are considerable increases, and I am not aware that the cost of living has increased in Kingston. These men get their chief meal at the expense of the Government, and can exclaim—with one of the characters in the drama of the Restoration—although my right hon. friend has almost interdicted me from making quotations—"the gods can't harm me, I have dined." And after an employee of the penitentiary has dined substantially at the cost of the Government, his two other meals will be light ones.

The PRIME MINISTER. I might alter the hon. gentleman's quotation and say to him: We want to dine. There is no intention of increasing the salaries.

Mr. DAVIN. But there is a higher maximum provided in each case than under the existing law.

The PRIME MINISTER. If we attempt to increase the salaries of any of the officers, we shall have to ask for an appropriation and become subject to the criticisms of my hon. friend. There is no intention of increasing the salaries except in two cases, the chaplain and the chief keeper. We propose to combine the two offices of chief keeper and clerk of works, and give the chief keeper \$1,400, instead of \$1,200. The steward's salary is increased \$100.

Mr. FOSTER. Was there a clerk of work before, and what did he get?

The PRIME MINISTER. He got \$400.

Mr. FOSTER. Do these men get lodgings?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. They get one ration a day?

Mr. BRITTON. At mid-day and the night watchmen get a night meal.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I ought to congratulate the hon. member for Kingston, although I do not know exactly what I ought to congratulate him on. I am not sure whether this is simply a preliminary canter which opens up a vista of the final race-course or not, and whether there is a resolution still lurking around in the Cabinet for another salary for a supplementary Minister, but the hon. gentleman has done very well.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am glad my hon. friend takes it in that light, and accept his congratulations in advance. Perhaps when the thing is brought down he will reverse his course altogether.

Mr. BRITTON. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman for his compliment, but

he will see that the Minister of Justice has not been long at the work, and as the Kingston Penitentiary is in my constituency. I have, of course, to take some interest in it.

Mr. FOSTER. The excuse is perfectly valid. The members of the Cabinet are a little fresh on their business.

Mr. DAVIN. The same criticism has to be made on the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary. I find that power is taken to increase the salary of the surgeon by an additional \$200, if desired. Also to increase the salary of the accountant by an addition of \$100, from \$1,100 to \$1,200. Also to increase the salary of the chief keeper. His maximum at present is \$900, and now the power is taken to give him \$1,200. Again, what is the necessity of providing for these additional increases if it is not intended to give them?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have to speak with some hesitation on the subject, because I do not know much, if anything at all, about the inside management of the penitentiary, and unfortunately the Solicitor General is not here. There is no intention in this Bill to increase the existing salaries, but I have to make an amendment to the chief trade instructor, by adding the words "chief trade instructor and clerk of industries." The chief trade instructor and clerk of industries, when combined in one, will get \$1,500. Our intention is to combine the two offices and raise the salary to \$1,500.

Mr. DAVIN. The same criticism which I have made to the other penitentiaries will apply to Dorchester, Manitoba and British Columbia penitentiaries.

The PRIME MINISTER. In the other schedule, the Dorchester penitentiary, the matron's salary is \$500 and the deputy matron's \$400, instead of \$300. I understand that these are the actual salaries now paid.

Mr. DAVIN. For very good matrons and deputy matrons that is not too much.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed

#### COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT— INSOLVENCY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 160)—from the Senate—to amend the Companies Act.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The object of this Bill is to permit companies to issue preference stock. The privilege has been granted from time to time to companies to issue such stock, and I think I am correct in stating that it has never in any instance been refused. We propose to give general permission to companies to issue such stock under by-law.

It is provided that the Bill shall not apply to insurance companies or trust companies.

**Mr. BERGERON.** It is not quite in point in this Bill perhaps, but I would like to ask the right hon. leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) concerning any Bankruptcy Act to be brought down by the Government, or to be allowed to be brought down by any private member.

**Mr. CLARKE.** This session ?

**Mr. BERGERON.** Yes. I believe there has been a strong movement in the country to ask my right hon. friend to bring down a bankruptcy law. Some time ago I asked for the correspondence on this subject, and my right hon. friend asked me to give notice and move in the usual way. I did so, but have not had the correspondence yet. I would like to know from him why he has not acceded to this strong demand in favour of a bankruptcy law, and whether we may expect such a law during the present session, or at least within a short time ?

**The PRIME MINISTER.** Several attempts have been made to improve the local legislation of the several provinces. I believe it is accepted that the legislation of the province of Quebec is quite satisfactory to the trade at large. The legislation of Ontario has also been improved, so that I believe there is now practically no difference between the legislation of Ontario and that of Quebec.

**Mr. BERGERON.** But the same is not true of the other provinces.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** I speak of Ontario only at present. We have been in correspondence with the provincial governments in order to ask them to improve their legislation and put it on the same footing as that of Ontario and Quebec. Nova Scotia has responded and improved its legislation, and we hope that the same thing will be done in the other provinces. If that is done, there will be no difficulty at all ; you will hear nothing more about having an insolvency law.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Of course, my right hon. friend speaks from information in his possession. I do not know the facts, personally. So far as Quebec is concerned, there has never been any difficulty. Our civil law operates perfectly. I have often heard wholesale men in Quebec complain of cases of failure in the other provinces, when they lost the whole of their creances. My hon. friend said that necessary machinery had not been provided in Ontario. This is the first I have heard of it. I should be glad, if the correspondence between the members of the trade and the Government could be brought down.

**Mr. CLARKE.** As this subject has come up, I may mention that for some time I

**Mr. FIELDING.**

have had in my possession a number of documents dealing with this matter, and intended to bring it before the House, but an opportunity has not presented itself. It will be recollected by the House that a petition was presented to Parliament, praying for the passage of an insolvency law signed by leading manufacturers and merchants of Great Britain. The representations made were very strong, and it was urged that no time should be lost by the Government and Parliament of Canada in passing an insolvency law. I may say that I have, in addition to a copy of the petition, a number of trade journals printed in the old country, which point out, as the petition does, that British merchants and manufacturers labour under great disadvantages in Canada because of the non-existence of an insolvency law.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** I would point out that all the demands for an insolvency law come, not so much from this country as from outside—from Great Britain mostly. There is no demand at the present time in the country for an insolvency law, so-called. What the trade wants is a law which will effect two things—prevent undue preferences as between creditors, and also provide for the disposition of the estate of any party who goes into insolvency. What the trade particularly objects to is, that it should be in the power of the insolvent debtor to pay some favoured creditor. Under the civil law of Quebec, which is the common law, such preference are prohibited. This principle has been recognized in Ontario. I understand that in Nova Scotia also it is recognized by the law. What is wanted, in addition, is some machinery whereby the courts should have power to make disposition of the assets of an insolvent debtor. The legislation introduced into the province of Quebec seven or eight years ago has proven satisfactory. Similar legislation has been introduced in Ontario, and if the same provisions were made in every province of the Dominion, all the demands for an insolvency law would disappear. We do not want an insolvency law. The country is prosperous, and it is not required. That which is required, as I have said, has been, or we hope will be, provided for by the legislatures of the different provinces.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** In my opinion, it is not possible for the Government to overrate the importance of this question. I have no hesitation in saying, having had full means of knowing the effect of the statement, that there is nothing that has created such a barrier in the way of increased trade with Great Britain as the want of an insolvency law. I may say that the British Empire League have pressed that matter in the very strongest way. At their request, both myself and the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) pledged ourselves to

give our support to an insolvency law. It is enough to make one hang his head in shame to hear commercial men in the city of London describe the shameful manner in which they have been swindled through the want of an insolvency law in Canada. The statements made by the chambers of commerce and by leading commercial men in Great Britain have had the effect of making merchants absolutely distrust having commercial relations with the people of this country, for fear they may find their goods, or the proceeds of them, by means of a preferential assignment, handed over to some other person.

I doubt very much whether the measures to which my right hon. friend has referred will meet the case, useful as they may be; but I think that when the Government have exhausted their efforts in getting legislation passed in the various provinces, if they will take that subject up in the light of the legislation in other quarters, and bring forward an insolvency law, they will render a great service to the country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the dissatisfaction that has been spoken of by my hon. friend was more prevalent a year or two ago; I have not heard of late any specific complaint in the direction he has referred to. When I was in England less than two years ago, a large deputation of commercial men waited upon me, in conjunction with the High Commissioner, and expressed very strongly the views which the hon. gentleman has expressed to the House; but at that time provincial legislation was not in as good a condition as it is at present. I think that, to a considerable extent, the difficulty has been met by the provincial legislation to which the right hon. the First Minister has referred. There is one point, however, in which we are still defective, and that is the lack of uniformity in our insolvency legislation. If we are to rely upon the legislation of the provinces, we cannot have such uniformity. I was deeply impressed with the fact that the lack of such legislation prejudicially affected the trade relations between Great Britain and Canada, although at that time the laws were less favourable in the provinces than they are at present. But unless there be a uniform law there will still be more or less complaint.

Mr. McNEILL. I only desire to say that I endorse every word that has fallen from the leader of the Opposition in reference to this matter.

Mr. BERGERON. I would impress upon my right hon. friend the importance of that correspondence which I mentioned to him. He asked me to give notice of a motion calling for it, and I did so on the 25th of June. Surely it cannot be so difficult to bring it down. I hope he has no reason for withholding it.

The PRIME MINISTER. No reason in the world. Probably I have forgotten it, I will see about it.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to say a word in answer to the Premier and to the Minister of Finance about the local legislatures maintaining their laws in such a way as to help. This is a matter of trade and commerce, and belongs to the Dominion Government and not to the local legislatures. Local legislation is always subject to the caprices of local legislatures, whilst, if a good bankruptcy law were drawn up on business principles and passed by this Parliament for the whole Dominion, I think it would be more satisfactory to our own people, as well as to foreigners who are dealing with our people.

Mr. CLARKE. With the permission of the committee, I would like to read the concluding portion of a memorial presented to the House some time ago. I may say that this petition is signed by the leading business men and merchants of Great Britain, whose names are familiar, I imagine, to the business world of the Dominion:

Your memorialists, therefore, respectfully represent that there should be:

1. One insolvency law for all the provinces and territories of Canada, that such law should, 'inter alia,' provide for:
  2. The abolition of all preferential creditors other than governmental taxes, rent and wages.
  3. For the registration of all liens on goods, book debts or other securities, and that secured creditors should rank only for their debt, less a proper valuation of their security.
  4. Liens and preferences within a period of three to four months prior to an assignment or bankruptcy, to be deemed invalid.
  5. Provision against all fraudulent and preferential settlements.
  6. Provision for the means of enforcing to a trustee duly appointed by creditors an assignment on their behalf of the estate of a debtor who is insolvent.
  7. Provision of a public or other proper examination of a debtor before a judge or other authorized official.
  8. That in any appointment of official receivers the rights of creditors to a proper supervision and control of estates to be safeguarded.
  9. Traders to be compelled to keep books of account.
  10. Provision to meet the notorious evil of traders insolvent, or on the brink of insolvency, ordering or receiving delivery of goods on credit from persons ignorant of their financial position.
  11. Provision that where a debtor has obtained goods while insolvent within sixty days of his executing any deed of assignment or presenting any petition for the administration of his affairs to any insolvency court, that the creditors furnishing such goods shall be entitled to the return of all such goods as are available when the insolvency is declared.
  12. Provision against the frequent case of sales 'en bloc' of stock by traders insolvent, or on the brink of insolvency, before calling their creditors together.
- And generally your petitioners would urge that any legislation dealing with insolvency should, as far as practicable, be assimilated to

the law relating to insolvency in England and Wales, with such modifications or improvements thereto as your honourable House shall deem necessary or advisable.

Just one word more. I have had sent to me an extract from an article on bankruptcy in Canada, taken from the "Drapers' Record," a trade paper which has the largest circulation of any trade journal in the world. The opening paragraph of the article is as follows:—

The condition of the bankruptcy law in Canada is one of the greatest scandals of the commercial world. For years an agitation has been going on in this country for the purpose of bringing pressure to bear on the Home Government or the Canadian Government, or both, so that the grievances of British creditors of Canadian debtors might be abated. But nothing is done. We are quite aware that the Home Government cannot pass a Canadian Bankruptcy Act, but one would have thought that the Colonial Secretary, especially when he happens to be the author of the Bankruptcy Act of 1883, would have been able to make such representations to the Canadian Government as would induce the latter to seriously take up the question of bankruptcy reform. This, however, appears to be impossible; at any rate, Mr. Chamberlain does not stir himself in the direction indicated. British exporters have not waited supinely for the relief that never came. They have made several efforts to secure a proper consideration of their grievances, and now they are directly petitioning the Canadian Parliament, through the medium of the European Exporters' Association of Toronto, Limited. In order to strengthen the hands of the petitioners, we may institute a comparison between the legal situation in this country and Canada, so far as insolvency is concerned.

I need not read the whole of it.

Mr. McNEILL. What is the date of that?

Mr. CLARKE. I cannot put my finger on the date; it is quite recent. This is the summing up the article:

To sum up: The chaotic condition of the Canadian bankruptcy law is a grave public scandal, which ought not to be allowed to further continue. Representations to the legislature have hitherto been made in vain, but we cannot think that the weighty memorial that is to be presented to the Canadian Parliament by the European Exporters' Association of Toronto, Limited, will be similarly neglected. Thus to treat it would be worse than a scandal—it would be a disgrace.

This memorial, a copy of which I have in my hand, I thought it my duty, as opportunity offered, to bring forward before the committee, in hope that at the next session, at any rate, some legislation will be passed to meet the wishes of gentlemen who are so deeply interested in the promotion of trade between Britain and Canada, and who have memorialized for a change in the law.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

It being One o'clock, the Deputy Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. CLARKE.

House resumed at Three o'clock.

#### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the House, I beg to move:

That leave be granted the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts to sit during the time that the House is in session.

Motion agreed to.

#### THE WINDING-UP ACT.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 163)—from the Senate—to amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Fielding.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Although this Bill stands in my name, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is really in charge of it. My name is improperly placed to it, but the hon. gentleman will explain the nature and purpose of the measure.

Mr. McCARTHY. Any explanations that are desired, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to give the committee. The Bill is simply to amend the Winding-up Act and the Winding-up Amendment Act, 1889, Section 3 of the Bill enables a compromise to be effected. I may inform the committee that the Bill was very thoroughly discussed before the Banking and Commerce Committee of the Senate. In winding-up proceedings a clash sometimes occurs. For instance, if it is a loan company or a loan and banking company the depositors and debenture holders would be two distinct classes and they might have a dispute in regard to their respective rights and interests, and in case there was such a dispute no settlement could be arrived at between the contending classes unless every person in each class interested, or claiming to be interested, in the fund agreed. This section, as hon. gentlemen will see, permits a compromise to be carried out if a majority in number representing three-fourths in value think a settlement should be arrived at, subject, however, to the approval of the court in the winding-up proceedings being obtained. In other words, the judicial officer before whom the winding-up proceedings are taking place will ascertain and consider whether the settlement is one that he ought to approve of or disapprove of and he will approve or disapprove of it as he may see fit. But first there must be a coinciding of a majority in number representing three-fourths in value of the persons claiming. This section is taken almost verbatim from the English Act. As to the fourth section of the Bill it is, as will be seen, for the purpose of validating winding-up proceedings—taken under the Winding-up Acts of Canada. The Winding-up Act of Canada, R.S.C., chap. 129, gives the right of petition to wind up to a

creditor. The Winding-up Amendment Act of 1889 gives the right to a shareholder to petition. There may be some doubt whether proceedings taken under the Winding-up Amendment Act of 1889 to wind up a company by a creditor would be valid. This fourth section makes it clear and makes both Acts apply to every shareholder or creditor so that either a shareholder or a creditor shall have the right to petition to wind up a company, and that if proceedings were commenced under the Winding-up Amendment Act of 1889 by a creditor these proceedings will be validated. The fifth section declares :

The words "capital stock," where they occur in section 3 of the Winding-up Act and in section 8 thereof as hereby amended, and in sections 3, 4, 5 and 8 of the Winding-up Amendment Act, 1899, shall mean and be taken to have heretofore meant a capital stock either 'de jure' or 'de facto.'

A company may be in the position in which there is doubt as to the validity of the issue of its stock, but as in one or two instances in Ontario, the company dealt with that which might not be in law validly issued stock but which had been so created by all parties and paid dividends upon it, and increased the capital stock and paid dividends upon the increased capital. This section declares that in such a case capital stock shall be held to be stock either de jure or de facto. There are two other clauses which are suggested by the Government in regard to which I will not undertake to explain.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the real amendment to the old Act in this Bill ?

Mr. McCARTHY. The real amendment is in section 3 giving power to the judicial officer before whom winding-up proceedings have taken place, to approve of a settlement and to say whether it shall be carried out between contending classes such as debenture holders and depositors, for instance, when one is claiming a preference over the other, and when three-fourths of them agree that a compromise should be made, then the court may approve of such a settlement. It is taken practically verbatim from the English Winding-up Act.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) whether this Bill has been carried through the Senate under the supervision of the hon. Minister of Justice ?

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. Minister of Justice was present in the Senate Committee when the matter was fully discussed, when the Bill was reported, and when the Senate finally read it a third time.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

## PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). With the unanimous consent of the House, I would now move that the Order be called for the motion of Mr. Flint.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth) moved :

That inasmuch as it is desirable that legislation be enacted having in view the further restriction of the liquor traffic in Canada, and that such legislation should be uniform in all the provinces and territories of the Dominion, it is expedient, in the opinion of this House, to enact :

1. That subject and except as hereinafter mentioned, the sale of intoxicating liquors in every province and territory of Canada should be prohibited.

2. That the Act prohibiting such sale should not come into force in any province or territory unless and until a majority of the qualified electors therein, voting at an election, shall have voted in favour of such Act.

3. That upon such vote in favour of said Act being duly certified to the Governor General in Council, such Act shall be brought into force in said province or territory, and shall remain in force therein for four years and thereafter until the same shall have been repealed in such province or territory, such repeal shall not take effect therein until a majority of the qualified electors of such province or territory, voting at an election, shall have voted for the repeal thereof ; the proceedings for such repeal to be similar in all respects to those for bringing the Act into force.

4. That in order to avoid unnecessary expense and to secure the largest possible vote, the voting provided for in the said Act shall take place at a general federal election.

5. That this Act shall, on coming into force, suspend the operation of the Canada Temperance Act in any part of the province or territory where the same may be in force at the time, and such suspension shall continue so long as this Act is in force in such province or territory.

6. That while the said Act is in force in any province or territory, the sale of such liquors may be permitted for medicinal or sacramental purposes or for bona fide use in any art, trade or manufacture ; such sales to be made only by vendors appointed for that purpose, and to be subject to such regulations as will secure the due observance of the Act.

7. That while the said Act is in force in any province or territory, no brewer or distiller therein shall be permitted to sell his products except to vendors for the purposes of the said Act, or for export from the said province or territory to some place beyond the same, where the said Act is not in force—such manufacture, sale and export to be subject to stringent regulations.

8. That while the said Act is in force in any province or territory, no such liquors shall be permitted to be imported or brought into such province or territory from any other province or territory in Canada, or from abroad, except for sale for the purposes of the said Act—such importation and sale to be subject to such conditions and restrictions as will ensure the due observance of the Act.

9. That due provision be made in said Act for the enforcement of the same, and for the proper application of all fines and penalties imposed thereby.

He said : I desire to thank the Prime Minister and the House for the courtesy extended to me and to those whom I have the honour to represent in this matter, in allowing this resolution to be taken up to-day when I am perfectly aware that a large amount of other important public business would otherwise have been transacted. It has been arranged that this resolution should be seconded by my hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Bell). This resolution, as a majority of hon. gentlemen present are aware, emanates from the Dominion Alliance, an association which has been for many years doing good work in connection with the prohibition of the liquor traffic in Canada. Membership in the Dominion Alliance is generally obtained by being elected from any temperance organization favourable to prohibition, and it is the aim of the Alliance to represent the general public sentiment of those who believe in a prohibitory liquor law for the whole Dominion as the proper goal towards which citizens favourable to the progress of temperance should labour. It is not to be assumed that in any degree whatever those in favour of the lines sketched in this resolution, are at all disposed to drop the idea of total prohibition of the liquor traffic throughout the whole Dominion. The resolution represents to a very large degree a compromise between the two extremes of those who believe the operation of the temperance sentiment should work as it hitherto has worked through the Scott Act, through the various local organizations in the various provinces; and of those who believe that morally and politically it is the duty of those who favour temperance to rest satisfied with nothing short of the total prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating liquors throughout the whole Dominion. It is somewhat unfortunate, of course, that the matter should come up at this late hour of the session, but the peculiarity of the situation in regard to this question is, that whereas on almost every other question before the public, any private member can introduce a Bill which if approved by the House and the Senate would be ultimately passed into law; yet, on this subject affecting as it does, finance, as well as trade and commerce, it cannot be introduced in the shape of a Bill by any private member, and must be brought forward by resolution. This is, of course, a disadvantage. Any detailed measure dealing with the subject apart from national prohibition, dealing with it as a question to be worked out in detail as quasi national prohibition work, by means of provinces, must necessarily be of greater length than could be conveniently treated in the form of a resolution. I would have much preferred, had more time been placed at the disposal of those who sketched out this line of prohibitory effort, that it could have been incorporated in a Bill so that all its various clauses might be discussed and amended if neces-

Mr. FLINT.

sary, until we reached a point which would fairly express the sentiments of Parliament. Every hon. member in this House is aware that the prohibition agitation has taken a great many phases and aspects since the confederation of the provinces. Originally the evils of intemperance were attacked, and still are attacked, and still ought to be attacked, by means of the persuasion of individuals to refrain from the use of intoxicating liquors, and we are all aware that is a method of prohibition which is eminently practicable and which is in the main entirely satisfactory. But, as the question has been studied, and as the laws of the country have grown and developed, this has not been deemed the only means that society ought to adopt in order to diminish the admitted evils of intemperance, and, consequently, Parliament has been appealed to to place upon the traffic in intoxicating liquors certain restrictions; in the same manner as society has been appealed to by means of various organizations to adopt the principle of personal total abstinence so as to lead young persons of all classes of the community to voluntarily abstain from the use of intoxicating liquors, for the sake of themselves, as well as for the sake of those by whom they are surrounded. But as human nature is constituted and as society has grown, it has been found that additional aids were required; and, with almost common consent, the legislature has passed laws to restrict the traffic in various ways. These have aided in carrying on the temperance propaganda very materially, and have done their share in the work of making Canada to-day one of the most temperate countries on the face of the globe. Still, there has been a constant pressure upon the various local legislatures, as well as upon the Dominion Parliament, to go still further in this direction, and to consider the advisability of enacting laws which would prohibit entirely the traffic in intoxicating liquors, except for certain purposes which are generally admitted to be of some utility. This pressure has been exerted almost constantly on this Parliament since its original organization. This session has made it abundantly apparent that the time has not yet arrived when Parliament has nothing to do but meet, pass the Estimates and go home. I believe the late Sir George Cartier said that that was the ideal at which he hoped Parliament would some day arrive. It appears, as time progresses, that questions of great importance and interest to different sections of the country, and some of them to the whole country, are continually cropping up, and very violent discussions are heard in Parliament on these various questions. One hon. gentleman has the notion that if an export duty is put on saw-logs, a complete state of industrial and commercial happiness for the whole Dominion will arrive. Another has a panacea for all human ills, or a large measure of them at

any rate, in the form of preferential trade with the mother country. Another advocates reciprocity with the United States. Others think that the proper dealing with the question of the traffic in intoxicating liquors is of prime importance. My own view, however, coincides with what is perhaps that of the majority of hon. members present, that all of these questions, in their particular spheres and at their particular times, have a relative importance, and that no one question is of an importance which ought to exclude attention to any or all others. I do not desire it to be supposed that although, partially by the force of circumstances, I have on one or two occasions introduced resolutions looking to the prohibition of the liquor traffic, my mind is wholly taken up with that subject, and that I cannot sympathize with the views of any hon. gentleman who has other panaceas to recommend for the benefit of his suffering fellow-countrymen. But there can be no doubt in the mind of any hon. gentleman who has watched the progress of temperance reform, that throughout the country generally there does appear to be a larger number of the electorate whose minds are strongly set upon the desirability of further temperance legislation, and who on all occasions press this matter forward, at public meetings, at political meetings, and upon their representatives in Parliament—that there are a larger number of persons devoted to this means of benefiting the country generally than perhaps to any other one question with which Parliament has to deal. Whether or not that feeling is thoroughly and adequately represented in Parliament, is open to question. There is no doubt that it would be a very desirable state of things, if this public sentiment, which we all know to exist, could be represented in the Parliament of the Dominion as strongly as it is represented among the electorate. Many efforts have been made from time to time to ascertain to what extent the sentiment of large numbers of the electorate is represented in Parliament; but many difficulties, inherent in the nature of the question, have prevented this on previous occasions. No one can deny that the prohibition question is one full of difficulties, although it is full of interest. There are stronger opponents of prohibition than there are perhaps of almost any other great movement which we have had in the country; and there are as strong advocates of prohibition as there are of any other question that has ever been pressed forward to success.

A short resumé of the parliamentary history of prohibition may not perhaps be without interest. At any rate, it may very properly precede a general discussion of the question, which I hope will take place in connection with this resolution; and it ought to be a complete answer to any one who takes the ground that prohibition of the

liquor traffic is altogether absurd—that it is a mere intellectual, or abstract, or academic question. If it had been so, I think it would long ago have disappeared from the political arena, for no question which is purely of an abstract or academic character, which is a mere fad of some academic individual, no matter how interesting it may be, could ever have sustained itself so long as prohibition has done as a living question throughout this Dominion. It has been in the local legislatures and in the Dominion Parliament one of the most forceful questions we have had to deal with; it has created a cleavage, not along party lines, but within political parties; and although it does not appear to have made very great headway in the matter of legislation, at this very hour it is exercising a lively interest among hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, as well as among those they represent in every portion of this Dominion. In 1873 the question first moved on the Dominion Parliament in the nature of petitions, asking for a prohibitory liquor law, and a committee, to which the question was referred by Parliament, after consideration, reported favourably—reported not that it was a question that could be thought so undesirable, but reported with all gravity to Parliament that it should be taken up and should at some time be made the law of the land. A Royal commission was issued, I believe, in the next year, dealing with the subject, and the commissioners were instructed to make inquiries in the United States particularly, as to the working of prohibitory liquor laws in that country. That report, although valuable, was by no means exhaustive, nor can I find that the commissioners reported their opinion in favour of a prohibitory liquor law, but the general tendency of all their observations and the result of their inquiries show that a prohibitory law was admitted by those whom they consulted as not only desirable, but eminently practicable and workable. The following year, as a result of this agitation and the report of this commission, the matter was again brought before this House.

Mr. BERGERON. That would be 1875.

Mr. FLINT. Yes. And so strong was the feeling among the members of the House at that time that the matter went to a Committee of the Whole House, and a Committee of the Whole House, after some interesting discussion, voted that prohibition was the most effective remedy for the evils of intemperance. This report was not acted upon by the House itself. The point I am attempting to make is this, that Parliament did then give its imprimatur, as a Parliament, to the desirability of a prohibitory liquor law; that it took it out of the region of mere moral and abstract sentiment, and placed it upon a legislative and parliamentary basis; and by giving its sanction, it

has justified the efforts of those who from that as a basis went forward with renewed interest and energy, in encouraging throughout the country principles of total abstinence among those who were to elect representatives in future Parliaments. This agitation, although it did not result in the full remedy of a prohibitory law throughout the Dominion, led to the enactment of the Canada Temperance Act, commonly called the Scott Act, a most important piece of legislation, not only on account of the temperance principles to which it committed Parliament, but on account of the constitutional principles which were then enunciated and subsequently sustained, after very expensive and very extensive litigation. Parliament held, and held rightly as it appears from decisions subsequently given, that in the exercise of its power for the order and good government of Canada it could enact a prohibitory liquor law, and place within the jurisdiction of the electoral or other divisions in the various provinces the power of bringing that Act into effect over a given area in any province. In other words, the principle of local option was applied, on a large scale, by the Dominion, and that principle was upheld after appeal to the highest court; and as this principle, to a large degree, is attempted to be invoked along the lines of the resolution I have placed on the Order paper, I would call the attention of hon. gentlemen to its importance.

Passing along, however, you will find that the Canada Temperance Act, although it was adopted in many districts, was not worked to the satisfaction of many temperance and other people in those districts, and the reason why the Scott Act has been condemned has always been to me a matter of surprise. However, I think, in a general way, it may be said that it was condemned because it was not properly supported in those constituencies by public opinion. It may have needed amendment here and there and had public opinion arisen strongly in support of the Scott Act in these districts, and had those in favour of it impressed on Parliament the desirability of such amendments as were found from time to time absolutely necessary for its perfect working, those amendments could have been secured. But as soon as difficulties arose in the enforcement of the Act in many constituencies, instead of pressing forward for such amendments as would make the Act more workable, popular clamour demanded the repeal of the Act, and consequently the area over which the Scott Act exercises its jurisdiction has been largely diminished, and to-day it is in force in only a few counties in the upper provinces and not many in the lower provinces. But where it has been strongly supported, where public opinion has been most in favour of enforcing the Act, I believe it has worked very well. There are amendments that

may be deemed necessary for its perfect working, but in the main, where public opinion is strong, the Scott Act has worked fairly well. In 1884, the ex-Finance Minister introduced a resolution looking to the total prohibition of the liquor traffic in Canada, and the points he raised in his very able speech have never been satisfactorily answered. They may be answered by indifference or a feeling of hostility, but, as a matter of logic or reasoning, I cannot see that they have ever been fairly and fully answered; and as a result of the debate upon that motion, this House, in 1884, decided by a resolution that prohibition was desirable, repeating the dictum of the House in 1874, but there was a rider added. The House adopted an amendment to the effect that it was prepared to promote such legislation as soon as public opinion was sufficiently strong to sustain a stringent measure, thus indicating that although Parliament was convinced that prohibition was desirable and would be effective, another element had to be considered, apart from the abstract desirability and practicability of its being enforced, and that was that there should be a strong public opinion to sustain a stringent measure. It is this feature in connection with prohibition which makes it appear different from almost every other proposed measure. We do not find Ministers or private members, when introducing measures, appeal to any extent whatever to public opinion. They introduce their measures, no matter of what character, relying solely upon the inherent benefits which these measures promise to achieve and it is supposed that if the measure can stand logical argument, if it is in the line of the general principles of legislation, public opinion will support it. But in connection with the prohibition of the liquor traffic the state of public opinion is always made a very large portion of the discussion and enters very largely into its consideration. I think the reason is, in the first place, as I will show later, that public opinion varies more upon this than almost any other subject.

There are portions in every province of the Dominion where one may travel almost all day and scarcely find a person opposed to prohibition or favourable to the liquor traffic; and then he will strike a community where such propositions are scouted as absurd and ridiculous. The result in the various plebiscites show that some communities are almost unanimous in favour of the utmost restriction of the liquor traffic, while other communities are as strong the other way. In other words, public opinion on this question, though strong on the whole is not homogeneous. There are cities where as the strongest prohibitionist will admit, if prohibition were enacted, there would be great difficulties in the way of its enforcement. There are large communities where the very idea of prohibition is scouted as ridicu-

lous and absurd. In other communities feeling in favour of prohibition is so strong as to amount to a religious sentiment and to cause one who is not a prohibitionist or a total abstainer to be looked upon as a *rara avis*. So the question of public opinion, particularly in a law which has to be enforced largely through appeal to public opinion, assumes great prominence and great importance. In 1884, Parliament decided that prohibition was desirable, following up the resolution of Parliament in 1875, but declaring that it waited for further intimation as to the state of public opinion upon the subject. In other words, Parliament was ahead or feared that it was ahead of public opinion at that time. Matters went on year after year, and many hon. gentlemen who are now present heard the various discussions which followed in the following years. The results were, however, to confirm the desirability of prohibition. In 1889, Parliament again affirmed the desirability of prohibition, with the same saving clause that public sentiment should be ready for the reception and enforcement of the measure. In 1891, our esteemed friend Judge Jamieson, then a member of this House, proposed a resolution looking to the enactment of a prohibitory law by Parliament. The Government of the day moved an amendment that the whole question be referred to a Royal Commission for the purpose of making inquiries and reporting upon the whole bearings of the question. That commission sat for some time, travelled throughout the provinces of the Dominion and portions of the United States, took down an enormous mass of evidence and published its report. While I never joined in the denunciations of that commission which some good prohibitionists did, I believe the report has not that value which the expense and the pains taken might have led one to expect. Notwithstanding the fact that it contains very much valuable information, yet that information is not so arranged or systematized as to give any student a clear idea, without devoting to it more time than most students have to devote to the subjects of that kind, of the actual trend of expert opinion in the country. Still, the report is valuable to one who will give the necessary time to study it, and perhaps some student of social questions may take time to consider it and extract from it the most valuable of the store of valuable information which will throw light on this question. The result of the commission, however, was a majority report and a minority report. The majority report was against the bringing forward of a prohibitory liquor law for the whole Dominion. I have often wondered what position the Government of that day would have taken had the commissioners come to the conclusion that a prohibitory liquor law was workable. I have wondered whether the Government would have assumed the report

to be binding upon the Administration of the day to prepare and introduce a prohibitory liquor law. But they were not obliged to take up that question, because the report of the commission appointed by them was not favourable to it. Had it been otherwise, I think there would have been very strong pressure brought to bear upon the Government to adopt the recommendation of their own commissioners. These are the grounds on which the commission reported against a prohibitory liquor law. I only quote a short portion of the closing lines of their report :

They consider that the "aim" of any system of regulating or prohibiting the liquor traffic is to lessen or extinguish the evils which arise from intemperance or from the improper use of intoxicating beverages, and after the most careful and anxious consideration of the subject, they have come to the conclusion that this would not be accomplished by the enactment of a law prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors throughout the Dominion, and that if such a law were passed it could not be efficiently enforced. \* \* \* A prohibitory law partakes too much of the character of coercive legislation on a matter in regard to which a very large portion of the people consider they are qualified and entitled to judge for themselves, to be accepted as a measure they are called upon to unhesitatingly obey, and hence the impracticability of efficient enforcement with the powers possessed by the various provinces to legislate in respect to the traffic—the certainty that in some of the provinces prohibition would meet with determined opposition—with an open frontier, such as the Dominion possesses, largely bordering on states in which sale would be carried on, the undersigned consider :

That it is illusory to anticipate that a general prohibitory law could be enforced with any degree of efficiency.

I read this because it is only fair to those who take an interest in this question to know the most that could be said by able and cultivated men who gave many months to the consideration of this matter against national prohibition. And I take it that, considering the feeling of hostility which a certain class of the community would have to have interference with their private habits, the gist of the report is that public opinion in many portions of the country, combined with other disadvantages, would make a prohibitory law practically not enforceable. Upon these grounds rather than upon any ground of hostility to the progress of temperance or total abstinence, this majority report was made. But the minority report to the mind of one that has carefully studied this question contains matter of very great importance; and I think that the Rev. Dr. McLeod who made that report deserves thanks of Parliament and the country. He has presented in the pages leading up to his minority report, an amount of information and a wealth of close and logical argument which is practically unanswerable. The only possible answer is on those grounds I have referred to in the

majority report. But upon the evils of intemperance, the extent, nature and character of them, he has brought together the evidence with great force and power. Upon the advisability, from a moral and economical stand-point, of Parliament legislating to restrict those evils by means of prohibition to the utmost extent within its power, I think he has made an unanswerable argument. I will not enlarge upon the points which he has brought out in this report, because they are well known to all students of this question. This is the conclusion which the minority arrived at :

That the House was right in 1875 when it declared that the only effectual remedy for the evils of intemperance was prohibition.

That all the information that was given to this commission confirmed the opinion that the liquor traffic was bad in its influence upon all the proper industries and the best interests of the country ; that the various plebiscites showed a preponderating force of opinion in those provinces where plebiscites had been taken, in favour of a prohibitory liquor law, and that it would be wise at once to enact such a law.

The next movement after the report of this commission was adopted, or rather it was a movement which proceeded contemporaneously with the labours of this commission, was an exercise of pressure upon the Liberal party. It was hoped and expected that a political party, many of whose members were known to be advocates of prohibition, a party seeking popular support, would take up this question and make it a plank in their platform. I may say that I was one of those who hoped that the Liberal party would adopt prohibition as a plank in their platform. I was not at all sure that it would be to the immediate interest of the Liberal party to adopt such a plank as a political measure. I was not sure that it would contribute to their immediate triumph ; but I felt that if prohibition was made a plank by that party it would greatly aid the prohibition movement, and that, although the party might suffer immediately in some directions in consequence thereof, in the long run, and after the lapse of time, and perhaps after having suffered defeat, it would reap the advantage of the growth of prohibition sentiment in the community. In 1893, the Liberal convention met in this city, and when the proposition was brought forward the party declined to adopt it as a plank in its platform, the representatives of the party from the various provinces evidently being of the opinion that it was not desirable from a party stand-point, although they were doubtless animated by impulses as patriotic as we were ourselves in coming to that conclusion. The resolution which was adopted at that convention is familiar to all hon. gentlemen, it was decided that, should the party be entrusted with power, it would be their duty to take a vote of the

Mr. FLINT.

electors to ascertain their opinion upon the subject of prohibition, and that plebiscite was taken. The words in which the Liberal convention expressed their views upon the subject I will quote :

That whereas public attention is at present much directed to the consideration of the admittedly great evils of intemperance, it is desirable that the mind of the people should be clearly ascertained on the question of prohibition by means of a Dominion plebiscite.

There was present the well-known secretary of the Dominion Alliance, who was also present and assisted in arranging some of the terms of this resolution. He stated that it was the duty of Parliament to find out the state of public opinion, and then to enact such a law as the sentiment of the country demanded, which he believed was in favour of a total prohibition of the liquor traffic. Although the secretary of the Dominion Alliance, as well as the Alliance itself, did not believe that the taking of a vote was in itself a step towards prohibition, yet they looked upon it as the next best thing to having it taken up by a party and made a political question. Although they deemed the plebiscite a matter of vital importance, they accepted it only as a step along the pathway of the prohibition movement. During the discussion upon this question I would like to call attention to an observation made by Mr. McKeown, of St. John, N.B., a member of the legislature of that province. In supporting the resolution, Mr. McKeown said :

Some provinces might be overwhelmingly for prohibition, others might be the other way. Then, sir, I consider it would not be a problem impossible of solution or impossible to the statesmanship of this country to make such an amendment to the constitution as would enable us to have prohibition provinces in this Dominion, in the same way as they have prohibition states in the American Union.

Here we see sketched out in a rough way a possible means of solution of this question in case the result of the plebiscite in some of the provinces should be hostile to prohibition, and in other provinces favourable to it. The result of the vote showed that such was the case.

Now, to what extent the adoption of this resolution by the Liberal convention committed the Liberal party to the enactment of prohibition, has been very widely discussed. I do not think myself that it did commit the Liberal party to that extent ; I do not think it can be inferred from the terms of the resolution nor from the tone of the speeches in the convention that the Liberal party, should it obtain power, were bound, morally or logically, to introduce prohibitory legislation. I think that a candid consideration, both of the terms of the resolution and of the statements which were made subsequently in connection with it, would lead any one to conclude that the Liberal party were

not bound as a party to introduce a prohibitory liquor law, unless the result of the plebiscite showed such a preponderating prohibitory sentiment as to make it incumbent upon the Government to act in that direction. In other words, I think the Government of the day were left entirely free to act according to circumstances.

Mr. WILSON. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? I think the speech made by the Hon. Mr. Anglin clearly indicated the view he took in case it was carried; he said, no matter whether it was carried by a large or a small majority the Liberal party would be bound to introduce and carry through Parliament a prohibitory law. And I think that the speeches made by Mr. Fisher indicated that if his party was successful at the polls, and if the plebiscite was successful, they would introduce and carry through Parliament a prohibitory law.

Mr. FLINT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson), of course, at a later stage of the debate will be perfectly free to elaborate that point as fully as he desires.

Mr. WILSON. I ask your opinion as to it.

Mr. FLINT. I do not desire to enter into an elaborate analysis at this time of those speeches or statements.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Flint) state his view upon that very important point?

Mr. FLINT. I will state the views I hold upon the subject, and as to the extent to which the Government, or the party, were bound by these declarations. It was left open, as a matter of honour, and morals, and logic, to those who supported the view in favour of the plebiscite in that convention, and to all those who referred to the importance and relation of public opinion to this question, to weigh and measure such a public opinion as should be revealed by the result of the plebiscite. I could easily suppose many circumstances under which, while there might be a clear majority of votes for prohibition, it would still not be sufficient. Suppose the vote were exceedingly small, far smaller than it was, and suppose that of that small vote a very small majority was in favour of prohibition, I do not think that any hon. gentleman in this House would contend that the Government, or the party, would be bound to introduce a prohibitory liquor law. The whole area of the discussion was left an open subject; it was left open to weigh the vote and to consider the importance of the vote as a revelation of public opinion, to be weighed and considered after the vote was taken. It leaves room for wide differences of opinion amongst those who discuss the bearing of the vote after it is taken, and while one person may think that the vote was ample in numbers, and ample as regards the majority, to bind the

Government to bring in a prohibitory law, there are many throughout the country, as strong prohibitionists as any hon. gentleman present, who would take another view and hold that the vote was not sufficiently large, or sufficiently representative of public opinion, or that it represents a sufficient force of public opinion, to make a prohibitory law successful. My own opinion is largely represented by this resolution, that, had all the provinces given a vote as large in favour of prohibition, as some of the provinces gave, it would be an ample warrant for the Government of the day to take up this question and stand or fall by it. But I am not prepared to say that a vote, such as was given in some of the provinces, the province of Quebec particularly, does represent such a large majority of the whole electors of the country as would warrant a political party to bringing in a prohibitory law, although I am free to say that I would cheerfully support any Administration that, utterly irrespective of the vote upon this question, should bring in a prohibitory liquor law for the whole Dominion. I am of the opinion that when you make the vote of the country the basis or ground for introducing prohibitory liquor legislation, you distinctly weaken the case for prohibition; that the strength of the case for prohibition rests, not upon the plebiscite, as recorded in September, 1898, but it rests upon considerations which are entirely apart from that vote, and that, to the extent to which the vote was against prohibition, and to which the important province of Quebec pronounced against it, it distinctly weakened the argument for prohibition from the popular stand-point. I have always endeavoured during the time I have had the honour to be a member of this House, to avoid making this question one of a partisan character, knowing the enormous difficulties in the way of its accomplishment. I was in hopes, and have always been in hopes, that if prohibition was ever enacted, it would come as the result of the combination of both political parties, and as the result of an agreement. If any one is sufficiently interested to go over the arguments which have taken place on this question in Parliament, he will find that the weight and strength of public opinion have always been dwelt upon by every speaker who favoured prohibition, not public opinion as represented in one province, not public opinion as represented here or there, but, as regards national prohibition, public opinion as representing the whole country. It is true that, as a matter of mere technical correctness, there was a small majority for prohibition of 10,060 or 12,000.

Mr. WILSON. A good majority: over 14,000.

Mr. FLINT. At any rate, there was a small majority of the whole people of the

Dominion, but that is scarcely the correct way to consider it. Majorities must be considered as they actually occurred, large in some provinces, small in some provinces, hostile in another province. Upon this question of public opinion, and on the importance of it in the consideration of this question, I will quote some observations made by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) last year. The hon. gentleman discussed some of the difficulties and some of the advantages of prohibition. He said :

There is the difficulty of the enforcement of a prohibitory law which has to be looked at, and the Government and the Finance Minister have to face the question—on the one hand as to loss of revenue, and on the other hand an inefficient enforcement of prohibition in this country. \* \* \* My belief is that if the people of the country, by an overwhelming conviction, want prohibition enforced, they can have it enforced as well as other laws are enforced in this country—that if they do not honestly and earnestly, and by a very strong majority, want it, they cannot have it as well enforced as old settled laws are enforced.

We go back somewhat further, to twenty years ago, and see what was the opinion of some of the leading men of that day who were dealing with this question. It was discussed upon the Scott Act, an Act based entirely, in its being brought into force, upon public opinion in various localities in which it was sought to bring it into force. Mr. Mackenzie said :

In a measure of such vast importance, effecting as it did a sort of social revolution, it was essential that the voice of the people should be strongly and well pronounced in its favour.

Also :

He quite admitted that there was almost an absolute necessity that there should be a strong, if not almost universal, opinion in favour of the enactment of such a measure as this. \* \* \* And, for this reason, he would never favour the enactment of a prohibitory law which was not subjected to the test of the vote of the people, until he was satisfied that there was an overwhelming majority of the whole country in favour of the measure. On the other hand, he had no doubt whatever but that an entire prohibitory law might, could and should be passed when there was a perfectly overwhelming public opinion in its favour.

No man who ever held a prominent position in this House possessed more common sense in dealing with practical legislation than the late Hon. Alex. Mackenzie, and he was then advocating the Scott Act which at that time, in many portions of the country was considered a very great advance over any temperance legislation they had had previously. His opinion as here expressed coincides entirely with the opinion of the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster), who had given a great deal of attention to that subject and who had to a certain degree identified himself with it. In 1895 I had the honour to say in the House when discussing prohibition :

Mr. FLINT.

As to the feeling of the people of the province of Quebec, we, of course, are not fully informed ; but all the opportunities that I have had of looking into the state of public opinion in the province lead me to believe that there is a strong feeling there favourable to as complete a suppression of the liquor traffic as legislation can possibly effect. At any rate, some of the profoundest minds of the Church to which the majority of the people of Quebec belong have expressed themselves strongly in favour of the suppression of the liquor traffic by every moral and legal means within the power of the state to employ.

This was a personal opinion drawn from various sources previous to the taking of a plebiscite, and among the remarks which quite confirmed me in that opinion were some made by my esteemed friend Dr. Christie, a member of this House. He said in one of the debates :

I may be told that my own province (Quebec) has not yet spoken. That is true ; but I think I can fairly say a strong temperance sentiment prevails there, and I hope and trust that, although I do not venture to predict, that when the day of trial comes, the grand old province of Quebec will be found in line with the other provinces in favour of this great moral reform.

This shows that a representative from the province of Quebec, from his observations and study of the conditions in that province, had formed the same opinion as I had, namely, that it was highly probable that the province of Quebec was at any rate fairly in line with the temperance sentiment in the other provinces, as expressed by public opinion and by local plebiscites. The hon. gentleman from East Northumberland (Mr. Guillet), who was put forward by the Conservative Government to move that amendment, said :

I believe it would be wise, and in the interests of prohibition, for Parliament to confer upon the local legislatures the power to deal with the question ; or, if that is not possible, to obtain from the Imperial Parliament such an amendment to the British North America Act as should give Parliament that power. I think that would be a practical way of dealing with a question of this kind. Then, if the legislatures of those provinces, the people of which are prepared for the adoption of a prohibitory law, containing a majority of men who are in favour of prohibition, that same majority will see that the law is enforced. As soon as the state of public sentiment in any province demands a prohibitory law, the same public sentiment will demand its enforcement, and the question will be entirely in the hands of the people of such province when they have arrived at that conviction.

The general argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Guillet) was largely along the line of this resolution : that while he believed public sentiment was essential to the enforcement of a prohibitory law, he had his doubts as to the extension of that sentiment, and his mind grasped the idea that it might be possible to appeal to a strong public sentiment where it existed in the provinces, and to look towards a prohibitory liquor law

from that direction. The hon. gentleman from West Durham (Mr. Craig) said :

I claim that a prohibitory law must have a great majority behind it, not only of those who vote, but of all who have votes in this country. \* \* \* The law must have a great majority behind it to make it effective.

Again, he said :

Unless a majority of the people expressly declare they want prohibition, it is no use for any Government to pass a prohibitory measure, and if a majority of the people do not vote in favour of it when they have the opportunity to do so, then, I say, that is a proof they do not want it.

If time permitted I could quote from the speeches of various public men for the last 25 years to the same effect, but time will not allow of that. The present Prime Minister of Canada, replying to the leader of the Opposition in 1898 on this very question, said :

If the electors pronounce against it, the matter ends at once.

I may state that I am not quite in accord with my hon. leader on that point. I do not think that if the late plebiscite had gone against prohibition it would have ended the matter, because I have had sufficient acquaintance with the feelings and the sentiments and the motives which actuate prohibitionists to know that that would not have ended the agitation, but that they would have taken that as a new starting point and gone on still further agitating the question in the expectation that on some future occasion they would secure a large majority, and would make their feelings felt upon public opinion in various ways. However, that is a mere side issue and the Prime Minister possibly meant that it would end agitation for the present. He added :

But if there be a majority for prohibition, whether large or small, then it will be the duty of the Government to consider whether the time has arrived for the Dominion Parliament to place such an enactment upon the statute-book. I have only this to say to my hon. friend, that after the will of the people has been ascertained, if the Government does not then perform its duty, it will be open to my hon. friend to call the Government to a very severe account for failure to perform that duty.

There, the right hon. gentleman was in strict accordance with his great predecessor, the Hon. Alex. Mackenzie, and in strict accordance with all who have dealt with the value of public opinion in connection with the question of temperance reform. The whole question stands precisely there. It stands upon the argument based upon the results of the plebiscite, as to whether the plebiscite reveals that overwhelming and convincing public opinion throughout the whole country that would make it obligatory upon the Administration and upon Parliament to enact a prohibitory liquor law. The question still remains there and is susceptible of debate and difference of

opinion upon that point. Speaking on this question, I had occasion to say in 1898 :

The question is two-fold. In the first place, is the country ready and prepared in a proper way to support any Administration and any Parliament which would bring forward and pass a prohibitory law? The second question, and one of immense importance, is this: Is this Parliament ready to enact a prohibitory liquor law? \* \* \* We may have evidence to a greater or lesser extent as to public opinion throughout the various provinces upon prohibition in an abstract way, but that does not give us evidence as to the position which Parliament, as a Parliament, will take in connection with it.

The ground I have always assumed has been that the proper method by which prohibition should ultimately crystallize into the form of law would be by public education, by the manifestation of the public will at parliamentary elections, and that in each electoral district throughout the Dominion, from time to time, there should be such an overwhelming manifestation of public opinion in favour of prohibition that members of Parliament would be elected, pledged and determined to support and enact such a law.

In other words, in my own way of working out the question, the public opinion which I have always had in my mind as the public opinion which would carry through this Parliament a prohibitory liquor law was the public opinion manifested at the polls in the election of members to this House. From that stand-point I never had that faith in the plebiscite as a motive force for prohibition that some people appear to have had; because there always was this weakness, which was seen beforehand, and which is seen now more clearly, that while the plebiscite may possibly be largely a representation of the opinions of one set of men who took the trouble to vote on that occasion, yet the election of a member to this House is the public opinion of men who would be represented and who would enforce the enactment of the law. I do not go into statistics, because I have not made a study of the question from that stand-point. But there are, no doubt, members in this House today a majority of whose electors voted in the recent plebiscite in favour of prohibition, and yet who would not support a prohibitory liquor law: and they might go to their constituents and be elected in opposition to a prohibitory liquor law, although the academic abstract vote of the constituency on the day of the plebiscite may have been in favour of such a law; because the circumstances are different and the combination is different. And so I have always contended that the way in which this public sentiment, which I have always felt to exist, and which does exist in many portions of this country, was to make itself felt in Parliament, must be through the representatives who are responsible to the men who voted in favour of prohibition; and that the way of prohibition lies, not in plebiscites, which are only morally or logically binding, but in the ballot-box at the regular election of members to this House, which is strictly and

legally, as well as morally, blinding on the man who runs his election as a prohibition supporter.

I will not go over the figures of the plebiscite, because they are familiar to all. There were provincial plebiscites held in 1892, 1893, 1894, and so on, in some of the provinces, notably in Ontario, Manitoba, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. In these provinces the sentiment manifested in these local plebiscites was in favour of prohibition. In the same provinces, at the Dominion plebiscite, although the numbers were not as large as we thought they ought to have been, yet of those who did take the trouble to vote, the majority was a substantial and representative one in favour of prohibition. Therefore, making all due allowances for those who refrained from voting, for fear of other consequences, those who, though in favour of prohibition, did not take the trouble to vote, because they thought the vote would not result in anything, and those who, though in favour of prohibition, did not vote because they thought that if prohibition carried the question might embarrass their political party, at the same time, in addition to the representatives who come to this House from these various provinces whose sentiments individually are in favour of prohibition, we have every reason to believe that the public sentiment in the provinces of Manitoba, Ontario, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island is in favour of a prohibitory law on the strictest lines which were laid down by the hon. gentlemen whose speeches I have quoted. That is my own conclusion, and I think an investigation of the public press, and of the opinions of distinguished men in various walks of life—clergymen, moral reformers, and men of eminence, who are studying this question—will show that, making every allowance for those who are opposed to prohibition, and for those who think public sentiment is not strong enough to enforce it, there is, in these provinces, at any rate, conclusive evidence of a strong, nay, an overwhelming sentiment, in favour of prohibition.

But when we come to other provinces, I think the conclusion is equally irresistible that some of them can scarcely be said to be favourable to prohibition along the lines suggested by this inquiry as to the significance of public sentiment. I think that public sentiment in British Columbia in favour of a prohibitory liquor law is very weak, while that of the province of Quebec is decidedly hostile to such a law. Now, making allowance for the fact that in the province of Quebec, as it is alleged, the ballots were not altogether as fairly taken as they might have been, and making all due allowance for the fact that in some communities there was absolutely no friend of prohibition present, and that there were opportunities for wrong-doing if any one saw fit to take advantage of them, I think no one can fairly and honestly contend, in the face of the in-

Mr. FLINT.

formation which we have at the present time from the plebiscite, in which a majority of 94,000 was given against prohibition, and in the face of the opinions of the hon. members representing that province in this House, that the province of Quebec, in the matter of assisting to support and enforce a prohibitory liquor law, is in favour of prohibition. I think every one must admit—I know I do it with regret—that the province of Quebec is opposed to prohibition, will have none of it, and that in that field there is a large opening for missionary effort from the temperance stand-point, and opportunities for converting the people to a different view on this subject from that which they generally hold.

Now, considering the fact that the vote throughout the various provinces was not as large as many prohibitionists hoped and expected that it would be, considering the fact that nearly 50 per cent of the voters manifested no opinion one way or the other, but showed an utter indifference to the question, considering the fact that the great province of Quebec is, by an enormous and overwhelming majority, opposed to prohibition, the question arises whether, from a prohibition stand-point, it is advisable or wise or practicable for Parliament to enact a prohibitory liquor law extending over the whole Dominion. If such a measure or a resolution looking to it were introduced, I would personally vote for it, on the ground that prohibition does not depend primarily upon that point at all—that in my view each member of this House is bound to represent the sentiments of his constituents upon this question, and press forward to the best of his ability the views of his constituents on that question, utterly irrespective of the views of members representing other constituencies, who are opposed to it. Upon that ground I would support a general resolution looking to prohibition, partly for the educative purpose, partly for the purpose of representing the views and wishes, not only of myself personally, but of the constituency which I have the honour to represent, leaving out those who represent entirely different views to offset that vote by their votes on the subject. But if the argument is based solely and primarily upon public sentiment, and the wishes of the public, then this Parliament, as a whole, ought to hesitate before undertaking to establish prohibition for the whole Dominion, including a province which is manifestly hostile to it. The position which many hon. members hold upon this question is very well summed up by one of the religious journals which devotes itself largely to the advocacy of prohibition, the "Christian Guardian." Some time in last May, referring to the efforts made to bring about such a legislation as might possibly meet the wishes of Parliament and be a fair compromise between the two extremes, that paper said:

Shall we say: "Prohibition or nothing," and stay there? Shall we say: "This one thing we will stand by and do nothing else?" Or—shall we adopt a "do-everything" policy? Shall we support and strengthen everything that restricts or curtails or prohibits, in part or in localities, this baneful traffic?

This latter has been our policy for years, while prohibition is our goal.

If a more stringent license system is proposed, increasing prohibited hours, we have supported the proposal. If the age limit is raised, we have approved. If licenses can be reduced, we have helped. If better methods of education are available for public schools or Sunday schools, we have tried to adopt them and rejoice. If plebiscites are ordered by Government, then we are ready to call on our people to vote. We are in this attitude now. A committee of prohibitionists at Ottawa are now considering the best method of promoting temperance reform by Dominion action. We hope to find a path of progress in their conclusion, which will fairly and strongly unite our forces for a forward march.

That represents thoroughly the views of a large number of temperance people throughout the country. While favouring national prohibition as the goal, while being willing at all times to be counted as in favour of that desired end, yet they are not willing to reject any temporary measure which may lead towards it. And so when, at the early part of the session, men who had for years been identified with the temperance movement, men representing the Dominion Alliance, met in this building, they desired to bring something forward which would give a starting-point for discussion and action. And while not one of them, as far as I am aware, was in favour of taking a backward step with regard to national prohibition, yet the majority were willing to take a forward step and see if Parliament could not be induced to pass some legislation or take some action looking to the establishment of prohibition in those portions of the Dominion where public opinion was overwhelmingly in favour of it. After discussion, this resolution was sketched out, and I trust no one will treat it as if it were an attempt at a complete exposition of the case from that stand-point. It is simply a broad sketch, which leaves untouched a mass of details that would require to be worked out with care. But the main element of it is that each province should have the privilege and the opportunity of adopting within its own bounds as complete a prohibition of the liquor traffic as would be constitutionally found possible, adopting the principle of the Canada Temperance Act, which has been upheld as constitutional, and extending the scope of its operation to the whole province instead of to an electoral or other limited district. It is suggested by this resolution that this Parliament enact a general law providing for the prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors in every province and territory of Canada, and providing further:

2. That the Act prohibiting such sale should not come into force in any province or territory unless and until a majority of the qualified electors therein, voting at an election, shall have voted in favour of such Act.

If this is constitutionally possible, I ask hon. gentlemen if it is not a great advance over the present condition of things. I ask if it does not obviate one difficulty, and that is the overwhelming sentiment of one large province against national prohibition. If it is possible, it would not be unreasonable that Parliament should have its attention called to this possibility and be asked to take action. Of course, a constitutional suggestion against it will immediately arise. It will be said that we cannot constitutionally adopt any law of this kind on account of the provisions in the constitution which prevent our enacting a law that will interfere with the importation of articles of manufacture by one province to another. I do not desire to occupy the time of the House at any great length in elaborating an argument on this point. Section 121 of the British North America Act provides:

All articles of the growth, produce or manufacture of any one of the provinces shall, from and after the union, be admitted free into each of the other provinces.

It has been intimated that that forms a barrier against the enactment of a law based on this resolution. I do not think that this section, although prima facie it applies to this case, does so constitutionally. The general idea of this clause was to deal with the subject of taxation. It is under the heading of taxation. It is not under the head of parliamentary powers, and the primary object of passing this clause, which did not exist in the original draft Act at all, was that none of the provinces should levy any tariff of any kind upon the articles of manufacture of any other province. I presume, in the discussion of that Act, it was put in by way of caution and was not intended to limit the power of this Parliament to prohibit the introduction into any province of any articles which might be deemed to be injurious to its welfare and the good order of the country. There has been no litigation in connection with this clause, and consequently, we are free to consider it without reference to any reported decisions. While I cannot conceive it possible any province would be allowed to levy an import on the manufactures of any other province in order to raise a revenue, or for any other purpose, yet we must not take a view that will limit the power of Parliament to an extent I cannot conceive it possible was ever intended. It is explained that this section 121 deals with provincial rights. It is a restriction upon their power of indirect taxation, and has no reference to the power of the Dominion, in legislating for the order and good government of the country, to prohibit the

importation of an article into a province. That this is so is quite apparent from the tendency of legislation in another direction. A law is already enacted, prohibiting the importation of intoxicating liquors into any province for sale to Indians, and this clause has never been cited as applying to a case of that kind. It might be possible that, under some circumstances, this Parliament would think it essential and desirable for the order and good government of the country, to prohibit the importation into any province of an article which was regarded by the people of that province as noxious. In other words, if Parliament saw fit, for the order and good government of the Dominion of Canada, to provide that the sale of intoxicating liquor should be prohibited in any province of the Dominion, and under certain circumstances manifested its desire so to do, that would be constitutional. But even if this obstacle were found to be real, if the constitutional lawyers or the courts of the land should hold that it was beyond the power of Parliament to pass such a law, it would only compel Parliament to take one further step, if it adopted this line of reasoning and this resolution, and have the Act amended in such a way that the law would be made constitutional; in fact, it is a familiar idea to all that have been concerned in temperance discussion or temperance legislation, that, where the obstacles were so great in some provinces to the enactment of prohibition, it was not right that these obstacles should prevent the largest partial measure of prohibition being placed in force in other provinces; and many resolutions, passed by temperance bodies and church organizations, have intimated that they did not think it right that a hostile opinion in one province should prevent all progress and advance and all remedy against these evils in every other province. Acting upon that idea, the resolution has been brought forward.

But some people say: Will not the expense be very great, and will not the way be fraught with difficulties? There can be no doubt of that. Any step forward with a question like this is fraught with difficulty, and we find that those who are objecting to prohibition are not backward in pointing out those difficulties. There is, first, the great revenue difficulty, which everybody admits to be a very essential one. It is not wise under any circumstances to ignore it, to pooh-pooh it, or belittle it. It is a difficulty that has to be met. One of the most persistent arguments of those hostile to prohibition, or timid as to its effect, is, that if prohibition were in force in the whole Dominion, there would be a loss of a large amount of revenue which accrues to the country year after year, and which seems to be necessary to assist in meeting our annual charges. But if prohibition comes province by province, as public opinion comes up to the point, the difficulty will certainly be

minimized to a very great degree. Suppose that the province of Nova Scotia should accept this prohibition, and suppose that, after an enthusiastic campaign, the vote should result, as I presume it would result, in favour of the adoption of this measure in that fine province by the sea, the loss to the revenue would not be so alarming as if prohibition were adopted throughout the whole Dominion. Taking prohibition step by step in this way, meeting the views of the people province by province, as they declare themselves for it, the great financial difficulty that appears so frightful to so many well-meaning, but timid, persons, would disappear. The public revenue from the sale of intoxicating liquors in Nova Scotia, I suppose is not large—probably \$300,000 or \$400,000, an amount which would not be missed. If prohibition were granted province by province, as they were found willing to accept it, the treasury could easily make arrangements to meet any difficulties arising from loss of revenue. Another advantage which this method of proceeding would afford would be, that we should have a constant process of education in consequence of the agitation going on in the several provinces to carry the law into effect. If the law were carried into effect in one province for a few years before it was carried into effect in another, there would be opportunities of observing the workings of the law, and the difficulties of enforcement, and how they were overcome, and to observe in smaller area the benefits, as well as the disadvantages. If disadvantages accrued in one province, remedies could be applied in the law in order to make it more acceptable and more workable, not only in that province, but in other provinces that might adopt it.

I shall not read the whole resolution, because it has been a long time before hon. members, and it is not necessary to go into detail. If the principle of the resolution is accepted by Parliament, it will be the duty of those who have the time and the means at their disposal to work it out in the form of legislation, something along the lines of the Canada Temperance Act. The idea is not a new one. When the Canada Temperance Act was before Parliament, an amendment looking to provincial prohibition was moved, but was laid aside. In almost every province of the Dominion devoted temperance men, men whose sympathies with this movement could not be questioned, have suggested: Here is a way out of the difficulty. And I think, although I am in favour of the utmost measure of national prohibition, here is a way by which a large number of the difficulties can be removed. In this way those provinces where public sentiment is ripe for the measure, can have a prohibition law, and in those that are weak or hostile, time will be given those who favour prohibition, to work up public sentiment in favour of the reform.

Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I have spoken

Mr. FLINT.

too long on this subject, but I could not present my argument in any shorter space. With this statement I leave the subject in the hands of the House, feeling hopeful that it will be dealt with in a broad, sympathetic and patriotic spirit. I trust that in the discussion which may follow this resolution there may not be manifested that bitterness which is sometimes manifested in discussing this question, and which does a great deal of harm. I am willing to give credit for sincerity to gentlemen who oppose me politically and who oppose the views which I hold on this question. I am willing to give them credit for the same measure of public spirit, of patriotism and of an earnest desire to benefit the people that those with whom I labour possess. I trust that this great movement may be kept as far as possible free from party spirit, for nothing else can so tend to retard the progress of the prohibition movement as the introduction of the party spirit into discussions relating to it. I trust that every hon. gentleman will look solely to the promotion of such measures as will serve to diminish the evils of intemperance by restricting the traffic in intoxicating liquors, and if they cannot see their way to support national prohibition, that they will at any rate assist in working out what appears to me to be a practicable plan of allowing the separate provinces to adopt provincial prohibition where the people of those provinces desire it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). I have listened to the long and laboured effort of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Flint) who has taken his seat with a good deal of sympathy. He had a very difficult task to perform, and one which I think he has found rather beyond his powers. I could imagine, Sir, lawyer as he is, and special pleader as he is, the case he would have made out if he had been sitting on this side of the House, if he had not been restrained by the position in which he found himself, and in which the Government he supports has found themselves on this very important question. No person can overrate the evil of intemperance, no intelligent citizen can fail to recognize the absolute necessity of doing all that lies in his power to uproot, or at all events, to lessen, the terrible evil of intemperance. The effect of intemperance upon the state, upon the individual, upon every person who suffers from its baneful influence, is such that no person who desires to promote the public welfare can but feel that it is his duty to support every possible means of promoting temperance. An immense change has taken place in the civilized world on the question of temperance. The drinking habits of the people, within the short period of my own life, have undergone a radical change; habits that were formerly fashionable, habits that were looked upon with tolerance, have entirely

changed within the last 50 years, and those habits cannot now be indulged in with impunity without a complete loss of character and position. The great agency which has brought that about is two-fold, temperance organizations and the church. The enormous influence of the church, Catholic and Protestant of all denominations, throughout the world, has been most potent in this direction. If you take the position of the clergy of all denominations of the present day, and compare it with the position of the clergy 50, 60 or 70 years ago, you are struck with the overwhelming change that has taken place. It is now recognized as the duty of Christian people, by example and by precept, to do all that they possibly can to promote the cause of temperance, to dissuade men from intemperance, and to guard the community from its baneful effects.

But, Sir, I find my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) in his long speech here to-day, avoiding what is really the question that is agitating the minds of the people on this important subject, giving it the go-by, to indulge in a lot of platitudes with which we are all familiar, and which do not amount to much; we find that hon. gentleman, professing to be the leader in the temperance cause in this House and out of it, resuming his seat without making an apology to this House and to the temperance people of this country for the manner in which they have been grossly deceived and misled by himself and by members of this Government who took an important position in the great political conference which was held in this city in 1893, and who from that time to this have been deluding the people of this country to believe that all that was necessary was to bring the Liberal party into power and then this giant evil of intemperance would be struck down. The people were told that as soon as their wishes were ascertained by means of a plebiscite, the Liberal party would see that their wishes were carried out entirely, and this country would be relieved from the evils of intemperance. That is the doctrine the hon. gentleman has been preaching, that is the doctrine the Liberal party have permanently claimed they were going to carry out. We were told of the wonders they would accomplish provided the electorate of this country could be induced by a plebiscite to give their verdict in favour of a prohibitory law. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman has resumed his seat without attempting to apologize to this House for the declarations that have been made upon this question by the right hon. Premier, and made by the great apostle of temperance in the Government, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), that they would carry out the will of the people as a result of a plebiscite which cost this country nearly a quarter of a million dollars of the people's

money, at the same time that they had secretly agreed among themselves that no result should follow this vote unless an absolutely impossible contingency occurred, namely, that there must be a vote in favour of more than one-half of the entire electorate of this country.

I tell the hon. gentleman here to-day that he has lost his position as the great apostle of temperance. After wasting a couple of hours going around the subject, and venturing to give no apology to this House for the pledge he gave to the people, as a member of the convention, giving no apology for the pledge his party gave this country, a pledge that has been dishonoured, that has been forfeited and gone back upon by these hon. gentlemen, the temperance people will attach little importance to anything he proposes, and will have little faith in him, when he makes a proposition for the purpose of shielding and protecting the Government, and when he does so at the sacrifice of the principles of temperance which he has advocated in past years. That is the position which the hon. gentleman is brought face to face with, and which he has entirely failed to deal with to-day. He talks of the ideal condition of Parliament that Sir George Etienne Cartier predicted, when there would be nothing to do but Estimates to pass, and he was amused that that old, distinguished French Canadian statesman should have committed himself to such an absurdity. It is not so absurd, because the time has come when Sir George Cartier's prediction is fulfilled to the letter. What is the hon. gentleman here for? He knows that everything that can be done for the advancement of the prosperity and greatness of Canada had been done before this Government came into power.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hon. gentlemen opposite treat that statement with derision. Let me ask them to read the Governor General's Speech, delivered at the opening of this Parliament, in which they will find only a proposition to deform the Senate—reform, they call it—and a proposition to gerrymander the constituencies, for the purpose of enabling them to avoid facing the electorate of this country. Why did they require a gerrymander; what was the most important reason? They required it because they knew that, upon this great question of temperance, they had forfeited the respect and confidence of every man in this country who had any regard for temperance pledges and principles. What is this Parliament brought together for? The time has come that Sir George Etienne Cartier indicated: we have nothing but a gerrymander Bill and a proposal to destroy the usefulness of the Senate. We have nothing to do but vote \$53,000,000 of public money for these hon. gentlemen to enable them to strengthen

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

their hands in running elections. This is the position. The time has arrived that Sir George Cartier predicted, the ideal condition of things, when the only thing we have before us is to vote \$53,000,000 of public money to be used in such a manner as would do most good in helping hon. gentlemen to retain their positions in the House of Commons.

Now, I may say that the hon. gentleman has attached great weight to the fact that a prohibitory liquor law would involve a loss of revenue to the amount of \$8,000,000 to the country, and he seems to think that this is a frightful thing, and that it is a tremendous difficulty. I say that it is no difficulty at all. The man has no sound temperance principles in his heart and mind, who regards the paltry consideration of \$8,000,000 of revenue as a balance for a single hour against redeeming this country from the evils of intemperance, promoting its progress, promoting its industries, raising and elevating the country, and increasing its wealth and prosperity. The consumption of intoxicating liquors in this country, notwithstanding the improved condition of affairs that exists to-day, is the cause of so much pauperism as to render a loss of revenue of \$8,000,000 absolutely trivial. It can be met by the increased industry, the employment and ability that a sober and industrious man would have, and the ability he would have to discharge his duties to his wife, his family and his country. In my judgment, the loss of revenue is an utterly insignificant matter, and an amount that you could take out of these Estimates now before the House, without doing any harm to the country. The hon. gentleman could carry out the principles of temperance. I am not now expressing my opinion as to the duty of this Government upon the abstract question, but I say that no Government which ever existed in Canada, or in any other country, deserved the reprobation of every temperance man in the country to a greater extent than the Government which has deceived and misled the temperance public of Canada into believing that they were serious in their desire to promote the cause of temperance. Why is it that we could not wring out of the right hon. Prime Minister the declaration that he was bound to give to this House? Why is it that when they asked this Parliament to consent to spend \$250,000 of the public money in taking a plebiscite on the question of temperance, nobody in this House was able to wring out of the right hon. Prime Minister, or out of the Government, that dishonourable secret, that compact that they had entered into behind Parliament, behind the public, that there should be no result from this plebiscite, unless something that was absolutely impossible, occurred. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has admitted, on the floor of this House, that he was a party to that dis-

honourable transaction, that deception, practised, not only upon the temperance public, but practised upon the intelligent people of the Dominion. In my judgment, no man, no temperance man, supporting the Government, is in a position to look a temperance man in the face and ask his support for any man supporting the Government, or for a Government that, on such a great and important question, will go back upon everything like good faith. Every temperance man in this country was led, by the speech of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, the apostle of temperance in this Government, to believe that his declarations meant something, that his pledge to the people meant that if the temperance public would roll up a majority in favour of prohibition, they should have prohibition. That was his declaration. The right hon. leader of the Government was told across the floor of this House that it was his absolute duty to be frank and open with the country, and on the eve of that great struggle for temperance to let the public know where they stood. He was only asked to state: How large a majority will you require of the people; if you are not satisfied with an absolute majority, how large must it be in order to assure the people that they will have a prohibitory law? What was the language of the hon. gentleman? It was the language of an opportunist, and not of a statesman, the language of a man who is ready to adopt any policy or principle when it suits him, and to discard any policy or principle at a moment's notice when it is convenient to do so. The right hon. gentleman on that occasion displayed a want of policy and a want of principle, and he showed himself to be a mere opportunist. He said: I will give information as to what we will do, when we have the result before us. That is all that, on the floor of this House, the right hon. gentleman could be induced to say, although every temperance man in the country who was obliged to put his hand in his pocket and spend his time and his money in agitating the subject, in endeavouring to roll up a majority in favour of temperance, had an absolute right to know whether he was wasting his time and money in the advocacy of this cause or not.

Now, we are told by the right hon. the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) backs him up in his statement, that they had secretly an implied agreement that no legislation would follow unless there was an absolute majority of the entire electorate of Canada voting in favour of prohibition. Sir, if these hon. gentlemen had ventured to state that to this House, as they should have, this Parliament would never have consented to a quarter of a million of dollars of public money being wasted. Not a man on this side of the House would have voted, and I do not believe a single independent man on the other

side would have dared to vote a quarter of a million of public money to be absolutely wasted. I can tell the right hon. gentleman that he wants a Redistribution Bill very badly before he goes to the country, and one thing he should endeavour to place in that Bill is, that no temperance man should be allowed to vote. The prohibitionists and temperance people of this country will not support a Government who have deceived them, a Government which has led them into a great struggle when they were completely and utterly defeated on account of this concealed policy of the Government, before a single vote in favour of the plebiscite had been cast.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is what you always did; you lived by deceit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) has anything to say let him speak up so that we may hear him.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to say that you have lived politically by deceit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask you if it is in order for the hon. gentleman to interrupt me, and make that statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. In the first place the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) should have addressed the Chair, and in the second place it is absolutely out of order to impute any motive to anybody, or to say anything disrespectful or impolite.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Let me call to the attention of the leader of the Opposition that he charged upon the Government just exactly the same as has been charged upon him. I do not say that either is in order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You are out of order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) has not withdrawn his insulting language, and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if he will be obliged to do so?

Mr. McMULLEN. I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for not having addressed you directly, but I do not consider that what I charged is a violation of any rule of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Withdraw.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The language used by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) is not language that should be used in Parliament, and it is just as well that he should withdraw it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Under your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I consent to withdraw it, because it is a violation of the rules of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Now, Mr. Speaker, having disposed of this interruption, which I think may fairly be called an impertinent interruption.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Have I not a right to speak on the question of order? If the question is raised with respect to the word "impertinent," any dictionary will show hon. gentlemen opposite what they do not seem to know, that the word "impertinent" applied to debate means not pertinent.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In that sense there is no word in the English language that could more correctly describe the interruption of the hon. gentleman. It certainly was "impertinent" in the sense of not being pertinent.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the word "impertinent" was used as meaning not pertinent—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so, that is exactly how I used it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I find in Blackmore's decisions that the word "impertinent" has been ruled out of order on several occasions in the English Parliament.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In another sense.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. In the sense which I suppose the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) did not mean to use it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You are quite right, Mr. Speaker, in interpreting the term "impertinent" as meaning not pertinent to the debate, and when the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) made an interruption not pertinent to the debate he made an impertinent interruption.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am quite satisfied with the explanation which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has given, but while he is on his feet he should apologize for having imputed motives to the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have imputed no motives to the Government. What I have imputed was that the temperance people have been grossly deceived by the Government with regard to the plebiscite, and if my hon. friend wants evidence I will give him the highest authority. I have statements here; not of blatant temperance orators, who want to get seats in Parliament by riding the temperance horse.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Ha, ha, George E.

Mr. BERGERON. Oh, keep quiet.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not speak of such. I speak of that great power that above and beyond all has led to the temperance reformation that exists to-day; I speak of the church, which has advanced and promoted temperance views within the last fifty or sixty years. Any man whose eyes are opened knows that at this moment the church in Canada is emphatic in its declaration that they have been completely deceived and misled by the Government in regard to this question. My desire is but to occupy a very few moments of the attention of this House, for in the presence of my distinguished friend (Mr. Foster), who is the great representative of temperance on this side of the House I feel it would be improper for me to occupy the time discussing a question which he has made so thoroughly his own. I have referred to the church, and on a recent occasion the Methodist Conference of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, assembled at Mount Allison Theological Hall in the county of Westmoreland, adopted a resolution which I shall read. I will quote that resolution as an indication of what is thought by the church generally—the Church of England, the Presbyterian, the Baptist, the Methodist, the Roman Catholic—all over this country. This resolution will show that the temperance people of this country feel that they have been grossly deceived by this Government, which refused them information as to this implied agreement, information which they were entitled to receive before a quarter of a million of the public money was wasted. This is the resolution I refer to:

Resolved, That this conference views with profound regret and dissatisfaction the action of the Dominion Government in relation to the recent plebiscite on the subject of prohibition of the liquor traffic;

First, for the refusal to give definite information beforehand to the Houses of Parliament, though repeatedly asked for it, as to the intention of the Government on the supposition of a majority being found to favour such prohibition; and further, in refusing to indicate what majority would be requisite to warrant the introduction of a measure for prohibition;

Second, in determining that the negative vote in one province should count for more than the affirmative given in each of the others, and of the majority of the whole, in a matter of such importance to the well-being of the people, and introduced by the Government itself as a test of the wishes of the people;

Third, that the Premier himself has attempted to vindicate the inaction of the Government on the ground that it was always understood that such a majority as that given would not suffice for the introduction of such a measure, while he had steadily refused to give this intimation at the time when it was most eagerly sought, and would have been of the highest service.

This resolution was carried by a vote of 66 for to 9 against.

That resolution was passed at a convention of the Methodist Church of the whole pro-

vince of New Brunswick, and the whole province of Prince Edward Island, and was carried by a vote of 66 to 9. I give that to my hon. friends opposite to settle the question as to whether I am alone in the opinion I hold that this Parliament and the people of the country, especially the temperance people, were grossly deceived and misled in regard to this important measure.

Now, with all the efforts of the hon. gentleman to extenuate the action of the Government and to protect it in going back upon that which every temperance man in this country had a right to believe was the position they had taken, the hon. gentleman has declared that it would not be practicable to carry out a prohibitory liquor law in Canada, with a large majority of the great province of Quebec hostile to it. I understood the hon. gentleman frankly to admit that if the other provinces wished a prohibitory liquor law it would not be practicable to carry it out in the whole country in the face of a large province taking the position which the province of Quebec has taken. I am not going to discuss the question whether my hon. friend is right or wrong in that; but I say that exactly the same argument applies against the resolution which he has brought before this House—why? Because he says that this resolution provides that the various provinces, quite irrespective of the province of Quebec, may decide for itself what shall be done within the province. But, I ask him, has not a county in the province of Nova Scotia the same individual right that the province has? Suppose that when a vote is taken in the province in favour of a prohibitory law, one county gives a large majority against it. Are you going to allow the other counties in the province to coerce that county? If so, why not accept the verdict of the Dominion, taken as a whole, for a prohibitory liquor law? The hon. gentleman's resolution carries its own condemnation on its face. The resolution is, no doubt, brought forward by the hon. gentleman with the belief that it will promote the cause of temperance; but whether the hon. gentleman is aware of it or not, I believe it is inspired to protect the Government against the overwhelming sentiment of the temperance people of this country, as to the unfairness with which they have been treated by this Government in taking a plebiscite and then refusing to act on the voice of the majority—a majority larger than that by virtue of which they sit on these Treasury benches. Before this Government will recognize the vote that has been given, they require that the temperance people shall roll up a larger proportionate majority of the electorate than that which they obtained in the elections which placed them in power. Surely the decision of the electors that is sufficient to place these gentlemen on the Treasury benches and to maintain them there ought to be sufficient to justify them

in bringing in a prohibitory law. If it was not sufficient, they should have made that statement openly and frankly to the great temperance public of this country—ay, Sir, and to the Parliament of this country, who, I do not hesitate to re-affirm, could not have been induced to vote one dollar of public money, if they had known that it was to be thrown into the Ottawa and disappear without leaving a trace behind it. And after the struggle with which they convulsed this country in connection with this plebiscite, the temperance people are to be told, after they rolled up a majority of 14,000 in favour of a prohibitory liquor law, that it is not worth anything, that they are obliged to treat it with contempt, although it has a greater proportionate vote than that by virtue of which they sit in power—because there has not been polled an absolute majority of the entire electorate of Canada, a thing that never has been done, and probably never will be done. And yet, the hon. gentleman brings forward as a counterpoise, as an escape for this Government, an altogether futile proposition to allow the provinces to deal with this subject locally, without regard to whether all the counties in a province are in favour of it, or whether some counties are opposed to it—a consideration that is just as fatal to his proposal as the argument which he is using against the adoption of a prohibitory law for the Dominion. I do not intend to detain the House further than to say that in my judgment such a policy would be just as futile, and that if you are going to have local provincial option, it is far better to carry it a step further and allow that local option to be a local county option, by which every county in a province shall state what its views are on the subject of prohibitory legislation.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, as a temperance man I can join most heartily with my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in congratulations and felicitations in regard to the rapid growth of temperance sentiment in this country. I am happy to believe that temperance has made very rapid progress, more rapid progress, perhaps, than at any previous time during the last three or four years. I am happy to believe also that friends of progress in this direction are beginning to realize very thoroughly the great importance of reaching the individual—of convincing individuals and leading them to adopt temperance principles and conform to temperance action. I by no means underrate the importance of legislative restrictions and legislative enactments in connection with the promotion of the cause of temperance. But, Sir, I believe that legislative enactments may be adopted prematurely—may be adopted without that support of the public which is necessary to render them effective; and that it is possible that a legislative enactment with reference to temperance, in place of advancing temperance interests, may prove to be most de-

trimental to the cause, and a calamity to those interested in the reform of the people in this regard. The hon. gentleman, I am happy to say, expresses on this occasion sentiments with reference to temperance in the abstract that are of the most commendable character, and most fully meet with my approval. But the hon. gentleman, I think, does scant justice to my hon. friend who introduced the resolution to-day, when he tells him that he has failed in his duty because he has made no apology for himself or for the Government for his own failure and the failure of the Government on this question. He tells us that the Government has misled the people, that it has been false to its promises and its duty, that it has been guilty of deception and of fraud on this question. It will be my duty to examine briefly into these exceedingly serious charges against the Government of the day.

The hon. gentleman tells us that the pledge of the great Liberal convention held at Ottawa in 1893 was forfeited. Sir, the pledge of that convention was that this question should be referred to the people at the polls, that the people should be asked to decide this question at a plebiscite, disassociated from all other questions, and not at a general election where it would be mixed up with other issues. The pledge at that convention was carried into effect. The question was referred to the people in due time, and it will remain for me to examine a little later what the character of the verdict was upon this question. We are told by the hon. gentleman that the object of my hon. friend who has introduced the resolution and members on this side generally is to shield the Government. Sir, I would scorn to shield the Government if I thought it guilty of wrong, and I am happy to believe that the Government on this question requires no shield, and that its motives and its conduct, no matter how closely scrutinized, will emerge triumphantly from that ordeal.

The hon. gentleman tells us that we are swimming along on a wave of prosperity, but that it is all due to himself and party.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I did not make any allusion to myself.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will withdraw the statement, so far as it refers to the hon. gentleman, but he attributes all the blessings now being enjoyed to the action of the Conservative party in the past.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, I have a notion that God himself has something to do with it.

M. FOSTER. What will the German Emperor think of that?

Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. CHARLTON. It reminds me of the German Emperor who talks of "Me and Gott" when our friends over there talk of what they are doing. The hon. leader of the Opposition's speech presents considerable variety. He drops down upon the question of the gerrymander, and he tells us that the Government have sought to shield themselves from the wrath to come and to avert the fate that the aroused indignation of the temperance people of Canada will bring upon their heads, by an attempt at a gerrymander. Both the leader of the Opposition and myself have been members of this House a good many years. I have a very vivid recollection of the gerrymander of 1882. I have felt called upon on many occasions in this House to denounce that measure as one of the greatest political crimes, one of the most villainous pieces of political assassination ever perpetrated by a Government on this continent. I reiterate those sentiments to-day. I say that the Gerrymander Bill of 1882 was a gigantic political crime, and that by a fraudulent arrangement of the ridings of the province of Ontario, the Government of that day stole an advantage of over eighteen seats. Now, the Redistribution Bill introduced by this Government was simply a fulfilment of their pledge to the people that the wrongs and iniquities and outrages of the gerrymander of 1882 should be remedied at the earliest day. They had made in addition the promise that the iniquitous Franchise Act of 1885 would be repealed. They redeemed the latter promise, they did what they were able to do in redeeming the other. They passed a Redistribution Bill in this House that went back to the old principle of county boundaries, that was conceived solely and entirely with the motive of undoing the wrong that had been perpetrated, and that was faultless, or nearly so, in its character. It was conceived in a spirit of justice and calculated to secure justice to the electorate of the province. That Bill has been thrown out by another body. It is to the credit of the Government that it was introduced. The Government can point to its features, not only without shame, but as an evidence of their desire and intention to redeem their pledges and do justice. Then my hon. friend talks about the loss of revenue that would result from the passage of a prohibitory law, and he showed on this point a tone I was pleased to hear. He exclaimed: What does \$8,000,000 loss of revenue count, on the one hand, compared with the nameless horrors, suffering, degradation and woe that are the attendants of the liquor traffic on the other hand. That is good sentiment, and I am sorry that it had not more weight with the hon. gentleman, when he and his party were in power. Then was the time for them to have manifested their disregard of the paltry, mercenary loss of a few millions, when, on the

other hand, they could have conferred untold blessings on their country.

**Mr. WALLACE.** We had no instructions from the people then.

**Mr. CHARLTON.** I shall show very soon that no such instructions were ever given. Then the hon. gentleman tells us about a secret arrangement made in that dark star chamber conclave, the Privy Council of Canada, where the plan was concocted that the verdict of the people should be rendered nugatory and void upon the assumption that it required an absolute majority of the electorate of the country to demand prohibition before the Government would act upon their mandate. Well, the truth was that there was not an absolute majority of the electors voted at all. There was 6 per cent less than an absolute majority voted yea and nay, and there was less than one-quarter of the electorate for prohibition. So that whether there was a secret star chamber arrangement or not, it amounted to nothing, because an absolute majority never was even polled as a total vote.

Then the hon. gentleman tells us about the action of the churches, and I anticipated that he would have gone more fully into that question, but he read us the deliverance of one conference only. But he said that conferences of the Catholic Church, the ecclesiastical courts of the Baptist Church, the Presbyterian, the Congregational, have all upon this question condemned the Government. I would like to see him produce a deliverance of the Catholic Church, for instance, or the Presbyterian Church condemning the Government. There was a resolution passed by the Presbyterian General Assembly, which expressed the hope that, as the result of the reference of this question to the people, some legislation would be adopted that would be calculated to mitigate and lessen the evils of intemperance.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Is that the one you introduced?

**Mr. CHARLTON.** No, it was not; but the majority of those in that assembly who supported the resolution, distinctly disclaimed any intention to censure the Government for having failed to introduce a prohibitory law.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Will my hon. friend allow me to put him a question? Does he not know that from the day of Father Mathew, that great and distinguished Roman Catholic priest and apostle of temperance, down to the present hour, the Roman Catholic priests everywhere have been the great advocates of temperance, within the scope of their influence, wherever it was?

**Mr. CHARLTON.** Heaven forbid that I should ever accuse the Catholic priesthood

of being the friends of intemperance. I think nothing of the kind. I have the highest opinion of their conduct with regard to temperance. What I said was, show us a mandate or resolution from any ecclesiastical court of Rome condemning the Government of the day for not having introduced a prohibitory law on the heel of the plebiscite. With regard to these church courts, it is to be borne in mind that where resolutions were passed condemning the Government there was by no means unanimity with regard to the matter. And another point to be borne in mind is that the constituent members of these ecclesiastical courts can hardly be held to afford a good representation of the character and sentiment of the electorate. These two features of the case have something to do with the matter; and so far as the passage of resolutions by church courts is concerned, passed in the majority of cases by narrow majorities, with dissent on the part of a large portion of the people and that dissent more largely from the lay than from the clerical element, I attach not so great importance to that feature of the case as my hon. friend does.

Now, with regard to the case of the plebiscite, it is true it cost some money. But is the Government to be blamed for having incurred that cost when it was incurred in consequence of its pledge to give the people of Canada an opportunity to pronounce their decision upon this question—to refer this case to the high court of the people? Our hon. friends on the other side blame the Government for not having carried out what they allege to be the mandate of the people and in the next breath they criticise the Government because they referred the matter to the people to get their mandate upon it. We had an occasion some years ago in this House, when our friends on the opposite side were hard pressed by the temperance question. I have never known, within the twenty-seven or twenty-eight years that I have spent in Parliament, a session when, in my opinion, a prohibitory law would pass this House. But I have known but few sessions when some agitator did not press the question. My hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) used to figure in that category before he had the responsibilities of office resting upon him. I know, and every one knows, that the prohibition question was an awkward one for the Government; it could not control all its own followers, and the Opposition was ready to embarrass it in any way it could. So it caused the Government a good deal of trouble. At last, the time came when the temperance question reached the point where something had to be done. What did they do? They appointed a Royal commission to ascertain by careful and detailed investigation whether the drinking of whisky was an evil; and whether, if it was, it was an evil which was of sufficient magnitude to

call for legislative interposition ; and whether, if it was an evil of that magnitude, legislative interposition could be made effective in relation to the case. The commission went to work and continued its investigation just long enough to relieve our friends on the other side of the necessity of meeting that question during the life of the Parliament. And that investigation cost \$125,000, the object of that expenditure being, not to ascertain what the sentiments of the people were, not to ascertain what the majority of the people wanted of the Government, but, in common parlance, to get the Government out of a hole—to bridge over the difficulty until their term expired.

It is natural to contrast the action of the present Government with that of their predecessors. I desire to say a few words about the history of this question so far as it affects myself as a supporter of this Government, and so far as it affects the Government's action in this matter. We did have a Liberal convention in this city in 1893. It was a monster gathering. There were 2,500 delegates gathered from every section of the Dominion. It represented thoroughly Liberal principles and Liberal thought. That convention met and dealt with the leading issues of the day, and formulated its platform. Among other questions with which it dealt was the question of temperance. There was an element in the committee on resolutions, of which I was a member, that demanded that the Liberal party of Canada should place a prohibition plank in its platform. As a temperance man, I said: No, we do not know what the people of Canada desire ; we cannot place a prohibition plank in our platform, being in ignorance of whether the popular demand would sanction such an Act and it would be proper to ascertain, as a preliminary to action on that matter, what the desires of the people of Canada are. And it was decided that this question should be referred to the people at the polls ; and that decision was formulated in the plebiscite resolution that forms a part of the platform adopted by that convention. Now, in due time, the party then in Opposition came into power, and was called upon to face the pledge made by the great Liberal convention with reference to this question. How did they face it ? They waited until we had a voters' list that was fresh and new, so that the people could pronounce their verdict on this question without the use of a list three years old, as was the mode in vogue among our friends on the opposite side of the Chamber. The question was referred to the people. Now, I happen to know that the Government acted in this matter with the utmost good faith. It was suggested in caucus that the people ought to be made aware of the consequences of the adoption of the resolution, demanding of the Government the placing

of a prohibitory law upon the statute-books. My hon. friend has alluded to the loss of eight millions of revenue. It was claimed that this was a feature of the case that the people ought to understand, and that the reference ought to be made in language which would make the people aware that a vote for prohibition would incur the voluntary loss of eight millions of revenue, and the necessity of providing for that deficiency in some other way. It was rejected ; the Government refused it ; they refused to complicate the case or saddle the question with any such statement, but decided to refer the naked question as to prohibition, yea or nay, to the people.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) allow me to ask him a question ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is he not aware that during the struggle of the plebiscite, three members of this Government went out and publicly declared to the people that it was a question of direct taxation they were voting upon, as eight millions of revenue were at stake ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not know what that has to do with the statement I made, that the Government refused to place such a statement on the ballot paper. I suppose that the members of the Government had the right to vote yea or nay on this question as they pleased, that they had the right in common with other citizens to either uphold or oppose prohibition. In taking this course each side exercised the rights of free-born citizens in expressing their opinions upon a great public question, and exercised the same right when they voted upon that question. Well, Sir, the rider was rejected, and the naked question went to the people : Shall we have prohibition or shall we not have it ? Vote yes or vote no. And what was the character of the vote ?—and that is an important question to which I wish to call the attention of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. How large a proportion of the electorate responded to the invitation to express their opinion upon that momentous question ? Forty-four per cent, forty-four voters out of every hundred upon the list were sufficiently interested in this matter to come out to the polls and vote ; 22½ electors out of every hundred voted that we ought to have prohibition, and 21½ out of every hundred voted that we ought not to have prohibition. Twenty-seven out of every hundred voted for prohibition in the Dominion outside the province of Quebec. Now, what kind of a mandate is a mandate from 22½ per cent of the electorate ? What justification would exist for a Government of Canada to take the behest of 22½ men out of every hundred as the verdict of the hundred men ? Sir, it would have been an outrage upon the principles of popular government to have founded a law of any character, much less a law

of this important character, upon a request of 22½ electors out of every hundred upon the list.

My hon. friend asserted in the course of his speech that the verdict for prohibition was as pronounced as the verdict by which he and I and other members sit in this House. Such is not the case, Mr. Speaker. In 1891, on a list three years old, 66 per cent of the electors voted; in 1896, on a list three years old, 66 per cent of the electors voted; and in the election of 1887, on a list one year old, 70 per cent of the electors voted. The smallest percentage, then, in any of these elections that were held, held upon a list from which many voters had been removed, and many were dead, the smallest percentage we had was 66 out of 100, and voting upon questions at issue in the general elections. But here we have the precaution taken to have a new list, and as soon as that new list was ready the question was referred to the people, and the result of that reference was a response on the part of 44 out of 100, 22½ of whom voted yea and 21½ of whom voted nay. I have just to add that while the proportion was so exceedingly small, 22½ per cent, I know that a large percentage of that number consisted of Conservatives who voted for prohibition for the express purpose of putting the Government into a difficulty. I do not suppose there was actually 18 per cent, possibly not 15 per cent, of the voters voting for prohibition that voted for it out of conviction and from a desire to have the law; and a very large percentage, how large I cannot say, were using their franchise for the purpose of securing a result that would embarrass the Government and for no other reason.

I do not think it necessary to say upon this question any more than this, that as a temperance man I must repudiate the assertion made by the leader of the Opposition, that any stigma should attach to this Government, or any censure should be applied to this Government, because they failed to accept the voice of 22½ men as the voice of the 100. Sir, if the Government had passed a prohibitory law upon that narrow pedestal, that narrow percentage of the voters, it would have committed a breach of its trust, it would have been guilty of having placed upon the statute-book of this country an important enactment that must rest for its efficiency upon popular sentiment, and upon a great mass of voters in favour of the law to back it up. It would have made a mockery of prohibition by adopting such a law under those circumstances, it would have put back the clock of temperance for many years. So far from being worthy of condemnation, the Government, in my opinion, has acted with prudence, with discretion, and is deserving of the confidence and of the approval of the temperance men and of all citizens of this country.

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

## After Recess.

### YALE-KOOTENAY TELEGRAPH COMPANY (LIMITED).

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 7) to incorporate the Yale-Kootenay Telegraph Company (Limited)—(Mr. Bostock)—be read the second time.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I propose to move a slight amendment. I may explain to the House that when this Bill was under the consideration of the Railway Committee, the clauses here inserted by the Senate Committee, were left out in expectation that the proposed amendments to the Railway Act before the House would become law. There has been considerable delay, and as the amendments have not been passed, they have been inserted in the Bill by the Senate Committee. But I find that words which were recommended to be inserted by the Railway Committee of this House, in clause (f), have not been inserted. There is also a word inserted in subsection (k) which I propose to ask the House to strike out to bring these clauses in harmony with the amendments as proposed by the Railway Committee of this House. I beg to move:

That section (f) be amended by adding after the word "streets," the words "squares or other places," and that in subsection (k) the word "unnecessary" be struck out.

These two clauses have passed the Railway Committee in the form I have proposed, and if they pass the House they will be in accordance with the General Railway Act.

Amendments, as amended, agreed to.

### PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Mr. THOMAS CHRISTIE (Argenteuil). Mr. Speaker, in rising I may say that it is not my intention to occupy the time of the House at any length as I merely desire to express my hearty approval of the principle of the motion introduced by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), in favour of provincial prohibition. It is quite true that I would have preferred that we should have gone further. If this will not secure national prohibition it is a step in the right direction, and if it is carried out, will, I hope, tend to secure the entire prohibition of the liquor traffic at no very distant time. In view of the fact that a large majority of the electors recorded their votes in favour of prohibition, in all the provinces, with one single exception, the province of Quebec, I think it becomes imperative that some action should be taken. We should go just as far as we possibly can to meet the views

of the electors as expressed at the polls. It is true that the province of Quebec gave a large majority against prohibition, but surely that should not block the way of all the other provinces securing prohibition when they have voted for it and expect it. I am convinced that if the measure is made applicable to the provinces, and if ample provision is made for its enforcement, it will be a great success. If so we may expect that even the province of Quebec will soon fall into line and stand abreast of the other provinces on this question. I trust, therefore, that the Government and the House will give this measure a warm and hearty support and make it as perfect as possible. There can be no doubt that the country expects that something should be done to meet the wishes of the electors and see that they are carried out. There is no doubt that if no action is taken whatever, in view of the vote that has been taken, in view of all the promises that have been made, then the country will be moved to disappointment. I shall not further trespass on the time of the House. I trust to have the pleasure of recording my vote in favour of the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Flint).

Mr. A. H. MOORE (Stanstead). Mr. Speaker, representing, as I have the honour to do, one of the most important constituencies in the province of Quebec, and one which claims to be the banner county in the temperance reform movement, I would not be doing my duty as the representative of my constituents, I would not be meeting their expectations, were I to permit this discussion to close without first expressing my own and I believe their views upon this important question. There is one point in which I can entirely agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Flint) the mover of the resolution, and that is, that it is an important resolution and one of vital interest to the people of this country. This is a question which has agitated the minds of our people for a great many years past, and I venture to predict that it will agitate their minds in the future, and be a thorn in the side of every Canadian Government until it is finally settled. And, Sir, when it is settled, it will have to be settled in accordance with the highest moral and religious sentiments of this country. The ministers of the Gospel, the churches, the Women's Temperance Unions, the temperance organizations and associations throughout the length and breadth of the land have declared unrelenting warfare against this liquor evil, and they will not lay down their arms until it is destroyed. When this question is settled to their satisfaction, it will only be when the flag of prohibition waves in triumph over every hamlet, village, town and city throughout this broad Dominion. There is one feature in connection with this agitation which I regret. The prohibitionists and temperance reformers sometimes use very harsh terms towards their oppo-

Mr. CHRISTIE.

ents, stating that those engaged in the liquor traffic are rogues and unworthy the confidence of their fellow-men; while, on the other hand, those who engage in the traffic look upon temperance reformers and prohibitionists as fanatics and cranks. It has been my privilege to know a great many men who are engaged in the liquor business, and although I profess to be a temperance man, I have no hard words for them. It is not a fight against men, and as far as I am concerned, I think I can truly say that, compared with the population of this country those people, as a general rule, will not lose very much in the comparison. There are those, too, who curl the lip and point the finger of scorn at the prohibitionists, and say that they are undeserving of notice. But, Sir, this important question has not been beneath the notice and the consideration of the best men of the present age. The late Wm. E. Gladstone, one of the greatest statesmen of the century, after considering the matter, made up his mind, and made the statement, that drink was a greater evil than war, pestilence and famine. The late Duke of Albany, so nearly connected with our noble Queen, whom we all love and respect, after giving the matter consideration, came to the conclusion, that strong drink was the greatest enemy England had to face. I believe, Sir, I am voicing the sentiments of the hon. members of this House, when I say that we must come to the conclusion that strong drink is the greatest enemy that Canada has to face at the present time. And, Sir, the evils resulting from it are the reasons why such unrelenting warfare is declared against it by the best men and women of this country. It is the enemy of the home, of the church, and of the state, three of the most important institutions of the land; it is the enemy equally of the palace and of the humblest residence. The poet has given expression to these lines in regard to a humble home in the far-distant north:

Beneath this moss-grown roof, within this cell  
Truth, liberty, content and virtue dwell.  
Say ye, who dare this happy place disdain,  
What palace can display so fair a train?

Sir, the moment you place the intoxicating cup in the palace or in the humble home, truth, liberty, content and virtue take to their wings and fly away. Strong drink has crossed the pathway and injured the prospects of every man, woman and child in this country. It has crossed the threshold of the church, and degraded the most sacred and most important institution in this or any other land. We have been accused, that it has reared within our parliamentary halls, thus doing something towards sapping the very foundations of our state. It injures our people morally, spiritually, physically and financially. I need not, Mr. Speaker, go into details to convince the hon. members of this House that it is an injury, morally

and spiritually, and that where it is indulged in to excess, it degrades the spiritual and moral status of our people. I need not say to you hon. gentlemen that it is an injury physically. The testimony of physicians in every land is, that it is injurious to the physical system, and we know, from practical experience in this country, that sporting men will not risk their money in a contest where physical strength and endurance is concerned, unless the contestant has abstained for some time previously from indulgence in intoxicating liquors. It is also a financial injury; and, viewed in that aspect, there are a few figures which I shall have the honour to submit to this House.

It has been found by statisticians that the direct cost of intoxicating liquors to the consumers of this country amounts on the average to \$39,879,854, and the indirect cost amounts to \$103,242,862, making in the aggregate, \$143,122,716.

Something has been said by previous speakers in regard to the loss of revenue, amounting to \$8,455,022 per year. Take that out of the \$143,122,716, and the balance of the loss to this country would amount to \$134,667,694. I agree with previous speakers who have stated that in case prohibition should be adopted in this country, the revenue would take care of itself. I believe that with the railway subsidies which are promised to be granted this session, the expenditures of the present year will amount to between \$50,000,000 and \$60,000,000. It would not be a very hard matter to reduce those expenditures by that \$8,000,000; and even then the Government would be receiving from the people of this country a greater sum than any previous Administration had ever called upon the people to contribute. It was a matter of surprise to me to learn, and it may be a matter of surprise to other hon. members of this House when I tell them, that according to the record given by the statisticians, this whole business is carried on by 13,039 people, comprising all the brewers, maltsters, distillers, hotel-keepers, and bar-tenders. This great financial loss to the people of this country, to say nothing of the misery, woe, wretchedness and unhappiness of the people, is occasioned by 13,039 people, all against the 5,000,000 people, who might be happy, contented and prosperous were it not for this traffic. It would be in the interest of Canada were the Government to buy out the dealers and take the manufacturing and selling into their own hands.

I will give you a statement of the investments which are made in this country for the maintenance of the liquor traffic: The capital invested in distilleries, breweries and malt-houses, \$15,588,953; the value of real estate, estimated at \$38,000,000; fixtures, estimated by the owners at \$21,000,000, making a total of \$74,588,953. The total number of people engaged in the traffic in all its branches is 13,039. The direct cost to

the consumers, as stated before, is \$39,879,854. The capital invested in the distilleries in Nova Scotia is estimated at \$190,000; in Ontario, \$6,864,000; total, \$7,054,000. The capital invested in breweries is estimated as follows: British Columbia, \$236,380; Manitoba, \$277,300; New Brunswick, \$114,000; Nova Scotia, \$569,557; Ontario, \$5,305,805; Prince Edward Island, \$12,000; Quebec, \$1,796,411, making altogether \$8,311,423. The capital invested in malt houses is as follows: Ontario, \$220,000; Quebec, \$3,500. The total capital invested in distilleries is \$7,054,000; in breweries, \$8,311,453; and in malt-houses, \$223,500; making a total of \$15,588,953. The total number of gallons consumed by the people of Canada each year averages 21,676,749 gallons. The number of gallons consumed per head is four, or about twenty gallons to every family of five, and the wholesale price of the liquor consumed is placed at \$18,030,064. These are only some figures showing the magnitude of that system in the Dominion of Canada.

Now, the two great races who inhabit this country, and who pride themselves upon being the patrons and pioneers of civilization and enlightenment, appreciate educational and religious institutions. They believe that the prosperity of individuals, as well as of nations depends to a great extent upon these very important institutions. One of the old writers stated many years ago that men and women are what the institutions of their country make them. Therefore, it is a matter of the utmost importance to the people of Canada that we should patronize, encourage and support those institutions upon which the enlightened civilization and the prosperity of the inhabitants of this country depend. We have read in papers not long ago of some of those important institutions devoted to religious and educational purposes being in financial trouble; and the people are being called upon to contribute their mite towards the liquidation of debts that stand against them, in order that they can have a better prospect of success in this country. Let us inquire, then, for a few moments what the cost of the liquor traffic, per year of \$39,879,854, would do if devoted to educational and religious purposes. It would build a college worth \$30,000 for every constituency in Canada. It would pay ten teachers for each college \$800 each. It would build twenty-five elementary school-houses at a cost of \$1,000 each. It would pay twenty-five teachers \$300 each, which is a greater salary, I think, than the common school teachers of this country are getting. It would build one hospital worth \$30,000 in every constituency. It would pay two physicians for the same each \$2,000 salary per year. It would pay ten nurses \$500 a year each. It would build ten churches each costing \$4,500. It would pay ten ministers for those churches each \$1,000 annually. It would build one asylum in each constituency,

worth \$20,000. And when we add all that up, we find that it would amount to \$184,500 for each constituency. Taking the 213 constituencies in the Dominion of Canada, all these sums would amount to \$39,298,500, leaving \$581,354 to the good, to be used for incidental expenses. Is there any man within the hearing of my voice who will not admit that that money, if devoted to educational and to business purposes, would be a great boon to the people? And had the present Government carried out the expectation of the people and brought down a prohibitory law, this great boon would have been conferred upon our country. The people have not sat silently by while this strain upon their resources has been going on. Laws have been passed, regulating and restricting the traffic, but they have not proved satisfactory to the best class of people in this country. In 1864 the Duncan Act was passed. It was followed later in 1878 by the Canada Temperance Act. That Act seemed to meet with the greatest favour of any local prohibitory law that has found a place upon our statute-books. But it had great force lent to it from the fact that when it was passed the people were told that the Scott Act or the Canada Temperance Act of 1878 was given as a test of public sentiment, that wherever a county adopted this Act, it was evident that that county was prepared for prohibition, and when a sufficient number of counties had passed this Act to convince the Government that the country was ripe for prohibition, then prohibition would be given. The prohibitionists and temperance reformers in this country became therefore very much more active in inducing the several counties to adopt this Act in order to convince the Government that the country was ripe for prohibition. The time came when some 25 counties in Ontario, some counties in the province of Quebec, and many cities and counties in the provinces down by the sea, adopted the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, and the time came when the temperance people demanded of the Government the carrying out of its promise. They set forth that although not one-half of the counties had adopted the law, a sufficient number had adopted it to convince this Government that the country was prepared for prohibition. It had not run very long in some of the counties, in some of them the limit expired within which petitions for repeal could be filed, and in 1888 and 1889 petitions were filed against every county in Ontario, and in those two years every county in Ontario that had passed the law repealed it, and all but two in the province of Quebec, and some of the cities and counties in the provinces by the sea. Therefore, this took away the evidence that the people were prepared for prohibition.

Then the different temperance organizations and associations throughout the

Mr. MOORE.

country, the Dominion Alliance and the churches and temperance unions, all combined and adopted a policy of prohibition and no compromise—national prohibition, a total suppression of the liquor traffic in every county and every province throughout the broad Dominion, and the hon. Minister of Agriculture, in many places upon the temperance platform in the Eastern Townships, advised the people to strike out straight from the shoulder for prohibition and no compromise. That was the position after the Scott Act had been repealed, when so many of the counties had taken away the evidence that the people thought they had, that the country was prepared for a prohibitory law. What then was the attitude of the Liberal party? They professed that they were far more favourable to prohibition than the Conservative party. The people of this country were told upon the political platform and the temperance platform that if they wanted prohibition, the only way they could secure it was to turn the Tories out and put the Liberals in. To give strength to this sentiment, the Liberal party in 1893, in convention in this city, adopted on the 3rd June a prohibition plank in their platform. That was introduced by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, then simply the hon. member for the county of Brome (Mr. Fisher). He said, speaking of the Tory party:

They have put off the question; they have shunted it, and have not taken steps to find out the attitude of the country upon this question.

I am glad to be here to ask this Liberal convention to take a step which will bring about an opportunity for the people to express themselves upon this question. We know that in three of the provinces the Liberal Governments of those provinces have brought about local or provincial plebiscites, thus giving the temperance people the opportunity to show what they believe to be the truth, that the temperance sentiment of this country is strong enough to enforce a prohibition law if it is given us. I propose to read the resolution which will bring about this result, and which pledges the Liberal party, if returned to power, to give the people of Canada an opportunity to express their views upon this question, and the Government in power must necessarily carry out the expressed will of the people. There is no doubt that this is what the Liberal party would do, for we know their pledges can be trusted.

Subsequent events have shown how little trust is to be put in the promises and pledges of the Liberal party. There has been some play upon words with regard to the result of the plebiscite, and it will be well to inquire for a moment what is meant when we speak of the express will of the people. The will of the people is the desire, the decree, the choice, the determination of the people. The expressed will of the people is a declaration of sentiment, an utterance of the wishes of the people publicly made. The will of the people expressed at the polls is a declaration of the people who express their will by voting at the polls.

Therefore, the expressed will of the people, if we understand the English language at all, must be considered the will of the people as expressed at the polls, and the will of the people as expressed at the polls is the majority of those who have thus expressed their views. There can be no expressed will where there is no declaration, utterance or representation. The Government is bound by its promises and pledges to abide by the decision of the majority who went to the polls and voted on the 29th September last in favour of prohibition. The refusal to do this is to violate the well-understood and well-established methods and principles which govern all deliberative bodies in this and every other country governed by the people and is a flagrant violation of the most sacred pledges made by the Government on the most important question with which Canada has to deal. If it were otherwise, if it were claimed that on every question of public nature or otherwise the majority of the member's votes had to be polled in order to make a law, how many Bills have passed this House for which a majority of the members have voted? The statutes of Canada would be very small indeed if they contained only such Acts as were carried by the majority of the members of Parliament.

And we have a better claim to count those who staid away from the polls as being favourable to prohibition than they have to claim them as against it. If they remained away it was an indication that they were satisfied with what the majority of the people voted; they acquiesced in the decision, and we have the right to claim them as more favourable to prohibition than opposed to it. The hon. mover of the resolution made the statement that his party never had a prohibition plank in their platform. I was somewhat surprised at the statement he made, because I have always understood that the party introduced a prohibition plank in their platform in 1893. I have always heard it stated on the public platform when the temperance question was discussed, that the Liberal party were prohibitionists, because they had adopted a prohibition plank in their platform in 1893. The resolution relating to this subject adopted by the Liberal Convention in 1893 reads as follows:—

That whereas public attention is at present much directed to the consideration of the admittedly great evils of intemperance, it is desirable that the mind of the people should be clearly ascertained on the question of prohibition by means of a Dominion plebiscite.

And the promise went out to the people of this country that if the plebiscite carried, if there was a majority of the votes in favour of prohibition, then prohibition would be given. That was what the people of this country were made to believe—that if a majority voted for prohibition, this Government was bound by all that was fair and

reasonable and honourable and sacred, to come down with a prohibitory law. On September 6th, 1894, the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier is reported to have said to a deputation of Winnipeg prohibitionists—and this has never been contradicted:

He would pledge his honour as a man that as soon as the Liberals came to power at Ottawa, they would take a plebiscite all over the Dominion. By that declaration the party would stand, and the will of the people would be carried out, were it to cost power for ever to the Liberal party.

These were brave, bold and manly words. They went, as on the wings of the wind, throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion. Ministers in their pulpits rehearsed them, temperance organizations and unions throughout the country repeated them at their gatherings, and the man who uttered them was made in their estimation, a hero. He was placed side by side with those great patriots of old who made their names memorable on the pages of history, men who looked upon a stain upon their party or upon their country as an individual disgrace, men who would rather repose upon a death-bed of laurels than flourish in power and position, if power and position were to be attained by violating promises and breaking sacred pledges. It has been said that, in all emergencies amongst nations, man rises to the occasion, that men are provided to meet the exigencies of the time. The right hon. gentleman was looked upon as a second Moses that had come to conduct the temperance people, the people of this country, through the wilderness of intemperance to the promised land of prohibition. I think the right hon. gentleman stated that as soon as they came into power they would take means to bring the matter before the people. They came into power in 1896. The first session of Parliament they were not prepared to take a plebiscite on this question. The second session came and the second session passed, and yet the Government were not prepared to submit the question to the people. The third session came, and they felt that, perhaps, it was not policy to play with the people any longer, and finally the plebiscite was taken. The vote was taken on the 29th of last September. A few hours after the sun had set behind the western hills, it was flashed throughout this country, from east to west, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, that a great and glorious victory had crowned the efforts of the temperance people of this country. And, Sir, if the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues had had eyes that could see all over this country and note the devoted men and women on their knees thanking God for the great victory that had crowned their efforts, it strikes me it would have appealed strongly to their hearts. A month or more passed away and the temperance people became anxious to know what course the Government of this country was going

to take. They asked for an interview. It was granted. I do not think there has ever been seen within these walls so large a gathering of representative men and women from all parts of this Dominion as were there to present their claims before the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues. They presented their case, and we have the right hon. gentleman's reply. Perhaps it would be proper for me here to give the figures in regard to that plebiscite vote :

The official returns show the vote polled in the plebiscite on the question of prohibition to have been as follows :—

	Majorities		Majorities	
	For.	Against.	For.	Against.
Ontario .....	154,499	115,275	39,224	
Quebec .....	28,582	122,614		94,032
Nova Scotia ....	34,646	5,402	29,244	
New Brunswick..	26,911	9,576	17,335	
P. E. Island.....	9,461	1,146	8,315	
Manitoba .....	12,419	2,978	9,441	
B. Columbia .....	5,731	4,756	975	
N. W. Territories.	6,238	2,824	3,414	
Total.....	278,478	264,571	107,948	94,032

Let me say something in regard to the vote in the province of Quebec. I am not going to say that it was a fraudulent vote. This is not the time and this is not the place for an investigation of that matter. But there is something very peculiar in the circumstances with regard to that vote. There never has been a time in the history of this country since confederation when an election took place and the people within twelve hours did not know the practical result throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion, which party was triumphant and who were elected. We found out, in all the provinces save Quebec, how the matter stood the first night, and the official account does not change very materially the figures we got. The first report represented 33,000 of a majority in the province of Quebec against prohibition. For some cause or other the returns were not brought in, they were delayed from week to week and from month to month, and complete returns were not made in the province of Quebec until somewhere, I think, in the month of February, and those returns showed 94,000 of a majority in the province of Quebec against prohibition, whereas the first report showed only 33,000 of a majority. There are men in this country who sincerely and honestly believe that the difference between 33,000 and 94,000 was made up by fraudulently tampering in some way with the votes of that province.

It will be seen that after deducting the majority of negative answers given in the province of Quebec, the total majority of affirmative answers to the question in the whole Dominion was 13,916.

The total number of voters on the electoral lists as reported by the returning officers, was 1,233,849. The number of votes

Mr. MOORE.

polled in favour of prohibition was nearly 23 per cent of the names on the list.

An examination of the votes polled outside the province of Quebec gives the following striking results :—

Total names on voters' lists.....	898,992
Total number of votes polled .....	391,862
Votes polled for prohibition .....	249,905
Votes polled against prohibition .....	141,957
Majority for prohibition.....	107,948
Percentage polled of names on list.....	44
Percentage of list voting for prohibition.	28
Percentage of list voting against prohibition .....	16
Percentage for prohibition of votes polled .....	64
Percentage against prohibition of votes polled .....	36
Number of members of Parliament.....	148
Number whose constituencies voted for prohibition .....	120
Number whose constituencies voted against prohibition .....	28
Average majority for prohibition.....	1,042
Average majority against prohibition....	611
Majority of counties for prohibition.....	43

I have here the reply that was given by the Prime Minister to the delegation that waited upon him :

May I say to Major Bond that, as a prohibitionist, perhaps he is not altogether free from blame in this respect, because I believe the prohibitionists allowed the campaign to be all on one side. I am not aware that there has been any general agitation in Quebec for prohibition ; I am not aware that there has been a meeting held for the advocacy of prohibition outside of Montreal or St. Hyacinthe ; nor am I aware that there has been a newspaper outside of Montreal advocating the cause. There is only one way in which you can affect public opinion, and it is by the employment of the press, public meetings and such agencies, and if such agencies were neglected, certainly the result could only have been what it has been. Quebec, I claim, is perfectly temperate. The vote in Quebec must not stand alone, but it must be considered along with the vote of every other province.

Let me say here that this is not in accordance with the principles of the resolution which has been brought down by the member for Yarmouth. He proposes to consider the provinces separately and therefore contrary to the opinion of the Premier of this country. In regard to the Premier's statement that there were no meetings held in the province of Quebec, and no agitation for this question, allow me to read the number of meetings that were held in the various counties, and the amount of literature that was circulated, in order to work the people up to the point of voting for prohibition :

	Number of Meetings.	Literature—Leaflets.
Montreal .....	63	199,000
Compton .....	120	73,000
Megantic .....	33	14,000
Missisquoi .....	30	20,000
Wright .....	15	30,000
Argenteuil .....	34	55,000
Labelle .....	39	12,000

	Number of Meetings.	Literature— Leaflets.
Stanstead .....	80	.....
Quebec .....	9	10,000
Huntingdon .....	35	20,000
Richmond .....	41	21,000
Pontiac .....	100	.....
Brome .....	69	.....
Shefford .....	25	.....

You will observe that these meetings were held mostly in the eastern townships; and when I have shown you the amount of printed matter that was circulated and when I say that over \$5,000 was contributed for that purpose, you will see that the statement made by the right hon. Premier is not correct. No doubt, he made it unthinkingly. I do not accuse him of misrepresentation, but I presume he had not given his attention to the subject, and was saying what he honestly believed to be the fact. As a proof that the province of Quebec is temperate he gives the following figures:—

There are more than one-half of the rural municipalities which are under a local option law. Out of 933 rural municipalities the number of municipalities in which licenses were issued last year was 330, while the number in which no licenses were issued was 503. The people of Quebec are satisfied with their law, such as it is. We have had a local option law in Quebec since 1864.

It has always been enforced in more than half the province, and outside the towns and cities I think it is pretty well observed.

There is perhaps a suggestion of why so large a majority in a province, such a large portion of which is under prohibition, was polled against it. We have in that matter, a spectacle which stands, I think, without a parallel in the history of Imperial or any other Government under the British Crown. We have an important question, which the Government themselves submitted to this Parliament, and which was carried without a dissenting voice. It seems that an agitation was going on amongst the temperance people of this country, and the Government, becoming frightened that the plebiscite would carry, we had presented to us the strange spectacle of quite a proportion of the Cabinet themselves opposing the measure, going on the public platform, denouncing it and advising their constituents to vote against it. That may be one reason why the vote was so large against prohibition in the province of Quebec. The right hon. gentleman states also that the inhabitants of the province of Quebec are a law-abiding and loyal people. There is no hon. gentleman in this House, I think, who would deny the truthfulness of that statement. I do not think that there is a province in the Dominion of Canada more loyal or law-abiding than is the province of Quebec. History gives us instances where the French Canadian people were approached by foreign countries in the effort to induce them to give up their allegiance to the

British Crown and join their fortunes with those on the south side of 45. I think that we owe a debt of gratitude to the French Canadian race and a debt of gratitude to the Roman Catholic clergy, who, at that time, stepped into the gap, poured oil upon the troubled waters, and preserved Canada to the Crown of England. No man can say that the French Canadians are not loyal to British institutions and not loyal to our Queen. We have been told that two-thirds of the province of Quebec is already under prohibition, and that the people of that province will abide by any law that this Government may pass. These are the strongest reasons, in my opinion, why the Government should pass a law since Quebec was the only province that voted against the plebiscite. If they are loyal to the laws of this country and if two-thirds of the province is under prohibition, there is no reason why the province of Quebec should not be under a prohibitory law so as to be on equal footing with all the provinces of this Dominion. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Flint), who made the motion in this House stated that the vote was small; the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) stated that the vote, under the circumstances, was large. There is a disagreement between these two statements, but I am of the opinion that the good sense and judgment of the right hon. Prime Minister will be accepted on this point and that we will agree with him that, under the circumstances, the vote was a very large one. He said:

The plebiscite has resulted in a majority in favour of prohibition of the vote recorded. May I say that I agree with Mr. Spence when he says that the vote is, under the circumstances, a large one. While it does not involve a majority of the electorate, though a respectable proportion of it, the consideration for the Government is, what is to be done under the circumstances? I agree fully with the words spoken a moment ago by Dr. Hogg, when he stated that we are deeply concerned to know what is to be done under the circumstances. I understand that the ladies and gentlemen present are of the opinion that the vote which has been recorded is sufficient, in the words spoken by Mr. Spence, "to authorize the Government to enact prohibitory legislation," and that with the certainty that such law would be effective and loyally obeyed.

I think the prohibitionists and temperance reformers of this country will say that, with such an overwhelming majority of the people declaring in favour of the prohibitory law, the Government should carry out what they believe they promised them they would do. They believe that the Government should carry out the pledges given to the people of this country, and I believe, Sir, that the Government, if they would carry out their pledges, would stand stronger and more solidly in the affections of the people than they do now, or ever will do, unless they retrace their steps and give the people that for which they fought so valiantly and in which fight they believe they

won a great victory. I have a statement here made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), as reported in the Montreal "Witness." The hon. gentleman says:

That it would be a folly, and that it would be not consonant with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this Government owes to the people of Canada, if, on the vote as expressed in the plebiscite, this Government was to undertake to put in force a prohibitory law.

I have seen a great many temperance people since the plebiscite vote was taken. I have had correspondence with a great many others, and one remarkable fact was that immediately after the vote, there was a general consensus of opinion on the part of temperance men that on that vote no prohibitory law would be passed. That sentiment was almost universal over the length and breadth of the country.

The common sense of the people of Canada appreciated that the result of that vote was no cause of introducing a prohibitory law.

I have no doubt of the honesty of that hon. gentleman, but I must say that my experience is altogether different from what his has been. I have in my possession, piles of resolutions, passed by different organizations and churches throughout the Eastern Townships, condemning in the most emphatic manner the Government for not carrying out the promise which they made to the people of this country. Resolutions have been passed by the following named temperance organizations in my county:—

W.C.T.U.—Griffin, Cassville, Way's Mills, Stanstead Plain, Fitch Bay, Massawippi, Coaticook, North Hatley, the Stanstead County Union, Heathton.

I.O.G.T.—Cassville, R. Belle Bangs, secretary; Work Together Lodge, South Barnston.

Churches, County of Stanstead—Official Board of Methodist Church of Coaticook, P.Q., Rev. W. J. Hunter, chairman; G. L. Masters, secretary. Methodist Church, Smith's Mills and Apple Grove, represented by Rev. Mr. England, minister; Wm. Breevort, secretary. Presbyterian Church, Massawippi, Stanstead County, Rev. Mr. Pidgeon; Presbyterian Church, North Coaticook, Rev. Mr. Pidgeon; Congregational Church, Rock Island, Rev. E. Ellery Read; Methodist Church, Magog, P.Q., Rev. R. Corrigan; Methodist Church, Hatley, P.Q., Rev. Mr. Williams; Rev. Paul Pergan, for Methodist Church, Baldwin's Mills, Heathton, Corliss; three Methodist circuits of Beebe Plain, Rev. C. W. Finch; Baptist Church, Coaticook, P.Q., Rev. J. H. Hunter, pastor.

I have lists which would be very tiresome for me to read and for you to listen to, but they all of them express themselves in a similar manner to the following resolution, which was passed by the Stanstead County Women's Christian Temperance Union:—

Whereas the prohibition plebiscite held on September 29th, 1898, resulted in a substantial majority in favour of prohibition of all the votes cast throughout the Dominion, including an overwhelming majority of the votes polled in all the provinces, except the province of Quebec, and a very large proportion of all the possible votes cast in these provinces, and

Mr. MOORE.

Whereas the electors of Canada were led by the pledges of the Liberal party to believe that the Government and Parliament of Canada—which ordered the said plebiscite—intended to be governed in their legislative action by the will of the people as expressed at the polls;

Whereas, to a deputation of prohibitionists and in 1894, Sir Wilfrid Laurier made a statement as follows:—"He would pledge his honour that as soon as the Liberals came into power at Ottawa, they would take a plebiscite of the Dominion, by which the party would stand, and the will of the people will be carried out, even were it to cost power for ever to the Liberal party"; again, in 1898, he said to a deputation representing the Methodist General Conference, "that if the plebiscite meets with the support of a majority of the people, those who find themselves in the minority will have to concur in the verdict of the majority"; therefore

Resolved, that the Stanstead County Women's Christian Temperance Union deeply regret these broken pledges, and earnestly calls upon Parliament to accept the mandate of the electorate and carry it out according to promise, by enacting such legislation as will fairly embody the will of the people as expressed in the plebiscite, and thereby sustain the honour of the Government.

That resolution was passed by an organization consisting of 260 women. Now, I wish to speak for a few moments as to the honesty of the votes recorded in the province of Quebec. I have taken from the report on the plebiscite a copy of the result of fourteen polls, which show as follows:—

#### REPORT ON PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE.

L'Islet—Poll No. 21—	
Votes on list .....	82
Votes cast .....	77
Maisonneuve—Poll No. 35—	
Votes on list .....	141
Votes polled .....	139
Megantic—Poll No. 5 (Leeds)—	
Votes on list .....	97
Votes polled .....	97
St. James Ward, Montreal—	
Poll No. 16—	
Votes on list .....	92
Votes polled .....	88
Poll No. 56—	
Votes on list .....	101
Votes polled .....	98
Poll No. 62—	
Votes on list .....	151
Votes polled .....	148
Portneuf—Poll No. 30—	
Votes on list .....	83
Votes polled .....	80
Chicoutimi—Poll No. 28 (Bersimis)—	
Votes on list .....	11
Votes polled .....	10
Gaspé—Poll No. 6—	
Votes on list .....	40
Votes polled .....	37
Jacques Cartier—Poll No. 13 (Lachine town—	
Votes on list .....	111
Votes polled .....	110
Quebec West—Poll No. 2—	
Votes on list .....	114
Votes polled .....	112
Beauharnois—Poll No. 17—	
Votes on list .....	118
Votes polled .....	119
Quebec Centre—Poll No. 23—	
Votes on list .....	101
Votes polled .....	105

Quebec West—Poll No. 1—	
Votes on list .....	115
Votes polled .....	116
14 Polling sub-divisions—	
Total vote on rolls of.....	1,357
Total who voted.....	1,330
<hr/>	
All voted except.....	27

In these fourteen polling divisions the total names on the voters' lists were 1,357, and out of that number 1,330 are reported to have recorded their votes. I have had some experience in conducting elections in my part of Canada, and there are other hon. members in this House who may perhaps have had more experience than I, but I do not think that any honest members of this House will conscientiously say that in fourteen polling districts there could possibly have been such a large proportion of votes polled on lists which, be it remembered, were not new lists by any means. I cannot explain it to-day, but the time may come when this may be better explained than it can be at the present time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have called the attention of the House to the importance of this great question, and of the great evil that has been inflicted on the people of this country by 13,039 against the interests of five millions. I shall leave the resolution of the hon. member (Mr. Flint) to be criticised by some gentlemen better able than I, but at the same time I must state that an examination of its provisions does not recommend it very strongly to me. The preamble states :

That inasmuch as it is desirable that legislation be enacted having in view the further restriction of the liquor traffic in Canada, and that such legislation should be uniform in all the provinces and territories of the Dominion, it is expedient, in the opinion of this House, to enact—

An Act to "further restrict" the liquor traffic is what the temperance reformers and the Dominion Alliance, as well as all the churches and temperance organizations, do not want. Their object and their desire is for "the total prohibition of the traffic," and legislation to simply restrict it is contrary to the declarations and principles of the Dominion Alliance. It is laid down by Article 3 :

It is contrary to the declaration of principles of the Dominion Alliance. It is laid down by article III : "That the history and results of all past legislation in regard to the liquor traffic abundantly prove that it is impossible satisfactorily to limit or regulate a system so essentially mischievous in its tendencies."

Article 6 says :

Art. vi. That, rising above sectarian and party considerations, all citizens should combine to procure an enactment prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating beverages, as affording most efficient aid in removing the appalling evils of intemperance.

The constitution of the Council of the Dominion Alliance states in article 2 :

The object of the council of the Dominion Alliance shall be the immediate prohibition of the liquor traffic.

Therefore, the legislation which is proposed in this resolution is contrary in every respect to the principles of the Canadian Alliance and to the principles of all the important temperance organizations in this country. I challenge any hon. gentleman in this House to stand up and say that he has a mandate from the Dominion Alliance, or from any other authoritative source, to pull down the national prohibition flag and lift up in its place a local option flag, similar to the Scott Act, that has been discredited over more than three-fourths of this country. It is contrary to the constitution of all these organizations, and I have yet to learn of one man who has a mandate from those institutions to get up in this House and ask for resolutions to be passed that embody in them principles directly in opposition to those of the Dominion Alliance and the other temperance organizations of this country.

I have another great objection, which is, perhaps, stronger in my mind than it is in the minds of those who live in other provinces. From the great majority polled against prohibition in the provinces of Quebec, it would appear to be an absolute certainty, taking the province by itself, that prohibition is utterly beyond our reach, that the work of the devoted men and women throughout the province of Quebec is entirely futile, and that they can never expect to see the day rise when prohibition will crown their efforts. I have not that heart within my bosom to-night that would go back upon those devoted men and women who have been struggling for years, and who recently thought, from the promises made by this Government, that prohibition was in sight, when, instead of that, a mongrel substitute is submitted, which would relieve the Government from its responsibility and liability, pull down the prohibition flag and raise in its place a local option one, and deprive the people of my province of the hope of ever seeing the hoped for result of their labours. From the events which have taken place all over this Dominion, and recently in the county of Brome, we can come to the conclusion that the people of this country, the majority of them at least, want prohibition, but do not want the Scott Act. The repeal of the Scott Act was carried on the 21st day of last month in the county of Brome, which was under prohibition for over twenty years—the county which is so well and favourably represented by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, a strong and ardent prohibitionist. In that county, at the election, a majority of between 500 and 600 was cast in favour of prohibition, whereas on the 21st of last month a majority of 534 was cast against the Scott Act ; showing that the

people in the county of Brome are in favour of prohibition but opposed to the Scott Act. In the province of Ontario, 25 counties adopted the Scott Act; in 1888 and 1889, every one of those counties repealed the Scott Act; and at the provincial plebiscite, on September 29th, 1888, a very large majority of the people of Ontario voted for prohibition. Therefore, it is impossible to contradict the statement that a majority of the people of Canada are in favour of prohibition, but are opposed to a local option law such as is proposed by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint).

For these reasons, I am opposed to these resolutions. If I had not been speaking so long, and had not tired the House so much, I would try to say something about the grand effect that prohibition would have if adopted by the people of this country. I could tell you, what you all know yourselves, what you have learned by observation of the effect of the intemperate use of intoxicating drinks for beverage purposes. I cannot represent it, perhaps, more forcibly than to tell you of the transformation that is recorded in one of Homer's inimitable poems. Ulysses, one of his great heroes, after the siege of Troy, wandered about the country for years in search of his native shore. He was attended by the goddess Minerva, who protected him in many times of danger, and at last landed him on his native soil. The goddess touched him with her magic wand, and immediately his bright eyes became dim, his raven locks turned gray, his manly form became old and sbrunken, and he stood before his family and his friends to all appearance an old beggar clad in rags. That is the position to which individuals are brought by the use of strong drink, and that proportionately is the effect it has upon the people of this country. Give us prohibition, and, as the Hon. Mr. Foster said, in twenty years time the country would be so rich that it would not know itself. It could fairly be represented by the transformation which took place after the goddess Minerva had touched Ulysses a second time with her magic wand. His dim eyes regained their former brightness; his hair was restored to its natural colour; his form regained its manly proportions, and he stood before his faithful wife and his retainers clad in royal robes and in all the majesty of a king. That, Mr. Speaker, represents, in my opinion, the effect that prohibition in a quarter of a century would have upon the people of this country; and I, for one, after the promises that have been made by this Government, do not feel disposed to release them from their obligation, but to hold them to their promises. Let the prohibitionists and temperance reformers of this country stand solidly together, shoulder to shoulder, and this Government, or some other, will give the people prohibition, that will bring about this great transformation in the fortunes of our people.

Mr. MOORE.

I would like to see, Mr. Speaker, a platform something of this nature. It does not require the skill of a magician nor the subtle occult art of divination to picture what the effect would be upon our great Dominion were prohibition granted. Taking this in connection with the National Policy fully developed, protection to our native industries which will enable Canadian producers to control the Canadian markets; preferential trade with Great Britain and her cluster of colonies scattered all over the world; rapid and cheap communication and transportation, with cold storage facilities to enable us to compete successfully with our rivals in the English markets; immigration, to increase our population, of such desirable immigrants as will perform satisfactorily the rights and duties of citizenship; extension of the franchise to women, and in that way to bring about the purification of the ballot-box; and an honest, economical and efficient Government, of true and patriotic nation-builders, such as can be supplied by this side of the House, led by one of the ablest parliamentarians who has ever graced a seat in the House of Commons, our brave and able chieftain; will develop our varied and magnificent resources, and cause this country to become the most brilliant star in the firmament of nations. With such a policy and such a Government our great Dominion, extending from ocean to ocean, with all her wealth and resources, would experience a transformation as marked and pleasant as that experienced by the Prince Ulysses, when the goddess Minerva touched him the second time with her wand. Thanking you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. gentlemen for the patient hearing you have given me, I will conclude by quoting the lines:

Pull not the prohibition ensign down,  
To part with it we'd sigh;  
Let many an eye yet dance to see  
That emblem in the sky.

Mr. FIRMAN McCLURE (Colchester). Believing, as I do, that this question under discussion is one of the most important that could engage the attention of this Parliament and that it is one which will continue to engage the attention and tax to the very utmost the resources of our Canadian statesmen long after most of the questions that have been debated during this session have been forgotten, I have no apology to make for the few remarks I have to offer. At the very outset I wish to say that I regret exceedingly that I cannot support the resolution moved by my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). I regret this, because I feel that it is important, in any political movement, as this is, that those who are looking towards a common end should, so far as is consistent with a strict adherence to principle, pursue a common line of policy. I regret it all the more because I am well aware, notwithstanding the statements made

by the last speaker to the contrary, that this line of policy proposed by the hon. member for Yarmouth has had the endorsement of a very large and influential body of temperance workers in this Dominion, who see in it a way out of our present difficulty, and who think that it would be a step in advance. However, I am obliged in this case to act according to the light I have, and I cannot see in that resolution any merit which calls upon me to support it. I am not going to deny, and it is within the knowledge of more than one of the members of this House, that there was a time, even since the opening of this session when I was inclined to support some such policy as that proposed by the hon. member for Yarmouth, if proposed then, as now, as a compromise. When the present Government took the position they did in reference to the plebiscite vote, when they practically, if not in so many words, declared that that vote precluded and forbade the Government from passing a national prohibitory law, while I could not to the full agree with the position they took, I felt there was sufficient reason and sound argument in that position to justify the prohibitionists in saying to the Government: Granted, your position is sound, granted that that vote does not justify the enactment of a national prohibitory law, you are nevertheless not relieved from all responsibility in this matter. They might properly have said to the Government: the evils of intemperance in this country are so widespread and disastrous, the present manner of dealing with the liquor traffic is so illogical, unjust and inconsistent, and the right and the duty of Parliament to find a remedy for these evils has been so clearly and so often recognized, that we have the right to say to this Government: Granted that you will not give us a prohibitory law, what do you propose to give us? What remedy do you propose for these evils which you and everybody admit and for which everybody considers it is the duty of the legislature of this country to find a legislative remedy? And if the Government, in response to that appeal, had proposed this or any other reasonable proposition, I would have been inclined to give it my support. But the Government did nothing of the kind, and I am practically frank enough to say I believe we had the right to expect something of that kind from the Government. The Liberal party, years ago, when in power, recognized the duty and the responsibility resting upon the Government to deal with this question in a legislative fashion, when they passed the Scott Act. It is true that very shortly after they went out of power and had scant opportunity to do what was needed to make that legislation as effective as it should be. But even in Opposition the Liberal party was consistent in standing up and defending the policy which they had pursued when in power. I find that during

the campaign of 1881, the Hon. Edward Blake, speaking as the leader of the Liberal party, at Aylmer, in the province of Quebec, made this statement, and I refer to it only as showing the position which the Liberal party in Opposition held at that time with reference to the legislation which they themselves had placed upon the statute-book:

I am against the emasculation of the Temperance Act which I believe to be in contemplation at this hour. I am for the amendment of that Act in those details in which experience has shown defects preventing a fair test of its principles. I believe it to be the duty of the Government of the day, finding this law upon the statute-book, to determine whether it should be repealed or made effective. I believe that if they do not choose to repeal it they are bound to make it effective, and if they neglect dealing with the case they neglect their plain and obvious duty.

I am for a fair and full trial of the Act in the localities in which it is in force, with all the aid that executive action can properly afford. And here I may point out that the case which Mr. Mowat states with reference to the Dominion functions is much stronger than he put it, because, if I rightly understand it, the Temperance Act itself contains a clause providing that the collector of inland revenue, a Dominion officer, may bring prosecutions, and that it shall be the duty of the collector of inland revenue to act on informations and bring these prosecutions.

That is a clear statement on the part of the then leader of the Liberal party, that responsibility, rested upon the Government in reference to temperance legislation, apart altogether from the question as to whether they should deal with the broad question of prohibition or not. Therefore, I say that my dissatisfaction with the answer of the Government was not so much that they refused to give prohibition, as that they refused to do anything. They offered no compromise, and to-day we are in this position, that there is no ground for compromise between those who believe in the principle of prohibition and the present Government. We cannot agree upon a policy. The present Government admittedly is not a prohibition Government. There are prohibitionists in this country, and therefore upon that question the prohibitionists and this Government must separate? Now, what are you going to do?

If we are placed in that position, what are we to do? Are we to appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite? Shall we say to them: This Government has refused to give us what we think they should give us, and we appeal to you? I am willing to do so. But what answer do we get? What right have we to assume, from their present attitude, or from their record, that they will do anything more for us? The Scott Act was passed in 1878, and the Liberals went out of power shortly afterwards. The Conservatives came into power, and I charge upon hon. gentlemen opposite that during the years they were in power, the Scott Act remained a dead letter, because they refused

to take the steps which it was necessary they should take in order to make it effective. That is written indelibly in the history of this country, and they cannot, they dare not, deny it. They say that the Scott Act was repealed in many places because it was ineffective. I speak from practical experience, when I say it was ineffective because the late Government refused the plain duty that Hon. Mr. Blake pointed out, of making it effective. I am not exonerating the present Government; they have done the same thing. Both parties are on a level in this respect. I arrive, then, at this conclusion—the only conclusion at which a practical prohibitionist can arrive—that political parties, as organized in this country, are dead against prohibition; and I refuse any longer to allow any political party to appeal to me on the question of prohibition until that party declares its policy. My hon. friend from Yarmouth made his proposition; and what did the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) say? He abused the Government for the gerrymander; he abused the Government for breaking its promises; but I appeal to this House, did he hold out one promise, did he hold out the slightest expectation to the prohibitionists of this country that if he came into power, he would do anything for them? It is very well for him to tell about the enormous evils of intemperance, and how the country would be blessed, if they were abolished; but what would he do, or what would his party do, to do away with these evils or remove the difficulties in the way of prohibition? I want to take a straight course on this question, and I tell hon. gentlemen that on this question I am as much against the Government as they are; but I am not necessarily with them because I am against the Government, for they also are against the cause which I am advocating.

What are my objections to the proposals made by my hon. friend from Yarmouth? I hold that Canada—and in this respect I am obliged to differ from many who hold strong views on this question—Canada is in a peculiarly favourable position to give a trial to the enactment and enforcement of a national prohibitory liquor law. We have a people who are peculiarly law-abiding, intelligent and temperate. It is true, that many people of this country are not prepared as yet to accept the doctrine of prohibition, which, to my mind, implies the doctrine that goes down into the personal life of every man, that total abstinence to-day has become the duty of every good citizen. In that I differ from many of my fellow-citizens; but it must be held by any man who is prepared to go the length of national prohibition. Unless you hold that an individual is bound, not because of any abstract principle of right or wrong, but because of the peculiar social conditions that surround us, to say: Though it may be harmless to me, yet, for the sake of my fellow-man, total

Mr. McCLURE.

abstinence becomes a duty. If you are not prepared to go that far, what right have you to place on the statute-books a law which will make any other course on the part of others wrong and unlawful? To be prohibitionists, we must advocate the prime doctrine of total abstinence as a duty resting upon every man who wishes to live up to the full measure of the best citizenship of this country. Canada is in a peculiarly advantageous position to adopt that law and give it effective working. It is true, we have a large extent of sea-coast and a long border upon another country. We stand with our back to the North Pole and our face to the world, prepared to give this a fair trial; for I believe the people are prepared to make sacrifices of their personal desires, and appetites, and even their personal prejudices, in order that the welfare of all may be promoted. I do not expect, and I do not think that any rational prohibitionist would expect, that the enactment of a prohibitory law will immediately abolish the evils of intemperance, but I do believe, as the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) eloquently said on one occasion, that there is nothing you could do better to educate the youth to the conviction that prohibition is right, than to place it upon the statute-book and give it the endorsement of the people; that no higher course of education could be found than to make the laws of the country consistent with the best sentiment and highest convictions of the people. Whether I am in the minority or not, I am still in favour of the principle of national prohibition. But I am not in favour of prohibition by provinces, because, while we are peculiarly situated to give national prohibition a fair trial, provincial prohibition cannot get a fair trial. It is, to my mind, hopeless to expect, with the constitutional difficulties we should have to contend with, with the trade difficulties we should have to contend with, with the commercial reasons that present themselves to the country—it is impossible to dream of enforcing prohibition in Nova Scotia, with a license law at the same time in New Brunswick, or to enforce prohibition in Ontario, with a license system in Quebec alongside of it. I wish to look at this from the stand-point of my own province, and from that stand-point also I am opposed to this resolution. I tell my hon. friend from Yarmouth that if you get this Bill passed in this Parliament, and put it in force in Nova Scotia, we should not have equal restrictions upon the liquor traffic with those we have now—we should be taking a retrograde step, so far as Nova Scotia is concerned. What is the position? There is not to-night one drop of liquor sold in the province of Nova Scotia, outside the county of Halifax, but is sold in violation of the law. We have all the prohibition we can get. My hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) laughs.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is sold, just the same.

Mr. McCLURE. I did not say it was not sold. Unfortunately, it is. But, outside of Halifax County, there is not a place where it is sold but in violation of the plainest letter of the law of that province. Therefore, the prohibition which we would get under this proposal is not in advance upon what we have now. I cannot support the proposal for that reason. What then? As I said before, I see no remedy except the remedy which has been endorsed by this Parliament, of a national prohibitory law. And let it come soon, or let it come late, that is a principle which must some day be decided in this country; and it will only practically be decided by putting it in force. There is, up to this time, no nation occupying the position of Canada, having the same extent of territory, and the same population, and the same powers of self-government that Canada has, that has ever attempted to put a prohibitory law in force. It is unfair to compare the various states of the Union to the south of us that have adopted prohibitory laws, and to say that it has been a failure there, and that, therefore, it would be a failure in Canada. The circumstances are entirely different. The prohibition they have in the various states of the Union is the prohibition we should have under the resolution proposed by my hon. friend from Yarmouth—it is only partial prohibition. The national government has not prohibited the traffic. The inter-state trade goes on, and the wholesale trade is unrestricted. Therein lies the difficulty.

Then what are we to do? I say in the first place that there is no man in this Parliament or out of it who can undertake to defend our present system of dealing with the liquor traffic upon any rational grounds. What do we have? We have here at Ottawa a Government which collects an enormous revenue from liquor imported and from liquor manufactured in this country. They authorize the sale, they erect bonded warehouses in which men legally store the liquors, they take a revenue from it, they permit it, they authorize it, they sanction it, they encourage the traffic in it. Yet when we go down into the various provinces we find the provincial legislatures taking the traffic by the throat, declaring it to be an unholy thing, and destroying it by the force of the power they have under the constitution. Is it rational, is it consistent, is it a proper way to deal with any business? Either this business is a good one and should be protected, or it is a bad one and should be abolished; or it is neither one nor the other, and should be regulated. But we do neither. At one end we permit it, we encourage it, we take a revenue from it; and at the other end we throttle it, destroy it, say it is an unholy thing. I say the present system cannot be defended upon sound principle, and I am prepared—and in this I am much more radical even than my hon. friend who preceded me—I am prepared to

go the length of the late Henry George and say that there are but two ways of dealing with the liquor traffic problem, either make it absolutely free or destroy it altogether.

But I am told that the plebiscite vote is a complete and effective answer to our demand for prohibition. I do not agree with that. But I am going to say this much, and here I am bound to differ with some of the hon. gentlemen opposite and to differ with some hon. gentlemen on this side, when I say that while the plebiscite does not absolutely condemn prohibition, I am bound to say that if there is no justification to be found for the enactment of a prohibitory law except what has been found in the plebiscite vote, then the prohibitionists are out of court, they have absolutely no case. Now, we hear a number of gentlemen talking here as if it was an admitted principle that because a majority voted in favour of prohibition, therefore, you must get the law. Now, I know something about the campaign that was conducted under that plebiscite. I attended meetings in a great many counties of my own province, and took an active part in that campaign. I have read most of the literature upon the question, and until the day that the answer of the Government was declared, I never heard a prominent prohibitionist make the claim that a mere majority was sufficient to make it a duty upon the Government to pass a law. It never was claimed in this House, it never was claimed outside this House, and when hon. gentlemen undertake to-day to say that the Government has necessarily violated its pledge, or violated its promise, or done anything wrong because they do not pass a Bill in obedience to a mere majority, they state something that has occurred to their minds after the vote was taken, and which never occurred before. I am confident that my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster), who has been a student of this question for many years, will not agree with that position. He has placed himself upon record very clearly as to what kind of a majority should back up a law of this kind. Speaking in this House in 1891, he said:

That man is no true friend of the temperance cause, or of the prohibition movement, who will enact a law to-day, if he does not firmly believe in his heart that that law finds its reflex in the overpowering conviction of a preponderating and active majority in the country in favour, not only of its enactment, but of its maintenance as well.

“A preponderating and an active majority.” An active majority is not a majority that stays at home and takes no interest in the question. Therefore, hon. gentlemen are precluded from counting those who stay at home. So I do not at all agree with the position that any duty rests upon this Government to pass a prohibitory liquor law in consequence of that vote, because in the words of the hon. gentleman, there was not

revealed a preponderating and an active majority in favour of it. But I am bound to say this also, while I make that admission, that that vote taken under the plebiscite was not a full and fair test of the prohibition sentiment of this country. In the first place, as I had occasion to say once before, this matter of taking the plebiscite was something absolutely new to the people of Canada, and it was only with the greatest difficulty that they were brought to understand the necessity and the importance of recording their vote upon this question. When there were no outside influences to bring them to the polls they remained at home.

Then I have no doubt that political influences also entered into this contest. We heard a great deal after the election about frauds with reference to the vote in the province of Quebec. I believe the matter was very much exaggerated, but I am bound to admit from an examination of the returns and from the figures given by the last speaker (Mr. Moore), that in reference to that vote there were some very suspicious circumstances. When I find that in the entire province there was only a small vote on the whole, and yet in some 21 districts nearly every vote was polled, and in some cases actually more polled than were on the list, I do not say it proves anything, but I say it looks mighty suspicious to me at least. On the other hand, let me say that I do not look at the vote polled against prohibition as being of so much importance as the vote that was polled in favour of it, and when those hon. gentlemen talk about enormous frauds and stuffing of votes, let them be honest enough to answer this question. How do you explain it? If you say, as some do, that the province of Quebec is in favour of prohibition, why was it that so few came out and voted, Yes? Leave the "no" vote out altogether, and does the "yea" vote justify the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law? They were honest, they went to the polls, but I say that was not a complete test of the strength of the plebiscite vote. My own idea is that the correct way to have taken that vote was not to have called upon those who wished to vote "nay" to come out at all, but simply to call upon those who were in favour of the principle of prohibition to come out and vote, then we would have found the full strength without having to consider the antagonistic forces.

So for these reasons, and for others, I cannot accept the plebiscite as a final decision against prohibition. I admit frankly that it is not a justification for the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law, it does not afford sufficient grounds in itself to justify any Government in passing a prohibitory liquor law. But it is not such a test of public opinion as relieves the Government from the duty of dealing with this question in a legislative fashion. Since

they have refused to deal with it in any way, since they have said: Not only will we not give you prohibition, but we will do absolutely nothing, I am driven back to the position that, believing in prohibition, I have nothing to do but to defend the principle and to go to the country and educate the people up to a belief in the principle of prohibition. But that is not all; it is necessary that we should commence a campaign in this country, not only to educate the people in regard to the evils of intemperance and the merits of prohibition, but something more. What the people of this country need to learn more than that is the duty of recording their votes in accordance with their convictions upon this question. That is something they especially need to learn at this time. Now, that we have had the plebiscite and know where we stand, to a certain extent, our duty as prohibitionists is to go into every election campaign and make our influence felt there. It is not by supporting this Government, not by supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, that we will succeed, but by showing to-day that we have got the sentiment of the community educated to the point of believing in the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law, and by sending a representative from every county who will be prepared, in this House, to vote the convictions and the sentiment of the constituency which he represents. That we have not had up to this time. We have frequently been told that there are no evils in this country to be compared with the evils of intemperance. In a partial sense that may be true, but, I say, that in Canada to-day, although, perhaps, not to the same extent as in some other countries, there is another evil which is as dangerous to the national life of this country as the liquor traffic is, and that is the evil which arises from extreme partisanship, as exemplified by the party organizations of this country, which are represented on both sides of this House. To-day, confronted with this question, which touches more intimately the social, domestic and commercial life of this country than any other question that can be discussed in this Parliament, why is it, that no matter what party is in power, the prohibition question cannot get a fair hearing before Parliament? It is a fact which cannot be denied, that ever since confederation, no matter what political party was in power, this prohibition question has been played with as something that was to be got out of the way and not to be dealt with in a serious and practical manner. It is not because there is not a sentiment in favour of prohibition, but because while the people have been educated to believe in prohibition, they have not been educated up to the point of recognizing that a man, when he belongs to a political party, does not cease to have individual responsibilities, and does not deliver himself body and soul to his party. It is easy to talk these general principles and to

utter sentiments of this kind, but I admit it is not so easy to practice them. I have been a party man all my life; I was supporting the Liberal party before I was old enough to know its name and since, and it is not an easy thing for a man to break his party ties, but I have no hesitation in saying what I have said on every platform in my county and what I said I would stand by when I came to Parliament, that, on this question, both political parties were absolutely wrong, and that I would support neither. Upon this question I propose to take an independent stand, and I am not breaking with my party on general politics or denouncing their general policy, but, I say, that their course on the prohibition question has been as unsatisfactory to me as the course of hon. gentlemen opposite on this question has been unsatisfactory to me. The only course left to us is to so educate the people that the time will come when they will make their influence felt upon the political parties in such a way as to compel them to deal honestly with this moral question, as they do deal honestly with other questions. I was struck some time ago by reading an interview with a practical politician in the United States, Mr. Croker, well known as the "boss" of Tammany Hall, in which he gave utterance to some very sound political philosophy, which has made a deep impression upon me, although not believing in his methods. It is a revelation to me as to the methods by which party organizations in the United States, and to some extent in this country, are controlled. He made a statement, which, I believe, well illustrates, to some extent, the state of things in Canada:

The minority of cultured leisured citizens will not touch political work, no not with their little finger. All your high principles will not induce a mugwump to take more than a fitful interest in an occasional election. The silk stocking cannot be got to take a serious hand continuously in political work. They admit it themselves. Every one knows it is so. Why, then, when mugwumps' principles won't make mugwumps work, do you expect the same lofty motives to be sufficient to interest the masses in politics?

Now, while we have gentlemen coming together in meetings and conventions and denouncing the present Government and political parties for their hypocrisy and corruption upon such a question as prohibition, why is it that there is so much dissention and difference upon this question? It is because men who are preaching prohibition in our churches, because men who are preaching prohibition in our temperance lodges, who are preaching prohibition in the Dominion Alliance and elsewhere, have not come down to the point of feeling that if they are going to purify politics they have to take a practical interest in them. If it is true that scallawags, corruptionists and ballot stuffers are able to control party organizations, it is because these gentlemen to whom I have referred refuse to touch party politics with the tips

of their fingers. It is necessary for temperance men not only to convince people of the evils of intemperance, but to educate them up to a higher point, and to take a practical interest in the politics of the country. I say that I am a party man; I have always been a party man; I have been a party politician engaged in the politics of this country, and I am going to take part in them. I do not propose, because I am differing from the political parties on this question, to ostracise myself from the political associations with which I am connected, because I am prepared to take a position upon this question that is consistent with reason and with my convictions as to what is right. If hon. gentlemen opposite want my support they must give us something better than the declamations that we have heard to-day in denunciation of this Government upon this question. It is to be remembered that the only temperance legislation that we ever got came from this side of the House. The hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), has made some very strong statements upon this question. I remember years ago reading the utterances made by him on the public platform, so strong and eloquent and forcible in favour of the principle of prohibition that they have been up to the present time unanswered and are unanswerable. But when I found him standing up in this House, admitting frankly before his fellow-members, that although he once voted in favour of immediate prohibition, he did it only in a moment of weakness, and declaring that from that time forward he proposed to act honestly upon this question; when I read the solemn admission made by that hon. gentleman that, up to that time he had not acted honestly, I admit I admired his courage, his frankness and honesty in making that statement, but I lost faith and confidence in him as a leader of men. When we find him taking a position in favour of the principle of prohibition and even voting in favour of it, and then getting up and saying that he did it in obedience to the lash of public opinion and that he did what he did not believe in, I think we can no longer maintain confidence in that hon. gentleman. I do not propose to close these remarks without coming to a practical conclusion. I wish to place my convictions on record in such a clear and definite way that there will be no mistaking them. I propose to give hon. gentlemen opposite an opportunity of placing themselves on record. I propose to give them an opportunity, if they believe in the principle of prohibition, to vote for it, as I am prepared to vote for it, even against the party I support. I propose to close by moving this resolution, seconded by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Haley):

That all the words after "That" be struck out, and that the following be substituted in lieu thereof:—"in opinion of this House the time has arrived when it is expedient to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes."

I am prepared to vote for that, and to support it. And if hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to support it, it will be carried through this House, and we will have commenced a campaign in this country which will result in the enacting of a prohibitory liquor law, and thus we will have a fair test. I am not going to say that the country will blush as the rose, that there will be any such wonderful transformation as the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Moore), who has quoted Homer's writings to us, predicts, but I say that there rests upon Parliament a solemn duty, and it is to deal with this question as a practical question. The evils of intemperance cannot be magnified. Even at the expense of being called a temperance crank I am prepared to say here to-night that if only those in this country who drink intoxicating liquors suffered the evils from it, I do not think there would be any warrant for this Parliament to pass a Bill, but the worst evils that fall upon this country in consequence of the intemperate habits of the people fall not upon the intemperate themselves, but upon those who are absolutely innocent of any crime in connection therewith. I am not so much shocked at the fact that I see men now and again destroy themselves through intemperate habits, although, dear knows, that is bad enough, but when we go throughout this country, and see the reflex influence of this destroyer upon families that are innocent, then, I say, it becomes us, as men, to look this question fairly in the face and to see if we can pass a legislative enactment. If we cannot, let us admit it honestly, and let us confess that our theory is wrong; but do not go on year after year declaring that it is the duty of Parliament to find a legislative remedy, declaring year after year that prohibition is the only remedy, and yet sit silent, providing no remedy at all. I say, Sir, that upon this question the answer of the Government is unsatisfactory to me. I have heard no policy propounded in this House that deals with the question in a practical manner, and, therefore, I move this resolution, as embodying my own opinion, whether it is supported by anybody else or not:

That all the words after "That" in the original resolution be struck out, and the following substituted therefor:—"in the opinion of this House the time is arrived when it is expedient to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes."

**Mr. McNEILL.** Might I ask my hon. friend (Mr. McClure) a question? Was I correct in understanding him to say that he thought the expression of opinion by the people would not have justified the Government in passing a prohibitory measure?

**Mr. McClure.** I do not think I used the word "justified."

**Mr. McNEILL.** I do not mean to say that you exactly used that word.

**Mr. McClure.**

**Mr. McClure.** What I said was, that I did not think there was any mandate in that vote compelling the Government to pass a prohibitory liquor law.

**Mr. McNEILL.** Quite so; but my hon. friend (Mr. McClure) says, notwithstanding, that the time has come when a prohibitory law should be passed.

**Mr. McClure.** Certainly, that is what I say. What I say is, that while the plebiscite did not give a mandate to the Government to pass the law, yet the plebiscite was no condemnation of the principle of prohibition. And, notwithstanding that the result shown by the plebiscite, on the face of it, gave no mandate, yet I believe the time has come when we should pass a prohibition Bill. I say that, apart altogether from the plebiscite, because if we have no justification for prohibition except what is to be found in the plebiscite, then we have no case. I believe we have a case, apart from the plebiscite altogether.

**Mr. C. H. PARMALEE (Shefford).** Mr. Speaker, I wish, at the outset, to compliment my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. McClure) on the very able and eloquent plea which he has made for the principle of prohibition. He stated the case with all the keenness, and all the ability, and eloquence in which it could be stated by any hon. member in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

**Mr. PARMALEE.** In view of the amendment moved by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McClure) to the motion of the hon. member (Mr. Flint), it is quite evident that the prohibitionists, as represented in this House, are at sixes and sevens. We have the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) pleading before this House for provincial prohibition, and I am bound to say, under existing conditions, and taking public opinion as it is to-day, it seems to me that perhaps that is a more attainable end than some of the more drastic propositions that have been made. It is, however, a new proposal, and I do not think the House, without giving it very careful study and thorough consideration, is in a position to say whether it is practical or not. I am a simple layman, and I do not pretend to know whether there are constitutional difficulties or not in the way of this resolution of the hon. member (Mr. Flint); but I am under the impression that it contains certain propositions over which constitutional authorities may disagree as to our power to adopt them in this Parliament. As against the contention of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), we have the hon. member (Mr. McClure) advocating the immediate enactment of a prohibitory law, and we also have a prohibitionist like the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Moore), who wants prohibition, and who takes advantage of the circumstances to score the

Government for not granting it. Now, Mr. Speaker, when doctors differ, who is to decide? For my part, while I believe that prohibition is a great moral movement, supported by a large body of the people of this country, nevertheless, this House has to deal with the facts as we find them. While we all admit the evils of intemperance, while we all admit the great desirability of destroying them as rapidly as possible, yet when we come to legislate, we must, no matter what our opinions and principles may be—we must face the fact that we are dealing with a practical question, and that we cannot crystallize it into legislation any faster than public opinion will permit us. The Liberal party put a plank in its platform to the effect that the people of this country should be given a chance to vote upon this question, and while prohibitionists say now, and have said all along, that they never asked for the plebiscite, yet that is beside the question, because they certainly accepted the challenge, when the plebiscite was given them. It has been ably contended by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McClure) that the plebiscite vote does not give a fair expression of the prohibition sentiment in this country. I beg to differ from my hon. friend (Mr. McClure). I can recall the circumstances of the campaign. I know how the Government submitted the question to the country, stripped of all extraneous issues, and asked whether the people were in favour of prohibition or not. To that extent the Government completely met the wishes of the prohibitionists. The campaign, as we all know, was conducted with great ability on the part of those who believe that prohibition is the proper policy for this country. In the pulpit, in the press, on the platform, by the distribution of temperance literature, by the organization of committees to get out the voters, they conducted a vigorous campaign, and it is only fair to assume that the prohibition vote was polled. Now, Sir, when we come to examine that vote, it can scarcely be contended that it is sufficiently pronounced to warrant this House in going to the length of enacting such drastic legislation as the total prohibition of the liquor traffic in Canada, however desirable that may be in itself. I believe I am in the judgment of a great majority of the prohibitionists in this country when I say that they themselves would hesitate at having a total prohibition law passed in advance of a sufficient public opinion to support it. The experience of countries that have adopted a prohibitory measure in advance of public opinion and without sufficient support to sustain it, has not been such as to warrant us in imitating their example. I remember that a few years ago the "Globe" newspapers sent some able correspondents to the states of Iowa and Kansas to study prohibition at short range. They went from town to town, and from city to city, in these states, studying the conditions

which exist there, and reporting upon them exactly as they found them. And what they found was this: That where public sentiment was very strong in favour of prohibition, they had, as a matter of practice, a fair measure of prohibition, but where they came upon communities in which that sentiment did not exist, in which a majority of the people wished to use intoxicating liquors, they had nothing like prohibition, but unlicensed traffic and a far worse condition of affairs than we have under a license system.

I can compliment the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Moore) upon the length of his speech, and some of the poetry, too, was good. I will admit that he is a sincere prohibitionist, and I will admit further, that he is zealous and enthusiastic in his desire to do something to injure this Government. If things were not as they are, but if his friends were sitting on this side of the House, charged with the responsibility of legislating on a question of this kind, I fancy that the hon. member for Stanstead, and perhaps other hon. members of this House, instead of getting up and attacking the Government as they are doing now, would be as mild as sucking doves.

A good deal has been said about the plebiscite vote in the province of Quebec. It seems to have astonished a great many people that the majority in that province was so strong against prohibition. Knowing the province of Quebec as I do, I believe that vote fairly represents the opinion of its people. Total prohibition is foreign to the genius of the French Canadian people, and I do not say that to their discredit. They love personal liberty; they do not want their liberty restricted by a prohibitory law. But while I say that, I do not want to leave the impression that the French Canadian people, in respect to the excessive use of intoxicating liquors, are any worse than the people of the other provinces. As a matter of fact, I do not believe that there is a more sober, a more thrifty, or a more abstemious population in Canada, or perhaps in the world, than the French Canadian farmers of the province of Quebec. In very many portions of the rural sections of the province of Quebec, they have the best sort of prohibition to-day. As a matter of fact, less than one-third of the purely rural municipalities in the province have licenses at all. That is because the people are so abstemious in their habits that there is no demand for liquor, and there is therefore no incentive to anybody to ask for a license. And even where that is not the case, the clergy having a regard for the habits and morals of the people, inculcate principles of temperance and abstemiousness, and exert their influence against even the license system. So that when people in other parts of the Dominion put on superior airs of virtue, and point

with scorn to the province of Quebec and to the people of the province of Quebec, I say, let them take the beam out of their own eye; for when we come to compare the people of the province of Quebec, in respect to their habits in the use of intoxicating liquors, with the people of the other provinces, the comparisons will not be unfavourable to the people of our province.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another point perhaps more important than that. An attempt—an organized attempt, I may say—is made to cast suspicion on the integrity of the vote that has been cast in the province of Quebec. Even to-night the hon. member for Stanstead ventured to insinuate that there had been fraud. He did not make any open and direct charge, but he tried to lead the House to believe that the vote in the province of Quebec was not an honest vote, but that ballot-stuffing and other crimes were perpetrated. Now, I do not believe that. I believe that the vote in the province of Quebec was as honestly taken as the vote in any other part of the Dominion. The returning officers were all men of the highest character in the communities in which they lived. The deputy returning officers, so far as I know, especially in my own section of the province, were selected with the greatest care, for their ability to discharge their duties, and for the reputation they enjoyed for honesty and integrity in the community; and I defy those gentlemen who have attempted to make charges or insinuate charges of that sort to show that there is a particle of truth in them. The vote in the province of Quebec I believe to have been an honest vote, and unless these men are prepared to come forward and substantiate those charges, they will have to be branded as traducers of honourable and upright men.

The hon. member for Stanstead has said that he would force prohibition on the province of Quebec whether it wanted it or not. When we come to deal with the question of prohibition, we must deal with it from a practical point of view. I believe that the great majority of the prohibitionists themselves to-day believe that public opinion is not a prohibitory law; and it would be folly and worse than folly to put on the statute-book a prohibitory enactment which could not be enforced or kept there. When we come to speak of summary legislation, dealing with the habits of the people, it is admitted by every reasonable and right-thinking man who has given any attention to the subject at all, that the imperative condition for success is a very strong public opinion to sustain it. I do not believe we have reached that state of opinion in this country. It is true, this great moral movement has made considerable strides. It is also true that the habits of our people are steadily and constantly improving, until I think we can congratulate ourselves to day

Mr. PARMALÉE.

on being one of the soberest countries in the world—the country in which the consumption of liquor is the smallest per head, and in which the evils of the traffic, great as they are, are less marked than in other communities.

It is the habit of some prohibitionists to cherish the idea that Parliament delights to humbug and fool. I would like, if I can—perhaps I cannot—to disabuse their minds of that idea. This House is the creation of the popular will, and this House, when it knows what the popular will is, is naturally anxious to respond to the popular will and grant the desires of the people on all these great questions. I believe that to be the case in respect to the question of prohibition. I do deprecate the attempt to make party capital out of this question. The prohibition movement, though it is a political movement, having for its object the enactment of legislation, has not until now been a party movement. There are prohibitionists in both parties, and until one party or the other is prepared to make it a plank in its platform, thus making it an issue, it cannot be a party question. While I am not going to waste the time of the House in reproaching the Conservative party for what they have done in the past on the prohibition question, or for what they have not done to advance the great cause of prohibition, I would say that until the Conservative party are prepared to take a position on this question, it is unfair to try to humbug the people and make them believe that Codlin and not Short is the friend of the prohibitionist.

Perhaps I have spoken too long, but before I sit down I wish to propose a resolution, an amendment to the amendment, which will enable this House to express its opinion, so that we shall find out when we get through with this discussion, how the House stands on this important question:

That all the words in the amendment be omitted and the following substituted therefor:—  
“The result of the plebiscite on the question of prohibition of the liquor traffic in Canada shows that there is not an active prohibition sentiment sufficiently pronounced to justify the expectation that a prohibitory law could be successfully enforced, and, therefore, in the opinion of this House, such a prohibitory law should not at present be enacted.”

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). It was rather amusing, Mr. Speaker, to listen to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Parmalee), and then find them followed by the amendment he has just moved. He says that the temperance members of this House are at sixes and sevens on this question. He should have confined that statement to the hon. members on that side of the House, for his amendment simply means that the chickens cannot get out of the wet, and he is trying to get a shelter for them. I want to say,

while on my feet, that while the hon. member who moved the first resolution (Mr. Flint) was good enough to give us a resume of the history of this question, so far as the Conservative party is concerned, he carefully avoided giving us a history of this question as dealt with by hon. gentlemen opposite. I hold in my hand a book sacred to the memory of a certain convention held in Ottawa in 1893. I think they called it the Reform Convention. They were all reformers then, these hon. gentlemen opposite, but they have since changed their mind. Let me say this, that I have the right to charge these hon. gentlemen with being the parties who made this question a party question in this country, not for the sake of bringing about a great moral reform, but with the express purpose of making political gain. They made it a party question by that resolution which they adopted at their convention, a resolution which virtually meant nothing practically, so far as they were concerned, because that is what they tell us now. They simply made that resolution for the purpose of allowing their friends to go out to the country and catch the ear of the temperance people. For what purpose? To gain the support of these people for the Reform party. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) was the moving spirit in this great drama. The whole sentiment of these hon. gentlemen at that time may be thus expressed: Bring on your sacrifice and we will provide the fire. Yes, they were ready to provide the fire to burn up any Conservative holocaust on the altar of prohibition. But they have got the fire now on the opposite side of the House, and are jumping on it with all their political feet in the attempt to stamp it out. They have put up one of their members—for what purpose? To move on the lines of certain resolutions, which they claim were adopted in council by members of this House who are members of the same Dominion Alliance, but do not give the public to understand that there were members on this side who would not agree to such a resolution, but wanted national prohibition or nothing. But they gave out to this country that this resolution was the united voice of members of this House who are in favour of prohibition, sitting down in council with the Dominion Alliance on that question. What is that for? For the purpose apparently of putting the people of the country into leading strings, so that they will go in the direction hon. gentlemen opposite want them to go. But that attempt has fallen to the ground, and the temperance people have a perfect right to demand at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite what they implied when they asked the people to vote on that question. What was the implication? It necessarily followed that the Government would be bound by the voice of the people as expressed in that

vote. They let the people go into this great contest, with a great moral principle at stake, without letting the contestants know the conditions under which they were to enter the contest and fight out the question. For, having kept back secretly the conditions, every member of the Government is guilty even the Minister of Agriculture himself (Mr. Fisher). But when he allowed the people to go into the strife and expend their time and money, and when the people declared themselves in favour of prohibition by 14,000 of a majority, then the Government quietly sit down and say: We did not mean anything when we asked you to vote. That is the position these hon. gentlemen are in.

I am a prohibitionist and will vote for a Dominion prohibitory law, no matter from what Government it comes and against any resolution which proposes to remove from the shoulders of hon. gentlemen opposite the responsibility which the vote of the people has placed upon them. That is the ground every honest prohibitionist ought to take, and if these gentlemen do not deal with that question as the people have directed them to do, let the people deal with them. But these gentlemen are trying to draw their friends out of the fire. They are trying to get them out of the heat of an outraged public opinion, and you find that if one resolution will not do, they move another and then a third. But they will have to reckon with the people. It is very strange that the Minister of Agriculture, who made the statement that he was in the Government by virtue of his temperance principles, should remain in that Government when the public opinion has asked for a prohibitory law and the temperance people are condemning the Government for not granting it. I wish to point out another very curious thing. I have in my hand the resolution adopted by the Executive Commission of the Dominion Alliance on March 14th, 1899. I will only read an extract from it, because I do not wish to be tedious. One of the resolutions reads as follows:—

Resolved, that this meeting desires to express its strong dissatisfaction at the refusal of the Government to carry out the promise to take such steps as would give effect to the expressed will of the people, and earnestly calls upon the representatives of the people in Parliament to accept the mandate of the electorate, and carry it out by enacting such prohibitory legislation as will fairly embody the will of the people as expressed at the polls.

What do we find? We find that that hon. gentleman is one of the executive of the Dominion Alliance, and he sits on that executive while they are passing resolutions condemning the Government of which he is a member. I thought the hon. gentleman was a little more sensitive. What does that mean? Is that a guarantee to his friends, to his colleagues, the other

members of the Cabinet, that their lives are safe, that they are not to be harmed, that there will be a great deal of fuss and resolutions and all that, but that not one hair of their head will fall to the ground. Does he mean to say that he can sit comfortably, as a member of the Dominion Alliance, while that alliance is passing resolutions censuring the very Government of which he is a member? We find the name of the Hon. Sydney Fisher on the executive of the Dominion Alliance, and we find that gentleman in that capacity passing resolutions condemning himself and his friends.

Mr. DAVIN. Writes his own epitaph.

Mr. BRODER. Yes, writes his own epitaph. There seems to be some arrangement by which he is allowed to abuse his fellow-members of the Government. He is like the king of olden times who was likewise a bishop. He sometimes lost his temper and swore a little. His courtiers about him said: A bishop should not swear. And his reply was: I swear not as a bishop but as a king. So, I suppose the hon. gentleman swears, not as a member of the Government, but as a member of the Dominion Alliance; and I suppose in that way he will keep on swearing. I want to show what the hon. gentleman said in moving the resolution in 1893. I read at page 135 of this book, which is a very precious book just now:

I am glad, therefore, that the great party to which I belong, with which I have worked, is prepared to take a stand upon the temperance question, and to declare in its platform in favour of a step in the right direction upon this subject.

Now, what does that mean? Does he mean to say that they are in earnest, and that he is honest when he asks the people to pronounce upon this question? Or does it mean that he wants an opportunity for the representatives of his political party to go up and down the country and whisper in the ears of the temperance people: Your only hope is in the Reform party. That is the way in which they have acted. This report shows that Mr. Anglin got up and said that this resolution meant that a majority vote in favour of prohibition would mean that the Liberal party were bound to give them prohibition. He opposed this resolution, and appears to have been the only honest man on this question in that convention. But the Premier has said, if I am allowed to refer to a past debate, that there was an implied agreement between the members of the party and not between the party and the country, that there should be no more about this business. For ever after they were to hold their peace about that arrangement; and I think they are going to keep their agreement. Now, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is a farmer, and I am a farmer; but I cannot help thinking he does not represent me very well. It is a strange thing that when this fight was going on, the

Mr. BRODER.

hon. gentleman never put his head in his own province of Quebec to say a word in favour of prohibition. He was out of the country until a day or two before the taking of the vote. He spoke in Ottawa on the 16th of September, 1898—I think I remember the date correctly. And how did he speak? As Minister of Agriculture? No, Sir, he made himself as small as he could. He said: I am here as a private citizen. He laid aside his official robes and appeared as Mr. Sydney Fisher. But he did not appear in Quebec. We found the Minister of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière), the late Hon. Mr. Geoffrion, the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), and, I believe, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), speaking and working against prohibition—and the Minister of Agriculture here in Ottawa where he could not be hurt. When you look up and down the struggling ranks of the prohibition army fighting for doubtful victory, you do not see the well-preserved figure of the hon. Minister of Agriculture among them.

An hon. MEMBER. He was in cold storage.

Mr. BRODER. At any rate, where his influence was supposed to be greatest, and where he should have been as a representative of the people—in his own province—he never showed himself.

Mr. SCRIVER. He was not needed—there was a majority of 500 in his county.

Mr. BRODER. And my hon. friends opposite did not want him there. They wanted the other elements of the Cabinet to come down and say: Vote against prohibition, for it will kill Mr. Laurier. There was political influences used against prohibition and the hon. Minister of Agriculture did not use his influence in support of it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). My hon. friend (Mr. Broder) is altogether wrong. I did speak in my own county and in Montreal.

Mr. BRODER. I am glad the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) mentions Montreal. He spoke there in February, 1897, in Stanley Hall.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I spoke then, but I spoke also a few days before the vote, in September, 1898.

Mr. BRODER. I accept the hon. gentleman's correction. He made a speech in Montreal that I wish to call his attention to. I am glad he has mentioned Montreal, and I think he will not mention it again. He spoke in Stanley Hall, in February, 1897. He drew the attention of the meeting to the difference between the contention of the liquor men and his own. The liquor men said that if we carried the plebiscite we would not get prohibition, but he wanted to assure the people that if there was a majority on the plebiscite, prohibition would be

enacted. He is so reported in the "Witness." And where is he to-night? There was a majority in favour of prohibition, and yet the Minister is satisfied, although the Government does not enact a prohibitory law.

Now, what does this resolution of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) mean? It means continual confusion and more law, that is what it means. It don't prohibit the manufacture of liquor at all where the law is in force, they have not power to touch it. It does not pretend to touch the question of interprovincial trade! and the very moment a law of the sort suggested by this resolution is enacted, the whole question will be thrown into the courts to know whether you have this power or the other power. In other words, we would be sent hunting around the woods of the provinces with an old flint-lock musket with more powder in the pan than in the barrel, looking for our rights as a temperance party. That is a nice position in which to put the temperance men of this country, looking around the provinces for our rights. I consider it is only to help hon. gentlemen out of the position they are in, that is all. They stand face to face with an outraged public opinion. No matter what they say about the mandate of the people, that is what it means, and no honest man can look at it in any other way.

They say: Oh, well, both parties are alike. Is that a fact? When they approached Sir John Thompson, the late Premier, what did he say? He was manly and above-board, he told them he could not hold out any hope that he could deal with the question on the lines that they suggested. Is that the way they were dealt with by hon. gentlemen opposite? No, they were dealt with in an insincere way, they were led on step by step right up to the threshold of a realization of their hopes, and then the door was closed in their faces and in the face of their party. Now, they say they are no worse than we are. There is no comparison at all in reference to the conduct of the two parties on this question. In the first place hon. gentlemen opposite are wont to make it a party question. There is no man in this House can get up and move a resolution in favour of prohibition without censuring hon. gentlemen opposite as a Government, and they know that, and they call upon their followers to vote it down. Why? Because it is contrary to their declared policy on that question. Was that the case when the Conservative party was in control? It was always treated as non-party question, every member of the House was at liberty to vote for or against it without feeling that he was voting against his party. But hon. gentlemen opposite have fixed it so their friends cannot vote for prohibition without censuring them. I am willing to admit that it is a difficult thing to raise one question upon which you can hold men away from all other

questions, and get them to think that it is more important than everything else. I do not share the sentiment expressed by the member who moved the motion for prohibition when he condemned the party for being corrupt and all that. He knows more about gentlemen opposite than I do, and, perhaps, he is correct so far as they are concerned, but it does not apply to this side of the House.

Now, I want to say that while there is a strong sentiment in this country in favour of prohibition, there are a great many moderate-minded men who are not extreme on any question; and I believe that if a law was enacted in this House it would have to be such a law as would gain the support of that element in the country. I believe if ever we are to have a prohibitory law it will have to be on those lines, and of such a character as will appeal to the honesty and good intentions of that class of people in this country. I venture to say that the men who stand up and contend that we cannot pass that law in this country and enforce it, do not understand the make-up of the Canadian people. I believe if that law was placed on the statute-book to-morrow, there is moral stamina enough in the Canadian people to enforce it.

I venture to say that the Government, while they have invited the people to pronounce on this question, are now anxious to evade the responsibility which the vote has placed upon their shoulders, and I will vote against any resolution which proposes to remove that responsibility from the shoulders of the executive of this country who have asked the people to pronounce upon it. They have pronounced upon it, and now let that responsibility rest with the Government who sought the verdict. The temperance people of this country are in earnest, and I believe that those who think they can trifle with the temperance element of this country are making a great mistake. I believe further that the temperance people of this country will demand at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite what their vote on the plebiscite asks for, and they will demand it by their actions in the future. This Government will have to stand at the bar of public opinion, and they cannot get away from it. There was never a set of men on the Treasury benches that were so anxious to get away from themselves as hon. gentlemen opposite. Their whole effort has been to get away from themselves since they became a Government, to get away from the promises that they have made, to get away from what they led the people to expect of them if they got into power. What does this hon. gentleman's motion mean? In the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite it don't mean anything. It says there must be a vote of the people. They are very anxious to have a vote of the people. They have had votes of the people on sev-

eral occasions in different provinces. Manitoba, Ontario and other provinces have had plebiscites, and that is all that they have had. They have had a vote in the Dominion, and that is all that they have had. The hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, says :

The Act prohibiting such sale should not come into force in any province or territory unless and until a majority of the qualified electors therein, voting at an election, shall have voted in favour of such Act.

Well, supposing the Government say the vote does not justify them in bringing the Act into force. The Governor General in Council must pass upon it. Is there any qualification as to whether this vote shall be a mere majority or not? They are turning the whole question into a voting machine. They want the people to vote, and that is the end of it. I venture to say that the executive of this country are charged with that responsibility, and they should carry it out. We do not know that the Government are going to commit themselves to the resolution of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), but judging from the remarks of the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution for total prohibition, they are not. I do not know as they are going to commit themselves to anything. But I say that the people have committed them to a line of action, and they must take the responsibility of refusing to carry it out, and no motion their friends can make can pull them out of that position. I have only this further to say, that I am a prohibitionist, and I will vote for a prohibitory law, pure and simple, under proper conditions, proposed by any Government; but I am not going to vote for any resolution which proposes to give us a doubtful provincial prohibition, and throw the whole question into confusion, and bring it into disrepute in this country.

I hold the view strongly that if we are ever to have prohibition in this country we must get it within the next few years, because we are bringing into this country a foreign element who have habits altogether different from our own, and as the country fills up largely with this foreign element, who have habits different from our own in reference to this matter, the prospect of getting prohibition will gradually become more remote. The Minister of Agriculture took the position in 1884 that a prohibitory law would be an educator of the people. He does not talk that way now. He wanted to carry prohibition then because his friends were not in power; but he does not want to educate people that way now, he has changed his mind in that respect. I say that the proper way to do is for the executive to determine this question without a plebiscite at all, to take the responsibility of an Act, and stand or fall by it. It is about time that the people understood that the

Mr. BRODER.

executive are responsible for such legislation. Now, I have only to say that I shall vote against the amendment, and I shall vote against every other amendment that comes up that would remove the responsibility from where it belongs, and that is on the shoulders of this Government.

Mr. T. D. CRAIG (East Durham). I have something to say on this question, but as the hour is late, I shall be as brief as possible, and shall confine myself closely to the subject. The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Parmalee) said that he was sorry that political capital should be made out of this question. He said he thought it was an unfortunate thing that this should be done. That reminded me of the fact that when the Liberal party were in Opposition, they never ceased to make political capital out of this question, and that sometimes they gave the party in power a great deal of trouble. I find that, no matter what party is in power, they do not want to deal with this question, but they want to get rid of it, whenever they can. It is very difficult, in dealing with this question, to keep it apart from politics. That is something that we can hardly expect will be done. It is no use for the party on the other side of the House, if they have not carried out their promises, to say to the party on this side of the House: We did it as far as we were able to do it. I am not sorry that the Liberal party came into office. Some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House seem to think that I am not speaking sincerely, when I say that I am not sorry they came into power. But I am speaking sincerely, because I think, for a good many reasons, it is a good thing they came into power. It is especially a good thing because it lets the country see what these hon. gentlemen are. I do not say it is a good thing for the country, because I am not prepared to admit that. When the Liberal party were in Opposition, they made a strong impression on a good many people in the country because they claimed to be superior to the Conservative party. We all know that they claimed to be a pure party. I am not going to dwell upon this point, but I am saying that it is a good thing that they got into power. We now know that their claim to be a pure party is exploded, and I am sorry that it is exploded. Although I am a Conservative, the idea I had of them, from hearing it so constantly repeated, was, that perhaps they were a little purer than the Conservative party, but I have lost all faith in them. The "Globe" said, not long ago, that no party could now say: I am holier than thou. That is a great confession to make, because the "Globe" was continually claiming that the Liberal party were the pure party. I am sorry that idea has gone, but it has gone, and, after all, it seems to be a great pity that they did get into power, because the idea that they were a pure party

is disappearing every day more and more from our view. The Liberal party claimed that they were the economical party. I need not say anything upon that point, when we have Estimates before us amounting to nearly \$60,000,000. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said something—I do not know what. He is an economical man, and if the Government would allow the hon. member for North Wellington to pare down these Estimates, he would get them down to \$40,000,000. But they will not do that, and he has to sit there and support them, although they exceed the Estimates of any Conservative Government. They gave the idea that they were the low-tariff party, that they were going to relieve the people of taxation. That idea is all gone, too. They gave the people the idea, and they gave me the idea a little. I must confess that they were the temperance party of the country. That idea is fast fading away. We find to-night in this House a resolution introduced by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), for provincial prohibition, then an amendment made by one of the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McClure), in favour of total prohibition, and another amendment, against prohibition entirely. I think the Liberal party cannot claim that they are the temperance party. I am in favour of a prohibition motion, and I would be very glad indeed, if the Liberal Government would bring in a prohibitory law. I would be glad to support them, if they would do it. I know they are not going to do it, so that I think the idea has gone away from the country that they are the prohibition, or temperance, party. I do not say that I think the time for prohibition has come. But I do say, and I say it with all respect, that the Liberal party have been humbugging the people of this country on the temperance question. I suppose everything is fair in politics, but there is no doubt that they have been humbugging the people on this question to gain votes which they otherwise would not have gained, if they had not made these great professions about their temperance principles. What has been the history of the prohibition question in this House? A deputation came and waited upon Sir John Thompson at one time. He told that deputation frankly that he was not prepared to bring in a prohibitory law. I admired him for doing so in such a straightforward manner, and I know a great many men who did not belong to the Conservative party, admired him for the straightforward and manly stand that he took. But there is a striking contrast between the course of that statesman and the position taken by the Liberal party. Instead of taking that straightforward stand, they wanted the people to believe that it might be possible that they would get prohibition from them, and there is no doubt that Sir

John Thompson, by taking that manly stand on that question, hurt the Conservative party amongst temperance people. There is no doubt that a great many people were offended at Sir John Thompson because he was straightforward and honest, when the deputation waited upon him, and that they voted against the Conservative candidates. Some of these temperance people said that the Conservative party were not in favour of prohibition, and the Liberal party derived great benefit from this circumstance. I am not going to discuss the question of the plebiscite as at great length as I otherwise would, if time permitted, but I may say that the Liberal party, in promising the plebiscite, did so to please the temperance wing of their own party. By doing so they gave the people the impression that they were a temperance party. The plebiscite, instead of being an advantage to the Liberal party, has really put them in a very awkward position before the country. As has been remarked by an hon. gentleman, it has been a boomerang; it has come back upon themselves, and if the Conservative party are now able to point out that they are in an awkward position with the temperance people, it is due entirely to their own fault. They adopted this plebiscite to get an advantage; but, instead of getting an advantage, it has placed them in a disadvantageous position with the temperance people. What is my position on the prohibition question? I stated it very clearly about a year ago in this House. While the Plebiscite Bill was being passed through this House, I asked the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) what vote would be required in order that the Government would feel called upon to pass a prohibitory law, whether a majority of the votes cast, or a majority of the votes on the list. I did not get any answer, but the right hon. Prime Minister, instead of answering, asked me what my ideas were. I said very frankly that I thought it should require a majority of the votes on the list. Some hon. members say: "Hear, hear;" but, in saying that, they condemn the course of the Prime Minister in not giving the same answer as I did. The answer that I gave did not affect anybody, but if the right hon. Prime Minister had said what I said, if he had said that that was his own view, it would have been straightforward, and the temperance people would have known exactly what was expected of them. There are some who say that if that answer had been given the prohibitionists would have thrown the whole matter up, and they would have been in the right if they did. If the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had given a frank answer he would have acted the manly part as Sir John Thompson did when he announced his position on the question. To-day it has come to light that when the plebiscite resolution was passed at the Liberal Convention there was an

understanding between the members of the Liberal party that unless there was a majority of votes on the list cast in favour of prohibition the Government would not pass a prohibitory law. No doubt, that was the case, and no doubt the Premier knew it, but why was he not frank to tell the people of the country about it. I am not blaming the Government for not passing the prohibitory law, because I say frankly and honestly that if I were in the Government I would not pass a prohibitory Bill or that plebiscite vote; but what I blame the Government for is that they did not honestly tell the temperance people of this country that they must get a majority of the votes on the list in favour of prohibition before such a law could be passed. The Government did not make that frank statement, and so they put the country to enormous expense for nothing, and worse than nothing, because I say that the consequences of the plebiscite vote and the action, or want of action, of the Government upon it, has thrown the cause of prohibition back for twenty-five years. It must have been because of political reasons that the Premier did not make a frank statement of his policy, and so we have politics introduced again, and party placed before the principle of prohibition. The temperance people of this country have a right to condemn the Government and the Premier for not being frank in this matter, and I believe they will condemn them. Again, we know that the vote on the plebiscite was in a great many cases political. I have been informed that the people of Quebec were told that if they voted for prohibition they would hurt Laurier and the Government, and they were urged not to do so.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Oh, no.

Mr. CRAIG. Well, I have a very strong idea that that was the case in Quebec. I was told by a Conservative friend in my own constituency that a temperance man, a Liberal, said to him: It is all very well for you to vote prohibition, but we are not going to put Laurier into a hole. The vote was political and it all goes to show the difficulty of separating this question from politics when the Government in power is opposed to prohibition, as this Government is and was opposed to prohibition. The Government were undoubtedly afraid that the vote might be large enough to compel them to pass a prohibition law, and so we found some of the Ministers and a good many of the Liberal members working against prohibition in Quebec. The Government were not frank with the temperance people, and it was not manly on their part to pretend to be in favour of prohibition when some of the Ministers went through the province of Quebec and worked against it. The prohibitionists of Canada are, of course, not satisfied with the course of the Government, and hence we find this

Mr. CRAIG.

resolution brought forward by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Flint) as a sort of way out of the difficulty. I do not say that those who support this resolution are not sincere, but I know that I opposed this idea of provincial prohibition at the Dominion Alliance, because I did not think it was at all practicable. I hold that this resolution is one way of killing prohibition for good. I know the gentlemen who support it are quite sincere, and I had a letter from one of my constituents asking me to vote for the resolution, but I cannot do so, because I believe it is not in the interests of the country, and is only calculated to kill prohibition. If it were passed there is no doubt in my mind that Quebec would vote against prohibition, and I have a conviction that even temperance people in Ontario, in view of the attitude of Quebec, would not vote for prohibition. I feel satisfied they would not, if they were assured that Quebec would not vote for prohibition. Again, although there is some provision in the resolution for enforcing it, we do not know who would enforce it. The Government in power is not in favour of prohibition, and why should they enforce it? I am satisfied that it could only be enforced if the Government were in favour of it, and even if the Government were in favour of it, it would be found most difficult to enforce it. My position is this: I would like to see prohibition, but I do not think the Government is called upon by that plebiscite to pass a prohibitory law. If this Government or any other Government at any time think the country is ripe for prohibition and move a prohibitory Bill in this House, I will support any Government in that. If the Government were in favour of prohibition then the Government would enforce the law, but it would be a farce to pass a prohibitory law if the Government did not enforce it. Mention was made to-night of the Scott Act being a failure, and there is no doubt that the reason the Scott Act was a failure in Ontario was because it was not enforced, and that the Government were afraid to enforce it because by doing so they would offend a good many of their own followers. The Government was not a prohibitory Government, and they were not anxious to enforce it, and they let the Scott Act enforce itself, and so it was not enforced at all. I am satisfied that instead of this resolution leading to national prohibition as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Flint) said, the tendency, if it were passed, would be in the very opposite direction. I am satisfied it will not pass, because the Government are against it, and if it were passed it would not be enforced by the Government, so that the result would be that it would injure national prohibition by disgusting the people of the country with its non-enforcement. The country is getting more temperate all the time, thanks to temperance work, and we are all glad to see

that. A great many of us would be glad to see prohibition, but it is very doubtful if we ever shall. For my part, I shall keep total prohibition as my goal, and I will not consent to any filtering away of national prohibition by having prohibition in one province and not in another, and by having prohibition in one province not enforced, as it certainly would be, this condition would, in my belief, make the whole thing a laughing stock to the injury of the prohibition cause. Prohibition such as is proposed by this resolution would be a perfect farce.

I am not going to vote for the resolution of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McClure), because there is no probability of its carrying, and I am not going to vote for the amendment against prohibition either. I am going to vote against all three resolutions. I believe that if ever a prohibitory law is passed in this country it must come from the Government. I look on a great deal of this prohibition work in the House as a lot of humbug. There is no doubt that it is done to catch votes outside, and some of us are getting rather tired of it. Although in Opposition, and although I might use it against the Government, I do not intend to do so. I do not intend to vote for prohibition in this House, because I do not believe that the time has come for prohibition, judging by the recent vote.

Mr. J. H. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, at this late hour of the evening, at this advanced period of the session, it is impossible to speak with much detail upon the important question now before the House. I represent a constituency in which, at the plebiscite, there were about eight votes to one, polled in favour of the total prohibition of the liquor traffic of Canada. Representing a constituency of that complexion, it is the imperative duty of a member to endeavour to carry into effect as far as possible the mandate of the people. Of course, he must needs look around him and observe the condition of things. Sometimes he finds himself unable to carry into effect the wishes of the people in their entirety. Then it is his duty to go as far in that direction as the reasonable circumstances of the case will permit. Let us inquire what are these conditions. What is the precise attitude of the Conservative party towards national prohibition? What is the attitude of the Liberal Government? What is the attitude of the Senate? And what is the attitude of the temperance people? Unless a representative takes these things into account, he cannot either vote intelligently or act efficiently.

Now, what is the attitude of the Conservative party? We may go back perhaps, to the resolution submitted by my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Foster). In 1884, that hon. gentleman moved a resolution which, without its preamble, is as follows:—

That the right and most effective legislative remedy for the evils of intemperance is to be found in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes.

That was carried by a vote of 122 to 40. There was a resolution moved by Mr. Thos. White at the same time to this effect:

And this House is prepared, so soon as public opinion will sufficiently sustain stringent measures, to promote such legislation, so far as the same is within the competency of the Parliament of Canada.

These two resolutions represent what might be called the high water mark of temperance sentiment as expressed by the Conservative party of Canada. They declared they were in favour of the principle of prohibition, and they said more. They declared that as soon as the people of Canada are ready for the enactment of a prohibitory law, they were ready to enact it. They went that far, but they went no further. Why do I say that? Because in the same year another resolution was moved in similar terms to that submitted this evening by the hon. member for Colchester. It was a resolution to the effect that this country is now ready for prohibition. That resolution, in a Conservative House, was voted down by 107 to 55. Afterwards, in 1892, a resolution was moved by Mr. Jamieson in this House favouring immediate prohibitory legislation. An amendment was moved by the member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), to the effect that we are not sufficiently conversant with the state of public sentiment or with the manner in which prohibitory laws operate in other countries, and, therefore, it was advisable to have a commission appointed. That amendment was carried—that commission was appointed. It went around through this country and through certain portions of the United States, and took evidence. It took evidence from a few persons in this locality and that, and it came back and reported adversely to a prohibitory law, and adversely it would appear to the very principle of prohibition. That report seems to have been acted upon and adopted by the Conservative party from that time until the present. It seems to have been accepted as expressing the sentiment and conviction of the Conservative party in this House and in the country. We heard soon afterwards of a temperance delegation having waited upon Sir John Thompson, who answered the delegation in these terms: "A system of prohibition was out of the question, and could not be entertained by this Government."

We next hear of the matter in 1898, when a representative of the "Daily News" waited upon Sir Charles Tupper, the leader of the Opposition, who was then in England, for his opinion on the result of the plebiscite vote.

Question.—I suppose, Sir Charles, it may be taken for granted the recent plebiscite has, for the time being, put prohibition in Canada out of practical politics?

Answer.—Quite so. The result of the plebiscite is a serious blow to the prohibition movement. The diminution of the prohibition vote, as compared with the provincial vote of a few years ago, will certainly be used as proof that the demand for the prohibition of the liquor traffic has declined. There has been only one real attempt at prohibition in a self-governing province, and this was in New Brunswick. There it utterly failed, and it resulted, not in the destruction of the traffic, but in free trade in drink with all legal restrictions removed. The people were glad enough to repeal the law and get back to license.

There can be no doubt here of the ground taken by the leader of the Opposition on this question in a moment of sober thought. The prohibitionists of Canada had said: We have scored a victory in this plebiscite—look at our large vote. The leader of the Opposition says that it was a defeat, and not a victory. Temperance people say that the vote is large enough to justify the enactment of a prohibitory law. The hon. leader of the Opposition says that the effect of the plebiscite vote is to put prohibition for the time being outside the pale of practical politics. More than that, if I interpret his views aright, he goes to the extent of opposing the very principle of prohibition. However, I do not wish to push the argument to that extent. It is manifest, however, beyond all doubt that so far as the Conservative party and its leaders are concerned, while they have assented in this House to the principle of prohibition, and said they were ready to give it as soon as the people were ready to receive it, yet they declare that at present prohibition is out of practical politics. I am not here to denounce the Conservative party or their leaders for the conclusion at which they have arrived. I will even admit that, looking at it from the standpoint of their own party, from the rank and file of their supporters, nay more, looking at the matter from the stand-point of the interests of the country, they came to their conclusion honestly. Now, what is the attitude of the Liberal party? The Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, in 1878, was solicited to give this country prohibition. Petitions were sent into Parliament—more petitioners, actually, than voted at the plebiscite. Mr. Mackenzie himself was a prohibitionist, yet what was his answer? He said: Although I am a prohibitionist, yet I do not think the sentiment of the country is sufficiently matured for national prohibition. He gave them the Scott Act, a measure which was then accepted as a fair answer to the petitions, a measure which, wherever it has been put into effect, or attempted to be enforced, has been reasonably successful.

Reference has been made to Mr. Blake's speech in 1887, at Aylmer. He said on that occasion that he was opposed, not to the principle of prohibition, but to the expediency of its enactment. We did not then con-

sider the sentiment of the country ripe for the measure. In 1883 we find the Liberal party dealing with the question. They complained of the course pursued by the Conservatives. The Conservative party had gone round in different sections of the country with a royal commission, and had asked selected witnesses what their opinions were. The Liberals said: That is not the proper way to gauge public sentiment; the proper way is to ask the people—the whole people. Every man has an equal right to show by his vote how he regards this great moral question. Put us in power, and we will test public sentiment, not by examining a witness here and another there, but by a plebiscite of the whole people. That is what they promised, and, when they got into power, they fulfilled that promise and submitted the plebiscite. We have now the returns before us. These returns show that 23 per cent voted in favour of prohibition, and 21 per cent against it. All the rest of the people did not care, evidently, whether we had prohibition or not.

There were then two problems presented to the Government. The first was, whether, under the vote it would be expedient to enact national prohibition. The problem presented itself in this form: You have a number of people in a settlement—say, 100 voters. Twenty-three favour prohibition; twenty-one are against it, and the remainder of the 100 do not care one way or the other. Under the conditions would it be wise, or expedient, or feasible to put a prohibitory law on the statute-books? The Government came to the conclusion that as this was a measure which, more than any other, depended on the force of public sentiment for its efficiency, it was not expedient to put the law on the statute-book. There was manifestly not such a preponderance of public sentiment to back it up as would ensure the success of the experiment. The Government were manifestly helped to this conclusion by the condition of things in the province of Quebec. The result of the plebiscite there, indicated that only eight persons out of a hundred voted in favour of a prohibitory law. Now, this consideration doubtless presented itself to the Government. What earthly chance was there of enforcing that law in the province of Quebec, when only eight persons out of a hundred are favourable to its enactment? There was still another problem presented. It was manifested by the vote in the province of Quebec, that one element of the population was almost unanimously opposed to prohibition. That was the French element. The question doubtless presented itself to the Government in this form: Is it expedient, is it wise, for us to create race animosity by forcing upon the French element of the province of Quebec a condition of things which they have said by their votes they abhor and repudiate. Some hon. gentlemen in this House contend that the vote in that

province was not a normal one—that it was only accidental—that the French vote was so polled because the people were afraid to put Laurier into a hole. I would point this out, that although there were certain people in the province of Quebec who may have been afraid of putting the leader of the Government into a hole, yet on the other hand there was a considerable portion—but not the majority, who were very anxious to put him into the hole. That argument is not sufficient, therefore, to account for the fact that in the province of Quebec we have practically got a unanimous vote against a national prohibitory law.

I find also that the antipathy of the French people to national prohibition was not confined to the province of Quebec. In other provinces, wherever you have people of French nationality, you find them equally opposed to prohibition. It is argued that the vote in Quebec was due to certain members of the Government taking the stump against the measure. That cannot account for the vote throughout the whole of Quebec—much less for the French vote in the other provinces. There is another circumstance that leads to the same conclusion. In 1878 many petitions were presented to this House praying for national prohibition. The province of New Brunswick furnished 16,000 petitioners, and in 1898, 26,000 voters at the plebiscite. From Nova Scotia there were 13,000 petitioners, and of voters 34,000. But in Quebec there were only 14,000 petitioners, and 28,000 voters. This shows in the first place there was quite an advance in 20 years in prohibition sentiment in these provinces. But it shows also that in the province of Quebec the advocates of prohibition, though they tried their best to get signatures to petitions in favour of national prohibition, got only 14,000 names in 1878—not as many as there were from the province of New Brunswick, which has not more than one-fifth or one-sixth the population of Quebec. These figures indicate in a general way that the condition of prohibition sentiment among the French element has not changed—it was as hostile or indifferent to prohibition 20 years ago as it is to-day. I have no doubt that the consideration of these circumstances must have had its effect on the mind of the Government, and led them to the conclusion that it would not be expedient in the interest of the future of this country to antagonize the French people or create racial antipathies by enacting a prohibitory law for the whole of Canada, a law which those people have emphatically declared by their votes that they do not want. Now, Sir, I am not going to condemn the Government for the conclusion at which they have arrived. Looking at the question from the stand-point of party—regarding the party as an instrumentality for promoting our present and future welfare, and hence by all fair means to be perpetuated—view-

ing the matter in the light of the vote polled and also in the light of the conditions in Quebec, I believe the Government came honestly to the conclusion that it would be inexpedient to enact national prohibition. I was going to refer to the Senate, but I shall pass that with one remark. As the Senate is at present constituted, no general prohibitory measure that this House might enact would have the remotest chance of receiving the concurrence of that branch of the legislature. What now is the attitude of the temperance people of Canada on this question? Sir, they are divided. A large element say: We demand a prohibitory law in accordance with the plebiscite vote, and we will accept nothing less. But there is another large and respectable element who say: In view of the condition of things in Quebec and in view of the result of the vote as polled throughout the Dominion, we do not think it would be wise to try to force the hand of the Government to enact national prohibition. It would be safer and better, we think, to enact a measure providing a system of provincial prohibition—not as an end, but as a step towards ultimate prohibition—as a means to the end. Among those who hold views of that kind might be instanced the Dominion Alliance—a body of level-headed temperance reformers, who are supposed to represent and speak for all the provinces. That organization has come to the conclusion that it would not be wise, under present conditions, to enact a prohibitory law for the whole of Canada, including the province of Quebec. Now, Sir, look at the condition of things. Here you have the Conservative party of Canada opposed to prohibition. You have the Liberal Government reaching the same conclusion from different premises. You have the Senate hostile. You have the temperance people divided. Any practical man would be driven to the conclusion that it would be useless, under existing conditions, to advocate immediate national prohibition.

Well, what then? Are we to stop there? The people ask for bread. Will the Government give them a stone? Our temperance friends must remember that the distance between the condition of things that now obtain and national prohibition, is a long one. Is it proposed by this Government to assist the temperance people to pass a certain distance, along that road in the direction of national prohibition, or does the Government propose to place a sign-board right across the threshold of that highway upon which is written, No thoroughfare? I am aware that it is within the power of this Government to fold their hands and do nothing. It is possible to ignore the vote that was polled in the plebiscite election, when 276,000 persons demanded national prohibition. It is possible to ignore the fact that 43 of a majority of the constituencies voted in favour of prohibition. It is possible to ignore the hundreds and hundreds of peti-

tions sent in to the Government since September last, praying that effect be given to the plebiscite vote. I say it is quite possible to ignore all these considerations, but I believe that this Government is too wise, is too closely in touch with public sentiment, is too keenly alive to the necessities of the case, to fold their hands and do nothing. I believe that it is desirable, that it is expedient, nay, that it is imperatively necessary for the Government to take some action in the premises.

Then, in what direction? The Scott Act was in force in Ontario for a number of years. It was afterwards repealed in every county in the province. The Scott Act has thus fallen into disrepute throughout Ontario, and in certain other portions of the Dominion, and I do not believe that it is possible to revive it or improve it so as to make it acceptable to the people. I do not think, therefore, that legislation ought to be along the line of amendment of the Scott Act. How, then, shall we take a step in advance? The answer is clearly indicated by the results of the plebiscite. You have, outside Quebec, a majority for prohibition of 107,948. Outside of Quebec, 64 per cent of the electors voted for prohibition and 36 per cent against it, or nearly 2 to 1. In Ontario the vote stood 3 to 2 for prohibition; in British Columbia, 5 to 4; in the North-west Territories, 2 to 1; in New Brunswick, 3 to 1; in Manitoba, 4 to 1; in Nova Scotia, 6 to 1; in Prince Edward Island, 8 to 1. Now, Sir, do these returns not clearly indicate in what direction legislation should be enacted? It seems to me that certain of the provinces are now ripe for prohibition; they are as ripe now as they ever will be this side of the millenium. This vote in the provinces indicates to the Government the direction of legislation, that is to say, prohibitory legislation in those provinces where sentiment is sufficiently matured to justify the hope that that law will be efficiently enforced. In other words, it is a proposition along the line of the resolution submitted by my hon. friend from Yarmouth.

Now, Sir, I would like to point out and emphasize this fact, that there is no principle embodied in these resolutions which is not found in legislation already upon the statute-book—on precedent already well established. The first principle is that this law is not to go into effect in any part of Canada unless, and until a certain contingency arises. We might pass the law in this Parliament, but that would not give it vitality, that does not bring it into effect. Another event must happen outside of this Parliament to bring that law into force. The second principle is that there must be a majority of those who polled their votes at an election in favour of the measure before it comes into operation in a particular province. Now, these two principles are to be found in the Scott Act, and in the Dunkin Act. The principles of such laws have been submitted to the highest

court in the realm, and have been adjudicated upon by the Privy Council of England, and declared to be within the legislative power of the Parliament of Canada. But there is a third principle that appears to be novel, and yet, as a matter of fact, is not so. That is the proposition asking this Parliament to deal with and prohibit not only the sale of intoxicating drinks, but their importation and manufacture. Where have we precedent for dealing with and prohibiting the importation and manufacture? Look back to 1873. There you will find an Act of this Parliament affecting the North-west Territories—affecting territory as large as Europe. That Act remained upon the statute-book of this country for twenty years. That Act was never questioned, it was always held to be constitutional. That Act prohibited not only the sale but the importation and manufacture of intoxicating drinks; it prohibited the importation, not only from the United States, and from abroad, but from any of the other provinces of Canada into these territories. So now you have precedents established by the law of Canada covering every feature and principle of the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Yarmouth. The question has been asked: Why do you come to this Parliament for legislation? Why do you not act as they are proposing to do at this moment in the province of Manitoba? Why not go to the local legislatures for your prohibition? That is a very fair question and deserves a moment's consideration. Why? Because, in the first place, it is very doubtful whether the local legislatures have the power to deal with this question—even with the sale of intoxicating liquors, within provincial boundaries, not to speak of the matter of manufacture or of import. But, are you not aware that there are persons in high authority, even the hon. Minister of Justice himself, who has expressed an opinion that the local legislatures have the power to deal with this matter and to absolutely prohibit the sale of intoxicating drinks within provincial boundaries? I am quite aware of that. But there are other persons in this Dominion whose opinion is entitled to considerable weight and who have given an adverse opinion. There is Mr. S. H. Blake, whose opinion is entitled to respect; there is Mr. J. J. McLaren, of Toronto—the gentleman who argued this question before the Privy Council—who knows, or ought to know, as much about the question as any other man in Canada. Both these gentlemen have come to the conclusion that it is very doubtful whether the power to control the sale of intoxicating liquors, especially sales by wholesale and sales where some element of the purchase may have been made outside the province is vested in the local legislatures. I would like to put this matter at rest by quoting one or two sentences from the decision of the Privy Council itself. The first

question submitted to their adjudication was this :

Has a provincial legislature jurisdiction to prohibit the sale within the province of spirituous, fermented or intoxicating liquors ?

Instead of answering this question in the affirmative or the negative, the Privy Council say this :

These questions are in their nature academic rather than judicial—better fitted for the consideration of officers of the Crown than courts of law.

The replies will necessarily depend on the circumstances in which they may arise for decision. These circumstances are in this case left for speculation.

It must, therefore, be understood that the answers which follow are not meant to have, and cannot have, the weight of a judicial determination, except in so far as referred to in the opinions expressed in discussing the 7th question.

It is quite clear, and it will appeal to the mind of the professional man and layman alike that the judgment of the Privy Council is not conclusive upon that point, but rather leaves it in doubt, so that, when you ask me the question : Why do you come to this Parliament for your law, I have already answered you. We come to this legislature because we come to a source of power that is constitutional—that is admitted to be constitutional—that has been decided to be constitutional by the highest court in the realm. It is highly desirable that we should have a law uniform all over Canada. We cannot have that uniformity unless the statute emanates from this Parliament. We have the Scott Act in force in several of the provinces. It is not expedient to repeal the Scott Act, but only to suspend it pending the fair trial of provincial prohibition. That suspension can only be effectuated by this Parliament. Then again, we want to make the future law more efficient than the old Scott Act. That we cannot do unless we have a federal statute. There is a stronger reason than any I have yet indicated, and it is, that we come to this Parliament to ask for a prohibitory law which will deal with and control the manufacture and import of intoxicating drinks. No restrictive measure that does not cope with the manufacture and import can possibly be satisfactory or successful. It must get at and stop the source of the supply. What is our experience in Scott Act counties ? In my own riding, for instance, a dealer in Summerside can import all the liquor he desires. He imports it ostensibly for legitimate purposes, but in reality it is intended for distribution and illegal sale. As long as this condition exists, as long as the people are brought into contact with liquor, as long as the appetite has convenient opportunity to be satiated, just so long will all restrictive or prohibitory laws be violated. Unless your Act can be made far-reaching enough to deal with the question of supply and to control it, it is absolutely useless and absurd to

talk of the enforcement of any prohibitory liquor law. The constitutional right of this Parliament to deal with the matter of import from one province into another has been brought into question in this debate. The section of the Confederation Act bearing upon the point has to deal solely with the imposition of duties. It has nothing to do with the restriction or prohibition by this Parliament of the products of one province passing into the other. It merely prevents one province placing a duty upon the imports of another. That was the difficulty that had to be contended with at confederation, and that was the difficulty which was obviously intended to be remedied, and was remedied by the British North America Act. I could give other reasons for arriving at the same conclusion ; reasons that would be equally sound, but I do not wish to trouble the House with them at this late hour.

Before I conclude my remarks, however, I wish to deal with a subordinate phase of this question, yet equally important with the resolutions themselves. Our temperance friends are obliged to grapple with the vendors, whether we have national or provincial prohibition. I should like to receive from the members of this House some suggestions as to how we can best put the legitimate sale of liquor in the provinces where this Act may be brought in force, under efficient control. By legitimate sales I mean for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes. The great difficulty at the present time is, that the vendors make a profit from the sale of liquor. They violate the law because they are tempted to increase their gains. Is it possible to eliminate the element of profit. Permit me, Sir, to make a suggestion along this line. What is to prevent the Government of Canada taking the absolute control of providing the liquor for sale for legitimate purposes ? They could obtain the liquor either by importing it or by purchasing it from the manufacturer, or from both sources. Why not give to the Government the monopoly of purchasing from the manufacturers. Then all liquors not sold by the manufacturers to the Government would have to be sent abroad, or into some portion of the Dominion where the Act was not in force. The Government might also have the monopoly of the import for legitimate purposes into that particular province where the Act would be in force. I can see very many reasons in favour of a proposition of that kind, and very few against it. Suppose the Government had absolute control of the supply of liquor ; they would then put it in packages for the purpose of distributing it to these vendors. These packages would be of different kinds and sizes. They would be sealed with the Government seal ; they would be stamped with the Government stamp, and the prices at which they would be sold would be marked on them. From what source would you pay the salary of the vendors ? They would

be paid, not as heretofore out of the profits of their business, but they would receive a fixed sum, and that could be reimbursed to the Government out of the profits of the business. The element of profit to the vendors would be thus eliminated. And, Sir, other benefits would arise from a system of that kind. It would give to those who require to use liquor a safeguard that the liquor would be of pure quality and not adulterated—which is often now the case. That is well worthy of consideration. The Government would give out so many packages to be accounted for by the vendors and the vendors would make their returns accompanied by all certificates under which sales were made. In that way the Government would have the legitimate sale of liquor under perfect control. More than that, the Government would be able to control in this manner the illegitimate sales of liquor. The liquors would, as we have observed, be placed in packages sealed with the Government seal and stamped with the Government stamp. All other liquors in the country would be contraband. It would thus be easy for the Government and its officers and for the public to distinguish between liquor that is legitimate and that which is illegitimate, and in that way the enforcement of the law would be made easier. When liquor not so stamped and sealed was found in possession of any person he would be heavily fined and the liquor confiscated. Under such a system there need be no increase of officials—no increase of cost to the Government. The system might and should be made perfectly self-sustaining. Out of the profits of the business the Government should recoup themselves and pay the duty—pay the vendors' salaries, and pay the salaries of inspectors to enforce the law—should the fines be insufficient for that purpose.

I do not think, however, that on a question of this magnitude and importance it would be wise to legislate hastily. Therefore, while I am in favour of the propositions involved in the resolutions submitted by the hon. member for Yarmouth, at the same time I am of opinion that in view of the constitutional questions and other considerations involved, and because this session is now nearing its close, it would be wise to postpone legislation for the present. By next session the Government and the members will have had time to consider every phase of the question, and will then, I trust, be prepared to legislate along the line of these resolutions.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I desire to say a very few words, and I promise not to detain the House very long, upon the important subject which has been brought before us. I do not intend to enter upon a discussion of the question of prohibition at large, nor do I intend to discuss at any length the record of the two

political parties, nor the record of individuals, upon that question. I only desire to say a few words expressive of my own opinion in regard to the duty of the House with respect to the propositions which have come before us. I may say that I have been all my life an abstainer from the use of intoxicating liquors, and, since I have been of years sufficient to enable me to form opinions on subjects of this nature, I have been a strong advocate of the prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. As time has gone on, my opinion on that subject has not altered, but, rather, has become greater. I would be as strongly desirous as any member of this House, or any citizen of Canada outside of this House, of supporting a measure for the total prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating liquors, if I were able to come to the conclusion that such a measure could be adequately and properly enforced in the Dominion of Canada. A good deal has been said by various gentlemen about the attitude of the Government on this question. So far as I am individually concerned apart from my position as a member of the Government, I am perfectly free to express my opinion without feeling that I am in any way, expressly or impliedly, bound to take any particular course. My constituents and my friends, political and otherwise, have long been aware of my opinions on the subject; but I have never made my opinions on this subject my political stock-in-trade, nor have I ever, so far as I am aware, sought for any political support on that ground. I am, of course, bound by my position as a member of the Government, to act in accordance with the declarations of policy which have been authoritatively made by the Government or by the Prime Minister, representing the Government. It does not seem to me that there will be a very great difference of opinion in this House in regard to the actual question, as to whether the action of the Government, and the attitude it has taken upon this question, are the correct action and attitude or not. Even my hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Craig), who does not, I am sorry to say, agree with everything the Government does, is not prepared to say that the Government was wrong in coming to the conclusion at which it arrived, not to introduce a prohibitory law. I cannot find that the Government is open to any charge of deceit or improper conduct in agreeing to submit the question of a prohibitory law to the people. I am not going to discuss that question at any length; but I have heard nothing that convinces me that there was anything worthy of condemnation in the resolution taken by the Liberal Convention in 1893, and in the action taken by the Government in carrying out the pledge that was made to the country, when the platform adopted at that convention was promulgated. The pledge has been carried out—there is no dispute about that; the vote has been taken—and it seems to

me that the only practical question before us in regard to that particular phase of the question is, whether the vote did actually require the Government, in pursuance of its duty to the people, to introduce a measure of national prohibition. I need not repeat the reasons which were given by the right hon. Prime Minister, in the published letter which gave the reasons of the Government for coming to a negative conclusion on that question. If any fault is to be found with that letter, it would be in the fact that there was one phase of the result which, if I recollect aright at this moment, was not elaborated in it. If we consider the fact that of the two great provinces of the confederation, Ontario and Quebec, one voted by an overwhelming majority against prohibition. I think every man of experience in public life, every man who has given any careful thought to the question of the administration of our laws, will arrive at the conclusion at which I have arrived, that it would be the height of legislative folly for this Parliament to undertake to impose upon that great province a law which it had by an overwhelming majority declared itself opposed to. I do not think that any member of this House, on giving the matter careful consideration, will be prepared to say that, under such circumstances, there would be a reasonable prospect of success of the enforcement of that measure. When we carry ourselves forward intellectually to the position in which the government of the province of Quebec, charged with the administration of a prohibitory law, as it would in all probability be, or the position in which the Government of the Dominion would be placed, if it were charged with the enforcement of the law, should a prohibitory law be passed, in enforcing that law in a province in which the overwhelming majority of the people had declared themselves to be opposed to it, and in which the opposition to it was of more than usually strong and determined a character, we must, as sensible men, called upon to legislate, not on theory, but with a view of the practical conditions with which we have to deal, admit that it would be the height of legislative folly to undertake to impose on that province a law to which it had declared itself to be so overwhelmingly opposed. Let the members from the province of Ontario suppose that the conditions were reversed, and that the great province of Ontario had voted against the proposition for a prohibitory law in the same proportion as did the electors of the province of Quebec. I venture to say that there is no man experienced in the public affairs of this Dominion, and the public affairs of the province of Ontario, who would not say that it would be the height of folly to attempt to enforce that law upon a province in which an overwhelming majority of the electors had voted against it. It seems to me that that position hardly admits of argument; and when we find a man like the hon. member

for East Durham, not wishing to excuse the Government, and still saying that he does not see that the Government is to blame for not introducing a prohibitory law, we see that there is no argument in regard to that question, when we address ourselves to it as a matter of practical legislation. The position in that respect, would be intensified somewhat by the fact that the particular province which voted so strongly against the proposition for a prohibitory law, was a province different in race, and to some extent in religion—though that, perhaps, has nothing to do with the argument, and need not be mentioned—from the other provinces of the Dominion.

The province of Ontario, perhaps, might not feel so hard at being over-ruled by the other English-speaking provinces, but the people of the province of Quebec would be more than human if they did not feel their opposition to such a law intensified by the fact that it was enacted at the request or upon the demand of all the other provinces, in which the inhabitants are largely of a different race and language. There is no use talking about theory with regard to this matter. I challenge the most ardent prohibitionist, in dealing with practical legislation, that it would be wise or statesman-like to enact such a law under the circumstances. If that be the case, what are we to do? I do not believe that because such is the conclusion to which I am compelled to come, this Parliament, therefore, should take no action. I do not think it has been by any means conclusively established by experience that measures of local option are altogether inefficient—although we know that the degree of success in the enforcement of prohibitory laws has varied largely in different states of the union—yet I do not think it has been a failure and I do not think that this House would be justified in saying to the people of the provinces, who voted in favour of prohibition, that they were not capable of judging the situation. My province, by the great majority it polled in favour of a prohibitory law, merits and demands some recognition at the hands of the Parliament of Canada. No doubt, hon. members from Ontario feel the same way with regard to their province. I see no reason why this Parliament should not initiate and pass legislation which would give the people of each province an opportunity of placing upon the statutes a law which would carry out their wishes on this question. If such a law as is suggested by the hon. member for Yarmouth were placed upon the statute-book, I believe that in six months from the time the opportunity was given to Manitoba to secure the benefit of such a law, the necessary vote would be taken and a large majority polled. I have no doubt that any majority which the statutes might require in reason would be polled in favour of such legislation and a law put upon the statute-

book and enforced with a very reasonable degree of success. I feel strongly that we are bound, in view of the expression of opinion given in a proper, legal and constitutional way, to give some effect to that expression of opinion, as practical men having in view the enforcement of the law itself. I see no reason why in the province I represent, such a law could not be enforced. I am not perhaps as good a judge of the province of Ontario or the maritime provinces, but I do not see why such a law should not be enforced as well in those provinces. In view of the expression of opinion given, I see no reason why this Parliament should not give the people of the various provinces the opportunity of having such a law on the statutes if they so desire. I do not intend to address the House at length. I cannot vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McClure), for the reason I have given, and therefore do not think it would be wise or statesmanlike to express the view the hon. gentleman has expressed in this resolution. The motion which the hon. member for Shefford has placed before the House expresses a sentiment substantially correct, but I cannot support that as an amendment to or substitution for the motion of the hon. member for Yarmouth. So far as I can, I shall give the motion of the hon. member for Yarmouth a hearty and welcome support. I am bound to say that there are some details in the motion to which I would not like to hold myself committed; but it is not necessary to discuss these at length, for the principle of the amendment is one to which I can give hearty support.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox). The argument of the hon. Minister of the Interior amounts to this, that there is a stumbling-block in the way of prohibition, and that one of the provinces which is opposed to that policy, must be considered and allowed to control the others. So far as the motion of the hon. member for Yarmouth is concerned, which he says was approved by the Dominion Alliance, I believe there was a meeting of the Alliance called and a committee appointed to draft a resolution. The Liberals went in to shield the Government, and the others were not very anxious to shield them, and this resolution was the outcome. But I have the authority of a gentleman who acted many years as secretary of the Alliance, that he was entirely opposed to the resolution. I refer to Mr. Carson, who told me I might use his name publicly for that purpose.

There were some remarks made by the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Bell) that I wish to pay attention to, because they were unfair and uncalled-for. He says that the Conservative party are opposed to prohibition. So far as my knowledge goes, that is entirely untrue. The Conservatives are just as much in favour of prohibition as

the Liberals. The Liberals profess a great deal, but the difference between them and the Tories is that when a Conservative tells you he will do anything he generally does it, but when the other people tell you, you do not know what they may do, but they are more than likely not to do it.

The hon. gentleman made a reference to the Senate which was altogether uncalled-for. He said that we might pass resolutions and enactments to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors, but they would be blocked in the Senate. I do not think he has any authority for saying that or that he ought to have said it.

There is one thing I am particularly struck with, and that is the declaration made by every Liberal who has spoken on the question, that they are not bound by the vote on the plebiscite. Is not that a farce? They asked for a vote of \$250,000 to submit the question to the people. What for? That whether the people voted or not, prohibition would be as remote as ever, for if we can judge from what took place, unless 50 per cent were polled of the votes on the voters' lists, there would be no prohibition. That was most unfair. I remember when the right hon. First Minister was questioned very closely, as the Bill was going through, on this point, he would give no information. He would not say what majority he would require.

The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) says he is prepared to support the resolutions of the hon. member for Yarmouth, which provides that if the vote is carried in any province, though only by a bare majority, that province will be given prohibition. But he is opposed to prohibition for the whole Dominion, because one province did not give a majority for it. But might it not easily occur that one part of a province would be opposed to prohibition and the other favourable to it, and would not that be just as great a hardship in the working out of a prohibitory law in that province as the opposition of one province would be to its working out in the Dominion. When these gentlemen came to power in 1896, I believe that all their majority came from the province of Quebec. Did anybody rise in this House and say that the Government ought not to take office. No, what we want to cultivate is the feeling that we are one people, and that whatever the majority says will be law. I find that many people were of the opinion that nothing would come of the plebiscite, no matter how they voted. Those gentlemen who know most about the province of Quebec, know that there was quite as much politics there as temperance in the vote on prohibition.

I believe that in that great province the people who are opposed to prohibition went out and voted against the plebiscite, and that those strongly in favour of the Government went out and did likewise. I heard of a

gentleman in Brockville who had been a life-long Liberal, a good Methodist like my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), and myself, who reasoned with himself: I have been a temperance man all my life, but I am afraid that if I vote "yea" in this plebiscite I shall put the Government in a tight fix. I will go home and not vote. And he went home and did not vote. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said he was opposed to putting a temperance plank in the Liberal platform. That was a very extraordinary statement for that hon. gentleman to make to this House, in my judgment. I thought he was a man, if honest in his convictions as he appeared to be in this House, who would be prepared to sacrifice his political party to his moral and religious convictions. He has been a temperance advocate all his life—at any rate, ever since he came into this House. But I must say that I have noticed a difference in him in the Alliance since this Government came into power as compared with what he was before. Before this Government came into power he was strongly in favour of prohibition and was prepared to push it to an issue. But since his Government assumed office he has been prepared to make excuses, and when the plebiscite came on, he was prepared to have it submitted to the people, putting in what it would cost, and so on. I heard him say so, and that is why I believe it. A good deal of fault has been found because the late Government appointed a commission to go through this country and other countries to find if it was desirable to have prohibition or not. The hon. member for North Norfolk says that commission cost \$125,000. And in the face of that these gentlemen went and ordered a plebiscite to be taken, at a cost, as they estimate, of \$250,000. There is just this difference between the two parties in these cases: The commission was appointed and did its work, and I have it on good authority that Sir John Thompson said he would abide by the finding of the commission, be it what it might; and if their finding was in favour of prohibition, he would enact the law, and if the people did not approve of him they could turn him out. But the plebiscite was ordered and taken, and a majority of 14,600 was rolled up in favour of prohibition; and instead of these gentlemen obeying the orders of the people and doing as they were expected to do, they say they will do nothing.

Now, I want to read a little from this report of the Liberal convention—it comes in very useful just now. In the first place, I want to read what the leader of the Government said, to show that he ought not to have the plebiscite because he had all the knowledge that was necessary on this subject without it. He said:

You are aware that two years ago, against our protest, however, the Government of the day appointed a commission to investigate the liquor question, not only in this country, but in other

countries as well. This was done against our protest. We believe—I still believe, for my part—that we have all the information we require on which to form an opinion on this subject.

If the hon. gentleman had that much knowledge then, he ought to have told his colleague who submitted this resolution to council to commit the party to a plebiscite that we had all the knowledge that was necessary. And the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) said that he agreed with the First Minister on that occasion. The hon. member for Yarmouth said this afternoon that we should be backed up by strong public opinion before we enact a law to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors. I think if the hon. gentleman had evidence enough in 1896, when he moved the resolution for prohibition in this House to convince him that there was public opinion strong enough at that time to back up that measure, he has evidence that that sentiment still exists. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman allows himself for the Alliance or for anybody else, to waver from his position, and come in with a wishy-washy resolution instead of one straight for prohibition:

If there was one evidence in favour of the National Policy, previous to its being brought forward as a legislative measure, we have a thousand evidences of public opinion in favour of a prohibitory liquor policy. I think that the signs throughout the country pointing to the fact that the people generally favour a liquor law, are stronger than those in favour of any other legislation ever brought forward.

This is taken from the speech delivered by the hon. gentleman in this House on the 12th February, 1896, and reported in "Hansard" at page 1655. He says further:

The argument that public opinion is not strong enough to enable such a law to be carried out is not well founded. The law-abiding character of our people is sufficient guarantee that such a law would be effectively and successfully administered.

As to the feasibility of a prohibitory law, and results show that a strong degree of popular favour is behind that proposed law. In previous debates the numbers have been alluded to, but I think it would be proper to refer to them again, in order to press on the House the favour with which it has been received. In 1892, Manitoba declared in favour of prohibitory law by a majority of 11,592. In the same year the province of Prince Edward Island declared by a majority of 7,226 in the same direction. The province of Ontario, by a popular majority, leaving out of account about 10,000 votes of women, who, under the Dominion Franchise Act, are not qualified to vote, of 71,527 declared that it also was in favour of the enactment of a prohibitory law. The province of Nova Scotia gave a large majority of 31,400 of the voters in that intelligent province in favour of prohibition.

Now, the hon. member for Yarmouth gave these figures to the House at the time I stated, in 1896. In addition to that we have had the plebiscite, and I could give some figures showing that in his own province

the provincial plebiscite gave a stronger prohibition vote than the Dominion plebiscite. But there is another hon. gentleman whom I had the honour of hearing long before I was a member of this House. I happened to be in Ottawa, and I was in the gallery when that hon. gentleman delivered a speech. I refer to the Minister of Agriculture. You will find his remarks in the "Hansard," of 1884, page 982 :

There is another point which I now come to, and that is when we ought to prohibit. It is generally said that we should not prohibit until there is not only an evident desire on the part of the country for prohibition, but also that the country should be prepared to sustain the prohibitory measure and to assist in carrying it out. I believe this is, to a certain extent, true, and I believe also that one of the very best means of obtaining that happy period in the country's history is to commence prohibiting. I believe that the very fact that a prohibitory law is in existence is one of the very best educating powers in the community. I believe that, by the legislative action of Parliament, we may have a better influence upon the people of the country to bring them to that opinion than we can in any other way whatever. It is true that in years past moral suasion has been tried, and moral suasion has accomplished a great deal. Far be it from me in any way to detract from the noble efforts of those who have spent their time and labour in trying to improve the principles of the community upon this question, but I believe that, in conjunction with moral suasion, as an assistance and a help to moral suasion, it is absolutely necessary that the Government of the country should propose a law and should assist those who are trying this moral suasion to carry out the law and enforce it.

Now, I do not propose to find a great deal of fault with that hon. gentleman. I believe those were his honest sentiments at that time. He may have had reason to change his opinion since then but if he has changed it, I think it is since the plebiscite vote was taken, because I think that shortly before that time he made a speech in the city of Montreal, which was reported in the Montreal "Witness," of the 25th of February, 1897. It is such good reading that I am tempted to give you a few extracts from it :

The hon. gentleman, on being introduced by the president, Mr. J. R. Dougall, remarked pleasantly upon the coincidence that in the Federal Cabinet he represented both the temperance people and the agriculturists of the country. The strength of the temperance people would soon be tested in a notable contest ; but as for the agriculturists, he could say that he represented the most numerous body in the Dominion. And in dealing with this drink question, it was the country which was moral ; it was the country which was willing to do all in its power for its removal ; it was in the towns and cities they met with the most serious obstacles. It need not be doubted that he owed his position in the Federal Cabinet to the two elements mentioned ; and he might state that he was not the only Minister in the Cabinet who was interested, and deeply interested, in the cause of temperance. (Applause.) He had been a member of the Dominion Alliance for years ; he had been the president of

Mr. WILSON.

the society ; he was still a member, and proud to be so. Owing to the multiplicity of his new duties and engagements, he could no longer accept official position in the society ; but his interest in it and the work which it represented was as strong as ever. (Applause.) \* \* \* In previous plebiscite campaigns the issue was local ; this was Dominion ; it was largely a dealing with theory and principle ; it was well understood by temperance people, it was well understood by the liquor trade, that, whatever the result of the plebiscite, legislation would not follow upon the vote.

I do not know how he got that information. The Minister seems to have had it, but he did not communicate it at the time to any of the other temperance men. But the Minister at that time did not seem to take that view, for he said :

Now, let this vital difference be noted—if the temperance people won in this campaign, a prohibitory law would follow, and the liquor traffic would be killed in this country. (Loud applause.) \* \* \* Could the temperance people win in this campaign ? "I say yes, emphatically," exclaimed Mr. Fisher, "if there be proper organization requisites. First of all, there must be organization. You can do nothing without organization."

Now, I was under the impression that that committed the Minister pretty strongly to prohibition ; and when he introduced his resolution into the convention I have no doubt in the world that he was sincere and honest, because I believe he has been a temperance man for a good many years. I think he tried to commit his party to the principle of prohibition, and tried to induce them to adopt it as a plank in their platform, and if the other temperance men had been as honest as he was at that time, he would have succeeded. The hon. gentleman has had a lot of difficulties, no doubt, and some people are unkind enough to say that he prefers office to principle. I would not like to go that far, because I do not think that is fair. Men get into tight places in official life. I have no doubt the Minister is still anxious to do what he can for prohibition, but he is not prepared to do it on the lines he used to be. That is the unfortunate part of it.

Now, I want to say something more about the province of Quebec. I have no feeling of hostility to Quebec as a province, only I say it is absolutely wrong that any one province should govern the whole Dominion. There was a large vote given in that province against prohibition, just as there was in the province of Quebec for the Government. They came into power with a minority of the votes polled, and not many said nay, although they had only 45 per cent of the vote cast. It has been stated over and over again by Mr. Spence and Mr. MacLaren that these gentlemen came to power in 1896 on a minority vote. Now, I wish we could get a straight vote on prohibition in this House. I am afraid there was a little understanding between the hon. gentlemen who moved these two amendments to pre-

vent another amendment, because I noticed when the first amendment was moved the other hon. gentleman jumped up at once and insisted on having the floor, because he had his resolution all cut and dried. It did seem to me they were a little afraid that some other person might get in an amendment. I may be wrong, but that is the way it struck me. I am certainly in favour of prohibition, I am in favour of trying it. In my first campaign that was a test question, and I was foolish enough to take the same ground the Liberal party did at that time. I said I was in favour of leaving it to the people, and whatever the result was I was prepared to stand by it. I have taken that position now. The people have said they want prohibition, and I am prepared to say that so far as my vote goes here or elsewhere, it shall go for prohibition.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Before the vote is taken, I want to express my views upon this question, and, in doing so, shall not at this late hour occupy more than a moment or two. I may say, in regard to my position, that I take it that a representative is in duty bound to carry out in Parliament the views and desires of the people he represents. The majority of the people in the constituency which I represent, I believe to be in favour of prohibition. Prohibition, in the constituency of Lisgar, when the plebiscite was taken, had a majority in its favour of nearly 2,000. Therefore, I think it fair to assume that I have a mandate from the people of Lisgar to stand up in this House and vote for prohibition, even if I were opposed to the principle of prohibition, which I am not. If the people of a constituency are overwhelmingly in favour of a certain measure, and give a mandate, even if I did not believe in it myself, I would conceive it to be my duty to vote for that measure, or offer the constituency my resignation. That being the case, I stand here tonight prepared to vote in favour of the amendment presented by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McClure) in favour of total prohibition. Coming from the province of Manitoba, I may say that I am not a coercionist, and that I would not like to see the province of Quebec, which has voted so strongly against prohibition, coerced in this matter, and have prohibitory legislation forced upon it. But I am disposed to believe, Sir, notwithstanding all that has been said about the plebiscite, that the time is ripe for prohibition, at least in all the other provinces in the Dominion of Canada, except Quebec, and that there is a strong feeling amongst the people of Canada in favour of the total prohibition of the liquor traffic. I may say, that in my campaign I pledged myself to vote in favour of prohibition, if the matter came to a straight issue in the House of Commons. When the plebiscite was taken, I was not in favour of it being held at that particular period. I urged a

great many of my temperance friends to use their best endeavours to induce the Government to delay the taking of the plebiscite until a general election was held, but they made no representations to the Ministry. I believe I am absolutely correct in saying that if the plebiscite had been held at the same time as a general election, we would have had such a majority rolled up in favour of prohibition that the Government would be bound to give effect to that vote. If a general election had been held a year ago, and the plebiscite had then been taken, we would probably have had by this time prohibitory legislation upon the statute-book. I listened with the greatest patience and attention to most of the speeches that were delivered on the question to-day, and I was greatly impressed with the manliness and frankness of the speech of the hon. member for Colchester. I must congratulate that hon. gentleman upon the fearless, frank and honest manner in which he expressed his views. Many hon. members may not agree with the position that he took, but there is no hon. member who listened to him who will not agree that he was at least in earnest. He took a strong, fearless position and he spoke with great frankness, when he said that the Government of the day is not a prohibition Government. With that statement I agree, and with his other statement, that the Conservative party is not a prohibition party, I also agree. The people of the country who desire prohibition, it seems to me, have very little to expect from either the Liberal or the Conservative party. They seem to occupy very much the same ground in regard to the question of prohibition. Therefore, in my mind, it behoves the temperance people of the Dominion of Canada to take note of this fact. If they desire prohibition, they must elect candidates pledged to vote for a prohibitory liquor law, and who can absolutely be relied upon to so vote in this House. I know of no other way in which prohibition can be brought about. And so long as temperance people who desire prohibition, set the example of talking prohibition on the platform, and voting for candidates who are not pledged to support prohibition, and who cannot be relied upon to vote for prohibition regardless of party considerations, just so long may they expect to be humbugged in the matter of prohibition. There is only one way in which the people can get rid of this traffic in intoxicating liquors, and that is by absolutely discarding political considerations, and voting in accordance with their principles. I entirely agree with the remarks of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) in one particular, that if we had a prohibitory liquor law passed, as applying to the province of Manitoba, the sentiment of that province is so strongly in favour of prohibition that the law would be reasonably well enforced. Therefore, as I say, coming from a province so strongly in favour of

prohibition, and representing a constituency which has pronounced by such an overwhelming majority of the votes polled in favour of that principle, I am prepared to vote in favour of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Colchester, in favour of the absolute prohibition of the liquor traffic.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of entering into the details of the question which has been submitted to this House. I want simply to say a few words in reply to the remarks which have just been made by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). Of course, the hon. member is a better judge than anybody else can be of the mandate which he may have received from his constituents, and I shall say nothing upon that. But I will point out to the hon. gentleman that, when he says that he has received an imperative mandate from his electors to vote in favour of a prohibitory law, I am obliged to quote the figures which have been published in the official report. I believe that he is in the same position as all the other hon. members who represent constituencies that have given majorities in favour of prohibition, that is, he has certainly no mandate from the majority of his electors to vote for prohibition. I see by this return that the total number of voters on the list in Lisgar was 9,112, while the total number of votes polled in favour of prohibition was 2,289. This is less than one-quarter of the people, so that the mandate which has been given to my hon. friend to vote in favour of prohibition, is the mandate of less than one-quarter of his constituents. This is simply an illustration of the whole question, as it shows the position of hon. members representing counties like that of the hon. member for Lisgar. It is also an illustration of the fact that the Government has received no order from the majority of the electorate in this Dominion to introduce a prohibitory liquor law, and that the Government would not be justified in introducing such a measure, when only a small majority of the total number of voters and a minority of qualified electors have expressed their opinion on the question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Would the hon. gentleman allow me? I would state that the list which formed the basis of that vote is what we call in Manitoba a graveyard list of many years' standing, containing the names of hundreds of men who have left the constituency.

Mr. BOURASSA. At any rate, I am sure the hon. gentleman would not admit that he has over 4,000 people who are dead, but who, nevertheless, have the right to vote. However, I do not think it destroys the argument I am making, and it is, that the only mandate that any hon. member could have received from the county of Lisgar, and

Mr. RICHARDSON.

the only mandate that the Government could receive from the electors of Canada, must be a mandate coming from a straight majority of the electors. It has been said that the Government, when they came into power in 1896, did not have a straight majority of all the votes polled. That although the Liberal party had a majority of constituencies they had not a majority of the total vote. The questions are not the same. The representation for the House of Commons is not only based upon the majority that might be given by the total electors of Canada, but it is based on the majority of certain groups of people settled in counties and represented by one member each. It does not matter for the Government to know if there is a total majority of the electors of Canada that voted in favour of one party or the other, but it matters for the Government to know if they are supported by a majority of members elected by so many constituencies in Canada. In a matter of this kind, with a special question which has nothing to do with the general policy of the Government, which has nothing to do with the local interests represented in one county or a group of several counties, the only thing that can be taken into consideration is the total vote expressed in favour of that question. I hold that a question like prohibition must carry the majority of the total number of the electorate in Canada. And why? Because when the plebiscite took place at the request of a certain class of the people, the people who have asked for prohibition or the people who might ask for a plebiscite are supposed to give all the votes possible in favour of it, and all the votes that have not been polled cannot be interpreted, neither in favour of prohibition nor as neutral. They may be in favour of prohibition, but at the same time they do not take enough interest to go to the poll. I say that the vote that has not been polled cannot be counted in favour of prohibition. Supposing the Government would pass a prohibitory law, and in five or ten years hence the Government consented, on a demand being made, to grant a plebiscite to know if the majority wanted repeal of the law. I contend that then it would require a majority of the electors of Canada to repeal the law, because when the plebiscite is had, all the people that are in favour of the question put must vote, therefore, the votes that are not recorded cannot be interpreted in their favour.

Let me refer now to some of the statements made by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Moore). I am perfectly surprised that a representative of the province of Quebec, a gentleman who knows well the feeling of the people of that province, who knows their high moral standing; I was surprised to hear him insinuate that frauds were committed in that province in connection with the plebiscite vote. I know that an argument has been made out of the fact that the day after the plebiscite some news-

papers gave figures purporting to be of the supposed majority against prohibition in Quebec, and a week after it was found that the majority against prohibition in the province was much larger than at first supposed.

Some people have inferred from that, that the boxes were stuffed and that the vote was irregular. Well, that is a very strange argument. Suppose we use the same argument against the partisans of prohibition and what do we find? I remember very well that the day after the plebiscite was taken, the prohibition majority in Ontario was stated at 14,000, but day after day and week after week, it grew larger until it totalled up to 39,224. Would it be right to contend that in the province of Ontario, or in Nova Scotia, or in British Columbia, or in all the other provinces except Quebec, the vote was not honest, because it was found a week after the plebiscite that the majority was much larger than it was supposed to be the day after the plebiscite. That, therefore, is no argument to use against the province of Quebec, and those who are in favour of prohibition as well as those against it, ought be frank enough to confess it. I have only had a short time to inquire into the details of the plebiscite vote in the other provinces, but taking the report published by the Government and going over in a hurried way, I find some remarkable coincidents. For instance: I find that in the county of Frontenac at poll No. 20, the total names on the list were 74 and the total vote given was 60. That is a very large vote and much over the average given at the general election. Now, out of this total of 60 votes, 56 were given for prohibition. In the county of South Middlesex, poll No. 15, out of 89 votes on the list, 84 votes were polled, and 67 were in favour of prohibition. In the county of Muskoka, a large constituency where the distances are great, and where the vote is not generally very strong even in the bitterest party fight, at poll No. 14, out of 55 votes on the list 50 votes were polled and 47 were in favour of prohibition. In poll 40, 40 votes were on the list and 34 were polled, out of which 32 were in favour of prohibition. At poll 76, out of 63 votes on the list, 56 votes were polled and only 20 were against prohibition. Take the case of Prince Edward Island. I must confess that I had no time to go through the figures because in all the constituencies except King's, the figures for the total votes inscribed on the list are not given in detail but only the additions for the whole county. But in the one county of King's I find some remarkable voting. At poll No. 1, out of 105 votes inscribed, 87 votes were polled or supposed to be polled, and 84 of these were in favour of prohibition. At poll No. 6, out of 102 votes inscribed on the list, 92 votes were polled, and 80 in favour of prohibition. In poll No. 21, out of 109 votes inscribed on the list, 91 votes were polled, and 90 were in

favour of prohibition. But the most remarkable of all was in poll No. 4, at that poll out of 105 votes inscribed on the list, 107 votes were given and out of these 107, 103 sober men voted in favour of prohibition. Then in Algoma, at polls No. 102 and 102-A, the total vote inscribed on the list was 10, but nevertheless 21 convinced prohibitionists went and registered their votes in favour of this high moral principle or more than double the total number inscribed.

Mr. BERGERON. That is the machine.

Mr. BOURASSA. In the county of Cardwell, at poll No. 4, township of Albion, out of 67 votes on the list, 67 voted for prohibition, besides 28 others who voted against it; or we had 95 votes polled with only 67 on the list.

Mr. BERGERON. That is the machine.

Mr. BOURASSA. Yes, that is one of the machines which hon. gentlemen know, but which they would not like to have to-night. In South Essex, at poll No. 22, seventy-two voters were on the list, and there were seventy-eight convinced prohibitionist voters, besides six who voted against prohibition.

Therefore, the gentlemen who have made so much of the voting at a few polls in the province of Quebec, where there was a very close vote, must see that the argument can be turned against themselves. But I do not want to use that kind of argument. I think I am broad-minded enough to say that on the whole the vote was an honest one, in the province of Ontario as well as in the province of Quebec, and throughout the Dominion. But one of the reasons why we could not form an idea of the exact majority against prohibition in the province of Quebec, and of the exact majority in favour of prohibition in the province of Ontario and the other provinces is this—that at the plebiscite the feelings of the people were not so much aroused as at the general elections. Therefore, even where the representatives were at the polls—and at many polls there were none—they did not take the trouble to see that the reports of the voting were sent by telegram soon enough to be announced immediately in the newspapers. I know that in my own county, where everything was done honestly, and where I took no part in the fight, leaving prohibitionists and anti-prohibitionists to vote as they liked; I only knew the result days after the voting had taken place. Very much the same was the case in many other parts of the province of Quebec. In the large centres, like Montreal and Quebec, where the news could be got very quickly, we knew the result on the following day; but in the large districts of Chicoutimi and Rimouski, as well as in Labelle and Pontiac, it took about a week after the voting to learn the result. So it is about time that on this as on every other question we should argue on a broader

ground than that taken by the hon. member for Stanstead, and the other hon. gentlemen who tried to throw some suspicion on the voting in one province or the other. The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Parmelee) has spoken of the people of the province of Quebec in language which I need not repeat. Hon. gentlemen who know the province of Quebec know that it is as respectable, I will not say more respectable, as that of any other province. The people of that province, especially the farming community, are one of the most sober populations that can be found in this or any other country. At the same time, I do not know of any class of people who are so reluctant to see any law adopted that might be against the liberty of any man. I will not say that our farmers are prohibitionists. They like to take their drink once in a while; but they know how to take it, when to begin and when to stop. They do not want to be interfered with in their liberty; and I am sure it is the same with most people in all the provinces of the Dominion. Of course, the prohibitionists were convinced, and they were ready to make the fight. I admire those who made it from conviction. I admire those on both sides of the Chamber who have spoken in favour of prohibition from conviction. I admire those who have stood by the mandate of the electors, if it is in accordance with their views. But even if the majority in my county were given in favour of prohibition, if it was not a majority of the electors of my county, I would not feel like voting for it, because the majority did not feel like going to the polls. If the people of the province of Quebec had thought there was anything really serious in this they would have given a vote that would have shown 150,000 majority against prohibition.

Mr. BERGERON. They were right; it was not serious.

Mr. BOURASSA. No, they did not think it was serious, because they could not conceive that it was possible to enact such a law. They could not conceive that it was possible that some people would try to prevent them using an honest thing in an honest way.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. gentleman told us just now that there were 76 votes where there were only 70 names on the list. Could they do anything better than that, if they tried?

Mr. BOURASSA. I understand that the hon. gentleman is not able to discuss the question on any other ground than the narrow ground on which the hon. member for Stanstead has put it. I could say exactly the same thing of those twenty-one prohibitionists of Algoma, who voted at a poll where there were only ten who had a right to vote. I take the question as a whole. These are

Mr. BOURASSA.

matters of detail, and such things have been found not only in the province of Quebec but in the other provinces. Therefore, there is no argument in that, and experienced men should not descend to such arguments. In the other provinces also, if the people thought that the majority of the votes polled would have been in favour of prohibition, I am convinced that many more would have gone and voted for prohibition, and would have relieved the conscience of the hon. member for Lisgar. Under the circumstances, I think the Government would not be justified in introducing a prohibitory law, and I think it is pretty safe that they will not do so.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assinibola). Mr. Speaker, the arguments that have been used on the other side to-night may fairly be described as excuses—I mean on the part of those speakers who have defended the Government, because it is quite clear as hon. gentlemen speaking on this side have shown, that the Government has to make its apology to the people of Canada in regard to this question. Take the kind of argument made by my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa), who has just taken his seat, and by the Minister of the Interior. It is one that has no statesmanlike foundation whatever, and no foundation in constitutional conceptions of the workings of the state. Let us go to the country whence we get the word "plebiscite." How would the arguments that have been used by these hon. gentlemen respecting the size of the vote do in France? I have in my hand one of the most authoritative books written on France, a book written by Mr. Bodley. Dealing with the vote cast in France for the Government of the day, he writes as follows:

The political indifference of the French electorate is such that it is marvellous that scandals like that of Toulouse are not more frequent. Even there, in spite of the addition to the lists of 3,000 non-electors, who, doubtless, all went to the poll, nearly a third of the persons on the register refrained from voting. It is a significant fact that in the regions where the elections cause the greatest excitement, giving the impression that the entire population is interested in them, the abstentions are more numerous. The most turbulent election of 1893 was that of the Var, when Mr. Clémenceau lost his seat at Draguignan; but, though to assure his defeat, the forces of the boulevards were transported to Provence, the Department, which for a week was the talk of Europe, entered so tepidly into the fray, that only one-half of its voters went to the poll,—

So that in the most exciting election, with great issues at stake, only one-half went to the polls. If you were to apply the argument used by the hon. gentleman, the Government of the country could not go on. You cannot, from any statesmanlike point of view, accept the position taken by the Minister of the Interior or my hon. friend. In a constituency, at an election, you have not to do with the votes that are on the

register, but with the vote that comes out at the poll :

—and in the next division, at Toulon, the deputy elected received only a fifth of the votes on the register. The neighbouring Bouches-du-Rhône is politically the most conspicuous of provincial electorates, yet the attraction of 74 candidates for 8 seats brought to the urns little more than half of its electors ; and at Marseilles, whose boast it is that on its Cannebière take birth the revolutions which convulse France, barely a quarter of the voters in certain divisions took the trouble to attest their progressive faith.

If when, on these occasions, barely a quarter of the electorate came out to vote, the French Government declared that they could not regard a man who had been elected by such a small fraction as elected, what would become of the administration of France ? If you were to apply closely the arguments used by these hon. gentlemen to the position of this Government in June, 1896, I am afraid it would be in very ugly queer street.

Bordeaux is a city of less exuberant manners, but it has continued its political prominence, which was its tradition even before the days of the Girondins. It was the last stronghold of Boulangism, and the final stand of that party made the general elections of 1893 of rare interest ; yet, in the three urban divisions, Republicans and Monarchists, Socialists and Boulangists, could not bring to the polls 55 per cent of the electors.

Yet we have an instructed gentleman like the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), who of course is a Frenchman, pure blood, lecturing us in regard to the management of this great institution, this great electoral system, in which certainly the Anglo-Saxon has some claim, and telling us that we have to look, not at the vote cast, but at the vote on the register.

This occurred again in 1896, when the moderate Republicans, who boasted that they were forming a new national party of order, sent to Bordeaux a retired ambassador to contest a seat. The prosperous and the industrious classes so little heeded the proffered honour that they let a Socialist win by the votes of little more than a quarter of the electors on a register of 20,000.

If there were any sense in the argument of the hon. member for Labelle, what was the French Government about in allowing the Socialists to win by a little more than a quarter of the electorate on a register of 20,000. The argument will not bear examination for a minute.

What occurred ? In all Canada the total number of electors on the list was 1,236,419, and the total number of votes cast 543,058, or something less than one-half. There was a majority in the whole Dominion in favour of prohibition of 12,916, but there was a majority of 94,032 leaving the province of Quebec out. Was there anything peculiar about Quebec ? I say there was. The Minister of Agriculture was quoted by my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) as saying that the people could re-

gard the plebiscite as one that would result in legislation. The hon. Minister is on record in several places as having spoken in those terms. I have heard the organ of the most active Minister of the Crown, and a very able man who is now in Paris for his health, and whose health, I hope, will be greatly benefited. From the moment the plebiscite was launched, his organ assailed it vigorously. I have here "La Patrie," and if I turn to the number of the 26th July, I find a long leading article against prohibition. I find on the 3rd August, 1898, another strong article against prohibition. Here is a sentence : "We can assure our compatriots"—

Mr. BOURASSA. En Français.

Mr. DAVIN. No, I shall not give it in the original, for I am a little afraid that my hon. friend might, as he did the other night, find that my French offended his delicate tympanum, although he has an accent that is not pure Parisian, and that would make Edmond About start and gasp.

Mr. BOURASSA. I would not accept the judgment of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIN. I daresay not, because the hon. gentleman has a very good opinion of himself. "We urge our compatriots to vote against prohibition." On the 6th August, I find an article on "The plebiscite," again attacking prohibition. On the 16th August I find an article headed "The failure of prohibition," a long article of a column and a quarter in length, in which it is shown, or tried to be shown, how prohibition has failed wherever it has been tried. Again, on the 19th August "The example of Maine" forms the subject of an article, and my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) is quoted as against prohibition. Then, again, on the 26th August, we have an article on "Prohibition in Iowa," and its hypocrisy in Maine, Iowa, and elsewhere is held up as a warning against voting in favour of the plebiscite. On the 12th September there is an article, "Pas de Politique"—"no politics"—and the "World," of Toronto, is quoted as having a despatch from Montreal saying that the French Conservative party in Quebec will vote for prohibition with the object of embarrassing the Government of Laurier. And the editor goes on to say that if the French Conservative party were to do that it is for the French Liberal party to vote the other way, and that will counteract the whole thing. What is the meaning of that but to raise party passions in the minds of the prohibitionists of Quebec and to show the Liberals amongst the prohibitionists that there was an organized scheme to embarrass the leader of the Liberal party and to hint to them : The proper thing for you to do is to defeat that Conservative move, and the way to do that is to vote against prohibition. Let us suppose for a moment

that the claims of the Minister of Public Works as to his influence in Quebec are sound, that he can ring his bell and get the people to follow him as sheep follow a bell-wether. Then we may believe that the French Liberals who are devoted to prohibition went and voted against prohibition on political grounds, and if that was the case, the vote cast in Quebec must be considered a strong one in favour of prohibition. We come then to the 16th September, when prohibition is denounced as utopian. On the 24th September we have an article on the plebiscite, in which the writer urges the people not to lose sight of what a fiasco prohibition has been in Maine, Rhode Island, Vermont, Massachusetts and Kansas, and in every part of Canada where it has been tried, and urges them not to vote for it. The first article in the issue of September 26th is in the same tone, and on the 27th we have an article headed "The Plebiscite," also against prohibition. Then, we have an article in which the writer refers to the Minister of Agriculture as only representing one in the Cabinet on this question. My hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) quoted the Minister of Agriculture as saying he was not alone in the Cabinet in his views on this question, when he was wooing the votes, politically, of the people of Quebec. Here we have the Minister of Agriculture quoted in this paper as saying he is the only one, and this is held up as we know it was elsewhere, to show that this was not a question in which any member of the Government took an interest except the Minister of Agriculture. Not only that, but the hon. Minister of Public Works made a speech—I cannot lay my hand on it at the moment—in which he declared that the plebiscite was never a plank in the platform adopted by the conference in Ottawa.

Mr. DUGAS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Dugas) is from Quebec and knows that such a speech was delivered—it was notorious at the time. The way the Minister proved that this was not a plank of the conference at Ottawa was by saying that a large number of the people had gone away from the conference before that was brought before them. I was not at the conference, but this does not appear on the face of these proceedings, nor was it ever made to appear when these hon. gentlemen were seeking the votes of the electors. I have here a campaign sheet issued one or two years afterwards by a gentleman who is exercising great influence of a certain kind in the ranks of the Liberal party at the present time. It is headed "Dominion of Canada. Principles, policy and platform of the Liberal party," and it bears the name "Alexander Smith, secretary, Ontario Liberal Association, 34 Victoria Street, Toronto," and is dated January, 1895. The address to the reader at the beginning says, "This

Mr. DAVIN.

pamphlet is not for general distribution." Why not for general distribution? Because anybody who reads it will see that it was intended, not to meet the eye of those who could criticise it with knowledge of all the facts connected with the Liberal party. On page 5 of this pamphlet, after mentioning a number of questions said to be advocated by the Liberal party, we have this paragraph:

There are a number of other questions, such as temperance, the superannuation of public officers, the abolition of Government House, &c., on which the Liberal party has ranked itself in opposition to certain lines pursued by Conservatives.

What does that mean? That means nothing else but this—that the Liberal party had gone further than to say: We want a plebiscite. You know very well, Mr. Speaker, with your knowledge of politics, how that would strike the ear of any prohibitionist in Ontario or the west—the Liberal party has always ranked itself, on a question of temperance, against Conservatives, not on the plebiscite only, but for prohibition. That it was intended to deceive is palpable, because the abolition of Government House was never a plank in the Liberal platform. As the plebiscite was intended to catch prohibitionists, this abolition of the Government House was intended to catch the Patrons. Now, why do I speak thus?

Mr. McMULLEN. You can answer that.

Mr. DAVIN. What a ghoul that is waking up from his crass dreams of stupidity! what a wretched moral ghoul the member for North Wellington is, making a remark like that, meaningless, having nothing to it, coming out of the malignant recesses of a heart that has never been able to learn humanity, as long as he has lived.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will withdraw the expression "stupidity."

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, well, I will withdraw it, and I will say the brilliant lights of intellect gleam upon that brow of his perpetually. Now, Mr. Speaker, why do I speak thus? I say the time has come when we have a Government that takes \$250,000 to get from the people of Canada their judgment on a certain question. They get that judgment, and they were bound to take legislative action; they were bound, above all, not to take the course they are taking here tonight, trying to dodge it as much as they can. We had an argument addressed to the ex-Minister of Finance from an hon. gentleman opposite, in which he quoted what the ex-Minister of Finance said long ago, that it would require a large majority in favour of prohibition to warrant prohibition being enacted. But that argument will not help the Government. I remember well, when this vote for \$250,000 was being taken, the ex-Minister of Finance and others appealed

to my right hon. friend to say whether he would require an overwhelming vote, or what proportion of the total vote he would require, or whether he would require that every province should give a majority, and not one word could be got from the leader of the Government upon that head. Mr. Speaker, I say that in the judgment of the people of Canada, in the judgment of those who value public consistency and governmental efficiency, there is no defence that can be made of the Government in this matter that would satisfy the people of Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. W. J. ROOHE (Marquette). I think many of the members of this House, and the major portion of the people of the country will agree with me, when I say that the title of this resolution is a misnomer. Had it been called a resolution for the purpose of letting the Government down easily, it would, in my opinion, be a more appropriate application and one more in consonance with the object of its promoters. Those gentlemen who had for years past been trading on their temperance principles to further their own and their party's ends, must now feel, that is, if they have not passed the stage of feeling, that they occupy a humiliating position in the eyes of those who have the cause of temperance at heart. The mover of this resolution, years ago, I believe, on more than one occasion introduced a resolution in this House calling on the Government to adopt national prohibition. He espoused the cause of temperance, ostensibly from conviction, and was its great advocate, in season and out of season, on each and every occasion that he considered it would embarrass the Conservative Government. No doubt existed in his mind in those days that the country was ripe for prohibition, and when, after plebiscites had been taken in several of the provinces, and immense majorities had been rolled up in its favour, his convictions were still further strengthened that the people were overwhelmingly in favour of its adoption. And still, notwithstanding this fact, he, as a prominent member of the Liberal party, acquiesced in, and became a party to, an arrangement entered into between the prohibitionist and anti-prohibitionist wings of the Liberal party in convention assembled, to go through the farce of taking a Dominion plebiscite, with the private understanding that at least 50 per cent of the total vote on the lists would be required in its favour before action would be expected of the Government, by way of a prohibitory measure, a condition impossible of fulfilment, and no person knew this better than the mover of this present resolution. What greater act of duplicity could possibly be practised than the action of the Premier of this country, when, during the last session of Parliament, he was repeatedly pressed by

hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and particularly by the ex-Finance Minister, to declare the intention of the Government in reference to the vote that would be necessary to be polled in favour of prohibition before they would assume the responsibility of introducing a prohibitory Bill, to find him as repeatedly refusing to commit himself, denying the right of the Opposition to obtain such information, keeping back from the temperance people information that would have proved of incalculable benefit at that time, before the vote had been taken, and since admitting that the party had long previously come to a private understanding that at least 50 per cent of the total vote on the lists would be required. Had this decision been made public in advance of the vote, the temperance people would have recognized the impossible task set before them, and the public generally would have seen the huge farce that was being enacted, and loud and long would have been the condemnation of the Government for the useless and extravagant waste of \$200,000 to provide work for needy members of the party and to deceive the people with a false appearance of friendliness to the temperance cause.

Now, in a speech delivered in the city of Winnipeg prior to the elections of 1896, the Prime Minister expressed certain views that have already been referred to here to-night, in which he declared, on his honour as a public man, that if his party were returned to power, they would stand or fall as a result of the plebiscite, or, as he put it, by the will of the people.

In an interview had with members of the Methodist Conference he gave vent to the same expression and declared that the minority would have to abide by the wishes of the majority. In several other interviews he gave his interviewers to understand on each occasion, that if there were a majority of the votes polled in favour of prohibition this would be sufficient warrant for his Government to introduce a prohibitory measure. There was nothing said in those interviews of the people who would not vote and the most that could be claimed for that class would be that they were willing to abide by the verdict of the majority. Even after the vote had been taken he admitted to a deputation of temperance people that the vote had been a most favourable one in their behalf under the circumstances. It therefore came with all the greater surprise and disappointment to those who had pinned their faith to the Premier's promises and utterances, when they learned that the Government did not intend implementing his pledges by legislation in the direction indicated by the vote of the people. We are told that the vote against prohibition in Quebec was too great to ignore, that we cannot coerce Quebec, which seems to be a favourite word with hon. gentlemen opposite. But every province in the Dominion, with the

single exception of Quebec, gave large majorities in its favour and even with the adverse vote of Quebec there was some 14,000 of a majority in its favour. Is the rule now going to be laid down that on a question submitted to the popular vote, the minority is going to rule? There were 129 constituencies which gave majorities in favour of prohibition, and 84 constituencies gave majorities against it, or a clear majority of 45 constituencies in its favour, a larger majority than this Government had when they came into power in 1896; but still they did not hesitate to take office, because every province in the Dominion did not give them a majority, nor did they take into consideration the unpolled vote. Toronto gave a large majority against prohibition, but Ontario in which province Toronto is located, rolled up a large majority in its favour. In granting provincial prohibition to Ontario, therefore, would you not be perfectly justified in coercing Toronto, as hon. gentlemen are pleased to call it, and require that city to conform to the wishes of the majority? So would it be wiser and more reasonable to carry out the wishes of the majority including Quebec, or to allow the minority, the adverse vote of one province to dictate the policy to the greater number. But there is more than a suspicion that the reputed vote of the province of Quebec is not a fair index of the views of the people in that province, that in fact the "machine" got in its work by the stuffing of ballot-boxes, and the length of time it took to obtain correct returns from that province, 40,000 of a majority against being reported the day after the vote which had increased to over 90,000 in a couple of weeks' time. That coupled with other suspicious circumstances and charges that have been made lends great colour to the suggestion of an improper vote. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) a few moments ago referred to the returns from some polling places in Algoma, and to the returns from some other places as evidence that the prohibitionists had stuffed the ballots because more votes were polled than appeared on the list, in refutation of the charge made by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Moore), that ballots were stuffed in Quebec by the opponents of prohibition. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that in Algoma he was dealing with the polls in unorganized districts. In some of these districts that he has referred to a local election to the Ontario legislature was recently held, and we find that in one polling subdivision, the Empress Mine B, 12 votes were polled for the Conservative candidate, and 4 for the Liberal candidate, 16 votes in all, when there is not a single vote appearing on the list. At Oliver, 10 A polling subdivision, 4 Conservative votes were cast, 14 Liberal votes, making a total of 18 votes, when there was not a single vote upon the list. At Saw Bill, 16 A, 23 votes were polled for the Liberal

Mr. ROCHE.

candidate and there was not a vote on the list at all. At Ignace, 17 A, 8 votes were polled for the Liberal candidate and there were no votes on the list. In each of these cases that have been quoted by the hon. member for Labelle as evidence that the prohibitionists had been ballot-stuffing the polls were in unorganized municipalities and there were no lists whatever. No better evidence of the hypocrisy of the Government on this question is required or the duplicity practised on the people, than the spectacle of three Cabinet Ministers stumping the country against a policy that was made a principal plank in their own party platform, and declaring in advance of the vote that the temperance people were getting the plebiscite but that was all they would get, and even in granting that they said their party had made a huge mistake.

Surely that fact alone should be sufficient to disillusionize those temperance people who had faith in the promises of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture, and should convince them of the palpable manner in which they have been duped.

Now this resolution provides that before prohibition can be put into effect in any province, another provincial plebiscite must be taken, and taken only at the time for the holding of a general election for the House of Commons. What a farce that is, to be sure; have we not already had two plebiscites taken in the most of the provinces of the Dominion, one in favour of provincial, and the other for national prohibition? And what nonsense it is, and how superfluous to demand another vote on a question in which the wishes of the people are so well known. In my opinion this is merely meant to secure delay to allow the Government time to extricate themselves from the embarrassing position they have through, their own duplicity got themselves into. Knowing that a vote can only be taken once in five years, if this resolution becomes law they see an opportunity to put off as far as possible any action on the question and hope, like Dicken's Micawber, that something may turn up to relieve them of dealing with it at all. Almost every temperance organization of the country have condemned the inaction of the Government, and denounced this breach of faith with the temperance people, many of whom gave their votes to the party now in power on the strength of their temperance pledges. It was not the temperance people who asked for the plebiscite, the major portion of them considered it entirely unnecessary, expensive, and uncalled for. It was merely gotten up by the Liberal party as a campaign cry to draw a certain element of the voting population to their side, while at the same time they had not the slightest intention, no matter how large a majority was polled in favour of prohibition, to introduce and pass a prohibitory measure.

They had been so long in opposition and

so great was their anxiety to obtain power, that they became more reckless in their pledges, more profuse in the promises on each succeeding occasion they appeared before the electors, and now that their chickens are coming home to roost the so-called temperance men on their side of the House are put up to whitewash the Government and condone their actions, while throwing this sop to the temperance people to try and ally their restlessness and irritability caused by the hypocrisy of their own political leaders. This resolution only provides for the prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors in any province, and does not legislate against the manufacture and importation, as the Plebiscite Bill which was submitted to the people and on which they voted, provided for. It is therefore only a partial measure, a half-hearted attempt, and will not meet the requirements of the people in those provinces that have pronounced in favour of total prohibition. On the question of the prohibition of the liquor traffic including the importation, manufacture and sale I voted in the affirmative and pledged myself to support such a measure if introduced in this House to apply to the whole Dominion. I have always felt that the Government were insincere on this question, that they were merely utilizing it for party purposes, that they never seriously contemplated its adoption, and events have fully justified that opinion. I have received no instructions from any of my constituents to support such a resolution as this one introduced by the member for Yarmouth, no temperance organization in my constituency, so far as I am aware have endorsed it, and as I believe it is merely meant to remove the responsibility from the shoulders of the men now in power and not for the purpose of furthering the temperance cause I mean to oppose it.

Mr. ROBERT HOLMES (West Huron). Mr. Speaker, it is not because the resolution of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) goes as far as I would like it to, that I shall give it my support, but it is because it seems to me to be the most practicable and feasible solution of the problem now before us. In the brief time at my disposal at this late hour, I think I can show that the action of the Government is justified under the present circumstances. I am one of those who endeavour to look at circumstances as they are, and not as they might be. We have no right to go behind the vote recorded for the province of Quebec any more than the people of Quebec have the right to go behind the vote recorded in the province of Ontario, and I think we must look upon the matter just as it presents itself to us here. It has been urged to-night as an argument, that if we were to reverse the situation the people of the province of Ontario would not be willing to be coerced, as it is claimed it has been attempted to coerce the people of the pro-

vince of Quebec. Hon. gentlemen of the Opposition, in so many words, assert that the Government is bound to carry out prohibition, but at the same time there is a mental reservation that so far as the province of Quebec is concerned at all events, and indeed so far as the Dominion is concerned, prohibition would be clearly inoperative, because it has not public sentiment behind it. I want to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to one or two points wherein I think the Government is justified in the action it has taken. We look upon the province of Ontario as being the banner province so far as prohibition sentiment is concerned, and we regard the vote in the province of Ontario and the sentiment in the province named, as justifying us to some extent in the stand we take. I believe that an analysis of the vote in the province of Ontario would convince any reasonable man, that it would be decidedly imprudent at the present time to enact a strict prohibitory law. I represent a county that is as strongly prohibitive in its sentiments as any county in the province of Ontario. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) said that he was pledged to his people, and that his people had voted so largely in favour of prohibition that he felt it incumbent upon him, in harmony with their votes, to vote for prohibition. The same reason would impel me to vote for prohibition, but I do not think it would be a logical course to pursue, simply because my constituents, by a large majority, voted for the plebiscite. I do not feel bound to do so unless the other conditions existing were such as would justify me in believing that prohibition could be enforced. In the province of Ontario there are ninety constituencies, and out of these ninety, in nineteen the percentage of the total vote polled was slightly more than one-half the votes on the list. In sixty of the constituencies, the percentage of the votes polled was less than half the votes on the list. In six constituencies the percentage of the total vote polled was only one-third the total votes on the list, and that leaves out of the calculation the cities which, with one or two exceptions, were strongly adverse to prohibition. I hold that there is not a sufficiently strong sentiment evinced by these figures to warrant the Government in passing a prohibitory law. It has been stated to-night, and reiterated time and time again, that the people expect the Government to introduce a prohibitory law. I do not regard that as the fact, and I wish to quote briefly the opinion of one or two persons of high standing in the community, as evidence that the people at large do not regard the Government as being called upon, under the circumstances, to pass prohibitory legislation. At the recent Presbyterian Assembly the Rev. Mr. Jordan, who is represented as a Conservative, said:

I believe the Government has done wisely in not urging upon Parliament the acceptance of a

prohibition law, because such a law, if passed at the present time, would simply mean a foregone failure. "The true remedy," Mr. Jordan also said "was not prohibition, but education and legislation rightly used."

Mr. Hamilton Cassels, who is also quoted as a Conservative, said :

He was a Conservative as far as Dominion politics were concerned, but he did not believe in enacting a prohibitory law with a vote of only 22½ per cent of the electorate behind it.

Principal McVicar was inclined to think that there had not been a mandate in regard to prohibition. The Rev. Mr. Potts, who, as a good many people in this House know, is prominent in the Methodist Church, and who is also a Conservative, said that he did not believe that the Government was called upon to introduce a prohibitory measure. The Rev. Dr. Rose, of this city, who, I believe, is also a Conservative, has placed himself upon record as considering the Government is not justified in introducing a prohibitive liquor law in the face of the vote recorded. The New York "Independent," regarded as a very important religious journal, in discussing the Canadian plebiscite vote, said :

That the Dominion is not evenly and uniformly ripe for prohibition, and that there is need for a great deal of work to be done ere the liquor traffic in Canada is placed where it can do no harm is quite evident.

In view of the vote in the various provinces and the adverse vote in the province of Quebec, I think this Government is not justified at the present time in putting on the statute-book a law which, in my opinion, to a large extent, would be a dead letter. Even if there were presumptive evidence that that law could be enforced with a moderate degree of success, I, for one, would be prepared to give my vote in favour of it. I believe in the principle of prohibition, but I believe we can only advance along lines that carry the support of the people. The statement has been made that the country is ready for prohibition. I do not think it is. I took some part in the plebiscite campaign, and wherever I had an opportunity to speak I urged the people to go and record their votes, whether they were in favour of or against prohibition, because, I said, the Government would be influenced by that vote, and if people did not go out and vote, it would be taken as an evidence that they were not in favour of prohibition. Those who stayed at home certainly counted as much against as for the principle of prohibition ; and I think that was fair, because the man who does not come out and record his vote in favour of a law is not going to help enforce it. A law cannot be enforced, if it is not backed up by public opinion ; and to put a prohibitory law on the statute-book not backed up by stronger public sentiment than was indicated by this plebiscite vote would be a farce. I believe that the temperance peo-

Mr. HOLMES.

ple of the Dominion of Canada are not so unreasonable in their demands as to think that simply putting on the statute-book a prohibitory law would lead to its enforcement. They want to see a law that would be enforced, and they are satisfied that with the small proportion of the total vote recorded for it, it could not be enforced ; and the experience of the past has shown that. I do not think there is a breach of confidence on the part of the Government in not carrying out what has been called a mandate from the people to put on the statute-book a prohibitory law. There is no breach of confidence in the Government for not doing that. The Liberal party announced its platform in 1893 that they would submit a plebiscite and would be guided by that. Some speakers on the Opposition side argue that if there is a simple majority in favour of a prohibitory law, the Government are bound to enact legislation ; but they overlook the fact that in all legislation of this character, it is absolutely impossible to enforce it unless there is a strong majority behind it. A mere majority is not sufficient to insure the enforcement of sumptuary legislation, and I am surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite should ask the Government to put on the statute-book a law which they are unable to enforce. When the sentiment of this country is sufficiently strong and sufficiently expressed to justify the enactment of a prohibitory law and to ensure its enforcement, I would be one of the first to vote in favour of it. In the meantime, I am prepared to support the motion of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint).

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). It is not my intention, at half-past two in the morning, to enter on a discussion of this question, which has already been very fully dealt with. My intention, however, is briefly to state the position in which I stand with respect to this question, in case I should not be able to be present in the House when the division takes place. The resolution which has been introduced by the hon. member for Yarmouth is, to my mind, simply a return to the old Scott Act, but extending it to the provinces. The county of Halton, which I have the honour to represent, has been known as the banner temperance county of the province of Ontario. In the year 1881 the county of Halton adopted the Scott Act, and I believe it was the first county to take it up, and that Act remained in force seven years. In 1884, after it had been in force about three years, an effort was made to repeal it, but the Act was sustained by a majority of 180. Another vote to repeal the Act was taken in 1888, when it was repealed by a majority of 197, showing that between 1884 and 1888 the Scott Act lost the support of 377 voters. In eight municipalities out of nine in the county the Scott Act lost support between 1884 and 1888. No further attempt has been made to deal with that question

during the past ten years. Last year, when the plebiscite vote was taken, 1,894 electors voted for prohibition, and 1,272 against it, showing a majority in favour of prohibition of 622, all but two of the municipalities giving a majority in favour of total prohibition. Now, as I said, in 1888, the county declared against limited prohibition, against the Scott Act, a law somewhat similar to that which we are now asked to adopt by the motion of the hon. member for Yarmouth, whereas in 1898 the people declared in favour of total prohibition. In my opinion, the election, so far as the county of Halton was concerned, was a very fair one. I do not believe that the Liberal party there were aware of the fact that the Government had decided secretly that a majority of at least 50 per cent must be obtained before they would take any cognizance of that vote, and I am sure that the Conservative party was not aware of it. I believe the election was carried on with little or no attempt to secure anything but a fair verdict. The reason I rise to-night is simply to declare where I stand on this question. I propose to voice the views of my constituents, to follow the instructions that were given to me, as determined by the vote of 1888, and the vote of 1898, and in so doing I believe I can best discharge the sacred duty entrusted to me.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to represent a county which I believe gave the largest majority of any county in the whole Dominion of Canada in favour of prohibitory legislation. At a large mass meeting held in the Academy of Music in the town of Amherst previous to that election, I made a promise that if a majority of the electors upon the list in the county of Cumberland should vote in favour of prohibitory legislation, I would be guided by that vote in Parliament. The election resulted in 4,444 votes being cast in favour of prohibition and 308 opposed to prohibition. There were upon the lists in the county 7,782 votes. It will be seen that the vote in favour of prohibition was much more than 50 per cent of the whole vote upon the lists in that county, and I am prepared to abide by the mandate given me on that occasion, and to vote according to my promise.

We have heard a great deal with reference to the evils of intemperance, but I do not think they need be discussed. It is admitted that the evils of intemperance are the greatest that exist in the state.

I was one of the delegates to the Liberal convention in 1893, and I then voted in favour of taking a plebiscite. That vote I have never regretted, and if there were no other reason I would defend it upon the ground that the plebiscite election was a great educational campaign throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion, and that whatever money had to be paid out of the treasury, a good return was received in the tem-

perance education given throughout the country. There has been a great deal said by hon. gentlemen opposite as to the Government deceiving the people. It does not seem to me that there can be very much argument along that line. Let me quote from the Senate "Hansard" a debate that took place in that body in June, 1898, before the plebiscite was taken :

Senator Perley wanted to know whether a majority of the votes cast under the plebiscite would constitute a decision in favour of prohibition.

Hon David Mills replied that the object of the plebiscite was to ascertain the sentiment of the public on the subject and find out if the sentiment of the country was strong enough to secure the enforcement of a prohibitory law. The vote polled might be so small that it would not be an indication of the popular will, but only on evidence of indifference on the part of the people on the question. It would be the duty of the Government to use its judgment as to whether the vote taken is an expression of the popular will in favour of or against prohibition or not.

In the province of New Brunswick, during the plebiscite campaign, the Westmorland County Plebiscite Association, in their address to the electors, said :

Every vote unrecorded will be counted against prohibition. In this crisis, carelessness is criminal, simple delinquency on the part of large numbers will mean defeat, and widespread indifference means disaster.

In the campaign in New Brunswick Mr. Buchanan, who claims to represent the advanced temperance ideas of the country, made the following statement :

This question offers no possibility for divisions. It simply asks : Are you in favour of prohibition ? Every elector is obliged to place himself on one side or the other. There is but one single issue. You must discriminate between a plebiscite and an ordinary election. Each are entirely different. People ask how many votes will it take to carry this plebiscite. There is nothing to carry. It has one single, simple aim—that of gathering information as to their sentiment on the temperance question. If in a Scott Act election 5,000 voted for the act and 4,500 against the act it will carry. The plebiscite is simply to learn information. The Government wants to know the number for and against prohibition.

In the Halifax "Wesleyan" during the prohibition campaign a correspondent of that paper delivered himself in the following terms :

Whatever others may think, my opinion is that the Government acted wisely in not stating what will be regarded as a sufficient guarantee that the country is prepared for prohibition. The country is given a free hand, and if prohibition is wanted the people are now at liberty to say so. But while the Government has not stated what will be taken out as the voice of the country on the subject, we may fairly assume that nothing less than a majority of the names on the voters' lists will be regarded as a sufficient guarantee that the country wants such a law. A simple majority of the votes cast, unless that

majority is equal to a majority of the names on the voters' lists, would not be sufficient.

But not only was this opinion given by a plebiscite association and others who were engaged in that campaign, but a number of men prominent in public affairs in this country, gave utterances along the very same line. At the meeting in the Academy of Music, to which I have referred, I had the honour of listening to an address by the Hon. Mr. Dickey, the Minister of Justice in the late Cabinet of the leader of the Opposition, and the Amherst "Daily Press," a paper practically owned and controlled by him, in reporting that speech, said :

After introductory remarks, the speaker explained the nature and effect of the plebiscite, warning the people that what would be necessary was not a mere majority of votes cast, but as nearly as possible a majority of the votes on the electorate list ; there was nothing to be carried by a majority. The vote was a declaration of the people's wishes for the information and guidance of Parliament, and should be made as emphatic as possible.

It is thus clearly to be seen that if the Hon. Mr. Dickey had been a member of this Government he would have advised that on the vote no action should be taken. In the same newspaper, belonging to the hon. gentleman, I find its editorial, in the same issue, reads as follows :

In the course of the very able speech of Hon. Mr. Dickey, on Monday night, a text of which appears in this issue, it was pointed out just what would constitute a vote in favour of a prohibitory law in Canada, and the importance will readily suggest itself to the temperance people of securing as large a vote as possible on voting day. When an election for a member is held he who gets a majority wins, but not so in this instance. This is a case in which the Government asks the opinion of the people on a vital question. It asks how many people want prohibition, and as there are about a million people in Canada who have a voting voice, the Government will listen to those who say "Yes" and presume that those who say "No" and those who say nothing are not in favour of prohibition. This may not be in line with the popular supposition, but it is in all probability the view the Government will take of the matter when the voice of the people is heard. According to the wording of the ballot those who are not in favour of prohibition will be against it.

I do not wish to delay the House at this hour, but merely wish to quote some of the expressions made use of by leading newspapers and men in our country prominent in the temperance cause with reference to the plebiscite. The election was held, and the result was that about 22½ per cent voted in favour of prohibition, and 21½ per cent against prohibition, leaving 56 per cent of the total vote on the lists that did not vote at all, and I think there is considerable force in the argument of hon. gentlemen in favour of the position the Government has taken, namely, that 22½ per cent of the total vote upon the lists does not warrant the

Mr. LOGAN.

Government in bringing down any prohibitory legislation. These hon. gentlemen are not alone in that opinion, but have the support of eminent men throughout the length and breadth of the country, including the Rev. John Potts, the Rev. Mr. Rose, Mr. J. S. Robertson, Secretary of the Canadian Temperance League, and the Rev. William Patterson, who have pronounced in no unmeasured tones their conviction that it would be a great blow at the cause of temperance which they have at heart, if the Government should introduce prohibitory legislation at this time.

Besides being one of those who voted in favour of the plebiscite being taken, I was also one who urged strongly upon the Government that the straight issue should be put before the people and not be confused with any question of taxation. It is well known that strong pressure was brought to bear on the Government to have the question of taxation, the question as to whether those in favour of prohibition were prepared to pay a direct tax, submitted at the same time as the question of prohibition. I must congratulate the Government on not having yielded to that pressure and having submitted the question of prohibition pure and simple to the people.

It has been charged by hon. gentlemen opposite that the Government itself took part in this campaign and that members of the Government in the province of Quebec used undue influence against prohibition. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken to-night to show that more than two members of the Government spoke in Quebec against prohibition in that campaign. I will admit that the Minister of Inland Revenue did speak to the electors of his own county, at their request, giving his opinion on this question, and the late Mr. Geoffrion, who was a member of the Government without portfolio, also spoke to his constituents on the same line. But, outside of these there was not a member of the Government who spoke.

Mr. BERGERON. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte).

Mr. LOGAN. He did not speak against prohibition.

Mr. BERGERON. He spoke in Valleyfield in my county.

Mr. LOGAN. I am informed by members of the Government, who should know, that he did not take any stand against prohibition in that province. But, even if two or three members of the Government had spoken in Quebec against prohibition, we have the Minister of Agriculture who not only spoke in his own county in favour of prohibition, not only spoke in his own province, but he spoke in the metropolitan city of the Dominion and in this capital city of Canada, calling upon the people to come forward and

vote for prohibition. So, there is not much in the statement that people in Quebec were influenced by members of the Government.

I shall not detain the House at greater length, as I said before, the large majority of the electors in my county have given directions to me to vote in favour of prohibition. I have promised to do so and I am prepared to carry out that promise. I could not consider myself their representative if I did not do so. I will vote and do everything in my power to further the cause of temperance which means so much for the peace and happiness of our homes and the prosperity of our country.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2.45 a.m. (Saturday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 29th July, 1899.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### OFFICIAL DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. RICHARDSON presented the Sixth Report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates of the House as follows:—

Your committee recommend that Mr. Wilfrid Larose, one of the members of the present staff of translators of the official report of the Debates, be appointed chief translator to replace Mr. N. H. Beaulieu, whose delicate state of health incapacitates him from discharging the duties pertaining to the said office of chief translator, but that Mr. Beaulieu's services as translator be retained.

The foregoing recommendation to take effect from the beginning of the next session.

Mr. RICHARDSON moved that the said Report be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 180)—from the Senate—for the relief of Isaac Stephen Van Wart.—(Mr. Landarkin.)

### PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. GIBSON moved that the Seventh Report of the committee on the printing of both Houses be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

## RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House do resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Monday next to consider the following proposed resolutions:

1. That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant a subsidy of \$3,200 per mile towards the construction of each of the undermentioned lines of railway (not exceeding in any case the number of miles hereinafter respectively stated) which shall not cost more on the average than \$15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, and towards the construction of each of the said lines of railway not exceeding the mileage hereinafter stated, which shall cost more on the average than \$15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, a further subsidy beyond the sum of \$3,200 per mile of fifty per centum on so much of the average cost of the mileage subsidized as shall be in excess of \$15,000 per mile, such subsidy not exceeding in the whole the sum of \$6,400 per mile. The expression "cost" used in this resolution means the actual, necessary and reasonable cost and shall include the amount expended upon any bridge, up to and not exceeding \$25,000, forming part of the line of railway subsidized not other wise receiving any bonus, but shall not include the cost of equipping the railway nor the cost of terminals and right of way of the railway in any city or incorporated town; and such actual, necessary and reasonable cost shall be determined by the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals and upon the report of the Chief Engineer of Government Railways, certifying that he has made or caused to be made an inspection of the line of railway for which payment of subsidy is asked, and careful inquiry into the cost thereof, and that in his opinion the amount upon which the subsidy is claimed is reasonable and does not exceed the true, actual and proper cost of the construction of such railway, the lines of railway being as follows, that is to say:—

1. To the Central Ontario Railway Company, for an extension of their railway from, at or near either Coe Hill or Rathbun Station on the company's railway to, at or near Bancroft, not exceeding 21 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 55-56 Victoria, chap. 2. Revote.

2. To the Great Northern Railway Company, for a railway between Montcalm and St. Tite Junction, on the Lower Laurentian Railway, Quebec, not exceeding 53½ miles; and for a branch from their main line to Shawenegan Falls, Quebec, not exceeding 6½ miles. 53½ miles revote.

3. To the Philipsburg Railway and Quarry Company, shortage in the extension of their railway from a point on the company's line at or near the end of the subsidized section, to the Government Wharf at Philipsburg, Quebec, not exceeding 66-100 of a mile. Revote.

4. To the Strathroy and Western Counties Railway, for a line from Strathroy, Ontario, via Adelaide and Arkona, to either Forest, Tedford or Park Hill, not exceeding 24 miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by 57-58 Victoria, chap. 4. Partly revote.

5. To the St. John Valley and Rivière du Loup Railway Company, for a line of railway from Fredericton, in the county of York, New Brunswick, to Woodstock, in the county of Carleton, not exceeding 59 miles. Revote.

6. For a railway from Port Hawkesbury, on

the Strait of Canso, Nova Scotia, to St. Peter's, not exceeding 30 miles. Revote.

7. For a railway from Windsor, Nova Scotia, to Truro, via Township of Clifton, not exceeding 58 miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by 57-58 Victoria, chap. 4. Revote.

8. For a railway from a point at or near Brookfield Station, Nova Scotia, on the Intercolonial Railway, to Eastville, not exceeding 25 miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by 60-61 Victoria, chap. 4. Revote.

9. For a railway from Cross Creek Station, on the Canada Eastern Railway, to Stanley Village, New Brunswick, not exceeding 6 miles. Revote.

10. For a railway from the village of St. Rémi to Stottsville or some point on the Delaware and Hudson Railway (Grand Trunk) in the parish of St. Valentine, not exceeding 19 miles, of which 12 miles is a revote.

11. For a railway between Pontypool and Bobcaygeon, via Lindsay, Ontario, not exceeding 40 miles. 32 miles revote.

12. To the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company, for a railway from Aylmer to Hull, Quebec, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 60-61 Victoria, chap. 4, not exceeding 9 miles. Revote.

13. To the Portage du Fort and Bristol Branch Railway Company, for a branch line from a point on the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway at or near the village of Quyon towards the village of Portage du Fort, Quebec, not exceeding 15 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 60-61 Victoria, chap. 4. Revote.

14. To the Orford Mountain Railway Company, for a branch from their railway from a point between Lawrenceville and Eastman to Waterloo, not exceeding 30 miles. 4½ miles revote.

15. To the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company for an extension of their railway from Caplin to Paspebiac, Quebec, not exceeding 30 miles. Revote.

16. To the United Counties Railway Company, for a railway from St. Robert Junction to Sorel, 6½ miles, and from Mount Johnson to St. Gregoire Station, 1 mile, not exceeding 7½ miles. Revote.

17. For a railway from a point on the Central Railway in the county of Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, to the town of Liverpool via the village of Caledonia, or to the village of Caledonia, via Liverpool, or for any part thereof, the whole distance not exceeding 62 miles. Revote.

18. For a railway from Indian Garden, Queen's County, Nova Scotia, to Shelburne, in the said province, a distance of 35 miles. Revote.

19. The subsidy which the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company is entitled to receive under chap. 4, 60-61 Victoria, shall be \$6,400 per mile for the 80 miles provided in the said Act.

20. To the Bay of Quinté Railway Company, for such extension, branches or additions to its system as will enable the said company to connect its lines of railway or connecting lines with iron or other mines or mineral or wood lands in the counties of Peterboro', Northumberland, Hastings, Lennox and Addington, Frontenac or Leeds, payable in instalments regulated by the length of each of the said extensions or branches or additions, as the case may be, in lieu of part of the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted to the Kingston, Napanee and Western Railway Company, by 55-56 Victoria, chap. 5 but not exceeding \$3,200 per mile for 10 miles, nor exceeding in the whole \$32,000. Revote.

21. To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for 12 miles of their railway from end of their line at deep water on the Chicoutimi branch of their railway, to Ha! Ha! Bay, in

lieu of the subsidy for the 12 miles granted by chap. 4 of 1894. Revote.

22. For a line of railway from Hawkesbury, Ontario, to South Indian, not exceeding 35 miles.

23. For a railway from Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, towards Michipicoten River and harbour and to main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, not exceeding 40 miles.

24. For a branch line of railway from the main line of the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway to the town of Parry Sound, Ontario, not exceeding 5 miles.

25. For a railway from the village of Haliburton, via the village of Whitney, towards the village of Mattawa, Ontario, not exceeding 20 miles.

26. For an extension of the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway, from Tilsonburg to Ingersoll or Woodstock, Ontario, not exceeding 28 miles.

27. To the South Shore Railway Company, from Sorel Junction along the South Shore to Lotbinière, Quebec, a distance not exceeding 82 miles.

28. To the Massawippi Valley Railway Company, for an extension of their railway to the village of Stanstead Plain, Quebec, not exceeding 2½ miles.

29. For a railway from Port Hawkesbury, on the Strait of Canso, to Caribou Cove, Nova Scotia, a distance of 10 miles.

30. For a railway from Fort Frances, Ontario, westerly to a point at or near the mouth of Rainy River, a distance not exceeding 70 miles.

31. To the Central Railway Company of New Brunswick, for an extension of their line of railway from Newcastle Coal Fields to Gibson, New Brunswick, not exceeding 30 miles.

32. To the Canadian Northern Railway Company, for a railway from a point on the present line of the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway north of Swan River to Prince Albert, Northwest Territories, not exceeding 100 miles.

33. For a railway from some point near Antler Station to a point south of Moose Mountain, Manitoba, not exceeding 50 miles.

34. For a railway from Sunnybrae to Country Harbour, and from a point at or near Country Harbour Cross Roads to Guysboro', Nova Scotia, to make up deficiency in mileage between points mentioned and subsidized by 60-61 Victoria, chap. 4, additional mileage not exceeding 15 miles.

35. For a railway from Port Clyde to Lockeport, in the province of Nova Scotia, not exceeding 20 miles.

36. For a railway on a point of the Intercolonial Railway at or near Halifax to a point on the Central Railway in the county of Lunenburg, not exceeding 20 miles.

37. For a railway from Labelle, in the province of Quebec, in a north-westerly direction, to Nominingue, via Notre Dame de l'Annonciation, a distance not exceeding 22 miles.

38. For a railway from Owen Sound, in the province of Ontario, to Meaford, not exceeding 21 miles.

39. To the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company, for their line of railway in and through the city of Hull, Quebec, not exceeding 4 miles.

40. To the Western Alberta Railway Company, from a point on the United States boundary, west of Range 27, north-westerly towards Anthracte, in the District of Alberta, not exceeding 50 miles.

41. To the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company, for a railway from the town of South Edmonton, North-west Territories, to North Edmonton, and thence westerly towards

the Yellow Head Pass, a distance not exceeding 50 miles.

42. To the Restigouche and Western Railway Company, in addition to the 20 miles granted by 60-61 Victoria, chap. 4, and in continuation from the westerly end of the said 20 miles towards the St. John River, a further distance not exceeding 15 miles, and for the company's railway from a point on the St. John River, New Brunswick, at or near or between Grand Falls or St. Leonard, and extending easterly towards Campbellton, such point to be approved by the Governor in Council, a distance of 12 miles, in all not exceeding 27 miles.

43. For a railway in extension of the St. Francis Branch of the Témiscouata Railway to the mouth of the St. Francis River, a distance not exceeding 3 miles.

44. To the Canada Eastern Railway Company, for a line of railway from Nelson, New Brunswick, to connect with the company's main line running into Chatham, to complete the connection from Nelson to such main line, not exceeding in the whole 2½ miles.

45. To the Bay of Quinté Railway Company, for an extension of the company's line in a westerly direction from Deseronto for a distance not exceeding 2 miles; also for an extension of the company's line from its present terminus at Tweed in a northerly direction, not exceeding 5 miles, in all 7 miles—subsidies payable on each of the sections last mentioned as each of such sections may be completed.

46. To the Ontario, Belmont and Northern Railway Company, for an extension of their railway from its present terminus at Iron Mines in a north-westerly direction, a distance not exceeding 5 miles; and also for an extension of the company's railway southerly, from the present southern terminus thereto to the Central Ontario Junction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a distance not exceeding 2 miles, but the last mentioned aid for the said 2 miles of railway shall not be granted in case the Railway Committee of the Privy Council finds that adequate running powers on fair terms cannot be secured to the company over that portion of the line of the Central Ontario Railway between the present southerly end of the Ontario, Belmont and Northern Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's line at Central Ontario Junction.

47. For a line of railway from a point on the Pembroke Southern Railway at or near Golden Lake, Ontario, towards a point on the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway at or near Bancroft, not exceeding 20 miles.

48. For a line of railway from Paspébiac, province of Quebec, to Gaspé, in the said province, not exceeding a distance of 32 miles.

49. To the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company, for a line of railway from Ridgetown, Ontario, to St. Thomas, in the said province, a distance not exceeding 44 miles; this subsidy to be payable only in the event of adequate running rights over the Canada Southern Railway between the two points above mentioned not being granted to the first mentioned company on terms to be approved by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

50. To the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, for the construction of branches from the company's main line to the iron mine at Bluff Point and to the Martels mine in the county of Renfrew, not exceeding 5 miles.

51. For a railway from the village of Parry Sound extending northerly towards Sudbury, not exceeding a distance of 30 miles.

2. Resolved, That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies

hereinafter mentioned towards the construction of the railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:—

The Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company, for a railway from Stanley Station, on the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway, to Fort Francis, for a distance of 140 miles, at \$6,400 per mile, not exceeding in the whole ..... \$896,000 00.

To the Quebec Bridge Company, towards the construction of a railway bridge over St. Lawrence River, at Chaudière Basin, near Quebec, one million dollars, payable 40 per cent on monthly progress estimates approved by the Government Engineers, of materials delivered and work done ..... \$50,000 00.

To the South Shore Railway Company, towards the restoration and renewal of the railway bridge over the Yamaska River at Yamaska, Quebec. (Revote) ..... 35,000 00.

Towards the construction of a bridge over the Richelieu River at Sorel, 15 per cent upon the amount expended thereon, not exceeding \$35,000. (Revote)..... 50,000 00.

Towards the construction of a bridge across the St. Francis River, 15 per cent of the amount expended thereon, not exceeding ..... 15,000 00.

Towards the construction of a bridge across the Nicolet River, 15 per cent upon the amount expended thereon, not exceeding ..... 33,750 00.

To the Midland Railway Company, Limited, towards the construction of a bridge across the Shubenacadie River, 15 per cent upon the amount expended thereon, not exceeding.... 16,425 00.

To the Great Northern Railway Company, towards the construction of a bridge across the St. Maurice River, 15 per cent upon the amount expended thereon, not exceeding..... 15,000 00.

Also towards the construction of a bridge across the Rivière du Loup, 15 per cent upon the amount expended thereon, not exceeding..... 15,000 00.

Also towards the construction of a bridge across the Lac River, 15 per cent upon the amount expended thereon, not exceeding..... 15,000 00.

3. Resolved, That the subsidies granted to the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company, the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company are granted upon the condition, and if received and paid under the authority of this Act to the above mentioned companies respectively, shall be received upon the condition, that the said companies shall not, nor shall any of them, at any time amalgamate with any other railway company, or lease its line to any railway company; nor shall any of the said railways be leased to or operated by any other company; nor shall any of the said companies make an agreement for a common fund or for pooling its receipts with any other railway company, and any such lease, amalgamation or agreement shall be absolutely void, excepting in so far as such agreement may extend to traffic or running arrangements which have been approved by the Governor in Council.

4. Resolved, That the subsidies hereinbefore mentioned as to be granted to companies named

for that purpose shall, if granted by the Governor in Council, be granted to such companies respectively; the other subsidies may be granted to such companies as shall be approved by the Governor in Council as having established to his satisfaction their ability to construct and complete the said railways respectively; all the lines for the construction of which subsidies are granted, unless they are already commenced, shall be commenced within two years from the first day of August next, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years from the said first day of August, to be fixed by Order in Council, and shall also be constructed according to descriptions and specifications, and upon conditions to be approved by the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals and specified in an agreement to be made in each case by the company with the Government, which agreement the Government is hereby empowered to make; the location also of every such line of railway shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

5. Resolved, That the granting of such subsidies, and the receipt thereof by the respective companies, shall be subject to the condition that the Governor in Council may at all times provide and secure to other companies running powers, traffic arrangements and all other rights as will afford to all railways connecting with those subsidized reasonable and proper facilities in exercising such running powers, fair and reasonable traffic arrangements with connecting companies, and equal mileage rates between all such connecting railways, and the Governor in Council shall have absolute control at all times over the rates and tolls to be levied and imposed by any of the companies or upon any of the railways hereby subsidized.

6. Resolved, That the said subsidies respectively shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, by instalments, on the completion of each section of the railway of not less than ten miles proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole work undertaken, to be established by the report of the said Minister, or upon the completion of the work subsidized—except as to subsidies with respect to which it is hereinbefore otherwise provided.

7. Resolved, That every company receiving a subsidy under this Act shall each year furnish to the Government of Canada transportation for men, supplies, material and mails over the portion of its line in respect of which it may have received such subsidy, and whenever required shall furnish mail cars, properly equipped, for such mail service, and such transportation and service shall be performed at such rates as may be agreed upon between the Minister of the Department of the Government for which such service is being rendered and the company performing the same, and in case of disagreement, then at such rates as may be approved by the Governor in Council, and in or towards payment for such charges the Government of Canada shall be credited by the company with a sum equal to three per centum per annum on the amount of subsidy received by the company under this Act.

He said: I beg to state that His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of these resolutions, he recommends them to the House.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING.

## INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask the right hon. the Premier when he will be prepared to lay on the Table of the House the correspondence with the Secretary of State for the Colonies in regard to the correspondence between myself and Lord Aberdeen on the change of Government.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The correspondence is very short, and I expect I will be able to lay it on the Table of the House on Monday.

## LIGHTSHIP FOR HALIFAX HARBOUR.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I intended to draw to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) if he had been here a resolution of the Board of Trade of the city of Halifax, in respect to the immediate necessity of providing a lightship for the harbour of Halifax. I think a copy of the resolution has been forwarded to the Minister, but I do not know whether or not he has taken or is taking any action in regard to it. In order that it may be brought to the attention of the Minister (Sir Louis Davies) by the right honourable the First Minister, I shall read it. It is a resolution which was passed on the 25th of this month:

Whereas the recent loss of the steamship "Portia," off Sambro, while entering Halifax harbour, has brought to public attention the necessity for more adequate signals to safeguard the approaches to Halifax harbour in thick weather.

And whereas at a meeting of the Board of Trade, held on 18th instant, at which were present representatives of the Marine Department, the cable companies, pilot commissioners, harbour officials, steamship captains, and representatives of the various steamship companies, and commercial interests, it was the unanimous opinion of the meeting that the present signals, safeguarding the entrance to Halifax harbour are inadequate.

And whereas the increasing business of the port of Halifax as the chief Atlantic port of Canada renders it imperative that immediate steps should be taken to obviate the great danger now existing when entering the port in thick weather.

Therefore resolved, that the Government be asked to take into immediate consideration the construction of a lightship of the most modern type, to be fitted with the latest improvements, and to be utilized as a pilot station, and placed in the most suitable position of Halifax harbour.

I may say for the information of the Government that some few years ago there was a small lightship placed at the entrance of the harbour for the purpose which it is now sought to fill by the proposed lightship. That lightship proved altogether inadequate, and eventually it was removed and placed somewhere in the St. Lawrence. I trust that the matter will be brought to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I also trust that he will see his way clear to

take some immediate steps to comply with the wishes of this meeting of the Board of Trade and of the commercial interests of Halifax generally. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will notice that at the meeting referred to the business interests of every kind in the city of Halifax were very fully represented. He will also notice that the immediate occasion of the calling of this meeting was the loss of the SS. "Portia," which is supposed to have been brought about by the want of proper precautions of the nature indicated.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The date of the resolution read by my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) shows that this matter has only arisen within the last three or four days.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes; it is only dated on the 25th of this month.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I suppose the matter has had barely time to reach Ottawa, and I am sure that if my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) has received the document he did not have an opportunity of considering it, or he would have spoken to me on the subject. The pressure of work has been so severe recently that routine business necessarily does not receive that same attention which it would at any other time. To make provision for a lightship there would involve a considerable sum of money, which could only be provided for by a vote of the House, and I had desired and hoped that it might be possible that we would not have to introduce any further supplementary Estimates. I shall discuss the matter with my friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) may be sure that although my economic spirit as Minister of Finance might be against my sympathies as a member from the province of Nova Scotia, the matter shall have our best consideration. I occupy a kind of pooh-bah position in the matter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister (Mr. Fielding) will understand that I am not saying anything in the way of censure.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Quite so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am merely emphasizing the matter as far as I can by mentioning in the House the great necessity for this.

#### THE RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. KAULBACH. Among the resolutions proposing railway subsidies there are two which comply with the request made by me last year, as respects the line between New Germany and Shelburne via Caledonia.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I hardly think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) is in order.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am not going to make a speech, but I simply wish to allude to the matter in order to ask a question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) had better wait until the House is going into Committee of Supply.

Mr. KAULBACH. I simply wish to ask the Government to grant the request made last year by me to extend that road from New Germany to Halifax. I observe among the railway resolutions that there is one noted in this way:

For a railway on a point of the Intercolonial Railway or near Halifax to a point on the Central Railway in the county of Lunenburg, not exceeding 20 miles.

I do not understand that, because the distance between these two points is 40 or 45 miles.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The hon. gentleman's question would more properly arise in connection with the railway votes which will be reached on Monday. However, I have no objection to answer the hon. gentleman at once. Votes of this character are usually granted partially. It is not found convenient to grant them on the full mileage of the railway at the beginning. The object of granting the subsidy in question is to make a connection between the city of Halifax and the Nova Scotia Central Railway; and if Parliament makes the grant on the 20 miles, I have no doubt that in due course more aid will be granted, though that is something which the parties interested in the road would have to trust the Government and Parliament for afterwards.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am glad to get the information in that way.

#### MARINE INSURANCE RATES.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I wish to ask if the Government have any information as to the reason for the recent advance in insurance rates, discriminating against ports in the Maritime provinces as compared with the eastern ports of the United States. It is very injurious to the interests of our ports, and our shipping people believe that there is no justification for it. Have the Government taken any steps to inquire into the causes of this discrimination, or have they communicated with the proper authorities?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know whether anything in the nature of an informal inquiry has been made, but I know that this matter has engaged the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). The difficulty is a very simple one. If a fire occurs at Vancouver, the English insurance companies will at once increase the rates at Halifax. There is a tendency on the part of these companies to group ports covering a great extent of territory, and the

occurrence of a disaster in a distant port is likely to prejudice the insurance rates in another port far away. If two or three mishaps have occurred, whether in the St. Lawrence or down the Gulf, or on the coasts of the maritime provinces, the first thing we hear is that the insurance companies have put up their rates for the whole of Canada. That has been the experience of the past, and it is only by constant representations by boards of trade and parties interested in shipping that the insurance companies can be prevented from increasing the rates. I do not know that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has had any formal correspondence in regard to the matter, but I know that in connection with various accidents that have occurred to shipping, the question of insurance rates has engaged his attention. If anything can be done to get them reduced, I am sure that he will be glad to do it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I may say that this subject has engaged the attention of our High Commissioner, Lord Strathcona, and he has been doing all that can be done. We cannot as a Government make demands on these companies, as the rates are a matter of pure private business. As the hon. gentleman probably knows, two unfortunate disasters which occurred to our shipping, though having no connection in the world with the St. Lawrence route or any other Canadian route—one was the loss of an Allan Line steamer off Yarmouth, and the other was the loss of the "Labrador" on the coast of Scotland—were made an excuse and pretext, as the hon. gentleman has said, for raising the rates. I can assure the hon. gentleman that we have been endeavouring in every way in our power to try to get this matter put right. While on my feet I may say that I wish to lay on the Table, and I shall probably move a resolution about it afterwards, the articles of agreement with respect to the West India service which was under discussion the other day. It will be seen that the service has doubled in point of the number of trips, and that not much more than half the time that was consumed heretofore is consumed in making the passage.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I was asked to call the attention of the Department of Marine and Fisheries that the number of accidents and casualties on the coasts of the maritime provinces, as compared with those on the eastern coasts of the Eastern States, will show a considerable difference in favour of the maritime provinces.

#### SALARIES OF THE MINISTER OF CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE.

The House resolved itself into committee to consider a certain proposed resolution

Mr. FIELDING.

with respect to the salaries of the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. While there may perhaps be some differences of opinion—and I think from the criticisms which we see occasionally in the press that there are differences of opinion—as to what may be the proper number of Cabinet Ministers for Canada, I do not think there is now any difference of opinion on the proposition that the various members of the Cabinet having charge of departments should receive equal compensation. That point was very fairly put the other day by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, who was good enough to say that if this question should arise in his absence, he wished to be understood as expressing his approval of the present resolution. I do not think it is a matter which requires any elaborate statement on my part. The Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue have charge of very important departments, which collect enormous sums for the public treasury, and I think it is generally admitted—to put it in a way that should commend it to hon. gentlemen opposite—that they are as well entitled to those salaries as any of us who hold other departments. We intended to have brought this matter to the notice of the House last session, but in the rush of business which always takes place at the close, it was overlooked, and we have made the resolution to take effect on the 1st of July a year ago.

Mr. CHARLTON. There seems to be something invidious in placing two members of the Cabinet on a lower scale of pay than others, and I do not suppose any member of the House will object to this resolution. There is a matter in connection with the salaries of the members of the Government which lately has received a great deal of attention from the public press, and it strikes me as a matter that ought to receive attention in this House. That is the assertion which has been made that the Premier of this Dominion should receive a larger amount of pay than he now receives. I think there is a general consensus of opinion on the part of the press on both sides that we should give the Premier of Canada a more liberal compensation to enable him to discharge the duties, social and otherwise, which necessarily devolve upon him; and I take the liberty of referring to this question in the sense that I think it is one that deserves consideration and action.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has hardly done justice to the Government by the very brief way in which he has referred to this resolution. The question whether there should be a distinction in salaries or not is a matter for

which the present Government are responsible. There may be a consensus of opinion or not as to that; but I think the Finance Minister or the First Minister ought to offer some remarks to the House as to the position taken and the public pledge given by which the people were led to expect that an improvement would take place as regards the number of members of the Cabinet.

It seems to me that the great extravagance of the preceding Administration would not be repeated. In fact, they were asked to hurl us from power on account of that, and no man was stronger in that respect than the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and I believe that the right hon. the First Minister and party are on record as saying that there could be a reduction in Cabinet Ministers. And these poor fellows were to be kept down until political exigencies could be so far surmounted that a proper scapegoat could be found to be driven out into the wilderness from the Cabinet fold, so that when the salaries were raised there would be the plea that the expenses were not greater because the number of Cabinet Ministers was less. Evidently the Finance Minister has forgotten all about that, or if he has not he did not take the trouble to mention it to the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I appreciate, I must say, the spirit and tone of the remarks of my hon. friend. I am quite aware that there has been a good deal of difference of opinion on this question, and I cannot forget that on the side of the House to which we belong there have been some expressions of opinion that there were too many Cabinet Ministers. But this is a matter as to which considerable difference of opinion must be allowed to exist. Because that was the opinion of one member, it does not follow that it was the opinion of the whole party. The hon. gentleman said that I had myself, at some time when in Opposition, had declared or intimated that the number of Cabinet Ministers ought to be reduced. It has been my lot, in my time, to speak of expenditures, when I sat on the other side, but I do not remember that I ever expressed the opinion that the number of Ministers ought to be reduced, or that the salaries paid were too large. I think my view can be canvassed upon that scheme, and it will be found that never on any occasion did I express the opinion that the number of Ministers could be reduced. In one way, the number of Cabinet Ministers may be supposed to be large for a country like Canada. Very often there is a comparison made between Canada and the United States, but there is no comparison at all between the two systems.

Mr. FOSTER. No?

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend may have heard opinions to the contrary, but those opinions, I am sure, he does not

share. Cabinet Ministers in the United States have no legislative duties of any kind. Their duties are purely executive, and they are not bound, like Cabinet Ministers of Canada, to be on the floor almost four or five months each year looking after their parliamentary duties, which, in a sense, are perhaps more important than the executive duties. If the American republic can do with seven Ministers, it is quite obvious, from the difference of system in the two countries, absolutely impossible that we should govern this country with the same number of Ministers. And, moreover, although the executive heads are few in the United States, the number of sub-heads is very large. Take the Department of State alone, there are five or six different sub-heads all connected with one or another branch of the system. I know that some of my friends entertain the opinion that the number of Ministers ought to be reduced, but I do not consider that I ever expressed a similar opinion. I cannot forget that this is a vast country with a small population, but scattered all over the continent, and that every section expects, and rightly expects, to be represented in some way in the Cabinet. With regard to the salaries, I do not believe that anybody will contend that the salaries are too large. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was good enough to refer to me a moment ago. I appreciate the kindness of my hon. friend but I would not stand alone in this respect. If the salary of the Prime Minister were to be reconsidered, it should be not alone but along with the other salaries.

The question therefore stands in this position: It never was a principle on this side that there were too many Ministers or that they were too largely paid. Some members of the party have indulged in that opinion and expressed it.

Mr. FOSTER. Was there not a condition in the previous legislation?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, there was.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not much to add, but, as I said at the outset, nothing could be more cruel, remembering that these hon. gentlemen sat so long in Opposition, than to attempt to hold them to the opinions they expressed through that long sitting in the cool shades of Opposition, and I am afraid we must not look for it. I may say that I was not in the Government or in the country when the policy was adopted of appointing a Minister of Trade and Commerce and two Controllers, the Controller of Inland Revenue and the Controller of Customs. That was done under an Act passed when Sir John Macdonald was Prime Minister, but it was never brought into operation during his lifetime, and I took the opportunity of expressing to him my strong Opposition to the policy adopted. I did not believe it was a desirable policy. I believed that if

there were any two Ministers who ought to have seats on the floor of the House, it was the two connected with the Customs Department and the Inland Revenue Department. I also hold the opinion that if they were to be sub-heads, the head should be the Minister of Finance. They were so associated and intimately connected with the collecting of revenue department that it appeared to me their natural and proper head was the Minister of Finance. I must say that I think my hon. friend who brought into operation and established the practice of having a Minister of Trade and Commerce and making the Controllors sub-heads under that officer, certainly made, in my opinion, from a parliamentary point of view and from the way in which the business of the country is conducted, a mistake, and I have no hesitation in saying that, in my judgment, the Controllors should be made Ministers, and should enjoy the same salaries as the other Ministers, because, if they properly discharge the duties imposed upon them there are no officers of the Government whose duties demand greater attention.

I need not say how sorry I would be to do anything which would possibly interfere with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but I have also looked upon the creation of that office as entirely unnecessary. It is only necessary to look to the history of that department since it came into operation to find that no services of any kind have been performed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that have been practically of any value to the country whatever. I believe that trade and commerce must naturally devolve upon the Minister of Finance in whose department is the legislation that has relation to this branch of Government, in conjunction with the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue. Of course I need not say how deeply I regret having to say a single word that will appear to conflict with the interest of any hon. gentleman sitting on the Treasury benches; but we are now discussing a very important question, and that is how that which, I believe, all the House agree upon, can be brought about, the increase of the salaries of the Minister of Inland Revenue and of the Minister of Customs, so as to put them on the same footing as the other Ministers, without increasing the cost to the country. There is no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite have always been committed to the declaration that there were an unnecessarily large number of Cabinet Ministers. My right hon. friend has just explained the difficulty—that our country is so widely extended that it is not easy to give representation to the various sections in the Cabinet. But my hon. friend the Minister of Finance only a few days ago stated that the time had come when broader views were entertained in regard to that, and it was not proposed to maintain the idea of local representation in the Cabinet. I invite my

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

right hon. friend's attention to the advanced position taken by the Minister of Finance, which, no doubt, indicates that the province of Nova Scotia, at all events, will be ready to surrender one of its Ministers for the purpose of giving representation to sections of the country that are not now represented.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Probably, if the idea of local representation were done away with, we should have three or four men from Nova Scotia in the Cabinet.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no doubt that my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) has established such a reputation as to warrant the feeling on the part of those behind him that the province which he so admirably represents should have three or four Ministers. But I am speaking now not jocularly, but directly upon the point before us. We are disposed to support the reasonable proposition of having the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue, with the important duties devolving upon them, receive the same salaries as other Ministers. But we hold that it is not desirable to increase the amount given to Cabinet Ministers—taking that question apart from anything else—beyond what has ever been given before. If my memory serves me well, the legislation that raised the Controller of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue to the rank of Ministers was accompanied by the statement that their salaries would be increased when it was found practicable to decrease the number of Ministers, so as not to add to the total amount paid to Cabinet Ministers. As my right hon. friend has had it demonstrated that there is absolutely no utility in the Department of Trade and Commerce, I make the suggestion that, if means could be found by the elevation of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) to a governorship, notwithstanding the great void it would create in this House, the means would be afforded of doing justice to the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue without increasing the expenditure to the public.

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) would permit me, I would ask him his opinion on one point. If I understood him aright, he stated that the work of the Cabinet Minister is confined to his departmental duties, and that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has very little work in his department. No one knows better than my hon. friend that that is not a true view of the situation or of the duties performed by Ministers. He has been through it himself, and he knows that a Minister's duties are not confined to his department. It is true that the Department of Trade and Commerce is not a heavy department as compared with some others. For instance, the duties of the Secretary of State are not heavy. But the hon. gentle-

man know that the general policy of the Government may engage the time of a Minister. I remember the time, not far distant, when my hon. friend was Secretary of State. I leave it to him to say if he did not have as much to do as he had when he presided over some more important department.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Mr. Chairman, that is raising a new question. I have not said that the Ministers are confined exclusively to their several departments. I only point to the Department of Trade and Commerce as having proved absolutely useless. In fact, the position of Canada has suffered seriously through the want of discharge of the duties that the Minister of Trade and Commerce undertook, in the destruction of a great service that all parties in this House had declared to be of great importance to this country. The only achievement of which the Minister of Trade and Commerce can boast is that of having destroyed the Fast Atlantic Service, which he found ready to his hand when he came into office. I am not aware how valuable the hon. gentleman's (Sir Richard Cartwright's) services may be in other departments. As a general proposition, what my right hon. friend says has a great deal of force. I think it was our former Governor General, Lord Dufferin, who described his position in the Cabinet as that of maid of all work—not having onerous duties in his own office. He was constantly called upon to perform duties in other departments. No doubt, my right hon. friend, though nominally president of the Council, finds a great deal of employment outside of that office. The same may have applied to the Secretary of State's office when I held that position, being at the same time Prime Minister.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** But I spoke of a time before the hon. gentleman was Prime Minister.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Quite so; my right hon. friend gave me enough to do when I was Secretary of State and leader of this House—unfortunately for the country, and for himself, because it has involved him since in very great difficulties. I do not intend to prolong the discussion further than to say that I hope I will receive the grateful thanks of the Government for making a suggestion by means of which they could give these increases of salaries which we all approve without adding to the expense of the country.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** I certainly am thankful for the statement my hon. friend made the other day, as it shows breadth of spirit on his part. As to the rest, of course, we are thankful for small favours.

**Mr. FOSTER.** When was this done?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** At that time, a couple of years ago, I think, the

Ministers were controllers, but were advanced to the position of Cabinet Ministers. The Act stated that when the number of Cabinet Ministers should be reduced, the Controllers should be placed on an equal rank with the Ministers without an increase of salary. We think that part of the Bill was a mistake, and we propose to correct it.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I thought there was a pledge, and it was put in the statute-book.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Statutes are very often repealed.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Yes, in the hands of hon. gentlemen everything is liable to change except hanging on to office.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Well, we propose to hang on.

**Mr. McMULLEN** The ex-Minister of Finance has referred to me in this discussion. I undoubtedly was opposed to the increase of Cabinet Ministers, I opposed the appointment of the two Controllers. I contended that we have enough members in the Cabinet. But the Act was forced through this House, and these Controllers were appointed, but not for some two years after the Act was passed, which showed that there was no immediate necessity for their appointment. When Sir Mackenzie Bowell was Premier, in connection, I think, with the election of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior), a telegram was sent by the Premier to that hon. gentleman intimating that it was his intention to raise these Controllers to the rank of Cabinet Ministers, and to give them seats at the Council board. That was the first intimation we had of these men being placed in the position of Cabinet Ministers. If the hon. member for Victoria and the other hon. gentleman who occupied the position of Controller were considered by the late Government to be entitled to seats at the Council Board as a matter of justice, I am quite prepared to admit that the two gentlemen who occupied those positions recently under the present Government, are just as much entitled to the honour. I have always been of the opinion that our government machinery in this country was too expensive, and I hold that opinion still. I have opposed the increase of Ministers under the present Government, I did not consider they were necessary. It may be unfair to make invidious distinction against these two gentlemen by keeping them down to the old salary. But there is one redeeming feature about it. Since these men have been raised to the position of Cabinet Ministers our territory has considerably expanded. We have large responsibilities, and a considerably larger revenue. Take the case of the Minister of Customs. Hon. gentlemen will admit that the increased responsibilities that rest upon that gentleman in consequence of

the great growth in the revenue, has thrown upon him much greater labour than his predecessors had to perform. I presume the country is willing to pay men in proportion to the services they render. But I desire to be consistent in this matter. I contend that if we had fewer Cabinet Ministers the affairs of the country could be conducted just as well. But hon. gentlemen opposite are entirely responsible for the increase, and after the offices have been established and the Ministers have been installed in their positions, and the Administration has been divided into thirteen departments, it is a pretty hard thing now to cut down the number of Ministers, especially in view of the enormously increased work of the Government during the last two years. I dare say some of the smaller provinces would like to have increased Cabinet representation; British Columbia no doubt would. I would be glad if a readjustment took place whereby the smaller provinces should be represented as largely as possible. But that is evidently impracticable. I determinedly opposed the increase in the number of Cabinet Ministers until I heard the announcement of the leader of the Opposition two years ago. When this question was broached he jumped up and declared his entire approval of the course of adding to the number of Cabinet Ministers, and he also thought their salary should be put on a par with that of the other Ministers. Immediately that this Bill was introduced two days ago, before any one else had a chance to express an opinion on either side, the leader of the Opposition jumped up again and declared that this was a matter of justice, that these men were deserving of the increase, and that he strongly urged it two years ago. Now whether he will be able to carry his followers with him and make them sing the same song he does, is another question. He has not always been able to carry them with him.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sure I will have the warm sympathy of my right hon. friend if I am not always able to carry with me those sitting on this side.

Mr. McMULLEN. As I say, I was opposed to this increase in the number of Cabinet Ministers until I heard the declaration of the leader of the Opposition. Under those circumstances it is no use for hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to oppose these things when the leader of the Opposition supports them. For my part, I stand almost alone in my course in this matter, but I am willing to acquiesce in this proposition as a simple matter of justice to these gentlemen, if a reduction of Cabinet Ministers cannot be made. The ex-Minister of Finance is disposed to twit me a little on account of the criticisms in which I indulged years ago. I indulged in those criticisms honestly, the condition of the country warranted me in doing so. But I am glad to see

Mr. McMULLEN.

that out of a great many difficulties, out of the clouds and darkness that characterized the administration of the affairs of this country some years ago, we have merged into the glorious light of bright sunshine. Canada is prospering, and she can now better afford to pay her Cabinet Ministers than ever before.

Mr. DAVIN. The glorious way in which we have merged into the bright sunshine is evidently by piling up the expenditure. I do not object to paying the hon. gentlemen who occupy the respective positions of Ministers of Inland Revenue and of Customs, the same salaries their colleagues receive. But what the leader of the Opposition contends is what was always understood in this House, that once these gentlemen had seats in the Cabinet, the purely ornamental office of Minister of Trade and Commerce should then cease to exist. The Prime Minister makes no defence of it, except to remind the leader of the Opposition that it sometimes happens that a Minister occupying a comparatively unimportant portfolio may still exercise large influence upon public affairs. If that is a defence in this case, it may be made a defence for appointing 15, 16 or 17 Ministers. This is a growing time, the expenditure has gone up to over \$60,000,000; and if the hard-working farmers and artisans should next year keep up the growing time, we will probably have \$70,000,000 of expenditure, an orgie of extravagance on which the Minister of Trade and Commerce looks with complacency.

Why, Sir, I cannot sit in this House and look across the floor at the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce because, I may say, that nobody can sit in this House as long as I have—although we do not know each other—even if they are not intimate with them, without having a kindly feeling towards them. And when I contrast the appearance of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, with the appearance he used to wear on this side of the House, his sleekness, his self-complacent joy in life, the look of delight that beams from his countenance, as vast sums of extravagance are piled up, if one could forget the wrong to the country, the benevolence in the man would be stimulated and he would be led to reflect something of the joy and delight that are upon the countenance of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. On behalf of this country, on behalf especially of the west, I protest against having a purely ornamental office and against a Minister being paid \$7,000 a year merely because the right hon. Prime Minister can say of him: He can exercise some influence. I object further that, anybody who has been accustomed to examine the blue-books issued by the Department of Trade and Commerce and the blue-books issued by the Department of Customs, will see that the Department of Trade and Commerce is simply superfluity of naught-

ness. There is a wasteful expenditure on these blue-books which could be saved by simply giving a little more attention to the blue-book that is issued by the Department of Customs. I do not know really how the Government regard the people of this country. I am afraid that they are taking a view of the people that future events will not justify. If the people are so lost to all sense of observation, if they are so lost to all sense of perspective, that they cannot contemplate the extravagance of this Government, especially their extravagance when compared with their professions, when they were in office. If the people can condone it, then Sir, it will be impossible to classify the people of Canada amongst intelligent nations.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Seek some classification then.

Mr. DAVIN. The classification will be one that the right hon. gentleman will be able to make. The right hon. gentleman, when he sits here, when he has been driven from power, as I believe he will be on the first occasion, in consequence of that extravagance, will be able to classify the people, and he will be able to classify them amongst men who, when sold are not willing to remain in slavery.

Mr. TALBOT. And if the Government are maintained, what will be the hon. gentleman's classification?

Mr. DAVIN. What is that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot), who comes to the aid of his leader, says?

Mr. TALBOT. How will the hon. gentleman classify them if the Government are maintained?

Mr. DAVIN. I did not hear the hon. gentleman. I wish that when, before the hon. gentleman interrupts, he would take some lessons in vocal enunciation, so that he would have a large claim to belong to the class of articulate speaking men. When he fails to make himself clearly heard and understood he suggests a classification that is not exactly amongst articulate speaking men. I entirely protest against the suave passing over of breaches of promises such as we are face to face with to-day. Where is the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock)? The hon. Postmaster General is on record in this House as protesting against even thirteen Cabinet Ministers. Where is he to-day? The hon. gentleman who has just come in tells us that he, as well, is of the same opinion that we have too many Ministers, but he falls back on the fact that this is a growing time and that we have made some advances.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perfection is not of this world.

Mr. DAVIN. I know that, but I never knew that deterioration could become so

rapid, as I find in the exemplification of the right hon. gentleman. I know very well that he is not perfect, and I know very well that none of his colleagues are perfect, but as to any opinion I ever had of the Liberal party and of Liberal leaders, I am on record, in this House when the right hon. Prime Minister was sitting upon this side, as saying that he had not the materials around him to make a Cabinet. Whatever view I took of these hon. gentlemen, I never dreamed, in any pessimistic moment, that we should have them coming into power, and at the end of three years giving such a complete demonstration of the fact that men can forget all that is due to their worth, to their dignity and to the country that they profess to serve. I never could have dreamed it, and I have here to put on record my protest against this failure to carry out pledges. This is only one of many, because at every turn we find these extravagances. As I said here the other day there is not an atom, there is not a moral square in the carpet of fact, on which hon. gentlemen can stand and say: We have fulfilled our promises. First, the doctrine that Cabinet Ministers were too numerous is broken, and then there was the pledge, held out to us, not only by one Government, but by two Governments, because it has always been so understood, that if the Controllers were raised to the rank of Cabinet Ministers the superfluity would be got rid of. In regard to the personal element composing the superfluity, I would be sorry to see the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) disappear from the House or the Government. He adds to the dignity of the Government and of the House, and of course, with his vast experience and admitted great ability, he is a gentleman, whom even an opponent would not wish to see disappear from the House. Nevertheless he can be kept in the Government and in the House without increasing the pay of Cabinet Ministers, because, although they are all lords and gentlemen of high degree still I think that the right hon. Prime Minister, without putting on a pair of magnifying lenses, could find amongst his Cabinet gentlemen that he could get rid of without materially weakening it. I cannot believe that, under the circumstances, the people of this country will agree to the proposal, that now seems to be the accepted policy of the Government, that we must have fourteen Ministers paid \$7,000 a year each.

Mr. F. A. MARCOTTE (Champlain). (Translation). Mr. Chairman, I have very little to say in connection with the resolution now before the House. But I cannot refrain from saying how startled I was when hearing the hon. gentleman announce a breach of promise such as we are face to face with to-day. The hon. gentlemen opposite are now coming down and asking us an increase of salaries for two Cabinet Minis-

ters, after having so long protested, through that long sitting in the cool shades of opposition, against such an increase of expenditure. I am sure every hon. gentleman must have been impressed, as I was, in contemplating the eagerness with which the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues came down and asked for an increase of salary, when compared with their scruples in the matter of an increased indemnity to members of Parliament. They do not stand on ceremony when they come and ask the House to increase their own salaries, and they think it is a perfectly fair and reasonable proposition to lay before the House, and that it almost amounts to an economy.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is ample food for reflection on the part of every member of this House, in the fact that the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, while having no hesitation in increasing their own salaries, show themselves so dainty, so over-particular in the case of an increased indemnity to members of Parliament. If you talk of increasing the pay of members, the right hon. gentleman will be heard to say: "We cannot support such a proposition; we must reduce the expenditure and apply the pruning knife." But in the case of raising the salary of the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, it is quite different, and you will be told that the Ministers, having to perform such important services to the country, they are entitled to an increase of salary.

I think, Sir, there is an anomaly in that respect, and the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, far from showing any breadth of spirit, are open to the charge of egotism. It is a common saying that the fear of the electorate is the beginning of wisdom; but, of course, in their opinion, that applies only to the Government so far as an increased indemnity to members of Parliament is concerned, and it has nothing to do with increasing the pay of Cabinet Ministers.

Members of Parliament have a smaller salary than short-hand writers and other public servants, and it is ridiculously small, when compared with the salary of the Cabinet Ministers, who draw \$660 a month. And it goes without saying, that, having less influence and less prestige than Cabinet Ministers, members of Parliament have more trouble in carrying their constituencies and retaining their seats in this House, while having to shoulder the responsibility of the Government policy. I have no hesitation in speaking aloud on this matter, and voicing the general opinion of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. As I said, the indemnity of \$1,000 members of this House are paid is ridiculously small, compared with the salary the Cabinet Ministers and civil servants are paid.

The proposition now before us should afford ample food for reflection to hon. gentlemen opposite who, for eighteen long years, have denounced extravagance and advocated

Mr. MARCOTTE.

a policy of retrenchment and economy in the public affairs of this country. Our Cabinet Ministers have, no doubt, a great responsibility, and they have onerous duties to perform; but I say without hesitation that they are now betraying another of their pledges made to the electorate in respect to the salaries of Cabinet Ministers. The hon. gentlemen have falsified all their pledges in regard to economy given to the people, and especially to the province of Quebec, at the general elections of 1896, and on the occasion of my election in the county of Champlain, which I represent in this House.

Mr. BENNETT. If the Government had not already broken so many of their pledges the country would be startled to hear them announce the betrayal of another pledge in respect to the salaries of Cabinet Ministers. In this growing time, when every friend of the Government expects to profit it is reasonable that the Ministers themselves would also like to take pecuniary advantages of the results. I quite agree that the two gentlemen who are to be advanced to the same salaries as other Ministers are, in my humble opinion, entitled to an even salary with the others. When one contrasts the duties of the Secretary of State with the duties of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) or the Minister of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière), there can be no doubt in the world that the two latter perform more important services to the country. Only one reason for this increase in salary has been advanced, and that was by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) who claimed that on the ground that there has been an increase in the revenues of the country, and that therefore there should be a greater participation in the public funds by all concerned, but there is a salutary rule in life which advises that when one is doing well he should look out for a rainy day, and while the Government and their friends talk about the growing time in the country, as evidenced by the increase in revenue, it is a matter of fact that the claim is somewhat exaggerated. If my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Beith) were here I could point to the town of Bowmanville in which he lives, and which is to-day very quiet in point of trade. I might point to the town on the shores of Lake Ontario and I might ask my hon. friend from South Ontario (Mr. Burnett), who to-day is not in his seat, if he ever saw the town of Whitby as quiet as it is now. Take Newcastle, take most of the towns along the borders of Lake Ontario, and it is a remarkable fact that they never had a greater era of depression than they are now experiencing. There has been a period of inflation in some respects, I regret to say, but if you ask wholesale merchants and manufacturers, they will tell you that in many years that payments were never slower than they are to-day in Ontario. They will tell you that

people are living as it were in prospective, that they are hopeful of something which has not yet arrived. I admit in the Ontario towns where manufacturing is carried on to a considerable extent, and more particularly the manufacturing of machinery for mining and other purposes, there has been some prosperity, but, generally speaking, prosperity does not exist. I shall not charge the Government with breaking their pledges in this matter, because, in view of all that has occurred, the people of the country do not expect them to keep their pledges. The people have been disappointed continuously in that regard for the last three years, and at this late stage they have given up all hope of any fulfilment of promises on the part of the Government. Now is the time for the Government and for this Parliament to take in sail rather than to crowd on all canvas, and in order to test the view of the House, I beg to move, seconded by my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) :

That in view of the advancement of the Minister of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Pater-son) to the full rank of Cabinet Ministers, together with the allowance to them and the full salaries of Cabinet Ministers, there should be a reduction of the salaried Ministers of the Crown by at least one in number, and that the cost of civil government should be reduced according to such reduction in the Estimates for the current year.

In this resolution I have signalled out no particular Minister of the Government, but personally I should be very sorry if there was a resolution made that the services of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) should be lost to the House and to the country. Irrespective of politics, I believe that to-day, owing to his capabilities, owing to his hitherto unblemished and unsullied reputation for honesty and probity there is no man in the whole Administration—I except none—who stands higher than does the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. The people of Ontario, Conservatives as well as Liberals, give credit to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that he endeavours to lessen the great expenditure that is being settled on the taxpayers of this Dominion to-day. The Minister of Trade and Commerce is given credit for this by the people, that while he was a member of the Mackenzie Administration he did not set his sails to each favouring breeze. There were Liberals in 1873 who strongly pressed on the Liberal Administration that there should be an era of extravagant government, and it is creditable to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that he strenuously opposed that and stood out on principle. I believe that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is to-day the one remaining bulwark against extravagance and worse than the taxpayers

of the country have in the Cabinet. I believe he is the one gentleman who remonstrates and I only hope and trust that the Minister of Trade and Commerce, if there should be a change in the Cabinet, will retain a seat therein. If the Government does not accept this resolution which I have the honour to move, they will only give another proof of their absolute disregard for economy in the administration of the public service.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) who is at the present moment out of the House, in order to shield himself against the consequences of his change of heart in regard to extravagant expenditure of this country, referred to a statement made by the leader of the Opposition some two years ago. I desire to point out to the hon. gentleman, however, that the ground on which he was standing was not so sure and solid as he appeared to think it was. At the time the leader of the Opposition made the statement attributed to him, the following resolution was under consideration :—

The salary of each of the said Ministers shall be \$5,000 per annum, and shall continue at that rate until a readjustment of the departments of Government shall reduce the number of Ministers holding departments to thirteen or less, whereupon thereafter the salary of each of the said Ministers shall be \$7,000.

What the leader of the Opposition said was a plea on behalf of the two Controllers for a salary equal to that of the other Ministers, but only on consideration that the number of Cabinet Ministers should be reduced, and therefore the public revenue should not suffer. This is what he said :

If it is not convenient to make at the present moment a reduction in the number of Cabinet Ministers, which you evidently contemplate, why should you have these gentlemen in the invidious position of receiving a smaller salary. If it is not too late, I would suggest to the Ministers that they should reconsider this resolution and place the Controllers in the position which is justice to themselves and the duties they have to perform they have a right to. Under the circumstances, it would have been better to give the Controllers of the Inland Revenue and of Customs the full salaries so as to implement the promises of the Prime Minister, and then you could make your reduction in the number of Cabinet Ministers afterwards.

On the same occasion I took the opportunity of referring to this matter. I freely expressed my opinion that, as the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue had charge of very important and heavy departments, there was no good reason why those hon. Ministers should not receive as ample a consideration for their services as any other Minister of the Crown. I will read what I stated then and what I still hold. With reference to the department of the Minister of Customs, I said :

I believe it is one of the most difficult departments to manage, there is certainly a very large

amount of work, and I can see no reason whatever why that gentleman should receive only \$5,000 while the other Ministers are paid \$7,000 a year. My plan would be something different from anything that has yet been suggested. We have in the Senate two Cabinet Ministers. One the Secretary of State, occupies, to my mind, a minor position, and one of very little public importance. There is no good reason why that gentleman should receive \$7,000 a year, while the Controller of Customs should be put off with \$5,000. Then again, in the Senate we have the Minister of Justice, and in this House we have the Solicitor General, both of whom receive together \$12,000 a year. I would reduce the Minister of Justice and the Secretary of State down to \$5,000, and raise the salary of the Controllers to \$7,000 a year, and I think the money would be more equitably distributed than it is at the present time.

I hold the same opinion still. I think there are good reason why hon. gentlemen occupying seats in the Senate, as the Secretary of State and the Minister of Justice do, should not be paid the same indemnity for their services as those who have seats in this House. These gentlemen in the Senate have seats for life. As I understand that the resolution of the Government has been withdrawn, no doubt these gentlemen will consider their positions safe. They have their seats as long as they live, and it costs them nothing to carry those seats. They are put to no expense in the way of revising voters' lists or defending election protests. The Solicitor General is supposed to do a large part of the work of the Minister of Justice, and receives \$5,000 a year for that service. I can see no good reason why \$12,000 a year, independent of the salaries paid to the deputy and other assistants, should be expended on that department, and only \$7,000 on that of the Prime Minister. I further said at that time :

I am sure that the Minister of Justice, when he has in this Chamber an assistant in the Solicitor General to do half of his work, would be very well satisfied to take the sum of \$5,000 a year.

At that time the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) was good enough to reply to me by saying :

I am afraid that my hon. friend has not got sufficient respect for that august assembly which sits so near us ; but I will mention his suggestion.

I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce what was the result of the interview ?

**THE MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** I have no objection to state to the hon. gentleman ; it is taken under consideration. Now, I may be pardoned for saying a word or two, as I have been frequently alluded to in this discussion. I do not intend to take up the time of the House replying to the allusions that have been made to my own department. But I will say this, that if the opinion of members on both sides of the House is that the number

Mr. HENDERSON.

of Cabinet Ministers is too great and ought to be reduced, and reduced pretty largely, I make this suggestion—be it remembered wholly and entirely in a theoretical way, because at the present moment we are not in a position to deal with it. They will have to adopt some such system as that which prevails in the mother country, with very great advantage, in my opinion, to the public service and to the status of Parliament itself. As everybody knows, in England the number of Cabinet Ministers is relatively far less than it is with us ; but that is made up for by having a number of Under-Secretaries attached to the several departments, who take a very large share of the work, and who are for the most part chosen from among the younger members of the House. Theoretically considered, the English system, in my opinion, is far preferable to ours. I expressed that opinion more than once when I was in Opposition, and I may tell the hon. gentleman that I expressed it when this constitution of ours was in process of formation, before 1867. That system has the great additional advantages that a number of Under-Secretaries of junior age and experience can very properly be chosen, and from them, if they prove themselves worthy, a crop of Ministers can be ripened in due course. If we are to consider the matter in a purely theoretical light, without regard to existing conditions. I venture to say that in process of time something of that kind will have to be elaborated here, as it grew up in the older country, and I can see a great deal to be said for the introduction of such a system.

When confederation was formed, it was formed by the union of parties in all the leading provinces, and the result was that a very much larger number of Cabinet Ministers was introduced than probably would have been under other conditions. That state of things has continued to the present, and it is by no manner of means, as everybody is aware who has any experience of practical politics, an easy thing to depart from. As for myself, I can say this, that when my friends, from my own province or the Cabinet, think that I have become a useless member of it, I shall be the last man to trouble them with my services.

**Mr. CRAIG.** While it may be cruel, as the hon. leader of the Opposition says, to hold hon. gentlemen opposite to their pledges, still I think it my duty to remind them and the country of some statements they have made on the question of economy in the administration of public affairs. I myself am in favour of economy, but I am under the impression that the Government is becoming rather too extravagant, and I think the country is rapidly reaching the same conclusion. Perhaps the people do not realize this as fully now as they will later on, but certainly the day is not far distant when

they will become very wide awake. We are told that this is a growing time, and while it may be in some other respects, there is no doubt that it is a growing time as regards public expenditure.

I propose to read some very interesting selections from a speech made by the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) when in Opposition, and who at that time was one of the most economical men in the House. The selections I intend to read are from a speech he made on a Bill to reduce the salary of the Governor General, and will speak for themselves, and besides have a direct bearing on the subject before the House :

It looks to me as if the whole scheme of Government in Canada, as represented by costly Governors General, Lieutenant Governors and Cabinet Ministers, were founded upon too liberal a scale. For example, in the United States Government there are but eight heads of departments, each of whom is paid a salary of \$8,000 a year, or a total of \$64,000. In Canada, we have Ministers and departments galore—eleven Ministers drawing \$8,000 a year each, one drawing \$9,000, and three Controllers together drawing \$18,000 ; in other words, the executive heads of our Government cost us \$115,000 a year, as against \$64,000 a year payable to the corresponding heads of departments in the United States. In other words, we are paying about 80 per cent more in the way of salaries to the members of our Government than are paid to the members of the United States Government. I mention that as a further illustration of the extravagant scale upon which our Government was formed.

The hon. leader of the Government replied to this statement of the hon. Postmaster General this morning by saying that the system of Government here is entirely different from that in the United States. But I think we might search through the records of "Hansard" in 1895 in vain to find from the right hon. gentleman any such argument as he made this morning. Why did he not then point out the fact that the cases are entirely different? He does so now, but when the Postmaster General was in Opposition and made the statement I have just quoted, the right hon. gentleman gave it his silent endorsement. The hon. Postmaster General, in the same speech, further said :

Nor would I be doing fairly by the subject if I were to suggest that the expenditure has grown to its present proportions under the present Administration. Taking the returns that I have, covering a quarter of a century, giving the figures during the Reform regime as well as the Conservative regimes, there is nothing in the direction of economy particularly on this score, particularly to the credit of the Reform Administration of 1874 to 1878. So that my criticism is wholly also without reference to any particular Government.

The hon. gentleman said also :

The expenses of our Government have grown beyond what is reasonable ; and if we are going to apply the pruning-knife, we must begin at the top. The Government must set the example ; every one who is in possession of power must set the example, that we may bring back the

expenditure to a reasonable and moderate limit. Who can justify the expenditure of our country to-day ? It cannot be justified by the wealth of the country. There is nothing to warrant this enormous expenditure of nearly \$38,000,000, except the fact that we are burdened down with debt and with office-holders great and small.

The hon. gentleman at that time held up his hands in horror at the bare idea of an expenditure of \$38,000,000. But what a change to-day ! To-day we have an expenditure of \$60,000,000, and the hon. gentleman views it with the greatest equanimity. What a change in the short space of four years since he crossed from the one side of the House to the other.

I am going to read from the remarks of another gentleman who used to pose as a great economist, and has some pretensions to be one still, although no longer giving any evidence of it by his vote. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), a short time ago, twitted the hon. leader of the Opposition with the fact that he could not always carry his followers with him: I think that was rather to the credit of the Opposition, because it shows that there are members on this side who have some individuality of opinion and do not follow their leader blindly, as does the hon. member for North Wellington. That hon. gentleman does not, evidently, always feel quite comfortable in his present role, for he occasionally, but on very rare occasions, attempts to make some little show of independence by getting up and mildly protesting against some increase, but being always very careful not to vote against the Government. That, of course, he could never do or he would lose all chance of a Senatorship or some other preferment, and while I do not say that that is the reason, it is very suspicious that this hon. gentleman who, when on this side, used to preach a crusade, in season and out of it, against extravagance, has now lost the faintest trace of his former desire for economy and swallows everything. When on this side he supported a Bill introduced by the Postmaster General, then a member of the Opposition, to reduce the salary of the Governor General, and took very strong ground in supporting that measure. He declared it to be a good Bill, that the Government was altogether too extravagant, and that this reduction should be made. I propose to read one or two selections from what the hon. gentleman said, which, no doubt, will be interesting reading to his friends opposite, and the country :

The whole cost of the Government of this country is altogether too much. We have thirteen Ministers, each drawing a salary of \$7,000 and a sessional allowance of \$1,000 ;—

I wish the right hon. First Minister and his colleagues in the Government to listen to this, and they might have a little conference with the hon. member for North Wellington and find out what he thinks of all this talk going on in the newspapers sup-

porting the Government to-day, and some of those who do not, about increase of salaries to the right hon. gentleman.

—and I must say that if \$7,000 was considered an ample allowance twenty years ago, \$4,000 should be considered an ample allowance now.

I wonder what the Ministers have to say to that?

Four thousand dollars would procure to-day more of the necessaries of life or the ordinary supplies required by a member of the Cabinet, than \$7,000 would twenty years ago.

This is very important information for the members of the Cabinet, and I am glad I found it out for them.

Wheat, flour and other supplies are not over half the price they were. We pay the thirteen Cabinet Ministers \$92,000 in salaries and \$13,000 in sessional allowances; we provide them with private secretaries, costing \$9,000; we pay a deputy Speaker \$2,000; we pay two Controllers \$13,200; that makes \$129,200 for our Cabinet Ministers and our two Controllers; and we have also a Solicitor General, who costs us \$6,000 a year.

I see the hon. Postmaster General is coming in now, but I have got through the selections from his speeches.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL.** Read them again.

Mr. **CRAIG.** No, but I will tell him where they are, so that he may hunt them up, perhaps, for the next Cabinet council. He will find them in the "Hansard" of 1895, pages 3250 to 3252.

But I am reading now from the speech of the hon. member for North Wellington, who seconded the Bill of the Postmaster General for reducing the salary of the Governor General. I am a little surprised that we have not heard anything of that Bill since 1896. It was considered a most important measure at the time. The present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), made a very strong speech in favour of it, and so did the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). We may find that measure mentioned in the Speech from the Throne next session. We shall look for it very anxiously. Now, let me read another short selection from the speech of the hon. member for North Wellington. I ask the particular attention of the Minister of Finance to this:

But when you consider the whole condition of things in this Dominion, and the experience of other colonies that have been extravagant in this regard, you must see that it is time for us to call a halt and make a decided effort to bring the annual expenditure of the country down to a figure which our people can bear without feeling the burden so seriously as they do to-day. I believe we could reduce the expenditure of this country by five or six millions if the Government were only ready and willing to consent to it.

I wonder if that is the case to-day, that the Government are standing in the way of a reduction of the expenditure. We must hold

Mr. **CRAIG.**

them responsible for it, according to the doctrine of the hon. member for North Wellington.

I believe we could reduce the expenses of the civil service by from \$500,000 to \$750,000, if the Government would put fewer of their friends in office, and only employ men to fill the offices because they were capable and because they were needed.

I might go on reading almost for ever from the speeches of the same kind by gentlemen on the other side. I have not had time to look up the speeches of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). But I have no doubt that I could find even stronger speeches made by that hon. gentleman. I am glad that hon. gentleman is in the Cabinet, for I believe he is something of a brake upon the Government. But for him, the Estimates might be seventy millions. We heard that the supplementary Estimates were to be about \$8,000,000; but they were whittled down a good deal after the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) left the country. I think the country expects the Minister of Trade and Commerce to look after this expenditure. I am in favour of economy, but there is one thing I will vote for, and that is to employ somebody to make selections from the speeches of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Postmaster General and the hon. member for North Wellington on the subject of extravagance, and once a week read these selections to the Cabinet. One member suggests that the reading should be daily, but that would take too much time. Before the Council enter upon the consideration of any Estimates, these selections should be read, inculcating economy and showing that the farmers of this country are not willing to be taxed as they have been taxed. I hope the Cabinet will consider this question of economy. I am talking seriously; I am not talking for fun. The Finance Minister himself must admit that the expenditure is altogether too great. After having declared that \$38,000,000 was too much, how can they reconcile it with their principles to bring down Estimates for nearly \$60,000,000? The country realizes the absurdity of it, and will hold these hon. gentlemen to the promises they made when in Opposition.

Mr. **McDOUGALL.** What member of the Administration is charged with the executive management of the Pacific cable and the fast line? I notice the Postmaster General had charge of the Pacific cable question on the floor of this House, and also that when the Government came in, the management of the fast line was given in charge of the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), who has made so many trips across the Atlantic in connection with it. I should suppose that these matters should be in charge of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Does the Prime Minister refuse me

an answer? I think my question is quite pertinent.

The PRIME MINISTER. I beg my hon. friend's (Mr. McDougall) pardon. Did he ask me a question?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I want to know what member of the Administration is charged with the executive management of these services—the fast line and the Pacific cable?

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) knows that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) is not in good health, and cannot give to his department the same attention he would give otherwise.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That is not an answer to my question. The right hon. First Minister might inform me whether these two services are under the executive management of the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

The PRIME MINISTER. Which services?

Mr. McDOUGALL. The Pacific cable and the fast line.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Pacific cable, when it becomes a fact, will be under a commission sitting in London, as proposed by the Bill which has been passed.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But the negotiations with a view to the Pacific cable must be conducted by some Minister of the Crown. Who has the information I want?

The PRIME MINISTER. Negotiations have been carried on by the High Commissioner.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I suppose, then, the High Commissioner acts without any authority from any department here?

The PRIME MINISTER. The High Commissioner reports to me direct.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Then, we are to understand that so far the negotiations are with the Prime Minister, and not with any other member of the Cabinet?

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the amendment is in the right direction. I shall not, like my hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Craig) read in support of it speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite, when in Opposition. I might use up hours of time in doing so. But I desire to point out that the same work now done by the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue was done for many years in the past by hon. gentlemen who, I think, did their work equally to the satisfaction of the country, and for \$2,000 less each. When it was proposed to establish the Controllerships, it was said in support of the proposal that the expenditure would be much less than to have

two Cabinet Ministers, while the work would be equally well done with the Minister of Trade and Commerce as the representative of the two departments in the Cabinet. The work was done by the two Controllers, who were paid \$5,000 each, and now it is proposed to increase this to \$7,000 a year each.

In my judgment, if the work could be done equally well before with men who were quite as capable as the men who are doing the work now, and if \$5,000 a year was sufficient then, it ought to be sufficient for the same class of men now. The other feature of it is also objectionable, and that is that this resolution is retroactive. When we pass a Bill in connection with the civil service it is usually understood to apply only to the future. But this Bill goes back more than a year, and says that we shall give each of these men practically a bonus of \$2,000 apiece each for their services last year. I consider this is a violation of a principle that we have always held to be a correct one, that this Bill should not be retroactive.

Mr. CLANCY: I am puzzled somewhat concerning this right-about-face of the Government on this question within two years. I do not question the propriety of raising the two Controllers to the rank of Ministers. I have always thought that was a very proper thing. But it seems this had to be done by stealth rather than in a plain and open way. We were told two years ago that there was to be no increase in the salary then, and that such increase would only take place in case one of the present Ministers was done away with. Now that pledge has not been carried out. To be sure, we do not always hold hon. gentlemen opposite to a strict performance of their pledges; indeed we sometimes rather commend them for breaking their pledges. But there can be no excuse for their breaking this pledge under the circumstances, and we are puzzled to know how the hon. gentlemen have been able to seduce their supporters into agreeing in a course which they promised would only be taken on condition that one of the present Ministers was done away with. I think this is clearly an act of bad faith on the part of the Government.

Amendment negatived—yeas 17, nays 44.

Mr. HUGHES. May I ask if the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) is paired.

Mr. COWAN. No, I am not paired for anything in committee. That is expressly understood by the whips and by Dr. Montague and myself. In the early part of the session we were so paired, but that agreement was dissolved as applying to anything done in committee.

Resolution reported.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 182) respecting the Departments of Customs and Inland Revenue.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

**Mr. FOSTER.** May I ask the Prime Minister if it is proposed to sit after six o'clock to-day?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** No, I think not.

It being One o'clock, the Deputy Speaker left the Chair.

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

#### BILL WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 165) to incorporate the Yukon River and Atlin Lake Improvement Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

#### SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Department of the Interior—

Salaries and expenses in connection with the administration of the Yukon provisional district .....	\$100,000
---	-----------

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) in his place, because I am very anxious to make another appeal to the Government on the question of the dues imposed on mining licenses in regard to the output of gold in the Yukon country. As the hon. gentleman knows, I have always attached a great deal of importance to this question, because I regard the imposition of a 10 per cent duty upon the output as not only a very great injustice to those engaged in gold mining, but I believe it is injurious to the public revenue. My own impression, based upon the information I have been able to get, in reference to this subject, is that it has the effect of restricting gold mining in the Yukon, principally the development of claims of moderate richness, instead of enabling the development of the country by parties who have not a large amount of capital or resources to be carried on, the same as by parties who have obtained possession of very good claims. I am strengthened very much in this opinion by the report of the late and present officers of the Government in the Yukon. I hold in my hand Major Walsh's report, who says, under the heading of "Royalty":

On arrival at Dawson I found a great many questions awaiting solution which could only be disposed of by the authority of the Commissioner. For instance, the question of royalty, over which there had been considerable discussion, appeared to be somewhat mixed. I im-

Mr. COWAN.

mediately announced that royalty would be collected on all claims the leases of which were renewed subsequent to the date when the law came into force. Nearly all the leaseholders of the larger prospected claims showed a disposition to respect the collection of royalty. Others, however, were not so tractable, their principal objection being that their leases were granted for one year and that once being granted subsequent restrictions could not be placed upon them. I pointed out to the leaseholders that collection of royalty was necessary for the maintenance of courts of justice, for police protection, mail communication, and for public services. While acknowledging the force of these reasons, they submitted that a more thorough examination of the real cost of outputting the gold would convince the Government that the royalty is a severe tax, and expressed a hope that next year would see it removed.

I have never proposed that the royalty should be removed, but I do suggest that it should be placed on a footing corresponding to that which is exacted in other parts of the Dominion, in British Columbia and Nova Scotia, where gold mining has long been carried on, and also in other gold-mining countries, especially the United States of America.

Referring to the practice in other countries, I believe there is no parallel to be found anywhere for the exaction of such a royalty on the gold output as is exacted in the Yukon country. I made an appeal by cable to the Minister of the Interior from London, and he replied that it would engage the attention of the Government. I admit that a slight improvement was made when the exemption was extended from, I think, \$2,500 to \$5,000. Of course, that gave a certain relief, but a very small one. The effect of a 10 per cent royalty, which is so much in excess of that adopted in any other country, is injurious to the best interests of Canada in many ways. I am able to speak with positive knowledge when I say, that it has greatly retarded the introduction of British capital into Yukon gold mining investments, and I have no doubt capital from other countries, but I lay particular stress upon British capital. It has had a most depressive effect upon the introduction of British capital into that territory. It is so large that it has defeated its object, owing to the temptation to smuggle, and as the Minister must know, it is not a very difficult thing to conceal the output of gold, because there is such large value in such small space, that it cannot be so easily prevented as smuggling in any other branch of commerce. It has a doubly injurious effect, because when gold is, so to speak, smuggled, it lessens the report of the output, which tends to damage the value of the country in the eyes of the public. Major Walsh continues to say:

Royalty was not collected from any claims which had not got into good working order or which could not show a profit after paying a royalty, and this would represent a large sum.

The effect of this oppressive tax was that Major Walsh could not put the law in force. He says :

Again, more than half the leases were exempted from royalty on account of having been renewed previous to the date of the law requiring the payment of royalty coming into force. The collection of royalty will amount to about a half-million dollars.

I regard that statement as the strongest condemnation of the imposition of a 10 per cent royalty upon an output exceeding \$5,000, as the law stands at present. In another portion of Major Walsh's report, he returns to the subject, and under the heading of output of "gold and general prospects," he says :

The output of gold this year from the Yukon district will be in the neighbourhood of \$10,000,000. When I left Dawson on the 4th August, the spring and summer's output amounted to about eight and one-half million dollars, and we estimated that there was about \$2,000,000 of gold still on the dump, most of which could not be washed up for want of water, but, depending entirely upon rain, this could be cleared up before the close of the season. Three million dollars was carried over from last autumn, which was shipped out this summer. This amount cannot be counted in this year's output. It will require this year about three and one-half million dollars to do the business of the district.

When the difficulties of operation, the scarcity of supplies, and the lack of proper facilities for mining and the small territory worked are considered and understood, an output of \$10,000,000 is a remarkable showing, and justifies great expectations for the future.

I call attention to that, because he points out the great difficulties under which gold mining is carried on there. He says :

Practically, Eldorado and Bonanza are the only two creeks upon which any considerable work has been done. They, therefore, represent the output this year. Next year, with Dominion, Hunker, Sulphur, and several other creeks, as well as a great many hill and bench claims, will be added to the list of producers, and it is impossible to make any estimate now of what the product of gold will be.

I draw the attention of the hon. Minister to that, and again to another statement on page 18 of Major Walsh's report, in which he says :

The cold and inhospitable climate, combined with the expensive and hard labour attendant upon mining in that country, will always make it an unpopular and unfavourable "mining camp," and for this reason the mining laws and regulations must be liberal, so as to attract and encourage the population and capital of the world.

Again, on the same page :

They seem to think that with the staking of a claim a fortune is assured. This is a delusion, the best evidence of which is the fact that 50 per cent of the claims which have been staked in the Yukon district have either been abandoned or not entered for. I know many men who came into the district at great expense of labour and money who have withdrawn from it without even locating a claim, and I know of hundreds who

have staked claims who only did so with the hope of being able to sell them on the outside to people unacquainted with their value. After a claim has been staked there is a great deal to be done before its actual value—if it has any—can be determined. The cost of prospecting a claim may be anyway from \$500 to \$2,000, and even five times as much as the latter amount has been expended in prospecting claims which are now abandoned. Perhaps, with cheaper labour, they may be worked at some future time.

In the face of the statements of Major Walsh, the commissioner on the spot, who had the best means of judging, and who discloses that the mining laws were so severe that he had to resort to the unjustifiable—I might almost say—expedient of disregarding the law and using his own judgment; all that ought to have made such an impression on the Minister of the Interior as to satisfy him that a mistake had been made in this matter; and a mistake most injurious to the country. I venture to say that Mr. Ogilvie's opinion not only corroborates everything that Major Walsh has said, but goes a great deal further. I was assured by a gentleman of whose credibility I have no doubt that, Mr. Ogilvie told him that, in his judgment, the Government would receive a larger amount of revenue from a 2½ or 3 per cent royalty than from a 10 per cent royalty. I put it to the Minister of the Interior whether, in the face of all these facts, it would not be in the interest of Canada, in the interest of the Government, in the interest of the development of this great gold country, that we should mitigate that tax; at all events, reduce the 10 per cent royalty to a royalty more in conformity with the practice prevailing in the other gold-producing countries of the world. I do not intend to take up the time of the committee at this late stage of the session; but I felt, with the strong opinions which I hold, and which are generally held by parties who have taken an interest in this subject, that the Government ought to give that subject their attention. At all events, they should be in a position to try whether a more moderate exaction in that regard would not be attended with better results.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say a few words on this question, and perhaps the hon. Minister can answer everything at the same time. I have here a letter, on the same subject, from a young Ontario boy, who I presume is well known to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and he makes somewhat similar statements. Before reading the letter, I may say that when the question of the 10 per cent royalty was first considered in this House, I expressed my views very strongly against the wisdom of such a course, believing that the business would not warrant it. It appears that the miners entertain the same opinion. This young man says :

The miners complain very much at the Government taking a large royalty tax from them and won't even give them a passable road. I have got into many scrapes in trying to take sides with the Government and offer many excuses, but you cannot persuade the miners when they know they are getting the worst of it, and no doubt but they have got it in the neck on every side the past year. I am satisfied all the Government officials are either incompetent or dishonest and the majority are the last named—looking more to their own pockets and to the pockets of their friends than for the future welfare of this country. The best mines are owned by Americans and when I asked a shrewd Winnipeg lawyer how it was he said you know the Americans are better at tipping the officials than us Canadians and they have the best claims for that reason, and his remarks proved satisfactory to me when I got to investigating matters.

The Canadian Government is badly disgraced in this country and British justice is set aside by the people since they run across such injustice as has been practiced here. If it was not for the Mounted Police there is no doubt but the people would have risen in rebellion and perhaps slain several of the officials who have been running things this past year in a high-handed way. Why, the officials of the Government have more or less interest in claims that are supposed to be good or in a good neighbourhood and it has ruined this country for future development. They reserve, as well, every 10 claims for the Government, which practically leaves nothing for the mass of miners doing the hard work of prospecting.

It appears to me that the Canadian Government in sending out men here have sent all the scapegoats of the province—men of no ability who came with but one thing in view, and that is to fill their own pockets and ruin the reputation of British justice. The Yukon country is a thing of the past, and Government officials are the ones responsible for most of the injustice forced upon a brave, honest and industrious people, who have faced death to make a stake in this country. Thousands have left and gone across the border where there are better laws for miners, while thousands more have gone back home to Canada and elsewhere broken in health; no money and heart-broken because of the injustice met here at the hands of men in high offices.

I presume people on the outside would not believe me if I told some of the poor fellows' experiences in this country in the shape of killing themselves prospecting only to find themselves beat out of their locations by men sent here by a Government whose only aim is self and the man with the ounce (as they call it here). They call the Government tip "Mr. Ounce," which means in the past year if you wanted anything done by a Government official you had to have "Mr. Ounce" close at hand.

Mr. McMULLEN. Give us the name?

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. William Nightingale. I do not know what his politics are or anything about him; but from what he says: "I have got into many scrapes in trying to take sides with the Government." I take it that he cannot be a very strong politician on the Conservative side. I merely read the letter with the object of emphasizing the conviction I expressed nearly two years ago, that the 10 per cent royalty was a high-

Mr. SPROULE.

er one than should be imposed, and also for the purpose of giving the Minister of the Interior a little information in addition to the large amount he has already received, from men who went to that country from Ontario and other provinces, so that it may help him to better understand the condition of affairs, and if possible devise a remedy at any early day.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend has mentioned my name in connection with the letter which he has just read. I certainly know the gentleman to whom he has referred. He is like a man who lived in my riding who was of such pronounced political opinions that in the general elections of 1896, when the Tory party was defeated, he declared that he would not live in Canada if it was to be governed by the Grits. He is an uncompromising, ingrained, galvanized Tory of the very worst kind. You could not find in the whole of Canada a man more imbued with Toryism than this same gentleman, and I am quite sure that this letter has been inspired by the same spirit, with the purpose of trying to injure the Government, and with no other purpose; for he is Tory every day in the year and Sunday too.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman says he is a Tory. Is he a dishonest or untruthful man?

Mr. McMULLEN. You find many Tories who are fairly honest otherwise, but who in politics are absolutely dishonest. With regard to the royalty, I am very glad indeed that the hon. Minister of the Interior has withstood all the appeals that have been made to him to lower the royalty on the output of gold in the Yukon. When we come to consider the enormous expenses to which Canada has been put to maintain law and order in that country, and to hold it under the control of Canada, I think the Minister of the Interior deserves a great deal of credit for trying to make that country pay its own expenses, instead of taxing the people of Canada for that purpose. I give him and the Government the utmost credit for the admirable manner in which they have managed the whole Yukon district. When we consider the enormous distance at which the country is removed from civilization, lying 1,400 or 1,500 miles inland, without railway or telegraph connection, and to which a contingent of the Mounted Police and a force of volunteers had to be sent at enormous expense, we can see what a burden it would have been on the people of this country if the urgent appeals of the hon. leader of the Opposition for a reduction of the royalty from 10 per cent to 2 per cent had been acceded to. I hope the Minister of the Interior will continue to withstand such appeals, and to collect from the gold that is mined in that country the same percentage in the future that he has collected in the past. A very

large portion of the gold product is taken to the United States, and if, through the persistent efforts of the Minister of the Interior, we are able to hold 10 per cent of that product to meet the expenses connected with the opening up and development of the country, my hon. friend will deserve the undying credit of every true Canadian.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I listened with some care to the hon. leader of the Opposition in the expression of his views, which I have no doubt he has arrived at after careful consideration of this subject. I quite admit that the opinion of gentlemen of his experience, especially in connection with financial matters in which Canada is interested in the money markets of Great Britain, is entitled to great weight and serious consideration. The money market of Great Britain was entitled to very serious consideration. I regret I am not able to agree in the views which the hon. gentleman has expressed. I may say that the question of the royalties in the Yukon is not one that can be settled for all time or laid down as an absolute and permanent policy, to be followed in the future without any change or modification. It is a question that will have to be considered from time to time as circumstances may change. The position, in so far as the first year is concerned, was this. There was a number of rich claims that were practically all owned by aliens or men not Canadian citizens.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. McDonald, who has the sobriquet of the "King of the Klondike," is not an alien.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Perhaps I was speaking a little too generally when I said that practically all were aliens, but a very great majority of the claims were owned by aliens, and my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition will find that most of the claims which Mr. McDonald owns at present, had been purchased by him from aliens, who were the original discoverers, and purchased at very large figures in some cases. We were in this position. There was reported to be a number of claims, out of which very enormous profits were being made, because, while it has been extremely expensive and difficult to work mines in that country, yet enormous profits had been made, and were being made, very largely for the benefit of men who contributed nothing to our country, and who could not complain that they were badly treated, if called on to pay a percentage. I do not think that the imposition of the royalty has resulted in any great hardship. That which my hon. friend has pointed out with regard to Major Walsh's proceedings, simply indicates that the Government were solving that very difficulty, and had provided for it. The Government could not be fully aware of all the circumstances as they arose; there was

no telegraphic communication by which executive action could be transmitted from day to day, or week to week, and we had to give Major Walsh the discretion to remit the royalty in certain cases. I think he acted with extreme judiciousness, and I am confirmed in this opinion by the fact that, though he has been attacked on a great many grounds, I have not heard anything against him in connection with his management of the very difficult task of the collection of taxes. He made some remissions, where it was shown that the expenses of working the claims had exceeded the output, and he was called on to decide what claims the law applied to. He exercised his judgment to the best of his ability, and I have heard no serious complaint in that regard. The fact that no complaint has been raised with regard to Major Walsh's conduct in this most delicate and difficult matter proves that he exercised his powers with tact and discretion. I do not think that any great hardship was imposed on the men who paid the royalty. The total collection, which amounted to nearly \$400,000, was very much more than I anticipated a year ago, and it shows that, considering the exemptions, considering the large number of claims altogether exempted from royalty by reason of the fact that the leases had been renewed before the Order in Council imposing the royalty was passed, it must be admitted that the officers of the Government collected all the royalty they could reasonably have been expected to do. I agree in what the hon. leader of the Opposition has said, that when you impose a heavy tax, you put a premium on smuggling, but it does not follow that because some smuggling, some evasion of the law, takes place, it is unwise to impose the tax. That is a question which must be decided in view of all the circumstances. No doubt, some claim-owners endeavoured to escape payment of the tax, and concealed the output of their claims, but on account of that provision of the law which states that evasion or neglect to pay the tax imposed by Order in Council will, upon proof thereof, result in forfeiture of the claim, persons who own valuable claims are likely to be extremely careful before they make themselves liable to forfeiture of their title. That provision, our officers say, has been a very valuable feature, and had the effect of decreasing their difficulties to a large extent.

I do not think there is anything in the nature of an injustice suffered in consequence of this law. I do not think that any person who takes up a claim, knowing what the regulations are, can be held a victim of any injustice at the hands of the Government. And as to those men who took up claims a year and a half, or two years, ago, I do not think, under all the circumstances, they have any right to claim that the Government has treated them with injustice.

The view of my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is one that appeals very strongly to me, namely, that, if possible, this mining country should be made to pay for itself. So far that has been the result. There was a large surplus last year, and I think that there will be a considerable surplus this year. As to what the hon. leader of the Opposition has particularly adverted to, and what is no doubt the main reason for his opinion, namely, his belief that the imposition of a royalty deters the people from working claims which are not already known to be of undoubted richness, this is the view I have formed, and which seems to me will be borne out by the facts, though possibly it may be modified by future developments. The richest claims are worked out as quickly as possible by the owners and those operating them, and it would have been a great mistake to have a low tax while that process is going on, for the purpose of encouraging development of the poorer claims. If it should turn out that the number of rich claims is comparatively limited, and the country becomes reduced to working poorer claims, that will be the time for the Government to consider that phase of the question, and, upon careful examination, decide whether it is necessary to the development of the country that a very much lower tax should be placed upon the output, or that a somewhat less crude tax—for a general imposition of 10 per cent is more or less crude—might be easily worked out and adopted. It might possibly, within a comparatively short time, become desirable that a very much lower tax might be imposed upon certain classes of property, necessarily worked in a certain way, where the grounds are poorer mining grounds, and the output small, and the capital required large. That would be a matter to be considered, and I would not like to express any opinion until the circumstances arise.

I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the Yukon territory is not suffering from lack of progress or from the lack of sufficient increase in the output. From all we can learn, the output this year will be probably \$20,000,000, while last year it was hardly \$10,000,000; so we may see that gold is being taken out of the country as rapidly as there is any special occasion for at the present time. I would not care to father a policy that would result in abnormally stimulating the mining operations in that country to such an extent that we should have the experience some other places had had and the mining operations cease or nearly cease after a short time. Conversations I have had with some gentlemen who have come to interview me on subjects connected with the country do not lead me to believe that when capital is needed in an extensive and bona fide way under the advice of men thoroughly acquainted with the country, the royalty, as it stands at present, would necessarily exclude that capital.

Mr. SIFTON.

Several gentlemen have at different times approached the Government to obtain concessions to employ capital on a very large scale; and in the course of conversation it has always been told them that any arrangement made would be made subject—with, perhaps, a reasonable exemption for the first cost of machinery—to the ten per cent royalty, just as in the case of the ordinary miner. Of course, no arrangement has been made so far, or Parliament would have been made aware of it. But I mention this as an indication of the fact that many men who have carefully studied the Yukon district are of the opinion that capital could be employed in very large quantities, and that gold taken out in course of these operations can pay such a tax as we are now imposing without the operations being rendered unproductive. I desire to commend to the committee this idea—that the policy we have followed up to the present time has been that which seemed best under the circumstances. It has been followed with the object of compelling those who have taken up extraordinarily rich mining claims in our territory to contribute such a proportion of their product as to enable the Government of the district to be carried on without loss; and this, so far, has not resulted in actually retarding the development of the country. Though no doubt it has, to some extent, prevented certain operations which might have been carried on had the tax not been imposed, yet the progress of the country has been quite sufficiently rapid to meet our view, and there is no special object in adopting any policy which would result in greatly stimulating the progress of mining there at the present time, in view of the fact that a very large amount of gold is being taken out, and no great advantage would result in accelerating operations in that direction. So far as the future is concerned, while there is nothing to show, in my judgment, that the tax will injure the country; while I am not prepared to say that, even when operations are reduced to dealing with mining properties which are not so productive as those most largely dealt with now, that tax will be reduced—still, it may be reduced. That is a matter that we have to consider when we have had more experience of the country and can act with a more full and accurate knowledge of the conditions.

Mr. MARTIN. I had not intended to trouble the committee, but I have a letter from a friend of mine in Dawson City, who has been there for a year or two; and, I think some statements he makes may be of some service to the Minister of the Interior in dealing with these questions, and in remedying some of the abuses which he says exist in the administration of affairs there. The letter is dated the 26th June, and I received it a day or two ago—so that even in the summer season, it takes a little more than a fortnight for a letter to come from

Dawson City to Ottawa. My correspondent starts out by saying he has not had any news from the outside world, with the exception of a few clippings of newspapers, among others the "Star's" summary of Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper's speech on the Yukon government. He says:

Doubtless, many will think that Sir Hibbert's speech was strong, but I am sure that had an honest and capable judge, clothed with all necessary power, begun an investigation into the running of the various offices in Dawson last fall, at the time when the farcical white-washing investigation was begun by Commissioner Ogilvie, and had the report been published to the people, subsequent to the delivery of Sir Hibbert's speech, they would in chorus exclaim: "The half has not been told us." Instead of the Government appointing Commissioner Ogilvie to try Thomas Fawcett and his fellow-conspirators, it would have been more expeditious and less expensive, and not one whit more laughable, if they had appointed each of these little gods to try himself. Commissioner Ogilvie, like many great men before his time, has lived too long. He has lived to dig a grave and bury therein his once spotless reputation. Sir Hibbert's statements regarding the mail service are strictly correct, as everybody who has been in this country well knows. The statement of the Postmaster General that we had a fortnightly service here all winter is notoriously untrue. It is wonderful how a Crown Minister, having the least respect either for the position or himself, would utter in public so brazen a statement. Canada can afford to lower the postage to Great Britain and to the United States, but she cannot afford to give her own people, in her own territory, a decent mail service.

Now, Sir, I think it is pretty generally known, and by no people so well as by the Ministers of the Dominion Cabinet, that the administration of this territory is rotten. But it is not so generally known that the laws and regulations governing mining and the despotic authority with which those little gods of officials are clothed, are in themselves the chief reasons for this saturnalia of corruption. Now, I will point out to you a few of the absurdities of those regulations, regulations which are driving men out of the country every day, and if persisted in will inevitably be its ruin. We will take the royalty tax. Ten per cent is perhaps not too high for a few claims, perhaps a hundred or so, but on the great majority it is too much, it is nonsense. But the most outrageous feature of it is that the royalty is collected on the gross output; they don't care a rap whether the poor miner who worked hard all winter on his claim will have a dollar left after paying his expenses or not, the Government must have their swag.

Here is an instance of how it works. (I have this on the best authority). Two men owned a claim each having a half interest. They hired men and got out a dump. After they washed up, the Government took as its share 186 ounces, which in currency would be \$2,656. After the expenses were all paid the owners divided \$1,600 between them, \$88 apiece. In another case on Dominion Creek, a man after paying the royalty had not enough left to pay for the labour, and had to dig down in his pocket to pay his men. It may be because I am dense, but I fail to see any difference between this holding up of the Yukon miner by the Dominion Government and the holding up by the Jesse James gang of a Pacific express. If there must be a royalty, in

heaven's name let it be reasonable. Have it in the first place, by all means, on the net output of a mine, and again, don't make the little \$5,000 claim-owner pay the same as the \$100,000 man. Either have a sliding scale by which each will pay according to the amount he nets, or abolish it altogether. I am not opposed to a royalty altogether, but I think it wrong that a man with poor ground should be taxed the same as a man who has good ground.

Another regulation by which the Hon. Clifford Sifton advertises his utter incapacity, is that one by which a miner having recorded a claim, loses his right in that district. He may spend two or three months prospecting it, but if he finds nothing it is all off with him in that district. Statesmanship isn't in it. A man gets into the country, for the privilege of digging on a certain piece of ground he pays \$15; if he finds anything, all is well; if not, well, this is what the Government practically says to him: "Well, we gave you 250 feet of ground there to dig on, if you didn't get anything, we can't help it." "Of course there are miles of land in this district yet, there may be gold in it, too, but then you must not dig, you might find some. See those high hills over there; well, we will give you 250 feet (where you cross there is the watershed next) to dig on if you like, but if you miss there your name is Dennis, your services for the development of those two districts are no longer required. The best thing that we can see for you to do is to get out of the country." Nice way to develop a country, surely.

Another huge farce is this representing a claim three months out of every year. Claims in here are of two classes, those known as summer diggings and those known as winter diggings. Now, you will often see a summer claim represented in the middle of winter, and a winter claim represented in the middle of summer. Representing in this way, of course, means sitting in a cabin or tent, eating up grub and satisfying the Dominion Government, who no doubt suppose (as they are so thoroughly versed in those matters) that by this means they are aiding the development of the country. There should be a uniform time for the representing of summer claims and also a day fixed upon which all winter claims must be represented. All claims not represented at those dates should be open to re-valuation by the first man who stakes. This would remove a great deal of the hoodling material from the hands of the official gang who alone have entrance into the "holy of holes" where the consecrated records of the Yukon district are preserved from the pollution of the public gaze. One can do nothing alone, he can dig a hole 10 feet or so, and must then quit work. If two men can in six weeks show more work than one man possibly can in three months, why not count it as representative? But no, it won't go; must have three months living there. Work cuts no figure at all. It is not a development of the country at all, apparently, that they are aiming at. Now, if there is any man so dull witted as to think that it would be better to have one man three months digging a hole in the ground than two men half the time, there is for that man only one field where he may rise, he better apply at once to the Hon. Clifford Sifton at the Interior Department. We have here all the abuses of autocratic government and we have no voice, no vote in the management of our affairs. Little gods are sent in and set over us clothed with almost unlimited power, and sail in to make a fortune, none daring to make them afraid, for have they not

got at their backs the Government of Canada? We have taxation without representation, we have the "unearned increment" iniquity in its most pronounced type, and we have in reality no appeal.

There are a few other sentences in this letter, but I think that is all that refers to this question. I read it merely to show the committee and the Minister what a miner, who is on the ground, who owns a mine, and is anxious to work it, says are the hindrances with which miners have to contend.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the item passes, I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether the second instalment, which is now in my hand, of Mr. Ogilvie's report, makes, with the first instalment, the complete report?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, I think Mr. Ogilvie says, in the last paragraph, that there will be some matters which will require to be investigated.

Mr. DAVIN. I have gone through this report, and I do not intend, at this period of the session to take up the time of the committee in regard to it; I do not intend to attempt to do justice to it; I intend to take up one of the charges that Mr. Ogilvie was to have investigated just to show the way that the report leaves it. I will leave it to the committee, then, to judge of the character of the inquiry, and as to the justice of the particular charge to which I refer. One of the charges is this: that Mr. Sifton, being an employee of the Department of the Interior—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Wade.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has got one paragraph ahead of his subject. That will come later.

Mr. DAVIN. No, I do not intend to bring the hon. gentleman into it in that way. The charge was that Mr. Wade, being an employee of the Department of the Interior, staked a claim on Monte Cristo Island. When that charge was made, those who made it were attacked for their injustice to Mr. Wade and their injustice to the hon. gentleman at the head of the Interior Department. It was intimated, of course, that if it could be shown that an officer of the Department of the Interior had been guilty of any misconduct of that sort, the hon. gentleman would at once deal with it. However, when Mr. Wade came back to Winnipeg he was interviewed. He admitted that he had staked a claim, but he said that he was given special permission to stake claims in the Yukon. The Winnipeg "Tribune" which published this interview, commented on it in this manner:

Mr. Wade admits having staked a claim on Monte Cristo Island, but justifies his action on the ground that when appointed he was given

Mr. MARTIN.

special permission to stake claims in the Yukon. This is exactly the position that the "Tribune" apprehended it to be when the famous grab was made on Monte Cristo, and which elicited so much hostile criticism at the time. While officials with a high sense of the positions which they filled would have declined to compromise themselves in the slightest by competing with the miners in the rush for claims, the original blame is now shown to be at the door of the Government, or the department which permitted the officials to depart from the well-known regulation regarding the holding of land, and to take up claims for themselves. As we pointed out at the time, the blame is not so much that of the officials as the Government that permitted it.

On page 18 of this volume of Mr. Ogilvie's report, Mr. Wade is being examined by the commissioner, and he says, in reply to a question:

I was registrar of lands under the Torrens system.

On page 24 it will be found that Milo Roberts was being examined by Mr. Clarke, who is acting as counsel:

By Mr. Clarke:

Q. You heard what Mr. Howard has said in answer to questions asked him. Do you believe what he said is true?—A. So far as I know.

Q. Do you know that this money was paid?—A. Just what he told you.

Q. Have you any knowledge of the business arrangement between Mr. Howard and Mr. Wade, other than hearsay?—A. No, sir.

Up to that point they are dealing with a wholly different matter from that which I am talking about, but then, Mr. Wade interjects this remark:

Mr. Wade.—There were some charges made against me regarding Monte Cristo Island.

The Commissioner.—There has been nothing said about that to me as commissioner.

Mr. Wade.—I think it important that the commission settle the matter; this charge was made on the outside; it was the first charge made, and included Mr. McGregor and myself.

The Commissioner.—That is a matter for you to bring up yourself.

Mr. Wade.—Yes, Mr. Commissioner, I will state what was said. It was stated that Mr. McGregor and myself had gone out there at midnight, and that we had swooped down on the island and practically staked all the claims on the island. This island has been described as "The Official Island." It was stated that in so doing, we had robbed the miners and prevented them from recording, and that Mr. McGregor and myself had suddenly made ourselves rich, and that my claim was worth \$60,000. In answer to that charge, I want to say that we started for Monte Cristo Island in the morning in full daylight; there were no deeds of darkness about the matter at all.

You will see, Mr. Chairman, that to Mr. Wade's conception, though he is a lawyer and supposed to be rather an able man, the gravamen of the charge was, not that he had gone, contrary to law, and staked his claim, but that he had gone out there at midnight:

Q. What time of the year was this?—A. In March. Previous to going to Monte Cristo Is-

land, I had been asked by a miner, who was a friend of mine, to go up and stake a claim. I asked if I might bring a friend along, and arranged with Mr. McGregor to go along with me. We were received by my friend, Mr. Burland, and others; they showed us their map, which they had made two days before, in which they had reserved a place for me to stake.

I want to call the attention of the House to that. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that this Government official of the Department of the Interior had been in conversation with those miners in respect to staking claims.

So that was far from staking against the interests of the miners; I was staking on the invitation of the miners, who, two days before, had made this map, and asked me to stake. I staked a claim and Mr. McGregor staked a claim; they were all staking that day. So far were we from monopolizing the island, we had only staked two claims out of sixteen staked at that time. We certainly never valued our claims at \$60,000. As a matter of fact, the date of the renewal of these claims has gone by, and only one claim has been renewed. I would like to call Mr. Hurdman, who has a list of the claims on Monte Christo Island, the dates on which they were staked, and the number of them renewed.

Albert F. Hurdman, sworn and examined:—

By Mr. Wade:

Q. You are a clerk in the Gold Commissioner's office?—A. Yes.

Q. You have a list showing the claims on Monte Christo Island and the dates of staking, and the number of renewals?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many claims were there staked on that island?—A. Twenty-three.

Q. On what date did I stake?—A. The date of your record is 21st March.

Q. I staked the day before, that is, 20th March. Do you know as a matter of fact how many claims were left unstaked after we got through on that date?—A. Three, but they all could have been staked on that date.

Q. We only staked two claims out of twenty-three, leaving twenty-one for the miners?—A. Yes.

Q. Is Monte Christo considered valuable at all?—A. There is no inquiry in the office about it.

Q. Have any of these claims been renewed?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many?—A. One.

The Commissioner.—Who renewed that one?

Mr. Wade.—I was the foolish party myself, Mr. Commissioner. I found out from Mr. Hurdman I was alone. All I have said applies to Mr. McGregor as well as myself.

Mr. McGregor.—I think there were twelve staked on that date, and the balance were staked afterwards.

Mr. Wade.—We left eleven unstaked claims after we got through. If there is any other matter, I would like it gone into. Mr. McConnell is here, and he might be examined in regard to the bridge.

The Commissioner.—I have not heard his name mentioned in connection with this during the work of the commission.

Mr. Wade.—If there is any charge that any one knows against me, I would like to have it brought forward now. Mr. McConnell is here, and I tender his evidence if you have anything to ask him.

Well, Sir, the Minister of the Interior is a lawyer, and I think he will agree with me

that as a piece of farce in the way of inquiry, that has never been surpassed? You see Mr. Wade comes forward; practically pleads guilty to the charge and then makes what he considers extenuating explanations and one of these is, that he did not do it in midnight, but he did it in open day. Another is that he hints that his claim is not worth \$60,000. He says: We never valued it at \$60,000. Another is, that he hints there is no longer any inquiry now for Monte Christo. How could there be inquiries for Monte Christo if, as alleged at the time, the charges were originally made, every claim on Monte Christo was taken up.

Now, I turn to the commissioner's report to the Minister of the Interior, which will be found on page 5, and which contains this statement:

And there was also a charge against Mr. Wade in connection with Monte Christo Island. The evidence shows no criminal act on that gentleman's part, unless the act of an official staking and recording a claim can be considered criminal; but in so far from having done it in an improper manner, he shows himself, that he did it openly and after consultation with the miners themselves. Mr. McGregor was exactly in the same position as far as he is concerned with this matter. The evidence goes to show that the island at present, at least, is considered worthless. This may or may not be considered a mitigation of the fact, though it would not be of the intent—if there is any wrong in it.

As the utterance of a judge, that, too, will stand side by side with the questions that were put, or rather the no questions that were addressed to the witness, but practically volunteered. There is not one word asked him, no cross-examination, nor is there the least evidence that the commissioner thought it his duty to take it up, if Wade himself had not thrust it right before the commissioner. If you turn to the Dominion Lands Act, section 7, chap. 54 of the Revised Statutes, we read:

No person employed in or under the Department of the Interior shall purchase any Dominion lands, except under the authority of the Governor in Council, or shall locate military or bounty land warrants, or land scrip, or act as agent of any other person in such behalf.

Now, I want to ask the Minister of the Interior, as Mr. Wade said here that he was given special permission to stake claims in the Yukon; did the Minister have an Order in Council passed empowering Mr. Wade, while registrar of lands, to stake claims, or in what form did the Minister give him the special commission?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no Order in Council whatever passed, and when I was questioned as to this before, I stated exactly what happened. My recollection is now, that Mr. Wade spoke to me—I think it was while he was going up on the "Quadra, or, perhaps, in Skagway—and he asked me if there was any objection to him staking a claim. My recollection is

that I said to him that as he was not engaged in the recording of mining claims, I did not think it was contrary to law for him to stake claims. That is the recollection I have. When he came down, I saw the interview to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has referred, and I asked Mr. Wade what he meant by saying that he got special permission. He referred to that conversation I have mentioned; that was all that was said.

Mr. DAVIN. What action did the Minister take when Mr. Wade gave him that explanation?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My answer was what I said. He said he was referring to that conversation, and I told him what my recollection of it was, and he agreed that was correct.

Mr. DAVIN. Did he still remain registrar of lands, and in the employ of the Department of the Interior, or did the Minister dismiss him?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not dismiss him.

Mr. DAVIN. What was done?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He resigned.

Mr. DAVIN. Was it to avoid dismissal?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Sir?

Mr. DAVIN. Was it to avoid dismissal?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIN. Ah, well! I suppose the Minister has read the second instalment of Mr. Ogilvie's report?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, does it impress his mind—this one item of inquiry—does it impress him that that was investigated in a proper manner?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. It does?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. And is the Minister satisfied that Mr. Wade behaved properly in staking these claims?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Quite sufficient.

Mr. DAVIN. Is the hon. gentleman satisfied with the conduct of Mr. Wade?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is a different matter. I am perfectly satisfied that the conduct of Mr. Wade was not dishonest or in the ordinary sense of the

Mr. SIFTON.

word improper, or in the sense of imputing what would be ordinarily considered impropriety in an official. I am quite satisfied further, that if there was anything wrong in Mr. Wade's staking a claim under the circumstances, that I was more to blame for it than he was. Until he called my attention to the conversation which he had had with me, I did not consider it; and I am bound to say that after the conversation I considered that there was no objection to it. The law did not forbid the officials of the Department of the Interior to take up mining claims. It forbade them buying Dominion lands. The hon. gentleman could not find a court on earth that would decide that the law forbade Mr. Wade to take up a mining claim. If he looks at the Dominion Lands Act, he will see that it refers to all lands to which the Act applies. It is true it applies to all mining lands; but taking up a mining claim is not buying mining lands. That is a narrow construction of the Act; but the department construed it in that way to the extent of permitting, not simply an official of the department who had nothing to do with the recording of mining claims, but the recorder of mining claims himself, a justice of the peace and general administrator of the territory, to take up mining claims. Mr. Wade and those other gentlemen only did what Inspector Constantine had done without criticism or censure of any kind. I do not think it is desirable that that practice should be followed; and, as I said, I took the matter up and after considering it carefully, recommended to my colleagues that that practice should be stopped. But I say emphatically that there was nothing dishonest or improper in the conduct of Mr. Wade. As a matter of fact, there was nothing to investigate, unless it had been suggested—and I never heard it suggested—that Mr. Wade had secured a claim in some underhanded or improper way, and not as an ordinary individual who went out and staked a claim. Mr. Wade seemed to think that that had been alleged; but as he had taken up the claim in the ordinary way, and took no advantage of anybody, there was nothing to investigate, and the commissioner so finds. I do not understand the point the hon. gentleman makes.

Mr. DAVIN. Suppose, as a result of a thorough and exhaustive inquiry, it appeared that he had taken advantage of no one—

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What was to be inquired into?

Mr. DAVIN. What was to be inquired into was whether as an official of the department he had gone, contrary to the law, and staked claims?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is the most absurd idea I ever heard

suggested. Does the hon. gentleman think we should instruct Mr. Ogilvie to decide what the law and regulations of the department are? The hon. gentleman has a grotesque idea.

Mr. DAVIN. I have no grotesque idea at all, and the hon. gentleman cannot slide out of it like that. That is not my idea at all.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago it was.

Mr. DAVIN. My idea was not to inquire what was the law on the subject. There is the law, and my point was to inquire whether he had broken that law.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In other words, to decide what the law was. Mr. Ogilvie knew long before Mr. Wade went back that the law was what I have stated. The records show that Mr. Wade had recorded a claim. Does the hon. gentleman think that we should refer to Mr. Ogilvie to decide whether Mr. Wade, having staked a claim, had violated the law? That question, if it arose, would be sent to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. DAVIN. But the organs of the Minister of the Interior denied that he had done it; and then, when it was found that he had done it, the fact came like a clap of thunder, and it shows the guilty knowledge which the hon. gentleman has shown to-day. A gentleman who sat in this gallery, now the editor of the Winnipeg "Free Press," prepared the public mind by writing to the "Globe," whose special correspondent he was, and saying that for an officer of the department to stake claims was not a thing that should be condemned by anybody. Are we to prevent, he asked, honest and loyal Canadians from staking claims simply because they are officers of the department, when foreigners are coming in and taking up claims? That was done to prepare the public mind; but when it was found that the public conscience would not stomach it, but that every independent paper condemned such a suggestion—

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As that followed by the officers of the late Government and inaugurated by that Government.

Mr. DAVIN. I have nothing to do with that. Suppose the late Government did wrong, would it justify the hon. gentleman? Does not the hon. gentleman acknowledge that it was wrong? After he had been brought to book by the independent and Conservative press of this country and by independent public men, he says he then went to his colleagues, and proposed that they should forbid the officials doing what he himself says the Government permitted Mr. Wade to do. What is to be thought

of the hon. gentleman at the head of this department, with that clause of the Act in his mind? Here were two sharp lawyers talking to each other about staking claims in the Yukon. Mr. Wade is one of the sharpest lawyers in Canada, and Mr. Dalton McCarthy told me that the hon. gentleman was as sharp as a meat axe. We have these two sharp lawyers discussing what is to be done in the Yukon. Mr. Wade says to the Minister of the Interior: "May I take up a claim? I am registrar of lands; I am an official of the Department of the Interior; what do you say? Do you say that that section is against me? What am I to do?" The Minister of the Interior says to him: "I do not think you will be doing anything wrong if you take up claims." But he tells us here to-day that after the exposé took place, after the bullseye of public indignation was turned on his own conduct and the conduct of Mr. Wade, then he went to his colleagues and said, "We cannot permit this thing any longer." Mr. McGregor and Mr. Wade had each staked a claim. On being examined, Mr. Wade said: "I do not admit that it was worth \$60,000." Perhaps it would be worth \$59,000 or \$50,000. Suppose it was not worth \$10, the point is that he broke the law, that he went against the statute of Canada, and, according to his own statement, with the sanction of the Minister of the Interior. Now, having read the second instalment of Mr. Ogilvie's report, of which, having regard to the time of the House, I have given only one specimen brick, I say that any lawyer, or any man with horse-sense as to how an inquiry should be conducted, will say from that one specimen alone that the thing was an egregious farce.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the controller do? You have a controller and a clerk for the controller.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The controller is a gentleman I asked the Minister of Finance to nominate, and I believe he was an officer of that department. He was sent out for the purpose of exercising financial supervision over the accounts of all the Government offices in the district, and a letter of instructions was given him to this effect, that the revenues were to be paid over by the officers who collected them, as often as possible, not less than monthly, to the controller, and he was to audit the accounts and generally to keep track of the funds of the Federal Government in the district. He also supervises the payments made by the commissioner from the funds given him for the purpose of carrying on the administration of the district. We thought it well to have an experienced financial officer there, so that the difficulty we had respecting the finances and proper accounting in the early stages of last year, should not occur again. The arrangement

was, that his salary was to be \$1,500, and something was said about the possibility of an increase, and the question of increasing it to \$2,000 was decided by the Minister of Finance and myself.

Mr. FOSTER. Are not all the collections deposited at once in the banks by the officers?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. They are not paid over to the controller?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The officers at Dawson City pay their money directly into the bank to the credit of the Receiver General, and the controller's account shows the payments made by each officer, and how much each branch has collected.

Mr. FOSTER. What need is there for a controller? Under the regulations which prevail at Dawson now, as at Ottawa and other places, these funds are deposited in the bank, and the bank keeps the account. What do you want with a controller to find out what each man has deposited? He has no control over the deposits? The bank must be trusted to keep the deposit, and the Gold Commissioner to make it. Between the two you have all the machinery necessary. The controller seems to be nothing but the fifth wheel to a coach, the moment you have your banks there. If there were no banks, it would be necessary to have a capable controller, who would stand in the place of the bank.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have a number of officers there who collect the revenue, and it is most important to have an experienced officer, in immediate touch with the commissioner, who will know whether the revenues are properly deposited or not, and who, if anything occurs in connection with the amounts deposited, will be there to make an audit of the account. I am satisfied that if the hon. gentleman were responsible for what is going on, there was nothing he would do quicker than send an officer to exercise supervision.

Mr. FOSTER. Who audits the accounts of these officers?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Ultimately, the Auditor General. I have asked him to send an officer to audit all the accounts.

Mr. FOSTER. That takes away the last vestige of reason for the appointment of a controller.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Suppose an officer does not deposit what he should—

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose an officer did not in Toronto?

Mr. SIFTON.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The inspector, seeing the returns, and knowing what is coming in, can communicate with the Minister in a moment. If an officer in Manitoba, collecting money, does not make a return, or makes one which the inspector thinks is suspicious, there is no difficulty about his making an inspection at once. But supposing we did not have any one whose duty it is to oversee that sort of thing in the Yukon, we might be defrauded out of \$100,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, our controller is simply an inspector?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes; I am not sticking on the name.

Mr. FOSTER. But he has nothing to do with the deposit of money, and receives none.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. With the actual work of depositing he has nothing to do. The idea was, when he went up, that the officers would pay the money to him, and he would deposit it to the credit of the Receiver General; but my deputy says the officers make the deposits directly, and he has a duplicate statement.

Mr. FOSTER. His duties are those of an inspector?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In that respect, yes. Then, he is the accountant for the district. The moneys sent to the commissioner and paid out, are paid through his office. He examines the vouchers, and sees that everything is in proper form, and transmits to the department here.

Mr. FOSTER. Has Mr. Ogilvie to make a requisition on him for expenses, or does the Council have to make a requisition on him for any payment they authorize? Does he check out the moneys which are paid on Mr. Ogilvie's account, and on the Council account, and the like?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not know exactly what the regulation is, but he must either check it out himself or countersign the checks—it must be passed by him. Mr. Ogilvie, on taking charge, stated that he had not had much experience in financial administration and that somebody should be there to protect him in that respect.

Mr. FOSTER. You have four mining inspectors at \$1,500 each? What is their duty?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The first year the mining inspectors were there largely in connection with the collection of royalty, but now they are very largely engaged in taking evidence in regard to disputes that arise as to date of location and matters that come before the Gold Commissioner—questions of fact, when they have to go out and examine the claims upon

the ground and take evidence as to when parties were on the ground and so on.

Mr. FOSTER. They make report—they do not give decisions ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not recollect any case under the regulations in which they make decisions. If there are any, of course those decisions are subject to appeal to the Gold Commissioner. A great portion of their duties consist in settling in a rough-and-ready way disputes that arise in the location of claims.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, where parties agree to settlement in that way ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the routine of the payment of royalty ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am more familiar with the method adopted the first year than with that which is now followed—and the reason for that I will explain in a moment. In the first year a form was given to each claim owner or each man in charge of the working of a claim. The mining inspector locates himself in a convenient place where he can observe what is going on. He requires each mine owner or person in charge of operation to file a statement every fifteen days, showing the output of the mine, and upon that the royalty was collected.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that the washing outfit or the addition to the dump ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. While they were washing out. The inspector goes along the creek watching operations and forming an opinion, as well as he can, whether the statements made are correct or not. It will be remembered that the mining regulations provide that a false statement as to the output involved forfeiture of the claim—very heavy penalty, probably heavier in the eyes of the miner than if it required to be verified by oath. The officers report that while there were attempts at evasion and shaving of the amount of output where it was thought the mining inspector could not prove the case, on the whole, they were of the opinion that substantially they got pretty correct returns.

Mr. FOSTER. So, the payment would depend on the statement of the miner, which might be moderated, to a certain extent, by the report of the mining inspector ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The mining inspector receives the report, and decides for himself whether it is correct or not. If he comes to the conclusion that it is not correct, he has the power to go to the mine owners and say so ; and they have to adjust it between them in some way. If the statement is accepted, royalty

is collected on the basis of the statement. I believe there were some cases of dispute in which persons who were working claims at other places were called upon to give their opinion in regard to it. Of course, the method followed was a somewhat rough-and-ready method. But, on the whole, it is the only way that could be adopted.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the present modus operandi ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I was about to refer to that. Prior to the time for the collection of royalties, Mr. Ogilvie wrote to me and said he had made up his mind to recommend that the collection of the royalty should be placed in charge of the officers of the Mounted Police. I think he said that the mining inspectors were fully occupied otherwise—had, in fact, more than they could do without taking charge of the collection of royalties. He asked me if I would authorize the change to be made. I wrote giving him the authority he asked for. He has not advised me of the details yet, so far as I know. The department has been advised of the amount of royalty collected up to the 1st of July or thereabouts. It was \$400,000. Col. Steele has had the collection of royalty placed in his charge.

Mr. FOSTER. The royalty is collected at the mine ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Practically—it is collected at the office of the mining inspector on the creek.

Mr. FOSTER. It will be now collected, I suppose, at the office of the police detachment ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) will see that where the matter is left with the mining inspector the ultimate results depend on the honesty of the inspector and the mine owner. The least collusion between these two would defeat the object of the Government.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I quite agree with that.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, he will see that he should search this country with a fine tooth comb to get men who are at once capable and incorruptible to be appointed as mining inspectors.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Capt. Norwood, one of the inspectors, is a gentleman recommended to me by the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) as a reliable man and one competent for these duties. I know very little of Capt. Norwood, and do not speak of him from personal knowledge. The other mining inspector is Mr. McGregor. Mr. McGregor is, I think, a nephew of the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor), and I have been acquainted with

him for many years. I think it only fair to say to the committee, that while Mr. McGregor is not a man of scientific education, he is a man of good business capacity, who has travelled extensively in the western country and is thoroughly acquainted with the ways of western people. I am bound to say I could not find in the range of my own acquaintance a man more likely to handle a lot of miners and get along with them without trouble. My judgment has been justified by the result. I have not the least shadow of doubt, so far as Mr. McGregor is concerned, that the collection of royalty was carried on with absolute honesty. Had I had the least shadow of doubt about Mr. McGregor I would never have thought of appointing him to such a position.

I pointed out the difficulty of getting a proper man for that position. I pointed out that, not only was there an opportunity for being dishonest, but he was very likely to be accused of being dishonest, whether he was or not. Therefore, I wanted to assert that there would be no question about the character of the man to be appointed. Now, I want to call attention to this fact, that, after all the arguments and all the attacks that have been made upon the administration of the Yukon district and upon our officers, it yet remains for any single person to make any correct suggestion that there was anything improper connected with the collection of the royalties.

Mr. FOSTER. That proves absolutely nothing.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not say it proved anything; I said it was a significant circumstance, that is all.

Mr. FOSTER. There are just two men who can be privy to that. One is the man who owns the mine, and is interested in getting out of it all he can, and who looks upon the Government somewhat in the light of a highway robber, because it takes 10 per cent of his gross earnings, which he thinks, in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred, is exorbitant and unjust. So, the first idea of the miner is to beat the Government, if he possibly can. There is absolutely no system of analysis by which you can tell the contents of a dump, or what it ought to produce. You can in other mining, in quartz mining, lead mining, silver mining—you can by a system of assays come approximately near to what the output will be. You have no such counterbalance as that in the matter of placer-mining there. It is absolutely a rule of thumb, so far as the mining inspector goes, because he cannot test it in any way, and it is natural for the miner to keep all he can and give as little as possible to the Government. Now, when you take that into consideration, and the tremendous temptation which yellow gold has over men's minds, if there is any way possible by which there can be brought about a system in

Mr. SIFTON.

which the miner will co-operate, under an idea that his sense of justice is not being outraged, the incentive to deceit and fraud will be by that much less, and I am not at all certain that the ultimate product to the Government would not be quite as much. Unless you have a man who stays by that dump all the time, and is a practical miner, and sees the washup every day, it is absolutely impossible to gauge and hold a balance upon the miner himself.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is perfectly true, and those facts have come to my mind from time to time. The difficulty is one that I realize as much as anybody can. But, in the last analysis, somebody must be next to the miner. It might be that two men, acting together, might be more free from temptation, might be a check upon each other, and less likely to band in with the individual miner than one man. That was a point that I left to Mr. Ogilvie. I discussed that at considerable length with him, and decided that it would be well to put it in his hands to work out as well as he could. But in the collection of royalty on placer mines, there is no possibility of being absolutely correct; it cannot be done.

Mr. FOSTER. About how many mines are being operated now?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. According to my recollection, about 1,000 to 1,200 are in actual operation. They run mostly upon Bonanza, Eldorado, Hunter, Bear, Dominion and Sulphur creeks. They are all running out of Dawson within a partial radius of 60 miles. They are in a comparatively circumscribed district.

Mr. FOSTER. There is some plan, you do not know what, by which the Mounted Police are doing that work. It is very unsatisfactory to members of Parliament, when they want information in reference to the Yukon, to be told that it is not here, that it is in the commissioner's hands. I want to impress upon my hon. friend that all information respecting these operations should be sent from headquarters down to the Minister's office with the same regularity that a man would take his meals. When Parliament is in session, it ought not to be for months in entire ignorance of what is being done. The Minister ought to be able to know the regular working results of all these mines, so that, when information is desired, it should be accessible. I presume instructions are sent to that effect, and a good deal is left to the commissioner himself; but there is not much care taken towards having those regular reports and regular transcriptions of the work that is going on there sent to the department here.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The department here has been, every week or two, trying to get those reports.

writing, remonstrating, beseeching that the reports should be sent. But the fact of the matter is, that in the organization of a district of that kind a certain class of work which was not anticipated, falls upon the officers, and it takes a certain length of time to settle them into a regular system. I am satisfied that by the time the fall season closes, this year, we will practically have everything in that district in the shape the hon. gentleman desires. We will have the records complete, and a systematic report made to the department. I can assure my hon. friend that nobody realizes the necessity of exact, full and prompt reports and information more than I do. The communication has been slow and irregular, but the officers have been impressed with the necessity of keeping accurate reports. Still, I have found that the work in the district is of a character which men have to learn. Some men that I have sent up there, thinking that they were peculiarly adapted for certain classes of work, have turned out to be not so well adapted as other men that I thought not be so well qualified for their work, but who have turned out to be good officers in the positions in which they have been placed. I have found that men have to learn their work before we find out their particular adaptation for it. I think that things are going along satisfactorily in the Gold Commissioner's office, and that the affairs of the Yukon are upon a satisfactory basis.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to pre-judge Mr. Ogilvie's plan for the police to undertake this duty, but I want to point out that he is going from a skilled inspection to an unskilled inspection. There are a thousand mines, and these inspectors, who are on the ground and who travel from mine to mine, have become skilled in this matter, which is under their supervision. If it is handed over to the Mounted Police, the officers will not be able to do it because they have other work to do, unless a lot of new officers are appointed who will have nothing else to attend to. Consequently, it will be left to subalterns to take the money that the miners give them.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The officers will have the assistance of the services of the mining inspectors who are travelling up and down the creeks all the time. We have appointed two or three men who, I think, will be very competent men for the work. The officers will have the assistance of these mining inspectors at any time they wish to call on them.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not strike me that it is going to make it much better.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I may say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that the commissioner of the district, after going into the whole matter, wrote

me that he would recommend that this be placed in the hands of the police, and being on the ground, and understanding the whole of the circumstances, I thought it would be very difficult for me to refuse compliance with his proposal or to be able to say that he was wrong.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister could not say so, because the commissioner did not give him a chance to say it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, he did not give me the details.

Mr. FOSTER. I should have thought that it would have been the duty of the commissioner when he was going to make a change in the system of collecting \$500,000 or \$600,000 that he would have regarded it as something of importance, that he would have informed the Minister of what he proposed to do and have given the hon. Minister an opportunity to say that he approved of it. It seems to me that the first thing he should have thought of was to have detailed his plan to his Minister and said: This is the plan which I think is best; the distances are long; I will put it into operation and get your opinion of it as soon as possible. But he simply shows, as he shows in his report on the so-called judicial investigation, that it is nothing more than child's play. He may be a most excellent man in other respects, but, for heaven's sake, keep him out of a position in which he has to sift evidence and get at the rights of things in a judicial way. He was never born to exercise judicial functions, never practised it, and it is too bad to put him in a position of that kind. When he proposed to make a change in the system of collection, he should have said what he was going to do. It is contempt of court that he did not produce his plan and submit it to his Minister for approval. He should have sent it down to see what the department thought of it, and if he thought it was best not to wait until the plan was approved by the Minister, he could have put it into operation and got the sanction of the Minister afterwards. I would like to hear the hon. Minister say something as to how he proposes to work it out, because I am afraid he is going to get on a stool between two different sets of officers, and the Mounted Police are unskilled so far as mining matters are concerned. What about these cooks, servants and labourers? Are these salaries outside of rations?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. You have cooks, servants and labourers by whom the cooking and work are done. Are you going to supply the provisions besides?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Is my hon. friend going to adopt Mr. Ogilvie's idea of giving so much ?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Yes ; I do not say that I am going to adopt the exact scale that he has suggested, which may be changed ; but I am going to adopt the plan of giving the men a living allowance for a while, until we get a little more settled.

**Mr. FOSTER.** That will be subject to very frequent revision as the country opens up.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Could the hon. Minister tell me about how long Mr. McGregor and Capt. Norwood were in the employ of the Government and under salary ?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Mr. McGregor has been in the employ of the Government since September, 1897. Capt. Norwood, as a result of a very severe trip going in, became affected with a severe attack of rheumatism, and was obliged to come out. He was away for several months on leave of absence without pay.

**Mr. FOSTER.** How many months' service has he had to date ?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Within a few days of twelve months, from the time he was appointed till he left Dawson City. He left Dawson City on account of the state of his health. As soon as he was able to go back he went back, but when he was there for two months his health was such that he was obliged to come out again, and he took treatment at the hospital. He is now under pay while away from Dawson City.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Practically, he had about fourteen months' salary ?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Yes.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** What was his salary ?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** \$125 a month.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** How many months was Mr. McGregor paid by the Government ?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** He has been under pay all the time.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** He is still in the pay of the Government ?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** He is not in the pay of the Government, but he is now in the employ of the local council there, and is paid from their local fund. I understand he is occupying the position of inspector of licenses.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I understood that these gentlemen were dispensed with  
**Mr. SIFTON.**

long ago as inspectors of the gold mines and that other parties were put in their places.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Capt. Norwood's services have never been dispensed with. He came out owing to the state of his health. It was known that additional inspectors would be required and additional inspectors were appointed, but when he went back he went back to resume his duties as one of the inspectors. He was only there a short time, and the state of his health required him to come out again. He came out and has been in the hospital here, and I have not seen him nor made any arrangement as to the continuance of his service.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** The fact is, that the Minister has stated formally to the House, that he at the outset thought that rough-and-ready people would best do this kind of work. He has taken a non-certificated Yankee captain of a whaler, who is not a British subject at all, for one of the mining inspectors of the district, upon the recommendation of his friend the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden), and he has taken as another mining inspector a livery stable keeper in his own district, a friend of his own. I have in my hand here a statement which the Minister has altogether set aside in his reply, namely : That Major Walsh changed the law and gave these inspectors such directions as he pleased. Because I drew the attention of the Minister to the fact that Major Walsh had stated :

Royalty was not collected from any claims which had not got into good working order, or which could not show a profit after paying royalty.

This would represent a large sum. We have it that these utterly incompetent, utterly unsuitable people, who had no knowledge whatever of mining matters or anything of the kind, whose previous habits and business showed they were utterly unfit for anything of the kind, were placed in the position of collecting the mining royalty. I stated on the floor of this House, that an English gentleman, who was an entire stranger to me, who went from Moosomin to that country, and had been there two years, said that these two parties, sent there as mining inspectors, made fortunes in a very short time, and made fortunes by receiving bribes from the men they were appointed to receive the mining royalties from. This change in the law by Major Walsh confirms the statement as to the position they were placed in. Instead of enforcing the law, Major Walsh's report shows precisely that what this gentleman told me was correct. I was not aware when I was making the statement to this House, that there was a gentleman in the Press Gallery who was a fellow-passenger at the same time, and who wrote me a note to say that this English gentleman was in the habit of giving the

fullest details to large numbers of passengers in the smoking room every day, of the utter rascality that was carried on by these two men, and when I tell the Minister of the Interior that this Yankee uncertificated captain of a whaling vessel—a small whaling vessel—has made a fortune and deposited in a bank at Kentville the other day \$60,000 to his own name, it would puzzle, I think, the hon. Minister to cipher out, how this man, who has been travelling backwards and forwards as a valetudinarian, whose health is altogether broken down, and who has been receiving in all fourteen months pay at \$125 a month; it would puzzle him to tell where this man got his \$60,000. That Mr. McGregor came back a rich man is the belief of this party who had the opportunity of seeing the manner in which these persons discharged their duties, and the fact which was recognized by everybody that they were open to bribery on the part of the people from whom they were instructed to collect mining royalties. That Mr. McGregor also came back a man of fortune is, I believe, pretty well understood in Brandon. So far as the other matter is concerned, I have direct information that this gentleman who had been entrusted with these important duties, has, I say, deposited—a man without previous means—has deposited \$60,000 in the bank at Kentville.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. So far as Capt. Norwood's deposit of \$60,000 in the bank is concerned, I do not think it has any connection with the course of the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am sorry the Minister of Militia is not here just now, but he told me at the time of Capt. Norwood's appointment that Capt. Norwood was a man of some means.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He certainly is now.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That was at the time he was appointed. What his means were was not specially mentioned, but the statement the Minister of Militia made would certainly lead me to conclude that Mr. Norwood was a man of considerable means. He had been engaged in the occupation to which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has referred—I do not know whether it was a whaling vessel or a small whaling vessel or whether he was certificated or not—but, at any rate, he was willing to take the position we gave him. My information is to the effect that Capt. Norwood discharged his duties in a faithful and efficient way. So far as Mr. McGregor is concerned, if the hon. gentlemen means to say that Mr. McGregor was receiving bribes in any way, shape or form, or was dishonest in any way, he makes a statement which I consider absolutely false. I have not the least hesitation in pledging myself here that

it is false, because I know the man, and I know him thoroughly, and the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is going a long way when he gives to this House the statement, that a man whose name is not given, in regard to whom we have no information as to the basis of such statement, is the authority for the statement that Mr. McGregor, a gentleman known to many members of this House as a man of good character, has been openly receiving bribes and practically rendering himself liable to penitentiary. I cannot conceive a man of the hon. gentleman's experience justifying himself by that means, in making such an outrageous statement in regard to this man. If the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) had the least belief that such was the case, it was a simple matter for him to get some particulars which would enable us in some way to make an inquiry into the charge. But the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) does not do that. The very fact which the hon. gentleman states, totally discredits the information which he says that he has got. I ask the members of this committee what reliance they will place upon this statement that a gentleman, an English gentleman, in the smoking room upon the steamboat, was in the habit of telling the particular instances in which certain men had received bribes and rendered themselves liable to penitentiary. What likelihood or probability is there in that statement? It is the same as a statement which appeared recently in the Ottawa "Citizen." It was headed in enormous black letters "Corruption in the Yukon," and upon reading down the page I saw that a man in the employ of my department—I never saw the man before; he had been recommended in the usual way as a man to go upon a survey—had come back from the Yukon, and the "Citizen" reporter had interviewed him, and as the "Citizen" stated, he had actually looked wise, when he was asked: If the corruption in the Yukon was correctly reported. The fact that the man looked wise was given as an evidence that corruption was rampant in the Yukon, and big black letters were placed over the article indicating that every employee in the Yukon was corrupt. There was as much sense in that headline as in the hon. gentleman's statement: That an English gentleman—name not given—was in the habit of stating upon the steamer that these men were guilty of offences for which they were liable to penitentiary, if the statements were correct. I have to say this, that a gentleman, whose name I will give, an English gentleman, a gentleman whose name is prominent amongst mining men, and who has written the best book upon the Canadian Yukon district that has yet appeared, Mr. Tredgold, who now represents the London "Times," I believe, and the London "Mining Journal" in that district, told me in my office, that the two best officers any Government ever had in that district were Capt. Norwood and Mr. McGre-

gor. I am not giving the statements of an anonymous person, but of a man whose reputation is at stake, and who is, I believe, representing the London "Times," but certainly the London "Mining Journal," and other papers. I compare that statement with the statement made by Sir Charles Tupper.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I would like to see the evidence of the statement made by the party referred to, before I gave much weight or attention to it. I think it hardly becomes the hon. gentleman to give a private conversation on this subject, with which he has not favoured the country, nor given, so far as I am aware, over his own signature.

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He has published a very good book, giving an account of his trip and a description of the country.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I have no doubt that he is a gentleman of high standing and character, and has given some valuable facts; but I think you will search the book in vain to find the high character given to Capt. Norwood and Mr. McGregor which is given verbally by the Minister of the Interior. The case stands thus: The Minister of the Interior selected two persons from most unlikely positions, to discharge important and responsible duties in the Yukon country. Is there a man in this House who thinks that the Yankee captain of a whaler, not even a British subject, was a proper man to select, when British Columbia abounded with experts, who, by their standing and attainments, would have been fitted to discharge the important duties with which this man was charged. The hon. gentleman stands convicted by the absence of any qualifications required from such an officer; and then he goes into his own constituency, and takes a livery-stable keeper—

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I did not.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Then, it was in an adjoining constituency. He took his friend. What was he—a horse-dealer or a horse-stealer?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I only corrected the hon. gentleman because I know he would not willingly make a statement that is incorrect. The statement that this gentleman was a livery-stable keeper, does not happen to be correct.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** The hon. gentleman did not feel bound to correct that statement, when it was made by other gentlemen, but chose to let it go. He was a man of much more doubtful character, and that is, a horse-trader—a man who lives by exchanging horses—just the last position in which any member of this House would look to find a man to perform responsible duties

**Mr. SIFTON.**

of the gravest character, in the performance of which everything depended on the honesty, integrity and capacity of the man. The hon. gentleman has never dared to assert on the floor of this House that either of these gentlemen had any qualifications whatever for the duties with which they were charged. There is the first point. And the fact that these men return, after fourteen months' work, and are found to be men of fortune, is evidence that carries conviction to my mind that this Englishman and every one in the Yukon country, from the lady correspondent of the London "Times" down to every person of the least intelligence in the country, were right, when they said that the Yukon was a reeking mass of corruption. The Englishman who stated to me at the captain's table what I said, was not stating it to me only, but was stating it to everybody, as a part of his experience in the Yukon. He had been there for two years carrying on mining, and was evidently a man of standing and character. I did not know that a gentleman in the Press Gallery was a fellow-passenger; and he said to me: "You did not state it half as strongly as he stated it in the smoking-room—the terrible tale of rascality and corruption in the Yukon." He referred especially to these two men, Norwood and McGregor. He did not say that he had seen them receive bribes. People do not receive bribes in that way; but he said that it was a matter of notoriety in the Yukon that these men had grown rich in a few months, instead of discharging their duties and collecting revenue; just as Major Walsh said he had allowed them to do—violate the law, and give such relief as, in their judgment, they thought necessary. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that any Yankee captain of a whaler, or any horse dealer in this country, ought to be charged with a position of such responsibility and such temptation? Is it not a case of overwhelming temptation, when you give the discretion to a mining inspector to say what the law demands from a gentleman engaged in mining, or to do as Major Walsh says they did—let them go free—in violation of the law, when they thought the case was a hard one? The hon. gentleman will not dare to say that it is not a position of overwhelming temptation. Why, Sir, I understand that the hon. gentleman had superseded these men, and that there was now an entirely new staff; but it turns out that they are still in the pay of the Government. Is the hon. Minister afraid to discharge them? Is he obliged to keep them still in the pay of the Government? Do they know too much for him? Is the hon. gentleman acquainted with them too intimately? Is his association with them too intimate to enable him to get rid of these men, who, to say the least, are utterly incompetent for their duties, and to put men of character and standing in their places? That one fact is all that is required to satisfy the peo-

ple of this country that this judicial commission was refused because the whole rascality and corruption would have been unveiled and brought to light; and the hon. gentleman would stand in the position of having been largely responsible for all that rascality and maladministration that has disgraced the Yukon, and disgraced Canada, in the eyes of the world.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think it is much to be regretted that a gentleman of the age and position of the hon. leader of the Opposition should make such a malicious and unwarranted attack on a good Canadian citizen. I may tell my hon. friend that there is not the slightest foundation for the charges he has made against Mr. McGregor. Because he happens to be a farmer and dealer in horses and cattle, the hon. gentleman tries to make fun of him, and casts suspicion on his character, as that of a man who is not worthy of trust. I say to the hon. gentleman—and I believe that this country will agree with me—that among our respectable, honest, hard-working farmers and sons of farmers, he will find the best class of people in this country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is too thin.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is not, Sir. Mr. McGregor belongs to one of the best-known families in the province of Ontario, whose sons have taken honourable and leading positions in their own province and across the lines. A cousin of this man is one of the most prominent professional men in the city of Detroit, and his uncle is one of the most respectable members of this House. This young man went to school in Ontario, and afterwards went out west, and took up a farm, and, by his ability, energy and good character, proved himself to be one of the best Canadian citizens who ever went into that country.

If he had a fair measure of success it was because he was one of those sturdy young Canadians of character and energy whose word was as good as their bonds. When the hon. gentleman makes the statement that Mr. McGregor returned from that country with a slight upon his character, I set my reputation against the hon. gentleman's and reply that there is not one word of truth in what he has said. When anybody says that Mr. McGregor returned a rich man he states what is equally not true, for he is a comparatively poor man compared with what he was some time ago. This man's character stands high all through the country where he is known and is doing business. There he is reputed to be a man of honour and integrity. The fact that he has dealt in horses and cattle and has been able to conduct a large farm successfully against unfavourable seasons is no disgrace, and when the Government chooses its officers from that class of young Canadians rather than the class referred to by the

hon. gentlemen who are, in all probability, sent away from their own country by their friends in order to get rid of them, that class who are styled "dudes," who can put on airs and pretend they have some education, I think the Government is to be commended rather than blamed for its action. Mr. McGregor is a young man whose grandfather was one of the most respected men, and whose father is equally one of the most esteemed men in the province, and it is unworthy on the part of the hon. leader of the Opposition, it is unworthy of this Parliament, that he should get up and make such a malicious attack without any case. If Mr. McGregor had been guilty of anything, let him be punished, no matter what may be his character, but a man who has made a reputation for himself for integrity and good character among his fellow-citizens, a man who has conducted large business transactions, and whose word would be taken as quickly as that of any member of this House—to get up and without the slightest foundation make a malicious attack on such a man is unworthy the position the hon. gentleman occupies. The hon. gentleman has not a tittle of evidence to support him. An investigation has been held, and all these English gentlemen that he talks about and these Yankee skidaddlers who are knocking about Dawson City making attacks on the Administration, in which they were assisted by people anxious to condemn the Government, failed to materialize when given the opportunity of putting their statements to the proof. What has been the result? This man, by his business experience, good judgment and tact, and who was looked upon as a man of honesty and integrity, was able to approach the miners under the regulations that were, no doubt unpopular, as he has said himself—having to pay a tax is always unpopular—was able to collect the revenue and return it to this country. What better evidence could we desire that he is a good man for the position and a man of courage and integrity. He has been able, under adverse circumstances, and despite opposition, to collect the Government revenue. Why, my hon. friend and other members on that side were crying out that not one cent of this royalty could be collected. Their newspapers reiterated that cry, and yet we find that over \$400,000 was collected and returned into the treasury. Surely the man who had courage and tact and the business acumen to handle these miners, to go into these mines and collect this royalty, which hon. gentlemen opposite said would never be collected owing to the hostility to the tax, surely the man who could do this is entitled to our thanks, and ought to be spared any abuse. I do ask, at least he should not be maliciously attacked in this House or out of it, on the hearsay rumours gathered from a class of Yankee good-for-nothings, men who were known to belong to the criminal

class, and who were in communication with certain newspapers and people opposed to this Government. The hon. gentleman speaks of English gentlemen, but we have all had experience of this class. There is a certain class of these people to be found in Manitoba, the North-west, the Yukon and other parts of the country, and I leave it to the people of this country to say whether they would not have more confidence in the young Canadian holding a position of trust than in that class of so-called English gentlemen. In the name of fairness, irrespective of politics, I ask that when a man does his duty well, he should be given some credit and not be hounded down without the slightest evidence being had of any wrong-doing on his part.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I understand the hon. leader of the Opposition to have attacked Mr. McGregor, mining inspector in the Yukon. He is a nephew of mine who left this part of the country about twenty-one years ago, and he is a young man of just as good character as the hon. leader of the Opposition, or any other member of this House. It is true he has dealt in horses, and handled them by the thousand; it is true he has dealt in cattle by the thousand, but surely that is no discredit. If it were, what would become of my hon. friend to my right (Mr. McMillan), who enjoys as high a character as any man in this country, and who has been dealing in horses and cattle all his life? This young man has imported some of the best horses from England, twenty-five head at one time, also from California, Montana and other places. He has been a heavy dealer in horses and cattle. As regards his character, I have known him since he was a small boy, and helped to nurse him, and I never knew of a dishonest act committed by him. His father is older than myself and a man of recognized ability and character. The hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour), who sits behind the hon. member, knows my brother and his family by reputation, they are friends of his, and he can corroborate what I say.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But he is a cattle dealer.

Mr. MCGREGOR. They stand as high in the community as the hon. gentleman himself and his family. It was true that the calling of this young man may not be quite as high in standard as that of the hon. gentleman, but I have yet to learn that in any mercantile calling, whether dealing in horses or in cattle or other commodity, there is anything savouring of dishonour. It may be twenty-two or twenty-three years ago that my brother thought he had better go to Manitoba with his family. He arrived there with seven children, and I think in that family there is, at least now, thirty-five or forty in that country, and I am free to say

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

that they stand as well in the community as any other family I know of. I think this attack of the hon. leader of the Opposition was most unfair and unkind. To single out this young man for special attack when there is no evidence against him was most uncalled for. We have Mr. Ogilvie's report, and I read it over carefully, because I was very anxious, but I could find in it nothing against this young man, directly or indirectly, and if he were here to plead for himself, I think he could make out just as good a case as any member of this House could in defending himself from attacks.

There were many difficulties to contend with in that country. This young man had a knowledge of that western country, and when called on by the Minister of the Interior in the fall of the year, he took charge of a portion of the outfit and took them through to Dawson much more rapidly than any other outfit that had been sent out there, and I am sure that the duties of his position he fills with credit to himself and advantage to the Government, and that you will not find a mark against him as regards his character or conduct.

I am sorry to have to address the House on this subject. I should be sorry to say an unkind word about the hon. leader of the Opposition or his family, but I would not hesitate to compare the two families, and am sure that this young man and his family could stand the comparison.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Nothing would be further from my desire than to attack the standing of any person. I did not know that this man had an uncle in this House, but I think that that uncle failed very signally in discharging his duty to his nephew when he voted down a motion to have an independent judicial commission that would enable Mr. McGregor, and everybody else whose character was attacked in any shape or form, or upon whom any suspicion was cast to vindicate their character completely. If my hon. friend and the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) hold the high opinion which they do for Mr. McGregor—and I have said nothing against him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, not a word.

Mr. McMULLEN. You called him a horse-dealer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We are told that he is a farmer and has been engaged in large transactions in the purchase of cattle. But the hon. Minister of the Interior has allowed the statement to be made a dozen times here that Mr. McGregor was a livery stable-keeper. To-day we get a certificate of character for him from the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) and the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor). But they are very late. I challenge the appointment of these

two men for positions the duties of which they were unfitted to perform. Neither the hon. member for North Oxford nor the hon. member for North Essex has shown that Mr. McGregor had the slightest qualification for this office. They say he was a respectable farmer and of a respectable family. But it might as well be said that these things would justify his appointment as a judge of the Supreme Court.

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) would not send out a judge to collect the mining royalty.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** What I said was that the Minister should have appointed men who had qualifications for the performance of their duty—

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Exactly what I did.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Exactly what the hon. gentleman did not. With scores of able and qualified men in the country, men who understood mining and who were good accountants—

**Mr. MCGREGOR.** Mr. McGregor is a good accountant. He was in a bank as a young man, and is a good accountant and judge of gold.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I do not question the accuracy of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) says. But it does not touch the question. The charge is that these men were appointed to positions they were unfitted to fill. I gave the evidence of an English gentleman living in Moosomin.

**Mr. LANDERKIN.** Name.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I told hon. gentlemen that I would furnish the name when an independent commission was appointed before which this gentleman could give evidence.

**Mr. LANDERKIN.** Hearsay evidence—condemn a man on mere hearsay evidence.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** My hon. friend (Mr. Landerkin) had better not interrupt me or I shall deal with him with greater severity than I have hitherto done.

**Mr. LANDERKIN.** I am prepared to have the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) deal with me.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I should think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin) had better read the blue-book in which there is mention of a fact which touches him very closely before interrupting people who are discussing questions before this House. I am sorry that my hon. friend should, by these unseemly interruptions force me to use the means that would silence him. I have here a copy of the book—report of the North-west Mounted Police—and I recommend him to engage his time in perusing

it rather than in interrupting me. I gave the evidence of a gentleman who, I had reason to believe, was a gentleman of standing and character, who stated that it was notorious that Mr. McGregor and Capt. Norwood had made fortunes in a few months by the mode in which they had discharged or failed to discharge their duties in the collection of mining rents. I have proved from Major Walsh's report the course he allowed to be taken in regard to these mining rents—that he had allowed the officer to use his discretion as to how much should be paid, which was putting a great temptation in the way of those who were discharging these duties in connection with the mining in the Yukon. And when I find this confirmed by what seems to me good evidence, so far as Capt. Norwood is concerned, and when I find it stated that Mr. McGregor retired to Manitoba greatly improved in his circumstances to say the least of it, I feel that I should fail in my duty if I did not bring to the notice of this House—not an attack upon a farmer or a farmer's son—but the fact that men have been appointed that were not qualified for their offices, offices which it was stated, and widely believed, they had abused. I do not say that either touched a dollar improperly—

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? He has challenged my commendation of Mr. McGregor, but he has not said in what way Mr. McGregor was not qualified.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** He had no knowledge of mining—

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** Will the hon. gentleman allow me to state why I think he was a good man? In the first place, he was a young Canadian, with a good, fair Canadian education. Second, he had had a large experience in the west, including a considerable experience in the mining districts and in dealing with mining people. He had large business experience, and had built up a character for honesty and integrity.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** This is the first time we have heard that this gentleman had any knowledge of mining whatever. The Minister of the Interior has not discharged his duty to himself, to this House, or to Mr. McGregor in keeping back this fact. I have been charged with a malicious attack upon individuals. No language could be further from the truth. What I have stated was, that there was a case that demanded an independent investigation. And the greatest enemies of these officers are those who leave them under the imputation of having abused their offices by failing to discharge their duties, when they voted down such an independent investigation as, if their position is what they say it is, would have satisfied the country. I say it is they who are responsible, and not me, for the position those men occupy to-day. I have only drawn at-

attention to the report of Major Walsh, their own commissioner, and to the statements that the Minister of the Interior has allowed to pass unchallenged here; and now to-day, for the first time, we have this high character given to Mr. McGregor. Months ago these statements were made on the floor of this House, and it is only to-day that we find this gentleman given a high character. I say, if he is as innocent of any wrongdoing as I hope he is, the men with whom he has most ground to find fault are not those who made the charges in this House, but those who have given utterance, not to my views, or my opinions, but this man who stated on a passenger steamer, in the presence of scores of passengers, a gentleman who has been mining in the Yukon two years, that Mr. McGregor and Mr. Norwood made fortunes in a few months, and it appears to be true, and appears to be proved, so far as Capt. Norwood is concerned. I say that when such statements as those are made, it shows the absolute necessity there was for this Government to appoint a commission to make an investigation into those charges.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The somewhat painful experience the leader of the Opposition has had during the last fifteen minutes is a good evidence of the utterly baseless character of these Yukon charges. The hon. gentleman's experience is just such as would have met a commission of judges, if they had been sent up into the Yukon district to investigate these charges. He has had to acknowledge publicly, on the floor of this House, that he did not know what he was talking about, when he made these charges against Mr. McGregor. It is all very well for him to say that these charges had been made before on the floor of this House against Mr. McGregor. It is true that such charges have been made by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) and the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who went so far as to call Mr. McGregor a horse-thief. We have paid no attention to those charges; those who know Mr. McGregor, knew well that they were false, and did not think it worth while to pay any attention to them. But when a gentleman of the standing of the leader of the Opposition gets up and calls a man like Mr. James McGregor a rascal, describes him as a man whose proper place would be behind the bars of the penitentiary, then it is time for those who are friends of Mr. McGregor to insist upon a vindication of his character. Surely an hon. gentleman of his experience ought to know better. It does not matter much what the hon. member for Pictou says in this House in regard to these Yukon officials, it does not matter much what the member for West Assiniboia says about them, but when a gentleman of the standing of the leader of the Opposition makes such charges

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

as these on hearsay evidence, on the word of some unknown English gentleman, some remittance man, perhaps, who came out to this country to seek his fortune, some specimen of the class to which the hon. gentleman himself is so much attached—I say when a man of the standing of the hon. gentleman brings such charges against Mr. McGregor, a man who is respectable, a man who is well known in the province of Manitoba as a business man, it is time for his friends to pay some attention to them. The hon. gentleman does not give us the name of his informant, and when he does not give us the name of his informant he assumes on the floor of this House responsibility for the statements he has made. I happen to know Mr. McGregor, I have known him for fifteen years. It is true Mr. McGregor buys horses occasionally, and sells horses occasionally, and so do I; and I defy the hon. gentleman to say that I am any the worse or any more dishonest on that account. Some of the most honourable and respectable members of this House, on both sides, are in the habit of buying and selling horses. Mr. McGregor is a large dealer in horses, I myself have bought horses from him time and again, and I am proud to stand here and bear testimony to the fact that in every way in regard to business I have found Mr. McGregor a thoroughly honest, reputable and upright man. He is a large dealer and stockbreeder in Manitoba. His word is his bond. The reputation of James McGregor throughout the province of Manitoba is such that his friends deemed it unnecessary, when attacks were being made upon him in Parliament, in the earlier part of this session, to reply to them at all. But, as I said before, when the leader of the Opposition gets up in his place and makes such an uncalled for and slanderous charge as he did against Mr. McGregor this afternoon, then his friends began to think it was time to take his part. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear that the hon. gentleman is in the habit of getting up in this House and speaking of what he knows nothing about, and it does not come well from a man of his position. I must say, as a young member of this House, I feel a little diffident in calling attention to the attitude of a gentleman occupying his position, and to his reckless disregard of the rights of private citizens. It was painful for me to see the hon. gentleman crawling down as he did as soon as he found out that Mr. McGregor had friends in this House, although I am glad that he had the good sense and the discretion to recede from the untenable position he had taken in regard to that gentleman's character. I will say in conclusion that so far as my experience and my knowledge go, the men who went into the Yukon country as officials were first-class men, and if all the charges which have been made against the Yukon officials have as little truth in them, or are as foundationless as the charges which were made by the leader of the Opposition against

Mr. McGregor this afternoon, I think it is the best evidence possible of the wisdom of the Government in refusing to befool a commission of judges by sending them up there to discover an unheard of mare's nest.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 31st July, 1899.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### BILL WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 65) to incorporate the Restigouche Boom Company.—(Mr. McAlister.)

### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 183) to authorize the Government of Canada to construct a branch line of railway from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour, in the province of Prince Edward Island, as a public work.—(Mr. Blair.)

### PORT GEORGE, ANNAPOLIS COUNTY, POST OFFICE.

Mr. MILLS asked :

Who is the postmaster at Port George, Annapolis County? Has there been any irregularities in connection with said office that required the services of the inspector? If so, what were they, and what is the situation now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). Inquiry is being made in the district in regard to the matter set forth in the question. I have not got the information.

### MEDICAL ATTENDANCE TO INDIANS IN YALE AND CARIBOO.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. What amounts have been paid by the Government during the years 1896-7, 1897-8 and 1898-9 in the Electoral District of Yale and Cariboo for medical attendance and medicines?

2. To whom were these payments made, and how much to each medical man?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The answer occupies three or four pages. I will hand it in to "Hansard."

Mr. FOSTER. That cannot be done, I am sorry to say, unless it is read.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It will simply save the hon. gentleman the necessity of making a motion for the return.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I move that the paper presented be laid on the Table.

Motion agreed to.

### IMPORTS OF INDIAN CORN.

Mr. CLANCY asked :

How much Indian corn has been imported into Canada for home consumption for the eleven months ending 31st May for the fiscal year 1899?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The monthly reports received by the department do not furnish quantities. I am, therefore, unable to furnish the required information for the period mentioned, but, the imports entered for consumption of Indian corn for the nine months ended 31st March amounted to 17,729,074 bushels, valued at \$6,815,818. The exports of Indian corn from Canada for the same period amounted to 13,560,358 bushels, valued at \$5,405,323.

### IMPORTS OF BINDER TWINE.

Mr. CLANCY asked :

How much twine for harvest binders (or binder twine) was imported into Canada for home consumption for the eleven months ending 31st May for the fiscal year 1899, and the value thereof?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The monthly classification of imports does not enumerate this article. I am, therefore, unable to answer this question for the time mentioned; but the total quantity of binder twine imported into Canada for consumption during the nine months ending 31st March, 1899, amounted to 4,513,210 pounds, valued at \$296,155.

Mr. WALLACE. Might I ask the Minister whether it would not be a good plan to put that item in the classification?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Perhaps it would be.

### EXPORTS OF GRAIN.

Mr. HENDERSON (by Mr. McCleary) asked :

1. How many bushels of oats, pease, rye and wheat, respectively, were exported from Canada to Germany in the year ending 30th June, 1898?
2. How many in the year ending 30th June, 1899, or up to the latest date for which full returns have been received?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Oats, 712,842 bushels; pease, 43,821 bushels; rye, 556,273 bushels; wheat, 239,685 bushels. 2. The latest date to which full returns have been received is 31st March,

1899, being for nine months of the fiscal year 1899. These returns show the following exports to Germany:—Oats, 477,827 bushels; pease, 20,892 bushels; rye, 81,852; wheat, 46,015 bushels.

#### LEASE OF LOT 1, BLOCK 13, NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

What annual rental did John Wilson pay in 1893 and David Diamond in 1896 for the lease of lot one, block thirteen, in New Westminster, British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). On the 27th May, 1893, John Wilson paid \$250, being one year's rent to 12th May, 1894. Payment was made in advance. His lease being subsequently cancelled by Order in Council of 29th January, 1896, he paid no more. Mr. D. Diamond never paid anything as the Order in Council of the 29th January, 1896, which granted him the lease was cancelled by Order in Council of the 16th December, 1897.

#### COAL MINING RIGHTS, BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

Have any leases or rights to mine coal under the waters of the harbour of Nanaimo, B.C., been granted by the Dominion Government to any persons or companies.

If so, what fees or royalties have been enacted therefor ?

Will the Government bring down any correspondence in relation to applications made in that respect ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). No such lease has been issued. The correspondence will be brought down.

#### MAIL SERVICE—OTTAWA AND CYRVILLE.

Mr. HODGINS asked :

1. Who has the contract for carrying the mails between Ottawa and Cyrville ?

2. Were tenders asked for by public advertisement or otherwise for this service, and when ?

3. Who were the tenderers, and what was the amount of each tender ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). The mail service between Cyrville and Ottawa is at present performed by the postmaster at Cyrville, under a temporary agreement. The service was put up to tender on the 7th December last, the tenders being due on the 2nd February. There were no tenders received at the department, but after the date for the opening of the tenders a Mr. Lavigne called at the department and stated that he had tendered for the service at \$96 a year. No trace of the tender could be found, but the service was put in Mr.

Mr. PATERSON.

Lavigne's hands from the 1st April last, at \$96 a year. On the 29th May last, Mr. Lavigne, before the execution of a contract, declared that he would not continue for less than \$200 a year, and the service was taken over by the postmaster of Cyrville at the rate paid to Mr. Lavigne, viz., \$96 a year. The rate paid prior to the 1st April last was \$100 a year.

#### THE TRANSVAAL QUESTION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). With the unanimous consent of the House, Mr. Speaker, I beg to interrupt the regular course of the business, in order to offer certain resolutions which I believe the state of things now existing in a distant country under the suzerainty of Her Majesty seems to render appropriate. Every one will agree with me that the development of the British Empire has now reached such a condition and degree of consolidation that no part of it can affect to be indifferent to anything that may be going on in any other part, and, assuredly, we cannot be indifferent to the condition of things existing in the Transvaal state, which, it must be remembered, though an independent and self-governing country, is under the suzerainty of Her Majesty. Some 80,000 of Her Majesty's subjects have been allowed to become residents of that country, to purchase lands there, to open mines, to develop trade, to establish industries and to build up cities, yet are denied almost every kind of participation in its administration. They are subjected to discriminating and heavy taxation, and yet are denied any kind of representation, and although forced to bear their full share of citizenship, are denied the rights and privileges and liberties of citizens.

For my part, I do not hesitate to say that there are many things to be admired in the career and character of President Kruger. No one who has read his history can fail to admire his sturdy patriotism and force of character. But every one must admit that there would be much more to admire in him if, instead of being intolerant and oppressive towards fellow-members of the same community, he had remembered that patriotism does not preclude justice nor is it inconsistent and incompatible with generosity. At first blush it may be said, and perhaps with some reason, that if the people of the Transvaal have chosen to refuse the rights of citizenship to any but their own race, they are within their own rights—that to nations, as well as men, the old saying applies that every man's house is his own castle.

That would apply if Mr. Kruger had not allowed the Uitlanders to go into the territory of the republic to found and build cities, develop the country, and if he had not taken their money and filled his treasury with it. But, having allowed the Uitlanders to go into the country and become residents, the least that would be expected by those who took

up their abode therein was that, having assumed the duties of citizenship, they should likewise be given the rights of citizenship.

It must not be forgotten either, when we come to deal with this question, that Her Majesty is the suzerain of the Transvaal republic, and became so with the full consent of the people of the Transvaal. It must not be forgotten that, at a time when the Dutch population of the Transvaal was in dire distress, when they were threatened almost with annihilation by their neighbours, when they were threatened with something like civil war among themselves, they appealed for British interference and, after a series of events, which there is no use going into at this moment, a treaty of peace was concluded between the people of the Transvaal and Her Majesty, by which, on the one hand, while the independence of the Transvaal was recognized, on the other hand the suzerain power of Her Majesty was fully recognized and admitted. The least, then, that can be expected is that the subjects of the suzerain power should not only be not subjected to any kind of oppression, but be given also rights equal to those enjoyed by the citizens of the Transvaal republic.

I may be told, also, and it has been strongly urged, that the interests of the Empire require that, at this moment, the rights of the Uitlanders should be recognized in the republic. But I would not put the question upon any of the above grounds. Any of these grounds would appeal to British subjects and British subjects alone, but upon this question I think we can safely appeal to the conscience and judgment of mankind at large. We can appeal for protection to the Uitlanders in the Transvaal, not only upon the grounds of British citizenship and suzerainty, but upon rights which must appeal to the conscience of all men. If there is any country in the world it is this country of ours, Canada, where we can proclaim this principle, that wherever men of different races, but races of equal rank, are found to live together under the same government, the only policy which can give adequate justice to all, which can give satisfaction to all, which can insure harmony, is a policy of equal rights and equal justice, a policy which will give to every citizen, without any questions of birth or origin, the same rights, the same liberties, the same privileges, the same aspirations. This is the policy which we have adopted in this country, and I think we can fairly claim with some pride, that it has proved eminently successful. It is the policy which, at this moment, prevails in Cape Colony; it is on trial, but there, as here, it must prove, in the end, eminently successful. This is the policy which, I submit, ought to prevail in the Transvaal. Let the Dutch of the Transvaal Republic give to the English of that republic the same rights, the same privileges, the same liberties which the English of Cape Colony give to the Dutch of Cape Colony, and the problem will

be solved. The Uitlanders claim no more than that, the Imperial authorities claim for them no more than that; and it seems to me that it behooves the Canadian Parliament to bespeak its sympathy for such a noble, moral and just cause. If I be asked: What is the reason of this expression of sympathy, what object would it serve, what result would it effect, I simply answer: The object to be sought is that we should extend to our fellow-countrymen in South Africa the right hand of good fellowship, that we should assure them that our heart is with them, and that in our judgment they are in the right; the object would be to assure the Imperial authorities, who have taken in hand the cause of the Uitlanders, that on that question we are at one with them and that they are also in the right—and perhaps the effect might be also that this mark of sympathy, of universal sympathy, extending from continent to continent and encircling the globe might cause wiser and more humane councils to prevail in the Transvaal and possibly avert the awful arbitrament of war. Animated by these reasons, and speaking, I believe, the sentiments of all men in Canada, not only of one race but of all races, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Foster, the following resolution:—

1. Resolved, That this House has viewed with regret the complications which have arisen in the Transvaal Republic, of which Her Majesty is suzerain, from the refusal to accord to Her Majesty's subjects now settled in that region any adequate participation in its government;
2. Resolved, That this House has learned with still greater regret that the condition of things there existing has resulted in intolerable oppression, and has produced great and dangerous excitement among several classes of Her Majesty's subjects in her South African possessions;
3. Resolved, That this House, representing a people which has largely succeeded, by the adoption of the principle of conceding equal political rights to every portion of the population, in harmonizing estrangements and in producing general content with the existing system of government, desires to express its sympathy with the efforts of Her Majesty's Imperial authorities to obtain for the subjects of Her Majesty who have taken up their abode in the Transvaal such measure of justice and political recognition as may be found necessary to secure them in the full possession of equal rights and liberties.

I have to express not only my own regret, but I am sure, the regret of the House, that the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) is not in his seat to-day. But, before his departure, I conferred with him on this subject and communicated to him the resolution I have just placed in your hand and I have received this letter, which it is not only a duty but a pleasure to place before the House.

Ottawa, July 29th, 1899.

Dear Sir Wilfrid Laurier,—I regret to say in reply to your note just received, that it will not be in my power to attend the House to-

morrow, or it would have given me much pleasure to second the resolution of which you have sent me a copy in relation to the Transvaal, as I think we are bound to give all the aid in our power to Her Majesty's Government in the present crisis.

Yours faithfully,  
(Signed), CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. GEO. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Any extended remarks from me might be considered unnecessary, in view of the letter written by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), which has been so kindly read by the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), but a few words may not be out of place. In the first place we on this side unitedly and most heartily concur in every sentiment expressed by my right hon. friend, as well respecting the purpose of the resolution and the reasons for which it has been presented to the House. Nothing that he has said could have been better expressed. The reasons which he gave will be considered, I imagine, all-sufficient reasons with this House for the unanimous adoption of the resolution. I am sure that one thing will be fully recognized, and that is the almost infinite patience with which the British Government under Lord Salisbury and Mr. Chamberlain have conducted the negotiations, from the beginning, with the ruler of the Transvaal Republic. Impatience at delay may have been expressed by many of Her Majesty's subjects in Great Britain and outside of Great Britain, but I am sure we all believe, that, with an Empire of such power and such resources, the very best indication of the innate justice and soundness of her cause is given by what I cannot but characterize as the almost infinite patience with which these statesmen have carried on the negotiations looking to the recognition of the equal rights of British subjects before resorting to the dread arbitrament of war. Always, before war takes place, every resource which can be laid hold of ought to be exhausted; and at no time in the history of the world was that a sentiment more necessary to have imbedded in the popular mind than now. These men may be Outlanders so far as the Dutch Republic is concerned; but we extend to them to-day, as has been done from almost every quarter of the British world, that hand-grasp which will make the 80,000 British subjects there feel that, though Outlanders, so far as the Transvaal Republic is concerned, they are Inlanders taken warmly to the great heart of the British Empire. Nothing strikes us more strongly than the attempt—which may be based on grounds of self-preservation and limited patriotism—of President Kruger to keep for himself and the Dutch citizens of that Republic the rights, the privileges, the powers which they have hitherto had. But every one sees that it is a contest which can have only one termination; that to-day the civilized world is hostile to such a policy as that; and that all that is required, as I believe, is a con-

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

tinuation of that patience and the focussing of the attention of the civilized world upon that point to bring about an amicable solution in the end. Great Britain's efforts have always been marked by the free giving of equal rights to men of every nationality who choose to become citizens of her own country or of any of her dependencies.

That is in such marked contrast to the policy adopted by the Dutch Republic that it cannot help but centre the sympathies as well as the attention of the civilized world on that point. These resolutions, I think, are timely, then, because they say to our own British fellow-citizens, who are Outlanders in the republic, that they have the sympathy and the good-will of the British Empire as a whole, in all its parts, in their struggle for equal rights. No taxation without representation is a cry to which the world rises, and it will rise in the Dutch Republic just as surely as the sun rises. Outside of that, I think, great good will come from the introduction and passage of a resolution like this in that it is another proof of the solidarity of the British Empire throughout the world, that to-day, in these times of telegraph wires, and steamships, and quick transmission of intelligence, evokes a lively and sympathetic and deep interest in every part of the British Empire in the local fortunes of every other part of the British Empire; and as that sentiment surges round and round the world, Imperial federationists, like my hon. friend to my left (Mr. McNeill), Imperial federationists, as most of us here are in one sense or another, may well feel that their cause is being wrought out in the Empire by these very sentiments which are being cultivated through all parts of it. And lastly, without multiplying remarks, I wish to say that I consider this resolution is a timely one, if for no other reason than it shows that we here in Canada, as well as British subjects in every part of the outlying dependencies, have not lost our deep love for the old mother power. As children with a troubled and strenuous infancy, and a childhood wrapped round with clouds and enveloped in difficulties, we have being guided through them by the strong loving hand of a great mother power, we have been given the fullest opportunity to employ our strength, we have been given the freest opportunity to indulge our tendencies and our sympathies; and yet under that lenient and generous sway, every one of those colonies have come, in the time of their lusty strength, back to the old mother land to say: We love thee still, we are children of the brood, with thee we have been and with thee we will ever be.

Mr. ALEX. McNEILL (North Bruce). I desire to say just one word to offer my congratulations to the Government for having introduced these resolutions. I entirely agree with what fell from my right hon. friend the Prime Minister,

when he said that all that is desired is that the British people in the Transvaal should enjoy the same rights and privileges that the Dutch settlers in British South Africa enjoy. That is all that the Imperial Government desires. It seems to me that this resolution comes with special significance and force, when moved by the right hon. gentleman who, in the position he occupies, is an embodiment, if I may so describe it, of the freedom, and liberality, and breadth of British institutions. When we ask that the same rights and privileges should be given to our friends in the Transvaal that the Dutch have in British South Africa, we realize that the same liberal institutions are extended to the Dutch there that are extended to our French Canadian fellow-citizens here. At this very moment, as my right hon. friend occupies the position of Premier of Canada, so does a member of the Dutch race to-day occupy the position of Premier of the old British colony of the Cape. So it seems almost incredible when we come to understand what is the position of our suffering fellow-subjects in the Transvaal really is. Now, I should like to be allowed, with the permission of the House, to read a word or two from an article written by a gentleman who is specially well able to speak on this subject. He is a gentleman who occupied many positions of trust in South Africa. I will just give, in his own words, the position of trust he occupied there, so that the House may see how thoroughly competent he is to express his views on this subject. He was connected by ties of the closest intimacy with the Dutch very early in life. He was Attorney General of Griqualand, he was one of the judges of the Supreme Court of the Cape of Good Hope, he was British Commissioner on the Anglo-German Commission, he was administrator of British Bechuanaland, with supreme judicial as well as executive powers; he was resident Commissioner for Bechuanaland Protectorate and the Kalahari, with jurisdiction up to the Zambesi. He says he was always on the best terms with the Boers, that he had many conferences with them, that the most friendly feeling existing between him and them, that he entertains a sincere admiration for their many sterling qualities.

**Mr. WALLACE.** Who is this gentleman?

**Mr. McNEILL.** This gentleman is Sir Sidney Shippard, who was, as I have said, our commissioner in Bechuanaland. He was asked by the editor of the Nineteenth Century to write an article on this subject. He said he had carefully avoided giving expression to his views, but, under the circumstances, he thought it right to accept the invitation which was extended to him, and this is the picture that he traces of the condition of our fellow-subjects in the Transvaal:

British subjects in the Transvaal are denied all rights of citizenship, they are insulted, plun-

dered, even murdered by their oppressors; the courts of justice have been deprived of independence, so that neither safety nor redress can be had for our British fellow-subjects there. Their humble petitions have been openly flouted, although they were signed by 38,000 law-abiding petitioners in 1894.

This, you will observe, was before the raid.

They were treated as rebels merely because they petitioned. In the Transvaal Britons are slaves, and may be robbed, beaten, imprisoned and murdered. Their women are grossly insulted, their houses are broken into at any hour of the day or night by ruffianly police, who are a terror to the peaceable, and worse than useless against criminals. When an unfortunate British householder remonstrates, he may be shot dead in his own room.

What did take place, we all know. A short time ago, a Mr. Edgar was actually shot dead in his own house without one word being said to him. He was insulted in the street, and took refuge in his own house, and a policeman burst in the door. When he and his wife went to the door to see who it was, the policeman shot him down without one word being said. This case was taken before one of the judges in the Transvaal, and the redress the poor woman had was the statement by the judge that he was glad to find that the police were able to maintain law and order in the country. Sir Sidney Shippard goes on to say:

The wretched Englishman in the Transvaal has no civil rights, no protection from the law courts; in his case the verdict of a Boer jury is a mere farce. He is unarmed and helpless, an object of derision to his enemies. The money wrung from him has been expended mainly in fortresses, artillery, arms, ammunition and mercenaries to overawe him and keep him permanently in subjection. Lastly, in his despair, he has appealed to his Queen.

I thought it was only right to read these statements, because they are statements made by a gentleman who is an impartial witness. This is the picture that he draws of the condition of our friends in the Transvaal. I have only to say that I am exceedingly glad that this resolution is introduced. I observe there is no offer of material assistance. I take it that we all understand very well why there is no offer of material assistance. It is because everybody knows that material assistance is here, in Canada, at any moment, if it be required. When a great military empire, in 1896, ventured to interfere in this very question, this House, by acclamation, stated its willingness to render material assistance, and if there is not material assistance offered to-day we know that it is because it is felt that it is unnecessary to render assistance to a one-hundred ton hammer to crack a hazel nut.

**Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE** (West York). Mr. Speaker, before the resolution, which is meeting with such hearty and unanimous approval in this House, is adopted, I desire

to say a word of two in regard to it. I think the occasion is both timely and opportune that we, as British subjects, should do two things, first, assure the great mother land that we, too, are watching the course of events in every portion of the British Empire, and that we are in thorough and hearty sympathy with the mother land, as the resolution brought before the House by the leaders of the two parties has shown. Also, in the second place, desire to show to those 80,000 British subjects, far away in Arica, that here on the northern half of the continent of North America, where 6,000,000 of loyal British Canadians live, we are watching the course of events there. We are in hearty accord with them and we want to let them know it, and we want to let others know it too, as it seems desirable now, apparently, that the British Empire is of one mind in every part of the world and of one feeling in regard to this question. British subjects have been deprived of the rights of citizenship which Great Britain has given in every land where her flag has waved. We in Canada have given a conspicuous example of that, because here the fullest measure of freedom and liberty has been given to those who are not British born. We may, perhaps, say that greater freedom has been given by Great Britain than by any other nation to those not native born, because we have been examples of the greatest liberality with the most successful and satisfactory results. I desire to add my word of commendation to the resolution proposed by the right hon. leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), seconded by the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster).

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Foster :

That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Her Majesty's principal Secretary of State for the Colonies by the Speaker of this House.

Motion agreed to, all the members of the House rising to their feet and singing the National Anthem.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BEATTIE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), as the session is now drawing to a close and as I do not wish to do anything to prolong it, whether he will give me a day to discuss a Bill which I have on the paper to determine the length of the working day for workmen and labourers ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will be able to confer with my hon. friend, privately, on this subject.

Mr. WALLACE.

#### APPOINTMENT OF JUDGE FOR QUEEN'S COUNTY, P.E.I.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if an appointment has been made of a county judge in Queen's County, P.E.I., to fill the place of the late Judge Alley. The vacancy has existed for a pretty long time, and in the interest of business, as the county court will meet to-morrow, it is necessary that an appointment should be made. The vacancy has existed for two months, and has seriously interfered with business interests. I would like to know from the right hon. Prime Minister whether an appointment has been, or if not when an appointment is to be made, who the party is to be ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) asks if the appointment has been made, and if not when it is to be made. We have not yet made the appointment and the reason is that Her Majesty's Opposition has kept us so busy during the last few months that we have not had time for the consideration of the question that has been brought up by the hon. gentleman. But as soon as the Opposition has given us leisure to deal with the administrative part of the Government, we shall make the appointment.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). Mr. Speaker, I may say that it is very unbecoming on the part of the Government to neglect this appointment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There can be no discussion at this stage.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I find it necessary to refer a little more at length to the neglect of the Government in not making this appointment of a county judge for Queen's County, P.E.I.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I suppose the hon. gentleman will conclude by making a motion ?

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I will conclude by making a motion, because this matter is important. This vacancy occurred some months ago, and there is no reason whatever why it should not have been filled. The matter has assumed, I fear, too much of a political complexion. It is a case in which politics should have no standing. The court meets to-morrow, this is the last day. It is the most important county court in Prince Edward Island, yet we find this Government, although it has occupied so much time with other more frivolous things, cannot find time to appoint a gentleman to fill this position. It is not for want of applications, because if rumour is to be believed, applications are almost innumerable on the

part of certain gentlemen in favour of their friends, and also, I fear, from applicants themselves, which is not in accordance exactly with the position of a judge. The Government are certainly very seriously to blame, because the result is that parties and their witnesses are bound to appear in court in accordance with their summonses, and as there is no judge to try their cases, they have to go to their homes and lose another day; all to please this Government and their friends. This is a monstrous iniquity under the circumstances. If it were not that the Government are holding this matter over to serve their own political ends and their own political friends, they would easily find time to make an appointment, notwithstanding the opposition that is given to their obnoxious measures by the Opposition in this House. It is a great injustice to the province of Prince Edward Island that this seemingly small matter could not be attended to by the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think my right hon. friend answered this question in a serious way. I could not for a moment have imagined that the excuse he would give for retarding the operations of justice in any part of the Dominion would be the frivolous one that the Opposition in this House had been criticising Government measures. I think he ought to give a more serious excuse than that, and I am quite sure that he will. This is an important matter because the interests of justice depend upon it. This office has been vacant, I understand, for about three months, and everything before the county court has been at a standstill because there has been no judge. I understand that there is no machinery in the province to get over the difficulty, and that the only way in which it can be got over at all is by the appointment of a new judge, which makes it all the more necessary that this matter should be attended to. It is a serious matter where litigants and other people interested in cases are looking to the courts at their regular appointed times to adjudicate upon them. There should have been no difficulty at all in appointing a judge. Two minutes of dictation by the Premier, after consultation with his colleague from Prince Edward Island, would have put the matter before Council, and a judge could have been appointed without trouble and without loss of any time. I am sure my right hon. friend will not regard his excuse as germane. I imagine that there is little deeper difficulty than that. I imagine that there is a political difficulty somewhere. I imagine that my right hon. friend and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) have not been quite able yet to settle between contesting claims, with reference especially to consequences that may follow on some of these claims being allowed and certain appointments being made. That is

the difficulty and however much we may give a reasonable breadth and leniency to the Government in making appointments, when judgeships are concerned, party politics ought to take a back seat, and the interests of justice ought to be arranged for by a speedy appointment. I hope my hon. friend will be able to give a better excuse than that Her Majesty's Opposition have been doing their duty in this House.

The PRIME MINISTER. I must say that the excuse which I gave to my hon. friend was not intended as a final one, for the reason that I was taken unawares, and I did not know exactly the condition of affairs in regard to the matter. I know that there is a vacancy on the bench in Prince Edward Island, and that is about all I know. Unfortunately the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is ill to-day and not in the House. I shall have to see him and consult the Minister of Justice about it. It is my duty to give an answer to the very legitimate inquiry of my hon. friend, and if the matter is as represented by the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) that there is no machinery in the island whereby the place of the judge can be filled by another, it is a serious matter and requires proper attention.

Mr. SPROULE. I am a little surprised at the remark of the hon. leader of the Government, because this matter was brought to the attention of the Minister of Justice in the other Chamber over a week ago. He was told that unless the appointment were made by to-morrow it would be utterly impossible to go on with the work of the court; and I believe he gave the assurance that he would bring the matter at once to the attention of the Prime Minister and have it attended to.

#### SUPPLY.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself in Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Yukon Provisional District—Salaries and expenses in connection with the administration of the territory..... \$76,300

Mr. FOSTER. How often do the placer miners clean up? Do they take out their gold dust every day? If so, where is it stored in the meantime? And how often do they make a report to the Government or the mining inspector?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). They report every fifteen days to the mining inspector.

Mr. FOSTER. If he happens to be away, do they send the report in to Dawson?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Either to the mining inspector or to somebody who takes his place in the office down at the creek. Before the police took charge

of the work the reports were regularly made to him every fifteen days. I presume that now, since the police have taken charge of the system, the reports are made to the police officers. So far as the general practice is concerned, the practice of the miners is to wash out a little gold from time to time in the winter to pay wages, but the general clean up is in June, July and August.

Mr. FOSTER. They cannot wash out much in the winter.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Very little.

Mr. FOSTER. Do they make out a report on regular forms signed by themselves?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think so.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman any of those blank forms?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have them in the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, if the mining inspector is there, they report directly to him, and if not they report every fifteen days to his office. Do they send in the dust every time they report?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot say that they do. We have not any positive report about whether they do that or not. In some cases, the mining inspector must have given the parties a permit to pay on the wash-up in a month or two. The return seems to show that the inspector is satisfied that the people are responsible to whom he gives this credit. I cannot say positively that they pay every fifteen days.

Mr. FOSTER. Could my hon. friend lay on the Table the reports received regularly each fifteen days of all the placer mining operations showing the amounts washed, and the amount of royalty and what was sent to the Government.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I could lay on the Table a return showing the amounts produced by each mine and the amounts collected, but could not lay on the Table the returns that came from each mine, because we have not got them. The report shows exactly the amount produced by each claim and the amount collected.

Mr. FOSTER. All this goes to show how loose the machinery is for the accurate detection of the amount that should be received by the Government, and a report of that to the department. I think the hon. gentleman will have to give his officer there a regular woolling, to use a vernacular phrase. I know how it is. A man may attempt to operate a mine in British Columbia, and he will sit down for fifteen days and talk to his manager like a father as to the necessity, above everything else, of his sending in a weekly report, and he

Mr. SIFTON.

will send his manager out and hear from him once every Christmas.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am very much pleased to know that the hon. gentleman has a little sympathy for my position.

Mr. FOSTER. But mine managers have a little more freedom than the officers of the department. I would dock these men regularly part of their salary every month or fortnight that a report does not come in. It is too bad that we here, discussing Yukon matters, should be absolutely without information. The Minister himself is without it. He has tried to get it, has written over and over again without effect and when a new plan is made by the commissioner, down comes an intimation to the Minister by the nabob: I have changed all the arrangements, have made a brand new arrangement, but you are not to know what it is; it has gone into operation, and by and by, when I get a Sunday off and have nothing else to do, I will write you a synopsis of this system which I have put into operation. The system may be the best possible but that is not the way in which the department or Parliament ought to be treated. We are expending an immense amount on the Yukon, this country is all interested in its development, we are getting a large amount from it, but we want to know something as to the modus operandi, and the quick and regular transmission of information from the officers out there to the department here, so that in session time it may be given to the House is of primary importance. If there is any way by which we can perfect the machinery for collecting that royalty, the best consideration of the department and its officers is due to that question. If there be nothing in the future but this somewhat loose method, unless we can have some sort of analytical, scientific and sedulously persistent method of ascertaining and collecting this revenue, I think my hon. friend will come to the conclusion that the sooner some other system is adopted the better—a system of license perhaps, by which a sum might be paid which, even though it was a rough and ready way of getting at the revenue, would yet provide a way of avoiding the incentives to fraud which are, in the nature of the case, inevitable. I make these criticisms, not to find fault with the Government, but because of the circumstances. I quite acknowledge the difficulties in the way, but money—you have lots to burn—money, patience and intelligence, ought to overcome them.

Mr. SPROULE. What security does the hon. Minister take from those men who collect the royalty for the due fulfilment of their duties?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have a blanket bond from the guarantee company covering all the officers.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the amount of the bond?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. \$50,000.

Mr. WALLACE. How often do the mining inspectors make their deposits?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As often as they can. It is quite impossible to tell here.

Mr. WALLACE. What are the instructions given them?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The instructions are given them directly by the commissioner of the district and these instructions are to send the money in just as often as possible. The amount of royalty collected is very trivial except during June, July and August. In these months, I presume it is sent in every three or four days.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like information of the amount of royalties paid in each month during the last twelve months. We will say that \$100,000 was paid in for the month of June. I would like to know the exact amount for that month, and what reports the Government have of the amount which has accrued to the Government for that month. Of course, we have in our hands all the royalty collected during the last season. For this spring, we have not received a detailed statement. But you received statements every month or every week?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have received no statements of details for this season. The deputy received a letter from Mr. Lithgow, the controller, saying that as the royalty was coming in—this was towards the end of June—there would be about \$400,000 for that month.

Mr. WALLACE. Have you had any statement for the months preceding June?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My deputy informs me that there was a considerable sum of royalty for the preceding month, and he has a statement of that.

Mr. WALLACE. You will give us a statement for last year by months?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. I was not here on Saturday. Will the hon. Minister kindly tell me to what item in the main Estimates this is added?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Item 220: salaries and expenses in connection with the administration of the Yukon district.

Mr. WALLACE. I see that in that item there was an increase of \$24,800. This item

of \$76,000 added will make a total increase of over \$100,000. I understand the Minister explained these matters on Saturday. I will read the report to get the information I want.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is one portion of this item that I have not explained. The committee will see that there is an item of \$1,200 for a relief model. It is intended to get a relief model of that portion of the coast practically which constitutes the disputed territory. We have the information, with a reasonable degree of exactitude. For this information we look to Mr. King, who was the British commissioner, appointed along with the American commissioners in 1892 or 1894.

Mr. FOSTER. Who does that kind of work?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have nobody here who can do it. But Mr. King will ascertain where it can be done, and the work will be done under his supervision. The object is to give a bird's-eye view of the country for the information of the commissioners in discussing the boundaries.

Mr. WALLACE. What size will this model be?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is not yet decided. Mr. King says that this sum will be sufficient to pay for it.

Mr. WALLACE. Besides this item of \$76,000 for salaries and expenses, to be added to this item No. 220, there is also an item for contingencies, \$35,000. "Contingencies" looks to me very much like expenses, so that would be virtually an addition to the amounts.

Mr. FOSTER. Who controls the contingencies expenditure?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The department here. I ask \$35,000 additional because I am afraid—in fact, I am reasonably certain—that expenditures will be found necessary that we have not been able to foresee.

Mr. FOSTER. How many items has the hon. Minister? I want to keep one small item in his department on which matters may be discussed. I have one or two points I wish to discuss, and others may arise.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We might hold item 97 for that purpose.

Additional amount for Dominion Lands..	\$3,000
Salary of Chief Inspector of Timber and Forestry .....	2,500
Salaries of five extra clerks at head office, at \$400 each.....	2,000
	<hr/>
	\$7,500

Mr. FOSTER. Is this office of chief inspector a new office?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Yes. I ask this item of \$2,500 for the purpose of establishing the office of chief inspector of timber and forestry. I have had my attention directed to this subject a great deal by persons familiar with it, and also by the press. Ever since I took charge of the department I have felt that this branch of our work was greatly neglected, but we have had no officer who has the expert knowledge, both from a scientific and practical point of view, to give advice on the subject. The officers we had were Crown timber agents, ordinary bush rangers, or timber inspectors. I intend to utilize these officers' services in connection with the Indian Department and a general way. These are matters requiring such attention all the way from the Pacific Ocean to eastern Manitoba, and we have also large timber interests in the Indian reserves in the eastern provinces. I do not intend to have this appointee an officer of the Indian Department, but I intend to make use of his knowledge in connection with these matters of timber and forestry. It is my desire that this officer should give special attention to forest preservation and renewals. Particularly in the North-west, that subject has been badly neglected. I have attempted to carry out the policy which was outlined by the department before I took charge of it—but concerning which nothing had been done—in the way of making timber reserves, but I have been handicapped by the fact that I have not had an officer who could give his time and attention wholly to it.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I can see that my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) could do something in that way if he were going to undertake reforestation or the planting of trees where there have been no forests up to the present time. But, with reference to our timber-covered areas, I do not see what benefit an officer of this kind would be. We have large areas of country which are covered with timber, and we have certain rules under which these may be leased and the timber cut; and it is the business of the timber inspectors to see that those rules are properly carried out. These are officers who would look after the preservation of the forests. But I do not see that a forest expert would be of any particular use in that respect. If you want to preserve the forests, or to prevent the cutting of too much timber, or of timber below a certain size, and to preserve it from fires, you have simply to issue your instructions to those different officers, and they are intelligent enough, I suppose, to carry out those instructions. If you are going to enter upon the work of planting forests in the North-west, then expert testimony may be necessary. Is that what my hon. friend proposes to use this vote for, and has he decided on some plan?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I have no plan yet, and this vote is for the  
**Mr. FOSTER.**

purpose of arriving at a better plan, and for the purpose of deciding upon effective regulations. The inspectors we have now are purely local men; they are for the purpose of checking the operations of the men who have timber limits, but they have no special knowledge regarding the preservation of forests. In the North-west we have large areas of timber land, concerning which we have no report from any officer of the department. Petitions have been received from the settlers, asking us to take steps for the preservation of the forest from fires, and at present there are no proper means for doing so. I have done something in that direction on the report of Mr. Stephenson; but he is a very busy man, and has not full and accurate knowledge of the matter. I can assure hon. gentlemen that when this officer is appointed, he will be one of the busiest men in the department.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I understood that Mr. Macoun, of the Experimental Farm, was largely engaged on that duty, and that various members of the other Experimental farms are also taking up the same work, such as ascertaining what class of trees would be suitable for planting in that country, and also for replanting with forests.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Providing seed for farmers.

**Mr. SPROULE.** No, but ascertaining what kind of trees and shrubbery would be suitable for planting, and also replanting the country, where it has been denuded of the original forest. That information has been collated by officers of the experimental farms for some years past. So far as that portion of the work is concerned, the Minister seems to be duplicating it. I understood also that he had an inspector, Mr. Pierce, who has been doing Timber Inspector's work largely for years.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Mr. Pierce has nothing to do with the timber.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I have repeatedly talked with him on that question, and I understood that was part of his duty. It seems to me this is practically the establishment of a new office, to be filled by somebody who is to do work that is already being done by two different agencies, one by the officers of experimental farms, and the other in connection with the Interior Department.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The work that is being done by the officers of the Experimental Farm is not the same class of work at all, but it is work of a horticultural character, such as ascertaining the best kind of trees for cultivation. The officer I require will concern himself with existing forests.

**Mr. WALLACE.** The Minister is wrong in that matter, because, as explained by the

hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), the very work that he tells us he proposes this officer should perform, is supposed to be performed now by officers of the other departments. But, outside of that, the Minister has given us a very crude statement upon which he proposes to appoint this officer. He ought to be able to justify this expenditure to Parliament in a more satisfactory manner than he has done.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is it proposed to appoint as timber inspector?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Stewart, a Dominion land surveyor. He has been engaged for the department as surveyor in connection with the delimitation of the boundary between Ontario and Manitoba. He has been recommended to me by the members of the Ontario Forestry Commission as being a very competent man for that purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. What experience has he had?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He has been connected with timber matters for a great many years in the province of Ontario. I do not know where he resides.

Mr. CLANCY. Is that Mr. Elihu Stewart, of Collingwood?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, that is the gentleman.

Mr. CLANCY. He is the gentleman who was one of the Liberal candidates at the general election in North Simcoe, and who was defeated?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, I am informed that this is the gentleman.

Mr. CLANCY. I can tell the hon. gentleman that while I have nothing to say as to his ability as a surveyor, he never had anything to do with timber.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken, if he says that I employed a gentleman to do work that he is not qualified to do.

Mr. CLANCY. I can tell the hon. gentleman that Mr. Stewart has been feeding at the Ontario crib for a great many years. He has been making useless surveys of townships that no one is living in, and that nobody intends to live in. If these are his qualifications, I will admit that he is eminently fitted for this work. But he does not know anything about timber. While he may be a very good surveyor, he does not know anything of the duties of a timber inspector.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Would the hon. gentleman say by what authority or by what knowledge it is that he says this gentleman has no knowledge of timber?

Mr. CLANCY. I know this gentleman. I do not reflect in the least upon him or upon his ability as a surveyor, but I have known him since the time he was a boy, and I went to school with him.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What has he done while he was employed by the Ontario Government? Has he not been engaged by the Ontario Government in connection with the timber business?

Mr. CLANCY. No.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He has not?

Mr. CLANCY. No, he has been engaged making surveys.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. CLANCY. I have had more to do with him than the hon. gentleman himself. Mr. Stewart has been for years employed surveying townships in Ontario. If the hon. Minister will take the trouble to look at the Ontario public accounts, he will see that the sum of \$35,000 is put in regularly for the surveying of new townships. Mr. Stewart has been engaged in this work from year to year, as regularly as the years come round. He finally became entitled to such prominence that he was a candidate in the last general election in North Simcoe. He was defeated, and now he is securing his reward. I have nothing to say, personally, against Mr. Stewart; but as a timber inspector, he has had no experience, and he is entirely unfitted for it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. All I have to say in regard to Mr. Stewart's record is, that I am perfectly satisfied the hon. gentleman is not making a statement that is correct, if he means to say that Mr. Stewart is not qualified to be a timber inspector. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the Ontario Forestry Commission recommended him for that position.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are they?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not remember their names at the moment. Mr. Waldie is one.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman lay that statement before the committee?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Certainly, I will. I do not want this committee to run away with the impression that the hon. gentleman tries to create. The hon. gentleman is very reckless in his statements, when he undertakes to lead this committee to believe that I have appointed a man to a position for which he is unfitted, and the hon. gentleman has no warrant for making that statement. It will be proven that he has no warrant for making the statement that this gentleman has had no experience

in regard to timber, because the appointment was made on the recommendation of the Ontario Forestry Commission, whom I conceive to be eminently fitted to know whether a man was experienced in that work or not. I am not at this moment able to say whose advice I would be more justified in taking than that of gentlemen who were appointed, by reason of their expert knowledge of timber matters, to advise the Ontario Government in connection with the great timber interests of that province. The Ontario Government have had much greater experience in connection with timber matters than have the Dominion Government. The knowledge of the Dominion Government in reference to timber matters is much smaller comparatively, and their experience is not so great, with one or two exceptions, as the experience of the Ontario Government in connection with matters of that kind. If the hon. gentleman is endeavouring to lead this committee to believe that the man recommended for this position is unfit for it, he is making a statement in regard to a matter he does not know anything about.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one circumstance I will call the hon. Minister's attention to, and it is this: I can hardly conceive that an expert in forestry matters, a man who had devoted his whole life to them, and who is well up in his profession, who had adopted it as a profession, would be leaving that field, which is most interesting to a man who pursues it scientifically and practically, to run an election in Dominion politics. I cannot understand that a man whose tastes are in that direction, and who is an authority on this subject, could give it up for the doubtful privilege of representing a constituency in the Dominion Parliament. Generally, you will find that authorities on these scientific matters are in love with their business, and if they are not in love with their business, they are not men that we require, or that any country requires, in this work. If the Dominion has a man at all besides all these present timber inspectors, agents and forest rangers, it should have a man who is versed in forestry, a man that can be placed alongside of men who are authorities in the United States on that matter, and in other great countries. A man may be a very good surveyor, but he may not have that thorough scientific knowledge and experience that are requisite to a man that the Dominion Government should put at the head of their timber and forest resources in order to advise them on the subject of the preservation of timber, reforestry and foresting. I think the hon. gentleman will see that this vote should not be used for the appointment of a man to this position, unless he, scientifically, as well as practically, understands his business, and is able to stand shoulder to shoulder with any other man in reforestry and foresting matters. I have sym-

Mr. SIFTON.

pathy with the idea of having such a man in Canada, but I do not have any sympathy with appointing a man simply for the sake of making an office for him. He ought to be something more than a surveyor, something more than a man who knows what timber is, when he sees it. He ought to have some scientific knowledge and some experience practically in regard to, the matter of foresting, which is a matter of importance, and which will be sacrificed, unless you get the very best man available.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I perfectly sympathize with the position of my hon. friend from York that a vote of this kind ought not to be taken simply for the purpose of making an office for anybody. I perfectly sympathize with the idea that it would be putting my department in a very false and ridiculous position to appoint a special officer to do special work if he were not competent for the position. I decided to recommend this gentleman for this position, as I have said, upon the belief that satisfactory evidence had been furnished to me that he was competent, and upon the representation that he had been engaged upon timber work for a great many years past. I want to say further, that I am in no way bound to appoint this gentleman if he does not possess the qualifications required for the office, and I can assure the committee, without any fear at all of being deceived, and consequently without any fear of deceiving the committee, that if he does not possess these qualifications he will never assume the duties of this office.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister has told us that he has received proof of the qualifications of Mr. Stewart that are satisfactory to him. Let him furnish the House with that information. Is the House not entitled to receive it?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not say the House was not entitled to it. I said I would bring the papers down.

Mr. WALLACE. We are not unreasonable persons. We are anxious to be pleased, and perhaps what pleases the Minister will please us.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I shall have the papers here before three o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. Then go on with the other items, and let this stand until we get the papers.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to say a word about this item before it stands. In the creation of a new office, the first thing to be considered is that we are saddling the country with an expense that may last for a long time. That of itself is not the worst. The next point is the qualifications of the party who is selected to fill that office. The hon. Minister has informed the House that it is his intention to appoint Mr. Stewart.

I come from the locality where Mr. Stewart lives, and while I regard him as a very decent and respectable man, I think it will be news to those who are best acquainted with him, that he is an expert in reforesting.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not say that. The hon. gentleman should not get up and make a long speech about something that was not said. I said that he had been recommended in connection with possible work that might be done in the way of reforesting.

Mr. SPROULE. My first inquiry of the hon. gentleman was, what were the duties? The hon. gentleman mentioned reforesting as part of the duties. My next inquiry was, what kind of a man he was going to get to fill the position? He said he was going to get a man who was regarded as an expert in those lines, and as a proof he said the man was recommended by the Ontario Association on Reforesting. If he could not be regarded as an expert, the hon. gentleman should not have told the committee that he was; and I say it will be news to people living in the locality where Mr. Stewart is best known that he possesses any special or expert knowledge regarding reforesting. He is a good land surveyor, and a respectable and intelligent man in his own line, but outside of that, in my judgment, he does not know half as much as some of the men engaged in that line on the Experimental Farm. When the news goes up to the locality where Mr. Stewart is best known, the people there will rather regard this as an office made for the purpose of giving a political friend something, than for the purpose of getting expert work done.

Mr. CLANCY. I am not going to give Mr. Stewart's record, but I will begin about midway. I will commence at 1887. By the Ontario Crown Lands Report for that year, the hon. gentleman will find that Mr. Stewart got \$2,932 for surveying the township of Maria.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not say that he was not employed as a surveyor.

Mr. CLANCY. I am going to show that he was employed as that, and that alone.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not say that Mr. Stewart was not employed as a surveyor; but if the hon. gentleman is trying to lead the committee to believe that he had no experience in timber matters, and that his employment with the Ontario Government had nothing to do with timber matters, I am satisfied that he is mistaken.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman went much further than that. He said that I knew nothing about Mr. Stewart and was making a statement that was entirely untrue. I said that Mr. Stewart was, I be-

lieved, a very good land surveyor, but that in consequence of being engaged in that work, he had almost no experience in timber matters. According to the Ontario Crown Lands Report in 1888, Mr. Stewart received for surveying the township of Edgar, \$3,926; in 1889, for surveying the township of Bronson, he received \$3,504. This does not include all, because he has been receiving money every year up to the time the hon. gentleman has employed him. I have gone back as far as 1887, and I am not sure that I might not have gone back a few years further.

Mr. Stewart has been entirely engaged in another work, not pertaining to timber at all. I am not finding fault with Mr. Stewart, who is a very estimable gentleman personally, but I want to point out to him, when he is endeavouring to lead this committee to believe that he is appointing a gentleman of experience to an important position, he is entirely wrong, and I know well what Mr. Stewart's standing is with relation to that matter. I would ask the hon. gentleman to look at page 30 of the Crown Lands Report of the province of Ontario for 1890, and he will find that Mr. Stewart appears there as having been paid for surveying, \$1,626.38. Year after year he was employed by the Ontario Government to make surveys of townships and otherwise, and was not in the woods and forests, so far as I have any information. I am pretty well acquainted with the Public Accounts of the province of Ontario for the past year and I know Mr. Stewart very well personally, and I venture to state that he never had any direct connection with timber matters in his life.

Mr. BENNETT. Since the item is to stand in order that Mr. Stewart's capabilities may be looked into, I think it is only fair that the hon. Minister should look into the claims of other parties to see whether or not they are not entitled to the much coveted position. I know Mr. Stewart personally and I know he is a very estimable gentleman, but I have never heard of him as other than an ordinary surveyor. I can tell the names of a couple of gentlemen, who, no doubt, will be quickly recognized by members from the province of Ontario, and probably by the Ministers themselves, as having much more experience in the timber business than Mr. Stewart ever had. Captain John Sullivan, for the last twenty years has been engaged in bush-ranging.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Where does he live?

Mr. BENNETT. The trouble is that at present his residence is unknown. However, I think that could be easily found out, and as the duties of the office will permit the officer to be out of the province of Ontario, that would suit Captain Sullivan pretty well at present. In addition to Cap-

tain Sullivan, whose timber experience has been very wide, there is another gentleman, a friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, who is well up in the timber business, in which Mr. Stewart has no experience at all. He is a gentleman who has been in the employ of the province of Ontario off and on, for twenty-five years, and while something may be urged against him, everybody will conceive that in point of ability and thorough knowledge of woods and forests he is perfectly qualified. That gentleman is Mr. D. F. McDonald, and his ordinary post office address is Parry Sound.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am not acquainted with him.

Mr. FOSTER. Ask the Postmaster General?

Mr. BENNETT. He is a gentleman of varied experience, who has been upwards of twenty years in the employ of the Ontario Government. Wherever he is known, his ability for wood-ranging and that sort of business stands second to none. I would ask the hon. Minister, as this item is to stand until the afternoon, to diligently employ himself in the meantime inquiring into the business capabilities of Captain John Sullivan and Mr. D. F. McDonald for the position.

It being One o'clock, the Deputy Speaker left the Chair.

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. (Mr. Sifton). I desire to move to strike out that portion of the item relating to the clerks.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS. While we are discussing the subject of Dominion lands, I think it will be in order for me to ask the Minister if it is his intention, during this session, to bring in any legislation with reference to the seed-grain indebtedness. I have discussed this question with the Government and have brought it up in the House several times. The last time the Government issued seed-grain to the settlers in the North-west, they adopted a new method of taking security. Instead of taking a lien on the homestead of the party receiving the grain, the party had to get two bondsmen—each man getting seed-grain from the Government had to have two of his neighbours enter into bonds for repayment. That means that the Government is holding three homesteads instead of one for a small amount of money, sometimes not more than \$10 or \$15. This is highly unfair. If the Government is secured on one homestead, that is all they should require, and not try to hold these other parties. Another question in relation to this arises concerning abandoned homesteads. In the past the

Mr. BENNETT.

Government have given seed-grain and taken security on the homestead. In a great many cases the party who received the seed-grain had only made entry and had not performed his settlement duties, and so was not entitled to patent. In some cases these parties abandoned the homesteads. In case of other parties coming in and wishing to take up the homesteads, the Government demands payment for the improvements. So, when a man finds a good piece of land that he wants to take up and goes to the land office to see about it, he may be told not only that there is, perhaps, \$100 to be paid for improvements, but a certain amount for seed-grain as well.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ellis). I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis), but I may mention that there is an understanding that the discussion shall be confined to the item before the committee.

Mr. DAVIS. I thought this would be in order as we are discussing Dominion lands. In any case, I have only a word or two more to say. I desire to point out that the conditions to which I have referred tend to retard settlement and interfere with the formation of school districts, and everything of that kind. Something should be done to do away with this disability, and also to relieve the bondsmen on these seed-grain transactions.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. Minister was to give us some information regarding recommendations of Mr. Stewart from the Ontario Forestry Department.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will read the letters. One of them, it will be seen, is from Mr. Aubrey White. It is marked "private," but there is nothing in it of a private nature, and I feel at liberty to lay it on the Table of the House:

1 Toronto St.,  
Toronto, April 25th, 1899.

Hon. Clifford Sifton,  
Minister of the Interior,  
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir.—Should the Government establish a forestry department, I have great pleasure in recommending Mr. E. Stewart, of Collingwood, His experience as Dominion land surveyor and valuator of timber in connection with the Ontario Government gives him a knowledge obtained by few, and necessarily equips him for a position of that kind.

I have, therefore, great pleasure in recommending Mr. Stewart for any position that may be created in connection with forestry in your department.

Yours truly,  
(Sgd.) JOHN WALDIE.

Ontario Forestry Commission,  
Toronto, April 25th, 1899.

Sir,—I understand you contemplate creating a Bureau of Forestry, having charge of the administration of the woods and forests under the control of your department, and that Mr. E. Stewart, D.L.S., of Collingwood, has been named for the position. I do not like to tender unsolicited ad-

vice, but I venture to express my appreciation of the proposed plan. The advisability of keeping the lands better suited for growing timber than for other crops always under timber, and the adoption of a system of selling the standing timber under regulations that will subserve that end, must have the approval of those who have given the question of the part forests play in our industrial and economic welfare any attention.

As you are doubtless aware, we have no trained scientific foresters in this country, but from what I know of Mr. Stewart, I should think he would prove to be a successful administrator of such a service. His scientific training for his profession, his extensive experience in bush life, and in forestry matters in this province, peculiarly fit him for successfully inaugurating and conducting a bureau of forestry in your department.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) THOS. SOUTHWORTH,

Secretary Ontario Forestry Commission.

Hon. Clifford Sifton,

Minister of the Interior, Ottawa, Ont.

(Private.)

Department of Crown Lands, Ontario,  
Toronto, April 28th, 1899.

Dear Mr. Sifton,—I am informed that you are contemplating the establishment of a Woods and Forests Branch in connection with your department, and that Mr. E. Stewart, D.L.S., of Collingwood, is an applicant for the position of superintendent. Mr. Stewart has asked me to say what I know about his knowledge and ability in connection with forestry matters.

I may say that I have known Mr. Stewart for a great many years, and that he has a good knowledge of all timber, being capable of estimating limits and that kind of work. Indeed, he did, upon more than one occasion, conduct estimates on an extensive scale for this department, and we found him to be a most careful and accurate officer. In addition to this, Mr. Stewart has made a number of exploratory township and timber surveys for this department, and is regarded by us as one of our most reliable and efficient surveyors.

He was appointed by the Government of Ontario to the position of mining land agent at Rat Portage, which position he resigned, largely, I think, because the salary was not sufficient, and we were sorry to lose his services.

Mr. Stewart is all round a very strong man in connection with timber and land matters, and I am sure would make a first-class official in connection with your department. His business and general character are everything that could be wished for.

Very truly yours,

(Sgd.) AUBREY WHITE.

The Hon. Clifford Sifton,

Minister of the Interior, Ottawa.

Mr. SPROULE. These letters are all very well in their way. Mr. Waldie is an extensive lumberman, Mr. Aubrey White is the Deputy Commissioner of Crown Lands, and Mr. Southworth is the secretary of the Forestry Commission. I suppose letters have been invited from these sources as testimony for Mr. Stewart, who desires permanent employment under the Government. So far as I could follow the reading of them by the hon. Minister, there is not a word to

indicate that Mr. Stewart will be especially useful in the work of replanting the country with forest. They show that he is a good man to estimate timber, has had extensive experience as provincial land surveyor, and has done the work of timber estimating for the provincial government. But there is nothing to show that he is specially fitted for the position more than hundreds of men in the country. I know many men in the country whose appointment would be much more suitable. It seems to me that the sum and substance of this matter is this—Mr. Stewart has been a candidate in the interests of hon. gentlemen opposite—an unsuccessful candidate, but has been very successful in getting employment from the provincial government from year to year as provincial land surveyor—and has no permanent position in life and is desirous of getting one. Out of gratitude for what he has done for the political party in the past, I presume they are anxious to give him some situation. If there must be a situation made for a supporter, I would as soon see Mr. Stewart get it as any other, because he is certainly a respectable man. But it seems to me it is only making a new office which entails a permanent expense on the country, and from which there will be very little fruitful results.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In reply to the hon. member for Saskatchewan, I beg to say that the subject which the hon. gentleman referred to I have had under consideration during the last week, and I hope to be able to deal with it almost immediately.

Mr. CLANCOY. Will the hon. gentleman tell the committee what Mr. Stewart's special duties are there? It is a broad thing to say he is an inspector of timber, but that actually means nothing.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have described his duties as fully as I could.

Mr. CLANCOY. I confess I have not heard the hon. gentleman state more than that he was a timber inspector, which means absolutely nothing. I take it for granted that the hon. gentleman has appointed him to a position that he knows nothing about. Unless he is able to point out some new condition of things that has grown up lately that warrants this appointment, I think the committee is justified in refusing to give him the appropriation. I think Mr. Stewart is absolutely without experience in timber matters. His being a provincial land surveyor no more qualifies him for that position than if he was not a land surveyor. Now, Mr. Stewart's services, I may inform the committee, commenced with the Ontario Government in 1877 and ended in 1897. He has been employed consecutively every year by the Ontario Government, and he has drawn from the treasury of the province the handsome sum of \$50,167 during that period. Even in the year that he

was the candidate of hon. gentlemen opposite in North Simcoe, he was in the service of the Ontario Government.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That does not prove that Mr. Stewart does not understand timber matters.

Mr. CLANCY. It is pointed out clearly what his services were, and none of them referred to timber. He simply surveys township after township. There are timber rangers who make a report of timber matters, but Mr. Stewart has never made a report during that whole period on timber matters. During the year he was the candidate of hon. gentleman opposite in North Simcoe, he drew the handsome sum of \$3,145.50.

Mr. BAIN. Did not he do work for it?

Mr. CLANCY. He did do the work, but not the work the hon. gentleman is appointing him now to do, it was another class of work altogether. He was engaged exclusively in making surveys, and had nothing whatever to do with timber matters. Perhaps it is not a calamity that he has no qualification, because the hon. gentleman is appointing him to a position that will be entirely barren of results.

Mr. BENNETT. Has Mr. Stewart yet finished the survey of the Christian Islands he was on last year?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not remember that Mr. Stewart was engaged in surveying the Christian Islands for my department. So far as I remember, the only work he has done for my department was in connection with the delimitation of the boundary line between Ontario and Manitoba.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not feel disposed to keep up the discussion much longer on this item, but I think it is apparent to the committee that the Minister has put himself into an untenable position. The only excuse he could have for asking for this vote was to get a thorough man. It takes only a commonplace man to be a timber valuator and a good surveyor, but neither of these are requisites to what this office requires. Do you mean to tell me that you have not got just as good surveyors in your department now as Mr. Stewart, and just as good men to value timber?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman means to make an examination of timber and put a valuation on it, I suppose I have.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, these are all the references the hon. gentleman has. You cannot point to a single pamphlet this man has issued as an authority on forestry. A man who has been twenty years in the service should have made himself so thoroughly master of this subject as to have be-

Mr. CLANCY.

come known in the forestry work of the world. I believe the Minister could pick a dozen men out of his own staff who are in every way just as well qualified as surveyors and valuers of timber as Mr. Stewart. When the Government desires a perfectly well qualified man for the head of the dairy industry, for instance, they scour the country and inquire for men who are easily known as authorities on that particular subject. You cannot point to any evidence to show this man's special qualifications. Where is the forestry congress he has attended? What prominent part has he taken? What advice or opinion has he given to the world on this great matter during the last twenty years? All that is said in recommendation of Mr. Stewart is that he is a man of good character. No doubt, he is a good Dominion land surveyor and valuator of timber.

Mr. CLANCY. No, no, he has never done any valuation.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Waldie says he is a good Dominion land surveyor and valuator of timber. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) says he is not; that is a matter between my hon. friend and Mr. Waldie. But take it for granted that he is a timber valuator, as Mr. Waldie says, and what does that mean? Mr. Waldie is a lumberman who has to pay his dues, stumpage and the like of that. Before he can get his lumber lands he has to have the timber valued, and he then has to pay on the scale, which is laid down according to the recommendation of the valuator. That is all this gentleman had to do, as a valuator, to look after stumpage and timber licenses. That is as far as Mr. Waldie goes, and his twenty years' experience has been in surveying townships into lots. Then we come to Mr. Southworth. I do not know Mr. Southworth; he may be a forester or he may be simply the secretary of the commission, and I am not sure whether the secretary of the commission is an expert in forestry or not. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) informs me that Mr. Southworth is the best forestry man they have in Ontario. Mr. Southworth says that he approves of the proposal of the Minister to create a bureau of forestry, and that Mr. Stewart has been named for the position. He approves of the advisability of this step and of the adoption of the system of selling the standing timber under regulations that will subserve that end. That does not call for very high qualifications.

As you are doubtless aware, we have no scientific foresters in this country, but from what I know of Mr. Stewart, I should think he would prove to be a successful administrator of such a service.

An administrator of such a service, but he does not say that he has any scientific training. He says:

We have no trained scientific foresters in this country.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. What does he mean by a skilled forester?

Mr. **FOSTER**. He says:

As you are doubtless aware, we have no trained scientific foresters in this country, but from what I know of Mr. Stewart I should think he would prove to be a successful administrator of such a service.

You have to have as an administrator a skilled forestry man, but we have none such in Canada.

From what I know of Mr. Stewart, I should think he would prove to be a most successful administrator of such a service.

When you have worked it out, but we want the services of such a man before you get to the administration not those of a mere timber valuator.

His scientific training for his profession,—

What profession? That of a Dominion land surveyor, surveying lots for the Ontario Government until he went as a mining agent to Rat Portage and resigned that position. That is not the class of man we want as an authority in Canada. We want a man of scientific training as well as of experience. The very best man that Canada can get is none too good if you are going to get the services of a man of that kind. Mr. White is non-committal in his testimonial. He says:

I have known Mr. Stewart for a great many years, and he has a good knowledge of all kinds of timber,—

There are a great many other men, there is a number of members of this House who have a good knowledge of timber, but that they do not aspire to be placed at the head of a forestry bureau.

—being capable of estimating limits and that kind of work.

Indeed, he did upon more than one occasion conduct estimates on an extensive scale for this department.

These are estimates in regard to the quantities and values of timber.

In addition to this, Mr. Stewart has made a number of exploratory township and timber surveys for this department, and is regarded by us as one of the most reliable and efficient surveyors.

He only says "one of the most reliable and efficient surveyors."

He was appointed by the Government of Ontario to the position of mining lands agent at Rat Portage, which position he resigned.

I do not consider that these are at all sufficient to base the selection of Mr. Stewart to that position upon. The man you want for this position is a man well trained scientifically who will take hold of these great areas which have no forests and these

great forest areas of ours, a man of authority and attainments on whose advice we may rely and on whose directions we may set ourselves to work towards the conservation of these forests and towards the reforestation of vacant areas. You may take this man and pay him this salary, but I tell the hon. Minister that there will be no public confidence in the effort if he does not get a man of the highest attainments to be at the head of this department and to take charge of this work.

Mr. **TYRWHITT**. Mr. Chairman, representing, as I do, a riding adjoining that in which Mr. Stewart was a candidate, I have had the opportunity of knowing something of him personally and also by reputation. After listening to the speech of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), I am of the opinion that he has described Mr. Stewart's qualifications most accurately. I also am of the opinion that Mr. Stewart, while he may be a good Dominion land surveyor, is not an expert in the matter of timber. I speak of my own knowledge, having known him for a number of years. It appears to me that Mr. Stewart has been amply rewarded already for any service that he may have performed, in the interest of his party, and I can assure the hon. Minister that there are a number of honest Liberals in North Simcoe who would be only too glad to fill this position. I must take this opportunity of entering my protest against the creation of positions for defeated candidates. We had the promise of the representatives of the present Government during the campaign of 1896 that it was their intention to curtail expenses in all directions, to cut down salaries and appoint fewer officers, but instead of that, we find that the Government are increasing the number of their Ministers, increasing the number of their officers, that they are creating positions for defeated candidates and friends in the party and increasing the expenditure of the country at every opportunity.

Mr. **HUGHES**. Is this forestry department a new department?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. It is not a new department, but it is a new office.

Mr. **HUGHES**. I would like to ask the hon. Minister what he is doing in regard to forestry in this country?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I presume the hon. gentleman was not in to hear the discussion.

Mr. **HUGHES**. I was not.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I explained before that this officer is to be appointed for the purpose of generally superintending the preservation of timber, which work is under the charge of the department, and of making such recommendations and

assisting in carrying out such recommendations as may be deemed necessary for the purpose of preserving our timber. The particular way in which the matter will be worked out will, of course, largely result from his work afterwards.

Mr. HUGHES. Is there any intention on the part of the hon. Minister to have experiments made in the propagation of timber in districts under his control?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not got that far in it yet.

Mr. SPROULE. I take it that, according to this, there will be other inspectors under him, because he is called the chief inspector. It is not intended to have him as the only inspector?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No. There are the other ordinary inspectors in the different districts who will be retained and will work just as before.

Mr. SPROULE. How many inspectors has the hon. Minister in his department?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the exact number.

Mr. WALLACE. Give it to us within a hundred.

Mr. MORIN. What does the Minister mean by a timber inspector?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As understood in the department, it is the officer who endeavours to see that the regulations affecting timber on Dominion lands are properly carried out, and that the timber is protected from fire as far as possible. He also makes a return when a person cuts timber on Dominion lands.

Mr. MORIN. I have heard of inspectors of lumber, but not timber inspectors.

Mr. McNEILL. If the Minister is going to make some effort to stop the fearful waste of timber which is going on all over the Dominion, he is pursuing a right policy provided he puts the proper men in the proper place. The question is whether this is a proper man to appoint or not. I would be glad to raise my voice in support of any policy which would be in the direction of protecting our timber, because there is no doubt that a great waste has been going on.

Mr. COCHRANE. Does the Minister expect this gentleman to give him any information regarding timber?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. How will he get the knowledge?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He will get it by travelling over the ground.

Mr. SIFTON.

Mr. COCHRANE. I should think you would want some man who has practical experience for that. I suppose there are hundreds of surveyors who are just as competent as this man is, and I do not see how he could add to the information already in your department. It appears to me this is just a piece of jobbery to get a place for a defeated candidate. I have no objection to voting money in this House if it is going to be spent in the interest of the country, but I protest most emphatically against the Minister creating an office for a defeated candidate who has already drawn thousands of dollars from the provincial government. I suppose when he ran as a candidate he ran with the full knowledge that when he was defeated he would get a Government sit. We know how those gentlemen opposite protested against that kind of thing when in Opposition, and how they turn around and do the very thing they denounced. If the Minister of the Interior and his colleagues procured money the way they procured votes, by false promises and broken pledges, they would be in the penitentiary now. They told us that they were going to economize, and that the departments here were crowded with officials from garret to cellar, but since they came into power they are appointing new officials all the time. Does the Minister of the Interior hear what I am saying?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. Well, I want you to pay attention to this and to hear it too.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can assure my hon. friend that I not only hear it, but I will take special care to read it in the "Hansard" to-night.

Mr. COCHRANE. Well, if you promise to read it in the "Hansard," there is no use my straining my voice on you. I say this office is just on a par with the inspectorship of immigration agencies. The Conservatives had no such officials when they were in power, but this Government created such an office to give a friend of theirs a job. I am glad the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has come into the House. We remember how his virtuous soul rose in indignation day after day at the extravagance of the Tory party. But now he sits smiling there, voting in favour of all kinds of extravagance. I do not know what position he is going to get—

Mr. HUGHES. The Senate.

Mr. COCHRANE. Well, they had better put him there pretty quick, because if he goes on swallowing himself day after day as he has done since the Liberals came into power, there will be none of him left to go into the Senate. I have strong opinions about this matter, and I do not want to create a smile, because it is too serious. These gentlemen opposite denounced extra-

vagance when they were in Opposition, but when they get into power they run riot with the people's money. They tell us it is a growing time, and we all know it is a growing time in extravagant expenditure. When they were in Opposition, did they not tell us when we had a surplus that it did not make any difference, because the people paid the taxes anyhow, and now, instead of applying the excess revenue to wiping out the national debt, they are devoting it to finding jobs for their friends and wasting it in all kinds of schemes. I challenge the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) if he can honestly defend any of these extravagant expenditures? Is what was wrong when he was on this side of the House, right because his friends are in power? They dinned in our ears that thirteen Ministers were too many, and after listening to them day after day, I became almost convinced that there was something in it. They have thirteen Ministers, with two controllers, at \$7,000 a year each, and we have not heard a word this session about the napkins down at Government House.

Mr. WALLACE. Were there any applicants for this besides Mr. Stewart?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. WALLACE. I see that these recommendations of Mr. Stewart are more than three months old; they are dated last April. How was it that Mr. Stewart and his friends knew that this office was going to be created, and no one else knew it until these Estimates came down? I would like to ask if there are any recommendations of Mr. Stewart besides those we have had to-day?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, these are all.

Mr. WALLACE. Did not the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) recommend him?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. WALLACE. That is strange, because I am sure that he would be very anxious to have him out of the way at the next election. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has made some recommendations. Does the Minister intend to take them into his serious consideration?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. member for East Simcoe will put them in writing, I will consider them.

Mr. FOSTER. They are on "Hansard"; that is better.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to make a short reply to the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane). I thought that at the commencement of this session we had thoroughly threshed out all these matters.

Mr. WALLACE. The threshing machine has been working ever since.

Mr. McMULLEN. I thought it was generally understood that we would try to rush through the business of the House; otherwise, I would try to answer my hon. friend. I have always been a strong advocate of economy, and am still; at the same time I am prepared to see the services of the country properly conducted. I believe the services of this man are required, or the Minister of the Interior would not appoint him. I do not believe in appointing unnecessary officials, and when any officials are not necessary, I will be as willing to cut down their numbers as the hon. member for East Northumberland.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). There can be no question about the necessity of protecting the forests of the North-west.

Mr. FOSTER. No such question has been raised.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I would draw attention to section 78 of chapter 54 of our Revised Statutes, which makes it incumbent upon the Minister of the Interior, or whoever is in charge of the interests of the North-west, to pay due attention to the protection of the growing timber.

The Governor in Council may, from time to time, for the preservation of forest trees on the crests and slopes of the Rocky Mountains, and for the proper maintenance throughout the year of the volume of water in the rivers and streams which have their sources in such mountains and traverse the North-west Territories, reserve from sale, lease or license such portions of the land in the North-west Territories on, or adjacent to or in the vicinity of the Rocky Mountains.

And so forth. Any one who takes an interest in the question, knows how important it is to preserve the forests, especially those in which are the sources of the rivers, and which are necessary to maintain the irrigation and the fertility of the lands, for we know that on the maintenance of these forests largely depends, not only the regular supply of water now in our rivers, but also the agricultural prosperity of the country.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior to give me the name of one square mile of timber in the North-west Territories which is not taken up?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend has certainly got a very mistaken idea of the timber of the North-west Territories. There is only a comparatively small portion of the timber of the North-west Territories taken up. There is a vast quantity of the timber in the North-west Territories which has never been touched, and of which only the vaguest reports are in the possession of the department; and they have not been advertised nor sold, and are

not held by anybody. What my hon. friend is trying to get at is the merchantable timber, the timber used for building purposes. We are not discussing that. The timber in the province of Manitoba is not building timber. It is timber which grows on the Riding Mountains, the Duck Mountains, the Moose Mountains, where the settlers get their wood supply, and which has an effect on the climate as well.

Mr. HUGHES. I asked the Minister if he intended to take into consideration that class of timber that could be grown in the North-west. I was told that it had not been taken into consideration, and I could not see what this man was to inspect, if it was not merchantable timber.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend did not understand me, or I did not understand him. What I understood him to ask was, if I had any plans for reforestation, and what I said was, that I had not got that far yet.

Immigration—

Payment to the trustees of the colony of St. Paul des Métis, to enable them to supply seed grain and farm implements to settlers in distress within the colony ..... \$2,000

Mr. FOSTER. What does this mean?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The explanation of this item is as follows:—In the spring of 1895 a memorial was presented to the Minister of the Interior by the Very Rev. Father Lacombe, O.M.I., on behalf of His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface and their Lordships the Bishops of St. Albert and Prince Albert, praying that an industrial school be established and a reservation be made in connection therewith of a tract of four townships of Dominion lands in the district of Alberta, with a view to the betterment of the destitute condition of the majority of the half-breeds of the North-west Territories. In order that the parties mentioned might be able to carry out their plans in regard to the colonization of the poorer classes of half-breeds, the Dominion Government leased four sections of townships 57 and 58, ranges 9 and 10, west of the 4th meridian, for a period of 21 years, for the purpose of an industrial school for the education of half-breed children, and for the same period a lease was granted for the balance of the land in the said townships. Power was given to them to sub-lease the lands in lots of eighty acres to the half-breeds in distress who made application for shelter and help. In addition to the land grants the Government voted \$2,000 for the purchase of seed grain and farm implements so as to help the settlers to start in their work, and the Rev. Father Lacombe states that a judicious distribution was made, and the help given at that time was of great benefit to them.

Mr. SIFTON.

On the 3rd January last, Mr. Ruttan, the agent of Dominion lands at Edmonton, and Mr. Coleman, homestead inspector, made an inspection of the colony. The cost of maintenance of the colony, the erection of buildings, purchase of agricultural implements, &c., must have exceeded \$8,000 during the past three years.

The funds at the disposal of the trustees will not admit of their doing as much as they would like, and they ask the Government to aid them to enable the new settlers in distress who are coming in to establish their homes, and give them fresh supplies of seeds and implements. It has been decided to ask for a grant of \$2,000 for this purpose.

Mr. HUGHES. Where is this colony located?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In townships 57 and 58, ranges 9 and 10 west, 4th meridian.

Mr. HUGHES. Out there in Alberta.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, the northern part.

Mr. HUGHES. How many settlers are there in this colony?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Speaking from recollection, 200 or 300 men, women and children.

Mr. HUGHES. How much was given this colony previously?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. \$2,000.

Mr. HUGHES. You might as well put them on a pension-roll.

Mr. WALLACE. To whom were these four townships leased?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They were leased to three or four trustees. The lease was just in the form of a letter from the department.

Mr. WALLACE. For what term was the lease?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They occupy the land during pleasure.

Mr. HUGHES. Is this money to be repaid?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. HUGHES. Why is it not expended under the direction of an officer responsible to this Government?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Because I think it would be better expended the other way.

Mr. HUGHES. What are the names of the trustees?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. There are four trustees. The name of one of them I have not got; the others are Mr. Justice Ouimet, Senator Dandurand and Archbishop Langevin.

Mr. McNEILL. This is a very large sum given these families, and the second amount paid them, as I understand. I am much in favour of giving to people in distress, but to give such sums as those seems to be a very extraordinary course to pursue. It seems to be about \$100 a family, both on this occasion and the previous occasion. That is a serious precedent to set and one can understand what tremendous pressure will be brought to bear on the Government in the future for this kind of thing.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I do not consider the amount excessive at all. I took some time to think about it before making up my mind, and all these applications are the subject of a good deal of consideration before they are acted on. It seems to me this is a meritorious enterprise, for the establishment of which I cannot claim any credit, but only for carrying out what was begun by the late Government. The half-breeds have to enter the battle of life along with the white people, and it is not uncommon for them to get the worst of it, and Father Lacombe inaugurated this idea of establishing this colony to provide where these destitute half-breeds might be gathered in and be enabled to earn a livelihood for themselves and at the same time build up the country. The idea is not to give \$10 apiece to the people, but for the trustees to purchase the necessary implements and seed grain, and any property that is not of a perishable character will remain the property of the trustees.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these half-breeds that are getting scrip?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. No, I do not suppose that any of the half-breeds in this colony will get scrip.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that that is a sort of common refuge for unsuccessful half-breeds, who are taken charge of, under kind and paternal leadership, in the endeavour, if possible, to induce them to settle down and make a living for themselves, but these half-breeds are probably the same ones that the Minister was so decided in declaring should not receive any scrip payable to bearer, although, whilst he was stating that, his own commissioners in the North-west were giving away hundreds of thousands of dollars of scrip payable to bearer, all of which will represent an immense depreciation of value before it reaches the half-breeds themselves. This thing ought to end somewhere, and it is no excuse to allege that this matter was gone into in 1885 and a start given to it. Is it to become a yearly grant?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. It is practically, to all intents and purposes, a vote for relief, something in the nature of the vote we give to assist the Indian schools.

Mr. BERGERON. In which county?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. It is out of the range of counties. It is in Alberta township 57.

Mr. BERGERON. Are they voters?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I suppose they are, but they will be a long distance from a polling booth.

Mr. WALLACE. Can the hon. Minister tell us whether the experiment is a success or failure?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. The report of my officer, who is a very experienced man, is favourable, that the colony is doing well, and should be encouraged. It is in a sense the establishment of a semi-relief institution. If these people did not get there, they would be upon the community and relief have to be given them by the community.

Mr. WALLACE. The first was an experiment which, the hon. Minister says, was fairly successful. Is this \$2,000 for the same crowd, or is it for a new crowd coming in?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I have not thought of limiting the action of the trustees, but allow them to use their own discretion.

Mr. WALLACE. But surely the Minister asked the question that I am asking before he consented to submit this matter to Parliament? Is this for the parties we helped three or four years ago?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. Whoever upon the reserve requires assistance will be given assistance.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the Minister to say that there are 200 in the colony?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I have sent out since and ascertained that there are about 50 families—say, 250 people in all.

Mr. SPROULE. This, then, will be about \$8 a head or about \$40 a family. I apprehend that there are thousands as deserving half-breeds as these scattered throughout the North-west, but these are chosen out to be made pensioners upon the country to this extent—it would appear they too are pensioners, for we are not told what progress they are making. They have already been assisted in starting farming, but we have no information as to how they have progressed.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I can get the hon. gentleman a report, if he wishes.

**Mr. SPROULE**. It would be better if we had a report before we are asked to vote this money. This is a principle we should not adopt of starting little colonies, even of half-breeds, here and there throughout the country, because it means that these votes must be left in the hands of a few men who practically make a living or part of a living out of it, and they will find an excuse year after year for asking a renewal of the vote until it will become an annual affair. We have no evidence of beneficial results following this. Before we continue the experiment we ought to be satisfied that beneficial results have followed what has been done.

**Mr. HUGHES**. This Dominion is trying to induce immigration from Europe to the North-west, and the advertisements of our agents throughout the world point to this country north of Edmonton as a magnificent place in which settlers can find a home. But on the other hand the Government tells the world through this Parliament that a number of families, who have had the pick of the four best townships in that district and who were brought in and started in farming two or three years ago, are back now for a good round income for each family. We have seen too much of this. I shall move that this item be struck out. I object to having this money voted to these four trustees. Who are they? Not one man of them has ever been near this colony, and I dare say not one man of them will go there. If the Minister will appoint some responsible officer who will go there and see that this money is rightly expended for the benefit of these people, if they are destitute, it will not be so bad. But he is establishing a principle that will find a ready following all over this country. If he will put this expenditure under the charge of a responsible officer, I should not object so much, but I do object to handing it over to a church organization. How does the Minister know that they want seed grain there, when the harvest is not in?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the information.

**Mr. HUGHES**. Then I have pleasure in moving—

**Mr. McNEILL**. I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) will not move to strike the item out. It is too valuable a precedent. There are some Indian lands in the Peninsula of Bruce which are very rocky, the settlers upon which have to face grave difficulties with which they have been struggling for years. In many cases it is exceedingly difficult for them to succeed in raising crops enough for their stock even. A year or two

**Mr. SPROULE**.

ago there was great distress there. If my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) is doing so much in the North-west, I hope he will do something for my friends in the Peninsula of Bruce.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. Of course, the half-breeds of the North-west are in an entirely different position. No doubt if my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) represents the condition of these people in North Bruce to the Ontario Government, they will be relieved.

**Mr. McNEILL**. No; this is a case under my hon. friend's (Mr. Sifton) administration. These people are settled on Indian lands.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. It is no part of the duty of the Indian Department to take care of the citizens who buy Indian lands; it is only the duty of that department to see that they pay for them.

**Mr. HUGHES** moved to strike out item 96, as follows:—

Payment to the trustees of the colony of St. Paul des Métis, to enable them to supply seed grain and farm implements to settlers in distress within the colony. \$2,000

**Mr. WALLACE**. The hon. Minister has entirely failed to justify this vote. Whether this money is to go to the men who came in 1895 or to a new crowd he is unable to say. Again, this money is to go into the hands of men who cannot be there to personally supervise the expenditure, and in any case they are not responsible to this House for the proper expenditure of the money. Another thing is that the Minister has not demonstrated that these men are not among those who have received half-breed scrip. The Minister has not yet proved to this House that these people have not received half-breed scrip in large amounts, and I assume it to be the case, unless the Minister shows me some rule by which they would be prohibited from getting half-breed scrip. He has not done that, and we must have the assurance from the Minister and evidence to prove that these men are not receiving half-breed scrip to the amount of tens of thousands, before we vote this additional amount.

**Mr. HUGHES**. Not only that, but the Minister asks us for \$2,000 for seed grain and farm implements, and he has the hardihood to say that he has no information as to whether they want seed grain or not. How does he know but that they may be raising much more grain than they need, and able to export grain in large quantities instead of requiring assistance? I would like the Minister to give us the data whereon he is asking for this money. From whom does he get a report that this money is wanted?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. The grant is made upon the recommendation of Senator Dandurand, and Father Lacombe,

as one of the members of the board. I want to say to my hon. friends that there is no reason at all in the position they are taking. They voted for a similar grant in 1895, or whenever it was, and they got no such information, and the department had not any. It was paid out without any vouchers then, and without any specification as to what it was going to be used for. My hon. friend's scruple for details comes very late, because he is trying to apply one rule to the department now and quite a different rule from that which he applied to it before. The hon. member for West York had no difficulty at all upon the question before, and his desire for details comes rather late. I say frankly that I have not got a specification of the number of families that require seed grain, and how much each one requires, but I took for facts the statements of those gentlemen who called upon me. I say now that I am prepared to rest my justification for this vote upon the good faith and the accuracy of the representations Father Lacombe made to me. I think the committee will be perfectly safe in entrusting these trustees with the distribution of this money. How do we do in the case of industrial schools under the charge of the Protestant Church or the Catholic Church? We simply vote \$140 or \$150 per head, or whatever it may be, we vote it en bloc to that church to be used for the support of their schools. We send an inspector there to see if the school is properly carried on, and we also send an inspector here to see if this money is properly expended.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is perfectly justified in moving that this item be struck out, owing to lack of information. In 1895, or whenever this aid was granted, it was given simply on the representation of Father Lacombe, who came down here saying that he had a scheme under hand, and he was convinced he could do a great deal of good to the half-breeds if he had this assistance, and the assistance was given. In the inauguration of this scheme there was a vote granted, that was merely to set the thing going, there was no understanding that it was to be a yearly grant.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We are not doing it year by year.

Mr. FOSTER. But you are giving no information as to the success of the experiment, you are not able to say whether you are going to duplicate this to these families who have been supplied out of a former vote, you are not able to tell us that you are going to keep it away from the half-breeds in the North-west who have received scrip, you are not even able to tell us whether this plan precludes these men from coming down and settling in those places and getting lands in addition to the scrip they hold in their pockets. I think the Minister should be able to give the committee

some assurance on these points. This committee is not ungenerous with regard to the half-breeds of the North-west. If anybody has a claim upon us, it is the Indians of the North-west; if anybody has a claim upon our respect and confidence it is Father Lacombe, who, for many years, has been tried and trusted by all political parties and by men of all shades of religious belief in this country. But the Minister must not presume upon these things and ask us to give him a vote of \$2,000 without giving us a scrap of information.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman cannot show one case, of all the many instances in which moneys have been voted in this way, in which a detailed schedule of the particular cases and the amount to be paid to each one, was ever given. Moneys were voted in large sums for the purpose of supplying seed grain in the North-west Territories. Did the Minister bring down a schedule of the settlers that were going to get help? Nothing of the kind. The Minister received a general report, he was satisfied from the reports he received that there was a necessity for this assistance, and it was put in the hands of reliable men to distribute, exactly as we are doing in this case.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this to be repaid? The Minister has not said a word about that. But the seed grain given on the former occasion was to be repaid.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman never saw a detailed statement of the cases in which relief was going to be given laid upon the Table before.

Mr. FOSTER. In the case of seed grain it was put in the hands of responsible officers, and the House was well satisfied that proper securities were taken. It was not a gift, but it was an advance to be repaid, and I believe nearly the whole of it has been repaid. So with regard to the schools. We adopted a plan by which to educate the Indian children, we give so much per year, and this policy goes on from year to year. But the present case is entirely different. I complain that my hon. friend, without saying that this thing is going to stop this year, has given us no information at all. I would like to know whether he considers it right that the half-breeds of the North-west, who have got within three months time \$250 in scrip from the commission there, no matter whether they have kept it or not, are to come down and take a portion of these lands and get a portion of this relief as well. Are they to be outside of this arrangement or inside? Does the hon. Minister know?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Chairman, I must confess that I am a little surprised at the attitude which is taken by the Opposition upon this vote. They

know that we are simply following the very policy which they inaugurated themselves in 1895. The Government are not inaugurating this policy. At that time the Opposition, so far as I can remember, did not attack or criticise this vote. The Government of that day put it upon the ground which then appealed to every hon. member, and which, I hope, will now appeal to every hon. member. Father Lacombe has been the apostle of the half-breeds for fifty years. He has given his life to them, and he has come to the conclusion, and he has represented to me, as I am satisfied he has represented to the hon. leader of the Opposition, and as he represented to me more than once when I was in Opposition, that he wanted to make an attempt to organize that colony, which he calls the colony of St. Paul des Métis, and to bring as great a number as he could of half-breeds to take up their abodes in these townships and to make farmers of them, to get them to go into agricultural pursuits and follow a pastoral life. Father Lacombe is a man who knows all about these matters, because he has given his whole life to the work he has undertaken. The attempt has succeeded more or less. It has succeeded to some extent, although I do not think it has been absolutely successful. But there has been enough of success not to discourage the attempt. I do not say that we should give a vote for this purpose every year; but when, four years after the first attempt Father Lacombe again came to the Government and asked for a similar grant to go on with the work, we gave it to him, relying on his honour and his well-known character to apply it to the purposes for which it was intended. We now give it to him, having faith in his honour and in his character, and well believing that the money will be applied to the purposes for which it is intended. The hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster), asks as to whether this vote will be used to pay money to those half-breeds who have received scrip recently. I confess that this ought not to occur, and I think the hon. gentleman can rely upon Father Lacombe's honour and high character to see that the money will not be expended except in the way it is intended for the assistance of these half-breeds. I am quite aware that this is something in the nature of an experiment. Something has been done already in this direction, but Parliament surely ought not to be parsimonious in this matter. We cannot treat the half-breeds as white men, neither as Indians, but we must treat them as occupying an intermediate position. We do not treat them as Indians, because they do not acknowledge the tribal system; but they are entitled to some assistance, and the object of the vote is to endeavour to induce them to do some labour, to become farmers, and to follow an agricultural life. I must admit that I was

**Sir WILFRID LAURIER.**

surprised a moment ago, when the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) asked if these people were voters. I think he is altogether out of place, when he makes such an insinuation as that. There is no reason for it, because the money is placed in the hands of a man who is out of party politics, who has no party politics, and for this reason the vote is one that deserves the favourable attention of the committee.

**Mr. LaRIVIERE.** Mr. Chairman, I sincerely regret that there should be any opposition offered to this vote. We are voting large sums of money for objects that do not promise such good results as this vote of \$2,000. As has been very properly said by the right hon. Prime Minister, this is an experiment which is being made on behalf of the poorer class of half-breeds in the North-west Territories. These men are in such a position that, unless the Government came to their assistance, they would be paupers, wandering about the country, being a charge on the local municipalities, while the object of this movement which is now going on, is to assist them to become valuable citizens. Of course it is not possible, within the very short time that this colony has been in existence, to achieve, perhaps, as much as was anticipated; but unless the Government come to the rescue of Father Lacombe in the project he has been carrying out, and assists the enterprise, it will never achieve anything. I am satisfied that the assistance that has been given has been judiciously employed, that whatever further assistance will be needed in future will be given, and that we will feel satisfied that we have done something for the poorer class of half-breeds in the territories, who deserve our consideration.

**Mr. BERGERON.** The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has mentioned my name, and that is the only reason why I am on my feet now. A few moments ago I asked a question which the right hon. gentleman seems to take in a bad way. I was looking at the vote, but the explanation which the right hon. gentleman now gives must modify my view in the matter. The vote is:

Payment to the trustees of the colony of St. Paul des Métis, to enable them to supply seed grain and farm implements to settlers in distress within the colony.. \$2,000

We expected further explanations than had been given by the hon. Minister. The right hon. gentleman gives an explanation which changes my view of the case a little. The right hon. gentleman says that the money will be entrusted to the hands of a man in whom we have every possible confidence. I accept that statement; I have known Father Lacombe himself, and by reputation, and I have no doubt the money will be spent in a judicious way. But the right hon. gentleman will admit that we are not here to give

charity right and left, so that, as far as the principle of the vote goes, I do not change what I said a moment ago. I may say that, like him, I have every possible confidence in Father Lacombe, in whose hands this money is to be put. I have the very same confidence that I had in him before, but the right hon. gentleman cannot say the same thing, because, some three years ago, when Father Lacombe wrote to him on the school question, he had not the confidence in the judgment of Father Lacombe that he seems to have now.

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to say to my right hon. friend, when he seems to think we are hard to move in reference to this matter, that I think he was scarcely quite fair in the observations he offered a few minutes ago, although I am quite sure he did not intend to be unfair. What we ask for is information in regard to this experiment. A vote was taken in 1895 for this work, and surely it is reasonable to expect that we should know something of what the result of the experiment has been. I confess that when my right hon. friend pointed to the labours of Father Lacombe in connection with this matter, and referred to the absolute trustworthiness of Father Lacombe himself, that it had a very strong effect on my mind. Still, I must say that the House has a right to know the result of this experiment commenced four years ago. We know that Father Lacombe is most anxious to do what he can to assist these people, but it is one thing to vote money in order to carry out an experiment which may be useful, and it is another thing to vote money, as stated by the Minister of the Interior, for pure charity. We are entitled to be informed whether these half-breeds who go there and receive the benefit of this grant, and we are also entitled to know whether any half-breeds who have received scrip, also receive aid from this appropriation.

The PRIME MINISTER. Though I had several conversations with Father Lacombe on this matter, I have never gathered that the half-breeds who received scrip would receive a share in this grant also. My answer to the statements of hon. gentlemen is that we can rely on Father Lacombe that he would give these seed grants to those who are needy and not to those who are in affluent circumstances. It is our misfortune to be called upon occasionally to give seed grain, on the plea that certain people happen to be in needy circumstances, and it goes without saying that such grants should only be given to those who are in want. Father Lacombe may be relied upon to give this grant only to those poor fellows who have been persuaded to give up hunting, and to try if they cannot make a livelihood by farming. I repeat frankly that no instructions have been given on this point. It would never enter into the minds of any-

one I am sure that Father Lacombe was so wanting in business ability, indeed I would say so wanting in charity, as to give this grant to persons who do not need it. I suppose if there is a report in the department the Minister will bring it down. As I have said, I have had several conversations with Father Lacombe on this matter, and his opinion is that the experiment has been only partly successful. I would not say that it is altogether successful, and I think Father Lacombe's reports will be found to run in that direction.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not object to vote money for charitable purposes when that becomes necessary. But I do object to vote public money until we know what has been the result of similar expenditures in the past. The Minister (Mr. Sifton) said this grant was equivalent to a grant for industrial schools, and he knows that every year we have a detailed report of all that is being done in these industrial schools. Now, we only want the same information in regard to this expenditure, it being an analogous vote as the Minister says. The Minister says we voted this a few years ago without having the information, but he must remember that was at the very beginning of the enterprise when there was no possibility of getting any information. The experiment has now been carried on for some years, and we ought to know whether it has been successful or otherwise. How much seed grain has been raised by them, how many of them are becoming self-supporting, are they taking to civilized life and learning to cultivate the soil: these are all things we ought know about after experimenting for five years.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is only the second vote that has been taken.

The PRIME MINISTER. There was a vote taken in 1895, and none has been asked for since until now.

Mr. SPROULE. That would somewhat alter the case, but nevertheless we should have the information.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I said I had a report in the department, and if the hon. gentleman asked me for that report, he would get it.

Mr. SPROULE. We have been asking for that for the last hour.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. You have not asked for it yet.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister is derelict in his duty in not bringing down that report.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot carry the whole department over here.

Mr. SPROULE. When we ask for information in this House the Minister has no business to treat the matter with levity and

to talk about carrying the whole department over here. That is not becoming in him or any other Minister of the Crown. As representatives of the people we would fail in our duty if we did not get the information before voting this money, and the Minister is very much mistaken if he thinks he can put us off in that jaunty manner. The hon. gentleman can sit there and laugh in derision by the hour, but if he thinks that all the information in the world is boxed up in that cranium of his, and that we are bound to take everything on trust because he is at the head of the department. I can tell him that the country has not that unbounded confidence, either in his integrity, his ability or his frugality, that would lead them to be satisfied with his ipse dixit. We want more than that, and if he does not give it, he cannot expect us to vote the money.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** What I desire to point out is simply this. I stated that I had the report, and that I would bring it down if it were asked for; but the hon. gentleman did not say he wanted it.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I did not hear the hon. gentleman say that, or I would certainly have asked for it.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I perfectly recognize that it is the duty of a Minister to furnish all the information he can possibly furnish in any shape or form; but no matter how much information he brings, there will be some things that he cannot foresee, which will be asked for, and about which it will be necessary for him to send and get information from the department; and any information which I have in the department I am willing to obtain and furnish to the committee to the very best of my ability. The only information I have not furnished is that report. I stated in a general way what it contained. If the hon. gentleman had asked for it, I would have sent to the department for it, and would have it here by this time; but it would not give the committee any more information than I have given. I have not got a detailed statement of what the trustees propose to do with the money. I stated that when I was asked. I have a general statement of the necessities of the colony, and I am asking the committee to vote the money to be advanced to the colony, leaving the trustees to exercise their discretion in regard to its disposal.

**Mr. WALLACE.** I have observed specimens of the most colossal—cheek, I was going to say, if it is not improper; but I say this, that when a Minister gets up and tells us, on every item that comes along, as the Minister of the Interior is doing to-day, and as other Ministers have set the example of doing before him, that if he had known, if he had had the slightest inkling

**Mr. SPROULE.**

or knowledge that we wanted any information, he could have furnished us with the information, but that it is sprung upon him as a matter of the greatest surprise that he would be asked for any information about any item of expenditure. I assume that when a Minister comes and asks for a vote of money, he comes loaded up with information on which he can justify to the House and the House to the country, the appropriation that is made. The Minister of the Interior says he has furnished all the information. He has furnished absolutely none. His statement was that the settlement there was fairly successful. That is the whole extent of the information he has been able to give to this House. Anybody could make that statement; it does not mean anything. We must assume that there has not been very great success or they would not require to come back here for another grant. The Minister tells us, too, that we are estopped from making any objections because in 1895 we did not object. The hon. gentleman was not here in 1895, and does not know what occurred then. But if we failed in our duty in 1895—I am not stating that we did—is that going to prevent us seeking information to-day or requiring the Minister to justify himself in asking for this money? In 1895 this was stated to be an experiment; it was to be a new departure with reference to the half-breeds. After that money was appropriated, inspectors were appointed to supervise its expenditure, and after all the safeguards have been taken, and they come back here and ask for another grant for a similar purpose, they are in duty bound to tell the House what they did with the last money, what measure of success they had, how many people have gone in there, and all other particulars. The Minister comes and says: "I have the report, but I left it at the department; I did not think it worth while to submit it to this House." We want that report here. The Minister thinks the House of Commons is of too little importance to bother himself furnishing any information to except what information may be dragged out of him piecemeal, which is very little, because either he has no information on the subject or he is afraid to communicate that information to the House. He tells this House that he cannot carry all the information around with him. I know that his capacity for carrying information around with him is quite limited; but, Sir, we can fairly ask him to furnish us with the documents, and we will load ourselves up with the information; but he has not done that. He is struck dumb with surprise that he should be asked to do that. Then he tells us, "You cannot show a case in which a detailed statement is made of money expended under similar conditions." To commence with, there is no money expended under similar conditions. He said there was money voted for seed grain. As has been

pointed out on this side of the House, that money was loaned, and security was taken for it; the Government inspectors distributed it; and the money has been very largely returned. It is not, therefore, a parallel case at all, and the Minister, when he is caught in a vain attempt to justify a vote of which he has either no information or is afraid to give the information to the House, attempts the old scheme of bluffing it off. We need hardly tell the Minister that that scheme will not work to-day, but that he will have to give the information to this House; and, more than that, he will have to treat the members of the House of Commons on this side with a little respect. I have listened during the last hour or so, and all the answer the Minister would deign to give was a sneer and a laugh when proper information was demanded and proper criticism was given by an hon. member of this House. I can tell the hon. Minister that if he desires to get his Estimates through, he will have to give us the information we are entitled to and that courtesy which is due every member of this House.

**Mr. DAVIS.** My hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) has made a motion to strike out this item from the Estimates. I know something of the work that Father Lacombe has been doing, and can assure hon. members that he is doing excellent work in the North-west Territories.

**Mr. WALLACE.** The hon. Minister has told us, in general terms, the ranges and the townships where this settlement is, can the hon. member tell us how far from Edmonton it is and in what direction, and so on?

**Mr. DAVIS.** If the hon. gentleman will ask my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), in whose riding it is, he will get the information he desires.

**Mr. WALLACE.** I understood the hon. gentleman was about to give us the information which the Minister was unable to give.

**Mr. DAVIS.** I know the locality, but not the township and the range.

**Mr. WALLACE.** We want a little information about the locality. Where is it from Edmonton?

**Mr. DAVIS.** I am speaking to the motion, and, as I understand it, the hon. member for North Victoria has made a motion to strike \$2,000 out of the Estimates, which are there for the purpose of assisting this colony established by Father Lacombe. Father Lacombe is doing first-class work, and there is no sum of money which the House could vote to a better purpose. As a matter of fact, it will effect a saving to the people of this country. As is well known, all over the North-west Territories there is a certain number of half-breeds who have no knowledge of agriculture, who never had any, who have been hunters, and these people, when

settlement comes in and their mode of livelihood—freighting and the hunt—is taken away, fall into very straitened circumstances. As a general rule, they establish themselves around the different police posts all through the North-west Territories, and have not been able to support themselves, and the North-west Mounted Police have been in the habit of giving them rations from time to time, and helping them along. Father Lacombe then came forward with this scheme, by which he proposes to take hold of these people and establish them on a colony, where they will be taught agriculture and how to earn a livelihood for themselves. Surely, in such a good work, it is not too much to ask that we should get a little assistance from the Government. Of course, this money is not going to be paid back the same as seed grain given to other people in the North-west. That cannot be expected, but these people are citizens and have to be looked after, and Father Lacombe has undertaken to establish them in a reserve and is doing good work. This man has given up his whole life to the half-breeds, he is not making anything out of it, he is certainly doing good work, and I hope the House will not strike out that item.

**Mr. HUGHES.** I do not know what the object was in the hon. member for Saskatchewan getting up. He has not given any information to the House, he does not know where the reservation is or anything about it, and is talking entirely away from the vote. The vote is for seed grain and farm implements to the half-breeds on a reserve.

**Mr. DAVIS.** I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, but will he allow me to set him right. The half-breeds were not on a reserve, but are those who have been hanging around the police posts and have been taken away by Father Lacombe and placed on this colony.

**Mr. HUGHES.** The report from the Minister of the Interior and the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) is that excellent work is being done on this reservation. Why, then, do these people need further assistance? We learn for the first time, from the right hon. First Minister, that Father Lacombe has brought in a report. I asked the hon. Minister of the Interior what information he has as to why seed grain and implements were necessary, if the colony has succeeded so well, and he told me that Senator Dandurand reported to him that these were needed. He never mentioned Father Lacombe.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I did. I said that Father Lacombe called on me and that Senator Dandurand also called on me. It was Father Lacombe's application I referred to particularly.

**Mr. HUGHES.** I stand corrected, but I must say that I listened very attentively,

and the first mention we have had of Father Lacombe's name was from the First Minister.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken.

Mr. HUGHES. I was not aware before that Judge Ouimet or Senator Dandurand or Archbishop Langevin was in the agricultural implements or seed grain business. It is quite beneath the dignity of this House to ask these gentlemen, including Father Lacombe, to buy agricultural implements. What were the circumstances when the vote was given in 1895? There were a number of half-breeds who were in distressed circumstances. I do not know how they got into that condition, but if they were in such a pitiable condition as then described, it speaks very little for their tutelage when they had to hang around Mounted Police posts and get assistance from the Mounted Police. But be that as it may, these men were in that condition in 1895, and it was considered advisable in their interests that they should be taken and placed on these townships, and these were not the worst townships, but among the very best in that magnificent district around Edmonton. These four townships were set apart for these people, and this country voted the money for the object Father Lacombe had in view. We had confidence that he would see these people were brought in and well looked after. The only reports we have had are that these colonies are doing well, but the hon. Minister wants another vote. I ask him why this seed grain was necessary and he cannot tell. He cannot tell but that they may be selling any quantity of grain to the new people going in there, the miners, the Doukhobors and the Galicians, and we are anxious to know about all these matters.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), who spoke some time ago, makes severe demands upon the hon. Minister and all of us on this side. He not only requires most detailed information as to the expenditure of the money that was voted by his own colleagues when in power, and the report of which should have been presented by them before they left office, but he goes further and asks the Minister to tell him, not only how many bushels of grain these half-breeds had and how many hay rakes and wash tubs and so on, but also that we should treat with some little respect the representations of hon. gentlemen on that side. A detailed report of all the particulars of the farm operations of these half-breeds might be obtainable, but to ask that we should treat the representations of hon. gentlemen opposite on this particular question with some little respect is a very severe demand upon us. We all know that this demand for information and details is perfectly hollow. If the details should be given by anybody, they should be given by those who voted the first appropria-

Mr. HUGHES.

tion, and who were in office when the results of the first experiment were ascertained. My hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) was then a semi-attached member of the Cabinet; and he should have insisted then on the information being brought down. It is not information these gentlemen want; they want to keep the House sitting—

Mr. HUGHES. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) is imputing motives to hon. gentlemen in this House. I call for your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CASEY. There is no doubt about the ruling—it is not in order to impute motives. I would say that it would appear that the motive is to keep the House in session.

Mr. HUGHES. I call for your ruling on that expression, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ellis). I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) qualified his remark with the expression "it appears" and, in that form, it is not out of order.

Mr. CASEY. In fact, I do not think the House could be described as sitting at the present time, most of the business is done on the other side—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. When I say "business" I mean that which occupies the time of the House. I think the Opposition are not sitting in a parliamentary sense, they are sitting in the same sense as an old hen that has an insane desire to produce offspring from some odd pieces of crockeryware. They are setting, Mr. Chairman; they are clucking—"clocking," as the farmers' wives say; and I do not think they can be brought to their senses except by being treated as these subjects are generally treated—put in a covered barrel in the woodshed and occasionally sprinkled with a little cold water. If time is to be taken up with this vote, let us say a word or two about it. I do not think that gentlemen on the other side are wise in precipitating a discussion on the treatment of half-breeds. Their own treatment of them was not so very satisfactory. They goaded them into a rebellion—

Mr. DAVIS. Two rebellions.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, two rebellions—

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. We are in the last week of the session, and while I do not wish to curtail any person's right to go over the North-west rebellion, if he wishes to do so, I want to say that we on this side—

Mr. CASEY. That is not a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FOSTER. I am speaking in the interest of expediting business—

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman rose to state a point of order, but he has not stated it.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well, go ahead; you will find that it will not do you much good.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman rose to a point of order, but he did not state any point of order. He objected to any reference to the North-west rebellion. It is apparent that the House will sit as long as it is going to sit, and there is no reason why we on this side should not do a little of the talking. Their treatment of the half-breeds was a scandal and a disgrace and a disaster to the country. They had better let us have the management of them for a while. As to this vote, it seems abundantly clear that Father Lacombe is a man who understands the half-breeds, a man who can help them and do them good. He is not a political favourite of the Government—that was clearly brought out by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). If the Government are giving money, it is for the half-breeds and not for any special partiality they have for Father Lacombe. That the money will be well spent is admitted by all who know him. It only remains to be objected, then, that we have not had a detailed account of how every dollar of any previous vote was spent. That is simply absurd, and hon. gentlemen opposite know it. If they want to keep the House sitting, they might as well do it on a question on which there was room for reasonable discussion, and not on a matter of this kind. The fact I wish to emphasize is that hon. gentlemen opposite have always made a hash of their management of the half-breeds, and they are showing now by their opposition to this item that they do not want anything done to civilize or improve these half-breeds today. They did not civilize them themselves, and they object to our doing it. I hope those who are interested in the half-breeds will take note of the action of these hon. gentlemen.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not rise to continue the discussion, but simply to call the right hon. First Minister's attention to the fact that he is not acting fairly in endeavouring to make a point against my hon. friend from Beauharnois when he charges him practically with taking an improper view of the state of things there by reference to people having votes. The right hon. gentleman has evidently forgotten that persons in a similar position in Ontario as to accepting charity are in precisely the same position respecting their votes. Or he is, perhaps, not aware that under the franchise of the province of Ontario, which we have now adopted, a person receiving aid or charity in that province is not entitled to vote. As to the other questions, I do not want to say more than this. This House has never in the past, and I hope will not in the future, insist upon precedents for cases of this kind. No doubt, Father Lacombe is doing good work in the North-west. The Minister of the Interior, in my opinion, put himself in a false position when he commenced to

search for similar cases. He could not find them, and the discussion arose. It is quite within the right of any hon. gentleman to ask if persons receiving scrip are receiving this help, and also whether persons are receiving help year after year. This House has a right to definite information, and the hon. gentlemen who ask for it are quite within their rights. They are more entitled to it in view of the importance of the work and of the trustworthy hands in which we know this money is to be placed.

The PRIME MINISTER. So far as the Government is concerned and so far as I am concerned, there is no intention to make this an annual vote. It is an exceptional case, and ought to be treated as exceptional. It ought to be treated so even if it should come up again, which I hope it will not.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of the Interior said he told us that he had a report in his department. I did not hear him say it in the first place. But it does seem to me that if he expected to have this money voted, this is where he should have the report. The report might be in his department for ever, without the information it contains coming to the House. My desire was to get some information about it, because I did not feel like voting against this item; it may be used for the best purposes in the world. I would be disposed to support it, if we had that information which would justify us in voting for it. I do not think it would be asking too much from the Minister to allow this to remain until the evening session, and bring the report with him.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I want particularly to repudiate the statement that I have in any way, directly or indirectly, refused to give information. I have given all the information I had. As I said to my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), when he was speaking in the first place, I told him, if he wanted that report, I would send and get it, but he did not say he wanted it. As to the other matters, I gave all the information I possibly could. Now, the information was such that any member of the committee, if he was not satisfied with it, could have refused to vote for the grant, and could have condemned my proposition. But no member of the committee is justified in opposing this item on the ground that I have refused to give any information that I possess, for I have not.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. Minister distinctly stated that he had a report on the success of the colony, and that the report was favourable.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. And I said I would bring it down, if asked for.

Mr. HUGHES. Then I asked the Minister if he had a report upon which he based his action in asking for this grant, and I understood that he had no such report.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I know a little about these people, as I have been there. I do not think we have been over-lavish to the first settlers of that country so far. There is a method by which conquerors wipe out the original inhabitants, by sword, or by pestilence coming after the sword of the invaders, and by other methods, for instance, by fire-water. But so far as the half-breeds are concerned, when they are in charge of reputable persons, like Father Lacombe and others, I think we ought, in their interest, as well as our own, to leave the matter with them. We own the soil, and we are getting advantages of our pioneer work. If we are going to discriminate nicely about every dollar and where it goes, this is not the place for it. They ask for money, and they ought to get it, and I think we can trust these people to use it wisely. Now, have we ever had detailed accounts for all the money we have spent here. Until this late day we have not called for detailed accounts, and is it fair now for the first time to do so? I can understand hon. gentlemen asking: When will this cease? When will these people be self-supporting? But it is too late to come down now for the first time and ask for a tabulated statement of how every dollar was spent. I have no doubt the vote will be judiciously employed. But back of all that, we can afford to deal with the Indians and half-breeds of that country in a different way from the way we deal with any other people in Canada. They used to own the country, and we owe them justice, and the result has shown that when they are well treated, they do not raise any disturbance. I am confident that under Father Lacombe and others every dollar will be well spent, and better spent than many thousands that are spent in the older provinces.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. SPROULE. I see the Minister has received some papers. Is that the report? If so, he might give us a little further information.

Mr. HUGHES. While the Minister is getting his report ready, perhaps the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) would enlighten us in connection with this matter.

The PRIME MINISTER. The item is passed.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no desire to speak on this subject, but if any hon. gentleman wants to know what I know, I am willing to tell him. I did not take part in the debate, because it seemed to me that the less any member knew of the subject, the more anxious he was to speak about it. The vote relates to a missionary enterprise that is in the district that I represent. I am acquainted with the locality, I am also acquainted with the missionary who has the enterprise in charge, and I know something of the peo-

Mr. HUGHES.

ple who are affected thereby, having practically lived amongst them for twenty years. Speaking of the subject in a general way, I would say that this is an effort on the part of Rev. Father Lacombe to do something in the interest of certain half-breeds of the North-west. It is not applicable to all the half-breeds, it is not a question concerning the half-breeds generally, but it is an effort on his part to do something towards improving the condition of certain of the half-breeds in the North-west. The half-breeds at one time were a very well-off people. With the destruction of the buffalo and the advance of civilization, men who were worth \$5,000, or \$15,000, or \$20,000 twenty-five years ago, were reduced to poverty; and, like any other people, when reduced from comparative affluence to poverty, as their condition of life changed their habits of life changed. Unfortunately, some of them sank, as I may say, in the scale of life to a very low point—not all of them, but some of them. It was, then, for the purpose of doing something on behalf of those half-breeds who were not able to bear up under new and adverse circumstances, that Father Lacombe instigated his scheme. Now, for my part, I will say that, having discussed the matter with Father Lacombe, when he began his scheme, I could not see the same prospects of success that he saw. However, that has nothing, or very little to do, with the present question before the committee. The House or the Government, in their wisdom, saw fit to take up the proposition of Father Lacombe. They made certain arrangements with him whereby he was granted four townships, and four very good townships, about 160 miles north-east of Edmonton. The Government, with the consent of the House, made this grant to him on certain specific conditions. I think they also gave certain assistance, and on the strength of that grant of assistance, the Roman Catholic Church, or a certain section of it, went in, expended money, built buildings and induced half-breeds to go there and settle. The parties whom it was intended to benefit were the parties who had absolutely nothing. The purpose was to benefit the most needy. If you are to benefit a man who has nothing, you have to provide something with which to benefit him, and I think Father Lacombe was rather over-sanguine as to his ability to secure funds with which to benefit these people. I presume and understand the position to be that the money he secured by private or public subscription, and received in aid of one kind or another, he expended in giving so many families a start on this reserve. But this was only a very small number of the half-breeds of the Territories who would naturally require that assistance, and I suppose he comes now and asks for a further sum to bring in families, who require just as much assistance as those who went in. The Government having assisted a large

number of half-breed parties, and been to some extent the cause of the church and many private citizens putting money into the scheme, I would feel it too serious a responsibility to take upon myself to vote against this additional grant being made, in hope of carrying on the scheme to a successful conclusion. The Government has committed itself to the scheme, and has been the cause of an expenditure of money by other parties. While the Government is not bound to put in any more money, it seems to me only fair that when only a small amount is asked it should be contributed in order that the scheme shall have a fair chance of success; and if it fails the responsibility will not rest upon this House.

**Mr. HUGHES.** The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver), who comes from that part of the country, and should know all about the question, admits that he does not know anything about it, because the whole of his remarks were prefaced with "I suppose." "I presume," &c. He says that this amount of money is to take new immigrants in there. The hon. Minister of the Interior says it is for seed grain. I would like to know who is correct.

**Mr. OLIVER.** May I be allowed to answer the question? The missionary desires to bring in new half-breed settlers who are destitute. This is the purpose for which the grant was made in the first place. This seed grain is being provided for these destitute settlers. There is no use in bringing a man on the reserve unless he can be provided with seed grain. It is not for settlers who are destitute on the reserve; it is for destitute half-breeds whom they desire to provide for when they go on the reserve.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I understand that the hon. Minister has the report, which I would like to have read.

**Mr. OLIVER.** My information as to the crops on the reserve last year is that they were good, and that the settlers were doing quite satisfactorily according to their means.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The report which I have been requested to get and to read is from Mr. A. A. Ruttan, Dominion land agent, who was accompanied to the colony of Mr. Coleman. It is as follows:—

Department of the Interior,  
 Dominion Lands Office,  
 Edmonton, 19th January, 1899.

The Secretary, Department of the Interior,  
 Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—Referring to your letter of the 19th October last (Ref. 360530), I beg to report that I left Edmonton on the afternoon of the 31st ult., with Mr. Coleman, and arrived at the Lacombe colony, St. Paul des Métis, on the evening of Tuesday, the 3rd inst.

The Lacombe colony comprises townships 57 and 58, ranges 9 and 10, west 4th meridian. It

was established by an Order in Council dated the 28th December, 1895. A schedule is appended hereto, giving the names of the reads of families, acres under cultivation and number of cattle. The whole population of the colony is at present about 270. It is situated in a rolling open prairie country, immediately east of and adjoining the Saddle Lake Indian reservation. Its chief water supply is afforded by Manawan Lake, a large irregularly-shaped body of water lying to the south of the centre of the colony. The lake is about ten miles, or more, in total length, and occupies an area of probably nine square miles. It is of a fair depth, good water, and contains an abundance of pike of good size and quality. There are about ten to twelve square miles of timbered lands extending to the shores of the lake, and, on the south side, much of the timber being spruce of a size suitable for building-logs and lumber. It should, if carefully conserved, supply also a sufficiency of fuel and fencing for all time to come, to meet the needs of the colony. Coal has not been as yet discovered in the colony. The soil is a vegetable loam of varying depth, upon a clay subsoil, and is of uniform excellent quality. Much of the 363 acres now under cultivation was made ready only during 1898, and the product of the land which was in crop last year (1898) is roughly estimated at 3,000 bushels of wheat, 400 bushels barley and 500 bushels oats. The wheat grown is principally Red Fyfe and Ladoga, the latter being superior in yield and quality as well as in earlier maturity. Potatoes and all other garden vegetables yielded a good crop of fair quality. Owing to the meagre outfit of agricultural implements, the area of crop in 1898 is much less than it might have been if the settlers had been fully equipped. There are at the present time only eight or ten ploughs, one or two sets of disc harrows available for operations in 1899.

The improvements made by the Roman Catholic Mission since the colony was first established are the following:—

A mission-house, 40 x 30, frame, 2½ stories, shingled roof, foundation of blocks of stone, supports, cellar about 20 feet square. It is a well and substantially built house, and serves at present as a residence for Rev. Father Thérien, priest in charge of the colony, and five or six lay brothers, who are employed in various capacities in the work of the colony, as carpenters, school teachers, blacksmith, machinists, &c., &c. The actual expenditure on material for this building is \$800. This does not include labour.

The building as it stands is worth not less than .....	\$1,500
Stable, 22 x 26, hewed logs, thatch roof, well finished inside .....	200
School-house, logs, thatch roof.....	100
Unfinished saw and grist-mill, with material on ground for completion.....	800
Engine for threshing-machine (to be used for saw and grist-milling) with thresher.	1,250
Engine, for saw-mill, saws, belts, &c.....	400
Grist-mill apparatus (capacity for gristing being about 100 bushels of wheat per diem .....	360
Smut machine .....	200
50,000 ft., B.M., of saw-logs now at mill...	300
	<hr/>
	\$5,110

The whole mission establishment seems to be on a business-like basis and well conducted. In addition to the expenditure above outlined, the mission has purchased and now holds, for the use of the colonists, the following implements:—

	Cost.
6 Ploughs .....	\$150
1 Disc harrow.....	34
2 Common harrows.....	28
1 Binder .....	150
1 Mower .....	80
	\$442

Adding to the above several items of outlay the cost of maintenance of the mission during the past three years, the whole of the expenditure must have exceeded the sum of \$8,000.

#### School.

There are about 65 children of school age in the colony, but the average attendance at the day-school does not appear to have exceeded 15. The reason of so large a percentage of absentees is said to be the impossibility of persuading the parents of the necessity of regular and continuous attendance, and in large measure the poverty of the families and the lack of clothing for the young people.

#### Deserters.

Only two families have as yet left the colony, and their desertion was said to be due to the fact that Father Thérien was unable to undertake, with the resources at his command, to promise to support the people.

#### Food Supply.

Pending the organization of the half-breed colonists into an industrial community, they are able to supplement the products of agriculture by hunting and by resorting to the whitefish lakes of the north. A road is now being opened to Island Lake, 30 miles to the north, which is a first-rate fishing lake, and will be easy of access when the new trail is established.

#### Church.

The intention is to erect a separate church so soon as the colony's resources permit. At present, services are held in the second storey of the mission building.

#### Store.

A store is conducted by Robert Logan, of Beaver Lake. It contains the usual stock of groceries and clothing, but all of these things are sold at prices largely in advance of cost much exceeding the usual profit allowance. So soon as the colony is industrially in a more advanced condition, it will be comparatively easy and safe to establish a co-operative store, supplies being obtained wholesale from Montreal or Winnipeg, and retailed at a profit advance sufficient only to pay expenses.

#### Grist Mill.

It is the intention to have the grist-mill completed and running next season. At present, the colonists have to transport their wheat to the mill at White Fish Lake, 40 miles distant, and to then suffer the inconvenience and delay attendant upon the tedious process of getting their flour from a mill, the maximum capacity of which is 500 lbs. flour per diem.

When the flour consumed in the colony is gristed on the spot an indirect benefit will also be realized in the use of the bran and shorts (mill offal) in feeding to stock.

#### Domestic Water Supply.

Water is believed to be available from wells of a depth not exceeding 25 feet in all parts of the colony reserve.

Mr. SIFTON.

#### The Colonists' Opinion of the Situation.

I was invited to meet the members of the colony, who congregated, to the number of 18, in the mission building in the afternoon of the 4th. All spoke in Cree, Mr. Broudreau acting as interpreter. Several of them spoke at some length, the substance of their statements is that they are satisfied with the colony and with their prospects for the future if they can get implements enough for the farming operations of 1899, and if a boarding-school for their children can be established and maintained in the colony. They expressed dissatisfaction with the day-school, which, they say, does not answer the purpose. They cannot at present clothe their children and send them to school regularly in either summer or winter. They were all agreed that the boarding-school is essential to their well-being. I am inclined to agree with them, and of the opinion that it cannot be too soon established. The first immediate need of the colony is, however, an adequate supply of farming machinery. This ought to be arranged for immediately by the mission authorities, and delivered in the colony by the 1st April.

There is no reason why the colony should not be an industrial success if properly equipped and managed. They can sell the beef that it is possible to raise to buyers from Edmonton, and a large quantity of bacon and flour could be distributed advantageously from this colony to the Indian agencies.

Father Thérien informs me that his colonists have on two occasions made application for the opening of a post office, one, I believe, addressed to Mr. Oliver, M.P., the other to the Postmaster General, without result. They have asked that the post office be named "St. Paul des Métis." If there is any objection to this on account of its length or otherwise, the name "Thérien" would be acceptable and suitable, and complimentary to the reverend gentleman who is working so ably and energetically in an enterprise of great public utility.

If the Roman Catholic authorities would undertake to run a boarding-school on the plan of the very efficient one which is now conducted on the Saddle Lake Indian reserve, it would be an excellent thing for the colony.

The half-breeds who are unable to make a comfortable living outside will then become permanent settlers within the colony. In ten or fifteen years' time the boarding-school will have done its civilizing work, and the whole half-breed community will be infinitely better able than at present to support themselves in pretty much the same social condition as the rest of us. They are now a weakness to Canada by reason of their ignorance and consequent helplessness; they will, however, when suitably educated, be a strength in the national life. The Roman Catholic organization is peculiarly well-fitted to undertake educative work of this nature.

The Gray Nuns, the fathers and the lay brothers possess the requisite experience and aptitude for the special works in which they may severally engage. Their best services are given voluntarily, without pecuniary reward, and simply as a religious duty. They are, perhaps, the more enthusiastic and sincere on this account. Whatever means may be employed, the education of these half-breed colonists should be undertaken as soon as possible. It should be entirely free of cost to the colonies for at least the first five or ten years. If agricultural implements can be provided immediately and an assurance given that a boarding-school will be established in the present year or in 1900, the poorer

half-breeds who still remain outside of the colony will be induced to take up residence therein. It is obvious, however, that as matters stand at present, the half-breeds who are without means and in whose interests, primarily, the colony was established, are the least able to avail themselves of it. They might enter it fearlessly if their young children could be placed in a boarding-school, leaving the parents free to hunt and fish for the subsistence which the colony farm cannot be made to yield in the first year or two. I do not think they will enter unless on this condition. Many of these people should never have been enfranchised. It is evident that we cannot afford to leave them in their present state of helplessness, and that every year's delay increases the difficulty and cost of final reclamation.

The lands in the colony are sufficient in extent—on the plan of 80-acre farms—to accommodate about 1,000 families. As the colonists develop industrial habits, and as their means and desires expand, they will forsake the colony for a wider and freer field.

These people are much more unfortunate than the Indians; they were too ignorant to realize the meaning of enfranchisement, and it is, perhaps, doubtful whether Canada really got rid of its obligations to these former wards by allowing them to withdraw from treaty (whose obligations and privileges they did not understand) to a freedom of the perils of which they were certainly most sublimely ignorant.

It is not pleasant to make these comments on the situation, but the conditions which suggest them will have to be faced sooner or later, and it is, therefore, my duty to make such a plain statement as the facts appear to compel.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) A. A. RUTTAN,  
A.D.L.

Mr. SPROULE. That contains a good deal of information.

Mr. HUGHES. We are very glad to get that information. Will the Minister tell me now who owns the land?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Government own the land.

Mr. SPROULE. It is leased to them.

#### Dominion Lands—Capital—

Examination of survey returns, printing plans, &c..... \$50,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where will these surveys be made?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is for a number of surveys. There is to be a survey of the Doukhobor reserve at Thunder Hill in Assinibola and Saskatchewan, consisting of six townships, and a survey of the Doukhobor reserve at Kamasck, consisting of about seven townships. Then an expedition has been sent out to fix a number of points of the parallel of sixty degrees of north latitude, which forms the boundary between British Columbia and the Yukon Territory. It is proposed to commence with the portion of the boundary between Teslin Lake and the Dalton Trail. A survey will be made of township 1, range 12, east of the principal meridian; subdivision of townships 33 and 34, ranges 19, 20

and 21, west of the principal meridian, on the east shore of Lake Winnipegosis; subdivision of the eastern halves of townships 33, 34 and 35, the southern half of township 35, range 25, and the north-western portion of township 34, range 17, all west of the principal meridian, between Lake Dauphin and Swan River; subdivision surveys in the Lake Dauphin district; subdivision of the southern half of township 37, range 25, and of townships 37 and 38, ranges 26 and 37, on Swan and Woody rivers; survey of township outlines east of Porcupine Mountain, between the Swan and Red Deer rivers; survey of the second meridian from the tenth base line to the Saskatchewan River; surveys in the Swan River district, to be made during the winter in places where summer work is impracticable or too expensive on account of swamps, timber, &c.; subdivision surveys in southern Alberta, in response to urgent applications for the subdivision of thirteen townships on the Milk River, eight townships between the Milk River ridge and Belly River, two townships near the Mormon colony on Lee's Creek, some township outline surveys up the Crow's Nest Pass, and numerous small surveys to accommodate settlers in remote localities; surveys in the Edmonton district, consisting of subdivision of township 45, range 22, township 48, range 22, township 49, ranges 22 and 23, township 46, range 26, and township 47, ranges 26, 27 and 28; survey of the town site of Field, B.C.; surveys in the British Columbia Railway valley, as much as possible, of lands in actual occupation by settlers, scattered from Burrard Inlet to Golden; \$10,000 for irrigation surveys under arrangement with the North-west Government; \$21,000 for Yukon surveys; and \$23,000 for temporary employees at the head office, including draughtsmen, photographers, lithographers and printers.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the surveys in the Yukon surveys of mining claims?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not altogether. The surveyors are surveying a town site, and land for which application is made for purchase and a deposit made with the land agent. Of course, we cannot have the same kind of subdivision there that we have in a prairie country. The Yukon River and one or two other rivers are surveyed, and the surveys of the land are tied on to the rivers.

Mr. FOSTER. When a mining claim is staked and it has to be surveyed, who surveys it?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. All the surveying of mining claims done there yet has been done by our surveyors. I fancy that three-fourths of the difficulties about registering claims has been due to the fact that the claims were not surveyed, and the surveying has been done by our

surveyors to enable the Gold Commissioner's office to get its business straightened up.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that at the Government's expense or at the prospector's expense ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. So far it is at the Government's expense.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that is right. In all other parts of Canada the survey is always at the expense of the prospector or the mining company, and has to be made before the license or the patent is issued.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Government does not recognize any liability whatever to survey a claim, but it has been done because the Gold Commissioner's office could not get on without a survey. The greatest difficulty that has occurred there has been as to whether there has been enough ground on a creek to make the number of claims for which application has been made, and surveyors have been sent out for the purpose of going over the claims and settling that question. The action of the Government in this respect is simply due to force of circumstances. If we waited until the individuals got the claims surveyed, we would never get our records, which are an actual necessity. In view of the fact that we are collecting a very heavy tax from the miners, I think we can afford to survey the claims; but we do not recognize it as an obligation.

Mr. SPROULE. Are these surveyors paid by the day or by the contract ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. All our surveyors are hired by the day—\$5 per day and expenses.

Amount required to build new wharf at Lake Manniwanka, Rocky Mountains Park .....	\$600
---	-------

Mr. FOSTER. What is this wharf for ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is for the purpose of permitting pleasure boats to land. It is in the Banff Park.

To pay for one or more well-boring machines, and operating the same, for use in the North-west Territories.....	\$5,000
---	---------

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Government decided to purchase a machine for the purpose of boring in the North-west Territories, and this is for the purpose of purchasing two more. These machines are sent to a certain settlement where there is difficulty in getting water, and they put down test wells for the purpose of seeing whether water can be got and at what depth. A settler might put down a well 50 or 75 or 100 feet and find no water. If he knew that he would get water further down, he might go on, but not knowing the formation, his money and labour are wasted and he does not go any further. These

Mr. SIFTON.

machines make a test, not for the purpose of an artesian well, but from 100 to 200 feet down, and when water is got, the well is cased up and is used as a public well. This has been a very great boon, indeed.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the municipality or town or settlement contribute anything ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, it is only a test well.

Mr. SPROULE. How many test wells have been sunk ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not that information. The machines were sent to the North-west Government, who operated them, and I am not able to say whether we have a report showing the number of test wells sunk or not.

Mr. DAVIS. One of those machines has been operated in my district, where they put down test wells in several of the outlying districts. They are never operated around a town or settlement close to a town. When they strike water, the settlers dig their own wells. The experiment has been very successful with us. There are portions in my district as elsewhere, where the land is first-class, but the difficulty is in getting water, and if you can assure the people that they can get water, settlement would rapidly develop.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 181) for the relief of Isaac Stephen Gerow Van Wart.—(Mr. Landerkin)—(on division).

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Expenses and salaries connected with the commission appointed to inquire into half-breed claims in the North-west Territories, out of which payment may be made to J. A. Coté, as Half-breed commissioner, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act .....	\$7,000
--	---------

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this item ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When the supplementary Estimates for last year were under consideration, I explained that the commission had been appointed, and gave the membership and the rates of pay. The amount required before 1st July was \$1,000. The amount required under this item is made up as follows :—

Commissioner James Walker, at \$10 per day for 6 months .....	\$1,800
Commissioner J. A. Coté, at \$5 per day, for 6 months .....	900
Two clerks (Messrs. Jos. F. Prudhomme and C. Mair) at \$100 per month each for 6 months .....	1,200
Living, travelling and incidental expenses.	3,100
	<hr/>
	\$7,000

Expenses of relief party and furnishing provisions to distressed people along Liard and Dease rivers..... \$25,000

Mr. FOSTER. We want a full explanation of this ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is an estimated amount, the estimate being based on the best information we could get. Of course, we shall only expend what is necessary. I will explain the circumstances under which this liability was incurred. On the 26th April last a letter was received from the Premier of British Columbia stating that advices had been sent to his Government by the provincial agent at Cassair and the inspector of the Hudson's Bay Company trading posts informing the Government that great suffering, destitution and sickness, caused, in great measure, by exposure and starvation in high latitudes, prevailed in the north-eastern portion of British Columbia amongst a comparatively large number of people who were on their way to the Yukon by way of Edmonton. The inspector of the Hudson Bay Company brought with him alarming accounts from that region. The Premier of British Columbia pointed out that these unfortunate people were in no sense settlers in British Columbia, and therefore, the province could not assume the responsibility of their rescue and maintenance. They were caught by the winter in endeavouring to reach the gold fields of the North-west Territories, and had, no doubt, been disappointed and beaten back by the obstacles to travel in that uninhabited country. The British Columbia Government had already established a small hospital at Glenora, and had been extending aid to as many as it was possible to reach, but the number said to be destitute in the part of the country mentioned called for assistance beyond their means, and should be met by the Federal Government. On the strength of the above report a telegram was sent to Hon. C. A. Semlin, expressing willingness to do anything possible to assist in relieving the distress of the people referred to, and Major Perry, who is an officer of the Mounted Police, stationed at Vancouver, was asked to send a report in regard to the situation. He wired that the Hudson Bay Company's officers at Dease Lake and Liard River were instructed in February to relieve all cases of bona fide destitution. On the 9th of May, Major Perry again wired that the Hudson Bay Company did not know the

quantities of provisions at different points on the Liard River posts available to meet the distress, but at Glenora there was ample; further that the first boat up the Stikine would leave Wrangel on the 20th May, and that there was a pack train at Glenora which could start for Dease Lake about 1st June. Another telegram was received stating that Premier Semlin's telegram was based on a letter from the Government agent at Telegraph Creek, dated the 18th March—that is the provincial government's agent—and received in Victoria on the 18th April reporting that the Hudson Bay Company's manager at Glenora had just returned from a trip to Liard River, and stated that about 400 people were wintering along the Liard and Dease rivers and Dease Lake, and that many were without provisions and were compelled to eat horses and dogs. The Hudson Bay post had relieved some. On the receipt of Major Perry's telegraphic report word was sent from the department to Mr. Chipman, commissioner of the Hudson Bay Company at Winnipeg, stating the facts, and asking him to undertake to forward supplies for their relief. This Mr. Chipman consented to do in the following terms:—

Supplies Glenora considered inadequate for so many people. To deal promptly with the matter probably necessary charter special steamer for Stikine portion of journey. The steamer could also be utilized to bring people out, which will be less expensive than feeding them in the country. Difficulties organizing and conducting transports make it impossible to give immediate estimate of probable cost. Company will gladly do all possible to assist Government, and would suggest basis 20 per cent on actual cost. Necessary act quickly take advantage river navigation and pack train.

To this the Government replied as follows:—

Government wish company to send forward supplies for people on Liard River by special steamer if necessary, up Stikine River and up pack train from there. Wire if you will push matter forward as soon as possible.

Mr. Chipman telegraphed in answer to this:

Arrangements are being completed to carry out wishes of Government regarding relief to miners by sending special steamer and necessary provisions.

On the 15th May, Mr. Chipman telegraphed:

Arrangements completed that by 17th inst. provisions will leave Vancouver and meet river steamer at Wrangel, to be forwarded immediately to Dease River by pack train from Glenora.

This shows what has been done in regard to the matter. We have, as yet, no official report as to what has been done by the expedition. We have news to the effect that a large number of people have been brought in. Some of them have been brought in by another trading company, I understand. That information is furnished to me by one of the members for Victoria, and it is probable that some compensation will have to

be given to the company that did that portion of the work ; under the circumstances, they would be fairly entitled to it. It is almost, if not quite, impossible to tell just what amount of money will be expended. but, under the circumstances, the Government felt that these men should not be allowed to starve there without this assistance being given to them.

Mr. OLIVER. The statement of the Minister of the Interior would lead me to suppose that, as in the case of the reports published in papers from time to time, there has been some misapprehension in regard to this matter. I am in receipt of letters from parties in the district affected. That there has been a good deal of sickness in that district is quite true, but, although I have direct information from that country, I have no information that there has been any serious or general shortage of provisions. As a matter of fact, I have a letter, dated from Dawson on the 24th of June, which mentions the names of certain parties who wintered on the Liard and Frances rivers, and who had reached Dawson this spring. They made no mention whatever of either sickness or starvation, such as are mentioned in this report. I do not wish in any way to discredit the action of the Government in taking measures to relieve distress, even on the reports that have been received ; but, owing to the very large amount of capital that has been made out of these reports, I would like the distinction to be clearly drawn between distress that occurs by reason of disease, and distress that occurs by reason of lack of food. So far as my information goes—and I have direct information on the subject—there was not by any means that serious lack of food that has been represented in the newspapers, and that was, no doubt, the basis of the relief expedition sent out by the Government. I was in hopes that by the time this item was reached the Government would have information as to the facts of the case. I am very sorry that is not so ; but as information has not been received, of course it cannot be given to the House. For the present I merely desire to correct, as far as possible, a very serious misapprehension which has been given, through a part of the press to the public in regard to the occurrences in that country.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this the first money that is proposed to be used for that purpose?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. PRIOR. In regard to the relief that has been sent to these men, I think that the explanation of the Minister of the Interior was a correct one, so far as I can make out from letters I have had. It seems there were a large number of men at the Liard River, many of whom were in sore distress. Some had no food whatever, and, besides, were in distress from being frozen and hav-

Mr. SIFTON.

ing the scurvy. The miners who were in fair circumstances there, signed a petition, which was sent down to the local government agent, stating they had only food enough for themselves, and none for these men, and that some assistance must be sent, or these men would die. The local government agent had no power, because the provincial government refused to do anything, on the ground that it was the duty of the Dominion Government. The agent of the Hudson Bay Company up there was applied to by the local government agent, but he could do nothing, of course, on his own responsibility. It seems, then, that they applied to Mr. Warburton Pike, manager of the Casca Trading and Transportation Company, who have a steamer running on the Stikine and pack trains running up into the interior. Mr. Pike immediately saw that speedy assistance was needed, and, therefore, he took the responsibility on his own shoulders, and sent off a train of provisions to come to the assistance of those men who were in such dire distress. The Minister says he considers that the company are entitled to some compensation, and I do not think that any member of this House will deny that, having taken this responsibility, without any authority from the Government, but simply from motives of humanity, the company should be thoroughly recompensed for any expenditure they have incurred. I hope the Minister will remember that when their claim comes in, and that he will see that they get compensation for the expense they incurred in this regard.

The committee rose, and reported progress.

#### DEATH OF MR. SPEAKER EDGAR.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, it has been very often my duty, during the present session of the House, to announce sad news to the House, and I feel most painfully the necessity under which I am, of again being placed in the position of performing this very melancholy duty. We have been really living in the shadow of death ever since this session was opened. Death has been unrelenting, and it has chosen its victims amongst the most useful and experienced members of this House. At the very opening of the session, and before the speech from the Throne was delivered, we had to deplore the death of a once very respected member in the person of Mr. Wood. At a later day we had to deplore, almost simultaneously, the deaths of Mr. Ives and of Mr. Geoffrion, one a member of a former Administration, the other a member of this Administration, and now we have to deplore the death of the first commoner in the land. The news has just reached us that Sir James Edgar, Speaker of this House, has departed this life. I have no words to say how great the loss is to us, personally, to me especially, and I am sure the House will agree with me that, to

the House generally, it is a most painful loss. Sir James Edgar had been, up to the time of his election as Speaker, a strong party man, but, I believe, a fair opponent. Since he has been in the Chair, I believe, it will be the consensus of opinion, on both sides of this House, that he discharged his duty with great dignity, with fairness, and with general acceptance to both sides of the House. To his loved ones, to his family, the loss is simply irreparable. I have very little, indeed, I have no more to say, but it must be my sad duty to move the adjournment of the House, and to move that when it does adjourn it stands adjourned until to-morrow at three o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, the suddenness of the news adds to the regret and the sorrow that we all feel at the death of our fellow-member, and the first commoner of this country, in the person of Sir James Edgar. He was, of course, more intimately known to gentlemen on the other side of the House, his own political and personal friends, but I am sure that we, upon this side of the House, especially those of us who have been in this House for the last fifteen or twenty years, have always known him as a man of worth and standing. The position of the Speaker of this House is a difficult one under the best of circumstances. The little differences of opinion that arise are at most a good deal magnified in the heat of debate, but I am quite sure that we all believe, on this side of the House, as well as on the other side, that the late Speaker had no other object and no other wish than to preserve proper order and decorum in the House, and that his decisions have been as fair and as equitable as he in his position could make them. I join with my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in tendering to his family the most sincere condolences. Death has come very suddenly: it has come to our side of the House as well. Colleagues on both sides have been stricken down very suddenly without a note of warning, and both sides have been sadly afflicted. It only goes to show us that, as my right hon. friend has said, that we are all living in the shadow of death, and it is a salutary lesson to us that in all our little differences, which after all are only little differences, we are members of one common, human family, bound over a very short pathway for a land unknown. Such dispensations should temper, as I have no doubt it does temper, the heat of party strife and the impetuosity of party debate. At these times we, more than at any other times, find that we are all men and brothers. This side of the House join with my right hon. friend and his friends in our sincere regret at the untimely death of Sir James Edgar, and join with him also in most sincere condolences with his family and his friends.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 8.35 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, August 1st, 1899.

The House met at Three o'clock.

### ELECTION OF SPEAKER.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Governor General having been informed of the death of Sir James Edgar, is pleased to give leave to the House to proceed to the choice of a Speaker.

Sir John Bourinot, the melancholy event which we had to deplore yesterday now brings us to the duty of selecting a new Speaker to preside over the deliberations of this House. It were a mere truism to assert that the office of Speaker of the House of Commons is one of the most important of all those that can be either given by the Crown or conferred by the people. Our system of government rests upon the basis of free and untrammelled discussion, and the duty of presiding over the deliberations of the House of Commons, where this free and untrammelled discussion must take place, is, we must admit, one of the most difficult and delicate, when we remember that the object is, as it ought to be, to maintain absolute impartiality between all parties in this House; to keep even the scales of justice and to give the same measure to all; to maintain the dignity and decorum of this House; to keep intact those rules and traditions which many generations have handed down to us as the best method devised by man for the government of a free people. The office of the Speaker, therefore, is one which requires many and varied qualities. It requires, first of all, long experience on the floor of the House, because, without experience, all other qualities, however great they might be, would be of little avail. It requires prompt and sound judgment, independence of mind, firmness of temper; and if to all these qualities is added gentleness and kindness of disposition, we may well say perfection would be well-nigh reached. I submit to the judgment of the House and the judgment of members who came here at the last election, above all to the judgment of those who have been long associated with this House, that all these qualities are possessed in an eminent degree by one of our colleagues, Mr. Thomas Bain, member for Wentworth, province of Ontario.

Mr. Bain is one of the oldest and most experienced members of this House. He entered this House in the most brilliant period of parliamentary government in Canada. He entered it at a time when parliamentary science was represented on the floor of this House—to speak of the dead only—by such men as Sir John Macdonald, Mr. Dornon, Mr. Edward Blake, Sir Alexander Galt and Mr. Abbott. A man

who has been trained in such a school must have acquired a great deal of knowledge, which will stand him in good stead in the Chair. Apart from these, I appeal to the judgment of every one in this House that the member for Wentworth being often called upon to preside over the Committee of the Whole, has given signal evidence of his fairness of mind and impartiality and soundness of judgment. This vacant chair has been adorned and graced by men whose names will live in the history of Canada, and I venture to predict that if Mr. Bain is elected to the Chair, as I am sure he will be, he will prove a worthy successor of the men who have left such honourable records behind them.

I beg, therefore, to move that Mr. Thomas Bain, member for the electoral district of the south riding of Wentworth, do take the Chair of this House as Speaker.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I rise for the purpose of saying that I believe I am expressing the sentiments of this side of the House when I say that the hon. gentleman who has the good fortune to be named by the Government to this high office is worthy of everything that has been said of him by the right hon. leader of the Government. I am quite sure that every person who has had the privilege of sitting in this House with the hon. member for Wentworth agrees in the statement that whether as a member of this House, as frequently occupying the position of Chairman of Committees or as occasionally occupying the position temporarily of Speaker, his duties have always been discharged in an independent, able and impartial manner that commends him to the approval entirely, I believe, of this House.

The motion being put to the House,

The Clerk of the House (Sir John Bourinot) declared the motion carried in the affirmative, *nemine contradicente*; and Thomas Bain, Esq., member for the electoral district of the south riding of Wentworth, duly elected to the Chair of the House.

Mr. Bain was conducted from his seat in the House to the Speaker's Chair by the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding).

**Mr. SPEAKER ELECT.** I beg respectfully to thank the House of Commons for the honour they have conferred upon me in electing me unanimously as their Speaker. I feel specially grateful for the kindly way in which the hon. leader of the Opposition has expressed himself, and I can assure the House that it will be my best endeavour to discharge the duties attached to my office with justice and impartiality. I can only appeal to gentlemen on both sides when I say that I feel sensible of my inability to efficiently discharge those duties, and I ask for their earnest and kind co-operation for the preservation of the rights and privi-

**Sir WILFRID LAURIER.**

leges and duties attached to the House of Commons, starting from time far gone past.

The Serjeant-at-Arms (Col. Smith) then placed the Mace on the Table of the House.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** I have now to inform the House that it is the pleasure of His Excellency the Governor General that the House shall present their Speaker this afternoon at four o'clock in the Chamber of the Senate to receive His Excellency's approval.

The sitting suspended until four o'clock.

A Message was delivered by René Kimber, Esquire, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod.

Mr. Speaker,

His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this Honourable House in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber;—and then Mr. Speaker spoke to the following effect:

May it please Your Excellency:

The House of Commons have elected me as their Speaker, though I am but little able to fulfil the important duties thus assigned to me.

If, in the performance of those duties, I should at any time fall into error, I pray that the fault may be imputed to me, and not to the Commons, whose servant I am.

The Honourable the Speaker of the Senate then said:

Mr. Speaker,

I am commanded by His Excellency the Governor General to assure you that your words and actions will constantly receive from him the most favourable construction.

And the House being returned,

PRAYERS.

#### RAILWAY RESOLUTIONS.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask my right hon. friend when it is proposed to discuss the railway resolutions?

**The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).** Well, we are now occupied with certain items of Supply concerning the Yukon, which we intend to finish. Probably, though I would not say certainly, we will go on with the railway resolutions to-morrow.

#### QUEEN'S COUNTY COURT, P.E.I.

**Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.)** Before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg leave to ask the right hon. gentleman if a judge has yet been appointed to the Queen's County Court to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Judge Alley?

**The PRIME MINISTER.** I may say to my hon. friend that this appointment would have been made to-day but for the illness of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). It will be made to-day, or certainly to-morrow.

### SUSPENSION OF THE VILLE MARIE BANK.

Mr. MONK. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and of the Government to the financial situation created in Montreal by the suspension of the Ville Marie Bank. In reply to an inquiry made the other day, the Minister of Finance said there was no law authorizing the Government in the case of the suspension of a bank to name an inspector. If that is the case, I think that the present moment is an opportune time for the Government, now that Parliament is in session, to change that portion of the Banking Act before the House rises. It is not necessary for me to speak of the situation created among the depositors of that bank by its suspension. The newspapers have given us some information about it, and it is hardly possible to convey to the House an idea of the extent of the embarrassment, trouble, and, in some cases, misery, caused by the closing of the doors of this bank. If at the present time the Government were able to name an inspector who would take immediate cognizance of the affairs of the bank, and report from time to time to the Government, under orders from the Department of Finance, as to the correctness of the latest financial returns made by the institution, and as to the actual conduct of the business of the bank by its directors during the time of its suspension, it would have a most reassuring effect not only on the people interested in that particular bank, but on the public in general. I am sure that if the Government had that power, its exercise would have a most soothing effect upon the public in Montreal; therefore, I would respectfully suggest to the Minister of Finance that he avail himself of the present sitting of Parliament to amend that section of the Banking Act and to obtain that power. I know that under such circumstances the Government are somewhat reluctant to assume responsibility. But what I would suggest is, that the hon. Minister should obtain power to name an inspector of banks upon the demand of a certain number of depositors in a bank situated as that bank is, so that upon the initiative of the creditors the Minister could name such an inspector. I am sure the nomination of such a functionary, the duties of the inspector being to satisfy himself, to report to the department upon the situation of the bank, and also to co-operate, on behalf of the Government, with the directors, would have an excellent effect, and I am sure that the Bill of that nature, even at this late stage of the session, could very easily be put through both Houses. At the present moment the situation in Montreal is very critical, although I have every reason to believe that the danger has been exaggerated. But some action taken by the Gov-

ernment would, I am sure, have a most reassuring effect, and produce excellent results.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, I may say that the Government fully realize the importance of the question which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has brought to the notice of the House, and that we will give his suggestions all due consideration. Hitherto, it has not been deemed expedient that the Government should assume the responsibility of appointing inspectors for the banks. It has been felt by the distinguished gentlemen who have preceded me in the office of Minister of Finance that the appointment of such inspectors would have a somewhat misleading effect upon the public mind, because it has been felt that the inspection would not be thorough or complete, and unless the inspection were thorough and complete, it would be far better that there should be no inspection at all on the part of the Government than that one should take place that would be somewhat inadequate and misleading. However, new occasions teach new duties, and if there is anything that has occurred in Montreal which will teach the Government to adopt better methods, we shall be only too willing to learn from our experience, and I will be glad to discuss the question with my colleagues. I do not know whether it will be possible to do anything this session in reference to this most important question, but if anything can be done to reassure the public mind in these matters, it is desirable that we should do it. Whether action be taken this session or not, I would remind the House that next year there will have to be some legislation respecting the banks and anything we may be able to learn from our present experience, will stand us in good stead at that time. The hon. gentleman's suggestion will receive every consideration from the Government.

### SUPPLY.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

#### Militia—

Pay of officers and men .....	\$50,000
Food, clothing and necessaries and transportation of same, transport of officers and men, contingencies and all other expenses .....	\$75,000

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Mr. Chairman, I beg to move:

That after the word "pay" in the first item, the words "and transport" be added.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) explain what this extra \$50,000 is for?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is the pay for the present year of 100 men. Orders have been already given for the withdrawal of 100 men, and this vote of \$50,000 is to pay the men who are left, and to pay for bringing the other 100 back. It is estimated that the cost of the transport will be about \$10,000, and the pay of the force remaining in the Yukon, \$40,000. As soon as consent is obtained from the United States Government to bring the men out through American territory, by way of Skagway, they will start on their journey.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What proportion of the force is withdrawn?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. About one-half.

Mr. WALLACE. How many were there altogether?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Two hundred.

Mr. HUGHES. I did not catch what the hon. Minister said about coming by way of Skagway. I trust that no recognition of American ownership of Skagway has been given.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, I did not mean that. But it is impossible, I presume, for the force to get out to the ocean to embark on the steamboat without crossing American territory at some point, and it is necessary to get consent in order to do that.

Mr. BERGERON. Before we proceed any further with this item, I want to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister a matter which was discussed when we were going through the main Estimates, about some contracts which were given to Mr. M. Workman, of Montreal, for trousers and military coats. The hon. Minister will remember that there was some discussion on the point that Shorey & Co., of Montreal, had tendered at a price very much lower than the party to whom the contract was awarded. Shorey & Co. offered to supply the goods at 49 cents per coat less than the contract price, but the contract was not given to that firm, because they would not agree to the condition of the anti-sweating clause, which was comprised in the tender. I said to my hon. friend that I had every reason to believe that Mr. Workman, of Montreal, was not complying with the anti-sweating condition, but was doing the work in the same way that Shorey & Co. had proposed to do it. My hon. friend said that it was a dangerous assertion, because Mr. Workman had sworn that he had worked according to the anti-sweating clause. Shorey & Co. said that they would do the work according to their own way, and, because they would not

accept the condition of the anti-sweating clause, the department would not give them the contract. Workman got the contract at 49 cents per coat higher, but Workman has not worked according to the condition of the anti-sweating clause. I have proofs of it, and I propose to put the facts on "Hansard," so that the hon. Minister may take notice of them, and deal with the question in his department. Trousers were made by Madame Victor Labonté, at Ste. Thérèse, 150 pairs; by Madame D. Labonté, Ste. Thérèse, 150 pairs, and by Madame Amanda Labonté, 171 pairs, making altogether 471 pairs. Great-coats were made as follows:—Mesdames Paul Gagnon, Ste. Thérèse, 100 coats; Alphonse Renaud, Ste. Rose, in Laval, 100 coats; Cléopâtre Desjardins, 12 coats; Celine Fortin, 36 coats; Rose Desjardins, 48 coats; Anna Desjardins, 74 coats; Arthur Charron, Ste. Therese, 100 coats; Octavie Ouimet, Ste. Rose, 56, making 526 altogether. I have here the declarations of all these parties, before witnesses, as to the work they have done.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Do they state the wages?

Mr. BERGERON. No, they say nothing about wages. The result of all this is that the Government have paid 49 cents more for coats than Shorey & Co.'s tender, the reason given by the Minister being that he could not entertain their contract because they would not accept the conditions of the contract with regard to the sweating; and yet Mr. Workman who got the contract, had the work done in the same way in which Shorey & Co. were honest enough to say they would have the work done. Therefore, I say that Mr. Workman, in agreeing to accept the conditions in regard to the sweating system, misled the Minister. I put the matter before him, so that he can deal with the charge made against Mr. Workman.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If my hon. friend had had the memorandum earlier, I might have been able to give him an answer, if there is one. I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman for calling my attention to the fact, which I was not aware of before. In justice to Mr. Workman, I will say this. As the hon. gentleman remembers, I explained that we gave out certain orders just before the annual drill, both to Sanford and to Workman, to be done quickly; and these orders they were unable to undertake unless we permitted them to do them in the way they had been doing in the past. I have a memorandum of one of the employees of the department to say that the infantry trousers to which my hon. friend refers were got in that way, by a special order, and not by contract; and I have a further note saying that the first 500 overcoats had to be got in a hurry, and before Workman's shops were ready. These, my officers know, are the only cases in which there was a departure.

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

But since the hon. gentleman has brought the matter to my notice, I promise him that I will have it carefully investigated, because my only object is to enforce this clause. Seeing that not only Shorey & Co., but other contractors, were excluded on account of the terms of our contract, it is my duty to see that the men who have taken the contract adhere closely to the letter of the contract, and I shall do so.

Mr. BERGERON. I may say to my hon. friend that Messrs. Workman & Co., at the time they tendered, had not any such factory as they pretended they had, and have not got it to-day; but all the work is done outside.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think that the Minister of Militia, before incurring such a serious responsibility as to pay an increase of 40 cents for overcoats, resulting in an enormous additional charge upon the revenue of Canada, should have taken some means of ascertaining whether the party to whom he gave this contract could do the work in any other way than the way in which the Messrs. Shorey proposed. I confess that I do not myself see any reason, especially if Canada has to pay heavily for it, why a contractor of high standing and character should not be able to employ worthy people to do the work at home, if they pay a fair and legitimate price for it. Therefore, I do not see any reason why Messrs. Shorey & Co. should have been deprived of this contract when they offered to perform the work at a lower price than anybody else, and the work given to another person. When the Minister of Militia and Defence refused to accept the lower tender, and gave the work to one of his friends, as I assume he did, at a much higher rate, he was bound to ascertain whether that contractor had the means of complying with the terms. It appears that he had not. Messrs. Shorey & Co. had this contract taken from them because they were going to go outside of their factory to get a portion of the work done; and they stated honestly and fairly to the Minister that they were willing to give him the fullest information and to put it into their tender. The question is a very serious one, involving a great loss of public money; and it appears now, from the statement of the Minister of Militia and Defence, that a large part of this contract is admittedly done in the precise manner in which Messrs. Shorey & Co. were prepared to do the work, and at 40 cents a coat more. It appears to me to be a most unjustifiable transaction. The Minister of Militia and Defence is, at all events, blamable to this extent, that when he took the contract away from the Messrs. Shorey and gave it to the Messrs. Workman he did not inquire, as he could have done, whether Workman & Co. were going to do the work in precisely the same manner as Shorey & Co.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. leader of the Oppos-

tion was not here, I think, when the discussion on this subject took place before, and when I explained very fully what had happened. As a matter of policy, this Government decided to introduce into certain contracts for clothing a clause which prevented sub-letting or farming out of these contracts, in the interest of the labouring people.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. Minister mean that a contractor who employs a person to do a certain amount of work at a certain price in his own home is sub-letting a contract? I do not call that sub-letting a contract. I call that getting the work done, and if the price paid is a fair and reasonable one, let the Minister of Militia and Defence explain why the Government feel bound to take such a course.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I quite admit that the price paid will have a great deal to do with it, but what is known as the sweating system is that system by which work is given out by the large contractors to poor people who are paid ruinously low prices, and it is to prevent that practice that this policy was adopted. Mr. Shorey knew perfectly well the terms upon which we asked for the tenders, and he refused to comply with them, so that we had no tender from him to consider. There were others in the same position. The Sanford Company put in two tenders, one higher than the other, but they said: If we get a certain proportion of the contract we will be bound by our lower price. It turned out that they did get a larger amount, \$60,000 or \$70,000, and so they did the work at the lower price. The late Mr. Sanford came to me about this matter and he said he would have to hire a building and put machinery in it in order to fulfil this contract, and could not afford to do that without getting a very large amount of the contract. I believe that was done by the Sanford Company.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Did the hon. gentleman investigate the prices at which the former contractors had been letting out their work to people in their own homes? If he found that they had been paying fair prices, that would have been sufficient guarantee against sweating.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I cannot say I did.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then you did not find out that they were paying low prices?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, I did not ascertain the prices; but we considered the system a bad one, and the principle we adopted in these contracts was not to encourage the sweating system. The Workman Company, I believe, are a solvent concern, and they assured the department that they would make the necessary arrangements to do the work in their own factory just as the Sanford Company did, and up to the present, I

believed, they had done so, and was very much surprised to hear my hon. friend say they had not.

Mr. BERGERON. Not yet.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend must be mistaken, because I have the assurance from one of the officers of my department that he was in the factory and saw the work going on.

Mr. BERGERON. Somebody must be deceived.

Mr. WALLACE. Where is that report?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It was a verbal assurance by an officer in my department that he was in Montreal in Workman's factory and saw the work going on. The hon. leader of the Opposition says that a very large part of the work was done in the old way. I am told that 500 coats only out of the 4,000 were done in that way, and that the infantry trousers, to which the hon. member for Beauharnois has referred, were outside the contract altogether. That was a special order made for the camps we have just had. In the same way the Sanford Company did work under the old system, where they were not bound by this contract. Under this contract an affidavit has to be made on each application for payment, and no payments are made except on the affidavit of a manufacturer that he has complied literally with the terms of the contract.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend has not shown what necessity there is for the adoption of this policy of absolutely preventing any work being done except in a factory. I confess that I do not know much about the subject, but my impression is that you may have sweating in a factory just as well as outside. It all depends on the price, and I can imagine that quite as small wages might be paid in a factory. If this is a Government regulation, why does it not apply to all the departments? I am told that the right hon. Prime Minister obtained from Shorey & Company the coats for the Mounted Police, and I am quite certain that he consulted the public interest in doing so, and I do not see why the same thing should not have been done by the Minister of Militia.

Mr. FOSTER. Has Mr. Workman received his pay?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. He has received part of it.

Mr. FOSTER. What conditions do you put before the pay is given as regards sweating?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. An affidavit must be made that the contract has been literally complied with before any payment is made.

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

Mr. FOSTER. That is, that the clothes must be made in a factory?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the Minister of Militia was not as careful as he should have been in the making of the contract. He should have assured himself, before he gave a contract at all, that the successful tenderer, or the one to whom he wished to give it, had all the requirements necessary in order to have this sweating condition carried out in the spirit of the law. But he tells us that he did not take those precautions. Two precautions were required: First, an inspection as to whether there was a factory or not of sufficient size; and second, the price paid for the labour. If these two things had been satisfactorily ascertained, the hon. Minister would have been then in a position to say whether the sweating condition was lived up to or not. Is this the system that the Government are going to make operative in these contracts for clothing and supplies? Are they going to compel the clothing to be made in a factory, in a steaming street in Montreal, and prohibit respectable householders in the country from making up those garments in their own homes where they are surrounded with every convenience? Is it better to drive these people into a crowded factory, filled with operatives breathing a heated atmosphere than having the work distributed at as good or better prices amongst the homes of habitants around the city of Montreal in the different parishes? If that be the system adopted by the Government, the sooner it is got rid of the better. It is a farce, because it produces a worse condition of things and prohibits the people from taking advantage of a better condition of things. What will be the rule with reference to the making of articles in the city of Montreal? I first came across it in the case of the manufacture of such articles as shirts, collars and cuffs. Instead of being made in the factories, they were made in this way—the material was cut in quantity and the garments in this form were taken out to hundreds, and I was going to say thousands, of homes in the parishes near Montreal. Women and young girls do the work of sewing at their homes at so much a piece or so much per dozen. It was done there when other work could not be got, and the homes round and about the city of Montreal were actually made comfortable and wealth was gained—wealth for these simple-living people—for these homes by that kind of work, which suited them. The same system is used by Mr. Shorey in connection with his clothing department. Now, would it be a just thing to drive the work out of conditions like that, conditions conducive to health and happiness, and shut it up in crowded factories in the city of Montreal? And to do what? Merely to

carry out what is known to be a fad. Is it not plain to every one that in doing that, you take the work out of the best conditions and actually force it into the worst conditions. Now, when Mr. Shorey put in his tender, he was honest enough to make known the way in which he got his work done and to say that he proposed to do this work in that way. He was refused the contract. I have here the list of Mr. Shorey's prices and the list of Mr. Workman's prices; and in almost every case, Mr. Shorey's prices are much less than the other. When we come to the matter of great-coats, they were 49 cents less in Mr. Shorey's tender than Mr. Workman's. Mr. Workman got the contract and 4,000 great-coats were made which gave to Mr. Workman \$2,000, or thereabouts, of the people's money over and above what would have been given had Mr. Shorey had the contract. It is stated, and stated very confidently, that Mr. Workman has no factory. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) has no report to give to this House showing that Mr. Workman has a factory. But suppose he did have a factory, take then the conditions under which the work is done. Does it tend to better conditions for the working people to give the contracts in this way, did it conduce more to the happiness and comfort of the real homes of the people of Canada? There cannot be two opinions on that question. The Premier had no doubt upon the question. When the Premier called for tenders for clothing for the Mounted Police, Mr. Shorey did the very same that he did with reference to the Minister of Militia's contract—he marked in red ink that if he got the contract, the work would be done in the regular way, and that might conflict with the anti-sweating conditions. But he got the contract, because the Premier considered the conditions were far better than those insisted upon by the Minister of Militia. Here is a case of one member of the Government and the leader of it, saving money to the people and contributing to the best conditions of the manufacture of these articles, and another member of the Government crowding people into heated factories and actually preventing the establishment of the best conditions. We are told that there were only a few great-coats. But here is one of the affidavits. It is dated Montreal, 28th July, 1899, and says:

I carted for Mr. M. Workman, of this city, about 2,000 military great-coats since the 1st November, 1898, to different work-people—

Where—in the factory of Mr. Workman? Not at all.

—to different work-people in the parish of Ste. Rose.

That is some twelve or fifteen miles outside of Montreal.

Mr. BERGERON. In the county of the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin).

Mr. FOSTER.—

I also carted these same coats back to and delivered them to the said Mr. M. Workman, 1883 Notre Dame Street.

This is signed by the carter, Calixte Belanger, and also by two witnesses. Is that a factory? Under the very eyes of the Minister, the conditions of the contract are entirely ignored, and the work is done just as Mr. Shorey wished to do it. It is done under the same conditions, but Mr. Workman is paid 49 cents more for each great-coat in order that the glory of an alleged anti-sweating system may be paraded before the labouring men of this country. What does Mr. Shorey say? I have a letter in which he speaks of some of these things:

You will find the great-coats with attached capes, 4,000 in quantity, were given to Workman, McShane's friend.—

There is a very good item. Mr. McShane is a party politician, who has to get along. Mr. McShane is the friend of Mr. Workman. Mr. McShane gets the contract for Mr. Workman.

—at 49 cents per coat more than ours. We affirm that there is no sweating in Montreal. The clause calls for work to be done in the contractor's factory, and not in the homes of work-people. We deal at all times direct with work-people, and pay them current and satisfactory prices. Sweating means contract work, getting some man or person who employs people in his or her own shop, paying inferior wages in price per garment, working long hours, and keeping the people steadily on the grind. We know of no one doing such here. Our work is frequently done in the country by farmers' wives and daughters, they coming to us or we sending the work to them by wagon or railway train, cut in quantities, and they make it up and return to us when ready, and receive their pay at once. To make militia or any clothing as the tender asks for, in our own factory, our system would have to be altered altogether, and our present employees in the rural districts would be deprived of the means of livelihood which they have enjoyed for many years. Farmers' wives and daughters are thus of great assistance to the heads of families. We have been thanked many times by curés in the rural districts for giving work to families, thus keeping the families together and preventing young women seeking employment in cities, where they are subject to great temptations.

Fully 75 per cent of our work is done in the country—Ste. Rose, Ste. Thérèse, Boucherville and like places taking the bulk of it. Convents, such as the Sacred Heart, do a great deal of work for us. We pay the convent mentioned above \$1,000 to \$12,000 annually. So, according to the present system of calling for tenders, these as well as country people would be deprived of the work. I do not think the present contractors carry out this clause in the contract. In making up our tenders we made a red-ink line around the clause and wrote the Minister that we would only make garments in the usual way, that is, cut and trim them in our own factory, and send them out to be sewn in the usual way. The

Minister will probably answer that Shorey's tender was irregular. Well, are they seeing to the enforcing of this clause with Workman, who got all the work? I think not.

There is another matter. Is it a fact that when these gentlemen take the contract for making these great-coats, they are not at liberty to go to get cloth wherever they wish?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, it is not a fact.

Mr. FOSTER. Or is there some favoured cloth maker to whom it is recommended, in that way which can be so easily done as a suggestion but which has all the authority of a command, that it must be cloth from a certain place?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. He then mentions that he had received tenders with reference to the Mounted Police Department, and that he marked in red ink, the same as in the other case, the conditions under which he would do it, and that he got the tender. I think this is a most instructive commentary, both upon the way in which this anti-sweating clause is being worked out, and also on the methods of the Militia Department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). My hon. friend alludes to the part of these conditions that requires the contractors to provide proper sanitary conditions under which goods are manufactured, as a fad. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition also appears to disapprove of such conditions. Now, I may say that the ex-Minister of Finance is quite in error when he asserts that the sweating system in all its viciousness has not acquired a foothold in the city of Montreal. Some time ago I received information that caused me to have an inquiry made upon this subject, and if time admitted, I would lay before the House the report of the gentleman who made the investigation, both in the city of Montreal and in other cities. His report shows that garments were being manufactured in various places in Canada under conditions most detrimental to the health and morals of many engaged in that work. Because the anti-sweating conditions adopted by my colleague in the Militia Department and by myself, require a contractor to supply accommodation and facilities whereby work can be done under sanitary conditions, the hon. gentleman assumes that the term "factory" means some place congested with people, unwholesome in every respect. Now, if the hon. gentleman studied the conditions, I am sure he would have reason to correct his conclusions upon that point. The conditions generally seek to accomplish, what? The payment to the workingmen who do the work for a fair wage, and that the contractor shall see that they are enabled to do their work under proper sanitary condi-

Mr. FOSTER.

tions. Whilst in many instances piece-work may be done to advantage at the homes, yet the balance of the testimony seems to be in favour of the work being done where the factory building can be open to inspection and the adoption of proper sanitary arrangements enforced. These conditions are not oppressive, they are intended for the good of those who bear the heat and burden of the day in connection with this work. My hon. friend is not familiar with them, but I may say that they provide that in connection with any of these works the contractors shall pay to the workingman a fair wage, such a wage as is fair and legitimate in the district where the work is being performed; that sub-letting shall not be permitted; and that the work shall be done under proper sanitary conditions. Whether it be in a street that is crowded or uncrowded, whether it be in the home or whether it be in the country, the contractors shall satisfy the department that the conditions under which the work is conducted are such as they ought to be. I should regret extremely if we had to divide upon a principle of this kind. It is not a question upon which there ought to be a difference of opinion; and if my hon. friend would only reserve his judgment and study the conditions, I would place in his hands a report which will have some influence, I am sure, upon his mind. I should deplore it if, on a question of this kind, concerning the welfare of the great industrial classes, it should happen that there was a division of opinion. I will not hold him responsible for the opinion he has expressed, because I am sure he would revise that opinion on a deeper study of the subject. I would say that the conditions in question have been in operation in my own department for a little while, and we have found nothing to complain of. We require the voucher of the account that comes in from the contractor to be accompanied with an affidavit of the member of the firm who is to pay the wages, also by any one else who may be able to give any evidence and to testify of his own actual knowledge as to the rates that he has paid, and those rates of wages to be paid must be such as are the going rates for work of that kind in the district where the work is to be performed—fair rates, not the result of sub-letting. These conditions have received the approval, not only of the workingmen of Canada but of the great industrial classes of Great Britain. There is nothing novel in them so far as our action is concerned. We have lagged behind in their adoption. The principle on which these conditions were established was affirmed as a result of a report of the Committee of the House of Commons of England as far back, I think, as 1891. The report and recommendations of the committee of the British House of Commons received the unanimous endorsement of the House of Commons. Whilst I am speaking

in a general way, I think, I am speaking by the look when I say that almost every Government contractor in England is required to comply with the spirit of these conditions. The spirit of these conditions is that the Government shall assume the responsibility of seeing that the work is performed under proper sanitary conditions, and that the fair-going wage in the district where the work is being performed shall be paid. These are the principles involved in these conditions. It may happen that work has suddenly to be performed when there is no provision to have it performed under these conditions, but I am sure that my hon. friend, upon consideration, will not take exception to the great underlying principle. Not only has it the imprimatur of the precedent to which I have referred, but it has been substantially endorsed by the industrial classes throughout all Canada, and I would again express the hope that no hon. gentleman in this House will put himself in antagonism to the principle of these conditions, at least, until he has so thoroughly mastered the subject that he would be able to justify any other attitude. Experience of the working of this system for eight years in Great Britain has justified, not only the maintenance of it, but it is a sufficient warranty for our adopting it here. I think the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence has done well to incorporate this principle in his contracts, and even if a few garments have, under special circumstances, been manufactured outside of these conditions, it is certainly no reason for undoing the scheme as a whole. It is not the lowest price alone under these conditions that we should seek to pay, but we should require tenderers who are tendering to supply goods, to put in a schedule of wages, and this should be inserted as a part and parcel of the contract. When contractors take contracts at starvation rates they are obliged, either to lose money or to pinch those who have to do the work for them, and it seems better to put all tenderers upon one common plane by laying down a rule that will fix the minimum standard for the wages that they will pay. For these reasons, I think the principle of these conditions will commend itself to the good sense of this committee.

Mr. WALLACE. I think that we have seldom, in this House, witnessed an hon. member sailing around the question for such a long time as the hon. Postmaster General has done without getting near it. What has he told us? He has not referred to a single charge that has been made from this side of the House. He could not do it apparently. He told us that there are four conditions that are imposed in opposition to the sweating system. First, he said that the sweating system was detrimental both to health and morals. In regard to this contract, Mr. Shorey says that 75 per cent of

his work is done at all times by the farmers and people out through the country. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General what there is detrimental to morals and health when this work is done by the women, wives and daughters, working at their own homes. There can be no place where the morals of young people would be more carefully guarded than under their own roof-tree, and, therefore, the insinuation, if it means anything, means that these people are not safe as regards their morals when they are living in their own homes. The next point is as to their health. Does the hon. Postmaster General mean to tell us that people working in their own homes, in comfortable homes, throughout the country, are less healthy than if they were crowded in workshops where there are hundreds and thousands of people crowded together, and where the sanitary arrangements are not as good as if these people were working in their own homes? We have in this House what are said to be the best sanitary arrangements that can possibly be devised. I am rather doubtful of it, but there is no factory where as much care is taken to preserve the sanitary conditions as in the House of Commons. Yet, to-day, this House is almost panic-stricken with the idea that the sanitary conditions are bad and the mortality in this House is something dreadful to contemplate. We cannot have better sanitary conditions than at the homes of the people. The hon. Postmaster General's next point is in regard to the sub-letting of contracts. It could not be charged against Mr. Shorey that he has sub-let the making of a single garment. Any one who knows anything about the tailoring business knows that this work is all done by piecework, so much for every garment. Mr. Shorey pays so much for each garment, and there is no sub-letting either in the factory or in the country, and the charge cannot be made that there was sub-letting in regard to any of these garments made in the country. Then, the hon. Minister says that there must be some regulation about a fair rate of wage. I would like to know what regulation the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence made in this regard. Did he make a condition that a certain amount should be paid for making an overcoat or a pair of trousers or a tunic or any of that clothing?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The wages paid are to be reported to the department.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the hon. Minister let us have the report?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have not the report here.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman cannot let us have the report. Then, all the other conditions laid down by the hon. Postmaster General seem to have nothing in them. As far as morality is concerned, I

think I have demonstrated clearly that the conditions for morality are more favourable in the homes of the people than in a crowded factory in Montreal, that the health of the people and that the sanitary conditions are better in the homes of the people, that subletting has not been practised, and that Mr. Shorey pays the regular rate of wages. It has not been stated that Mr. Shorey has not paid as fair wages as were paid by Mr. Workman. But the country loses \$2,000 on these 4,000 overcoats. The hon. Minister says that there was a case of urgency. He has allowed the anti-sweating condition to be violated, and he has not shown us where the urgency exists. Did the department not know how many volunteers they had and how many volunteers they were going to call out? Did they not know this months before the contracts were let, so that there can be no plea of urgency in this matter?

Here is a statement made in this House by a responsible party, who swears that he carried 2,000 of these military overcoats out to the country to get them made. Under these conditions, Mr. Shorey could not have the contract, but Mr. Workman could. It looks to me as if there was a job in this from start to finish, or else total incompetence on the part of the Militia Department.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Some years ago it became my privilege, at the request of some workingmen's organizations, to look into the question of sweating; and if the Postmaster General will look up the records, he will find that an investigation was made in an official way, only a short time ago by a gentleman appointed for that purpose, and I think his report will show that not a great deal of sweating was then being practised in the Dominion of Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite will not, I think, be able to place themselves before the country as the champions of the workingmen, because I do not think that the history of legislation will show that hon. gentlemen opposite have been as much so as hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. However, we are united in this debate, as we ought to be, upon the principle of giving every man a fair day's pay for a fair day's work; and more particularly should that be the case where the Government, as in this case, controls every contractor who is doing work for the Government. When a contractor takes a contract of this kind from the Government, he must perform it in either one of three ways: he must do it in his factory, let the contract to some one else, or allow people to do it at their homes. Now, the question is not as to the method by which he may perform the work, but the question is as it was stated by the hon. Postmaster General, who gave his whole case away when making the statement, whether the going rate of wages was paid for the work. Now, in order to see that the fair rate of

Mr. WALLACE.

wages was paid, what has the Minister done? In the first place, I think the Minister gave his case away when he stated that he had no information as to how much Messrs. Shorey & Co. paid for the work, bearing in his mind the principle laid down by the Postmaster General that it was the desire of the Government only to see that the going rate of wages in vogue in the district was paid.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A fair wage.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman afterwards said a fair wage.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You must take altogether what I said.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am making the words as the hon. gentleman used them. He first said the going rate in vogue in the district and afterwards a fair wage. The two are the same.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I mean current wages.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Current wages, which will be found to be the fair wage; the exception is the unfair wage. Bearing that in mind, what has the hon. gentleman done? Messrs. Shorey had been fair and upright contractors. The Minister assents to that. They had done their work well, and given satisfaction to the Government. Then, I submit, as a fair proposition that when the Minister was giving the contract again, and when Shorey & Co. were the lowest tenderers, his duty, if he desired to protect the workingmen, was to have inquired—and no one would have objected to the most careful and scrutinizing inquiry—as to how much Messrs. Shorey & Co. had been paying for their work. And yet the Minister tells us that he made no such inquiry. Am I correct in that understanding? The Minister says I am correct. He takes the contract away from a reputable firm, who had done the work well and to the satisfaction of the department, and who were the lowest tenderers, ostensibly for the protection of the workingmen, while he fails to make a single inquiry as to whether the workingmen are being fairly dealt with by the Government contractors or not. There must have been some other reason than the desire to protect the workingmen. I want now to ask another question. Where can the Minister show me that there is any defence of the workingmen's rates saying that a big contractor shall not let a sub-contract? It is not in the mere letting of a sub-contract that the wrong is done to the workingman. The question all hinges on the Postmaster General's statement that a fair wage should be paid. If a man takes a contract, and has not the factory or the conveniences to fulfil the requirements of the contract, and if he lets a sub-contract, he should let it at a fair price; that is the

requirement the Government should make of him. It appears to me to hamper a contractor without being a defence of the interests of the workmen, for the hon. gentleman to place a clause in the contract such as I have referred to. As regards sanitary conditions, we have had it shown this afternoon, beyond all contradiction, that this work was being done amid surroundings and in places whose sanitary conditions must of necessity have been better than in the factory where the Minister, under that clause of the contract, required the work to be done. I am told that the greater part of Shorey & Co.'s work was done in the county of Laval and the county of Jacques Cartier. I am told that if they had secured this contract, they would have had the work done in the peasant homes of these two counties. Now, I want to ask the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) whether he thinks the sanitary conditions would be better in a factory at Montreal or in the homes of Laval and Jacques Cartier. Yet the Minister tells us that he took the contract away from this firm because they would not bind themselves down to a clause which they did not feel they could honestly keep, without inquiring as to what wages they had paid, or what the sanitary conditions were under which the work of their contracts had been performed. I want to ask the hon. gentleman how much he knows now as to the sanitary conditions under which this work was done. The hon. gentleman must remember that, upon sanitary ground and in defence of the workmen's rights and morals, he gave that work to a higher tenderer, and it became his bounden duty to have a rigid inspection, first, as to prices paid, and second, as to the sanitary condition in which the work is done. Has he a statement of the wages paid at present for the work?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have none here.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has he any comparative statement, showing the prices paid for this work, and other work of the same kind, in the city of Montreal?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then, on what does the hon. gentleman base his statement, that a fair wage is being paid, or that current rates are being paid? There is no protection for the workmen whatever. If you can compel the contractor, under this clause, to show what wages he is paying, you could compel the contractor who would not adopt this clause, to show what wages he was paying to those who were doing their work at their homes, instead of at the factory. It has been established pretty well that Workman & Co. have not lived up to the condition of their tender and contract. I would not ask the hon. gentleman to accept the state-

ments made, without investigation, but it is the duty of the hon. gentleman to make further investigations in order to ascertain if this firm have lived up to their contract, and if not, and they have been paid, a claim lies against them by the Government. If they have sworn to a statement which is not true, that places them in a very unpleasant position, financially and otherwise. They got their contract on the agreement that the work should be done in a factory. We have evidence that it is not.

Mr. BERGERON. They have no factory at all.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is controverted.

Mr. BERGERON. They have none yet.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Why, you have a carter who declares that he carted 2,000 garments. That does not agree with the answer of the Minister, who says there were only a few garments made outside, and those were garments needed in a hurry.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Five hundred was the statement.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But here is the affidavit of a carter who says he carted 2,000. The Postmaster General said that a few garments might be made outside, but I do not think that term would apply to 2,000 or to 4,000.

Mr. BERGERON. And the rest were sent down by express.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If that is the case, the hon. gentleman undoubtedly ought to proceed against these contractors. If he finds out that Workman & Co. have not got a factory, or that they have got a factory which is not capable of doing the work, and that they are doing the work by the very system they agreed not to follow, I wish to know from the Minister whether he will take proceedings against these parties, not only to cancel the contract, but also in the ordinary way in which he would be justified in proceeding against them under the circumstances.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I wish the House to know the conditions that have existed, and which warranted the adoption of the principle in question. I have here a report of Mr. McKenzie King, who investigated this matter.

Mr. WALLACE. Who is he?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is at present on the staff of Harvard University. He is a graduate of the Toronto University, but not living in Canada at present.

Mr. BERGERON. What does he know about Montreal business?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He was directed by myself to make an inquiry into the sweating system to ascertain whether it had acquired a foothold in Canada. The hon. member for Beauharnois seems to think that there is no sweating in the contract works in Montreal. But he will find that Mr. King gives evidence to the contrary. On page 9 of the report, Mr. King writes as follows :—

For a period of over ten years past, and, in fact, until within a year or so ago, certain firms in Montreal were awarded large contracts for the manufacture of Government clothing for the militia and mounted police. Similar contracts were let to a firm in Toronto, and also to a firm in Hamilton which had, in addition, a large contract for the supply of clothing for the post office letter-carriers. With respect to all these contracts by the firms in question, the system of sub-contracting, as already described, was resorted to. In no case did it appear that the Government contractor had the clothing manufactured on his own premises, or even in such a way as to be subject to his immediate supervision. With the exception of the cutting of the cloth, which is done in most cases almost entirely by machinery, and the making of the button-holes, and, in some cases, the putting on of the buttons, in both of which processes machines are also used, the whole work of manufacture was carried on in places not under the control or supervision of the Government contractors. In the making of practically all of the tunics of the militia and mounted police, the work was done in shops owned by sub-contractors, who had agreed with the Government contractor to make up the goods at a specified price or sum. Practically all of the riding breeches for the artillery, cavalry and mounted infantry were made up in the same way. The trousers, however, some of the tunics, and many of the great-coats, in the making of which less skill is required, were let out direct to women in their homes, to be made up at so much apiece. In the case of the clothing of the post office letter-carriers, the overcoats and tunics were made in his shop by a sub-contractor, while the trousers were made by women in their own homes. Wherever a sub-contractor was given the work, he, in turn, employed a number of hands to work for him. A few of these—very few, in fact—were men; by far the largest number were women and girls. In several instances the sub-contractor was a woman. Wherever the work was given out to persons in their homes it was generally women who were employed. In some cases the different members of the family assisted in the sewing, and in a great many cases, one, two, three or more strangers, usually young women or girls, were brought from the neighbourhood and paid a small sum for their services, by the week or piece. It was no uncommon thing for young women and boys to give their services gratis for a second time to the sub-contractor, either in the home or in the shop, and thus serve a species of apprenticeship on the supposed condition of learning the trade. Others began to work, or continued it, at the rate of a few cents a day.

Mr. WALLACE. What contractors does that refer to?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. King in his report says that he has accompanied this report with the names, but he has not, for obvious reasons, given in this

Mr. BERGERON.

printed volume the names of the particular persons whose dealings he has described.

Mr. WALLACE. Why not?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. For reasons of good taste :

It was no uncommon thing for young women and boys to give their services gratis for a certain time to a sub-contractor, either in the home or in the shop, and thus serve a species of apprenticeship. On the supposed condition of learning the trade, others began to work, or continued it, at the rate of a few cents a day.

Then, on page 11, coming down to the particulars in Montreal, reference is made to Government contracts made with four firms, whose name will doubtless appear in the Public Accounts. He proceeds to say :

The making-up of the cavalry great-coats was let by the firm which received the contract to a sub-contractor, who agreed to make them up for \$1 each. He received the cloth already cut, and also the thread, but was required to do all the sewing and pressing in the manufacture of the coat, including the work on the linings, pockets, a large cape, buttons, buckles, hooks and eyes, &c. \* \* \* The making of the button-holes was alone excepted, this being done by machines at less than one cent apiece on the premises of the original contractors. This sub-contractor had his own shop in the city, and, while working on these coats, usually employed from 18 to 20 hands. Seven or eight of these were men, and the rest young women or girls. As was invariably the case, the men received from two to four times the remuneration of the women, although it was generally admitted that the work performed could not have been done any better by the men, while in some cases it was thought that it was done decidedly better by the women.

On page 12, he says :

These wages, it should be mentioned, were the best the men had ever received for any considerable length of time, many of them having commenced at \$3 a week, and received a gradual increase as time went on. The wages of the women were much lower. According to the sub-contractor's statement, \$3 a week was considered a good wage for a woman, and this was what he himself paid the majority of his female hands. The best paid woman, he said, had received \$5.30 a week, the lowest \$2 a week; and it was possible, he thought, to secure working girls at \$1.50 a week. I was informed by the young woman who was said to have been paid the highest wage that, for the first year she had received \$3, for the second year \$3.50, and for the third year \$4 a week, and that only in her fourth year of service for this sub-contractor had she received \$4.50 a week. This was the highest wage that had ever been paid her while in his employ. While two or three of the best paid women had received \$4 a week, some had been paid \$3, others \$2.50, others \$2.25, and a number \$2 a week. For this wage men and women alike were required to work 60 hours a week, that is, from 7 o'clock in the morning till 12 noon, and from 1 till 6 o'clock in the afternoon for six days of the week.

He then proceeds to speak of the manufacture of the riding breeches for the cavalry, artillery and mounted infantry. These he said were made by sub-contractors :

According to the sub-contractor's statement, some of the women and girls received \$1.25, others \$2, and the rest \$3 a week. They worked by the piece, and if they cared to work overtime they were allowed to do so, and thereby increase their earnings. A number of them, particularly in the summer months, were accustomed to come to the shop at 6 o'clock in the morning and work there till after 9 o'clock at night. Occasionally they brought with them food for both lunch and supper, and ate it in the shop. Others, instead of working overtime in the shop, took the different materials with them to their homes, and worked on them there during the evenings. The most that the best paid hands appear to have made by thus working overtime was about \$5 a week. A good many of the females employed in the shop were under twenty years of age; some were scarcely fifteen, while others were thirty, or thereabouts.

Another sub-contractor who made riding breeches was a woman, who wrought in her own home, with the assistance of her daughter, and who, during the busy season, employed three girls, all under 20 years of age. The girls received for the first three months \$1.50 each a week, and \$2 a week afterwards. They worked six days of the week, and if they quit an hour earlier on Saturdays were obliged to put in extra time on other days. The mother and daughter worked frequently till 11 o'clock at night. No men were employed.

Mr. BERGERON. Why do you not lay the report on the Table of the House?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I want to read it. Mr. King proceeds:

The artillery and infantry great-coats were made up largely by women in their homes. Many of the workers lived in villages at a considerable distance from Montreal. In some instances the work was taken in by farmers' wives who had little to do at certain seasons; in other cases the women appear to have continued to work all the year round. In some instances only the members of the family assisted in making up the garments, but not unfrequently women or girls were employed at a wage of \$1 or \$2 a week.

Then, on page 15, he says:

Four dollars a week represented the gross earnings of this woman, who wrought daily over fifteen hours out of the twenty-four. What her net earnings were may be estimated by deducting her expenses for rent, fuel, light, &c. I mention this case in particular, because I have reason to believe it to be typical of many such cases in the villages in the neighbourhood of Montreal.

Mr. BERGERON. How much did the hon. Minister pay for that report?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) would do well to give serious consideration to such a subject as this, which so intimately concerns the welfare of the people.

Mr. BERGERON. The whole report is wrong.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman may be indifferent to the interests involved; but, if he is, perhaps he will permit the committee to listen uninterrupted to this report which is written in the interest of the whole community.

Mr. BERGERON. The report is not true. I want to know how much of the public money was paid for it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is not the question to-day, but that can be answered too.

Mr. BERGERON. We want to know that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend must take this evidence. Now, I ask him to listen to this:

Another woman, who made military great-coats at 40 cents each, had employed four girls to assist her. She usually paid them 25 cents a day if they were first-class sewers.

Is that the cause the hon. gentleman is supporting?

Mr. BERGERON. What I say is that that report is not true.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Now, if the hon. gentleman will be quiet—

Mr. COCHRANE. All this has nothing to do with the question.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) if he thinks—

Mr. BERGERON. If the hon. Postmaster General will tell me how much he paid for that report, I will answer him.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the gentleman was paid \$200 for his investigation.

Mr. BERGERON. It is not worth fifty cents, because it is not correct.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is the information he gives—

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. Postmaster General allow me to ask him a question?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not wish to be interrupted.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I was only going to ask a question.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to finish, then I will answer any questions.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If this report does not apply to the work of the Shorey firm, it is no use, so far as this discussion is concerned.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At page 15, I find the following:—

She usually paid them 25 cents a day if they were first-class sewers. In other words, under this system of sub-contracting, heavy Government clothing was actually made up at 2½ cents an hour.

Is that the system my hon. friend supports?

The woman herself was in the habit of working till midnight, and, during the summer months, commenced her tasks as early as 5 o'clock in the morning. It was only, she said, when she had

hired help that her gross earnings, even when thus working overtime, exceeded \$1 a day.

Another female sub-contractor, who had also received 40 cents for each military great-coat with capes, had employed five girls, some of whom were paid \$2 and others \$1 each a week, which means that the \$1 a week workers wrought at the rate of 1½ cents an hour.

At page 28 is the summary. Mr. King says :

1. Practically all of the clothing manufactured for the Government of Canada, under the contract system of the past ten years, has been manufactured for the most part on premises other than those of the Government contractors, and according to one of the three modes of sub-contracting already described. As a result of this, the Government contractors have had no immediate supervision of the contract work, and have, in fact, only assumed a partial responsibility for the methods and condition under which it was performed. In other words, the contractors, while reaping the benefits of the contract in question, have failed to discharge adequately the duties and responsibilities which may not unfairly be regarded as appertaining to the proper carrying out of their obligations.

2. Most of the work on Government clothing has really been executed by women and girls. Where these have been employed in shops, their wages have been, on the whole, exceedingly low ; and where the work was performed in homes the prices paid were often such as to necessitate long hours of labour for a very meagre return. In the case of those employed by sub-contractors, the general rule has been to require a maximum amount of work for a minimum amount of pay. Exceptionally long hours and other objectionable features have marked the course of employment of the workers in the homes, and of not a few in the shops.

The introduction of a sub-contractor who resorts to hired help has involved the necessity of realizing a double profit out of the work of the hands, and, as a consequence of this and the competition of sub-contractors, the wages of the majority of those engaged on Government works have suffered a considerable depression. The wages received will not bear a comparison other than unfavourable with those paid as a fair return for labour in trades or occupations.

The conditions under which much of the Government work has been executed has been such as to prove injurious to the health and well-being of those engaged in it. There has been no practice of adequate inspection of the methods or of the work itself, and, as a consequence, individuals and the public alike have been exposed to continuous risk from the spread of contagion, as well as to harm in other ways.

I need scarcely add that the existence of such conditions, apart from any other attendant evils of the sweating system, constitute emphatically, in the words of your communication, "sufficient grounds for Government interference, in order that future contracts may be performed in a manner free from all such objectionable features."

Now, I give that evidence to the committee, and I present my hon. friend with the report. If these conditions exist, I am sure my hon. friend would join hands in any action trying to put an end to it.

Mr. BERGERON. That is not correct.

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Can the Postmaster General say that a single word of that evidence applies to the manner in which Shorey & Co. do their business? Because that is the way in which Shorey & Co. do their business, and the prices they paid, and the way in which Workman & Co. do their business, and the prices they paid.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the House thinks it is proper for me to give the names of the contractors, I will be pleased to turn up the accompanying schedule. It is a year since I read that report, but my recollection is, that he says in that report that, for obvious reasons, he has not printed in the body of that report the names of the contractors to whom he refers.

Mr. BERGERON. He was very prudent, because he could not name any.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He says now that he sends me a list of the contractors, and I have no doubt that in my possession in the department is a list of the contractors in question.

Mr. BERGERON. I wish you would bring them down.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If it is thought proper, I am willing to give the names.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then, does the hon. gentleman see that the whole onslaught which is made against the sweating system ought to be taken into serious consideration by the Minister of Militia and Defence, because the contract has been done by a firm who has been using this sweating system. I want once more to ask the Minister of Militia and Defence if he finds this to be true, whether he will proceed in the proper way against Workman & Co.?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is no difficulty in answering my hon. friend's question. The Government has entered into a contract with the firms of Workman and Co., and Sanford & Co., and if it turns out that these firms, or either of them, have been systematically deceiving the Government, that they have no factories, and are not carrying out the contract in accordance with its terms, most assuredly I shall proceed according as the circumstances seem to demand.

Mr. BERGERON. I have only spoken against Workman & Co., not against the others.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I say, both concerns; an inquiry will be made into both cases.

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

### After Recess.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose at six o'clock, the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), was reading an essay, which I am sorry I have not in my hand just now, written by a gentleman named King. He may be a very nice man; I have nothing to say against him, because I do not know him. He is a professor in a university—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). At Harvard—not a professor, but he is in some position there.

Mr. BERGERON. And he was paid \$200 to find out that the sweating system was in force in Montreal.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not say that.

Mr. BERGERON. That is what it means.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I said that he was employed to study the question whether it was in force there or elsewhere.

Mr. BERGERON. According to what my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) has read he found out that the sweating system was in force in Montreal, but I want to tell my hon. friend there is no such thing in Montreal as the sweating system as it is understood in Ontario. The system in vogue amongst manufacturers like Shorey & Co. and others, is the system that is allowed even by the tailors of Montreal. I can tell my hon. friend that some of the best tailors in Montreal, Gibb & Co., for instance, have their work done outside of their shops altogether. They give their work to women and girls, who do it at their own homes, and there is no other system than that followed in Montreal. All that the hon. Postmaster General has read, and all that he has said, are apart from the subject before us. What is the subject before us to-day? There was a discussion between the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence and myself about a contract which was given for artillery coats and trousers. The hon. Minister did not give the contract to Shorey & Co. because they would not subscribe to a clause in the tender against working under the sweating system, and because they were honourable enough to say that they had their way of doing their work and that they would not change it. They did not get the contract. The contract for coats was given to Mr. Workman, Workman not declaring what Mr. Shorey had been honourable enough to say, that he would continue the system of sending coats outside of his factory.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, Mr. Workman accepted this condition.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend will have to decide that with him later on. The

contract was given to Workman at 49 cents a coat more than Shorey would have made it for, Shorey's tender being \$6.25 and Workman's \$6.74. There is the whole case. Has Workman done his work as the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence expected him to do it or not? I understand that he has not done it in that way. The hon. Minister said that he had instructions from his department that Workman did the contract according to the expectations of the department, that he did the work in his own factory and not outside. I have proved to-day, and it was read this afternoon that 2,000 coats were made outside of Montreal altogether, in Ste. Rose in Laval and in Ste. Thérèse in Terrebonne. I have proved that this work was done just as Mr. Shorey has done it, although Mr. Workman's contract was 49 cents higher. Trousers were also made outside of the shop, and they were sent by express. If my hon. friend desires an investigation he can easily have the express people testify to the fact. The hon. Postmaster General has given us an essay upon the sweating system. That is not the question here at all. I say that there is no such thing as the sweating system in Montreal. The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence said that the reason for not giving these contracts to manufacturers employing people outside of their factories, was that the work was done at ridiculously low prices. It seems to me that the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence and the hon. Postmaster General should be anxious, as trustees of the public in this country, to see that the work is done as cheaply as possible, provided the people are perfectly well satisfied with the remuneration they receive. I am sorry that the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) is not here. I wanted to ask him a question this afternoon if I had had a chance before six o'clock. He must have received letters from people in his county complaining of the fact that the Government forced public contractors not to have work done, as it has been done in the past, by people living in his county at Ste. Rose, and also by people living in the county of my hon. friend for Terrebonne (Mr. Chauvin). I know that on the 27th of July, the Mayor of Montreal, the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine), wrote to some manufacturers in Montreal telling them that he was going to impress upon the Minister of Militia and Defence, and upon other departments, that no such clause as this be inserted in future contracts. Has the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence received any such communication from the Mayor of Montreal?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Not yet.

Mr. BERGERON. Probably the hon. gentleman will receive it, because it was only on the 27th of July that the Mayor of Montreal wrote to the manufacturers that he was going to ask that a change be made in that

direction. The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) must have received some letters, not only from the people who are employed in this work, but from some others who are interested in the matter, in Laval, asking him to impress upon the Government the necessity of striking that clause out of public tenders. I hope the hon. Minister of Militia will take note of this and will find out whether Workman has deceived him or not, and if he has I will leave it to my hon. friend to deal with him. I see that the hon. member for Laval has come in. I want to get his testimony in regard to the work that is done in Laval, for different houses in Montreal, and to ask him whether there is necessity of striking that clause out of public morality, by reason of work being done in the homes of the people in his county. I want also to ask him if he has received letters from people who used to be employed in that work, or from some of the parish priests, asking him to do everything in his power to get that clause struck out of public tenders, representing that it has taken away a great deal of work from the people in his county that has been done by them for many years at a remuneration with which they are perfectly satisfied.

Mr. FORTIN. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) has asked me a question, I may say, in the first place, that I did not receive any letters from people, or from curés, in the localities interested. I can very well understand the reason: I understand that there is quite a collection of these letters and affidavits in the hands of the hon. gentleman. As regards the question of danger to morality from people working in their own homes for such firms as Shorey & Co., Workman & Co., and others, I must tell the hon. member what he knows, that, certainly, there is no better place for the people to work in than their own homes. As far as that is concerned, I think my opinion will accord with his own. Although I do not care to discuss the merits of this particular contract, or to discuss the sweating system, of which, indeed, I know very little, I can tell the hon. gentleman something that, perhaps, he is not quite aware of, and is it this, that, although these people choose to remain at home and work for these manufacturers, they complain of the insufficiency of the prices they get from them. I have heard it stated, again and again, that these women and young girls were killing themselves from morning till night earning a bare living. This is the complaint I have heard at Ste. Rose, more particularly, where I live, and where these persons reside and are known to me. They, of course, do that work themselves at home and they are not required to work in the factory. They repeatedly complained of the insufficient amount from those contractors. I do not allude specially or more particularly to Shorey & Co. than to other firms of a similar character in the city of Montreal.

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. MONK. I do not wish to enter upon any discussion of the sweating system, but in so far as I understand the system, I wish to bear testimony to this, that that system is not practised by Messrs. Shorey. I wish to say further that not only that company, but most of those engaged in similar manufactures in the city of Montreal are a great boon to our people. I challenge the statement of my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Fortin)—I challenge it at least as far as my own county is concerned—the people are continually complaining of the prices paid to them for the work which these manufacturers caused to be executed by the farmers' families. What the committee must bear in mind is that those who undertake this work are by no means paupers. They are the families, as a rule, of rather well-to-do farmers. The mothers and daughters have considerable leisure time, particularly at certain seasons. And the fact that they should be charged with the execution of this work is a great boon to them. It enables them to acquire habits of thrift. It gives them an interest in their work, and there are a number of manufacturers besides Messrs. Shorey & Co.—manufacturers of shirts and collars, who always distribute their work in the rural counties surrounding the city. The work which is distributed in that county is a source of great gratification to the people there.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Might I ask the Minister what were the terms of the contract as to the sweating system?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The terms of the contract, or what is known as the sweating clause, are as follows:—

With a view to suppressing the sweating system and securing payment to the workmen of fair wages, and the performance of the work under proper sanitary conditions, this contract shall be subject to the following regulations, and strict compliance with the true spirit and intent of the various provisions herein contained is required:—

1. All articles included in this contract shall be made up in the contractor's own factory, and no portion of the work of making up such articles shall be done at the houses of the workpeople. The contract shall not, nor shall any portion thereof, be transferred without the written permission of the Minister of Militia and Defence, and sub-letting of the contract or of any of the work to be performed under the contract, other than that which may be customary in the trades concerned is hereby forbidden.

That is the essential point.

If the contractor violates the condition herein mentioned against sub-letting, he shall not be entitled to receive any payment under the contract for work done by the sub-contractor, and the Minister of Militia and Defence may refuse to accept any work performed by a sub-contractor in violation of the prohibition herein contained against sub-letting.

The factory, and the work there being performed under this contract, shall at all reasonable times be open to inspection by persons therefor

authorized in writing by the Minister of Militia and Defence.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** Will the hon. Minister tell us where this factory is ?

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** I have not inspected it. There are only two or three more points which I propose to present in reference to this matter, and one is that since I left here at six o'clock, I saw the officer of my department, who I stated a few days ago when my main Estimates were up for discussion had inspected the work of the factory. He heard the statement made this afternoon by my hon. friend and that officer says that he has been in that factory several times. That it is a large, capacious, light, well ventilated and healthy factory; that it is larger than Sanford's factory, against whom my hon. friends seem to have no objection. That is the statement made by an officer in my department who was not appointed by me, whom I found in the department, and who I believe to be a thoroughly upright man, and he made that statement to me deliberately since we left this Chamber at six o'clock. I thought I could not be mistaken. I stated very positively that there was a factory, that it was well equipped, and that I believed clothing was being made in that factory, and to make assurance doubly sure, I spoke to this officer.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Who is this officer ?

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** His name is McCann. I never saw the factory, I had no occasion to go to the factory, but I asked him about it. It is diagonally opposite the head office of Workman & Co., where his goods are sold. That is the statement which I make. I cannot make it more specific than that. Now, with regard to the wages paid I have to say this, that every employee in the Workman establishment is a member of the trades union, and that the wages paid are the wages fixed by that union. Here is a statutory declaration of the wages paid :

Foreman and superintendent shall be paid \$14 weekly. Fitters, open and trimming work for hands and arranging linings for hands to commence work, \$8 and \$10. Main operators on the machine paid by the piece, earned weekly from \$10 to \$20.

I may say here that Mr. McCann has told me that at his last inspection he saw a young woman there who told him that sometimes she earns more than \$9 a week. That is in pretty strong contrast to the statement read to my hon. friend the Postmaster General of four girls earning from \$2.50 to \$4 or \$5 a week under the old system.

Pressers to assist machine operators, same press belts, paid by the week, \$7 ;—

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** What report are you reading from ?

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** I am reading from Mr. Workman's sworn affidavit.

—tellers and girls employed to fit coats and for basting lining, paid by the week, \$3 to \$4.50 ; pressers for coats and belts, paid by the piece, earn weekly \$10 to \$12 ; finishers, girls employed for sewing on buttons, &c., earn weekly \$3 to \$4 ; examiners, after coats are entirely finished in shop, earn weekly \$12 to \$15 ; button-hole makers, paid by the week, earn \$10 to \$12, and girl assistants, \$3 to \$4.50. Special examiner, before packing, \$12 ; packers and workers, \$10. Our factory flats are two in number, well-lighted back and front, are 25 feet wide, 100 feet deep, ceiling 12 feet high, properly arranged for the comfort of the hands, machines running by electricity,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

**Mr. BERGERON.** It requires an investigation, because my information is quite the reverse. I read affidavits, too.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** Is it to be assumed that an affidavit made by a respectable manufacturer in the city of Montreal is not to be considered worth as much as the affidavits which my hon. friend read ? I do not understand that he read any affidavit stating that there was no factory in existence. That was his own statement. He did not say he had an affidavit to that effect ; but he took the responsibility, as a member of Parliament, of stating on the floor of this House that the Workman Company, of Montreal, had no factory whatever.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Yes.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** The hon. gentleman repeats it now ?

**Mr. BERGERON.** Yes.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE** (reading) :

—comfortably heated, closets, &c. We open our factory at 7.30, close at 6 p.m., allowing one hour for meals. Total number of hands employed at present is about 40. Our factory is located at 1857 Notre Dame Street, nearly opposite our main premises.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** Will the hon. gentleman tell us how many the Sanford Company employ ? He told us that the Workman factory was larger than the Sanford factory.

**Mr. WALLACE.** I can tell the hon. gentleman that the Sanford Company have from 1,500 to 1,700 employees.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** They are engaged in other work. Workman & Co. do the same. I want to say to my hon. friend from Beauharnois that the Workman Company, I am informed, have contracts with the city of Montreal to make clothing for the firemen. They have also contracts with the Electric Tramway

Company to make the clothing for their employees. Now, is it not possible, and even probable, that the affidavits read by my hon. friend may have referred to the clothing made under these contracts, for military clothing? I think the hon. gentleman ought at least to be willing to give the benefit of the doubt to this firm. I can scarcely understand why my hon. friend seems determined to pursue Workman & Co. with such malignity as he has done for some time past. I can understand his friendship for the Messrs. Shorey; but, surely, he is not persecuting the Workman people because they happen to be Liberals and the Shoreys Conservatives.

Mr. BERGERON. No; I want to help my hon. friend to see that his aims are carried out.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (reading):

The special examining, stamping and packing is done at our main store, where also the cutting is done by cutters employed at a salary of \$12 to \$14 weekly, and superintended by our regular foreman; that in all other respects the provisions of the said contract have been observed, and the work performed in the manner provided and called for in the said contract.

And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing it to be true, knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1898.

MARK WORKMAN.

This is dated the 12th of January, 1899. Now, a good deal has been said as to the general principle we have adopted, which is opposed to the sweating system. I do not propose to enter into a discussion of that matter, but I repeat what I said earlier in the discussion, that, after having gone carefully into the question with my hon. friend the Postmaster General, who took special pains to inform himself in this matter, I was satisfied that he had made out a case, and that it was in the interest of the working people, from a sanitary stand-point, and a material stand-point, and to increase their wages, that we should adopt this clause in our contract, opposed to the sweating system. My hon. friend from Beauharnois is quite sure that there is no such thing as the sweating system in or about Montreal. As to that, he appealed to my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Fortin), who certainly did not bear him out, because my hon. friend said that there were complaints on every hand as to the low rate of wages paid to people who were doing this work; and I believe that the statistics will show that in that neighbourhood there are a great many deaths, and a great deal of distress and sickness, due to the fact that these people work too many hours in their homes, staying in the house all day, and not getting proper exercise, in order to get the miserable pittance allowed to them by the manufacturers. I do not say that Mr. Shorey differs

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

in this respect from other men. Neither did the hon. member for Beauharnois say that Mr. Workman in that respect differed from Mr. Shorey, or paid less wages. I do say that I believe that system has the effect of reducing the rate of wages paid to the people who do the work. Why is it that Mr. Shorey offers, as my hon. friend claims, to do the work at a lower price than anybody else? He does it because he gets the work done at a lower price.

Mr. FOSTER. If that be so, I would like the Minister to go through many of the columns in which the tender of Mr. Shorey was higher. Why was it higher in those cases? Because he was paying higher wages, according to the argument of my hon. friend.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend from York claimed that Mr. Shorey's price was lower in almost every instance.

Mr. FOSTER. No; I said that in some he was lower, and in others he was not.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I understood that the point of the hon. gentleman was that the country was losing a great deal of money by giving the contract in the way we did in order to adopt the system we insisted on being followed.

Mr. BERGERON. So you did, you lost \$1,960.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Well, the country can stand the loss, if we remove from the working people the danger of sickness and obtain for them higher wages. I think I have fairly well justified the course I have pursued. The hon. gentleman has made certain charges which I promised to investigate so as to see whether his statement be true that the clothes are not made in a factory but somewhere else. But that Mr. Workman has a factory I think there can be no question. I cannot conceive it possible that a large manufacturer, such as he is, a man of means, occupying the position he does in the city of Montreal, would concoct such a tissue of falsehoods as he would be convicted of concocting if my hon. friend's statement were true.

Mr. BERGERON. No doubt my hon. friend states what he is convinced is true, and it is not a question between he and me, but between his informers and those who are giving me the information. I do not know Mr. Workman at all, but I have every reason to believe that he is the gentleman who is down in the directory as Mr. Mark Workman, merchant tailor, of the Mammoth Clothing House, Montreal. If he has a factory, he must have built since a few days. He is not a manufacturer but purely and

simply a merchant tailor, and no doubt a very respectable man.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. A merchant tailor is a manufacturer.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Not in the sense we are describing one at present, and my hon. friend knows what I mean. He is not a large manufacturer like the Sanford Company.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. He has the contract for the supply of clothing for the firemen of Montreal and the employees of the Electric Tramway.

Mr. **BERGERON**. That may be, and if he has the contract for the firemen it is only lately, because there has been a great fight in the city council of Montreal over this matter, and the contract was taken away from the one who had it. Mr. Charlebois used to be the man who made the clothes for the police and firemen.

Mr. **LEMIEUX**. Mr. Charlebois was not a manufacturer.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Neither is the other. They both do the same kind of business. We are here to perform a public duty, and it is not a question of casting aspersions on Mr. Workman or of booming Mr. Workman, or Shorey & Company. I am not here to boom Shorey & Company. They have been manufacturers for the last fifty years and their standing is very good. It is not a question of being in favour of or against Mr. Workman, but of criticising this Government for having paid him for doing certain work which could have been done at a cheaper rate by another man. My hon. friend says he could not understand how a man like Mr. Workman could give an affidavit if he has not a large factory where he employs some forty working people, a factory larger than that of the Sanford Company in Hamilton.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I did not say that. What I said was that the factory where the military clothing is being made by Mr. Workman is a larger room than that which the Sanford Company use for the manufacture of military clothes.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Mr. Workman keeps a store at 1880 Notre Dame Street, and the large room of which my hon. friend speaks of is on the other side of the street, and not at all on the premises occupied by Mr. Workman.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. It is opposite them.

Mr. **BERGERON**. When the hon. gentleman talks about the sweating system, does he not mean that under that system the employees are not employed in the factory itself but somewhere else?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. That is a factory itself.

Mr. **BERGERON**. If Mr. Workman rents a room five or six blocks away from his premises, would you call that employing men in his own factory?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. Certainly.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Where is the difference between renting a room a few blocks away from the store and having the military clothing made there or renting a room in the parish of Ste. Rose?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. It is all a question of the construction of the agreement.

Mr. **BERGERON**. It is purely a question whether the one is a Grit and the other a Conservative. My hon. friend has stated that in this matter he was actuated by a regard for the public good, but let me read for the information of the House a few declarations which I have in my hand and which I set against the affidavit of Mr. Workman that everything he supplied has been made in this factory at such a number opposite his store on Notre Dame Street:

Ste. Rose, 27th July, 1899.

I have made for Mr. M. Workman, of Montreal, about 100 military great-coats since the 1st November, 1898.

**MRS. ALPHONSE RENAUD.**

H. M. Dart and M. Clouthier, witnesses.

Ste. Rose, 27th July, 1899.

I have made for Mr. M. Workman, of Montreal, 12 military great-coats since the 1st November, 1898.

**CLEOPHILE DESJARDINS.**

H. M. Dart and M. Clouthier, witnesses.

Ste. Rose, 27th July, 1899.

I have made for Mr. M. Workman, of Montreal, 36 military great-coats since the 1st November, 1898.

**CELINERE FORTIN.**

H. M. Dart and M. Clouthier, witnesses.

Ste. Rose, 27th July, 1899.

I have made for Mr. M. Workman, of Montreal, 48 military great-coats since the 1st November, 1898.

**ROSE DESJARDINS.**

H. M. Dart and M. Clouthier, witnesses.

Ste. Rose, 27th July, 1899.

I have made for Mr. M. Workman, of Montreal, 74 military great-coats since the 1st November, 1898.

**ANNA DESJARDINS.**

H. M. Dart and M. Clouthier, witnesses.

Ste. Thérèse, 27th July, 1899.

I have made for Mr. M. Workman, of Montreal, about 100 military great-coats since the 1st November, 1898.

**ARTHUR CHARRON.**

H. M. Dart and M. Clouthier, witnesses.

Ste. Rose, 27th July, 1899.

I have made for Mr. M. Workman, of Montreal, since the 1st November, 1898, about 100 military great-coats.

MADAME PAUL GAGNON.

H. M. Dart and M. Clouthier, witnesses.

Ste. Thérèse, 27th July, 1899.

I have made for Mr. M. Workman, of Montreal, 150 pairs military pants since the 1st November, 1898.

DAME D. LABONTE.

H. M. Dart and M. Clouthier, witnesses.

Ste. Thérèse, 27th July, 1899.

I have made for Mr. M. Workman, of Montreal, 150 pairs military pants since the 1st November, 1898.

DAME VICTOR LABONTE.

H. M. Dart and M. Clouthier, witnesses.

Ste. Thérèse, 27th July, 1899.

I have made for Mr. M. Workman, of Montreal, since the 1st November last, 171 pairs of military pants.

AMANDA LABONTE.

H. M. Dart and M. Clouthier, witnesses.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have already told my hon. friend that those pants were a special order, not included in the contract.

Mr. BERGERON. How does the hon. gentleman know that the ones I am reading are the ones not included or not?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They were the only ones made. He made very few. His principal work was overcoats.

Mr. BERGERON. There were 471 pairs of trousers made in the parishes of Ste. Rose and Ste. Thérèse and 576 overcoats.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The number of coats you read of were 470.

Mr. FOSTER. The number would not make any difference in the principle.

Mr. BERGERON. These people who have signed these declarations are all respectable people. I do not know them, but if my hon. friend has an investigation he can have them brought before the committee and swear them, or he can ask his neighbour from Laval (Mr. Fortin) whether these are respectable people or not. I do not think they would sign these affidavits unless they were convinced they were true.

Mr. FORTIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. There was a carter who carried the coats. Here is what the carter says who carted the coats:

Montreal, 28th July, 1899.

I carted for Mr. M. Workman, of this city, about 2,000 military great-coats since 1st November, 1898, to different work-people in the parish of Ste. Rose. I also carted these same coats.

Mr. BERGERON.

back to and delivered them to the said Mr. M. Workman, 1888 Notre Dame Street.

CALIXTE BELANGER.

There is the case. I put it as I have it. It is my duty to lay these things before the Minister of Militia and the House, and I think he should be well satisfied to have these things brought before him.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Certainly. I am not finding any fault.

Mr. BERGERON. Unless these are forgeries, the facts show that there has been a bold violation of the contract, so that \$1,960 of public money has been paid to Mr. Workman for nothing. So far as the sweating system is concerned, I repeat, that we have no such thing in Montreal—no such thing as sub-letting contracts, as has been stated by that report read by the Postmaster General. My hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Fortin), I suppose, in his anxiety to say nothing against the Government which he supports, will not say anything for or against the sweating system; and he probably knows that this may be brought against him in his county, because the people there are clamouring for the work. If the remuneration were such a pittance as has been said, they would not be writing to everybody to prevent such a system as the hon. Minister of Militia says should be carried out. They need the work, they like it, and they are satisfied with the remuneration they receive. The only thing the hon. gentleman will be able to say in his own defence is to tell the people: You are not paid enough. That always takes with the people. But, as a matter of fact, the people are satisfied with the money received, and want to work.

Mr. FORTIN. I have answered the question put by my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) to help him. I think he should accept my statement as true.

Mr. ROSAMOND. May I ask is the anti-sweating clause in these contracts similar to the anti-sweating clause in the contracts made by the British Government?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend the Postmaster General can probably answer that question, as he drew the clause.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think that this corresponds substantially with the clause in the British contracts. I have the report of the House of Commons on the subject. I have not it at hand at the moment; but if my hon. friend desires it, I will bring it, and he can have the opportunity of perusing it.

Mr. ROSAMOND. I am inclined to approve of the clause in the contract, so far as the sweating system is concerned. I cannot say that I quite agree with my hon.

friends on this side who have spoken against the clause; but I had no idea the clause was as severe as it appears from what has been read. I hardly think I should be inclined to make it quite so strict. My idea of the sweating system is, that the evil lies largely in the sub-letting of contracts by the Government contractor, and I think that is really what the Government ought to guard against. If the Government did that, and followed up the letting of the contract by seeing that the contractor carries it out strictly, they would, to my mind, be doing very good work. The discussion between the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) and the hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) seems to me to be upon a question whether the contractors, Workman & Co. had fulfilled their contract or not. The hon. member for Beauharnois has made some very strong statements, followed up by affidavits, and it seems to me to be the duty of the Government to see whether the statements and affidavits which are submitted by him, are correct or not. If they are correct, certainly the contractor has not been living up to his contract. While I am on my feet, I may say a word with reference to what the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) said, in speaking of this contract system and the anti-sweating system. I must take exception to what the hon. gentleman said with regard to factories. He used the expression "heated factories." I have no hesitation in saying that the workers in factories of that kind are in much better conditions, so far as health is concerned, than if working in small rooms. "Heated factories" is not a term, I think, that ought to be applied to them. They are large, airy, roomy, and very much better fitted for working in than are the small rooms of dwelling-houses. The small rooms of dwelling houses are more likely to be heated and unhealthy for work of that kind than are factories. I certainly do approve of the anti-sweating clause in the contract, if not carried quite so far.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. While I cannot speak with absolute positiveness as to the conditions, yet, since my hon. friend put the question, I am able to answer, I am sure, with absolute accuracy, that the conditions in the contract which required that the wages paid shall be "current wages paid to competent workmen in the district," is substantially the condition adopted by the Imperial Government. I do not desire to enter into the controversial questions of fact that have been interjected into this discussion, and which, perhaps, form a very important part of this question. I think it is only fair that the hon. member for Beauharnois should, in the presence of the explanations given, reserve, or in fact withdraw, his criticisms, until he can disprove the statements made by the hon. Minister. The Minister states that a small percentage, about one-

eighth, of the overcoats had been made not strictly under the anti-sweating conditions, because they were urgently required, and the contractor had not provided the necessary equipment. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) read the affidavit of a carter to prove that some 2,000 great-coats had been carted around. The affidavit proves nothing, except that these great-coats were carted. Of course, these coats could be carted from shop to shop. He carted the manufactured goods. We have nothing to do with them after they are manufactured.

Mr. BERGERON. No, he carted them over to different parties in the place where the coats were made, then he brought them back.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is not the statement made to the House. The statement was read that he carted so many coats, manufactured, of course.

Mr. FOSTER. The statement is a double one. The statement was that he carried 2,000 of those military coats to the homes in St. Rose, and that he carted them back again after they were made.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; there is no reference whatever to the making in the statement; the hon. gentleman read nothing about the making.

Mr. FOSTER. All I can say is that is what I read.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not have a chance of reading the statement, I heard it quoted from, and heard my hon. friend read that he carted that number of coats. However, the hon. member for Beauharnois complains, and this is the gravamen of his charge, that the Government paid nearly \$2,000 more for these coats than was necessary; that under the sweating system they could have been obtained so much cheaper. Therefore, the issue between us now is whether it was the duty of the Government to have acquired them at the cheapest possible price at which men and women can live or starve, or to have acquired them at a higher price. That is the issue between us, and I accept that issue.

Mr. BERGERON. That is not the issue.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is the issue my hon. friend has thrown down in this House.

Mr. BERGERON. No, no.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, I took down the hon. gentleman's words. He complains that we gave a contract to Mr. Workman when the work could have been done cheaper. That is what the hon. gentleman says.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That simply means one thing, that under this system we are pledged to pay current wages to competent men, and that caused the price to be a little more. Is this country prepared to pay current prices, or do we wish to continue the old system of grinding the lives out of these working people? That is the issue presented to the House, and the House will understand where the hon. gentleman is upon this issue. The country will make no mistake whatever in discovering the significance of it.

Mr. FOSTER. The country will know where we both stand.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am surprised that the ex-Minister of Finance cannot receive my criticism in patience. I wish now to refer to the hon. member for Lanark, who addressed himself to the subject in a fair way, and has practically approved the whole system. He approved the principle whereby sub-letting is prevented, because sub-letting makes the sweating system possible. Therefore, if it is recognized that we shall adopt all conditions necessary in order to prevent the sweating system, we must adopt the conditions against sub-letting, or against any system that permits the manufacture to be carried out in that way or would involve the application of the sweating system. Now, I would like to know how you can prevent sub-letting the work if it is sent out in piecework all over the country. The only practical way by which you can enforce the anti-sweating condition is to control the manufacture and not permit sub-letting; also to secure that the manufacture will take place under your own eye. But that cannot take place unless in centres, or in places under the control of the manufacturer himself, or the contractor himself, so that he can pledge his solemn oath that the work was conducted in the manner required, and that he paid current wages to the workingmen who did this work. For that reason it becomes necessary in order to secure the payment of fair wages, that there shall be centres of manufacture, and it is also necessary for the other reasons that my hon. friend referred to, the health of the operatives, and that satisfactory premises shall be provided for that purpose. That means endorsing the system which Mr. King shows has obtained not merely in Montreal but in Toronto and Hamilton, as my hon. friend will find according to the testimony given in that report. Mr. King took a long time, he visited many points in this country and has got particulars. I say the question is whether we shall adopt the views of the member for Beauharnois and permit the system of manufacture whereby women are paid between one and two cents an hour for labour, or shall we adopt a system whereby they can get enough wages to earn a reasonable livelihood. I think the country will be perfectly

Mr. BERGERON.

satisfied with the way we have spent this \$2,000, or any other sum if it has the effect of levelling up wages, or setting an example which may have the effect of levelling up the rate of wages throughout the country. I do not speak for others on this question, but speaking for myself I believe it would be a wise thing in the interests of the country if every bit of Government work that is to be issued were, if possible, issued under similar conditions, so as to prevent sub-letting whereby contractors are able to make several profits out of the labour of the workingmen. In that case the middlemen will be cut out, the profit that goes to the middlemen will go to the workingmen, they will be the gainers, and the middlemen will disappear altogether. Now, is that not in the interests of this country? When we discussed this question before, I expressed a hope, and I now repeat that hope, that with a more full understanding of the question, all the members of this House would come to the view that this provision is a wise one, and one that should be extended instead of being adversely criticised. I believe the member for Beauharnois has criticised it more out of loyalty to a friend who did not get the contract, than from a study of the subject and a conviction that the principles involved here are not in the public interest.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend does not understand the question at all. I never saw in my life a gentleman so clever as my hon. friend in surrounding a question with cobwebs. The whole question is very simple. I am not talking against the workingmen of this country for whom my hon. friend wishes to be known as the champion. The Minister of Militia and Defence invited tenders to make military great-coats, and Mr. Shorey of Montreal, said he was ready to tender, and he tendered at a lower price than any other tenderer in the country; he tendered for great-coats at 49 cents lower than anybody else. He said: If you exact from me an adherence to that clause in your tender that will prevent me from doing our work in our usual way, the way we have been doing it for the last 20 or 30 years, that is, sending it out to different parishes around Montreal, we cannot take the contract at that price.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. At any price, he could not do it at all.

Mr. BERGERON. The Minister of Militia and Defence puts him aside, he does not consider his tender. What I complain of now is that my hon. friend gives the contract to Mr. Workman, of Montreal. Well, I say that Mr. Workman, of Montreal, fulfilled this contract in the same way that Mr. Shorey had declared that he would do it, and for saying which he was put aside. It is not a question as to whether we were giving a high price to the workmen of this country or not.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The hon. gentleman said that we should have had the work done cheaper.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I am as much in favour of giving a good price to the man who does the work as the hon. Postmaster General is, but the question is: Why was the contract taken away from Shorey, who would have done the work for \$1,960 less, and given to Workman, although he did it in the same way that Shorey was to do it?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. That is not correct.

Mr. **BERGERON**. That is correct, and that is why I say the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence should have an investigation. Let the hon. Minister have an investigation and he will find out. What does Belanger say? Belanger says:

I carted for Mr. M. Workman, of this city, about 2,000 military great-coats since the 1st of November, 1898, to different work-people in the parish of Ste. Rose;—

Does my hon. friend think that he was doing this to amuse himself? He says:

—I also carted these same coats back to and delivered them to the said Mr. M. Workman, 1888 Notre Dame Street.

Not at the factory of which my hon. friend spoke a moment ago.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. It does not show they were made there. My hon. friend said they were taken there to be made.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I said so and I say it again.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. It is not in that document.

Mr. **BERGERON**. That man will swear that he carted them and he will give us his explanation as to why he carted them. There would be no sense in a man promenading between Montreal and Ste. Rose just to get fresh air. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence to give the number of the street where the new factory is.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. No. 1857.

Mr. **BERGERON**. When was the contract given?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. On the 10th of January, 1899.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Well, I have here the directory of the city of Montreal for the year 1898-99, and No. 1857 is blank.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. That was printed long before 1899.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Well, then, what does it prove?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). It was printed in 1898.

Mr. **BERGERON**. This was printed in July last year. What does it prove? I leave it to the hon. Postmaster General to say whether his theory in regard to the sweating system—

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Does the hon. gentleman propose to prove by a book, printed in 1898, that a certain building did not exist in 1899?

Mr. **BERGERON**. I do not say that. There is a house at No. 1857, but there is nobody in it. My contention is that Workman has no factory, never had a factory, and that, probably, when he heard of the discussion we had a month ago, he leased a room at No. 1857 and call that his factory. I would ask my hon. friend if that is what he would understand by a factory. He professes not to be working according to the sweating system because he leases a room across the street and calls it his factory.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. I am sure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) does not desire to misrepresent anybody. This declaration was made by Mr. Workman on the 11th of January, 1899, before David Robertson, justice of the peace and a commissioner for taking affidavits, and in it he states that he has a factory, describes the size of the room and gives these particulars that I have quoted.

Mr. **BERGERON**. What is the size of the room?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. 100 by 25 feet.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. And he says that all his work is done there.

Mr. **BERGERON**. This is another reason why my hon. friend should investigate the whole case.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. The inspector is here. The man who knows all about the factory of his own knowledge, and has been there, over and over again, is on the floor of this House now, and if he were permitted to speak, he could tell the hon. gentleman what he has seen. He is a reputable officer of my department and a gentleman who has been in that department for years.

Mr. **FOSTER**. When did he inspect the factory?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. In March.

Mr. **FOSTER**. March of this year?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. Quite so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Two months after the contract was made.

Mr. BERGERON. It is as clear as day now. The contract was made last fall.

Mr. FOSTER. When was the contract made?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. On the 10th of January, 1899.

Mr. BERGERON. All these coats and trousers were made in different parishes out of the city of Montreal, and Workman leased that property, I suppose, about two or three months ago, and now declares that it is his factory, when, as a matter of fact, his work was not done as it should have been done there, and my hon. friend is in duty bound to have the whole thing investigated.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman's case has broken down lamentably. I have been thinking over the matter since the discussion came up, and I may explain, in addition to what I have stated, that both Sanford and Workman firms, who got contracts, stated that they must have time to get ready to do this work under the new system. Mr. W. H. Sanford himself told me that it would be necessary to have additional rooms. We gave both Sanford and Workman additional time. The advertisements were published in the autumn, and before we entered into the contract, we were satisfied that they were in a position to comply with the contract literally. That contract was not made until Mr. Workman had completed his factory, put in electric plant and shown that he was in every way in a position to carry on the work. We found that we needed 500 overcoats, and as we could not wait until this condition of the contract could be complied with, we gave him these coats to make, and we gave an order to the Sanford firm to be made in the same way. We had to have this work done; we could not wait to have it done in the way that the contract stipulated. The hon. member for Beauharnois seems to have shifted his ground since six o'clock. This afternoon the gravamen of the charge was that we had lost some \$1,900 or \$2,000. Since the hon. Postmaster General made his spirited observations, in which he brought the thing to a straight issue as between the sweating system and the improved system that we have appointed, the hon. member for Beauharnois has receded from the ground he took this afternoon.

Mr. BERGERON. Not at all. I have not receded. I have not changed one word of what I said. I say the Government have lost \$1,960.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Why is it that we have lost \$1,900?

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

Mr. BERGERON. Because Shorey & Co. would have done the work the same as Workman & Co. for \$1,960 less.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Because we refused to continue the sweating system.

Mr. BERGERON. Not at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. BERGERON. If my hon. friend has refused—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. BERGERON. If my hon. friend allows me to speak, why will not the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) allow me?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If the country has lost \$1,900, the labouring people of Montreal have increased their wages by that amount, and they have that money in their pockets. The people of Canada at large will not hesitate to pay that, or even more, as the hon. Postmaster General has said, in order to do away with the vicious system which the hon. member for Beauharnois is here to-day as the advocate of.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the hon. gentleman defending now?

Mr. ROSAMOND. Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that the question is as to whether that \$1,960 has gone into the hands of the workmen or not. That seems to be the whole question. If the contention of the hon. member for Beauharnois is right, I think that \$1,960 must have gone into the pockets of the contractors. That is really the point in dispute, and it is the question that we have to solve in this case. The question is, as to whether Workman & Co. have done this work in their own factory or sent it out to Ste. Rose, or Ste. Thérèse, or other places, in order to have the work done. If they did that, they violated the spirit of the contract. If they did the work in their own factories, then the workmen have probably got the \$1,960, but I do not think there is really any necessity for disputing about it. The facts of the case ought to be inquired into by the Minister.

Mr. BERGERON. I have not changed at all what I said before dinner and during the time we have been discussing this matter. I say we have lost \$1,960. This money has gone into the pockets of the people working in the country, in the very same way that Shorey had done. The whole story is, that it was taken away from Shorey & Co. because they were Conservatives, and given to Workman because he is a Liberal.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) is forgetting what he said. He stated that the Government could have got this work done cheaper; and he

further added, that the people were perfectly satisfied with the wages that had been paid to them, and for that reason he objects to the system that we are endeavouring to introduce, whereby the sub-letting and lower wages consequently may be prevented. Now, I take issue with him. I do not believe that the people, although they could work for starvation wages under the sub-letting system, are in any way satisfied with it. They may take the wages under a sort of compulsion, but that they are satisfied with them, I deny, and if they are satisfied with them, it is a satisfaction of necessity, and not the satisfaction that would arise if they were free to refuse such wages. The wages that have been paid to workmen under contracts in which we have introduced the anti-sweating conditions, if Mr. King's report is correct—and it seems to me to be correct—have been far greater than the wages paid by Government contractors for many years past. They have not been such wages as competent wages should receive. We take our stand against that low system of sub-letting, with the view of securing payment of current wages to competent workmen.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend the Postmaster General is most unfair in one respect, and if it were not in the House of Commons, I would say it was most unstatesmanlike. I may say that if it were on the platform, I would say that it was the part of a demagogue. Will my hon. friend the Postmaster General tell me what wages were paid by Mr. Workman to the people who made those military great-coats under the contract with the Minister of Militia?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia read an affidavit upon that point.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Militia and Defence read no such figures. He has not such figures under his hand. If these affidavits are true—and we have no right to say they are not true—some 500 of these great-coats were made in Ste. Rose by people in their own homes. They would have been done by Mr. Shorey in the homes of the people. The argument of my hon. friend is, that lower wages would have been paid in the case of Mr. Shorey having them done in the homes of Ste. Thérèse and Ste. Rose, than was paid in the actual making of them by Mr. Workman, who had at least 2,000 of them made in those same homes, according to these affidavits. Are not these affidavits from a dozen persons, whose respectability is vouched for by the man who knows them, the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin), who sits in this House? Are not those as good as Mr. Workman's? Mr. Workman's is a general affidavit, and these are special affidavits, and that is the difference between them. The Postmaster General has not one scintilla of evidence to base that appeal upon, namely, that the wages

paid by Mr. Workman for the making of those great-coats was one cent more than paid by Mr. Shorey under his contract. What is his reason? His reasoning is, that Mr. Shorey would not have paid lower than Mr. Workman, unless he paid sweating wages. That is the argument. That is the assertion. But anybody knows that any one can make a general statement of that kind, and anybody knows that the Postmaster General did not attempt to prove it. Why, it is disproved on their own grounds, because Mr. Shorey must have been paying sweating wages because his tender was less by 49 cents per coat. In these same tenders Mr. Workman is lower in nine out of ten of those articles than Mr. Shorey, and, by the very same reasoning of the Postmaster General, Mr. Workman must have been paying sweating wages. Now, Sir, that is the kind of argument upon which my hon. friend the Postmaster General tried to base an appeal to the people, and in which my hon. friend the Minister of Militia was foolish enough to follow him. He got his great-coats done in Ste. Rose at the homes of the people, and the Postmaster General said that these great-coats were taken out to Ste. Rose, 12 or 15 miles distant, and, being mentioned as coats, and then were brought back as ready-made, that this carter had been carting them round the workingmen's homes at Ste. Rose for the purpose of taking fresh air. That is unworthy of a man who is chancellor of the university, that is unworthy of a man who instituted penny postage, that is altogether unworthy of a man who took up a scheme after it was laid in its foundations by a party opposed to him, and now claims all the credit for himself. That is unworthy of a man who, having opposed a fast-line service, tooth and nail, in this House, now takes credit for a 20-knot service. That is unworthy of the men, and of the man, who, when on this side of the House, brought in a Bill to lower the salary of the Governor General, supported it, and was applauded by his own party. Now he does this to espouse the cause of the labouring man, but he cannot deceive the people. They have taken his measure on these other subjects, in which he has posed to the gallery, and they will not be again deceived.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend endeavours to deal with the general subject that I tried to discuss, by supposing that I was addressing myself as to the facts as to Mr. Workman's contract. I expressly stated that I did not intend to discuss the details, for I am not familiar with the controversial side of this issue. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia makes certain statements. They are contradicted. The hon. member for Beauharnois declares that the working people were perfectly satisfied with the wages that were being paid to them under the former system.

Mr. BERGERON. Will my hon. friend allow me one word? My hon. friend is not just in that statement, though I do not suppose he wants to be unjust to me. That is not the way I put it. In answer to the hon. member for Laval, who said that these people were clamouring that they were not paid enough, I said that they must be satisfied with what they got, whether it is high or low, because evidently they are afraid that even what they are receiving will be taken away from them under the regulation the Minister of Militia has established. I did not say that they are perfectly well satisfied with their price, because I am sure that if you went through the parishes, they would all say they would like to get more; but they do not want to lose what they have.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman says that his words meant that, I accept his statement; but what he said was that the people were perfectly satisfied with the wages they had to-day. I draw from that the conclusion that the hon. gentleman prefers the old system to the one with the checks which we have imposed. If that is what the hon. gentleman means, I take issue with him. If he simply refers to some isolated cases, that is another thing. I discussed the general question, and, because I was doing so, the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), not being able to address himself to that proposition and discuss it logically, seeks to wander into other avenues. We are quite capable of discussing other issues, and even discussing the hon. gentleman and his record, if necessary; but there are certain seasons when such discussions are in order, and certain seasons when they are out of order. I am discussing the proposition before the Chair, and if the hon. member for Beauharnois spoke in ambiguous language, and did not desire a larger meaning to be taken from his words than he now seeks to give to them, I, of course, accept his statement. I would be the last one to try to put a member in a wrong position. We may all at times fail to express our intentions clearly; but if any hon. gentleman says that he is satisfied with the old system of wages, and objects to our endeavouring to place safeguards on Government work, then we are at issue with him.

Mr. BERGERON. Just one word, and I am finished. We are getting away from the point. If it is proved to the satisfaction of my hon. friend, before a committee or anywhere else, that Mr. Workman had his contract fulfilled in the way that Mr. Shorey would have done it, by these people working in the country, will my hon. friend then say that the law is observed and the contract carried out as it should be?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to direct a little attention to the

Mr. MULOCK.

proposition he has now suggested as a proper matter for inquiry. I take the statements which he has read to the House, and reading them, I do not come to the conclusion which he has come to, nor do I think they warrant the inference he has drawn. Reading these statements, I find that they had no reference, necessarily, on the face of them, to any work that was done in performance of the contract which is now in question. What is the hon. gentleman's attack? It is that my hon. colleague the Minister of Militia has made a contract under which the country has sustained a loss of \$1,900 or \$2,000, when we could have had this work done at a price that much lower. He attacks the Minister of Militia for improvidence in that connection, and in order to support his attack he produces statements from a number of very reputable people to the effect that they had manufactured military coats for the department. But unfortunately for his argument and the deduction he would draw from it, the statement says that these articles were in all probability manufactured and delivered before the contract that is now in question was entered into at all.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Had this firm a contract before?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They had no contract before.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understand from the Minister of Militia and Defence that the first contract entered into by his department with the Messrs. Workman was made on the 10th of January, 1899. It is true that under pressing urgency he had given an order for 500 great-coats before this contract was entered into, and not subject to the terms and provisions of this contract.

Mr. HAGGART. What time was that order given?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In November.

Mr. HAGGART. The tender was accepted on the 9th of August.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was no contract entered into until the 10th of January, 1899, as appears from the affidavit which has been read by my hon. friend.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understood that what was dated the 10th of January, 1899, was the affidavit of Mr. Workman as to the manner in which the contract had been fulfilled.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The first clause of the affidavit which was read by my hon. friend refers to the contract as dated the 10th of January, 1899.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the date of that affidavit?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is made on the 11th of January.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman must be wrong. The contract, he says, was entered into on the 10th of January, 1899, and the affidavit stating the way in which the work was done is dated the 11th January, 1899. I think the hon. gentleman is one year wrong in his facts.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it possible that the man was paid ahead?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think it was likely he was paid ahead.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister of Militia will decide that. When was the contract let?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The contract was sent to him earlier, but it was not actually executed until then.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But he was doing the work for three or four months under the terms of the contract without the contract being formally signed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can very well understand the intense anxiety of hon. gentlemen opposite. It must be perfectly apparent to the committee that it is not the facts which they are desirous of getting at, or three or four of them would not get up at the same time in order to create a clamour or drown the statements made. The Minister of Militia states that the goods which were ordered in connection with this contract, and which were manufactured and received by him, and in respect of which this alleged loss took place, were made and delivered subsequent to the date of this contract, except that some 500 great-coats had been ordered previously. If that is the fact—and the documents which I have referred to and the statement of the Minister of Militia and Defence bear it out—the papers which the hon. member for Beauharnois produces as establishing that these articles were made outside of the premises and in contravention of the contract, do not bear out the inference he draws from them. The 500 great-coats were made prior to the time this contract was entered into and outside of this contract, and not subject to the sweating clause contained in it, so that the terms of the contract cannot be made applicable to them at all. Look at these different statements, they all bear the date of the 27th July, 1899.

Mr. BERGERON. They were taken on the one day. And the others were taken a day or two after, which I will have to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These statements were made on

the 27th July, and if you will add up the number of great-coats which these several people alleged in their declarations that they made since the 1st November, you will find that they aggregate 470, or 30 less than the number which the Minister of Militia explained were made under a special order that did not come under the operation of this clause. So that my hon. friend's case is far from being made and he is still open to the charge of having made a complaint against the management of my hon. friend which he has not supported, and he and his friends find themselves in this very unpleasant position, that they dug a pit into which they themselves have fallen. If you wanted any conclusive evidence of the fact, you will have it in the heat displayed by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), when he rose to reply to my hon. friend and wandered all over the field, talked to us about the fast line and a variety of other things, and intimated that my hon. friend was no better than a demagogue because he had called attention to the actual position of affairs. It seems to me that my hon. friends opposite are in this position, that they undertook to charge against the Minister of Militia that he had made a loss, and they find they have been running dead counter to a sound principle which they are afraid to take issue upon, and are now making desperate efforts in order to escape the consequences of their criticism.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister of Militia has spoken a great deal about the sweating clause in the contract. In my opinion this clause was put there for the purpose of sweating Conservative tenderers out of the job.

Mr. BERGERON. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have listened to the discussion very attentively, and that is the only conclusion I can come to. The facts are these. The Government advertised for tenders for great-coats and other military clothing. The Messrs. Shorey, a reputable house that has been in business for thirty or forty years, to my knowledge, manufacturing clothing, not only on contract with the Government but for the trade of Canada generally—and I myself purchased clothing from them twenty-five or thirty years ago—replied to the Government advertisement, and put in a tender at the price they were prepared to do the work for. But Mr. McShane has a friend who is a merchant tailor in Montreal, and I challenge the officer of the department, who is there on the floor, through his Minister, to contradict the statement I am about to make. In August, when these tenders were accepted, Mr. Workman had no factory for the manufacture of clothing, nor had he any factory for some months later. He did not manufacture any more than other merchant tailors would do in their line of business. Through Mr. McShane, Messrs. Workman & Co. prevailed on

the Minister to apply the sweating clause to the Messrs. Shorey, and the Minister said to that firm: Because you farm your work out to the citizens in the parishes around Montreal, to be sewn by the piece, you come under the sweating clause, and your tender therefore must be sweated out, and Mr. McShane's friend must get this job. The contract was signed on the 11th of January, but the tender was accepted the 1st August, and Workman & Co. were told to get to work. They got their garments cut out and hired a carter to cart the material around and cart back the made-up material, and all this time they had no factory. The Minister's officer, Mr. McCann, who is on the floor, will not say that Workman & Co. had a factory in operation in October, November or December. The Minister states that they had one in March, and it appears that they rented a room across the street and put in some electrical machines to do some work for their retail store, and had about forty men at work. But we know that they farmed out all the Government work, and that my hon. friend from Beauharnois is correct when he says they had no factory. Mr. McShane, however, prevailed on the Government to give them this job, and they did just as the Messrs. Shorey would have done; they gave out the work in exactly the same way, they paid the same prices to the citizens around Montreal for doing the sewing, and they made 50 cents profit over Messrs. Shorey's prices. The hon. Postmaster General is now pleading the cause of the workingman, just as he did that of the Patrons at the last election. But what did he do for the farmers when he came into office? He handed the binder twine made in the penitentiary to a ring, and enabled that ring to squeeze 10 cents a pound out of the farmers for that twine more than they should legitimately have charged. He enabled Mr. McShane's friends to do something on the same scale, when he gave Mr. Workman the contract at 50 cents per piece higher than one of the most respectable firms in Montreal offered to do the work for. When this contract was let in August, Workman & Co. went to work to make the coats. The Minister of Railways says that the contract was only signed on the 9th January, but Workman & Co. had manufactured the greater portion of the goods during the previous fall. The contract was only signed on the 9th January, and yet they made a declaration on the 11th of January that the clothes were all made. Is it possible that they could have made the clothes in two days? The Minister could not have read the contract. The contract was signed on the 11th January, but the tender was accepted in August, and these men were told to go to work, and did so, and they farmed the work out around Montreal just as Messrs. Shorey would have done, and made a clear

Mr. TAYLOR.

profit of \$1,960 over Messrs. Shorey's tender, which they were enabled to do simply because they happened to be friends of Mr. McShane and the Government.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think it would have been just as well for the Minister of Militia and Defence if the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) had read this affidavit before proceeding to discuss it. When the Minister of Railways and Canals began gleaned information and commenting upon it to the discomfiture of hon. gentlemen on this side, I thought he had not heard it as I had heard it a few moments before. He said that this affidavit was with reference to the amount of wages to be paid by the contractor—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think I said that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is certainly what the House understood the hon. gentleman to say. And when I interrupted him and said that was an affidavit which declared that the work was done and showed the conditions under which it was done, he said: No, it was an affidavit as to the wages.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As to the contract.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What did the hon. Minister think the affidavit contained?

The PRIME MINISTER. Let us hear what the affidavit is.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will let the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) hear the affidavit, because it bears out exactly the contention on this side.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would rather judge of that myself.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am sure the right hon. gentleman is a good judge, and I am willing to accept his judgment. If it does not appear to be what I said we will allow the item to pass without a moment's question. The tenders were called for on the 5th August, they were received, I think, on the 9th August and opened on the 11th September. The contract was awarded on the 11th September, 1898. This affidavit bears date 10th January, 1898; but it is evidently a mistake. It is evidently January, 1899. The departmental stamp shows that it was received on January 12th, 1899. This affidavit does not say that certain wages are to be paid under these provisions of the contract, but it does say, as the right hon. Prime Minister will agree, that certain wages were paid.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will be able to form an opinion about that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But I wish to whet the right hon. gentleman's appetite first.

The PRIME MINISTER. But I am afraid that after all, you will not give me a good deal.

Mr. MONTAGUE (reading)—

That as to that certain contract—

The PRIME MINISTER. Read the whole of it.

Mr. MONTAGUE (reading)—

Canada,  
Province of Quebec,  
County of .....

I, Mark Workman, in the county of Hochelaga, do solemnly declare that as to that certain contract dated the 10th day of January, A.D. 1899, between Her Majesty Queen Victoria and Mark Workman, of the city of Montreal, the rates of wages paid in connection with the said contract are as follows, viz.:—

I will not read the list, because the right hon. gentleman has heard it read.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is all right; that is what he is going to pay.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Paid, not to be paid. That is set out clearly in what follows:—

Our factory flats are two in number, well lighted back and front, and are 25 feet wide, 100 in depth, ceilings 12 feet high, properly arranged for the comfort of the hands, machines running by electricity, comfortably heated, closets, &c. We open our factory at 7.30, and close at 6 p.m., allowing one hour for meals. The total number of hands employed at present is about 40. Our factory is located at 1857 Notre Dame street, nearly opposite our main premises. The special examining, stamping and packing is done at our main store, where also the cutting is done by cutters employed at a salary of \$12 to \$14 weekly, and superintended by our regular foreman.

That looks as though the work had been done. Well, perhaps the next sentence will make it clearer:

That in all other respects the provisions of the said contract have been observed and the work performed—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That sounds like it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That sounds like it, does it not?

—in the manner provided and called for by the said contract (or as the case may be).

The wages paid and the work performed, this affidavit says, according to the contract.

And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1898.

(Sgd.) MARK WORKMAN.

Declared before me at county of Hochelaga, in the city of Montreal, this eleventh day of January, A.D. 1899.

(Sgd.) DAVID ROBERTSON,  
Justice of the Peace,  
A Commissioner, &c.

Mr. FOSTER. This contract was dated?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The 10th January.

Mr. FOSTER. And the affidavit?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The 12th January, and the work had all been done, remember. The work was done, evidently, before the contract was properly signed at all. Now, another point. Five hundred of these coats, the Minister says, were permitted to be made without the anti-sweating clause being applied. Now, let us get at the facts. Shorey & Company had agreed to make these coats without the anti-sweating clause for 49 cents apiece less than the tender of Mr. Workman. The anti-sweating clause is revoked for the benefit of Mr. Workman to allow him to make these coats in the same manner as it was proposed by Mr. Shorey they should be made, that is, by sending them out to the wives and daughters of the men of the parishes around. And yet the Minister allowed Mr. Workman his contract price which was 49 cents apiece more than the same coats were to be paid for according to Mr. Shorey's offer under the same system. Surely if Mr. Workman was to have the anti-sweating clause relaxed, he should have reduced his price which he received by reason of the insertion of that anti-sweating clause. All the sophistry of the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), in his vain and noisy attempt to fasten the advocacy of sweating on this side of the House, will not convince even the Minister of Militia himself, I think, that the proposition I am stating is an unfair or ungenerous proposition. If Mr. Workman got 49 cents more by reason of the existence of the anti-sweating clause, surely that 49 cents ought to be taken off if the anti-sweating clause was to be removed and the work was to be done as Mr. Shorey said he would do it. I do not desire to prolong the discussion, but I do desire to resent, for myself and for every other member on this side of the House who has spoken in this discussion, the attack which was made by the Postmaster General and followed by the Minister of Militia. No man on this side, in discussing this question, has for a moment advocated any system by which an honest day's pay should not be given for an honest day's labour. No gentleman on this side has advocated the squeezing of the workmen or workwomen out of a single cent that they have earned.

The Postmaster General knew as well as we did that what we were contending, whether we were right or wrong, was that while they had ostensibly offered to do away with the sweating system at a cost to the country, in this particular, of about \$2,000, that the same system obtained, and that the work was done in the same manner as it would have been done if Mr. Shorey had received the contract and had been permitted to let the work out to the families as he had done in previous years—and cheaper to the country, as the member for Beauharnois said.

What does the Postmaster General say? This is what he says: If the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House says he is in favour of the sweating system then we controvert him, because we are opposed to that position; that is the line of demarcation, that is the division between hon. gentlemen on the two sides of the House. I answer that that is not the point of division, and I refuse for my part, for a moment, to be called the advocate of the sweating system, and I refuse, as the member for Beauharnois has refused, to pay for the abolition of that system in connection with certain works at an expense of \$2,000 to the public treasury, and still have that sweating system remain.

The PRIME MINISTER. It seems to me that if this subject is approached in the proper light it is a very simple one, and there is no reason for the long discussion we have had upon it. I will endeavour to discuss it in the light of the facts which have been presented to us here to-night. Two tenders were received for that work—I speak of only two, because only two are in issue here, the tender of Mr. Shorey and the tender of Mr. Workman. The tender of Mr. Workman was accepted, though higher, because he offered to do the work in accordance with the anti-sweating clause. Now, the only question that arises is whether Mr. Workman has kept his pledge. Now, what are the conditions which were imposed upon Mr. Workman? Certain conditions were imposed upon him, and the member for Beauharnois contends that Mr. Workman has violated the anti-sweating clause of those conditions, because he gave the work out to be done in the parishes around the city of Montreal. Now, this is where I join issue with my hon. friend. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not deny that it is a wise precaution for the Government to require that all the work done by contractors for the Government should be done with the anti-sweating clause. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not oppose the policy of the Government on that point. Do they oppose it, yes or no?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then, they are satisfied that it was proper to give the contract to Workman & Co., though it cost the country higher. But what they blame the Government for, what they blame the Minister of Militia and Defence for, is that he did not compel the contractors to carry out the contract in that particular. That is the position. They do not blame the Government for having given that contract to Workman & Co. at a cost 49 cents higher than the price of Mr. Shorey's tender; they do not blame the Government for that.

Mr. FOSTER. I certainly do if my hon. friend puts in that way.

Mr. MONTAGUE.

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend says that he does blame the Government for doing so let us so understand it.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, let us understand it. As the hon. gentleman puts it, I blame the Government. My hon. friend may not have put it as clearly as he meant to, but as he puts it, I blame the Minister.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, if I do not put it correctly, it would hardly be honourable for my hon. friend, nor conducive to the interests of the country, to quibble over it. If I do not put it correctly, let him correct me. The Minister of Militia and Defence, having to give that contract, gives it to the higher tenderer because he offered to take the contract with the anti-sweating clause in it. That is the position, and if my hon. friend says that is wrong, let us so understand it. But I do not understand that he does say so. Now, the only question before the committee is, Did this contractor live up to his contract? Has he carried out the anti-sweating clause? The affidavit read, and quibbling also is indulged on that, quibbling which I think is quite unworthy a discussion of this kind. Then, the contract was dated on the 10th of January, and the affidavit was dated on the 11th, and a great deal of sport has been made because this affidavit speaks of the contract having been executed when the contract was dated just a day before.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I made no reference to that at all.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, my hon. friend did not, I admit, but other gentlemen tried to make a point out of that. The facts are plain enough. These tenders were asked for in August, and the contract was awarded in September, and it was signed in the month of January. In the meantime, it had partly carried out. There is no other way of reading the contract. The member for Beauharnois contends that there was a violation by Mr. Workman of that stipulation in the contract which demanded that the whole work should be done in his premises, and that instead the work had been let out to the people in the county of Laval and elsewhere. Now, for my part, I see no violation of the anti-sweating clause there. Why, Sir, it would be monstrous to suppose that a workingman could not do his own work in his own premises. The clause of the anti-sweating system exacts that no workingman shall be kept at work in the premises of his employer, not in his own home, but in the premises of his employer under unsanitary conditions, and conditions that are not favourable for doing the work.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the right hon. gentleman not know that that very clause is embodied in the contract?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. No, if I read the contract aright. The contract binds the contractor that his own premises shall be kept in a sanitary condition, and if he sublets the contract, it shall be carried out in premises which are equally in a sanitary condition. But, Sir, unless I am greatly mistaken, I would be sorry to believe that the contract should be so construed that the work could not be done, for instance, by a man who lives in the parish of Ste. Rose or elsewhere. At least, if that is the letter of the contract, it is not its spirit. Now, let us discuss that question seriously. What we must insist upon is that the contract shall be carried out in premises supplied by the employer, which shall be in a sanitary condition. But surely a man is not thereby precluded from working in his own house; I do not understand the contract in that way.

Mr. **BERGERON**. After we have been discussing this matter for three or four hours, we come to an understanding with the right hon. gentleman. The right hon. gentleman knows a firm of manufacturers in Montreal called Shorey & Co. As the right hon. gentleman has said, they have a very large store where they keep the goods which are made. They have tailors in the store who cut the goods and they get the people, from the 1st of January to the 31st December, to make up these goods in their own homes in St. Rose, Ste. Thérèse, Boucherville, Verchères, and all around the city of Montreal. They do not sub-let their work. These people work in their own houses instead of working on the floors of the stores of Shorey & Co. Now we have the whole case. When Shorey & Co. tendered they said that they could not accept the work with the anti-sweating clause at the same price because they would have to enlarge their building. They said: If you allow us to have the work done, as we have done it ourselves in the past, we can tender at a lower price. I can tell hon. gentlemen that they have a plant which other manufacturers in Canada, except the Sanford Company, have not got for making such work, because they have been doing this special work for twenty years. If the right hon. gentleman will just listen one moment I will explain to him what we are complaining of. It is not that Workman's tender was accepted and that Shorey's tender was not accepted, but what we have been complaining of this afternoon is that Workman has been carrying out the contract in the way that Shorey would have carried it out by having the work done outside at Ste. Rose, at Ste. Thérèse, and we do not blame him for that, but he did it in the same manner that Shorey would have done it, except that he got 49 cents more, and that the Government has paid him 49 cents more.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. The hon. member for Beauharnois says that Mr. Work-

man has had the work done outside. There is no evidence of that. But let us say that he has. It is a very important subject, and I think this discussion ought to be carried on in a serious way and not as a stormy debate. We are all agreed that there should be an anti-sweating clause. How far this anti-sweating clause should go I am not prepared to say, but I do say that it should not go so far as to prevent working women doing work in their own homes. I do not think that could have been the intention of the contract, but if it is the intention of the contract, I think the clause should have been modified to that extent, because I do not want poor women to be deprived of doing work in their own homes. If that be the case a more liberal construction of the clause, I think, should be given, though I must insist that the anti-sweating clause shall be kept in all contracts. Still, a modification should be made so as not to deprive working women of the opportunity of working in their own homes.

Mr. **MONFAGUE**. The hon. Postmaster General should withdraw his storm entirely.

Mr. **BERGERON**. He should withdraw all he said this afternoon.

Mr. **WALLACE**. I think the hon. Postmaster General will withdraw the statements he has made in the face of the very clear and lucid statement of the right hon. Prime Minister, a statement which we can accept very cordially on both sides of the House. I rise more particularly to call attention to this fact: The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence told us that it was quite true that there were some garments, both trousers and overcoats, that were not included in this contract, and, therefore, not under these conditions. The reasons the hon. Minister gave to the committee was that it was a case of urgency. These goods, he said, had to be got and got in a hurry, independently of the contract. He told us that the contract was dated the 9th or 10th of January, and that these goods were made in November, October and on other dates. I look at this schedule prepared by the Government, and I see that tenders were received up to the 9th of August, and that tenders were opened on the 9th of August, 1898. We know that the award was made in September. Well, then, these overcoats that were needed as a matter of great urgency, were made after the 9th of September; they were made in October, in November and in December, at the time after the award had been made to Workman & Co. to make these overcoats under these anti-sweating conditions. Yet, in the face of that the hon. Minister of Militia tell us that it is true 600 overcoats and 500 pairs of trousers were made, not subject to the anti-sweating clause, because it was a case of urgency. Why, Sir, this contract was running at the same time, and then he tells us that they had

to disregard the terms of it. They had accepted the tender of Workman & Co. at \$6.74, but they had the tender of Shorey & Co. for \$6.25, or 49 cents less, before them, and they could have accepted this lower tender, because these overcoats were to be furnished them, not under the anti-sweating clause. We have further information, which is undenied and undeniable, that not less than 2,000 of these overcoats were made out in the country districts, that they were not made in accordance with this pretended anti-sweating clause. I am glad, and the committee will be glad, that the right hon. Prime Minister has repudiated the stand and the position taken by the hon. Postmaster General against making these garments in the homes of the people in the country as a portion of the anti-sweating clause and as being injurious to the morals, the health and the industrial conditions of the country. The right hon. gentleman has rightly told us that there is nothing that will conduce more to the industrial prosperity of the people than allowing these people to make these things in their own homes.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope that the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence will make a demand at once upon Workman for a refund of the \$1,960. The only reason he had for refusing to allow that work to be done by Shorey was that Shorey was going to do it in the homes of the people. He has heard the right hon. Prime Minister tell us that this is an illiberal and wrongful interpretation to attach to the anti-sweating law and that, so far as he is concerned, he does not believe it is tenable in the least. Therefore, no ground exists for the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence paying \$1,960 more to Workman than he could get the coats made for as well by Shorey. But over and above all that, there are these strange and irregular tenders being called for on the 5th, tenders being opened on the 9th, the contract being awarded in September, and these gentlemen allowed to go on in the face of the Minister's own interpretation of the law, violating it according to his interpretation and getting the work done in the homes of the people. There is \$1,960 of the people's money which has been utterly wasted, not saved to the workingmen, but which has gone into the pockets of the contractors.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is a question for consideration. I have only to say that, so far as working women in the country are concerned, I have no reason to be doubtful, and I think it is most proper that the work should be done in the homes of the people. So far as working in the cities is concerned, there would be good reason for an anti-sweating clause, but there ought to be a distinction made as to working in the homes of the people in the country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman whether this

Mr. WALLACE.

clause is inserted in the contract he let for Mounted Police clothing?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not prepared to answer that.

Mr. MONK. I think our chance of recovering those \$2,000 are very slim under these circumstances. I would like to address the Minister of Militia upon this question which interests us in that part of the country where a great deal of the work was done. What is the amount that has been paid under the advantage of this anti-sweating clause, what is the amount which has been paid per piece to the people in the country? Everybody is aware that the people who work under this contract are in reality the people in Jacques Cartier, Laval and Terrebonne counties. Has that clause benefited them in any way? The work having been executed exactly as with Shorey it seems to me we have a right to know what differences and what advantages accrue to the people.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am inclined to say the prices were fair.

Mr. MONK. The right hon. gentleman will allow me to say there is nothing whatever to show that there has been any progress in this respect. The hon. member for Laval told us this afternoon in answer to my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), that the people complained there that they were worked to death. Under those circumstances, having before us a transaction of this kind, I think we are entitled to know exactly how much has been paid to Mr. Workman. We do not know—the Minister of Militia or anybody else in this House is unable to tell us, and it is a pity we cannot get that information.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the Minister of Militia and Defence if the sweating system is carried on in the Cart-ridge Factory at Quebec?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Not that I am aware of. I think in a few instances the piecework is done by the day. The same system prevails at as Woolwich, but it is not general. I may say to my hon. friend that there has been no complaint to me.

Mr. INGRAM. It is perhaps due to the Minister of Militia to offer an explanation, and it is due to myself that I should make an explanation to those gentlemen for certain questions I placed on the Order paper early in the session. I received very long correspondence from some parties in Quebec complaining of the way in which the Cart-ridge Factory was being administered by the Government. The labour element complained, and they sent me a number of questions to place on the Order paper. I did not place those questions on the Order paper because they were very offensive. I pruned

them down as well as I could, to try and meet the views of those who wanted the information, and tried not to make them offensive. I did not succeed and in his answer on the 27th of April, the Minister of Militia found fault with the way they were put on the Order paper. They are as follows :—

1. What were the Government's reasons for dismissing the members of the labour association, Mechanics' Assembly No. 10,061, out of the Quebec cartridge factory ?
2. How many were dismissed ?
4. How many girls and boys have been injured and maimed in the said cartridge factory during the last two years, and to what extent were they injured ?
5. What remuneration did they receive while suffering from said injuries, including the time laid up from such injuries ?
6. What was the nature of the correspondence which took place between the labour party in the city of Quebec regarding the refusal of the cartridge factory authorities to admit for the purpose of inspection the provincial factory inspectress, Madame Provencher ?
7. What was the result of the inquiries made by the Government regarding the said refusal ?
8. Who is responsible, the Minister of Militia, the Deputy Minister, or the superintendent of the said factory, for the perpetuation of the sweating system as conducted therein ?
10. What is the minimum rate of wages paid to young girls and boys in the said factory ?
11. Is the Government aware of the fact that the earnings of some of these employees per week does not amount to more than \$1 ?
13. Was there a petition presented to the Government or any member thereof, praying for the dismissal of Charles Roy ? What were the reasons alleged in the said petition, and whose signatures were attached thereto ?

I have omitted the other questions, that the hon. gentleman said were offensive, and in my judgment they are.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will say to my hon. friend that it is impossible for me at this moment to give the answer, but I will see when I get "Hansard," and will give him a complete answer, on any occasion that may be convenient.

Militia—

Construction of small armouries..... \$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where are these to be constructed ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I may say that we have a list of several places, and the selection has not been finally made, but I think at the following places. At Sussex, N.B.—

Mr. FOSTER. At what cost ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Approximately \$3,000 ; Guelph, \$2,000 ; St. Thomas, \$1,500 ; Cobourg, \$3,000 ; Cornwall, \$2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is taking more than his estimate.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. As I explained there are sev-

eral places named and selected. These are probably the places. I think the sums named are not excessive, and it would be less than the sum named.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot congratulate the Minister on the defence of his estimates, but what is the principle which underlies this building of armouries ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The reason for it is this, that with our new rifle, which is a very sensitive weapon, it is found advisable upon the recommendation of the General Officer Commanding, in which I concurred, that instead of distributing the rifles as was done formerly, to have separate armouries and to appoint an armourer at each one of those places to take care of the arms.

Mr. FOSTER. For instance, Sussex would be the central armoury for the province of New Brunswick ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Not for the province. It is proposed to have one for each battalion.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is the hon. gentleman doing that for all the counties ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. As rapidly as possible.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Because I would like to say that the 37th Battalion is one of the best in the province of Ontario, and I do not think it has an armoury at any point in the county which is at all worthy of the excellence of the 37th.

Mr. HUGHES. I take the liberty of suggesting to the Minister that there is great need for an armoury in the county of Victoria, and I can inform him that a very suitable building can be had and the entire cost would not exceed \$1,000. So that he would save \$1,000 by erecting one there this year.

Militia clothing .....\$30,500

Mr. FOSTER. What is this ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Our main estimate for clothing was not large enough, and we require this much more. It is for all the different kinds of clothing.

Mr. FOSTER. Will this be made by contract also ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it will not be considered as part of the anti-sweating system that the homes of the habitants of the province of Quebec would be interdicted from doing this work ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. So far as my own views are

concerned, I would not object to that very much, but I think there should be an inspection of the houses and rooms to be occupied. In many cases I think the neighbours come together in one central room, and do the work in very much too small quarters.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that is done in the country places.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In some cases it is done, and I think we should in our contracts provide for inspection being made from time to time. We should have a list of both the houses where the work is done and the people employed.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, Shorey will get a chance at this.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has Mr. Workman done all his contract yet?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I cannot say.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman should deduct 49 cents apiece for the 500 coats which he made outside of his own shop.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not think Mr. Workman should be liable for that. If any one is liable, I suppose I should be personally liable.

Mr. BERGERON. How much money has he been paid?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman.

General service medals (5,000 medals).... \$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. Are these medals got by contract?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They are got from the Royal mint.

Claim of F. X. Mathieu, for costs in Queen vs. Sureties of the late Col. Bellefeuille. \$199 30

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is this?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. These are the costs in the suit against the Crown, recommended by the judge under the circumstances, to be paid. The matter was before Council and an Order in Council was passed authorizing the payment.

Compensation to Octave Ouellette for injuries sustained while working at drill hall, Montreal..... \$750

Mr. FOSTER. How do we become liable for that?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This case has been before the Department of Justice, and after very careful consideration, the Minister of Justice recommended that we should pay this amount. The party asked us for the right to bring

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

an action, and it was thought better to come to a settlement, and to agree to what the Department of Justice recommended rather than have a lawsuit. The circumstances were these. This man was working on the drill shed in Montreal, and owing to a defective ladder on which he was standing giving away, he fell over backwards and was very seriously injured.

Mr. FOSTER. Who was conducting the work—the Government or a contractor?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The Government.

Mr. BERGERON. When did this occur?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In December, 1895.

Mr. BERGERON. What Mr. Mathieu is this who is to be paid these costs?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. He is a lawyer of St. Scholastique.

Mr. BERGERON. How was it that he was employed in a case from Longueuil?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. He was employed by the Department of Justice, and a report was made to Council by that department recommending the payment.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Going back an item or two, will the Minister tell me what site is being purchased for this armoury at St. Thomas?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is a site that will probably be purchased from Dr. Wilson, a former member of this House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the price being paid?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. \$6,000, I think, for 8½ acres. There is a drill shed now there, but it is altogether unsatisfactory. The colonel of the battalion, Col. Stacey, saw me about it. In fact, they do not use it at all, and we have to pay a pretty heavy rental for the use of another place. So we came to the conclusion to dispose of the drill shed property, and Dr. Wilson is willing to buy it at the price of \$2,000, but I propose to offer it at public auction, and whatever that brings will go to reduce the amount to be expended. It is proposed to build on that site an armoury and use the land for purposes of drill. The colonel says he would prefer a building of that kind and a larger area to drill on, than a drill shed with a small quantity of land.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose the hon. gentleman will expropriate the land in the ordinary way?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Either that or value it. There

has been no bargain concluded as to the price. We know the price asked for, and a certain amount has been offered for the drill shed, but we have not gone into that yet and shall take means to get a proper valuation.

Mr. INGRAM. Are we to understand that this \$6,000 is just to cover the land?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Well, while I have no objection to a reasonable price being paid, \$6,000 is out of all proportion to the value.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We will not give more than it is worth, but that is the amount asked.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How far is it from the centre of St. Thomas?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is near the railway works.

Mr. BERGERON. To whom does the land belong?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Dr. Wilson, the former member.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the hon. gentleman a report on the value of the land?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, from the Quartermaster General.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is it fit for the use intended?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am told that a large amount of it will have to be filled up. Has the hon. gentleman got the Major General's report?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am sorry to say that I have not got it here, but he says it is worth that amount.

Mr. INGRAM. I have had something to do with real estate in St. Thomas. That has been my business for some time, and I know that the land in question is not worth half that price. Any one in St. Thomas, who knows anything about land, will say the same thing. I am prepared to consent to a very good price being paid to any one from whom the Government wish to purchase land, but \$6,000 is altogether too much. That land is hollow and will have to be filled up. I was of the opinion that possibly \$2,000 or \$3,000 would pay for the building and the balance would pay for the land.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understand that the hon. Minister has agreed to expropriation proceedings?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Regular expropriation proceedings, that is all we ask.

Mr. MONK. I wish to draw again the attention of the hon. Minister to the case of Joseph Larose, of St. Laurent, about which we have had much correspondence. The committee is aware that Mr. Larose suffered irreparable injury from receiving a bullet from the rifle ranges. He is ruined for life. He is a small farmer, and although this happened two years ago, there has been no improvement whatever in his general state of health. We voted him a year ago \$1,000, but he very naturally claimed more and sought for leave to proceed against the Crown, and I believe the Government recognize very fairly that, under the circumstances, he was entitled to a petition of right, and leave was granted to take such. I make a last appeal on his behalf. At present he is in a very embarrassed condition, and all I ask the Government is to pay him a certain amount of this \$1,000, and he is perfectly willing to sign any document by which he will agree that the amount paid will not prejudice the rights of the Government. Under these circumstances, I ask the hon. Minister to take up his case once more and at least pay him a certain amount of the vote.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend has many times brought Mr. Larose's request to me, and I am sorry I have not been able to agree in his view. Last year we passed a vote for \$1,000 as compensation. No doubt his case is a very sad one, but he has declined to accept the money. I took the ground that as he would not accept the money, it was not within my power to pay out any portion of it, because we do not know what the result of his suit may be. The amount voted by this Parliament was understood to be a final payment, and I am quite sure the Auditor General would not allow any payment to be made to him which was not final.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the vote say in full payment?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That was the understanding in Parliament.

Mr. MONK. I do not see anything in the vote which would lead any one to say that there was any cast-iron rule as regards the payment. All I ask is that the Minister should pay a certain amount and take a receipt, and I do not see what there is to prevent his doing so.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We do not know what the result of the case may be when it goes into court.

Mr. MONK. The vote will always stand.

Compensation to the widow of the late Captain F. E. Stewart .....	\$1,000
--	---------

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is the case of the widow of an officer who went out to Wright County, near here, when there was a difficulty there about the collection of taxes. The result of the exposure was that this man lost his life. He came home with his health impaired and died shortly after, and this is a gratuity to his widow.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the case of the late Major Maxwell, of the Halifax Garrison Artillery. He lost his life, not technically on active service, but practically. He was attending a school of equitation in Halifax for the purpose of qualifying himself for the position he held in the battalion. While engaged in qualifying himself in that way, not, it is true, in the school, but outside the hours of school, he was thrown from his horse and died in a few hours. He has left a widow and a number of children who have scarcely any means of subsistence whatever, and I brought his case to the attention of the Minister in the hope that some provision might be made for his widow and family, and I regret very much that nothing has been done. It may be that technically his case does not come within the class of those dealt with in this way, but still I believe the case of Major Maxwell is as worthy of consideration as that of Capt. Stewart.

The case of a man who dies from exposure some years after he has been in active service, does not seem to me to be stronger than that of Major Maxwell, who fell from his horse during the time when he was taking a course in the school of equitation. It is true, that he fell from his horse an hour or so after he had left the school for the day, but it was while he was practising what he had been taught in the school. Practically, if not technically, he was in active service. I cannot see on what grounds provision should be made for the widow of Capt. Stewart, and not for the widow of Major Maxwell. I do not think there is a single person in the city or the county of Halifax for that matter, who would not consider the Government were doing a fair and equitable and just thing in making such a provision; and I would like to know from the Minister on what ground a distinction is made between the case of Capt. Stewart and the case of Major Maxwell?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Major Maxwell's case, I think, has been stated quite correctly. He was taking the equitation course prescribed under the rules of field officers. But he was not satisfied with the way he was going on at school, but went out on his brother's horse, as though for a ride, apart altogether from the

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

work of the school. It is true, he might not have done that, had not the equitation course not been going on. But it seems rather dangerous to establish a precedent that an officer who happened to be taking the equitation course, was killed while riding his own or his brother's horse, should have claims upon the Government for compensation. I think the case is a very sad one, and one which, I must confess, I had at first felt inclined to consider favourably. But, on careful reflection and taking the best advice I could get from my colleagues, it was decided that it was not such a case as would entitle us to recommend Parliament to grant a gratuity. As to the difference between the two cases, I think there is very marked difference. Capt. Stewart was on active service. It is true, he did not die at the time, but he contracted consumption in that camp, which resulted in his death at not a distant period. It was as a result of his serving the country at that time that he lost his life. As to whether the other case is one we should reconsider or take up again, I can only say that I would be glad to go through it and see if we could arrive at a different conclusion. At the present time I cannot but think that we have taken the proper course.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I may be allowed a word in answer to the hon. Minister. He has mentioned that his own view is more or less favourable to the claim of Major Maxwell's widow, and I am inclined to think that the advice of his colleagues is not based upon a very thorough knowledge of the facts. Supposing that Capt. Stewart, being technically on active service, had gone out to ride while the riot was not making active progress, and, in the course of that ride, had been killed. No one would pretend to say that his widow should not be compensated. He would be on active service the whole time; but, practically, he would be no more on active service than Major Maxwell was. Major Maxwell had been attending the school of equitation. If he could have afforded it, he would have gone to Toronto for this course, and then he would have been in the same position as Capt. Stewart; but he was a young man, making his way in the world, and so, instead of going to a school at a distance, which he could not afford to do, he took the course in Halifax. Out of the hours of school, and while endeavouring to perfect himself in the work he was doing in the school—it makes no difference whether on his own or on another person's horse—he was killed. There is no doubt about the facts. This comes within what the lawyers call a proximate cause, just as much as does the case of Capt. Stewart. Capt. Stewart was engaged in active service, and after he left that active service, the disease manifested itself. It is conjectured—but incapable of absolute proof—that he got that disease while engaged in active

service in suppressing this tax riot; and so, the Government makes provision for his widow. Major Maxwell's attendance on the school of equitation was as much the proximate cause of his death as was the active service the proximate cause of the death of Capt. Stewart. I venture to say the proof is as absolute in one case as in the other. Capt. Stewart's widow got compensation, while the widow of Major Maxwell is refused it. I think the Government should reconsider the matter, and if compensation is made to the widow of Capt. Stewart—of which I make no complaint, because I think it is right—I ask that, on the same grounds, a compensation should be made to this widow, who was left in destitute circumstances. Major Maxwell was an active, able and efficient officer, whose record as an officer, I am sure, would commend his case to the department. I trust, therefore, the Minister will reconsider this matter, and make a fuller explanation to his colleagues, and endeavour next year to do what it seems to me should be done in this case.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I sympathize very deeply with the case presented by my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax). I would rather make a strong argument in support of it than say a single word against it. I would rather leave the door open in order that, if possible, a case may be made. The case is one of a distressing character. I cannot agree with my hon. friend that the two cases of Maxwell and Stewart are exactly alike; I think there is a marked line of difference between them. In one case an officer was in active service when he took the disease from which he died; in the other case an officer was not in active service. However I would not argue against my hon. friend, because I would like to find some reason to advise my colleagues to make the payment.

Mr. PRIOR. Before this item passes, I want to call the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence to a case which he knows by the name of the Macaulay Point claim. I will read the names of the gentlemen who are interested in this claim: Fred. Fell, J. Jardine, W. F. Bullen, R. W. Reford, Henry Moss, Wm. Moss, J. G. Tiarks, Chas. Kent, Thornton Fell, A. Keating, H. O. Price, H. F. Bishop, S. J. Pitts. All these gentlemen are the owners of property at Macaulay Point, near Victoria, B.C., and who bought the property in May, 1891, by auction, from the Hudson Bay Company. I may say that at that time there was a small fortification built at Macaulay Point close to this land, which was occasionally used by the active militia of Canada. I asked for a return and the papers have been brought down with all the correspondence in regard to these claims, which papers I have now before me. It seems that soon after these gentlemen

purchased this property, the Government saw fit, at the instance of the Imperial authorities, to enlarge these fortifications. To do that, they had to close up one or more of the roads that had already been made there. I may say that the site where these lots were bought is one of the most beautiful in the province of British Columbia. It is a splendid site for houses, and these gentlemen bought for the purpose of building residences there. It is close to the seashore, and close to the main road, and there is a magnificent view across the straits to the snow-capped mountains beyond. This matter has been going on now for five years. The first claim was made in 1894, and since then several more claims have been made. In the meantime, two or three claims were adjudicated upon before the hon. gentleman took charge of the department, and the then Minister of Militia and Defence, Mr. Dickey, I think it was, referred the matter to the Minister of Justice, and acting upon his opinion he paid these claims. But these gentlemen who are now making a claim are in precisely the same position as those who were settled with, and to my mind they have a very strong case for compensation from the Government. The reason they claim compensation is that on these fortifications which have been built very large guns have been mounted, there are three six-inch quick firing guns, and the concussion of their discharge makes it very dangerous for any houses to be built near there, as the windows are liable to be broken. It has been contended, I believe, by the district officer commanding there, Colonel Peters, and also by Major General Herbert, who has been out there, that this is not a good case for compensation. I contend that if a man buys a lot and the Government step in and build fortifications close to him so that he cannot occupy his house without having all the windows broken, he has a good claim for compensation. Besides, when the forts were built, one or more of the main drives around the point were closed so that the owners of the adjacent property could not drive around the water front; moreover, the view of several of these lots was blocked by the building of the fort. The first letter I want to bring before the Minister was written by Messrs. Fell, Jardine, Newcombe and Bishop, to Messrs. Earle and Prior, members for the city of Victoria in this House:

We would point out that it is not a matter of equity, but justice we have a right to.

The taking away of the streets and enlarging the fortifications has destroyed the property altogether for the purpose for which it was bought. We are perfectly satisfied with our purchases, owing to the beautiful situation and its nearness to the city, and at no distant date it would have been a good investment. Had any of us ever dreamed that we were purchasing land where fortifications were to be erected we should have selected another location. The Hudson Bay Company sold the property for residential purposes,

and to induce purchasers to build they offered a bonus of 20 per cent to those building houses costing not less than \$4,000.

The closing of the streets and enlargement of the fortifications has completely altered the appearance of the place, whilst the privacy, as a residential locality, has completely disappeared.

The next letter was from the secretary of the Department of Militia and Defence, to Major A. W. Jones, their agent in British Columbia, who was asked to report on the claim. I will read only a portion of Major Jones's report :

There is no doubt, however, that the petitioners, as set forth in their letter of the 13th March, addressed to Messrs. Prior and Earle, have sustained serious loss, but to what extent intrinsically is a very difficult matter indeed for me or any one else to decide upon. I am not inclined, however, to set forth that they have a very strong claim, by reason of the redoubt being built, for long before the auction sale at which they purchased their lots there was in existence at Macaulay Point a three "7"-gun battery, and that upon ground owned by the Government, which goes to prove that this particular spot had long prior to the petitioners becoming owners of lots in this locality been selected for military purposes.

This, of course, is very unlucky for the unfortunate property-holders, but can scarcely, I think, be interpreted as an act of aggression on the part of the Government.

I may say that, although Major Jones says there was a battery there, it was a battery of small guns, only fired at long intervals, and the guns were not at all of the same size as are now mounted there. He goes on to say :

The petitioners in this instance have sustained direct loss, and to my mind are entitled to compensation. They purchased, in good faith, lots for building sites according to a certain plan which was registered according to law, and which showed thereon certain streets, which enabled, and would, in so far as they knew and were entitled to expect, give them access to certain points on the sea-front for all time to come. The Government, therefore, having deprived them of this privilege, become liable for damages. Having arrived at this, therefore, it becomes necessary to determine to what extent.

Were these four claimants all to be dealt with, I would at once and without hesitation be in favour of recompensing them as they ask, but there the matter would not end; indeed, upon the contrary, it will only be beginning, for if the claims now under consideration are to be recognized, we must take cognizance of all those (and there are, I think, some five and twenty more) who will undoubtedly be entitled to like remuneration. There being, therefore, so many conflicting circumstances to contend with, it seems to me that I am unable to give any tangible solution of the question, further than that compensation should be awarded, but to what extent I am not prepared to define.

It is clear, therefore, that the agent of the Militia Department on the spot states that he considers that the four claimants that he is dealing with ought to be compensated, but as there are five and twenty more, he does not like to recommend it.

Mr. PRIOR.

Well, if it is fair to give compensation to four it is fair to give compensation to twenty-five for they are all situated alike. The next letter I have to read is one from Major A. W. Jones, the agent of the department, dated the 20th of July, 1895 :

Victoria, B.C., 20th July, 1895.

Captain A. Benoit,  
Secretary of the Dept. of Militia and Defence,  
Ottawa.

Sir,—Referring to the claim of Messrs. Fell, Jardine and others, and regarding which you wrote me under date 8th July, I have the honour to explain that when I alluded to the closing of certain streets in my letter on the 18th June, I should have been more explicit in naming them, viz.: Seaview and Stevenson roads.

I admit I am wrong, however, in stating had these not been closed they would have afforded "access to the sea-front for all time to come," for, as you correctly point out, they merely give access to the frontage of certain lots which extend from these roads back to the sea.

In palliation of my error, however, I may explain that owing to the situation or lay of these roads, which overlooked the water-front, a fine view of the straits was afforded from this particular location, which is now quite cut off, and it is in this that the petitioners feel aggrieved, as from Vaughan Street, their present front, they are quite precluded from any view whatever over this particular stretch of water, and they accordingly contend that had they been aware that these roads would at any time be closed to them, they would never upon any consideration have been induced to purchase property in the neighbourhood for resident purposes, to say nothing of being subject at times to loud concussions from the guns and, in case of war, imminent peril.

It is particularly this matter, to my mind, which makes this adjacent property objectionable as residential for the future, and will, I have no doubt, prevent intending builders of homes from completing their former intentions in this direction, and thereby throw upon their hands certain lots as comparatively useless.

I have the honour to be, sir,  
Your obedient servant.

(Sgd.) A. W. JONES,  
Major.

I may say, as I showed before by the letters I have read, that the Hudson Bay Company sold that property for residential purposes and offered to anybody who would build a house costing \$4,000, a bonus of 20 per cent, and a great many of these gentlemen could well afford and would under other circumstances, have built. There are a lot of letters, but I will only read those which are necessary to make the case as short as possible. The next letter I wish to read is from Drake, Jackson & Helmcken, the lawyers of the Militia and Defence Department and the Justice Department in British Columbia. They wrote as follows to the Deputy Minister of Justice in regard to Mr. Fell's claims :

Victoria, B.C., 21st March, 1896.

The Deputy Minister of Justice, Ottawa.

Sir,—We have the honour to state that Mr. Fell has shown us a telegram from Hon. E. G.

Prior, asking us to report on this claim. Mr. Fell purchased Lots 5 and 6, Block XXI, having special advantages, as you will notice in referring to the auctioneer's plan, by reason of the roads. They are very fine lots, with nice situation, and we think the claimant would succeed in establishing a claim for depreciation due to the closing up of Seaview Road, Vaughan Street is laid out, but not graded.

The claimant is willing to accept as compensation 35 per cent upon the amount paid, without interest or other outlay. We understand the price paid, including interest, is \$3,551.55. The interest paid is nearly \$200.

We should advise that the claimant be offered without prejudice an amount not exceeding 25 per cent on the amount paid, exclusive of taxes.

The matter was referred by the Department of Militia and Defence to the Deputy Minister of Justice, and there is a letter here from Drake, Jackson & Helmcken to the Deputy Minister of Justice in regard to Mr. Reford's claim. It says in part :

There can be no doubt that Seaview Street was of advantage, by reason of its affording people the privilege of driving along a good road, and there can be no question of Viewfield being a splendid and delightful location for residences. We cannot, however, admit that the establishment of the fortifications has deterred parties from building, as we think the reason for not building or otherwise utilizing the property is due and chiefly due to wholly different causes. Neither can we advise that the Government would be justified in paying Mr. Reford the full amount of his claim.

Then they go on to say :

It might be argued—and as it is in certain cases—that vibration due to the firing of guns will interfere with the windows of houses, and probably cause either structural injuries ; but, from what we are advised by military experts, we are satisfied that this ground is untenable.

I may say here to show how fallacious is their argument in this case, that before these guns are fired the authorities now send word to the people in the few houses which at present have been built, to open their windows because a great many have been broken when they have fired these big guns. They go on to say :

Judged by this standard, we cannot see any legal liability towards Mr. Reford ; but, assuming his lot suitable for residential purposes, which, as we have before pointed out, we cannot admit, it is possible that Mr. Reford might succeed in substantiating a claim for damages ; but, in our opinion, damages would not be very large ; and in view of the fact that the Crown would be put to a certain amount of costs if a contest arose, we are of opinion that it would be advisable to offer without prejudice a sum equal to 20 per cent on the actual amount paid, exclusive of taxes and incidentals—an exceedingly liberal offer.

Although the lawyers of the department say that they do not think this gentleman, Mr. Reford, has a legal claim, they take care to advise the Government that the best thing they could do would be to pay him 20 per cent. The next document that I will

read is the copy of a report of a committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council on the 28th of April, 1896. This is after the claims of Messrs. Fell and Jardine had been referred to the hon. Minister of Justice, and after his report had been made upon them. This is the report from Mr. John J. McGee, Clerk of the Privy Council. It says :

On a report dated 22nd April, 1896, from the Minister of Militia and Defence, stating that a number of the proprietors of lands adjacent to the new works of defence at Esquimalt have preferred claims for compensation for damages to their property, caused by the erection of the said fortifications. That these claims have been examined both by the local agent of the Department of Militia and Defence and the agents of the Department of Justice. That there is no doubt that an equitable claim for damages has arisen in the matter, and that the amount which should be paid has been carefully considered.

The Minister, concurring in a report which has been made by the Department of Justice, recommends that each such claimant should be offered, without prejudice, an amount equal to 25 per cent on the amounts which have been paid for the respective properties, with interest added to the purchase money at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from the date of purchase to the present time, but exclusive of all tax payments.

The Committee submit the above recommendation for Your Excellency's approval.

(Sgd.) JOHN J. MCGEE,  
Clerk of the Privy Council.

The Honourable  
The Minister of Militia and Defence.

That was addressed to His Excellency and the Government paid Mr. Fell and Mr. Jardine an amount of 25 per cent on the amount paid for their property, with interest added. The next letter I want to call the hon. Minister's attention to is one from the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence to the district paymaster stating that the claim has been allowed and that he must make out the respective sums exactly. The next letter is from the Militia Department to the hon. Minister of Justice, dated the 7th of August, 1896, and was signed Eugène Panet, Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence :

The advice which is now requested of you, in regard to Mr. Newcombe's claim, is whether it should be dealt with upon the percentage basis of settlement recommended in your letter above quoted, respecting the claims of Messrs. Fell, Jardine and Reford, and if so, upon what rate of percentage.

Then there are a lot of other letters, one from the District Officer Commanding, dated 8th February, 1897, in which he says that he does not think these persons have any claims, another from Major General Gascoigne, who has been out there, and who says that Mr. Pitts has no claim whatever. The next letter to read is one from the agent in British Columbia, Major Jones, to the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, which is a report on the claims of Messrs. Moss & Tlarks. It says :

Again on 18th of June, 1895, I had the honour of reporting to Capt. Benoit, Secretary of the Department, as to claims generally in this neighbourhood, and in both instances I set forth that if one or two claims received the favourable consideration of the Government (as in the case of Messrs. Fell and Jardine), I considered that one and all were equally entitled to compensation, and I am of the opinion that the claimants now being dealt with are, therefore, owed some remuneration, but in what proportion I can only suggest upon being informed of the exact location of their properties in relation to the fortifications and after a personal inspection thereof.

I retain all documents in connection with the matter until I make my report, when all will be returned to you.

I have the honour to be, &c.,  
(Sgd.) A. W. JONES,  
Major.

Col. C. Eug. Panet,  
Deputy Minister  
of Militia and Defence, Ottawa.

The next one is from the same gentleman. Major Jones, to the Department of Militia and Defence, dated the 12th of July, 1897. It reads as follows:—

With regard to the claims for compensation for alleged damages to the properties of Henry Moss, Wm. Moss and J. E. Tiarks, I last had the honour of addressing you the 30th ult., when I advised that before I could intelligently go into the question it would be necessary for me to procure from these claimants the numbers and location of their different lots.

This I have now done, and furthermore visited the different situations, and the more I consider the problem the more intricate and difficult does it appear to me for any one individual to judge and settle successfully without the aid of sworn evidence setting forth where and what particular manner these various claimants have sustained loss or damage.

In a general way, I may state there is nothing that I can add to my former letters of the 14th December, 1894, and 18th June, 1895, on the subject, and wherein I pointed out that if one or two claimants received from the Government compensation for damages owing to the erection of fortifications there, I consider that all those persons who purchased lots at the auction sale of the Puget Sound Agricultural Company (the Hudson's Bay Company) in May, 1891, were equally entitled to some remuneration, and would (upon one or any being admitted) undoubtedly put in claims, and so it will continue after the four or five now before us have been adjusted, others will be put forward.

My reasons for surmising this are as follows:—

I need not go on with this, as I have already told you the circumstances. Then, he says:

And for this, in my opinion, the purchasers of lots under this particular plan, as set forth at the auction sale in May, 1891, have sustained a loss and accordingly are entitled to some remuneration.

Further on, he says:

In the case of the last named, however, (Tiarks), this gentleman, in 1893, built a house upon this lot at a cost of about \$1,750. Other owners, I am inclined to think, will desist from improvements in this way now that the new fortifications are in front of them, their lots consequently become almost useless to them, and certainly unproductive to a degree which un-

Mr. PRIOR.

doubtedly will be a cause worthy of consideration when assessing damages.

We see from that that Major Jones is under the impression that every one of these gentlemen has good grounds for the claim he makes for compensation from the Government. On July 18th, 1898, there is a letter signed A. Power, from the Department of Justice to the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, in which he says:

You have the report of our agent, suggesting a basis for settlement, and if you do not consider the proposal satisfactory, it would be well to have the amount of compensation determined by the court.

Now, this is what I want to call the particular attention of the hon. gentleman to. It seems to me that the only fair thing for him to do is not to leave this matter to Major Jones or to any one in his department, for they seem to be at cross-purposes, but to allow these persons to have their cases tried in the Exchequer Court, giving them all the assistance possible to bring the matter to a conclusion.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Have they asked for it?

Mr. PRIOR. No, they have not asked for it, because they think that since you have given compensation to two or three, and they are all in the same position, you should give the same to them. This goes on to say:

Mr. Reford has been for years endeavouring to obtain a settlement, and he has written this department time and time again about the matter. May I therefore ask you to expedite the matter as much as possible, and inform me within a few days what your department intends to do so that a satisfactory reply can be given to Mr. Reford's inquiries.

There are a lot more letters on the matter, but I will not read them. The last letter is from Capt. Benoit, secretary of the Department of Militia and Defence, as follows:—

Department of Militia and Defence,  
Ottawa, 8th March, 1899.

Sir,—I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 23rd ultimo, with reference to claims for damages to properties at "Viewfield," and especially of lot No. 1, block 21, and lot No. 11, block 19, submitted by you to this department in July, 1894, arising from the closing of the roads and the erection of fortifications on the Government grounds, and in answer, to inform you that special attention has been given to the matter by the Honourable the Minister of Militia and Defence, who, after a minute perusal of all the papers in the case, has stated that he did not see how the Government could be held responsible in any way for damages in this connection.

I am therefore to advise you that your contention in this case cannot be admitted, and that the claim cannot be entertained.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) A. BENOIT, Captain,  
Secretary of the Dept. of Militia and Defence.

Robert W. Reford, Esq.  
23 St. Sacrament St., Montreal.

This is the whole case. I am not a lawyer, and I cannot put it with the argumentative force of some hon. gentlemen in this House who are learned in the law; but I have given the plain facts of the case as they occurred from time to time. For five years these gentlemen, who bought lots intending to build beautiful residences on them, were stopped because the Government had enlarged the fortifications and put large guns there, and closed up some of the roads, whereby the view was obstructed, and some of the most beautiful drives were stopped. I hope the Minister will give the matter his kind and immediate consideration, and if he is still of the opinion that his department cannot compensate these gentlemen, although it compensated others who stood in exactly the same position, he will allow them to take their cases, or one case on behalf of all, to the Exchequer Court; and if the Exchequer Court finds that they are in the right and have equity on their side, I hope he will see that they are compensated in a proper and satisfactory manner.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. I am not able to enter into a discussion of the question now. I had a memorandum prepared, which, unfortunately, has been mislaid; but I do not know that it would be of any particular advantage to discuss it further. The hon. gentleman has presented his case, it is now in the "Hansard," and I will promise him to take it up and reconsider it carefully as soon as the session closes, and come to a conclusion one way or the other. I must say that as he is on the spot and is familiar with the circumstances, I feel that a great deal of weight is to be given to his opinion.

Arms, ammunition and defence—for equipment ..... \$128,000

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to ask if a part of this sum is to be expended on a naval and military brigade. Is the Government doing anything in that direction?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. Nothing at present.

Mr. McNEILL. I am sorry to hear that nothing is to be done in that regard. I quite recognize the forward movement which has been made in the annual drill of the militia, but I think it is very important that something should be done also in connection with our naval defence. I find that the Major General, in his report, under the heading of "Principles governing the Defence of Canada," lays the utmost stress upon this particular method. He says:

As a most important element in the defence of Canada, I cannot but impress the necessity of the naval defence of Lakes Erie and Ontario. The Militia Act of 1886 contemplated the formation of a naval militia brigade, and I strongly recommend that steps should be taken with that intention. Training ships with an instructional staff would be productive of most valuable re-

sults, not only as a strong and most important element of defence, but as a means of educating the sea-faring population and of improving the shipping interests of the inland waters of Canada.

I do not wish at this late hour, and particularly at this late stage of the session, to enter into a discussion of this question. I think that the mere reading of that recommendation by the officer in command is of itself sufficient, and I would urge very strongly upon the Government that, since they have not done anything this session, they should take special care to do something next session. I am quite satisfied it is a matter of most vital importance, and that is also the view of the General, who, I believe, is one of the ablest officers the Government has ever had in Canada.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. There is no doubt whatever of the very great importance of this matter. In addition to the General's report, the Defence Commission, which had this whole matter before them, made a report which, while, of course, it is a secret one, there is no impropriety in my saying does not differ from that of the General. My hon. friend, however, will understand that we cannot do everything in one year. We have made some progress, of course, at some expense to the country, and possibly next year the matter will be taken up; but whether by me or by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, will have to be considered. I can assure my hon. friend that we are not losing sight of so important a question.

Mr. BRITTON. I wish to call attention to the neglect to spend a little money on the walls of fort at Kingston, and particularly on these two martello towers that were unroofed by a storm some two years ago. Several thousands are to be expended on the walls at Quebec, and, while no doubt, that expenditure is required, it is not needed more than at Kingston, where the condition of the walls and the fort is simply disgraceful. If the walls were all removed and grass-seed planted, the place would be presentable, and not look so dilapidated, and perhaps for all practicable purposes that would do well enough; but in their present condition the walls are an eye-sore. I am aware it is late in the session, and many demands for expenditure are made, and I can hardly hope to have a vote introduced for an expenditure in this direction this summer. But I simply call the attention of the hon. Minister to the necessity for repairs on these works, unless the Government are prepared to allow the walls and the earthwork to become absolutely useless. If they are prepared for that condition of things, something at least ought to be done to cover the unsightliness; and if they are not, something ought to be expended each year to

maintain these works in some degree of efficiency.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) With respect to the subject of naval defence, as the hour is late, I shall not trespass on the time of the committee at any great length. A large amount is being expended on the militia, some \$2,000,000 or \$2,500,000, and in my opinion, if a certain portion of that were devoted to the establishment of a naval reserve in this country, that would be much more effective in strengthening the Empire. From the mouth of the St. Lawrence, around the coasts of Nova Scotia and the Bay of Fundy, we could produce 50,000 good and able seamen, and no doubt the Pacific coast and the lakes could also furnish a large number, and I think it is well worthy the attention of the Government to give some little consideration to this branch of the defences of the country and the Empire. I have not very carefully thought out this matter, but it is a well-known fact that when the British Government put a ship out of commission, they bring her to England and pay off the men, retaining a shipping master, and a quartermaster, and perhaps a few hands, to look after the ship in the meantime. In my opinion, that could be done just as well in this country in the port of Halifax, on the Atlantic, or the port of Vancouver, on the Pacific. The nucleus of a naval reserve is already in the hands of the Government. Our fishery protection service furnishes a class of first-rate men that could be utilized without interfering materially with that service, as they are practically out of work from October until April. With the ship paid off at the port of Halifax, these men might be taken on, the ship equipped, a West India trip be made during the winter, and in that way the men could easily put in six months' service, which would be an excellent drill and establish a nucleus from which the naval service of the country might be increased. Able-bodied seamen for the navy might be drawn from that service. There are no better men to be found, I suppose, than the hardy fishermen on the coast of the maritime provinces, and no doubt on the Pacific coast and the lakes as well. But those in the maritime provinces have not only to work in summer, but very often in the winter, at least some portion of them. If these men's services were utilized, by an arrangement between the Canadian and the British Government, a naval reserve might be brought into action that would be most effective for the navies of the Empire. I would like to have gone into this matter at greater length, but feel reluctant to do so at this period of the session and at this late hour. The subject is one of great interest, and which the Government ought to carefully consider. This reserve might not only be utilized for the service itself, but would give employment to a number of our fishing

Mr. BRITTON.

population, who for a large portion of the year are out of work.

Mr. MONK. In connection with this item of \$75,000 for rifle ranges, I would like to ask the Minister if anything is being done towards the acquisition of a rifle range in the vicinity of Montreal. I understand that the rifle range at Côte St. Luc has been abandoned, and as we have a large number of battalions in Montreal and vicinity, they would like to know what steps are being taken towards replacing that range.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is quite true that the range at Côte St. Luc is inadequate; there has been an accident there and we can no longer continue rifle practice there. Several ranges have been suggested, and I think some three or four have been surveyed, either by officers of my department or by competent engineers in Montreal. But no decision has been come to, because we have no money with which to purchase a range. When we get this vote, I hope to be able to make some provision for the riflemen of Montreal during the present season. I am not able now to indicate where it will be, but I may say that in the direction of Pointe aux Trembles there are two or three ranges which military men think would be suitable; they have been surveyed, but no steps have been taken to appropriate.

Mr. HAGGART. What rifle ranges are you going to purchase with this \$75,000, and what equipment? Was the experiment made with the Oliver equipment satisfactory?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, entirely satisfactory. We paid Col. Oliver \$5,000. We took a great deal of pains to test the equipment, and had a dozen sets made, and the same number of two or three other kinds. We sent them to the different districts, and I think the result has been favourable. With regard to rifle ranges it is proposed to purchase one in Montreal, which will be somewhat expensive, and one in Victoria, B.C. We are now purchasing a rifle range in Hamilton for which we pay \$7,000. Then, at Bedford, N.S., we are purchasing one for \$10,000. With this vote we expect to provide necessary accommodation in the several places. It may not all be spent. I cannot give the hon. gentleman full details, but I think the places that I have named will pretty well use up the vote.

Mr. HAGGART. Upon what principle does the hon. gentleman proceed? Does he propose to furnish ranges at the headquarters of all the battalions?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, the idea is to have one for each military district, if possible, in some

of the larger districts perhaps more. But we cannot think of providing rifle ranges for every battalion, that is out of the question, though some assistance can be given. In some places where there is a good background, a rifle range can be purchased without much expense.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be done with \$128,000 ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. \$33,000 is a revote ; Oliver equipment, camp equipment, two divisions and one cavalry brigade, \$19,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is meant by camp equipment ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is a recommendation made by General Hutton. I am really not able to give the details. Equipment for corps of engineers, \$5,000. In New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island there is one division in each which have never been properly equipped.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the equipment ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is a very long list. These estimates have been carefully made up by General Hutton. Equipment for four bearer companies of the army medical corps, \$18,000 ; artillery material and ammunition, \$53,000. Bearer companies are for the purpose of taking care of the wounded. There is one to be established in Halifax, one in Montreal, one in Toronto, and one in Quebec. There are three ambulance wagons with surgical instruments.

Mr. BERGERON. Are you going to take a part of this vote to pay for the cannon which the hon. gentleman bought last year on the other side ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, I have given all the items.

Mr. BERGERON. I see in the press the report of some guns arriving in Quebec. Can the hon. Minister inform me what they are and how much they cost ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There are twelve 40-pounders, and a number of five-inch howitzers, and they will be distributed at Montreal, some at Quebec, and some, I think, at Kingston. They cost about £20,000.

Mr. BERGERON. That is about \$100,000 for guns. The late Government were criticised a good deal for bringing in guns. We shall have lots of fun in the next election over this importation.

Mr. BENNETT. The captains of companies are allowed \$40 a year, and it devolves upon each captain to furnish a suitable place for storage for the accoutrements of his company. I have two or three cases in my own riding where, the Government

not having provided an armoury or drill hall, the captain has to pay for the rent of the building. But there is this anomaly—that even in cities where the armoury is provided, the same amount is allowed to each captain, and the captain where no armoury is provided is allowed no more. I have been asked to call attention to this fact and see if a new arrangement could not be made so that a fair proportion of the rent of a building could be provided.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The rule is to allow \$40 to each captain. Not much space is required as a rule. Each captain takes a room in his own house or in some outbuilding at no expense whatever.

Mr. BENNETT. But they have to pay rent.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Practically the expense is nothing. No doubt there are some cases such as the hon. gentleman refers to. And my attention had been called to the matter. It is very difficult to discriminate. This is the same rule as has existed at least since confederation. There have been very few hardships, and, as a rule, the captains make no complaint.

Mr. BENNETT. I am not a military man myself, but those familiar with military affairs, I think, will know that it is very difficult to get up interest in companies. Where they have no room in which they can drill during the winter months, it is difficult at the commencement of the season, to work up a company ; whereas, in the towns, where the department provides a drill hall, the interest is kept up. In my own town, a captain with commendable pluck, hired a decent-sized room for the use of his company, but the rent was just about the amount given him. I would suggest that an amount should be provided for this purpose.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will look into it.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose it will not be the most grateful thing to do, but has the Minister any idea what he is asking Parliament for militia purposes this year ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In the vicinity of two millions of dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. That, as my hon. friend will see, is an enormous vote. I know that it is popular in very part of the country to do as much as possible for the militia ; but I wish to call attention to the fact that it is possible to overdo it. I should be glad to feel that for this large expenditure the Minister is really making an effective force ; but I venture to say, with a great deal of diffidence, because I am not an expert, that the same criticism may be applied to this as to previous votes, that much of it goes to mere

machinery and frills and too little to the making of an effective fighting force, such as we aim at. I do not wish to take up the matter in detail, but I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Finance to the fact that these estimates are growing very fast.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The vote is not very much larger, I think, than it has been in the last three years, or, perhaps, than it was in 1895.

Mr. FOSTER. Outside of capital expenditure, it is.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not sure of that. It has been the opinion in the past, I think it was so under the Administration of which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was a member, certainly it was so under the Administration of Mr. Mackenzie, that if any economy was to be effected, it should be effected at the expense of the militia. If any vote had to be cut down it was the militia vote that had to suffer. I think that was a foolish policy. As I said in discussing the main Estimates, we should do one thing or the other—either make our force effective or save our money altogether. If a million and a quarter will give us a militia which is not effective, and a quarter of a million more—I am speaking of the charge against income—will give us an efficient militia, I think it poor economy not to expend the quarter of a million. That is the policy we are trying to carry out. I am not taking credit to myself. A process of development has been going on. I found the militia, when I took the head of the department, in better condition than it had been before. It has gradually improved since its organization, certainly with the last fifteen years.

There are two or three points that I may mention to my hon. friend in respect to which I think he will agree with me. The most important is in respect to the education of the officers of the active militia. The standard is very much higher to-day than ever it was before. We have effective schools and we are insisting upon every officer having that qualification which he can only get by attending one of these schools for a certain length of time. We are insisting that no company shall go into camp unless, at least, one of the three officers is fully qualified. Another thing we have done, which I think is important. We have limited the time of service. There was an age limitation, which was not adhered to, but to which we have tried to adhere to much more strictly, and we are bringing that regulation into operation as rapidly as possible. We have fixed the time limit there. A commanding officer shall, under the regulation, retire from his command at the end of five years, but his term may be extended to eight years. We

Mr. FOSTER.

have tried to adhere as closely as possible to that, and it has been done to a very considerable extent. The result of that is that all these officers, young men particularly, after serving five or eight years, go out at the age of 45, go upon the reserve list and may be called upon and will be called upon from time to time. They are effective officers who would be of immense advantage to the country in case of any trouble. By this system we shall be enabled, in a very short time, to double the number of effective officers in the militia of Canada. It is too late an hour and too late in the session to go into a full discussion of the subject, as I would have liked, but my hon. friend will find that the money that we are spending is being well expended, and that the line which is being taken is one which will result in very much greater efficiency than ever before.

Mr. FOSTER. At this stage of the session I do not want to provoke a discussion of the militia, but I just simply want to say, that if we are going to be generous in our expenditures let us be generous where it really promises to make the force effective. I have a good deal of faith in our present General, and I would like to see his recommendations carried out as far as possible, but it is quite possible that a gentleman, enthusiastic and taking a view of war over the British Empire, might have ideas that it will be impossible for us to carry out with our limited resources.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Mr. Chairman, I do not know anything about the purchase of the equipment as I do not know what is being paid for it, but as far as I can see there is no extravagance practised in the militia at the present time. I think that the expenditure is quite necessary. A few years ago the militia only went out once in every two or three years and we could not keep up the interest or enthusiasm so that this drilling at such infrequent intervals was really of no benefit. The men forgot the drill when they went out only once in two or three years. I think the militia expenditure is handled more carefully and not quite so extravagant as that of the other departments. I do not think there has been any extravagance at all, and if we reduce the amount of the expenditure we will have to reduce the militia force of the country. I see that there is an amount for the Royal Military College in Kingston. I may say that I tried to get one of the graduates of that college to come out and go into camp, but I did not succeed. If the Government are to keep up that college at all, to make military men, you should allow them to come to our military camps, if they do not come, it is discouraging to others who sacrifice their time and business. I hope that the members of the Government will see that it is the duty of every man who is made a soldier to file an appearance in the

annual camps to better qualify himself to defend the country when it is necessary.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he has leased the Ile aux Noix Wharf, opposite St. John?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, it has been leased to a company, one of whom is a gentleman named Mr. Naylor.

Mr. BERGERON. What have they leased the island for?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think they are using it for a summer resort.

Mr. BERGERON. Are the Government repairing the barracks?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Only in so far as it is necessary to keep them from tumbling down. The people are doing the work themselves, but so far as it is necessary to keep the place from destruction we have agreed to do something.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the amount of the lease?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. One hundred and fifty dollars a year.

Mr. BERGERON. For twenty-one years.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think so. We were getting \$80 a year before and had to pay a caretaker 50 cents a day, but now we get rid of the expense of a caretaker and get \$150 a year. The parties do all the repairs which they want, other than those to which I have referred.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the estimated cost of what the Government are doing on the island now?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The Government are doing nothing at all.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the estimated cost of the repairs?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We have no estimate yet as the work has not been commenced.

Mr. BERGERON. I am informed that the work has been commenced?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The gentlemen who have leased the island are working.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that there are some of the Government workers there?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman cannot tell me the estimated cost?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No. The work has not been done, and no estimate has been made.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that I want to see no cheeseparing in the militia Estimates. We have had enough of that in the last twenty-five years, and I trust we will have no spirit of that kind on either side of the House in future. Canada pays less for military purposes than any country in the universe, and in a country as wealthy as Canada is, I think it is scandalous that we should be taxed to the tune only of about 25 cents per head per year for the militia. The militia has been kept up by the officers going into their pockets and bearing the expense that has been thrown upon them by successive Governments. I think that hon. members of the House might very well improve themselves in their knowledge of the militia of the country. It is only tonight that one more than ordinary intelligent member of this House was surprised to learn that the permanent corps are not pensioned. I would suggest that the Minister make a note of this pension matter, and I trust that the Government will not bring in a half-hearted measure, dealing with it in a narrow spirit, but will deal with it in a broad spirit befitting the militia of this country. The expense is about 25 cents a head. It should be 50 cents a head at the very least, and then it would not be equal to what it is in other countries. I will take the opportunity of again pressing on this Minister of Militia, as I have pressed on others, that while the present system of granting certificates to our officers is a great improvement on the system of some years ago, it can be greatly improved. A young officer is appointed, say, to be a second lieutenant, and before he can attend a military school he has to provide himself with a uniform that will cost him anywhere between \$50 and \$75. Only a limited number can attend the school at a time. I would suggest that there should be a cadet system instead of an officer system, and let these provisional second lieutenants go there by hundreds, and if necessary stand beside men in the ranks. When I was going through the military school, the officer standing beside me was a lieutenant-colonel, while I was a full private, and when I got through I knew as much about drill as that officer. Let a simple uniform be provided for these different schools, so that the young officers would not need to provide themselves with expensive uniforms as they now have to do, before going to the school. I trust also that there will be no diminution in the annual drill but that each corps will drill at least twelve days every year. The Minister spoke of officers being placed on the reserve list, and of officers retiring after five years' service. I believe it is well that there should be a period beyond

which no officer should hold command of a regiment; but I think that five years in the majority of cases, will be found to be too short a period.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** There is a maximum age—three years more.

**Mr. HUGHES.** No self-respecting officer is going to hang around and ask for three more years of service.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** The district officer commanding may recommend it in the case of a very good officer.

**Mr. HUGHES.** No self-respecting officer would take it. When my five years were up, my resignation would go in. But why should there not be the rank of colonel in our Canadian militia in addition to that of lieutenant-colonel? And why should not officers who attain this position be retained as brigadier commanders for two or three years, and then pass on to the reserve list. I notice what has been said by General Hutton, and I congratulate the Minister on continuing the good work. General Hutton has infused a new spirit into the volunteers of Canada, which has already borne excellent results. The great majority of his suggestions, I am free to say, are on right lines, and are in accord with the best interests of the Canadian militia.

**Mr. DOMVILLE.** I would certainly have liked to criticise the management of the Militia from an outside stand-point. While I thoroughly believe in putting the militia on a proper footing, we must halt when we come to what is called in the "Illustrated London News" of the 23rd of February, noisy militarism; that is to say, there is a class of officers in the service, not here, perhaps, who advertise themselves considerably, by articles written by themselves, and known as the Wolseley school. Gen. Wolseley is a very good general and has earned a good many honours; but he has always taken care to have himself written up. I have read articles in the English papers about the militia of Canada that must have come from here. Putting politics aside, it is a great credit to our militia that it is so well conducted, while this newspaper says that in England they can hardly equip their militia regiments though there is an abundance of officers there. I think it is right that the militia should be put into good shape, but I do not like the idea of my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), who talks about our being taxed to a greater extent for their support. I think the people of this country will halt about being taxed to such an extent as to have us become a warlike nation and contribute an army to go abroad. Are we to become a warlike nation and equip an army to go abroad or are we simply to

**Mr. HUGHES.**

maintain an army to act on the defensive? While having every love for the mother country, I am not prepared to see a great taxation placed on our people simply for the purpose of carrying out this imperial idea of the federation league.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** Who is it writes the articles in the "Advertiser"?

**Mr. DOMVILLE.** I will find out, and let the hon. gentleman know, if I can. I will put a question on the Notice paper. I am entirely in accord with the hon. Minister in all he is doing, but there is one thing I would like to point out to him, and that is, that he can find officers trained in this country to handle our army. I would like to ask him whether every billet in this country is to be filled by officers imported?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** No.

**Mr. DOMVILLE.** What inducement is there to a Canadian to go through the Military School and qualify himself for service, if he is to be turned down on every occasion by some officer brought out from the old country, who thinks he knows more than he does? There has been about \$100,000,000 spent on our militia since confederation, which represents nearly one-half of the debt of Canada to-day, and each General we bring out turns the other down. One is for buttons, and another is for shooting, another is for tattoos, another is for cavalry, another for mounted infantry. Now, which is right?

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** Buttons.

**Mr. DOMVILLE.** I dare say that would suit my hon. friend: he would look well in buttons. To my mind, a step has been taken in the right direction in getting good arms. But what is the use of having good arms, if the men cannot shoot? I think that General Herbert's idea was the correct one, namely, to start from the bottom, and teach every man in this country to hit the mark. Then, if an emergency should arise, they can go out and do something; but this galloping all over the country, with an imaginary enemy in front, and another in the rear, and another on the flank, may be a very pretty manoeuvre, and please the press, and sound well in England, but, as the French say, "Ce n'est pas la guerre." What we want is a militia trained to shoot. If the men can shoot, a week will put them in good shape as regards drill. If that were not the case, our militia would be a mighty poor business, for there is not a camp in the country that is not composed of at least 50 per cent recruits. Take this idea of retiring at the end of five years. A colonel has gone to all the trouble to keep his men together, and then has to retire after five years' service, simply because of the imperial idea of making room for officers below him. But in the old country the senior

officers have a pension to start on, and if they are of any use, they generally get a staff appointment somewhere. The time has come when we should make up our minds as to what our militia is going to be. I am not finding fault with the vote, but I object to our going in for an Imperial army. As the representative of the taxpayers, I object to it. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior) will admit that if you put a man on the reserve, after three or four years, with a new drill coming in, and new rifles, and everything changed, he will be very little use afterwards. If he is any good, he might as well be kept on, and if no good, let him be got rid of before. I believe in the Switzerland system of teaching our men how to shoot first. Next year will be our year of criticism. We have not had time to criticise, so far, and we must be careful how we criticise these gallopers over the country, and offend an Imperial officer, who is superior to anything in this country. When I was over at the Jubilee, they called us colonists, and these do not even agree amongst themselves, because each general that comes out here, says the one who was here before him was no good. What is the next general who comes out here, if we bring out another—and I hope we will not—going to say? I hope we will get some General out of our own country, and I hope the staff appointments will be given to our own men, and I think I can find a good many men here who, though they may not agree with me in politics or anything else, would make excellent officers for these appointments. I am willing to take things as they are up to the present, but next year I shall be prepared, if spared, to go into all the details with regard to the expenditure during the regime of the present Major General. I have not a word to say about his being a good or a bad officer. I hardly know him by sight, for I have only seen him once, and may never see him again, but next year there will be ample opportunity for us to find out how much further we are to go, and whether we are going to put our foot right down and say what the position of Canada is to be in reference to the militia. If we want to place Canada in the position of a warlike nation, we want not only arms, but arsenals, and forts, and all the latest equipments. No sooner have we purchased artillery than we find it out of date, and replace by quick-firing guns, and the same may be said for our rifles. Canada would have to spend about \$20,000,000 a year to keep up an army of the kind suggested by the present Major General.

**AN HON. MEMBER.** We cannot do it.

**MR. DOMVILLE.** Then, we will see what is the next best thing to do. While doing everything he can to promote the efficiency of the service, I hope the hon. Minister will not allow himself to be led away by any-

body who might be classed as belonging to that section of opinion which the "Illustrated London News" calls noisy militarism.

**MR. HAGGART.** We require an explanation from the hon. Minister, after the extraordinary statement made by a gentleman who, I believe, is a colonel on the active force, that the recommendation of the General will saddle this country with an expenditure of at least \$20,000,000. Is that what the hon. Minister is leading us to by his estimates? Or is there any foundation for the statement of the gallant colonel who has just addressed the House?

**THE MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** I have the greatest possible respect for my hon. friend from King's, N.B. (Mr. Domville); but, having very carefully looked into this question, I do not view with as much apprehension as he does the suggestion of the General. I think that the expenditure of the present year, a considerable part of which is on capital account, will not be exceeded next year, and will probably be slightly reduced, while carrying his recommendations into effect.

**MR. BERGERON.** I wish to go back to this Isle aux Noix matter. I think it likely that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, King's) is not aware of what is actually going on. I am under the impression that this place would be a first-class place for a camp in that part of the country.

**THE MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** We have an absolute right to go and hold a camp whenever we please. That is specially provided in the lease.

**MR. BERGERON.** At the same time, if I am not mistaken, it is understood that the barracks there, which are nice buildings and well constructed, are to be fitted for a summer resort, kept by Mr. Naylor, who is the agent of a company made up of friends of St. Johns of the Minister of Public Works. Of course, it is not in the department of the Minister of Militia, but we shall find in the Estimates that we are to spend \$8,000 for a wharf—and this is simply for tourists. Then, there is \$4,500, as I have heard, for another wharf at Sabrevois, which is of use only to gentlemen of a club. We have built a wharf for \$10,000 at Iberville, also for the benefit of a club there. The only vessels stopping at this wharf are yachts and other pleasure craft, except one barge. We are spending money by the bushel. If it is useful, it is not so bad. But I do not think we should build wharfs here and there on the Richelieu River merely for pleasure seekers and for the benefit of the members of a club. This property has been leased by the Government for \$150 a year for 21 years. The Minister thinks he has done a good thing because it was formerly leased for \$40 a year and they had to pay a caretaker. If it were leased for

that before the Government that was responsible for it was responsible for something very bad. The man who paid \$40 made \$400 or \$500 a year, having a pasture on the island and charging those who sent their animals there—which will give an idea of the size of the island and what can be made of it.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to say to my hon. friend from King's, N.B. (Mr. Domville) that I think he has wrongly conceived the views of the present Major General Commanding in some respects. I can certainly say that the Major General agrees with the honourable and gallant member for King's in believing that the soldiers should be good shots. A very practical system has been carried out in training them. As for the annual drill, the Major General has the same view as the hon. and gallant member. The General has inaugurated a very useful training in connection with these camps, the exercise of having what we call manoeuvres. The men, in performing these manoeuvres, learn as much drill as on a routine parade, and they also learn the country which they may be called upon to defend in case of necessity. I am satisfied that when my hon. friend (Mr. Domville) looks into the matter he will find that his views and the Major General's are one—another proof that great minds run in the same channel.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like to hear an answer from the hon. Minister to what has just been said by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). Is it true that the barracks at Isle aux Noix have been leased?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I stated that. The barracks have not been used for many years. The buildings are going out of repair. The island has been rented to a farmer, or somebody, for a trifling sum, and the buildings allowed to go down. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) says that Mr. Naylor represents a company. I do not know anything about that. He made application for the island, and, on looking into the matter carefully, we considered that \$150, which was more than three times what we had been getting, was a fair rental. Mr. Naylor becomes the caretaker himself. We are saved \$200 or \$300 a year.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You are at liberty to re-enter at any moment?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes. I thought it a good arrangement, and I think so still. Mr. Naylor wants to use it as a summer resort. It is better to use the buildings than to leave them unused, and in his own interest he will take good care of them. The repairs are being done by him. The Government will do any work that is considered absolutely necessary to prevent any part of the build-

Mr. BERGERON.

ing being destroyed. But we have not undertaken any general system of repairs.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No expense of fitting? The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. BERGERON. But the barracks will be devoted to hotel purposes. They are making rooms there, and if the Minister should require to use them for a barracks, he will have a great deal of expense to put them in military form again.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) is mistaken. There are rooms there now. This man would not incur heavy expenditure such as the hon. gentleman indicates. I do not think much change will be required. I understand that the man who has been living there has destroyed some of the buildings and some repairs may be necessary to restore them.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) refers to the manoeuvres that were carried out. No doubt they are very good, but the fact that they were carried out proves my argument. It shows that the idea was there before the present General came, for he could not in ten days knock the men in these additional movements. I did not want to criticise, but only to say what Canada is willing to do. If our officers can do these things that are spoken of, that is about all we require. I do not think that there is any need for articles in the paper such as I have read, one of them, if I remember well, speaking of the "paralysis of the militia." It is not very much paralyzed if the hon. member for North Victoria speaks correctly. If our men could do all these things they are not too bad, and will compare even with some of the British regiments that learned marching and countermarching and turned out nothing at all. We have only to go back to history not long ago, at the time of General Braddock, when the colonists knocked the blazes out of the whole of them.

Intercolonial Railway—

Increased siding accommodation.....\$90,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has become necessary to extend double sidings at almost all the points along the line, owing to the increased number of cars. A great deal of time has been lost by having to break up trains.

Mr. HAGGART. Why is it charged to capital account?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You could not possibly do it out of ordinary revenue, it was not a matter of repair, it is extension and enlargement.

Mr. HAGGART. I never knew siding accommodation to be charged to capital account before.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Well, the hon. gentleman did not, nor would we if we were simply making ordinary extensions and renewals from time to time. But where you have to do all these immense extensions that we are required to do now, it is a totally different matter. We have to get new rails, we have to lay down new track, new beds, and a good deal of construction work is required. This is quite beyond the ordinary.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. I wish the hon. gentleman had been here and heard the speeches of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who declared time and again, in the old days, that this capital account of the Intercolonial Railway should long ago have been closed. Now, instead of its being closed, it is being opened up very widely, and things are being charged constantly by the hundreds of thousands to capital account that were, under the old regime, charged to current account. If the hon. gentleman will refer to "Hansard" last year he will see items, renewals of bridges, for instance, always charged under the old system to current account, and the hon. gentleman has charged them to capital account. I venture to say that in the present Estimates there are three times the variety of items, yes, four times the variety of items, charged to capital account that were charged to capital account under the old Government. Now, that absolutely destroys the figures for purposes of comparison. The hon. gentleman will go to the country and say he has been managing the railway with a certain line of economy, and the effect will be that what ought to be charged up to current revenue account and so increase his deficit, is charged up to capital account, and goes to the debt of the country, and the hon. gentleman receives credit for running the railway with greater economy and efficiency, whereas he is adding to the debt of the country. Here is an item for increased accommodation in the way of sidings. What is the cause of that? It has been increased owing to the increased revenue, therefore, the increased facilities ought to come out of revenue.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It is original construction.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. But for the purposes for which these sidings were constructed the demand has been increased by the trade, consequently the revenue has been increased. If that is not the fact, then the hon. gentleman has no right to construct them. This I say, that for all purposes of comparison the figures have been absolutely spoilt, the hon. gentleman must admit that.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I absolutely join issue with my hon. friend in respect to the statements he has made. In the first place, when he says that there is a greater variety in the num-

ber of charges which are included under the head of capital expenditure than in the past, I join issue with him on that proposition.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. We will go through them and compare them. Here is siding accommodation.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Take the item of siding accommodation. Can the hon. gentleman say with any approach to fairness that the conditions that we are called upon to grapple with to-day are analogous to any conditions which have been recognized as existing during the past? I am called upon to-day to add to the sidings throughout the whole line from one end to the other. What is the reason of that? It is because the time has come when, if we are to do railroad work in a proper manner, up to date, with proper facilities, we must adopt a different class of engines and we must haul heavier loads, not particularly because the business has increased, but even to do the business we are doing at a cost which will enable us to do it profitably.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. That doesn't meet the statement at all.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think it materially affects his statement. I think the hon. gentleman will find that in the past there have been charges in respect of extensive siding accommodation. But even if that is not the case, does the hon. gentleman say that any of my predecessors was called upon to furnish sidings and accommodation that would cost, I won't say \$90,000, I will say one-tenth of that? I venture to say that you won't find \$10,000 spent in providing new siding accommodation in any one year in the history of the Intercolonial Railway. The conditions now confronting us are conditions which are entirely on a footing with the original construction of the road. If we are going to do business, we are called upon to put the road in such a shape that we can use heavy engines and haul heavier trains. We cannot use heavy engines to haul longer trains unless we have additional siding accommodation, not between two or three points, but at every point along the line where crossings take place. The hon. gentleman never undertook such an expenditure as \$90,000 in any one year, or a tenth part of it, in the way of siding accommodation. He can turn up the items which have gone to make up the total of capital expenditure, and he cannot find any item approaching one-tenth of this point for that class of expenditure.

Mr. **HAGGART**. I would not think of putting it in.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, such an expenditure was not made on account of sidings. The hon. gentleman spent \$10,000 or \$20,000 in build-

ing fifteen or twenty miles of siding where we are spending \$100,000. We are going to do the whole of it now, but we are doing as little as possible to enable us to get along. Take other items and you will find that they have always been regarded in past years as properly coming within capital expenditure, when they have not been made, but we are face to face with conditions on the Intercolonial that are entirely distinct from any that the hon. gentleman had to grapple with or that have arisen in years past. There is not a railway that has not thrown on the scrap iron heap its 40 or 45 ton engines, and replaced them with 80 and 90 ton engines. You must change the character of your road. It is impossible to do it out of income and you must do it out of capital account or not do it at all. The question is: Shall we do it or not do it? I think the opinion of any person who will travel over the Intercolonial will be that we have been endeavouring to bring the road up to modern requirements, so that it will produce good results.

Mr. HAGGART. Imagine the Grand Trunk, after paying a dividend, borrowing an amount to increase its siding accommodation. \$90,000; to provide increased station accommodation, \$15,000; to provide increased accommodation at Lévis, to build an elevator at St. John, and so on, amounting altogether to nearly \$600,000. These amounts are never charged by a railway to capital account upon a road fifteen or twenty years old, as the Intercolonial is. They should not be charged to capital, and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) used to say, again and again, to me that there should be an end to capital account unless you build a portion of the line for the purpose of tapping it or adding to it. The hon. Minister's capital account this year amounts altogether to \$1,600,000. My capital account, in 1895, was \$211,000, of which \$100,000 was to build a new branch to Dartmouth, so that the capital expenditure was a little over \$100,000. If the hon. gentleman wants more modern equipment he has no right to charge it to capital account. He should take it out of income, and that is the only way that a comparison can be made between the management of the railway between 1893, 1894 and 1895, and between 1898 and 1899. The hon. gentleman should keep his capital account for items which are strictly chargeable to it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) is quite correct in saying that in 1895 the capital expenditure, on the Intercolonial, was \$211,000, and that \$100,000 was spent for a new railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to tell the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals that I have discussed this question with the big railways, and I have made it a point to

Mr. BLAIR.

ascertain what the rule is which obtains with them. These great railways in the United States lay down the rule that where, for instance, they are putting down a heavier rail, they charge to capital account the difference between the cost of the rail they put down and what it would cost for a rail of the same weight as the one they take up. That is a matter of betterment and it is invariably charged to capital account. This is the practice of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they cannot do otherwise. It is not fair to the stockholders, who are entitled to dividends to take from the earnings of the road to pay for permanent extensions.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that this is not done in the United States? I will tell him that the railway journals are full of statements to show that it is done. I read a statement the other day to the effect that the dividends on the preferred and common stocks of the Northern Pacific would be influenced a great deal by reason of the enormous extensions which were being made by the board of directors out of income account.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman say that the earnings of the road should not be applied towards betterment, if where a new rail is to be supplanted by a better one that the earnings should not be applied towards it? He says this is an injustice to the stockholders.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the doctrine that is laid down.

Mr. HAGGART. That is the doctrine the hon. gentleman lays down. What is the difference between that and borrowing the money and voting a preferential stock for the purpose of supplying the machinery? What is the injustice to the stockholder?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is all the difference in the world. Supposing the receipts from any one of these railways were a million dollars this year, and they were able to take \$500,000 out of that for the purpose of making an extension of their line, does the hon. gentleman say that it is of no moment to the shareholders whether or not that \$500,000 is borrowed at 4 per cent, which would only cost the company \$20,000 a year, leaving the difference between that sum and the \$500,000 for distribution among the shareholders, or whether they took the whole of that money and expended it?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Their security is made the less valuable, if their debt is increased.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all, because they have the extension to show for it, and that extension is supposed to have earning capacity, or it would not be made. They are not adding

to the burdens of the company in one case, but they are taking the money right out of the earnings of the shareholders in this year for the purpose of improving the road.

Mr. HAGGART. It does make a difference whether the amount is taken out of the interest which they are entitled to apply on capital; but the hon. gentleman says that if the money is put upon an extension of the road, they have not the debt, and they have the extension. If that is true, if you borrow the money, you have the extension of the road, but you have the debt as a liability.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. Minister says it would be unfair to absorb all the earnings of the road, because the stockholders this year might not be the stockholders next year. But there can be no parallel between such a case and that of the Intercolonial, of which the stockholders will be the same years hence as they are now. There is no advantage to Canada in showing a surplus by constantly unloading on capital account. The principle the hon. gentleman has laid down does not apply to the Intercolonial, and it might end in a very great vice.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman overlooks this very important fact, that we have not the income, and do not expect it, out of which to do this work. It is a matter of comparative unimportance whether the money is borrowed for the purpose of making these improvements, or taken out of the surplus earnings, if we have them.

Mr. CLANCY. There is only this difference, that one appears in the unpleasant light of a large deficit, and the other in the more congenial light of a public debt.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. To me it is an unimportant matter whether or not this work is done under the form of a capital expenditure or under the form of an income expenditure. The main point is to get these things done which are necessary in the interests of the Intercolonial, and which we cannot straggle over a period of years. You cannot strengthen your bridges by degrees; you have to have them strong enough to carry your engines and heavy trains, and you have to extend your sidings now, and enlarge your engine-houses now. You have not the money to do these things now; your income does not suffice. The surplus that would be shown under the most favourable circumstances would not be large, and to use the form of an expenditure on income account in meeting these charges would simply be adding to the debt under another form. My hon. friends, however, say that for the purposes of comparison this method of making the outlay is not fair. On that point I am prepared to join issue with them. The extensions and improvements on the Intercolonial are just as large, and larger, than

in times past, and I am going as far as I can in drawing on income; I am not asking for anything on capital account that I can avoid; but these works have to be done now to be useful, and, for the purposes of comparison in the future, the hon. gentleman's position would not be in the slightest degree impaired. The hon. gentleman would argue that I should go on and do whatever is necessary out of income, and show a deficit of \$1,500,000 this year, so that my hon. friend could say: When I had charge of the Intercolonial, I was able to keep the deficits within \$100,000, and look at what they are now.

Mr. CLANCY. Then there will be no limit to the hon. gentleman's capital expenditure?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There will be no limit, if you gave full range to your wishes in the matter, except the needs of the system.

Mr. CLANCY. Suppose the hon. gentleman thought proper to ask \$10,000,000 for these purposes, he would be able to say next year that, as the result of that large expenditure, there is a favourable balance on the side of income, although we have added that much to the public debt. Will the hon. gentleman say it is a fair statement of account, that by means of charging expenditure to capital he is able to show a surplus.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman will see that the expenditure on appropriations asked for are not extravagant. He assumes that I would set my imagination to work in order to make large expenditures in every possible direction, but we are proceeding very moderately and within reasonable limits. I am only taking the course which I think any one will say I ought to take, who is interested in seeing the Intercolonial Railway put upon a fairly sound business footing. I do not think the people want the Intercolonial Railway to present the appearance of a bankrupt concern, but to have it, so far as possible within reasonable and moderate limits, a road which will be a credit to Canada.

Mr. HAGGART. Suppose an item is charged to capital account, the first charge against the revenue the next year is the interest on the increased capital account, but there is no such charge as this on the Intercolonial Railway and the hon. gentleman may go on increasing the capital account ad infinitum, and there is no charge for interest against the revenues the next year. I object, especially on a railway that belongs to the Government, to any such charges being put against capital account as those which are now charged against it. Perhaps I have been guilty myself to the extent of about \$100,000 per year, but even my action does not justify the hon. gentleman in charging these things to capital account. I say that such things even as

building elevators or a dock at Halifax should not be charged to capital account. They should be charged fairly to the road itself. It is high time that the capital account should be closed, except in cases such as building branches of 30 or 40 miles in Prince Edward Island, the cost of which is a fair charge to capital account. But it is not fair to charge sidings, increased station accommodation, or anything of that kind to capital.

Increased station accommodation..... \$15,000

Mr. HAGGART. All I ask is that all this work shall be done by tender and contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is always done so.

Increased accommodation at Lévis (revote, \$34,000)..... \$80,000

Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount required altogether?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think we will require at least \$20,000 more than we are asking. That will depend upon the cost of our station.

Mr. HAGGART. You are going to build a new station?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Why build a new station here if you contemplate building a bridge? If the bridge is to be built, why not put the station where it should be later on?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If my hon. friend knew the state of public feeling there, he would know that we would not be justified waiting until the bridge is built, and even after the bridge is built this station will also be a very important one. The bridge will be constructed six or seven miles further up the river, and I hardly think will be favourably located as a means of recrossing the river in substitution of the present station.

To build an elevator at St. John (revote, \$40,000) ..... \$114,000

Mr. HAGGART. Is the contract let?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes; the elevator is \$98,000, and the foundation \$16,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair) brought down the correspondence in the McDonald case which we discussed on the main Estimates, and which he promised me to bring down when we discussed these Estimates?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I thought I had already laid that on the Table, but I find I was mistaken. I have both the report and the correspondence here.

Mr. BERGERON. If my hon. friend will be kind enough to send them to me, I will not question him until I read the papers.

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. HAGGART. I need not add to the protest I made the other evening against the policy of building elevators at St. John. In my opinion the expenditure is unjustifiable. The Government cannot carry grain to that port to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has elevators there and which has a shorter line and is losing money I believe, or not making money on the grain carried there, but is carrying it for the purpose of building up a maritime trade at St. John. Where can the Government get their grain? In Montreal? The Canadian Pacific Railway has its own ocean terminals at St. John, and the Grand Trunk Railway at Portland. The Intercolonial Railway is very unlikely to get grain coming down by the St. Lawrence. It may be possible that they will get it from the Canada Atlantic Railway; that is the only possible way that I can see. This building of elevators at the northern part of the port to compete with elevators already at the southern part, is altogether unjustifiable.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman's (Mr. Haggart's) leader has stated most positively that he is in error in that.

Mr. HAGGART. I speak for myself.

Increased accommodation at St. John (revote) ..... \$49,600

Mr. HAGGART. Is that in connection with the deep water facilities?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. I have the papers which have been brought down, and I find these specifications give the fullest details of the contract. The contract is a lump sum contract, as the hon. gentleman said, except in reference to two items, dredging and rock excavation. My difficulty, when discussing the matter before, was to know how the party was to be paid under a lump-sum contract. By looking at the contract I am not helped out of the difficulty. He is to be paid within 25 per cent of the monthly estimates as the work proceeds. But there is no way of finding out what the progress of the work is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why not? Surely my hon. friend must know that the engineers who drew the plans and made the estimates, ascertained the quantities of the various classes of work and put a value upon them and will make calculations based upon the contract prices as compared with the figures of their estimates.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) is using exactly the argument I used at the time of the debate on the subject. I told him the fullest details were made out by the engineer and furnished to the department and he would be able to pass on the

schedule he had prepared. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) denied that there was such information. I find now the specifications attached to the contract give us the most minute details, just as I said should be done. The engineer has a schedule of prices and makes an estimate of what he thinks the price should be for doing the work. And as the work under the contract proceeds, he pays out the amount monthly to the contractor as the prices compare with the estimate he had in relation to the work. We could not get these details from the Minister. I am glad to see that the engineering department of the Intercolonial Railway was not so negligent as I understood from the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) will take the trouble to read the "Hansard" report of the discussion he refers to, I think he will find his memory does not serve him accurately. I told him what he is now stating. He may recall that he was under the impression that the contract would show just what prices were to be paid to the contractor for the different classes of work. I endeavoured to point out that that would not appear in the contract, because it was a lump-sum contract.

Indiantown Branch, to pay amount of award of Walter Shanly of \$34,675.23, and interest thereon from 1st December, 1886, to 1st July, 1899, to Hon. J. Snowball ..... \$52,148 44

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) will please give us full details of this. When I was Minister of Railways and Canals, the Hon. Mr. Snowball had a claim against the Government for certain work he had done on the Indiantown branch. An Order in Council was passed by the late Government which modified the original contract, and under this modification his claim was submitted to the Exchequer Court. I would like to know whether that Order in Council has been altered or modified, or whether this claim has been awarded by the Exchequer Court?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no modification in terms, perhaps none in fact, of the Order in Council the hon. gentleman refers to. A reference was made under the order to the Exchequer Court, and the judge passed upon the question. In so doing, however, he pointed out that in strict law he would be compelled to pronounce against certain of the items, and he submitted the question as to whether anything should be allowed in respect to certain of these items as a matter which the Government might properly take into consideration. The claim was pressed upon us, and I felt it was impossible for my department to approach it from an independent and fair point of view, and upon referring the matter to the consideration of the Council, it was decided that these

questions and all the facts pertaining thereto might be submitted to the judgment of Mr. Walter Shanly as a gentleman of established reputation, and one who had been frequently entrusted with the discharge of similar duties. I will put my hon. friend in possession of his report.

Mr. HAGGART. I got two reports of Mr. Shanly, one on Hugh Ryan & Co. and the other on Heney & Borthwick.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You will find Mr. Shanly passed upon these and made certain recommendations. The judge to whom the matter was first referred reported in favour of the contractor, that \$10,665 was properly payable to Mr. Snowball. Some of the other items which the judge had left in the way I mentioned were referred to Mr. Shanly, who reported that \$24,019 might be allowed of these items, and he further reported that an additional sum of \$12,000 might properly be allowed. This \$12,000 arose in connection with what might be called easements upon the original work. The judge was of the opinion that he was bound strictly by the letter of the contract, and that inasmuch as the contractor was allowed to lighten his burden or was relieved of doing a certain portion of the work, it was his duty to place a value upon these easements which he did to the extent of \$12,000. Mr. Shanly reported that that amount might be allowed, but the Government, on considering the whole report, did not feel that they could adopt Mr. Shanly's view. They did so to the extent of \$24,000, which, added to the \$10,000 that the judge had awarded and which had not been paid, makes the principal sum \$34,655.

Mr. HAGGART. I can see how it was made up. It appears that Judge Burbidge allowed the contractor, over and above his contract price, \$10,665. As I understand it, the reference to the Exchequer Court was on a memorandum prepared by myself on the 16th of October, 1895. I have not had time to look into the papers, but I understood the Minister had ordered a fresh one to be submitted to the Exchequer Court.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think not.

Mr. HAGGART. The judge's award was \$10,665. To this Mr. Shanly now adds, by way of increase, a further sum of \$20,940. Did I clearly understand the Minister that these were claims which the judge thought in equity ought to be paid?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He said that as a strict matter of law he could not allow them, but the Crown might, as a matter of equity allow them.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose as a matter of law he was not entitled to anything. It

was only a matter of grace that he was entitled to anything at all from the Exchequer Court.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the way the reference went he was entitled as a matter of law.

Mr. HAGGART. But the reference was an extension or alteration of the contract, a waiving of certain rights, which we had under the contract one of them that the certificate of the chief engineer should be final, notwithstanding that the contractor might have all the equities in the world. We waived certain things we were entitled to under the contract, and submitted it to the Exchequer Court. That was the extent of our grace.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Having done that, then it became possible for the judge, from a legal point of view, to allow items up to \$10,000 by reason of these waivers.

Mr. HAGGART. What I cannot understand is the Exchequer Court judge going past the submission to him and saying there were other claims which he considered were equitable and right. There may be, but I have no doubt the judge would not report it so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The report of the judge does not say that it was equitable and right that these others should be paid, but it says that as respects these other items many of them—the report of Mr. Shanly does not report favourably upon all—but as respects those the judge reports that they are matters which could properly be dealt with by the grace of the Crown.

Mr. CLANCY. Does he recommend that he should deal with them?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I take it that he does.

Mr. FOSTER. He makes a statement that it may be dealt with, but he does not recommend it.

Mr. HAGGART. Why does the hon. Minister not give all to Senator Snowball that Mr. Shanly reported he was entitled to?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was one item relating particularly to a matter of easement. We felt that having entered into a contract which required him to do certain work, when he was relieved of a part of that work, it was not fair, or just, or equitable, and we did not see that we should allow him to be paid for work which he had not done.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not understand the hon. Minister rightly. I think that I know what an easement is perfectly well. Would the hon. gentleman tell me exactly what was done by the contractor which he claims, un-

Mr. HAGGART.

der this easement, was entitled to payment for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Suppose he were required to build a bridge, and suppose that that contract came to be changed in such a manner as to enable him to go around and to carry out his contract on a different line, which would dispense with the necessity of building this bridge; suppose that, by reason of the fact of being allowed to change the line of the road, he was going to save \$10,000; the contractor would claim that we ought not to have deducted from the contract price the value of the easement, or saving. Under these circumstances, Mr. Shanly was of the opinion that it would be proper to allow him that amount, but we did not think so and we refused to recognize the award to that extent.

Mr. HAGGART. Suppose a contractor has a lump sum contract for building twenty miles of road and that, instead of twenty miles of road he were to build 18 miles and make as good, or a better road; under these circumstances I think the contractor is entitled to full payment for the twenty miles. Of course, this is a matter of judgment entirely, but that is usually done.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman, perhaps, does not recollect the terms of the contract. The contract provided that if there were any lessening of the cost of the work, by reason of the change, the contractor was not to get the benefit, but it was to be deducted from the price.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that thoroughly. Under the contract he is entitled to nothing, and it is only a matter of grace and by doing away with some of the rights of the Crown that the Exchequer Court was enabled to give him \$10,000. As a further matter of grace I suppose he was entitled to the whole of the amount Mr. Shanly has made a fair report I think he should be entitled to the whole amount.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if these papers which have been brought down are all the papers connected with the McDonald matter?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not seen them, but I am informed that these are all.

Mr. BERGERON. I have just looked over them, and they show that the accusations brought against McDonald were nearly all of a political character.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Very largely so.

Mr. BERGERON. There is hardly anything else except the charge of having given passes to some of his friends and allowed a great deal of travelling on the Intercolonial Railway without reporting to his chief

officer. To this the Government did not attach much importance because they only gave instructions to the commissioner to try the political charges. To all these accusations Mr. McDonald made a general denial, and then an investigation takes place upon the political charges. I will just read, because I want this to go on record, the report of Mr. Bedard, which is as follows:—

It is very easy to see now that out of the ninety-three witnesses whom the complainant had produced and examined, there are not five who have been able to give any evidence worth examining and discussing. Putting aside Charles Belleau, Henri T. Roy, Charles King and David Pottinger, whose testimony explains, to a certain extent, their being summoned as witnesses, I am forced to declare that most of the other witnesses have failed to establish anything in support of charges and there appears no reason, no excuse for having summoned them; because either they know nothing personally or give their evidence in favour of the defendant. Seeing the difficulties one has generally to face when trying to prove facts connected with politics, I decided from the beginning to give full swing to complainant; and his attorneys consequently conducted their investigation pretty much as they were pleased to do. I intervened only when they were evidently beating about the bush, fishing for evidence, or wishing to prove facts certainly irrelevant. But now that we have the case of the complainant, one single charge brought against Mr. McDonald. And more particularly, I fail to find any excuse it is impossible to say that the evidence justifies for producing so many witnesses who knew nothing, or testified in favour of the defendant.

There is evidently a very strong feeling against Mr. McDonald in Fraserville, and a powerful pressure must have been exerted by his political friends upon the complainant to procure his removal. It is no part of my duty to say whether that feeling is founded on real grievances, or reasonably derived from unjust prejudices. But I would fail in my duty were I not to say plainly and unhesitatingly that the complainant has been given full opportunity to prove his charges, and that he has not been able to substantiate any of them by his evidence.

Mr. McDonald has examined seventeen witnesses, among them several members of Parliament, whose constituencies are traversed by the Intercolonial Railway. All and every of one of them have testified to what was already established by complainant's witnesses, to wit: That Mr. McDonald has taken no part whatever in the last election; that he was neutral to such an extent that his friends often found fault with him, and declared he was more flush with Liberals than with Conservatives, and they have nothing to say against him. It is also established that, though requested by the then leader of the Conservatives, Mr. Angers, to take part in the fray, he refrained from so doing, and that he even forbade his son to have anything to do with politics.

Those undoubted facts go to explain certain circumstances which, at first sight, might raise a certain amount of suspicion, and impose upon me the conclusion that Mr. McDonald has not taken any apparent or offensive part in the last federal election, and that the charges brought against him by the complainant are not supported by the evidence.

The whole, however, respectfully submitted.

(Signed) J. E. BEDARD,  
Commissioner.

Quebec, 12th March, 1897.

That is the whole case, and I understand, that upon this report Mr. Macdonald was subsequently dismissed. He was paid his salary all through by order of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. While he was suspended?

Mr. BERGERON. A letter of the 19th of January, 1897, by Mr. Schreiber to Mr. Pottinger states that pending the investigation of the charges preferred against him McDonald will be suspended from office, and he was requested to deliver all papers and documents to Mr. Belleau, who is to be in charge. Then McDonald himself is acquainted with his suspension. In a letter of the 6th of April, 1897, Mr. Schreiber writes to Mr. Pottinger:

I am in receipt of your letter of the 12th ult., with reference to the pay of Mr. McDonald for the time he has been off.

In reply, I am to say that his salary is to be paid for his full time.

In a letter of the 12th of June, 1897, to Mr. Pottinger, Mr. Schreiber writes:

I have yours of the 9th inst., inclosing a voucher from Mr. A. R. McDonald for expenses for the months of March, April and May, amounting to \$139.75, with receipts attached for \$3.75.

Yes, the railway is to pay his reasonable expenses. I return inclosures.

It seems as if the superintendent was anxious to know whether he should pay the salary, because here is another letter of the 23rd of August, 1897, addressed to Mr. Pottinger by Mr. Schreiber:

I am in receipt of your letter of the 21st inst., stating that you are still paying Mr. A. R. McDonald's monthly salary as it become due.

In reply, I desire to say that I am quite aware of it, and until I am otherwise instructed I fear I will have to continue.

Then there is the dismissal on the 13th of December, 1897, when Mr. Schreiber writes to Mr. Pottinger:

I am to instruct you to dispense with the services of Mr. A. R. McDonald at the end of this month.

On the 13th of December, 1897, Mr. Schreiber writes as follows to Mr. Pottinger:—

Message received. The department have written you to dispense with the services of A. R. McDonald, and to appoint Ouellette. Letters go to-day.

On the 30th of March, 1898, Mr. Schreiber addressed to Mr. Choquette, then member for Montmagny, the following letter:—

I am to inform you that instructions have been given to Mr. Pottinger, General Manager of Government Railways, to pay Mr. Bédard for the time he was engaged on the A. R. McDonald investigation at the rate of \$20 per day.

There is the whole case. Some time ago it was stated that there were other charges against Mr. McDonald. I wish to make it clear that there were not, but that the only charge against Mr. McDonald was political

partisanship. A few other things in connection with giving passes to political friends were discarded by the department, and instructions were given to the commissioners to try him simply on political issues. The commissioners report that there was nothing proved against Mr. McDonald, and his lawyers were even paid by the Government. His dismissal is simply an arbitrary act on the part of the Government.

To provide for changing the draw-bars of freight-cars from the link and pin coupler to the Master Car-builders' standard couplers ..... \$10,000

Mr. CLANCY. What does that mean?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are required to equip our cars in this way in order that they may be admitted into the United States. The law comes into effect on the 1st of next year, and any cars that are not so equipped may be excluded from the United States. I am not doing it now simply as a beginning; it has been going on for a number of years past. I am doing it as rapidly as I can.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman to pay a royalty on these?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, this is the cost of the article.

Improvements at Point Tupper..... \$8,500

Mr. FOSTER. What is being done there?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have had one or two accidents there, and it is necessary that we should extend the pier, so as to get clear of the shoal, which, I believe, tends to obstruct the passage.

Mr. FOSTER. Will that be done by tender?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, yes.

Improving the telegraph service ..... \$13,000

Mr. FOSTER. What are you going to do?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have to have a separate line for the purposes of the Intercolonial. At present it is impossible to get a reply to a telegram inside of forty-eight hours.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are you going to put up poles, or only a wire?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are going to pay a contribution towards it. For the main part of the line we pay \$10 per mile, that is, between Lévis and Moncton, and for the rest \$30 a mile.

Mr. FOSTER. To whom are you giving this?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. To the Great North-Western, as far as that system extends, at this end of

Mr. BLAIR.

the line, and to the Western Union at the other end.

Mr. HAGGART. Are you going to keep it in repair?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, that is to be done by them. They have engaged to give us a separate and distinct wire.

One first-class passenger coach..... \$10,385

Mr. MONK. Is this being built, or is it built already?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is built already. We found it necessary to increase the number by one. We could not get it built here. It is built by the Wagner Company.

Mr. HAGGART. Were tenders called for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There were no advertisements issued. We sent circulars. The Pullman Company told us that their shops were filled with work and they were not in a position to take any more work. We communicated with the Wagner Car Company and the Barney & Smith Company, and the Wagner Company's tender being considerably the lowest, we gave the work to them. There are only three firms of considerable size in this business, and those are the three I have mentioned.

To provide new appliances and apparatus in connection with the installation of the Pintsch gas car lighting system.... \$4,850

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is that the best system?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Cheaper than electricity?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Very much.

Refrigerator cars..... \$80,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Those will be built under contract. We had twenty, and there is a great demand for others, and we are getting thirty more.

To build an elevator at Halifax (revote). \$77,000

Mr. HAGGART. Will this finish it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Contribution towards rebuilding Cowan's Bridge over Pigeon Creek, in the township of Emily ..... \$1,500

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We constructed a dam there and raised the water, and the people claim that we should contribute towards the cost of the bridge, representing the increased cost over what it would have been if we had not raised the water.

Deepening, &c., River St. Pierre, Lachine ..... \$ 9,000  
 Enlargement (revote) ..... 20,000

Mr. MONK. I want to call attention to a demand made some time ago by the municipal council of the town of Lachine. There is an old canal not used at all to-day between the new work and the principal street passing along the river's edge. The old canal is in an abandoned state and used for no purpose at all by the department. The town of Lachine has increased considerably since the last few years, and not long ago the council petitioned the Minister to obtain the use of it from the department for the purpose of embellishing it at their own expense and using it as a public park. They ask for no expenditure of money, but only the use of the canal, and I urge very strongly on the Minister to look into that petition. I think it was well founded and I think it had received the recommendation of the local government engineer. It should be granted as soon as possible as the town is pressing to carry out some improvements, it can only be of use for the Government to take possession of the work.

To pay Heney & Borthwick extras in connection with their contract for drainage works, reported in their favour by Mr. Walter Shanly..... \$8,932 86

Mr. HAGGART. And that, I understand, is to stand for the present?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Rainy River—

Lock and dam..... \$ 25,000  
 St. Andrew's Rapids—Red River..... 150,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These should be classed under the head of Public Works, and will be dealt with when we come to the Estimates of Public Works.

Rebuilding a portion of the south wall of the canal at Atwater Avenue..... \$15,000

Mr. MONK. Has that work been carried through?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A portion of the wall is disturbed by frost. The work has not yet been done, we have had no means to do it.

Mr. MONK. I suppose tenders will be called for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose so; our policy is always to call for tenders if possible.

Mr. HAGGART. We should have the direct promise from the Minister, because the Minister of Finance has refused to give it to us on some votes for the Public Works.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In some cases.

Mr. HAGGART. We intend to make motions on this subject unless the Minister

gives a distinct promise that any item of \$5,000 or over shall be let by tender as the law requires.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no hesitation in giving that promise in 99 cases out of 100, but my deputy tells me that it would not be wise to make a definite promise in this case. I will say that it will be done by tender and contract if it is practicable and in the public interest—in fact, unless there are very cogent reasons against it.

Mr. MONK. When I speak of calling for tenders, of course, I mean a public call. The Minister of Public Works, in some cases in Montreal counts it calling for tenders when he sends out circulars.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not. Our advertisements are inserted in the papers.

Mr. MONK. There are a large number of contractors in Montreal, and if this is put up to public tender, I am sure the Government will save money.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I wish to qualify what I say so far as the case of steel bridges is concerned. In that case, specifications and circulars are sent to the bridge builders. There are only a few of them. They all get notice.

Mr. HAGGART. I may be allowed on this item to remind the hon. Minister that he promised to bring down information with regard to those who were called upon to submit tenders in cases of contracts for supplies for the Intercolonial Railway. I had a list of them when I was at the head of the department, and I do not know of any person of importance who wishes to tender but was put on the list. The hon. Minister said that the list had been increased. I should like to have the list for the last year of my administration and now to compare them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a pretty extensive list. I will try to get the information.

Mr. HAGGART. No, the list is a small one—thirty or so, altogether, I think.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My deputy tells me that the lists may be in Moncton.

Mr. HAGGART. No, they are here.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That may have been the case when the hon. gentleman was at the head of the department, but of course, the deputy knows best where they are now. I wish to guard myself against making a promise I cannot fulfil. If the lists are here they shall be placed in my hon. friends hands to-morrow; if not, they shall be telegraphed for.

Mr. HAGGART. The list was submitted to me every time a contract was to be let, and I made it a rule that the contracts should go to the lowest tenderer, and if two parties were equally low, the deputy was to decide. In judging of the qualities of articles to be supplied, it was left to the School of Science in Montreal to judge. I have seen the list with every contract that was let when I was in the department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These lists come up with the tenders now, wherever tenders are sent in answer to circulars. But it may be that the lists are sent back. If they are here, they shall be furnished my hon. friend to-morrow.

To pay salary and expenses of experts to gather information and prepare a uniform code of rules and regulations for the railways of Canada ..... \$2,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Better let this stand, because I may have to drop it. I thought a Bill might be passed this session which would make this vote effective.

To defray the expense of procuring the attendance of witnesses in inquiries before Railway Committee of the Privy Council into charges of discrimination in rates by railway companies ..... \$2,000

Mr. HAGGART. Surely the hon. Minister does not intend to pay the witnesses ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will tell the hon. gentleman what I propose to do. If I am given this grant—which, let me say, is only an approximate amount, I do not suppose all this will be required, but I want to have sufficient for the purpose—I do propose to pay the expenses of witnesses who will be required for the purpose of having a thorough and careful inquiry in regard to the complaints that are reaching us from all quarters with respect to discriminations of the railways in their rates, particularly in the matter of oil. Particularly on the question of oil, people have complained that both the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway are in the habit of giving large rebates to the Standard Oil Company which makes it impossible for others to enter into successful competition with them. It is a difficult thing to say, even if it is true, how far we should go. The inquiry is attended with a good deal of expense, and we have felt that it would not be an unreasonable thing to ask Parliament to give us a sum out of which we can pay the expenses of witnesses whom it will be necessary to summon for the purpose of giving evidence in this investigation. A good many people will require to be brought from the different counties, officers of the different roads will be required to give evidence on the question. No private claims will be considered.

Mr. BLAIR.

Ottawa River—

Survey in view of improvement to navigation ..... \$10,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We intend to make a survey ourselves for our own information.

Mr. MONK. Is any part of that vote to be used on the Ottawa from here down to Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think so, it will be necessary to have the whole river surveyed.

Mr. CLANCY. Has a survey already been made by a private company with regard to this work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understand that the company has been doing something in connection with this work, and has some engineers on the river. The question is one of such immense importance in every way that we thought it would be desirable for us to ascertain from an independent stand-point what the actual prospects are and where works will require to be constructed. It may be that on further consideration this will be used as a contribution to people who are now working; on the other hand, we may think it desirable to put engineers on portions of the river ourselves.

Mr. CLANCY. At first I understand the company asked the Government to guarantee their bonds at 2 per cent on \$17,000,000; but from a discussion that took place this session we were told that the company asked a guarantee of \$20,000,000 at 2½ per cent. I wanted to ask the hon. gentleman whether he has ascertained approximately what the probable cost of the work would be.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Payment to A. P. Ross, formerly superintendent, Cornwall Canal, of an amount being the house-rent allowance of \$200 per year, in lieu of house accommodation from the time it was discontinued, 1st July, 1891, to the 31st March, 1897, the date when Mr. Ross's services were dispensed with..... \$1,200

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This was part of the arrangement under which Mr. Ross was engaged. As I understand it he was to have a fixed salary with house rent, or \$200 in addition. Not only was it the arrangement but I am reminded that there was an Order in Council passed to that effect. The building was occupied for other purposes during the time this gentleman remained superintendent of the canal, and he therefore did not get the benefit of the \$200 which he claimed he was entitled to. It was brought to my attention a little while ago, and having looked into the papers, it appeared to me the claim could not well be disputed. However, I re-

ferred it to the Department of Justice, and that department gave a strong opinion that Mr. Ross has a legal claim to this amount.

Mr. PRIOR. Was it discontinued for any special reason?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The building was rented to somebody else, the Crown received the rental.

Mr. PRIOR. When making a claim on the Government, I mean?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am informed that the way the arrangement first came before the committee was that the old superintendent was allowed by the Government to remain in possession of this house which, under the Order in Council, Mr. Ross was to have the right to use, and the value of which was estimated at \$200. The old superintendent was left in it in consideration of his agreeing to instruct the new man to his duties. He remained in it during the whole of these years, and the question was not raised, as there was no demand made by Mr. Ross until this year.

Mr. PRIOR. I suppose he was one of those offensive partisans?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think Mr. Ross was a good friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, and no doubt continues to be to this day.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Mr. HAGGART. What will be taken up to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). To-morrow morning we shall take up the Ottawa resolution and after that the railway subsidies.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In regard to the railway subsidies, I would say that the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) has asked that we might have furnished some plans or maps, particularly of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, showing the different railway lines, so that they can be seen readily. I have said that I would have them prepared, so that it may not be possible to take up the railway resolutions if they are not ready. If it is possible to get them in the evening, we may take up the resolutions then.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I might inform the hon. Minister of Finance that it would expedite the discussion of the Public Works estimates if he would give me the report in regard to the port of Maitland that I have asked for.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I feel that I am somewhat at fault in that matter. I have sent word to the Public Works Department, but I have not yet received it. I will make inquiry to-morrow. If the consideration of the railway subsidies be postponed we shall go on with the supplies.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2.25 a.m. (Wednesday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 2nd August, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 184)—from the Senate—to amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

Bill (No. 185)—from the Senate—to amend the Expropriation Act.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

Bill (No. 186)—from the Senate—to amend the Yukon Territory Act.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

### PETER VANLUVEN vs. DOMINION BANK.

Mr. BELL (Addington)—(by Mr. Taylor) asked:

1. Was a fiat granted to Mr. Peter Vanluven, of Yarker, Ont., to bring suit against the Dominion Bank at Napanee, Ont., for alleged violation of its charter?
2. If so, has it been revoked or retarded in any way?
3. Will the Government bring down the correspondence in relation thereto?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The Deputy Minister of Justice has furnished me the following memorandum, which gives the information desired by the hon. gentleman:—When Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper was Attorney General he authorized Peter Vanluven to use his name for the purpose of recovering penalties against the Dominion Bank for alleged violation of the Bank Act. Afterwards it was discovered that a claim had been included in the information to set aside the charter of the bank, which the Attorney General did not intend to authorize. We communicated with Mr. Vanluven's solicitors and informed them that unless they amended the information by striking out the claim for cancellation of the charter, we would withdraw the fiat. After some correspondence, not getting any satisfactory undertaking from the solicitors, the fiat was withdrawn. Mr. Dickey was then Attorney General. There is no objection to bringing down the correspondence, if it is desired.

**HUDSON'S BAY COMPANY'S STEAMER  
"STRATHCONA" ON STIKINE  
RIVER.**

Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. Has the Government made any arrangement with the Hudson's Bay Company or their agent, in regard to the expenses of running their steamer "Strathcona" on the Stikine River during this season by which expenses are to be paid by the Government and regarded as incurred for the relief of destitute miners in that district?

2. If not, has any other arrangement been made with said company by which any money has been, or will be, paid to them on account of said steamer running on said route, or on account of said company supplying relief to destitute miners?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. No. 2. There has been no arrangement with the company in regard to paying the expenses of the steamer on the route but there has been an arrangement by which the company shall furnish relief to destitute travellers and the expenses therefor are to be paid by the Government. That was explained to the House in Committee of Supply a day or two ago.

**POSTMASTER AT FLESHERTON, ONT.**

Mr. DAVIS (by Mr. Richardson) asked :

Is not J. Sproule postmaster at Flesherton? If so, has any complaint been made against him and what is the nature of it? Has it been investigated? If so, by whom, and what was the nature of the finding in the case?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). Mr. R. J. Sproule—not J. Sproule—is postmaster of Flesherton, Ont. There has been no recent complaint against Mr. Sproule. In February, 1884, it was found that Mr. Sproule had been illegally applying to his own use Money Order and Savings Bank funds. The matter was investigated by the Post Office Inspector at that time stationed at Barrie, and Money Order and Savings Bank business was, as a result of the investigation withdrawn from the Flesherton post office. Flesherton has not since been a Savings Bank office, but money order business was restored on the 2nd January, 1886.

**POSTMASTER AT PORT GEORGE,  
ANNAPOLIS.**

Mr. MILLS asked :

Who is the postmaster at Port George, Annapolis County? Has there been any irregularities in connection with said office that required the services of the inspector? If so, what were they, and what is the situation now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). I mentioned the other day, in reply to this question, that inquiries were being made. I was not then, nor am I now, in a position to give an answer. I will try to get an answer before prorogation. The question

Mr. FIELDING.

had better be left on the Order paper in the meantime.

**PRIVILEGE—QUESTION OF—APPOINTMENT OF MCGREGOR & NORWOOD.**

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish to occupy a few moments on question of privilege. The House will remember, that during a former session, I had occasion to bring before the attention of this House the fact that Mr. Magurn, then the correspondent of the Toronto "Globe," had sent a lying telegram to the Halifax "Chronicle" with reference to a matter that was before this House. And the present Judge Lister was then a member of this House and Chairman of the Committee, stated that his attention having been called to the importance of the statement contained in the telegram and as Mr. Magurn was connected in some capacity with the committee, he had insisted upon his correcting that statement he had made, which was done. Mr. Magurn is now it appears, editor of what I believe is recognized as the organ of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), the Winnipeg "Free Press." I have received a telegram which goes to show that Mr. Magurn has a successor in the Press Gallery of this House who is qualified to take his place as a sender of false telegrams concerning what takes place in this House or in Committees of this House to newspapers for the purpose of conveying false information to the country:

"Free Press" correspondent telegraphs:

Sifton said that McGregor was not a livery stable keeper and Tupper said that if he was, as he understood him to be, a horse dealer, it only made the matter worse, as such a calling was of a most disreputable nature and in itself enough to condemn any man engaged in it.

I made no such statement that it was of a most disreputable nature; I said that I did not think that the fact of a man being a horse dealer was likely to improve the position very much over his being a livery stable keeper. Again referring to the conduct of the hon. member for Essex:

McGregor, Essex, gave a flat contradiction to the statements of Sir Charles who, beginning to see where his reckless malignity had landed him, endeavoured to cover his retreat by pleading that he had been misinformed and by attempting to show that if they were not the scoundrels he had depicted they certainly ought to have been, and that similar charges had been made against them in the House earlier in the session without contradiction.

That is a verbatim report of what has appeared in the "Free Press" of the proceedings of this House, and I say to the House that it would be impossible to crowd more lies into a similar space. The fact is, I made no charge against Mr. McGregor, nor Mr. Norwood, but I stated that, in my judgment they had been appointed to positions for which they were not qualified, and that a gentleman in whose credibility I had

every reason to place confidence, had stated in the steamer in which I crossed the Atlantic that it was notorious that these gentlemen became rich in the course of a few months by accepting bribes instead of collecting the revenue that they were called upon to collect. That statement I found afterwards was confirmed by a gentleman who was connected with the press gallery, and who was in the steamer; he stated that the statement concerning these two men was made in the most open manner in the smoking room in the presence of a great number of passengers. I said that, in my judgment, it was a case that demanded investigation. I had no evidence except what I stated to the House, and I said that the name of the gentlemen would be given at once if an independent commission was authorized to investigate that matter. I took the ground that the occupations these parties were engaged in unfitted them for the collection of royalties on mines.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Order. I think my hon. friend is overstepping the limit allowed. He has no right to discuss the matter again, after correcting the statement that has been made.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. I am showing to the House that nothing could be more false than this statement. When my hon. friend from Essex stated that he knew Mr. McGregor to be a man of good character, I said I thought it was unfortunate that the hon. gentleman had allowed the criticisms in regard to McGregor and Norwood to pass unchallenged when they were made at an earlier period in the session; and that if he was correct, as I hoped he was, in the statements he made, he had failed in his duty in not supporting an independent investigation that would establish the characters of these gentlemen. But to say that I said in reply to the member for Essex, what he knows, and what every man in this House knows, is a base falsehood, that I said if they were not the scoundrels they had been depicted, they ought to have been, is something so monstrous that I feel that this House is bound to take the position that no man should sit in the press gallery under the protection of the House, who uses or rather abuses the position by sending such lying telegrams over the country. I think I would fail in my duty to the House if I did not call attention to such an outrageous abuse of the permission that is given to parties to sit in the press gallery of this House.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). I think the hon. gentleman is unduly sensitive. I am not finding any fault with his remarks, he has probably just cause of complaint. But I am sure each one of the members of the Government might make a similar complaint as to the comments of Conservative correspondents, which very often are unjust, unkind and absolutely unwarranted by the facts. If both sides of the

press will learn to be more considerate, I am sure it would be a great advantage to all concerned.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. If any hon. gentleman opposite will bring forward a single case in which any gentleman connected with the press has libelled any member of the Government by such false statements as that, I will not hesitate to join him in having that member of the press expelled from the gallery of this House.

#### COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. **DAVIN**. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that the Privileges and Elections Committee was called this morning for half-past ten o'clock; we were up there at that hour and remained until eleven o'clock, when I had to come down here. I am told they are waiting still, because no Minister was present to authorize the chairman to go on. Why, Sir, this is a great scandal, that an inquiry of this importance should be going on at this period of the session and we can make no progress because a Minister of the Crown is not present. I am sure the right hon. gentleman will thank me for bringing this to his attention, because I give him the utmost praise for his own statement in this House that he wanted an inquiry, but his own colleagues are not aiding him, and the inquiry is being burked.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Order.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). The statement the hon. gentleman has made is altogether untrue; that is the only answer it is necessary to make.

Mr. **DAVIN**. I rise to a point of order, and ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker. A Minister of the Crown says that the statement I make is altogether untrue. He cannot make that statement; it is out of order.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. The hon. gentleman said that the Prime Minister's colleagues were burking the inquiry upon the committee; I say that statement is altogether untrue.

Mr. **DAVIN**. I insist on the point of order being settled. I insist that you should make the hon. gentleman withdraw the word "untrue."

Mr. **McMULLEN**. I contend that the statement made by the Minister of the Interior is quite in order. The member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) made a statement, and the Minister of the Interior has declared that the statement is untrue, not that the statement that the hon. member made is untrue, but that the statement he has made with regard to the matter brought before the House is untrue. He is quite right to make that statement.

Mr. DAVIN. I want the ruling of the Speaker.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If you will permit me, on the point of order, I will say this: The hon. gentleman says that members of the Government in the committee have burked an inquiry. That is purely a matter of opinion. The members of the Opposition upon the committee have accused the members of the Government upon it of burking an inquiry. The members of the Government have taken such a course as they conceived to be consonant with their duty; they do not conceive it to be correct to say that they have in any way burked the inquiry; on the contrary, we say we have facilitated the inquiry in every way possible. The hon. gentleman is of the opinion that the members of the Government are burking the inquiry, and because he entertains that opinion he assumes that he is in a position to state as a fact that the members of the Government are burking the inquiry. Now, I say it is not true to say that the members of the Government have burked the inquiry. That is my opinion, and I think, Mr. Speaker, I have a right to express my opinion as well as the hon. gentleman has a right to state his. If the word "untrue" offends the sense of parliamentary propriety, I am willing to substitute the words "altogether unfounded."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It has been ruled in the House, as you know, and, in fact, ruled in opposition to my own contention, that it is not permissible to use the word "untrue" in regard to a statement made by an hon. member in this House; therefore, I imagine there can be no question as to that.

I may be permitted to say, however, in support of the opinion formed by my hon. friend, that, I think, if the hon. Minister of the Interior is of the opinion that the supporters and members of the Government, on that committee, have promoted this inquiry, he holds that opinion alone. I believe the publication daily of the proceedings of the committee has left the impression on the mind of everybody in this country that the members of the Government, and especially the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), who had charge of the matter, have been doing everything they possibly could to prevent examination, to prevent inquiry and to prevent the truth being got at.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the impression made upon my mind and I believe it is the impression made upon the mind of every intelligent man in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would inform hon. members that there is really nothing before the House at this present moment. The question was raised by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) as a personal

Mr. McMULLEN.

matter and I think I shall have to rule that the whole discussion is out of order. With respect to the point raised by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia, I think it is undesirable to use the direct statement that the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has used, when he said that the statement made by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia was untrue. I think the subsequent statement made by the hon. Minister of the Interior covers the ground much more effectually and avoids that source of irritation that, I think, it is desirable that we ought to avoid in dealing with each other across the floor of this House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me, I would like to give an answer to a statement made by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin).

Mr. BERGERON. There is nothing before the Chair.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is nothing before the Chair, but I think the House will permit me to answer the insinuation which is made by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia when he states that Ministers were deliberately burking the inquiry. If Ministers were not present this morning there is ample reason for it. As far as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) is concerned, who has had charge of this inquiry, there is one good reason for his absence, and that reason is that he is sick in bed. That will answer for him. As to the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), he has one of the busiest departments in the Government. He has to answer all his correspondence before coming here, and then he has to be here at 11 o'clock to answer questions. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) is attending the Railway Committee, which is now sitting. As to the statement made by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), it is such as would not be expected from him under the circumstances of this case. When the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is absent and is sick in bed, he should not have made an allegation of that kind against him. It was not fair to my colleague to make such a statement in his absence. If he were present he could defend himself.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I was not aware that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was not at this moment in the committee.

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend did not know that he was not in the committee he had not listened to what the hon. member for Western Assiniboia had said. It may be the impression of the hon. leader of the Opposition that the Government have tried to burk that inquiry, but it is not my own impression.

Mr. SPROULE Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER. I would inform the hon. gentleman that this discussion is out of order.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems rather strange that the rule should be applied to one side and not the other.

Mr. SPEAKER. I allowed a statement to be made by the leaders on both sides.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House. I did not make any reference to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). Although the hon. Minister of the Interior has a busy department, we all have a busy task at this time. Hon. members came up to the committee at 10.30 and were dancing attendance there when word came up from the club that the god was at breakfast.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, since the adjournment of the House has been moved—

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It has not been moved.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not understand my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) to have moved the adjournment of the debate. I may be permitted to say that anxious as all parties are to dispose of the work of the session, everybody knows that the business of the House is carried on under great difficulty, when the House and committees are sitting at the same time and that it prevents the attendance, at two places, of hon. members.

#### PORT MAITLAND HARBOUR.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) whether he has the report in regard to Port Maitland Harbour.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I have sent to the Public Works Department and I expect it during the morning sitting. I will not move the item till I place it in the hon. gentleman's hands.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I want to say to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that he was good enough yesterday to say that the railway subsidies would be taken up to-day. I will be obliged to leave after the morning sitting and I was anxious to say a few words on that question before I went away.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). As soon as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) comes in we will interrupt the business before the House and move the railway resolutions so as to

give the hon. leader of the Opposition an opportunity of making the remarks that he intends to make.

#### GRANT TO THE CITY OF OTTAWA.

The House resolved itself into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that in consideration of the Municipal Corporation of the city of Ottawa, providing adequate water supply and fire protection for the property of the Dominion Government in the said city and in the vicinity thereof, and exempting the Dominion Government for any charge therefor, the Minister of Finance and Receiver General be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada the sum of sixty thousand dollars per annum for a period not exceeding twenty years, for the purpose of improving and beautifying the city of Ottawa by the acquisition and maintenance and improvement of public squares, and the improvement of the streets and thoroughfares in the said city: such sum to be paid to a Board of Commissioners to be appointed under the authority of an Act of the Parliament of Canada to be passed for such purpose.—(Mr. Fielding.)

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this resolution is to set apart a sum of \$60,000 per annum for a period of twenty years for certain improvements in the capital city of the Dominion. Although the sum of \$60,000 is there mentioned the actual increase in the expenditure proposed by this resolution is the sum of \$45,000. There is at present paid to the city of Ottawa, the sum of \$15,000 per annum for water service and fire protection. It is proposed by this resolution, or by the scheme which will be founded upon it if Ottawa will consent, to divert that \$15,000 which is now paid from the ordinary city funds of Ottawa and place it together with the \$45,000 additional in the hands of a board of commissioners, and that the whole sum shall be expended under the direction of the Government. We make this proposal upon the ground that the capital city of Canada has claims upon the Government and upon Parliament such as cannot be advanced by any other city. Even if we had not that consideration in mind I think we should feel bound to offer some additional allowance to the city corporation in compensation for the supply of water and fire protection, when we have regard to the very large amount of property which the Dominion Government own in and about the city of Ottawa. I think it will be found that, if we applied the same water rates to the water supplied for the Government as is paid by private citizens, leaving out of consideration the question of general taxation and confining ourselves to the question of water rates entirely, that the city of Ottawa might fairly claim a further sum for that service than the \$15,000 that we contribute at present.

Mr. WALLACE. That is for water rates alone ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is for water rates and fire protection. While calling attention to that fact I do not base the resolution so much upon it as upon the general ground that the capital city of Canada has special claims upon the consideration of the Government and of Parliament. The capital city is in a peculiar manner representative of the whole Dominion. Every citizen of Canada must have some special interest in the capital, greater perhaps than he would have in any other city in the Dominion. If it is not so, it ought to be so, and I am sure we all hope that we are growing into that feeling, that the capital city of the Dominion should be regarded as having special claims to consideration. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister on one occasion spoke of making Ottawa the Washington of the North—an expression which I am sure in one sense pleased our friends of the city of Ottawa, and which has more than once been recalled to the mind of my right hon. friend. Yet, if he were literally to fulfil the assurance, perhaps I should say the expectation thus created, if he were to attempt to make Ottawa the real Washington of the North, I am inclined to think that our good friends of the city of Ottawa would be the first to complain; for the conditions of the city of Washington are peculiar. Washington has no representation in Congress, and no municipal organization in the same sense that Ottawa has. The fact that it is the national capital is fully recognized. The national Government assumes control over the District of Columbia, contributes to its maintenance, and in all respects engages in obligations which are greater than we perhaps would be willing to undertake here. So I think the proposal to make Ottawa in reality the Washington of the North, in the literal sense of the expression, would give satisfaction neither to Parliament nor the city. To Parliament it would be objectionable because it would cost too much; to the citizens of Ottawa it would be objectionable because it would deprive them of the rights of representation which they now possess. However that may be, believing that the capital city ought to be a matter of interest to the whole country, we propose that this additional sum of \$45,000 shall be applied to the improvement of the city of Ottawa.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the \$60,000 include the \$15,000 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yea. The \$15,000 to which my hon. friend refers is at present paid to the city. We propose to ask the city to give up that \$15,000, and allow it to be diverted into the new fund, with the additional \$45,000, the two items making up the \$60,000. I think, Sir, that

Mr. FIELDING.

the proposal will in the main commend itself to hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, irrespective of politics. I am not unmindful of the fact that it has been received with some criticism in other parts of the Dominion. It is but natural that the residents of other cities should look with a little suspicion at a grant of this sort. To each one of us the city in which we happen to live has naturally the first claim upon our attention, and it is difficult for us to think that any other city has a greater claim on the Government. But the answer to that is that there is but one capital of the Dominion, and that fact seems to impose on the Government and Parliament an obligation which does not exist with reference to any other city. It might be supposed that the effect of a grant of this sort to the citizens of Ottawa would be to relieve the citizens of Ottawa of taxation. Such, however, I am confident, will not be the case. The city of Ottawa is one of the most heavily taxed cities in the Dominion. The citizens of Ottawa have shown considerable public spirit. They have a beautiful city, and have a right to be proud of it. Many of us who come from other parts of the Dominion and see its handsome residences, the fine grounds surrounding them, and its many other attractive features, all feel that the citizens of Ottawa have done much for the adornment of their city. This grant is not likely to lead to reduced taxation in the smallest degree; but its effect will be to give to the city some improvements which perhaps it might not otherwise be able to undertake. We think that the grant, being of a national character, should not pass into the hands of the civic government, to be dealt with as ordinary municipal moneys are; but should be placed in the hands of somebody responsible to the Government and to Parliament, in which hon. gentlemen on both sides could have the utmost confidence and whose management of it would give us the assurance that the money would be expended wisely and well for the objects which we have in view. We therefore propose in the Bill which will be founded on this resolution that a body of four commissioners shall be appointed for the management of this business, three of them by the Governor-in-Council, to hold office during pleasure, and one by the corporation of the city of Ottawa. Inasmuch as the work of improvement will belong not only to the commission, but also to the city government, it is desirable that there should be harmony between the two bodies; and to secure that we think it desirable that the corporation of Ottawa should select one member of that commission, who may be appointed for any period not exceeding three years. He will presumably be a member of the city council of Ottawa, either His Worship the Mayor or one of the aldermen.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not necessary.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not necessary, but if he should be a member of the civic corporation, then he will only hold office so long as he is such member, and when he ceases to be a member of the corporation he shall retire; but the city corporation can then, if they think fit, elect him as a private citizen. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) seems to have some objection to that.

Mr. FOSTER. It is too evanescent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a matter of detail, and I shall be glad to have the assistance of any hon. member in working out the details. We propose that the commissioners shall perform their services without compensation. It is expected that they will be gentlemen who have a patriotic pride in the capital of the Dominion, and will be willing to perform these services without fee or reward. We propose that as far as possible there shall be no paid officials. When the actual work goes on in any department, we can only do that by employing men to do it; but so far as the organization is concerned, we propose that it shall be a labour of love to those who attend to it. The secretary we propose shall be chosen from the civil service, and shall serve without pay. I presume that in the public service in Ottawa there are many gentlemen who have sufficient interest in the development of this scheme to act as such without pay. We propose that the funds shall be paid quarterly in advance, and deposited in a bank to the credit of the commission, and that cheques shall be drawn thereon only by the chairman and the secretary, so that there will be no need of a treasurer. The bank designated by the Government shall be the treasurer, and shall have charge of the funds. We propose that the commissioners shall from time to time prepare estimates showing what they propose to do, and what the expenditure is likely to be; and that no expenditure shall be made until the estimates have been submitted to the Government and receive the Government's approval. In this way the Government shall have a general review of the work, while at the same time we shall have the benefit of the initiation of these gentlemen, who I am sure will be warmly interested to the improvement of the city of Ottawa, and will thus have a free hand in proposing schemes of which the Government will have to approve before the moneys are expended.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister has not yet given the House any clear idea of the character of the work the commissioners will have to do or the instructions that will be given to them in regard to the improvements they are to undertake.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Inasmuch as we require the commissioners in

every case to submit their plans of the work and their estimates to the Government, we think we shall not be obliged to give them instructions. The hon. gentleman's question is a fair one as applied to the general scheme; but we will not give them any detailed instructions, inasmuch as they will not be able to spend a penny until they have submitted each project to the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman provide that no expenditure whatever shall be made by the commissioners except by public tender and contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not anticipate any objection to that. Certainly for the construction of any new work I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that it should be undertaken by tender and contract, except where not practicable. I quite agree that every possible precaution should be taken to have the expenditure made in such a manner and on such terms and conditions that will best accure to the benefit of Ottawa and meet the approval of every member of this House.

Mr. WILSON. Will the hon. gentleman give us a general outline of the work to be done.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certain works will be commenced and be a first charge on the fund. For instance, certain streets immediately fronting the Government property or leading to the various Government properties might well be improved by asphaltting or works of that kind. They have in Ottawa what is called a local improvement law, whereby the owners of property contribute to the laying down of sidewalks and the asphaltting of the main streets. The Government, not being taxpayers, do not come under that law, and consequently have not been obliged to contribute, but these commissioners will be allowed to contribute out of this money their proper share of the local improvements, just as if the property were held by private citizens. That no doubt will take a considerable portion of the money. For example, Wellington Street, immediately fronting the building, ought to be in a much better condition, and the asphaltting or otherwise improving the pavement of that street ought to be dealt with in this manner.

Mr. WALLACE. The Government, as I understand it, have for many years past undertaken the full responsibility of all expenditure on that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is an agreement, which has been in force some years, between the Government and the city, whereby certain works are to be carried out by the Government, chiefly the bridges across the canals and the slides. We do not propose to interfere with that agreement as regards these works. There is only one respect in which we do propose

to interfere with it ; It is provided that the Government shall maintain Wellington Street, including the sidewalks on both sides. The agreement has been so interpreted, but the maintenance of the street has not been understood to mean asphaltting. That would come in under the local improvement scheme and has not hitherto been done, but the ordinary maintenance of the street is a charge on the Government. That ordinary maintenance would still be a charge, but if the city desires, as we do, to construct an asphalt sidewalk or other improved pavement on the street, that will have to be done out of the funds placed in the hands of the commissioners.

Mr. WILSON. Would the hon. Minister expect the city to contribute its share, inasmuch as the Government now keeps up the street ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We propose that the property owners on the other side shall be obliged to contribute their share. I think that the agreement at present is somewhat defective in that respect, and when the Bill is laid before the House, gentlemen will find that we propose that the property owners on the south side of Wellington Street shall not be relieved of any obligation which would be imposed on any other property owners in the city. It is at present claimed that they are not obliged, but it appears to us that that is a very unreasonable agreement, because the property on the lower side of Wellington Street is in the hands of banks and clubs and other wealthy institutions, and if any property can pay its share of maintenance, it is that.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We propose that it shall in no manner be relieved from the obligation which rests upon private citizens in other parts of the city. The local improvements will be one of the principal things that will be a charge on this fund.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Asphaltting the streets ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the streets immediately surrounding Government property or any street which might not be otherwise asphaltted leading to Government property. That is a matter which will be within the discretion of the commissioners, subject to the approval of the Government. Another work proposed, and concerning which no definite understanding has been come to, is the improvement of the canal bank. It has been suggested that after the works of more immediate importance are done, we might beautify the city very much by taking the Government property on the line of the canal bank and removing many of the eye-sores that at present deface it, and making it something of a park or boulevard. The two branches of expenditure will

Mr. FIELDING.

absorb a considerable sum. No doubt, from time to time, other means will suggest themselves to the commissioners for beautifying the city, and such improvements may be made in the way usually taken by the park commissioners in any city. We have not worked out any scheme in detail, further than to provide that the commissioners must, in every case, have the approval of the Government for any work they undertake, and we shall be glad to adopt any suggestions of hon. gentlemen on either side which will be of advantage in working out the scheme.

Mr. FOSTER. What do you do now for the city ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have a clause in the draft Bill explaining exactly what we are now doing :

Nothing herein shall in any way alter or change the agreement now existing between the Government and the corporation with regard to the control and possession by the Government of the said Major Hill's Park, the abolition of tolls on and the free use by the public of the Union Bridge over the Ottawa River connecting the cities of Ottawa and Hull, and the maintenance and repair and keeping in repair by the Government of the following bridges and sidewalks in the said city of Ottawa :—The bridges over the Rideau Canal, known as the Dufferin, Sappers and Maria Street bridges, the bridges over the Chaudière slide, and the sidewalks on the east side of Elgin Street and on the south side of Maria Street in front of and along the side of Cartier Square ; or shall in any way alter or change any of the provisions of such agreement except as in this Act provided.

These various works are the works which, under the existing agreement, the Government are obliged to keep up in the city of Ottawa.

We are paying the sum of \$15,000 to the city for water service and fire protection. It is proposed that we shall take that sum and divert it to the new fund to be created and place it under the control of the commissioners.

Mr. WALLACE. Will we have still the right to the water supply ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. One of the conditions will be, before we appoint any commissioners under this Act, that the city must by by-law agree to be bound by it for the terms of years contemplated by the Act, and one of the obligations they will assume will be to supply water and fire protection to all the buildings owned by the Government within the city of Ottawa, and the Experimental Farm, Rideau Hall and any other property which the Government may now own or hereafter acquire, during the term of the agreement, either within the city or in the immediate vicinity thereof. The city of Ottawa, in return for this expenditure of \$60,000, is to supply water service and fire protection without any limit, either as respects the present Gov-

ernment property or any property that may hereafter acquire by the Government within the city or its immediate vicinity. I think I have now drawn the attention of the committee to every point of importance in the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the aggregate of annual cost to the country on behalf of the city of Ottawa ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would not like to admit that my hon. friend is correct in the suggestion that all this money is spent on behalf of the city of Ottawa, because the bridges over the canals and other expenditures of that kind—

Mr. SPROULE. It comes out of the consolidated revenue and is under control of Parliament and we should understand what we are voting before we vote it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The phrase that I did not agree with in what my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) said was "on behalf of the city of Ottawa." As respects the bridges over the canals, the slides, and so on, these are obligations which are undertaken by the Dominion Government in every part of the Dominion, and money spent in this way here cannot be said in any way to be contributed for the benefit of Ottawa. But the hon. gentleman has a right to know the sum. The average sum for a long period from 1885 down to last year, for the maintenance of these bridges and other things was \$27,500 per annum.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that include construction ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, the construction had taken place before this.

Mr. WALLACE. Does it include \$15,000 for water supply ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, I am advised that includes the payment for water supply.

Mr. SPROULE. I mean including the expenditure on Major's Hill Park and other outlays incurred within the city limits ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This includes the annual maintenance of Major's Hill Park.

Mr. SPROULE. Does it include the expenditure on it as well ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It includes the maintenance—whatever it costs to keep it up.

Mr. BELL (Picton). Does it include the fence which was constructed last year or the year before ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think we can very well charge the city with the cost of a fence around the Government grounds.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the hon. Minister is exactly fair. I asked for information as to the expenditures charged to consolidated fund and spent within the city—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will tell me what it is he wants, I will get the information for him.

Mr. SPROULE. If I say I know what I am not supposed to know, then the hon. gentleman will give me the information. He admits that he has not given it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, what information is it ?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. Minister tells us the outlay for a fence around these grounds was not—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman surely would not say that we are to charge the fence around the Government grounds to the city of Ottawa ?

Mr. SPROULE. That is not a fair answer, in my opinion. I want to know what outlay has been incurred by the Dominion Government in relation to these grounds and keeping them up. That is the information I desire to have, and either the hon. Minister does not understand the question or he is evading the question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not evading the question, because my hon. friend has not asked that question until now. It is a new question altogether—the cost of maintaining these grounds.

Mr. SPROULE. I mentioned clearly enough what I wanted—the expenditure charged to consolidated revenue within the city limits.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can only say that the question is an entirely different question from the former one. I do not consider the outlay on these grounds as having any bearing on the subject before the committee. Surely the maintenance of Parliament ground—

Mr. SPROULE. I do not require that. These grounds belong to the Government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And does not the fence belong to the Government ?

Mr. SPROULE. My object in asking the question was to ascertain how much the country paid for the building up and ornamenting the city of Ottawa. I think that is quite pertinent in connection with the present proposition. I do not mean to oppose the proposition in toto. But I think it is a carrying out of what was really an idle boast made by the Premier to please the people of Ottawa. My judgment at the time was, and subsequent information has confirmed it, that it was a mere boast made

to please the people of this city. But the right hon. Premier has been reminded of it from time to time and the Government have to bring down a vote in an attempt to carry it out. But now that they have decided to ask for this money, they seem at a loss as to what they are to do with it. No doubt the object of it was to gain political strength and standing in the city of Ottawa. But for this I do not think the country will feel under obligations to the hon. Minister. Again, this means the appointment of a new commission—a new pull for somebody. Three of the commissioners will be friends of the Government, and they will have certain patronage and will have control of money to be expended, so that they can give employment to their friends. All this can be used to consolidate and strengthen the party now in power with the electors of Ottawa. That was the object sought, in my opinion, and it is a wrong object. In the third place, this commits us to an expenditure for too long a time. Twenty years is one-third of the length of human life, almost, and the binding of a Parliament, or city, or country, or any corporation nowadays to any line for twenty years is entirely too long.

The PRIME MINISTER. What length of time would my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) suggest?

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that half the time would have been quite long enough. Things change very much inside that time; it is frequently found desirable and necessary inside one-quarter of that time to change the regulations and conditions, and I do not think we should be committed to any course for such a great length of time. I do not think the country will view with great pleasure the proposition to spend, in addition to what we have already spent, \$60,000 a year. The question as put to the Minister of Finance was to ascertain how much the country is spending year after year already for this purpose, so we could estimate whether we are justified in spending this additional amount. But I have been unable to get the information from him. It is important that we should have this information, because other towns and cities are interested in this expenditure as well as the city of Ottawa. It seems to me that the Minister of Finance might reasonably have expected, when proposing such an expenditure as this, that such a question would be asked. We have expended money year after year on Major's Hill Park, which, in my judgment, was purely the squandering of public money. It went to political friends of the party in power, and not adequate value was received by the country for that expenditure. It is true that it helped to build up and beautify the city of Ottawa; but other towns and cities in Canada get no advantages from it. And now it is proposed that we shall spend a

Mr. SPROULE.

great deal more. We should have the information asked for.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I regret very much that my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), in that rasping manner which he sometimes has, insists that I am evading his question. I have every desire to give the hon. gentleman the information he wishes, but I do not admit that it is the duty of a Minister to have these facts all in mind so as to be able to answer any question instantly. If I had had any idea that the hon. gentleman would ask this question I would have been ready to answer—and if I knew now what he wanted, I would try to get him the information. But this notice has been on the Order paper for a month, and in that time, the hon. gentleman could easily have framed a question which would have brought the information he desired. I did not know that the question would be raised as to the cost of beautifying these grounds, and so on. Of course, everything done in the way of beautifying the grounds, enlarging the buildings, and so on, must benefit the city of Ottawa; but I do not see how all this can be charged as being for the benefit of Ottawa. If the hon. gentleman will tell me what he wants I will give him, in the fullest manner, the information he asks for.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps I may be allowed to interpose for a single moment. My right hon. friend was good enough to say that he would have the railway resolutions taken up. I would suggest that the resolution now under discussion be allowed to pass and the debate take place on the second reading of the Bill, and that we should take up the railway resolutions. I desire to have an opportunity of making a few remarks.

Mr. SPROULE. Of course, I accept as gratuitous the allusion to my rasping voice.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Pardon me, I did not allude to the voice of my hon. friend. I was referring to his insisting that I was evading. I did not allude to the hon. gentleman's voice; I beg him to believe that I have not the slightest desire to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. I only wanted to say that if the Minister is going on with the public works, he might expect to be asked how much the expenditure has been on that work up to the present time, therefore, I thought it was reasonable for him to assume that this question would be asked. As I stated in the first place, I want the aggregate of the expenditure which was drawn upon a consolidated revenue of Canada to be applied within the limits of the city of Ottawa, outside the Parliament buildings and the Parliament grounds.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will get the information.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the Minister also bring down a summary of how the \$27,000 is arrived at, how that is to be annually expended by the department on the city, so as to give us the details of that \$27,000?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will endeavour to get such information as will meet the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. SPROULE. I want, in addition to that, the expenditure on the parliamentary grounds here, but not the buildings.

Mr. BENNETT. Furthermore, assuming \$27,000 to be the amount, is there a calculation in that of the interest on the investment? Take, for instance, the bridges.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No; it only includes ordinary maintenance, nothing in the way of interest.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it intended to have two members of Parliament sitting in this House from the city of Ottawa?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend will have to ask another branch of the legislature, which has declined to allow us to make arrangements respecting representation.

Mr. CLANCY. While assenting to take this step to pass the resolution, I do not want to be understood as assenting to the proposition involved in that resolution.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 187) respecting the City of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting the granting of the subsidies therein mentioned to the railway companies, and towards the construction of the railways also therein mentioned.

Motion agreed to.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I understand that the hon. leader of the Opposition desires to address the committee on the subject of these resolutions at this time, as he desires to leave this afternoon. I may say that the leader of the Government has called the subject out of the order which I anticipated. I was requested last evening by some hon. gentlemen opposite to procure a map and some plans which would show the location of the different roads, and I am having them prepared now. They may not be ready until this evening, possibly not until to-morrow,

but I have the full staff occupied in preparing them. With this explanation, I very gladly defer to the hon. gentleman's wishes to speak upon these resolutions. I would like to mention, furthermore, that there are one or two substantial amendments which it will be necessary to make in these resolutions, correcting typographical errors, and otherwise. One of importance refers to the subsidy which is proposed to be granted to the Ontario and Rainy River Railway. The statement appearing in the resolutions as they are now on the Table is that the subsidy is for 140 miles, the mileage to be calculated from Stanley to a point on the Duluth Railway going westward for that distance. I shall ask the committee to allow me to change the wording of that clause so as to make it read, 140 miles, to commence at a point 80 miles west of Stanley. Hon. gentlemen will see the distinction. Already the first 80 miles are subsidized under the resolutions of 1897, so that change would be necessary in order to cover the whole mileage upon the same basis as the \$6,400 per mile from Stanley to Fort Frances.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no intention of going very fully into this subject. I am greatly obliged for the opportunity given me this morning to make a few remarks in regard to this very important question. It is well known in this House that the Liberal-Conservative party and the various Governments that represent that party, have held that it was a very proper and useful appropriation of public money to promote the construction of railways in various parts of the country, and that where the commercial character of a road was not sufficient in itself to warrant obtaining capital for it, the Government could come to its assistance, and, by giving a certain amount of public aid, it would not only promote the general trade and business of the country, but also would recoup, to a large extent, the expenditures thus made by the increased business that would be transacted and the increased revenue that would follow in its train. That policy, Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered, was sharply opposed and controverted by gentlemen on the other side of the House. The policy of the Liberal party was announced in very clear and explicit terms in regard to this matter; in fact, I may say that the leaders of the Liberal party in this House treated the proposal of granting subsidies to railways as a corrupt and unwarranted proposal, as a thing that ought to be repressed and abolished; and we had a great deal of controversy on the floor of this House on that question.

We had a great deal of controversy upon the floor of this House upon that ground. I may draw the attention of the House to a public declaration made by the Liberal party in regard to this question of giving subsidies to railways, which was formulated and put before the country in the most authentic manner by the Liberal party at the last general

election. Therefore, this subject was made by them one of the issues between the parties. I may say that I am quoting this from a Liberal newspaper, published by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), one of the supporters of the Government, which says :

The Winnipeg "Tribune," a Liberal paper which has some regard for Liberal principles,—

And that is paying a very high compliment to the "Tribune," because I am afraid it is pretty much alone in having any regard for Liberal principles.

—was speculating a few days ago upon the expected subsidies (which, however, it estimated would be only about \$3,000,000) and in that connection cited the following as an official declaration made on behalf of the Liberal party prior to the general election of 1896 :—

"The policy of bonusing railways by cash and land grants from the Dominion Government has become a fruitful source of jobbery, speculation and corruption. Under its operation favourites of the Government have been enriched. Appropriations have been made for the sole purpose of purchasing the support of constituencies, and vast sums of money have been voted without regard to the public interest, while millions of acres of land that should have been held in trust by the Government for the future homes of hardy and deserving settlers, have been handed over without consideration or justification to charter-hawkers, whose intervention actually retards the construction of the lines whose franchises they control, for the purpose of extorting money from the ultimate builders of the roads. The policy of granting these subsidies has repeatedly been condemned in Parliament by the Liberal party."

That is the official declaration on which these hon. gentlemen opposite went to the country. What have we to-day? No less than a proposal to bring down railway subsidies which they state were a fruitful source of jobbery, speculation and corruption, amounting to \$6,500,000, in round figures. I put it to hon. gentlemen opposite that this is another most striking instance of what you may call principle and practice confronting each other. If they were sincere, if the statement they made that the whole policy of bonusing railways, and that is the position they had taken for twenty years in this House while they were in Opposition, were a sound one, if it be true that the great object and aim of bonusing railways is to provide a means of jobbery, speculation and corruption, then I say that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) has placed the Government, of which he is a member, in the position of proposing the most gigantic measure of jobbery, speculation and corruption that has ever been introduced into this Parliament.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) does not think that himself.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think so. I say that the issue that was put before

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

the people was a false issue. I say there is no foundation in truth for it; I say that one of the wisest uses that has been made of public money, in the past, one that has promoted the progress and prosperity of Canada, more than anything else, and more than any other appropriation of public money, is the money that has been spent to secure the construction of the enormous railway system of this country, and which has opened up the great resources of the country in a way that nothing else could have done and which, without that aid or assistance, it would be fruitless to hope to accomplish. I only draw the attention of the House to the fact that my hon. friends opposite are obliged to turn their backs upon the policy upon which they claimed the support of the people of the country and upon which they asked them to place them in power. They are obliged to do this just the same as they were in reference to the National Policy tariff, because they find that their position compels them to adopt the policy and principles of their predecessors, and, I may say, not only to adopt them, but to carry them out to a length to which they had never been carried out before. Now, I do not intend to go at all into these railway proposals. The time is altogether inadequate for that, and I have no doubt that, in a good many instances, these measures have been very carefully considered, and that the Government feel that they are justified in making these appropriations for the purpose of carrying out and extending the railway system of Canada, which must be steadily extended as the country develops, and as means are demanded for opening up new sections of the country.

When I went to the country I was denounced by the Liberal party for the enormous and tremendous expenditures that I proposed when I stated, fairly and frankly, to this House and to the people of the country, what we proposed to do in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. I was held up to public execration by the gentlemen who issued this declaration of policy and of principle denouncing all railway subsidies as a means of jobbery, speculation and corruption, and who placed themselves in opposition to my scheme. Where do they stand to-day? Where are those things that were paraded, for the condemnation of the country, in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway? Hon. gentlemen opposite found that the course I had taken in regard to it, was so sound and judicious that they not only adopted it, but they thought that the \$5,000 per mile which I had secured the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway for, by the Canadian Pacific Railway, was not sufficient, and they gave \$11,000 a mile instead of \$5,000 per mile to secure the construction of the same road, adding \$2,000,000 to the burdens of the people over and above what the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had agreed to construct the road for. I was denounced throughout the

country by the organ of the party, the "Globe" newspaper, for having proposed to subsidize and to aid in the extension of a railway from Winnipeg to Hudson Bay. The statement made as to the amount I proposed in connection with that project was altogether unfounded. The arrangement I made, just before the general elections, largely reduced the obligation that was then resting upon the Government in regard to that measure. But what had we the other day? We had a gentleman, to whose position and standing in the party the Government have paid the highest compliment, by reason, and I do not question the soundness of their judgment, of appointing him one of the international commissioners, on a most important occasion—I refer to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton)—telling my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and the Government, that they had made a great mistake in guaranteeing a certain amount of money for the securing of that most important work, the Pacific cable, and that they would have done much better to have devoted themselves to the construction of a railway to Hudson Bay. So that, we have from the mouth of the hon. gentleman who has received a certificate of character of his ability, standing and position in this House, over and above that of his fellows, by the action of the Government in appointing him to such an important position, a declaration that this measure, for which I was so loudly denounced, to secure the construction of a railway to Hudson Bay, is so important a work that it should have taken precedence over the Pacific cable. I need not say anything more in defence of my action in that matter. I was again denounced by the "Globe" newspaper, and the organs of the party all over the country, for proposing to waste an enormous sum of public money in overcoming the rapids on the great Red River at St. Andrews, between Winnipeg and the lake.

Although I was denounced for proposing to waste public money on this work, hon. gentlemen again follow the example I set them, and an appropriation of \$140,000 is found here for commencing that very important work. I am taking no exception to that work. I think the Government are acting wisely in expending money to overcome the difficulties imposed by the St. Andrew's Rapids. It is a work which requires to be dealt with as a public work, and I am very glad to find that the Government have an appropriation for it. I propose also to support the construction of the Rainy River Railway as a work of great public importance, which will open up a great gold country in the province of Ontario, and which in the public interest should be promptly pushed forward and completed. I do not hesitate to say that I believe the Government are acting wisely in dealing with that work, which I have no doubt will make a very valuable return. But I was

a little astonished at some of the appropriations which I find. When we were discussing the Drummond County Railway proposition, I drew the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, who I see is not beyond the possibility of being influenced by the powers of reason, to the fact that if he wanted to bring the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, he had the means of doing it and at the same time carrying out a public work to which both parties in this country had, to a considerable extent, pledged the public faith. That was the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence, thus enabling the Intercolonial to be brought into the city of Quebec and putting it in a position to have the Drummond County Railway, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway all competing for its traffic to and fro. Not only that, but if the Government wished to establish communication with Montreal, all they had to do was to say to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, "Take our trains, freight and passengers over your road from the city of Quebec to Montreal and we will take yours from the city of Quebec to St. John or Halifax, giving you the use of our terminal facilities as you give us the use of yours." I showed the hon. gentleman that he could accomplish his object of bringing the Intercolonial into Montreal in that way without the expenditure of one dollar of public money, except the money needed to secure the construction of the bridge; and what was his answer? He treated my proposition with ridicule. Take up "Hansard" of this session, and you will find that he treated with absolute ridicule the idea that \$1,000,000 would secure the construction of that bridge. But we had not been pledged to a million dollars. Now, the *raison d'être* of the construction of the bridge is gone. The reason Parliament was warranted in giving \$1,000,000 to build a bridge at Quebec was to bring the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway from Lévis into Quebec. That was a sufficient reason why the city of Quebec, the legislature of Quebec, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, should all participate in the work. I drew attention to the fact that we had frankly stated to these parties that when they were ready to take hold of that work, they could rely on the Government for substantial aid in accomplishing it. My hon. friend, however, treated the suggestion that we could secure the construction of that bridge by the expenditure of \$1,000,000 with derision and as too absurd for discussion. Now, what is the fact? We have secured access to the city of Montreal for the Intercolonial by the Drummond County Railway and by the arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway; and yet we are called upon to vote the \$1,000,000. I do not hesitate to say that if I were in the House when that vote came up, I should support it, for

I feel that the city of Quebec, that old historic city, has been led to expect that the Government would aid in the construction of that bridge; and I am only too glad to know that the expenditure of \$1,000,000 will undoubtedly accomplish the prompt completion of that work at an early day. But, unfortunately, the great saving and advantage to the country that would result from the construction of the work are gone. The hon. gentleman is locking the stable-door after the horse is stolen. More than that, when the question of how we should bring the Intercolonial into Montreal was considered, the hon. gentleman will remember that I made the proposition, which was treated with great scorn and contempt, that if he was determined to come to Montreal by a line to the south of the St. Lawrence, he should come by the South Shore Railway, for this reason, that instead of running through a comparatively desert country, as the Drummond County Railway does, the South Shore runs through a thriving and populous section of country; and that work would have been accomplished at less cost than the means which the hon. gentleman has adopted. But now what does he do? In the first place, he builds the bridge at Quebec, the whole object of which is gone, and which will only tend to take our traffic from the Drummond County Railway, which was obtained at such expense; because when the bridge is constructed a large volume of traffic from the maritime provinces will no doubt go by the city of Quebec and over the Canadian Pacific Railway, which will thus be brought into sharp competition with the Government road.

I think I only require to draw attention to the position which my hon. friend the Minister of Railway occupies in regard to this subject to show that this matter has been entered upon without that due regard to the interests of the country which, I think, he was bound to take into consideration in the first instance. He was bound to bring the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal via Quebec, and make the city of Quebec its terminus by the construction of this bridge, and if he did not do that, he was bound to take this infinitely superior line by the south shore of the St. Lawrence as a means of reaching the city of Montreal. He now proposes, having secured access for the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal at an enormous cost, to establish by these two expenditures of public money a most complete and successful means of rivalling the Drummond County road, and taking away the traffic that otherwise would be forced to go over that road. I do not intend to take up the time of the committee further than to say that while my opinion is unchanged as to the great value of Government subsidies in aiding the opening up of important lines of railway communication, while I never regarded that policy as a means of fraud, jobbery, speculation or corruption, while I felt

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.**

that the opposition of hon. gentlemen opposite to that policy was unwise, I may venture to hope that since they now adopt our policy, it is not for the purpose of using these Government subsidies, as they say they were susceptible of being used, to buy up constituencies right and left, and thus merit the censure they cast on their opponents.

I am greatly obliged for the opportunity given me of briefly stating my views and pointing to where I think the hon. Minister has failed very largely, but at the same time, under all the circumstances, I do not hesitate to say that, were I here when the vote is taken. I would not feel myself in a position to refuse either aid to the South Shore line of railway—which I believe to be very important in the public interest—or the construction of a railway which would connect the lines of railway on the south of the St. Lawrence and the Intercolonial Railway with the old city of Quebec.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** I have just this to say to my hon. friend, who has spoken for the last time this session, that I have no very serious fault to find with the criticisms he has made of our proposal. The criticism he made of the policy followed by the Liberal party, when in Opposition, on the question of railway subsidies would have been more effective, if he had been able to connect the extract he made from a newspaper with the name of any member, or any leader, of the Liberal party. So far as I know, the quotation which my hon. friend found in the Winnipeg "Tribune" of a few days ago, taken from a statement made in 1896, at the time of the general elections, never received any official confirmation on this side.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** It is put in the "Tribune" as an official declaration made by the Liberal party prior to the general election of 1896.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** My hon. friend has quoted a paragraph which appeared a few days ago in the Winnipeg "Tribune," and which purports to have been copied from a paper issued in 1896.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** It is in inverted commas.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** No doubt the quotation was taken from some paper, but I do not remember ever seeing that paper, and I do not know if it has been taken from any paper, except perhaps some election pamphlet issued on the authority of somebody, but not on the authority of anybody that I knew to be responsible for the policy of the party. My hon. friend is the father of the policy we are following, and I congratulate him. I think it has been a very useful policy in many ways.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry that it was abused in the past in some instances, for the purposes of jobbery, speculation and corruption. We cannot hold my hon. friend responsible, because he was in England at the time, but he no doubt paid too much attention to public affairs in this country not to be aware that these charges of corruption and speculation were substantiated in more than one instance. He knows that in the case of the Lake St. John Railway subsidy, the charge was brought home that the subsidy had been diverted to purposes of speculation and corruption. But because a policy has been abused at times, is no reflection on its merits. I am not aware that from 1883 to 1896, from the year my hon. friend introduced that policy until he went out of office, he can connect the name of any leader of the Liberal party with any criticism on the germane idea of that policy. It is impossible, of course, to tie up a party to any given theory. This is a free country, and no doubt there were Liberals and Conservatives who criticised that policy, but as to the general policy itself, it never was assailed, so far as the germane or the mother idea of it is concerned. This is all I propose to say with regard to the general question.

As to the criticism of the Quebec bridge and the South Shore Railway policy, I was glad to hear my hon. friend say that if he were here, he would not oppose the grant to the bridge for the South Shore Railway. I believe these two grants are eminently useful, and will serve very good purposes. But this is not the occasion to discuss the items. That discussion can be best reserved when they are submitted. I move that the committee rise.

Mr. SPROULE. I desire to say a few words on the general policy, and propose to be very brief. What I purpose saying, I do as an individual member of this House, charged with his responsibility as a representative of the people. Let me first observe that we have been spending liberally for years in subsidizing railways. We have not been niggardly in that respect; and, as evidence of that, I may mention that the report I have here shows that we have spent \$44,815,000, which has been used for that purpose, and if we take what has been spent with what is now available, or voted for expenditure, \$47,315,000. In the earlier history of this country, it seemed to me desirable that they should spend thus lavishly, because there were no other means by which railways could be built. But I think the day has come when we should change our policy. We should not give this money without hope of repayment. In my judgment the time has come when every dollar that we put into railways for the purpose of building them should be in the form of loans either bearing a low rate of interest or at no interest at all. When we look to

the United States, we find that for many years they have not given any money to railways, except on the undertaking that it should be repaid to the country. Their conditions in respect of railways are very much the same as ours. In looking over the returns I find that their railways in the aggregate pay no better than ours, and so are no better able to repay the subsidies than ours would be. In 1896, when the last general election was held, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways and Canals will remember, and the Ministers from Ontario especially will remember, a party arose known as the Patrons. One of the planks of their platform was, no more subsidies to railways. And it is known that everywhere—or, at any rate, I speak with certainty of my own part of the country—the Reformers and the Patrons claimed to be standing on the same platform so far as this matter was concerned. The Patrons in this House will, I am sure, agree that these railway subsidies are being voted in violation of the platform on which they went to the country. Here are fifty-two railways to be subsidized and nine bridges—and this bridge business, by the way, is a new departure from the policy heretofore followed—making sixty-one objects for which subsidies are to be granted, not a dollar of which subsidies we need hope to have returned to the country. Our country is now comparatively well developed, but even now, if all these subsidies were for railways in new parts of the country which are now without railway facilities, I could see some reason why these grants should be made. But I find that these railways go through the oldest as well as the newest parts of the country, places where there are already good railway facilities and where the railways earn good returns. In such cases, there is no justification in the world for giving these bonuses. Whatever justification there may have been in the past for these railway subsidies, the time has come when we should change our policy, and any money devoted to this purpose should be given in the form of loans, so as to secure repayment to the country.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Before the committee rises, I ask leave to say a word of personal explanation. It has been the custom, particularly during the present session, to quote the newspaper with which I am connected, the Winnipeg "Tribune"—of which, as a matter of fact, I am the editor—as a Government organ, in order to cast reproach upon the Government. I wish to say that the "Tribune" has never been a Government organ, is not now, and, so long as I have any connection with it, I trust, never will be. It is a paper which, during the existence of the late Government, disapproved of the policy of that Government and did all that was in its power to drive that Government from office. It has always been, and still is, a Liberal paper, supporting Liberal

principles, but in no sense a Government organ. It is not under the control of any Government or of any clique that is connected with any Government, and no Government or party is in a position to exercise any control over its policy. It is a paper which seeks to do its duty by the public. In saying so, I have no desire to exalt myself or the paper, or make it appear that I regard myself as better than my fellow-members or fellow-citizens, or that the "Tribune" is better than its contemporaries. I am only saying that it does its duty to the people, according to its understanding of what that duty is, and I deem it but fair to the Government that this statement should be made, as it might be calculated to prejudice the Government to an extent which the circumstances do not justify, to have the "Tribune" constantly quoted by opponents of the Government as a Government organ. A study of the affairs of the country convinces me that a partisan press is about the worst curse that can befall a country, and fair-minded men will agree with me that our press is, with a few excellent exceptions, a thorough-going partisan one. I am convinced that if we had a pure and independent press, freed from the trammels of partisan politics, we would soon have a purer and better state of political affairs in our Dominion, and until the press is improved I despair of seeing a revolution in our political life. It is in that belief, nay, with that deep conviction, that I have used what influence I possess to make the press as independent as possible. Now, with regard to the question before the House, viz., that of bonusing railways, I propose to be heard at some length, later on, in opposition to railway bonusing, and in regard to details of bonuses proposed. I regret to say that my views are at variance with the position taken by the Government, and with that taken by the leader of the Opposition.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to say that if he understood me to say that his paper was an organ of the Government, he misunderstood me, I made no such statement. I said the "Tribune" was a paper published by a gentleman who certainly ordinarily supported the Government. I did not say it was a Government organ. But I want to remind him that in his paper he says that this extract which I have read to the House, was from an official source; it was published before the election in 1896. I think my hon. friend is bound to inform the committee what that official source was.

**Mr. RICHARDSON.** Before answering the hon. gentleman's question let me say that I do not wish to be misunderstood in connection with this matter. I have not risen in this House for the purpose, indeed that is furthest from my mind, of seeking to make it appear that I wish to

**Mr. RICHARDSON.**

be obsequious to the Government or apologetic for any position which the "Tribune" has taken. In regard to the extract in the "Tribune," I may say that I quite approve of it, if it is an official declaration made by the Government or Liberal party, and I may say that I think the "Tribune" did quite right in reproducing it, and in using it against the Government. That is my position on that point. I may say that I never saw the extract until I saw it in the paper. I did not inspire its publication, although, as I say, if it is an official declaration, I approve of its having been published. I did not know anything about it until my attention was called to it in the paper. While I would not say that everything that appears in the editorial columns of the "Tribune" is absolutely right, still I believe that it is probably as nearly right as it is possible for men with a proper sense of duty to make it. Hon. gentlemen will, of course, understand, that owing to my residence here during the session I can neither write nor revise one-thousandth part of what appears in the "Tribune," although I do not apologize for one word that appears therein. There is a disposition to make it appear as though I had written every line in the "Tribune." In this particular case I did not know anything about the publication of the extract till I saw it in print.

**Mr. DAVIN.** The hon. gentleman has told us he is the editor, and he has stated, very properly, that as editor he is responsible for what appears in his paper, although, of course, everybody knows, who knows anything about newspaper work, that he don't write all that appears in it.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** He did not say everything.

**Mr. DAVIN.** I say he is bound to let us know. Here is a statement on the first page: "Railway bonuses. The following is an official declaration made on behalf of the Liberal party prior to the general election of 1896." That appears in the Winnipeg "Daily Tribune," of July 20th.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The hon. gentleman has said that he has no personal knowledge of any such declaration.

**Mr. DAVIN.** No, Mr. Speaker, but—

**Mr. COWAN.** Order.

**Mr. DAVIN.** Will that bleached negro keep quiet? I say the hon. gentleman is bound to let us know what is his authority.

**Mr. COWAN.** Do I understand the hon. member to refer to me as a bleached negro? I ask the hon. gentleman to take that back.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.** I do not think it is proper to apply that word to an hon. member of this House.

Mr. DAVIN. I grant that it is not flattering, but that man knows well—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I take it back.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman knows well that it is not permitted by the rules of the House to address a member as this man or that man. He must always address a member of the House as that hon. gentleman, or that hon. member.

Mr. DAVIN. I take it back if it is contrary to order. But I say I am in a position to prove to the satisfaction of any court of justice that that hon. gentleman has been one of three members who in this House, in successive sessions, have conspired to destroy free debate in this House, and if his sins had not been cumulative I would never have used the expression.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is not permitted by the rules of the House to say that members have conspired to destroy free debate in this House.

Mr. DAVIN. I will withdraw that. But I want to ask the member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson): Will he let us know his authority for making this statement in his paper on the 20th?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have already told the House that I did not make the statement, that I did not even know it was there till I saw the paper—

Mr. DAVIN. But the hon. gentleman is responsible. He could telegraph to his editor and get him to give the authority.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I can do that.

Mr. DAVIN. Will the hon. gentleman do that?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have no objection to do it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the committee rises, I would ask my hon. friend if it is intended to go on with the discussion of these resolutions after three o'clock? Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are anxious to know when the discussion on these resolutions will take place.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not later than to-morrow. I have promised the maps which will be required, they will surely be ready to-night, and the debate will take place to-morrow.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

#### COMMITTEE ON RAILWAYS, CANALS, &c.

Mr. SUTHERLAND presented the 22nd and 23rd reports of the Select Standing Com-

mittee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I right in understanding that the Bill amending the Railway Act was passed, as well as this Bill mentioned in the 22nd report?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Only the three clauses to which there was no objection. With the consent of the House, I beg to move:

That Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the British America Pulp and Paper Company, be placed among the private Bills on the Orders of this day for consideration by the Committee of the Whole, in accordance with the recommendation of the 22nd report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) explain why a Bill that is commercial in its character should go to the Committee on Railways and Canals?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Bill was referred to the Private Bills Committee, but as there was a clause in it taking power to build a considerable length of electric railway, connecting the works of the company, it came before the Railway Committee, and the powers were cut down very materially. The Bill now merely gives power to build an electric railway for the purposes of the company and not to build a public road.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I beg to move:

That Bill (No. 5) to incorporate the Alaska-Yukon Railway Company; Bill (No. 44) to incorporate the Alaska and North-western Railway Company; Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company; Bill (No. 57) respecting the British Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company, and to change its name to the British Yukon Railway Company; Bill (No. 94) respecting the Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company (Foreign); Bill (No. 101) to incorporate the Glenora Railway Company; Bill (No. 102) to incorporate the Yukon Pacific Railway Company; and Bill (No. 117) to incorporate the Ottawa Suburban Railway Company, be withdrawn, and the fees paid thereon be refunded, less the cost of printing and translation, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the twenty-third report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraphs Lines.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) explain, before the motion passes, how it was that one Bill was put through and that others, some of which appear to be unexceptionable in their character should not have gone through, for instance, the last Bill to incorporate the Ottawa Suburban Electric Railway Company.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The committee decided that these Bills were not to go through and the promoters asked leave to withdraw them. A resolution was passed to that effect in the committee.

Mr. WALLACE. Was it for want of time or because the committee did not approve of them ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think more perhaps for want of time than anything else. But all the other Bills, with the exception of that one referred to in the 22nd report, were opposed, and I suppose the promoters came to the conclusion that, at this stage of the session, there was no chance of the Bills becoming law. It was mutually agreed that these Bills should be withdrawn.

Motion agreed to.

### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Towards the construction of a branch line from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour, including bridge over the Hillsborough River ..... \$250,000

Mr. SPROULE. This is a new work, is it not ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). This is for an extension of the line of railway to Murray Harbour.

Mr. WALLACE. Has the hon. gentleman a map of it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no map of it. It was in regard to railway subsidies that I proposed to have maps prepared. The amount is to construct a railway from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour. The construction of this work includes a bridge across the River Hillsborough, and the building of some 44 miles of railway. It is estimated that the railway and all permanent works in connection with it will cost \$470,000.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the estimated cost of the bridge ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The cost of the railway line is estimated to be in the neighbourhood of \$470,000. The cost of the bridge will be in addition to that sum. We are not taking any steps particularly with regard to the bridge, although a portion of this grant may be used in starting the sub-structure. The estimated cost of the bridge is in the neighbourhood of \$800,000. This was the estimate of about a year ago. If we were to construct the superstructure of the bridge at this time, which I am not proposing to do, we would have to add the enhanced price of iron. I might explain that the bridge will not only be a railway, but a highway and traffic bridge for vehicles and pedestrians. So important did the people of the Island regard the latter feature of the structure, that they proposed to the Government to bear about one-half of the expected cost of

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

the bridge. They have the authority of the legislature of the province to enter into an agreement with the Government to pay 3 per cent per annum on one-half the cost at that rate. They have expressly stipulated by their legislature for an agreement with this Government to pay \$12,000 a year, in consideration of which we are to make provision for a highway for foot and passenger traffic.

Mr. SPROULE. It looks very much as if this vote were in pursuance of an understanding come to with Prince Edward Island some time ago to expend more money in that province. If the bridge and railway are built, they will ultimately cost \$1,270,000, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement ; and he now asks us for \$250,000 as the first instalment of that amount. I fancy that the other provinces will not regard this as exactly fair to them, for it is practically an additional subsidy to the province of Prince Edward Island, which is not given to the other provinces, and I presume that the Government have taken this means of granting it, so as, if possible, to hide it away, in the hope that it will not be recognized as a subsidy granted to Prince Edward Island by the Liberals in pursuance of their promise that if they came into power, they would give that province an additional subsidy.

Mr. MARTIN. My hon. friend does not understand exactly the position of affairs as regards Prince Edward Island. Ever since confederation that province, so far as any railway expenditure is concerned, has been totally overlooked, while the hon. gentleman will see, if he looks over the statistics which have been laid on the Table of this House, that the provinces of Ontario and Quebec have been receiving from year to year large sums for railway purposes from the exchequer of Canada. I have here a return which was laid on the Table of this House in 1895, showing the mileage of railways that was subsidized in the provinces, as follows :—Ontario, 1,663 miles ; Quebec, 2,136 miles ; New Brunswick, 646 miles ; Nova Scotia, 482 miles ; Manitoba, 100 miles ; British Columbia, 328 miles. But there was not a mile subsidized in Prince Edward Island. The same is true with regard to canals. If the hon. gentleman goes over the Public Accounts, he will find that about \$80,000,000 were spent on canals, \$13,582,291 of which was spent since the present party came to power, but Prince Edward Island never received a dollar of that expenditure. I am very much pleased that the Government propose to make this expenditure, which is only scant justice to Prince Edward Island. The late Government were committed to such a scheme as would give a fuller measure of justice. Many sections are neglected in this scheme, and I am very glad that the present Govern-

ment are to some extent carrying it out. I would like, however, to have the Minister give us a little more information as to the route. I think the scheme of the late Government was much more preferable.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The intention is, unless some engineering difficulties intervene, to go in as direct a line as possible to the harbour. I do not think I can state anything more definite than that.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to be assured whether or not it is to be built by contract, and tenders called for?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Unquestionably. That is the only way to build it.

Mr. MARTIN. Has the hon. gentleman any information as to when tenders will be called for?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I would not want to commit myself at this moment to a statement on that subject. We shall have to have careful engineering inspection, the route positively outlined, and all the necessary profiles obtained, before we can ask for tenders. I think the work is not sufficiently advanced yet to enable us definitely to name a date when we can ask for tenders.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand that the survey is practically finished.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** We have a fair survey, but not sufficient on which to issue specifications and to ask for tenders.

Mr. MARTIN. I have here a sketch taken from the survey, as it appears in the department. The survey, so far as I can see, is pretty well finished, and the route clearly laid down, with the exception of what are termed the loops. It gives two starting points, one at the village at South Port, and one a little below the village. There is another loop line on the plan, giving the option of two routes, the one known as the Vernon River line, and the other as the Vernon Bridge line. Can the hon. Minister give me any information?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** As between those, not at present.

Mr. SPROULE. In answer to the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island, it is true that the other provinces got subsidies but a large share of these was for the purpose of building the transcontinental line in fulfilment of the agreement with Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia when they came into confederation, and cannot in any sense be regarded as subsidies to the provinces. But this is not a subsidy by way of assistance to build a railway, but is a draft on the

exchequer of the country to the whole extent of the cost of building the railway, and therefore every dollar that goes into the building of this railway and bridge is to come out of the consolidated revenue fund, because we are asked to vote the first instalment, which is \$250,000.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The hon. gentleman is not quite correct. The estimated cost of the railway is to be borne by Prince Edward Island.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going on to say that, but I understood the hon. Minister to say that the island will pay the interest on one-half, but not furnish the money. That means at least \$800,000 subsidy practically direct to Prince Edward Island.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Hardly that, because the railway will belong to the Government and all the benefits accruing from it will go to Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. A railway which will never pay the cost of operating is not very likely to be of much advantage to the Dominion and the whole benefit will be to the locality. It is practically another subsidy to Prince Edward Island. I understood, a good many years ago, when we last rearranged the subsidies to the provinces, that this rearrangement was to be, in the words of Mr. Blake, a final finality, and that we were never again to be approached for the purpose of giving more subsidies to the provinces. I know that Prince Edward Island has been clamouring for this for a long time. The hon. gentleman says that railways in other provinces were assisted. True, but they were assisted on the same principle as railways in every part of the country, Prince Edward Island included. Where a railway is absolutely needed the country is prepared to give \$3,200 per mile to assist its construction, but this grant is to build a new railway and bridge in toto the cost of which will amount to \$870,000. I do not think that the province of British Columbia will be satisfied unless it gets something, or the other provinces. This is the commencement of a new departure that will ultimately lead to very heavy expenditure being rolled up against the country.

Mr. MARTIN. When the hon. gentleman says this is a new departure he speaks without his usual knowledge of the facts. If he will look at the return laid on the Table, he will find that there was built by the Dominion Government, altogether out of the Dominion exchequer, such railways as the St. Clair branch, the St. Charles branch, the Rivière du Loup branch, the Dalhousie branch, the Indian Town branch, the Oxford and New Glasgow branch, the Dartmouth branch, the Pictou Town branch, the Annapolis and Digby branch, the Cape Tra-

verse branch, and the Cape Breton Railway. The hon. gentleman has no objection at all to the expenditure by the Dominion on canals. He would not be satisfied with a mere subsidy to a canal. No, it must be built altogether at the expense of the Dominion. The provinces of Ontario and Quebec are the provinces in which these canals were built, and therefore the expenditure on them by the Dominion is all right, but after he has all these canals built and all the subsidies voted for railway accommodation that his province requires, he wants to have no further subsidies granted anywhere else. For what reason? Because his province has all the railways it can possibly want, and it has besides all its canals built at the expense of the Dominion. Just to show what a small share of this public expenditure Prince Edward Island has actually received, let me read to the House from the return I have in my hand. The province of Ontario has received since confederation \$30,000,000, not to speak of what has been spent on canals; Quebec has received since confederation \$15,000,000; New Brunswick, \$9,000,000; Nova Scotia, \$15,000,000; Manitoba, several million dollars; British Columbia, \$21,000,000; the North-west Territories, \$7,000,000; and Prince Edward Island only \$653,000, or at the rate of \$5 per head as against \$10 or \$15 per head to the rest of the Dominion.

Mr. DAVIS. Did the hon. gentleman say that the North-west Territories got \$7,000,000.

Mr. MARTIN. \$7,604,819.60.

Mr. DAVIS. Is that in money or lands?

Mr. MARTIN. Without any lands at all. With the lands the amount would be much greater.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman must be figuring on the construction of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and he has no right to include the cost of that.

Mr. MARTIN. This is a statement made by the Department of Railways and Canals and brought down in a return not later than the 30th June, 1898.

Mr. DAVIS. How much of that \$7,000,000 has been expended on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway and how much on the branches?

Mr. MARTIN. I cannot go into details, but I presume the hon. gentleman has a copy of the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and if he will be as assiduous in looking over that as he is in asking questions he will get the information. I can hardly be supposed to give him all the information he requires on this subject. This vote for Prince Ed-

Mr. MARTIN.

ward Island is one that can be justified on any ground that can be taken. I am well pleased that the Government has thought proper to include this vote in the Estimates. I am only sorry that other sections such as Rustico, etc., is overlooked. I want that the vote shall be properly expended, that tenders shall be called for, and that the work shall not be unduly delayed. As I said before, the late Government brought in a Bill in 1896 for the construction of this very line as well as others; and to show what interest the province have in it, they are ready to help the building of a bridge at Southport to the extent of a sum not exceeding \$12,000 a year, which represents a capital of \$400,000, which is a very considerable sum for a province that has already expended very largely on railway construction. I am astonished that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule), coming from a province which has had such a large expenditure on railways and canals, should not rise a little above the consideration of his own province. I think his ideas of the maritime provinces are not large enough. Though Ontario is a large province, it is not the whole world, nor is it the whole of Canada. If the hon. gentleman would come down to Prince Edward Island, I feel confident he would change his views; and, on returning, with enlarged vision if anything were proposed for the province of Prince Edward Island, he would not stand up and oppose it as he does now.

Mr. SPROULE. I can only say that it seems to me that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) is swimming around in that little island province as a frog swims around in a well—he is disposed to think that it is the whole world. As to the data on which he bases his argument, I have the report of the Minister here. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) gives four items which aggregate \$90,000,000, but all that the Minister of Railway's report says was spent by way of subsidy was \$44,815,000. So, his calculation must be wholly astray.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman's (Mr. Martin's) statement is not limited to the expenditure, but covers the whole report.

Mr. SPROULE. He forgets that the great transcontinental line passes through Ontario for several hundred miles, without which, of course, the terms of confederation could not be carried out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But it does not traverse Prince Edward Island.

Mr. SPROULE. But, as I understood, we bought about all the railways that Prince Edward Island had, to recoup Prince Edward Island for the heavy expenditure which had taken place in other provinces for the building of railways.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. But we took the railway.

**Mr. SPROULE**. But the railway is of no benefit except to the people who are living there, while we pay the cost.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. But the hon. gentleman must not forget that the island was entitled to come into confederation with a certain debt, based upon its population; and a portion of the debt was made up of the cost of constructing this railway, which is handed over to the Dominion. True, it has not proved a very productive asset. But the time it has been in the hands of the Dominion Government is but a short time in the history of a country. And it is to be hoped that it will become more productive and become a source of income to Canada.

**Mr. SPROULE**. This was long after Prince Edward Island came into confederation, when we were arranging the subsidy.

**Mr. MARTIN**. Not at all.

**Mr. SPROULE**. What I say is quite correct. I was in this House when the transaction was closed, and I was not here when confederation took place. Now, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says that I am quite ready to have money spent in canals. But the canals are in a wholly different position; they are highways of commerce for the whole Dominion, to carry the produce of the west to the east and that of the east to the west. The money spent in their construction cannot be regarded as the same as subsidies to railways.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. You could not get any railway company, under the circumstances of the island, to undertake the construction of a railway.

**Mr. SPROULE**. That only proves that the railway will not pay and is therefore unnecessary.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, it is because the Government own the whole railway system of the island.

**Mr. SPROULE**. But if it was an enterprise which promised to yield dividends, parties would take it up and carry it on, and then, if they wished, they could hand it over to the Government to be run in connection with the railway system of the province, and get compensation for it. This is not the same as a subsidy given to build a railway. It is practically an additional subsidy given to Prince Edward Island.

**Mr. WALLACE**. I am sorry that the Minister of Railways and Canals has not given us much of the information we asked for, so we have to rely on other sources. There is about 210 miles of railway in Prince Edward Island. The cost of operation was

\$231,000, while the income was \$158,000, so that there is a deficit of about \$72,000 a year. That is to say, to take a dollar on this road costs about a dollar and a half for, say, \$1.40. That being the case, we should approach the construction of further railways in that island with great caution. But caution now seems to be thrown to the winds, the only question seems to be: How much do you want? In addition to the sums here proposed, there must be an expenditure in order to build a bridge. The Minister tells us that, on the estimates of last year, the bridge would cost \$800,000. Taking the increase in the price of iron, I suppose it will be a fair thing to say that the bridge now would cost \$1,000,000.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think that would be excessive.

**Mr. WALLACE**. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals thinks I am not accurate, but he has not given any figures that are accurate; so, as usual, we are left to make our own estimates. What would the hon. Minister think would be a fair estimate?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think that \$100,000 over the estimate would cover the increased price of iron.

**Mr. WALLACE**. \$900,000, very close to a million dollars for the construction of the bridge. \$470,000 for the construction of the railroad after bridge is built, would make in round figures between \$1,300,000 and \$1,400,000. Well, we have paid already \$3,750,000 on capital account for railroads in the province of Prince Edward Island, for a little more than 100,000 people.

**Mr. MARTIN**. Who paid it?

**Mr. WALLACE**. The people of Canada.

**Mr. MARTIN**. The people of Canada did not pay it. If the hon. gentleman will sit down for a few minutes, I think I will be able to enlighten him.

**Mr. WALLACE**. I will be through in a moment or two, and my hon. friend can have the whole afternoon. I do not like any sectionalism. I do not like any provincialism, I have never given a vote in that light. I may say for the constituency I represent that we have never had a dollar of public money expended there except for the payment of our postmaster. We do not ask for any expenditure of public money in my constituency. We are contributing our share to the revenue of the Dominion, and all that we ask is that the money shall be economically and judiciously spent. My constituency never has made any demand for public money. I do not care whether the expenditures for public purposes are made on the Atlantic or the Pacific; I want to see the whole country opened up and developed. But I want to be able to justify to my con-

stituents every expenditure that we make here, and to show that it was a wise and judicious expenditure. Now, in this case my good friend behind me (Mr. Martin) tells us how they have contributed. We have been told before that Prince Edward Island has paid the debts of the Dominion, that when the other provinces were hard up Prince Edward Island contributed to their finances and got them out of financial troubles, that they have paid more than their share per capita of the expenditure. I do not think they have. Now, they must present to this House a much stronger argument than the argument which was used by the members of the North-west Territories; it is not sufficient to say that as \$7,600,000 were expended in the other provinces in railway building, therefore Prince Edward Island is entitled to something. We cannot be satisfied with any such flim-flam arguments as have been used in that case. I have pointed out that for every dollar taken in by that railroad after it has been in operation many years, after money has been spent liberally upon it out of capital account to the extent of more than \$3,750,000, to-day it takes more than \$1.40 to collect 100 cents. Under such circumstances, I think the Government should proceed cautiously before they propose to add \$1,400,000 to the indebtedness of this country in the construction of that piece of railway; more than two-thirds of which is for a bridge across the Hillsboro' River at Charlottetown harbour. Prince Edward Island is fortunate in many ways. It is long and narrow, indented with bays and harbours in every direction, an island of great fertility, producing capable and able men, as we know from the representation it has sent to this House. They have a line of railway running through the whole length of it, they are a maritime people. Now they propose to run a line of railway nearly parallel to the coast from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour. That, I presume, will be like the other lines of railway built in Prince Edward Island; it will take \$1.40 or \$1.50 to gather a dollar's worth of revenue, even after the preliminary work, even after it has been running for 20 or 30 years. I think the Minister of Railways and Canals will have to do what he has not yet done, give us some statement that will justify this expenditure of \$1,400,000 of the people's money. It is true they are only asking a quarter of a million to-day, but the expenditure of that quarter of a million inevitably carries with it an expenditure of a good deal more than a million in addition. The Minister of Railways and Canals has not yet, by any statement he has made, justified that expenditure to this House.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) I know the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) is a man of reason, and is capable of being appealed to from the stand-point of fair play and common sense. First let me point out one or

Mr. WALLACE.

two errors into which he has inadvertently fallen. He refers to this proposed expenditure as \$1,400,000. As a matter of fact it is \$1,000,000, because the \$400,000 is contributed by Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman also says the Government of Canada has already expended \$3,768,000 upon railways in Prince Edward Island. Now, I would like to point out to my hon. friend the true situation. I would like him to reflect upon the facts of the case and then tell me whether his statement is correct.

Mr. WALLACE. I will say that my authority is taken from page XIII of the report of the Deputy Minister, where he says: "The total cost of the road and equipment chargeable to capital account at the close of the fiscal year, is \$3,768,107."

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) I am perfectly satisfied that my hon. friend believes what he says. But I ask him as a fair minded man to look into the matter and see whether Prince Edward Island has not paid for its own railway. I know the impression prevails in the minds of many members of this House that the Dominion Government paid for the railway in Prince Edward Island. But as a matter of fact the Island Railway was built by the local Government, and paid for by the sum of \$3,114,000—part of the \$3,768,000 which the hon. gentleman refers to, was actually paid out by Prince Edward Island and charged to her under the terms of the Union. It was subtracted from the amount of the debt that was placed to the credit of Prince Edward Island at confederation. I want my hon. friend now to be fair and see if this is not the case. Let him remove from his mind the prejudice which exists.

Mr. POWELL. What was the amount of the debt?

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) The amount of the indebtedness authorized and credited to Prince Edward Island in 1873, was \$4,701,050. From that amount was deducted the cost of the railway, viz., \$3,114,000—also our local indebtedness—some \$500,000. The balance was placed to our credit with the Dominion, and on that balance we draw interest at 5 per cent.

Mr. McMULLEN. At the union did not the Dominion assume the debt created by Prince Edward Island for constructing that road?

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) No.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes. Did the Dominion not assume the debt of Prince Edward Island?

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) Well, the Dominion assumed the debt, but they charged it up against the amount we were entitled to receive, so that the Island, in fact, paid the debt. Now, let me read one of the sections of the terms of Union:

That in consideration of the large expenditure authorized by the Parliament of Canada for the construction of railways and canals, and in view of the possibility of a readjustment of the financial arrangements between Canada and the several provinces now embraced in the Dominion, as well as the isolated and exceptional condition of Prince Edward Island, that colony shall, on entering the union, be entitled to incur a debt equal to fifty dollars per head of its population, as shown by the census returns of 1871, that is to say: four millions, seven hundred and one thousand and fifty dollars.

That sum represented \$50 per head of our population. Against that \$4,701,050, there was charged the \$3,114,000, as shown in the Public Accounts, that my hon. friend from York (Mr. Wallace) has before him.

Mr. McMULLEN. And assumed by the Dominion.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) And assumed by the Dominion.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is right.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) But, of course, let us distinctly bear in mind that although the \$3,114,000 was assumed by the Dominion, the railway of Prince Edward Island was actually built by us in the first instance, and it was charged to us and deducted out of the amount payable to us under the terms of the union.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) if there was any exceptional treatment at that time as against Prince Edward Island? The hon. gentleman seems to be arguing that there was.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) There was no exceptional treatment whatever. She came in exactly as the other provinces at so much per head of the population. The only apparently exceptional treatment was the difference between \$45 per head and \$50 per head. This was accorded her partly by reason of her isolated position and partly for the purpose of manifesting that Canada was willing to treat the smaller province, not only in a just, but in a generous manner. I want my hon. friend from York (Mr. Wallace) to emulate this spirit of justice and generosity. Let me appeal to him now on another point. According to the terms of the clause I have read, Prince Edward Island came into the union with the distinct understanding that a certain further amount of money was to be expended by the Dominion Government on railways and canals. It was understood and agreed that there was to be expended on canals \$25,000,000; on the Canadian Pacific Railway, \$30,000,000; on the Intercolonial Railway, \$10,000,000; and there were sundry other estimated expenditures of \$14,000,000. When we came into the union, the public debt of Canada stood at \$82,187,000, and all these further expenditures were to be made. The whole of these amounts, viz., \$161,187,000, divided by 3,600,000 population, gave

\$45 per head. Prince Edward Island had a population of about 94,000, which at \$50 per head gave us the \$4,701,050 to which I have referred. It was not contemplated at that time that we would have had such a large expenditure as we have since made upon canals, upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, or upon the Intercolonial Railway, or that a large amount of money would have been expended in building or subsidizing local railways. The expenditure of \$41,000,000 that has since taken place for local railways, was not contemplated at all when we entered the union. It was, in fact, contrary to the terms of the union. That policy was inaugurated in 1882 by a Conservative Government, and it has been continued since by a Liberal Government. I am one of those who have made an honest effort to interpret the terms of the union, and I cannot find that the Dominion Government were justified in making one dollar of expenditure for local railways under the terms of confederation. But, having made that expenditure, it is impossible for Prince Edward Island to reverse the current of public policy, and all we can do is, that if the Government have determined upon a wrongful and unconstitutional expenditure, they should accord to us a fair share of the expenditure. This is the only way in which justice can now be done to Prince Edward Island. Now, instead of the Dominion expending on canals, as agreed, \$25,000,000, we have expended \$28,494,000 more; instead of expending on the Canadian Pacific Railway \$30,000,000, we have expended \$32,000,000 more; instead of expending on the Intercolonial \$10,000,000, we have expended \$24,358,000 more, and instead of incurring sundry expenditures of \$14,000,000, we have increased that expenditure in the matter of local railways by \$30,815,000. I want to ask the hon. member for York, and every other hon. gentleman in this House, if it is fair to us, in Prince Edward Island, that we should be asked to pay our share of all those large expenditures contrary to the terms under which we entered the union, and yet receive no return?

The least that the members of this Parliament can do with reference to Prince Edward Island is to give us a proportionate share of that excess of expenditure, and of that unconstitutional expenditure—not a million merely, but two and a half millions. I do not care whether you call this a subsidy to Prince Edward Island or a subsidy towards the construction of railways in Prince Edward Island. In either view it is only a partial measure of justice meted out to us. It is only returning to us a portion of the moneys which we ourselves have contributed—wrongfully and contrary to the terms of union—towards the construction of railways and canals in other provinces. Before I conclude, I want to point out that the late Conservative Government, some three years ago, introduced resolutions into

this House looking towards the construction of seven branch railways in Prince Edward Island. The amount of money that was to be expended in their construction was largely in excess of the amount now proposed. So our hon. friend of the Conservative party can have no cause to complain if we are following to a slight extent the precedents which they themselves established. Moreover, if hon. members from the rest of the Dominion will look at this matter squarely in the face they will see that it is merely a measure of justice and not an act of generosity which they are meting out to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have just a word to say on this resolution. I am sorry that the Intercolonial Railway has not been allowed to remain just as it was at the close of the parliamentary career of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. The present leader of the Opposition unfortunately opened the capital account, and commenced constructing branches; and from that time to the present there has been a continuous expenditure for the construction of branch lines—the Picton branch, the Oxford and New Glasgow branch, the St. Charles branch, branches to Sydney and North Sydney, and all over. It was, in my humble opinion, an unfortunate mistake that these roads should have been constructed at the entire cost of the Dominion, while in the other portions of the Dominion the people were called upon to lay the financial basis by taxation for the construction of their own lines of railway, and to run themselves into debt for that purpose. I admit that it is pretty hard to stop a system when it has been inaugurated and kept alive for some 18 years. We have the two parties going to Prince Edward Island, the one outbidding the other. We are given to understand that Sir Charles Tupper, when he went to Prince Edward Island previous to the last election, in order to carry the province, promised that if he were returned as Premier he would build not only this line, but no less than seven lines in Prince Edward Island. The result is, I presume, that the present Government are compelled to take into consideration some of these claims if they are to have any foothold at all. By this system, hon. gentlemen opposite bought up the country, building railways here, there and everywhere, and hon. gentlemen now in power have very great difficulty in stopping that system. I admit that it should be stopped. In the case of Prince Edward Island there may be an exceptional condition that does not exist anywhere else. It is away out in the Atlantic, largely by itself; it is not connected with the Dominion by any other lines. The lines there are largely owned and operated by the Dominion, and I am sorry to learn that they are operated at an annual loss; but whether they are operated at a loss or a profit, we

Mr. BELL (Prince East, P.M.I.)

have undertaken, in bringing that province into confederation to operate those lines. I presume that there are other sections of the country where railways are paying as badly, perhaps worse, than in Prince Edward Island. I am exceedingly sorry that all these lines have been consolidated in one account, and that we are not able to show how the different branches built by hon. gentlemen opposite are remunerating this country for the money invested. I would like to know how the Cape Breton branch and other branches are paying. We could tell that while the accounts were kept separate; but in order to hide the conspicuous deficits that were brought to the attention of this House from year to year, the late Minister of Railways consolidated the accounts, and so mixed them up that to-day you cannot tell the earnings of any particular branch; and I believe that was done for the purpose of hiding the extravagance of hon. gentlemen opposite in building lines that never paid. Now, it is said that the canals are a return for the railways built in Prince Edward Island. The canals of this Dominion, however, are just as much in the interest of the provinces in the east as they are of the provinces in the west. Prince Edward Island wants flour; so does Nova Scotia; and by the deepening of the canals, Prince Edward Island and the other provinces by the sea get their every-day wants supplied at considerably less cost than they would otherwise have to pay.

Mr. McALISTER. Is not the Intercolonial as much advantage to Ontario?

Mr. McMULLEN. I contend that the Intercolonial has been operated largely in the interests of the maritime provinces, and I hope that now that connection has been made with the city of Montreal its administration will be such that it will bring some little return to this Dominion for the enormous amount sunk in it. We have \$56,000,000 sunk in that railway, besides an actual loss of \$10,000,000 on its operation since its completion. If it is prudently operated now, it should begin to pay its own expenses, and bring something to the account of the people who are now paying about \$2,250,000 a year of interest on the cost of its construction. I am sorry to hear the statement of the hon. member for West York in regard to the receipts and expenditures of the Prince Edward Island Railway.

I regret that the Government have felt called upon to add to Government roads in this country. I had hoped that we had reached a period when we had ceased building Government railways, but in this case I believe there is an exception, for the simple reason that you cannot get a company to build a road that is only a short line connecting with another road. Another reason is because the record of these roads in Prince

Edward Island is such that he would be worse than a madman who would put money into any of them, because he would never get it out. I regret that the Government have seen it their duty to undertake the construction of this line, and I earnestly hope that this will be the last, but have no right to indulge in such a hope because the history of the past will no doubt be repeated in the future. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in power, pushed along railway subsidies and the construction of branch lines in addition to the Canadian Pacific Railway, year after year, and the result is that the present Government have a difficult task to put a stop to the system these hon. gentlemen inaugurated. They have, however, made wonderful progress in that direction, for they are only building one line, whereas if we had the hon. leader of the Opposition in power we would be building a number of lines.

Mr. MARTIN. I think it is very necessary that the House should have some definite information as to what the province of Prince Edward Island has been charged with for the building of its railway. The statements we have heard are repeated time and again that Prince Edward Island did not pay for its railway. They are without foundation, and I think the time has come when such statements should be finally contradicted, that they may not be repeated in this House. I have in my hand the Order in Council of the Privy Council of England on the admission of Prince Edward Island into the Dominion, which sets the question in dispute at rest beyond controversy. I do not think that hon. gentlemen wish to misrepresent the case willingly, but so long a time has elapsed, that the circumstances are to a great extent forgotten. Now, this Order in Council which ought to settle it is as follows :

By Order in Council, dated Windsor, 26th June, 1883, Her Majesty thought fit to accept the terms and conditions set forth in the Address of the Houses of Parliament of Canada and from the Legislative Council and House of Assembly of Prince Edward Island of May, 1873, and it is declared by Her Majesty that, from and after the 1st July, 1873, Prince Edward Island shall be admitted and become part of the Dominion. By the resolutions which form the basis of the calculations it is provided that the railway under contract and in course of construction by the Government of Prince Edward Island shall become the property of Canada. To carry out the above provision, it was agreed that the cost of these railways should be assumed by the Dominion, and that the money so paid shall be charged as against the debt of Prince Edward Island.

I think that puts the case beyond doubt. The cost of the railway is charged against Prince Edward Island.

I hold in my hand a statement of the amounts paid by the province of Prince Edward Island, which totals \$3,144,214.41 for the construction of that railway which is charged against the province, and, on that

amount the province loses interest since confederation. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has laid great stress on the fact that the Prince Edward Island Railway was not self-sustaining. I am astonished at his making such strong statements as he has made. Let him look at the huge deficits on canals, let him turn to the reports of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and he will find that this Dominion has spent something like \$80,000,000 on canals, the receipts from which are only \$407,000 and the expenditure on which amounts to \$540,000. That is that the receipts do not cover the expenditure by the amount of \$140,000 a year. If you add the interest on the \$80,000,000, which would be about \$2,500,000, where would you be landed? You would have an annual loss of \$2,633,000. Will the hon. gentleman presume to say that any person, as a business speculation, would go into the building of canals? But why should not our canals be built on a business basis just as well as our railways? To give an instance of the expenditure on canals, \$13,582,291, of which was spent since hon. gentlemen came into power. I have in my hand the receipts from and expenditure per year on the Trent Valley Canal, for which his own party voted, since they came into power, \$1,250,000. Why did not the hon. gentleman say that that was not a business arrangement? There are no receipts worth mentioning from that canal, but all the same he voted for it like a good supporter of the Government. The receipts from the Trent Valley Canal, according to the last railway report, are \$1,404 and the expenditure \$10,102, or, as the hon. member would put it—it takes over \$7 to collect \$1. This is a work on which nearly \$3,000,000 has been expended by the Government, and all the receipts from it amount only to \$1,400 a year. There is something the hon. gentleman can exercise his ingenuity on, if he likes to go into figures. There is a work on which his party has spent \$1,250,000, and from which the receipts amount to but \$1,400, and on which the expenditure runs up to over \$10,000.

Take the other canals, take the St. Lawrence Canal, the receipts from it are only \$128,338, and the yearly expenditure \$194,107. On that one canal alone there was between \$60,000 and \$70,000 of a deficit last year. Why did not the hon. gentleman stand up and oppose the construction of that canal?

Mr. McMULLEN. Does my hon. friend wish to lead the committee to believe that I voted for the construction of the Trent Valley Canal? I never did anything of the kind. On the contrary I voted against it, from the beginning to end.

Mr. MARTIN. Did not the hon. gentleman vote last session in favour of an expenditure on that canal? Can he deny it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That was for work done under

contract made before the change of Government.

Mr. MARTIN. I have the Estimates in my hand. We all remember the delegation that came down here from the Trent Valley Canal district, and we know that they went home after \$650,000 had been placed in the Estimates and the next year another \$600,000 was placed in the Estimates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. All of which was to pay for work done on the contracts existing at the time.

Mr. MARTIN. Perhaps so, but I say the hon. gentleman did not vote against it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have opposed from its inception the construction of the Trent Valley Canal, and voted against every appropriation in connection with it. But my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) knows that when the country enters into a contract for any work, an incoming Government must carry out that contract. This Government must carry out what their predecessors have committed them to.

Mr. MARTIN. That is not always the case but I will refer the hon. gentleman to the next item—the Chambly Canal—receipts \$21,892.07, and the working expenses \$37,063.54, or costing nearly \$2.00 to collect \$1.00. But I do not think it is necessary for me to say much more on this subject. One hon. gentleman said that Ontario had spent large sums on railways. I have here a statement which shows that, since 1873 up to 1896, the Ontario local government had spent \$7,306,538 on railways, while the municipalities had spent \$10,069,143, a total of \$17,375,681, or at the rate of \$8 per capita.

Mr. McMULLEN. That was right out of the pockets of the people.

Mr. MARTIN. But the same statement show that Prince Edward Island spent \$3,144,214, or at the rate of over \$28.00 per capita.

Mr. McMULLEN. But the Dominion assumed the debt created for that.

Mr. MARTIN. No, it was charged as against Prince Edward Island, and we lost the interest on that amount. This expenditure on railways that I have quoted would amount as I have said to \$28 a head, against \$8.21 for the province of Ontario. On the other hand, expenditures for railways were made from the Dominion treasury in the province of Ontario at the rate of \$14.13 per head of the population of the province in Prince Edward Island at the rate of \$5.82 per head. So, we find that this great province that is contributing so much towards railways, has actually had \$14.13 per head spent by this Dominion as against \$8.21 per head it has spent itself. I do not say anything against hon. members who oppose

Mr. BLAIR.

this vote for Prince Edward Island, because they do not understand the conditions; but that it is a vote that can be fully justified; and I would advise hon. members to give the question some study before they venture to speak on it.

Mr. HAGGART. I desire to say only a few words in support of the contention of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Martin). His statement is literally correct. On entering confederation, Prince Edward Island was charged \$3,144,000 for the road partly constructed and partly to be constructed. They were entitled, in other words, to \$3,144,000 in cash. They said to the Government: You take this undertaking off our hands and charge us with the amount. And so the Government assumed the road. If the road was a paying concern, the people of Prince Edward Island were entitled to the interest which they were allowed, or \$150,000 a year. But it was not a paying concern; we lost on it at the rate of \$70,000 a year. I think that is a fair charge to be made against the interest which they would be entitled to. We came to the conclusion that they were entitled under the confederation arrangement to \$60,000 or \$70,000 a year. And so I brought down some resolutions to the House to grant subsidies to different lines of railways in Prince Edward Island—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is, the votes to build them?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, not to subsidize them in the ordinary sense. One was the very road now under discussion. I think the Government are perfectly justified in proposing it. This road is a road which the people of Prince Edward Island have set their hearts upon. They are entitled to some consideration from the Government in the shape of a subsidy or balance to make up a subsidy which they were entitled to at confederation. I think it would have been better if the Government had followed the resolutions which I introduced into the House and undertaken the whole of these roads at once. If I remember rightly, these lines included one from the main line to Stanley Bridge, another from the main line to Rustico, another from North Wiltshire to Crapaud, two little lines in the direction of Richmond Bay, one from Harmony and one from Charlottetown—besides the one now under discussion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What was the mileage altogether?

Mr. HAGGART. According to my recollection, it was about 105 miles. Though I have often been charged with heresy and often laughed at for it, I am of the same opinion as the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), that when for Dominion purposes, large expenditures are made in one part of the country, it is sound public policy, and it

is just, that expenditures to counterbalance these should be made in other parts which are not benefited by the first expenditures. In spite of all the charges of heresy, I have never got that out of my head yet. Prince Edward Island has received nothing in the shape of subsidies to railways at any time. It is entitled to its share; and if the people have set their hearts on these little lines of railway, they should have them. The charge to the country would not amount to over \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year. Even if it amounted to \$70,000, and the deficit on the Prince Edward Island Railway was only \$70,000, it would be only fair-play and just to Prince Edward Island under the terms of confederation.

Those were the principal grounds on which I introduced the resolution. I was aware that instead of receiving a substantial revenue from it the probabilities were that there would be a deficit. I calculated on this deficit, and on those grounds I introduced the resolution. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) finds fault with the resolution which I introduced. He says it is compulsory on the Government now to introduce resolutions in this particular direction because we promised so much, and they had to perform part of it. The hon. gentleman is prepared to swallow his words in detail; he will swallow a resolution for this part of the railway, and next year, I suppose, if the Minister of Railways and Canals brings down another resolution, he will swallow that. He finds fault with the manner in which I kept the accounts for the Intercolonial Railway. He said that on the different sections of the Intercolonial Railway, the Oxford and New Glasgow branch, the Cape Breton branch and others, I purposely added the whole of the receipts and expenditures into one account for the purpose of confusing the country. I did not do what the Minister whom he is supporting does—confuse them by adding the Drummond and Montreal section of the Intercolonial Railway, notwithstanding the promise of his colleague in another branch of Parliament, and the promise given to the country in this House that we would have a detailed account of the receipts and expenditures from that road. I only mention these things for the purpose of replying to the member for North Wellington, and for the purpose of supporting this undertaking, which the members from Prince Edward Island have so much at heart.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the route been decided upon between Charlottetown and Murray Harbour?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. We are going in as direct a course as possible. Surveys have been made, but I think they will require to be gone over again. But substantially we are

pursuing as direct a course as possible from Charlottetown, crossing the Hillsboro' River direct to Murray Harbour. The line is 44 miles and a quarter long.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the provincial legislature grant anything towards this line?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. The hon. gentleman will find in "Hansard" what I said on this subject. They engage to pay one-half the estimated cost of the bridge. \$400,000 would be one-half the cost and they engage to pay 3 per cent interest upon that amount, or \$12,000, in consideration of our making not only a railway bridge but a highway for foot-passengers over the bridge. They pay that for all time.

Mr. FOSTER. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has brought to the attention of the House the resolutions which were introduced in 1896 by the Government of that day. I remember going very carefully into the matter with my hon. friend and another member of the Government as a committee. We did not go into it in connection with this one particular part of the island, but we went into it with reference to different parts of the island, with an idea of proposing and carrying out such branch roads as, when fully completed, would connect every portion of the island which it seemed to us had need of communication with the mainland, and out of which we believed that a fair traffic could be got. I know we went very carefully into the questions of cost and returns with the officers of the Railway Department. My hon. friend says that he faced a deficit as a result. I think from memory, that the deficit he faced was very small when it was put over a number of years. We thought it was small in view of a probable fair accretion of traffic, and we came to the conclusion that if these were once built every section of the island that could call for connection with the mainland would be satisfied, and that in the end the deficit would not be greater than at the present time, if indeed it was not made less. It is true that Prince Edward Island is a maritime province. It is indented everywhere with small bays; and it is true as well that the railway did a larger part of the traffic of Prince Edward Island in those days than can be done by water, and this is part, I think, of an economical policy. With reference to this line, considering its deficit and its cost in the past, I think it is part of an economical policy that these branch lines should be built, not profusely, but where there is a possibility for a return from the traffic, and that they should at once be made feeders to the main line and concentrate the traffic into the main line. Then, I think that by a fair and economical management, not only will you satisfy the needs of the island, but I believe you will

put the whole traffic of the island with reference to the Intercolonial Railway and its branches in such a position that the deficit will not be any greater, if it is not, indeed, much less, than it is at the present time. That is my recollection of the result that we came to as a consequence of a pretty thorough study of the subject in connection with the Department of Railways. We brought those resolutions down to the House, and if we had remained in power we would have carried them through, and not only Murray Harbour, but the other sections of the island which demanded them, as they do now, these advantages, would have had these lines of communication. On that basis I cannot do anything else but support this vote, which is only a part of our scheme, and I am only sorry the Minister has not carried out the plans outlined by the department under the management of my hon. friend, and completed this system by a network of small lines which would have called in to the main line the traffic from the outlying portions. So I am in favour of this vote, not only because I believe it is right, but because it was part of our own policy when we were in power, a part only and not the whole of it. The hon. member for North Wellington made a most unfortunate slip from the view of political morals when he brought himself down to the sticking point. Although he himself is opposed to this vote brought in by the Minister of Railways and Canals, still he thinks the Minister should bring it in because, if he did not, the other party would get ahead of him. Now, that is the baldest kind of political corruption with regard to subsidies.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) When the late Government took this matter up they contemplated extending the Murray Harbour branch by way of Montague Bridge. I may say here for the benefit of the Minister of Railways and Canals, that Montague Bridge is the principal place of trade in a large section of country, it is a growing town, and it is the largest shipping place in Prince Edward Island, being at the head of tide-water. It was contemplated at that time that the road should run down by way of Kinross, Murray Harbour Road, that a branch should run down the valley of the Montague River and up the valley of the Browns Creek, another branch of the same river, and wind round to Murray River. That distance was supposed to be about 60 miles, the present line is about 45 miles. Now, if it is built to Montague Bridge, I believe it will be the greatest source of traffic for that line along the whole route from one end to the other. I think the Government should consider that route before they commit themselves entirely to the other, and that they should make a survey of it. I may say that I regret very much that the branches that were contem-

Mr. FOSTER.

plated at that time have not been considered in this vote. There was at that time considered a branch from O'Leary Station westward, from Summerside northward, from Emerald northward, North Wiltshire, Royalty Junction northwardly, Harmony eastward to Elmira, and Southport to Murray Harbour.

There is one small branch of road from Harmony to Elmira which goes to a part of the province in which there are no harbours and the people have to haul their fish and their produce for a long distance. This is a large producing section of the country. There are cheese factories in that district, and large lobster factories along the coast, and a small branch line of only a few miles, would be a great benefit to the people in these districts. I have nothing further to say, at present, except to emphasize the fact that I trust the Government will consider the matter that has already been brought to their notice in regard to the reduction of fares on the Prince Edward Island Railway and that they will take into consideration the fact that the road, being a surface road, and by running in a winding direction, is greatly lengthened. I would say further that I believe every one of these contemplated roads that I have referred to would be feeders to the main line, and the traffic on them would be just as important as that on the main line is at present. If the traffic on these branch lines were to become as great as it is at present on the main line the expense of operating the branches must be greatly lessened as the same management and the same rolling stock would be utilized on the branch lines. The result of the increased traffic would go largely towards wiping out all the deficits that appear in the operating of the road at present. At this late stage of the session I will not detain the committee longer than to make these few remarks.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to give me his attention for a few minutes. According to the survey that was partly made in 1896 this branch was to be 65 miles long. The present survey only contemplates a branch 44 miles long.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Forty-four or forty-five miles.

Mr. MARTIN. In reducing the length of the road I think an injustice has been done, and I think the road will not be such a useful one if it is carried out in this way. I wish to impress upon the hon. Minister the fact that under the old plan laid down in 1896 when the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) was in the Railway Department, there was a spur from a point on the proposed line passing at or near Montague Bridge and joining the existing main line at New Perth or Cardigan, which would accommodate Caledonia, the western

sections of townships 57 and 58 and sections of townships 59, 61 and 63, which will be afforded with accommodation under the present scheme. I understood from the engineer in charge, when he was down in the province, that that part of the line was to be surveyed. I went to him and asked him whether that part of the line was to be surveyed. He told me that he did not have any instructions about it, but that he would write to the department. I went to see him shortly afterwards and he told me that it was to be surveyed, but the result has been so far that there has been no survey. I think the object to be attained and the usefulness of the road will, to a large extent, be lessened if this spur is not constructed.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** As far as it goes, it is all right.

**Mr. MARTIN.** Yes, as far as it goes but a change of location will be required if this spur is not built and I am sure the hon. Minister will give his consideration to this matter.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The subject will receive consideration.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I desire to say a word in reply to what was said by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals when he spoke of the fairness of making an expenditure in another province in the light of an expenditure made in one province where it does not benefit another. If that principle were carried there would never come a time when we would not be arranging to make expenditures in the various provinces. If that principle held good, let us apply it to the Intercolonial Railway in its bearing upon the province of Ontario. The expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway, according to the report of the Department of Railways and Canals, amounts to \$55,668,000. That was of little or no value to the province of Ontario.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Ontario trade will get into Montreal.

**Mr. SPROULE.** But this was before the line ever reached Montreal. It never could be used for Ontario trade because the trade of Ontario went through Montreal to the Atlantic navigation and did not traverse this railway at all. So that, in reality Ontario got very little if any benefit of that expenditure. There has been an expenditure made since in Ontario and it will be held, according to the principle laid down by the hon. Minister, that the expenditure which took place since for the Canadian Pacific Railway and other railways should be recouped to Prince Edward Island and the maritime provinces now by some additional expenditures. I do not think that would be exactly fair, and I do not think the principle

holds good, and if carried out in that way it seems to me that it would ultimately reach a point of the utmost absurdity. If you are making an expenditure in the province of Prince Edward Island that not only entails that much money of the country being spent, but entails a perpetual loss for all time in the future, then it becomes hard to justify and this must be the case in Prince Edward Island, because, as the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) pointed out it costs us \$1.50 a year to keep up the railways in Prince Edward Island for every dollar earned. This is a charge placed upon the country and it becomes, under these circumstances, a still more unjustifiable expenditure. I could understand that if this branch line added to the trade of the main line to such an extent that it would make up a portion of the deficit which occurs there every year, there would be some justification for the expenditure, but if this expenditure only entails a further deficit, from year to year, for all time to come, then, I say, it is unjustifiable and in my judgment the people will not justify it.

**Mr. McALISTER.** I would like to ask the Minister if it is his intention to put back the night agent at New Mills?

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I confess that I have not in my mind at this moment that there has been any change made recently. I will inquire into it. What is the name of the station?

**Mr. McALISTER.** New Mills. The night agent has been at New Mills for years back, when it was a less important place than it is to-day.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Only a portion of the year?

**Mr. McALISTER.** The night agent has been there for a number of years back all the year round, and I may say there is a great deal of business carried on all the year round there. There is a great deal of trade there, and we know that in the country districts they do not carry on business in the same way as in cities and towns. They are very often there for freight, and very often go to ship freight after the hour the day agent goes off. It puts them to a great deal of inconvenience, not having a night agent there.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The hon. gentleman (Mr. McAlister) will recall the fact that we made arrangements which would admit of our regular agent doing all the work required at that station. The hon. gentleman may remember that it is only in the evening and morning, and not during the night, that trains arrive and depart. Of course, you have to start very early in the morning to make connections, but it was thought that the re-

gular agent could discharge all the duties required there.

**Mr. McALISTER.** The local passenger traffic is largely on the freight trains and mixed trains, and these come in, I think, after the hours when the station agent will be off. In the winter season the trains are not regular, and passengers come in there, and have no means of knowing where the trains are, whether they are near the station or far away. Sometimes the station is very uncomfortable, from the fact that there is no fire there, and I think, considering the business carried on at New Mills, they are entitled to better accommodation than they have. A night agent should be there. My information is, and my recollections are, that a night agent was on for years back all the time—summer and winter—in fact, I am satisfied as to this. I hope the Minister will look into the matter. I may say also that the accommodation at Nash Creek is not what it should be for the agent.

To pay Messrs. H. Ryan & Co., amount of award on claims in connection with their contract for the construction of a canal and lift-lock at Sault Ste. Marie, Ont., referred to W. Shanly, Esq., C.E., as arbitrator .....	\$211,505
Dredging at lower entrance channel to canal .....	20,000

\$231,505

**Mr. HAGGART.** Mr. Chairman, this is the most extraordinary item, I think, that has been in the House for a great many years. The session before last, there was an amount brought down in the Estimates for the purpose of paying a final estimate for this work. Last year there was a further estimate brought down for the purpose of paying Mr. Ryan the sum of \$20,000 in full, if I remember, for his claim in reference to the Sault Ste. Marie Canal. I could not understand, after a final estimate from the engineer the year before, why it is that a subsequent estimate is brought down for the purpose of paying him the difference between \$4.50, which was allowed him for the building of some stone-work along the line of the canal, and \$7.50. For the payment of \$4.50 a yard I was criticised—the late Government was criticised and found fault with, because it was in excess of the value of the work that was done. I paid it because I thought under the schedule he was entitled to it. I thought it was a large sum to pay \$4.50, but, to my astonishment, the present Minister brought down a sum of \$27,000 to pay the difference between \$4.50 and \$7.50. It was opposed in the House—the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) was in the House at the time—and the Minister says: I will drop this item, and I will leave it to the courts for the purpose of deciding. If I remember rightly, because I have not the information here, I

**Mr. BLAIR.**

asked for full information in reference to this before debating it, but I have only got the award of Mr. Shanly, upon which this amount is based. If I remember rightly, the contract was entered into with Mr. Ryan in 1888 for the purpose of building this work. Under that contract the chief engineer was made the sole and final judge as to everything in reference to that contract. Subsequently we referred the claims to the Exchequer Court. There were two subsequently entered into, one in 1892 and one in 1894, with Mr. Hugh Ryan, and that clause, leaving it to the chief engineer to be the final judge, was eliminated, and any claims which the contractor might have to be referred to the Exchequer Court of Canada. There does not seem to be any reference to the Exchequer Court. I cannot understand from the Minister what authority he had to leave it to Mr. Shanly to be the final judge of this. He had a final report from his chief engineer in reference to that work. Why is it the Minister passed over the Exchequer Court, and left it to Mr. Shanly to report upon? Is the Exchequer Court of no more use in Canada—a court established for the sole and only purpose of trying cases of this kind and doing away with the old system of proceedings, by which claims might be left to some favourite of the Government or some person who might, perhaps, be influenced by the contractor? The most extraordinary part of this proceeding, if I am correctly informed, is this, that the Government was not represented by any counsel or solicitor before this tribunal—that, in fact, neither party had counsel; but that the matter was left wholly to Mr. Shanly. Why was it that the engineer who was in charge of the work during the whole time of its construction, Mr. Crawford, who, if any one, should have appeared before that court as a witness, was never called? As the case was submitted to Mr. Shanly on an Order in Council, I understand that the Government are bound by the award, that Ryan & Co. can bring an action to recover the amount, and that the Government have no appeal to the Exchequer Court or the Supreme Court. I want to know why the Minister did not bring down all the papers, together with the evidence in the case? Why does he go behind the contract of 1888, for the purpose of going, not to a court, but to an arbitration—a system which the country declared it had no confidence in, and, therefore, provided in all contracts let by the Railway Department that all such matters should be referred to the Exchequer Court. The Minister himself, in the session before last, brought down an appropriation which was to be in payment of this account in full. Last session he found that the contractors had some kind of an equitable claim for \$27,500. Where is the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), who found fault with me because he claimed that the work did not come up to the standard, for which I had

paid \$4.50 a yard? Now, the Minister brings down an estimate for the purpose of paying the difference between \$4.50 and \$7.50. Last year he made the statement that \$27,500 was to pay this claim in full.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. What is the use of making a statement of that kind?

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman brought down an estimate which was supposed to pay the account in full.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. On what authority does the hon. gentleman state that?

Mr. HAGGART. I will get "Hansard." If I remember rightly, the Minister stated last year that he had a final estimate, and that the sum he asked for was in payment of it. When there was a final estimate, and a vote was taken for the purpose of paying a specific amount, the Minister was surely bound to tell the House that Ryan & Co. had other claims besides the difference between \$4.50 and \$7.50 per cubic yard.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to tell this House that he did not know that Messrs. Ryan & Co. had a claim of over \$400,000?

Mr. HAGGART. I never heard of it. I thought the claim of the year before was settled in full; and last year, when the Minister brought down the item of \$27,500, he was so ashamed of it himself that after getting the consent of Council to its introduction, he withdrew it. I thought that if anything was to be left to arbitration, it would be the question whether that work came under a special classification and whether the contractor was entitled to more than \$4.50 per cubic yard, because that was the only question before the House at that time. But what I want the Minister to answer is this: Why does he go past the Exchequer Court and leave the claim to Mr. Shanly? Why does he not get the Department of Justice to look after the interests of his department, and argue the question before the arbitrators? If the Department of Justice is busily engaged, why does he not get another solicitor? Why is the investigation not made in an open court, so that the country may know what is going on and its interests may be looked after? Why does the hon. gentleman go outside of the conditions of the contract? Why did you go past the condition of the contract? If it is provided in the contract of 1888 that the chief engineer shall be the final judge and the arbitrator, why does not the chief engineer do his duty? If you are bound, under the subsequent contracts of 1892 and 1894, to leave it to the Exchequer Court, why did you not leave it to that court? And then, if you avoid these two

points, why is it that you did not conduct your case in a manner that any other case for a much smaller sum is conducted before an arbitration, and that is, by counsel for the Government and allow counsel for the defence?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have listened to a great many attacks from the hon. gentleman since I have been in this department, but one which strikes me with more amazement I have never listened to. My hon. friend lived through a very large portion of this transaction, and if his memory is of any service to him, he ought to be able to recall the leading facts. I presume that he must be familiar with what was transpiring in his department, the contracts he was making, the leading features of those contracts, the usages which prevail in interpreting contracts, and the general results, particularly in the working out of the "Soo" contract, and all my hon. friend here has been charging against me he must know is entirely unwarranted if he were speaking with any recollection at all of what transpired. He does not even state the character of the contracts entered into. They were two as between the Government and Messrs. Ryan & Company in connection with the Sault Ste. Marie work. The principal contract, the one out of which the largest portion of the claim which they subsequently preferred against the Government arose, was a contract under which, if any dispute arose between the contractor and the Government, the Government were bound to name an arbitrator, and it was stipulated that the chief engineer of Government works should be that arbitrator. A subsequent contract was made for some additional work of a very much more limited character, in connection with which some portions of these claims have arisen, but that contract differed from the original one in this particular, that it provided that if a dispute arose, it should be referred to the Exchequer Court, but it had no reference to disputes which might arise under the first and main contract between these parties.

Mr. WALLACE. The ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) made the statement that in case of dispute under the first contract, the chief engineer was to be the sole arbitrator.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I have stated that.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister has not followed that out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, and I will tell you why. The reason which I venture to say must be within the knowledge of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, but which he has evidently forgotten, is that my Deputy Minister, as he tells me, since he has been in the depart-

ment, has uniformly refused to act in the capacity of arbitrator under these contracts, because he felt that the position would be an unfitting one. He felt that the position of arbitrator to deal with cases in respect of which he had given his judgment and opinion to his Minister and the Government, was one he ought not to be called on to fill, and which he declined to fill, and it was because he entertained that view that the subsequent contract contained a reference to the Exchequer Court in substitution for the reference to him as an arbitrator.

When these claims came before the department, growing out of the completion of the work under these two contracts, it became a right which the contractor had, and which we could not gainsay, to refer them to arbitration. It was not a matter in which we had any alternative at all. I could not say to Messrs. Ryan & Company: We will not give you this arbitration, for I was obliged to agree that they were entitled to an arbitration. It was then the chief engineer took the attitude he told me he had uniformly taken and refused to act. The ex-Minister of Railways must know that what I am stating is correct, that the chief engineer had uniformly refused to act in that capacity for reasons which, no doubt, commended themselves entirely to the approval of my hon. friend. We had a claim which, in the larger part, consisted of differences and disputes arising under the first contract, and a portion of which arose in respect of the second contract, and it was a question for us to determine whether or not we would consent that this part of the claim, which arose under the second contract, and which was to have gone to the Exchequer Court for determination, should not be sent to an arbitrator for determination, together with the other portion of the claim arising under the first contract. It was a question whether we should not treat the claim as a whole, leaving all the questions to be determined by the one authority. There could be no doubt as to the wiser course. An arbitrator was to settle the major part of the claim, and in choosing one, we took care to select a person, not only in whom we had confidence but in whom the public also would have confidence—a person who had the necessary experience and knowledge as an engineer to take up the various items and deal with them, because they were not questions of law but of engineering, in respect of which an engineer would be the most competent authority. No person could question as to which was the wiser course to adopt—whether we would split up a portion of the claim and send it to the Exchequer Court to be dealt with by a gentleman who would, no doubt, be competent to deal with questions of law, but who could not be supposed to be well informed on delicate questions of engineering, and would not be regarded as so desir-

Mr. BLAIR.

able a final referee as one who had all his life been working on engineering questions.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman argue that he had not power, under that contract, to refer the dispute to the judge of the Exchequer Court, but that he was forced to refer it to an arbitrator?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say undoubtedly nothing was authorized in the first contract except a reference to an arbitrator.

Mr. FOSTER. That is to the chief engineer?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, or to any person that might be acceptable to the other side, in substitution, as an arbitrator.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend argue that when once an arbitrator is named in the contract and the person named fails for any reason to arbitrate, then it is not possible for him to send a claim to the Exchequer Court?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could not compel any reference to the Exchequer Court. This question, therefore, came before me in that form. Applying my best judgment to the question, I felt that since there was a right from the contractor to exact a reference to arbitration, and the duty cast upon the Government to make that reference, the best results would be accomplished by selecting as arbitrator a gentleman whose knowledge, training, experience, reputation and standing would fit him better than any judge of any court to determine what was right and proper between the parties. And, therefore, instead of splitting the matter up on the basis of the contract in the form in which they happened to be, one being two years subsequent to the other, I thought we could get a better settlement in the interest of all concerned and would be able to justify our conduct to Parliament and the country with greater certainty if we had all the suits determined at one time by the same arbitrator.

Mr. FOSTER. Were there claims under the second contract too?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have endeavoured to make that clear. The amount of the claims under the second contract necessarily bear a small proportion to the total amount of the claim. I prepared a recommendation to Council, and the conclusion arrived at was in accordance with the view I have stated; and a reference was made to Mr. Shanly as arbitrator. Now, whether the amount awarded is a just result or not is not the question. We have to pay out what the arbitrator awarded.

Mr. FOSTER. Another important point was that the Minister stated that his inform-

ation was that it was left wholly to the arbitrator, that there was no counsel.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The matters went to arbitration under as fair conditions to the Government as to the contractor. There were no lawyers on either side. The hearing was a lengthy and most exhaustive one; and the evidence which each side deemed it to be in its interest was produced before Mr. Shanly, who sat for a number of weeks hearing all this testimony. It was not a legal question or one in which legal argument was necessary—it was a question of engineering. The chief engineer was present and closely followed the proceedings. Mr. Thompson, the superintending engineer of the Welland Canal, who had been through the whole work and was thoroughly and personally familiar with it in all its details, strenuously contended for the Government view of these various questions; and I think that no one would say that the interests of the Government in the matter would be likely to fall with Mr. Thompson, who is known to be, above all, a very straightforward man, one whose idea is: Let duty be done though the heavens fall; and in no degree could be considered as wanting in capacity for the work. I know from the complaints made from time to time by the contractors that they felt that Mr. Thompson exceeded all bounds and all reason and fairness in the strenuous way in which he contested the various claims of the contractors. The whole matter of that claim is open to the closest scrutiny and examination. I do not think it would have been possible to have a matter dealt with upon lines which were more defensible than those on which the department dealt with this particular claim. I felt that we had no alternative, but must make a reference to arbitration; and if anybody can suggest how it would have been possible to have an arbitration conducted in a more thorough way or in a way more in which the interests of the Crown would be more likely to be protected, I should like to hear it, because I am at a loss to conjecture in what direction it could be found.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the evidence taken down?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Mr. Butcher, the stenographer, took down the evidence. That evidence is not, at the moment, in our possession; but we can procure it, if it is desired.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Minister say the department has not a copy of the evidence?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, it is in the possession of Mr. Shanly at present.

Mr. FOSTER. But it belongs to the department?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Oh, yes, I have no doubt Mr.

Shanly would furnish it. The evidence on either side was given under the solemnity of an oath, and was all taken down by a shorthand writer. The arbitration has resulted in a certain way and we have no alternative but to pay it.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. Minister give the committee a little information as to the grounds of the claim. We are in total ignorance of that.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) a few days ago, expressed a desire to have the papers brought down. They are very voluminous. The claim itself in its different branches is of such a character that I do not think it would exactly throw a flood of light on the question if I were to enter into it. It is a technical claim, and one which, I think, the hon. gentleman himself would not wish to have me go into.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has not cleared up the point that was raised as to the proposed vote of last year.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I was just coming to that.

Mr. HAGGART. And the year before, where it was stated that it was a final estimate.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) kindly read what I said?

Mr. HAGGART: (reading)

Sault Ste. Marie Canal—

To pay wages of employees whilst unoccupied owing to delays for which the Electric Company were not responsible .....	\$ 624
Construction .....	80,000
To pay contractors, Hugh Ryan & Co., the cost of pulling down and rebuilding timber wall in prism of canal, &c.	5,796

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the \$80,000 is to pay the balance of the claim of Mr. Ryan?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes, this is to pay the Ryan firm.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I was going to explain this point. What the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) has read does not bear out the statement he made. What he said was that I asked Parliament to vote, \$27,000—

Mr. HAGGART. No, \$80,000 the year before that.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is not the item to which the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister has not followed me. I said the year before the hon. Minister stated that an item he brought down to the House of \$80,000 was to pay the Ryan claim. I asked if this was a final estimate. After the final estimate was paid in a subsequent year, the hon. Minister brought down an item of \$27,500.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to turn up "Hansard."

Mr. HAGGART. I have it here, and will send it over to the hon. gentleman. The statement was clear, and in the debate on the subsequent year I referred to it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Let us not connect the two years together, for the effect is confusing and prevents a clear understanding of what occurred. In 1897, I brought down an item, covering a claim which I said had been made by the Messrs. Ryan in connection with this revetment wall.

Mr. HAGGART. The revetment wall is separate, as the hon. Minister will see.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what I say; it is a totally separate claim.

Mr. HAGGART. That is in 1898.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But the hon. gentleman knows that when the item of \$80,000 was brought down in connection with the Sault Ste. Marie Canal—

Mr. HAGGART. That was for the purpose of covering the final estimate, was it not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not want to confuse the two. There was an item of \$27,000 in connection with the revetment wall, the payment of which I asked Parliament to sanction; and the question arose as to whether the amount allowed for the stone should be \$4.50 or \$7. An objection being taken to the item, I abandoned it. But I could not have suggested to Parliament at that time that the \$27,000 was to be a settlement in full of the claim of Ryan & Co. I am not going to confuse the \$80,000 with that, because they are entirely distinct. I stated to the House at that time that the \$27,000 was to settle the claim of Ryan & Co. for the extra figure in respect to the cost of that stone, and I thought they would accept that amount. It was objected to here, and I stated to the hon. gentlemen, when the objection was taken, that I would withdraw the item and let it be disposed of according to the terms of the contract. I was prepared to pay that \$27,000, because I was satisfied that the claim was just, and that we might as well settle it as have it go to litigation, which I thought might then ensue with respect to their whole claim. Well, then, the item was withdrawn, and they did not get this claim paid, and this claim went in, I presume, with the other items of their claim, and was included in the general award which was made under this reference to arbitration, in accordance with the terms of the contract. The claim of Ryan & Co. was between \$400,000 and \$500,000, and that

Mr. HAGGART.

claim could not be presented until the final estimates were in, and until they were in his possession. I was in the Department of Railways some time before the engineers completed their final estimates or submitted their report.

Mr. WALLACE. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has stated that he had no knowledge of any such demand being made. There is a direct conflict between the Minister and the ex-Minister, and I think the House is entitled to some documentary evidence to see who is right.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. About what?

Mr. WALLACE. This claim of \$400,000. The ex-Minister says there was no such claim in the department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The ex-Minister cannot speak as to what occurred in the department after he left it.

Mr. WALLACE. The contract was finished long before he left it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He can speak as to this, and I ask him to speak as to this, whether the final estimates were in his possession before he left the department. They were not in my possession until months after I came into the department. I do not think they were in my possession in the session of 1897; they were not in possession of the department until after the session of 1897, and that is why I can show the hon. gentleman how unreasonable he is, when he makes a complaint that I should have been willing to pay \$27,000 at that time, when I had in my mind a final settlement, because I had asked for an appropriation of \$80,000. I asked for that appropriation, based upon the estimate of the officers in my department; their estimate was that \$80,000 would complete the construction and settle the bill for the Sault Ste. Marie Canal. I dare say they felt themselves warranted in giving me that information, and in authorizing me to ask Parliament for an appropriation for that amount, even before these final estimates were concluded—and if they were, they were not in the possession of the contractors, and we had not been furnished with the demand which the contractors made, based upon these final estimates, for the payment of between \$400,000 and \$500,000. In all candour, I stated to Parliament that I wanted \$80,000 to pay that bill, and I assumed that the estimates of the engineers would approximate that amount. But we did not know, as anybody being in the same position would not know, what claim was likely to be made by Ryan & Co. in respect to the accuracy or otherwise of these final estimates. I knew there were three or four small items, of which \$27,000 was one, a proper item to be paid; therefore, I was

willing to ask Parliament for authority to pay this in the following session, but it being objected to, I felt I was not under obligation to press it, and I let it go, to be determined in the ordinary way.

Mr. FOSTER. All I can say at present is, that we ought to have the information which the hon. gentleman has in his possession, and which the House has not, which he says is voluminous, and I take it, this is a somewhat voluminous vote, too, so far as the amount is concerned. I do not suppose the Minister expects that we are going to vote this without additional information; if he does, he is very much mistaken. We have absolutely no information at all. I would like him to bring down, first, the contracts upon which this claim has been based.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can give the hon. gentleman the contract, if he likes.

Mr. HAGGART. For 1888, for 1892, and for 1894.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, I would like to have the chief engineer's report upon the final estimate, which report, I suppose, is made up—the whole matter known to the Minister. I suppose he has all information as to what should be paid to square off the whole bill?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can give the hon. gentleman a copy of the engineer's report in the final estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, I would like to have also the Order in Council which authorized the reference of the matter in dispute.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has got that.

Mr. HAGGART. I have got Mr. Shanly's award. In Mr. Shanly's award is set forth a summary of what the Order in Council is.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will see that the House should have as much information as he himself, or nearly so, before it can pass an item as big as this. It is a big item. On the face of it, my hon. friend came down in 1897, or after that vote of \$80,000, and he was asked, in so many English words, if this was a vote to pay the final estimate, and he answered by the affirmative monosyllable, yes; that is, he gave his assent to that, and all that bears it out. My hon. friend says, probably enough, that he found out afterwards that it was not the final estimate, but this is the way that it appeared to the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This was the estimate of the engineer at that time as to what it would cost to clean up the construction of the Sault Canal.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend's question is plain and the hon. Minister's answer

is as plain as it can be. I cannot go out into the concessions and side lines of the hon. gentleman's internal economy to find out what reservations he made. That being the statement in 1897 we were surprised when last year, in 1898, there came down this vote:

Sault Ste. Marie Canal—

To pay Messrs. Hugh Ryan & Co., contractors, for the construction of Sault Ste. Marie Canal, the difference between the amount of \$4.50 per cubic yard, paid on account of the construction of a masonry revetment wall built of sandstone and the contract price, \$7.50 per cubic yard, for the said wall of limestone..... \$27,525

Everybody who was in the House when these investigations were going on at the Public Accounts Committee knows how vehemently the late Minister of Railways and Canals was attacked for paying out this \$4.50, so that we were surprised last year when the hon. Minister proposed to pay \$27,000 to make up the \$7.50 per cubic foot against the report of the officials of his own department and the Minister of the department who preceded him. The moment the proposal was brought down we began to wonder what grace was shown to the contractor who induced the hon. Minister to put this amount in. When it was brought before the committee the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), being cognizant of the circumstances and of the discussion that took place in the Public Accounts Committee, said:

How is it this additional sum has been paid in connection with this matter? I understand that Mr. Ryan first contracted to supply sandstone at \$7.50 per cubic yard. Afterwards the contract was changed, and he was allowed to use the stone taken from the bed of the canal, and the previous Government allowed him \$4.50 per cubic yard for that stone.

In the discussion which took place the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) gained added light, and he goes on to say:

The proposition to pay this increased price is a surprise to me. It appears that Mr. Ryan entered into a contract for this canal on specifications calling for a certain kind of stone, which stone was found at a considerable distance from the canal. Now, after proceeding with the work, they found that they were able to take stone out of the bottom of the canal itself quite as good, if not better, than the stone which it was specified should be taken from the quarry at a distance. He used this stone on the permission which he applied for, and with the sanction of the engineer in charge, quarrying it out of the bottom of the canal and using it in construction. To pay him the same price as he would have been paid for stone quarried at some considerable distance and carried to the works, I think, would be unfair. I do not think that any man would do that in his own business. If I contracted with a man to build me a house, using stone of a quality to be found some considerable distance from the work, and if, after beginning the work, he found that stone of as good a quality could be got on the site of the house itself, I do not think I

would pay him the same price as if he had brought the stone from a distance.

He goes on to detail the circumstances, and says :

I do not see why we should be asked to pay this additional price. The explanation given by the Minister, I must confess, is not satisfactory to me. I think we should have some other explanations.

The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals declares that there is no other explanation. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) says after the Minister has said that he withdraws the item :

I think that is the best course to pursue. There is no question that Mr. Ryan applied for the privilege of using the sandstone that he was taking out of the bottom of the canal, in place of limestone. Now, having got that liberty, there might be some doubt as to what he should be entitled to receive. But he applied to the department and liberty was given, and, as a result, the responsibility, of course, rested upon the late Government.

The item was withdrawn. I am led to believe that Mr. Ryan would have been quite well satisfied to have taken this in lieu of all his claims.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Which? The \$27,000?

Mr. FOSTER. This was looked upon as a sort of equitable arrangement by the hon. Minister, as taken from the remarks that he made.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That he would be willing to accept \$27,000?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all.

Mr. FOSTER. After these two votes in 1897 and 1898, and without one scrap of additional information the hon. Minister comes down, three or four days before the end of the session, and asks us to put through a vote of \$211,505 to satisfy the claim of the late contractors. That is rather a stupendous conclusion after what transpired in the Public Accounts Committee, then, in 1897, under the Minister's vote, and then in 1898, under the Minister's vote. He asks that the House should just vote this through without further explanation or some further ground than that. When was Mr. Shanly's report received?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. On the 15th of April he enclosed it to the department. The agreement for a reference was made in September, 1898.

Mr. FOSTER. One strong point would be in reference to the nature of the contracts themselves, but the hon. Minister would not expect us to vote this amount without hav-

Mr. FOSTER.

ing been given an opportunity to satisfy ourselves that there is some ground for it, an opportunity to satisfy ourselves that the Government took a proper course in referring the matter to Mr. Shanly. I asked the hon. Minister a question as to whether he thought himself debarred by that contract, that the chief engineer refers to, from putting the matter before the Exchequer Court, and the hon. Minister was of the opinion that he was. We can only judge as to whether he was correct in that or not according to our judgment after seeing the contracts. I think the hon. Minister had better perhaps bring down the chief engineer's report, the Order in Council, the contracts and all the items. What we ought to have first is the evidence. It is a pretty voluminous thing to undertake at this time of the session, but this stood over last year, and if it is necessary that there should be full information before \$200,000 of the people's money is paid out, it can stand over for another year. There is no pressing necessity for it. It has stood over for a good length of time and it can stand over for another year if it is necessary we should look into this evidence. When we get this other information we may come to the conclusion that we do not need the evidence.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not the slightest objection to affording the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, on that side of the House, every fraction of information which is available.

Mr. FOSTER. Another thing is the naive simplicity that is shown by my hon. friend, the childlike faith—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is too complimentary by half.

Mr. FOSTER.—the childlike faith in human nature when he will come down, three or four days before the end of the session, with a proposition of this kind. I see the sardonic grin on the countenance of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright).

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am accustomed to all that simplicity from the maritime provinces on both sides of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a display of childlike faith on the part of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) that he should bring down an item under these circumstances about three days before the House is to finish its business and not give previously to that time what any one might consider to be vital information to the House to make up its mind.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I confess, Mr. Chairman, I

counted upon the knowledge of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals as sufficient for anything that might be wanting in respect to this information.

Mr. FOSTER. We have great confidence in the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must protest against my hon. friend professing to have discovered in the countenance of the Minister of Trade and Commerce anything indicating a question as to the thoroughness with which this case has been presented. I say to the hon. gentleman that I have felt that if ever there was a transaction involving a claim against the Government which had been gone into carefully, and in a thorough manner through all the various stages this claim is one, and I do not hesitate to say at once to the hon. member that I would furnish him with a copy of the contract. I can furnish him with the Orders in Council at once, and if he would take the time to read them I will let the item stand in the meantime. Of course I cannot say as to what my own conclusions would have been if I had heard the evidence. I would be very sorry to suggest a doubt as to the wisdom and justice of Mr. Shanly. I have not followed the evidence. I felt that we were obliged to refer this matter to an arbitrator and after the arbitrator had decided I felt that the controversy was at an end, and, therefore, I have not studied the evidence. I never asked to see it—that is the fact. We do not want to pay a year's interest at 6 per cent unless absolutely necessary to do so.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister stated that the chief engineer always refused to act as arbitrator.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He declined to act from the moment he came into the department until the present time.

Mr. HAGGART. If I remember correctly this Act referring these matters to the Exchequer Court was passed before he was Deputy Minister. Mr. Page was chief engineer, and, therefore, it could only apply to contracts which preceded 1898.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is what the contract says:

It is hereby agreed that all matters of difference arising between the parties hereto upon any matter connected with or arising out of this contract, the decision of which is not hereby especially given to the engineer, shall be referred to the award and arbitration of the chief engineer for the time being having control over the works, and the award of such engineer shall be final and conclusive; and it is hereby declared that such award shall be a condition precedent to the rights of the contractors to receive or be paid any sum or sums on account or by reason of such matters in difference.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister mistakes altogether my objection. I knew perfectly well that in 1888 the chief engineer was the sole arbitrator. What I stated was that immediately after 1888, the Exchequer Court Act was passed and the jurisdiction removed from the chief engineer, and I could not understand when the Minister stated that the chief engineer had refused in every case.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, he refused in the cases which have come up.

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

### After Recess.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 172) to incorporate the British America Pulp, Paper and Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

#### SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

> Transportation facilities—

Port Colborne, harbour improvements \$150,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. While I regret, as I am sure we all do, the absence of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) in connection with the presentation of his Estimates, I particularly regret it in relation to this item to which I now invite the attention of the committee. The hon. Minister, I know, has devoted a great deal of attention to the transportation question, and has looked forward with very much interest to the opportunity of developing before the House the plans he has prepared and has had in his mind regarding the improvement of our facilities for transportation from the great west to the ocean. I had hoped, when I agreed with the hon. Minister to endeavour to take charge of his Estimates in the House, that before the time arrived for presenting these items, I would have an opportunity of making a personal visit to the localities in which some of the more important of these works were to be constructed, so that I would be able to bring some personal knowledge to the discussion of them. I have to admit, however, that in consequence of the great pressure of work in the House, I have not been able to carry out that intention; and so I have to rely on the information that has been placed in my hands. With regard to the works at Port Colborne, the engineers of the department have made surveys and presented reports which contemplate a very large expenditure. In asking for this vote, however, we do not intend to commit ourselves to the carrying out of these larger

expenditures. It may be that after a little time the business will so develop as to justify the Government in asking for much larger appropriations. Our purpose, however, is to ask for an appropriation of \$150,000 for the construction of a breakwater in the harbour of Port Colborne. Hon. members may recollect that in the Estimates for the Department of Railways and Canals we have taken an appropriation for \$350,000 for the purpose of deepening the entrance to the Welland Canal at that point. It is assumed that that work will go on, and that at the same time steps will be taken by the Public Works Department towards the construction of a breakwater for the purpose of protecting the entrance to the canal. I am advised that the construction of the breakwater, if carried on under ordinary conditions, the contractor having to obtain his material in the usual way, would involve an expense of \$360,000 for the full length of the breakwater; but if the work of deepening the harbour at the entrance to the canal is in progress at the same time, then the rock taken out, if available for the breakwater, will enable the contractor to construct it at a much lower rate. The difference in that respect would amount to about \$88,000. It is very desirable, therefore, that these two works should be carried on simultaneously. We are not proposing to take an appropriation for the whole cost of the breakwater; but we anticipate that with this sum of \$150,000, assuming that we shall be able to get the material in the way described, we shall be able to construct from 1,000 to 1,700 feet of the breakwater.

I am informed by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways that he may require the rock from the excavation to be used at the entrance for work in connection with the canal. The proposal is to build the outer end of the breakwater, as much as is possible for the \$150,000, and if the business at Port Colborne develops to a very large extent, as is expected, no doubt demands will be made on the Government for larger expenditure, in order that the harbour may be deepened, but for the present that is all we propose to spend. For the present, with the deepening of the entrance of the canal, as proposed, and with the construction of this portion of the breakwater, as proposed by the Minister of Public Works, we shall take a great step in advance. The intention is to have a sufficient depth of water to enable large vessels from the lakes to come down to Port Colborne and discharge into smaller vessels to go through the Welland Canal.

**Mr. WALLACE.** What is the carrying capacity of vessels going through the canal?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Seventy-five thousand to eighty thousand bushels is about as large as you can take through the canal with a 13-foot draught of water, which

**Mr. FIELDING.**

is all that the depth of 14 feet would allow to go through the canal.

**Mr. HAGGART.** What is the depth of the proposed improvement?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Twenty or twenty-one feet.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** The amount in the Estimates is a very small one, only \$150,000. By the courtesy of the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fielding), I have been permitted to see the report of the engineers upon this whole scheme. I do not fancy that there is any gentleman in the House who will object to a proper increase of our transportation facilities, so long as it is held within bounds, but I think the House will be somewhat astonished to find that the officers of the department report that to carry out this work, and complete it according to the ideas of the hon. Minister of Public Works—and I suppose those ideas are the policy of the Government—will cost no less a sum than \$5,300,000 or \$5,400,000. That is the report which the hon. gentleman has under his hand. It was astounding to me, and I fancy the figures are astounding to almost every gentleman in the House. What is proposed to be done? I think the hon. gentleman will agree, in the first place, that one of the largest items is the proposed harbour of refuge there, and a number of acres of rock will have to be blasted, west of Port Colborne, at the entrance to the canal, at a cost of something like \$3,000,000.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** We are not proposing that.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** That is the scheme, as I understand it. The question is, whether the whole scheme is not to be carried out, if you vote this expenditure. My hon. friend from Welland will know more about it than I do, but all I know is, that the officers of the department report that over \$5,000,000 will be required to complete the scheme, and I think the House should hesitate before adopting a scheme that will cost that amount, without first obtaining the best possible expert evidence.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** We are not proceeding on the basis of any such estimate as that. You can get engineers' reports for carrying on very large operations, but I wish my hon. friend would not assume that, in asking the House to consent to the expenditure of \$150,000, we are basing it on any such project. He is quite correct in saying that among the various schemes there is one involving several million dollars.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** That is the only scheme.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The only scheme which we submit is the scheme of constructing a breakwater at a cost for the present of \$150,000. That will complete this work, as we now undertake to do it, and

then, if nothing further be done, it will be still useful for the protection of the entrance to the canal. If it be deemed desirable later on to deepen the harbour, that will involve a much larger expenditure, and if deemed desirable to lengthen the breakwater that will involve still more expenditure. The completion of the breakwater would cost \$360,000, if the material had to be supplied, and \$280,000, if the material were available out of the excavation in the harbour. But if nothing more be done, we will still have a useful work, costing \$150,000, for the protection of the entrance to the canal, and whatever may be done in the future will be entirely a matter for the judgment of the House. But the passing of this vote does not necessarily commit us to any larger scheme.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the length of the breakwater proposed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The whole breakwater would be between 5,000 and 6,000 feet in length, and the cost is estimated at \$360,000, if the material is to be supplied by the contractors, or \$280,000, if the material is supplied from the dredging of the harbour. We do not propose to build the whole breakwater, but the outer end, as we are advised that will afford useful protection to the entrance of the canal, even if no additional work should be afterwards constructed. It is to be cribwork.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. Minister submit a plan?

Mr. OSLER. I noticed the other day in the Senate "Debates" that Senator McCallum discussed this matter in the Senate on the 12th July, and I fancy there is no man in the Senate, or in this House, who has such a knowledge of the conditions prevailing there. Senator McCallum says that you cannot get a 22-foot harbour at Port Colborne on an expenditure of \$2,000,000. There is nothing but rock at Port Colborne harbour at the entrance, and there is no anchorage.

If that is the case, surely it is not wise to begin and expend \$150,000, which will entail possibly ten times that expenditure later on. I do not think it is a proper thing to submit an estimate for any public work, unless the whole probable cost is given, and then state that what is asked is only a beginning. It is not right to ask for \$150,000, when that may be committing the House possibly to an expenditure of eight or ten times the amount. In this case I should judge, from Senator McCallum's remarks in the Senate, that he, at all events, believes that the proposed expenditure will be utterly thrown away. I do not know the conditions myself, but I have a great deal of faith in Senator McCallum's business judgment and knowledge on such a subject, and I think the Government should be fairly

posted as to the probable cost of the work before it will be of use, and as to whether it will be of any use at all. They should be thoroughly informed as to whether the harbour is one that can be made use of with 20 feet of water. I do not think the Government have sufficiently considered that question. I do not think the Government have sufficient information to know whether this money is going to be thrown away, or whether it will require an expenditure of millions more to make it of use.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There can be no question that while this is an innocent-looking vote of \$150,000, if the hon. Minister of Finance will do the committee the favour to read to us the report, he will find that this is only a very small part of an expenditure of over \$5,500,000, as recommended by the engineer. I may tell the committee, although imperfectly, as I have not now the report in my hands, what the hon. gentleman proposes to do. In the first place, if the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) understands Port Colborne, he will understand that there is not a natural harbour there at all. The Government intend to construct a breakwater by a mile or so, and to build another long breakwater at the east also, I think. As I understand it, they propose to dredge a certain portion of Government land situated east of the canal and make a large basin; and then, from Sugar Loaf Point, a short distance west of Port Colborne, they propose to extend a large breakwater out into the lake, making a harbour of refuge, and then they propose blasting out that section of the lake between that breakwater and the pier at Port Colborne. It will take \$2,500,000 to make the harbour of refuge contiguous to Port Colborne. Then, there are elevators, docks and all the rest. The hon. gentleman says that the Railway Department is doing a certain portion of the work. That is correct, but it is in addition, as I understand it, to this vote.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What the Department of Railways propose to do is in connection with the canal only, of course?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At the entrance to it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Outside of which there is a rocky bottom and no anchorage, as the Senator from Monck has said. In fact, the report of the engineer states the reason for this vote almost in the opening sentence, when it says that it is the purpose to construct a harbour at Port Colborne. No matter how the Minister may gloss it over, this House will have undertaken a work which, eventually, is going to cost, the engineer tell us, \$5,500,000. And what I contend is that, before we enter on any such enormous scheme, we should have a well-matured plan before us and that the

whole transportation problem ought to be thoroughly considered and decided upon.

Mr. BENNETT. What particular purpose is to be served by the construction of the proposed breakwater?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is for the better protection of the entrance to the canal.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) able to assure us that with the construction of that breakwater vessels will be able to enter in a storm and lie there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It certainly will be much better than if there was no protection. No doubt, the completion of the whole breakwater from the shore would be a better thing, but I am advised that the construction of the portion mentioned will be substantial protection to the entrance to the canal.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it contemplated, as part of the scheme, to build elevators there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The report of the engineer, which I brought down, does include elevators; but we are not proceeding on those lines. We intend to construct this breakwater, which, we are advised, is a useful thing, if not another cent is spent upon the harbour. Elevators are part of the scheme outlined, but that is a question for the future.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the construction of the breakwater an indispensable work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is considered that it will be a very great improvement, but not so good as if we could make the whole breakwater.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The report covered the cost of wider basins, new breakwaters, elevators, docks, bulkheads and a harbour of refuge, the whole thing to amount to \$5,500,000. I certainly took it that that was the scheme that the department had decided upon. And I think the people of Port Colborne understand that this is the intention of the Government. I think I can go so far as to say that the Minister of Public Works has promised to construct elevators. I do not know whether he has promised the other works or not, but I know that the scheme is laid out by the engineers.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Montague) has had in his hands a report of what was really the cost of equipping the port of Port Colborne as Buffalo is equipped. It would be, no doubt, a very desirable thing to have such a port, but it is not what we have in view. Of course, everybody would be glad if we could have such a report as that. The report provides for all these things. It provides amongst other things for these breakwaters and elevators. But the estimates speak for themselves. If

Mr. MONTAGUE.

these other improvements are to be taken up, that will be the time to discuss them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) need not have any apprehension—there is the sum and substance of what we propose to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose what my hon. friend hears is correct, and this is merely an academic report—

The PRIME MINISTER. No, it is not academic; it is very practicable, if we had the money.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, suppose it is a report that, so far as it concerns to-day, is academic and all the Government propose to do is to erect a breakwater, but with no intention of proceeding further at present—where is the report, and what is the basis upon which we, who are not experts, are asked to vote \$150,000, which is a large sum of money?

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. What is that basis?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). Perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will allow me to reply to one of his questions—what is the object of the breakwater?

Mr. FOSTER. And the necessity?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What is the object and necessity of the breakwater? There is on the upper lakes a large fleet of vessels of various sizes. Many are not adapted for the canal service, and are plying, some of them between American ports and some between Canadian ports—

Mr. FOSTER. How, not adapted to canal service?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are too large. There are very few vessels of the inland merchant marine that are able to make use of our canal system, and it seems necessary to provide for the transfer of grain at the mouth of the canal if we are to receive any considerable quantity of the grain of the west.

Mr. FOSTER. The transference.

Mr. HAGGART. The transfer from larger vessels to vessels of the capacity of the canal.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How are you going to do it without increased elevators?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The elevators will come by private enterprise. The deepening of the mouth of the canal will have to be done by the Railway Department. There is an item in the railway estimates to enable the Railway Department to deepen the water at the entrance of the canal to the depth of 21 or 22 feet this year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The railway item is \$350,000.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The scheme involved in these Estimates contemplates the erection of a breakwater, which is a complete structure in itself and wholly independent of a large number of features embraced in the general report of the engineers, that report presenting what they conceive to be a proper and ideal equipment there, if the country was committed to it, and if it were a wise scheme to adopt. But supposing no other features of that report were adopted except the breakwater, accompanied by deepening the entrance to the canal, there will be at this entrance some landing piers where large vessels drawing deeper water than the canals contain, will come in and run alongside these landing piers and transfer their grain to the canal vessels. It is necessary to have a breakwater to enable that transfer to take place. The breakwater will no doubt act advantageously in diverting the immense amount of traffic that now finds its way, even from Canadian ports, to Buffalo. There is no reason why we should not attract a very large amount of grain from Duluth as well. American vessels will be entitled to load at Duluth and unload at Port Colborne, and if the rate of freight by our route is cheapened, we have every reason to expect a large share of the wheat trade that now finds its way down the Erie Canal to New York. The construction of this breakwater then will give a direction to that traffic and its development. If the results justify any enlargement of the scheme it will be for the House, on a future occasion, to consider the evidence, and to determine whether they are in favour of a larger scheme. But you may put it down as an absolute axiom now, that you cannot utilize the fleet that is now upon these upper waters and that is not able to pass through the Canadian canals, you cannot get any advantage of that existing fleet unless you have facilities by which these vessels can safely go to Port Colborne and remain there while they transfer their cargoes.

Mr. **SPROULE**. How is it proposed to transfer the cargo from one vessel to another?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. There is no doubt that once facilities are provided by a breakwater so that trade can go there, private enterprise will do the rest so far as elevators are concerned.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I mean the transferring of a cargo from one vessel to another, because I apprehend it will be very expensive.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. That is done by an elevator system, either floating or fixed.

Mr. **McNEILL**. What is the length of the breakwater to be?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The breakwater from the outer eastern point

to Sugar Loaf Point will be 5,700 feet, that is the total length, and it will inclose some 500 acres. It will then run westerly for between 1,000 and 2,000 feet. At the easterly end the depth of water is 21 feet. In the middle, a short distance north—I cannot say how far, the maps will show it—you come to 17 feet at low water mark.

Mr. **McNEILL**. A short distance from each end? Does this breakwater go from the land outwards?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The easterly limit will be at a point 5,700 feet from the shore.

Mr. **McNEILL**. I am speaking of the work which this \$150,000 is to build.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. It will commence at a point 5,700 feet east of Sugar Loaf Point, and will then run westerly for a distance of between 1,000 and 2,000 feet.

Mr. **McNEILL**. This breakwater you are going to construct ends at this point you are speaking of?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. No, it commences at the east, 5,700 feet east of the shore. The shore runs in a south-westerly direction. This will be opposite the mouth of the canal, sufficiently removed from it to enable vessels to come in and be sheltered, and to prevent some seas washing upon the end of the canal.

Mr. **McNEILL**. In that case you are going to build between 1,000 and 2,000 feet out into the water. That is evidently the beginning of a larger scheme. You are going to leave that little piece of breakwater there without finishing the whole construction that will be necessary. What would be the total cost of the construction of this breakwater from the point of which my hon. friend speaks, the easterly point to the extreme limit that it is contemplated to build the breakwater?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The breakwater is composed of cribbing, the cribbing is filled with stone, then it is ripped on the sea side, and a large portion of the cost of that filling depends upon the cost of getting the filling itself. If the filling is obtained in the harbour from the dredging that will take place and the deepening the mouth of the canal, the cost will be somewhat less. But if the contractor is obliged to find his filling where best he can, the total cost of this breakwater for a distance of over a mile from the easterly point to the shore, inclosing nearly 500 acres of sea room, would be \$360,000. But if the filling can be obtained as part of the process of deepening the harbour there will be a considerable reduction, if the contractor, for example, could utilize the material taken out from the bottom and apply it towards filling the cribs. In that case there would be

a deduction of about \$80,000, bringing down the cost to about \$270,000. That is what I understand the reports of the engineer to show.

**Mr. McNEILL.** That is the lowest this breakwater itself will cost?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** It is not a question of the lowest. It is a fair estimate by the engineers.

**Mr. McNEILL.** That must be the lowest estimate the hon. gentleman has just given.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** It is the highest and the lowest.

**Mr. McNEILL.** I am speaking of the lower of the two.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** Two hundred and seventy-two thousand dollars would be the higher estimate, if the filling of the breakwater were obtained in a certain way, but if the filling is to be conveyed to the breakwater from any source that the contractor can get it, then the cost would be \$360,000 for a distance of 5,700 feet, connecting Sugar Loaf Point with the point I referred to.

**Mr. McNEILL.** Then, the deepening which is provided for in the railway vote is to cost \$350,000, and this breakwater is to cost, if the contractor is not fortunate enough to find, when he digs out, that the material is suitable for the filling of the breakwater, another \$350,000.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** Not at all; it may never be considered necessary. Experience will show whether it is necessary to lengthen the breakwater or not.

**Mr. McNEILL.** The hon. gentleman does not mean to tell us that he will leave about one thousand feet of the breakwater standing out in the middle of the water without continuing it?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** There are many such instances, and it suits the purpose admirably.

**Mr. WALLACE.** Where?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** There is one at Port Arthur.

**Mr. McNEILL.** But these are not breakwaters of that kind; they are simply to break the sea and to give shelter to vessels lying further up.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I am not an expert, but those who are experts say that this will answer the purpose.

**Mr. McNEILL.** I do not profess to be an expert, but I have been brought up at the water's edge, and I think I ought to know something of what the purpose of a breakwater should be. This is a most unusual condition of things. I never heard of a vessel going out to lie alongside a breakwater

**Mr. MULOCK.**

of that kind to transfer cargo. If they had a little boat, and they discharged their cargo in the shelter of the breakwater, as soon as they left the shelter of the breakwater, they would be exposed to the heavy sea. I do not think that the hon. Postmaster General can be serious in suggesting that it would be contemplated to construct the work in that way, by leaving a little piece of breakwater out in the water without finishing it.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I think this is to answer the purposes of a breakwater, and not of a landing. It is not intended that vessels are to lie at this breakwater.

**Mr. McNEILL.** That is what we understand from the hon. Postmaster General.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** No, vessels are expected to lie at the entrance of the canal, and the breakwater will be a protection to the vessels entering the harbour. But they are not expected to lie at the breakwater.

**Mr. McNEILL.** How are they to get there? What is the depth of the water further up?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Thirteen or fourteen feet of water, but with the appropriation that is taken by the Department of Railways and Canals, which is \$350,000, it is contemplated that there should be a depth of water sufficient for vessels drawing 20 feet of water to go into the entrance and lie there. It is not contemplated that they shall lie at the breakwater.

**Mr. McNEILL.** To discharge to a small vessel, under the shelter of the breakwater, while lying at the breakwater.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** No; it is proposed that they shall within the entrance of the canal.

**Mr. McNEILL.** It is not a complete work, and it is one that is unlikely to be left in that condition?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Perhaps not.

**Mr. McNEILL.** At all events, the expenditure is \$150,000 and \$350,000.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Yes.

**Mr. McNEILL.** That is half a million for this incomplete work.

**Mr. McCLEARY.** Some time ago we had this question of improving Port Colborne harbour discussed in the House. From listening to some of my hon. friends on this side of the House, you would think that there was no harbour at Port Colborne at all. The fact is, that vessels are going down the Welland Canal carrying 75,000, 80,000 and 85,000 bushels of grain. As I understand it, all that is necessary is to provide a depth of water in Port Colborne harbour, so that large lake carriers, drawing from 20 to 22

feet of water, can come into that harbour. There must also be a breakwater to protect them. A breakwater is absolutely necessary to be constructed to some length outside of the harbour itself, so that a barge and her tow, or a large freighter itself, can make the harbour in safety. Any one who is acquainted with the northern shore of Lake Erie, knows that it is very rocky about there, and time and time again boats have run on the rocks, when striving to make Port Colborne, because there was no breakwater to protect them. Owing to the absence of a breakwater, a very great deal of trade that should have come to the Welland Canal, has gone to Buffalo.

Mr. SPROULE. You want a harbour of refuge there.

Mr. McCLEARY. No. I think the Government are taking a very wise and prudent course in regard to this matter. This whole question resolves itself into this, so far as the transportation question is concerned, whether an all-water route is best for this country, or a part-water or part-rail route. If we have the Port Colborne harbour equipped as the Government propose to equip it, to give us 20 feet of water in the harbour, and to build a breakwater to protect large lake carriers, we will have an all-water route from Duluth, or Port Arthur, straight to Montreal, when the lower canals are finished. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) has referred to the statement made by the Hon. Senator McCallum in the Senate regarding the cost of these improvements. The hon. Senator's scheme is, that a canal should be built from Port Maitland. Of course, he is interested—I do not say, personally—but it is right in the constituency of Monck. In order to carry out that plan, as has been shown here in the House, it would involve the building of a new canal 20 miles long, and cost a great deal more than the Government propose to expend at Port Colborne. As to the matter of elevators, I do not know what the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) has promised. My own opinion is, that the Government should build these elevators, and own them, and not allow them to be placed under the control of any company or private individual, who might be able to hinder trade for considerations of private gain. Of course, it would cost money. I have nothing to say in that regard particularly, but my own opinion is, and the opinion of the people that I represent is, that the Government should build, own and control the elevators there. I do not think there should be any objection taken to this vote, because, as a matter of fact, all Governments in our country have committed themselves to this expenditure on the Welland Canal during many years past. Over \$25,000,000 have already been expended on the Welland Canal, and we have spent upwards of \$80,000,000 on the canal system. Now, when we need probably

a million dollars, or a little more, in order to complete this work, I think that no objection should be taken to it.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, I should just like to add a few words to what has been said by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary). I quite agree with what he said in regard to improving the harbour facilities at Port Colborne. We who live in the Niagara Peninsula know the necessity of improving the Welland Canal, and at no time in the history of Canada is the Welland Canal of more importance to the prosperity of the country than at the present moment, in view of the fact that the other canals are approaching completion. Now, I am not in the confidence of the Government as to whether they intend to erect elevators or not, but there is one thing I think I can point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that apart from any consideration whatever the first duty of the Government is, in my opinion, to improve the entrance to Port Colborne harbour for larger or smaller craft. At Sugar Loaf Point, a distance of one mile from the present piers of Port Colborne, there is a very shallow reef of limestone. This ought to be removed if nothing else is done, because, as the hon. member for Welland has pointed out, a large number of vessels in stormy weather have to run to Buffalo and discharge their cargoes that were intended for the Welland Canal, and I venture to say if the reef itself was removed there would be stone enough got out of that with the deepening of the harbour to fill a breakwater of sufficient size to run the length proposed by the Government. Whether the policy of the Government in building elevators is one which they intend to take up or not, I would just like to call the attention of the House for one moment to show you how this feature of business is looked upon in the city of Buffalo, where they have so many elevators. The return of the Board of Trade in the city of Buffalo, 1898, states:

The amount of grain, including flour, shipped from the upper end of Lake Superior to the seaboard in 1898 was, as stated by the returns of the Board of Trade of the city of Buffalo, 123,419,573 bushels. Of this large amount only 1,500,000 bushels passed through the Welland Canal.

In 1896 the value of American craft passing through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal was \$43,006,200; Canadian craft, \$2,135,300. The proportion of freight carried by our Canadian vessels was 4 per cent.

In 1897, 17,600,000 bushels of grain were shipped by the Canadian Pacific Railway from Fort William, of which 12,928,000 went by the way of Buffalo, and only 2,000,000 via Montreal to the seaboard.

Mr. Thompson, of Duluth, states that a vessel can carry 2,700 tons of freight through the Ste. Marie Canals and make the run from Duluth in 3½ days, and cost, on an average of \$120 per day—Duluth to Buffalo is 1,000 miles—and turning this into figures, it means that 15 one-thousandths of a cent per ton per mile for carrying freight on the Great Lakes is the actual cost;

that is to say, the steamers do for \$10 what it costs the railways \$27 to do.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if this statement of Mr. Thompson, which I have no reason to doubt, is correct, I think this House will see the importance of making the harbour of Port Colborne of such a character as to receive not only the smaller craft, but the larger craft on our inland waters, and without going to the expense of building elevators of a permanent character, you could have those floating elevators like what are used in Buffalo almost every day. In Buffalo they have forty ordinary elevators and six transfer towers and eight floating towers, and the latter have no storage capacity at all so that if the larger vessels coming down from the upper lakes had sufficient accommodation at Port Colborne, these elevators could transfer to our fourteen-foot vessels for our lower lakes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman permit me? Could those floating elevators be used?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, they use them in Buffalo harbour, even if the Government do not go to the expense of building elevators of a permanent character they could, at least, hire those floating elevators to do the work at so much a bushel, but I quite agree with my hon. friend from Welland in what he said. I would like to point out to the Government the danger of elevators becoming the property of private individuals. It would be quite within the mark for any company in Buffalo to erect an immense elevator in the harbour of Port Colborne, getting a site from the Government and getting one also in Montreal, or even if not in the city of Montreal so long as they have the accommodation in the harbour of Port Colborne they could practically tie up all the work the Government had done by charging such excessive tolls for the elevating the grain; and those vessels would be obliged to go to Buffalo and transfer by way of the Erie Canal. So I say in the interest of the country it would be well for the Government not to give any right to elevate the grain. My own candid opinion is that after the harbour of Port Colborne is completed, if there is a necessity for elevators, transfer the grain out of larger vessels into the smaller ones—they should be the property of the Government—and if elevators for storage purposes are required, they should be built by the Government, and the smallest charge should be made. Now, we find in Buffalo alone with the forty elevators, which my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) spoke about, the six transfer towers and the eight floating towers. The latter have no storage capacity, however. The capacity of the whole is 21,000,000 bushels of grain and cost about \$13,000,000, and they can transfer in 24 hours 5½ millions of grain. The Canadian Pacific Railway have four

Mr. GIBSON.

elevators at Fort William with a capacity of 5½ millions, and can transfer 40,000 bushels per hour. Now, Sir, what would be the advantage to the Dominion of Canada by having an all-Canadian route to the seaboard? The distance from Port Arthur to Port Colborne is 825 miles; from Port Arthur to Buffalo, 870 miles, or a distance of 18 miles in favour of the harbour on the Welland Canal. From Port Colborne to Montreal 375 miles, and the distance from Buffalo to New York by the Erie Canal is 495 miles, or a distance in favour of the Welland Canal route of 120 miles. From Montreal to Liverpool the distance is 2,800 miles, and from New York to Liverpool, 3,080, or the distance in favour of the Welland Canal route of 280 miles. In short, from Port Arthur to Liverpool by the Welland Canal route is 4,027 miles, and from Port Arthur to Liverpool via New York would be 4,446 miles, or a distance in favour of the Canadian route of 418 miles. When you take it from Port Arthur or take the grain from Duluth or Chicago by Port Colborne in the Welland Canal, you have in each and every case the advantage of 419 miles and the advantage of the whole grain trade of the west being shipped through our own canals, by our own people and in Canadian vessels. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I think the Government are justified and I do not live in that county. I quite agree with every word that my hon. friend who represents the county of Welland says, apart from every political consideration. I think it would be wise for the Government to complete this canal system by increasing the harbour accommodation at the town of Port Colborne, and by erecting a breakwater there of sufficient length to reach out to Sugar Loaf Ridge. The Government should see that contracts are let without delay, so that in the future vessels instead of running past the harbour of Port Colborne in stormy weather they should make the harbour instead of running for Buffalo.

Mr. BENNETT. When the question was first introduced it was the opinion of the House that the Government was simply asking for the construction of a breakwater at the entrance of Port Colborne to meet the present trade, but as the discussion proceeded and the different facts were presented, it is now clear that the Government are about to embark upon a very large expenditure, and the first earnest of that is that in the current year there is to be expended at least half a million dollars. The Government should take the House and the country into their confidence as to what they propose to do in regard to this great question of transportation. The hon. members from Toronto and from other parts of western Ontario have been formulating a scheme for carrying grain from the waters of the Georgian Bay to Toronto by rail, and then shipping by water from Toronto to

Montreal. It has been stated in the press that the intention of the present Government is to purchase what is known as the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway, in order to carry grain from the western states by water to Parry Sound, and then by rail from Parry Sound to Montreal, and there ship it in vessels to the old country. To-night, however, both of these propositions may be said to be set at naught by the Government, which proposes to endeavour to build up a trade by means of the largest possible grain vessels on the great lakes going to Port Colborne, and there to tranship into smaller vessels to pass through the Welland Canal and on to Montreal. Let us consider that proposition. I admit that if you had to-day at Port Colborne a depth of water of from 20 to 22 feet, you would be able to accommodate these large vessels capable of carrying from 150,000 to 200,000 bushels of grain, and these vessels would be able to discharge their cargoes at Port Colborne into smaller vessels capable of carrying 70,000 or 75,000 bushels to the port of Montreal. This is the proposition which the Government have announced to-day, as I understand it, because it cannot be possible that they intend to spend this \$500,000 at Port Colborne when the present trade is accommodated by the facilities there now. The proposition is to endeavour to fight every other possible grain route on the upper lakes by this proposed route to Port Colborne. It means that all the carrying trade going to-day to Kingston and Prescott, where elevators have been established by private capital, is to be killed off at once and for ever; because if large vessels go to Port Colborne and discharge their cargoes there, there will be no breaking of bulk at Kingston or at Prescott. Then it means that though Mr. Booth has built a railway at great cost, with the hope of establishing a large grain trade from Parry Sound to Montreal, the public funds of Canada are to be expended to kill off his enterprise. It means further that although the Government have extended the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, they are going to give up for all time to come the prospect of having a paying grain trade on the Intercolonial east from Montreal, because if the grain trade is all to go by way of Port Colborne to Montreal, it will be shipped at the latter port into vessels for the old country, and the Intercolonial system of railway would only have the carrying of any grain that might remain in elevators at the close of the season, when navigation from Montreal to the sea is at an end. It also means that while the Grand Trunk have a line of railway through from Montreal to the town of Midland, where they have established two large elevators, that route, too, is to be fought by the Dominion; and while I do not wish to view this question from a sectional point of view, I say it behooves the Government to consider well whether or not it is going to pay the country as a whole to en-

bark in this large expenditure in order to fight private capital which is already invested. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) and the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), both lay down this proposition—that if we have deep water in Port Colborne harbour, with the necessary break-water which must be constructed there, we may hope to be able successfully to fight the trade going to Buffalo. On that point I join issue with the hon. gentlemen. The real advantages which Buffalo has are not in carrying the grain trade from Buffalo to New York by water, but in the fact that there are seven lines of railway running from Buffalo direct to New York, which, with the keen competition among them, succeed, in conjunction with the upper-lake craft, in giving a cheaper rate than the present rate to Montreal. Therefore, I contend, in view of past events, that you cannot successfully fight the Buffalo trade by the proposition now before the House. Moreover, this must be remembered, that we have to-day a water route from Lake Superior through to Montreal, with vessels capable of carrying 75,000 bushels from Duluth, Fort William and other points through to Kingston and Prescott, where they in turn discharge into barges capable of carrying from 25,000 to 40,000 bushels; and, with the enlargement of the St. Lawrence canals to 14 feet of water, there will be a possibility of carrying grain from Fort William and other ports on the great lakes in vessels capable of carrying from 60,000 to 70,000 bushels through to Montreal. What does this huge expenditure mean? It means that while we are unable to kill off the Buffalo trade or to get even a small proportion of the Buffalo trade, we think that by being able to bring vessels carrying 200,000 bushels to Port Colborne we are going to overcome the difficulty. I am not going to give my opinion on that point, because it requires the ideas and opinions of men who have made a special study of the question. But it is admitted to-day that the small quantity of grain that goes to the port of Montreal via the Welland and St. Lawrence canals is due to the fact that the port of Montreal is not open as long as the port of New York, and that we have not the return freight from Europe to Montreal that they have to New York; and when this House is asked to commit itself at the outset to an expenditure of \$500,000, is to be followed up by the erection of elevators and the provision of storage facilities for the transportation of grain, the House is virtually admitting that the proposition to deepen the St. Lawrence canals to 14 feet is regarded as an assured failure.

We are confronted with this admission by the Government that this scheme of bringing 75,000 bushel barges to Kingston, and then discharging them into 40,000 bushel barges, to be carried in 14 feet of water down the St. Lawrence canals, or of bring-

ing 50,000 bushel barges from the upper lake ports clean through to Montreal, which the present Government and the past Governments believed would be a success, is a failure. We were told in years past by those interested in transportation that once 14 feet of water was obtained through these canals we would be able to carry 50,000 or 60,000 bushel barges through to Montreal, and we would be able to overcome the rivalry of the Buffalo route. But what has experience proved? I have not got the figures of the amount of grain handled at Prescott and Kingston last year, but I believe I am within the mark when I say that not more than 10,000,000 bushels of grain were handled last year at Kingston and at Prescott. That is to say, we had those vessels carrying 50,000 to 75,000 bushels of grain, and of course smaller vessels also, which transferred their cargoes at Kingston and Prescott into smaller barges that went down to Montreal, and yet only 10,000,000 bushels practically were handled this way in the whole season of last year. I may be incorrect in those figures, but I think I am pretty near the mark. Taking as a basis, that 10,000,000 bushels of grain went through the St. Lawrence canals last year, what do the Government say of this route? They say that it has been a failure, and that we cannot hope, under present conditions, to expect to handle in this way any more than 10,000,000 bushels, but, they say, if you afford us facilities to bring to Port Colborne the largest vessels, carrying 200,000 to 300,000 bushels, and then transfer their cargoes to smaller boats to go through the Welland Canal to Montreal, we may be able to successfully cope with the Buffalo trade. What does the experience of the past prove? It proves that the St. Lawrence canal route has not been a success, and let me tell the House this, that last year, although it was the first season of Mr. Booth's line, he carried as much grain over the Parry Sound Railway as was carried down the Welland Canal, about 10,000,000 bushels. And I see it stated in the public prints, and believe the statement to be correct, that on Mr. Booth's line, over 6,000,000 bushels of grain have been carried the present season; and I am within the mark when I say that the Grand Trunk Railway have carried from Midland to Montreal in the present season, upwards of 7,000,000 bushels. This all goes to prove that to-day on this rail route to Montreal, from points on the upper lakes, there has been carried, in this the dullest part of the season, upwards of 13,000,000 bushels over both these lines, and hon. gentlemen must remember that it is in the fall that the grain trade increases. I know that it is now expected by the Grand Trunk Railway that they will carry from the port of Midland alone 20,000,000 bushels this year, and I have heard the statement made that Mr. Booth's line will carry an equal amount.

Mr. BENNETT.

If 40,000,000 bushels of grain are to be carried by these two lines of railway from points on the Georgian Bay to Montreal, and only 10,000,000 bushels down the Welland Canal and afterwards down the St. Lawrence canals, what is the House to think about this new proposition? If the House votes this large sum of half a million dollars, it means that the Government are simply admitting the failure of the present arrangement, and are declaring that by changing the system and having larger vessels going to Port Colborne, they may be able to carry something cheaper than in the past and as a result be able to cope with the Buffalo trade. The greatest competitors to-day of the Buffalo trade are the Grand Trunk Railway line from Midland to Montreal and the Parry Sound line from Parry Sound to Montreal, because they have shown that in the past year they carried nearly 20,000,000 between the two, and are justified in expecting this year to carry 40,000,000 between the two. Viewing the matter in this light, I submit that the Government should carefully weigh this proposition before embarking on this enterprise and spending half a million dollars. It is quite plain, judging by the large trade that has gone through Port Colborne in years past, that there is no absolute necessity to-day for the construction of this breakwater. It has been urged that there are some boulders and shoals at the entrance of the harbour, and these should be removed as quickly as possible; but if the trade at Port Colborne has gone on successfully for the past twenty years without the construction of this expensive breakwater, why should its construction be undertaken at present? If the vessels that to-day are going there are accommodated—and they must be or they would not go there—why then the necessity of doing this large amount of dredging, the cost of which is estimated at \$350,000, and the construction of this expensive breakwater. I submit, in view of the fact that the Government have coupled the two estimates together, and that the intended expenditure in this regard is to be half a million dollars for this year alone—

Mr. GIBSON. What would you propose in place of the Welland Canal route?

Mr. BENNETT. Nothing can be suggested in place of the Welland Canal.

Mr. GIBSON. The Welland Canal route, I mean.

Mr. BENNETT. My argument has been this, and I am sorry if I did not make myself plain, that the Welland Canal demonstrated last year that it could only attract an annual trade of about 10,000,000 bushels, and I think I am correct, because I am taking the figures of the grain transhipped to Kingston.

Mr. GIBSON. 15,000,000 or 16,000,000 bushels.

Mr. BENNETT. I spoke subject to correction, but admitting that 15,000,000 bushels of grain were carried by way of the Welland Canal and the St. Lawrence canals because that would be transhipped in turn at Kingston and at Prescott, then it follows that in one season the trade over the Parry Sound Railway almost ran up to that amount, because 10,000,000 bushels of grain were carried over the Parry Sound Railway last year, and it is expected by the Grand Trunk Railway that they will carry 20,000,000 bushels this year from Midland to Montreal.

I am not speaking of this question from a sectional point of view but on the large question of transportation. I have referred to the Toronto scheme of railway from Georgian Bay, and the Government, while they have not promised active assistance, are certainly lending their ear to the proposition of the Ottawa Ship Canal. It should be the policy of Parliament to settle at once and for all what is to be accepted as the state transportation system. If it is to be by way of the Welland Canal, I suppose this must of necessity follow as an adjunct. If it is to be by way of the Ottawa Ship Canal, this should be laid to one side. If, on the other hand, the Government intend to stand to one side and let private enterprise, like the Parry Sound and Grand Trunk Railway do the transportation, it is inopportune for the Government at present to embark on this large enterprise until they have a settled line of policy. It cannot be contended that the present expenditures are indispensable, because there is at present a trade to the Welland Canal of 15,000,000 bushels. Therefore, there is no necessity for deepening the entrance of Port Colborne; therefore, there is no necessity to construct this breakwater. The trade that has been done in the past will be done in the future on the present facilities. But if the Government commits itself to this proposition, they virtually admit that to-day, with 14 feet of water to Montreal they do not hope successfully to compete with the other routes; but they do hope by getting the large vessels to Port Colborne and taking the grain there by smaller vessels to Montreal, that they will be able to compete successfully with Buffalo for the large grain trade of the west, which, I am glad to say, is increasing year by year.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the Minister of Finance given us an outline of the whole scheme proposed? Because, it has been rumoured that the scheme included not only the making of a harbour but the building of elevators, and that the Government intended to propose some scheme by which parties who provided capital for building elevators, should be supported, to a limited extent, by the Government. Is that contemplated?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Nothing is contemplated beyond the works that have been announced. Of course, there are various plans and propositions and suggestions in regard to Port Colborne, involving large sums, and, in relation to another port, much larger sums. But we set these aside. It is not proposed to do anything with the matter of elevators.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I appreciate the loyalty displayed by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), and the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary), to the constituencies they represent, through each of which the Welland Canal runs. I do not say that they do not take a larger view of the question than the local one, but we cannot but admire the loyalty with which they defend the expenditure of a large sum of money on the Welland Canal. It has been stated that an hon. gentleman who spoke in another place on this subject was influenced solely by the locality in which he lived. I think that if his speech, to which the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) referred, is read, it will be seen that he did not take that position, but took the position, which was already taken by some of us in this House, that if the money is to be spent, it should be spent in a way to secure the best possible returns to the country. If that is a mere local and narrow neighbourhood view, the word has a definition with which I am not familiar. As regards myself, just a word was dropped by the Minister of Finance in his closing sentence, in which he said that while there would be a large expenditure here, the expenditure would be larger at another point.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was not referring to my hon. friend (Mr. Montague).

Mr. MONTAGUE. I may remind my hon. friends from Lincoln and Welland that my constituency runs almost to within a stone's-throw from Port Colborne. And, consequently, I might, if local reasons only were to influence me. I could offer no objection to an expenditure so near my riding.

Mr. GIBSON. You would rather have it at Port Maitland?

Mr. MONTAGUE. But that is not the question. The question is whether this sum of money can be spent profitably to the country, and whether, after it is spent, what is expected to be gained by the expenditure will be gained. It is well known that expenditures have been made—and I am not going to say that this is true only of one Government or of another—expenditures have been made in connection with these canals that have not turned out to be of financial or trade advantage to Canada generally. We are all agreed upon the point that, if the Welland Canal is to be a success in attracting a larger trade from the lakes, it must have a proper harbour, and the question to decide is whether we are going to have a

proper harbour by the expenditure of this \$150,000 and the \$350,000 to be spent under the Railway Department. I am here to say—not that I have expert knowledge on the question, but I am advised by those who have expert knowledge—that the expenditure of that sum will not attract these larger boats on the lakes, that it will not attract this increased shipping.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Would it not attract a reasonable portion of the trade if the route is cheaper?

Mr. MONTAGUE. It will attract a reasonable proportion of the trade, if the expenditure is reasonably successful in getting a good harbour. If the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) will assure me that it will do so, I will give him an answer.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will not the grain take the cheaper route, if it is practicable?

Mr. MONTAGUE. It remains to be seen whether it is cheaper and as safe. If the route is cheaper, but is not safe, it will not be followed. You might absolutely do away with the charges on the Welland Canal, but if you did not provide a safe harbour of entrance, you would not attract a vessel there of increased size.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then, the cheapness of the route does not enter into the question unless we have convinced ourselves that by the expenditure of this sum of money, or whatever sum they propose to spend, a safe harbour will be provided. I have read very carefully both the long report dealing with the larger scheme, and the mere private memorandum, which the hon. gentleman was kind enough to send me, and I fail to find any report by any engineer which says that this expenditure of \$150,000 taken away from the expenditures proposed on the larger plan—which calls for an expenditure of \$5,500,000 to complete the scheme—will be a great advantage to navigation. If the hon. gentleman has such a report, it is his duty to give it to us. In my judgment, the hon. gentleman has simply picked out one of the items which is proposed in that large report, he has picked it out for this year, and in the following years we shall have the other items picked out to the tune of \$5,500,000 before this work is completed and before hon. gentlemen opposite will be able to pretend that they have completed a good harbour at Port Colborne. The hon. gentleman admits that there is a rocky bed outside Port Colborne harbour. Will the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) tell me how you can have a successful harbour without some anchorage facilities outside? There are no anchorage facilities there whatever. You may expend as many millions as you like,

Mr. MONTAGUE.

but you will never be able outside of Port Colborne harbour to anchor a ship. Then, will you tell me this: Are you going to be able to attract the larger boats from the lakes without a harbour of refuge at Port Colborne? How many boats can you put in now, even if you construct this breakwater? How many boats can you put in to the entrance of the canal?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With a breakwater, you can put every boat on the upper lakes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman would not say that if he was dealing with shipping of his own, he would want more careful protection and better facilities than a mere breakwater hung up in the lake would give to the shipping such as the hon. gentleman expects to attract to that port. If he is going to attract the trade of the larger and more valuable boats that ply on the lake, he will have to have a harbour of refuge, and the only way he can have it will be by the expenditure of \$2,500,000 for blasting out all that area between the breakwater constructed from Sugar Loaf Point out into the lake and the present pier at Port Colborne. That expenditure will be \$2,500,000 as set forth in the report from which I quote these figures to the House. Now, the next point is: How are you going to attract these boats without dockage facilities? Have you got it? You certainly have not. You may build this breakwater twice its length, but you must give additional facilities. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) will not deny what I am stating; and without these dockage facilities you will be unable to attract these larger boats from the lake. Then we are told by the acting Minister of Public Works that he does not propose to enter into the erection and construction of elevators. Now, without these elevators all the scheme of bringing larger boats there, and of transferring the cargoes into smaller boats and taking them through the canal must fail. The Postmaster General tells me: Let private individuals spend that money. But the member for Lincoln rises immediately in his place and says it won't do for private individuals to spend this money, because they will tax the trade too much by their elevator charges, and that will ruin the route altogether. There is a good deal of sense in the argument of the member for Lincoln, and the more sense there is in it, and the more force there is in it, the more it lends strength and force to the argument I am making, that this scheme must be taken in toto as advised by the engineer of the Department of Public Works, and if taken as he advises, it eventually places upon the treasury of Canada a burden of \$5,500,000. Now, then, the member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) says that is all right. Let us understand it then, let us not be sailing under false colours, and let the Minister, if

he means that, and let the Government, if they mean that, state openly to this Parliament, which votes the money, whether in the end we will be required to spend \$5,500,000 instead of \$150,000 for the construction of a mere breakwater.

Now, then, another point. One hon. gentleman has referred to the work in connection with the harbour at Port Maitland. The whole point is where we shall get the best harbour and the best returns. I am not here to advocate the claims of Port Maitland, unless the claims of Port Maitland are far and away above the claims of Port Colborne as a safe and proper harbour. A report has been made upon Port Maitland, and I will only say this, that after reading that report I have come to the conclusion that somewhere in the neighbourhood of Port Maitland, on the day that that report was made, there was a little bird whose nest is built somewhere around the harbour of Port Colborne, for there is an amount of information which I do not think, of his own opportunity or privilege, the engineer, who I know very well and who is a very excellent man—there is a lot of information there which it seems to me must have been gratuitously given to him and prepared for him, or it never would have been collected exactly at that time and by him for the purpose. Now, what are the facts? I think we have an admission, and we will have an admission now, I fancy, by the member for Lincoln and the member for Welland, that a mistake was made originally when the Welland Canal was constructed. It should have been constructed from Port Maitland, it should have been constructed there by reason of the fact that there was a good harbour, that there was no rock to blast, that the cutting was all of mud. The question is now, and I am only raising that point in a general way, whether it is even yet not too late to correct the mistake which has been made. What do we have? We will have, if the expenditure is made at Port Maitland, an expenditure of less than this sum required at Port Colborne for the harbour at Port Maitland, elevators, the wharfs and in addition the deepening of the feeder to Welland Junction and not more, as the Minister of Finance says, an expenditure of a good deal less according to the engineer's report; and if the hon. Senator McCallum's figures are to be taken, and he is a man who thoroughly understands whereof he speaks, we would have an expenditure a vast deal less, and we would have a splendid harbour, we would have a natural harbour, and we would have much better facilities, I am told, than will be provided at Port Colborne, even by the expenditure of this large sum of money. I am not here to advocate the special claims of Port Maitland, unless it is shown by the best evidence that it is the proper place to spend the money. I am here merely to ask the information for the House and for the

country as to whether it is proposed to expend \$5,500,000 at Port Colborne before this work will be completed. I am here to say again that my information is, and I am only relying upon the information of those whose knowledge is good, my information is that unless you build docks, that unless you build elevators, unless you make a harbour of refuge, the mere construction of a pier at Port Colborne to cost \$250,000 or \$300,000 will be largely a waste of the money, and if it is a waste of the money, I am sure there is no hon. gentleman in this House who wants to vote it. If it is going to give a good service and a return for the money, I am just as willing to vote it as any other hon. gentleman.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. gentleman says that the building of a harbour at Port Colborne was a mistake. I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that this mistake has been in operation for a good many years, nearly a century since the commencement of the old original canal. Now, I am sure that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) and the Senator whom he has mentioned were members of the Conservative party, and the hon. member for Haldimand in this House, and the Senator, either here or in the Senate, when the enlargement of the Welland Canal took place, were in the confidence of the Government of that day; and the route from Port Maitland had been, as the hon. gentleman desires this House to believe, the best route and the cheapest, and best increasing the facilities of the Welland Canal. I think that the gentleman who presided over the Department of Railways and Canals, the late Mr. John Page, would have seen that route long ago, without either the hon. gentleman or Senator McCallum calling his attention to it. Now, he started out by criticising the member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) and myself simply because we had advocated the enlargement of Port Colborne harbour. Now, the hon. gentleman said that we should be above localities.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No; I said I had no doubt the hon. gentleman was above localities.

Mr. GIBSON. But he immediately sailed in to advocate throughout his speech the enlargement of the Welland Canal via Port Maitland, and that has been his whole theme from beginning to end. The expenditure of this money in Port Colborne, he says, is backed up by the member for Welland and myself, and he admires us for our loyalty. Now, I may say it makes no difference whatever to me, so far as I am personally concerned in the county of Welland; but I am free to say that as the harbour of Port Colborne has cost a million dollars, and as the harbour of Port Colborne alone now requires to be deepened, I am sure that after all the expenditure of \$25,000,000 to increase the Welland Canal to a further

depth of water, it would simply be the work of a lifetime. The most practical feature of the case is, and the one which can be most readily accomplished in order to increase the carrying capacity of our inland waters, is to take steps without delay to deepen the harbour of Port Colborne so as to admit of the larger craft which is now sailing in our inland waters. I am prepared to say that, had the engineers of the Government of twenty-five or thirty years ago foreseen the increased capacity of our inland shipping, greater provision would have made in the canals, particularly in the Welland Canal. When the locks were built from Port Dalhousie up to the summit level at Thorold, and when lock 24 was completed by the Government of the late Sir John Macdonald, it was considered that 12 feet of water was all that ever would be required for our inland navigation. But every hon. gentleman who has gone through the canals, knows that, no matter how large the locks may be built, vessels are immediately built to fill the locks. The locks of the Welland Canal, which are 274 feet long within the gates, 40 feet wide and 14 feet in depth, are called locks of the regulation size. The hon. gentleman knows very well that when the aqueduct was built, it was built to give 14 feet of water on the mitre sill, and we know that from time to time silt enters the harbour at Port Colborne. When the report was made by those who went up to examine Port Colborne harbour, there was only 13·87 feet of water in that harbour; so that, even apart from the larger scheme, there is the necessity at the present moment of giving increased facilities to shipping at Port Colborne harbour. But what my hon. friend knows, and what every gentleman who resides in that locality knows, is that the reef outside of the harbour of Port Colborne is a danger to navigation. There is no difficulty about the harbour itself, except that a greater depth of water is required; but the danger lies in this shoal or ridge, which is about a mile outside of the harbour. In ordinary weather the water is sufficiently deep to carry any inland craft over it, but we know that in a heavy sea a vessel rises and falls eight or ten feet, and there is danger of breaking the back of the vessel while crossing this reef in stormy weather. The Government was waited upon by one of the most intelligent delegations that ever came before it. It was headed by Capt. Carter, and composed of gentlemen largely interested in our inland shipping, and they impressed upon the Government the great need for the removal of this obstruction at Port Colborne harbour.

Mr. CLARKE. What would it cost?

Mr. GIBSON. As I understand, the whole matter, without allowing anything at all for the elevator—

Mr. GIBSON.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the hon. gentleman understand that this work is proposed to be done out of this vote?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As I understand it, they will require another vote of \$275,000.

Mr. GIBSON. I do not think that \$350,000 would build the pier out to the ridge, and remove the reef.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is not proposed to be done; so that the construction of this breakwater does not remove the difficulty in connection with Port Colborne harbour. The hon. gentleman's own memorandum points out that, in addition to the \$350,000 that is to be spent in the canal, in addition to the \$250,000 or \$300,000 that is to be spent for the breakwater, it will require \$275,000 for the removal of the reef that the hon. gentleman refers to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not strictly correct. What is proposed to be done by the Department of Railways and Canals will give 20 feet of water right into the canal, even if the other dredging is not done at all.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What width will the channel be?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Four hundred feet in width, at least.

Mr. GIBSON. From an economic standpoint, or from a contractor's standpoint, I would advise the Government—and I have given them no advice in the matter at all—to build, in connection with the work, a subaqueous blasting wharf, in which the debris from the blasting of the rock might be filled into the cribs, instead of being carried out and dumped into the lake at deep water, so that the whole of that crib filling could be done at a nominal cost, while it would cost a large sum of money to carry the rock out into deep water. My hon. friend doubts the necessity of building a harbour of refuge. I am not going into the question of a harbour of refuge, but I say there is an absolute necessity of building a pier out to that reef. As I said before, when I spoke upon this question, I cared not whether the Government went into the larger question of elevators or not, but I wished them to do one thing immediately, and that was, that they should deepen the harbour of Port Colborne, and that they should deepen the entrance, which is obstructed by that limestone ridge.

Mr. WALLACE. Is that outside of the breakwater?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, the present breakwater.

Mr. WALLACE. No, I mean the proposed breakwater.

Mr. GIBSON. It would not be outside of it.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the removal of that ridge cost \$350,000 more?

Mr. GIBSON. I never went into the figures further than this, that when the present hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was making a tour of the Welland Canal, the question of lighterage came up between himself and Mr. Thompson, the superintending engineer. I have no doubt that the hon. member for York is aware of the fact that a considerable amount of lighterage is being done by the Grand Trunk Railway between Port Colborne and Port Dalhousie, and that in order to save the expense of that, it is desirable that large lake crafts which come from Chicago, Duluth and Port Arthur, should be able to go into Port Colborne harbour and have their cargoes transferred to vessels drawing 14 feet of water. It was pointed out then that these vessels could not make Port Colborne harbour in stormy weather, and that, in order that they should be allowed to come in, that ridge will have to be removed. My hon. friend spoke about the fact of Port Colborne harbour having been in use without this ridge being removed. I wish him to understand that none of these craft has ever been brought into Port Colborne harbour with a full cargo. None of these vessels have been laid down in 14 feet draught of water. Now, the larger vessels are drawing from 18 to 19 feet of water, just deep enough to cross the mitre sill of the lock on the Sault Canal. It is for the purpose of bringing this craft into Port Colborne, if I understand the question aright—

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the larger vessels, drawing 18 feet of water are going in there?

Mr. GIBSON. No, they cannot at Port Colborne. I say it is for the purpose of bringing the larger vessels into Port Colborne that this proposition of the Government to deepen the harbour, and to remove the reef, is made. I am sure I tried to point out to my hon. friend just as well as I could.

Mr. WALLACE. How far is that bridge he speaks of from the shore?

Mr. GIBSON. It is from the point of the present breakwater—about a mile.

Mr. WALLACE. It is outside the breakwater?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, about a mile.

Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand the Minister to say that this expenditure of \$250,000 is intended to be expended on the cribwork which extends to Sugar Loaf Point?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. That is what I understood from the Minister, and the \$350,000 is

intended to be expended on building of a lock at Port Colborne on the Welland Canal.

Mr. WALLACE. How do you deepen at the breakwater which he intends to utilize?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The breakwater is in deep water.

Mr. HAGGART. There is the new one to be constructed from Sugar Loaf Point. I understand the expenditure by the Railway Department is for the purpose of deepening the canal from the lake up to the mouth of the lock at the mouth of Port Colborne, and he would need a depth of 21 feet to utilize this part of the cribwork which he intends to build. There is only a very small distance which is navigable at 21 feet, the rest is 17 feet and 14 feet.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is 20 feet of water where the cribwork starts.

Mr. HAGGART. My argument is that it would be entirely useless to expend \$250,000 on a breakwater unless you intend to do the dredging up to the extent of 21 feet. The hon. the Postmaster General says that the depth of the water beside the breakwater is 21 feet. True, it is for a short distance, but for such a short distance it would be impossible to utilize it. The only possible use for the breakwater is that vessels drawing 21 feet of water could sail and take a turn to the right or left inside the breakwater, using the docks and utilizing the elevators there for the purpose of transferring the grain from heavy draft vessels into those of 14 feet. The expenditure at present will not do that. The Minister says it will be utilized entirely for the purpose of protecting vessels going into the canal of 20 feet draft. I deny that it is so. The object of the breakwater is for the purpose of protecting the vessels that lay in the docks.

Mr. GIBSON. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that there will be docks running out from the breakwater at right angles?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, that is the proposed plan. It is in the proposed plan submitted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the plan of a larger scheme which we are not able to go on with.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister says we are not pledged at all to this plan. That it is not to be taken into account in regard to this expenditure, and that his object is to build a breakwater which will be on an independent plan altogether. I say it is no use whatever for the purpose of vessels sheltering behind it and transferring their cargo to vessels of 14 feet, because to utilize it for that purpose you will have to dredge the inside up to 21 feet. You know the short distance between the locks and the mouth of the harbour, only a very few vessels can lie there. It would be impossible to put elevators there and have three or four

vessels transferring their cargo into smaller vessels. The engineer who proposed that saw the difficulty at once. Then, to dredge the harbour from the mouth of the locks out to the lake to the depth of 21 feet, he proposed to build a breakwater up to Sugar Loaf Point, and in order to do that the whole plan will have to be carried out.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, not at all. The hon. gentleman is reasoning rightly, but he is applying his reasoning rather beyond what is practicable, or what is intended or necessary. The hon. gentleman admits that inside of the breakwater will be an admirable place for the sheltering of vessels that are not unloading. That is correct. But he argues that there is not depth of water to enable them to do that. That is where his reasoning is wrong. At present there is a depth of some twenty feet of water at the easterly point of the proposed breakwater. That depth extends westerly at present some 600 feet, the engineer informs me. The plan will show what the width of that depth of water is. There will be a large amount of filling required for the cribwork, and that will be obtained by the deepening of the harbour at the same time. In that way the deepening of the harbour will do the double service.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where does the hon. gentleman propose to take the rock out?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I should think the contractor for the building of the pier would be required, as part of the contract, to deepen where it would be necessary in order to make the most effective use of the pier for the purposes of shelter, in case the vessels do not proceed to the entrance of the canal to unload. I am told that the whole amount of the excavation of the harbour would be required to supply stone for the cribwork and the pier at the entrance and all harbour improvements; but it is not necessary to do it all in order to build that pier. By excavating sufficient to fill the crib, you provide plenty of sea-room alongside for vessels to come in and lie at harbour, and it becomes available pro tanto as a sheltering place for vessels.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that it would be necessary to blast all that out to fill the breakwater and pier? Does he know the estimated cost of it? It is \$2,500,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not care if it is \$500,000,000, for we have not adopted the plan involving such expenditure. The fact is that the filling would utilize, if necessary all the excavation you would have to make in order to get twenty feet of water. But I am not saying that it is necessary to deepen to twenty feet the whole 480 acres to be inclosed in the breakwater.

Mr. HAGGART.

If the development of the trade warrants it, future Governments will hereafter deal with that matter the same as Governments have dealt with the Welland Canal system in the past. The present work is absolutely necessary.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Have you an engineer's report to show the value of that breakwater to the harbour? The hon. gentleman has not a line from an engineer to show its value. We have asked for it time and again.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All the same, the engineer says that that block will be of substantial value as a protection to the entrance of the harbour.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman knows that an off-hand opinion is one thing, and a well-reasoned report is another thing.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will read one passage.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is private information for the Minister.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is a statement for the guidance of the Minister, made by the engineer of the department, Mr. Lafleur.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the date of that report?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is dated to-day.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman will not ask the House to accept that as a report.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The engineer says:

If the present appropriation for \$150,000 is applied solely to the construction of the breakwater, it would build about 1,700 feet of its outer end, which would be of utility even if not further extended, as a protection to the entrance of the Welland Canal.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is a pretty strong report, is it not?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It states the point. If it were a thousand folios, it would not be any more valuable. It is not the length of the report that makes it valuable.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman says he has a report from the officers of the department, that the breakwater can be utilized up to 600 feet. We have surveys of every portion of that here, and they show that the full extent that can be utilized is about 400 feet, and this would strike a depth of 12.4 feet, 15.7 feet, and 13.6 feet. The hon. gentleman is right in stating that it will take a great quantity of stone to build the breakwater. To do that profitably you must proceed at the same time with the excavation to a sufficient extent to fill the cribwork; but the hon. Minister does not propose that. Ho-

says it was not intended to utilize it. The Postmaster General says it can be used pro tanto for the purpose of transferring grain from vessels drawing twenty feet to vessels drawing fourteen feet. The hon. Minister says that this breakwater, even if not used for the purpose of transferring grain from a heavy-draft vessel to one of a lighter draft, would be useful for the protection of the harbour. Any one can see at a glance that it is not intended for any such purpose—that the only possible object of the breakwater is to make a harbour for the transfer of grain contemplated on the larger scale. The argument of my hon. friend is strictly correct that it is a useless expenditure of money unless it is contemplated for the larger scheme which the engineer proposed to the Minister of Public Works. This will be a useless expenditure of public money unless the larger scheme proposed by the engineers is proceeded with. There is no argument on the other side at all. Does the hon. Postmaster General think that a floating elevator could lie inside that breakwater and a large vessel lie along side from which could be transferred its cargo into the elevator. My hon. friend from Lincoln can tell him differently. The plan is only practicable as a complete plan for the purpose of transferring grain from heavy draft vessels to lighter ones, and if the hon. Minister of Finance asks for this expenditure of \$150,000, without having in contemplation the greater scheme, he is asking us to vote a useless expenditure.

Mr. WALLACE. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the various opinions about this expenditure on Port Colborne harbour. The hon. Postmaster General has told us many times over that this breakwater could be completed with an expenditure of \$280,000, under the one condition of things, or \$360,000 under another condition. But what we have failed to get yet, and what we ought to get, is the report of the engineers endorsing the scheme that the Government are proposing by this vote. The Government have absolutely no report of any engineer to justify the expenditure of this money. The nearest approach to any report from an engineer is that this expenditure of \$150,000, which the Postmaster General is advocating, would be of some utility. No doubt it would be of some utility, but is that a justification for the expenditure? The whole object of it is to make a harbour of refuge, and it may be desirable and necessary to provide a place where vessels can go in and unload a portion of their cargo and then go on their way through the Welland Canal, and load up when they get through, or where larger vessels can transfer their cargoes to smaller vessels. But in order to do that there must be two things. First, there must be substantial elevators, because you cannot always find a smaller vessel there into which to unload, and then

you must have a floating elevator to transfer a cargo from one vessel to another very rapidly and satisfactorily. In order to have this, you require a sheltered harbour. The hon. Postmaster General tells us that you can have a sheltered harbour with the breakwater he is advocating. I deny that proposition. I say that you cannot, by any possibility, have a sheltered harbour under the conditions stated by him. Here is a breakwater starting from Sugar Loaf Point, 5,700 feet, or one and one-twelfth mile, to a point where the Postmaster General says the water is 20 feet deep. Then, you travel back westward to Sugar Loaf Point, and he says you get a distance of 1,000 or 2,000 feet—the total distance is 5,700 feet—but if you travel back 1,000 to 2,000 feet, you may get a sufficiently good breakwater by an expenditure of \$150,000, to make a useful harbour. It cannot be done. But, Sir, it leaves a gap from the end of that Sugar Loaf Point of 4,000 feet or three-quarters of a mile of an open sea on an open coast. But he says that by putting in this little block of 1,700 feet, you are going to have satisfactory results, and that the report of the engineer says that it will be of some utility. Surely that is not what we are going to vote for. In order to build up a harbour where the cargoes of vessels can be transferred from the larger vessels to the smaller vessels, where vessels can be lightened, you must have elevator protection, which you have not got. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) tells us that outside of that there is a great ridge of rock. He says that the ridge of rock must be absolutely removed, because the danger to vessels through it is very great. The larger vessels could not go in at all, because the water is not sufficiently deep. Supposing you have this breakwater of 5,700 feet constructed, which the Government do not propose to do, but supposing you have that done, what do you find? 800 or 1,000 feet from the shore the average depth of the water is from three to four feet. I looked over the soundings, and I find some places two feet, and some two and a half, some three feet and four feet. Then, there is another ridge of 500 feet outside of that, which they propose to make ten feet deep, but it is on an average to-day not more than six feet, and so it goes on and this is all rock-bottom. Why, you would have to create a harbour there. From two feet and three feet you have to deepen it to twenty feet or more to make a safe harbour for the class of vessels now navigating the lakes with cargoes of 200,000 bushels, and a burden of 6,000 tons. You will require a navigation of from twenty to twenty-five feet in order to hold these vessels, and if you are going to do the trade there, if Port Colborne is going to be the distributing point where the cargoes will be unloaded from the large vessels to the smaller vessels you will require to have a place better than this where

large vessels can go in and unload, if they are careful, and deposit their cargo in an elevator or transfer it by a floating elevator to the smaller vessels that will go through the Welland Canal and the St. Lawrence Canals to Montreal. But this vote does not propose anything tangible. It is not a practical statement which would receive the endorsement of a single engineer. Therefore, when these hon. gentlemen come here asking, in the first place, for an expenditure of \$350,000 by the Department of Railways and Canals for a work which is neither a railway nor a canal, and of which we have the particulars now, I say that this expenditure will not produce tangible results. When they get the work, for, say, \$150,000, they will have a work the most that the engineer can say concerning which is that it will be of some utility. But, Sir, it will not be of sufficient utility to justify this expenditure. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Haldimand this expenditure is worth nothing unless it means the whole scheme to be carried out in its entirety with an expenditure at Port Colborne of between five and six millions of dollars. Of course, work of that magnitude would extend over a number of years, and we could not have the benefit of it for many years to come. It seems to me that the scheme is of very doubtful utility, more especially when it can be seen that Providence has designed a shorter route from the Georgian Bay across to Lake Ontario at or near the city of Toronto, by means of the Georgian Bay Canal, a double-track railroad or one of these schemes that have been promoted and pronounced feasible, which can be completed in one year and which will provide for the immediate interests of the country. The Government are plunging into an expenditure which will be utterly useless unless they supplement it with \$5,000,000 for these other works. In my opinion they are simply doing it with a view to an intended election. They are throwing the public money right and left and telling the people: See, what we are doing for this growing and prosperous country. Expenditure to be justified must be made with the knowledge of the work undertaken and must be carefully considered. But this scheme of devoting \$350,000 to removing part of the rocks—millions would not remove them sufficiently—and \$150,000 for making an almost useless breakwater, cannot be justified by the Government or by the Minister of Finance or the Postmaster General who have been advocating this scheme to-night without an adequate idea of what is involved.

Mr. BRITTON. This question is too important a one for me to let it go at all events without a word or two, though I do not desire to trouble the committee at this late hour. The question is whether this amount asked is really necessary to improve the har-

Mr. WALLACE.

bour at Port Colborne, to enable the Welland Canal to do the business it is calculated to do. If this work is necessary to give facilities to the trade which is done on the Welland Canal, I think it ought to be granted; if not, I think it ought not to be granted. The Minister of Finance tells us that, so far as it is now presented to the House, it is no part of this larger scheme that has been referred to so many times. I confess that it seems evident that the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) has the idea that it is part of a larger scheme, and that is certainly the opinion of many in this country—a scheme for providing elevators, and so on, involving a very large expenditure for the purpose of attempting to capture the whole trade of the St. Lawrence. If it is part of this larger scheme, so far as I have light at present, I should certainly oppose it; and I feel very strongly that if it is necessary, or partly necessary for the larger scheme, and if it is not absolutely necessary for the purpose of the trade as it is at present, or as it may be with the Welland Canal as it is and doing the business of the St. Lawrence as we are doing it, the Government ought to hesitate before spending this money. I am sure the Minister of Finance will not take it amiss if one of his supporters says this much—as he is acting for the Minister of Public Works, who has more fully considered the matter, that before a dollar of this money is expended a careful examination shall be made to see whether it is necessary now for the harbour accommodation of Port Colborne, for this trade which is coming to it under present conditions, and if it is not, that the money will not be expended. I ask the Government to consider well before they commit themselves to this larger scheme and to see whether the conditions of trade will warrant all the expenditure that, it is said, is to be made in reference to the St. Lawrence route. Much as I desire that we should have all that we can get for the St. Lawrence, I do not think that we should shut our eyes to facts. We never can get the whole of the great western trade for the St. Lawrence.

We ought to get a great deal of it; and I think that the possibility of getting more than we have is better with the 14-foot channel. For one, so far as I have understood the question, I am not in favour of the Government expending money on elevators and other facilities of that kind, except at the port of Montreal, which is exceptional and for the providing of facilities for which there are very important reasons. If some such plan were adopted as has been adopted in relation to graving docks, a plan of Government assistance, giving to all alike, private enterprise will answer every purpose that will be of any advantage to this country as far as elevators are concerned. There are elevators doing the business of the grain-carrying trade of the St. Lawrence; and if

more elevators are necessary, I am satisfied that private capital and enterprise are ready to take hold of that matter, or, certainly, ready with a little Government assistance given in such a way as will afford satisfaction. If this vote is necessary to improve the harbour of Port Colborne without reference to the larger scheme that has been talked about, I shall be in favour of it. But with the statements the hon. Minister of Finance has made to the House and with the reasons that have been given by the members who have spoken on this subject, there has certainly been enough to put the Minister on his guard before the money is expended to see that it is necessary for the harbours of the Welland Canal, as it now is part, and not as part of a larger scheme. If it is part of this larger scheme, whether it cost \$5,000,000 or more, it must necessarily be an experiment to capture all the trade of the St. Lawrence, and I would certainly not favour that.

Mr. McCLEARY. It seems to me the opposition to this vote means the abandonment of the Welland Canal route as a through route for the grain trade of the great lakes. As to whether this vote is part and parcel of a greater scheme that may be necessary, I am not prepared now to say. This I do know, that when the Welland Canal was originally built it was built for vessels drawing twelve feet of water, and it was found subsequently that \$3,000,000 had to be spent upon that canal to make it at all effective to compete for the trade that was going to Buffalo. Now if the Government, after spending this \$350,000 in Port Colborne for deepening the harbour and \$150,000 or \$250,000 for making this breakwater, find that is not adequate to give Port Colborne harbour the proper facilities to encourage the larger lake carriers to come there, having regard to the great expenditure we have made in this country on our canals, will any one say that they should not increase that expenditure to any amount that may be necessary on the Welland Canal, which is the key to the St. Lawrence route as well as the key to the great upper lakes for carrying the trade of the west through to tide water in the east? While I do not want to charge hon. gentlemen who oppose this with being local in their arguments or as being selfish in this regard, still it is very strange that the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) should get up and oppose this vote. He probably thinks that Kingston might be hurt if we had a line from Port Colborne right through to Montreal, and if Port Colborne harbour was improved so that vessels drawing 22 feet of water could enter it. The member for West York (Mr. Wallace) objects to it because he says they have under consideration a marine route of some kind that will go through his constituency, possibly. But I want to tell him

that we have had a route from Collingwood as long as I can remember to carry the grain of the west to Montreal, but it never carried any, because the all-water route is the route that is going to attract traffic, because it is the cheapest and the best. Traders will take the route which is the cheapest and the quickest, and undoubtedly no one will contend that an all-water route is not much cheaper than either an all-rail route or a route part rail and part water.

Mr. WALLACE. How is it that the Parry Sound takes more than the Welland Canal?

Mr. McCLEARY. Simply because the Welland Canal is in the deplorable condition in which it was left. If we had 14 feet of water in the Welland Canal through to Montreal, so that boats could go through the Welland Canal with 75,000 or 80,000 bushels, the Parry Sound road would not be carrying so much; and if I am to believe what I hear regarding the Parry Sound road, they are not going to carry very much more at the same rate that they did last year, because I do not think it has been a very paying speculation for the gentleman who has put his money into it.

Mr. WALLACE. Freight rates are going up all round.

Mr. McCLEARY. Of course, that depends on the condition of freight generally. We know that water rates have gone up as well. Now, I have no knowledge of the details of what the Government intend to do at Port Colborne. I never saw the plan until to-night. But we who live around Port Colborne know that time and again vessels have gone by Port Colborne simply because there was no protection for them in the form of a breakwater. The idea of the Government is to have at least the beginning of a breakwater, and have it out sufficiently far to protect any of those large lake vessels that come down there; so that when Port Colborne harbour is dredged out to twenty feet, vessels can come in there safely and not run on the rocks, as many have done in the past. Had I time I could go more into details regarding the all-water route as superior to any other route that has been spoken of for carrying the trade of the North-west. The wise men in years gone by knew that by cutting a canal through the Niagara peninsula to join the waters of the great lakes with Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence route, they would provide the cheapest best and swiftest route; and if our Government in the past had been alive to the true condition of affairs, and had put the Welland Canal into an up-to-date condition, and Port Colborne harbour in the position it ought to be, I think Buffalo would not now be carrying 50 per cent of the lake traffic, but the Welland Canal would be getting it.

Mr. McNEILL. I am sorry that any words of mine should seem to be in any way opposing the scheme which my hon. friend is so energetically in favour of. His speech, I think, has been in favour of the larger scheme entirely, and that is something which I think this committee should be very careful about committing itself to. Now, with regard to what we have before us, because we have not got the larger scheme before us, I want to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that the memorandum or report of the engineer which he referred to a little while ago, is a condemnation of what is proposed. I do not see how it can be regarded as anything else when an engineer of the Government says that it is a thing of "some utility." What words could be used which would condemn it more strongly with faint praise? It is "damning it with faint praise" to say that an expenditure of \$150,000 would result in "some utility." I think in the face of such a report as that this vote should not be asked for.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In reference to the remarks made by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), I may say that I entirely agree with him, that an expenditure of this character should not be entered upon by the hon. Minister of Public Works without the gravest consideration. I am quite satisfied that the Minister will give it every consideration. Under any circumstances, I do not hesitate to say that the Government ought not to be committed, and Parliament cannot be committed, to any expenditures beyond the sums which have been submitted to Parliament in these Estimates. If the larger scheme is as good a scheme as some hon. gentlemen say it is, that is a question which the Government must deal with in the future, if they deem the scheme worthy of consideration. While I say this, I may say that I am warmly in sympathy with all that has been said regarding our utilizing the St. Lawrence route, and that we should not hesitate to engage in liberal expenditures to draw the trade to Canada which is now going away from her. But if these are correct views, I think we can safely trust Parliament to sustain the Government in what is deemed fair and reasonable in carrying out any larger scheme. Let us not be carried away; let us not be scared by this large scheme, on which several engineers have reported. That scheme contemplated the building of two breakwaters, of twelve docks costing \$1,600,000, dredging to the amount of \$2,750,000, the building of three elevators at a cost of \$450,000, and an allowance of \$250,000 for engineering. The Government do not propose to commit themselves to that scheme.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not sit at the present Council table, and I do not know what took place there.

Mr. McCLEARY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has sat at Council.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I want to show, by a series of consecutive ideas, just how this thing happened. The Government come down with a vote of \$150,000. There is not a single report of an engineer, in the first place. Does the hon. Minister mean to tell me that Council ever passed a vote of \$150,000 without some report of an engineer, showing that the work was to be of great utility? My impression is, that the wording of the memorandum which the engineer has prepared for the Minister is, as the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) has said, a condemnation of the proposal. Is this committee to vote \$150,000 for constructing a piece of a breakwater out into the lake near Port Colborne because the engineer says it is going to be of some utility? This phase of it never was considered at Council. There is no report, and there is no plan.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Oh, yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The plan is for the whole scheme. The report is for the big scheme, and the information is in regard to the big scheme; but as to this, there is not one jot or tittle of calculation, and not one line of a plan. How did it get in here? It got in here in this way: When the hon. Minister of Public Works went away, he had adopted the big scheme: he was prepared to propose a great deal bigger vote than this. We are told that this vote, in his absence, was cut down a good deal. I do not know whether it is true or not, but it is certain that a little piece of the work is brought down here with a report on a big work and a plan for a big work, and it looks to me as if a little piece had been taken from the big vote, and this little piece of the big work is brought down to this committee without any further evidence than the mere expression of the engineer that it will be of some utility. That is the ground upon which the hon. Minister of Finance asks us to vote this money, when I believe, if the information given to me by a practical man is correct, that the putting down of that breakwater there, without completing it to Sugar Loaf Point, and without doing the rock excavation on that 7-acre area, and making a harbour of refuge, will be a waste of money. I am not opposed to this vote because it is Port Colborne harbour. I am as much interested in that section of the country as I am in the other, and I do not want to detract from the trade of the Welland Canal. If the hon. Minister can assure me, from the report of the engineer, that this money is going to be well spent, and that it is going to give an advantage to Port Colborne which will likely enable her to secure the shipping trade of the lakes, I will support it. If the hon. gentleman cannot give us that assurance, he ought not to ask the committee to pass this amount. \*

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has been giving us some memories of what has happened in Council in his days. I can assure him that his description of what happens in Council now is entirely an imaginary one.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How is it that we have a plan for the big work, and no plan for the little work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The engineer sent up there some months ago made a report on an elaborate scheme, and accompanied it with a full plan.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And that was practically adopted by the hon. Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. It has neither been adopted by the Minister nor endorsed by the chief engineer of the Public Works Department. It was a report made by a divisional engineer, assisted by one of the officers of the department. It would be quite possible to take a portion of that scheme and adopt it. It does not follow because a report is made proposing the construction of twelve docks, that you must adopt the whole of the scheme.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where is your plan?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The plan does not necessarily adopt any particular number of docks. The hon. gentleman has argued that the proposed breakwater is useless, and that it commits us to a scheme. That is an entirely erroneous method of argument. But let us assume that he is correct respecting the utility of the proposed breakwater; let us assume that the breakwater is only moderately useful.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Of some utility.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Suppose it turns out that in the form proposed it is of no utility at all, and that you have to complete the breakwater. You can complete the breakwater for \$360,000 at the most, and thus, with an additional expenditure of \$200,000, you would have a complete and perfect harbour of refuge.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the hon. gentleman say that he is going to get a harbour of refuge?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If, after you build this breakwater for \$150,000, that does not make it useful, and an additional expenditure of \$200,000 will be necessary to complete it, it is certain that you will have a useful harbour of refuge.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There will be no harbour of refuge.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am told that there will be an ample harbour of refuge, with a minimum of 13 to 14 feet of water, and 20 feet of water at certain places.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You have that depth of water now. You want a greater depth so as to get larger vessels in.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With the appropriations that are now made, without one dollar of extra appropriation, we will have a 20-foot channel into the Welland Canal, so that large vessels can come in. We know that the lack of that channel is driving business away from the St. Lawrence route.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, as the hon. gentleman has been kind enough to refer to me, I will say that the Minister of Finance is perfectly correct in his contention because a thousand feet of that breakwater could be put down in 22 feet 4 inches.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Finance is much interested in getting these Estimates through or not. For my part I am very anxious that we should make some progress. I am afraid that all the hammering that has been done has not convinced the Minister of Finance that he is embarking upon a doubtful scheme and one which is very expensive in so far as he chooses to go or says he chooses to go and which may be tremendously expensive if he goes the whole length. There is one instructive commentary on this whole business. Shortly before the Minister of Public Works left for Europe, I noticed an interview of his in one of the papers in which he made an extended reference to great works which were to be undertaken and carried out at Port Colborne. He mentioned two points, one was Montreal and the other was Port Colborne, and he left the impression on my mind and I think the impression is a fair one, and on the public mind, that the Government was going to undertake an immense work at Port Colborne and an immense work at the port of Montreal, and that both of those were meant to capture the trade for the St. Lawrence route. He dwelt upon the Port Colborne one especially. I do not know what the hon. gentleman may say by way of defence of his \$150,000 or \$200,000 project, but here are the circumstances. The Minister of Finance asks a vote of \$150,000 and a total expenditure of \$250,000 or \$300,000 for a breakwater. When he comes to deploy before the House his reasons, and they must be good reasons to ask for a vote of that amount of money, he has nothing in the shape of a report, nothing in the shape of a plan, but the report and the plan upon which five and a half million dollars are to be expended, nothing else. If they only intend to make the breakwater and do what the Minister of Finance proposed to do, when he comes with that vote to the House, why has he not his report and his plans with regard to that. The only report and plans he has is with regard to the \$5,500,000 expenditure. Taken in connection with the

interview of the Minister of Public Works, with his statement over and over that this is a Government which is going to capture the trade for the St. Lawrence, with his special interview with reference to the big works at Port Colborne, I am convinced that the Minister of Public Works proposed the idea that there should be an immense harbour, detailed as in this plan at Port Colborne, and that, in connection with the great improvements in Montreal, should do what he has been talking so much about, capture the trade of the lakes for the St. Lawrence route. I want to warn this Government—I do not think they should need to be warned—that when they undertake the work which private wealth and private enterprise is able to undertake and will undertake and ought to undertake in this country, to build the elevators and make the facilities for commerce in this country, through and through, they are, to use the western phrase, biting off more than they can chew. This country will not sustain them in the end, and this country is not prepared to pay the bills and it is unnecessary that they should. Why the very moment that you undertake this work and spend your \$700,000, and that is what it will amount to, \$360,000 for dredging and \$360,000 for a breakwater, if you are going to carry it out as my hon. friend says—that is \$750,000 that you are in for. Do you mean to say that you can stop at that and hold yourselves up to this country as undertaking a thing and stopping before you have carried it through to its fulfilment. It is not a harbour of refuge that you are after for vessels of small depth, but what you are after is to capture the heavy vessel traffic. Can you stop when you find that that work does not capture your heavy vessels? I do not believe this House can approve what you propose to do according to the Minister of Finance. You must get sufficient depth and area in order to make the transfer from heavy vessels and capture that trade.

What, then, have you to do? You have to have greater berth room; you have to have what that breakwater was meant for, the scooped-out harbour, which is going to cost millions; and you have to have your docks and elevators. Private capital will not go in when the Government is so eager to do this work itself. Once you have made this beginning by spending \$750,000, there will be a call for more than a little floating elevator. The Government will have to build elevators there, and if you build elevators there you will have to build them elsewhere. The Government are going into a business to which there is absolutely no end in this country, and there is no need of it. A certain amount of Government assistance is right in a young country; but there comes a period when the wealth of the country in aggregated forms is able to take hold of these enterprises and carry them out and manage them with private capital. The

Mr. FOSTER.

Government ought not to undertake that branch of industry. But it is reaching out here and there. The jaunty indifference with which the Prime Minister the other night proposed to expend \$70,000 for a wharf where there was no water, no inhabitants and no business, and the jaunty way in which we undertake the beginnings of what will prove to be millions of expenditure at Port Colborne, without a single commercial report before the Government or this House as to what they expect to capture, only shows the idea that these gentlemen have in regard to these expenditures. Where is the expert testimony and report that even if you had these facilities you would capture that traffic? Why, Sir, the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Minister of Public Works are dead in love with the Parry Sound connection. The Minister of Public Works has been holding it up sky-high as the great route which will take the wheat trade of the North-west. How many routes are we going to have? And here is an item in these estimates, \$10,000, for the survey of the Georgian Bay Canal, which the Minister of Railways and Canals proposes to go into. Are we going to commence these \$5,000,000 expenditures at every point of the compass, one route competing with the other? It appears to me that we are going into matters without sufficient consideration. I would like to see the expert testimony; I would like to have the business calculations to show that if you had these works done at Port Colborne, we can reasonably hope to capture that trade against these other different routes. I cannot help thinking that the proposed work is of no use except as a small bit of that magnificent scheme which the people of this country will be called upon to undertake, involving an expenditure of \$5,000,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman opened his remarks by expressing the opinion that the Government did not require to be warned in the direction in which he spoke, and yet he immediately followed by pointing out what the Government were embarking on, and showing the committee that the Government did require to be very seriously warned before embarking on this expenditure. Now, I would like to say to the hon. gentleman that the members of the Government—a portion of them, at all events, and I will not include myself in the category—are capable of thinking these questions out, probably, as thoroughly and as successfully as the hon. gentleman. This Government are not likely to embark on tremendous undertakings without foreseeing what they will lead to, or without being able to realize as fully and adequately as the hon. gentleman, the character and extent of the burdens they will impose on the country. The hon. gentleman is criticising the present vote, I will not say without information, but without having thought the subject out, and without

really knowing what the facts are, and what the objects are, and what it is possible to obtain by the moderate expenditure proposed. Now, I have myself given this subject of the improvements at Port Colborne harbour some little consideration. Ever since I had the opportunity of visiting Port Colborne some few years ago, I have been impressed with the importance and the necessity of something being done which up to the present has not been done, for the purpose of securing to us a portion, at least, and we hope a considerable portion, of the grain traffic of the west which hitherto has found its way to Buffalo; largely because we have had no facilities whatever at Port Colborne. My hon. friend knows that a vote was asked by me as Minister of Railways and Canals for an expenditure at Port Colborne. He was told what the object of that expenditure was. He was told that the purpose was to deepen the entrance to the canal a most necessary and important work, if we are to afford the possibility of vessels of a large draft bringing their cargoes to the Welland Canal at all. Unless that canal entrance is deepened, we exclude absolutely and completely the admission of that class of vessels which for years past and up to the present have been carrying the great bulk of the tonnage of grain from the west. We propose not only to deepen the entrance to that canal, but we propose, also, to afford, in connection with that work, as we may very well do, berth facilities for those vessels, at which they can safely lie, and lying there, can transfer their cargoes to the smaller barges of 14 feet draught, which will be used for carrying the grain to Montreal. That is the object we have in view in that appropriation in connection with the Department of Railways and Canals. Mr. Thompson, who has been for many years familiar with the working of that canal, who is as thoroughly acquainted with it as any man on the River St. Lawrence, who has studied the situation carefully, and knows the requirements of the trade of Port Colborne, tells us what we have to compete against, and what facilities we have to furnish in order to make a successful competition and capture a portion of that trade. Mr. Thompson, in the many conversations which I have had with him on this subject, has assured me in the strongest possible terms, that there were two things, and only two things that we would require at the outset in order to demonstrate that we would be able to capture any portion of that traffic. We shall have to run out our jetty pier sufficiently far into the lake to get deeper water; and, as part of the extension of the pier, we have to provide a couple of berths at which vessels of a greater draught and carrying the larger tonnage, will be able to lie and discharge their cargoes. He thinks that at the outset as an experimental work, to demonstrate whether or not we can offer sufficient inducements to a portion of those larger

vessels to bring their cargoes to Port Colborne, this will suffice. Then, there is another thing which he says is absolutely necessary. You have to afford protection at the entrance to that canal, and to these wharfs and piers which we propose to construct and furnish. In all stormy and rough weather, vessels cannot lie there unless there is a breakwater protection, and it is Mr. Thompson's opinion, which he has expressed to me over and over again, that if we build a breakwater at the points indicated on this plan we are to afford the protection required.

Mr. BENNETT. Assuming that you had to-day a state of affairs prevailing at Port Colborne that steamboats carrying 250,000 or even 300,000 bushels, could discharge there, what is it assumed that they could discharge into—steam vessels going through to Montreal or tow barges—and then what lessening of freight would there be as compared with the present system of discharging a 75,000 bushel boat at Kingston into a 20,000 bushel boat.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have two classes of vessels now carrying grain—the vessels drawing about 18 or 20 feet of water which are going to Buffalo, and the vessels of a smaller draft, drawing only 14 feet or thereabouts, which can go through the Welland and the St. Lawrence canals to Montreal. The result of our deepening of these canals, it is hoped, will be a very great increase in the fleet of vessels of the lesser draft, and possibly they may in the future, if the expectation of the shippers on the lakes are realized, displace the larger draft vessels entirely. But for the present we have to contemplate that for many years to come, these heavy draught vessels will carry a considerable portion of the grain; and if they do, it is necessary, in order that we may get a portion of that trade, that we should provide them the necessary berth accommodation at Port Colborne, or we will not get them at all. The expectation is that if we get these vessels, they will transfer at the berths we propose to construct there into vessels only drawing 14 feet.

Mr. BENNETT. Steam or tow?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Probably both. They will utilize the vessels as they become available. Whichever is decided to be the most economical class of vessels to construct will be constructed in the future. Both tow and steam barges are being used on the lakes, and both not drawing more than 14 feet of water will use our canals and go to Montreal. The purposes which the engineers in my department have in view is to be able to make an experiment and fair trial, by a moderate and reasonable expenditure, in the first place, in the deepening of the

entrance and providing an additional length of pier, the placing of two wharfs at which these vessels may lie, drawing any depth of water, and upon one side you will have the deep draught vessels to unload into the barges which will lie on the other side of the pier. To accomplish that a large expenditure is not necessary. If the development is as great as we hope, possibly a larger expenditure will have to be made in the future, but we would not be justified in making that expenditure now, and the Government is in no sense committed to any larger expenditure in that connection. We will undertake no enterprise in connection with the improvement of Port Colborne which ought to be undertaken by private enterprise. We only propose to do that which private enterprise cannot be expected to do. Could it be expected for a moment that the improvement of the entrance to the canal would be taken up by private enterprise, or the placing of the two piers I have spoken of, or the building of the breakwater? None of these things come within the scope of private energy, but necessarily, in our country and the United States come within the duty and responsibility of the state or Federal Government. Now, we have before us the idea that a breakwater of at least 1,000 or 1,200 feet, to start with, will be most useful and effective as a protection to the entrance of this canal. It may be that we will find that a further extension of that may be desirable but no one who knows anything about the condition, as I am assured by Mr. Thompson, will say that a breakwater of 1,000 or 1,200 feet, properly placed will not be most useful as a protection to that harbour. If it should transpire in the future that the extension of the breakwater to the shore would be necessary for the development of business and in the needs of business in dredging the harbour and excavating it, and making it of a uniform depth of 20 or 22 feet, building further additional piers, all this may be done, but no Government would ask Parliament to do that unless it had seen, as the result of the experiments made, that the development in that direction would justify it in taking on and incurring this additional expense. Nothing could be more reasonable than the proposition made in connection with this work, and I am glad to know that my hon. friend from Welland has addressed himself to this point and given the committee the benefit of his judgment, which corresponds entirely with that of the Government in this regard, except that he proposes that we might go further. I have no doubt, from the information I have received from those competent to give an opinion, that the expenditure will be a most valuable inducement to an expansion of our grain trade.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the \$350,000 referred to for the dredging dredge a channel 450 feet wide from the deep water in the

Mr. BLAIR.

lake into the proposed cribwork or a point in the canal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We do not propose to dredge to a depth of 20 or 22 feet into the canal, but only to dredge to a distance sufficient to enable those vessels to reach our piers. We are throwing out the jetty with the piers attached to it, it will get out into moderately deep water, and there will not be a great deal of dredging required except for the entrance, and we are not considering that it will be at all necessary to carry the deep dredging into the entrance beyond these points.

Mr. BENNETT. The other accommodation would have to be constructed on the proposed cribwork?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, not on the breakwater, but on the extension pier that is in connection with the appropriation which I have made.

Mr. FOSTER. How many feet of berth room?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We would have two piers about 520 feet in length each. I can assure the committee that this question has been very carefully considered. I have the plans in my department, and am about to ask for tenders for this work. It has been considered with an eye to the most economical expenditure, and with a view of getting the best results by way of experiment with the least cost.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the Minister what it will cost to have this sandstone reef removed that the member for Lincoln says lies outside the harbour?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not proposed to disturb that shoal at all in dredging the entrance to the canal. That shoal is to be the initial point for the planting of the breakwater, and from that point it runs in towards the shore.

Mr. CLARKE. I understood from the hon. member for Lincoln that it would be necessary to remove that shoal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would be necessary, if you are going to make a harbour of the interior.

Mr. GIBSON. I was on a delegation, along with Capt. Carter and others, that came down from Port Colborne to point out to the Minister of Railways and Canals and other hon. gentlemen present at that interview, that in order to make the entrance into Port Colborne safe, this shoal or ledge off Sugar Loaf Point would have to be dredged to a depth of 22 feet of water. As I have said before, I have never given the matter a thought from that day to this, until I saw the plans to-night. It is possible that the

plans proposed by the Department of Public Works and that proposed by the Department of Railways may be of a different character; but the plan that has been submitted to-night, and the one we have been discussing, is the plan, I understand, that is furnished by the Department of Public Works. The Minister of Railways and Canals says to-night that he proposes in this expenditure to provide two jetties for the purpose of receiving the larger sized vessels into Port Colborne harbour at this Point. The question occurred to my mind: How is he going to get over the Sugar Loaf shoal with a vessel drawing 18 or 19 feet of water in stormy weather, because there is not more than 21 feet at this point. In stormy weather these vessels will rise and fall 8 or 10 feet. So, the Minister has forgotten the fact that the larger craft cannot in stormy weather get in without the removal of that shoal.

Mr. McCARTHY. This transportation question is one which the House can well afford to consider for some time. There are a great number of contending routes, and as to which is the best one to adopt, the Government has to decide. But the Government has also to decide upon what expenditure it will make for the purpose of improving the routes which at present carry our freight and grain, until the larger scheme is adopted. Until this evening I was not aware that such extensive plans had been made, and that a report had been prepared in respect to Port Colborne harbour. It would appear from that report, as stated by the member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), if that scheme is adopted by the Government, that there will be a necessary expenditure in the neighbourhood of \$5,000,000 or \$5,500,000. Now, that of course is a very large expenditure, compared with which the sum we are asked to vote to-night is a mere drop in the bucket. As I understand the proposition of the Minister the vote asked is only for the purpose of protecting that harbour for the present. Now, I do not think it is necessary at the present time, notwithstanding what the Minister has just said, to obtain a depth of water for the admission of vessels of 20 feet. Twenty-foot vessels cannot go through the Welland Canal. My hon. friend from Welland (Mr. McCleary) talks about local feeling. I suppose it is not because he has a local feeling that he has addressed the committee this evening. I admit that, so far as I am concerned, I have local feeling, both as being interested in the city of Toronto and in the town of Collingwood, which is in my constituency. Now, if these 20-foot vessels have to go into the harbour of Port Colborne and there discharge, we can look at the question from that stand-point, and it only requires consideration from that stand-point. That means transshipment, and in that case Port Colborne

would be in no better position than Collingwood, while the route via the Port of Collingwood would be 278 miles shorter than via Port Colborne. I rise at present for the purpose of impressing upon this committee that before they adopt any such scheme as the one which has been submitted in that report, they should well consider the other routes which are asking for consideration. The route which, I submit, is the shortest, the route which is the least expensive, is via the port of Collingwood by means of the construction of a railway from that town to Toronto. If there ever was a natural course by which freight could be carried, it is across that narrow neck of land which lies between the Georgian Bay and Lake Ontario, namely, the region between Toronto and Collingwood. The distance is only 70 miles; it is an easy country in which to build a road, and the expenditure would not be, according to the estimates, anything like \$5,000,000. Now, the route via Port Colborne cannot be advocated as an all-water route, so far as 20-foot vessels are concerned. At the present time only 14-foot vessels can go through the Welland Canal; so that, if we are going to have a 20-foot route, the question is, whether you are going to spend enough money to deepen the Welland Canal to 20 feet, and deepen that harbour so that 20-foot vessels can get in. If you are not, then the other route is the one which should receive the consideration of the Government. But there is another reason. I am not opposing the present grant, if it is for the purpose of keeping up the efficiency of the Welland Canal, because that is necessary at the present time. But when we extend ourselves, as apparently it is the intention of the Government to do, in order to obtain a transportation route which will be all-Canadian, then we must look about to see which is the better one. Now, what has been the effect of the Welland Canal route? It has been of greater advantage to American vessels than it has been to Canadian vessels.

You find that in the year 1897, as appears in the report of the Department of Railways and Canals, of east-bound freight, Canadian vessels carried 338,519 tons, and United States vessels 687,939 tons. And west-bound freights, Canadian vessels carried 7,458 tons, and United States vessels 210,834. This is an object lesson, but we must have a knowledge of the coasting laws between the two countries to apply and make it an object lesson. American vessels cannot carry freight from a Canadian port to a Canadian port. Nor can a Canadian vessel carry from an American port to an American port. If you have a better, shorter, cheaper route it would be the Canadian vessels that would carry the freight, and in that way you will build up that which ought to be built up, a Canadian inland marine. And if this be so, we can only do it in such a way as will have the effect to a large extent of preventing Amer-

ican competition and building up what will be known as an all-Canadian route. In that way also we will carry from American ports to Canadian ports. The shortest and the cheapest route from the western states and the Canadian North-west to the seaboard, is via the Georgian Bay, Collingwood and Toronto.

**Mr. McCLEARY.** Will the hon. gentleman give us some figures to show that this will be a cheaper route instead of merely making the statement?

**Mr. McCARTHY.** If the hon. gentleman will take Cockburn Island as a common point, he will find the figures to be as follows:—To the Detroit River 288 miles, down the Detroit River 18 miles, through Lake Erie 216, Welland Canal 22, Port Dalhousie to Kingston 148 miles, Kingston to Montreal 160 miles. total 852 miles. From Cockburn Island to Collingwood 193 miles, Collingwood to Toronto, by rail 70 miles, Toronto to Kingston 148 miles, Kingston to Montreal 160 miles, total 574 miles—which makes a difference in these two routes of 278 miles, and to this must be added the delay going through the canal. So it must be much cheaper as well as shorter. How long does it take to go through the Welland Canal?

**Mr. McCLEARY.** A boat will go through the Welland Canal in 15 or 16 hours. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) please tell us what his lake freight would be by Collingwood and railway from Collingwood to Toronto thence by water to Toronto?

**Mr. McCARTHY.** If the hon. gentleman will tell me what his lake freight rate is from Cockburn Island to Port Colborne, I will tell him what it is from Cockburn Island to Collingwood. It will be the same so far as the lake is concerned. The question is whether 70 miles of rail will be more expensive than the 278 miles of lake and river and the additional time lost in the canal, for the sending of it by rail from Collingwood to Toronto will be a much greater saving of time. Upon the figures of distances, it would be cheaper to go via Collingwood and Toronto. It cannot logically be otherwise. I am free to admit that water freight is cheaper than rail, but it must not be forgotten that we have only 70 miles of rail. At Port Colborne you have the same transshipment as you would have at Collingwood. I do not desire to detain the committee any longer, but I desired to lay before the Government and the committee the great advantages the Collingwood route has over all others. In view of the fact that this discussion has covered so much ground and so many other gentlemen have expressed their views, I felt that it was my duty, representing the constituency that I do, to lay these facts tersely before the committee.

**Mr. SPROULE.** The Minister of Railways and Canals has told us that Mr. Thompson

**Mr. McCARTHY.**

was thoroughly acquainted with this locality and had given him the most minute information with regard to it, and upon that information the hon. Minister based the proposed work.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) understood me correctly when he said Mr. Thompson gave me my minute information. He gave me very clear and lucid statements of the nature of the works and the objects to be achieved.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Why, then, did not the Minister submit that information to the House?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I am speaking of frequent conversations I had with Mr. Thompson.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** Mr. Thompson gave the hon. Minister information regarding the work to be done under his own department?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Yes, and what would be required in the way of a breakwater.

**Mr. SPROULE.** It occurred to me as desirable that we should have that information, because a great deal of the criticism upon this item would have been saved. I do not wish to be understood as opposing this item, except in this connection—if it is part of a larger scheme, and is likely to accomplish for the transportation of this country what the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Railways and Canals claim, I think we are justified in spending a large amount of money for that purpose. But I confess that I think the expenditure of this amount alone would be of very little use. I cannot lead myself to believe that, if this expenditure is made, vessels carrying 230,000 or 240,000 bushels would come in there and lay up. I do not think there would be room; and I do not think there would be a chance to get in. Then, if it is intended that the cargoes of these large vessels shall be transferred to smaller ones without floating elevators, I can only say that the cost will be so great as to make the scheme entirely impracticable. Unless it is to be of some substantial benefit, I do not see why we should vote this money. I agree with every word that fell from the lips of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton). I think there is no justification for the expenditure unless it can be shown, and clearly shown, that some substantial benefit will accrue in increasing the transportation of grain from the west through Canadian channels. I do not think that has been shown. I agree with the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) that probably this is merely a portion of the expenditure of the larger scheme taken up by the Minister of Public Works, and he is utilizing it for the purpose of justifying the expenditure to-day.

He is taking a portion of the expenditure that was intended to be made by the hon. Minister of Public Works before he left the country, and cutting it up for this work, but he accompanies this vote with no plans and no explanations that would justify the House in making the expenditure that is proposed. What is that expenditure? It is \$520,000 at the lowest estimate. That is a large amount of money, but when we consider what the country would gain, substantially it would not be so much. This vote means the commencement of an expenditure upon a work which, when completed, will amount to \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000. That is a large expenditure, but it seems to me that it would be very inadvisable for us to commence with the expenditure of a smaller sum. If it were clearly shown that it was going to be of any substantial advantage I would be in favour of it, but as no information has been presented to this committee to show that this expenditure would be advantageous, I am opposed to it.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to occupy the attention of the committee at any length, because I have not had the information as to the proposed scheme long enough before me to be able to master it. We should not expect the hon. Minister of Finance to be as well posted as the hon. Minister of Public Works in regard to a matter which is not in his own department, but I submit that it is due to the members of the committee, when a matter of such vital importance to the Dominion generally is involved, that the submission of the expenditure of such a large sum of money should not be delayed until the closing hours of the session. It is hardly fair to ask the committee to take into consideration a proposal in regard to which the information that has been vouchsafed to us, up to the present time, has been of the most scanty character. There is a marked difference of opinion amongst gentlemen who profess to know all the merits, or demerits, of this proposal. Reference has been made to this subject by an hon. gentleman in the Senate, who comes from the Welland district, and who knows, I presume, whereof he speaks, and who declares that not Port Colborne, but Port Maitland is the natural harbour; and it must not be forgotten that Port Maitland was the Imperial Government harbour years ago. If it is not inconsistent with the rules of the House, I may be permitted to quote some of the remarks which the hon. Senator McCallum made upon this subject. I do so, not to take up the time of the House or to offer any factious opposition to the scheme proposed by the hon. Minister of Public Works but rather to draw attention to the very wide divergence of opinion which exists as to the best national transportation route for the Dominion. Mr. McCallum says:

Port Maitland harbour was the proper harbour for the entrance to the canal, and for this reason: to-day there is 17 feet of water at the entrance to Port Maitland harbour, and for miles up the river you have 20 or 30 feet. There is a bar outside of the harbour for a short distance. Probably it would take a dredging machine a couple of days to remove it. I tell hon. gentlemen that for fifty-four years Port Maitland harbour has not cost the Government of this country one cent for dredging, and I defy contradiction.

Mr. GIBSON. How much traffic has gone there?

Mr. CLARKE. I will come to that in a minute. We are speaking of the probable cost of Port Maitland harbour. Of course, I am not vouching for the accuracy of these statements. I cannot give any estimates as to the cost of the construction of the proposed works, but, of course, when I have read the statement, if I am permitted to read it, of Senator McCallum, a gentleman who has had a great deal of experience, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) can assume the responsibility of contradicting the statements made by Mr. McCallum if he thinks they are wide of the mark. The hon. senator proceeds to say:

There is a sandy beach of four miles with good outside and clay bottom, and, as I have said, with a very little expense you can get 22 or 24 feet of water there all the time. \* \* \* The consideration of a proper entrance to the canal is very important, because seven months of the year the larger portion of the trade will go by our canal. If it does not, our policy heretofore has been all wrong, and the sooner we find it out the better. But we do not help it if we build a breakwater to raise the water over the rock bottom at Port Colborne. It will cost a great deal more to do that than it will to dig the canal from Port Maitland to the junction of the Welland Canal.

This is a statement which, I submit, has been made by a gentleman who has had a great deal of experience in that section of the country. He knows whereof he speaks and his opinion ought to be of some value in enabling us to arrive at a decision.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Twenty miles away from the entrance.

Mr. CLARKE. I may read further from this hon. gentleman's opinion.

Mr. GIBSON. We have read them ourselves.

Mr. CLARKE. If the committee does not desire the information I will not trouble it by reading any more.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CLARKE. I know the hon. Minister did not interrupt me, but I was interrupted by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson).

I know that it would be necessary to dig 18 miles of canal and enlarge the feeder. It could be done. I have made a few figures in reference to it, and I know something about canals and dredging. They have placed \$350,000 in the Estimates for Port Colborne harbour, and I know that they could dig that 18 miles of canal much cheaper than going to Port Colborne. You can do it for \$650,000 to \$700,000. If the Government wish to do it, and do it in haste, they can set the dredges to work to-morrow. They can advertise for tenders and have it finished for next spring's navigation. It is the easiest digging I know of anywhere in Canada. There is no rock anywhere, and any one can see what it will cost. It would have to be dug 5 yards deep, 18 miles long, 100 foot bottom and some of the bottom of the feeder is now 2 feet below the lake level, and for 2 miles out of the 18 miles the route is through the Grand River swamp, which is from 3 to 4 feet down below Lake Erie's level. I know these facts, and, therefore, I say that we should be careful not to waste money in that way.

I take the opportunity of drawing the attention of the committee to this fact, because it would seem that, even if it is determined to pin our faith to the Welland Canal as the national route, it shows that there is a wide divergence of opinion amongst those who profess to know something about the matter as to whether we should stick to Port Colborne or adopt Port Maitland as the entrance of the canal. But I have a memorandum here, prepared by a gentleman who has had a great deal of experience in regard to this question of transportation. I refer to Mr. Kivas Tully, who has been the engineer of the Ontario Government for a great many years, a gentleman who has had wide experience, and who believes that the best route to be adopted for the proposed national grain route would be established by the construction of a ship canal or a line of railway between Collingwood and Toronto. The memorandum which I have before me says that as far back as 1855 a convention of delegates from the leading cities in the United States and Canada declared that—

The immense trade from the North-west demands the immediate construction of a canal. \* \* \* "The estimated cost of a ship canal for vessels of 1,000 tons burden," Mr. Kivas Tully says, "is \$22,170,000," and an Act was passed for its construction in 1856, but owing to the difficulty of procuring the necessary capital, the project was abandoned at that time. It was subsequently revived, and a Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly in 1857 reported: "Should the system of granting public lands in aid of public works of a national character be continued, your committee respectfully submit that no works yet projected in Canada has equal claims with the Toronto and Georgian Bay to a liberal grant." This resolution was afterwards affirmed by a Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly in 1864.

When the late Capt. Eads (an eminent hydraulic engineer) was in Toronto in 1881, he examined the plans and model of the ship canal, and though satisfied as to its practicability, he made the following remark: "If lake navigation is to hold its own, you must fight railroads with railroads."

Mr. CLARKE.

In 1884, Capt. Eads brought forward his project of a ship railway across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, which would have been, probably, carried out but for his death in 1887.

The question of a ship railway between Lake Ontario and Georgian Bay was submitted to him, and his reply as follows:—

I have carefully examined the profile and route for the proposed ship railway from Georgian Bay to Toronto, and from the result of your surveys over the route I am not only satisfied that the ship railway is entirely practicable over it, but that it furnishes one of the most remarkably favourable locations for such a construction of which I have any knowledge.

In a previous letter Capt. Eads stated:

I am glad you are considering the ship railway matter which you brought to my attention when I was in Toronto in 1881. It is undoubtedly the proper solution of that problem.

In 1874, Mr. David Blain, ex-M.P. for West York, procured an Act for the construction of an air line between the Georgian Bay and Lake Ontario, which was renewed in 1892, as a ship railway, and the time was extended. The cost of a single track between Collingwood and Toronto would be \$3,000,000, and the distance would be reduced by the construction of this air line to 74 miles. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Toronto Board of Trade, who have been giving a great deal of attention to this matter, prepared a memorandum which has been submitted to the Government, drawing their attention to the feasibility and practicability of constructing this Collingwood-Toronto air line railway as a national road for the conveyance of grain from the North-west to the seaboard. I might draw the attention of the committee to the fact that the Government is now engaged in deepening the Collingwood harbour in order to make it a first-class harbour. They are spending a very large sum in Collingwood harbour, and this air line from Collingwood to Toronto would be the complement of that expenditure. I further draw attention to the fact, notwithstanding what my hon. friend from Welland has said, that Mr. Kivas Tully has declared that the Welland Canal can never be made a national route for the transport of grain from the North-west to the seaboard; and whether his report is right or wrong, he has been firm in his opinion and he has not seen fit to change that opinion which he has held for 40 years.

Mr. McCLEARY. If the hon. gentleman has pinned his faith to a report of forty years ago, held by Mr. Kivas Tully, I do not think it is an up-to-date opinion. The hon. gentleman will remember that there has been an international deep waterway commission appointed between Canada and the United States. The United States Government commission is going on. They have reported to their own Government that the

Welland Canal route is the only proper route. It is a natural route for the trade of the North-west. That is an up-to-date report made by live men in conjunction with the commission appointed by this Government.

Mr. CLARKE. I am glad, Mr. Chairman, to get the information which the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) has given us. Mr. Kivas Tully expressed this opinion as far back as 1859, and still adheres to it. Judging by past experience, it is reasonable to believe that the bulk of the western trade, having passed the St. Clair River and reached the eastern end of Lake Erie will find its way to New York by way of Buffalo. The diversion must be further west than Buffalo. Mr. Tully, in 1888, did not hesitate to repeat that opinion. In a letter addressed to the Hon. John Beverly Robinson, late Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, he stated :

I cannot avoid expressing my belief that the enlargement of the Welland Canal will not divert the western trade from the Erie Canal through the St. Lawrence to the Atlantic Ocean

The canal statistics, since the enlargement, clearly prove Mr. Tully's statement to be correct. The completion of the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway further proves that the trade can be diverted, as 10,765,000 bushels of grain were carried to Montreal over 383 miles of railway in 1898. The Grand Trunk Railway carried 6,000,000 bushels from Midland to Montreal—over 451 miles of railway, and a large quantity from Owen Sound, over 495 miles of railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway also carried a large quantity of grain over 460 miles, from Owen Sound to Montreal. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the above railways can divert a large portion of the western trade, a direct line, with only 74 miles of railway, the distance between Collingwood and Toronto, and 308 miles of water during the season of navigation, the distance between Toronto and Montreal, should divert a much larger portion with greater benefit to Toronto and Montreal. The principal object to be attained by the construction of an independent air line from Toronto to Georgian Bay would be transshipment at Toronto, during the season of navigation, thereby lessening the cost of transportation. Now, Mr. Chairman, just let me say one word in reply to the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary). He says that the international convention which has been called, has declared in favour of the Welland Canal route. Mr. Kivas Tully draws my attention to the statement contained in the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals for 1898. The Minister says in his report :

As having an interesting bearing on the question of canal vs. railway transport of grain from the west, it may be noted that whereas grain and pease passed down to Montreal through the St. Lawrence canals to the extent of 560,254 tons, an increase of 64,386 tons over the previous year, the quantity carried to Montreal amounted to

228,586 tons, an increase of 74,869 tons. The quantity of grain carried to tide-water on the New York state canals was 569,362 tons, a decrease of 183,677 tons ; while the quantity carried by the railways of the state amounted to 4,132,740 tons, an increase of 267,980 tons. Of the total freight, carried by the canals and railways of the state of New York respectively, amounting in 1897 to 43,711,512 tons, the proportion carried by the canals has fallen steadily from 68.9 per cent in 1859, and 47 per cent in 1869, to 8.3 per cent in 1897.

Now, I do not exaggerate, when I say that these are extraordinary figures, showing that notwithstanding the facilities that have been given to shippers, grain in much larger quantities is being conveyed from Buffalo to New York by rail than formerly. The quantity being conveyed by the canals is getting smaller every year, while the quantity being carried by railways is constantly increasing. If this statement is correct, I think it is due to the people of Canada that before the Government embark on an expenditure that may reach between \$4,000,000 and \$5,000,000, every means should be taken to ascertain what is the shortest and most feasible route from the North-west to the seaboard. The hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) pointed to the fact that this Parliament has already voted \$10,000 as its contribution towards making a survey of the water route from the Georgian Bay, via Lake Nipissing and the Ottawa River, to the St. Lawrence ; and in view of the repeated representations which have been made by eminent engineers, and by business men, represented in the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto, as to the feasibility, the practicability and the utility of an air-line from Collingwood to Toronto, and in view of the advantages that would be gained to the farmers of the west by the construction of an air-line, thus shortening the route from the west to the sea-board, it seems to me that it is premature for the Government to ask us, at this stage of the session and with the insufficient information of which we are possessed, to vote an initial sum which may eventually involve the Dominion of Canada in a very large expenditure, to perfect a route that may not be taken advantage of by the shippers and the business men of Canada after the money has been expended upon it. I do not mean to say that the route by Collingwood and Toronto is the ideal route. I would not even commit myself to the statement that it is the best route ; but, I repeat, there are so many different views entertained by men in different parts of the country as to which is the best route, that, in my humble judgment, we have not yet sufficient information before us to enable us to give this question of transportation the consideration which its importance deserves. For this reason I, for one, would be very glad to see the Government hold its hand for a year, and in the meantime appoint a commission of engineers from the Department of Public Works and the Department

of Railways and Canals to inquire, not only into the feasibility of the Ottawa, Lake Nipissing and Georgian Bay route, but also into the feasibility of the Toronto and Colingwood route. I am sure that no factious opposition will be offered by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, if they are satisfied that the Government have selected the best route under all the circumstances; and it is because I believe we have not yet the necessary information before us to justify us in endorsing the expenditure of \$150,000 as an initial expenditure on a very vast work at Port Colborne, that I have risen to make these remarks. I am satisfied that when the people of Canada are assured that the best route has been selected, they will unite in supporting the Government in asking for the money that may be necessary to complete that route at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. GIBSON. When I was interrupted by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), I was going on to say that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has shown me the plan by which he intends to make a breakwater immediately—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not a breakwater. I have nothing to do with that.

Mr. GIBSON. That was his scheme—to make a breakwater at the point now occupied by the lighthouse. And if that plan were carried out, all the talk we have heard to-night might have been avoided. The whole discussion has been in favour of trying to obtain another route for carrying grain instead of the Welland Canal, as if that route were now only projected for the first time. Every gentleman is advocating a route of his own. Now, the case put by the Minister of Railways and Canals has been well considered, and it is only because the Government realize the importance of preventing the traffic of the Welland Canal being diverted to the railways and to the United States, that they are proposing this improvement. As the hon. Minister of Railways has pointed out, the making of a harbour of refuge of the 400 or 500 acres is something that may be well deferred for years to come. And the Minister of Finance pointed out, this work is not for the immediate future, but will only be done as the requirements of the country demand it. I, therefore, ask to be allowed to point out to the committee that, according to the plan held by the Department of Railways and Canals, provision can be made for two wharfs immediately to the south of the lighthouse, without entering upon the larger expenditure about which we have had so much discussion to-night.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We have now had the declaration of the Government that they do not propose to go on with the larger scheme, costing \$5,000,000, but that their belief is,

Mr. CLARKE.

that the construction of this breakwater at an expenditure of \$150,000 will be very valuable to navigation. Is the Minister now prepared to say that the money will not be spent for the construction of this breakwater, unless it is shown beyond reasonable doubt, by the report of competent engineers, that the construction of a breakwater will be of great value to navigation, altogether apart from its being a portion of the larger scheme?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think we are satisfied already that the work will be useful, and if so, we do not require the report of engineers to show that it will be.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the work will be useful, you will have to have a report of an engineer to show that it is.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have the opinion of our engineer already on that point.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We have no report nor plan in regard to that. If the Government do not desire by the expenditure of this money to begin the big scheme, they will give us that promise.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Government do not desire to commit themselves to the expenditure of one dollar beyond the sums mentioned here. Nevertheless, I do not feel like giving my hon. friend a promise that we will not spend this money without getting a further report, because I think the reports before the committee are amply sufficient to justify the expenditure of the money. My hon. friend's great fear is that we are going into the larger scheme. I have given him the assurance that we are not, but if it has the merits some hon. gentlemen think it has, they will vindicate themselves and we will be open to come to the House at some future time and present the scheme when the House will judge it on its merits.

The committee rose, and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Thursday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 3rd August, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FRANCHISE ACT—BILL RESPECTING.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understand a Bill was promoted in the Senate making an am-

endment to the Franchise Act which amendment removed an anomaly in the Act as respects the province of Prince Edward Island, that it passed the Senate and has been sent to the House, but I see no notice of it on the paper.

The CLERK (Sir John Bourinot). No one has taken charge of it.

Mr. FOSTER. Who knows when it comes?

The CLERK. You will find it stated in the Journal.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope the First Minister will take the responsibility.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will look at the Journal first.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understood it was to go upon Government Orders?

The PRIME MINISTER. I shall have to consult the Minister of Justice about that, and I will give an answer to my hon. friend this afternoon.

Mr. MARTIN. I understood the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) was to take charge of the Bill.

#### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 184)—from the Senate—to amend an Act passed at the present session of Parliament respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to railway debts.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

#### QUALIFICATIONS OF OFFICERS ATTENDING LATE MILITARY CAMP AT LÉVIS.

Mr. TYRWHITT (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

What percentage of regimental officers who attended the late camp at Lévis, had passed the qualifying examination?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The percentage of regimental officers who attended the camp at Lévis and who had passed the qualifying examination, was 75 per cent.

#### POWERS OF CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY RESPECTING BRANCH LINES.

Mr. RUTHERFORD (by Mr. Richardson) asked:

Whether the Canadian Pacific Railway Company possesses the power to build branch lines from points on the main line to any point within the Dominion by depositing a plan of the same in the Department of Railways?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The question is one which involves the legal interpretation which is to be put upon the Act 44 Victoria, chapter 1, and in the absence of some judicial determination, perhaps it would hardly

be proper for me to offer any decided opinion upon it.

#### INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to press upon my suave and generous friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, who was so flush with his offers of information last night, to bestir himself a little more. I find the chief engineer's report is not included in the papers he gave me, on the final progress estimates; and I want the Order in Council for the reference to Mr. Shanly. I have the original contract of 1888, and I have an indenture of 1891. I understood there was another of 1892, but I may be mistaken. It was stated here last night that there were contracts, in 1888, in 1891 or 1892 and in 1894?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There were two contracts, there might have been some confusion as to the dates. Two are all I am aware of. I will find out.

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) whether the work is to be let by tender?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I would so assume. The point has not been raised, but I take it for granted it will.

#### RAILWAY SUBSIDIES

House again resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting the granting of the subsidies therein mentioned to the railway companies, and the construction of the railways also therein mentioned.

1. That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant a subsidy of \$3,200 per mile towards the construction of each of the undermentioned lines of railway (not exceeding in any case the number of miles hereinafter respectively stated) which shall not cost more on the average than \$15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, and towards the construction of each of the said lines of railway not exceeding the mileage hereinafter stated, which shall cost more on the average than \$15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, further subsidy beyond the sum of \$3,200 per mile of 50 per centum on so much of the average cost of the mileage subsidized as shall be in excess of \$15,000 per mile, such subsidy not exceeding in the whole the sum of \$6,400 per mile. The expression "cost" used in this resolution means the actual, necessary and reasonable cost and shall include the amount expended upon any bridge, up to and not exceeding \$25,000, forming part of the line of railway subsidized not otherwise receiving any bonus, but shall not include the cost of equipping the railway nor the cost of terminals and right of way of the railway in any city or incorporated town; and such actual, necessary and reasonable cost shall be determined by the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals and upon the report of the

Chief Engineer of Government Railways, certifying that he has made or caused to be made an inspection of the line of railway for which payment of subsidy is asked, and careful inquiry into the cost thereof, and that in his opinion the amount upon which the subsidy is claimed is reasonable and does not exceed the true, actual and proper cost of the construction of such railway, the lines of railway being as follows, that is to say :—

1. To the Central Ontario Railway Company, for an extension of their railway from, at or near either Coe Hill or Rathbun Station on the company's railway to, at or near Bancroft, not exceeding 21 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 55-56 Victoria, chap. 2.—Revote.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It may be desirable that a general statement, though perhaps a brief one, might be made at this stage rather than at any other, and what remarks I have to address to the committee in that connection I will address at this time.

The committee will have observed, if they have gone over the various items of the subsidy grants which are embraced in these resolutions, that they provide for railways in almost all portions of the Dominion, and embrace a total mileage, on the basis indicated here, which would involve a possible liability of \$6,500,000 of money in round figures, or, to give a close and accurate statement, which involve a liability of \$6,540,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That is revotes and all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. In this amount there are included revotes of \$1,647,120, and new votes of \$4,893,175.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend excuse me for interrupting him again, but we may as well have the information as we go on. In making up that calculation of \$6,540,000, the hon. gentleman only makes an approximate estimate on the basis of \$3,200 a mile. He takes no account of the percentage that may be added on the account of the difficulties of construction.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No; on the basis of \$3,200 a mile.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the minimum sum.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have based it on the minimum estimate of \$3,200 a mile, except as otherwise provided in these resolutions in only one case. This totals up, no doubt, in the aggregate, a larger sum than it has been usual and customary, at any session of Parliament to vote in this way. A comparison, however, with the appropriations and the subsidy votes which have been passed, from time to time, since this policy was adopted does not, I think, so far as amount is concerned, make an unfavourable showing as between those appropriations and the present resolutions if it is taken to be an unfavourable view that the amount should be

Mr. FIELDING.

large or that, it even should be larger than has been previously voted. I find that there were some years, and I refer now to the period between 1888 and 1894, when the total sum voted was in excess of \$4,000,000, including, I admit, revotes, as well as new votes. The amounts voted in these years were as follows :

1888.....	\$1,297,104
1889.....	3,088,071
1890.....	3,613,210
1891.....	765,474
1892.....	4,136,649
1893.....	1,052,088
1894.....	4,658,560

The committee will observe that I have only mentioned here the amounts which have been granted by way of cash subsidies. I have made no reference whatever to the many millions of acres of lands, which, since the policy was adopted, have been granted by Parliament in aid of railways. The total acreage, including the original grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway, is 40,000,000 acres.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister (Mr. Blair) has not given us the subsidies for 1895 and 1896.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was nothing granted in 1895 and 1896. There were, of course, subsidy votes brought down but not granted, and I am only taking those that actually passed Parliament. I may take occasion, perhaps, to furnish, later on, if the subject is referred to, the total subsidy grants which it was proposed to make.

Mr. FOSTER. Which were brought down to the House ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, which Parliament was asked to grant, but which grant was not made. I have not included the land subsidies, but have confined my statements here exclusively to the moneys granted. It may be said, and it has been said, as I observe, in the public press, that this is an exorbitant sum to grant for such a purpose, and there has been a disposition, in that portion of the press, at all events, which is opposed to the Government, to regard the amount as proper to be added to the assumed liabilities of the Dominion, or the liabilities which the Government is asking Parliament to assume, and which are included in the general total which, I see, is made up as representing the financial obligation assumed at the suggestion of this Government to the sum of \$60,000,000. I need not say to hon. gentlemen, who have had experience in the past, that it would be unfair and exceedingly inaccurate to put forward such a statement at all as representing the sum of the fixed, or likely to be fixed, liability of the Dominion. We know, as a matter of fact, that ever since money subsidies have been granted by Parliament, sums have been voted, year after year, largely in excess of the amounts which are called

for under such appropriations. I have not made a close calculation in regard to the proportion between the amounts of these subsidies which have been voted and the amounts which have been taken up, but, I think, I am well within the mark when I say that of all the subsidy grants which have been made, from time to time by Parliament, not one-half of the amounts have materialized, or which the Government, after they have passed Parliament, has been called upon to make good. The result is that, while Parliament is asked, through these grants to assume a liability, and while there is involved in them, in a sense, a liability to the extent of the gross amounts which the subsidies total altogether, yet, after all, it is only a contingent liability, and it is based upon such a contingency, that no very large percentage of the moneys granted by Parliament has been found to materialize, as I have said. I think I am speaking well within the mark when I say that probably not one-half of the sum which has been, from time to time, voted by Parliament has been called for by any of these companies. The amounts, therefore, which we are asking to-day are not so much in excess of the sums which have hitherto been voted, on occasion, by our predecessors. I am, I think, relieved of the necessity of justifying, from a party stand-point, at all events, the proposals which we are now submitting to the committee, by the action, or by the statements which has been assumed and which were made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, in respect to these grants.

I was very much pleased indeed to hear the hon. gentleman address himself as he did to the committee in respect to these matters frankly and explicitly, as he did in effect, withdrawing any question as to the attitude of the parties in this House in respect to these proposals as a whole, and expressing his readiness to assent and approve of the grants which we were asking Parliament thus to make. So that, I take it, I am relieved from the necessity of offering to this Parliament any defence at all of these proposals. No doubt there will be some few gentlemen on the other side of the House who may not be disposed to follow their leader in this regard, but who may repudiate the attitude which he has taken with respect to these proposals. There will always be found, I apprehend, on both sides some few who will not place themselves entirely in accord with their leaders; but they do not speak for their party. They are expressing their independent views, while from what has been said in his place here by the hon. gentleman, speaking as leader of the Opposition, these proposals in the main have the assent and approval of the Opposition in this House. My hon. friend, however, while he gave his unqualified assent to the policy which the Government are continuing to pursue in this regard, did not refrain from making a criticism of our action by claiming

that in these particulars we were departing from what has been the declared policy of the Liberal party. The hon. gentleman did not furnish the House with any evidence of the grounds upon which he based that statement. What little evidence he did furnish was I think, scarcely such as to convince everybody of its sufficiency. I think it would scarcely convince himself. It was not to be supposed that any newspaper, though it might be recognized as an organ of the Liberal party, no matter how influential it might be, would be authorized to declare what the policy of the Liberal party is, unless the Government had declared itself through its proper official channels, or unless the Liberal party while in Opposition had declared its policy in a formal way through its leaders, or when assembled, as on one occasion it was, to lay down its platform. Unless the Liberal party had declared its policy against giving subsidies to railways through its authorized leaders, it could not be said to have declared such a policy; and I understand that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was unable to put his finger on any such declaration or to rest the imputation he cast on the Government in this regard upon any sufficient evidence whatever. I understand that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), from the remarks he made, was out of joint with his leader in this respect. But though we recognize the prominence of my hon. friend in his party, though we recognize that in the event of a change of Government at an early day, my hon. friend would be fully entitled to regard himself as a strong claimant for a Cabinet position, yet I do not think that even my hon. friend would contend that his utterance here, in antagonism to that of the leader of his party, ought to be received as a declaration of the policy or principles of the Conservative party in the country. So that we may assume that the only differences of opinion with regard to these proposals which may exist on either side will be individual differences, and not differences as between the two parties in the state.

The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, however, took occasion to refer in a critical way to one or two grants which are included in these resolutions—not because he thought they ought not to have been included in these proposals or because he was opposed to the grants—for he declared that if present he would vote for them—but because he felt that they were not in harmony with the policy which the Government had adopted in regard to one or two undertakings, more particularly the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. He contended that the proposal to give a subsidy of \$1,000,000 to the Quebec bridge while a meritorious proposal in itself, and one which he heartily sympathized with and would support, was yet in direct antagonism to the policy which

the Government had adopted in regard to extending the Intercolonial to the city of Montreal. The hon. gentleman, to my mind, did not reach that conclusion by any very logical process, nor do I think, even if his reasoning had been logical, that it was well founded in fact. There is a radical defect in the hon. gentleman's proposition, because he based it altogether upon the assumption that if the Government had in their minds, as they must be taken to have had, the intention of asking Parliament for aid to this bridge to the extent of \$1,000,000, instead of reaching Montreal by the Drummond County Railway and by the arrangement with the Grand Trunk, we ought to have stayed our hand and have endeavoured to utilize this bridge by means of reaching the city of Montreal. I see that one hon. gentleman opposite entirely endorses that proposition. Well, Sir, I do not know that I need detain the committee at this period of the session to argue that question; but I will just take the liberty of pointing to one or two insuperable obstacles which it appears to me would lie in the way of such a proposition. It would, in the first place, involve a considerable delay—and delay is a thing which I do not think we would be justified in permitting—because the building of a bridge across the St. Lawrence at Chaudière would be necessarily a work of time. It does not follow, because we are prepared to give a company aid to the extent of \$1,000,000 in the construction of that bridge, that the bridge will be immediately constructed.

Mr. BERGERON. How long will it take?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not prepared to say how long.

Mr. BERGERON. Twenty years?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should be glad to see it built without any delay.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will it ever be built?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend would not accept any opinion from me if it were adverse to that of his leader, and his leader has assured this House that it will unquestionably be built, and built at once.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman tell me what is the distance by way of the bridge at the point where it is likely to be constructed from Lévis to the city of Quebec?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think it will be over 14 miles.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And the width of the river as well?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am including the width of the river in that.

Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think the leader of the Opposition declared yesterday that the bridge would be immediately built.

The PRIME MINISTER. He said it ought to be built.

Mr. BERGERON. I understood him to say that there was no doubt it would have been built if the Drummond County Railway had not been used as the route, but if the route had been made by the bridge and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then I understand that the Government are granting a bonus for the purpose of putting the town of Lévis into connection with the city of Quebec, and that it would be necessary to make a trip 14 miles around to get from Lévis to Quebec.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all. That is not the object of the grant. The point is to get a bridge across the St. Lawrence which will be available for access to Quebec from all directions on the south side of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. WALLACE. How far is the bridge from Quebec?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Between six and seven miles. It is certainly the most suitable part of the river to cross, and the structure would cost less there than anywhere else, and I think would be as convenient, on the whole, as if constructed anywhere else.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Put it in another way. Freight coming from the east, for instance, bound for Quebec will, of necessity, be compelled to go around fourteen miles instead of being ferried across the river.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Because we have a bridge across the river above Quebec, it does not follow that all the freight will cross that way. It will be a good deal a matter of convenience and of the class of freight whether the freight will cross in the ferry or go round by the bridge. But the situation is no different in that regard from what it is at Lachine, where the Canadian Pacific Railway from the east has to run up the river several miles above Montreal and cross and then run down. What I was trying to point out is that some time will necessarily have to elapse before the bridge can be constructed and be utilized for railway purposes. Time is an essential ingredient in all these matters, and we do not want to have to wait three or four years for the purpose of completing our connection at Montreal, when that can be done at once, and is practically now in operation. My hon. friend, when he comes across the St. Lawrence by this bridge, will then have two or three serious questions to consider, and serious obstacles to overcome. He will have an additional mileage, very much in excess of the mileage which

now we would have to cover in reaching Montreal from Lévis, on the south side. He would then have to make arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. WALLACE. How much additional mileage ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Fifteen or sixteen miles at least from Quebec alone, but thirty miles further from Lévis, and he would then have to confront the still greater difficulty of making arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I do not think it would be practicable to do this upon terms which would be acceptable to the Government of Canada and advantageous to the Intercolonial Railway system. We know, as matters stand to-day, and will continue to stand for all time, that the Intercolonial Railway is a competitor with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the business from the east going west, and for the western business going east. The territory which the Intercolonial Railway drains is territory in respect of which it properly owns the business coming to railways ; but if we had to depend upon making arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway in order to reach Montreal via Quebec, we would be hampered at every turn, and it would be impossible for us to do business in any kind of successful competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway, when we would need to use 163 miles of their road in order to reach the point of destination. So that there are a great many questions to be considered, and the intention of the Government, in aiding the construction of a bridge at Quebec, in no wise conflicts with the policy we have adopted and which is now in practical operation, of giving the Intercolonial Railway at Lévis connection with Montreal, but is entirely consistent with it. Instead of hurting, it will help, in every respect, the Intercolonial Railway in its connections with Quebec and Montreal.

Passing from that point of criticism, the hon. gentleman mentioned another. He said that while he is prepared to favour the grant we are asking Parliament towards the construction of the South Shore Line Railway, we were creating another competitor for the Intercolonial Railway. I join issue entirely with him on this question, because I cannot perceive in what direction or on what class of business or in what way the South Shore Railway, if it were built all the way along the south shore, and even if it were to connect with the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway on the south shore would be a competitor with the Intercolonial Railway. I am of the opinion that that railway would rather be a feeder to the Intercolonial Railway than take business from it. We know that the route of the South Shore Railway carries it along the south shore through the populous portions of that section of country, through parishes which

have no railway connection otherwise, or a large portion of which have no other railway connection, and will therefore serve a district or country which is not now and never will be served by that portion of the Intercolonial Railway that we have acquired from the Drummond County Railway Company. There is a considerable mileage distance between the two roads, and that distance, even if it were less than it is, would not prevent the Drummond Railway from doing business with the people along its own route. So that in no respects can I see how the building of the South Shore line would militate against the interests of the Intercolonial Railway, or how we would thereby be bringing another competitor into the field. The business we have been looking chiefly for in making this connection is not the local business. We have not counted on the local business as a material ingredient leading us to adopt that policy. I do not despise, by any means, the business we will get. That business is increasing, and likely to increase. We are going through a country which is improving every year, whose fertile soil will be settled up and will provide support and maintenance for a very considerable population, and that will be an advantage to us in connection with our extension to Montreal, but that has not been the impelling motive on which we chiefly base our policy. We are willing to accept the material advantages in the future in that local business, but it is the opportunity for doing through business that we have been desiring to obtain, and it is because we are satisfied that in reaching Montreal we will reach a point which will not only give us but receive from us an immense volume of business which would not otherwise, from a railway point of view, be able to reach. I cannot, therefore, subscribe, and I think I have furnished the committee with good reasons why I cannot subscribe, to the objections which have been taken by the hon. leader of the Opposition to our grant in these particulars.

Let me turn the attention of the committee, for a few moments, to the general results, apart from the individual proposals themselves. I am not going to discuss the individual grants at any length, but will defer any observations I may have to make on them until each case comes to be dealt with in its turn.

The first resolution is a continuation of the resolutions adopted in 1897 for the first time. We keep to the idea that general subsidies shall be limited to \$3,200 per mile, unless the actual and bona fide cost of the construction of the particular railway in question applying for the subsidy does exceed \$15,000 per mile.

Mr. WALLACE. How do you ascertain that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is provided in the statute of

1897 that it shall, in the first place, be ascertained by careful personal inspection by an engineer of the department, who examines the work and ascertains what it ought to have cost; then looks into the books, accounts, vouchers, and papers of the company to see what they represent it to have cost, and makes his report to the Chief Engineer. The Chief Engineer passes on the returns and the information furnished him, and advises the Minister, who reports to the Governor in Council, and the Governor in Council determines finally whether or not the amount of subsidy the company is entitled to receive would be in excess of \$3,200 a mile, and, if so, to what extent it should be in excess of that amount. The effect of this section has not been to produce the results which hon. gentlemen opposite at the time it was proposed by the Government anticipated, or, at all events, represented that they feared it would result in. It was charged that we were practically giving a large number of railways, which would be constructed under its operation, very much larger subsidies than it was usual for Parliament to give, that, instead of having to give \$3,200 a mile, to a large percentage of those, we should give double that amount, or, at least, over \$3,200 a mile. We have had two years' experience of that section, and we find that only two roads have been found entitled to receive more than \$3,200 a mile. I have here a memorandum of the amounts. I was under the impression the other evening, as was my deputy, that there was only one road in this category, but I find that there are two. The first is the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Road, which, we all know, is a very important road, and a very expensive one to construct. This company received an additional \$3,200 per mile for 54.58 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, it received \$6,400 a mile altogether?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Was there no portion of it which received anything between \$3,200 and \$6,400?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. There are no roads which cost more than \$15,000 that did not cost sufficient to entitle them to \$6,400 a mile. To a considerable portion of this line, hon. gentlemen opposite themselves gave a fixed subsidy of \$6,400 per mile.

Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand that if a road costs anything more than \$15,000 a mile, it is entitled to \$6,400 a mile subsidy?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No; it is not entitled to a dollar beyond the \$3,200, unless it exceeds \$15,000 per mile; and then it is only entitled to 50 per cent on such excess, and in that case

Mr. BLAIR.

there is a limit of \$6,400 a mile. I have mentioned one of the roads that received this extra bonus. The other was the St. Lawrence and Adirondacks, on a very small mileage of 13½ miles. The amount which has been paid in respect to the clause of the Subsidy Act of 1897, was \$433,792. Both of the roads receiving an extra subsidy are roads which would have been regarded as entitled to special consideration from Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the amount they would have to cost in order to be entitled to \$6,400 a mile?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They would have to cost \$21,400 a mile.

Mr. FOSTER. So that the portion of the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound road which costs more than \$15,000 a mile costs \$21,400 or over, a mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When the hon. gentleman says "any portion," he states it in such a way that I can neither assent to it or dissent from it. To entitle them to receive this \$6,400 a mile, they would have to show that \$21,400 a mile was the average cost of that section. Some portions of the line would cost a great deal more than other portions.

Mr. FOSTER. What section?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This whole 54.58 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. That was the whole length subsidized by the hon. gentleman's Bill?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will remember, they were not entitled, under this Act, to receive the added subsidy in respect of the cost of a bridge in excess of \$25,000 or even on that amount if the bridge had received special subsidy, nor for any sums which they would pay for terminals or rolling stock or right of way in or near a city.

Mr. HAGGART. If the cost of construction of a road were only \$10,000 a mile, and if it is specially mentioned as entitled to \$6,400 a mile, is it entitled, under this resolution, to anything more than \$6,400?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. That first clause is made applicable to the roads "undermentioned."

Mr. HAGGART. It seems a little doubtful.

Mr. WALLACE. What was the estimate of the Chief Engineer of the cost of the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot tell exactly, but it was

far and away in excess of the amount that would be necessary to entitle it to receive the sum they did receive. In both roads there was no room for controversy or questions as to the right of the company to the double subsidy.

Mr. FOSTER. But the hon. gentleman did not pay on the estimate of the engineer. He paid on the actual cost ascertained?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, and I think I may add that we were very materially aided, after we had come to a conclusion on it, by the scrutiny the Auditor General gave to the accounts.

Mr. FOSTER. That is about the only check we have on the Ministers; and then they sometimes steal a march on the Auditor General by paying by credit checks. The point that was raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) is worth considering. It would seem that this clause respecting \$3,200 a mile is applicable to all "undermentioned" roads. And among those "undermentioned" is one to which \$6,400 a mile is given. I think the hon. gentleman will have to guard that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It certainly is not the intention to give more than \$6,400 a mile in any case.

Mr. HAGGART. It is not the intention; but I think from the wording of the clause, it would not be so clear as it should be.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. gentleman would be in error in that. The line which is specially given \$6,400 per mile is under another resolution.

Mr. COCHRANE. Could the Minister do it under that clause if he wanted to?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I think not.

Mr. FOSTER. They are under the same resolution, and there is no exception made.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are not under the same resolution, they are under a second resolution. This is the form in which it has been done in the past, and in which it was done in 1897. We provide in the first resolution, and that was kept distinctly in view, for all the companies are to receive \$3,200, and which may become entitled to the additional grant; then our next resolution provides for a straight grant of \$6,000. The first clause ends: "The lines of railway being as follows." That would expressly limit it to the railways there named. I mention these facts because I think they will have a reassuring effect upon our hon. friends opposite, and they will see that the fears which they expressed much stronger in 1897 when similar proposals were under consideration, have not been realized, and that we have placed

a very safe limit when we have named \$15,000 within which to restrict the grantees to the subsidies for a lesser amount. There may possibly be a difference of opinion as to whether we have not been too stringent in that regard, as to whether we have not named too high a sum as the limit within which the company must be restricted to the first named subsidy of \$3,200. But I think there is no ground for any anxiety as to the number of roads that may be entitled to receive a larger subsidy than \$3,200.

I desire now to make some comment upon two of the other resolutions which are named here. One places a limitation upon the powers of certain companies therein named as to their legal right or power to amalgamate, combine interests, or place themselves in the hands of another railway company. I refer to this section:

3. That the subsidies granted to the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company, the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company are granted upon this condition, and if received and paid under the authority of this Act to the above mentioned companies respectively, shall be received upon the condition, that the said companies shall not, nor shall any of them, at any time amalgamate with any other railway company, or lease its line to any railway company; nor shall any of the said railways be leased to or operated by any other company; nor shall any of the said companies make an agreement for a common fund or for pooling its receipts with any other railway company, and any such lease, amalgamation or agreement shall be absolutely void, excepting in so far as such agreement may extend to traffic or running arrangements which have been approved by the Governor in Council.

The committee will observe that there are three railway companies mentioned here.

Mr. WALLACE. I want a good deal of information about these; so the Minister will not be, as usual, taken by surprise.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend, I am afraid, is not in the best mood this morning. I know he has a great thirst for information. The Canadian Northern Railway Company is the company which has been incorporated by Parliament to build a road in extension of what is called the Dauphin line running up into the Saskatchewan country, and from Swan River, which is the present terminus of the northern line, in an almost direct westerly course to Edmonton. I think this company has been chartered by Act of Parliament to construct a line through to that point. The Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific is the company which has been incorporated by Parliament to construct beyond Edmonton northerly and westerly through either the Peace River Pass or the Yellow Head Pass, and through to the Pacific coast. These three lines are lines which it may be found desirable hereafter, and in the interest of the whole country, to amalgamate together. That is a possibility of the future, and if

they are constructed, as I think they will be, I believe the missing links between them will be built, and when they are built, they will constitute an additional transcontinental line. I see before me at this moment an hon. member of Parliament who is closely identified with an enterprising journal which has strenuously advocated that whatever should happen in respect to any of these lines, Parliament ought always to make it a condition of any aid that they should not be permitted to amalgamate with existing railways, or to form a combine which might prove detrimental to the public interest, and prevent the construction and operation of an entirely independent line of railway into the western country.

Mr. HAGGART. Could any railway company, no matter whether this clause was in it or not, do what the Minister supposes they could do without an Act of Parliament?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can assure my hon. friend, yes.

Mr. HAGGART. They might pool their rates, but anything else they could not do.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Every railway company could do it. The hon. gentleman will see from the language of this clause that it does not simply cover the case of the transfer of a charter or the amalgamation of two companies into one company. That, I grant, it would be necessary for Parliament to sanction before it could be accomplished. But there are other ways, as the saying is, of choking a cat besides doing so with butter.

Mr. MACLEAN. Suppose there are two companies whose shares are controlled by the same men, who have the same board and the same administration, how would you reach them? In Toronto there are two light companies who did not amalgamate, but they elected the same president, the same board of directors, and they have a common object. How will you reach a case of that kind when the shares are controlled by the same men? They will work together.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say that an amalgamation can be made in a practical sense, that even a lease could be made between one company and another without having legislative authority for the purpose. You could practically unite two companies without their coming to Parliament at all.

Mr. MACLEAN. Can you prevent that by this clause?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I think so. I will not pretend to say that you could prevent a shareholder of one company selling his stock to a shareholder of another company, and if my hon. friend felt that it was essential and

Mr. BLAIR.

necessary that that should be done before there could be any protection guaranteed to the public, there is only one way in which he could prevent such an amalgamation as that and that would be to prevent the construction of railways altogether.

Mr. MACLEAN. Then the railways are the masters and we are not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, the railways are not the masters. I do not consider that the railways are the masters of this country today. I should be sorry if the time should ever come, and I do not think the time will ever come when the railways will be the masters. I think it is proper that when Parliament gives aid to any undertaking to annex to the grant any conditions which it deems necessary in the public interest, but not impossible conditions, not unreasonable conditions, not conditions which would defeat the enterprise altogether, not conditions, the only alternative of which would be to not allow the undertaking to be proceeded with, but conditions which are reasonable, which are practicable and which will, in all human probability, as far as one can see, accomplish the end desired. I cannot conceive of any case arising looking to a combination between two companies which would not be amply covered and against which the public would not be amply protected by this clause. I would be very happy to accept any suggestion which any hon. gentleman may make, looking to the improvement of this provision if it is possible to be improved. I shall be only too glad to do it, but I was in hopes that the hon. member for East York would have appreciated the effort that we are making in this direction.

Mr. HAGGART. We are not finding fault, we are only criticising the clause to see if the result, that the hon. Minister aims at, can be obtained from the clause.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was referring to the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). I think that the question of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) was a perfectly proper one, and I am glad to answer it. I am now referring to the hon. member for East York.

Mr. MACLEAN. I take it then that the hon. Minister admits that it is possible for companies to so manipulate their stock and their directorate that they will not come within the law, and yet that they would practically effect an amalgamation. The hon. Minister practically admits that this clause which he proposes to guard the people's rights will not guard the people's rights.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A most extreme and, a most violent assumption! I do say that I regret

that the hon. member for East York has not more encouragement for us, and does not appreciate the efforts which are being made in the direction in which, I have gathered, he desires we should move and which, he desired, that the provision in regard to railways should have taken.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend asks: Is it not possible that the shareholders of one company may acquire the stock of another company. It is true it is possible. But, there are hosts of things which are possible which are not likely to occur. It is possible for the railways to come to this Parliament and to find a sufficient number of hon. members so amenable to the influences which they can exert that they can practically control the legislation of this country. But, does my hon. friend imagine that they can do it? Does he think that such is at all likely to occur? No human device can provide protection against all the possibilities, and if my hon. friend, as a legislator is looking towards that as an end, he might as well give up his labour at the outset because he cannot reach the accomplishment of that end.

Mr. MACLEAN. Well, then, the hon. Minister is not accomplishing what he pretends to say he is doing. He is saying to the country: I am protecting your interests by introducing legislation to prevent these amalgamations, but his clause will not cover certain cases, and these are the cases that are occurring every day. What are the Vanderbilts doing every day? They get control of the shares of a railway company, elect their own board of directors and their own president. They do not amalgamate, but practically they do the same thing because the boards of the two railways pursue the same policy. While the hon. gentleman tells the country that he is going to provide against such things, in this resolution, he is not doing it. He does not cover this specific case, and it is a case that is happening every day. Railway lawyers say: We do not care what restraining clauses are placed in the railway legislation of this country as long as we are able to manipulate the stock.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Any amalgamation which may take place between two railway companies is declared to be absolutely void under this third clause. Any leasing, any agreement which provides for common or joint operation, or for amalgamation, in any sense, or for a common fund, pooling receipts, or any of these things that are possible to occur, in any reasonable or probable course of events, we can provide for. But, the fanciful and improbable, we cannot provide against by any legislation which may be prepared. Yet, while I say that, I say this clause would be effective for the accomplish-

ment of every reasonable desire which has been expressed particularly in the newspaper press and by members of Parliament on this question. We provide here that this road will legally be to all intents and purposes an independent highway, and if anything occurs whereby its independence is threatened, whereby its interests are consolidated, or any other thing which can only take place in violation of this statute this agreement is absolutely void. An appeal will be open to the courts to provide means to bring such an agreement to an end.

I come to another clause in the subsidy resolutions which, I think, is one of very great importance, and which marks a distinct departure from the legislation of the past. These grants which have been hitherto made have been, unquestionably, nothing but gifts. There have been no conditions attached to them further than that the roads which were being aided should be built in a particular manner in accordance with the specifications provided by the Government. We still continue, as a matter of course, these provisions; we will require that the line shall be constructed in accordance with the usages of the past, but we have grafted upon this a principle which is a very material departure from the usages of the past. We have, in point of fact, ceased under these resolutions to give bonuses to railways; we have ceased to make gifts to them from the public treasury and we have substituted, rather, what we might properly describe as advances to the companies from the exchequer of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. Simply advances?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, simply advances. They are advances in every sense of the word; they are payments made to these companies in consideration that they will perform, on their part, a certain class of obligations, that while the country has certain services which it requires to have rendered they are to treat the payments that are made to them as a partial, or as a full payment as the circumstances of the case may justify. I venture to say that this proposal is a distinct improvement upon the railway proposals of the past, that the country will get substantial benefits from the conditions which we have incorporated here, and that it will get a substantial pecuniary return from these services, not limiting the benefits that will accrue to the country to the indirect results, but in the shape of the direct benefits that will accrue to the country. In my opinion—and I think that opinion will be shared by hon. gentlemen opposite—we are only on the threshold of railway construction in this Dominion. I would have been glad, as I am sure the country would have been, if, when the policy of granting bonuses to railways was initiated, it had been practicable or had occurred to those

initiating that policy, that some condition involving an adequate return to the exchequer of the country for those grants could have been exacted. But these considerations come to us as things develop, and it was only reasonable and natural, in the earlier periods when subsidies were given—at a time when subsidies were as much or perhaps more needed than at present—that the main consideration was to secure the construction of railways, and the idea of a direct return to the exchequer did not present itself. But we have now reached a time when in my opinion we shall have an immense growth in the mileage of railways constructed, and when there will no doubt be a continued demand on the treasury for assistance to these undertakings; and we shall in my opinion best meet the reasonable desires of the country by annexing some valuable condition to the making of these grants, which will secure to the treasury a material and substantial return.

Mr. MACLEAN. May I interrupt the Minister to ask him a question in regard to the fourth resolution? When it says that "the location of every such line of railway shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council," does that include the location of stations? Here is an opportunity to protect the people in that respect which the Minister might avail himself of.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, there is nothing in express terms in this resolution providing for the location of stations.

Mr. HAGGART. Since the Minister is interrupted, would he deal a little more fully with clause 4? The companies cannot utilize the subsidies until, in addition to the action of Parliament, an Order in Council is passed granting them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is entirely true. The mere fact that Parliament has passed this Act does not entitle any company to come to the Government and demand a subsidy as a matter of right. They have in the first place to satisfy the department that they are capable of carrying out the work and as to their bona fides. Then they have necessarily to submit their plans for approval; and, as a condition of our entering into a contract with them, we may require that stations shall be located according to the desire or determination of the department, the Minister, or the Governor in Council, and any other condition that is reasonable.

Mr. MACLEAN. Why not put it in here?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are various conditions attached to contracts providing for the granting of subsidies which are not expressly contained in these Acts. I may say to the hon. gentleman that for the past two years

Mr. BLAIR.

all the subsidy contracts entered into have contained just such a condition as he has referred to, and it is the intention of the department to continue what has been done in that respect. But this is only one of the many conditions which from time to time are provided for, even though the statute does not mention them.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the Minister to say that the Government were to get not only an indirect, but direct return for these subsidies.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) referred to the other point, I was proceeding to explain to the committee this clause, which I have characterized as a distinct departure from the course of procedure in the past, and my view as to securing a distinct and direct return to the treasury from the railway companies which are receiving these subsidies. I said that in my opinion railway building in this country was really in its infancy. We have to-day closely approximating 17,000 miles of railway built and in operation in Canada. Looking back over the years which have elapsed since confederation, we shall be seen to have made a most extraordinary advance. We had in 1868 only 2,278 miles of railway in operation, while to-day we have nearly eight times as many miles. During those 30 years, therefore, we have increased our mileage 800 per cent. I have no doubt in my own mind that there are gentlemen now sitting as members of Parliament who will live to see the time when we shall have 40,000 miles of railway or more in Canada. In that view, you can well perceive that we are likely to get the full benefit of any conditions such as are contained here, providing for the rendering of a direct service such as now involves a pecuniary charge on the Dominion by these companies. The criticisms which I have seen on this clause in the newspaper press—I have not heard any from hon. gentlemen opposite—have not to my mind been very consistent. I have seen the argument made: "Oh, this proposition is a mere sham; it is a mere pretense that we are not giving subsidies, but only making loans or advances; there is nothing in that, because there is no substantial service which any of these companies are likely to render which will amount to anything, or which, when they come to work themselves out, are likely to mean any saving to the exchequer." But that is not so. If hon. gentlemen will carry in their minds the fact that my hon. colleague the Postmaster General is to-day paying a million and a half of money for the carriage of his mails over railroads in this country—a sum very nearly equal to \$100 per mile for every mile of railway in Canada—they will see that the charge for the carriage of the mails alone has become a very serious item of our ex-

penditure, and anything which would tend in the future, either to limit the increase of that charge, or to give us back any portion of the money advanced to these companies, would be a most valuable condition attached to the granting of these aids. The average amount, as I am informed by the Postmaster General, which has been paid for several years past for the conveyance of mails by the railways in Canada, has been \$1,447,000 per year. Therefore, the total average annual payment to each railway for the conveyance of mails per mile has been \$94.43. While it is true that this provision will not be retrospective in its operation, while it will not apply to existing lines, it will apply to every new line built under it, and the new lines which are built under it are going to be employed for the carriage of mails just the same as railway lines have been in the past. And if they are so employed, you will see that we will be entitled to get back, under the provision contained in this Bill, 3 per cent on the amount of the subsidy. If the subsidy is \$3,200 per mile, the Postmaster General will get back an amount equal to about the average sum he is paying for the carriage of mails to-day. And if the carriage of mails increases, the amount would exceed that, and be payable by those companies which would be under this Bill in receipt of the larger subsidy of \$6,400 per mile.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the hon. Minister at his hand the practical result of this clause as applied to other railways, because a very similar clause has been inserted in two or three railway charters already. There is one in the charter from Regina to Edmonton, and I think from Calgary to Fort McLeod, and in the Hudson Bay charter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose the hon. gentleman refers to these railways that were entitled, under their contract, to \$80,000 a year for a term of years in addition to the land subsidies?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not the information the hon. gentleman refers to.

Mr. HAGGART. The clause in these other cases is very nearly the same words as this.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It will be useful to have that information, and I have no doubt the Postmaster General will be able to furnish it. It may be well to point out that these railways, to which the hon. gentleman refers, have been built in directions which hitherto have not afforded a very large amount of return. The railways have not gone into districts which were settled or in which settlement was growing rapidly. But along these railways we are proposing

to construct, there will be a settled population in a very short period, and a considerable mail service will follow, and in these cases the working out of this clause will be productive of results.

Mr. HAGGART. They were to carry the Mounted Police and the military and all officers of the Government, and that was to be charged against their subsidy.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Is there any intention of making the companies pay up arrears of interest?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). As soon as the services are rendered, the claim would arise?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, and there is no provision for any payment of arrears of interest. Each year settles itself.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The service must be rendered in that year, and you will not enter an account against them, if not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. MACLEAN. Then you will not get much of a return.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That does not follow. We do not want to annex a condition that is going to be self destructive. We do not want to give with the one hand and take away with the other. We are giving aid simply to encourage the construction of railways, and do not want to impose conditions which will prevent their construction.

Mr. WILSON. Why should some pay interest and others not? Why should not that be a charge against them?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The principle we are proceeding upon is that wherever there is a public service to be rendered, the rendering of that service must be done by the company to the extent of 3 per cent interest upon the subsidy, but if we do not require the service to that full extent, we do not charge the company with the difference.

Mr. WILSON. If it is not done in the current year, why should not the three per cent be a charge against the road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The effect of that would be to encumber the railways with a burden of accumulated interest or impose the duty on the Government of winding up the undertaking and preventing its being run. We do not want to propose unreasonable conditions.

Mr. WILSON. Would it not be more businesslike to do it that way?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not think the case is at all analogous with that of a business transaction. This is not in a sense intended to be a business transaction. We are pursuing a policy based upon the idea that it is in the interests of the country that railways should be constructed and operated, because the indirect results to the country justify the aid given. But we say, while that is the case, if it should occur that the Government desires to have any service rendered of a governmental character, if the postal department for instance, wants its mails carried or the militia department its men or supplies, the company must, as a condition of its acceptance of this aid, render that service, and if they do render it they will be open to a charge by the Government for the service rendered during any one year to the extent of 3 per cent interest on the subsidy.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Does the hon. gentleman stipulate the prices at which these mails may be carried, because otherwise the company might charge a price far beyond what it ought to recover?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We have provided for that. We have provided that the rates and charges are, in the first place, to be a matter of agreement. If the Minister of the department who requires the service is unable to agree with the company, then the matter is to be determined by the Governor General in Council. The final determination of the rates is to be made by the Governor in Council.

In addition to the mails which we have carried, the cost of carrying which the Postmaster General informs me averages nearly \$1,500,000 per year, there are supplies of all kinds and volunteers and police to be carried for some one department or another, and all these cases are covered by this provision.

Mr. **HAGGART**. The Post Office Department have a right to run their cars and mails over any railway in the Dominion at such rates as they think proper without any reservation.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. How is that idea worked out practically? Has it ever occurred within the hon. gentleman's knowledge that the Government have enforced their right and undertaken to fix the rates?

Mr. **HAGGART**. Yes, in every case by Order in Council.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The impression I have gathered in respect of the rates is that they have been very liberal indeed.

Mr. **HAGGART**. That is the fault of the Government, but they have the power to fix their own rates.

Mr. **WILSON**.

Mr. **FOSTER**. They have not been liberal in the opinion of the railway company.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It is hardly to be expected that the railway companies would be satisfied with any rate—at least, it is hardly to be expected that if they were satisfied they would say so. That is the effect as it would work out under this clause. I am prepared to furnish the maps which the hon. gentleman asked for.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I do not propose to take up very much time on the general question. We have to take up each one of these sections in committee, and it is not desirable to have a double discussion. But there are certain general considerations which the hon. Minister has raised and which will require some remarks from gentlemen on this side of the House. In the first place, my hon. friend endeavoured to break the somewhat surprised feeling in the public at the enormous subsidy for railways which was brought down by the Liberal Government—\$6,540,000 for this year—by gently intimating to the public that this was not all real, that there was a good deal about it that was assumed, for a purpose, of course; it must not be assumed that all this was a liability, and that probably a large part of it would never be called for. The hon. gentleman forgot that he was passing a most severe criticism on himself and on his Government as a set of business men in saying that they brought down to the House actual money votes for a large number of schemes which they believed would probably never be realized. A business Government and a business Minister would not bring down to this House in these days estimates of public works of which he was not sure as to their basis and prospects, and as to which he did not feel that there was a probability of their being carried through. But in speaking as he did, my hon. friend was looking to the disturbed state of public feeling, which is leading people all over this country to ask anxiously if it is really a Liberal Government that is in power, composed of men who formerly perambulated this country and diligently, season in and season out, scored the preceding Government for reckless waste of public money involved in railway subsidies. He said he did not think it was necessary for him to set his party right with reference to the subsidy question. Why not? Has the hon. gentleman any idea of consistency in public men, or is the doctrine that he enunciated not long ago in the province of New Brunswick, that Government, after all, is only a matter of deals and compromises, the principle upon which this Government is really being carried on. It would seem so from the hon. gentleman's action in this matter.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I hope it will not be assumed, because I do not contradict the statements

made by the hon. gentleman, that I am accepting them as accurate. The last statement I entirely repudiate.

Mr. FOSTER. I have to take the hon. gentleman's statement across the floor of the House; but it was a matter of public report and notoriety which my hon. friend did not at the time contest or take the trouble to deny. But the hon. gentleman thinks his party is not inconsistent at all upon this question, and he challenges us to refer to the particular statement or resolution of his party which condemned railway subsidies. Well, Sir, if my hon. friend is great in anything he is great in audacity, and his greatness was never shown more conclusively than in his speech of this morning. I might reply by saying: Can you instance a case of one single leading Liberal or one single Liberal newspaper which, for the last twenty years, that is, since 1882, has not been continually denouncing this system of railway subsidies, from the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), even down to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who seems to be so quiescent in these latter days. I remember a very famous letter which was written by the then active and vigorous Minister of Trade and Commerce, when he was trying to get on the soft side of the Patrons, for a reason, running a tilt with the present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) to see who would get the largest following of Patrons—the confiding Patrons—and in that letter the hon. gentleman stated—and it is on record—we are one, you the Patrons and we the Liberals; we agree upon this, we agree upon that, we agree upon the other; and amongst those things upon which we especially agreed was that there should be no subsidies granted to railways. Has time blotted out all these records of the past, or are they still embalmed there? And yet, with magnificent audacity, the present Minister of Railways and Canals challenges hon. gentlemen, in the year 1899 in the Dominion of Canada, to put their fingers upon one single instance in which the Liberal party denounced railway subsidies. Why, you cannot put your finger down without covering some statement of that kind, from "Hansard" out into the party press. Oh, well; suppose it is so; everything is right now, they say, because yesterday the leader of the Opposition, in the name of the Opposition accepted all these things and swallowed them holus bolus. My hon. friend is very anxious to hide beneath the ample wing of the leader of the Opposition. I have heard him on the floor of this House when some of his expressions were not so gratulatory and so approving with reference to the leader of the Opposition. But now he has no necessity to make a case. Why? Because, as he asserts, again with that magnificent audacity, that the leader of the Opposition stands behind all these resolutions and has declared that the Opposition stands behind them. Neither is

true, the Liberal-Conservative party undertook, in 1882, a policy with reference to railway subsidies, which was to give to companies in reasonable amounts and at a reasonable rate per mile, assistance in building new lines of railway. The Liberal-Conservative party adopted that as a principle of action, and carried it into operation until 1896, when it gave way to the Liberal party and Government. Well, Sir, from 1882 this principle of giving aid to railways was attacked session after session in this House, and attacked outside of the House, by the present Liberal Government, by the leaders of the party, and its representatives in this House and their associates the whole country through. What was not said against the system by resolution, by speech and by editorial everywhere? They urged that it was bad in principle, that it was corrupting in its influences, that it was a vast enginery for the disposal of public moneys for party benefit. No one but the Minister of Railways and Canals would attempt to deny that, or call it in question. Now, Sir, these gentlemen come in after having denounced this policy for seventeen years, and they eclipse the gentlemen who were responsible for and carried out the policy under the late Government. The hon. gentleman gives the amounts which were voted from 1888 to 1896 inclusive, revotes and all, at \$17,000,000 in round figures.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not give the amounts to 1896. I only gave those to 1894, without including the proposal of 1895.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is technically right. He did not include 1895 and 1896, because none were granted. He strove to get through with his speech without admitting that none were granted in those years, in order to keep up the average. But an inconvenient question brought from the hon. gentleman that none were voted in either of those two years. So that for those years \$17,000,000 in round numbers were voted, or in nine years an average of little less than \$2,000,000 per year. But when these hon. gentlemen get their hands on the tiller they turn the old ship of party policy straight around and head for this port with double the sail, twice the engine-power, and a colossal recklessness as compared to the party who had been responsible for the policy in former years. No rocks that may be possibly ahead daunt them; no storms that may be looming in the electoral sky keep them from crowding on more and more sail, and their stokers from adding to the fierce fires beneath the engines. They have made up their minds to beat the other fellows, and they are going to do it if it takes six millions and a half against the average of two millions during the years I have quoted of Liberal-Conservative subsidies. But still this is all condoned by the fact that the

Conservatives had a policy and still have a policy of granting adequate and reasonable subsidies to roads that may be worthy of it. Now, I take the ground of the leader of the Opposition. He stated that so far as he was concerned, he proposed, if he were here, to support certain of these votes, and he mentioned them. I shall support certain of them, too; and I daresay there are members on this side of the House that will have preferences; some they will not support, and there may be some who will support none. But I want to say that the leader of the Opposition had not the least idea of endeavouring in the slightest degree to commit the Opposition in this House to vote holus bolus, without criticism, without exercising their judgment with reference to these subsidies. Well, Sir, my hon. friend went into an array of details into which I am not going to follow him, because these will come up later on. Then he came to some general principles. He saw, I suppose, that he had hardly made the case good that the Liberals were not inconsistent in voting \$6,500,000 for what they call railway subsidies. But will they be called railway subsidies? I suspect that before the statutes are printed you will find that they are no longer called railway subsidies, but they will come out under the brand new heading of advances to railways, to be hereafter repaid, loans for special services that some time or other they will be bound to render. And so any doubting Thomas amongst the Liberal supporters in the country who when his member goes home, will ask him the question: Well, Sir, I thought you were always opposed to railway subsidies. So I am yet, my good friend. And yet you voted \$6,500,000 for railway subsidies. You are quite mistaken, my honest friend, we did not vote a dollar of railway subsidies; we simply voted some advances to railways which they are to repay us in due time. And so he will square himself with the honest voter and get out of it in that way. It is clever, it is remarkably clever. My own feeling is that it is so clever that the honest voter will see through it too quickly. One would think the like had never been done before. At first, what we were anxious to do was to give as much as possible without burdening the treasury, in helping railway construction in the earlier times, and we gave \$3,200 as a free gift. Afterwards conditions, first one, then another, were made, and at last in some of our large contracts we provided that services should be rendered and the services are now being rendered. One thing must be taken into account. In the first place, by this gratuitous scale of his by which he grants according to the cost of construction, the Minister includes bridges, which in the Liberal-Conservative time were never included for special help; he includes their cost into bringing up the average which shall entitle them to \$6,400

Mr. FOSTER.

instead of \$3,200. I am willing to give my adhesion to this, that these roads if they can be built with a subsidy under these conditions, it is fair to say to them: When we want services from you we will ask you for these services, and we will set off our help to you now to a certain extent against these services. But in many cases the assistance will never be adequately met. My hon. friend goes one further. Not only does he completely overturn the old Liberal contention that there should be no railway subsidies, but he brings forth the proposition that we are just commencing the subsidies to railway construction. Do you think that railway construction is going to stop in this country, he says. No, we are just on the eve of great railway construction. His remarks went to show that they had just entered upon the policy of subsidies to railway construction. So that not only have they reversed their previous policy, but they have gone still further now in the amount of \$6,540,000, and in the statement of the Minister inviting all and sundry to come in with their schemes; for, he says, we have just commenced railway construction in this country; and if you live long enough, he says, you will see 40,000 miles constructed in this country where you have only 17,000. Well, I hope we shall see such a development of railway construction in Canada as the hon. gentleman anticipates. But I hope it will be a principle more and more strongly adhered to by every Government that, hereafter private capital and the aggregations of the wealth of citizens shall build these roads, except in cases where it is absolutely impossible to have them built unless the Government gives some reasonable subvention. I hold that the Government should no longer hold out an invitation to railway promoters and capitalists in order to get them to sketch out lines and to push lines, with the idea of getting Government help. Cases arise, and will arise in the future, where private capital and its aggregations will not be able to build a road. Then, the Government may reasonably take into consideration whether it will help, but it ought to be laid down as a principle that aid shall not be given where private capital is at all adequate to the construction of the road and the opening up of the country by it. I do not want to transgress over the hour of one o'clock, and consequently I will not say any more on this question. I just wished to make these remarks on the general question, and we can more profitably discuss the different items when we come to them, under their several heads, but I felt that it was necessary to make these remarks in reference to my hon. friend's statement. I wish the hon. gentleman would bring down a statement—the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) and the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) will help him to get the information, as it will be

mostly in their departments—showing the real return we have got from the Calgary and Edmonton road, and from the Prince Albert road.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). These railways only run a train once a week.

Mr. FOSTER. My right hon. friend is behind in his knowledge of railways. The Edmonton line runs trains three times a week.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps so; but they are not run daily.

Mr. FOSTER. And the other one runs daily.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) please give me the names?

Mr. FOSTER. There is the Edmonton and Calgary road and the Prince Albert road. These two, I know, have that clause, and have been operating under it.

Mr. DAVIN. I have one or two remarks to make, but I will not be able to conclude them before one o'clock.

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

House resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). Mr. Chairman, when recess was called, I proposed to address to the House a very few remarks. What I wish to address myself to, and what I wish to ask the attention of the committee to, is the difference of opinion that was manifested yesterday in this committee between the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper). The hon. leader of the Opposition, in his speech, in which I do not think he went as far as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) credits him with going, pointed out, I think, very properly, that the present Government, in bringing down these bloated railway subsidies, pronounces the strongest possible satire on their own declarations and statements, when on this side of the House, and especially on an emphatic declaration of theirs prior to the election of 1896. What the hon. leader of the Opposition did, in the course of his remarks, was to quote from the Winnipeg "Tribune," which had, on the 20th of July, on the front page, a square containing the following:—

#### RAILWAY BONUSING.

The following is an official declaration made on behalf of the Liberal party prior to the general election of 1896:—

"The policy of bonusing railways by cash and land grants from the Dominion Government has become a fruitful source of jobbery, speculation and corruption. Under its operation favourites of the Government have been enriched. Appropriations have been made for the sole purpose of

purchasing the support of constituencies, and vast sums of money have been voted without regard to the public interest, while millions of acres of land that should have been held in trust by the Government for the future homes of hardy and deserving settlers, have been handed over without consideration or justification to charter-hawkers, whose intervention actually retards the construction of the lines whose franchises they control, for the purpose of extorting money from the ultimate builders of the roads. The policy of granting these subsidies has repeatedly been condemned in Parliament by the Liberal party."

I am going to read what the right hon. Prime Minister said:

So far as I know, the quotation which my hon. friend found in the Winnipeg "Tribune" of a few days ago, taken from a statement made in 1896, at the time of the general elections, never received any official confirmation on this side.

I want to call the attention of the committee to this language, because it is very peculiar. It shows that the right hon. Prime Minister is aware—and certainly that is a fair inference—that in 1896 a statement was made, at the time of the general elections, in these terms. Let me quote:—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is put in the "Tribune" as an official declaration made by the Liberal party prior to the general election of 1896.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend has quoted a paragraph which appeared a few days ago in the Winnipeg "Tribune," and which purports to have been copied from a paper issued in 1896.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is in inverted commas.

The PRIME MINISTER. No doubt the quotation was taken from some paper, but I do not remember ever seeing that paper, and I do not know if it has been taken from any paper, except perhaps some election pamphlet issued on the authority of somebody,—

If this means anything, it is, that the right hon. Prime Minister does not know that it has been taken from any paper, but that he knows that it has been taken from an election pamphlet issued on the authority of somebody.

—but not on the authority of anybody that I knew to be responsible for the policy of the party.

There is the statement of the Prime Minister. I have in my hand here the campaign pamphlet issued by the Liberal party:

#### DOMINION OF CANADA.

Principles, Policy and Platform of the Liberal Party.

Copies of this pamphlet can be had by Liberal candidate from Alexander Smith, Secretary Ontario Liberal Association, 34 Victoria St., Toronto. To the Reader:

This pamphlet is intended as an aid to young men and others who wish to work on behalf of Liberalism and good principles. No one can suppose that in so limited a space more than a small fraction of the shortcomings and misdeeds

of the Conservative party can be alluded to. While some attention is paid to the system that has prevailed at Ottawa for the past fifteen years and more, the chief place is given to a short sketch of the principles, policy and platform of the Liberal party. There are also hints for organization, a few remarks upon the Patron platform, and a very brief sketch of Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, the Dominion Liberal leader. In compiling this little document, parliamentary reports and debates of the session of 1894 have been resorted to, but where later authoritative facts could be obtained they have been used. This point should not be forgotten, so that when later blue-books and parliamentary reports are produced there may be no misunderstanding.

This pamphlet is not for general distribution. It is for speakers, committeemen and other workers on behalf of the cause of Liberalism and good government. Copies of the platform, however, for general distribution can be had upon application to

ALEXANDER SMITH,

Secretary Ontario Liberal Association,  
34 Victoria St., Toronto.

Then comes a chapter on the Liberal leader, and I will spare my right hon. friend the reading of that chapter, because I do not think his modesty would be equal to the agonizing ordeal of hearing it read. Now I come to page 6 of this work. It is headed "Organize and Work Now":

In order, then, that the political issues of the day may be brought clearly before the people, it is generally for each one interested in the welfare of our country to do all in his power to form associations for the purpose of arousing the electors to a sense of their duty, and inducing them to attend to the practical work of a campaign. There should be no faltering now, and each man should consider it his duty to see to it that a meeting of the committee is at once called for his polling district. It may be called by the chairman or secretary of the polling district, by a notice in the local newspaper, and announcement in the school-house or at some public place or assembly, or, if there is no committee, by two or three friends getting together, and after devising some plans for calling the meeting, "pass the word along," and thus begin by a judicious use of this pamphlet, speeches on the principles, policy and platform of the Liberal party can well be delivered by local men, and once the work is begun no effort should be spared to keep up the interest by social and other gatherings. Speaking alone is not all that is necessary, and after the polling district committee is efficiently organized, with a chairman, this chairman (as many as may be necessary) and a secretary-treasurer and sub-committees appointed, a couple of copies of the Dominion voters' lists should be immediately secured.

And so on. Ample directions are given for organizing; but the point I want to direct the special attention of the committee and my right hon. friend to is this:

By a judicious use of this pamphlet, speeches on the principles, policy and platform of the Liberal party can well be delivered by local men. Then on page 8, comes "the Liberal policy":

During its term of office the Liberal party strove to advance the interests of the country, and while in opposition, with the same end in

Mr. DAVIN.

view—the general good—it has, by resolutions and debates in the House, together with addresses throughout the land, stoutly maintained its principles. The Liberal party, believing in freedom of trade, freedom of speech, and freedom of conscience, is progressive in its character. This was strongly exemplified by the National Liberal Convention, held in Ottawa, June, 1893, when Liberals from every section of the Dominion assembled, and without any previous arrangements, proceeded at once to take counsel together upon the political situation.

Now, I will ask my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) to keep his eye on that excerpt from the Liberal platform published in the "Daily Tribune," and copied by the leader of the Opposition, while I read what is here amongst the principles and policy of the Liberal party in this pamphlet, issued from the authoritative quarters in Toronto:

The policy of bonusing railways by cash and land grants from the Dominion Government has become a fruitful source of jobbery, speculation and corruption. Under its operation favourites of the Government have been enriched. Appropriations have been made for the sole purpose of purchasing the support of constituencies, and vast sums of public money have been voted without a regard to the public interest, while millions of acres of land that should have been held in trust by the Government for the future homes of the hardy and deserving settlers, have been handed over without consideration or justification, to charter-hawkers, whose intervention actually retards the construction of the land whose franchises they control, for the purpose of extorting money from the ultimate builders of the roads. The policy of granting these subsidies has repeatedly been condemned in Parliament by the Liberal party, and this resolution is in harmony with the attitude of the Liberal party upon this question. (See resolutions 3 and 6, Liberal platform.)

Is that in the ipsissima verba, Sir?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, word for word.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, resolution 3, on page 28, is as follows:—

Purity of Administration.—Condemn Corruption.

That the convention deplores the gross corruption in the management and expenditure of public moneys which for years past has existed under the rule of the Conservative party, and the revelations of which by the different parliamentary committees of inquiry have brought disgrace upon the fair name of Canada.

The Government, which profited politically by these expenditures of public moneys, whereof the people had been defrauded, and which, nevertheless, have never punished the guilty parties, must be held responsible for the wrong-doing.

Then, resolution 6, on page 53, is as follows:—

That, in the opinion of this convention, the sales of public lands of the Dominion should be to actual settlers only, and not to speculators, upon reasonable terms of settlement, and in such areas as can be reasonably occupied and cultivated by the settlers.

These are referred to as the roots of this comprehensive principle. Under these cir-

cumstances, I think the Prime Minister can hardly maintain, what he has stated here :—

No doubt the quotation was taken from some paper, but I do not remember ever seeing that paper, and I do not know if it has been taken from any paper, except perhaps some election pamphlet issued on the authority of somebody, but not on the authority of anybody that I knew to be responsible for the policy of the party.

Suppose it rested there, what state of things have we come to in this country? Here is a pamphlet issued by the Liberal party in Ontario, coming from the organizing officer of the party, eulogizing the leader, and stating the principles of the party on which the speeches of future members of Parliament and others trying to persuade public opinion are to be founded. Suppose it rested there, where are we? If the hon. gentleman knew nothing whatever of the fact that his friends were stating what is mentioned in that quotation published by the "Tribune," what an extraordinary state of affairs that is. We are asked to believe that the leader of a party, for which the public were asked to vote because of certain opinions advanced on the platform of that party, knew nothing whatever about a cardinal principle of that platform, and is in a position to repudiate it. The right hon. gentleman tells us :

I do not remember ever seeing that paper, and I do not know if it has been taken from any paper, except perhaps some election pamphlet issued on the authority of somebody, but not on the authority of anybody that I knew to be responsible for the policy of the party.

Suppose my right hon. friend knew—because that construction is capable of being placed upon his words—that such a pamphlet was issued—and it is next to impossible to believe that he did not know that his friends throughout the country were holding this up as one of the reasons why the Liberal party should be returned to power, namely, that they would shut down on railway subsidies—suppose he knew that and did not approve of it, but was ready to take advantage of it, where are we, from any standpoint of public ethics, from any standpoint of knowing where we are at? We need not leave it there. I will read again the language of my right hon. friend. He says :

It might have been published in some pamphlet, but not on the authority of anybody that I knew to be responsible for the policy of the party.

That surely implied that some, at least, of his present colleagues were capable of being made responsible for the policy of the Liberal party. Take, for instance, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce; he was certainly one of the leaders of that party when they were out of power, and is one of their leaders now in the Government. What does he say? I have his words here. If the right hon. gentleman would take the ground—which I do not believe he would think of doing for one moment—that this

was a campaign pamphlet issued from the office of the Reform party in Toronto by the Liberal organizer, Mr. Smith, in order to help the Liberal speakers on a hundred platforms, but that nevertheless the right hon. gentleman is not responsible for it—suppose he were to take that ground, in so doing would he not present a sorry spectacle? I have, however, a statement from the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce entirely endorsing what is stated in the pamphlet, and that hon. Minister was the most, or anyway one of the two or three most weighty men in the Reform party during those eighteen years when they were out of power, and is one of the weightiest men in the Government to-day, in intellect, anyway. Here is a letter written October 1st, 1894, to a person closely connected with the Patron organization, and published in the "Farmer's Sun," for the purpose of showing the Patrons that they would have very good friends in the Liberal party. He said :

What are the other planks of the Patron platform affecting Dominion politics? They are these: Economy of administration, purity and independence of Parliament, tariff for revenue only, reciprocal trade, protection of labour from monopoly, no railway bonuses.

No railway bonuses! No railway bonuses!

There is simply no single one of all these objects which the Liberal party have not been fighting for, moving resolutions for, and doing their best to obtain any time during the last twenty years. Look at the records of Parliament; look especially at the several motions on the Budget; look at their platform, and at the very last resolution moved by myself in Parliament, and you will see that, as regards Dominion politics, there is evidently no ground of difference between the Patrons and the Liberal party.

What is it that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce laid down there? It is that in repeated resolutions, and especially resolutions on the Budget, the Liberal party approved those principles, including no bonuses to railways, and we know that the right hon. gentleman voted with him on those motions of want of confidence. I need not read these motions, because I have the statement of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, which shows that in every dot of the statement of my right hon. friend was opposed to the facts. My right hon. friend says, speaking of the policy of no more railway bonuses referred to in that quotation, that it had no official sanction. I have just shown that it had. The right hon. gentleman says, speaking of the quotation, that such a statement against railway bonuses was not made on the authority of anybody that he knew to be responsible for the policy of the party. But I have shown that it had the authority of the present Minister of Trade and Commerce.

I think that is a very serious state of things. I will leave that where it is. It is a repudiation by the right hon. Prime

Minister of a most important principle in the policy of his party. I may drive the nail further home by one more quotation from the Minister of Trade and Commerce on this very subject. Speaking of the railway bonuses he said—you remember that the "Hansard" of 1894 is referred to by the organizer who composed that pamphlet, or is responsible for it:

What justification is there for heaping—

It is "helping" here; but, evidently, "heaping" is meant.

What justification is there for heaping on our overburdened people all these expenditures for enterprises of the merits of which we know nothing at all, and which, if they be one-quarter as valuable, or one-tenth as valuable, as they have been represented to be by the hon. gentleman, ought to be able to pay their own way. I object to the whole system for the matter of that, but particularly, it seems to me, that going into the wilderness in this fashion, on the vague statement that there are valuable coal mines, in which, even though they are as valuable as they are represented, the people of Canada have no interest, is something worse than throwing away our money.

I think I have shown that the Liberal party was, by its official mouthpiece, pledged to the policy stated formally in the pamphlet issued on the eve of the election of 1896, from which pamphlet, evidently, the acting editor of the "Tribune," who represents my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), when he is engaged, not in writing, but in statesmanship, quoted; and the author of the pamphlet is entirely justified by the two planks formulated in 1893 at the convention, and by the language of one of the foremost Liberals of the party, which I have quoted here to-day.

Mr. JOHN ROSS ROBERTSON (East Toronto). I want to say a few words upon this subsidy question in general, and more particularly in connection with the subsidy to the Rainy River Railway Company, the voting of which will, in my opinion not only paralyze the public interests of the west, and which subsidy is directly contrary, not only of the opinion of the people, but of the press, in the western part of this Dominion. I would have supported the Government on this question as readily as I supported the Government on the question of extending the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, if I could have seen anything in the proposal but deception and disappointment for the people of western Canada, and plunder for the interests which this Government delights to enrich at the public expense. I am no admirer of some of the railway bargains which were made by Conservative Governments in the past. Those Governments worked under difficulties. The times were times of despair to hon. gentlemen opposite, and of doubt to the best of Canadians in the country; they were times of danger and uncertainty regarding the position and possibilities of the

Mr. DAVIN.

west; and the Conservative party made sacrifices which it should not have made, and mistakes which, I hope, it would not make, if it were in power to-day. The great objection I have to this bargain, and every other railway bargain which this Government has made in western Canada since it took office, is, that it duplicates the worst errors of the bargains the Conservative party made under conditions which were less favourable to the country. In my judgment, Canada's great mistake has been in giving its credit, its money and its land to every crowd of railway promoters who wanted to build railways with the country's resources. I hope I am no bigot on the question of Government ownership. I am not in favour of Government ownership of railways in the abstract; but I hold that the Government ought not be afraid to own any railway it is not afraid to pay for. What I find it difficult to get at is, why this Government can never get beyond Mackenzie & Mann. The privileges which have been conferred upon these favoured gentlemen by the Liberal governments at Winnipeg, Toronto and Ottawa are valuable. I know that I am always accused of finding fault and never making any helpful suggestions. But the question I am asking may pass as a suggestion. Why could not the Government of the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) have worked with his friends in Toronto and Winnipeg, and settled this railway question for ever to the advantage of the whole country? It seems that Mackenzie & Mann have received great aid from the government at Winnipeg, and the government at Ottawa, and finally they come down to Ottawa to this Government, and call upon them to stand and deliver. If these three governments had combined their money, their credit, their lands and their charters, they could have made a better bargain with Mackenzie & Mann than any single one of these governments could make dealing with that enterprising firm one at a time. Why should not these three governments have joined their resources and their powers, and offered the privileges which have been showered on these favourites to the company which would build the road for the smallest subsidy and carry freight at the lowest price? I believe that if this privilege had been disposed of at public competition, the three governments could have made better terms for the country than they have been able to make under this plan of letting every government play a lone hand, and letting Mackenzie & Mann take every trick. The hon. the First Minister could work with the provincial governments to protect the party against the Senate, and why could he not work with these same provincial governments to protect the country against the railroad bargainners, who first bleed Manitoba, and then Ontario, and lastly the Dominion, for the benefit of Mac-

kenzie & Mann, and, I have no doubt, the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have yet to see the first shred of evidence to justify the childlike faith of the hon. gentlemen who pretend to believe that Mackenzie and Mann and the Canadian Pacific Railway are two distinct factors in the railway situation. I believe that they are two in name, and one in fact. If it were a crime for Mackenzie & Mann to be allied with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and those two gentlemen were in the dock, charged with that crime, the circumstances would convict, no matter what they might say, or what my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) might say on their behalf. The theory that Mackenzie & Mann are separate from the Canadian Pacific Railway does violence to all the probabilities and all the facts of our experience with this Government. The friends of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the press of this country are the friends of Mackenzie & Mann; the friends of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the present Government are the friends of Mackenzie & Mann. The hon. the First Minister sat on the fence and allowed the Canadian Pacific lobby to crush the Canadians in the Boundary Creek country, who were fighting for the right to have a railway built at private expense. He is not on the fence to-day. No; he is down leading the hosts to battle for Mackenzie & Mann, or, in other words, for the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte)—and no one hopes more sincerely than I do that he may return to this country completely restored to health—I believe that the hon. Minister of Public Works would come out of his sick-bed to shoulder a musket in the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway, if President Shaughnessy had anything to fear from this deal with Mackenzie & Mann. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has never been known to differ from the Canadian Pacific Railway on a public question, even the elevator question; and he, too, has suddenly developed into the wild, untamed and fiery enemy of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have read somewhere that all natural law is based on observation, and certain circumstances which are constantly occurring and recurring, are finally accepted as evidence of a natural law. Apply that rule to all the circumstances relating to the case of Mackenzie & Mann, and observation will surely teach the diligent student that the absolute identity of Mackenzie & Mann with the Canadian Pacific Railway is established by the natural law of coincidence. In the Drummond County case, I did not hesitate to support a bargain with the Grand Trunk Railway for the benefit of the country, although I am not a friend of the Grand Trunk Railway, and no admirer of its management. I would not hesitate to vote in favour of a deal with the Canadian Pacific Railway in the name of Mackenzie

& Mann, or in that company's own name, if the country were to be benefited. This Government, in my opinion, is not securing for the country the benefits which it might secure.

The hon. gentlemen opposite may talk as they please about the bad bargains which were made when the Conservative party was in power. The Conservative party sacrificed possibilities, perhaps probabilities; but the Conservative party never pretended to have made Canada a nation, it did not figure as the author of a growing time. But this Government which made Canada a nation, which claims responsibility for a growing time, this Government, I say, has sacrificed certainties in its dealing with railway promoters.

The line from Winnipeg to Lake Superior, which might have been used as a check upon the tyranny of the Canadian Pacific Railway, is to become a mere branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, built with the public credit, the public lands and the public money, and presented to private individuals to be used, possibly, for the oppression of the people, and certainly for their own profit. As to the concessions, it is too early to speak. In all these bargains the railway companies usually concede more on paper than the people can ever get in practice. Considering that the Canadian Pacific Railway will have the railway practically as a free gift, the concessions ought to be substantial. But I am afraid that the people of the west will have to fight harder and back up leaders like the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) and the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) before they realize much from this bargain, which is a sample of what the country gets from a Government by partisans for the benefit of railway promoters.

Now, as to the contractors of this road, Mackenzie & Mann, I understand that in addition to this enormous subsidy for the Rainy River road and its branches, these lucky contractors are to have some hundreds of thousands for the collapse of the Yukon deal. Well, would it not be as well to give these gentlemen the combination of the national treasury at once, and save the time of Parliament in voting the public money?

Mr. TAYLOR. They have taken the hinges off the inside door.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Yes, I wonder they did not take the whole case. Now, is it possible that this compensation to Mackenzie & Mann may be covered up in the \$1,800,000 we are now giving away to these contractors? For my part, I am not yet clear on this matter of compensation to these contractors, William Mackenzie and Donald Mann, the men who have undertaken this Rainy River Railway contract. It is a question with me as to whether they could get compensation at all. This House was told

that the hon. the Minister of the Interior had driven such an exceedingly clever bargain on behalf of the country that Mackenzie & Mann would have been ruined if the Senate had not stepped in to save them by knocking out the scheme. Well, it is not long since the "Globe" declared that there were no two men in Canada more grateful to the Senate for saving them from ruin than William Mackenzie and D. D. Mann. I have been accused, as I said before, of opposing everything, and never proposing anything. An hon. member ought to be able to criticise without being called upon to create. I would like to help in destroying everything evil in connection with the work of this Government, and with the kind permission of the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), I would like to assist in the construction of something good. I understand he objects to criticism, and wants helpful suggestions, and my helpful suggestion is that if the Minister of the Interior made such a good bargain as he was said to have made, Mackenzie & Mann ought to be called upon to compensate the country for the services of the Senate which saved them from ruin. Why, Mr. Chairman, if it had not been for the Senate, these two poor, simple-minded Canadians would have been ruined by the surprising genius of the Government's great bargain-maker, the hon. Minister of the Interior. The country pays the Senate which is said to have saved those contractors from ruin, and their gratitude for a signal deliverance from the trap which the Minister of the Interior set for them, ought to lead Mackenzie & Mann to wipe out all claims against this suffering country.

The question of compensation to these contractors, Mackenzie & Mann, is one which should be treated strictly upon a business basis. I say again that the question arises whether these contractors are entitled to any compensation at all. An hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House, when this Yukon scheme was under discussion, excused the bargain on the ground that the whole Yukon business was a huge gamble. Well, possibly this Rainy River contract may also be likened to a huge gamble. They have to take their chances, and they may come down for an additional subsidy. Mackenzie & Mann are shrewd men, and they went into this bargain with their eyes open. If the Bill had been put through Parliament they would have won great wealth, and as the deal failed to get through, they may write down their loss as one of those sporting events the chance of which must be taken by every one who goes into a huge gamble.

I am not inclined to condemn the Government for trying to save their partners in its mistake from loss. I do not think that if Mackenzie & Mann are entitled to compensation their claim is a moral claim, that is, if a moral claim can arise out of an

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON.

immoral transaction such as this Yukon bargain. At all events, their claim is not a legal claim, and if they are to get compensation at all, the Government is doing all that it should do when it asks this Parliament to let Mackenzie & Mann out of this transaction with whole bones. Any compensation they get should not go one cent beyond the actual expenses. If these contractors never got a cent for their losses through the failure of the Yukon bargain, the country would not owe them anything. They might compensate themselves out of their excessive profits from the Lake Dauphin Railway deal when, through the kindness of the then Attorney General of Manitoba, they were able to use the credit of that province and the lands of this Dominion to the extent of \$16,000 per mile for a railway that was built for \$8,000 per mile. I do not think that Mackenzie & Mann would suffer any great hardships if they were asked to take the losses on the Yukon deal out of the same pocket which has been filled by subsidies from their Liberal benefactors at Winnipeg, Toronto and Ottawa.

I was glad to hear the right hon. First Minister, when the subsidies were brought down, announce that the Senate resolutions would be withdrawn. I think that he acted wisely in so doing. There has been no deadlock between the Senate and this House of Commons. It may be somewhat of a coincidence that the Conservative Senate began to develop the virtues of a vigilant watchdog about the time that a Liberal Opposition began to develop the vices of a Government. The Senate has differed from the Government in its interpretation of public opinion on one or two notable occasions. I believe that the Senate was more nearly right than the Government, and if the Senate should see fit to disapprove of the Government's action on this subsidy question, in my judgment the Senate will be conforming to the best interests and opinion in this country. I do not hesitate to say that I believe that the Senate was a good deal too much of an echo to every Conservative Government; and if the present Government is spared to fill the Senate with its own partisans, the Senate will become too much of an echo for every Liberal Government, and such a Senate would shut its eyes and empty the public treasury into the laps of subsidy hunters. Canada, in my judgment, if this resolution brought down by the First Minister had not been withdrawn, would be degraded by the plan of treating the Imperial Parliament at Westminster as a sort of bicycle repair shop, to which we are to run whenever this country punctures one of the tires of its constitution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. I think the hon. gentleman should confine himself as much as possible to the discussion of the resolutions concerning railway subsidies. As I understand his remarks, he is discussing a resolution which has been withdrawn.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Well, Mr. Chairman, you will at least permit me to say that Canada has suffered no grievance which could justify the leader of the Government in turning the British North America Act into the raw material for campaign issues. The Senate may have embarrassed the Government, but better that the Senate should embarrass the Government than that the Government should embarrass the country. It might be possible to amend the constitution of this country to suit the politicians who want to strike down the arm which the Senate of Canada occasionally places across the door of the national treasury, so as to preserve the resources of this country from the subsidy-hunting railroad bargainers. The country would probably then ask why that cannot be done, why the Imperial Parliament which can amend the British North America Act to suit the politicians, cannot also amend the British North America Act to suit the people who want Canada to be free to choose her own official language, and who demand that every province of Canada shall have entire and absolute freedom in educational affairs.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to offer some criticism with regard to these bonuses, and I have been debating in my mind whether I had better offer that criticism at the present time or when the items come up clause by clause. I have made up my mind that it would take less time and be much more satisfactory to myself and to hon. members that I should offer my remarks generally at the present time. At this late period of the session, I would not like to be guilty of the bad taste of making any extended speech, although, I must confess that, as far as my own views go, if I failed to rise in my place at the present time, in order to protest against some of these subsidies, and the conditions under which they are being granted. I would prefer to resign my seat in the House of Commons, so keenly do I feel upon that point. I will endeavour to be as brief as possible. On the question of railway bonusing I have long taken the view that the time has come in this country when the giving of railway bonuses to railway corporations should cease. I am not prepared to say that loans may not be made to railways, or that advances may not be made, if they are properly secured, but, so far as my view goes, I believe we have reached a stage in the history of the Dominion of Canada when the Government should build and own the railways itself. At an earlier period of the session I took occasion on a motion I introduced, to present to the House some figures with regard to what the Dominion of

Canada has contributed towards the construction of railways. I was able to prove from the figures that this country had paid in cash and lands, assuming the lands to be worth the value placed upon them by the company itself, \$135,000,000 for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, while the estimate by the company of the cost of the road was only \$91,500,000. Notwithstanding these vast subsidies, we know that, in every part of the western country, traversed by the Canadian Pacific Railway, the most exorbitant rates have been, and in many cases still are, exacted all along the line. So persistent was the agitation against these rates that the late Government felt it to be its duty to refer the question to a commission in order to see if something could not be done by which relief could be afforded to the people. I was able to point to the argument of Sir John Macdonald, when these bonuses were going through Parliament, that the company that was receiving these subsidies would in virtue of the great public assistance contributed, be able to carry the freights of the country at about one-quarter of the rates that would be charged by other companies that were not subsidized. This being the position, in regard to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I claim that, in view of our experience, the time has come when there should be a change of policy. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), has intimated that this Rainy River Railway is but a link of what may yet be another great transcontinental railway. If that is true, has the time not come when the Government, in view of our experience, should absolutely safeguard the interests of the settlers in the west in the building of this new road? We have had sufficient experience of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Surely we should place such restrictions in the contract, in connection with the building of this new road, as will absolutely safeguard the interests of the settlers in that country. I very deeply regret to be obliged to differ from the position which the Government has taken on this question, but I am in hopes that, when all the arguments are fully laid before the hon. members of the Government, they will, at least, adopt such measures as will substantially safeguard the interests of the settlers there. I made, the other day, a brief calculation as to the amount of lands which we have contributed to the building of railways in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and I find, from official sources, that we have contributed no less than 40,000,000 acres of land, exclusive of lands in British Columbia, and other parts of the country. Let me read to the House, from an official source, a brief statement showing to what companies these lands were given:

STATEMENT showing Railways in Manitoba and the Territories Subsidized by Grants of Lands, up to July 1st, 1898.

Name of Railway.	Mileage Subsidized.	Acres Granted per Mile.	Total Areas Granted.
Alberta Railway and Coal Co.—Main line, Dunmore to Lethbridge (now C.P.R.)	109 50	6,400	700,800
Alberta Railway and Coal Co.—From Lethbridge to international boundary (now C.P.R.)	64 62	6,400	413,568
Calgary and Edmonton Railway (now C.P.R.)	340 00	6,400	2,176,000
Canadian Pacific Railway—Main line..... (1,103 in Man. & N.W.T.)			18,206,986
C.P.R.—Deloraine and Napinka Branch.....	18 01	6,400	115,264
C.P.R.—Glenboro' and Souris Branch.....	45 24	6,400	289,536
C.P.R.—Kemnay and Estevan Branch.....	156 86	6,400	1,003,304
C.P.R.—Pipestone Branch.....	31 30	6,400	200,320
Great North-west Central Railway (now C.P.R.)	50 00	6,400	320,000
Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Co. (Dauphin Railway, Mann & Mackenzie).....	125 00	6,400	800,000
Manitoba and North-western Ry.—Main line (probably C.P.R.)	430 00	6,400	2,918,400
Manitoba and North-western Railway—Branch from Binscarth (now C.P.R.)	26 00	6,400	
Manitoba and South-eastern Railway Co. (now C.P.R.)	98 00	6,400	627,200
Manitoba and South-western Colonization Co. (now C.P.R.)	218 25	6,400	1,396,800
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Steamboat Co. (now C.P.R.)	253 96	6,400	1,625,344
Red Deer Valley Railway and Canal Co. (now C.P.R.)	55 00	6,400	352,000
Saskatchewan and Western Railway Co. (now C.P.R.)	15 47	6,400	99,008
Winnipeg Great Northern Railway (now Mann & Mackenzie)	900 00	Div. A., 6,400 " B., 12,800 " C., 6,400	8,480,000
	2,937 21		39,725,130

Now, I think, I have been able to demonstrate to this House the immense amount of land we have given, in that country, for the bonusing of railways. The total is 40,000,000 acres, exclusive of British Columbia, where practically a kingdom in coal lands has been given away, and large subsidies in lands in other parts of the country. I have been able to show that the great majority of it belongs to the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is, probably, the largest owner of land in the civilized world. It represents 40,000,000 acres, or 62,500 square miles—equal to one-fourth of the area of Austria-Hungary, very nearly one-third of the area of France, over one-half of the area of the United Kingdom, and over two-thirds of the area of Italy. The best lands in that country having now been exhausted, we find that the railway exploiters, the people who are after the Government to build railroads and allow them to own the same now want cash subsidies. It seems to me that the time has come when we should cease giving these people subsidies. I have looked up some statistics in the Year-book of 1897 and I find that the cash contributions to railways in Canada from federal, provincial and municipal sources amount to something like \$200,000,000, and all we have to show for that sum at the present time is the Intercolonial Railway. In addition to what we have spent on railroads, we have

up to the present time spent \$70,000,000 or more on our canal system—a total contribution of \$270,000,000 for transportation in this country. It would take the entire revenue of this Dominion, at \$40,000,000 a year for seven years, to pay the amount which this country has contributed to transportation. Now, I want to present an argument that will appeal specially to people who live in the North-west. Let us assume that the wheat crop of that country amounts to 40,000,000 bushels per annum, it would take the crop of that whole country for twelve years, at 50 cents a bushel, which is about the average price that has been received there, to pay the enormous contributions which this country has made to transportation. If you take the entire population of the Dominion of Canada at 5,000,000, you will find that we have contributed for every man, woman and child in the country, \$54 per head. If you add the gifts of land which we have given to these railway companies, estimating it at \$2 per acre, you will find that we have contributed to transportation \$350,000,000, which is equivalent to \$70 per head of our entire population—men, women and children. In order to make these comparisons effective, I have endeavoured to get some statistics with reference to what has been done in the United States. As nearly as I can gather, I find that the people of that country have not contributed

Mr. RICHARDSON.

to transportation more than about \$1 per head. In fact, they are against railway bonusing; and members who have studied the question will bear me out that even in the construction of their transcontinental railways, extending from ocean to ocean, when aid has been given, it has only been given as a loan, and as a rule the amount has been returned to the Government which granted it. That seems to me to be the proper principle on which aid should be granted to railways in this country. It is all well enough to assist in the construction of railways; but when these railways are able to provide for themselves, it seems to me they ought to return to the country the amount of money that has been granted. I am informed that the constitutions of some of the states absolutely prohibit the granting of bonuses in any form whatever. If the people of the United States had assisted transportation to the same per capita amount that we have, they would have contributed in cash \$3,780,000,000—more than twice the entire national debt of the republic. If they had contributed in cash and lands to the same per capita amount that the people of the Dominion have, they would have contributed \$4,900,000,000. And yet, notwithstanding these immense expenditures on transportation, I am sure that the statement which I am about to make will startle the House: that at least five-sixths of the entire products of the North-west which come east do not pass over the canals which have been constructed in Canada at such an enormous cost to the country, nor over the railroads which we have bonused so lavishly, but through American channels, via Buffalo to New York. And, notwithstanding these startling figures, we are still going on contributing enormous sums for transportation. The other night we saw, I think it was about \$1,000,000 voted for the development of the Trent Valley Canal—an expenditure which we are told will run up to probably five or six or ten millions of dollars. That is not a national undertaking and will be of no benefit for carrying the great trade of our country; and, notwithstanding all we have done, we are still going on with this folly. It would look as if we had established in Canada the national industry of bonusing; but unless we draw the line somewhere we shall soon find that people will not even run a wheel-barrow or a truck without applying to the Government of Canada for some assistance. I am informed that the Government have had applications this session for no less than \$20,000,000 of aid for railways, so that it would seem that the Government have had quite a task in paring their contributions down to \$8,500,000. It would seem as if the railway raiders were bound to push their enterprise to its very limit. It might not be a bad idea for somebody to suggest to Mr. Crockett, the able Scottish novelist, who has written such an excellent book on "The

Raiders" of Scotland, that he should come to this country, where he would find sufficient data to write a companion book to that one; and I am sure it would not be necessary for him to go into the field of fiction. If he confined his data entirely to fact, I think he could make a book sufficiently interesting and startling for the people of any country.

Now, I want to discuss—and I will do it as briefly as possible—the Rainy River Railway, the project which I have risen especially to discuss at the present time. As the country generally knows, the people of the North-west have complained very bitterly of the high freight rates which the Canadian Pacific Railway have charged on the road extending from Winnipeg to the head of Lake Superior. It has been generally felt in that country that the rates on that line have been exorbitant in comparison with the rates on other lines; and for years Mr. Greenway has been using his best endeavours to secure competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway by the construction of a branch from Winnipeg to Duluth or Fort William, with the view of bringing about a reduction in the rate on wheat to a reasonable figure. Some fifteen or sixteen years ago the rate was from 28 to 30 cents per cwt. from Winnipeg to Fort William, on a railway a little over 400 miles in length. In 1889 the Northern Pacific Railway was introduced into the province of Manitoba, and the rate was then cut down to 21 cents per cwt. Since that time Mr. Greenway has been doing his best to secure the construction of another outlet. I have looked over the resolutions, and I find that the total aid to the construction of the line between Rainy River and Fort William or Port Arthur, which it is proposed this Government shall give at the present time is \$1,856,000. There is one clause, however, under which the aid on a 70-mile section might be reduced from \$6,400 per mile to \$3,200 per mile, and if that were done the entire aid would be \$1,632,000. In addition to that immense assistance from this Government, the Ontario Government, at its last session, granted a subsidy to the extent, I think, of something like \$1,250,000, or at least \$4,000 per mile. I have been informed also that the Manitoba Government has in contemplation an additional grant to this very link to the extent of \$4,000 per mile. As the House knows, the Manitoba Government has assisted the construction of the Manitoba and South-eastern Railway, extending from Winnipeg to Buffalo Bay down by the Lake of the Woods, being the connecting link with the Rainy River Railway when the through line is completed. The aid to the Manitoba and South-eastern is a special guarantee of its bonds to the extent of \$8,000 per mile, almost, if not entirely, sufficient to build that road. If we add together these different subsidies, if we add what this Government is giving and what the Ontario Gov-

ernment is giving, and which I presume the Manitoba Government might give: \$4,000 per mile, we will find that we are giving to these people the enormous subsidy of \$14,400 per mile, which would be sufficient to build the entire road, in my opinion, although, of course, not being an engineer, I would not like to make any positive statement, although railway construction is now so cheap compared with former years that the public have no conception how small it is.

It was understood some time ago that the Manitoba Government had proposed to aid that road in Ontario on the condition that a low rate would be granted for the carrying of wheat from Manitoba to the head of lake navigation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Our subsidy does not extend beyond the foot of the lake, and does not go to the other side of the lake, to which their subsidy would apply.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I did not make the assertion that the Manitoba aid was actually granted. I said that I had been informed that such a proposition had been made.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understood the hon. gentleman to assert that there was practically \$14,000 per mile given this road.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I said that if the Manitoba Government gave that \$1,000,000—and the information I have is that they contemplate contributing a million dollars to the construction of the road between Fort Frances and Fort Stanley, and if you divide the mileage into that, you will get about \$4,000 per mile, and these subsidies together would make the enormous grant of \$14,400 per mile.

Mr. WOOD. Have the Winnipeg Government or the North-west agreed to give anything in hard cash, or simply guarantee the amount of interest on the bonds?

Mr. RICHARDSON. The remarks that I have already made entirely answer that question.

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). The statements of the hon. gentleman, so far as the Manitoba Government are concerned, are rather misleading. The Manitoba Government have guaranteed bonds to the extent of \$8,000 per mile on the South-eastern Railway, and they have secured their guarantee by a mortgage on the road.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have already stated that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is no part of the line included in this resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is a connector of the Rainy River road.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But no part of this.

Mr. RICHARDSON. No. There is absolutely no difference of opinion between us, and if permitted, I will put the case so fair that he who runs may read. I am not here for the purpose of misleading the House in the slightest degree. My statement was that the Manitoba Government had already aided the Manitoba and South-eastern extension from Winnipeg down to Buffalo Bay by guaranteeing the bonds of that company to the extent of \$8,000 per mile.

Mr. HAGGART. What do you mean by guaranteeing their bonds?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I shall come to that. Inasmuch as that road has a valuable land grant, the subsidies guarantee and lands will be entirely sufficient to build it from Winnipeg to Buffalo Bay or Lake of the Woods. What I said was that I had reason to believe that the Manitoba Government had contemplated granting a subsidy of \$1,000,000, which I think would figure out about \$4,000 per mile on the mileage, on condition that a rate of 10 cents per 100 pounds on wheat would be granted in the carrying of wheat from Winnipeg to Lake Superior. I did not state positively that it would be done, but that I was informed it would be. And I was so informed by a member of the deputation which came from Port Arthur recently to urge the granting of federal aid to this enterprise. I went on to say that it was to be a cash subsidy, and that if that were done the total subsidies, including the proposed grant, would amount to about \$14,400 per mile, which I am inclined to think would be sufficient to build it. The hon. Minister of Railways say he has never heard of it, and even assuming that the Manitoba Government is not going to give a cent, the aid would still be very large.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. How do you make up \$14,000 a mile? What is the mileage between Winnipeg and Port Arthur?

Mr. RICHARDSON. That would not bear on the question.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, it would, because if you expend \$1,000,000 over the mileage between Winnipeg and the eastern limit, you would have to distribute that amount over the mileage.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What is the mileage from Fort Stanley to Fort Francis, for it is only on that mileage the aid would apply?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Two hundred and eighty miles.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Divide \$1,000,000 by 280.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You have to add on the other piece.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is already added, by the guarantee of the bonds on the Manitoba and South-eastern to the extent of \$8,000 per mile.

Mr. HAGGART. What percentage do the bonds cover? It depends entirely on what percentage they cover.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The question of guarantee has nothing to do with this possible aid to the line between Fort Stanley and Fort Frances.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The bonds are guaranteed to the extent of \$8,000 per mile from Winnipeg to Buffalo Bay. I am not sure what the interest was, but I presume it was 5 per cent.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Four.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Of course, the hon. Minister of the Interior knows the facts. But that point has nothing to do with the proposition I am laying down. I do not mention the matter as a fact, but I give it to the House as I got it and state the source of my information. If Manitoba did give that assistance, it would be to assist the building of that section between Fort Frances and Fort Stanley. The Minister of Railways and Canals tells us that this is 280 miles. I do not know the exact mileage, but I made a division of what I thought would be the mileage, to \$1,000,000 and found that the aid would be about \$4,000 a mile. I am not giving absolute figures, but making a calculation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I was not in the Chamber when the hon. gentleman, as I understand, spoke of a proposal to give aid of \$1,000,000. Would he kindly let me know what he said?

Mr. RICHARDSON. What I told the House was that I had been informed that the Manitoba Government proposed to grant aid to the extent of \$1,000,000 to assist the construction from Fort Frances to Fort Stanley on the line east of that already aided by a guarantee bond from the Manitoba South-eastern, on condition that a through rate of 10 cents per hundredweight be given on wheat. I did not make that as an assertion, but merely said I had been so informed, and on that I based a calculation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think it a very improbable report.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am not here to say whether it is probable or improbable. I said that, assuming it to be true, it would make an enormous subsidy to this railway; and the proposition I made was that it would be in the interest of the people of the western country as well as in the interest of the entire Dominion if this Government would make a proposition to the Manitoba and

Ontario Governments that, inasmuch as the combined aid which might be granted for the construction of this road would be sufficient to construct the road, it would be a good idea for the combined Governments to build the road and hold it as a railway highway upon which all companies might have running powers. If Mann & Mackenzie desire to run trains over the road, they could be allowed to do so on paying a certain charge. If that were done, the interest of the people would be absolutely safeguarded. This is the most important railway link that will ever be built in this Dominion of Canada, in my estimation. It will be the link over which the immense products of the great North-west country will pour, probably for all time; and, if that is so, is it not desirable, and especially so in view of our experience with the Canadian Pacific Railway, that inasmuch as the country, through the different Governments, is going to pay practically the entire cost of the road, the Governments themselves should build that road and hold it as a railway highway for all time. That is my proposition, and I believe it is a fair one. I am in hopes that the Government may yet adopt it.

Now, I want to refer to another matter, and it bears very particularly upon this point. In the resolutions which are before the House there is a clause to which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals referred at considerable length this morning. That is the clause which is supposed to prevent the amalgamation of this road with the Canadian Pacific Railway or with any other road in the future. That clause gave rise to considerable cross-questioning and considerable argument at the time. The best answer I can offer to that is to read a brief extract from a speech which the Minister of Railways and Canals made in this House last session on that very subject. He was referring to a motion which the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean, made with reference to the control of rates and the prevention of amalgamation on this road. As reported in "Hansard," the hon. Minister spoke as follows. The reference in the first place is to the hon. member for East York:—

The hon. gentleman has said, why does not the Minister of Railways consent to a clause being inserted in this Bill that this railway shall not pass into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway? Well, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you why. Not that I would not very much regret seeing this railway, if it becomes, as is hoped, an important trunk line in the future, pass under the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway; but I am not at this moment really able to advise this House as to what kind of words or what sort of a section could be framed which would prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway from acquiring this road. I wonder how you would go to work to do it. Would you say that the persons who shall invest their money in this enterprise shall not sell their stock or their bonds to anybody who might be acting in the interest of the Canadian

Pacific Railway? The only way you could do that would be to say that they shall never sell their stock or bonds at all—that the stock or bonds shall never pass out of the hands of the people who invest in them, and that no person who is, or is likely to be, directly or indirectly subject to the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway shall invest a dollar in this enterprise? Would you not make yourself entirely ridiculous by inserting any such clause in the Bill? If the hon. gentleman cannot come any nearer to a solution than that, he will have to leave things as they are, and run the possible risk of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company buying up those interests. You will have to submit to that contingency, so far as I can see; and no provision that we can incorporate in any law is capable of avoiding it. I would be as averse to the Canadian Pacific Railway getting control of this railway as the hon. gentleman. I am willing to give them fair-play; I think they are entitled to fair-play; but I do not like to see them picking up every little railroad that may be constructed in Canada any more than the hon. gentleman does.

I do not wish to be put in the position of casting the slightest aspersion upon the integrity of the Minister of Railways and Canals. I have watched that hon. gentleman pretty closely, and I must say I have learned to admire him. So far as my judgment goes, I think he has done considerable to protect the interests of the people as against the railway corporations. But I am bound, as a representative of a western country to point out the difficulties in the present case. We have a clause in these railway resolutions providing that no amalgamation shall ever occur between the Rainy River and the Canadian Pacific Railway. You see I have been able to prove, from the words of the Minister himself, that that clause is not worth the paper it is written on. The logical conclusion, the only conclusion that hon. gentlemen can come to is that, if you cannot prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway—and the Minister says you cannot—from absorbing the Rainy River Railway, then, I say, in God's name the country should own that railway itself. I think that is the only way in which we can protect the public interests. I wish to be entirely moderate, but I am bound to say in view of the interest of the people in the west in this matter, in view of the agitation that has been worked up over this question, in view of the universal desire of the people of Manitoba and the North-west that their interests should be fully protected the control of this new and important outlet should be held by the Government. I am bound to be, as I have said, brutally frank on this occasion.

I do not propose to have my constituents say that I failed to do my duty on this question. I want it distinctly understood that I am seeking to represent the views of the people that sent me here. I may say that I made a tour through the province of Manitoba and spoke at a number of places on this very question. I did not speak at Liberal meetings, I did not speak

Mr. RICHARDSON.

at Tory meetings, but the meetings I addressed were generally Farmers' Institutes, composed of Liberals and Conservatives; and I am bound to say that in every case when a resolution was submitted on this very question, it was carried unanimously, declaring that it would be in the interests of the country that the Government should control this important branch railroad between Winnipeg and Port Arthur.

Mr. MACDONELL. Were they not already sufficiently served by communication at the expense of the country?

Mr. RICHARDSON. That would not at all affect this point, for the reason that this particular railway about which I am speaking is not designed to serve a settlement of people; it is a railroad running through a portion of country much of which is, I think, barren, from Fort Francis down to Fort William. There is very little settlement on that line, but I understand there is some settlement along the Rainy River.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is quite rich in minerals.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The point I wish to make is that this railway derives its importance from the fact that it is going to be a highway over which will go the immense products of the north-western country to lake navigation at the head of Lake Superior. If that be the case, then the importance of absolutely safeguarding the interests of the people will be understood by every member of this House.

Now, I am not disposed to think that even the clause in these resolutions with reference to running powers will prove of any value. There is a clause which provides—the Minister of Railways and Canals will put me right if I am wrong—which provides that running powers shall be granted by the Governor General in Council to all who may apply for it. Now, we may provide that running powers may be granted over the road that we aid. We are now aiding the road from Fort Stanley up to Fort Frances and down the Rainy River, some 70 miles. Now, what possible value will the granting of running powers over this piece of road that we aid, be to the country? If the resolutions provided that running powers shall be granted over the road from Buffalo Bay to Winnipeg, that is on the Manitoba South-eastern aided by the Manitoba Government, then running powers will be of some value. But, so far as I can see, there will be no particular value if they only provide for running powers from Fort Stanley to Fort Frances, or to Rainy River. I would like to hear from the Minister of Railways on this point.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think we would scarcely be in a position to impose any condition as respects running powers over lines which are

incorporated by provincial legislation, and over which we have no legislative control.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then, that makes my position invulnerable. It is clear that it entirely destroys the value of that provision in the resolutions, if, in lieu of the bonuses we are granting, we can grant running powers only over the piece that we aid. I would like to ask the members of this committee of what possible value will running powers be from Fort Stanley to Fort Frances, or down a piece of the Rainy River, if you have not got running powers over the pieces which connect?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman would not build a railroad in that case.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I believe it would be better to wait than that we should build it under the present conditions, because I believe it would create an irritation and dissatisfaction in the North-west that will do irreparable injury in that country.

Now, I made another calculation which I thought was of some interest, and which I would like to present to the committee. If you take the wheat product of the west for the past fifteen years, it is perhaps safe to assume that on an average eight million bushels were exported. This would represent a total export of 120 million bushels, or 76 million hundredweight. Now, the rate which the Canadian Pacific Railway has charged during the past fifteen years to carry wheat from Winnipeg to Fort William has averaged from 30 cents per hundredweight to 17½ cents per hundredweight. It is quite true that owing to an arrangement made in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, a reduction of rates from 17½ cents to 14 cents was recently secured, but we paid for it in cash. I think it would be fair to say that the average rate for that period has been about 20 cents per hundredweight for the last fifteen years; the people of the west have been paying about 20 cents per hundredweight to have their wheat shipped from Winnipeg to Fort William, about 425 miles. Now we are informed that the Parry Sound Railway carried wheat from the North-west last year at the rate of 5 cents a hundredweight over their line, and I am informed, and believe, that some of the American lines, notably the New York Central, carry wheat for 2½ or 3 cents per hundredweight for a similar distance.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, no.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think so, from Buffalo to New York. I say I believe that was done, and I will endeavour, if necessary, to give the committee additional data upon that. But at least, rates for similar distances on different railroads have been very low, and I believe, have not, in a number of cases, been more than 5, 6 or 8 cents

per hundredweight for the same distance. Therefore, if the Parry Sound Railroad carried it for 5 cents, it would be safe to assume that the Canadian Pacific Railway could carry it for 5 cents without losing money, particularly so when it is remembered that the people of Canada presented to the Canadian Pacific Railway the entire line between Winnipeg and Port Arthur. Upon such assumption, the company has reaped a profit of 15 cents a hundred, or in fifteen years has made a net profit out of the settlers of the west of \$11,520,000 on the through rates from Winnipeg to Fort William, to say nothing of the immense profits on the high local rates which have always prevailed, and do still prevail, in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. If the cost of carrying wheat be placed at 8 cents a hundred, the Canadian Pacific Railway would have reaped a profit of \$9,216,000, and if the cost was 10 cents a hundred, the company has made out of the people \$7,680,000. The mileage of the Parry Sound Railway over which wheat was carried, is the same as the mileage between Winnipeg and Fort William.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is 30 or 40 miles less.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understood it was practically the same. Notwithstanding this immense loss to the settlers, the country paid for the road, and Sir John Macdonald said that the Canadian Pacific Railway could carry freights at about one-quarter of what would be charged on other lines, owing to the vast public subsidies given.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has not made its 10 per cent dividend yet.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says that the Canadian Pacific Railway has not made its 10 per cent dividend yet up to the present time. Is he quite sure of that? So far as we know it has not, because the late Government committed the gigantic blunder, the unpardonable, insane blunder, of giving these immense subsidies to the Canadian Pacific Railway and inserting a clause which provides that until it earned 10 per cent on the capital actually expended in the railway, there could be no reduction of rates.

Mr. MACLEAN. How much was actually expended?

Mr. RICHARDSON. One of the first things I did on coming into the House this session was to place a notice on the Order paper of a motion appointing a commission to find out what was actually expended, and declaring that the excess of subsidies which the Government had given towards the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, ought to be deducted from the capital actually expended in the railway; the object be-

ing to demonstrate that even under the bond the time had come to secure Governmental control of rates.

**Mr. MACLEAN.** The Canadian Pacific Railway made all that money in the west, and the Government has taken no action in the matter.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I am afraid the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) is not friendly to the Government.

**Mr. MACLEAN.** I want the Government to make the inquiry. What became of the motion of the member for Lisgar?

**Mr. RICHARDSON.** Some hon. member moved the adjournment of the debate, and it has not been heard of since, as the order was never again reached. I do not propose to extend my remarks any further at the present time. I think I have spoken at sufficient length, and with sufficient earnestness and warmth, to satisfy the House that at least so far as I am concerned, I am in very deep earnest in regard to this matter. I did not want to make any statement that was not reasonably fair, or that would not be borne out by the facts. It is an extremely difficult matter for any member at any time, and particularly for a young member of this House, to differ with the party to which he usually gives allegiance. It is a difficult matter, I say, at any time, but I have felt it to be my duty to the people I represent, and to the west, the people who are in deep earnest in regard to this matter, to speak as I have done on the present occasion. I am not sure whether this is the proper time, but I propose to move an addition to the main clause or preamble upon which we are speaking at the present time. I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Oliver:

That the following be inserted after the word "railway" first used in the last line but one of the preamble:—

"That during the construction of all railways herein bonused, all books, accounts and records showing the actual cost of construction shall be open to inspection by the Government, in order that if it be subsequently determined by the Government to acquire any or all of the railways subsidized, they may be so acquired with a knowledge of their actual cost and at a figure from which shall be deducted the bonuses given by Government."

That the rates, both passenger and freight, shall at all times be subject to revision and control by the Governor General in Council, provided that whenever such rates produce a net earning of more than 6 per cent on the actual cost of the road and equipment, less the amount of subsidies received from any source, the rates shall be reduced to such point as shall only produce 6 per cent on such net cost.

**Mr. E. B. OSLER** (West Toronto). **Mr. Chairman,** I want to make a few remarks on the general principle of the resolutions, without going into the details of the individual subsidies. What strikes me, in connec-

**Mr. RICHARDSON.**

tion with these enormous subsidies which are proposed, is the curious and extraordinary fact that nobody appears, for the moment, to think there is any limit to running into debt in Canada. It seems to have passed away from the minds of the hon. Ministers that at one time, at all events, in their political career, they believed that a limit should be fixed to the debt of Canada, and that it should be held steadily in view by the party in power. This has been my view for a long time, and I believe it most thoroughly. I expressed the view, when I offered myself for election, that the time had come when Government aid to railways in the older provinces should cease entirely. I have not changed my view on that point, but what I have seen since has rather confirmed that view. I believe there is not one single item of aid in this long list that ought to be granted by this Parliament. There is not one single railway proposed on this list which, if it is a business proposition and a railway that ought to be built, will not find capital in Canada, and out of Canada, to build it. The original reason for granting railway subsidies was very good and proper. The Ontario Government granted large subsidies to open up the timber limits and fertile districts in Grey, Bruce and other counties. They should have stopped long ago, but within later years they have been bonusing lines to duplicate lines already aided. This is being done in this House now. It was a most vicious principle. It helped to destroy capital. It is all very well to insert a clause in these charters saying that railways shall not be amalgamated, and that they shall be independent. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals last year, in expressing himself on that view, was quite correct. It is impossible to put in a clause that will prevent the absorption of a railway, if that railway is run by men who find that they are not making money. If the road is being run at a loss, the bondholders will close it out, sell it, and the only bidder that will buy it will be the rival road. That has been the history of railroads. You have only to take the one instance, where the very large grant of \$12,000 a mile was given to the Northern Pacific Junction Railway, connecting the Northern Railway with the Canadian Pacific Railway at North Bay. The most stringent provisions were put in, that the Northern Pacific Junction should never be sold to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The Grand Trunk Railway, in its rivalry with the Canadian Pacific Railway, acquired the Northern Pacific. It is easy to talk about the question, but it is not so easy to suggest any possible means whereby you can prevent one road being absorbed by another road. A strong combination of capitalists built the West Shore system from New York, in rivalry with the Vanderbilt system, or the New York Central Railway. A number of these capitalists in New York

almost ruined themselves in trying to carry out that enterprise, but when the clouds of the financial panic that took place had cleared up, it was found that the Vanderbilt interest owned the West Shore road. Every road you are aiding will fall, as surely as the sun sets, into one of the two great systems of Canada. There is no other way for it, because no short road can live and pay its expenses. That has been the history of all roads. You cannot get capital in the world's markets to-day to build a short road, unless there is a Government guarantee. To show you that long ago funds were available for railway building in Canada, in the case of a railway that was a commercial necessity, the Ontario and Quebec Railway was originally chartered and had bonuses from various sources, amounting to nearly \$1,000,000. The Grand Trunk interest, through its friends, obtained control of the charter of the railway and of these bonuses. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, however, wished to construct a line over the same route, to connect its own line with the Great Western. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company and its friends, therefore, got together, obtained another charter, and built that Ontario and Quebec road without one dollar of bonus from the Government or from any municipality in this country; and I venture to say that it is as paying a road as there is in Canada. There was a business necessity for that road, and the business men found the money for it. The main point which I wish to make is, that I believe the time has come in this country when we should say that our debt shall not pile up any higher. We are having very great prosperity; we are having a surplus revenue. On the strength of that, the Minister of Railways brings down subsidies unheard of before in the history of this country; and he supplements these subsidies by saying that they are only the beginning.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I did not say that.

Mr. OSLER. I think the hon. gentleman said that we were only looking to the future, that railway building had only commenced in this country, and that the Government would be asked for further enormous sums, or some such language. Now, there is no necessity for bonusing these roads; but there is every necessity for stopping the bonusing of any road, unless it may be in the North-west, or in the Yukon, or where some great public interest requires it. In such cases the Government should aid the roads, and aid them liberally; but I mean the ordinary roads in the older provinces. With regard to the condition, that postal services to the amount of 3 per cent of the subsidy shall be returned to the Government, I find that the Calgary and Edmonton road earns altogether in Government work, including the transport of troops and mails, \$5,000 a year. That is an enormous interest

on the subsidy, is it not? The Qu'Appelle and Long Lake road earns a little under \$2,000 a year. The Manitoba Railway earns, I believe, about \$5,000 a year. These three roads are running through good districts in the North-west, and they have been in operation from ten to fourteen years. That will show how much revenue Canada may expect to derive from the postal services. Now, apart from the consideration of increasing our debt, which I think is the most important one in connection with this matter, there is another consideration which is perhaps indirectly more important. I differ with my leader, and with the leader of the Government, when they agreed that these railway subsidies were not sources of corruption. I contend that they are a main source of corruption in elections, such as we are now having exposed. It is from such subsidies that the money is supplied to pay the men who have been engaged in the ballot-stuffing and the election frauds which we hear so much about. These men are not committing these crimes for nothing. They are paid with the money of the people. What else can you expect, when a Government stands with open hands, and says to every section of the country: Apply to us, and we will give you any possible Government aid. That has been the position the Government has taken in regard to these railway subsidies. It was the condition that existed before they came into power. It is a condition which I personally have opposed very strongly, whenever I had an opportunity to do so. It is a condition which I intend to oppose as long as I have any voice here or elsewhere. I believe the Government are doing a great injustice to Canada in giving this opportunity to the people to come forward, with their cap in their hand, and say: Please give us a subsidy. It has been stated that \$22,000,000 of subsidies have been asked for on this occasion. That certainly means that there are a great many hungry mouths to be fed, and that the Government have only seen their way to feed about one-fourth of them. Perhaps promises may have been made for further subsidies later on. But, for the two broad reasons I have stated—first, that our debt is high enough, far too high, that there is no necessity for these subsidies, and that we should keep steadily in view the necessity of reducing, and not extending, our public debt; and, secondly, that these lavish votes of public money, from whatever Government they come, must tend to corrupt the morals of the people—I oppose most thoroughly these proposed railway grants.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The discussion which has taken place to-day, though we are at a very advanced period of the session, is one which I think ought to be fruitful. It has brought us to the consideration of many question to which it is just as well to give our attention, because they deeply affect the national life of

this country. We have at once to consider whether we shall stop the policy which has prevailed for the last fifteen or eighteen years, of bonusing railways, and whether we shall follow in the way hinted at by the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster), and boldly urged by some of his followers, of ceasing to give grants to railways at all, and leaving all parts of the country to shift as best they can. Let me say at once that it is quite easy for old sections, such as the country around the city of Toronto, which are gridironed with railways, to say that no section of the country should have any railway aid—that the unsettled parts of the country, where the settler has to go into the heart of the forest, with nothing but his axe, or on the wide prairies, must wait until private capital provides them with the railway they require for the development of the country, and in the meantime the settler must do the best he can. The hon. member for York stated that the Liberal party were going back on their policy in this respect. He stated that there was a time when the Liberal party opposed railway subsidies, and he said that that position had been maintained by every member of the party, from the Prime Minister down. Now, Mr. Chairman, so far as I am personally concerned, I call upon my hon. friend to say when and where I opposed the policy of bonusing railways. I certainly did oppose what he himself very properly styled the policy of giving subsidies to charter-hawkers; but as to opposing the policy of giving help to those railways which must have help in order to develop those parts of the country which are not yet developed, I think my hon. friend will find it hard to cite a line, a sentence, or even a syllable, from me in that respect. Nay, more, since I have been in office, I have been approached by delegations, and before I took office I had consultations with friends on this very subject. And to the delegation I spoke publicly, and my words were reported. I said that I could not, for my part, give up the policy which had been followed in this country for many years, and I asked the older portions of the country, which had been developed and settled upon this very policy, which had received their share of Government bonuses to railways, to come to the help of their needy fellow-citizens, who had not the same good fortune, and contribute to give them that assistance which they had received themselves. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) said that he was against this policy and that it was a corrupt policy. I never like to be personal, but my hon. friend belongs to a corporation which, I believe, has received no less than \$100,000,000 from this country. Whether that had a corrupting influence upon the politics of this country, I leave for him to say. We have given no less than \$100,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway, we have been spending millions of money in other directions,

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

and it was because it was found not possible to develop the country otherwise that this policy was adopted. When the Canadian Parliament adopted the policy of bonusing the Canadian Pacific Railway as it did, of making a free gift to a private corporation of its own creation of no less than \$100,000,000, the Parliament of Canada did a thing which never had been done before in the history of any country. Why did we do it? There were special reasons why we did it. Hon. gentlemen opposite must not forget that our position is a peculiar one. The Government has been called on to maintain, develop and assist the progress of this country to an extent it would not have been called upon to do had we been situated differently. But we are alongside a great nation, which has enormous wealth and a vast and growing population, and we found that we could not develop our resources satisfactorily, that we could not keep up the race with them unless our Government were prepared to come to the assistance of those who were ready to give their energy, enterprise and capital to develop the resources of our country. We would have proceeded, no doubt, more slowly and cautiously had we been alone on the continent of America, but as we were situated alongside that great nation, having to contend against its immense capital and resources, the Government, this Parliament, and the people of Canada were induced to put their hands into their pockets and try to put ourselves on a level so as to be able to compete with our neighbours. This policy we are now following.

I heard from this hon. gentleman that there should not be a single dollar of bonus given to the older part of Canada. He is ready to give assistance to the new parts, to the North-west and the new settlements, but to the older parts he would not give a dollar of assistance. Let private capital, he said, take charge of the business, let private capital come to the rescue of those in need in the older portions, but they must not expect any assistance from us. Well, the subsidies asked from Canada, under these resolutions, to be expended in the older part of Canada, cover sections of country where the farmers have to cart their produce a distance of thirty or forty miles. Does the hon. gentleman say that we should not come to the assistance of those farmers in the older parts of Canada? He says that he will maintain the policy of letting them shift as best they can, and as they have been doing for the past twenty years, and compel them to cart their produce in winter forty or fifty miles. This would be an inhuman policy, and I appeal to the good sense of the House to take a more generous view of the position, and to say that wherever we find a condition of things of that kind we should come to the rescue of the people.

I quite agree with the policy of my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), that we should not give subsidies to charter hawk-

ers. I admire his repentance, but it is a tardy repentance indeed. If subsidies have been given to charter hawkers, who is responsible? Who has given those subsidies to those charter hawkers? He was a supporter and a member of the Government that alone gave these subsidies. I quite agree that we should not continue that policy, and only give aid to bona fide enterprises, but we are bound to come to the rescue of those who have been suffering.

My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) was also horrified this forenoon at the magnitude of our subsidies, and the hon. member for Toronto said he was shocked also and horrified at the magnitude of the subsidies, which are the largest, according to his language, ever brought to the attention of Parliament. The hon. member for Toronto has not been very long in Parliament. He came at the last general election; but if he had been here in the session of 1894, he would have been called upon by his party to vote subsidies amounting to—how much? \$6,500,000. If he had been here in the session of 1884, he would have been called upon by the Government of the day, of which, I suppose, he would have been a supporter, to vote subsidies amounting to \$9,166,000. Let anybody take the statutes of 1884 and look over the figures, and there he will find subsidies for railways to the amount of \$9,166,000. My hon. friend from Toronto was not in the House then, but my hon. friend from York was. He was not then a Minister, but a supporter of the Government, and although to-day he strained at the gnat, he then swallowed the camel without hesitation. He voted for every penny of the subsidies asked—and all bonuses, not one of them an investment, given for railway construction.

My hon. friend also took, I will not say unfair meaning, but an undue meaning, out of some words spoken by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways this morning. My hon. colleague said very truly that although we ask Parliament to vote \$6,500,000 subsidies, it was not to be expected that these were all to be expended at once. We have had experience before, and we know that these railway subsidies, which are voted in one year, are expended in a series of years. The expenditure does not and cannot take place in any one year. It will take three or four years, probably more, to absorb the expenditure here voted. And the Minister of Railways called attention to the fact that though on paper Parliament is asked for a large sum of money, it does not follow that the whole amount will be expended this year. The experience of the past shows that these subsidies have always been expended from year to year over a large period of years, and, moreover, there are a good many of them which may not be taken up at all.

My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) says that he understands why these railways were taken up. The Minister knows well, he says, that

the railways will not be required, and that the subsidies are voted for an object. My hon. friend can speak by the book if that is his intention. He can see subsidies standing year after year on the statute-book as far back as 1890. Did he, when he introduced that expenditure, have a sinister object in view? Was he looking to the expenditure of money in elections or was he honest and sincere? No doubt he will say that he was honest and sincere; can he not be as charitable to his opponents as he would be to himself, and admit that at least we have as much sincerity as he had?

These are the general features of the policy, but I must confess I was rather surprised to see one item of this expenditure criticised as it has been, and that is the subsidy to the Rainy River road. If there is a road which ought to be encouraged it is that. It is going over what is properly called a new country. It is going to develop and build up a new province of Ontario, bounded by Manitoba on the one side and Lake Superior on the other—a province which in ten years may have 100,000 or 200,000 inhabitants. It crosses a very fertile section of country. There is not even in the great province of Ontario a better section of agricultural land than the valley of the Rainy River. And from the valley of the Rainy River towards Fort William is one of the finest mineral countries in the world. Therefore, I think if there is a project that ought to be viewed with favour it is this one. What are the reasons advanced against subsidizing this section of railway? The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Robertson) stated his opposition to the subsidizing of this road and his reasons for it. His reason is simply that the money will go to Mackenzie & Mann. I observe that my hon. friend (Mr. Robertson) has one strong characteristic. He seems to be blind upon some questions. He seems to have Mackenzie & Mann in one eye and the Canadian Pacific Railway in the other, and when any question comes up in which either of them is concerned, he is blind to the merits of that question. So far as my information goes, there is no love lost between Mackenzie & Mann and the Canadian Pacific Railway; but so blind is my hon. friend that he does not seem to be aware of that fact. He sees in this subsidy a sinister motive, and thinks that this railway is to be absorbed by the Canadian Pacific Railway. That may be or may not be, but if there is anything that can be done to prevent that, it ought to be done. We ought to take every possible precaution against this danger cited by the hon. gentleman. Let my hon. friend relieve his vision for the moment on Mackenzie & Mann and the Canadian Pacific Railway and read the resolution. I doubt that he has read it yet. Let me call his attention to resolution 3, in which he will find the following disposition:—

That the subsidies granted to the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company, the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company are granted upon the condition, and if received and paid under the authority of this Act to the above mentioned companies respectively, shall be received upon the condition that the said companies shall not, nor shall any of them, at any time amalgamate with any other railway company, or lease its line to any railway company; nor shall any of the said railways be leased to or operated by any other company; nor shall any of the said companies make an agreement for a common fund or for pooling its receipts with any other railway company, and any such lease, amalgamation or agreement shall be absolutely void, excepting in so far as such agreement may extend to traffic or running arrangements which have been approved by the Governor in Council.

This is what we can do—we can legislate against amalgamation. Will my hon. friend from East Toronto tell me what more we can do? This is the Parliament of Canada and we are here to make laws. We see danger in the future, and we take precautions against that danger. But I have heard the argument made by my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) a moment ago, that all this disposition was useless, that any company would find it possible to get rid of that. I have yet to learn that there ever was a law placed on the statute-books which could not be violated. This Parliament will have reached the acme of perfection which has never yet been reached by any other Parliament, when it places on the statute-books a law which cannot be violated by those who are interested in violating it. But because our laws are violated, is that a reason why we should not pass them?

There is all the difference between this law placed upon the statute-books with this section and this law placed upon the statute-books without this section. If it becomes law, as I hope it will, no amalgamation will take place, or, if it does take place, it will be illegal and the hand of the law will rest upon the offender. But this is not the remedy proposed by my hon. friend from Lisgar; nor, if I remember aright by my hon. friend from East Toronto. They want the Government to build this railway. This is a new policy—that the Government should go into the building and ownership of railways. So far as I am concerned, I have only this to say—I am not in favour of the Government building and owning railways. We have one railway and that is enough for the present time. I do not know what may come to pass in the future when men become more radical than they are at the present time. I do not know that the people of Canada may not be induced to go into the business of building and operating railways; but at the present time, I venture to assert, the common opinion of the people of Canada is not in favour of our having more railways than the one we have. These

Str WILFRID LAURIER.

being our views, I cannot accept the suggestion of my hon. friend from East Toronto. What was his suggestion in detail? It was that we should combine with the Government of Manitoba and with the Government of Ontario to build and own this railway. It is very true, we might do that if the other Governments were willing, and if we thought that this Government should extend its ownership of railways. But who assured my hon. friend that the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Ontario are disposed to go into the business of building and operating railways. If not, while we are negotiating, the people will not have the railways they want, the farmers will not have the service they need, and the miners will not have the opportunity to develop the country. That policy is too hazy for the consideration of business men. Our policy, the only practicable policy, is to develop the country as rapidly as possible by means of the aid we wish to give. That is the position. It would be susceptible of very many developments, but at this period of the session, I should not trespass more upon the time of the House. I think I have said enough to make it clear what is the position of the Government and what ought to be the policy of the Canadian people upon this question.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ellis). Mr. Richardson moves—

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The reading of the resolution precedes the speaking.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). Whatever may be the personal views of the mover of the resolution or myself with regard to the Government ownership of railways, the committee will see that those views are not embodied in the resolution, and we are not, at the moment, raising the issue of Government ownership, nor are we questioning the subsidizing or the railroads referred to in these resolutions. We are merely considering or criticising the terms upon which the subsidies are granted. Regarding the terms attached to these subsidies so far as they are effective, they are very satisfactory to me. I consider they are a distinct improvement in our railway legislation, and I am glad to see that they have been adopted as a part of the Government policy. But I wish to see these improvements carried a step or two further so that they may be more effective in protecting the public interest than as they stand at present.

Let me here correct an impression that may have arisen in the committee that the North-west is principally interested in these subsidies by reason of getting the larger share of the money to be voted. The amount of money to be voted is about \$6,500,000. I find that for purposes west of the Lake of the Woods there is provision made for 250 miles of railroad, for which \$800,000 is to be

voted. That is the total amount of direct interest of the western country in these subsidies. We are discussing the question not because of our great interest in the amount of money, but because of our great interest in the principle involved in the granting of the money, and because of our desire to see the interests of the public whom we represent more thoroughly safeguarded than they appear to be in these resolutions.

I divide these subsidies into three classes. One is the class of colonization roads in the west, for which \$800,000 is asked. The other class is for the construction of railroads and bridges in the east, in the old settled provinces, where the construction cannot be expected to add greatly to the development of the country, although it will no doubt add greatly to the convenience of the people. There is a third class, that covered by the different charters of the Ontario and Rainy River scheme. That road, in one of its features, may be a colonization road so far as it relates to the provinces of Ontario and Manitoba; but so far as it relates to the general western country it is neither a colonization road nor is it a road for the development of established settlements. It is a road to provide additional facilities for the export of the grain of the North-west; if it is not for that purpose it is for no useful purpose, judged from a western stand-point; if it is not for that, it is certainly not for any important purpose. Now, let it be understood that the only interest of the west in that road is in so far as it will ensure lower freight rates to the people of the west and to the people of the east. If the construction of that road does not give assurance to the people of the west of lower freight rates on grain going out and on goods coming in, they have absolutely no interest in its construction. At the present time the Canadian Pacific Railway will haul our freight out and haul our freight in, they can handle all the freight there is; we do not need another road there. The only need we have for another road is to get a reduction in freight rates, and inasmuch as these resolutions do not in any way ensure a reduction in freight rates over that piece of road, we desire to have them amended so that they will lead to such reduction. We hold the principle that if the Government is to give aid to railways, the country should get something in return more than the mere existence of the railway. The time has gone past when the mere building of a railway was a favour. Terms and conditions are what are wanted now.

An hon. member suggests that this provision for getting a return of 3 per cent interest on the amount of the bonuses is a sufficient return for aid granted. I do not quarrel with that at all. That is a very good provision so far as it goes, but it does not touch the point I am dealing with. We do not build railroads simply for the purpose of having them, and

we do not make terms with a railroad simply for the purpose of getting our money back. We build railroads for the purpose of getting transportation, and then we build additional roads for the purpose of getting improved and cheapened transportation. Now, where there is such a large amount of money involved as there is in this Rainy River road, we who live in the west, whose interests are more directly bound up with the question of freight rates than people in any other part of the country, would not be doing justice to those whom we represent, nor to the country generally, if we did not draw attention to the fact that when the House is called upon to vote this large amount of money, there is no arrangement made by which the expenditure shall serve the great interest that we have in view.

This question of reduced railroad rates between the western country and the east is not only a question of interest to the west. I have stated before in this House that it is a matter of interest to the manufacturers and commercial people of the east as well as it is to the people of the west. If the commercial and manufacturing interests of eastern Canada are to increase, it can only be by the development of the west, it can only be by being enabled to hold the trade of the west against their competitors across the line, and they can only hold that trade by getting cheaper transportation than they have now. At present they are at a disadvantage in length of distance and in rate of transportation, and every man in this eastern Canada who is interested in commerce or in manufactures should see that the rates of transportation between the east and the west are reduced to the lowest possible figure. The commercial people of Chicago, of Detroit, of St. Paul, are better situated as to freight rates than the merchants of Toronto or Montreal. The manufacturers of these cities are better situated than the manufacturers of Toronto and Montreal. If you are going to hold the western trade, if you are going to increase that trade, if you are going to get the whole of that trade as you should get it, and as we wish you to get it, you must provide for freight rates that will not only compete per mile with the railways on the other side of the line, but you must overcome the greater mileage you have to haul your freight. It is stated in the Trade and Navigation Returns, I understand, that the trade of Canada with the United States is increasing by millions and millions of dollars every year; that within the last two years it has doubled, or something like that. Is there not something to be learned in that statement of fact; because it is a statement of fact? Is that increased trade all done through the eastern cities? Does it all pass through the houses of the merchants of Toronto, Hamilton and Montreal, or is there a large part of it that comes directly into the North-west Territories and

into British Columbia, of which they get no share at all? The amount of that loss of trade is increasing from year to year as business connections are established in the west with the United States and freight rates become lower and lower upon the goods coming from the United States. I have said before and I say it again, that there is never a railway train rolls out of Montreal to go to Vancouver that does not charge more for the freight or the passengers carried by it than is charged on a parallel train rolling out of New York bound for San Francisco. The farmers of Canada pay more for the transport of their grain over the Canadian Pacific Railway to the port of Thunder Bay than their neighbours, five miles across the line, pay for hauling the same kind of grain to the port of Duluth over the same road, that is to say, over the Canadian Pacific Railway under the name of the Soo line and connections. This is a state of affairs that this House should take cognizance of. It is foolishness to shut our eyes to the fact that the disadvantages of our position are being increased, even although we have paid millions upon millions of dollars for the purpose of overcoming these disadvantages. When we are paying out \$2,000,000 for the purpose of doubling our railway facilities between Lake Superior and the prairies, it is the time for us to see that we provide against our money being used for the purpose of keeping us out of the trade of our own country.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a few words in reply to some of the statements of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) and in reply to some other hon. gentlemen who have already spoken. I have no intention of taking up the time of the House in the discussion of these resolutions, but I think that a few of the remarks that have fallen from my hon. and esteemed friend behind me (Mr. Richardson) should not go without a reply. The people of the province of Ontario have a great many relatives living in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. From the people who live in Manitoba and the North-west Territories letters have come complaining of the rates that have been charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway for the export of their products and for taking in the necessary supplies. A feeling of sympathy has been created towards these people, which has actuated the people of Ontario to support, in any possible shape or way, anything that can be done to grant all necessary relief to the people of the west. Unfortunately, when the charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway was originally made a provision was inserted that the rates should not be interfered with until such time as the company earn 10 per cent upon the money invested in the line. That shuts the door

Mr. OLIVER.

against any direct Government interference with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am not here to say that the Canadian Pacific Railway rates are excessive. When the Grand Trunk Railway was built, I can state, from my own personal experience, that they charged for wheat from Guelph to Montreal, a distance of 385 miles, 20 cents per hundred. Now, my hon. friend has stated that the Canadian Pacific Railway carries wheat from Winnipeg to Port Arthur, a distance of 444 miles, for the same rate. The history of railroads shows that as the country opens up and as traffic increases, railway companies are enabled to considerably reduce their rates. What I was about to point out was that a feeling of sympathy has been created in Ontario by the complaints which have come from the west in regard to the rate. What are we doing today? We are saddling ourselves with this liability for the purpose of granting the people of the west the relief that they desire. The Government have taken the only step open to them to provide this relief, by subsidizing this new independent line for the carriage of freight at reasonable rates. They will keep control of the road. They intend to make arrangements for controlling the rates, and they propose to provide that the road shall be used by any other railway companies when necessary. They are taking all possible precautions to guard against the road being operated in conjunction with the Canadian Pacific Railway. This is all done to relieve the very men who are complaining because we are granting this subsidy. I say it is a very poor return to the people of Ontario and the people of the whole Dominion who are loading themselves in debt in order, if possible, to grant all necessary relief to the west, when, instead of evincing a spirit of thankfulness to the people of the Dominion, my hon. friend here behind me (Mr. Richardson) finds fault, and says he is not disposed to encourage the granting of this bonus and that he is not disposed to encourage the construction of the road. I would like to know what he would expect the Government to do for the relief of these people if not what they are doing now. He says that he would advise that the Government should own the road. Our experience in the ownership of railroads has been rather an unfortunate one. We own the Intercolonial Railway, and we have over \$55,000,000 sunk in it. The people are paying \$2,200,000 a year in interest upon that money, we are not receiving a single dollar in return, and up to the present, as I said a day or two ago, we have lost \$10,000,000 in addition in operating the road. I would like to know if the people want to go on further and build more Government roads. I do not think so. Notwithstanding the complaint that has been made by the hon. member for Lisgar in regard to freights over the Canadian Pacific Railway, I challenge him here to-

day, to cite a single country in the world, civilized or otherwise, where the people get as low rates as in Canada for their railway service.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) has challenged me to cite a single case where lower rates are given in any other country than those which are given by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, I am not saying anything of the kind. My question is this: I want the hon. gentleman to name any other country in the world where the general rate, passenger and freight, is as low as it is in Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN. In the state of New York people are travelling for 2 cents a mile, while in Canada they pay 3 cents, 4 cents and 5 cents a mile.

Mr. McMULLEN. No.

Mr. MACLEAN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am not going to give way to any hon. gentleman now.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I cite the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Soo line, which carries freight for the American people for one-half what the Canadian Pacific Railway charge the Canadian people on their Canadian line.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend appears not to understand the question I put to him. I will put it again and let him answer it if he will. I want him to cite me a single country in the world, civilized or otherwise, where the general rate for traffic or the carriage of produce is as low as it is in Canada.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is much lower in Germany and in Belgium than in Canada.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ellis). As I understand that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) put a question to the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) nobody else has a right to interfere.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Chairman, I will proceed with my address. Taking our railway service as a whole, on the American side as well as on the Canadian side, I contend that the rates are as low, if not lower, than those of any other country in the world, and I challenge any hon. member to prove otherwise.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand that the hon. gentleman has made a general challenge. If the hon. member will read the report of the Railway Commission, which sat under the instructions of the late Government, he will find that the rates in the United States are lower on the average than they are in this country.

Mr. MACLEAN. I also make that statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McMULLEN. I might, perhaps, have qualified the statement by saying the continent of America; but I say that the general traffic rate in Canada is as low—

Mr. MACLEAN. No.

Mr. McMULLEN—as that in any other country. My hon. friend said that they did not grant any bonuses in the United States for the construction of railroads. That may be true; but they granted enormous tracts of land for new lines of railway in various states—land that was very valuable and that was in many instances sold at a large profit. But those sections that did not make grants of land took stock in the railways. I can refer my hon. friend to a county in Missouri which took stock in a railway to the extent of \$300,000, and paid every dollar of it. The road was built, but after a few years the bondholders closed out all the stockholders. The railway was put into the hands of a receiver and sold, and the result was that that county lost its \$300,000 of stock. Might it not just as well have given the railway a bonus? I challenge the hon. gentleman to point to a single railway south-west of the Missouri River or the Mississippi River that has not been in the hands of a receiver during the last ten years. He cannot do it. The different counties and sections which took stock in these railways were promised by the companies that their stock would be good, that they would get their interest and their money back; but in every case the stock has been closed out. I can cite one county in the State of Missouri where, whenever a judge is elected, the people make a compact with him before his election that he will stand to be imprisoned before he will sign an order for the collection of the interest on the \$300,000 of county bonds that was issued to that company, and every year, at the instance of the company, whose headquarters is in Boston, that judge goes to jail, where he remains until the time comes when he has to go and hold court, when he can be held no longer. I know that as a fact. That is the history of railroads in the United States. Now, I am not disposed to encourage extravagant railway bonuses, but I do say that the cases now before this House are worthy of serious consideration. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) talks about stopping the increase of the debt and the giving of bonuses. He can well afford to say that now. He is a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they have got all they want, and it is all very well for him to say that we should stop now. But I think the different lines on the list before the House deserve its serious consideration. I would ask the hon. member for West Toronto, suppose Sir Charles Tupper had been elected, and were sitting here as leader of the Government, and suppose he brought down subsidies to implement the

promises he made in the last election, I would like to know if the hon. gentleman would get up and make the same statement he made to-day.

Mr. COCHRANE. Would you?

Mr. McMULLEN. He would not do it. He would get up and say he would support the bonuses. In 1888, the hon. ex-Minister of Finance stated that the debt of Canada had reached its zenith, and that he looked forward with the hope that in the next few years it would show a decided decline. That was a year or two before the election. What was the history of that hon. gentleman and his colleagues when they got the confidence of the country again? During the time of the last Parliament they actually increased the debt of the country by \$20,000,000. Now, I venture to predict that with all the subsidies which the present Government propose to grant, and with the other gigantic improvements which they have undertaken, they will not, at the end of this Parliament, have added \$10,000,000 to the debt of this country, and at the same time they will have done more to develop our resources, to secure immigration and to promote the progress of the country than hon. gentlemen opposite did in the eighteen years they were in power. Now, the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) talks about the Rainy River Railway having been bonused to the amount of \$14,500 per mile, claiming that that is excessive. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what is the average cost of the construction of railways in Canada? I have had a little experience in railway building, and I know what it costs. If my hon. friend had a little experience of that kind, he would know that to build a railway through such a country as the Rainy River Railroad is to traverse, is no ordinary undertaking. Instead of that road being built for \$14,500 a mile, I venture to predict that it will cost double that amount. I have carefully examined the surveys and the profiles; and if my hon. friend does that, and sees the rocky sections that have to be traversed and the rivers that have to be bridged, he will agree with me that if Mackenzie & Mann build that railway in accordance with the standard they propose and with the grades which they declare they will not exceed, they will not build it for \$28,000, let alone \$14,500 a mile. This House and the country should certainly appreciate the condition attached to these subsidies, that after the railways are completed and commence operations, they shall be required to pay the Government 3 per cent on the amount of the subsidy for any services they render to the country. That is a provision for which the Government deserve a great deal of credit, and which will be appreciated by the country at large. The hon. member for West Toronto says he looks on that as nothing. I look on it as a great deal. There is not a road in Canada that is not earning more or less from the Dominion for carry-

ing mails and rendering other services; and their return to the Government on account of these services to the amount of 3 per cent will go on in the future as a permanent investment. The country stands in a better shape with that contribution than it would if it held stock in the companies, because that stock might be closed out by the bond-holders in a few years, as has been done in the United States. But the step which the Government has taken has given the country a sure and permanent stock. No matter what company may own the road, it will have to comply with the provisions in the charter under which the road was built, and pay the Government 3 per cent, if they earn the money. So that if we take stock to-day in that road for the amount of money we are going to advance towards its construction, we are safer, with that provision in the charter, than if we were joint stockholders with Mackenzie & Mann.

My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. John Ross Robertson) gave credit to the Senate for the action they took with regard to the road proposed to be built to the Yukon. Let me say to my hon. friend that he will not find the people prepared to endorse the course of the senators on that matter. As the right hon. First Minister has said, there never was in the history of the country a greater blunder committed than when the Senate rejected the proposal to build that road, and that blunder placed Canada in the position she occupies with regard to that country to-day. I earnestly hope that such a blunder will never be again committed. Had we gone on and constructed that road, Canada would to-day occupy a better position before the United States and England than she does at present. If that is the kind of service which the Senate is to render the country, let me tell them that the Reform party is going to stay in power a great many years and the existence of a second Chamber is going to be seriously brought into question. We live in a democratic age, when the people claim the right to rule themselves, and will see that their representatives, directly responsible to them, are not prevented in carrying out the will of the people, and will let our respected Senate know that they had better carefully consider their ground before they oppose a policy adopted by the people's representatives, if they do not want to lose the confidence of the people.

There is another matter which my hon. friend has brought to my mind. One would fancy, to hear hon. gentlemen opposite, that no one in this country has a right to commit it to any expenditure except the Conservative party. They are the only party that ought to be allowed to spend the public money, and all that the Reform party should do, when in power, is to clean up the floor pay all the debts, wash and clean out the House, and leave it ready for our hon.

Mr. McMULLEN.

friends, swept and varnished, to take possession of. But we do not intend to follow that course. We believe that when the country is prosperous, the Government have a perfect right to spend public money for the development of the resources of the country, and I believe that the investments thus made will be appreciated and sanctioned by the people. It is rather surprising and somewhat amusing to hear these hon. gentlemen question the right of Reformers to commit the country to any debt. Apparently, their view is that they and they alone are entitled to do this. They hold a similar view with regard to the civil service. They fancy it is a little Tory reserve into which no one shall be admitted except the faithful and that it is extreme presumption on our part to interfere with them at all. These hon. gentlemen talk about subsidies to railways, but I challenge them to show any subsidy on the list such as the one they submitted to aid the Caraqueet Railway. I would like to know where, in the history of the country, you will find any record of any railway which at all compare with that of the Caraqueet Railway? It received large subventions to aid its construction, and stands there a monument of political folly. The man who got the subsidy did the best he could with it, but there the road stands as a monument of the recklessness that characterized the granting of subsidies by these hon. gentlemen. No such recklessness will characterize the subsidies now on the list.

The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) said that these subsidies would become the sources whence money would be taken for the purpose of hoodling constituencies. I dare say he spoke from experience. In all probability, he knows a good deal more about that kind of thing than we do. We are mere infants in that respect compared with him and his friends. He has given us a pretty good inkling of what the course of hon. gentlemen opposite was when in office, but I am quite sure the Government will not follow out any such system. There is no doubt that these railway bonuses were in the past the source from which large sums were drawn to buy up constituencies, but I can assure my hon. friend that the honesty and uprightness and fairness of hon. gentlemen on this side will prevent any such practice being adopted by this Government, and I believe that the supporters of this Government are not the kind of men to tolerate anything like a raid being made for the purpose of debauching constituencies, on the men who get these subsidies.

I earnestly hope that our friends from Manitoba will now admit that there is a very strong feeling of sympathy in this House and throughout Canada for them, and will cultivate a little appreciation and thankfulness instead of continually complaining that they are being oppressed and that we are doing nothing to relieve them. We are doing everything we can. This road

never would have received a subsidy but for the purpose of helping the people of the North-west. Look at what this Government did in the matter of the Crow's Nest Pass line. In order to secure relief to Manitoba an increased bonus was given that line on condition that a decided reduction should be made in freight rates, and I have heard an hon. member now in his seat, declare that the reduction in the rates last year netted the province of Manitoba \$600,000. We gave that additional subsidy for the purpose of granting relief, and are doing the same in this case, and I hope that the people of Manitoba will be a little thankful now in place of continually finding fault.

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

### After Recess.

Mr. MACLEAN. We, who sit on this side of the House were not at all surprised at the remarks made by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). We are used now to hear him repudiate everything he had said in former days in this House. In the old days we heard him denounce Government extravagance session after session, and now we hear him, when his friends are in power, session after session justifying every form of extravagance proposed by the Government. But I was surprised to hear the hon. gentleman go a step further, and lecture his friends on that side upon what their attitude ought to be in regard to the expenditures of the Government. In the old days, when the people of Manitoba and the North-west were complaining of the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway and other monopolies, the hon. gentleman was always their champion, and assisted in fighting their battles. But this afternoon he turns round and lectures the hon. member for Lisgar and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and says, practically, that they know nothing of the grievances of the North-west; that they ought to keep mum, and that the Government is doing a great deal for them. I think he went a little too far in that respect, but perhaps, after all, I should not be surprised at anything he does. To use the common expression, he is prepared to go the whole hog in accepting anything that this Government may bring down. This afternoon we have heard some remarkable statements in the House. We have heard the leader of the Government say that he does not believe in Government railways. Hon. gentlemen on this side say the same thing, and I believe the respected leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) takes that position. I stand here as one who believes, and has always believed, in the Government ownership of railways. The leader of the Government will find that he has made a sad mistake in declaring, as he did this afternoon, that he did not believe in

Government ownership or Government control of railways. The coming question of this country concerns railways and transportation—

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) is making a mistake. The leader of the Government, I think, did not say that he did not believe in government control of railways, but in government ownership. Hon. gentlemen, in discussing this matter, should differentiate between government ownership and government control.

Mr. MACLEAN. What I say is, that the leader of the Government this afternoon regretted the expenditure that Canada had made in connection with her national railways, and said that people were not prepared to justify any further expenditure on that account.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think he said that.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is my recollection of it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That bears out what the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) says. The leader of the Government deprecated further expenditure which would result in Government ownership of railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But he did not say he regretted the expenditure that had been made.

Mr. MACLEAN. He said it was a great mistake.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. It was one of the articles of confederation. How could it be a mistake?

Mr. MACLEAN. He opposed the government ownership of railways, and said that the people would not justify further expenditure on that account. I am willing to stake my reputation and any chances I have in the future on this line: I believe in the nationalization of railways and of all great public franchises; and, in connection with city government, I believe in the municipalization of civic franchises. That is the coming principle in governments, that is the principle that is going to win, I think, in the present, and certainly in the immediate future. People are tired of what has taken place in the past. The railways have become the masters of the country, instead of the people being the masters in their own country. All over the world this progressive policy is attracting the young men. I am in favour also of the nationalization immediately of the telegraph system of this country, of the issue of notes, which the banks now enjoy, and a great many other things. Only the other day Lord Salisbury made an

Mr. MACLEAN.

important deliverance in the old country. He said that the policy that would rule the higher politics of the world concerned railways, and the government that did not control the railways, had hardly any future. And only the other day the president of the great metal organization in England, speaking of the competition which the merchants and manufacturers of Great Britain are now forced to encounter throughout the world, said there was no relief for England except the nationalization of railways and the reduction of the enormous freight rates. Bismarck, when he undertook to consolidate and regenerate Germany, nationalized the railways; Australia has nationalized her railways; Italy has nationalized her railways; France has nationalized her railways. And all the world over that same principle is going on, and the people of those countries would not hear for a moment of the denationalization of those railways and turning them over to the control of companies. I believe in the policy of government ownership of railways in Canada, and I believe that now is the time to carry it further than we have carried it hitherto. I do not deplore the ownership of the Intercolonial Railway by the Government. The Intercolonial Railway to-day is the finest asset the people of Canada have, and I want to see that road extended, and strengthened, and put in the North-west of this country. I have been over almost the whole of the Intercolonial Railway within the last three weeks. I wish to compliment the Minister of Railways and Canals on the excellent service that that railway is giving. It is a splendid railway. The people seem to be satisfied with it, and to regard it as the people's railway. And I may tell my colleagues in this House that I was pleased to ride over that railway on my parliamentary pass. It was the people's railway, and I thought the least the people could do was to let the representatives of the people see that railway, and so I had no hesitation in using my pass. It is a railway that ought to be strengthened and extended, and that is the only way that we can solve the transportation problem in this country. We have now two great railways, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway. If these roads are united in anything, it is in regarding the Intercolonial as the most dangerous foe they have to encounter. And they are ready to strangle it any day. They tried to acquire it, I believe, from the late Government; and, failing in that, they have tried repeatedly to entangle it and deprive it of its usefulness as a competitor and regulator of themselves. They can be depended upon to keep on trying to do the same thing. They nearly succeeded in tying it up for ninety-nine years the other day. But for this House and the wisdom of a certain other body—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am afraid the hon. gentleman

(Mr. Maclean) is now straying into a subject he does not understand.

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman understands it quite well. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) who rebukes me, accepted the suggestion that will prevent the road being tangled up—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has not been accepted yet.

Mr. MACLEAN. But we hope it will be. What we ought to do in order to regulate these great monopolies, is to strengthen the Intercolonial Railway, and if we build any more railways with the people's money, we should take absolute control of those roads and use them to regulate the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. The Government system of railways is to-day in Montreal. It is no trouble, by making an arrangement with the Canada Atlantic Railway and the Parry Sound Railway to put the Intercolonial Railway at Georgian Bay. It would cost the country very little to obtain running rights over that railway, and once at Georgian Bay, where are you? You are right in the heart of Ontario, and by a line of steamships you connect with Port Arthur, and there you touch this very railroad under discussion, namely, the Rainy River road. Let these three Governments, which are practically building this road with the people's money, insist on that railway being a Government railway, owned by the Government, and let it give free, common running rights to every other company that applies for it. By putting the Intercolonial into Winnipeg you will solve the railway problem of this country. But if you give that link to an independent company and allow the people to have no more control over it than is proposed in these resolutions you miss entirely the protection of the rights of the people of the North-west.

Now, when I say that I am in favour of the nationalization of railways I do not mean to say that we ought to borrow millions of money and to-morrow buy out the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and all the other roads in this country; but I do say that not one dollar should go into any railroad that really affects the transportation question, not one dollar of the people's money should go into that railway unless the people own and control it. Now, it is proposed by these resolutions to give subsidies to various railways that are to be new lines to the North-west and through the North-west, and we are told that some of these lines are likely to form links in a great transcontinental line. It was said here this afternoon that Mackenzie & Mann are really the agents of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and while I thought that myself some time ago, I begin to think now that they really have in view the construction of a great transcontinental

system in this country. I believe they have associated with themselves Mr. George A. Cox, a very strong man, that they have big financial concerns behind them, that they are in a position to finance the scheme in England; and that they really do intend to build another great transcontinental system, but they intend to build it with the people's money. Well, I say if it is to be built with the people's money, let the people control it, because the more of these railways you have owned by private corporations the harder will it be for the people eventually to extend the Intercolonial Railway into that country, and by that means to give the people genuine relief from traffic charges.

Now, this question came up two or three years ago. I saw what was coming two or three years ago, and from time to time I invited the attention of the House to this very question. Especially did I invite the attention of the North-west members to this question, one which some of them also saw, and I pointed out to them at the time that the real relief to this country from traffic charges was to come from that direction, and I must congratulate the member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) on the way he spoke this afternoon, and on the stand he has taken in this matter. He sees that the so-called regulations that are in the resolutions will not protect the people; he sees that the people's money is going into another great transcontinental system over which the people will have no control, and which system will be a rival, even a hostile force, to the people's own railway. That is the thing that happens in all these great monopolies that you create. The moment you create a monopoly in this country, whether it is a national monopoly in federal affairs, or a provincial monopoly, or a municipal monopoly, they become immediately hostile to the people who created them. Look at cities where they give these lighting franchises to private companies; as soon as they have their franchises and become entrenched, they are the enemies of the city, and prevent the city from doing anything for itself. Now, I have heard another remark made here this afternoon from a gentleman who sits on this side of the House and who is a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway; he said what the people had long suspected, namely, that a great deal of this money voted in the name of subsidies to railways finds its way into the corruption of the people.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Has found its way.

Mr. MACLEAN. Finds its way into the corruption of the people. The hon. gentleman is exact as to what time is meant. I say it is rather odd that these subsidies should come down just at the time when an election is imminent in Manitoba, and when, probably, an election is not far off over the whole Dominion. In the United

States it is found to-day that all kinds of government have been corrupted by these great corporations which have been created. The fact is that in the United States representative institutions have almost failed, and they have almost failed here because of the growing power and the growing corrupting influence of these great corporations. If we are to learn anything from history it is that we ought to avoid creating these great monopolies, and giving these immense franchises to them, but we ought to keep them for the people alone. The people of the United States to-day are simply over-burdened by the supremacy of the great corporations there. They do not know how to get rid of them. They control the legislatures, they control the courts they control the politicians, they control the great majority of the press. They are bound up together. They have organized great trusts and they are simply bleeding the people white. The same thing will happen in this country if we do not check it in time, and luckily we are in a splendid position to check it. We have a railway of our own to-day, a railway owned by the people. It covers the maritime provinces, it has extended from Quebec into Montreal, and it could easily be extended to the west. I would vote to-morrow for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Toronto and put it at the Suspension bridge on the Niagara River.

Mr. FROST. How much ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Whatever would be necessary. Now, if we pursued a course like that, we would check these corporations and we would do a great deal for the people. But the more corporations you create and the more money you give them, the harder will it be for us ever to get any relief.

Now, the hon. gentleman knows that this feeling is growing in the country. He knows from what the North-west members have told him this session, and previous sessions, that the people of Canada are in favour of the nationalization of railways; and knowing that, he is trying to make some concessions to the people, and he is trying to make us believe that practically these will be national roads, or that they will be controlled by the Government. Now, I have looked at these so-called regulations in the resolutions which are said to secure the people, and I find they are of very little benefit. Take the third resolution, the one that says there shall be no amalgamation of these companies. Now, the Minister had read to him this afternoon his own words saying that you cannot prevent amalgamation; and we have had a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a man of wide experience in railway matters, the member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), stating this afternoon that it is absolutely impossible to prevent these amalgamations. Any reading I have done on this subject is all to the same ef-

Mr. MACLEAN.

fect. I gave an instance this afternoon of two lighting companies in Toronto. The stock is held by the same men, they elect the same president for each company, the same directors, and they work together. There is no amalgamation, you cannot reach them, but they do what an amalgamation does when it takes place in substance and in fact. We have the admission of the Minister that regulation is ineffective, and the statement of the member for West Toronto that it is ineffective; but immediately after we have the Prime Minister getting up and saying that these resolutions do really protect the people. Now, that third resolution does not protect the people from amalgamations taking place, and I say that one of the first amalgamations that is likely to take place in this country, although the people may not believe it to-day, is that of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, who will consolidate to fight the people's railway, the Government system that we now have.

There is not a great deal of protection for the people in the fourth resolution. The fifth resolution is not effective, for the reason pointed out by the hon. member for Lisgar this afternoon. Unless you have complete control over the whole of this railway, and all of it comes within this clause from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, as the hon. member pointed out this afternoon, you cannot regulate its rates, because there are portions of it, as was admitted by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, that do not come within the jurisdiction of these resolutions.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They come under the jurisdiction of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. MACLEAN. And I am led to believe that a certain portion of the railway will run through the State of Minnesota. I want my hon. friends from the North-west, who propose to support these resolutions, to remember that. Part of this railway will go through the State of Minnesota, and if that is the case, this so-called protection in regard to rates does not amount to anything. Forty miles of the road, I am told, go through the United States. Then, we have the seventh clause, which speaks about giving service in return for the money advanced. We heard the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) speak eloquently about that service this afternoon. But we heard the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) tell us how much this service amounted to in three years under an agreement with the Government similar to that which is now proposed. We heard what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals said this afternoon as to how much this was worth, but we also have what the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, the Toronto "Globe," said two or three days ago, as to how valuable this really was. I will ask

hon. members to listen to me while I read three or four lines from that paper :

The arrangement for the carriage of mails by the companies receiving subsidies is entirely new. The price for the carrying of mails, military supplies, &c., is to be arranged, if possible, between the Minister and the company, and in case of disagreement by the Government. But the Government is to be credited with a sum equal to 3 per cent on the amount of the subsidy. So that where the company renders services up to this amount, the Government will receive back interest on the amount of its subsidy, in fact, rather more than the interest at which it can borrow money in the markets of the world.

It goes on to show how the Government could make money out of this deal, that they could borrow money at 2½ per cent, and that they would get 3 per cent of a return from these railway companies. What do you think of that? We heard this afternoon what return the railway companies will pay for the advance, and it is that they will carry the mails, or they will perform any other service which may be required by the Government for the same advance. It may not amount to \$10 a year, while the interest on the money will be thousands of dollars, so that, practically, the service will be of smaller account. All through, I say, that the protection to the people amounts to very little. I give the Government credit for a desire to try and do something to regulate the railways of this country, but they have not gone about it in the right way. There is only one way to regulate the railways of this country, and that is to nationalize all railways that are built, and to control all the railways that are not nationalized. I see that my hon. friend from Manitoba (Mr. Rutherford) is laughing, yet, if there is anything that the people of Manitoba are willing to go in for, it is the nationalization of railways.

Mr. FROST. How does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) propose to do it?

Mr. MACLEAN. I would nationalize every railway in this country, but I do not know whether the people would go that far or not. If you cannot nationalize all the railways by putting your national railway, the Intercolonial, alongside of them, by putting your national railway into the city of Winnipeg and forcing them to reduce their rates.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) has done me the honour of referring to my smile. I would like to ask him if he thinks that the wheat of Manitoba grows in the streets of Winnipeg. I would also like to ask him how, even if he had the Intercolonial Railway in Winnipeg, he proposes to regulate freight rates on wheat into Winnipeg? At the present time we have a railway at Portage la Prairie connecting with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the railway to which I refer refuses to give to the Northern Pacific the same rate as it gives to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

In consequence of that it costs 12 cents a hundred more to ship wheat from Neepawa to Duluth over the Northern Pacific than it does to ship wheat from Neepawa to Fort William over the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman states that he would bring the Intercolonial Railway into Winnipeg. We will suppose that he has that railway in Winnipeg at the present time; how does he intend to get over the difficulty to which I have alluded?

Mr. MACLEAN. Quite easily. The people of the North-west Territories would build their own railways to connect with the Government system touching at Winnipeg. They would see the advantage of it, and prairie railways can be built for \$6,000 or \$7,000 a mile,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, no. You could not get the iron there for that.

Mr. MACLEAN. Iron has increased in price a good deal recently and it might cost \$8,000 a mile. But prairie railways can be easily built up there that will make connection with the Government railway and the people are prepared to put their money into such lines if they can touch a railway that will give them cheap transportation to the sea. It is not a question of getting to Winnipeg, but it is a question of getting to the seaboard. The Government claimed, when two years ago they built the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, that they had reserved running rights for the people, or for other railways that desired to avail themselves of them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have already granted running rights over that line.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, I give the hon. gentleman credit for that. He claims credit for all these little things, but I would like to give him credit for doing a great thing. It would be no trouble to provide relief, in regard to transportation, if the Government would extend the Intercolonial to Winnipeg.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) to say that we should parallel all the lines now existing in Manitoba and the North-west Territories?

Mr. MACLEAN. No.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I think that is the amount of the hon. gentleman's answer to my question.

Mr. MACLEAN. It may not be necessary. I will tell the hon. gentleman how far he could go, and it would be as far as Bismarck went when he was dealing with the railways of Germany. He said to the railway companies: I propose to nationalize the railways; let me know how much they cost you, and I am ready to pay you the price of them. The owners of the railroads made

up very large sums and presented a statement of them to Bismarck. Bismarck sent for a staff of engineers and said to them: I want you to go and make a survey and let me know what it would cost to parallel those railways. The coon came down in five minutes.

Mr. FROST. Do you compare Manitoba with the empire of Germany?

Mr. MACLEAN. No, I give an instance where it was done. It is the doctrine of the present, as well as of the future, that the nationalization of railways is the only cure for the transportation problem in this country. The only way to remove the grievances of the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories is to give them what the people of eastern Canada have, a railway owned by the people and run in the interest of the people. If the Government were in earnest, and they are only half in earnest, they would provide a remedy for the existing evils along these lines. All they are doing to-day is misleading the people by telling them that they are getting substantial concessions for them, that they are doing something with the railways that was never done before and that the result of their resolutions will be to afford relief to the people of the North-west Territories. There will be no relief for the people of the North-west Territories, except upon the terms upon which it was demanded this afternoon. If the construction of this railway and the expenditure of this public money will give them reduced rates, then, they will favour it, and there is nothing in it for them unless they get reduced rates. But the only way they can get reduced rates is to nationalize all the railways that are built, or, at least, use the one railway owned by the Government to regulate all the others. This is a proposition that cannot be denied; it is a proposition that the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) repudiated in a large measure this afternoon, but it is a proposition that I believe in, it is a proposition that other men in this country believe in, and it is a proposition that is commending itself all over the world. The people of the United States are suffering to-day more from the domination of the railways than are the people in almost any other country. True, they had cheap transportation there to-day, and true it is that a great many railways, as the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) pointed out this afternoon, have passed into the hands of the receiver. But why did they pass into the hands of a receiver? Because the roads were plundered and ruined and sold out by railroad wreckers. It was not the conduct of the people or that the railways would not need it, or that the road is not getting a good rate for the traffic it carried, but these roads were plundered and ruined and passed into the hands of the receiver because of the action of railroad wreckers and pro-

Mr. MACLEAN.

moters. Now, we ought to avoid all that in this country. What did they propose to do in the United States to relieve the transportation problem? They propose to build a great transcontinental system there, owned by the people, to be double-tracked or even four-tracked from Chicago to Baltimore and from Chicago to New York and from Chicago to St. Louis, and then straight across the country to the Pacific—5,000 miles of railway, and if this goes on in the United States at the rate it is to-day you will find the people of the United States rising in their might and building their own national railways. It would be almost an impossibility to nationalize the immense number of roads, but, as I said before, it is a very easy matter for us in this country to extend our own national railway and in that way limit the monopolies that now exist. There is no other way. I have studied the matter from as many points of view as I could, and I see no other way than by extending the national system.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I would really like the hon. gentleman to explain how he proposes to get the wheat from the province of Manitoba and the North-west into Winnipeg through his Government railway plans?

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity of explaining to the people of the North-west why he did not support such a scheme. I am not going to give him brains or do his thinking for him. There is an old Greek proverb, to play upon the harp you must play upon the harp: that if you believe in yourself and use the people's money for building these roads you will very rapidly accomplish a great reform. I am sorry to see that the Government which promised to do so much for the North-west, has done nothing but support private corporations, and the great bulk of this money will go into the creation of great fortunes. You are going to establish millionaires in this country. Look at the number that came out of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The same number will come out of this transcontinental railway they propose to build. The Stephens and all the others associated with the Canadian Pacific Railway are to be succeeded now under a Grit regime by the Coxs, Manns, Mackenzies, and others. There was never such a rapid development of millionaires under Government encouragement as to-day under Grit rule.

Mr. WOOD. That is evidence of the prosperity of the country

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, it is a growing time for millionaires; but the farmers of the North-west will think differently and the hon. gentlemen opposite have been given quite a lesson this afternoon. I am prepared to do anything to increase the protection given in these resolutions and to vote for the proposed amendment submitted this

afternoon by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson).

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to take up much time of the House in discussing this question. The members of the Opposition criticised the Government with reference to those railway subsidies, and I am sure it is very impressive to listen to the story of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) talking about public money being squandered and insinuating that it is to be used for political purposes. If the hon. gentleman had that frame of mind some years ago, it would be better for all concerned, when he and his friends got one hundred millions out of the Canadian Pacific Railway deal. If the hon. gentleman had taken this line of action then and at the time the Regina and Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway charter was going through, it would have been much better. I will not go so far as to say that they used it to assist political friends in this House, but the people of the North-west know as a matter of fact that the hon. gentleman and his friends had quite a rake-off. Now, times have changed. Another party is in power. They tell us we should not do such a thing as grant railway subsidies. I might point out to the hon. gentleman that when they are running the affairs of this country they parcelled out nearly one-half of the lands of the North-west Territories to their political friends. Now, if the Government propose giving subsidies to railways, and they propose to give \$3,200 cash a mile, and they propose that the parties getting that money shall pay interest at the rate of 3 per cent. What did these gentlemen do? I have here a list of the land and the mileage which makes very nice reading. We find the amount of subsidy earned to be 28,561,354 acres of land. They got that as a subsidy for building 2,617 miles of railway. Now, putting a fair price—say, \$3 per acre on that, we find it amounts to \$32,721 per mile; and now they talk of the present Government giving the small sum of \$3,200 per mile. The hon. gentlemen were very generous when they were in power in granting subsidies to the North-west. It is like putting your hands into another man's pocket and make a good fellow of yourself. They gave away any amount of land. They were generous. Heretofore the people of the west have been subsidizing their own railroads by land grants and as cash subsidies were given in the east our people were paying for their own roads and assisting to pay for eastern roads. This Government have placed us on the same footing as the people in the east, that cash subsidies will be given and the lands of the west kept for the settlers. With reference to the Rainy River, I claim it is right and proper for the Government to help to build the road and to safeguard the interests of the people. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richard

son) has told us that no matter what legislation you might put on the statute-book, you could not prevent persons interested in one railway acquiring an interest in and perhaps control over another railway; but I would like to know how you could keep their earnings down to 6 per cent as he proposes, as the railway company could water the stock. I claim that the only way to protect the interests of the people is for the Government to maintain running powers and control of rates on every railway—the same kind of control, in fact, that the Government retained over the Crow's Nest Pass road. I understand that this is provided for in an amendment to the Railway Act; and it is a much more effective provision in safeguarding the interests of the people than the amendment of the hon. member for Lisgar. With reference to granting subsidies to railways, if we want to open up and develop this country, we can only do it by building railways, not only in the west, but in the east. There are large portions of this eastern country which are not yet opened up, and which require railways as well as the western country. Not only the present Government, but the late Government have voted subsidies of \$3,200 a mile for certain railways, and have re-voted them year after year, and yet up to the present time nobody has offered to take these subsidies and construct the roads. The present Government, on top of that, are imposing a claim of 3 per cent interest on the money advanced; and if this House goes still further and adopts the amendment of the hon. member for Lisgar, you will not find any person willing to build a railway for the small subsidy offered. I claim that it is a vital necessity to the people of the North-west to have the Rainy River Railway built, and if you adopt the amendment of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) it is very questionable if the gentlemen who propose to build that railway will be able to raise the necessary capital. As the Government will have control of that road, in regard to running powers and rates, it is quite unnecessary to adopt the amendment. There is no doubt that we must have more railways in the North-west Territories, and I am glad that the Government have adopted the principle of giving cash instead of giving lands. At the rate at which people are going into that country we shall soon have to open up more territory to provide places for them. Most of the free lands in the province of Manitoba are at present taken up, and portions of the North-west Territories are pretty much in the same position. You cannot get people to settle in a district where there is no railway. There is at present a proposition before the House for a subsidy for 100 miles of railway in the district of Saskatchewan, to accommodate between 700 and 1,000 families, some of whom have been there for 15 years, and who settled there on the promise of hon.

gentlemen opposite that they would give them railway communication. Yet up to the present time that has not been done, and if this Government are granting a small subsidy of \$3,200 per mile to that road, they are only carrying out what hon. gentlemen opposite promised about 10 years ago, but failed to carry out, and I am sure there will be no objection to that. You cannot settle people more than 20 miles from a railway. If they are going to raise produce at a profit, they cannot haul it any further than that. We expect in 10 years to have 5,000,000 people in the North-west Territories, and then we will contribute just as much to the revenue as the present 5,000,000 people do, and it will be very easy to pay the interest incurred for construction of roads. I cannot see my way to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Lisgar, because I think it would be detrimental to the best interests of the west, as it would have the effect of preventing the construction of railroads. I consider the safeguards embodied in the Railway Act by which the Government have control of running powers and rates on every railway in the country, afford all the protection that the country requires.

Mr. D. D. ROGERS (Frontenac). At this late hour I will not detain the House for any great length of time, as I do not intend to repeat what has been said by other hon. members, though I have many figures and extracts from papers of a startling and even alarming character in regard to railway corporations and monopolies. This railway question has been a very live question among the farmers of this country for the last eight or ten years. One of the planks of the Patron platform of Ontario deals with it; and at the meetings of the Patrons it has often been a subject of discussion whether we should grant any more bonuses to railways. We all felt that in the older settled portion of the country it was not necessary to do so but as we had our new Ontario, with its great mineral wealth and a great North-western country, which we would have to open up at some time or other, we felt that it might be necessary to give a little railway aid to that country. The Patron platform in the North-west was not in exact unison with that in Ontario on that point. The Patrons in the North-west felt that Government aid was necessary to secure the construction of railways in that country. But the general feeling in Ontario was that too much money had been granted in the form of bonuses to railways in the past, and that it was time to call a halt. That was the general feeling among the Patrons all over the country, and it has been expressed in this House to-day. It is quite evident that there has been some improvement of late in the way of establishing Government control over the railways; but

Mr. DAVIS.

it is not enough, and I, for one, wish that the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) could have made his resolution a little stronger. The hon. member for East York spoke about nationalizing our railroads, but many obstacles stand in the way of that proposition.

We have as capable and honest men as can be found in other countries, and ought to be able to find men who can conduct the management of railways owned by the Government just as well as these railways are managed in Australia and other countries. It is rather a poor admission to make, that the system of government management of railways could not be conducted in this country with average economy and efficiency. I am convinced that if we had to begin over again, we would never give our national railways away to any great corporation. It may be a little late to take action just now, but I do feel that we ought to seek to recover our lost ground, and take advantage of any opportunity to place ourselves in a better position as regards the control of our railways. I do not see why a man in a position somewhat similar to that of the Auditor General, could not be appointed to oversee the entire management, and who would be as free from government control as the Auditor General is. We ought to be able to get just as good men as Van Horne, and Hayes, and other railway magnates, to manage our system. I do not think it is an impossibility for the Government to handle a railway system honestly and economically, if the proper means be adopted. We know that that is done in other countries. In the state of Delaware, for instance, the railways are made a source of revenue to the state, and, in fact, pay the greater portion of the state taxation. Of course, that is an old-settled country, and not to be compared with this, but still we ought to be able to proceed in the same direction. It has been strongly urged that we cannot prevent the amalgamation of railways, because we cannot prevent the buying of railway stocks and bonds by people who want to get control of the lines of railway. But there is nothing to prevent our inserting a clause in railway charters compelling the company to give the Government the first chance, in the case of any sale, so as to prevent the road falling under the control of other parties. By this means the railway could not pass out of the hands of the chartered company without the Government knowing it, and if the Government felt that an injustice was being done, they could put that clause into force.

I feel very strongly on the question of the increase of the national debt. Of course, the cause of our national debt is mainly due to the building of railways and canals, and that is also the cause of its continual increase. We all know that our municipal corporations have had to shoulder a heavy burden from that same

source, and they feel it continually. Take my own county: we have bonused railways to the extent of about \$200,000, and, with other indebtedness, our debt runs up to about \$300,000. Our councillors, a few years ago, consolidated that debt and made an arrangement to pay it off in thirty years by annual instalments. That shows the feeling of the farmers against burdens of any kind. They are willing to pay a direct tax on their land in order to have the burden of debt reduced. That \$300,000 will be paid off in twelve years. We have been paying it off for the last eighteen years, and in twelve years more will be clear of it. Through all the pressure of hard times, the farmers of that county bore that direct taxation in order to get that burden off their shoulders. It is rather discouraging, then, for them to find, when they are reducing their municipal debt, their federal and provincial indebtedness continually increasing. If the Government would formulate some scheme for the gradual reduction of our indebtedness from year to year, they could not adopt a policy which would be more acceptable to the people. Let it be based on the principle of a collective revenue from some particular source, applied to the reducing of our debt, and it would be a move in a direction highly acceptable to the great mass of the people. We find other great countries reducing their debt, and still going on with their expenditure. England is spending heavier than before, but she has paid off \$335,000,000 of indebtedness in ten years. We know the enormous debt that France has paid off in late years. We know that the United States have paid off an enormous indebtedness. Certainly, some little move in that direction in Canada would do more to strengthen this Government than any policy they could adopt. Of course, being a new country, our needs for expenditure are greater. But if we have good times at present, and our revenue exceeds our expenditure, instead of spending that excess, let a couple of million dollars be put aside to pay off our national debt, and you have no idea how satisfactory that would be to the people, even if they had to be taxed a little extra in order to do it. The people are not in a mood to stand any increased indebtedness, even if times are good. If the Government would form a fund of some kind to pay off so much of the national debt each year, our people would feel that the burden was getting less, and be more satisfied.

I would wish that the amendment were a little stronger, but it is a move in the right direction, and I cannot do less than support the resolution, so far as it goes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I merely wish to say a few words in explanation of the amendment, for the benefit of those members who were not here when I moved it. The amendment proposes that the Govern-

ment shall have access to the books, accounts and documents relating to the construction of these railways subsidized, in order that the Government may know exactly what the cost of their construction was, so that, if it be determined at any later period to take possession of these railways, they can be taken possession of at their net cost, less the public subsidies. The other point of the amendment is, that the rates shall be based, not upon the enhanced cost of the road, the stock and bonds of the road, but the actual cost of the road, less the bonuses granted.

As to the question of Government ownership of railways, I would like to discuss that matter, but do not want to take up the time of the House. I am generally in favour of the platform enunciated by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean). I believe that Government ownership of railways is something bound to come, and that before very long. So strong a hold has that idea taken of the people of the west, that Mr. Hugh John Macdonald, as leader of the Opposition in convention, practically adopted the policy of Government ownership of railways.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). I rise, in the first place, for the purpose of entering my protest against the course which the Government has taken in introducing the railway resolutions. Here we are, with nearly five months of the session ended—we came here on the 16th March, and it is now the 3rd August—and the most important resolutions the House has to consider are placed before us only to-day. I can remember, as every hon. gentleman who was here in the olden days can remember, and as every hon. member knows from his knowledge of public affairs, every member of the present Government and every hon. gentleman who sat with them in those days, was loud in his protest against what they considered the injustice of bringing in railway subsidy resolutions late in the session. They protested that it was improper, that it was immoral, that it was dishonest. I will detain the House by reading a word or two what these hon. gentlemen have said in protestation against the course which they condemned then, but which they are following to-day as unblushingly as if it were the proper thing to do, and as if they had never said a word against it. At the end of the session of 1894, the Government proposed subsidies amounting, if I remember well, to between \$3,000,000 and \$4,000,000. The present Premier objected. He said:

The session has lasted four months,—

This session has lasted nearer five months than four.

—and the Government have had more time than was necessary to prepare these resolutions. How is it possible that this House can discuss these

resolutions intelligently, covering, as they do, about sixty different railway schemes, and involving, as they do, over three millions of dollars? It is quite impossible under such circumstances that any man in this House can give intelligent attention to this question. I protest against such proceedings.

Now, does the right hon. Prime Minister protest to-day? He protested when there were three millions in subsidies. We have more than twice that to-day, and as I shall show before I sit down, perhaps four times. This money we are asked to vote at the close of a long session, though there were opportunities when the discussion might have been carried on earlier, and it was the Government's duty to present these resolutions at the proper time for the due and deliberate consideration of this House. But the right hon. First Minister was not the only one. Mr. Mills said:

We are in the fifth month of the session, and we now have for the first time brought under our attention a number of railway projects, the merits of which we have no opportunity to consider.

That is our case to-day. We have no opportunity to consider these resolutions. I venture to predict, and it does not require much of a prophet for that, that when we come to the particulars of these resolutions the Government will have no information to give; but it will be as it was the other day, as it has been every day this session—when the Minister proposed a vote of public money, he has no information worth considering to give to the House. And when we come to deal with these 54 railway schemes, the Government will be utterly unprepared to present a statement to this House or lay documents before the House that will enable hon. members to intelligently consider the subject. There was another gentleman who spoke—the present hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright):

This abuse is one of long standing, and therefore all the worse.—

It is of a good deal longer standing now. But why, particularly, did the hon. gentleman condemn it?

—We ought, in all conscience, at the time of the Budget, or about that time, to get a description of what our obligations are and what further obligations it is proposed the country should incur.

Is that sound doctrine? I think it is. If it be sound doctrine, I would ask these hon. gentlemen why they do not carry it out in practice? Is it merely to show that every doctrine they approved while in Opposition they utterly condemn now that they have crossed the floor?

The practice of putting these resolutions off until the end of the session is carried on for the express purpose of stifling and preventing inquiry.

Mr. WALLACE.

Why did these hon. gentlemen bring down their railway resolutions at so late a period? Is it for the purpose of stifling and preventing inquiry? I think it is. Then, the present hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mullock) said:

To-day we have scarcely more than one-half the House sitting, and not one of us has had the opportunity of communicating with the outside world before we are asked to vote away public money.

Our complaint again.

It is on the line of the whole financial administration of this Government. They are practically engaged in wrecking the finances of Canada.

That was when our annual expenditure was less than \$40,000,000, all told. And yet these hon. gentlemen lightly and airily, at the tail end of a long session, ask us to vote six and half millions or twelve and a half millions, as the case may be, besides five and a half millions of supplementary Estimates, and ask us to finish the work in three days. We can hardly do it. We intend to tell the Government that we expect full information about this expenditure, twelve millions at least. The present Postmaster General further said:

The recklessness with which the rights of the people are being dealt with, the recklessness with which our finances are being handled, the recklessness with which our credit is being dealt with, the recklessness with which the possibilities of this country are being disregarded, convince me that the interests of the country are entirely subsidiary to the interests of the men who are on the Treasury benches.

Now, I would like to ask these hon. gentlemen to take this medicine for themselves, and tell us what they think about it. Then, there is another whom I should quote—the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen)—“Jim,” he is called here. He said:

I do sincerely deplore the condition to which political morality has dropped,—

He cannot sing the old songs to-day.

—as exhibited by hon. gentlemen opposite. It is to be hoped that the end of this system is drawing near.

It is further away than ever.

It is to be hoped that the end of this system is drawing near. It is to be hoped that the people of Canada will see through these schemes, will see through the object of the Government in bringing forward measures of this kind at the close of the session; and it is to be hoped that, although it is late in the day, although the country is heavily burdened with debt, although the annual expenditure has now reached an enormous sum—that even at the eleventh hour the country will get relief from this abominable truckling, and, I may say, the political rascality that is exhibited in this whole scheme.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What paper is that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) is reading?

Mr. DAVIN. "Hansard."

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman is reading from a newspaper.

Mr. WALLACE. No, "Hansard."

Mr. LANDERKIN. "Hansard" is not in that form.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin) is getting a little mixed.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman does not know the difference between "Hansard" and a newspaper.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin) does not appear to know the truth when he hears it. Now, with regard to the proposals themselves, my opinion, and I have expressed it before, is this—that while in the past it was absolutely necessary, for the opening up of the country, that the Government should aid railways, to build them as in the case of the Intercolonial Railway, or to give liberal subventions of both land and money, as in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, or to grant subsidies in aid of construction for the opening up of branch lines to develop various parts of the country, yet I contend that the time has come, that it came some time ago when the Government should, as a rule, stop bonusing railways. Let the railways be built in the future on a commercial basis, and let those who have charge of the interests of those roads build them because they are regarded as profitable commercial enterprises. Of course, there will be special cases that must be dealt with in a special manner, so that it would be impossible to lay down a hard and fast rule and say that in future we would grant no further railway bonuses.

Mr. WOOD. How can the hon. gentleman make a speech like that when he was a member of the other Government and a member of the other party?

Mr. WALLACE. That is a hard question to answer. But I ask the hon. gentleman to turn up the "Hansard," and he will see all my speeches in Parliament. Now, Mr. Chairman, I say that we cannot lay down a hard and fast rule; I think that is a true policy for any Government to take. Yet, when we have spent money in every direction, when, according to hon. gentlemen opposite when they were on this side of the House, we had far exceeded the debt we were justified in having in this country in view of our wealth and population, this Government is proposing to squander money recklessly in every direction; they are proposing to-day a larger expenditure than ever has been incurred before. Here we have railway subsidies for \$6,500,000. But that is not the measure of the liabilities that we are incurring. The old Government only gave \$3,200 per mile, a sum which was based upon the cost of steel rails and appliances

for the construction of the road; but this Government are giving double that amount, or \$6,400 per mile. The Minister of Railways and Canals tells us to-day that they are not going to give that in many cases, that in many cases it will not materialize, that the money will not be earned. But he makes it very easy to earn the money. He says that any road that expends more than \$15,000 a mile will have a claim on the second \$3,200; if they expend \$2,000 a mile over the \$15,000, they will have a claim, and in order to claim the full subsidy of \$6,400, the cost of the road will have to be \$21,400 per mile. In order to compute that they are to take these railroad bridges, even those that have received an extra subsidy from the Government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it is just the reverse of that. They cannot include more than \$25,000 in respect of any bridge, and nothing of any bridge which has received special aid.

Mr. WALLACE. The \$25,000 covers nearly the whole of this class of bridges, except in very exceptional instances; they receive a special subsidy for the building of those bridges, and I see a whole list of bridges that are to be bonused. Then, the cost of all these railroad bridges is to be added in, so as to enable these companies getting subsidies to make a legitimate and proper demand under these regulations for the \$6,400 per mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The resolution says the very reverse of that.

Mr. WALLACE. I will read the resolution:

That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant a subsidy of \$3,200 per mile towards the construction of each of the undermentioned lines of railway (not exceeding in any case the number of miles hereinafter respectively stated) which shall not cost more on the average than \$15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, and towards the construction of each of the said lines of railway not exceeding the mileage hereinafter stated, which shall cost more on the average than \$15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, a further subsidy beyond the sum of \$3,200 per mile of fifty per centum on so much of the average cost of the mileage subsidized as shall be in excess of \$15,000 per mile, such subsidy not exceeding in the whole the sum of \$6,400 per mile. The expression "cost" used in this resolution means the actual, necessary and reasonable cost, and shall include the amount expended upon any bridge, up to and not exceeding \$25,000, forming part of the line of railway subsidized not otherwise receiving any bonus.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is it. "Not otherwise."

Mr. WALLACE. Up to \$25,000, and not exceeding \$25,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But nothing, if that bridge is specially subsidized.

Mr. WALLACE. I see here that all those costing over that receive a subsidy of \$50,000, \$35,000, and one down as low as \$15,000; but nearly all of them go over the amount; and, therefore, are to be included in the cost of the road-bed so as to bring the amount over \$15,000 per mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is the very reverse of that. No bridge which costs less than \$100,000 gets a subsidy.

Mr. WALLACE. The South Shore bridge gets \$50,000. It does not say here—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is a revote.

Mr. WALLACE. It does not say in the information we have here that it is to be 15 per cent or any other percentage. We have no means of knowing, the Minister has not given us the information, neither in the resolutions nor in his speech.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is your vote, one that you put there.

Mr. WALLACE. Suppose it was, that was many years ago, under different conditions. This is a new House of Parliament. It is not a sufficient answer to say that four, or five, or six years ago there was a vote for a similar project, and, therefore, that is all there is to be said about it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a vote for the same bridge.

Mr. WALLACE. We should require the Government to give us the fullest information on every scheme before this House, whether it is a revote, or whether it is a new vote. But he says that a portion of these votes may never be called for. Well, that means that they are proposing, without proper investigation, to give bonuses to railroads for which a proper commercial basis has not been presented to them as a justification for a subsidy. That is virtually what the Minister of Railways and Canals tells us to-day. They are offering bonuses practically to coax men to endeavour to raise money to build railroads, without considering whether the necessities of the country would justify the construction of that road; they are squandering money and coaxing people to attempt to raise further money by selling their bonds and to come to the Government for \$3,200 or \$6,400 per mile. Then the Government says that if the company crosses a large bridge they will give them \$50,000 or \$100,000 to assist in building that bridge, the same as they are doing with regard to the Intercolonial Railway at Charlottetown.

The Minister of Railways and Canals says: We are relieved from the necessity of defending our policy because the leader of the Opposition yesterday fully endorsed it.

Mr. BLAIR.

and if there are any objectors on this side of the House, they are so insignificant as to be scarcely worth consideration.

Well, Mr. Chairman, all I have to say is that the Opposition claim the right to a good deal of latitude and we shall exercise that right. We shall not be deterred by the hon. Minister of Railways from criticising his proposals or from examining into his proposals, and we will compel him to justify the votes he proposes in this House. We will have to ask him to present to us arguments that will be sufficient to justify, in this House and before the country, the enormous expenditure he proposes. What does he propose to do? Take the history of railway subsidies for the last nine years, and the hon. Minister himself has given us the figures. Eighteen million dollars in subsidies have been voted in these years, or an average of \$2,000,000 a year while he proposes \$6,500,000, but the companies may earn the additional subsidies which will make it \$6,500,000 more or \$13,000,000, less the double subsidy for the railway bridges. We will call it \$12,500,000, although it is more than that. It may be that we are voting \$12,500,000, which is more in one year than the average of the six years under the former Administration. I never heard the hon. gentlemen, who are now occupying the Treasury benches, say a word in commendation of this policy in the past. I never heard a justification of that policy from hon. gentlemen. Although I think it was a right and a good policy it is not a policy for all time to come, but, on the contrary, it is a policy that was justifiable in the early days, in opening up the country. We have reached the position to-day when the Government should adopt a new policy and should justify the building of these railways upon a strictly commercial basis. But an opposite course is taken. People are invited, implored, asked to come in and build these railways, to borrow money, to get subsidies from the Government, to do everything, and when some of these railways are built it will be found that they are in advance of the times, of the requirements and necessities of the people, that they will not be able to pay their working expenses and will not justify their construction at this time. I say that we are proceeding in this matter with a recklessness, a prodigality and an extravagance that are without parallel in the history of this country. The reckless proposals that are being made now are utterly unjustifiable, but we hear, to-day, that down in the city of Montreal, the Government are sending out contracts to have the voters' lists printed on short notice, that the Government presses here are so fully occupied and the necessity of having the list printed, in order to prepare for the election is so great, that they are printing them in Montreal.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Where did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) read that?

Mr. WALLACE. I heard it to-day. I would like to ask the right hon. First Minister if my information is correct?

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman's information is absolutely wrong.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know whether the right hon. Prime Minister ought to deny that statement because the other statements that the hon. gentleman is making are of a piece with it.

Mr. WALLACE. I have made no statement about it. I say I have been informed of it. The other statements I have made are statements I have made from my own knowledge and from reading the statements of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. The comments I have made upon them are justified by the statements that I gather from the resolutions of the hon. Minister himself. Now, Mr. Chairman, I say that the proposal that is made to build a second line of railway from Fort William to Winnipeg, 40 miles of which, we are told, goes through the United States, is unjustifiable. I think the Government have performed their duty in that regard when they built one line from Fort William to Winnipeg. I think that the duty of the Government to this country was fully completed when they did that. If there is a necessity for a second line of railway it should be built as a commercial enterprise. If the Government find, in order to cut rates, or to regulate the prices on traffic there, that this line is necessary, I do not think that they are justified in building it, unless they absolutely control that railway themselves. I go further and say that the Government are not justified in giving a dollar of subsidy to build a railway from Fort William to Winnipeg. That road should be left to the private enterprise of citizens if a second line is necessary between these two points. What do the Government propose to do in regard to this road? They propose to give \$6,400 per mile. This Rainy River Railway Company have a further subsidy from the Manitoba Government, at one end, and from the Ontario Government at the other end. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals what subsidies that railway is getting per mile from the Ontario Government?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot say.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister cannot say. Just imagine, Mr. Chairman! Here is a Government giving a subsidy to a railway company in order to enable them to build that road. They know that the railway company are getting a subsidy from the Ontario Government. Still when we ask them what subsidy they are getting the hon. Minister tells us, in his bland and innocent way, that he cannot say. It may be thought

they are getting a sufficient amount to build the whole of the road from the Ontario Government, yet the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals comes along and wants us to give them \$6,400 per mile additional without making a particle of inquiry as to what amount has been given by either the Manitoba or the Ontario Government, or as to what assistance they require to build this road, without having a consultation as to the terms with the other parties so as to know what would be a proper amount to vote for the construction of this road because, so far as Ontario is concerned, the money comes from the Dominion Government, in the first place, and in the second place, from the Ontario Government. We are left entirely in the dark. The hon. Minister tells us that he does not know. Does he know that they are receiving a bonus from the Ontario Government? I presume he knows that much. He does not know whether it is \$1,000, \$2,000, \$3,000, \$7,000 or \$9,000 a mile. Then we ask him if he knows what they are getting from the Manitoba Government, and I presume the hon. Minister is quite innocent of any information upon that subject as well. These votes aggregating \$6,500,000 that are proposed in the last days of the session are totally unjustifiable expenditures of the people's money, and there is no valid excuse or reason for asking us to sanction them. It may be that in the 52 lines of railway on the list, there are some commendable enterprises. I am not denying that, but I pick out the Rainy River Railway and see how unjustifiable the expenditure is in regard to it. The same can be said in regard to others, yet, they are proposing to vote away millions of the people's money, and it will be voted away because the Government have a majority at their back who, while they condemned such proceedings when they were in Opposition, are ready and willing and anxious to vote away the people's money at every opportunity.

Now, Sir, what is the reason for this? Is it, that that independence with which they were credited, when on this side of the House, was only a thin veneer, was only a pretense, or is it, that with the power of a Government, with the powers and influences that they can wield on private members, they make those men fall into line, and not only stand up and vote for these iniquitous grants, as I have heard hon. members—like the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen)—and defend the very course that they have spent their whole life in condemning? I think, when the people of this country realize the enormous expenditures that are being proposed to be carried through without that thorough investigation necessary, they will condemn the reckless expenditure of the people's money in this country.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) Mr. Chairman, as this seems to be a general discussion on the subsidies the Government have

brought down, I wish to say a few words before the motion is put. On looking over the subsidies, I find that the huge amount of nearly \$7,000,000 is asked for railways all the way from 100 miles in length to two, six, nine miles, and even to one-sixty-six hundredths of a mile—a little over a half mile. I do not know why subsidies are given to small lines like these, because I cannot believe that they could not get private capital to build those small lines if they will pay. In looking over all those subsidies, I find there are large amounts given to every province except one—British Columbia. That seems to me very strange. There is not one single dollar given to a railway in the province of British Columbia. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that I firmly believe in the policy of aiding railways, either by land grants or by subsidies of money. I know that in a country like Canada, especially in the more unsettled portions of Canada, it is impossible to get private enterprise to take hold of those undertakings and to open up the country as they should be opened up without Government assistance. For years past huge sums of money have been expended in the older provinces, nearly altogether. They have been spoon-fed by the Government in subsidized roads, until now almost the whole country is honey-combed with rail roads. But, Sir, that is very far from the case in the west, and I think it is time that the Government came to the conclusion that British Columbia and the North-west—I am speaking more particularly for British Columbia—are to get their fair share of any public moneys going. I may say there is no richer portion of the country than that same province of British Columbia. I do not wish to go into statistics to prove it, because I took occasion some weeks ago to do so. I showed that British Columbia, as a whole, was the third greatest contributor to the Dominion treasury in the whole of the confederated provinces. I need only to call attention to just one portion of British Columbia. That is the district of Kootenay, which is known over the whole civilized world. We have seen large amounts of gold and silver coming out of the mines in that district, and I am very glad to say that I believe Canada will see the very same thing on just as large a scale on Vancouver Island. The mines that are being opened up there now are showing up just as good as the mines did in the Kootenay, when they had only the same amount of money spent upon them. The members of the Government must certainly have been applied to for assistance in the way of subsidies for British Columbia railways, and I would like to know the reason why they have not given us assistance? There was one railway that the people of British Columbia wanted—the Victoria, Vancouver and Eastern Railway. This is a line that they might well have given assistance to. It would run from Vancouver through the country towards Boundary Creek, and

Mr. PRIOR.

on to the Kootenay country. Another line was that from Nanaimo or Wellington, running north up to the head of Vancouver Island. This is a line that would open up a fine tract of mineral, timber and agricultural country. I am very sorry to see that there is not a sum placed in the Estimates for this road. Another road that is greatly required is that from Kamloops or Ashcroft up into the Cariboo district. This line has been wanted for many years. The only means of communication into the Cariboo country is the old Cariboo wagon-road. It is out of date at present. Machinery is required in there to make those mines pay, and there is no doubt, if a railroad were built there, it would be a paying concern within a year or two. The people of British Columbia require it, and I am surprised that the influence of the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock) that we hear so much of, has not been sufficient to show the Government that they were wanting in their duty in not giving a subsidy to that road. I might say that if the Government wished to do justice to the province, they might have given a subsidy to a portion of the British Pacific Railway. That railway is one that is supposed to run, and I am sure will run, from Vancouver Island across the Seymour Narrows, up through Cariboo, to the Yellow Head Pass. I see that item 41 subsidy for 50 miles to the Edmonton, Yukon, Pacific Railway, a line running from South Edmonton and North Edmonton on to the Yellow Head Pass. Although it comes to the confines of the province, still there is not one dollar going to be asked for the province of British Columbia. The Government saw fit to bring down a vote for \$1,270,000 for the province of Prince Edward Island. It is a province with a small population like British Columbia, and if they can do that for a province like Prince Edward Island, surely they might give a million dollars, or two millions, for British Columbia. The British Columbia members are always met with the answer, whenever they say anything about expenditure to hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House: Look at the huge amount of money we spent on you in building the Canadian Pacific Railway. I take exception to that altogether. The construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was a part of the terms of confederation, and the railway would be no good to the eastern portion of the Dominion if it had not gone through British Columbia. So we can cry quits on that. And because it was more expensive to build through the mountain sections of British Columbia than it was over the plains or in eastern Canada, is no argument why that should be put down to the debit of British Columbia. I do not wish to take up the time of the House at this late hour of the session, but I wish to enter my emphatic protest against the neglect shown by the Government. I consider that it is an insult to British Co-

lumbia to bring down this huge amount of railway subsidies without a single dollar for the province of British Columbia.

Mr. J. G. HAGGART (South Lanark). At this late hour of the evening, I will make my remarks as concise as I possibly can. I intend to offer some remarks in reply to the right hon. leader of the Government, who, replying to the hon. member for East York, and particularly the two hon. members from Toronto, stated that it would be hard to find anywhere any observation of his opposed to railway subsidies. All I can say is that he is the only member of the party on the opposite side who was not opposed to railway subsidies. Again and again, in this House and in the country they protested to the fullest extent possible against the granting of railway subsidies. As to the policy of the late Government, I am proud of that policy, which has done more to develop this country than anything else they ever did. Their policy was to grant \$3,200 per mile for assisting in the construction of railroads. That sum was the actual value at that time of the steel rails required. Every one knows that at the decreased price of steel rails at present, they can be got at almost half of what they cost at that time. The late Government subsequently added a grant of 15 per cent for all bridges, the cost of which exceeded \$100,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite have introduced an entirely different policy. Not content with the policy with which they found fault of granting \$3,200 per mile, the Minister of Railways at present takes power to grant \$6,400 per mile.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman's Government never gave more than \$3,200 per mile?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, there were some lines of railway for which we gave more, and there are some lines of railway that the Government are building altogether. We gave a larger sum towards the connection between the Northern Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. We gave a certain annual allowance, which would be in excess of that amount, for building two or three roads in Manitoba. I will deal with that point afterwards. I am now dealing with the general policy of the Government, which is to give larger subsidies than the late Government. Why is that, when steel rails have decreased in value? The late Government granted \$3,200 per mile on the principle that that was the cost of the steel rails, and that the money would be recouped to the country indirectly in the shape of capital introduced into the country, and in the shape of increased receipts from customs in connection with the construction of these lines of railway. When an hon. gentleman stated that \$6,500,000 was an enormous sum of money to vote in one session for railway subsidies the right hon. leader of the Government said that the

subsidies brought down in 1884 amounted to \$9,500,000. That statement, when I heard it, fairly staggered me, because I knew that the expenditure on subsidies which were granted by the late Government in 1883-84 and in the subsequent years did not amount to \$1,000,000, and that the total expenditure on all the subsidies granted by the late Government for the purpose of constructing railways from 1882 to 1895, inclusive, was only \$14,000,000, very little more than \$1,000,000 per year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How much was voted?

Mr. HAGGART. I am not saying how much was voted. I sent for the statutes in which these subsidies are set forth, and I find the following: to the government of the province of Quebec, in consideration of their having constructed the railway from Quebec to Ottawa, \$954,000. Does the hon. gentleman think that was a subsidy? For the portion between Montreal and Ottawa, \$12,000 per mile, or in all \$1,440,000. Both of these roads were completed at the time. For the construction of a line of railway from Oxford station on the Intercolonial Railway to Sydney or Louisbourg. Does the hon. gentleman consider that a subsidy, when the whole line was built as a portion of the Intercolonial? For a branch of the Intercolonial Railway from Metapedia eastward towards Paspébiac, \$300,000. For a branch of the Intercolonial Railway from Derby station to Indian Town, \$140,000. The actual subsidies voted in that year were only \$2,100,000. Under the arrangement for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and no person knows it better than the right hon. gentleman, we arranged with the province of Quebec to take over these roads which that province had constructed, and which were to form part of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The people of Quebec insisted that Quebec should be one of the termini of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and for the purpose of carrying out that arrangement, these amounts were voted. If it were the right hon. gentleman's Minister of Railways who brought that down, he would not include it in the subsidies at all. He would bring it down in the same form as he brought the vote for the Prince Edward Island Railway—in an entirely different resolution. Is the \$1,600,000 expended for the Drummond County Railway a subsidy? Is the expenditure for bringing the Intercolonial into Montreal over the Grand Trunk Railway a subsidy?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, that is our road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Did you own the road between Quebec and Montreal after you paid the money?

Mr. HAGGART. Do you own the Grand Trunk into Montreal?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** We own the Drummond County Railway.

Mr. **FOSTER.** We own the Cape Breton extension.

Mr. **HAGGART.** The right hon. gentleman, I think, ought to be more careful in making a statement in justification of his Government for bringing down \$6,500,000 of pure subsidies. The hon. gentleman places a great deal of reliance upon the peculiar condition under which these subsidies are given. Under clause 3:

3. That the subsidies granted to the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company, the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company are granted upon the condition, and if received and paid under the authority of this Act to the above mentioned companies respectively, shall be received upon the condition that the said companies shall not, nor shall any of them, at any time amalgamate with any other railway company, or lease its line to any railway company; nor shall any of the said railways be leased to or operated by any other company; nor shall any of the said companies make an agreement for a common fund or for pooling its receipts with any other railway company, and any such lease, amalgamation or agreement shall be absolutely void, excepting in so far as such agreement may extend to traffic or running arrangements which have been approved by the Governor in Council.

In my innocence I thought that no railway company that received a charter from this Government had the power of doing what is here guarded against. The insertion of this clause is a work of supererogation. No railway company, unless it is specially mentioned in its charter, has the right to amalgamate with or lease the line of any other railway company. Again and again, companies come to this Parliament asking for the right to amalgamate with other companies or to lease the lines of other companies; and not only has the company which desires to amalgamate or lease to come to this Parliament, but the other company which desires to be amalgamated or leased has also to make application for the necessary power. There are some companies which have a general power. The Canadian Pacific Railway has, to a certain extent, a general power, but every other company which receives a charter from this Government has no power to amalgamate with any other company whatever or to lease any other line whatever. It has to come to this Parliament for authority to do either. And what is there to prevent a company doing the same thing under this provision?

Then, the next clause deals with their ability to construct the line. That is the ordinary clause which is in every subsidy Act. They must first get the approval of the Governor in Council to the contract and everything else. The approval of the Governor in Council to the line has to be obtained. The Minister of Railways has the power to

Mr. **HAGGART.**

disapprove the location or even the stations, if the stations or the lines are not placed in the particular manner which he thinks is right.

The hon. gentleman introduced legislation this session to give him the power, I think, principally of an ex post facto character, to deal with railways already built. But every railway company that comes for the purpose of making a contract with the Government has to file its plans and its location, showing where the different stations are. The Minister of Railways has the power to say: I do not approve of the line, you must alter it in a certain direction; if you do not alter it, or if you do not establish your stations—I think I will even go as far as that, but I may be mistaken in that particular point—I shall not enter into the contract with you, I shall not ask the Governor in Council to enter into the contract to give you the subsidy granted under this Act.

The hon. gentleman lays great stress on these lines:

That the Governor in Council may at all times provide and secure to other companies running powers, traffic arrangements and all other rights as will afford to all railways connecting with those subsidized reasonable and proper facilities in exercising such running powers, fair and reasonable traffic arrangements with connecting companies.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I did not say there is anything new in that. I only referred to the other two clauses.

Mr. **HAGGART.** There is nothing new in that, because the power existed before. But the clause on which the hon. gentleman's friends on the other side laid particular stress is the extraordinary one providing that the company shall perform Government service, and that in or towards payment of the same, the Government shall be credited by the company with a sum equal to 3 per cent per annum on the amount of the subsidy. The hon. gentleman's friends appear to claim that the Government were going to get from these companies 3 per cent on the amount of the subsidy. The hon. gentleman had hardly the hardihood to state that. He did not believe it himself but some of his friends made that statement. Take the average amount which the Post Office Department pay for the carriage of the mails on an average railway. I am speaking of a completed railway, and not of one on which twelve miles or twenty miles additional are subsidized, and on which it would be impossible to carry out this provision. I will take the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway which is 263 miles in length. It is a completed road, and a fair road for the purpose of illustration. It is more than fair, for it would likely get much more for postal service than any one of the roads subsidized under this Act. What does that road receive for carrying the mails over its 263 miles. \$5,600 per year, or less than \$25 per

mile. On the \$6,400 then, which the hon. gentleman intends to give, he will get, under this provision, \$25 per mile for the postal subsidy, taking the Parry Sound Railway as a criterion. So that on a road of 100 miles, which would get a subsidy of \$640,000, he would receive \$2,500 in return. You will see at once what probability there is of that 3 per cent being returned to the Government, and the hon. gentleman says it is not to be accumulative at all. The company are not to be charged 3 per cent and then credited with the cost of the postal service, but the cost of the postal service is to be charged against the subsidy each year, and any deficit between the charge for that service and the 3 per cent is not to be carried over against them. It is only the actual service done that year that is taken into account. There may be twenty years in which there is no postal car run over the line at all or no freight or policemen carried for the Government, and in such a case there is no charge whatever against the company. It does not accumulate at all, but the moment a postal car goes on, or some other service is rendered for the Government, then it is to be counted against the 3 per cent interest on the \$6,400 per mile, and no difference whatever is carried over against the company. There is not the slightest probability of the Government ever getting one-tenth of one per cent in return. I asked the hon. gentleman to bring the amounts received from the different railways, which had that clause in their charter already, and on which has been expended I do not know how much in the shape of subsidies, but up in the millions. On some of the roads in the Northwest Territories, the highest amount he received was \$5,000, the next highest amount \$3,000, the next \$2,000. I would not mention this particularly, were it not for the fact that that clause is put in for the purpose of deceiving the public. There is no adequate return or actual return under it. There is no actual return. That is put in to be used as an argument during the contest that is likely to occur soon; it is to be made the basis of a statement that these votes are not to rank as subsidies, but are rather in the form of advances from the Government to these different railroads, and on which we shall receive interest. That has been used by the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis). He says he admires the policy of the Government in not subsidizing the railroads in the way the late corrupt Government did, but in loaning the money, on which the Government will get a return of interest. The hon. gentleman talks about \$89 per mile. This is what it would be in the case of roads like main lines of the Grand Trunk or Canadian Pacific Railway, over which the mails run half a dozen times a day. The services that will be run over these bonused roads could not possibly earn more than \$20 a mile. And how is the hon. Minister to apply the principle of a road,

only one section of which, 20 miles at the end of it, is subsidized. Will he make them put a postal car on for that 20 miles, or is the Post Office Department going to deduct from its payments on account of this subsidy of 20 miles? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) prides himself on the power he is taking in this connection. But he forgets that the Post Office to-day has power to say to any railway in Canada: You must carry our mails over your road, and we will fix the rate of remuneration ourselves. Of course, it must be a reasonable rate. But it is the greatest absurdity, this talk of being recouped by the interest of 3 per cent on the investment made in assisting these roads. I do not know which roads these subsidies are for—I will consider them as they come up, when we go into the details of the matter. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the rest of them have swallowed their opinions with reference to bringing down the subsidies late in the session. But that is only what they have done with regard to everything else. They are only following the course taken by one of their great leaders in the local House. Fault was found with John Sandfield Macdonald for bringing down his resolutions late. But Hon. Edward Blake, when he succeeded to power, brought down his resolutions in the dying days of the session, and insisted that they should be carried en bloc, or not at all. And the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has fallen from grace in this matter, as he has with regard to every other promise that he made to the people of this country. He introduced them at the last moment; and he finds his friends, who were so clamorous against us, although we quoted Mr. Blake's introduction of his railway resolutions, are prepared to endorse him in the course he has taken in this matter. As to the principle of bonusing railways—and I was always in favour of it—I am not particular as to the road to which a bonus is given. If private capital, the municipality, or the province is interested enough to build the road, that should be sufficient for us—so long as we confine ourselves to a maximum of \$3,200 a mile. For such a bonus the Government is recouped indirectly, yes, and directly, by the operation of the road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think that any one who might have endeavoured to follow the discussion that has so far taken place on these resolutions, would experience a great deal of difficulty in making up his mind as to just what was the opinion, collectively, of hon. gentlemen opposite. A Government that might desire to meet the views of its opponents, would be in rather an awkward dilemma in trying to do so under the present circumstances. We have all varieties of opinion, from the stern, vigorous and determined opponent of subsidies of all kinds, to the most generous and liberal-minded of givers. We have had

sectionalism and all sorts of isms. We have had from my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson)—I am sorry he is not in his place, that I might say what otherwise I might wish to say—

Mr. CLARKE. He stayed here until ten o'clock, hoping to hear the hon. Minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have been trying to get an opportunity to speak. I feel some reluctance in characterizing the attack of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Robertson) on these propositions as I think it richly deserves. I was amazed. I must say, at the attitude of my hon. friend. I have listened to his speeches in this House, when he has given us evidence of breadth and liberality in dealing with public questions; but I have never heard the hon. gentleman address this House on a question that had any relation to railways, in which either the Canadian Pacific Railway or Mackenzie & Mann could be connected in any way, when he has not exhausted his epigrammatic style in denouncing the proposal. All you need to do, apparently, in order to secure the bitter hostility of the hon. gentleman, is to have somebody whisper in his ear that possibly Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann may, if not now, at some day in the remote future, have some connection with the enterprise. Is not that calculated to weaken the effect of the hon. gentleman's condemnation, as well as of his advocacy of any cause in this House? I am sure the hon. gentleman has a broader mind than to give way to impulses of that kind generally. But he seems to be unable to control his violent antipathy to Mackenzie & Mann. Granted that this enterprise of the Rainy River Railway is a worthy and meritorious enterprise, grant that it is an enterprise that ought to be liberally aided from the exchequer of the Dominion, grant that that ought to be done at once—yet the moment the hon. gentleman hears that Mackenzie & Mann may take up the enterprise, he will oppose it—throw aside all questions of benefit to the country, but oppose it simply because Mackenzie & Mann are connected with it. Now, it strikes me that the hon. gentleman has destroyed the value of his criticism of these proposals by the way in which he has approached them. If the Rainy River enterprise commends itself to the favourable opinion of the country, I take it, that it is a matter of perfect unconcern to us whether Mackenzie & Mann are willing to put their money in it and give the country the benefit of their enterprise or not. Instead of condemning such men, I should think the hon. gentleman would be the first to lend them a helping hand in taking hold of such an enterprise as this. We have not too many men like Mackenzie & Mann in this country. Have they done anything unworthy? Can any gentleman say that they have been guilty of any transactions in connection with Government,

Mr. BLAIR.

or in any public matter, which disqualifies them from being dealt with or recognized by the Government? I am not aware of it. When we desire to see an important railway enterprise carried on, can we pick men up on every blueberry bush and set them to work? I doubt if we can. Mackenzie & Mann, therefore, I say ought not to be used by the hon. gentleman as a bugbear. It is beneath him. I am sorry he is not here in order that he may hear me frankly express the impression which this matter has left upon my mind.

Now, coming to my hon. friend from the city of Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior), he has, I regret to say, exhibited what I do not think any other gentleman who has taken part in this discussion has exhibited, that is to say, a spirit of sectionalism in the discussion of these propositions.

Mr. PRIOR. No other hon. gentleman in this House has any occasion to be sectional, because British Columbia is the one province that has been left out altogether. As soon as ever a British Columbia member gets up and says anything for his province, he is always told he is sectional.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The very fact that the hon. gentleman pleads that excuse is the best evidence that can be afforded of the truth of the charge I make. I say the member for Victoria has not any ground upon which to charge this Government, or even this Parliament, with sectionalism. I do not think he can point to any disposition evidenced at all by this Government since it has been dealing with public affairs, in which we have evinced any unwillingness to treat every part of this Dominion in the same fair, just and reasonable manner. My hon. friend comes from a province which, he says, has received no consideration in these subsidies, when the very last time the Government had railway propositions to submit to Parliament they gave in effect \$3,000,000 to help a railway enterprise, exclusively or largely for the benefit of the province of British Columbia. Does my hon. friend think it a reasonable proposition to submit to this House that every time the Government asks for aid to an enterprise, it must needs dole out money in equal proportions to every province of the Dominion, irrespective of whether they have any particular work or undertaking which has a claim in itself, because of its own intrinsic merits, upon the bounty of the Dominion? I take it my hon. friend is giving away entirely to a local sentiment which is not worthy of him, which is not justified, and which, when you have regard to the treatment that province has already received up to this time, has no foundation in fact. I would have judged—and I will not say it in any unfriendly disposition to my hon. friend—I would have judged from what occurred in this House no later than last year, that

he considered he had railways enough in the province of British Columbia, for if my memory serves me right, while my hon. friend was opposed to allowing a company which was incorporated for the purpose and was ready to prosecute and push forward the enterprise of building the Kettle River Railway in that province—

Mr. PRIOR. Does the hon. gentleman say I was opposed to that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think so.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. gentleman better be careful before he makes a statement like that I would like him to show one single word I spoke in opposition.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I take it the hon. gentleman was opposed to it, or else he would not have paired with a gentleman who was in favour of it. Did not the hon. gentleman pair as against the Kettle River project?

Mr. PRIOR. No, I did not pair for it, or against it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, I accept unqualifiedly the hon. gentleman's statement, if he says that he did not pair on the vote on the Kettle River Railway against the incorporation of the company for the construction of that road.

Mr. PRIOR. I want to say that I never paired to miss any vote since I have been in the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, was the hon. gentleman paired on that vote? Is he certain that he was not?

Mr. PRIOR. I do not think I was in Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is not certain of it, he is not sure that he did not pair on that vote. Well, if he did pair on that vote against the Kettle River charter, I am sure I am warranted in assuming and drawing the inference I did that he was then, at all events, of opinion that the province of British Columbia had railways enough and did not want any more.

Mr. PRIOR. That is no argument.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If my hon. friend, in point of fact, did not pair and did not take any action one way or the other against it, of course I withdraw the statement I made, which was entirely founded on the assumption that he did oppose the charter to the Kettle River Railway. Now, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has undertaken to throw some light on this question, and I think, from the expression I noticed on his face, that he felt very comfortable in the

belief that he had put the Premier in a very false position, and he seemed to have demonstrated to his own satisfaction that the Premier had made statements with reference to the amount that was given by way of subsidies in aid of railways which were not accurate, and which, according to his description of what was done in 1884, was much less than the amount stated. Now, there is no doubt of what the hon. gentleman's view is, it is a very fair view. He is in favour of bonusing railways liberally, he is consistent with his own past, he has not stultified himself, as a good many of his friends have done on the other side of the House, in this debate. He states his position frankly, and I accord him credit for it. Well, he has told us that it is an entirely fair thing to do to take the amount of the subsidies which are being voted in 1899 and in adding these up to reach the total of the expenditures of this year made by this Government. But while he thinks that it is fair to add the gross amount of railway subsidies as a part of the expenditure of this year—

Mr. HAGGART. Did I say a word about expenditure?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman surely must have done so. Did not the hon. gentleman speak about the enormous, the extravagant sums that we are spending this year on subsidies? If he did not, I will take it all back.

Mr. FOSTER. He certainly could not, because you have not expended a cent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, but he was referring to these subsidies, and I think I heard the hon. gentleman enlarge upon the magnificence, upon the immensity, upon the enormity, and upon the extravagance of the proposals now before this committee.

Mr. HAGGART. Not a word.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then I am entirely in error, and not only did I fail to hear him correctly, but I heard him absolutely wrongly. But the hon. gentleman certainly cannot deny that he pointed out that the expenditure of the late Government was only so much, covering a long period of years, and that the average was a very much smaller sum than we are proposing to spend this year. Now, I suggested to the committee this afternoon that it did not follow that because these votes were passed the expenditures would take place, and thereupon my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) seized upon the statement I made, and founded upon it an argument that I was really coming to this House and making proposals without knowing what I was doing without having investigated the question, without having convinced myself that these works were

likely to go on, and that, therefore, it was evidence of incapacity on my part in putting such proposals before the House.

Now, my hon. friend made a point, as he thought, against us when he charged that there was evidence of incompetency on the part of this Government, but, if so, there was equally strong and convincing evidence of the same measure of incompetence on the part of the past Administration during all these years. Does the hon. gentleman deny that there were, year after year, voted large sums by the Government of that day in aid of railways which were not called for? Why? Because the expectations of the promoters of these undertakings, and I will take it, the hopes of the Government, in offering these aids, were not realized, so that if it be true that some of the proposals which we are now laying before Parliament, be evidence of incompetency on the part of this Government, if it be evidence that we have been derelict in not having sufficiently searched the matter and in not having investigated and got at the facts in regard to all these undertakings, as proved by my admission that some of the subsidies would not be taken up. It is equally convincing evidence that the same inability to judge and the same incompetency existed in past years. But let me return to the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. He has, as I have said, satisfied himself that the right hon. Prime Minister had made a statement which cannot be verified and which, when you look at it, is not borne out by the facts. What was that statement, and I will call the attention of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals to it particularly because it is evident that it has escaped his notice. The right hon. Prime Minister stated, in answer to a statement which was made by the hon. ex-Minister of Finance to the effect that this series of resolutions called for a larger sum in subsidies than had ever been presented to Parliament before, that that was not a fact, that while there are new votes and revotes in the proposals now before the committee aggregating \$6,500,000, the Government of which the hon. ex-Minister of Finance was not then a member, but of which he was a supporter in Parliament, in 1884, had introduced proposals, in which they asked for upwards of \$9,163,000 for similar purposes.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They did not do it?

Mr. FOSTER. Not for similar purposes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I affirm and reaffirm the correctness of the statement the right hon. Prime Minister made, that there were subsidies and votes passed through Parliament for \$9,163,000, for similar purposes.

Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. FOSTER. In this \$6,500,000 that we are asked to vote now, is there a single dollar for the extension of a branch of the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, nor was there then.

Mr. FOSTER. Just wait a moment—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will calmly keep his seat, I will be able to make my statement from my own point of view, and whether it is right or not or whether it is wrong, will appear clearly when what I have read is read. What I have been saying is that when the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals challenged the correctness of the statement of the right hon. Prime Minister when he said that it was not correct for the hon. ex-Minister of Finance to allege that these proposals were higher than had ever been made to Parliament before. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals said that it was not correct on the part of the right hon. Prime Minister, to say that, in 1884, the proposals, which he justified and approved, and which were made by the Government which he supported, were over \$9,000,000, and that they were made for practically and identically the same purposes.

Mr. HAGGART. No.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would ask the hon. gentleman not to interrupt me. The hon. gentleman says: No, these were not subsidies. I will clear up that point. I presume that we can accept the statutes; we can surely accept a parliamentary declaration on the subject, and the parliamentary declaration is that they were subsidies. Let us go through the items, every one of them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is labouring under a delusion if he says that the Government built the Cape Breton Railway as a Government work. Not a dollar of these subsidies went for that purpose. The Cape Breton Railway did not become the property of the Dominion until many years had elapsed after this grant was made. It did not become the property of the Dominion until 1891.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think they took authority in 1887 or 1888 to build.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But it is 1884 that we are speaking of, and it was in 1884 that the Prime Minister alleged that these votes had been passed, amounting not to \$6,500,000, but to \$9,500,000, or 50 per cent more than the proposed appropriations which have caused so much fear and anxiety and alarm to hon. gentlemen opposite. Let us go through these items. The first one is: "To the Government of the province of Quebec."

My hon. friend will say that this was a gift to the government of the province. It is a subsidy all the same, and the Act says "a subsidy."

Mr. HAGGART. Was not the road built and running then?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That does not make a particle of difference and this is only worse than the hon. gentleman's explanation in regard to the Cape Breton road, because the Cape Breton Railway later on became the property of the Dominion. What difference is it whether you are giving a grant in aid to the Government or to the railway company? You are giving a grant which was to aid the property, not of the Government, but the property of another railway company:

To the Government of the province of Quebec, in consideration of their having constructed the railway from Quebec to Ottawa, forming a connecting line between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, via the Intercolonial and Canadian Pacific railways, and being, as such, a work of national and not merely provincial utility, a subsidy—"A subsidy," not "a subsidy," says the hon. gentleman.

—a subsidy not exceeding \$6,000 per mile for the portion between Quebec and Montreal, 159 miles, not exceeding in the whole \$954,000,—

What is the next item?

—and for the portion between Montreal and Ottawa, 120 miles, \$12,000 per mile, not exceeding in the whole \$1,440,000.

Now we come to the line crossing the state of Maine and forming a part of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Does the hon. gentleman, in his kindness of heart towards the Canadian Pacific Railway, think that a grant or subsidy should be made to the Canadian Pacific Railway because it is the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that it should not be calculated or taken into account and should be stricken out of the \$9,000,000?

For the construction of a line of railway connecting Montreal with the harbours of St. John and Halifax by the shortest and best practical route, after a report of competent engineers, a subsidy not exceeding \$170,000 per annum for fifteen years.

Subsidy again; no question about "a subsidy." Now, then we will come to the question about the Cape Breton Railway? What does the statute say in regard to that?

For the construction of a line of railway from Oxford Station on the Intercolonial Railway to Sydney or Louisbourg, a subsidy not exceeding \$30,000 per annum for fifteen years, or a guarantee of a like sum for a like period as interest on the bonds of the company undertaking the work, in addition to the subsidies previously granted.

Is not that encouragement on the part of the Government of Canada to pay \$30,000 for fifteen years for a line of railway from Ox-

ford to Sydney or Louisbourg? We are dealing with the proposals that were laid before Parliament in 1884, and we are making comparisons between that year and the present year, and in making that comparison, I say that the statement that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has made has been completely and absolutely established.

Mr. FOSTER. But you have not read them all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If you want me—

Mr. FOSTER. Read the last two.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. (reading):

For a branch of the Intercolonial Railway from Metapedia eastward towards Paspébiac, 20 miles, in the province of Quebec, a sum not exceeding in the whole \$300,000.

For a branch of the Intercolonial Railway from Darby Station to Indiantown, 14 miles, a sum not exceeding in the whole \$140,000.

These are the two items out of all.

Mr. FOSTER. You said there were none.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then, I was in error.

Mr. FOSTER. I might save the time of the House; if the Minister of Railways and the Prime Minister want to prove that there was a year when a larger amount of money was voted for railway purposes than this year they need only go back to 1880—the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. gentleman's argument can be as effectively demolished by the votes in 1884 as by reference to other years. I addressed myself particularly to the question that both the ex-Minister of Finance and the ex-Minister of Railways dealt in the first place with the grant to the province of Quebec, which they allege was not a subsidy, and a vote in aid of the Cape Breton Railway. My hon. friend has complained, as some others have complained, that the Government has been very derelict in not bringing down those railway resolutions earlier in the session. I have no doubt that my hon. friend has heard that complaint before, and if it is true that that complaint has been made on the same side of the House from those who are now supporting this Government, he has succeeded in establishing that the party then in Opposition and now in power were putting forward an unreasonable demand. He has succeeded in establishing that they were not consistent in the strict sense of the word with their present attitude. But of what practical value is that?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are here for practical purposes, for the purpose of governing the

country, and because some of us, when in Opposition, not having had experience—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When my hon. friends cease their hilarity—

Mr. FOSTER. One cannot help it, when the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) is said to be inexperienced.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend must admit that when the Minister of Trade and Commerce was in the Government the era of subsidies had not dawned upon us, and he, therefore, could not speak with the knowledge and experience of hon. gentlemen opposite. They know from personal experience that it is impossible for a Government to properly mature its proposals and lay them before Parliament until all the members of Parliament have been here for some time. My hon. friends have had this experience in the past. They have invariably been compelled to delay these resolutions, and I will assume that they did so under compulsion. Did they do it with any improper intent or for the purpose of accomplishing any improper end? I am willing to acquit them of any such intent. They must admit that they were constrained by force of circumstances to delay the presentation of their railway proposals. I think that is a fair and complete answer to what the hon. gentleman has alleged against us. Possibly some of us may be guilty of inconsistency, but we are guilty of no greater crime.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the hon. Minister say why he has doubled the subsidies from \$3,200 to \$6,400?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will tell my hon. friend why the proposals have come into Parliament in this form as in 1897. My hon. friend will recall the fact that there were railways, not one or two, but many which were at the instance of the late Government aided to the extent of sums varying from the ordinary \$3,200 subsidy up to \$5,000; \$6,400; \$8,000; \$10,000 and \$12,000. No scale, no rule, no regulation guiding the action of the Government in making these proposals, but just as the exigencies of the moment might have urged them. Will my hon. friend from Beauharnois say that that was a wise course to take or that it would not be better to devise some general rule which you can apply to all the applicants coming to Parliament for railway aid. Instead of picking out one road because there happened to be more political influence behind it and giving it a large, generous subsidy of \$12,000 a mile, we have said to all, with the single exception of the Rainy River road—that is an exception, I admit, but it seems to be an exception which is approved on all hands—

Mr. BLAIR.

bring yourselves within this general rule and you will be entitled to additional assistance. The ex-Minister of Finance, who, it will be remembered, urged us most strongly to give a subsidy of \$6,400 to the Rainy River road, is prepared to justify that grant to-day. But what we have felt was, that instead of treating those individual subsidies and individual undertakings in a special way, because they had some more pull than other undertakings in some remote part of the country, instead of treating such in an exceptional manner, we concluded that it would be juster all round to lay down a rule which could be made of general application. Perhaps we may not have hit the happy medium in respect to the limit under which the cost of the railway will not entitle the company to any larger subsidy than the \$3,200; but we have made the best attempt in that direction which is in our power, and we are in a position to say to all applicants, whether they come from British Columbia on the one hand, or from Nova Scotia on the other: We have laid down a general rule; bring yourselves within the purview and operation of that rule, and your company, though it has not any big political backing, will be entitled to reap the benefit by reason of the increased cost of the road. That is the principle on which we have proceeded, and I venture to say, apart from a disposition that may be found among hon. gentlemen opposite to make a little political capital out of our course, that any one who applies a fair judgment to the matter, will say that it was wise and just to make such a rule to be applied all round.

Now, I was led to ask the permission of the committee to address it at this stage because our friends the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) and the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), the one had moved, and the other had seconded, an amendment to the Government proposal. That amendment, I may say at once, does not strike me as one which can be, or ought to be, accepted. I will not say that the object which these hon. gentlemen have in view may not be a desirable object to attain. In some respects I think it has much to commend it; but, as a whole, I am bound to say—and I think I am voicing the general sentiment of this Parliament—that the proposal has not sufficient merit to justify its acceptance at this time. I was unable to gather from the speech which the hon. member for Lisgar addressed to the committee this afternoon, what his general attitude towards the railway question is. I fully realize that this question in this country, as in almost all other countries, is one about which there is an immense divergence of opinion. It is a question that raises complicated and difficult problems about which men differ in all directions. My hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) has most advanced views on the question. He would nationalize all railways. Has my hon. friend

sat down and considered what that proposal means? I understand from his statement in this House that if he had the power, he would give effect to that policy, and nationalize all the railways of this Dominion. I do not think the hon. gentleman has thought that question out. What does it mean? Why, it means incurring an enormous additional debt to that which Canada is at present carrying. Perhaps a hundred millions might do it. I doubt very much whether it would on reflection. I am sure it would not. A hundred millions would not buy the Grand Trunk Railway and nationalize it; two hundred millions would not perhaps nationalize the Grand Trunk Railway system. Then, how much is he going to ask the people to go into debt for to nationalize the Canadian Pacific? Is not it a mere dream, an absolute delusion, to talk about such a thing? And yet the hon. gentleman would set his face against every proposal to offer the slightest aid or encouragement to railways in this country out of the Dominion exchequer until the people of Canada had determined to nationalize all the railways of the country. Perhaps five hundred millions would do it, or possibly less. It might, perhaps, be done for four hundred and fifty millions.

Mr. CAMPBELL. A thousand millions.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A thousand millions, my hon. friend says. I have never sat down to think it out.

Mr. FOSTER. Has your hon. friend sat down to think it out?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It never became a subject of discussion in this House until the hon. member for Lisgar made his proposition to-day.

Mr. RICHARDSON. My proposition was, that until we reached the point when it was thought desirable for the country to acquire the railways, we should adopt the principle that all railways to be built should be built and controlled by the Government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not understand that the hon. gentleman was prepared to give the railways any encouragement, unless we were prepared to take them over. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that it was a plank in the platform of the Conservative party in Manitoba that the Government should own all the railways. Well, that is a stupendous question, a question of enormous magnitude. It is a question which makes a man dizzy, when he thinks about it. I am sure that my hon. friend for East York has not thought about it. I doubt whether my hon. friend from Lisgar has given it very serious consideration. If he had, and if he had plainly seen his way to raising this extra five hundred millions, or, as my hon. friend says, a thousand millions, of

money in order to buy these railways and own them, he has not advanced very much towards convincing the people of the country that that would be a wise undertaking. Unless my hon. friends will get down from that high altitude on which they are standing, and deal with practical questions in a practical way, neither of them will succeed in accomplishing very much in the way of affording relief to the people of this country from the burdens under which, from a railway point of view, they are at this moment labouring.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the hon. Minister will give me an hour or two, I think I would be able to convince him, from the statistics I have in my desk, that the nationalizing of the railways would be a very good thing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Possibly the hon. gentleman has studied the question and satisfied himself; but, after satisfying himself, he has a considerable contract on his hands, in my judgment, to satisfy any considerable number of other people; and he has a still greater contract to satisfy a sufficient portion of the people of this country to induce them, and to induce Parliament to commit the country to his proposition. I have no doubt that there may be circumstances and conditions under which it might be desirable that the Government should own some particular railway. I have more or less sympathy with the hon. gentleman, if he would put his ideas in a practical form—if, instead of spreading himself over this whole wide Dominion, and saying we ought to own all the railways, he were to say that we should own some particular railway under particular circumstances.

Mr. FOSTER. The Crow's Nest Pass, for instance.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, the Crow's Nest Pass. I can understand that it might be a very reasonable proposition that the Government should own that railway. I could sympathize with a suggestion of that kind, but the hon. gentleman is not making a suggestion of that kind, and I was unable, after listening to his argument as closely as I could, to see how he got down from this height at which he started to the proposition embodied in this amendment, and which he prefers to the Government proposal. This leads me to examine for a moment these proposals in some detail. The amendment is as follows:—

That during the construction of all railways herein bonused, all books, accounts and records showing the actual cost of construction shall be open to inspection by the Government, in order that if it be subsequently determined by the Government to acquire any or all of the railways subsidized, they may be so acquired with a knowledge of their actual cost and at figures

from which shall be deducted the bonuses given by the Government.

That is the first proposition my hon. friend makes in amendment to the first resolution. As to that I would say, and in this I am expressing the view of the Government, that there would be no objection to adding to these resolutions a distinct one to the effect that the books, accounts and vouchers, showing what the cost of any railway that was aided from the Dominion exchequer has been, showing what its earnings and its expenses are, should be available to the Government, at any time, on request. There could be no harm, and there might be some advantage, in having it expressly laid down in statutory form that the Government should possess such power. If my hon. friend attaches any value to that part of his proposition, I would go with him to make it part of the proposal now before Parliament. There would be no particular objection to such a clause being put in, because it would only apply, as now suggested, to railways which have been bonused by the Government. If that were a desirable thing to do, I think some little improvement might be made in the phraseology, so as to really give effect to the object the hon. gentleman has in view.

But as to the concluding portion of the clause, it is open to the very gravest objection. I think it would not be well that we should declare that the Government ought to have the power to take any railway out of the hands of the railway company at its cost. I do not think it is a reasonable proposition. The adoption of any such clause would be to defeat the very object we have in view in giving these aids to the several railway companies. We would be giving with the one hand and withdrawing with the other. It would be fatal to the successful financing of any of these companies, and would therefore practically defeat the objects we have in view. For that reason the concluding portion of the first clause of the amendment does not strike us favourably, and I would ask him to withdraw that clause and accept one which I will offer in a moment, which, I think, will secure the information he desires, and which as he suggests it would be important for us to have.

Mr. FOSTER. To what end?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. To this end. I am free to confess that the proposal somewhat favourably impresses itself on my mind, because if you have accurate knowledge, upon which you can depend, of the actual cost of the railway, its earnings, the cost of operating it, you will be in a better position to judge as to whether the rates which are being imposed are reasonable or excessive. No person would be unwilling to allow any one who goes into an enterprise of that kind,

Mr. BLAIR.

surrounded with uncertainties as it always is to the final result, to secure a fair and reasonable return on his investment. I think Parliament would be willing that the people concerned in the promoting or carrying on of railway enterprises should have reasonable return for the investment they make, and you can only judge as to whether or not that result is being attained when you are accurately advised as to what the railway undertaking cost, on the one hand, and what its earnings and the cost of operating are, on the other.

There is another clause which the hon. gentleman has in his proposed amendment, and which, with the permission of the committee, I will read :

That the rates, both passenger and freight, shall, at all times, be subject to revision and control by the Governor in Council.

The hon. gentleman need not have put that in his amendment because that is here already. It is here in the strongest possible terms, terms as strong as those in the hon. gentleman's amendment. He must have overlooked that fact when he drafted this amendment. He is apparently disposed even to qualify that portion of the clause as he has it. He gives up to the Government the power to revise and control the rates, both passenger and freight, but subject to this provision :

Provided that whenever such rates produce a net earning of more than 6 per cent on the actual cost of the road and equipment, less the amount of subsidies received from any source, the rates shall be reduced to such a point as shall only produce 6 per cent.

That is an impracticable suggestion. Having due regard to the public interest, it is not a reasonable suggestion to make. I do not think Parliament ought to say to any man or body of men who are being invited to invest their moneys in such uncertain enterprises as the building and operating of railways, that the utmost limit of their earnings shall be 6 per cent. They may have to operate that railway for years at a loss. They may, perhaps, have to pay out of their own pocket, for a considerable period, a portion of the cost of operating it, but the very moment they succeed in obtaining good results, the moment their business becomes successful, and they are able to earn 6 per cent, that moment you will place a limit on them and say that their rate must be cut down so as to confine them to a 6 per cent dividend. That proposition would be fatal to the financing and the floating of any railway enterprise, and my hon. friend would only be accomplishing, in an indirect manner, what I know some desire to accomplish in a direct manner, that is totally defeat the construction of railways altogether under this Bill. That is not the object of the Government. While the disposition of the Government in respect of the railways of Canada now in

operation and the railways which are being promoted and are in contemplation, is to safeguard the public interest to the fullest degree, we must be practical, we must be reasonable, we must deal with them in a spirit of fairness, we must deal with them in such a way that they may succeed in establishing themselves as we desire to see them do, and we must treat them in a business and enlightened way—and I think we should fail to do that if we adopted either as proposed. Now, I intend to bring my remarks to an end. No doubt my friends opposite will be delighted to hear that.

Mr. BERGERON. We have not been accustomed to this kind of talk from the hon. gentlemen opposite when they were on this side. We like this.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am glad I am able to please the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron). I succeeded in doing so once before. I must be particularly happy in that regard. I ask the House to dispose of the amendments in accordance with the views I have expressed. I have here an additional section which I shall propose at a later time, and I read it now that hon. gentlemen may see that whatever merit there is in it is fully and adequately—

Mr. FOSTER. This is the axe to behead Mr. Richardson.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) is beheaded, he has beheaded himself. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) will support this and withdraw his own or not. I am not going to press him to do so :

That, as respects all railways receiving subsidies under the foregoing provisions, the company at any time owning or operating any of the said railways shall, if and when required, produce and exhibit to the Minister of Railways and Canals, or any person appointed by him, all books, accounts and vouchers showing the cost of constructing the railway, the cost of operating the same and the earnings thereof.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you not that power already ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think not. I am glad to see the impatience of hon. gentlemen opposite. It affords me some hopeful indication that they will assist us in the early disposal of the question now before the committee.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh. oh.

Mr. DAVIN. What is it ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is in order.

Mr. DAVIN. I desire to understand the amendment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will send it over. I am not now moving it.

Mr. DAVIN. Quite so. I understand it is a suggestion to the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson).

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am suggesting it, and I will move it.

Mr. FOSTER. Will not the hon. Minister change his mind ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps I might.

Mr. FOSTER. It surely cannot be another Kettle River question ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not change my mind on that. I wonder if the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) did.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). It is clear from the amendment suggested by the Minister of Railways and Canals that the North-west Territories and Manitoba need expect none of the railway relief that they might fairly have hoped to get from a Government formed by Liberal leaders who had held out to the people such glowing prospects in regard to railway legislation, should they get the reins of power. After the very long speech we have had from the Minister of Railways and Canals, I am not going to take up the time of the committee. I am deeply impressed with the views that were expressed in 1894 by the present Prime Minister and the present Minister of Trade and Commerce as to the utter futility, at this time of the session, of asking men to consider such vast propositions as are found in these railway resolutions. Mr. Chairman, with a majority such as we have to face and in the dog-days, there is nothing for us to do but submit—and protest. I have more than once appealed to the Liberals in this House and out of the House in respect of the treason to Liberal principle that we have witnessed from time to time, and never more strikingly or more glaringly than at this hour in this Parliament. I had to allude to-day to a letter written to the "Farmers' Sun" in 1894, by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce. I have the same paper in my hand to-day. It is now edited by a gentleman who is certainly a friend of the Premier, and certainly an enemy of the leader of the Opposition, and, I think, very unfriendly to the Opposition altogether. I have an article here in which he denounces the Opposition. But I have also an article in the issue of August 2nd. And how is it headed ? It is headed "The Liberal Apostasy." And apropos of what is it so headed ? Apropos of the very resolutions we have now to consider, and in regard to which, when my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) moves a resolution pointing in the direction of relief

for the travelling public, and my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) seconds it, the Minister of Trade and Commerce comes forward with a suggestive amendment which is nothing better than a mere futility. This is what the "Weekly Sun" says :

The original Estimates for the current financial year brought down by Mr. Fielding amounted to \$46,286,550. The supplementary Estimates brought the total amount asked for by the Government up to \$51,783,895. This was an enormous amount to spend, but the end was not to be yet, and last Friday morning honest citizens were startled to learn that the night before the Government had brought down a resolution donating \$6,540,295—

The Minister of Railways and Canals will observe that this friendly writer speaks of this money as donated. But hon. gentlemen opposite speak of it as an advance ; "convey the wise it call" :—

—to a crowd of railway promoters and bridge-builders. The appropriations asked for were thus increased to \$58,324,190.

This does not include the \$1,400,000 appropriated by a special Act for the purchase of the Drummond County Railroad, nor does it include our share of the cost of constructing the Pacific cable, which, at the lowest estimate, will be \$2,360,000, and is likely to be far greater. If we add these sums to the general appropriations, we shall find that the total amount the Government proposes to spend is \$62,084,190. This is \$12 for every individual in Canada and \$60 for each family.

\$62,000,000. Take the value of an ordinary farm.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman endorse those statements ?

Mr. DAVIN. I am glad to see my hon. friend the Postmaster General there, because this is a paper that he used to own, or at all events pulled full stroke oar in, and partly by means of which the Liberal victory was won.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman endorse those figures ?

Mr. DAVIN. I am reading for the edification of my hon. friend—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman endorse them ?

Mr. DAVIN. He has on his left the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who declared at Brandon that the cost of carrying freight from Chicago to Boston was 10 per cent less than the cost of carrying freight from Winnipeg to the seaboard ; and he said it was a thing we must deal with. Has he dealt with it ? Does the Minister of Railways and Canals attempt to deal with it ? The Minister of the Interior comes from the west, he comes from the land whence he ought to get a certain amount of reforming vigour. But although he makes this statement, we do not find him implementing it :

Mr. DAVIN.

This is \$12 for every individual in Canada, and \$60 for each family.

When the Postmaster General interrupted me I was about to put it in this way, in order that the farmers may realize it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman say these figures are correct ?

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend can reply to me. Take the average value of a farm and divide this \$62,000,000 by the average value of the farm, and you have the number of farms that these men are spending every year. Fifteen thousand five hundred and fifty farms a year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Now the hon. gentleman is endorsing these figures, if he makes that statement.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, I say that these railway subsidies now have practically brought up the expenditure to over \$60,000,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman say that this \$62,000,000 that he has pictured there is going to be expended during the present fiscal year ?

Mr. DAVIN. Of course, it is possible that some few thousands may not be expended. But will the hon. gentleman say that \$56,000,000 will not be expended ? \$56,000,000 is very different from \$33,000,000 in regard to which the right hon. gentleman declared up in Toronto that they could reduce it, perhaps not by \$5,000,000, but by probably \$3,000,000.

The donations are given, not in response to public demand, but private pressure. They are brought down in the dying hours of the session, when members are anxious to get away, and when there is not time for public discussion. They are given to promoters of roads in old-settled sections of the Dominion as well to promoters of roads in comparatively new territory. In Ontario the donations are made to roads to which the Ontario Government has already given millions of money, and in respect of which the people of this province will now have to pay a double tax. As if enough had not been done for the railroads, they are given a million and a quarter of dollars to build bridges for their lines.

It is not easy to discuss the granting of all this money with calmness.

And he goes on to denounce in his own eloquent way these proposals, because he is one of the ablest men in Canada, and is a friend of this Government. Well, there is another article on the same subject in this paper to which my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce wrote that letter in which he stated that they were on the same platform as the Patrons. Here is an article headed, "A Gross of Green Spectacles" :

We are asked to approve the voting of \$6,540,295 to the various railroad promoters because one of the conditions of the grants is that the railroad companies shall, when required, carry members of the militia and their supplies, and

the Government mails, and that, in whole or partial payment for these services, the Government shall be entitled to charge up against the railroad companies 3 per cent per annum on the amount of subsidy voted for the line. This is something, no doubt, but it will not bring us back one cent of the principal.

This writer does not see how utterly futile it is, but the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has shown what is its value, and his argument on that 3 per cent is irrefragable. You have only to look at what has been earned by the railway going from Calgary to Edmonton to know that it is a piece of dust-throwing in the eyes of the people.

It will do little, if anything, to reduce the amount we now pay existing lines for the carriage of militia and mails.

The "bargain," as the Government terms it, with the railroad promoters bears a striking resemblance to a bargain made some time in the last century by one Moses, the son of the Vicar of Wakefield.

Now, I am going to respect the anonymity of this writer. My hon. friend the member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), in quoting from this great writer in the "Tribune," gives his name. It would therefore, perhaps, be permissible to give his name, but I will not do that. I will not break the seal of anonymity. We can recognize the hand of a great master of expression, and also the allusiveness of the great writer:—

Moses, Oliver Goldsmith tells us, was deputed to sell a colt at a neighbouring fair, and, with the proceeds, to buy a suitable horse for the vicar and his family. Like Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Moses was one of whom his friends entertained high expectations. So striking is the resemblance, not only between the two bargains, but between the kind of company into which both Moses and Sir Wilfrid Laurier came to grief, that we give the account of the experiences of Moses in the vicar's own words. After telling how the fond mother was predicting with confidence the success of her son at the fair, he continues:

Now, that is the view of the organ of the farmers in Ontario; that is the view also of a most able critic, of a man who can look on all questions of the time, not merely with vast literary knowledge, but with great experience, great achievements in historical investigation, and also a man who is a profound student of political economy.

"As she spoke Moses came slowly on foot and sweating under a deal box, which he had strapped round his shoulders, like a pedlar. "Welcome, welcome, Moses. Well, my boy, what have you brought us from the fair?" "I have brought you myself," cried Moses, with a sly look, and resting the box on the dresser. "Ah, Moses," cried my wife, "that we know, but where is the horse?" "I have sold him," cried Moses, "for three pounds five shillings and twopence." "Well done, my good boy," returned she, "I knew you would touch them off. Between ourselves, three pound five shillings and two pence is no bad day's work. Come, let us have it, then." "I have brought back no money," cried Moses, again; "I have laid it all out in a bargain, and here it is." pulling out a bundle from his breast; "here they are: a gross of green spectacles, with silver

rims and shagreen cases.' 'A gross of green spectacles,' repeated my wife, in a faint voice. 'And you have parted with the colt and brought us back nothing but a gross of green paltry spectacles.' 'Dear mother,' cried the boy, 'why won't you listen to reason? I had them a dead bargain, or I should not have bought them. The silver rims alone will sell alone for double the money.' 'A fig for the silver rims,' cried my wife, in a passion, 'I dare swear they won't sell for above half the money at the rate of broken silver, five shillings an ounce.' 'You need be under no uneasiness,' cried I, 'about selling the rims, for they are not worth sixpence, for I perceive they are only copper varnished over.' 'What,' cried my wife, 'not silver; the rims not silver?' 'No,' cried I, 'no more silver than your saucepan.' 'And so,' returned she, 'we have parted with the colt, and have only got a gross of green spectacles, with copper rims and shagreen cases; a murrain take such trumpery. The blockhead has been imposed upon, and should have known his company better.' 'There, my dear, cried I, 'you are wrong; he should not have known them at all.' \* \* \* By this time the unfortunate Moses was undeceived. He now saw that he had indeed been imposed upon by a prowling sharper, who, observing his figure, had marked him for an easy prey."

Sir Wilfrid Laurier has got us something for our money, and Moses got something for the colt.

Now, I have taken the liberty—and I do not think that anybody, no matter how eminent he might be, can object to it—of comparing the right hon. Prime Minister to Faust, to the hero of that great German drama. At a previous session I compared him to a prince of the blood, Clarence, who appears in one of Shakespeare's plays. His friend, who regards the Opposition with great scorn, and always speaks well of the Premier, here compares him to Moses, in "The Vicar of Wakefield." Why? Because he has allowed himself to be a party to bringing down these enormous railway subsidies, contrary, as I have shown already in this committee to-day, to the professed principles of the Liberal party, contrary to the promises and pledges held out in the pamphlet sent broadcast throughout the country, on which, I suppose, some hon. gentlemen opposite founded their speeches in 1896, sent from the office of Mr. Smith; contrary to the declared views of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). Is it not an astonishing thing that a great writer, speaking for the farmers, has been led to compare the right hon. gentleman to Moses, in "The Vicar of Wakefield," who takes away a horse and brings back a gross of green spectacles with silver rims, which turn out to be copper, varnished or gilt? I was very sorry, I confess, to hear it intimated by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) that he would oppose the motion of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), because I had gathered from his professions in previous sessions that he was devoted to any action that would give railway relief to the people of the North-west, and especially to

the people of the Saskatchewan. I must say that I do not think we have had any help from him this session in doing anything for the railway needs of the North-west Territories, or the railway needs of the Saskatchewan. Mr. Chairman, so far as I can, after a hurried reading of the amendment suggested by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, form any opinion, I do not think it would throw any glamour over such of these items as are monstrous proposals of extravagant bonuses for railways in long-settled districts.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like very much to agree to the withdrawal of the amendment in favour of the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, but I cannot see that his suggestion covers the point at which the amendment aims. I do not propose to suggest to the committee, as the seconder of the amendment, or to suggest to the Government, that the mover and myself have by any means found a solution of the railway problem. We have merely put into a form of words a suggestion as to the difficulty in which we find ourselves in regard to railways at the present time, and the possibility of relief from that condition. The condition in which we find ourselves is, that we are tied up in regard to rates, because our railways are overloaded with stock and bonds. We are prepared to pay rates on whatever a railway actually costs. To do that will not make our rates excessive. What makes our rates excessive is, that we have to pay interest on money far beyond what the roads cost. The amendment is to cut off from the railways of the future the necessity of paying interest on more than the actual cost of the roads. That is the purpose, although it may be imperfectly framed. It may not be effective, but that is the idea in the advocacy of that principle.

Amendment (Mr. Richardson) negatived: Yeas, 13; Nays, 81.

To the Great Northern Railway Company, for a railway between Montcalm and St. Tite Junction, on the Lower Laurentian Railway, Quebec, not exceeding 53½ miles; and for a branch from their main line to Shawenegan Falls, Quebec, not exceeding 6½ miles. 53½ miles, revote.

Mr. FOSTER. Part of this is a new road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Six and a half miles is new, and the rest is a revote.

Mr. WALLACE. Where does this road commence and what is the whole project?

The PRIME MINISTER. I can give the information to my hon. friend. This road is intended to strike the Parry Sound Railway at South Indian and run to the Ottawa River at Hawkesbury, from Hawkesbury to St. Jerome, from St. Jerome to Montcalm,

Mr. DAVIN.

and from Montcalm to the Lake St. John Railway, going down the Lake St. John Railway to the harbour of Quebec. It is now practically completed, and it is expected that it will be in operation next fall.

Mr. WALLACE. Will this vote complete the line?

The PRIME MINISTER. The whole subsidy asked this year will complete the railway from the Ottawa River to the harbour of Quebec. This branch is a spur to the pulp mills on the St. Maurice River.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the distance?

The PRIME MINISTER. Taking the built roads, the distance from the Ottawa River to the harbour of Quebec must be in the neighbourhood of 200 miles. The whole length of the Great Northern will be in the neighbourhood of 100 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. There is a bridge across the Ottawa River, too.

The PRIME MINISTER. The bridge was subsidized two years ago.

Mr. WALLACE. This is said to be a revote. Is a revote under the conditions of \$3,200 a mile, or under the new terms made by the Minister that if they give proof they can earn \$6,400 a mile?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a revote under the conditions that if the railway cost over \$15,000 a mile, it will be entitled to the addition.

Mr. WALLACE. Then, it is a revote only to the extent of \$3,200 a mile.

The PRIME MINISTER. Part of this subsidy, if I remember rightly was voted several times. It was a revote again in 1897. I am under the impression that a small section of the railway was subsidized by the late Government for \$6,400 a mile. This is a revote, but it comes under the conditions of the general proposition which we have adopted.

Mr. HAGGART. I think the Minister had better leave out the word "revote."

The PRIME MINISTER. That is only inserted for the information of the committee. It is not a new project. It has been before Parliament several times.

Mr. FOSTER. What my hon. friend means is this. When you go back to the original Act which made the vote, it is a vote for \$3,200 a mile, and when the Auditor General comes to pay the whole sum, he will pay \$3,200 per mile and no more, because the sum of money is distinctly stated in the original Act.

The PRIME MINISTER. The word "revote," which is in italics, is simply a memorandum for the information of the committee, and not part of the legislation.

Mr. WALLACE. But there is no sum of money mentioned. The old vote is \$3,200 a mile, while the new vote may be double that amount.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is an alteration in the conditions. The first vote was for a subsidy of \$3,200 a mile without any conditions; this is for a subsidy of \$3,200 a mile with conditions which may increase the amount, as stated in the resolution which we have just adopted.

To the Phillipsburg Railway and Quarry Company, shortage in the extension of their railway from a point on the company's line at or near the end of the subsidized section, to the Government Wharf at Phillipsburg, Quebec, not exceeding 66-100ths of a mile. Revote.

Mr. D. B. MEIGS (Missisquoi). Before this is carried, I would like to say a few words about the Phillipsburg Railway. It is a railway built in Missisquoi County, and it has been subsidized to the extent of \$7,200 per mile—\$4,000 from the government of Quebec and \$3,200 from this Government. The road has been built four years, but has not been operated. In the winter season they do not pretend to run it at all, and in the summer season they run one or two trains a week. They have no time table, and they only run it for their own convenience. We have another railway in the county of Missisquoi, which is almost in the same position—the Montreal and Province Line Railway, which was built about fourteen years ago, by means of a subsidy of \$4,000 a mile from the Quebec Government. They got a charter from this Parliament, but the railway has not run for fourteen years, and there is not much left of it except the rails. The Quebec legislature on the 16th of January last passed an Act to sequester all railways bonused by the Quebec Government that did not run. I understood that that was sent here to the hon. Minister of Railways. I interviewed him myself, and asked him if this Government would introduce a similar Bill to that passed in Quebec, so that the parties would be forced to run these roads and that the taxpayers would not be obliged to lose the large amount spent on these roads. That has been one of the difficulties with these roads that have been bonused in the county of Missisquoi. Since they finished the roads and got the bonus they never ran them. We have two roads in that county. I have tried to induce the hon. Minister of Railways to pass a similar Bill to that passed by the province of Quebec, and he refused. He said it was a bad Bill for the province of Quebec. I do not know why he should take the responsibility upon himself of making that statement. We have a Liberal Government in that province and a very popular Government and they passed this Bill, and these railways only interest the province of Quebec. They do not inter-

est the Dominion. The Montreal and Province Line Railway was paid \$4,000 per mile, and this Government never paid a cent nor was ever asked for a cent; and I think it is no more than fair that the provincial government should have the right to sequester their own railways and try to get back part of their money. The Montreal and Province Line Railway is 60 miles from St. Lambert to Frelighsburg, and 40 miles of that road is running from St. Lambert to Farnham. The other portion, from Farnham to Frelighsburg, has not been run for the past fourteen years, although the company received \$80,000 upon that piece. The road was sold at public auction and is now owned by a man in St. Albans and run by the Grand Trunk Railway in his interest. The man is holding the road and not more than a week or two ago was offered \$150,000 for it, but he is asking \$200,000 for it. They refuse to put this 20 miles of railway in running order, and I think the Government ought to take some steps to force those people to run the railway and not have the country lose this large amount of money and have these railways going to ruin.

This Phillipsburg Railway is in the same position, only it received \$3,200 per mile from this Government, besides a wharf built at Missisquoi Bay that cost the Government \$4,000 to \$5,000. Since that wharf was built, they have unloaded one load of coal upon it, and that is all the use it has been put to. The Government ought to take some steps to force these people to run that road. I take this occasion, when this item is before the House, to urge the Government to do something. The company were to have \$3,200 per mile and there was some mistake in the measurement and on 66-100ths of a mile they have never yet received anything, so that I think this amount is due to the company. It seems strange that the country should lose this large amount of money and not have any railway. The people in that country are up in arms and think it is a great imposition on the county that the road is not run.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is quite correct in what he states. He brought to my notice on several occasions the condition of things existing in his county with respect to this railway, the Montreal and Province line. He brought to me a copy of the Bill with a communication from Mr. Duffy, member of the Quebec Government, in which he expresses the hope that the Government of Canada would ask Parliament to pass a similar measure, the object being to enable the Government of the province of Quebec to take possession of any railways which they had subsidized and which were not being operated according to their contracts. The need of their coming here was owing to the fact that the Montreal and Province Company had received their charter from the Dominion Parliament, and were not subject

therefore to the control of the legislature of the province of Quebec, so that the province could not sequester that road. On looking into the Bill passed by the province of Quebec, I pointed out what appeared to me an objection to our adopting that legislation. It would be very unwise in us to assume any such responsibility as has been assumed by the province of Quebec. No doubt the Government case was one of considerable hardship but it is one which frequently arises, and the obligation which would be assumed under that Bill would be very serious. The province of Quebec undertook by legal process to obtain possession of any railway not being operated, and they assumed the further responsibility of operating and maintaining it, and what they desired was that the Government of Canada should take that obligation upon itself in respect of any piece of road in the province of Quebec which had been incorporated by the Parliament of Canada. I later saw Mr. Duffy and pointed out to him the objections to that legislation. I said it would never do for the Government of Canada, by legislation, to undertake to make itself liable to take over and operate every railway that had failed in the hands of the company which was to build it. That would be a pretty serious obligation, and, therefore, I could not advise my Government to approve that legislation.

Mr. MEIGS. They could get the money back. They could get the \$4,000 a mile back. The road is a valuable one, there is not a bit of risk, they have refused \$150,000 for the leased part of the road.

Mr. WALLACE. How many miles?

Mr. MEIGS. Forty miles from St. Lambert to Farnham, which is leased to the Grand Trunk Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was because the 20 miles were not run, that the province of Quebec desired to have some power vested in them whereby they could take possession of the road.

Mr. BERGERON. Could not this Government force the company to operate that road, since they were subsidized by the Government?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the trouble. We never were. We are powerless so far as that remedy is concerned, because we had never subsidized that company, and there was no subsidy contract between the Government and the company. There was no contract between that company and the Dominion Government to operate the road. I do not think there was any such contract between the province of Quebec and the company. The difficulty was that they were not proposing to get any legislative authority from this Parliament to deal with the road in a

Mr. BLAIR.

particular way that would not involve obligations upon us, but they passed a general Bill under which they charged themselves with the duty and responsibility of taking over any road in the province and—

Mr. MEIGS. They were not obliged to take it over.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But they conferred upon themselves the right to take it over, and having taken it over they took upon themselves the responsibility of operating it and paying out of the provincial treasury the cost of operation; and they asked us as a Dominion to adopt that legislation from a Dominion point of view.

Mr. MEIGS. They took the right to take such roads over, but they did not oblige themselves to run them. They could take the road and sell the rails and get part of the money back. But what I claim is that this road is a valuable property. No one in the county is interested in that road; it was sold by public auction and was bought by a man named Stranahan, of St. Albans. The owners are not citizens of Canada. They have a sort of provisional company, and Mr. Greenshields, who is the legal representative of this man Stranahan, is one of the provisional directors. What was wanted was that the Quebec Government should be given power to deal with the road. That, as I understand it, is all that Mr. Duffy, the commissioner of public works of Quebec, asked.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, what he asked was that we should recommend to Parliament the same legislation generally as they had enacted in the province of Quebec. I pointed out the difficulty, and I thought he saw it and yielded. I asked if he could suggest some way in which some specific power might be given that would be of service to him, but I had no suggestion from him in that regard.

Mr. BRITTON. Is this two-thirds of a mile not constructed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, but there was shortage in the mileage allowed for.

Mr. BRITTON. In other words, you are paying a debt?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are giving them the balance of the subsidy which they would have had had there been no error in the mileage.

Mr. WALLACE. How much a mile?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. \$3,200.

To the Strathroy and Western Counties Railway, for a line from Strathroy, Ontario, via Adelaide and Arkona, to either Forest, Tedford or Park Hill, not exceeding 24 miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by 57-58 Victoria, chap. 4. Partly revote.

**Mr. FOSTER.** How much of this is re-vote ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Seventeen miles, if my memory serves me.

**Mr. WALLACE.** Is the company formed? Who are the owners, or who apply for the subsidy ?

**Mr. CALVERT.** The charter has been granted by the provincial legislature to some citizens of Strathroy, and, I think, of London. Mr. Grist, of Strathroy, is the president, and I think the present mayor of Strathroy is a director, and also the sheriff of London. I may say that in 1894, this House granted :

To the Strathroy and Western Counties Railway Company, for 25 miles of their railway from St. Thomas, through the counties of Elgin and Middlesex, towards Forest Station or Park Hill, on the Grand Trunk Railway, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 a mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$80,000.

This was enacted under 57-58 Vic., chap. 4. Since then the promoters of the road have decided to ask for a grant from Caradoc station, seven miles south of Strathroy, into the town of Strathroy, thence to Adelaide village, thence to the village of Arkona and thence to the village of Forest or the town of Parkhill. The company propose to leave off that portion from Caradoc station on the Canadian Pacific Railway, southward to St. Thomas. This road will pass through the finest agricultural district in the province of Ontario. I believe that more farm stock and farm produce has been shipped out of the county of Middlesex than of any other county in Ontario. This road will connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway and with the Sarnia branch and the old Great Western Railway, now the Grand Trunk Railway, at Strathroy, and the Grand Trunk Railway at Forest or Parkhill. I do not see any reason why the money should not be granted now, as it was granted in 1894.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Was the part of the road now asking for a subsidy subsidized in 1894?

**Mr. CALVERT.** A portion of it, as I have read.

**Mr. HAGGART.** The part subsidized before was from St. Thomas, 25 miles. How far is the commencement of this road from St. Thomas ?

**Mr. CALVERT.** About 18 miles from St. Thomas.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Then, this is only a re-vote of 7 miles ; this is a transfer of the other on to this part.

**Mr. CALVERT.** The vote at that time reads :

Strathroy and Western Counties Railway Company, for 25 miles of their railway from St. Thomas, through the counties of Elgin and Middlesex towards Park Hill.

**Mr. INGRAM.** The object to be gained by running a line from Caradoc to Strathroy, 7 miles, is to have connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. You have all the advantages of both lines of railway from Caradoc to Strathroy, without building additional mileage.

**Mr. WALLACE.** The explanations given by the member for West Middlesex (Mr. Calvert) are unsatisfactory. It appears that in the old days a subsidy was voted for another line of railway entirely. That has lapsed, and this is put in, partly as a re-vote. Its starting point is 18 miles from the starting point of the other road from Strathroy. It is in a country where there is a network of railways ; it is a line that is unnecessary. Forest is supplied with railway accommodation.

**Mr. CALVERT.** There is only one line at Forest.

**Mr. WALLACE.** There is no necessity for bonusing a railway like that.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** There is quite a straight stretch between these two points that has no railway facilities.

**Mr. CALVERT.** This road will pass through the village of Adelaide, which is of considerable importance ; and the village of Arkona, which is an incorporated village, and it passes through one of the best portions of an agricultural district. Arkona must be 8 or 9 miles from a railway. It is 12 miles from Watford, where a stage runs every day, and 8 or 9 miles from Forest.

**Mr. MONK.** I think we ought to be careful in granting bonuses to places that are already reached by railways, when there are places that have no railway communication at present. We have in the county of Jacques Cartier a railway that branches off from the Grand Trunk Railway and goes as far as St. Laurent, a large town, relatively speaking, in the centre of the county. When the subsidy was granted to that branch, it was understood that it would be prolonged as far as St. Genevieve, which has no communication whatever with any place, neither by water nor by rail.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Was a subsidy applied for ?

**Mr. MONK.** Of that I am not aware. Probably, the people in that part of the country thought that when this Government came into power, the system of subsidizing railways was going to be abolished. If that is all that is required, there will be no difficulty in obtaining an application. I mention this, because St. Genevieve is the only place thus deprived of communication by water or by rail. That branch of railway which is named the Jacques Cartier Junction Railway, received a subsidy. While on

this subject, I may mention to the Postmaster General that a couple of weeks ago the morning train, carrying the mails, ceased running to St. Laurent, causing great inconvenience to the people of that town. I would also ask the Minister of Railways and Canals to interfere and see that that morning service is resumed, if it is in his power. They previously had a morning and an evening train, and now they only get the evening train.

Mr. FOSTER. This subsidy is an example which scarcely bears out the Premier's plea this afternoon for a subsidy for railways. You are subsidizing a line of road which runs through a country, most of the villages of which have now railway communication, and none of which is more than seven or eight miles from railway communication. If you are going to take public money to subsidize roads in the very thick of a railroad country, the Premier's plea falls to the ground for the outlying districts. There is no section of country in any province that cannot claim a subsidy, if you subsidize a road of this kind.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can explain on what principle he and his late colleagues subsidized the Canadian Pacific Railway from London to Windsor, passing within two or three miles of the Grand Trunk Railway all the way, and passing through the same villages, in sight of the Grand Trunk Railway most of the way?

Mr. HAGGART. It was not subsidized.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It was subsidized to Chatham.

Mr. CASEY. If there is any criticism to come from anybody in regard to building railways within the reach of other railways, I do not think it comes very well from an hon. gentleman who was member of a Government which did that?

To the St. John Valley and Rivière du Loup Railway Company, for a line of railway from Fredericton, in the county of York, N.B., to Woodstock, in the county of Carleton, not exceeding 59 miles. Revote.

Mr. WALLACE. Who are in this company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The late Mr. Baird, I think, was president of the company. I do not know just the members. Mr. Manchester was in it, and Mr. Troop. The company has a corporate existence. I do not think there is a political friend of the Government in it, so far as I know.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if this is in connection with some line of railway or is it a new line of railway from these two points?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a new line. It has no

Mr. MONK.

connections beyond at either end, but it connects these two points.

Mr. WALLACE. Is there not a line from Woodstock to Fredericton?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a line on the opposite side of the river and a line away back.

Mr. WALLACE. It seems that there are two lines of railway already from Fredericton to Woodstock. This bonus is for a third line, so that they are pretty well supplied.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is almost a day's drive between them to get from one to the other. I imagine that you would have objected to a subsidy to this road because it has been revoted three or four times.

Mr. WALLACE. I suppose that this is one of the subsidies that the hon. Minister does not expect to be called upon to assume liability for.

For a railway from Port Hawkesbury, on the Strait of Canso, N.S., to St. Peter's, not exceeding 30 miles. Revote.

Mr. HAGGART. Is that under contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This line is not under contract. I do not know whether it has been more than once voted, but it has at least been voted once.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think this is the second or third time it has appeared.

Mr. HAGGART. This is not the line that will go to the coal mine that Mr. Mann has the contract for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No this is not the same.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had an earnest appeal from the hon. leader of the Opposition and other hon. gentlemen to include this new railway in the list.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This application is for a road by way of St. Peter's to Louisbourg, on the south side of the island. There is a road from Sydney to Louisbourg, but it is by a roundabout way. This will be a more direct way.

Mr. WALLACE. Is that part of a railway in existence?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

For a railway from Windsor, N.S., to Truro, via township of Clifton, not exceeding 58 miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by 57-58 Victoria, chap. 4. Revote.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This road is actually in course of construction. It runs from Windsor, in Hants County, to Truro, in Colchester. There was some ques-

tion as to the location of the road, whether it should run by way of Brookfield or Clifton. After some objection the Clifton route was adopted, and the road is under construction. The subsidy was voted before, but it was allowed to lapse, and now the contractors wish to have it revoted.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The change was made at the instance of the corporation of Truro.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes.

Mr. **WALLACE**. Is there a line of railway from Windsor to Truro?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. No.

For a railway from a point at or near Brookfield Station, N.S., on the Intercolonial Railway, to Eastville, not exceeding 25 miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by 60-61 Victoria, chap. 4. Revote.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. This is a road running up the Stewiacke River. It has been voted for a number of years. It was associated with the road mentioned in the last vote, but the company were not able to build both. It is under a provincial charter and is a branch to the Intercolonial.

Mr. **WALLACE**. It is a feeder to the Intercolonial, but not owned by the Intercolonial.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. No. The company are chartered by the province.

For a railway from Cross Creek Station, on the Canada Eastern Railway, to Stanley Village, N.B., not exceeding 6 miles. Revote.

Mr. **WALLACE**. Is that part of a line of railway?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It will be a branch of the Canada Eastern.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Running from a point on the Canada Eastern to the thriving village of Stanley.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes.

Mr. **SPROULE**. How does the hon. Minister expect to have this short branch line constructed if it is not in connection with another line.

Mr. **FOSTER**. It is part of the Canada Eastern.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Perhaps the hon. Minister intends to include that when he purchases the Canada Eastern.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. If it were built and owned by the Canada Eastern and the Canada Eastern were purchased by the Government, I suppose it would be included in the purchase.

Mr. **SPROULE**. It is unreasonable to expect a company to build these short lines

of railway unless they are in connection with some other lines of railway because they will not pay. It seems to me that it is only a waste of time and money, because no person would form a company to build a railway six miles long for the purpose of getting this bonus without having an arrangement made with some other company to run it when it was built.

Mr. **WALLACE**. Like the railroad, the history of which was given to us to-night by the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Meigs). You get the bonus and do not run the road.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. This road is not going to be built for the sake of the subsidy. It is going to be built for the sake of the road. The road if built, connects with one of the most flourishing and one of the largest villages, in any part of New Brunswick, outside of the cities and towns. The hon. gentlemen opposite will be able to tell the committee that there is no part of the whole county of York more flourishing than the village of Stanley and its surrounding country. The proposed route, if it ever is built, will be built by the aid received from the people themselves, in addition to the subsidy granted by the Government.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Is there any charter for it now?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Who applied for the bonus?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It is applied for by the people of Stanley.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Name the company.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The president of the company is Dr. D. K. Moore. There are a number of other gentlemen connected with it, Mr. Humble and others.

For a railway from the village of St. Rémi to Stottsville or some point on the Delaware and Hudson (Grand Trunk) in the parish of St. Valentine, not exceeding 19 miles, of which 12 miles is a revote.

Mr. **MONET**. I would move for a change in this item. The name of the parish of St. Rémi has been changed to that of St. Paul de l'Isle aux Noix, and I would move that the name be changed.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Is there an incorporated company to build this road?

Mr. **MONET**. There are two charters, one from the local legislature, and one from this province.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Is there any portion of this railway built yet?

Mr. **MONET**. About seven miles, but they did not build the whole road. This road

was subsidized for the first time in 1892, and the subsidy was granted from Napier-ville.

Mr. WALLACE. I understand the hon. member to say that there were seven miles built?

Mr. MONET. Seven miles, partly built.

For a railway between Pontypool and Bobcaygeon, via Lindsay, Ont., not exceeding 40 miles. 32 miles revote.

Mr. MONK. Is there a company in existence for the construction of this road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This subsidy is asked for by the municipal council of Bobcaygeon and Pontypool, and is to connect the village of Bobcaygeon with Pontypool via Lindsay.

Mr. McHUGH. I may say this road connects with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Pontypool. It is a railroad running back from the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the village of Bobcaygeon. Bobcaygeon at present has no railway connection. The distance is some forty miles. The whole line is through a very fine agricultural district, and is going to serve a section of country that has no railway in it at the present time.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any provincial subsidy for this road?

Mr. McHUGH. No.

Mr. WALLACE. Have the municipalities raised any money?

Mr. McHUGH. There were 32 miles of this road subsidized in 1891. At that time the township of Verulam had given a bonus of \$15,000, the village of Bobcaygeon \$25,000 and the town of Lindsay \$25,000. One municipality refused to bonus the road, and the money market was in such a state at the time that they could not float the bonds of the road, and the charter was allowed to lapse. It has been revived, and we are asking for a revote, with the eight miles added that were not bonused before. I think that was simply a mistake, for it was intended to bonus the whole line. The points were named; but the distance between them is 40 miles instead of 32 miles.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman think this will be enough to carry the riding the next time?

Mr. McHUGH. It is not intended for that purpose at all; I may say that the promoters of this road are selected without reference to their politics at all. I think more of them are Conservatives than Liberals, but they are good business men. Mr. Flavell, of Lindsay, Mr. Boyd, of Bobcaygeon, and Mr. Dobson, in the other Chamber, are Conservatives. There are some Liberals also, but all the promoters are selected without reference to their politics.

Mr. MONET.

Mr. WALLACE. Are the bonuses that were granted by the municipalities still valid?

Mr. McHUGH. They have lapsed, but the intention is to go back to the municipalities and ask them to vote the bonuses again, to supplement this bonus, and in the present state of the money market, the promoters of the road have every confidence that they will be able to float the scheme, and secure its construction.

Mr. HUGHES. I may say that Mr. Boyd and the other gentlemen in the company have every confidence that with this bonus the road will be built, and it will be a very useful road, too.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the Minister, as a matter of information, if it is exacted by the department, before any subsidy is granted, that a company should be organized?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, that has never been done, but before the subsidy is agreed to be paid there must be a company.

To the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company, for a railway from Aylmer to Hull, Que., in lieu of the subsidy granted by 60-61 Victoria, chap. 4, not exceeding 9 miles. Revote.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that it is a very needless waste of money to grant a subsidy to build a railway where a railway has been already built, and sold to, and used by the electric railway. If it was not worth while for the Pontiac Pacific Junction Company to hold the nine miles which they already had, I do not think we should vote more money to enable them to build over the same line.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not possible for them to get running powers over the present road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The difficulty is this. The line has fallen into the hands of the Hull Electric Company, and when the question came before the Railway Committee of this House whether the Pacific Junction Railway could not properly, and adequately for its purposes, acquire running rights over the existing line, the conclusion arrived at was, that it was not desirable to run an ordinary steam railroad over a line which was used as an electric tramway running its cars every three or four minutes. It was not considered safe for human life.

Mr. SPROULE. Who owned the road when it was sold to the electric company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Canadian Pacific Railway, I think.

Mr. SPROULE. Under what arrangement did the Pontiac Pacific Railway use this road?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Under an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and my impression is that the Canadian Pacific Railway passed it over to the Hull Electric Company.

Mr. **SPROULE**. My impression is that when the Electric Railway Company were seeking some amendment to their charter it contended that that line was the outlet of the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway, and that the electric company had agreed to haul the cars of the company, both freight and passenger, from Aylmer down to Hull which would be a great saving to them and would serve the convenience of the public as well as another line, so that there was no need of another railway. Yet, within two years we are asked to subsidize another road.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. This subsidy has been on the statute-book more than two years.

Mr. **SPROULE**. It might be three years but it is not more. I do not think there is any justification in duplicating subsidies to duplicate railways through the same territory.

Mr. **INGRAM**. Does the hon. gentleman know that the Pontiac Pacific Junction Company are constructing part of that now?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. They are under way. We settled what route they might take, in the Railway Committee, and they had a charter from Parliament, and are now actually carrying on the construction of the line.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Did they own this once before?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No.

Mr. **INGRAM**. Where they are constructing the present line is between the river and the railway.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We decided it was impracticable to carry a steam railway over an electric road. They could only carry freight between midnight and three and four o'clock in the morning, which would not serve any business interest.

To the Portage du Fort and Bristol Branch Railway Company, for a branch line from a point on the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway at or near the village of Quyon towards the village of Portage du Fort, Que., not exceeding 15 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 60-61 Victoria, chap. 4. Revote.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Is it to be a portion of the Pontiac Pacific Junction?

Mr. **MACKIE**. It has nothing to do with that road. It joins it at Quyon, and there was a bonus given some years ago for a road between Portage du Fort and Quyon; that is 25 miles. The road commences at

Portage du Fort, running towards Quyon, 15 miles. We are making a change, to start from Quyon, running 15 miles towards Portage du Fort, so that we can have connection with the Pontiac Pacific at Quyon. This line is proposed to run straight through to Pembroke. This is only a portion we are bonusing now. It is supposed to cross Portage du Fort into Ontario, and run to Pembroke.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Does it get any provincial subsidy?

Mr. **MACKIE**. No, not yet.

To the Orford Mountain Railway Company, for a branch from their railway from a point between Lawrenceville and Eastman to Waterloo, not exceeding 30 miles. 4½ miles revote.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What is the explanation of this?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have before me a petition which was received from the company. The petition sets forth that the company is unable to extend its operations in such a way as to secure an effective service, unless the mileage is increased and some important points reached that are not now reached by the company. The idea is, that the line is to start from its terminus at Pond, near Kingsbury, which is a point on the Grand Trunk Railway, between the Windsor Mills and Richmond, to connect with the Grand Trunk Railway near Waterloo.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Mr. Chairman, absolutely no information is given about this. According to the map there are roads on four sides of this, yet they propose to run a road across from one to the other, a short distance away from a road already built; and when we ask why we should subsidize 25½ miles of this road, the Minister has no information.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have given all the information I think there is to give.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The hon. gentleman has given all he has, but it could all be put in a mosquito's bladder.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. We are ready to admit that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is entitled to more information than has been given. That information could be given at once if the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) were here, but he is away attending the funeral of the late Speaker.

Mr. **FOSTER**. But the Minister of Railways and Canals is responsible for these votes, and he ought, at least, to take the trouble to inform himself concerning them. This vote had better be allowed to stand.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Very well, let this stand.

To the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company for an extension of their railway from

Caplin to Paspébiac, Que., not exceeding 30 miles. Revote.

Mr. FOSTER. What is this ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is just what it represents itself to be—the line is built from Metapédia to Caplin. The proposal is to extend it to Paspébiac.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a revote—is it the same distance as before ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

The PRIME MINISTER. The road is nearly built.

To the United Counties Railway Company, for a railway from St. Robert Junction to Sorel, 6½ miles, and from Mount Johnson to St. Grégoire Station, 1 mile, not exceeding 7½ miles. Revote.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that the United Counties Railway now runs to Sorel, if so, there must be a railway there. Why do you want to parallel that railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The portion from St. Robert Junction to Sorel is not built. An arrangement was made to use the Montreal and Atlantic Railway between these points. The company find it necessary now to build.

Mr. FOSTER. If they have running powers now, why is it necessary to subsidize a new road ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have not effected an arrangement.

Mr. FOSTER. But the Government can compel an arrangement to be effected. It is much easier to do that than to spend public money to build a new road alongside of one already in existence. We ought not to duplicate roads where there is no necessity for it. There is not an immense traffic on these roads. You can be reasonably sure of a seat if you want to travel on the United Counties Railway. It is not because there is a growth of traffic that a new line is necessary. I know that the object is to get into Sorel. But they get in now, and why cannot a running arrangement be effected by which they can always get into Sorel ? We have not money to burn, you know.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is only 6½ miles.

Mr. FOSTER. All the more reason why there should be a running arrangement. No reason has been given why the road should be built.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose my hon. friend knows that the traffic over that road is very slim. There is a road already built forty miles, but not a bit of it is running. Here is a long line of road from Drummondville into Sorel. I daresay thirty miles long, and it is not running, and here is another road

almost with a stone's throw of it, and when it gets up to St. Robert it runs off on to this road, which is not being used, for six and a half miles, and runs into Sorel. Now, we are asked to build another road, within a stone's throw of a road which is not being run except for six and a half miles of it. In the name of common sense, why cannot they go on running over it all the time ?

The PRIME MINISTER. There may be something in what my hon. friend says. But I will explain the condition of things there, as I know them pretty well. The road does not run from Sorel to Drummondville at the present time. Some six or seven years ago the bridge over the Yamaska River was washed away in a freshet and has not been rebuilt. We feel sure that it will be rebuilt with the new subsidy we are giving for the construction of the South Shore Railway. But there is something in the objection made by my hon. friend that, perhaps there is no need for this railway, and we will let it stand.

For a railway from a point on the Central Railway, in the county of Lunenburg, N.S., to the town of Liverpool via the village of Caledonia, or to the village of Caledonia via Liverpool, or any part thereof, the whole distance not exceeding 62 miles. Revote.

Mr. KAULBACH. It affords me very great pleasure to find that the Government has acceded to my request by placing, as a revote, the usual sum of \$3,200 per mile for the proposed railway from New Germany to Shelburne, known as the Nova Scotia Southern, as it is a road I had advocated most earnestly some years ago, and having obtained a vote from the late Government, it would have been a cruel thing to have refused it now, or allowed it to lapse, more particularly as a larger sum of money has been spent, and much labour employed on construction already, and large numbers of men are being employed at present, without a dollar of call having been made on the Government up to the present, so far as I am aware.

I am also delighted to find the Government has acceded to the request for an additional resolution for railway extension from New Germany to Halifax, as by this connection we will have the shortest, the most interesting, the best, and certainly the safest route from Halifax to Boston, via New Ross, New Germany and Shelburne, and a fast line of steamboats to connect between Shelburne and Boston. By this route a five hours quicker despatch can be obtained between Halifax and Boston than by any other route, and the tortuous and dangerous waters of the Bay of Fundy avoided, as Shelburne harbour is one of the very finest in the world, easy of approach at all seasons and all hours, night not excepted, good anchorage, well sheltered and offering least risk to life and property, it being on the face of the broad Atlantic,

than any other harbour on the coast that I am aware of.

As provincial road grants are a thing of the past in Nova Scotia, or the appropriations for that purpose so small as to be hardly worth naming, money grants having been expended imprudently in purchase of iron bridges, and now in the payment of interest on borrowed moneys, I consider the people of New Ross, New Germany, Ohio, and the other sections through which this road will pass are entitled to a convenience or consideration of this sort, to reach a market, as the carriage roads are in that deplorable condition at present as to render travel over them an impossibility without encountering many risks.

By the opening of this railway farming and mining interests will be developed, which as yet, although rich, are in their infancy, and the forests, which abound in valuable timbers, can be brought into practical use.

New Germany is a fine agricultural as well as industrial centre, situate on the beautiful LaHave River, having natural scenery of ravishing beauty, offering an uninterrupted stretch of fine, rich, arable soil from the eastern confines of Lunenburg County, stretching westwardly directly across the county, and far beyond its western confines, and through northern Queen's to the "Indian Gardens," which is settled in part by an intelligent, tidy, frugal and industrious people, all along the line of the proposed railway.

Let me say that this Government is making no mistake in giving encouragement to this road, as the previous Government had done, as this railway, known as the Nova Scotia Southern, or Harvey Road, passes through a country richly interspersed with beautiful lakes and streams affording excellent pleasure or sport for the angler or huntsman, and is studded with luxuriant spruce, pine and other forest, to say nothing of the purity of the climate, and the verdure and freshness of the country, a country affording inducements not only for the tourists but the thousands of settlers to make happy homes for themselves and their children, as the very best farming land can be obtained along and near this line, covered with a primeval growth of forest of pine, spruce and hardwood at very moderate prices, averaging from \$1.50 to \$4 per acre, and of a quality equal to any in Ontario, for which they claim very much higher prices.

The markets are good for all farm and forest products with a mere trifle for the cost of transport, and in most cases, are immediately at hand, as no part of the proposed road will be more than 16 miles from the seashore. Halifax and Shelburne, being the extreme ends of the road, the distance between these two points being about 120 miles, opens up a market at short intervals all along the line, New Germany offering a

good market now, and when this road is built farmers all along the line of route from Indian Gardens east to Halifax will find a ready market at Halifax for all their farm products, as well as their small fruits, and can furnish milk to that city every morning at paying rates, the same as Truro and other places are doing at present.

As the Government is conceding to the wishes of the people by having a resolution for the extension of the road from New Germany to Halifax, which I very strongly advocate, I will defer any further remarks I have to make till the subject comes up.

For a railway from Indian Garden, Queen's county, N.S., to Shelburne, in the said province, a distance of 35 miles. Revote.

Mr. KAULBACH. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) will allow me, I will suggest a correction in the wording of the resolution, as I know more of the geography of that country than perhaps he does. He will observe that the previous resolution says: "To Caledonia" or "to Liverpool." That would leave a gap between Caledonia and Indian Gardens. I would suggest that it be worded "from Caledonia, Queen's County, to Shelburne."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Kaulbach) had better let it stand as it is. It is a revote in the former terms, and the parties interested in the railway have never taken any exception to it. I think we might let well-enough alone.

The subsidy which the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company is entitled to receive under chap. 4, 60-61 Victoria, shall be \$6,400 per mile for the 80 miles provided in the said Act.

Mr. OLIVER. When we were discussing the general provisions, I understood the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to say that the interests of the public, in regard to rates over this Rainy River road, were fairly well guarded by the Railway Act, either already standing, or the proposed provisions. I would ask the hon. Minister if he could give us any information as to the policy of the Government in regard to rates on that road?

Mr. WALLACE. We have come to an item that will provoke a good deal of discussion, and I think it had better stand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) would like the item to stand, we can get through with some that will not provoke discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. Let it stand.

Mr. WALLACE. I think it is about time to finish for the night.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is quite early.

Mr. WALLACE. I can stay here as long as anybody.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to provoke any discussion. I simply ask the question of the hon. Minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I apprehend, that the hon. gentleman would think it would be better to present some particular case before he would ask what the Government might be disposed to do in such a case. The general policy of the Government would be to see that the rates imposed by the company were not excessive.

Mr. OLIVER. The question I had in my mind was, as to whether it was intended by the Government to make a substantial reduction in the rates at present charged between Winnipeg and Thunder Bay.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The question of rates upon this, as upon any other line, would have to be dealt with by the Government when the occasion arose. I suppose, what the hon. gentleman would have in his mind is, that we would undertake to make it a part of the contract, or one of the conditions under which this subsidy is given, that the company would undertake to carry its freight at a fixed tariff which we might settle upon. I confess to the hon. gentleman that that view has not presented itself to my mind, and I would think it would be extremely difficult for the Government to deal with such a case in advance. We would have to take up the whole question of the through rates and the rates of the other connecting lines of this company, to ascertain, or to judge, as to what the proper proportion would be, or as to what the proper rate would be to assign to this particular road. This could only be done when the time came to put the road in operation. I think it would be quite impossible to do it in advance. At all events, that is what occurred to me. Of course, we reserve power to control rates, and we will have to deal to the best of our judgment, and on the best information we can get, with each situation as it arises.

Mr. OLIVER. What I had in my mind was, that this seemed a parallel case with the Crow's Nest road. When the subsidy was voted, an arrangement was made whereby certain rates were secured.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These rates were secured over an existing line, then in operation.

Mr. OLIVER. It struck me that now, when we are voting the money, we should make our bargain as to the rates we expect to get.

Mr. WALLACE. I understood the hon. Minister was going to allow that vote to stand.

Mr. WALLACE.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I offered to allow the matter to stand.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Would the hon. Minister tell us if it will be taken up the first thing to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It will be taken up to-morrow.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I may not be here to-morrow, and I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he has a map showing this road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is right before the hon. gentleman.

To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for 12 miles of their railway from end of their line at deep water on the Chicoutimi branch of their railway, to Ha! Ha! Bay, in lieu of the subsidy for the 12 miles granted by chap. 4 of 1894.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this over the same route as the old vote?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The same distance?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

The PRIME MINISTER. I can give the information which I have with regard to this vote. My hon. friend is familiar with the geography of the Saguenay River. The river forms a bay at Ha! Ha! and then projects to the Chicoutimi. The country is very rough, as my hon. friend knows from Ha! Ha! Bay to Chicoutimi. This is to be a line from Chicoutimi to Ha! Ha! Bay, passing in the interior somewhat, but not exactly girding the river.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it is a different road from the old road?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think not there is no difference at all.

For a line of railway from Hawkesbury, Ont., to South Indian, not exceeding 35 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a new road, and we want an explanation of it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This line is an extension of the Great Northern, the object being to connect the lines of railway from Quebec along the course of the Great Northern and strike the Canada Atlantic at South Indian.

Mr. HAGGART. Is there not a railroad there already?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are some thirty-odd miles to be saved.

For a branch line of railway from the main line of the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound

Railway to the town of Parry Sound, Ont., not exceeding 5 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. What is this ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a little branch to connect the town with the railway. We were strongly urged by the corporation of the town to grant this assistance.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not reasonable to suppose that a large railway like that would make this connection with the town ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a pretty considerable undertaking.

Mr. McCORMICK. I may say that the people of Parry Sound have no connection with the railway except by boat, and this is a very expensive piece of road to construct.

For a railway from Port Hawkesbury, on the Strait of Canso, to Caribou Cove, N.S., a distance of 10 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. There is another railway from Port Hawkesbury to Louisbourg. Where does this go ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a road under contract now from Port Hawkesbury to Port Hood and the coal mines at Broad Cove. This is an extension of 10 miles in a southerly direction to what is regarded as a very useful harbour. This has no connection with the other road.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the extent of the subsidy granted by the local Government ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The local Government usually give \$3,200 a mile. I understand that there have been some negotiations with a view of getting from the local Government \$4,000 a mile for that particular road.

To the Canadian Northern Railway Company, for a railway from a point on the present line of the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway north of Swan River to Prince Albert, N.W.T., not exceeding 100 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. That is an extension of the Rainy River road ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. HAGGART. It is part of the same system.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It may, perhaps, be ultimately. That would be a matter for future consideration.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). What is the length of the road you are subsidizing to the Rainy River between Stanley Station and Fort Frances ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. 220 miles at the outside. This piece of road of 100 miles, is required to connect Swan River with Prince Albert. It

will form unquestionably a part of the line which now has been built to Swan River.

Mr. FOSTER. From what place ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. From Winnipeg by the Dauphin route. They call it the Dauphin line.

Mr. HAGGART. It passes the Dauphin Lake. It is all part of the same system that runs from Port Arthur to Rainy River and onward, and their intention is some time or other to get through to the Pacific.

Mr. PRIOR. What is the distance between the end of this line, when built, and the other line ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is 100 miles from the end of this subsidized mileage to Prince Albert. As between Prince Albert and Edmonton, it must be between 300 and 400 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. What the Government has started in on is to subsidize and build a road through to the Pacific Ocean.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Hundreds of miles are being subsidized in these places for that purpose. For instance, you begin at Port Arthur, and are subsidizing through to Winnipeg.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, through to the mouth of the Rainy River, on the Lake of the Woods, and then the same road is being subsidized by the Greenway Government from that on to Winnipeg, and the province of Ontario is giving a subsidy to this as well. Then, when they reach Winnipeg, the same concern have a road which runs from that there to Swan River,

Mr. RUTHERFORD. They start at Portage la Prairie.

Mr. HAGGART. They have running powers into Winnipeg.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. And the terminus of this road is at Portage la Prairie ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is, and from there you have a road built by the same concern running to Swan River. There is then the gap between Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie. Then, when you get to the Saskatchewan River, this 100 miles takes you to Prince Albert.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is 200 miles to Prince Albert.

Mr. FOSTER. You are within 100 miles of Prince Albert, and, of course, the inference is that another year you will supplement that. You are not going to leave the thing half done.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, you skip a lot of river and get over towards Edmonton, and there you have taken up this year a company, and are pointing them towards Yellow Head Pass, and are giving them a subsidy for a long portion of that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Fifty miles.

Mr. FOSTER. You are embarked on a plan of subsidizing a transcontinental system of railway through to the Pacific Ocean; and having commenced that, you are in duty bound to go on. The country might as well see that we are proposing by bits to subsidize a road through to the Pacific Ocean. That is what is meant.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is quite possible that in course of time all these things may be done, but, in the meantime, these individual grants will be very useful.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these not the very basis which make that possible?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no justification for that statement. It is possible, and more likely, that in the future these roads will be extended and will come together. But the justification for giving these subsidies at present is not because there may possibly, in the future, be a connection between them, and they may constitute one through line, but because railway conveniences and accommodation must be provided if that country is to be settled. I am informed by gentlemen who have been there that the country is one of the finest and most fertile portions of the whole Dominion. People are ready to go in there in numbers as soon as they have any assurance that railway accommodation will be provided, and people who have gone there already in the expectation, particularly in Prince Albert and the surrounding sections, that a railway would be provided, are threatening to leave, and will leave, unless railway connection is made. The same observation applies to the condition of things at Edmonton. No doubt we have a valuable heritage in the North-west, a country that will fill up if we enable the people to get out and in with their traffic and otherwise. It is necessary, apart altogether from the idea of another transcontinental system of railway, that we should give this aid and stimulate the construction of roads on their individual merits. It ought to be no objection that at some remote day those different links will be joined together, constituting one entire system, but that has nothing whatever to do with the present proposition; and I want it distinctly understood that it is upon the merits of these roads and because they traverse most valuable fertile country, it is necessary to subsidize their construction in order to induce the settlement the country requires.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. HUGHES. This road is going to branch off from the present line running north through the Dauphin Valley at the lower Red Deer River, and from there to Prince Albert is nearly 200 miles. The country is unsurpassed by anything I have ever seen in the Dominion. Swan River Valley is already filled with settlers from all parts of older Canada and the province of Manitoba, although the road has not more than entered yet. The territory lying north and north-west to Porcupine Mountain on through to the Carrot River district is unsurpassed in Canada; and on the merits of that country, it is the duty of the Government to open it up for settlement. The local traffic and the adaptability of the land for settlement will warrant any Government in running a road into it for the settlers. The settlement extends 85 miles east of Prince Albert, but beyond that the people cannot possibly haul their produce to market. The land is extraordinarily good, but the produce cannot be hauled more than 85 miles. I think it would be well to give the bonus for the whole distance to Prince Albert, but if the bonus is given next year, it will enable the settlers to take out their crops by the road and will benefit the whole community. One word more as to the climate of that locality. This road does not run on the same prairie level as the Canadian Pacific Railway west of Brandon. The prairie level will not, at any point, exceed 1,400 feet in height—running from 900 to 1,400 feet. It is what is called the first prairie level. The second prairie level is colder and the winds are stronger. Those who have lived in that locality and have spent some years in Manitoba near the 49th parallel say that the winds are much stronger near the boundary. The Swan River district is in what they call the region of calm.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we had better adjourn now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Let us take these votes down to the bottom of the page. There is nothing controversial.

Mr. FOSTER. If it is not controversial, it will pass as easily to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But we want to feel as if we had advanced the work. I am afraid we have made little progress.

Mr. FOSTER. But it is late, and we have a full days' work to-morrow. I think good progress has been made.

The PRIME MINISTER. If there is anything controversial, we will let it stand.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole of it is controversial.

The committee rose, and reported progress.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose we will go straight on with this to-morrow?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2.05 a.m. (Friday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 4th August, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### SALE OF RAILWAY PASSENGER TICKETS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved:

That the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 32), from this House respecting the sale of passenger tickets be read a second time and agreed to.

He said: This is the Bill introduced by the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie), some time ago, and it is to prevent what is known as ticket scalping on ferry boats and steamboats, as well as on railways. The amendments are really verbal.

Motion agreed to.

### STENOGRAPHERS' FEES AT PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE.

Mr. FORTIN presented the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections:

By an order of the House, dated Wednesday, July 12th, 1899, your committee were authorized to employ the services of a shorthand writer to take down such evidence as your committee might deem necessary. Owing, however, to the large amount of evidence taken, your committee have found it necessary to obtain the services of two assistant stenographers. They, therefore, recommend that the usual fee of \$5 per sitting of the committee be allowed to each of the three stenographers for each meeting of the committee attended by them.

Mr. FORTIN moved:

That the usual fee of \$5 per sitting of the committee be allowed to the three stenographers employed by the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections for each meeting of the committee attended by them in accordance with the recommendation contained in the second report of the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fortin) what he means by each meeting of the committee. I understand that there is a morning session and an afternoon session. Five dollars for each of these is important in this sense.

Mr. FORTIN. I understand this is the practice in such cases. Upon the adoption of the first report of the Select Committee on Privileges and Elections the committee was authorized to employ a shorthand writer. It was found impossible to have the whole of the work performed by one man so that three stenographers were actually sworn and have taken the notes until today. This motion is to allow the committee to pay each of these three stenographers attending the committee, according to the practice in such cases.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Fortin) has not answered my question, which is somewhat important. Suppose your committee meets at 10 o'clock and sits until 11, that you meet again at 2 and sit until 4, and meet again at 8 and sit until 10, would you pay \$15 to each of the stenographers, or would you pay them \$10. It makes a great difference to the House, and in some cases it might be very unfair. The stenographers ought to have fair pay, but I do not think we are justified in paying them unfairly. Besides I think three stenographers is a large number.

Mr. DAVIN. The point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) can be met by putting in a provision that there shall not be more than \$5 paid for any one day. I am not going to oppose the report thus understood, but my impression is, and I would venture to say that it would be verified, that I think the custom is—I know it is so in England—to give the work of taking the notes to one stenographer. He gets the professional fee of a guinea a day there, or of \$5 here; then the stenographer is paid so much per folio, and he employs whatever subordinates he requires, one, two, three or four. I am not going to oppose this motion, but I think it ought to be made clear that there would not be more than \$5 paid for one day. At the same time I believe that the Chairman in supposing it is customary to give \$5 a day to each stenographer, is under a misapprehension.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this all that the stenographer gets, or is he paid by the folio?

Mr. DAVIN. He is paid so much per folio.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I do not see that the stenographer is entitled any less to \$5 a day for attending a meeting of the committee because it happens to be held in the afternoon.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not the point I made. I want the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) to know what my point is.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. As I understand the hon. gentleman, his objection is to the stenographer receiving \$5 for each meeting of the committee when two meetings are held upon the same day. When the committee is pressed with business it meets in the morning, for two or three hours, the stenographer attends the meeting and takes the notes for which he gets \$5. If the committee holds another meeting in the afternoon the stenographers are just as much entitled to the same pay for attending that meeting as attending a meeting in the morning.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Suppose it is just five minutes' work, or half an hour's work, they will be receiving the same amount as for a more prolonged sitting?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is making a supposition that does not exist. If the committee only give the stenographer half an hour's work I suppose the committee can be trusted not to pass a resolution or to vote that the stenographer shall get \$5 for that. But the committee are not holding meetings of that kind. The committee are holding meetings in which a great deal of evidence is being taken and a great deal of labour is being involved on the part of the reporters. The committee are meeting at 10.30 and sitting until one, they are meeting again sometimes at three and sometimes at four and sitting until six. The meetings, which are held in the afternoon, involve just as much labour on the part of the stenographers, as the meetings in the morning. I do not see why we should apply a special rule to the stenographers of this committee and deprive them of the advantage of the general rule applied to all other committees. I am not saying whether \$5 is too much or too little; I express no opinion about that, but the committee are following what they understand to be the general rule, and I do not see any reason why the general rule should not be applied to the stenographers of this committee.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I suggest that the motion be not pressed now, but that the precedents be consulted in order to ascertain what the general rule is. In 1891 we had very much the same condition that exists to-day when committees were sitting almost all day long. The precedent established then can be consulted, so that we may see what the practice is.

Mr. **FORTIN**. I have struck out the words "five dollars" as the fee for each sitting of the committee to be allowed to the stenographers.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I think we had better see what the precedents are.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. **FOSTER**.

## DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. **MARTIN**. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the leader of the Government a question in regard to the proposed amendment to the Dominion Elections Act. The right hon. gentleman gave us to understand yesterday that he was to consult the Minister of Justice on the subject. I would like to ask him if the Government have decided anything in regard to the Bill.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If my hon. friend were to press his question to-day, I would have to give him a negative answer. I have discussed the matter, not with the Minister of Justice—I could not see him yesterday—but with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), and he has some objection to the Bill. Therefore, the hon. gentleman must not press his question to-day.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Is it quite within the right of the Prime Minister to negative a Bill which is sent from the Senate at this stage of the session, so that if the Government are not favourable to it, it can be prevented from being brought in on the motion of any private member? The Government might be opposed to it, and yet the House might wish to canvass it.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. At this stage of the session, anybody can move the first reading of the Bill, but as to the second reading, unless the Government facilitates it, it has a very slim chance of going through.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Suppose the Government could not support the measure, would they yet facilitate the bringing of it before the House?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. That is what I referred to when I said to my hon. friend a moment ago, that if he pressed me for an answer, I would have to tell him that the Government would not facilitate the business; and I asked him not to press the question, because I wanted to consult my colleague in reference to it.

## SEED GRAIN INDEBTEDNESS.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 189) respecting securities for seed grain indebtedness. He said: I may explain that some years ago the Government advanced a certain amount of money to farmers in the North-west for seed grain, taking bonds from the farmers, which constituted a lien upon their homesteads. The Government also required the farmers who got the seed grain to get certain persons to join with them as bondsmen or as securities for the payment of the money. This Bill is for the purpose of giving the Government authority to release the bondsmen from liability where the land of the original settler

is liable and is considered to be a sufficient security.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether the Bill merely deals with the bondsmen?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on going thus far. The measure will undoubtedly get rid of what is a wanton grievance; that is to say, it is a grievance which there is, in my opinion, no reason whatever for keeping in existence, because the Government has ample security for any sums that may be owed it without having these men held by their bonds. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on taking that part of the question up this session. The hon. gentleman will remember that shortly after he became a Minister, when he paid his first visit west, I headed a deputation to him on this subject, and in the House, and by letter I again and again brought this matter before him. The relief of the bondsmen was the serious matter; but I should have liked that he had gone further, and when the Bill is before us in committee, I will suggest—because I could not, as a private member, be able to move the kind of amendment I would like to move—certain amendments which I hope I may be able to persuade the hon. gentleman to accept.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### NEWFOUNDLAND AND CANADIAN FISHERMEN.

Mr. KAULBACH. I would like to ask the Ministry if they have had any recent correspondence with Newfoundland in respect to the supply of bait to Canadian fishermen, and if so, what answer they have received. It seems to me that the harsh and ungenerous treatment which Canadian fishermen have received from the sister colony of Newfoundland is not what they have a reasonable right to expect. The Canadian fishermen are endeavouring to be loyal to the sister colony of Newfoundland, but the restriction imposed upon the French is pointed directly to their bait supply also which is unnatural and unfriendly as well as unjust. The restriction under which Canadian fishermen have to pay duty on their barrels and salt, not as an article of merchandise, but retained on the ships and taken away seems to me to be also very unfair. I would ask the Government if any correspondence has been had with Newfoundland on the subject, and if so, what is the answer of that colony.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I may say to my hon. friend that I stated, in answer to a similar question put by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) the other day, that

there had been a large amount of correspondence with the Government of Newfoundland on this question. Representations were made to the Dominion Government that the Newfoundland Government had enforced the regulation prohibiting the export of fish from Newfoundland for any other purpose than food, which prevented the fishermen of Nova Scotia obtaining fish for bait, as they had previously been accustomed to do. These representations were forwarded to the Newfoundland Government, along with an official report on the subject. We have since forwarded another report, but no official or other reply has been received from the Government of Newfoundland up to this morning, when I inquired about the subject in the department. Mr. Venning, in the department, said he would not be surprised if we received a reply in a day or two, but, up to the present we have not had any.

Mr. KAULBACH. I would ask the Minister if the Government was reminded of the duty exacted from Canadian fishermen on barrels taken to Newfoundland on their vessels and not landed, and also on salt. They made no entries of these things, and, in my view, they should not be compelled to pay duty on them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Representations were made to the Dominion Government on those subjects, and forwarded to the Newfoundland Government, and I shall be happy to show my hon. friend, if he comes to the department, the answer of the Newfoundland Government to each of these complaints. I am rather inclined to think that the argument is not altogether on one side. There are some grounds for the action which the Newfoundland Government took; but it would be impossible to give the hon. gentleman, across the House, as much satisfaction as I would be able to give him, if he came to the department and saw the despatches.

#### THE PROHIBITION QUESTION.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the Premier if he intends to give Parliament another opportunity this session to discuss the prohibition question?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I must say that I have not given the matter any consideration; but since my hon. friend has become interested in the question, I will consider it.

Mr. WALLACE. That is a very indefinite answer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not more than the demand, I am sure.

#### RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain pro-

posed resolutions respecting granting of the subsidies therein mentioned to the railway companies and towards the construction of the railway also mentioned.—(Mr. Fielding.)

(In the Committee.)

For a railway from some point near Antler Station to a point south of Moose Mountain, Manitoba, not exceeding 50 miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I wish to alter this resolution by striking out the words "south of" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "near to."

Mr. WALLACE. What is the explanation of this resolution?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I may perhaps be more familiar with the locality than my hon. colleague. This proposed line is an extension of what is known as the Pipestone or Souris Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That branch runs south-westerly from Brandon to Antler, and the Pipestone branch of the Souris branch starts about 25 miles south-west of Brandon and runs almost due west. The line was built some years ago to a place called Preston near the western boundary of the province of Manitoba, and last year was extended 20 or 30 miles. The intention is to give a bonus to the extension of this line, from the present terminus to a point about 50 miles further west. I may say that the settlers of the Moose Mountain district have perhaps the greatest claim on this Parliament of any people in the west with regard to railway communication. That country was settled a great many years ago, at a time when lines of railway were projected through it, and when the immigration literature of the Government intimated that a line of railway would be built there. The country was settled many years ago, and a great many of the original settlers moved out and others went in under the belief that railway facilities would be provided. Some three or four years ago another exodus began, and it was only upon the most urgent representations that these settlers were induced to remain. I pledged myself, not that I would secure a railway for them, but that I would do my utmost to secure railway communication for them, and I have urged that upon my colleagues ever since I have been a member of the Government. The territory from the western boundary of Manitoba, where this line would terminate, is an extremely fertile section. I do not know a more fertile and promising portion of country, which has not been altogether taken up, than this, and settlers are now coming in, and by the time the railway is constructed almost every available homestead will be taken up along the line of this railway for many miles each side.

Mr. FOSTER. Who operates that road?

Mr. BLAIR.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this an extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is a branch line.

Mr. WALLACE. We ought to have more information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman must be hard to please. I can only state that people in the localities are applying for it through my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton).

Mr. WALLACE. That makes the matter still worse.

Mr. DAVIN. I agree with the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) that this is one of the most justifiable votes in this long list.

Mr. WALLACE. We have not yet the information we have been asking for.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What is the information that the hon. gentleman wants?

Mr. WALLACE. Who has made the application for this, is it the Canadian Pacific Railway Company?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I stated that the road was a branch line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that this will be an extension of that branch.

Mr. WALLACE. It is not an independent company, that proposes to hand it over to the Canadian Pacific Railway?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No; it is part of their system.

Mr. HAGGART. Then the grant ought to be made to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the extension of their line westerly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know how it could make any difference. A very large number of votes are put in this form.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Some hon. gentlemen say: No. But I say: Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Grants to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the extension of their line are given direct to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are a number of grants not only in the present list but in past lists in which the vote is given without naming any company, but simply stating that it is for a line of railway between certain points. It is quite immaterial. But it sometimes becomes necessary where there are three or

four rival companies chartered to build the line, and the Government must satisfy itself which is the best position, and to which it is most desirable in the public interest that the subsidy should go.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) mean to say that there are rival companies in this case?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then what objection can there be to stating the purpose that the Minister has in view? Wherever definiteness can be had, it should be had.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no necessity for it.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister says that this is not done, but I would refer him to the very first vote in this list:

To the Central Ontario Railway Company, for an extension of their railway from, at or near either Coe Hill or Rathbun Station—

And so on. Then No. 2:

To the Great Northern Railway Company, for a railway between Montcalm and St. Tite Junction.

And the same form is followed in No. 13, No. 14, No. 15 and many others. The Minister should not be vague and indefinite in this resolution and withhold information that should be freely and fairly given. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) speaks about cases where there are rival lines, but there is no suggestion that there is such a state of affairs here. This is simply to extend the branch line of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Antler Station. There are no rival lines. It appears to be a commendable extension, because it opens up a section of country that is not served by a railway at present, so that this would seem to be a justifiable subsidy, if this system is to prevail.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see any reason why the Minister should not state in this item what he means, unless there is some purpose that we do not know of to be served. I can easily see another purpose that might be served. In this case there is only one line of railway to be extended, the Canadian Pacific Railway. A very embarrassing and undesirable situation could be created if the Government were to enter into a contract with some other company for the construction of that 50 miles. That other company could have a very good chance of making a dicker with the Canadian Pacific Railway, becoming, in fact, charter-mongers, a business with which my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), like myself, does not sympathize. There has been too much of this charter-mongering in connection with these railway subsidies from the day they were first brought in. A small company taking the middle position is able to treat with the larger companies

to sell out to them or release their charter to them. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals can easily see that that is a complication that might arise. I am not going to say that it will arise, but it might arise, and you give it a chance to arise by being indefinite in this case. There is too much of this charter-mongering. Men who never expect to put a dollar into railway enterprises, have their names on numerous railway directorates. Why? Not because they want to build railways, but because they want to sell out the franchises. Why give countenance to these men when it is not necessary?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The way in which these resolutions are drawn, is largely a matter of accident, so far as the phraseology is concerned. I have counted, and I can tell my hon. friend there are from twenty to twenty-five similar cases in this and other lists of railway subsidies.

Mr. DAVIN. They ought not to be there.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say they ought; it is perfectly proper.

Mr. DAVIN. Why is it proper?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is the object to be gained? The object is to have the line of railway constructed between the two points named.

Mr. BERGERON. No.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, it is.

Mr. BERGERON. No; the object is to hold the charter until some big concern can be got to buy it out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman cannot find one of the subsidy Bills in which there are not numerous illustrations of the same kind.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is no matter what we did, why don't you do what is right?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I want to say to my humorously indignant friend that there is nothing calling for justification. We have no purpose except to get this road constructed. There is no public interest involved that makes it necessary to change the phraseology as it is here.

Mr. COCHRANE. If the Canadian Pacific Railway is going to build that line and own it, why does not the Minister take the committee into his confidence and say that he is going to give this subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway. If there is any reason why it should not be done, why does not the Minister tell it? It appears to me that there is some reason for putting it in this way, or the Minister would not evade the question and put it as it is.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not understand the indignation, humorous or genuine, on this vote. It is not customary, and nobody knows it better than my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) to vote subsidies for parties who do not ask for them. I have asked my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) if the Canadian Pacific Railway had ever put in application for this subsidy, and I understand that they have never done so. That being the case, does he ask us to give this subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway? This subsidy is not intended for the benefit of the Canadian Pacific Railway nor any other company, it is intended for the benefit of the country through which that railway will pass.

Mr. BERGERON. Which company asks for it?

The PRIME MINISTER. No company has been asking for it. The people along the line have been asking for it, as they have done in many other cases. My hon. friend knows that at all times, since 1883, the Government have been and are constantly approached by parties representing to the Government that they are very detrimentally situated, that they have no railway in their section, and asking for aid. The only thing the Government can do is to put a subsidy upon the statute-book which any persons can take up if they choose, and put their money and energy into it for the building of that railway. That is our justification. This case is not exceptional, it has been done this year, it has been done every year; and I do not see what is the cause of the opposition to this particular vote.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see, if he goes over these subsidies that wherever in a case like that you have one road of which the one you propose to build is an extension, you grant to that road. Now in point of fact, my hon. friend knows that unless the Canadian Pacific Railway builds that 50 miles, no other company can build it. It ends nowhere, and it begins at the terminus of the present Canadian Pacific Railway branch. It is absolutely impossible for any other company to build and operate that 50 miles, it must be done by the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is one statement of the case. Another statement is that the Canadian Pacific Railway has not asked for it. But this vote would not have been asked for at all unless the Minister of the Interior had been sure in his own mind that if it were granted the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would take it up and build it. I think he could not honestly have proposed it but for that. My hon. friend has scruples about forcing the vote upon the company. That is one thing to be considered. On the other hand, there is the point which we raised on this side as to the very objectionable practice of allowing a third party to intervene on a line of railway which can only be extended

Mr. COCHRANE.

by the company as part of its railway extension, and consequently opening up a vista for the operations of the charter monger, numerous specimens of which are to be found around Ottawa at any season of the year, and especially during a session of Parliament; and we may meet some of them probably before we get through with these subsidies. Now, in the Central Ontario Company it is to be an extension of their road. In the next case the vote is given to the Great Northern Railway Company to make an extension, it is a subsidy to the Great Northern Railway Company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Look at number 43, there is a strong instance.

Mr. FOSTER. What is 43? "For a railway in extension of the St. Francis branch of the Témiscouata Railway to the mouth of the St. Francis River." It is the St. Francis branch which is to be extended, whoever owns the St. Francis branch?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not a grant to the railway company.

Mr. FOSTER. But from the reading of that it is, and if there is a company that is operating a railway and this three miles is to be tacked on, no one else but the company can build and operate that railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then you would argue against putting the name of the company there which is entitled to receive it?

Mr. FOSTER. Wherever it is possible for the Minister to give the actual name of the company which will do the work, it ought to be done. It never ought to be left open unless there is a complete doubt as to who can or will take it up.

Mr. HAGGART. The leader of the Government appealed to me as to what is the custom. In a great many cases the grant goes directly to the benefit of the main line of railway. Let me give some instances. A railway from Cobourg northerly to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. They may have made arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway that after they have built the line the company will take it over and run it. There is another from Pontypool to Haliburton. In these cases it is not voted to the railway which afterwards runs it, but to the company for the purpose of extension. I can understand that. But here is an extension of what is a main branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think then that the vote always goes to the railway that intends to benefit by it. There is a vote now for an extension of a line of railway in Quebec which I think will benefit the Canadian Pacific Railway, but that is to the company. The Canadian Paci-

fic Railway will not work it or operate it unless the municipality or private individuals contribute for the purpose of the extension. It is for that purpose then that a company builds it and then leases it to the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other company. It may be an indirect benefit to them. But these lines of railway were subsidized by land grants. I see no reason whatever, nor is there any precedent, for the road to be assisted by direct vote.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I confess I do not understand the desperate antagonism of our hon. friends on the other side to the vote unless the Canadian Pacific Railway is named in the resolution. My anxiety so far as this bonus is concerned, is to see a bonus authorized by this House that will secure the construction of a railway, and for my part I do not care whether it is the Canadian Pacific Railway or some other railway. The Northern Pacific, I may say, has a line of railway very near that point, and I do not know any reason inherent in the circumstances why, if the Northern Pacific made a proposition to extend its line through that territory, it should not do it. I do not think it is particularly likely. I said in answer to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) that the line would be an actual extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway Pipestone branch; but if any other company came along and offered to build the line, I did not see any reason why it should not have just as good a right to do it as the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not see any reason why the Government should be bound to give the bonus to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as against any other company. Supposing the Northern Pacific made a proposition to extend their Belmont branch and to give facilities to a larger section of country, where it would be to the general advantage of the country, I do not see any reason why it should not be accepted by the Government, I do not see any reason why, necessarily, in this particular case, the Canadian Pacific Railway should be made the recipient of that bonus, whether the proposition should appear to be in the public interest or not. There does not seem to be any possible reason why the resolutions should be changed so as to bind the hands of the Government.

Mr. SPROULE. What company holds the charter over the district now?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I doubt if any company does. It is doubtful if the Canadian Pacific Railway have authority; they may have under their ordinary authority to build branch lines, but serious doubts have been cast upon that by eminent legal authorities and I have serious doubts about it myself, without claiming to be an eminent legal authority. I am inclined to doubt that either the Cana-

dian Pacific Railway or the Northern Pacific have authority to build the line. I have not looked at it lately, but my recollection is, that the Northern Pacific have authority to extend their line over the territory. It never occurred to me until this discussion arose, but I think they have. The Canadian Pacific Railway have authority to build branch lines, and, therefore, would have authority to go over the territory. In any event, so far as this committee is concerned, and as far as I am concerned, what we want to get is the railway. I see no special reason why hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House should be so particularly desirous of protecting the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has given the very strongest possible reason why the Canadian Pacific Railway should be included in this grant.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is; all companies are included in this grant.

Mr. HAGGART. But named and mentioned in this particular vote. The hon. Minister of the Interior asks: Why should it not be possible for the Government to enter into an arrangement with a private company for the purpose of extending this line of road from Antler Creek through this 50 miles of territory? The hon. gentleman saw the difficulty he was in by giving it to this particular company, and he said: Why should we not give it to the Northern Pacific Railway Company, who could build a connection from the Antler Creek station with their line of railway in Manitoba? Does the hon. gentleman suppose that Parliament is going to subsidize a company for the purpose of building a line of railway running alongside the Canadian Pacific Railway up to Antler Creek and cutting out their connection westward one hundred miles? If it were possible for the Government to do that, or to give it to an independent company, the House would hesitate a long while before they would give a subsidy to the company. The only reason for inducing the Government to give a subsidy to the company is, that the people in that section of the country may be benefited, and the only way they can be benefited is by giving it to the Canadian Pacific Railway for an extension of their road in that direction.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As a member of this committee, I totally and entirely repudiate the idea that, because the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any other company, build a line to a particular point, that nobody else can build a line from that point any farther. I hope the day will never come when this Parliament will adopt the principle that because a railway corporation builds a line of railway up to a certain

point, no other company can start from that point and build on. I do not think I ever heard a more preposterous proposition, and I can hardly imagine that the hon. gentleman could have had time to think what he was saying, and what argument he was presenting to this committee, before he got up and addressed such a proposition to it. I do not know of any reason why, if a company gets a charter and builds a line of railway, the whole of Canada has an embargo placed upon it, and that if another railway is to be run from that point, it must be built by the same company. I do not recognize, and I do not propose to recognize, any such principle, as a member of this House. So far as the hon. gentleman's suggestion goes, it is an entirely unfair suggestion, and a suggestion which is not warranted by anything I said, although I do not want my hon. friend to understand that I accuse him of misrepresenting me. He could not have heard me rightly. I do not suppose that the Government would give a bonus to the Northern Pacific Railway Company to extend its line parallel to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. I did not say so. What I said was, that I understood the hon. gentleman to say: Why should not this particular portion of the road be bonused, and the Northern Pacific be induced to build its line up for the purpose of meeting it at Antler Creek?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I said that the Northern Pacific has built a line of railway to the neighbourhood, not far from this particular place. If the Northern Pacific builds a line of railway to Antler station, and we ask Parliament to give a bonus from that point on for 50 miles, we would not be bonusing a line of railway parallel to the Canadian Pacific Railway. They would be building that without any bonus, and it would be for the Government to decide which proposition was in the interest of the country. I see no reason why the committee should now say that no liberty of action should be left to the Government, that, no matter what they thought, willy nilly, the Canadian Pacific must get that bonus, because they built a line to Antler, to tie our hands under all circumstances, no matter what might happen, so that we will be bound to give that bonus to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not see any reason why such should be done at all. No reason has been suggested, except the reason, which I think is a most absurd and inadequate reason, which the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has given, and the reason is, that because the Canadian Pacific Railway runs to Antler station, nobody else should be permitted to build beyond that.

Mr. HAGGART. How far is the Northern Pacific terminus from Antler Creek?

Mr. SIFTON.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Fifty or sixty miles. If the Northern Pacific Railway Company, seeing this provision in the statute, came to the Government and said: We will build the line to Antler Creek, and then we will go on to the Moose Mountain district, I do not see any reason why the Government should not be in a position to consider that proposition. Suppose the Canadian Pacific Railway would say: We will not build that line for \$3,200 a mile; and another company said that they would build it. We would then be in a nice position. I am astonished at the position the hon. gentleman is taking. There seems to be no argument in favour of the position that the hon. gentleman is taking, except it be a desire to compel the Government to give that bonus to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and he seems to be acting more for the Canadian Pacific Railway than for the settlers.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton), I think, has changed his tune entirely since he first addressed this committee. In the first place, he said, in explaining this vote, that it would not be possible that the grant should be given to any other company than the Canadian Pacific, that no other railway could utilize this grant. Now we have an entirely different string to his bow. He wants to dangle this grant between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Northern Pacific. He tells us that the Northern Pacific line is within 60 miles of Antler Creek, and that it is possible that an arrangement may be made with the Northern Pacific people to make the extension. I never proposed any such preposterous idea as the hon. gentleman suggests; I did not say that because a railway company builds to that point, no other railway company should be at liberty to extend beyond that point. I was showing the absurdity of a company, which had its railway only 60 or 70 miles away from the terminus of another railway, which could control the whole of its traffic, own it and check it at this very point, being given this grant. When the hon. gentleman asks: Why should we not give it to another company, which might make arrangements with the Northern Pacific to have a connection there?—I asked: Why should the Northern Pacific be induced to parallel another line of railway, which is at present at Antler? The hon. Minister says: Why should we not negotiate with the Northern Pacific, if it is necessary in the interest of the country; its road is built to within 50 or 60 miles of that point. What we object to is not that this bonus is not given to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purpose of extending the Canadian Pacific Railway, but that it may be open to the Government, if they think proper, to give it to a rival company of the Canadian Pacific Railway, who are on the ground at the present moment, and that

they may say to the Canadian Pacific Railway: We will induce another company to make this extension over the ground which you have built upon at the present moment.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The hon. gentleman has stated the point, not with absolute accuracy, but with a considerable degree of accuracy; that is to say, that it is desirable that the Government should be in a position to give this bonus to a rival company if the terms offered by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are not satisfactory.

**Mr. HAGGART.** You are at liberty to give it to the Northern Pacific without considering the Canadian Pacific Railway at all, or without offering any terms to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** That is a dreadful thing—that the Government of this country should think of giving a bonus to any other company without considering the Canadian Pacific Railway.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Has any other company a charter power from this Government or from the provincial government to build that line?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I explained what my view was. My hon. friend need not have got so far afield, because from what I said he might have known that there was no purpose in the mind of the Government in regard to that matter at all. I said that it had never occurred to me whether the Northern Pacific had power to build this line at all until this discussion began, and that now it appeared to me that the Northern Pacific had the power under their charter.

**Mr. FOSTER.** My hon. friend said a moment ago that you should not tie the Government so that they could not grant the bonus to anybody. There is a reasonable certainty that the Canadian Pacific Railway has power to build branch railways; and there is no other company that has power to build in that section.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Are you sure?

**Mr. FOSTER.** I am leaving out the two contestants, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Northern Pacific.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. I think there is another company.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Then, it is the duty of the Government to tell us what other company has charter powers to build there.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** We are not awarding a contract at this moment. We are only getting power.

**Mr. FOSTER.** The Government is asking power to use this subsidy just as it pleases. This House has a right, before it votes the

subsidy, to know what are the possibilities of the case. We want something to go upon. The only reasonable certainty is that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has charter powers to build that line. We say that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is the only company which can build it unless you show that some other company has charter powers; and if you do not give the subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, you preclude yourself from giving it to any other company if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company does not undertake it. What other company has these charter powers?

**The PRIME MINISTER.** It seems to me that after all this discussion we ought to know where we are, and I think we do. The position taken by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) is that this is a commendable railway. The hon. member for West Assinibola (Mr. Davin) also stated that he was in favour of this railway. Therefore, we have the fact that it is unambiguously admitted to be a desirable work. We take power to have this railway built by a company that will undertake to do the work. This is done, not for the purpose of assisting this or that company, but for the purpose of serving the interests of the people who want the railway. The position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite is this: "We do not object to the grant, but we want to have it given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by name, and to nobody else. If better terms are offered by another company, we do not wish the Government to exercise their discretion, for which they will be responsible to Parliament, but we wish to bind them in advance to the Canadian Pacific Railway." There is a strange thing about this. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have not asked for this subsidy. They ought to know, like everybody else in the North-west, that this would be a valuable railway. Without casting any reproach on the Canadian Pacific Railway, I think I can say that they have not been slow in the past to ask for rights and privileges. In this case they have not done so. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: "You must give the subsidy to them and to no one else; we do not care whether they have asked for it or not." I do not know the conditions of the case. I assume, however, from the statements made by parties who ought to know, that this is a commendable railway. If hon. gentlemen opposite want to take that position that though commendable the scheme is to be impaired by undesirable conditions, we cannot help it, though for my part I do not think the position is reasonable. I do not think they can seriously ask us to give a subsidy to a company which does not ask for it. What guarantee have we that they will build that railway if we give them the subsidy which they have never asked for? But there is one way of getting over the diffi-

culty. The hon. gentlemen opposite can move to have the vote altered in order to have the subsidy paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway. If the hon. gentleman will make that motion, he will be within his right.

Mr. WALLACE. The statement of the First Minister has completely misrepresented the attitude taken by gentlemen on this side of the House. He says that we say that you must give the subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway and to nobody else. We have never taken that attitude. The position we take is that the Government should give an honest statement of the case. They have not do so in this instance. This railway, if it is anything, is an extension of the Pipestone branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that is what the statement should say; but it does not. The Minister of the Interior says the Northern Pacific may jump in there any day, and demand the right to build this railway; are we going to refuse them that right if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company does not ask for the subsidy? The Northern Pacific cannot jump in 50 or 60 or 100 miles from its present line to this point. The First Minister tells us that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has never made any request for this subsidy. Who has made the request? We are entitled to have the papers in regard to this vote laid on the Table of this House. The hon. First Minister himself said some years ago, in a similar case, that it was impossible to proceed until the papers were laid on the Table. We ask the Minister of Railways to place the papers on the Table.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What papers?

Mr. WALLACE. Any papers upon which this grant is based. He says there has been no communication from the Canadian Pacific Railway and there has certainly been none from the Northern Pacific. There is no other road that has a charter reaching that point or that could ask for this subsidy.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What papers does the hon. gentleman allude to?

Mr. WALLACE. Any papers, any petitions, any requests, any letters requesting that this subsidy of \$160,000 be voted. Give use some justification, some basis upon which the Minister came to the conclusion that he would be justified in asking this vote. Has he any such documents?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. WALLACE. Just what I thought.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Therefore I would have some difficulty in producing any.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. WALLACE. Therefore as no railway company or individual or corporation has ever asked for this grant at all, it looks like an election scheme. The Government can say to the electors: Though you did not ask us, we have given a subsidy for a railway through your country. We want to know who has asked for this subsidy. The Minister of Railways says that the railway company has not asked for it, that he has not a line or a document or a request from a corporation or individual, or any petition or request of any kind asking for this grant.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are going too far.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman says he has no documents.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. How am I going too far? If the hon. gentleman has any documents, he is bound to place them on the Table.

The PRIME MINISTER. I supposed my hon. friend was in favour of the road any way?

Mr. WALLACE. The right hon. gentleman has exaggerated the statement I made. What I asked was, looking at the map, when we were voting last night hundreds of thousands of dollars for parallel lines of railway that could not be justified by any necessities of the people—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You did not oppose one.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman is making a statement which is as inaccurate as any he ever made.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What one did you oppose?

Mr. WALLACE. I opposed the whole scheme on general principles. I opposed almost every one of those on the first page. The hon. Postmaster General, I assume, was not here, and yet not having been here and not knowing what position I took, he says I did not oppose one.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Did you make a motion?

Mr. WALLACE. Another question. I shall make a motion and compel the hon. Minister to put himself on record. He will have more difficulty explaining to the electorate of North York his votes and course, and less time to spend with Sim. Hewitt and the rest of the gang in West Huron and the other constituencies of Ontario, where he hides himself in the back room of a hotel, when other Ministers are out on the stump.

Mr. McMULLEN. Order, order. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. WALLACE—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. He did not raise a point of order.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes I did.

Mr. WALLACE—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. member for North Wellington distinctly declared that he rose to a point of order, and it was the duty of the hon. gentleman to sit down.

Mr. WALLACE. I want to—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman must sit down as well as I.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman must obey the Chair.

Mr. McMULLEN. My point of order is that the hon. gentleman is supposed to be discussing the granting of bonuses to railways, and in place of doing that he is now discussing the West Huron election. Is that in order?

Mr. WALLACE. On the point of order. I beg to say that I am in the judgment of every member when I say that the hon. member for North Wellington got up three times and called order, and he has no right, Mr. Chairman, to assume your functions.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to confine himself to the point of order.

Mr. WALLACE. I was doing so. I was setting myself right and have the right to do so, and I shall not give up any of my rights. With regard to the point of order raised by the hon. member for North Wellington, it is like his usual statements, too insignificant to be noticed. I shall not depart from the rule. I was discussing the question before the House when I was interrupted by the hon. Postmaster General, who had no right to interrupt me, as you have often ruled, Sir, without my consent. I gave no such consent. He said that I had not made objection to those votes. I replied that he was not here when those votes were passed through the House, and could not possibly have known whether I objected or not, and further that I did object more strenuously perhaps than any other member of the House. I said further that it would be better for the Postmaster General to attend to his duties in this House, that he would have some work cut out for him when he went back to his constituencies in the North Riding of York in attempting to justify his votes and the course he had taken in the West Huron election, where other men came out in the open, and he

was as usual secret in the back room of a hotel. I was proceeding to discuss the question, and had no desire to get away from it, and it was only when interrupted by the Postmaster General which with irrelevant and inaccurate statements that I felt compelled to reply to him.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps I may have to go a little out of the record too. I do not desire to interrupt the deliberations of this committee by embarking in a discussion not pertinent to it, nor does the occasion itself offer an opportunity of dealing with slanderous insinuations, utterly false, founded on absolute imagination—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is a point of order before the Chair and not decided yet. We were discussing the granting of certain railway subsidies, and ought to confine the discussion as much as possible to these subsidies. It would be much better if hon. members would not interrupt, except with the consent of the hon. member who has the floor. He should be asked whether he consents to the interruption, and I hope the discussion will proceed on those lines in the future.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I desire to make one observation, in order that the remarks of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) shall not go on record without being contradicted. He alluded to a person named Sim Hewitt. I can say that, to my knowledge I never saw the man in my life.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. To his second observation—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for West York has the floor. If he gives way to the Postmaster General—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He abandons the floor.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. At the same time, I think it would not be absolutely irregular, the statements having been made, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) should have an opportunity of denying them. I think that then, it would be right to proceed with the discussion on the railway subsidies.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. To the first specific statement made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) I have given an emphatic denial. As to the insinuation that my action in West Huron consisted in secreting myself in a hotel, I say that my sole action in that riding consisted in addressing meetings of electors publicly, openly and honourably, and discussing the issues of the day; and I here challenge the hon. member for West York or anybody else to prove what he has insinuated. I challenge an inquiry.

Mr. WALLACE. The Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) has evidently lost his temper. I was not only referring to West York, but to other places as well. In North Grey, I was present—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think there is any use in discussing these personal questions. It would be much better to continue discussion of the railway subsidies.

Mr. WALLACE. I quite agree with you, Mr. Chairman. The challenge is like many other challenges of the Postmaster General—a vain and empty boast. I know what he did in North Grey—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. I know what the hon. gentleman did in North Grey—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. I would invite hon. members to discuss the question before the Chair. An assertion has been made and has been denied, and, so far as the hon. member (Mr. Mulock) is personally concerned, it must be accepted.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not unwilling to accept his denial, so far as West Huron is concerned—and that was the extent of it. But I know what occurred in Owen Sound and throughout North Grey—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. WALLACE. That is all I have to say about that; and perhaps hon. gentlemen will permit me to go on with the discussion, which is what I am anxious to do. In fact, I had not departed from it, and had no desire to do so had not the Postmaster General interjected other matter. But in all such cases he will find me ready to take a hand in the discussion. I will not make any statements that I cannot prove and those that I make will not make him any more comfortable—he may be sure of that. Now, with regard to this resolution for a subsidy from Antler station, why is it not put in the same form as Resolution No. 43, to which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals invites our attention:

For a railway in extension of the St. Francis Branch of the Témiscouata Railway to the mouth of the St. Francis River, a distance not exceeding 3 miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not a grant to any specific company.

Mr. WALLACE. We do not care for that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But that is the point made.

Mr. WALLACE. That was one point. Why does not the hon. Minister say "from the terminus of a branch of the Canadian

Mr. MULOCK.

Pacific Railway"? There is no other road there to be extended. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: We must not make a hard and fast bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway, because, in the first place, the Canadian Pacific Railway never asked for this subsidy. We have asked the Minister of Railways and Canals who did ask for it, and he is unable to tell us.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not. What business have you to make such a statement as that?

Mr. WALLACE. I will ask the hon. gentlemen (Mr. Blair) to address the Chair, and, even though he does sit close to the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), I would ask him not to follow that hon. gentleman's example and lose his temper. We must observe the rules of debate, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry to have to call your attention so repeatedly to the violation of the rules by hon. gentlemen who should set an example to the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am very glad that the hon. member (Mr. Wallace) has seen fit to call my attention to this point. I am sorry to say that every day the rule is broken, observations being made not to the Chair, as the rules require, but directly to hon. members. I invite hon. members to address themselves to the Chair.

Mr. WALLACE. I shall be very glad if the few remarks I have made, calling forth your very proper observations, Mr. Chairman, have the effect of producing better order and closer adherence to the rules, the observation of which is so necessary for the proper conduct of business. Now, to resume—we asked for the papers in this case, and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals said: What papers? I said: The papers, documents, petitions of individuals or corporations asking for this vote. The hon. gentleman said: We have no such papers. If there were such papers it would be our duty to call for them in order that we might see what justification there is for voting this subsidy of \$160,000. The right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said that I agreed to this subsidy. I agreed to this extent, that, according to the map, there is a large extent of country which, I am informed, is well settled and fertile, which is not well supplied with railway facilities. If that is the case, this subsidy would be more justifiable than subsidies we voted yesterday to parallel existing lines of railway. The opening up of new country is the only case in which the vote of a subsidy should be justified at all. I do not alter the opinion I expressed yesterday that the system of voting these subsidies should be abandoned, and we should only vote a subsidy where the case is so clear and where there are such strong special reasons for voting it as to justify Parliament in granting a subsidy.

Mr. SPROULE. My object in asking the information I did from the Minister of Railways and Canals was for the purpose of ascertaining whether there was any company that had made a proposal to build this road. I remember that the late Sir John A. Macdonald suggested the principle upon which these bonuses should be granted. He said that if there was a company who held a charter for the route, and which had made a definite and satisfactory proposal to build the road, the name of the company should be put in the resolution when the bonus was first voted; but if there were two or three companies holding charters over the same line and it was not decided which one would go on and build, then it was to be left an open question and the name of no company was to be mentioned, or a third, where the locality needed a railway and the public had asked for it, but there was no charter for the route. In this case I wanted to ascertain whether there was any company asking for the subsidy, or any memorial or petition from any corporation asking for it. Now, I can understand readily no company being named in this subsidy if no company has agreed to build it, or proposed to build it, although it may be a desirable road to build in the public interest. My point is that we should as much as possible prevent the possibility of charter brokerage or some person who may become a bonus monger coming in and working a racket for the purpose of making some money out of it, after getting control of this bonus and then going to companies to negotiate with them for a transfer of the bonus.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could not state with certainty as to whether the Canadian Pacific Railway have at present legal authority to go on and construct this line. That is a matter that will no doubt be very carefully considered. I know no reason at present why, if the Canadian Pacific Railway have the power and if they are willing to build it, they should not have the opportunity of doing so.

Mr. SPROULE. Then there is the question, What corporation has been asking for this bonus, or by what kind of a memorial was an application made? That would bring out the information which it is desirable the House should have.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not understand what my hon. friend means about a charter-monger getting control of this subsidy. I do not understand how that can be done. There is only one way in which a company can get control of any subsidy, that is when it enters into a contract with the Government for the purpose of building the road; when that contract is entered into, then the Government engages that the subsidy shall be paid to it. There is no such condition arising under this which calls for action by

the Government. We had no memorial before us nor application from any railway company; but we were assured by the Minister of the Interior that the people in that neighbourhood earnestly desired that aid should be offered for the construction of this line, and they believed that if a moderate aid was offered it would lead to the construction of the railway. The Minister of the Interior made those representations to us. It is quite evident from what he has stated to this committee that his representations in that regard were entirely well founded, and we concluded it was desirable that a road should be built. Now, is the House going to be told that a member of the Government may not make representation to his colleagues, that the Government may not inquire into and report upon them, and offer a subsidy for the building of a line which they are satisfied from the representations made to them by their colleagues that the railway would be in the public interest? I cannot imagine that there can be any objection to that, it has been done over and over again. It has been done not only in the case of a railway which involves an expenditure of \$150,000, but in the case of railways, one of which was referred to last evening, and which was aided in 1884 to the extent of \$2,500,000. There was no company incorporated for the purpose of building the short line across the state of Maine, and no memorial was presented to the Government in its favour.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to say that I did not condemn the principle that because there was no charter there should be no grant. I asked for information for this reason, that sometimes individuals get control of these subsidies, and there may be other railway companies that have charters in the locality, and they go and negotiate and lay off one against the other, and say: We have power to get this charter; will you agree with me to build it? It was to head off these charter brokers that I wanted to ascertain who were the promoters of this railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We stated an hour ago that we acted on the representations of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not oppose this vote, as I am anxious that the road should be built as quickly as possible. If I have any fault to find with the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals it is that, from the account he gives, it does not seem to me that he has taken means to see that the work is pushed forward quickly, because all he has done is to come here and ask us to give him a vote.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could not very well do anything until I had the vote.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the hon. Minister could. For instance, the hon. Minister

could have spoken to these parties who would have been inclined to build this line, and he could have asked them if they were prepared to go on with it and be in a position to tell us. He ought to be in a position, not to say only that he wants the money in order that he may negotiate, but that he wants the money to carry out such and such an arrangement.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That would be objected to.

Mr. DAVIN. Neither the Government nor the Canadian Pacific Railway are justified in remaining even where this extension would leave them. When the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, Regina was made the capital of the North-west Territories, and the Government sold the town sites, selling it to the people upon the assurance that it was to be the capital of the Territories, and not only the capital, but that it was to be one of the ends of a division of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But in 1883 the Canadian Pacific Railway took away the end of the division. Thereupon a deputation came to Ottawa, saw Sir John Macdonald, and Sir John Macdonald sent for Mr. Stephen, now Lord Mountstephen, the then president of the line. Sir John Macdonald said to him: "Why have you taken the end of the division away from Regina? It was understood that Regina was to be the end of the division. You have done very wrong and it must go back again." Mr. Stephen agreed to bring it back, but he said: You will give me a day to go to Montreal. He went to Montreal, and upon coming back, he saw the deputation with Sir John Macdonald, and he said: "Sir John Macdonald, I am powerless to bring back the end of the division." It is unnecessary to state what reasons he gave. It is sufficient to say that he said he could not do it without doing great injury to the line. Then he said to this deputation, in the presence of Sir John Macdonald, by way of compensation to those parties, some of them gentlemen from the province of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, who had invested thousands of dollars in Regina property: "As we cannot bring back the end of the division we will extend the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, loop it down and bring it around by way of Pipestone and up to Regina." If the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals will look at the Canadian Pacific Railway map he will find that this line is projected right to Regina, and so on to connect with Saskatoon and Prince Albert, which would make it a complete commercial and colonizing line. What the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals should do is to take money to build, not merely fifty miles, but to build a line right to Regina. If the hon. Minister will do me the favour of looking at the map he will find that the line is projected by the Canadian Pacific Railway. What I want, in

Mr. DAVIN.

the interest of the North-west Territories, and in the interest of those who have gone in there to settle is as great railway facilities as it is possible to obtain, and I want to see the line built. In reference to the question that has been raised here to-day, it seems to be an important question, and I do not think that, notwithstanding what the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says, and notwithstanding that there are people of great eminence connected with this House who have confidence in the system of getting a credit of this sort to enable the Government to make a bargain with whomsoever they please, I do not think it is a desirable way. I see the danger of granting the vote in its present form. I am not saying this because it is a Liberal Government; I would say the same thing if a Conservative Government were in power. Everybody knows that I criticised the Conservative Government pretty freely. This leaves it open to some man to come in, make a deal, and if it ultimately ends in building the road at all, it will enable him to go to a large company for so much money from that company, become a director, and have the line built. I am in favour of seeing the line built, and I shall support the vote.

For a railway on a point of the Intercolonial Railway at or near Halifax to a point on the Central Railway in the county of Lunenburg, not exceeding 20 miles.

Mr. KAULBACH. Mr. Chairman, I cannot say too much in favour of this proposed extension of the Nova Scotia Southern Railway east from New Germany to Halifax, as by it New Germany, Foster Settlement and New Ross, excellent agricultural districts, will be opened up or developed, now lying comparatively dormant owing to the want of proper facilities to reach a market, the carriage roads, for want of repair, being next to impassable.

The resolution refers to this extension as intending to connect with the Intercolonial Railway, which I think is unwise, and as I feel I am better acquainted with the geography of that section of country than most others, I may be permitted to suggest that after its leaving New Germany and reaching New Ross a beautiful section of farming country, offering inducements to settlers, that the road make a detour east for Halifax instead of the Intercolonial, in order to gain connection with Chester Basin, Chester and Hubbert's Cove, important points for business, and rendered attractive as favourite resorts, owing to the beauty and variety of nature's endowments, and the attractiveness of the scene, which can only be appreciated or realized by a personal visit. Among all the towns in Nova Scotia as favourite resorts, there are few fairer or more attractive than Chester and its environments, a proof of which is given

by the way it is thronged with tourists every year.

By this route the head water of St. Margaret's Bay is reached, which, in addition to the many benefits and conveniences this thickly-settled section would receive, it would contribute to the road a large percentage of passenger and freight traffic.

If the road as proposed is to be carried from New Ross to connect with the Inter-colonial away from Halifax, it will pass through an uninteresting and worthless country without making the road any shorter, and, worse than all, it would be suicidal to the trade and the best interests of the country, and would deprive Chester and the adjacent places I have named, of all benefits, or any connection whatever with this proposed road in any way.

I therefore urge that a due regard be had to what I have stated, and that the road after leaving New Ross, connect with Chester and the adjacent places named, and from thence, as near as practicable, direct to Halifax, as being in the best interests of the country and all concerned.

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

House resumed at Three o'clock.

To the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company, for their line of railway in and through the city of Hull, Que., not exceeding 4 miles.

Mr. CLANCY. Is that an extension of the road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is to bring the Ottawa & Gatineau Railway opposite Nepean Point, where they have to come in order to cross the river and get into Ottawa.

To the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company, for a railway from the town of South Edmonton, N.W.T., to North Edmonton, and thence westerly towards the Yellow Head Pass, a distance not exceeding 50 miles.

Mr. CLANCY. Is that an extension of a line already built?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, it is an extension of a line already built, although it is not likely to be prosecuted or extended by the same company which now runs up to Edmonton. It is an extension into a country which is a rich agricultural district, and with a view of inducing settlement.

To the Bay of Quinté Railway Company, for an extension of the company's line in a westerly direction from Deseronto for a distance not exceeding 2 miles; also for an extension of the company's line from its present terminus at Tweed in a northerly direction, not exceeding 5 miles, in all 7 miles—subsidies payable on each of the sections last mentioned as each of such sections may be completed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I wish to amend this by adding after the word "from" on the second line.

the words "a point at or near Richmond boundary road near." Also after the word "payable" on the fourth line, to add these words "on progress estimates as may be, from time to time, prescribed by the Governor in Council."

These provisions are being made for a couple of little branches that are to connect the present line with important mineral sections, and it is the desire of the company and the people interested in the Deseronto enterprise that they should have the opportunity of selecting the most desirable point at which connection may be made.

To the Ontario, Belmont and Northern Railway Company, for an extension of their railway from its present terminus at Iron Mines in a north-westerly direction, a distance not exceeding 5 miles; and also for an extension of the company's railway southerly, from the present southern terminus thereto to the Central Ontario Junction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a distance not exceeding 2 miles, but the last mentioned aid for the said 2 miles of railway shall not be granted in case the Railway Committee of the Privy Council finds that adequate running powers on fair terms cannot be secured to the company over that portion of the line of the Central Ontario Railway between the present southerly end of the Ontario, Belmont and Northern Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's line at Central Ontario Junction.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The word "cannot" is an error, and should be "can," on the eighth line, and add the words "subsidies payable on each of the sections mentioned as each of said sections may be completed."

To the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company, for a line of railway from Ridgetown, Ont., to St. Thomas, in the said province, a distance not exceeding 44 miles; this subsidy to be payable only in the event of adequate running rights over the Canada Southern Railway between the two points above mentioned not being granted to the first mentioned company on terms to be approved by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. CLANCY. I want to ask the hon. Minister what the object is of tying this subsidy up by a condition that most people know to be impossible with regard to running powers on the Canada Southern Railway between St. Thomas and Ridgetown?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The question is one which we did not feel we could definitely determine off-hand. If it is possible to secure adequate and sufficient running powers for the Lake Erie and Detroit Railway over the Michigan Central from Ridgetown to St. Thomas, then that would be a proper thing for us to do, and it would be our duty to do it, seeing that the two roads would be practically paralleling one another for nearly their whole mileage. We want to protect ourselves, because if proper and sufficient running rights can be arranged, if the state of business on the Michigan Central is such as to admit of local roads using it, without prejudice to its

interests and the interests of the people, why should they not do it? The Railway Committee will give that matter every consideration before the question is determined.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is now placing a power in the hands of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council that is absolutely unnecessary. I hope he goes further than considering the mere convenience of the two companies. There are the rights of the people to be considered. What is the case? The Lake Erie and Detroit Railway runs from the town of Walkerville along the lake shore to the town of Ridgetown. In the early history of the country, as is well known, the settlements were along the lake and rivers; but as lines of railway were built, they ran at a distance from the lake; and the settlements along the lake shore and towns became in a backward condition, and people had to drive long distances to reach the trunk line of railway. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) has an intimate acquaintance with the railways in the western peninsula and he knows that they are trunk lines.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is so.

Mr. CLANCY. The Canada Southern and the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk are all trunk lines. There is a road that was subsidized partly by the Dominion Government and partly by the province of Ontario, running from Sarnia to the Rondeau, a point on Lake Erie. The whole traffic must depend upon connections with every one of the trunk lines. But the trunk lines do not pretend to run on a schedule with this road, which is owned by a company independent of them all. The Canada Southern, above all other roads, pays no attention to the local traffic. There is absolutely no defence for tying up this subsidy until it pleases these companies to give running powers, for running powers cannot be got that are satisfactory.

Mr. BEATTIE. There is another point that my hon. friend has not brought out. The Lake Erie and Detroit road have lately acquired the London and Port Stanley. To enable them to form a connection, they would require to build from Ridgetown to St. Thomas. The Michigan Central, as is well known, is a part of the great Vanderbilt system, and any running rights they gave would be subject to any regulations the Michigan Central might make. There is a large coal business done between Conneaut in Ohio, and Port Stanley. They have enormous steamers that bring twenty-seven railroad cars loaded with coal, making two trips a day, and they have no means of reaching their western branches, that run from Ridgetown to Walkerville, and from Rondeau to Sarnia. It is only by having a line from Ridgetown to St. Thomas that they can form a complete connection with

Mr. BLAIR.

their branches. It is only a local road, one built by local enterprise, that will look after the local business, as the Michigan Central is a through road entirely, and does not pay sufficient attention to the local trade. It is necessary that this should be constructed in order that the eastern and western roads should be connected.

Mr. CLANCY. I think the Minister should be reasonable. I do not wish to continue this debate, but I think that what I urge upon him is perfectly fair. I can understand that the Canada Southern, for reasons which appear to them satisfactory, oppose this; but beyond that there is no reason against what I urge, on the ground of paralleling existing lines. It is simply a case of a local road paralleling a through road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would be glad to meet the wishes of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy). The case from a local point of view has very considerable merit. But the hon. gentleman must see that the Government is in this position—the question has been brought up, and the Canada Southern have made strong representations to the Government upon it. They say there is no necessity for building another line—

Mr. CLANCY. That is nothing new.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have stated, and, I believe, with all sincerity, that there is no occasion for duplicating this line, that they can afford all the necessary convenience and appliances which the local road requires to do business between Ridgetown and St. Thomas. In the face of representations of that kind, and, at all events, until we—

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. Minister permit me? I would ask him if he thinks that a quarter from which to take representations on this subject? It is not an independent source, as the hon. gentleman knows. It is perfectly natural that they should speak as they have done. But surely the hon. Minister ought to give us some other reason than the statement of an interested party. Local municipalities that were already burdened with railway bonuses, came to the aid of this road, and purpose burdening still further to secure its construction. Against this fact, showing the importance of, and necessity for, the road, is it reasonable to take as a guide the representations of those who are interested in opposing it?

The PRIME MINISTER. This is a very important question, and I must confess that I have some sympathy with the views presented by my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy). We might as well dispose of this question frankly. My hon. friend knows that it has been objected, that if this were to pass without qualification, as my hon. friend pro-

poses, it would mean the paralleling of an existing railway for a considerable distance, and that at a distance of perhaps not more than 6 miles from the existing road. I would like to have the views of my hon. friend as to what reason there can be for that condition of things.

Mr. CLANCY. This road, in going from Walkerville to Ridgetown, parallels the Michigan Central in the sense that it goes through the Lake Shore district, taking in the whole district of country that is seeking an outlet on the east. As it approaches St. Thomas, it comes more nearly to the Canada Southern than at any western point. If that were the starting point of the road, I could understand more force in the hon. gentleman's contention, but that is practically the outlet, and so the paralleling has not the same effect.

The PRIME MINISTER. As I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy), he says that, owing to the condition of things which exist in the locality, the Canada Southern ought to be paralleled at a distance of from 2 to 6 miles. That is a position to which, for my part, I will give very earnest consideration. I do not know that we should be disposed to go so far as he wants us to go—that is, to take away this condition—but for my part, I would go as far as possible to meet the views of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) remained until two o'clock this morning, in the hope of having this resolution come up. But he is not able to be here at this time. I would ask the Minister of Railways and Canals to allow this item to stand over until the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) is in his place, as the road under discussion is entirely in his constituency. I know he has something to say about it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would gladly accede to the hon. gentleman's request if it were possible; but I have had a conversation recently with the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), who said he wished to be here. I told him it was impossible for us to hold the grant if he was not here, particularly as I knew his views, which correspond with those which the hon. member has expressed. I am glad to find the hon. gentleman has the same views, and they will have due consideration by the Government when the matter comes to be considered. Certainly it is not the policy of the Government to subsidize the construction of parallel lines so close together. The best we can say under the circumstances is that which has been said by the right hon. Premier on the subject.

To the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, for the construction of branches from the company's main line to the iron mine at Bluff Point and to the Martele mine in the county of Renfrew, not exceeding 5 miles.

Mr. BERGERON. Last year we had before the Committee of Railways and Canals some very serious matters about this railway. Could my hon. friend tell me whether these differences among the shareholders have been settled?

Mr. BRITTON. They have all been settled, all the arrears of interest on the old bonds were paid up to the 1st of January of the present year, and a new issue of bonds was made carrying interest at 3 per cent for the residue of the term, and preferred stock was issued to the holders of the 6 per cent bonds for the amount represented by the difference between the 3 per cent, the new bonds carried, and the 6 per cent, the old bonds carried. So far as I know, every one is satisfied, and the road now is entering, I think, upon a new career.

Mr. BERGERON. A good paying basis.

Mr. BRITTON. It is going to be nip and tuck, of course, with the road.

Mr. BERGERON. It didn't pay before, I understood?

Mr. BRITTON. No, it did not pay interest. This will help the road. There is a mine that is now proposed to be opened up, and they desire to build the road to it. They intend to bring out large quantities of ore, and send at first a large quantity to Hamilton.

Mr. WALLACE. Are these branches for the purpose of carrying the ore?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Doing all the business that may possibly offer. I may admit that the business which is to be brought to the main line by these extensions is chiefly ore and wood.

For a railway from the village of Parry Sound extending northerly towards Sudbury, not exceeding a distance of 20 miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a very strong opinion in western Ontario, particularly in Toronto, that lines of railway should be built in the direction of Sudbury, particularly as it was alleged that if constructed in that direction they will tend to open up a very valuable country which, up to the present time is, comparatively speaking, undeveloped. It is exceedingly valuable as a timber country, and likely to be found to contain a good deal of mineral wealth.

Mr. WALLACE. There is water communication there which is much more suitable for the timber wealth than a railroad would be. I think the hon. gentleman will find that this demand from Toronto for a road is not for the purpose of opening up this country, but to have a through line, first to Parry Sound and then to continue on to Sudbury.

Mr. McCORMICK. This is a country I am very familiar with, and I congratulate

the Minister of Railways and Canals on offering this subsidy. The country which will be developed by this line is very rich in minerals, very rich in timber, and is besides a first-class agricultural country, and this line will tend to develop it in all these respects. I assure the hon. gentleman that I heartily endorse the grant.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like permission to go back to No. 44, and to get some explanations about it, as I was not present when it came up.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is a small shortage in respect of a part of the Canada Eastern Railway which was subsidized under a former law. The hon. gentleman may remember that two extensions of the Canada Eastern were sanctioned, and a subsidy voted for 10 miles covering those two extensions, one to Bluebrook and the other from a point on the main line to Nelson. That portion of the country has been completely left out of railway connection with the Canada Eastern. When these lines were built it was found when they came to be measured that they were two miles and a quarter longer than the mileage which the grant had covered. The grant was for 10 miles, and 12½ miles was taken.

Mr. FOSTER. In reference to vote No. 41, I would like to ask a question or two. Who compose the company connected with that road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The company is one which was incorporated a couple of years ago, if my memory serves me, at the request of, or at the instance of the corporation of Edmonton. They contracted some liabilities in connection with this road.

Mr. FOSTER. The town of Edmonton?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. I think, perhaps, that, not only a more detailed but a much more accurate statement might be made by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), who is thoroughly familiar with the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. Could my hon. friend give me the details in reference to the personnel of the company, the nature of the country through which the road runs, and as to whether or not we are to get through ultimately by way of the Calgary and Edmonton road?

Mr. OLIVER. Was the hon. member (Mr. Foster) addressing me?

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid I shall have to address myself to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver).

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) sufficient information.

Mr. McCORMICK.

Mr. FOSTER. I noticed the distressed and pained look that came suddenly upon the hon. Minister when it occurred to him that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) might not be in the House. I would like to hear from the Minister, for the time being, from Alberta, as to the company, as to the road, how it can be started from Edmonton, and whether it is a continuation of the road that runs from Calgary to Edmonton?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could give that information.

Mr. FOSTER. As the hon. Minister does not know, the hon. member for Alberta may, perhaps, come to his rescue.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Although the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) may be intending to be humorous, this is rather small-sized play on the part of an hon. gentleman who has been Minister of Finance. I have acquainted myself sufficiently with the facts and could furnish them to the committee, but I thought the committee would very much prefer to hear from the hon. gentleman representing the locality, who knows, of his own knowledge, all the facts which are necessary to be furnished, and who has furnished me with much of the information which I would give to the committee.

Mr. OLIVER. The charter that is now held is a continuation of the charter that was secured by the municipality of Edmonton some years ago under the name of the Edmonton District Railway. It is not a part of the Calgary and Edmonton charter. The charter was obtained for the purpose of securing an extension of the railway from the end of the present Calgary and Edmonton line south of the Saskatchewan River, across the river to the north side, and for the construction of radial branches in different directions. The charter was acquired from the town of Edmonton the year before last by a company.

Mr. FOSTER. Who acquired it?

Mr. OLIVER. The present company. Of course, I cannot tell who the shareholders of the company are. Hon. gentlemen will know the names of the incorporators better than I do. The statute will show the names; I do not know them.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably the hon. Minister knows them.

Mr. OLIVER. The gentleman with whom we dealt was Mr. Pugsley. Mr. Pugsley, I believe, was the promoter of the present company; he acquired the charter of the Edmonton District Railway Company, and last year secured an extension of these rights so as to make the charter extend to the Pelly River, by way of Peace River. At this session he acquired an amendment to the charter, providing that the company may build a branch through the Yellow

Head Pass. That is, I presume, an answer to the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. FOSTER. This vote is for fifty miles. Does this carry it to the Yellow Head Pass?

Mr. OLIVER. No. This will only carry it across the river and about to the limit of the surrounding agricultural settlements. It is about 250 miles from Edmonton to the Yellow Head Pass; perhaps not quite that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If you go to the Peace River it will be 520 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. It is always a good thing in railway promoting for a company to have a large prospect ahead of it by getting upon a travelled route, or what may become a travelled route. What is the information that the Government itself has in reference to those who make up the company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The representations which have been made to the Government by the persons who are representing the company are that the company would be prepared to satisfy the Government, in the event of the bonus being granted by Parliament, that they would carry the work to a successful completion. Of course, the matter has not been gone into between the representatives of the Government and this company as yet with any degree of fulness. It is not customary to do that until the Government is placed in a position by Parliament to contract, if they are satisfied with the accuracy it receives.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is there in the company beside Mr. Pugsley?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know the personnel of the company. Mr. Pugsley is the solicitor, as far as I am aware, acting for these gentlemen. He has had a good deal of interest in the north-western country. I think he was associated with his brother, the promoter and builder of the Regina, Long Lake and Qu'Appelle road, which road is in successful operation, and he is prepared to satisfy the Government of the ability of his company to build the road.

Mr. BERGERON. When was the company incorporated?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This company was incorporated, I think, at the present session. At all events, if it was incorporated previously, it came this session and got some powers or an extension of its corporate powers.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, then, we ought to be able to get the names of the promoters.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I did not interest myself sufficiently to inquire, or to ascertain, who the shareholders or the individual persons are who are connected with the company.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister must have had some basis upon which he brought down this vote. He must surely have satisfied himself as to the bona fides and power of the company. If so, he could not help but find out who the members of the company were, or was it that he had sufficient confidence in the solicitor, that whatever he said went? Surely the hon. Minister can give us an explanation?

Mr. BERGERON. This is a matter of over \$320,000. The Minister should give us the petition in which the grounds for this vote are set out. Can the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) tell us whether the consideration given to the town of Edmonton was a money consideration or a consideration of an extension of road? Was it a purchase or a prospective extension of road that led to the transfer of the charter?

Mr. OLIVER. The town was not in a position to take advantage of the charter, on the general principle that a municipality has great difficulty in handling a matter of that kind; Mr. Pugsley came there and offered to take over the charter, paying the town the actual disbursements it had made in securing it, and making certain agreements as to the time at which he would complete the road (subject to the completion of the bridge across the river), and as to the location of the station.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the time limit?

Mr. OLIVER. Within one year after the completion of the bridge he was to complete the road into the town of Edmonton. The great object aimed at by the town in securing the charter was to get the road extended into the town.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the bridge completed yet?

Mr. OLIVER. No. It is expected to be completed this fall.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the extent of road covered by the Edmonton town charter?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not altogether clear as to that, but it strikes me that from South Edmonton there was about 100 miles north to Athabasca Landing.

Mr. FOSTER. That is in the direction of the Peace River?

Mr. OLIVER. No, due north. The Peace River is north-westerly. But there was provision for two branches. I think one was to run north-easterly towards Fort Saskatchewan for 20 miles, and the other about 90 miles in a north-westerly direction towards the Peace River.

Mr. FOSTER. Was there a branch towards the Yellow Head Pass?

Mr. OLIVER. The Peace River and the Yellow Head Pass branches would be first

in the same direction, and they would deviate afterwards.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend remember whether there was an undertaking as to the length of time in which the road to Athabasca Landing should be completed?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not perfectly clear on that point; but the road was to be completed to Athabasca Landing or to Fort Assiniboine.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Fort Assiniboine.

Mr. OLIVER. That was to be completed within a year, or some other limited time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. George McAvity is the president of the company, and Mr. B. F. Pearson, of Halifax, is the secretary.

Mr. WALLACE. Who are the other officers?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know who the other officers are. The proposal of these gentlemen is to construct a line as far as Fort Assiniboine, if they get the necessary assistance, that is, 96½ miles, within the time named in their charter. But we did not feel called upon to aid them at present beyond the 50 miles stated here.

Mr. FOSTER. This is to subsidize them to go towards Fort Assiniboine.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. The district will be admitted by those who know it to be a very rich farming district, one in which settlers will be likely to gather if the railway facilities are extended, and one in which the Government would very much like to see settlement take place. I think it is generally admitted that unless railway construction takes place, settlers will not go into the remote western country.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, there are no incorporators other than these gentlemen, who simply took the transfer of the town of Edmonton charter?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They got legislation through this Parliament, I think, at the present session, and they are a regularly constituted company.

Mr. WALLACE. Can the Minister give us any information as to the personnel of the new board, or any other information about them?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot tell who they are. I have never inquired.

Mr. PRIOR. It seems to me very important that we should know who the gentlemen back of this charter are. This is a

Mr. OLIVER.

charter for a railway to run to the Yellow Head Pass, I understand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And possibly beyond it.

Mr. PRIOR. The people of British Columbia are greatly interested in that railway, because any line that goes through that pass will probably be extended into the interior and ultimately to the coast, and I think that this Parliament should see that this charter does not get into the hands of men of straw.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. We have had this legislation before the Railway Committee on several occasions, when the fullest detailed information was given. Mr. McAvity is a man of well-known financial ability. Mr. Pearson is also a man of standing in the country; and it is evident that this company is in a much stronger position than many companies which are organized to carry out works of this kind. They have shown in the past that they are able to finance such enterprises as this, and I should think that the character of these men would be sufficient evidence that they are acting in good faith, and that they will be able to carry out this work to the extent to which it is being helped at the present time by this subsidy.

Mr. FOSTER. It appears that this road, which was to run to Fort Assiniboine or to Athabasca Landing, is not heading in that direction at all. It is heading as straight as a die for the Yellow Head Pass, which is in a direction straight away from Fort Assiniboine. The idea which the Edmonton charter holders had was to have the road built to Athabasca Landing or to Fort Assiniboine. That charter has been transferred to these gentlemen, and they have got a change by which they have authority to build through the Yellow Head Pass and on to Fort Pelly. So far as the hon. gentleman's information goes, these gentlemen have a double-header, that is to say, they may go in two directions. One pass is not sufficient for them to conquer, but they propose to surmount the two. They propose to pre-empt by their charter the two passes eligible over these mountains to get to the Pacific by a new route. Instead of carrying out what it seems they promised to do, instead of building from Assiniboia or Athabasca Landing, they have got power since to go to the Yellow Head Pass; and this subsidy of fifty miles is heading as clearly towards Yellow Head Pass as is possible, and directly away from Fort Assiniboine, directly north. So that what is apparent from the marking and from what little information we have been able to glean, is that it is a more ambitious project these gentlemen are taking up—nothing more nor less than getting possession of the pass for a transcontinental railway. And lest one pass would not be enough, they have got two passes. Who are these gentlemen who have

got all this? Who was it that, almost the moment the hon. Minister of Railways got his portfolio, began to course up and down from the maritime provinces to Ottawa, from Ottawa to Edmonton and the far north, and from Ottawa to the Crow's Nest Pass and the far west, looking for railway business, seeing what possible advantages lay in that direction for future railway work? Who else but the gentleman who is solicitor for this company, who is the intermediary for so many companies? He it is who seized upon the idea that if the Edmonton charter could be got, that would be well to have, and that afterwards it could be changed and additional powers got, and the two passes could be pre-empted, and they then could stand in the direct passage to the north for a transcontinental railway. Any one looking at that line and seeing its direction, and then going back to Rainy Lake road and seeing its direction, can see that the Government subsidies to 500 miles of railway or more, linked in one here, and the other there, and another in another place, are all bits of what is to be ultimately projected, a transcontinental line, and these gentlemen, with this solicitor, have been spry enough to get hold of a charter for the two eligible passes, and undertook to promise, when they bought out the charter powers from Edmonton town, that they would secure the lines in certain directions.

Now, then, it is necessary for us to know if they are in the gap, in the bridge way, for a transcontinental road, which is being projected, and being subsidized in different parts, that these gentlemen are railway builders, that they have abundant capital, that at least they are a sufficient guarantee that this business is not simply a business of getting a franchise and selling it out at a profit, but a legitimate business of railroad building on an ambitious scale, and that these gentlemen are able to carry it out. It is a queer thing that the Minister of Railways would undertake to give these powers and these subsidies, pointing in a direction straight away from Fort Assiniboine towards the Yellow Head Pass, and that he should not have satisfied himself what is the personnel of that company. But he knows no one except the solicitor, and he has an idea of who is president. Outside of that, he has not inquired at all.

I see that here is an Act, chap. 63, 61 Vic. respecting the Edmonton District Railway Company. That is the transfer Act passed in 1898, I imagine. By it the Edmonton District Railway Company sells out its rights, which were to build a railway:

From its point of connection with the Athabasca River, as defined by chap. 17 of the Statutes of 1896 (first session), to the Peace River, thence to a point on the Nelson River, and thence by way of the Nelson, Liard and Francis rivers, to the navigable waters of the Pelly River.

Section 10 of the said Act is hereby amended by striking out the words "and Athabasca rivers" in the sixth line thereof, and inserting in

lieu thereof the words "Athabasca, Peace, Nelson, Liard, Francis, Pelly, Mackenzie, Peel, Porcupine and Yukon rivers."

Why, my flight of imagination was modest compared with what this solicitor proposes to do. He proposes to pre-empt, by charter rights, if he possibly can—and he has been successful in doing it—not only the Athabasca River and the Peace River, but the Nelson, Liard, Francis, Pelly, Mackenzie, Peel, Porcupine and Yukon rivers, and if there were more flowing into and around the Antarctic circle, no doubt they would have been pre-empted too. Section 3 provides:

Section 8 of the said Act shall apply to the extension of the railway hereby authorized; provided that with respect to that portion of the company's railway constructed, or under contract to be constructed, between the Peace River and the navigable waters of the Pelly River, the company may issue bonds, debentures or other securities to the extent of \$25,000 per mile.

Nothing done without bonds.

The capital stock of the company is hereby increased to \$5,000,000.

Why should it not be? Who in the world would attempt to collar the Mackenzie, Yukon, Pelly, Liard, Nelson, Peace and Athabasca rivers with less than a capitalization of \$5,000,000. It would be out of keeping with the magnitude of the scheme that there should be a less capitalization.

The railway of the company and the extension hereby authorized shall be commenced and 15 per cent on the amount of the capital stock expended thereon within two years from the passing of this Act, and the railway extension shall be finished and put into operation within five years from the passing of this Act.

Nothing in this Act contained shall be held or construed to vary any of the conditions contained in an indenture made the 16th December, 1897, between the Edmonton District Railway Company and the municipality of the town of Edmonton and the Hon. William Pugsley.

That is the Act of transfer by which Mr. Pugsley got the rights of the Edmonton company, and that Act transferring it to him contained these enlargements which I have spoken of.

I do not know what has taken place since, and I could not get the information from the hon. Minister, with this single exception, that he told me a petition was put in, which I have not yet been able to see, and that on the strength of that, he was giving this fifty-mile subsidy.

There is another chapter in this business. During this session there was an Act passed by which the Edmonton District Railway Company—that is, the corporate existence which Mr. Pugsley has had transferred to him:

—hereinafter called "the company," may lay out, construct and operate from some point on the line of railway which it is already authorized to construct, a line of railway either to the Yellow Head Pass or the Peace River Pass, and

thence by such route as is found or deemed most practicable to a port in the province of British Columbia, or to connect with the line of railway which the British Pacific Railway Company is authorized to construct.

The British Pacific Railway Company, I think, runs up through Vancouver Island, so that this is still another extension.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It runs up where?

Mr. FOSTER. Through Vancouver Island.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It runs on the mainland.

Mr. FOSTER. It has to run through the island to get down to Victoria.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has a charter from the island as well.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. So after securing the Yukon, Mackenzie, the Pelly and the Yellow Head Pass and the Liard River, and so on, they have power here to connect with the British Pacific Railway Company. This gives them power then to run off from the former proposed route to the Yellow Head Pass and over to the ocean:

Provided, however, that in respect to so much of the said line as may be constructed within the province of British Columbia or the Yukon district, or within the territory to the westward of the eastern entrance of either the said Yellow Head Pass or Peace River Pass, the issue of bonds, debentures or other securities under such section may be extended to aggregate the sum of \$25,000 per mile.

Then they changed the name of the Edmonton District Railway Company, because that is a rather restricted name. A man never looks well in a boy's clothes; and in this case the trousers only reach the boot tops and the collar scarcely comes to the middle of the shoulders. So, as this extension was given, the name had to be changed, and the circumscribed entity is changed into the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company—"but such change in name shall not in any way impair, alter or affect the rights or liabilities of the company, nor in anywise affect any suit or proceeding now pending," and so on. Then it provides for annual and special meetings of the company, and the meetings of the directors and where they may be held. And it is provided that the railway of the company and the extension hereby authorized shall be commenced and 15 per cent of the capital stock expended thereon within two years of the passing of this Act. And the subsidy as it appears in the resolution brought down is for that portion of the line going toward the Yellow Head Pass. Now, it seems to me that, with a company with such charter powers and controlling such franchises as this, we ought to have the fullest information, and to know whether it is a bona fide railway-constructing company or a charter-

Mr. FOSTER.

mongering company. The Minister, surely cannot have gone on and allowed the granting of all these powers and the subsidizing of this portion of the road without having assured himself with reference to the personnel of the company and as to their ability to carry on this undertaking. But the point I wish particularly to make is that the subsidizing of this road this year inevitably carries with it the subsidizing of the road throughout to the Pacific coast, and this is the vantage ground taken with commendable enterprise by Mr. Pugsley as solicitor on behalf of his company. Now, we ought to know the whole personnel of the company that has power to undertake and carry out so ambitious a project as this to which the Government has committed itself by the subsidy proposed to-day.

Mr. OLIVER. I am somewhat at a loss to understand to what particular point the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) takes exception—whether to the charter or to the subsidy?

Mr. BERGERON. It is to the scheme.

Mr. OLIVER. I suppose the scheme is embodied in the charter. But the charter was dealt with from time to time and from session to session and by amendment after amendment by the Railway Committee and in this House; and I think it is a rather peculiar thing, and a strange loss of time to begin an attack upon the scheme or upon the charter now. As to the merits of the subsidy, I suppose that is a perfectly legitimate question; but as to the charter, as to the parties connected with it, and so on, all these have been before the House. I do not see how they are particularly open to criticism at this time. If we are to understand from their criticism that the hon. member and those who support him object to this scheme in its inception, and particularly in its extension, I, for one, cannot agree with him, nor do I think the people in that part of the country will agree with him. In the beginning the scheme was for saving the interests of the people of a considerable part of that country, which had been ignored and thrown down under charters already granted, possibly without due knowledge of the facts, by the House under the late Government. We tried to save ourselves by getting this other charter. In dealing with this new company, we preserved our rights, rights which, I am sorry to say, so far as our judgment goes, have been persistently ignored, and will be still further ignored if hon. gentlemen opposite have their way. As to the extension of this scheme and the point raised that it is part of a trans-continental line, I do not see where the objection lies. Speaking as one from that part of the country, I can say that we hail it with all the more pleasure if it is part of a trans-continental line. And I want to say to this House that if this is a part of a trans-continental line which will carry a railway

westward from Winnipeg by way of the Lake Dauphin district, Swan River Valley district, Prince Albert, the Saskatchewan Valley, Edmonton and the Yellow Head Pass through the Cariboo country to the Pacific coast—it is the best railroad proposition before the world to-day, and it will do more for the development and settlement of the Dominion of Canada than any other scheme before the public. I am speaking of the scheme now as a railroad scheme, not of the aid given to it nor of the form nor conditions of that aid—that is a matter entirely separate, which I should be very glad to hear the hon. member discuss from the same point of view as I have discussed it. But let us not mix the question of the scheme with the question of the aid given to the scheme. As to the scheme itself, I certainly desire to be considered as supporting it in its beginning, in its progress and in its fullest development. So far as this particular aid is concerned, it will enable this company, in the first place, to carry out its agreement with the town of Edmonton and afford protection to the interests of that town and the surrounding country.

Mr. HAGGART. What are the rights of the town of Edmonton to which the hon. gentleman refers?

Mr. OLIVER. The right to railroad connection of Edmonton and the large settlements surrounding it on the north side. It will enable the company to afford railway communications to one part of the settlement on the north side of the present limit of the settlement and so enable the settlement to be pushed much further westward.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the settlement in the direction which this road runs, towards Yellow Head Pass? And for what distance is the country settled?

Mr. OLIVER. The settlement is the best on the north side of the Saskatchewan—the Stony Plains settlement, which lies directly west of Edmonton, through which, I presume, this or any other road would run in order to get to the Jasper Pass, a thick settlement for about thirty or thirty-five miles west of the town. There is some broken country then, but I have every confidence that if the road was built through that country to a length of 50 miles, it will be settled up to that extent. It has already been stated in this House that when people go more than 30 or 40 miles away from a railroad, they cannot raise grain profitably, on account of the cost of hauling it to the railway. The extension of this road will not only benefit the people who are there, but it will induce settlement in a country now unoccupied.

Mr. FOSTER. We have now had the different steps by which the charter formerly owned by Edmonton town has passed into other hands and has been enlarged. I can-

not find in either of the Acts that have been passed, the personnel of the company. I think now we ought to have the personnel, and know who we are dealing with.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If this were a debating club, and we were here for amusement, I could understand the hon. gentleman getting up and practising intellectual gymnastics in the way he has been doing this afternoon, reading the names of all these rivers, as if there was something peculiarly funny and ridiculous about the business. If he wants amusement, let him turn over the various statutes of the last fifteen or twenty years incorporating railway companies, and he will find exactly the same funny and peculiar conditions which he has dwelt upon this afternoon. It is an undoubted fact that Mr. Pugsley has identified himself with this grant, but it is no reason why he should be held up to ridicule because he has not been a political supporter of the hon. gentleman. If he was a political friend of the hon. gentleman, he would not comment upon him in this manner. I think it would be much more becoming to the hon. gentleman, if he would address himself to the subject before the committee in a reasonable way, and I am sure that what he has to say would have a great deal more weight on this side of the House. There is no reason why any of these gentleman whose names have been mentioned should not be spoken of in this House with respect. I do not know any reason why the name of Mr. McAvity should be sneered at. He is a gentleman universally respected in the city of St. John; he is a leading member of one of the strongest firms in New Brunswick, a firm of the best financial standing. Mr. McAvity is a gentleman whose connection with any public enterprise gives confidence to that enterprise in the eyes of the public. I have stated to the committee that Mr. McAvity is president of this company, and that Mr. D. L. Pearson, of Halifax, is secretary. Mr. Pearson is a gentleman who has been successfully identified with some of the greatest projects that have ever been started in Canada. The hon. gentleman has no right to say that any representation which that gentleman makes is unworthy of consideration by the Government or by Parliament. I say I furnished all the information that was necessary to lay before my colleagues, when these proposals were being considered, to give them the assurance that they were bona fide and substantial, and backed by substantial men. I did not inquire as to who were the other incorporators of this company. The time might come when it might be proper for me to inquire; I would inquire before the contract was entered into. We are not required to make any inquiries before the subsidies are granted. When a contract is applied for, then it is our business to satisfy our-

selves with regard to the stability and sufficiency of the company to carry out the enterprise which they have in contemplation. Until then I am not called upon to do it. I have no further information to give to the committee than I have given them on this subject.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I want to say a few words on this item. In the first place, I think the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) was a little mistaken in trying to leave the House under the impression that Mr. Pugsley waited until the present Government came into power to lie to the west to see what openings there might be for railway construction. If my memory serves me right, Mr. Pugsley, whose name has been mentioned, knew the road well already; he had made trips to the west while the Conservative party were in power, and was then identified with railway construction in that country. While I had not the advantage of knowing him as well then as I do now, I am quite sure his reputation with the Government of that day depended as much upon the recommendation and endorsement of the hon. member for York as upon any other source at that time. Therefore, I think it is unfair to Mr. Pugsley to say that he waited to go to the North-west to look for railway investments until the present Government came into power, when I know, as a matter of fact, that he was interested in railway enterprises out there under the former Government.

But I rise particularly to refer to another railway, and I hope it will not prolong the discussion when I mention the fact that there is no subsidy at all for it. It may be easily understood why there is no subsidy, when I mention the fact that the promoters have not pressed for a subsidy. Therefore, I do not rise because I am disappointed that there is no subsidy for the railway authorized this session to be constructed from Edmonton, via Athabasca Landing, to the Peace River. When the time comes, I will discuss the propriety of the construction of that road, though not this session; and I think I have information of considerable importance to this House and to this country upon that subject. My reason for referring to it now is, that it affords me an opportunity of denying a slander started against me some time ago, which I never thought of sufficient importance to raise as a question of privilege and to refer to a newspaper article. After I changed my political relationship with the leading gentlemen on this side of the House, several newspapers seemed to consider it their duty to try and injure my reputation in every way they could, in the most unworthy, the most cowardly manner. Amongst them was a newspaper in Winnipeg; I think it was called the "Telegram," a Conservative paper. It indicated that, from its own knowledge, I was too poor a man to under-

Mr. BLAIR.

take a trip to the Peace River at my own expense, and that, therefore, I had gone there at the expense of the Government, and this was another whip the Conservatives kept in store for me, at the proper time to show why I had changed my allegiance from the Conservative party. They have never cracked that whip, because they had no whip to crack, and as they have been too cowardly either to retract, or to state, the foundation upon which they made the charge, I take advantage of my position here to say that it was made out of whole cloth and that there was no foundation whatever for it. When they say that I am a poor man and could not afford the trip I admit that I am a poor man, and am not ashamed of it. I made the trip honestly and fairly without any aid, either directly or indirectly or any assistance from this Government or any other Government. I did not even get a map from the department, and I was under no compliment to any Government or any political party for that trip. I made it as an honest man. So particular was I that before starting I applied to the Department of the Interior and took out a mining license so that when I got out there I might not violate any of the mining laws. When I reached Edmonton, anticipating that I would go to British Columbia, I went in and applied for a mining license and paid for it. I received no moneys from the Government, directly or indirectly, and all I can say is that this is a wilful slander and a cowardly one. I have taken this opportunity to put myself right, though I do not know that it was necessary that, in the estimation of the public, I should put myself right, but it is as well to show the lengths to which these newspapers and the men behind them, will go when they will make such cowardly attacks as this from which I have suffered, although, after all, I do not suffer severely from it. Let them go on; let them not spare me on my account. But, to the respectable portion of the press I do appeal for that fair criticism and fair treatment that in this committee, I ask at the hands of every one. With such cowardly attacks as those which have been made upon me I have no sympathy, and I have nothing but contempt for the individuals who follow such a policy. I hope the committee will excuse me for having transgressed upon its time to answer this cowardly slander in the way I have done. I made my trip to the Peace River country as an intelligent man to obtain such information as is useful to a Canadian representative in Parliament. I obtained that information, and I intend to utilize it whenever it can be of use to this committee and to this Parliament. I obtained it legitimately, and I will use it legitimately.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for King's has exhibited—

An hon. MEMBER. The hon. member for York.

Mr. DOMVILLE. He used to be the hon. member for King's. The hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), has exhibited a great deal of warmth. I took down his words, and he talked about charter-mongers. Why throw all these slurs; why attack everybody. Why does the hon. gentleman want to blast the reputation of everybody? Suppose they are charter-mongers, if they are doing some good work, why condemn them. There are a great many things we could have said about the hon. gentleman which we have not said about him. If we went back to the records of the House we might find that a certain gentleman wrote to the Government for 500,000 acres of land and said that if they granted it he would for ever pray.

An hon. MEMBER. Who was that?

Mr. DOMVILLE. I will tell the hon. gentleman in confidence if he wants to know, it was Geo. E. Foster. It is on the records of the House. It was brought down when his own party was in power.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. DOMVILLE. The question is a very pertinent one. I am going to point out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that Mr. McAvity is quite as respectable a man as anybody who may criticise him in this House, and it seems to me so hard that any hon. member should find fault and attack people who cannot defend themselves on the floor of this House.

An hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I am in order; I am speaking to the question of the Edmonton Railway. Let it be Mr. McAvity or anybody else, if Parliament thinks it is a proper object for which to grant money, what difference does it make who builds the road? We might go back and recall the time when my hon. friend projected a railway from Butternut Ridge to Apohaqui with the object of carrying a lot of votes, and which has not been built yet. The project was a worthy one and I would have been very glad if the road had been built. But it was only put forward to capture votes; it did get a lot of votes, but it has not been built. Suppose somebody had accused the hon. member for York, or any one else connected with it, of having a sinister object, would the hon. gentleman have regarded the criticism as fair? The people of the country are satisfied to have public railways constructed if they are worthy projects. I do not want to say very much, but I would ask the hon. gentleman to treat his own countryman, Mr. McAvity, a thoroughly respectable man with ordinary fairness. Mr. Pearson, of Nova Scotia, bears

a good reputation. He has never preached, it is true; he has never run any temperance union, but he is a good man. Consequently, he has never had anything to fall from, no distance to come down the ladder, but he has steadily gone up the ladder in the estimation of the people of the country. He has a good record, so much so that only the other day the Bank of New Brunswick wanted his brother to act as one of the directors of that institution. What is the hon. member for York going to gain by finding fault with all these people down there? Is he taking this course because the province of New Brunswick will not look at him or his party. If so, there will be a hard row to hoe for his friends later on. How are his friends going to meet the people of New Brunswick when such men as Mr. McAvity and others are characterized as having been guilty of all sorts of villany. I would ask the hon. gentleman to remember we may go to a great length on this subject, if it is necessary to question the motives of others.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I think the position taken by the hon. Minister of Railways is scarcely a tenable one. He took the position that it would be time enough to get information as to the bona fides of the company, to whom he is granting a large amount of public money, when this vote was passed, and that was all we had to do with it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I can give my interpretation to what took place, and I propose to give my interpretation if the Chairman will protect me.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) may give any interpretation he pleases, but it is not what was said.

Mr. FOSTER. If the courtesy of the hon. gentleman does not lead him to allow me to make my statement I will have to call upon you, Mr. Chairman, to protect me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would ask hon. members not to interrupt.

Mr. FOSTER. The position taken by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was that it would be quite time enough for him to look into the personnel, the bona fides and financial ability of this company, whom he is asking this House to grant a large sum of money to it for the construction of a railway, when the money is granted, and when it is in his power to make a contract for them to expend the money in building the road. That is not the parliamentary idea; it is certainly not the proper parliamentary idea. This committee is asked to vote a certain sum of money for a certain company, but before it votes a single

dollar to give to that company to construct this work it should know down to the minutest detail, the personnel and standing of the company. That was the position I took, and that was the opposite of the position the hon. Minister took. I am quite willing that the difference between the position of the hon. Minister and my own position, from a parliamentary point of view should go before the House and the country. It was a very cheap trick of my hon. friend; it was nothing more than a cheap device to put in my mouth what I leave to both sides of this Chamber to witness I never said. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if I said one word in my reference to Mr. McAvity that was derogatory to a man, or wanting in the least in respect for a man whom I know well, and whom I respect. The members were here when I spoke, and the members are fair, and they know that I said no word with reference to Mr. McAvity that could be construed in the slightest manner into disrespect to him.

Mr. BERGERON. Nor anybody else.

Mr. FOSTER. But it is a cheap device of the hon. gentleman, when he wishes to give no information to this House—which is his chronic state—to put words into the mouth of his opponent, and then to topple over the man of straw, and turn round to his supporters, as if to show what a wonderful victory he had gained over an opponent. I say again, that I said no word in this House that was derogatory of Mr. Pugsley. I said that he was the solicitor of the company, and that he had taken time by the forelock, and had got privileges. He had a perfect right to do it. There is no derogation or contempt to him implied in that, so I did not say a word derogatory to Mr. Pugsley. I know Mr. Pugsley well, and I am not here to speak of him, or of any man, in a derogatory way, and I did not do it. But a little cheap sympathy and applause was sought to be gained by the Minister of Railways and Canals and his bosom friend in imputing to me the charge of speaking of these gentlemen as the embodiment of all villainies. Nothing of the kind; I did not do it. But I say we have a right, when voting the people's money—and it is ours, as representatives and trustees of the people, and does not belong to the Minister of Railways and Canals—to demand, and it is his duty to give us, the personnel of this company to which we are asked to vote a large subsidy, so that we may judge whether we should give it into their hands or not. The company might be composed of the most respectable men in the world, and yet this House might come to the conclusion that under certain circumstances it would not vote the money to that company. This is a perfectly tenable position. The Minister of Railways says that it is time enough for him to give the information to the House when the Government come to give a contract to this com-

Mr. FOSTER.

pany; but this is the time, when we are voting the subsidy, that we should have the personnel of the company. With reference to the remark of the gentleman who spoke last, I have not a word to say.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend, who is an experienced parliamentarian, knows as well as anybody in this House, if not better, that there is a hazy line, when you speak of men or things, where it is difficult to say whether you speak respectfully or disrespectfully. When my hon. friend spoke of Mr. Pugsley in his last address, he spoke in a manner to which nobody could take exception; but when he spoke of him in his previous address, to those who listened to him, it was a question whether or not he was speaking in derision or otherwise. When he spoke of Mr. Pugsley dancing around Parliament, and dancing around the department, going about as a charter-monger, I do not think my hon. friend was showing the proper respect to Mr. Pugsley which he now professes for him: and, therefore, he must not find fault if he laid himself open to strictures which I think were well deserved. But, coming to the main point of the objection of my hon. friend, let us see where we are. My hon. friend wants to have information in regard to this company. My hon. friend knows perhaps as much in this respect as the Minister of Railways or anybody else. He has only to turn to the statutes.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I turned up the statute, and there is no name that appears there.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is wrong.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, I have not seen it.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend must not forget that there has been a series of charters in regard to this company. The first was in 1895—an Act to incorporate the Edmonton District Company—and here are the first incorporators:

Herbert Charles Wilson, William Summerville Edmiston, John Edmund Kelly, Colin Ferrie Strang, John Cameron, Thomas Bellamy, Joseph Henry Picard, all of Edmonton, and William Tyndale Jennings, of Toronto.

The charter they obtained was for this purpose:

The company to lay out, construct and operate a railway of the gauge of four feet eight and one-half inches from some point within the town of Edmonton, in the district of Alberta, North-west Territories of Canada; thence in a southerly direction to a point in South Edmonton on the Calgary and Edmonton Railway, and to connect therewith; also from some point within the said town of Edmonton, thence in a north-westerly direction via the village of St. Albert to a point on the Athabasca River, at or near Fort Assiniboine, with a branch to Stony Plains; also from some point within the said town of Edmonton, thence in a north-easterly direction

to a point at or near Fort Saskatchewan, together with a branch to a point on Sturgeon River.

This charter has been extended from time to time by this Parliament. Now, my hon. friend a moment ago said that this company, which started with this small beginning, had extended its charter in almost every direction—to the Liard, the Pelly, the Yukon, the Peace, and so on. Nobody took any exception to the granting of these powers to this company, and it is now too late in the day to question whether Parliament in that respect acted wisely or unwisely. We did it, and there is the end of it.

Mr. FOSTER. Not the end.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, so far as granting the power is concerned. It is too late in the day for my hon. friend to say that Parliament should not have granted that power.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is the inference from the hon. gentleman's remarks. The question now is, whether we shall grant this subsidy or not. My hon. friend wants to know who the incorporators are. My hon. friend knows that the shareholders of a company may change ten times over. The original incorporators may have sold their rights, and may now have nothing to do with the company at all. Evidently, that is the case; and now the Government is asked to grant a subsidy to this Edmonton District Railway Company.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend reads item 41, he will see that this is a different company.

The PRIME MINISTER. By an Act passed this session the name is changed; but it is the same company under another name, and the officers of the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company to-day are the men who were the officers of the Edmonton District Railway Company. Now, who are they? My hon. friend has a right to know whether or not this company is able to carry on the work it has undertaken to do. But my hon. friend knows as well as I do that if a railway company, or any other kind of company, comes before Parliament for any grant, favour or right, Parliament never demands the list of its incorporators or shareholders. The officers themselves may not know who the shareholders are. The hon. gentleman knows that a company is never represented by its shareholders in a matter of this kind, but by its board of directors. If the president and secretary of this company were men of straw, with no weight, or credit, or capital, or respectability, my hon. friend might have made a point against this proposition. But my answer to my hon. friend is this. We have the president and the secretary of this company speaking for it. As to Mr. Pearson, I do

not know him; but I understand that he is a man of respectability in the community where he lives. But the name of Mr. McAvity, the president, is known all over Canada as that of one of the most respectable business men of the country. When Mr. George McAvity lends his name to any enterprise, does that fact not carry with it a certainty that the enterprise is not a bogus one, but one that should receive the confidence of the Government and Parliament—nay, of my hon. friend himself? He will not dispute that, I am sure, and, therefore, what more information does he want? Is the scheme a meritorious one or not? As to the merits of the scheme, I refer the House to the remarks of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), which, I think, are conclusive.

My hon. friend says it may be a scheme for a trans-continental line. What if it is? Who objects to that? For my part I would be glad to believe that it is a trans-continental scheme, but I do not believe that for many years to come, at all events, it can have that character. But if it has, that cannot be an objection. Therefore, if the scheme is meritorious and the men who ask for the grant carry weight and respectability, I want to know what more my hon. friend can expect?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend's own intelligence and good sense will teach him what more is necessary. I would like to see the document from which the hon. gentleman read.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have a memo. on it for my own private purposes.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the document the hon. gentleman read?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is an abstract, and I am not going to furnish my own private memo. to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it was an application signed by Mr. George McAvity?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. The Prime Minister read it to the House as being the application of these parties.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is an abstract from their application.

Mr. FOSTER. The application was read by the Prime Minister, signed by George McAvity, but the Minister of Railways says it is only a private memo. of his own. That must be incorrect. No private memo. of the Minister himself can be the petition upon which is based the grant. Surely that cannot be.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I find, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FOSTER. I have the floor. My hon. friend also will know that something more is necessary, when we are voting large sums of money for the construction of a work, than to know simply its president. The hon. gentleman's argument is that all the House has a right to know is who is president of the company, into whose hands you propose to entrust this public work and the expenditure of this money. Surely that is not a position my hon. friend would try to maintain. We are giving this vote to the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company and we have a perfect right to know who that company is. My hon. friend does not satisfy the demands of this House or the demands of justice in this respect, unless he gives us more than merely the name of the president. A man may be a man of the utmost respectability, as the president of a company, and yet his company, as a whole, may not be of that character.

(The Minister of Railways and Canals sent a paper across the floor to Mr. Foster.)

Mr. FOSTER. What is this?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is one of the documents my hon. friend wishes to see.

Mr. FOSTER. This is not signed by George McAvity. The name we have to conjure with is the name of George McAvity. That was the name to the petition that the Prime Minister read. But just shortly before the Prime Minister read, or while he was reading it, the Minister of Railways scored out something upon it with his pen, and consequently it became impossible to pass it over to other members of the House. It is no longer a public document.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was not a public document in any shape.

Mr. BERGERON. It should not have been read in the House, then.

Mr. FOSTER. This is simply a statement from Mr. Pearson, who is not the president of the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company, but the solicitor of the Edmonton District Railway Company (Limited). He says that he is authorized by his company to ask for a grant. But this is not a grant to the Edmonton Railway Company, but to the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company, a different corporation and a different entity.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The memo. which the hon. gentleman has is a copy of the document which was sent to me by the department, but the paper from which my right hon. friend read and from which I gave the names to the committee of the officers, was a memo. made for my own private information.

Mr. BERGERON. It belongs to the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. BERGERON. It should not have been read.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that contain the names of the company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It contains the names of the president and the secretary, and the hon. gentleman will not get the document.

Mr. FOSTER. Then perhaps my hon. friend will not get his vote.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If he resists our getting the vote until he gets the document, he will resist for some considerable time. I am under no obligation to give it, and will not yield to the dictation of any hon. gentleman to furnish private memoranda which I have in my possession, and have had prepared for myself for the purposes of these discussions. I am ready to furnish copies of all documents received in the department, (but private memo. I will not furnish, and from a private memorandum which I have in my hand I read to the committee. I ascertained from that document that the name of the president of the company was Mr. George McAvity, and the secretary Mr. Pearson, and I ascertained further that—

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman read the original document?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will bring the original from which the abstract was made, but will not furnish this memo. The request is absurd.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman must not put the question as though it is a matter between himself and myself.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I put it as though it was a question I had a right to determine, and will determine.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I want to explain—

Mr. FOSTER. I have the floor.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) has the floor.

Mr. FOSTER. What I was proceeding to say was this, that I do not think the hon. Minister has any right to make this matter a personal one between himself and myself, and to say that he does not propose personally to yield to the dictation of any one. I would be very sorry, Sir, to attempt to dictate to him. It is not as a private person I am speaking, but I am speaking in a representative capacity, and I am asking for information to which I think, as a representative, I am entitled; and if it is the right of a representative to dictate and compel the Minister, he must submit to be being dictated to and compelled. That is what he is there for. He has no right to stand up in his place in this House and to say to a representative of the people, who asks for

proper information, that he will not give it and will not be dictated to. That is a new doctrine to this House, and it is a doctrine which will not go down.

Mr. BERGERON. A Liberal doctrine.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no right to the hon. gentleman's private memorandum. But it is an odd circumstance that the hon. gentleman brought down with his papers a memorandum of information from which he read the petitions signed by Mr. George McAvity; and the Prime Minister had it passed to him, and he read the petition signed by Mr. George McAvity; but when I asked to see that, it suddenly became a private document and could not be shown. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement that it is a private document. The petition may be transcribed among memoranda of his own. But what I feel now that I must insist upon is that we shall see the petition signed by this company upon which this vote is based. I also want to have the personnel of the company of which George McAvity is the chairman. These things, as a representative, and not as a person, it is my right to have, and I propose to insist upon that right.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is a good deal of declamation upon the part of my hon. friend for which there is not the slightest occasion. He knows how these things are done. An abstract of the case is brought here, and the whole memorandum is typewritten. The name to the petition, in this case, would be typewritten like the rest. The hon. gentleman has a right to the petition and he shall have it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say, nor could I say, from personal knowledge, whether the petition is signed by Mr. McAvity and Mr. Pearson or not. All I know is that from the memorandum before me, Mr. McAvity is the president of the company, Mr. Pearson is the secretary. Whatever documents we have in the office will be furnished as a matter of course and not as a matter of peremptory demand on the part of the hon. gentleman. There is no possible objection to bringing them down. But I do protest against the hon. gentleman representing that either my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or myself professed to be reading a paper signed by these gentlemen. I furnished the names of the officers of the company when they were asked for; but when the hon. gentleman wished to know who are the incorporators of the company, I could not tell him. I do not know that we have the information he wants, but so far as we have it, it shall certainly be furnished.

Mr. BERGERON. It comes to this—that it would seem that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) has not taken the precaution to get all the information he should have concern-

ing this company that asks for a subsidy of \$320,000. This may be a mere company on paper. Surely he must recognize that we have a duty to perform, and that the members of the House are entitled to every possible information before we consent to voting public money to the tune of \$320,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Where do you get the amount?

Mr. BERGERON. Fifty miles at \$6,400 a mile makes about the sum I have mentioned.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It appears to me that my hon. friend's criticism is hardly fair. He knows that this company was incorporated by Act of this House.

Mr. FOSTER. Which one?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Edmonton District.

Mr. BERGERON. It has changed hands since then.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But, as an old member of this House and the Railway Committee, my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) knows that every charter granted incorporates certain parties with power as provisional directors, and after the incorporation or organization of the company, they have the right, under the legislation granted to associate with them all persons who may become shareholders under the Act. It seems unfair and unreasonable for any hon. member of this House to say that a subsidy granted by this House should depend upon the names of the incorporators as they appear in the Act, or that we should demand the names of the shareholders of the company before any business is done. This is quite contrary to all the precedents of Parliament and to the principle of the legislation we grant to railway companies. The Canadian Pacific Railway itself is represented here in the largest possible transaction by its president or secretary or other paid officer who may be very weak financially himself. As to the shareholders of that company, they may be all changed in a single day, and so may the directors.

Mr. BERGERON. But we know them. The list is published every six months.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But they may be all changed the day after publication takes place—shareholders, directors and president.

Mr. DAVIN. May I ask my hon. friend a question? I am asking for information. Do I understand him to say that at no stage of our legislation is it necessary or are we entitled, in the interests of the public, to know the parties with whom we are dealing?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Quite the contrary. Many of the mistakes of the past respecting the granting of subsidies to railway companies have been due to dealing with men who were well known not to have any financial strength, and, perhaps, none too good a character. I was trying to point out that the mere fact that the names of the incorporators of a company or the shareholders being made known would be no guarantee to this Parliament or to the Government in making a business arrangement with them. And if my hon. friend were fair in the matter, having had this railway company's Act dealt with by this House, and finding such men as George McAivty, wholesale merchant of St. John, N.B., and Mr. Pearson, of Nova Scotia, and Mr. Pugsley connected with the company, he would know that this is a far greater guarantee to this committee and to Parliament that they are going to make an honest effort and are capable to carry out as large a financial scheme as this than a list of shareholders could be. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) said that the subsidy was \$320,000. I think it was only half that amount.

Mr. HAGGART. If the road cost \$21,000 a mile, then the subsidy would be \$6,400 a mile.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But nobody knows better than my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) that there is no chance of this particular fifty miles costing even \$15,000 a mile. But this is diverging from the point I wished to discuss. We have granted subsidy after subsidy in the past Parliaments and in this Parliament that had not the same guarantee of financial solidity as in this case. I go further and say that I do not believe that there is any other railway enterprise that has come before Parliament that is more deserving of our support than this. I have a slight knowledge of the section of country affected, having visited it, and we are informed here to-day not only that it is a fertile country and admirably adapted for settlement, but that it is actually settled and that the people need the railway. It seems to me that this is a proper way to develop that country. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), I think, has brought more imagination than logic to play upon this question. He has read the charter powers of the company and so on. But the powers given under the Act are such as the Railway Committee give to almost any company asking for incorporation, with this exception—that particular care was taken in this charter, which has not been taken in the past, to limit the powers of the company and protect the rights of the people of the district. Special clauses have been inserted in this Bill that should have been inserted in charters given to companies in the past. I believe it is in the interest of Canada that this section of country should be developed. I

Mr. DAVIN.

I think the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) will agree with me that no more desirable enterprise in the interests of the prosperity of Canada could be carried out, if done with a reasonable subsidy, than the continuation of this road from Edmonton to Victoria. I would be willing to pledge myself to any company that would carry out this project all the way through, because I believe it would return to the Dominion in a short time one hundred times the value of the grant. I am surprised at the technical opposition that is being taken to this grant, when we have such strong and respectable men representing the company applying for it.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not understand the hon. member for York to oppose it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. When a gentleman makes a long statement we have to draw our conclusions from that statement. If he is not opposed to it, why waste the valuable time of Parliament in a long discussion? For myself, I have tried to defend the enterprise and to give reasons for doing so. In my opinion, it is one of the best enterprises that are before Parliament at the present time, and I am surprised that it should receive any opposition. I would appeal to my hon. friends to acknowledge that the men who have applied on behalf of this company are a sufficient guarantee of its bona fides, and let us lose no more time in discussing this question.

Mr. HAGGART. What the Opposition have been wanting, we have received from the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), and from the chairman of the Railway Committee (Mr. Sutherland). We have all along contended that this was a transcontinental road that we were subsidizing; the member for Alberta and the chairman of the Railway Committee take the same ground.

Mr. OLIVER. I defended the grant on local grounds.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman contended that this was a road that started in Ontario and went to Calgary, and by the Swan River to Edmonton, and from Edmonton to the coast. This is the information we have been trying to drag out of the Minister of Railways and Canals. We wanted to know whether we were subsidizing a transcontinental road or not, and these hon. gentlemen have furnished us with the information. This is, perhaps, one of the greatest schemes that were ever introduced into Parliament, except the Canadian Pacific Railway, and when a scheme like this comes up we have a right to the fullest information.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend misunderstood me. What defence I made of the scheme was made as a purely local scheme. I said it might become a portion of a transcontinental line, but, for the present, I was defending it as a purely local railway.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman, then, thinks it may become a transcontinental line, but the member for Alberta defended it from its initial starting point at Toronto to the Pacific coast. What is this company we are subsidizing now? It was incorporated in 1895, the names of the incorporators were given in the Act. The right hon. gentleman says it is not necessary to ascertain who take the place of the original incorporators. He forgets that in 1897 there was an indenture made by this particular company, and the whole company, *holus bolus*, is transferred in trust to a person of the name of Pagsley. We want to see that indenture, and to know who the incorporators are in that indenture. The hon. gentleman says he has a petition from a Mr. McAvity, president of this railway company, in favour of this grant.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I merely said that Mr. McAvity was president, and Mr. Pearson was secretary.

Mr. HAGGART. But I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he had a petition from them asking for this subsidy.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a petition in the office from the company praying that a subsidy should be given.

Mr. HAGGART. Is there one from Messrs. Pearson and McAvity for a subsidy for this particular line?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think they have signed it. We have the original document.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood that the Minister read a petition from Mr. Pearson in favour of this grant.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is in error. I did not profess to be reading a petition from them. In answer to a request for the names of the officers of the company, I read the names of Mr. McAvity, who was president, and Mr. Pearson, who is stated to me to be secretary. They appear on a memorandum made by the officers of my department for my private information. I did not read these names as being at the foot of a petition, for I did not know whether they were at the foot of a petition or not. I have sent for the petition, the original document will be here.

Mr. HAGGART. I leave it to the right hon. gentleman if the Minister of Railways and Canals did not lead this House to believe that Mr. McAvity had petitioned in favour of a grant for this road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No doubt the company did.

Mr. HAGGART. I leave it to the right hon. gentleman if the Minister of Railways

and Canals did not lead this House to believe that Mr. Pearson, the secretary, had petitioned in favour of this grant. The hon. gentleman could not have read the petition of Mr. Pearson in reference to this particular part. The petition of this gentleman is for an entirely different road; instead of being for a road to the west of Edmonton it is for one to the east of Edmonton. Let me read what the petition says:

I am authorized by the Edmonton and District Railway Company (Limited) to ask for a grant to aid in the construction of a line or lines of railway in the territory of Alberta, commencing at a point at or near the terminus of the Calgary and Edmonton Railway in the town of South Edmonton, thence to a point in North Edmonton a distance of six miles or thereabouts, thence westerly 100 miles or thereabouts, also commencing at a point on the last mentioned line in the town of North Edmonton aforesaid, and running thence easterly a distance of 20 miles or thereabouts to a point at or near Fort Saskatchewan; 6,400 acres of land per mile of said railway constructed and a guarantee of \$80,000 per year for 20 years, subject to the same terms and conditions as provided in the contract for a subsidy with the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.

Your obedient servant,

B. F. PEARSON,

Solicitor, Edmonton Dist. Ry. Co. (Ltd.).

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They did not get all that.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what the Prime Minister sent over.

The PRIME MINISTER. I sent over the papers we had here. I do not see any different petition in that paper.

Mr. HAGGART. This was a petition signed by Mr. B. F. Pearson.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is a grant to the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company for a railway from the town of South Edmonton, N.W.T., to North Edmonton, and thence westerly towards the Yellow Head Pass.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the petition from the president is precisely the same. I should doubt very much that there were two petitions.

The PRIME MINISTER. A petition of that kind is not from Mr. So-and-so; it is from the company.

Mr. HAGGART. I am aware of that.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) is aware of it, he had better state that he is aware of it. The petition is from the company, and it is only signed, on behalf of the company, by George McAvity, the president, and B. F. Pearson, the secretary.

Mr. HAGGART. I am aware that the Government did not make any such grant as that. But what I am arguing is, that there was a petition from Mr. McAvity, or

Mr. Pearson, in favour of a different project.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no petition from Mr. McAvity or Mr. Pearson, but there is a petition from the company.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Pearson signs it on behalf of the company. Now, we have got it that the petition is one from the company. A few moments ago we were told that the Government had a petition from Mr. McAvity and Mr. Pearson in support of it, and that Mr. McAvity would guarantee the completion of the undertaking. I know nothing at all of these gentlemen, and it may be that they are as capable as any one else in the country to construct the railway. I have never heard of Mr. McAvity before, but I take the assurance of the hon. Minister of Railways and of the right hon. Prime Minister, that Mr. McAvity is financially capable, and that anything he puts his name to, he will carry out. But we find out there is no communication from Mr. McAvity on the subject, but that the only communication is from the company with which Mr. McAvity is connected. Mr. McAvity may be privately guaranteeing the enterprise, but he does not come out and publicly support it. It is as a matter of form, as a member of the company, that he petitions the Government for assistance to build this line of railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I sent over to the department for the original documents. Here is a plan, which I will hand over to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), but in the meantime I will read this document, and I have no objection to the hon. gentleman having it, when I have read it. It is as follows:—

The petition of the Edmonton District Railway Company humbly sheweth:

That your petitioner, the Edmonton District Railway Company, was incorporated by Act of the Parliament of Canada, 59 Victoria (1896) cap. 17, with authority to construct and operate a line of railway of standard gauge from some point within the town of Edmonton, in the district of Alberta, N.W.T. of Canada, thence in a southerly direction to a point in South Edmonton on the Calgary and Edmonton Railway, and connecting therewith; also from some point within the said town of Edmonton, thence in a north-westerly direction by way of the village of St. Albert to a point on the Athabasca River at or near Fort Assiniboine, with a branch to Stony Plains; also from some point within the said town of Edmonton, thence in a north-easterly direction to a point at or near Fort Saskatchewan, together with a branch to a point on the Sturgeon River.

That by an amending Act, passed by the Parliament of Canada, 61 Victoria (1898), chap. 63, the said Edmonton District Railway Company was further authorized to construct and operate a line of railway from its point of connection with the Athabasca River, as above set forth, to the Peace River, thence to a point on the Nelson River, and thence by way of the Nelson, Liard and

Mr. HAGGART.

Frances rivers to the navigable waters of the Pelly River.

2. That the co-operation of capitalists of ample means has been secured in furtherance of this enterprise, and your petitioner relies on this co-operation, together with such Dominion and local subsidies as may be obtained for the satisfactory completion of the undertaking.

3. The present operations of your petitioner, the said company, will, if it is contemplated, be confined to the building of the short strip of railway from the town of Edmonton to the town of South Edmonton, a distance of about four and one-half miles, and also the building of the extension northerly to the point on the Athabasca near Fort Assiniboine, a distance of about 92 miles, as provided for in the Act 59 Victoria, cap. 17, above referred to. The present application is merely for assistance in the erection of these two sections of the company's undertaking.

4. That the cost per mile of the sections mentioned will, it is estimated, vary to a great extent, the work contemplated on the  $4\frac{1}{2}$  mile strip from Edmonton southerly to South Edmonton being, from the nature of the country traversed, exceedingly costly and expensive, while that from Edmonton northerly towards Fort Assiniboine being of not more than average difficulty. Between South Edmonton and Edmonton the road, as projected, crosses the north branch of the Saskatchewan River by way of the railway and highway bridge now being constructed by the Government of Canada. The situation and level of the bridge necessitates very difficult grades, cuttings and embankments on both sides of the river, as well from the junction with the Calgary and Edmonton Railway at South Edmonton to the bridge, as from the bridge to the high lands or plateau forming the upper part of the town of Edmonton, where the company's shops, sheds and general station will ultimately be situated. The estimated cost, therefore, of the strip of railway from Edmonton to South Edmonton, based upon accurate and careful survey by competent engineers, is \$25,000 per mile, while the estimated cost of the section of railway from Edmonton to Fort Assiniboine, based upon preliminary surveys and the current price in that locality of materials, rails, sleepers, and the like, is \$16,000 per mile.

5. That upon the shorter strip of railway, as above described, between Edmonton and South Edmonton, there will merely be required a small steel bridge or a trestle over Mill Creek; on the longer section of railway from Edmonton to Fort Assiniboine there are a number of important streams to be crossed, among them the Pembina River, which will require to be spanned by modern steel bridges. Full particulars of these structures have not as yet been received from the engineers.

The country to be traversed in the proposed route to the Athabasca River consists of excellent farming and grazing districts; but the chief value of the road lies in the fact that it is a necessary link in connecting Edmonton and the railway system of the North-west with the great water routes of the North-west Territories. From Fort Assiniboine above mentioned there is an excellent water route, available, with the exception of a few easy portages, even as far north as the Klondike district, and the steamers at present running on the Athabasca and connecting rivers opens up the vast mineral and agricultural resources of the North-west.

The railway is also an absolute necessity to the settlers at present pouring into the Peace River district lying to the north-west of the Athabasca River, affording them facilities and means of

access at present, to their great detriment, denied them. The absence of adequate railway facilities, such as now projected, has been represented to be the only factor in preventing the exceedingly rapid growth of this great district, which is rich in all natural resources.

Your petitioner, therefore, prays that assistance may be granted by the Government of Canada towards the erection of the aforementioned sections of railway, and, as in duty bound, will ever pray, &c.

Dated this 9th day of March, A.D. 1899.

THE EDMONTON DISTRICT RAILWAY CO.

(Sgd.) By GEORGE McAVITY,  
President.

(Sgd.) B. F. PEARSON,  
Secretary.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman said that he would bring down the petition from the company in favour of this grant. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the petition is for an entirely different road from the one he is subsidizing at the present moment. The charter of the Edmonton District Railway Company and the amended charter of 1897-98 was for the building of a road north to Fort Assiniboine to connect with the waters of the Pelly. This road that this petition is in favour of, goes north, while the one that the hon. Minister proposes to subsidize, runs in a westerly direction. The hon. Minister must surely think that he can impose upon the credulity of this committee, when he states that he has a petition in favour of the proposed grant that he is bringing down. Does he think that we do not know the difference between a line that is running north, and one that is running west? What is the reason, then, that the Minister has changed this grant from a line directly north to one west? What further information or petition has he? If there is any information, the committee is surely entitled to it. With regard to the Opposition opposing the grant of a subsidy for 50 miles west of Edmonton, I protest that we are not opposed to anything of the kind. As for myself, I am favourable to it for the purpose of developing that section of the country. But we are entitled to be informed of the plans and purposes of the Government. We have not had a word of documentary evidence presented to this committee in favour of the subsidy the hon. gentleman proposes. We have, first, a petition from a company for assistance in an entirely different direction. A couple of months later we have a petition from Mr. Pearson, who represents the company; but the Minister does not deign to give us any information as to why he changed the subsidy which the company itself requested to one entirely different.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I confess my entire inability to follow the hon. gentleman through all the turns and twists which he appears determined to take in connection with this matter. I do not know what is the matter with this project, to have excited such determined

and bitter hostility from hon. gentlemen opposite. We have been treated for the last hour to thunderings and vapourings because there was an assumption on the other side of the House that I had said I was reading from a petition signed by the president and the secretary. That occupied the serious attention of hon. gentlemen for about an hour. I felt that it was very necessary for me to put myself on my guard; and, having simply an abstract of the petition in my hand as a private memorandum, I was reluctant to state that the petition was signed by these gentlemen. I have produced the original document, which contains the signatures of Mr. McAvity and Mr. Pearson, verifying what hon. gentlemen assumed that I had improperly stated in the beginning. Now, we do not hear a word or a whisper of the petition; but my hon. friend tears off madly in another direction and declares that we are giving this subsidy on terms and in a direction that we have not been asked to give it. My hon. friend has been furnished with the information that he has been clamouring for; he has in his hand a copy of the original paper, which shows that so far as there has been any departure from the terms under which the company applied for a grant, that departure has been by reason of a subsequent application received from the secretary of the company.

Mr. HAGGART. Where is it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The document under the hon. gentleman's hands is dated the 9th of March. The secretary of the company, under date of the 30th of May, writes us as follows:—

I am authorized by the Edmonton and District Railway Company (Ltd.) to ask for a grant to aid in the construction of a line or lines of railway in the territory of Alberta, commencing at a point at or near the terminus of the Calgary and Edmonton Railway, in the town of South Edmonton, thence to a point in North Edmonton, a distance of six miles or thereabouts, thence westerly 100 miles or thereabouts.

We have not seen our way to give the company aid for 100 miles, in accordance with their amended request, but we have given them aid for 50 miles. If the hon. gentleman can possibly suggest any other reason why we should further delay the committee on this matter, he will no doubt endeavour to do so; but I think we have furnished every reasonable information that can be asked.

Mr. FOSTER. We should have had this information two or three hours ago, when we took up the item. We should have had the petition, with the grounds set forth for the application. Everybody understands that and will assent to that proposition; but the Minister of Railways, with his usual unreadiness, had not this or any other information of a documentary character, and it

was only after pounding for two or three hours that we have at last got this original petition from him. Now, the information is still incomplete, and at the expense of exposing myself to the strictures of the Minister of Railways, I shall have to point out wherein it is incomplete. In the first place let me say to the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), and to the committee that they will look in vain in anything I said this afternoon to find one single sentence opposed to the building of this road. But there were one or two points that I wanted to bring out. One is that this is really, I believe, a part of a transcontinental system, and the Government, having come to that conclusion, should frankly state it, because the country might as well know first as last what they are effecting, and what will be the outcome. I think we have demonstrated to the satisfaction of the House that that is the underlying idea, and that these sections which have been bonused to-day—in Ontario, in Manitoba and the North-west—are portions of that transcontinental line. I have, however, said no word in condemnation of the scheme for putting these railways through.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, the hon. gentleman was a very hearty supporter of the thing from the first, no doubt.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I am glad the hon. gentleman realizes the position. On the contrary, as the Minister of Railways now says, I have been from the first a hearty supporter of the scheme; and I want no better evidence of that than his statement. After two hours of debate, we have at last got from the Minister what ought to have been on the Table of the House at first, namely, the petitions; and what do the petitioners ask for? Here is a regular petition, setting forth the merits of the scheme, and containing representations as to the kind of country through which the railway runs, and calculations as to the engineering difficulties of the line; and what was asked for in that petition? First, the short line between the two Edmontons of some four and a half miles; secondly, a line from the town of Edmonton north-westerly to a point on the Athabasca River at Fort Assiniboine—that has not been granted; third, a line from Edmonton to Fort Saskatchewan in a north-easterly direction—that has not been granted. This is information such as we ought to have from any bona fide company asking for a grant to construct a great public work. At last we have got it. But the whole of these calculations are, let the committee understand, in support of the requisition for 4½ miles between the two Edmontons, a line north towards Assiniboia, in order to connect with the water stretches, and one easterly to Fort Saskatchewan. But what are you giving? You are giving to a road running to North Edmonton, and then westerly

Mr. **FOSTER**.

to the Yellow Head Pass. That is not asked for in this petition. The reasoned-out petition, giving the grounds on which the company ask assistance, giving the representations of the company, does not mention that line at all. But two months later a petition comes in from the secretary, which is simply a request, without any grounds for it being given at all. I want to know from the hon. Minister what were the grounds upon which the company, in its petition, threw aside virtually what it had asked for in the first petition, and asked instead for a subsidy for 100 miles running westerly, and I want to know the reasons why the hon. Minister, on that simple request, without any grounds being given in its support, set aside the other well-reasoned request, and granted as much as he could on the 100 miles westerly?

Mr. **HAGGART**. They had not got a charter even for that 100 miles.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Had this company a charter to build westerly?

Mr. **HAGGART**. It was passed five days ago, but the company had not got it then.

Mr. **FOSTER**. They had not that charter when this petition was in. The second petition was in on May 30th, and they had not the charter then.

Mr. **HAGGART**. They have not got it yet, because it has not become an Act of Parliament.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Did it not receive assent the other day?

Mr. **HAGGART**. I do not think so. It is only four or five days ago it was passed.

Mr. **FOSTER**. We have a perfect right to ask the hon. Minister upon what information he set aside the well-reasoned petition of March, 1899, and granted a subsidy of fifty miles due west, upon this simple request made a month or two later, and not supported by any reasons at all. There must be some ground on which the hon. Minister decided to depart from the request of the first petition.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think my case is almost hopeless—

Mr. **FOSTER**. I think it is really.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not think I can convince the hon. gentleman by any statement I may make or any evidence I may tender. An answer to one question simply furnishes the hon. gentleman standing ground for making another.

Mr. **FOSTER**. True, and it will until I get the right information.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have stated to the committee that after the receipt of the first applica-

tion, the secretary of the company filed another, stating that he was authorized by the company to request that a departure should be made from the first application. The company came up here, they applied to Parliament for the necessary authority to change the route of their railway, so as to entitle them to go westerly from North Edmonton towards the Yellow Head Pass. After they had made that application and had good evidence that their application would be successful, they filed another formal communication, dated 30th May, 1899, in which their secretary said he was authorized by his company to ask for a grant to aid in the construction of a line from South Edmonton to North Edmonton, a distance of about six miles, and thence westerly 100 miles. We have complied with the amended request of the company, and we have put in a grant for a line from South Edmonton to North Edmonton and thence westerly, fifty miles, in accordance with this request. That is how we came to do it. What were the reasons which induced the company to ask Parliament to amend their Act I am not aware of. I am not in their confidence. I only know that we are satisfied the country all around Edmonton is one which would justify the construction of railways in different directions.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If there were three or four railways radiating from the town of Edmonton, I apprehend that the cost of their construction would be justifiable.

The subsidy which the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company is entitled to receive under chap. 4, 60-61 Victoria, shall be \$6,400 per mile for the 80 miles provided in the said Act.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the provision in that Act?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The original Act is for 80 miles from Stanley. That is the old subsidy Act.

Mr. FOSTER. That is Stanley station?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, we have got to make a change when we come to the next resolution, so as to provide that these 80 miles will not be duplicated.

Mr. OLIVER. As regards the control of the Government over this road when completed, I understand that the whole scheme from Winnipeg to Lake Superior, passes a short distance through the United States. Will not that tell very strongly against that control of rates which we might otherwise hope for, on the part of the Government, under the regulations?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not see why that should be the case. Any arrangements made looking to a definite fixing of the rates would be made in respect of the mileage, and if 30 or

40 miles of the entire length run into another territory, that could be considered and have its weight in fixing the rates. I do not see at this moment that it would be any more difficult to fix the rates than if the road were running through our territory completely. I apprehend that the road which passes around the foot of the lake and through the United States, will be either owned or controlled by the same interest.

Mr. BERGERON. I think we ought to pause before subsidizing a railway which goes through the United States. At the cost of an immense expenditure we subsidized the Canadian Pacific Railway to go north of Lake Superior, so as to have an all-Canadian route, and I am afraid we are not consistent in subsidizing a line that will go partly through the United States, and which may carry the produce of the North-west Territories over to that country.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is rather late. He should remember the Algoma branch.

Mr. BERGERON. I remember the line on the north shore of Lake Superior.

Mr. OLIVER. It is desirable that we should have a thorough understanding with regard to the control of rates over this road. The idea struck me that the fact of its passing through the United States would have a very serious effect in preventing the Government from regulating the rates. The hon. Minister, however, does not seem to anticipate any difficulty in this respect. But I would ask whether after the moneys are paid over to the railway, after it is completed, and after the company have exercised their full rights to issue bonds, will it be possible then for the Government to regulate the rates and to reduce them, without regard to the possibility of the company earning interest on the bonds which it has sold, and the sale of which was authorized by the Government? I say, will it be possible to reduce the rates irrespective of the rights of the bondholders?

Mr. DAVIN. Before the hon. gentleman answers that question, I want to ask another question of a cognate character. The eastern terminus of this line is at Port Arthur. Well, one of the objects of this line is to give competition between Port Arthur and Winnipeg with the Canadian Pacific Railway. During the winter its traffic and passengers cannot go east through Canada except by the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway naturally will have nothing to do with a line that is its enemy and therefore this line is looking to dip down into the United States to go to Duluth and connect with the American system. We ought to pause before we give the maximum bonus to a line that will be part of the United States system. My desire is to fight the national system and to get the best advantages for the people tra-

veiling upon it; but when it comes to helping the lines in the United States against the national system, then I will fight for the national system. But I will do everything that I can to lower the rates on our Canadian system. Now, during the winter, when the lakes will be closed up, how is this line to get its traffic to the seaboard? My argument is this: The line evidently intends to connect with Duluth and from Duluth with the American system, and therefore our wheat from the North-west over it will be taken through the United States. When we are subsidizing a line like this we should take a guarantee that some arrangement will be made whereby the freight of our products in the North-west, which are every year growing in volume, should go over the Canadian lines, and should not swell the traffic of the United States, enriching a foreign country instead of enriching ourselves.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The hon. gentleman's remarks indicate that he has given but a superficial attention to this question. The only wheat that could go over this line would be wheat coming over the Manitoba and South-eastern Railway from Winnipeg. When the Manitoba and South-eastern, and this extension, get to the mouth of the Rainy River, as it is projected now, then the fear of the people who are interested in Canadian trade will be that a short line will be run to Duluth, and that that wheat will go to Duluth; and that will inevitably happen unless they get connection by way of Port Arthur.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I will first answer the question of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). He desires an expression of opinion from me as to whether any authority which may control the rates over this line will be compelled to take into account the bonded liabilities of the company. While I would not like to speak for the body that may have to determine a question of this kind, I may say, without pretending to determine it now, that I would feel that it would be proper to consider the actual cost of the railway. While I say that I think it would be in the power of the Governor in Council absolutely to disregard the question of cost at all, whether the company got any dividend or any return at all upon their investments, the Governor in Council should not absolutely disregard that consideration, and I apprehend would not feel justified in doing so.

**Mr. RICHARDSON.** In view of the Minister's statement and of the further fact that when we gave such large aid to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway we asked from them a quid pro quo in the way of a reduction of rates, I beg to move that the following be added:

**Mr. DAVIN.**

On the condition that the rate on wheat over that portion of the line subsidized by the Government shall not exceed a per mileage rate based upon a gross rate of 8 cents per cwt. between Winnipeg and Fort William, upon the through line when completed, with proportionate rates upon all outgoing and incoming freight according to classification.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 5; Nays, 25.

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

### After Recess.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 181) for the relief of Isaac Stephen Gerow Van Wart.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

#### RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

House again resolved itself into committee to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting the granting of the subsidies therein mentioned to the railway companies and towards the construction of the railways also therein mentioned.

The Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company, for a railway from Stanley Station, on the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway, to Fort Francis, for a distance of 140 miles, at \$6,400 per mile, not exceeding in the whole. \$896,000

**Mr. WALLACE.** It will be convenient at this stage to know the different bonuses that are proposed to be paid to this Ontario Rainy River Railway Company. We want to have a look at the map, to have it pointed out where the railway runs; we want a statement of the total amount that has been voted before, and what is proposed for the future. This is a portion of a scheme that, I presume, will involve a further expenditure. We want to know the length of the road, the portion that runs through the United States, and all the particulars in regard to it.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Does the hon. gentleman seriously ask me to repeat what I have already stated in the House?

**Mr. WALLACE.** I have been in the House during the whole of the time that the railway resolutions have been under discussion, and I have not heard the information given that I am asking the hon. Minister for now. I have been paying particular attention to every resolution that has passed, except for a few minutes after three o'clock.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I desire to withhold no information from the hon. gentleman. I know he is an earnest seeker after knowledge, but I can assure him, that if he has been in the House, and has not heard me state what he

is now asking me to state, he is not in possession of all his faculties. I can perhaps briefly recount what I have already stated to the committee. The Ontario and Rainy River Railway has already a subsidy, under an Act passed in 1897, of \$3,200 a mile, with the contingent possibility of earning \$6,400 per mile, under a clause similar to that which has been introduced in the present Bill. The distance for which that subsidy was given was 80 miles, from a station called Stanley, on the Port Arthur and Duluth Railway. The clause which is now under the consideration of the committee, is a clause in substitution of the clause which was put in the Act of 1897.

Mr. WALLACE. Then, the subsidy which the Government propose to give for this first 80 miles, is double the subsidy that was first proposed for it. On what ground do they propose to double the subsidy?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In order to ensure the construction of the line. We propose to give a fixed subsidy of \$6,400 per mile.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the Ontario Government giving?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know, but I am informed that they are getting a subsidy from the provincial government for some portion of this line.

Mr. WALLACE. Surely, the hon. Minister knows what the subsidy is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Minister does not know; the Minister has been informed that the Ontario Government have given, or are proposing to give, \$4,000 a mile, either in land or money.

Mr. WALLACE. The Government of Ontario do not only propose to give \$4,000 a mile, but they voted that at the last session of the legislature; so that they will have \$10,400 a mile for the construction of this road. I see that the hon. Minister is proposing another vote—item 30—for a further distance of 70 miles for the same road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, this is a road which is much more easy of construction, and can be more cheaply built.

Mr. WALLACE. It comes under the general provision that they get \$3,200 a mile, and they have to prove their right to any further sum.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. They will not earn any more than \$3,200 per mile by reason of the character of the country through which the road passes.

Mr. WALLACE. Then there is a further subsidy to the Ontario and Rainy River

Company from the railway to Stanley Station, to the Port Arthur Road and Western Railway by Fort Frances, a distance of 140 miles. That would appear to be travelling over the same ground.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, it would naturally show here. I think the hon. gentleman understood me to say that it was an error. We proposed to make it the point of departure, 80 miles distance from Stanley Station. That is practically covering the same grant as one made two years ago, but we are proposing to add a further subsidy upon the additional mileage between the point west of Stanley Station and Fort Frances—140 miles at the sum of \$6,400 per mile.

Mr. WALLACE. I think it would be proper to consider these three items together, because they can scarcely be understood otherwise. First, the railway is bonused and built to Stanley Station. Will the Minister tell me what distance that is from Fort William?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot state what the exact mileage is. It is not over 20 miles, I think.

Mr. WALLACE. Then they have a further distance under clause 19 of 80 miles, which would bring it up to 100 miles from Port Arthur. Then they have under clause 2, 140 miles, reaching from the end of that 100 miles to Fort Frances. Then the estimated distance from Port Arthur to Fort Frances is 240 miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. From the most accurate measurement that is possible to make, it is between 219 and 220 miles between Stanley Station and Fort Frances, and 70 miles from Fort Frances to the mouth of the Rainy River where you strike the foot of the Lake of the Woods.

Mr. WALLACE. That is where the road strikes the United States. That is the point where it leaves Canadian territory. Then we have 240 miles in all, and 70 miles to Fort Frances, amounting to 310 miles. What is the estimated distance the road goes through the United States?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Thirty-five or forty miles.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it surveyed through there?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think so yet.

Mr. WALLACE. Then it comes into Canadian territory again at a distance of 345 or 350 miles from Fort Arthur. What distance is it from there to the city of Winnipeg?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot tell what the distance is—

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister should treat this committee in some sort of a decent way and give us the information. He sits there and if he chooses to answer, he will give "about" or something like that. I never saw the time yet in this House that a Minister of Railways when he was subsidizing a railway claim like this, could not give us some information about it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I want the hon. gentleman to understand that he is not going to lecture me. I think it is most impertinent on the part of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). What right has he to stand up and undertake to lecture me as though I was his subordinate. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that I know my duties and that I intend to perform them, and I want him to recognize his duty and that he has got to treat other members with some little respect, even though he has had the misfortune to be a Minister of the Crown. I have not declined to answer any questions; on the contrary, I have endeavoured to answer the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) fully. He has asked me the length of the road from Winnipeg to the boundary line. I did not know it, and I appealed to my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton), who did not hear me at the moment. As soon as he heard the question he answered that it was 310 miles, and then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) takes occasion to lecture me. I want him to understand that I will not submit to it.

Mr. SPROULE. You have got to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I have not. The hon. gentleman is under a great misapprehension when he thinks that I will submit to it. It is possible for me to go out into the corridors of this House and to treat the hon. gentleman's question without any notice.

Mr. FOSTER. Try it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will try it unless the hon. gentleman acts in a manner which becomes a gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has made several exhibitions of himself, but none so painful as this.

Mr. WALLACE. I can tell the Minister of Railways that his attempt at a game of bluff will not go in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. He need not expect to think that a little cheap talk such as he has been indulging in to-night is going to prevent us from getting information which the House and the country are entitled to. If I desire information I ask for it in proper terms. I asked for information about the two subsidies that are being voted for this road.

Mr. BLAIR.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Did not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) get the answer from me?

Mr. WALLACE. We saw how, in a sneering way, he got up and stated that he did not suppose I was quite sincere or quite in earnest in my desire about this matter, and that he had given certain information to the House. I have been in the House every hour, I think, since these railway resolutions have been under discussion; I have listened as attentively as I could to the explanations, or the so-called explanations, of the Minister of Railways, and, Sir, I think it was a matter of humiliation to the members of this House on both sides to see the utter lack of information possessed by the Minister with regard to every railroad that came up. He had received fair warning that he would be required to place on the Table of the House, as it was his duty to do, all the papers with regard to these matters. Have we had a single paper placed on the Table of the House from the commencement up to the present moment? The Minister has read papers, and when he was asked to place them on the Table and let us see them, he declined, saying that these were private memoranda. Well, where are the public papers which we are entitled to see? The maps which he has laid on the Table are only apologies for maps. This afternoon, although Fort Assiniboine was mentioned a dozen times, I defy him to show Fort Assiniboine on the map except where it was written in by the ex-Minister of Finance.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) showed me where it was.

Mr. WALLACE. There has been no attempt to give the House the information it is entitled to receive. When he is asked about these matters, he manifests indifference, or says, "I suppose," "I don't know," and so on. I am reminded that when Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Railways and had railway projects to bring before the House he fairly deluged the House with explanations and with documents that might be required to give every member of the House an opportunity of familiarizing himself with the whole subject. But in this case as in all others, we are denied proper information. The Minister threatens to walk out into the corridors and give us no information. For the most of the time, he might as well be out there, for all the use he is to the members of the House. Why, Sir, it has become a roaring farce, the way the members of this House are treated by the Minister when we are voting away millions of dollars of the people's money. When we go back to our constituents and attempt to justify these votes, if one should be barefaced enough to attempt to justify them, what are we to say? That we investigated them, and were satisfied that

they were right? Nothing of the kind. What I have learned about this railway is that its length is 460 miles. Twenty miles are already built; there is a subsidy for eighty miles; then there are 140 miles; then, forty miles or thereabouts in the United States; before you reach that there are seventy miles, making 350 miles; and on the other side of the lake there are 110 miles, making a total of 460 miles. I think the Canadian Pacific Railway from Port Arthur to Winnipeg is about 425 or 427 miles long, so that this railroad would be thirty or more miles longer, and a portion of it runs through the United States. Canada is giving a larger subsidy to this road than it has given to any other line of railway with the exception of a short line from Gravenhurst to North Bay, which was given \$12,000 per mile. For the most of this railway we are giving \$6,400 per mile. The Minister says that one portion of it will not be able to earn the \$6,400 per mile. That is a matter that remains to be seen; but in the meantime the province of Ontario is also giving a subsidy to this railway of \$4,000 per mile, making a total of \$10,400 per mile. Now, either this railway is necessary for commercial purposes or it is not. If it is necessary for commercial purposes, it is an outrage to subsidize it to the extent of \$10,400 per mile. If it is not necessary for commercial purposes, that is an enormous sum of money to give as a subsidy, totally unjustifiable under any circumstances or conditions. But for myself, I go still further, and I say that the Government and this country have done their whole duty when they have built a line from Port Arthur to Winnipeg as part of the great transcontinental line of railway from ocean to ocean. If the business of the country requires two lines of railway, the second line should be built as a commercial enterprise; and in my view, it has not a claim to a dollar of public money. We are told, "Oh, the Government is going to have it for a competing line, and therefore we shall be recouped many times over, and the Government is going to retain control." I think I have heard that kind of talk before. The Government have full control over the Grand Trunk, over the Canadian Pacific Railway in the province of Ontario, and over other railways throughout the country. So that the power supposed to be possessed by the Government of giving the people better railroad rates has, as a matter of fact, never been exercised, and, therefore, never has been of any value to the people. In my opinion these enormous subsidies, amounting to \$10,400 per mile, from the province of Ontario and the Dominion, to the greater portion of this enterprise, is not justified by any argument I have heard advanced, and is a wanton waste of the people's money. Therefore, I shall oppose the proposed grants for the Rainy River Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if there has been any calculation of the cost of this road submitted to the department?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There has been no written report submitted on the subject, but I have had a good deal of communication with the firm of Mackenzie & Mann and have had conversations with the engineers in my department. The chief engineer is pretty well acquainted with the district through which the road runs, and he is of opinion that that portion of the road from Stanley Station to Fort Frances is a very expensive railway to build. It runs through a rough country and will cost well up to \$20,000 odd per mile. The other portion of the line, we are satisfied from information received from various sources, would be a very much less expensive railway to build, but from Fort Frances through to the head of Rainy River is a comparatively level and fine agricultural country, and we are given to understand that about \$13,000 or \$14,000 at the outside per mile will build an excellent first-class road from Fort Frances to Rainy River.

Mr. FOSTER. Have no reports been submitted to the Minister at all, as to the cost of the road from Stanley to Fort Frances, and the engineering difficulties?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not any report as to that.

Mr. FOSTER. How does the chief engineer come to the conclusion that it would be a very costly road to build?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He is acquainted with the character of the country through which the road passes.

Mr. FOSTER. Has he been over the country?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think so.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Minister know whether or not his chief engineer simply sat in his office and made calculations or any kind of experimental survey in any way?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He did not.

Mr. FOSTER. And the hon. gentleman did not think it was necessary to inquire into it before recommending the subsidy?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not beyond the opinion we have.

Mr. FOSTER. What opinion?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have said that the information I have had from my chief engineer, not in writing, not as the result of a survey, but from his knowledge of the country and the

class of work required to be done, is that the road will be a very expensive one to build. As a matter of fact, we know that the sum of \$3,200 was specifically voted two years ago, subject to the contingent possibility of the road costing over \$15,000 and earning a subsidy of \$6,400 per mile. They were unable to finance upon that grant, by reason of its indefiniteness. The information received since the Act of 1897 was passed, was that they would earn the \$6,400 a mile, in view of the fact that the indefiniteness of the grant made it impossible for them to finance upon it, and that \$6,400 per mile was the amount the Government felt they would be justified in giving to aid the railway, they ask Parliament to fix that definitely.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I should suppose that the chief engineer must have had the necessary information before him. The hon. gentleman will recognize the fact that the country through which this road will pass is pretty well known. This enterprise has been under consideration by the people, anxious to have a road, for a great many years, and quite a number of written and printed reports have been made, especially to the provincial legislature. What I wish to convey is this, that at the time of the application for an extra amount, over and above the usual grant by the provincial legislature, a special survey was made.

Mr. FOSTER. By the provincial engineer?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. At the request of the provincial government. I am sorry I cannot remember just now the name of the man who made the calculation, but he calculated that the cost of the 220 miles, for which the \$6,400 per mile would be granted, would be about \$27,000 per mile. It was on the strength of his report that the provincial legislature increased their grant, and they had in view the fact that we would give a bonus of \$6,400 per mile. This is a section of the country in which the western portion of Ontario feel a very great interest. It is acknowledged by all who take an interest in these matters that there is a very much greater agricultural wealth of lands there than was anticipated before the country was so well known. In addition to that, my hon. friend will know, from recent discoveries, that there has been a great demand from our own rolling mills for the iron in that country, and that the development of this great industry in Canada depends altogether on railway communication through these valuable iron deposits, and that, in course of time, the whole connection there might make this a very paying property. There have been a great deal of money and energy put into this enterprise, but all the efforts that have been made have been unable, until lately, to get the enterprise into anything like a good financial position. When it was taken up by Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and whoever their associates may

Mr. BLAIR.

be—and I have seen it stated that they are wealthy men, but at any rate we all know that these contractors are men of experience and wealth—and when this bonus was granted in 1897, it was thought probable these men would be able, with their experience and financial ability, to finance this undertaking. But it was found that they could not do so. It was thought by the financiers that if connection were made with the properties Mackenzie & Mann had in the west, it might be made a paying property, and with this subsidy they might be able to raise the money to build the road. I find that the unanimous voice of the provincial legislature irrespective of party is in favour of the construction of this road by means of provincial and Dominion aid. I have watched the proceedings there very closely, and I can say that in the legislature and outside of it, in the cities and towns of western Ontario particularly, they are very much interested in the development of this section, well known now as New Ontario. In view of the report submitted to the legislature—I was under the impression that a copy of these statements had been sent to members of the House, but I know that members are busy and are apt to overlook these things, but I read and carefully studied one that came into my own hands—I think we may fairly conclude that it will be advantageous to the whole country that this subsidy should be given.

Mr. FOSTER. Two years ago, when the graduated system of subsidies over \$3,200 was being discussed, I said that there were two roads that were about on a par as affecting two great sections of the country—one was the Crow's Nest Pass, as affecting British Columbia, and the other the Ontario and Rainy River Railway, as affecting the new lands of Ontario, and I have no disposition not to stand by my assertion of that time. The difficulty they had in financing the enterprise was that they themselves did not know and could not tell the men to whom they went for money exactly what subsidy they would receive—and financiers, before they advance money, want to know exactly what the resources of the enterprise are. I thank my hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) for the information he has given to me and to the House. But I cannot but contrast the methods of the Ontario Government, notwithstanding the many hard things said about that Government, with the work of our own Ministry here. The usual railway subsidy in Ontario, as I understand it, is \$2,000 a mile. They were asked to supplement that with another \$2,000. But before the Ontario Government ventured to come down to their legislature with a proposition to double the subsidy, at their request, a thorough investigation and survey was made of the cost, and so when the proposal was laid before the legislature, they had the data on which to base their claims, which resulted, as my hon. friend said, in great unanimity.

mity in doubling that subsidy in the Ontario legislature. But here, where we have a very effective Railway Department, so far as engineering ability is concerned, there is no attempt to give the House any information as to the cost of the road. When we are asked to double a subsidy, not only should we have information for ourselves, but we should have information so that when we go to our constituents, by whom we shall be questioned about this, we may be able to give a fair explanation as to the reasons which led us to a conclusion. But it turns out that there was not even a report from the engineer of the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Blair's) own department. He has nothing but word of mouth. Now, I do not believe in this word of mouth business. It is good for a man in the department to talk to his engineer, but when it comes to formulating appeals to this House for substantial financial aid, we ought to have something more than the mere talk between the Minister and his officer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What engineering reports had the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member when a subsidy to the amount of \$170,000 a year for fifteen years, a total of about two and a half millions, was voted to build a railway across the State of Maine? Will the hon. gentleman say that there was any engineering report procured or furnished to Parliament?

Mr. FOSTER. I have two replies to make to that. In the first place, even if what the hon. gentleman suggests were true, it would be no justification for the negligence of the hon. gentleman at this time. In the second place, I am inclined to believe, although it was some time ago, that we laid very full information before the House. Now, what right has the Minister to come down here and ask us to double the regular subsidy of \$3,200 a mile without any report as to the engineering difficulties and the probable cost of the road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. May I ask the hon. gentleman another question? What right had the hon. gentleman in one of the largest committees of the House last session, to declare that in his opinion the Government ought to ask Parliament to give \$6,400 a mile to this railway in place of the subsidy they had given?

Mr. FOSTER. So far as I am personally concerned, I probably know that country better than the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) does. It happens that I have been through it. I am not asking this for general information at all. But I am not an engineer and cannot estimate the cost of a

road. What we want is information, not only for ourselves but for our constituents as well. The very fact stated by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) that a careful estimate and survey had shown that the cost would be \$27,000 a mile for that portion of the line was a basis for an intelligent opinion, and one that could be used by those before whom it was laid as justification for their action before their constituents. But we come down to the pitiful position that the hon. gentleman had a talk with his engineer, who never was over the ground, and they came to the conclusion that the subsidy should be \$6,400 a mile. That is no way for the hon. gentleman to run his department, and it is no reasonable basis upon which to ask this Parliament to double a subsidy already granted. I believe that the road is a very difficult road to build after you get some distance beyond Stanley Station, right up to Fort Frances. From that point to the mouth of the Rainy River, it is an easy road to build. But that is a general statement, and why in the name of goodness, when a demand was made for \$6,400 a mile should we not have called for the report of an engineer, then let the chief engineer of the department go over that and report to the Minister? Such a report placed before this House would give an intelligent basis for a vote. In voting for this \$6,400 a mile, which I propose to do, I vote on what I know to be the general difficulties in the way of building a road up to that point, owing to the number of small lakes and the peculiar conformation of the country. But so far as this House is concerned, they have nothing before them upon which to form a judgment. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) never was there, and has not a shred of information on the subject. When the matter was decided in Council, there was no information before Council.

The PRIME MINISTER. I had good information.

Mr. FOSTER. Did my hon. friend have an engineer's report?

The PRIME MINISTER. No. I had the report of my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is going to make a very clever answer: he is going to say he had the splendid authority of the hon. member for York. Well, the member for York is not an authority on engineering matters. And my hon. friend did not have the courtesy to ask me to Council, when that matter was being discussed. But I know my hon. friend feels in his heart that we should have had that information. We want something to justify this vote before the country, as well as to justify our action here. I may get up and say that this road will cost no such amount of money; another man has just as good right to say it will cost a great deal more than that. But there is

only one way to get an approximate cost, which is an engineer's report and calculation.

The PRIME MINISTER. I submit to my hon. friend, and to his own moderation, that he is altogether hypercritical in this matter. Of course, we must have information, but there is information sometimes which runs in the streets, and which we do not require to have in concrete form in order to enable Parliament to act. Two years ago my hon. friend supported the Government in voting a large subsidy to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and he had himself taken action the year before. What information had he before him then?

Mr. FOSTER. We had the information of an experimental survey.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman had no critical information upon the subject; he had just such information as we have upon this. Everybody knows, my hon. friend knows better, perhaps, than others, because he has been there, that this is a very expensive piece of railway to build, and that it will cost much over \$20,000 per mile. Everybody knows that, because there have been reports upon reports in past years published in the newspapers upon that subject. But now my hon. friend says that, upon top of all that, we should have another survey and another report. Surely, my hon. friend is altogether too critical, and does not pretend that in a matter of this kind the department has not followed business methods, when they have taken information which is in the hands of everybody.

Mr. HUGHES. It is not my intention to lecture the Minister of Railways and Canals, but I really think it would be very much better for the sake of getting his resolutions through the House, if he had fortified himself with a little data. He could have got it from any of his clerks in a few minutes, and I think he would have found that these resolutions would have slipped through more easily. I presume it is an oversight. He should remember that the general membership of this House is not posted as to that Rainy River road. Here three subsidies come in, and I defend the subsidies right straight through. But while the member for York (Mr. Foster) had a chance of knowing the details, other members of the House are not as well informed. Now, I think the Minister could have strengthened his case by pointing out the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway through this same region. I understand it cost in the neighbourhood of \$35,000 a mile to build through a country similar to what this will traverse during the first 220 miles of its course. I say, in all kindness, now to the Minister that it would be only courtesy, and help through his estimates, if he will just bring down a little more information.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. MONK. I want to add my approval of what has been said by my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes). I think the time employed in passing these estimates would have been shortened by at least two-thirds, if we had before us the Estimates at an earlier date, and if we had attached to those Estimates a set of documents such as would justify the grant in each case.

Mr. McCARTHY. I desire to say a word, as it is evident a vote is not going to be taken on this question. So far as the subsidy to the Rainy River Railway is concerned, and so far as the subsidy to the Quebec Bridge is concerned, I desire to place myself on record by saying that I would not support by my vote the sums proposed to be given to either of these two enterprises. I do not mean to say that I would not support votes of smaller sums, but these appear to me to be much too large.

Mr. SPROULE. I see by the Ontario Statutes that they voted last year in the local House a cash subsidy of \$1,000 per mile to the Ontario and Rainy River Railway for a distance not exceeding 205 miles, and they voted a subsidy of \$4,000 a mile to the other portion of the road. I understood the Minister to say that that portion of the road from Rainy River on was the light portion to build, and would not require as heavy a subsidy as the first section. But the provincial government, for the first portion of the road, voted a subsidy of \$1,000 a mile, and for the portion of the road from Rainy River on they voted \$4,000 a mile. I was going to ask upon what information the Minister had decided in giving the heavier subsidy to the first portion of the road, because I understood him to say that the second portion, from Rainy River on, would only cost the ordinary amount per mile, and therefore, was not likely to get the double subsidy?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it is common knowledge that that portion of the line from Stanley to Fort Frances locks is a very rough and difficult country through which to construct a road. But you find a very different country, and far more favourable for railroad construction, after you pass the locks, and all the way through to Rainy River, an ordinary good farming country. The land is very excellent, it is level, and the building of a railway will not be attended with a great deal of expense or difficulty.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Replying to my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), I think the Ontario Government first gave a larger subsidy, and this vote of \$1,000 was an addition, according to my memory, to the former vote of \$2,000 or \$3,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ascertain from the Minister if he has any information as to what time this railway is likely to be completed, if this money is voted, because it seems to me that is of great importance to the people of the west. And, when it is through, what arrangements would the company have for carrying the products of Canada through that portion of the United States through which the road must run, because it must run 40 miles through a portion of the United States?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am informed that they have already concluded an arrangement which will enable them to go on with the construction of the whole line immediately. They are getting pretty well down to the boundary with what is called the South-eastern line from Winnipeg to Duluth. They say they will have the link, which passes through United States territory, constructed and ready for operation, as soon as they can get down to the mouth of the Rainy River. They are now pushing the work along quite vigorously and they expect, inside of a year from this coming fall, to have the line finished right through.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps the hon. Minister misunderstood me in regard to the right of running through the United States. I was asking him if he knew whether any arrangement had been made whereby the produce of Canada could be brought from the west, taken through United States territory and returned to Canada other than in bond.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think they will have to be bonded.

Mr. SPROULE. I think these subsidies cover all that portion of the road between where we leave the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway until we reach the boundary line of the United States.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will not subsidize any part of the line running through United States territory, of course.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the distance will be 280 miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It will be something more than that, nearly 290 miles. We provide for 290 miles; it may fall short a mile or half a mile.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that they have already a charter for the portion of the line in the United States.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I regard this as a very important line and the sooner it is built the better for the country. I think we are

giving a very substantial bonus for the building of the road, but I cannot close my eyes to the fact that this is going to be an important line to the country. I know a number of people who have gone into that country, from some of whom I have received letters, who regard it as a matter of the greatest importance that this railway should be built at the earliest possible day. The greatest interest centres in the fact that this is another outlet for Manitoba, and it is important that the road should be built for the purpose of transporting the products of that country. I think it is regrettable that we cannot have some better guarantee for keeping this line entirely independent of the Canadian Pacific Railway and some control power over the freight rates to be exercised by the Government that will enable them, in the event of exorbitant rates being charged, to reduce them. My opinion is that the motion made last night by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) was a reasonable one, and I supported it, but the committee did not see fit to adopt that view. I think this matter is important, and it seems to me that, if it was possible to do it, either by making a provision in the subsidy clause, or by an independent Act, measures should be taken to keep this road separate from the Canadian Pacific Railway entirely, and to retain control over freight rates, so that the people of the west and of the east who have subsidized this road so generously shall not be charged more than they ought to be charged for the transportation of freight.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am exceedingly pleased to hear the remarks that have just fallen from the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). I look upon the construction of this road myself as exceedingly important to the province of Ontario. I cannot understand any man coming from that province who has studied at all the resources of this particular section which is to be opened up, both in regard to the minerals and in regard to the development of agricultural lands, standing up and opposing a grant in aid of the construction of this road. I quite agree that it is well that we should be exceedingly careful to secure the construction of the road at the lowest possible rate, but I would say to my hon. friends opposite that I have examined the surveys and profiles of this road. I saw them in Toronto where they were exhibited for the information of the members of the Ontario legislature.

Mr. FOSTER. These were the company's surveys in profiles.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes. I examined them carefully, and any one who would go over them would see that it is an exceedingly difficult undertaking to build that road. It is unquestionably going to be an expensive line to build and it will cost \$28,000 or \$30,-

000 a mile. My hon. friends opposite and other hon. gentlemen from Ontario are aware that recently the entire legislature of Ontario were asked to go out and visit that country so that they might see what they were paying their money for. They went up, made a thorough inspection of the country, and gave a creditable report of the results of their investigation of the resources of the country. They reported that it is highly desirable, in the interest of the province, that the road should be built. Conservatives and Liberals both agree that the evidences of the wealth that would be opened up by the construction of that road were such as to justify the work and make it one that would result to the lasting advantage of Ontario. In the face of all that, I think the Government are amply justified in making the grant they propose to make to secure the construction of that line. I feel quite certain that hon. gentlemen opposite when they were trying to make a contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway, did the best they could in the interest of the country. I have no doubt that the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) many times drove a hard bargain in the interest of the country and I believe the Government are driving a hard bargain in the interest of the country in order to secure the construction of this line, which I look upon as one of the greatest boons that can be secured for the province of Ontario. I could understand any man from the eastern provinces, or possibly from British Columbia, opposing this road from the want of knowing everything about it, but I cannot understand any man from Ontario who takes the trouble to make any examination at all of the resources of that country, and who realizes the agricultural and mineral wealth that would be secured, resulting in a large increase in population, and who has regard to the difficult character of the construction, opposing the granting of a subsidy to this road. I had a conversation a short time ago with a man who is familiar with the steps taken in connection with the location of the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Port Arthur westward. He stated to me, and I believe he stated what he knew to be true, that but for the engineering difficulties in the way the Canadian Pacific Railway would unquestionably have been constructed through the section to be traversed by the Ontario and Rainy River Railway. The only thing that deterred them was the increased cost of building the line in that direction. They realized fully the possibilities of the mineral resources of that section of the country; they wanted to possess the carrying trade of that country and they would have built through there but for the increased cost that the construction would have imposed upon them. So that they were forced reluctantly to abandon it. Now, it has been taken up by a company that has evinced a strong

Mr. McMULLEN.

determination to push the undertaking forward and carry it to completion. I hope many of us may live to take a trip over the new line as we have over the Canadian Pacific Railway, and if we do, there is no hon. gentleman who holds up his hand and casts his vote in favour of a grant towards the construction of that road but will feel proud that he had the privilege, in the Parliament of Canada, of raising his voice in favour of that enterprise, which will result in such advantage to the province of Ontario.

Mr. HENDERSON. I regret that I am unable to see as the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) does the very great advantages which are going to accrue to the province of Ontario in the construction of the Rainy River road. To my mind it will eventually become an American road and not a Canadian road. It runs to a point in the province of Ontario where it must terminate at least for five months in the year, but can only be regarded as a through line during the summer months while water communication is open. No doubt that freight coming over this road can find an outlet through the lakes during the summer months, but for five months in the year every thing brought over that road must either remain there till the spring of the year or else must be sent on over the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, I think it is quite absurd for us to suppose that the people in Manitoba are going to ship freight over the Rainy River road to Port Arthur and then take the risk of having to pay whatever the Canadian Pacific Railway may charge them to carry it on for five months of the year from Port Arthur down to Montreal. In my opinion the promoters of this road, if they do not know it now will eventually discover, that a great portion of the road can only be a local road for at least five months of the year, and that before long a spur road will be built from a point somewhere midway between Winnipeg and Port Arthur towards Duluth, and all the traffic for those five months of the year from Manitoba will go over a portion of this road and thence on to Duluth, making connection with American railroad systems to find an outlet at the seaboard. For these reasons I say I do not view in the same light as the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) does the very great advantages that are going to accrue to the province of Ontario on account of the construction of this road. Doubtless even as a local road the eastern portion of it will be of very great advantage to the people coming in there and will help to settle the country, but I think we must abandon the idea altogether that this road is ever going to be a successful competitor with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and if this is one of the chief objects in promoting this road, in bonusing it with the heavy bonus that we

propose to give, it seems to me the Government will find they have made a mistake.

Mr. CHARLTON. Some years ago when engaged in the work of the Ontario Mining Commission, I visited that section of country which it is proposed to open by the means of this road. The investigation of the commission with reference to the mineral resources of that region was such as to convince us that it was a country of enormous wealth and enormous possibilities, and I was struck at that time with the necessity of railway communication with this mineral region and to have an outlet for the mineral products. The iron deposits that will be opened up by this road are of inestimable value, and as far as my hon. friend's (Mr. Henderson) objections go that the road will touch the Lake Superior port and that an outlet will not be available during the six months of the year, I did not understand that the traffic of the region in the vicinity of the lakes is conducted by rail except to transport the ore from the mines to some lake port. That is the case with the mines on the south side of Lake Superior, and this road will serve the purpose that other roads do on the American side of taking the ore from the mines and laying it at points of shipment where it must necessarily be transported by water. As to the iron trade of the lakes now, this ore is transported exclusively in vessels. It is shipped from Escanaba, Marquette, and other harbours to Cleveland, Tonawanda, Buffalo and other points on the lower lakes and thence transported to furnaces at Pittsburg, and to other furnaces in the interior. Now, this road does not require one connection. It only requires to touch a good harbour on Lake Superior and if it does that, it will afford a necessary outlet to the vast mineral wealth that is in that region. It opens up a mineral section of great extent and of great value, and the road is necessary for the development of what is properly termed New Ontario. This is an enormous region with great resources, both agricultural and mineral, as well as timber. The road is one of the most meritorious projects presented to this House. So far as the objections made on the other side are concerned that the Government have not taken the precaution to make an active survey and to have from their engineers detailed information as to the cost of the road, they are not well-founded. We have available information possessed by the Department of Railways and Canals, and the information which the Ontario Government obtained when deciding whether they should double the bonus given to this road or not. This information is open to us. The result of the survey is well known to the head of the department and his engineers, and so far as the Government proceeding in the dark is concerned, I may say that such is not the case. Any person of ordinary intelligence who has given to this matter any consideration has abun-

dant source of information as to whether the aid asked for by this road is necessary or not. It is a matter which I think admits of no discussion. There is no doubt that the road will cost more than \$25,000 per mile, but so far as the cost of the road is concerned it is a well known fact that the road will open up a new section of country which will develop into one of the greatest agricultural or mineral regions known. If the road is necessary to the development of that great region, I do not think it is worth while quibbling about the question as to whether the Department of Railways should make a re-survey and re-examination when they have information derived from the company itself, and from the investigation made by the Ontario Government. These two sources of information furnish the Government with ample data on which to base its action. I have not the slightest doubt that any hon. gentleman who has examined this matter will say that the road is one of prime importance and that the aid asked for is amply justified by the character of the country and by the extent of development that the road will secure for the country it is to serve. For those reasons, knowing as I do the enormous mineral wealth of that country I cannot see why we should spend time uselessly in opposing the action of the Government in proposing a bonus to this road.

For a railway from Fort Frances, Ont., westerly to a point at or near the mouth of Rainy River, a distance not exceeding 70 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the Minister say whether or not it is the intention of the company to commence operations at both ends, that is, from Fort Stanley and from the mouth of Rainy River?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In the last conversation I had with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, they told me that they had strong hopes of being able to do that.

Mr. SPROULE. In this case will the bonus be doubled up?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The 70 miles will earn only the ordinary bonus.

To the United Counties Railway Company, for a railway from St. Robert Junction to Sorel, 6½ miles, and from Mount Johnson to St. Grégoire Station, 1 mile, not exceeding 7½ miles. Revote.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You will observe that this is a revote. It evidently satisfied the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) in his day; and the applicants, having already had the subsidy voted to them, urged upon us to put them in as good a position, at all events, as they had been put by previous legislation. I presume they must have made out a pretty good case.

Mr. FOSTER. There did not seem to be any case at all last night.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was a good case, the hon. gentleman would admit, when the previous subsidy was passed, Acts were passed.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot help that. It does not seem to have a leg to stand on now.

To the Bay of Quinté Railway Company, for such extension, branches or additions to its system as will enable the said company to connect its lines of railway or connecting lines with iron or other mines or mineral or wood lands in the counties of Peterboro', Northumberland, Hastings, Lennox and Addington, Frontenac or Leeds, payable in instalments regulated by the length of each of the said extensions or branches or additions, as the case may be, in lieu of part of the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted to the Kingston, Napanee and Western Railway Company, by 55-56 Victoria, chap. 5, but not exceeding \$3,200 per mile for 10 miles, nor exceeding in the whole \$32,000. Revote.

Mr. SPROULE. This seems to be a roving commission to go over several counties.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The only difference between this clause and the clause which was enacted in previous Subsidy Acts, extending back, I think, for a number of years, is, that instead of giving them a subsidy for 18½ miles, we have tied them down to 10 miles.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose you grant the subsidy, what authority have they to build a railway, unless they have a charter?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have specific powers under existing charters.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that they have power to build to where they have mines; but I do not think they have the same power to build to wood lands.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They must have the legislative authority to build, or else they could not avail themselves of the subsidy. They would have to take the risk of that. I have not examined the charter; I take for granted that they must have the power.

To the South Shore Railway Company, from Sorel Junction along the South Shore to Lotbinière, Que., a distance not exceeding 82 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us have a general explanation of all these South Shore votes.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is only one.

Mr. FOSTER. There are a lot of bridges.

The PRIME MINISTER. This subsidy is intended to give railway accommodation to the parishes along the south shore of the St. Lawrence. The South Shore Railway Company has built, and is now operating, a

Mr. BLAIR.

railway from the city of Montreal to the town of Sorel, on the Richelieu River, and it has built a bridge on the Richelieu River. The object of the subsidy is to extend the same railway from Sorel to the parish of Yamaska, on the Yamaska River; then to the parish of St. François du Lac, on the St. Francis River, Pierreville, St. Zéphyrin, La Baie du Febvre, Nicolet, St. Grégoire, Bécancour, Gentilly, St. Pierre les Becquets, St. Jean Deschallons, Lotbinière; then it stops there. The company asked a subsidy up to Lévis, but we deemed it advisable this time not to grant their request.

Mr. FOSTER. But it is coming.

The PRIME MINISTER. No doubt it will, but for the time being we thought it sufficient if we extended it up to Lotbinière. The reason is this. This railway, as it is built, will be tapped by two railways, which will cross it at right angles, that it to say, going from the Grand Trunk Railway towards the St. Lawrence—the railways from Arthabaska to Three Rivers and from Lister to St. Jean Deschallons, in the vicinity of Lotbinière. Those two roads are running now. This railway has for its object the giving of railway accommodation to these parishes on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, which I have just named. They are wealthy parishes, which at one time were served by navigation in the summer, but my hon. friend knows that market boats are becoming gradually obsolete, because now that there is a railway on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, the market boats are debarred from the traffic they had in carrying freight from both sides of the St. Lawrence. In winter time the people are absolutely shut out from communication. All these parishes beyond Sorel, Yamaska, St. François du Lac, St. Zéphyrin, Bécancour, Gentilly, St. Pierre les Becquets, are absolutely without communication, so that there are ten or twelve different parishes, all fine farming parishes, in this condition. My hon. friend said yesterday that this is paralleling another railway, but in that he was not accurate; it is not paralleling another railway in any sense of the term, but is serving the parishes which are on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, but which were disconnected from all other parallel lines. The history of railway construction upon the south shore is this. A railway was built, first, from Montreal to Ste. Hyacinthe, and then to Richmond, and Richmond to Portland via Sherbrooke. That was about 1852. Between 1852 and 1853, another branch was built from Lévis to Richmond. All that distance between Lévis and Montreal, which is to-day served by the Grand Trunk Railway, runs in the valley of the St. Lawrence, between about 36 or 40 miles distant, on an average, back from the river. Since that time a new railway has been built, the Drummond County Railway. Hon. gentlemen from the pro-

vince of Quebec are aware that between the St. Lawrence and that section of the country which is served by the Grand Trunk Railway—that is to say, the counties of St. Hyacinthe, Bagot, Drummond, Arthabaska, Mégantic, Lotbinière and Lévis—there is a section of country now served by the Drummond County Railway which is very good land, marshy, with clay bottom. The Drummond County Railway has done good work in draining that section of the country. It was originally a lumber road, but it has opened up several parishes, and is opening up more and more, and in a course of time, these will become valuable and wealthy parishes. I have heard the statement made that the Drummond County Railway could give no local traffic. Up to the present it has always given a very large lumber traffic, and it will give, as the country develops, a large agricultural traffic as well. But there was no connection between the parishes on the shores of the St. Lawrence, and those new ones opened up by the Drummond County Railway, so that these parishes I have just named are not in any way served by the Drummond County Railway, and, therefore, are entitled to the advantage given to all localities which are not served by any kind of railway. These parishes in winter time are absolutely shut out from communication. They are at distances varying from 30 to 40 miles from market, some further away, and on our heavy winter roads locomotion is almost impossible, and marketing is done under very great difficulties. So that there is every justification for giving assistance to that railway.

Mr. FOSTER. Will there be much winter traffic along that section?

The PRIME MINISTER. Most of those parishes are on the south shore of Lake St. Peter, and there is no better farming land in America. It is a large hay producing country especially, and produces other large crops besides.

Mr. FOSTER. They are not raising many of those in the winter season.

The PRIME MINISTER. But they export them in the winter.

Mr. HUGHES. That will be a third line between Montreal and Quebec.

The PRIME MINISTER. There will be three lines between Montreal and Quebec on the south shore.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not intend to criticize this in a hostile spirit. On the contrary, I would rather congratulate my hon. friend on obtaining the consent of his colleagues to subsidizing a line, which after all is pretty much parallel to two others. One thing I feared when the Drummond County line was so heavily subsidized, was that nothing would be done for this part of the

country, but I would like my hon. friend to be candid and say that this is a portion, purely and simply, of the Atlantic and Lake Superior road.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not at all.

Mr. BERGERON. It will be, there is no question about it. I do not say that there is any harm in that, but my impression is it will.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is the South Shore not a different company?

Mr. BERGERON. From Sorel to Montreal, but that part which is subsidized here, I am convinced, will be part of the Atlantic and Lake Superior. I do not see any other way for the Atlantic and Lake Superior to come from Lévis.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Has not the South Shore company a charter entitling it to build from Sorel down to the Chaudière?

Mr. BERGERON. I would imagine they have. But I am putting the question to the Government, and it is my impression that this is a part of the Atlantic and Lake Superior.

The PRIME MINISTER. It cannot be. Parliament very injudiciously and imprudently gave two charters over that section of country—a charter to the Atlantic and Lake Superior, and a charter to the South Shore Railway. We are giving a subsidy, not to the Atlantic and Lake Superior, but to the South Shore Railway. That is the position.

Mr. BERGERON. It will practically come to the same thing. But I think my right hon. friend is not quite correct. I think that the charter granted was rather to another line, called the Great Eastern, that was going to Chateauguay and Huntingdon; and the Atlantic and Lake Superior got the charter which had been granted to the Great Eastern. There is no question about the service which these lines will give to the people. But I want to remark to my right hon. friend that there is nothing which shows better the lack of wisdom of the Government in taking over the Drummond County Railway than the subsidy he is now asking. The proper way to bring the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal would have been by this line. Had we done so, we should have avoided the immense expense which this country has incurred through this whole Drummond County scheme.

The PRIME MINISTER. Let us discuss that point for a minute, as the hon. gentleman has referred to it. The policy assented to by this Government, and I believe not denied by gentlemen on the other side, was, that it was advisable to bring the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. But whether

It was denied or not, I maintain that it was a wise policy. Then, we had open to us alternative propositions. We could have bought the Drummond County Railway, as we did, or we could have subsidized the Drummond County for \$3,200 a mile, and built the railway which we are now subsidizing.

Mr. BERGERON. What does my right hon. friend mean by—

The PRIME MINISTER. My position is, that it was good policy to bring the Intercolonial Railway right into Montreal.

Mr. BERGERON. Let us admit that.

The PRIME MINISTER. We choose to bring the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal by buying the Drummond County Railway at \$12,000 a mile. If we had not done that, how could we have brought the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal? The hon. gentleman will say that we could have built the railway we are now subsidizing. We had to have a road belonging to the Government.

Mr. BERGERON. You could have had running powers.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend admitted that it was wise to extend the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. If so, it was wise to own the road; therefore, we bought it. If we had not bought the Drummond County road, we should have been obliged to build the railway we are subsidizing. Does my hon. friend pretend that we could have built that railway for \$12,000 a mile? Why, that is preposterous. This road is far more expensive than the Drummond County Railway. There is no great difference in mileage, but the bridges on this road would have been very expensive. This is a section of the country where there are great rivers—the Richelieu, the Yamaska, the St. Francis, the Nicolet, the Bécancour and the Rivière Duchêne—six large rivers, the bridges over which would be far more expensive than if built up the streams.

Mr. MONK. I cannot allow the statement of my right hon. friend to go unchallenged on certain points. So far as he endeavours to convince this committee that the railway subsidy is necessary for these parishes, he speaks uselessly, in so far as gentlemen in the province of Quebec are concerned, because on that point there can be no doubt whatever. I am astonished that this has not been given, and the railway has not been built, before, because these are large and prosperous parishes, and, as the right hon. gentleman says, they are entitled to a subsidy, especially when one examines the list of the subsidies contemplated under the present resolution. But it is exactly over the route we are now subsidizing that the Drummond County Railway should have

gone. There is no question about that. At the present stage of the session I must not go into details. But let the committee consider that this is a much shorter route from Lévis to Montreal, let them consider that it runs along the river side, and that it runs through parishes which undoubtedly would be most profitable to the Intercolonial Railway. At the present moment we have railways running north-west from Montreal—we have the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, running as far as Vaudreuil, 30 miles from Montreal, and the Lachine Railways and some electric railways running toward the Back River. These railways pay enormously. An official of the Grand Trunk told me that the railway to Lachine and that part of their route to St. Anne's and Vaudreuil were the part of the road that paid best throughout the country. There is an immense passenger traffic in summer, and in late years even in winter, and it increases every year. In the direction of Verchères and Varennes, in fact the whole way from Montreal to Sorel, we should have a passenger traffic that would pay from the very inception of the road. From Montreal to Sorel, during the summer, the Intercolonial Railway, with proper management, would have had a passenger traffic immediately remunerative, and even further than Sorel. The hon. gentleman says that the road would have been expensive, that it would have cost more than \$12,000 a mile. But that railway was in great part built. The right hon. gentleman must not forget that when we entered into this transaction for the acquisition of the Drummond County road, there was already a road in existence, running from Longueuil to Sorel, which, an hon. friend tells me is 51 miles. That road was on the market. It had been sold by the sheriff, and it was going a-begging. You would have deep water on one side of you all the way, which in summer would be especially desirable. I have no experts' reports before me to demonstrate the fact, but I am perfectly certain that building that railway from Longueuil down to Lévis, we would have realized great advantage, and we would not have paid the absurd price, as it seems to me, which we did pay for the Drummond County Railway. Moreover, we should not have become dependent upon the Grand Trunk Railway, as I am convinced we shall, even at Ste. Rosalie, before we reach St. Hyacinthe; we should have been our own masters until we came opposite the city of Montreal. In my opinion, we committed a grave mistake, when we made that roundabout journey through the woods to reach St. Lambert. So far as the Drummond County portion of the road is concerned, it will never pay, whereas our line through these rich and prosperous parishes would have paid handsomely. Having reached Longueuil and St. Lambert we might then have made an arrangement

with the Grand Trunk Railway and we might have used their terminals. But there were other ways. We could have crossed the St. Lawrence without going up as far as the bridge. Once we got beyond Victoria bridge we could have crossed at any place we pleased, and we could have had our own terminus in Montreal. But upon that question it is not for a layman to speak. Now, as concerns this grant, it is there we should have made our entry into Montreal from Lévis, we should have gone along the south shore of the St. Lawrence River, along the water the whole way. We could have acquired a road which would have been a magnificent route, and cheaper than the one we have now taken by the Drummond County Railway, and we would have had a traffic of which this committee has no conception. The population in Montreal is increasing rapidly, and the local traffic for a radius of 20 or 30 miles is enormous. I regret that the Government did not give that point more serious consideration before entering into the transaction known as the Drummond County Railway transaction.

Mr. BERGERON. There is no question that, as the right hon. gentleman said a moment ago, he accepted the opportunity of bringing the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal. But it seems to me a better way would have been that suggested by the leader of the Opposition, namely, by a bridge at Quebec for which my hon. friend promises to give a million dollars, if he is serious. Then he could have brought the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal by that route, and by giving the Canadian Pacific Railway running powers over it. That would have been a great deal better route than by the Drummond County road. But I want to ask my hon. friend what he expects to do by giving a subsidy to this line from Lotbinière to Montreal. Does he expect there will be traffic enough from the parish of Lotbinière to Sorel and thence to Montreal, even for that part of the railway? I could understand it if that line was to start from Point Lévis, or from some large centre instead of the little parish of Lotbinière. Next year I imagine the Government will ask for more subsidies from Lotbinière down to Quebec, and so we will have another sum of money to pay notwithstanding all the hundreds of thousands which were sunk in the Drummond County transaction. There are several lines of railway there. There is the United Counties Railway, which also has a charter; that goes down to Sorel.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not in that direction.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, down to Sorel, and their charter brings them down below Sorel.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is at right angles with this road.

Mr. BERGERON. What about that railroad that goes to the Yamaska River and stops at the broken bridge? It runs parallel to that line which we are subsidizing now.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend has not looked at the map. The South-eastern Railway leaves Sorel and goes to Drummondville, thence to Acton and from Acton to the States. The South-eastern Railway is running north and south, and this is running east and west.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the name of the railway that runs down to Yamaska bridge?

The PRIME MINISTER. The South-eastern.

Mr. BERGERON. I see there is a sum of \$50,000 in these subsidies to rebuild that bridge. Where will that road go?

The PRIME MINISTER. That bridge will serve all the roads that have to cross the St. Francis River.

Mr. BERGERON. I am not opposing this, but I want the thing to be understood. We will have, for a distance of about 30 miles, five or six railways running in nearly the same direction.

The PRIME MINISTER. There will only be three parallel lines.

Mr. BERGERON. The Drummond County, the Grand Trunk Railway, the South Shore, the Atlantic and Lake Superior—

The PRIME MINISTER. The Atlantic and Lake Superior will never be built in that direction, because it will never have a subsidy. My hon. friend does not suppose that this Parliament is going to subsidize two parallel lines.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think my hon. friend will refuse to subsidize any railway that needs a subsidy down in those parts of the country.

The PRIME MINISTER. But the Atlantic and Lake Superior have been given a subsidy over absolutely the same ground which this railway is intended to cover. Charters have been given to the South Shore and to the Atlantic and Lake Superior over absolutely the same ground. We have chosen to subsidize one to the exclusion of the other.

Mr. BERGERON. But what about stopping this line at Lotbinière? What does he expect to do there?

The PRIME MINISTER. We have given as much work to this company as they can perform in one year.

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot see any justification for granting this bonus. Looking upon the map, I find there are two railways running parallel with this one three-fourths

of the distance, and not more than 12 miles, on an average, from the railway we are subsidizing. Three railways south of the river will then be subsidized and built if this one is built. There may be some justification for giving a subsidy to a railway that is going through a section of country not already served, or where there is no railway within a long distance; but that is not the case where you have two running parallel and another at right angles. I think a mistake was made in subsidizing three railways when one would have done the work. In looking over the map, at the time when the Government bought the Drummond County Railway I thought the bargain they were then making was a mistake and I think so still. But I do say that this vote of the large amount of money that we are now making, will not appeal with very great force to the people, especially of Ontario, when they see that we are voting \$262,000 to parallel a line for 50 miles by building another railway 12 miles away. In addition to that there is another road from 12 to 20 miles distant from this one again. I cannot understand in what way the Dominion of Canada is justified in giving subsidies of this kind. I can understand that we are justified in granting subsidies to open up the vacant lands of the Northwest Territories, British Columbia and the Lake St. John District where there are no railways and where the possibilities of development are great, but I cannot understand on what ground the Government can justify the voting of a subsidy of \$262,000 for a railway in an old settled portion of the country where there are already two railways within a short distance of each other.

The PRIME MINISTER. I must express my great astonishment at the language which has fallen from the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in view of what we saw this afternoon. This afternoon the committee voted a subsidy to the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway for a line from Ridgely to St. Thomas a distance not exceeding 44 miles, and the hon. gentleman did not oppose it.

Mr. SPROULE. I got up three or four times to protest against it, but there were others speaking and I could not get a hearing. I was called out when the vote was passed, otherwise I should have opposed it. I regard it as one of the subsidies that are entirely uncalled for.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, there is one hon. gentleman opposite who would have opposed that vote. But, this provides for the construction of a railway which will run, not 12 miles from the existing railway, but two miles.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the reason why I would have opposed it.

Mr. SPROULE.

The PRIME MINISTER. We have taken power to prevent the building of the road if we can obtain running powers over the Canada Southern Railway. But when we took it the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) and other hon. members urged us not to exercise that power, not to obtain any running rights, but to build a second line at a distance of only two miles throughout the whole length of 44 miles from Ridgely to St. Thomas, from the Canada Southern Railway. I was told privately afterwards, and I knew it myself, that all these towns and villages along the route had themselves bonused this same railway by putting their hands in their pockets in order to obtain a second line of railway, which is only two miles distant from the Canada Southern. They give as a reason for this action that their interests are not well served by the Canada Southern Railway; that the Canada Southern Railway pays attention to its through traffic, but does not attend to the local traffic, and it is for the benefit of the local traffic that they ask for another line distant two miles from the Canada Southern. They do more; they put their hands in their pockets and contribute their own money in order to secure the construction of that line. What is the lesson of this? It is that there are local conditions which we cannot ignore. It is all very well to philosophise upon general principles, and to picture a condition of things which may exist in your imagination, but does not exist in fact. My hon. friend knows that these parishes which are to be served by this railway, are left in a condition for six months, in the winter, in which they are practically without any communication at all. When the hon. gentleman makes an appeal to the province of Ontario and tells us that the people of that province will not submit to it, I tell him that the people of Ontario will not object to anything of the kind. The people of Ontario will not object to contributing their share to give their fellow-citizens of that part of the country, who are closed in for six months in the year, the communication that they themselves have all the year round. I would not be afraid to appeal to the people of Ontario on that subject. Then the hon. gentleman says: Why did you locate the Drummond County Railway where it was located? Why did you not locate it on the edge of the St. Lawrence? The promoters of the Drummond County Railway knew what they were about when they located the line and my hon. friend does not know the country as well as they do. The Drummond County Railway serves a section of the county which is not served by any other railway. The Grand Trunk Railway, the Drummond County Railway and the new South Shore Railway all serve different sections of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. Provided these two railways are built, on one side is the St. Law-

rence, and across the St. Lawrence is a railway paralleling this one, so that you will have one railway within two miles of the other. Where is it to get traffic from the north side, while on the other side it has to divide the territory 12 miles in extent with another railway. How much traffic is it likely to get provided it gets the business of half the territory, or six miles? From the custom that obtains in Quebec of bringing the people of the parishes fronting on the river together, there will be more business in that section, but the business of the other six miles will go to the other railway. I cannot see how this railway will secure any heavy traffic. From the discussion that took place two years ago, and again last year, we were given the idea that there must be a railway in that district. It occurred to me that it was the duty of the Government, instead of buying the Drummond County Railway, to build this railway, and then use it to bring the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal, so that they would not only have had the use of it to serve the needs of the locality through which it passed, but it would have served the purpose of securing the extension of the Intercolonial into Montreal.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the right hon. Prime Minister is doing this. It is true that these railways are not very far from one another, and to show that there may be something in the contention that they are too near to one another, I might mention that the people along the line of the Grand Trunk, in Drummond and Arthabaska, particularly, complained that trains on the Grand Trunk Railway were running irregularly. The answer of the Grand Trunk Railway was that they could not run trains regularly on that line because it would not pay them to do so. The traffic passes only on the Drummond County Railway, whatever it is worth, and we will see whether hon. gentlemen will have a deficit on that line, but the traffic on the Grand Trunk line between Richmond and Quebec does not amount to anything.

The PRIME MINISTER. We will have a surplus and not a deficit.

Mr. BERGERON. The right hon. gentleman may promise but we will see by the book. My hon. friend attempts to defend the Drummond County Railway deal and says that another road would cost more, but he is giving subsidies to this line, he is giving money for building bridges, and when all these subsidies are paid to the South Shore Company he will find that he will have a very nice road to bring the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal at a quarter of the expense he has paid for the Drummond County.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the resolution passes, I cannot help but say a word. The

right hon. gentleman need not have spent so much time in so many arguments to demonstrate to the committee why a subsidy was proposed, because there was a very short method by which he could have convinced the House of that. The right hon. gentleman promised it as an election matter years ago. The hon. gentleman who sits behind him read his promise in the election contest and this is the payment—a little deferred, you know. I think the note is probably one year behind, and it, no doubt, bears the accumulated interest, so that my right hon. friend has thoroughly implemented his promise. I am not going to open a discussion about the terms of the Drummond County Railway. What has been said by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, and my hon. friend on my left (Mr. Bergeron) has been well said. Both of those gentlemen have criticised that from this point of view, but it is instructive to remember that the Government, in the first place, spent \$7,000,000 as a capital sum in order to get possession of a road already built as to the most of it, and to get running rights over another already built as well as terminal facilities. At that time it was hoped that the Government would be obliged to spend large sums of money for the South Shore, but the Minister of Public Works set the South Shore claim to one side. He thought it was a preposterous thing, and in "Hansard" he can be quoted as saying:

The South Shore scheme is before you. But it is a prospective scheme. The South Shore people who have invested money in this property are friends of ours, nearly every one of them. But this Government has not to deal with friends or opponents; this Government has only to deal with business propositions. Suppose we had made up our minds to go by the South Shore. Let any of our friends opposite rise in his place and tell us how much it would cost. The South Shore scheme is out of the question.

That is when the Drummond County was at its height. The Minister of Public Works then made out that the South Shore was a line, a prospective line even, which was of no moment to them. It was thrown into the background, but that raised the ire of certain members of Parliament, and prospective members of Parliament, along that South Shore, and we find that their representations had effect, for I find that in a contest in Yamaska, I think it was, for the local House, in 1897, the federal member, Mr. Mignault, took a part in the contest, and a most instructive light is thrown upon the policy of my hon. friends in this respect. Before the people for a great number of years they had denounced railway subsidies as the most potent means of corrupting countries. They had gone to the country on a basis of electoral purity and independence of Parliament, but when this hon. gentleman came to take part in the local election, he declared, and he read as follows:—

I, the undersigned, declare that at several interviews during the months of March and April

last, Hon. Mr. Laurier, Prime Minister, gave me the assurance and formal guarantee that he would cause to be voted by the Parliament at Ottawa in favour of the South Shore Railway subsidies necessary to secure the construction of the bridges and the railway of the South Shore road from Sorel as far as the Chaudière Junction, near Lévis, and that the said subsidies would be voted at the present session from Sorel to St. Grégoire, at least.

That was made, according to this statement, in March or April, 1897, and it was after that that the Minister of Public Works had set aside and pooh-pooed this South Shore scheme. So that while the Government, through one of its representatives, was putting the South Shore scheme to one side and advocating the purchase of this other right of way and access to Montreal to the tune of \$7,000,000, a written statement, a thoroughly official statement, was given to one of the federal members sitting in this House, that the whole of the South Shore subsidies, bridges and all, down as far as Chaudière, would be granted. And tell it not in the hearing of public purity and of the independence of Parliament. This was read in an election contest in one of those counties, and I believe it had a very potent effect. But there was more. Mr. Leduc was running in one of these counties as a candidate. I think it was in the federal contest in Nicolet. His address contained this statement :

I am convinced that a line of railway traversing the parishes of the south shore is indispensable. If I have accepted the Liberal candidature it is because I believe I can do more for the railway than any other person. Be assured that if you are to be aided by the Government you must not send an adversary of the Government to the House

This is but another edition of Mr. Hardy's doctrine of cold justice. Mr. Leduc says, evidently with authority, knowing the Government with which he had to deal: You need not expect justice from this Government. This may be a very meritorious scheme, as you know it is, and as I believe it is, but, all the same, the Government will not give you any help if you send an adversary of the Government. You must send a supporter of the Government if you want its aid. Mr. Leduc was not badly advised, because Sir Wilfrid Laurier turned up at the election, and "La Patrie," which is the organ of the party in Montreal, and which, no doubt, gives the hon. gentleman full justice, is represented as saying :

Sir Wilfrid Laurier turned up at this election, and "La Patrie," Tarte's paper, reports him thus :

"Mr. Laurier spoke at Bécancour of the work of conciliation and progress accomplished by the Government, and urged the electors to elect his young friend and devoted follower, Mr. J. H. Leduc, who has inscribed at the head of his programme—subsidies for the railway on the south shore.

Then, "La Patrie" goes on to explain Sir Wilfrid Laurier's speech as indicating to the

Mr. FOSTER.

people that it would be more to their advantage to elect a Ministerial supporter of subsidies than an adversary of the Government. Mr. Leduc was well advised, and the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government went down to give Mr. Leduc countenance. Why? Because Mr. Leduc had inscribed upon his banner, first and foremost "subsidies for the locality, subsidies for the South Shore Railway." Now comes the date. That was the time when the promissory note was given in defiance of independence and purity of Parliament, in defiance of the old doctrine of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that railway subsidies were a potent means of corrupting constituencies; and the right hon. gentleman opposite, as soon as he could get leave to go down, went into that constituency and said: Vote for the man who inscribes "Subsidies for the South Shore" on his banner, and commonsense people as you are, know that we are only going to give you cold justice. It will be hot and warm and agreeable if you send a supporter of myself—if you send Mr. Leduc; but if you send an adversary, you know you have no chance of getting anything." What a commentary that is on Liberal professions and Liberal practise! What a commentary on the hon. gentleman and his supporters before they went into power! The promissory note was written then, subscribed by the Premier, endorsed by Mr. Leduc, and it is now being honoured by the party.

Mr. SPROULE. One of the few promises they have carried out.

Mr. FOSTER. One of the few promises they have carried out. It is not all carried out, but we have a good instalment of it: the South Shore, about \$262,000; bridge at Yamaska, \$50,000; bridge at Sorel, \$35,000; bridge at Nicolet, \$16,000. This is written on the back of the note: "Honoured to the extent of \$362,400; next instalment to be paid at the next session of the legislature."

The PRIME MINISTER. It is always a fine spectacle to have virtue preached by a man who practices it. My hon. friend, I think, would have done something better for himself and something better for me if, instead of quoting the comments of a paper on what I said at Nicolet, he had quoted my words. My hon. friend is too pious a man, I am sure, to make any promises in advance. His opponents can do that. But he is not a man who would make promises to expend public money before it is voted. What a spectacle it would be! What a commentary it would be on public institutions! The hon. gentleman has spoken of a promissory note. He has not shown the document. But let me refresh his memory with a letter that was written in the month of September, 1896, addressed to the Hon. J. Israel Tarte, Minister of Public Works. The idea that any man preaching virtue as my hon. friend does should have correspondence with and

should ask favours of my friend, Mr. J. Israel Tarte!

Mr. FOSTER. In order to try to reform him, you know.

The PRIME MINISTER. We shall see the kind of reform the hon. gentleman was preaching. Here is the letter:

House of Commons,  
Ottawa, Sept. 18th, 1896.

Hon. J. Israel Tarte,  
Minister of Public Works, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—At the request of Col. Tisdale, member for South Norfolk, I write you a line in reference to harbour improvements at Port Dover, Lake Erie. The late Government decided to put into the supplementary Estimates last session the sum of \$25,000 to assist in the improvement of that harbour upon the statements, plan and estimate submitted by the United States and Ontario Steam Navigation Company, supplemented by a letter from Col. Tisdale as to what was necessary to make that harbour available for the boats and trade of the ferry boats of the said company, which they had put on between Conneaut, Ohio, and Port Dover. As you are aware, the Parliament expired without supplementary Estimates being considered. The state of the harbour was such that great urgency was required for the immediate prosecution of the works. As the said company was to supplement the grant by an additional expenditure of its own funds, and it had previously expended a large sum of its own fund upon the harbour, I authorized Col. Tisdale to say to the company that if it should go on at once and complete the further improvements contemplated by the document, plan and estimates, the then Government would ask Parliament to vote the grant of \$25,000 to the said company as the Government's contribution to the said improvements.

As I understand from Col. Tisdale, he has placed all papers before you, I do not see that I can do anything further, except that if you bring down the grant I shall be glad to give it my support in the House. I may add that I had consulted Council before giving the assurance to Col. Tisdale.

Yours truly,  
GEO. E. FOSTER.

We have heard the hon. gentleman on this occasion, and times without number, protesting against this Government pledging the credit of the country before the money was voted; and yet the hon. gentleman did not scruple, on the eve of a general election, to promise to that company \$25,000 for that work. Yet the hon. gentleman poses to-day as a preacher and an apostle of virtue, and dares to preach to us and to reprimand us for what we have done. The hon. gentleman should be the last man to do that. There is his own act, and he had better keep silence in future.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that all the defence my hon. friend has? The apostle Paul might have abjured all the doctrines of a lifetime and gone straight to the bad place on just an excuse like that.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot help it, if you are to go there.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman as a public man makes a profession of profound virtue as regards the purity of Parliament and the independence of members. On that platform he brings his party into power. In Toronto he took to himself all the virtues, and after enumerating the number of bad men in the late Government, he said: "Whatever else you may have, if there is a change of Government, you will have independence of Parliament and you will have pure Government." On that as one of the planks of his platform, he gets into power; and he is scarcely in his seat before he hands over his written promises to the men who are supporting him in the House. He hands over his written promise to a gentleman who sat here for two years with that promise in his pocket—a promise of a judgeship or a governorship, one or the other; and that gentleman voted for measures to which he was in his heart opposed because he had the promise in his pocket and was waiting for its fulfilment. The hon. gentleman, after having made the promise, did not fulfil it until his party was threatened with wreck and ruin by the kicking of that gentleman and those who were of his way of thinking. Independence of Parliament! Here are subsidies promised holus bolus for a great line of railway, on condition that a member should go down and influence an election with it; and when this is brought to the hon. gentleman's attention, he thinks he has put himself right before an enlightened public opinion by getting up and quoting a letter which I had written with reference to the Port Dover work. And what was that letter? That was a matter of negotiation that had been going on for two or three years. It was a matter which the Government had considered and decided in Council; and if we had put through the supplementary Estimates in that year, we were going to propose the amount, for the sanction of Parliament. We had promised to do it. My hon. friend has not been able to read a letter from me or from any other member of the late Government to the constituencies, promising that something would be done if they would elect somebody who would support us, but that they must be careful to send us a supporter and not an adversary. More than that, the hon. gentleman has included in his Estimates this year a vote for that very work, and I suppose it will be passed by this House. If my hon. friend thinks he has righted himself by quoting a letter written by me, I think he has mistaken the intelligence of the people. The two letters are as different as they possibly can be, and were written for quite different purposes.

Mr. SPROULE. I recognize this difference between the two letters, and I think the Premier will recognize it himself. The one promise was made, not to Canadians who might influence the electorate, but to an American company who had no interest in

the elections in Canada. It was made purely for the purpose of having carried on a work which had been begun, which was standing under great disadvantages, and on which the other country had spent money to keep it going for the time being. There is the greatest difference between what is contained in that letter and the promise made by the right hon. Minister to the electorate down there. This letter could not influence the election in any way. It was addressed to people who had no interest in the election, and could not exercise any influence over the electorate, even if an election were being run.

Mr. BERGERON. The answer of my right hon. friend is not at all befitting the high position he occupies. The accusation brought against him is that he went to Nicolet and promised railway subsidies during an election. In reply, he purely and simply gets up and shows to the House a certain letter, and all he proves is what everybody was convinced of, that it is not at all safe to write to the Minister of Public Works. I think that this "tu quoque" argument is unworthy of the right hon. gentleman. Will he do the same thing as regards every other profession he made before the elections?

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that a justifiable answer? He accused the Conservative party of having used subsidies to public works in order to corrupt the electorate. He made this one of the greatest cries of his party all over the Dominion, he pleaded that if returned to office, he would inaugurate a regime of purity and economy. Well, he was returned to office, and we find him doing the very things which he accuses his opponents of doing; and when we bring him to book for this, he does not deny the charge but admits it, and in justification he says that Mr. Geo. H. Foster wrote a letter one day in the same sense.

The PRIME MINISTER. Quote the speech which I made.

Mr. WALLACE. There are between the cities of Montreal and Quebec, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, and now the Drummond County Railway, which has been acquired by the Government at an expenditure capitalized of \$7,000,000; and not content with these three roads, the Government now proposes that we shall vote a subsidy to another 82 miles of railway, amounting to \$362,000. And yet I suppose that between these two points, Montreal and Quebec, there is not sufficient business for one line of railway. I listened very attentively to the remarks of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) tonight, who spoke with a thorough understanding of the question, and I think he demonstrated clearly that the better course would have been for the Government to

Mr. SPROULE.

have acquired this South Shore line, the first 51 miles of which could have been had for almost nothing, as it was up for sale by the sheriff, and this road would have had this advantage over the Drummond County Railway, namely, that it runs through a populous district the whole way, furnishing passenger and freight traffic, while the Drummond County line runs largely through an uninhabited district, where there neither is now nor is there expected to be in the future, remunerative traffic. So that the Government has blundered in this matter from the beginning.

Another scheme which was suggested by the hon. leader of the Opposition was that, since the Government is now proposing to give \$1,000,000 towards the construction of the Quebec bridge, they could have utilized that bridge and have made their connection with Montreal over the Canadian Pacific Railway on the north shore of the St. Lawrence. There are many advantages in connection with that route. The objections made to it by the Minister of Railways and Canals yesterday were so very slight indeed that I shall not refer to them at any length; but, evidently, according to the statement of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and according to what information I have, if it were desirable and necessary that the Intercolonial Railway should be continued from Lévis to the city of Montreal, the argument of economy and the argument of enormously increased business should have prevailed in favour of the South Shore Railway as against the Drummond County scheme. That scheme was conceived in iniquity. Of that there is no doubt. By utilizing the South Shore Railway, the Government would have promoted the interests of the people of Quebec to an extent they will never do by the Drummond County scheme. Now, they are confronted with increased expenditure. Here is a road subsidized by the Government, and a large source of the business which it might have expected, as a portion of the Intercolonial Railway, it will be deprived of, because the Government are creating an active competitor against it, so that what they give with the one hand they destroy with the other. Therefore, those who are receiving the subsidy have no reason to thank the Government, but, on the contrary, should condemn the Government for not having, when they decided to continue the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, utilized the South Shore line and avoided those scandals which are connected with the Drummond County line, and besides have obtained a commercial line, the expenditure on which they could justify to the people. So, after two lines of railway had been in operation from Montreal to Quebec, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Government proposed to have two lines more, where one railway would be more than sufficient to take all the through traffic, and where the local traffic would be served effectually by this South Shore line.

Mr. MORIN. The railways from Quebec to Montreal, existing or proposed, are: the Grand Trunk, the Drummond County, the South Shore, the Quebec Central, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Great Northern. When these roads are all built, there will be six lines between Montreal and Quebec, and the St. Lawrence River besides. I know the distance between one road and the next, and the distance between the most northerly and the most southerly, but I do not propose to say much about that—no use to cry over spilt milk. The buying of the Drummond County road was bad enough in itself, but I claim that the Government did something worse. The worst feature that I see about this scheme was, that the Government made a contract or bargain with the Grand Trunk Railway to give them all the freight that comes from the east to Montreal, and, in return, the Grand Trunk agrees to give the Government all the freight from the west. This is neither more nor less than blackmailing the Canadian Pacific Railway. You cannot expect to get any favours from the Canadian Pacific Railway, so long as you treat them that way. Undoubtedly, the Government would have done better to have left the matter open, and would have done better not to have clogged itself up with any railway company. The Government is not a railway company, and it should have left the railway companies to do their own dealings among themselves. What will be the result of that? You are in duty bound to transport the freight up and down by the Drummond County road, but you turn around and you want to build a road from Sorel down to Lévis. You are talking now about building to Lotbinière. That is a local matter. But you cannot stop at that. Another year there will be more by-elections, and you will make more promises, and you will extend the road to Lévis. When this South Shore road is built, what will you do with it? You will have a road carrying local traffic, and nothing else, and you cannot get out of it. Below Montreal you have cut out all the freight. We know very well that in the summer time, the heavy time for freight, the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company carries freight down to Chambly River. It takes the freight that comes down on the United Counties Railway to transport to Quebec. Besides, all the way from Montreal to Quebec the shores of the St. Lawrence are lined with schooners and vessels of all kinds to transport freight up and down. Whatever they do transport, the railroads will not get it. Then, we know that the winter traffic on that road will be light, so far as freight is concerned. The country is very good, and very nice—I do not deny a word of it—but beauty alone does not pay. You talk of building the Quebec bridge. If you had let the Drummond County scheme alone, and built the Quebec bridge, you would have been all right enough. But you go on and build the Quebec bridge and who is

going to use it? Will some one please tell me that? There will be no one company to use that bridge, except the Lake St. John Railway Company, and they probably will send two or three cars a day in the winter time. We know that in the summer time their best port is Quebec, and the lumber and pulp that come down the road, will go to Quebec. The winter time is no time to handle lumber. The Lake St. John country is a great lumber country, but they never handle lumber in the winter. What will you do with your bridge, when it is built? You must remember that the Canadian Pacific Railway can transport freight from Quebec Montreal, Sherbrooke, Brownsville to St. John, N.B., cheaper than you dare transport it from Montreal to Halifax, because it is 164 miles shorter by the Canadian Pacific Railway than from Montreal to Halifax by the Government road. What object will the Canadian Pacific Railway have to take any freight below Montreal to Quebec and pass it over the bridge? That speaks for itself; there is no politics about that; it is plain business and common sense. You will have your bridge, and it will cost you three millions or three millions and a half, besides which you will have to pay three or four hundred thousand dollars to make connection from the Canadian Pacific Railway to the bridge and from the bridge to the Grand Trunk. What will the company do with the bridge? It will hardly be any use. But if you had left the matter open to the railway companies to tranship and transport whatever they wanted to, then your Drummond County scheme would not have been so bad. But you have tied up the country and tied up yourselves. Now do the best you can. God bless you.

For an extension of the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway, from Tilsonburg to Ingersoll or Woodstock, Ont., not exceeding 28 miles.

Mr. SPROULE. These places are quite a distance apart. Is there any company that has a charter covering this ground, and is there any prospect of the road being built?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry that the Minister of Railways and Canals is not present. I have not the information at hand.

Mr. INGRAM. Perhaps I can explain the position of this grant. The present line runs from Port Burwell to Tilsonburg, a distance of 16 miles. The object of this vote is to extend the line from Tilsonburg to either Ingersoll or Woodstock. The Government have placed in the main Estimates \$45,000 for the improvement of Port Burwell harbour for the purpose of making this a coal route, with a view of cheapening coal to the western portion of the province of Ontario. By having this extension from Tilsonburg they will connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the main line of the old Great Western division of the Grand Trunk Railway. So far as I can see the

object of the vote is a proper one, it is in the interest of the people of the western portion of the province of Ontario. This line is similar to several other lines that run between the Detroit River and the Niagara River.

2. Resolved, That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned towards the construction of the railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say :—

To the Quebec Bridge Company, towards the construction of a railway bridge over St. Lawrence River, at Chaudière Basin, near Quebec, \$1,000,000, payable 40 per cent on monthly progress estimates approved by the Government engineers, of materials delivered and work done.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose an amendment to this clause, to strike out the word "payable" in the third line, and make it read "40 per cent of which may be paid on monthly progress estimates."

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Minister give us an explanation of where this bridge is to be built and its cost?

The PRIME MINISTER. The committee is entitled to a full explanation of the appropriation which is now asked. This bridge is destined to cross the St. Lawrence River below the city of Quebec in the vicinity of Cap Rouge on the north shore, and of the Chaudière River on the south shore about eight miles from Quebec. The total length of the bridge, not counting the approaches will be 3,280 feet. It is to be a cantilever bridge. The central span from the centre of one pier to the centre of the other pier will be 1,000 feet; two anchor arms, together 1,000 feet; two arched spans, together 420 feet; four plate girder spans, together 260 feet. Clear height of the bridge over the water in full tide will be 150 feet. Clear height of masonry piers over high water 60 feet. Total cost of masonry is estimated in round numbers at \$1,200,000; the superstructure, \$2,400,000; total cost of the bridge, outside of the approaches, \$3,600,000. The company have asked for tenders, and they intend to commence proceedings immediately. They have spent, perhaps, \$30,000 or \$40,000 in surveys and preliminary work. The company is composed chiefly of Quebec gentlemen. Mayor Parent is the president of the company. The Commissioner of Crown Lands for the province of Quebec is a shareholder; in fact, the shareholders are the leading business men of the city of Quebec. I can only give a few names. Mr. Audette, of the firm of Thibaudeau & Co., the largest firm in Quebec, is one of the directors. Mr. Laliberté, chairman of one Harbour Commissioners, is one of the shareholders; Senator Paquet is another. Indeed, I do not know a single business man in the city

Mr. INGRAM.

who is not a shareholder in the company. The basis of the company has been formed with a total capital of \$200,000, of which \$50,000 has been paid down. They expect to obtain from the Government \$1,000,000 and from the city of Quebec \$500,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What control will the Government have over the tolls? Will the bridge be for railways alone or for carriages as well?

The PRIME MINISTER. A railway bridge only.

Mr. SPROULE. What control will the Government have over the tolls that are to be charged? What will the tolls be?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have had several estimates, but what the tolls will be, I do not know. Of course, the Government will have to keep over the tolls the same control that we have over the tolls of railways. As to the traffic estimates, I cannot say, as it is a matter of conjecture, but I will give the estimates which have been placed in my hands by the company. The committee, some two or three years, asked returns from all the railway companies which had traffic into Quebec. There is, at present, on the south shore, the Intercolonial Railway, the Grand Trunk, the Quebec Central; and on the north shore, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Lake St. John, the Quebec, Charlevoix, Montmorency, and then, this year, we shall have the Great Northern. In April, 1897, the secretary of the Quebec Bridge Company inquired at the head offices of the then existing south shore railways for a statement of the actual interchange of traffic between their stations and the city of Quebec. The following is a summary of the answers received :—

Intercolonial Railway.—Traffic with Quebec in both directions for the year (June, 1895 to 1896) amounted to 88,074 tons of freight and 59,760 passengers.

Grand Trunk Railway.—8,202 cars forwarded to and received from Lévis in the year 1896.

Quebec Central Railway.—Including all business to be derived from its connection with the American railway systems and from its own system going into Quebec, and also all business to be derived from a connection in Quebec with the North Shore Railways for traffic going south from Quebec, the officials of this railway estimated their probable traffic with Quebec through the proposed bridge at 12,520 cars freight and passengers.

I have another estimate of the traffic over that bridge. This is an old scheme; it does not date from yesterday. It has been before the public, more or less, for the last twenty years. In 1865, not this company, but the preceding company, which had undertaken the building of the bridge, obtained an estimate from Mr. Walter Shanley, C.E., of Montreal. On the 23rd of March, 1865, Mr. Shanley gave out the following estimate of daily traffic :—

160 cars bound east.  
40 cars bound west.

200 cars at \$4 = \$800 per day.  
Annual revenue (313 days), \$250,400.

About two years ago the present company, which is now asking for the subsidy and which has been reorganized, got another estimate from Mr. J. H. Walsh, general freight and passenger agent of the Quebec Central Railway, who made the following estimate of the number of cars that would pass over the bridge daily:—

	Cars.
Grand Trunk Railway .....	70
Intercolonial Railway .....	60
Quebec Central .....	44
Drummond County (now the property of the Intercolonial Railway).....	30
Canadian Pacific Railway.....	3
Total.....	207

(Which, at \$4 per car, would give an annual revenue of \$259,164.)

This last estimate is made by Mr. Walsh the general passenger agent of the Quebec Central Railway. The other estimate which I gave is by a gentleman of great authority, Mr. Walter Shanley, and practically they agree as to the number of cars which would likely pass over this bridge, and which will give a very fair traffic. This does not take into account the traffic of the Lake St. John Railway or the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway. The Montmorency is chiefly a passenger railway. It does not have a very large traffic service except in passengers.

Mr. SPROULE. At what dates were these two estimates made?

The PRIME MINISTER. One is in 1885, and the other in 1897.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the capitalization of the company?

The PRIME MINISTER. The total capitalization of the company is \$200,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How do they propose to raise the money?

The PRIME MINISTER. They have a capital stock of \$200,000, of which \$50,000 has been paid; they have \$150,000 from their shareholders; they expect \$1,000,000 from the Government of Canada; they expect \$500,000 from the city of Quebec, of which, I think, they are reasonably sure—I may say perfectly sure—they expect a subsidy, also, from the province of Quebec, although, of that they have not the same assurance. They raise the balance on their own credit.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the length of the bridge?

The PRIME MINISTER. 3,250 feet.

Mr. WALLACE. The actual bridge?

The PRIME MINISTER. The actual bridge, irrespective of the abutments.

Mr. FOSTER. They have to build the approaches, too?

Mr. WALLACE. What is the estimated cost of the approaches?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have not the actual estimates as to the approaches, but I would suppose that they would not cost more than \$400,000, making the total cost something like \$1,000,000.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if a comparison has been made of the length of the central span 1,600 feet with that of other cantilever bridges?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no data, and I cannot say how it compares with others. All I know is that the plan has been prepared by American engineers of great repute and that tenders have been asked from different companies, among them the Phoenix Company and Keystone Company. They had four or five engineers in consultation at Quebec. They thought at first of putting up a suspension bridge, but they believed that the pressure of the wind there was too great for a suspension bridge, and that a cantilever bridge would be safer. I cannot say what would be the comparison of this bridge, as to length, with other bridges of this kind. In regard to the span it is pretty long, but my hon. friend must remember that there is not a span of the full length of 1,600 feet, but that the main span is 1,000 feet and that there are two other subordinate spans.

Mr. HUGHES. The map says 1,600 feet, that is 800 feet inside the pier.

The PRIME MINISTER. The pressure upon the bottom of the pillars is expected to be seven tons to the square foot.

Mr. FOSTER. Do any railway companies take any stock in this?

The PRIME MINISTER. I can only speak for the Quebec Central. I know they have great confidence in it and it is expected that they would take stock.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the Quebec Central?

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend knows the Quebec Central and the Canadian Pacific Railway. He is familiar also with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway. The Quebec Central is a railway which connects with the city of Quebec and at present has its terminus at Lévis, and its Canadian terminus at Sherbrooke, where it connects with the American system of railways, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Boston and Maine.

Mr. FOSTER. On what principle does the Minister justify the granting of this subsidy—what is the principle that underlies it?

The PRIME MINISTER. The principle is this: The St. Lawrence River is altogether an exceptional river, and a bridge upon the St. Lawrence cannot be treated like an ordinary bridge. There has been a tacit understanding, a tacit rule in constructing railways that upon all bridges costing more than \$100,000 we would pay a subsidy of 15 per cent. Now, here is a bridge which will cost at least \$4,000,000. It is known that railway bridges costing more than \$150,000 are entitled to public aid. We have made a scale of gradation. All bridges less than \$100,000 must be provided for by the company that builds them and owns them. For all bridges costing more than that we give aid, and we have given aid as a rule of 15 per cent. I will leave it to the fair mind of every gentleman in this House, and I think I can successfully appeal to them on that ground, that when we are building a bridge which cannot cost less than \$4,000,000 we are certainly not exaggerating if we ask Parliament to vote a subsidy of \$1,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend seems to have lost sight of one very important fact. That this is a different bridge from a railway bridge. It is not a railway bridge in the sense of aiding the construction of railway bridges. The only principle we have gone on is this: Suppose a railway is passing through a country and it goes over a stream where the bridge is difficult to build. We give a certain percentage as a subsidy for the building of the bridge, but that is not a toll bridge, it is a railway bridge. We gave a certain percentage on the cost of the Grand Trunk Railway tunnel under the St. Clair River. That was a railway bridge; it was not a toll bridge.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The company charges toll. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has forgotten that it does not belong to a separate company and there is a toll charged.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, that is a very exceptional thing, because it is a highway for traffic and running between two countries, but take, for instance, the St. John River bridge. That is built by a company; it is not owned by a railway, but all that the Government did with reference to that was to loan the money at a fair rate of interest and the interest has always been paid. With regard to the Fredericton bridge a loan was given and interest to be paid, but the traffic has not resulted in the interest upon the loan being paid. However, that was the principle upon which the loan was given. Now, you have a bridge which is being built by private enterprise for a public purpose. I am not disposed to think that will overburden the gentlemen who are putting their money into it, but at the same time the hon. gentleman has read to us a long list of railways

Mr. FOSTER.

that will benefit that road in the interchange of traffic. But this is a toll bridge and the Government takes no lien in any way upon future earnings of the bridge. The principle is different from the general policy of aiding bridges in the first place. It is different from those I have instanced in the second place, and it can hardly be said to be parallel with the causeway or tunnel between ourselves and the United States.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot see any difference at all between the international bridge and the international tunnel. What reason can there be? The fact that it is an international work does not change the character of the work at all. We give that aid because of the exceptional character of the work. The St. Lawrence is an exceptional river and to build a bridge across it is a work of great magnitude. It is an exception to all rules, you cannot treat it therefore, like other bridges that we have been aiding formerly, but when my hon. friend says there is a difference between the tunnel at Sarnia and the international bridge, I would like to know where is the difference. If there is a difference at all, I think this work is more expensive than the tunnel.

Mr. SPROULE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that we are not giving any more assistance to this bridge than we are giving in connection with railway bridges.

The PRIME MINISTER. Oh, yes; I said we give more.

Mr. SPROULE. For railway bridges we give 15 per cent, and for this we propose to give 25 per cent. I think the Government should provide that, in striking the tolls for that bridge, the company would be entitled to earn only a reasonable interest on what money they put into it, outside of the subsidy. Otherwise they would be earning money on the subsidy and taxing every car of freight that passed over the bridge, for that purpose.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend would not, I am sure, ask that we should put that company in a position that would impair its finances. On the contrary, I think we should treat this bridge company as we treat the railway companies to which we have been granting subsidies; that is, we should provide that its tolls shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, and subject to revision by the Governor in Council, if they are found to be excessive. But I see no reason why we should apply to this bridge company a different rule from that which we have applied to railway companies in regard to tolls.

Mr. SPROULE. I have always held that it is radically wrong to allow railway companies to strike their own freight rates, and I never could see any justifiable rea-

son why we should allow them to earn dividends on money contributed by the country. I would be willing that they should earn a fair interest on every dollar they put in themselves; but I do not think it is fair, or equitable, or in the interest of the country, that they should collect interest on the money which the country has contributed. There has been too much quibbling, and an evident desire to avoid answering the question that has been asked from time to time: On what capital do you estimate a company is entitled to earn interest? Is it the capital they have put in themselves, or that capital, plus the subsidy contributed by the country? That question has always been evaded, and no satisfactory answer has been given to it, so far as I know. I put that question at the time the Canadian Pacific Railway charter was before the House. I held then that the provision put in that charter allowing the company to earn 10 per cent on the capital was wrong; but it was doubly wrong in this respect, that we did not define on what capital they were to earn it; and I believe they are to-day earning on both their own capital and on the subsidy given by the country. The sooner we lay it down that the Government, in striking a toll or rate, shall leave out of the calculation the subsidy paid by the country, and confine the company to earnings on the money they have put in outside of that, the better and the fairer for the people and all concerned.

Mr. MONK. There is a difficulty in the way of the suggestion of my hon. friend which occurs to my mind; that is, the parties undertaking the construction of this bridge have been relying on aid from the Dominion Government, the provincial government and the city of Quebec; and if we put that condition in our grant, the other powers interested may wish to impose a similar impediment, which may give rise to difficulty, when the company comes to fix its tolls.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) speaks of freight rates and of Government control over rates. If the Government had control over freight rates, I would like to know what power the Government here would have to fix rates on the long hauls coming from the western states and coming through Canada? Everybody knows that the different railway companies have their associations, composed of representatives of both American and Canadian railways, who meet from time to time and arrange the rates on these long hauls. I cannot see how this Government can control, or have anything to do with, the arranging of the rates on that portion of the long haul which is in the United States. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can explain that.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see that we can interfere with the rates on the American side, but we certainly can on the Canadian side. There is no justification for a lower rate on a long haul than it costs to haul the traffic; otherwise, the local rates must be proportionately higher. That is one of the weak features in the system of striking freight rates. I think every country should have sufficient control over its railway corporations not to give foreigners an advantage of that kind at the expense of its own people.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must confess that I see no objection whatever to the Government adopting the suggestion which the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has made. It is an eminently proper one, which I may say to the hon. gentleman has been in my mind with respect to similar enterprises; and I think no injustice can possibly be done to the individuals who may put their means into the undertaking, if the earnings from the portion over and beyond what is contributed by way of subsidies, are held to be sufficient to yield them a reasonable return upon their investment.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to ask the Minister what he would consider a reasonable return, and whether he includes the bonuses contributed by the Government as part of the money on which they would get the return?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am trying to make it clear to the committee that I do not think it would be proper to consider the bonuses given out and out, whether by this Government or the government of Quebec, as part of the capital of the company. What we are bound to regard as the object of the promoters of this undertaking is to get a bridge constructed across the river, to afford easy communication between the railways on each side—not that they may make a large amount of money by stocking the company. The stock of this company is a very moderate sum, and must commend itself to the members of the committee—\$200,000. It is evident that they are not capitalizing the company with a view to claiming dividends on a large amount of capital.

Mr. FOSTER. It amounts to just the same.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does not amount to just the same, I think, because they can get money on bonds much more readily than they can get people to invest in stock. When the question of rates comes to be considered—and the Government has ample power in that respect—regard will be had to the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WILSON. The hon. Minister did not tell us what he considered a fair rate. I supposed he got up to tell us that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I got up to say that in coming to the conclusion as to what would be a fair return to allow the company to realize, the Government would be bound to see that the cost of construction did not include the sums given by way of subsidies.

Mr. WILSON. You might give us the percentage you think they ought to earn.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not like to commit myself to a definite and positive statement as to what would be the percentage. That would depend very largely on what rate the company has to pay. If they can borrow \$100 at the rate of 6 per cent, one would think that 6 per cent would be a fair rate to allow. If they have to pay 7 per cent, a larger rate should be allowed. I do not think that the question of one or two per cent is a very large one, provided the Government keeps in view the principle the hon. gentleman has very fairly stated.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it 150 feet above high water?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. MONK. Has a similar condition been imposed in the case of financial accommodation given similar enterprises in the past. I see that Parliament has done something of the same kind in Sarria and somewhere else.

The PRIME MINISTER. At present the Governor in Council has power to regulate the tolls. The hon. member for Grey suggests that when we come to regulate the tolls, we should see that the company should not take any profit upon the bounty given by Parliament, but simply on their own investment. So far, however, though we have the power, I am not aware that the condition has ever arisen when we should apply it.

Mr. HUGHES. I see the bridge of Forth is 1,710 feet against 1,600 in this, but it is much heavier and cost over \$13,000,000 extra for the approaches.

Mr. BERGERON. No doubt this has been the work of engineers, but I remember years ago the cost of the bridge was put at a higher price.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have here the report of Mr. Theodore Cooper, consulting engineer of New York, who made a very elaborate report, and who is engineer of the company. He has made a very careful estimate, and I have already given to the House his estimate. The masonry is to cost \$1,200,000, and the superstructure \$2,400,000, or a total of \$3,600,000, apart from the approaches.

Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. KAULBACH. Has any inquiry been made of competent engineers as to what the cost would be of a tunned as compared with that of a bridge?

The PRIME MINISTER. A tunned is altogether out of the question. It is not practicable.

To the South Shore Railway Company, towards the restoration and renewal of of the railway bridge over the Yamaska River at Yamaska, Que. (Revote).... \$50,000

Mr. BERGERON. That has been voted three or four years and my impression is that this amount has not been taken advantage of, and the company refuses to build a bridge even with the offer of the Government. Have the Government any reason to believe that it will be acted upon, and that the bridge will be built?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). They assure us that they will build it.

The PRIME MINISTER. The South Shore Railway Company is ready to proceed.

Mr. BERGERON. Before we come to the final resolutions, I want to call the attention of the right hon. gentleman who has been so generous in aiding bridges and railways, to one bridge that he has forgotten, that is the bridge at Bout de l'Isle. A deputation came to Ottawa to see the Minister of Public Works last year, and I think they saw the right hon. gentleman also. They asked for a subsidy, and were promised that this year when the Government granted the subsidies they would certainly get one for their bridge, and they are very much surprised that the Prime Minister has not given what he had promised. I think it would be only an act of justice on the part of the right hon. gentleman to give the committee the reasons why he has not fulfilled his promise.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The explanation is very simple. So far as my personal opinion goes, I think they are fairly entitled to aid. But the subsidies this year, we are told, are very large. If I were giving my own money, I would have no hesitation at all in making them larger and to include that bridge. But in these matters one has to consider the public interest as paramount.

Mr. BERGERON. Preaching economy in the mouth of my hon. friend may appear superfluous. It seems to me that of all the roads which have been subsidized, there is hardly any of so much importance to the counties of L'Assomption, Berthier and Joliette, as this bridge would have been, especially after the charters granted to the Belt Line Electric Railway, and others. The hon. gentleman said this afternoon that the old parishes must not be neglected for the benefit of colonization companies. These are very rich and important parishes. More

than half the provisions that are consumed in Montreal come from the province of Ontario, and our farmers around the city of Montreal are deprived of that market because they have no means of communication. This would be a very important means of communication for all these parishes. I am very sorry the hon. gentleman has not been able to go a little further and to grant a subsidy for that bridge. It seems to me that an additional \$40,000 or \$50,000 for so important a purpose, would not have made a great deal of difference to the exchequer.

The PRIME MINISTER. I feel just as strongly as does the hon. gentleman with regard to the great importance of that bridge at Bout de l'Isle in order to connect the island of Montreal with the outlying parishes in those counties. But while the hon. gentleman holds the same view as I do on that subject, he must remember that the counties of Berthier and L'Assomption are not altogether without railway communication, although this new line is very essential to them. I grant that their present railway communication is insufficient. But look at the districts where we are subsidizing other railways. We are subsidizing, for instance, the South Shore Railway. The parishes which are to be served by the South Shore have no railway communication at all. In winter they cannot take their produce to market except by horse and sleigh; they have to carry their produce in the same primitive way which existed 50 years ago. These parishes lie at a distance from markets of 20 miles and upwards. Now, the counties of Berthier and L'Assomption are not in the same position, for they have at present railway communication, such as it is. Take the Great Northern Railway that we are subsidizing. It will serve a section of country which is fast developing, but which has no railway communication at all. Well, the Government was in this position, that as they could not give aid to all those which were applying to us, we thought those parishes which were wholly without communication ought to be served first. But certainly I think this bridge which the hon. gentleman refers to, ought to receive the same help which we are giving to these other projects.

3. Resolved, That the subsidies granted to the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company, the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company are granted upon the condition, and if received and paid under the authority of this Act to the above mentioned companies respectively, shall be received upon the condition, that the said companies shall not, nor shall any of them, at any time amalgamate with any other railway company, or lease its line to any railway company; nor shall any of the said railways be leased to or operated by any other company; nor shall any of the said companies make an agreement for a common fund or for pooling its receipts with any other railway company, and any such

lease, amalgamation or agreement shall be absolutely void, excepting in so far as such agreement may extend to traffic or running arrangements which have been approved by the Governor in Council.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to move a slight alteration. I move that, after word "amalgamate with," the following words be inserted:—"or lease its line, or lines, to any railway company, or any railway companies, other than those mentioned in this section, except as may here be authorized by Parliament." My attention has been called to the fact that two of the companies named in this clause had been permitted by express authority to make arrangement with other companies by amalgamation or leasing, and I would not suggest that we stand in the way of the exercise of any power of that kind which has been conferred after full consideration by Parliament.

Mr. BERGERON. To which companies does the hon. Minister refer?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Both the Ontario and Rainy River and the Canadian Northern. These have been expressly authorized to make leasing or running arrangements with other companies.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the use of this clause, then?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This clause is especially valuable, because it will prevent the possible contingency which is feared by many people in this House and in the country—amalgamation with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BERGERON. But this destroys the effect of clause 3, concerning which the hon. Minister made such a great speech the other day. There only remains one road, the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific, which does not fall under the proviso.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They all fall under the proviso so far as other companies are concerned. But Parliament has expressly given authority to the two I have mentioned to arrange with other companies. We insert this to prevent an arrangement with any companies except as expressly authorized by Parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose the Rainy River and Canadian Northern roads were to amalgamate, and then the Canadian Northern should amalgamate with the Canadian Pacific Railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would not be authorized. This clause expressly forbids these three companies amalgamating with, or leasing their lines to, any other company. But we now provide an exception in the case of any

arrangement already authorized by Parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. What companies are they authorized to amalgamate with?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Port Arthur, Duluth and Western in one case.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose the Rainy River road amalgamated with the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western, and then the Canadian Pacific Railway leased the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is a member of the Railway Committee, and understands the legislation that has been passed, but he has forgotten for the moment. There were a number of charters on which some money had been expended and some work done—the Hudson's Bay road among the others—concerning which power was given to amalgamate with, or lease to, the Canadian Northern. We gave the Ontario and Rainy River road power, as my hon. friend will remember, to purchase or lease the Port Arthur Duluth and Western. But we did not give power to amalgamate with the Canadian Pacific Railway; that was expressly prohibited.

Mr. ROGERS. It has been said that there was no possible way to prevent companies coming together by one purchasing the stocks or bonds of the other. It seems to me that it ought to be possible to provide that this road could not dispose of its stocks or bonds without consulting the Government or giving the Government the first chance to buy them. It would be no disadvantage and no hardship. Then, if they desire to do so, the Government could buy the whole thing out. The time will come when they will do it. If such a clause as I suggest were inserted, it would facilitate such a course, when public sentiment is ready for it, and in the meantime they could not do anything without the Government being aware of it.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to move a slight alteration to the seventh resolution. I propose to strike out after the word "every" in the first line the words "company receiving a subsidy" and to insert instead the words "railway subsidized under this Act." And after the word "shall" I propose to insert "be always liable in each year to furnish," so that the railway will be liable.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the object of changing it? The railway cannot furnish you anything, the company may furnish you with something.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps it will be impossible to suggest a better word than "furnish." It is the company that will receive the subsidy,

Mr. BLAIR.

but the company might cease to own the railway, and we want to impose a charge upon the railway which has been aided.

Mr. SPROULE. Supposing the railway that is receiving the subsidy is only two or three miles long—and there is one 66-100ths of a mile long—how would you arrange about securing a return in the way of carrying the mails? Would you divide the whole subsidy upon a mileage basis?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In the case of a railway a mile long, there will really be nothing earned.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose it were six miles long?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then you would get six out of a hundred.

Mr. WALLACE. When we were considering this matter, some time ago, the Government promised to supply the committee with information in regard to the return that has been received from the Calgary and Edmonton and other roads under a provision similar to this. Now is the time we want the information from the hon. Minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. Postmaster General will be here in a minute.

Mr. WALLACE. We have the Postmaster General here now, and, perhaps, it will be better that we should have his answer before we go on to some other business.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). I made inquiry. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the bulk sum that has been paid to the credit of the consolidated revenue fund, but the sum is at the rate that is payable in other cases for the carriage of the mails. The charge is, for a baggage car service, 4 cents a mile, and for a postal car service, 8 cents a mile.

Mr. WALLACE. That is very lucid, but it is not the information we are waiting for. I suppose anybody could have told us that. The question which was asked, and the question the hon. Postmaster General was supposed to have put down, that he might furnish the information in regard to it, was what return had been received in the form of interest on the subsidies paid to railway companies that were under obligation to perform a similar service. We want to know how much per mile was paid, how much in the bulk sum, what lines of railway received subsidies and the return in interest or the moneys earned in that way. We had that promised to us, and the hon. Postmaster General pledged the committee that the information would be furnished. But the hon. gentleman tells us that a baggage service costs four cents per mile and postal car service, eight cents per mile. We all know that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals

(Mr. Haggart) intimated it as his opinion that the deduction had not been made, that, although there was such a stipulation, still it had not been carried out. I think that was the point on which information was desired. In regard to the amount it would depend upon the frequency with which trains are run, and that would depend upon the nature of the settlement through which the railway runs and upon the business of the railways.

Mr. WILSON. The subsidies were granted to these railways on the same conditions as it is proposed to grant the present subsidies, and we want to know what return has been received by the Government, what the amount of the subsidies was and what has been paid out of the earnings. I understood the hon. Postmaster General to promise that the information would be brought down to the committee.

Mr. WALLACE. We want the information.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The railways in question received grants in bulk sums, which were called annuities, of \$80,000 for so many years, and in return they were to carry the mails for a limited number of years. I think twenty years. They did not expect to pay back in the limited number of years any sum at all proportionate to the sum received.

Mr. WILSON. And that was deducted from the yearly payments to these companies? I think we ought to have this information as it has important bearing upon the subsidies now under consideration. There is an impression in this committee that these payments will not be collected, and we feel sure that they will not be collected on some pieces of railway. Where there is a railway only two miles in length, and it runs through a yard, as it does in one case, or where it is entirely for the accommodation of the party who owns the mills and works, there will be no return from it. What we want to know is how this system has worked in regard to railways where this condition has been imposed, because, if the interest in this form is not to be collected, it is folly to put this condition in, and it is only deceiving the people. We have been told that these are not subsidies but loans. I am afraid that they are subsidies all the same. On general principles I am opposed to subsidies. I think the time has come when this Government should refuse to subsidize railways and when it should be left open to private enterprise to take hold of these undertakings. I know that is the feeling in my own riding. If hon. gentlemen will look at the newspapers they will see that what I state is correct. The hon. gentleman who represents us in the local legislature, and who is a Liberal, pledged himself in the election against subsidies, and especially against an extra bonus on iron, but when he got to Toronto, it was found that

his pledges were not as strong as his party fealty. He voted for these subsidies and his constituents, or quite a number of them, have asked him to resign.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They are all Tories.

Mr. WILSON. No, they are not all Tories. They are all Grits with the exception of two or three, and they are prominent Grits, too. I am strongly of the opinion that this country feels that we should stop giving bonuses to railways. The Postmaster General, across the floor of the House to-day, said that unless we moved amendments to those resolutions we would be responsible for them. I must say in the most emphatic manner, I am opposed to them, and if I could get a reasonable number of gentlemen to support me, I would move that they be given the six months' hoist.

Mr. DAVIS. I think the party the hon. member belongs to has been in favour of railway subsidies in the past. As far as our country is concerned it has given very large bonuses. They gave bonuses to the extent of about \$3,200 a mile and now that his party is in opposition they oppose giving bonuses altogether. I wish to point out that his leader has supported the giving of bonuses to railways.

Mr. WILSON. I do not pretend to say that I came to this House to follow a leader in everything he does, and I am sorry if hon. gentlemen on that side of the House are prepared to follow whatever their leader does. The people of the country are very much disappointed in the course that has been pursued by hon. gentlemen. Look at the resolution that was passed at the Liberal convention, held in Ottawa, in 1893, about economy and the debt being reduced. The First Minister pledged the people in Toronto that he would reduce the cost of running this Government by three or four million dollars a year, but they have not done that.

The PRIME MINISTER. That subject has been mentioned to-day.

Mr. WILSON. I know it has been mentioned, and it will be mentioned a good many times before the next elections. Now, all this discussion has arisen because of lack of information. The Government promised to bring this information down. Now if they cannot do it to-night I hope they will in the morning, because I think it is important.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman knows very well that two or three railways which have been given a land subsidy and a bonus of \$80,000 a year or a grant for a term of years are railways which were projected through a completely unsettled country. If they look along the line of those railways they will find that there is no population,

and for past years the population of that portion of the Dominion any more than the population of this has not increased. There seems to be stagnation somewhere. The fact is people do not come in in any considerable number. Now, unless we get the people to settle the country—unless the population increases—there is no business for those railways, and there is no use for postal service—

Mr. WILSON. Is that any reason why we should not have the information asked for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot furnish the hon. gentleman with information which is not at my hand, but some gentleman stated last evening that the amount which was received from this railway bonus did not exceed \$5,000 in any one year. I have no means of verifying the correctness of that statement but I have no doubt the hon. gentleman made it with the conviction that it was accurate. It might all be true, and yet it would not have any bearing on the position we take in making these advances. We are not doing this for to-day, but for all time. The time will come when the people will settle around those railways, and if they do there will be just cause for an efficient mail service as there is in any part of old Canada, and when that call comes it has to be responded to by the Postmaster General. All the aid he will have to give this railway company is to pay them for the service, and the Government will get the benefit. The hon. gentleman must not understand that there is any idea on this side of the House that we are going to commence the day after to-morrow or the next day after the Bill becomes law to get revenue from it. It may be some years before any substantial return is realized in respect to this provision, but the hon. gentleman must not be impatient. It is sure to arrive—sure as the sun rises, or else my hope, his hopes and all our hopes in the future of the country will have come to naught.

Mr. WILSON. The Postmaster General took the names of the companies that were given to him by the ex-Minister of Finance, and I think it is only fair that the Government should promise to bring that information down.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman does not perhaps quite remember the incident. The ex-Minister of Finance stated that though the principle of this subsidy resolution was not a new one, yet that, in his opinion, it had not been lived up to. It only existed on paper. It is not the amount, but the question whether or not the principle has been lived up to.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister will excuse me. I think it was both the principle and the amount.

Mr. BLAIR.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not understand anything about the amount, because the hon. gentleman will remember that the Premier was speaking at the time. When he made the observation that in some cases the earnings would be very small. This is the point as I understand it: Every dollar of earnings, every dollar for service rendered by these companies in question for the Government instead of having to be paid by the Government to the railways, is retained and paid over by the various departments into the consolidated revenue fund, and not, as otherwise would have been the case, the Government having to pay money out for the service so rendered. That was the principle, and that is the principle involved here. At the present moment we are paying on an average about \$94 per annum per mile on the railways in use in Canada for carrying the mails alone. There may be other Government payments for services on these lines. The amount which a railway earns in these ways is a changing amount, depending on the growth of the country, the frequency of the mails, and the need the Government would have to employ the different roads.

Mr. WILSON. Have you made the deduction?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have stated it here, and hon. gentlemen will find the information in the Auditor General's Report each year. There is nothing mysterious about it. Ever since that arrangement was made, I think in 1892, in every case, whatever money we would otherwise have had to pay in cash, was paid over to the Receiver General and retained as part of the consolidated revenue fund, and so much money saved. The variations are such that the earnings of one road would give no more idea of the earnings of another road than would the earnings on passengers or freight. In some instances we pay only four cents a mile for the use of a railway, which might not amount to more than a few dollars in the year, depending on the number of trains the railway runs, while in other cases we pay several hundred dollars a year for the carriage of the mails.

Mr. DAVIS. One railway which has been referred to runs into my district, the Regina, Saskatchewan and Long Lake Railway. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) stated that that railway was paid only \$2,000 a year for carrying the mails. I do not know why that railway was built. It was not for the convenience of the people of Saskatchewan. If it had been built where the people asked to have it built, I have no doubt that sufficient revenue would be derived from it to pay 3 per cent on the subsidy. The people of Prince Albert sent three delegates down here to ask for a railway to be extended into the district of Saskatchewan. They never asked for this road at all. They

asked that a subsidy should be given to the Manitoba and North-western, which ran through a fertile country, where settlers would go in, and where towns would spring up every ten miles along the line. But in spite of the representations of these delegates, who knew all about the country, the Government gave a subsidy to certain gentlemen, one a member of this House, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler)—6,400 acres of land per mile and a cash subsidy of \$80,000 for 20 years for carrying the mails—for building a line from Regina called the Regina, Saskatchewan and Long Lake Railway, which runs through a wilderness in which there is nothing but alkali swamps, and which will not be settled for 100 years.

Mr. WILSON. I guess that was a mistake.

Mr. DAVIS. It was a great mistake, and the friends of the hon. gentleman made the mistake. Along the 250 miles of that railway there are only a few miles where the lands are fit for settlement. In place of that railway bringing people into the district of Saskatchewan it has prevented people coming there, and stopped the progress of the district for years. For that reason we cannot expect more than \$2,000 a year of revenue from that railway. If the road had been built through the section of country where the people wanted it, you would have seen a different result. When the proposed extension is built from Red Deer Lake for 100 miles through the Dauphin country, there will be no trouble about getting 3 per cent on the subsidies, because every 10 miles you will find a large thriving town, and every quarter section from Dauphin Lake to Prince Albert is capable of supporting a family.

Mr. WILSON. I said nothing about the hon. gentleman's railway. I do not know anything about it. Because we made one mistake, that is no reason why we should make another.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman was criticising the Government for making this new departure. He said it was a myth, the idea of the Government being able to collect 3 per cent from the railways, and he cited the case of the Regina, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway, and I wished to point out the reason why it does not return a greater revenue to the Government, and why it should not be taken into consideration. That railway was a huge bungle and should never have been constructed.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not understand why this matter has been dragged into the discussion, because it does not seem to me to be relevant at all. The Minister stated in this case he had made a departure from the usual principle followed that would bring us a direct return. I asked what the direct return was, and he mentioned these mail services as the sources of the

return, saying that there had been other railway subsidies given on a somewhat similar principle. The difference is that in the case of other railways the arrangement has been for a limited time, while in this case it is for an unlimited time. The Postmaster General says the return was not large. The question was not whether the return was large or small. If I understood him correctly, he intimated that the return could not be got, and that the money was retained and paid into the consolidated revenue. It is only a matter of book-keeping. If that is done instead of the money being paid to the company, there must be an account of it, and I do not see why the information could not be got. Some private members are able to give the information, and I do not see why the Postmaster General cannot give it. I understood from the Postmaster General that this information would be available, and would be given to the House. But whether he has forgotten it or has made no effort to get it I do not know, but it seems to me it would not be difficult for him to get the information.

Mr. DAVIS. What difference would it make? Taking the facts into consideration that I have stated with reference to the Saskatchewan and Long Lake Railway, it would not make any difference, if it was only \$1,000. The fact of that road being built through a wilderness, where there is no settlement or chance of settlement, would be sufficient to show that we would not get postal revenue.

Mr. SPROULE. Do they carry mails, or Mounted Police, or Government supplies?

Mr. DAVIS. I suppose they carry the mail.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, the accounts must be somewhere, and ought to be available.

Mr. DAVIS. I wish to point out that, outside of the \$80,000 given at the time as a subsidy for the road for twenty years, this company got a subsidy of \$1,000 per mile for the construction of the road, putting the price on the land at which they are selling it.

Mr. SPROULE. That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. BRITTON. The hon. Minister has taken wisely the power of deducting the interest of 3 per cent in certain cases, but there is this case that ought to be provided for, and that is, where a bonus is given for an extension to a certain point. The extension is usually short, but may be a source of large revenue, and it will be wise for the Government to take the power to deduct 3 per cent from the earnings of any part of the road, in return for their assisting this extension. The Minister of Railways said that if a road were 100 miles long, and he subsidized six miles of an extension, he

would deduct six-one-hundredths of the whole earnings; but the case in my mind is where the extension was, for instance, to a mine, and at that mine a thriving village might in five years grow up and be an important source of revenue to the railway. In that case, under the resolution, there would be no power to make any deduction, if there was no work done over this particular extension. But might it not be wise to get some money back in a case of that kind?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I would be glad to give that suggestion consideration, and it may possibly prove to be workable.

Mr. **ELLIS**. I was going to suggest that the Government, in view of these large subsidies, ought to take power, by the Act itself or by Order in Council, to compel these railway companies to keep their books according to a uniform system. There is a great lack of knowledge of what they are doing, and it is impossible to get correct statistics of railway business and earnings, but if one uniform system of book-keeping were adopted by all railways, we could get at a variety of things of which we are now ignorant, and which it is desirable we should know. According to the report of the Interstate Commission of the United States, one of the great evils they have to encounter in furnishing proper information, is the great variety of railway book-keeping, and the suggestion has been made that there should be a uniform system. I do not know if the hon. Minister would like to grapple with that question, but it is one that will have to be grappled with, when my hon. friends from Lisgar, and East York, and the others have succeeded in having their views adopted, and these railways are put in the possession of the Government and nationalized.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have heard the complaint made, and no doubt there is a great deal in it, but it has seemed to me that it would be sufficient, at all events, when this Parliament comes to deal with the question of a railway commission, to have that matter considered then. There is no limit to the power and control of Parliament over these railways.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I want to make one more appeal to the Postmaster General for this information. If he is not able to get it, let him say so; but if he is, we ought to have it.

Mr. **WALLACE**. There is no question about whether it can be got or not. The reports of the department will show the business arrangements with those companies, and whether they have been paying off their indebtedness in this way, as the law provides. Two days ago the Postmaster General promised to give this information to the House. He has not done so. He tells us that baggage-cars get 4 cents a mile, and

Mr. **BRITTON**.

regular postal-cars 8 cents a mile. But we knew that already. Those have been the rates for the last forty years. What we want is the information we have asked for, and which he can very easily obtain. The Minister of Railways admits that we ought to have it, because he told us that he had just sent for the Postmaster General in order to get it. But when the Postmaster General came in, we found that he had not got it. We have come to a clause where we require it, and the Postmaster General is dumb. I would like to hear him speak.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I think we ought to have an answer from somebody. It is not unreasonable to ask whether this information can be had or not. If it cannot we are not so unreasonable as to insist upon it. But if it can, what reason can there be for not bringing it down at a later stage?

Mr. **DAVIS**. What difference would it make?

Mr. **SPROULE**. I am asking for information from somebody who has authority to give it.

Mr. **WALLACE**. I think we will have to take the bit in our teeth, and the rules and regulations of this House into our own hands.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not think the hon. gentleman can be allowed to do that.

Mr. **WALLACE**. We have had so-called explanations about different questions, and the only satisfactory information we have had on any subject was that given by the right hon. First Minister when he explained the case of the Quebec bridge. I think we will have to ask the right hon. First Minister to assume charge of these departments, because he is the only man who appears to be fit to run them.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I feel highly flattered. I had no idea that I was such a good administrator. My hon. friend the Postmaster General will look for this information and will bring it down if it can be had. Of course, it must take some time.

Mr. **WALLACE**. Perhaps 15 minutes to get it ready.

Mr. **DEPUTY SPEAKER**. Shall this resolution be adopted?

Mr. **WALLACE**. With the understanding that this information be brought down.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Yes, but we must have time to prepare it.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I propose now as an additional section, section 8, the section of which I spoke yesterday:

That, as respects all railways receiving subsidies under the foregoing provisions, the company at any time owning or operating any of the said

railways shall, if and when required, produce and exhibit to the Minister of Railways and Canals, or any person appointed by him, all books, accounts and vouchers showing the cost of constructing the railway, the cost of operating the same and the earnings thereof.

Mr. WILSON. Would it not be well to add that they should make known all the bonuses they have received?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would be of public record, and besides it will appear in the company's books.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER. Is section 4 adopted? I did not hear it read.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, it is the usual and customary clause.

Mr. OLIVER. I think a suitable and valuable amendment could be made by adding to the words "the location of every such line of railway shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council" so as to make read that railway stations also shall be subject to such approval. It would answer the purpose of an amendment to the Railway Act which has been proposed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think not. I pointed out to the Railway Committee, but perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) did not follow me, that, for the last two years I have been inserting a clause in every contract made giving a subsidy to a railway company bringing it within the right of the Government to locate the stations on the line. We will continue to do that, so it will be hardly necessary to direct the Government to do what it is doing and intends to continue to do. But the amendment to the Railway Act which was proposed goes far beyond this, as it provides that the Government shall have control of the locations of stations upon all railways that have received public aid, not only from the Dominion but from the province or anywhere else. That Bill has been blocked in its passage and cannot become law this session. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) will see that it is not necessary to make the amendment he suggests.

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to clause 5, I desire to ask a question. Where traffic arrangements and arrangements for running powers are made, is the amount of subsidies received by the road from which the running powers are asked taken into consideration?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am unable to state what action the Government has taken with respect to that point. We have had one case before us. Application was made by the Bedlington Railway to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council for the right to run

over some portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway Crow's Nest Pass line. We gave the running powers, and, in settling the terms in which they should be exercised, in other words, the amount that should be paid by the company seeking the running powers, we ascertained the cost of the line, deducted the amount of the subsidy granted and made our calculations on the balance.

To the United Counties Railway Company, for a railway from St. Robert Junction to Sorel,  $6\frac{1}{2}$  miles, and from Mount Johnson to St. Grégoire Station, 1 mile, not exceeding  $7\frac{1}{2}$  miles. Revote.

The PRIME MINISTER. I desire to make an amendment to this vote. After the words "six and one-half miles," I propose to insert the following:—

This subsidy to be payable only in the event of adequate running rights over the South-eastern Railway between the two points above mentioned, and of being granted to the above mentioned company on terms to be approved by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

At the present time the United Counties Railway enters the town of Sorel over a portion of the South-eastern Railway. They complain that at the present time they are threatened with losing their right of way, and they ask for this subsidy. I am of the opinion that there is no necessity for a second line of railway there if we can avoid it.

Amendment agreed to.

Resolutions reported.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.55 a.m. (Saturday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 5th August, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

### PRAYERS.

### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. In the "Daily Patriot," published at Charlottetown, P.E.I., in the issue of August 2, 1899, in a correspondence from Ottawa, I read as follows:—

Ottawa, August 2.—Following up their attack on all kinds of labour legislation, the Opposition yesterday devoted a whole session attacking Dr. Borden for giving to the workmen the advantage in his militia clothing contracts of anti-sweating clauses. They advocated the retention of those principles upon which sweating is carried

out. A few days ago, they made a similar attack on day labour, and at yesterday's committee, Sir Charles, adhering to the same policy of starvation wages to workingmen, and all modern improvement to lighten the burden of employees, fought against Blair's Railway Bill.

Now, I say that every word of that is false, and I will just read a few sentences to show what the Prime Minister said on that very subject in statesmanlike language, which every one would endorse. Speaking in that debate, to which this correspondent so falsely, maliciously, and mendaciously refers, the Prime Minister said :

The hon. member for Beauharnois says that Mr. Workman has had the work done outside. There is no evidence of that. But let us say that he has. It is a very important subject, and I think this discussion ought to be carried on in a serious way and not as a stormy debate. We are all agreed that there should be an anti-sweating clause.

So that you see we have the highest authority in this House stating that his impression of the debate, as it went on, was that we were all agreed that there should be anti-sweating clauses; and I shall be in the memory of every one here when I denounce this article as false and malicious. I am sorry I do not know who the correspondent is, but it is enough, I think, to bring the matter before the House, as I have done.

#### INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the Ministers to the fact that some additional information which was promised has not been brought down; first, the papers from the Department of Railways and Canals, which have been asked for long ago, and repeatedly, respecting the dismissal of Belanger and Michaud, at Trois Pistoles, on the Intercolonial; then, certain missing letters from the Department of the Interior, with regard to Yukon liquor permits; then, papers with reference to mining leases or claims for mining coal under the waters in the harbour of Nanaimo.

Mr. DAVIN. I also have to ask for some papers: The report of the Minister of Justice to Council, in the case of the Queen vs. Skelton et al.; also, the Orders in Council passed since June, 1896, in respect to contracts given without tender.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. PRIOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say a word to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair). Yesterday, or the day before, the hon. gentleman taxed me with having paired last session to escape the vote on the Kettle River Railway Bill. Now, I feel sure that the hon. gentleman does not want to do anything unfair or to do me or any other member of this

Mr. DAVIN.

House an injustice. I have looked up the matter, and I find that I left Ottawa on the 8th March, not intending to come back, and I did not come back that session. I did not pair that session. I find that the vote on the Kettle River Railway Bill was taken on the 15th April, five weeks after I left. I also find that the whips paired me on several occasions during the session, but without my knowledge or consent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I accept the hon. gentleman's statement unhesitatingly. He was not quite certain himself on the subject the other night; but now, as he is certain, I am glad to accept his statement.

#### QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the right hon. First Minister if he has received any communication from the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec concerning a Bill which passed Parliament a few days ago, without their knowledge, and in which there is a clause which reads as follows:—

All things heretofore done by the Corporation of Pilots for and below the harbour of Quebec and by the directors of the said corporation with reference to the distribution of the funds of the said corporation between the members thereof and the payment out of the said fund of sums of money to pilots who act as captains are hereby declared to be good and valid for all purposes.

It seems that this clause affects some cases which are sub judice, and would be most unjust to litigants. My information goes to show that the Harbour Commissioners are very hot over it, and have communicated with the right hon. gentleman to see whether a Bill could not yet be brought in to undo this clause.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My attention has been drawn by several parties in the city of Quebec to this amendment in the Bill. The Bill was introduced by the Solicitor General, at the instance of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, and it was generally satisfactory; but in the Senate the Minister of Justice introduced the amendment now complained of. This amendment is complained of by some, but highly supported by others. On the question of policy, I am not prepared to express myself at this moment. But the question is whether it affects vested rights, and I have put myself in communication with the Minister of Justice on this subject.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the right hon. gentleman be able to give another answer before we part?

The PRIME MINISTER. I should be very happy when I confer with the Minister of Justice. It is a legal question as to which I must obtain his opinion.

### WEST HURON REPRESENTATION.

Mr. MACLEAN. I wish to ask the right hon. gentleman if he is aware of a certain article which appeared in a newspaper yesterday, and would ask him if it be the case that a vacancy has occurred in the representation of West Huron?

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend must know that newspaper articles have not much weight sometimes.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may say that I have no official notice.

### THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 175) further to amend the Act respecting roads and road allowances in the province of Manitoba.—(Mr. Sifton.)

### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 190) to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. Blair.)

### STEAMSHIP SERVICE WITH THE WEST INDIES AND SOUTH AMERICA.

Resolution approving of articles of agreement for an improved steamship service between Canada, the West Indies and South America read the second time.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

### PROTECTION ON NAVIGABLE WATERS.

On order for consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 137) further to amend the Act respecting the protection of navigable waters.—(Sir Louis Davies.)

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I introduced a Bill prohibiting the deposit in navigable and tidal waters of rubbish, saw-dust, &c. The main object was to provide that harbour masters should still have the right to mark a place within the limits of the harbour where this rubbish could be deposited and some doubts were raised. The Bill went to the Senate and the objection was made that it applied not only to tidal waters but navigable waters. Eventually a compromise was reached and they agreed that so far as tidal waters are concerned the Bill would remain as it was, but with regard to non-tidal waters the depth should be reduced from 12 fathoms to 8 fathoms.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that there is any opposition, but my hon. friend from Toronto asked me to request that this Bill be allowed to stand until Monday.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If my hon. friend desires,

we will let it stand. I beg to move that further consideration of the amendments be postponed.

Motion agreed to.

### SAFETY OF SHIPS.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES moved second reading of Bill (No. 170) respecting the safety of ships.

He said: This Bill was introduced by me some time ago, and I requested at the time that those gentlemen who represent commercial interests should forward it to their several constituencies in order that I might have the benefit of the opinion of shipowners and others interested. The Bill has two main divisions. The first extends the time when vessels can leave for England with deck loads. No sailing ship or steamer can enter any English port after the 1st November carrying a deck load higher than 3 feet, and by our law they cannot leave this side after the 1st October, carrying a deck load higher than 3 feet. Of late years, steamers have been taking the place of sailing vessels, and the date of leaving here is earlier than it might be. After consultation with those representing the insurance interests and the shipping interests, they agreed among themselves that the 12th October should be adopted as the date to which we could extend the time. The clause of the Bill provides that steamships may sail from this side on the 12th October with summer deck loads.

The rest of the Bill has reference to provisions which were pressed upon me very strongly by the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Dobell), having for their object the control of the deck loads carried in summer, and providing that they should be subjected to the supervision of the Port Warden and no clearance given to any vessel with a deck load until certificate was produced that the deck load was according to law and the vessel seaworthy.

Since the Bill was introduced, I have received some very strong protests from a number of shipowners in the city of St. John, and from some in the province of Nova Scotia. They state that these provisions will be very harsh in their operation and will not effect the object we have in view; and that, at any rate, time should be given for their consideration rather than that they should be forced upon them at present. Messrs. Wm. Thompson & Son, of St. John, N.B., especially set forth the objections at great length. They say that many of their steamers load in outlying ports, and that it would be difficult to get efficient and satisfactory port wardens who would be suitable and could give the proper investigation and examination and keep such control as would be satisfactory to the shipowners on the one side and the insurance men on the other. They think they would be put at a

disadvantage, and they are satisfied with the existing laws, and contend that the insurance companies are the best judges as to whether they load their vessels in a proper manner.

Mr. FOSTER. That would apply to everything except the life of the crew.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The chief object in introducing this Bill was to obtain, if possible, a reduction of the rates of insurance charged by the British companies. They have raised the rates of insurance largely against this side, and we thought that by having this clause we should be able to gain a reduction of the rates. The Carmichaels, of Pictou, and the Thompsons, of St. John, say that it would not have this effect, and that it would harass them. Having considered the matter I propose to strike out all the sections in the Bill except the first, and give time for consideration; and it may be, re-introduce these provisions next year.

Mr. ELLIS. I am very glad the Minister has adopted that course. There is no doubt that the feeling among the shipping community of St. John was strongly against the Bill. Perhaps a year's consideration will enable the views of the Minister and the views of the shipping community to be brought more in accord than they are at the present time.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I move that the following be added to the section:—

And no master of any steamship so sailing shall incur or be liable to any of the penalties prescribed by the Act referred to.

This does not alter the effect of the section; it is put in for greater clearness.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I move to strike out all after section 1.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported, read the third time and passed.

#### CONDITIONAL LIBERATION OF PENITENTIARY CONVICTS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 171) to provide for the Conditional Liberation of Penitentiary Convicts.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

(In the Committee.)

The PRIME MINISTER. The object of this Bill is to introduce the ticket-of-leave system for convicts. The Bill follows, I believe, word for word, the English Act. That Act has been in operation in England for some twenty years and more, perhaps, and I understand, has worked satisfactorily. The Bill provides generally that the Governor in Council may allow a convict to be set at large on condition of good behaviour. The convict so set at large is not free; he can be rearrested at any time; but he is allowed to be at large, to some extent under the surveillance of the police. Here is a convict, a young man of good character, who may have committed a crime in a moment of passion, or, perhaps, have fallen a victim to bad example or the influence of unworthy friends. There is a good report of him while in confinement, and it is supposed that if he were given another chance, he would be a good citizen. Under the Bill power is given to the Governor General to order his liberation—of course, under certain rules to be established, in the framing of which we shall be guided by the precedents of England. The matter is experimental, so far as we are concerned, but we are guided by the experience in Great Britain.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the right hon. First Minister say whether they have adopted any system similar to this in the United States, and if so, how it works there?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not aware that it has been adopted by any state in the Union. We have been guided by the precedents in England.

Mr. CLANCY. What class of offenders does this apply to?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know that it is restricted to any class of offenders, but applies, by the terms of the Act, to all kinds. But in practice, it is to be assumed, the privilege would not be allowed to those guilty of heinous offences. But take the average run of offences—assaults, larcenies, and other offences of that kind, which are by far the most numerous with which courts of justice have to deal—and it is especially to those guilty of such offences that this system is to apply.

My hon. friend is also aware that in England the Act has been applied to political offences. Happily, we have no offences of that nature in this country. But it has been applied frequently in England to men who have been convicted of treason or offences bordering upon treason. In this country, the Bill would apply chiefly to offences of a minor character, such as larceny, assaults, and the like.

Mr. CLANCY. I wish to ask the right hon. gentleman a question. I have in my mind a very distressing case where a man committed an act, unpremeditated, that ended in the

death of his wife, and the act was committed under very aggravating circumstances. No defence was possible, and the man was sent to the penitentiary. The man's whole character was such that nobody could have expected it of him, his life had been rather exemplary; but through an uncontrollable temper he committed an act that ended in murder. I desired to know whether the Bill went far enough to give the Justice Department discretion to deal with a case of that kind?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, that is my construction of the Bill.

Mr. WILSON. I have a case in mind where a young man raised a \$5 bill to \$500. His previous conduct had been irreproachable, so to speak, but he was sent to the penitentiary, and that has entailed great suffering on his wife and children. I have good reason to believe that if he was set at liberty there would be no reason to regret it.

Mr. DAVIN. Legislation of this kind might work better in England than with us. We are a smaller people, and our political organizations are more active and more thoroughly organized than in England. That clause is very wide, and I am afraid that political pressure will be brought by whatever Government is in power on the Justice Department.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I differ with the hon. gentleman in that I think it would apply better in Canada than in England, because in the old country crime is more frequent, and people are brought closer together. I know several cases of young lads. I have in my mind one or two cases in New Glasgow of lads with excellent parents, but who were carried away into crime. One of them got drunk and did something, and they were put into the penitentiary. Now, one of the questions that agitate reformers is whether keeping young people in the penitentiary is conducive to their betterment. When a young man whose previous character has been good, commits a crime that sends him to the penitentiary, many surrounding cases may make his offence much more pardonable than some higher crimes would be. A boy who had been sent to jail again and again may be deemed incorrigible, but there are cases where a country boy, for example, coming to town, commits an offence, and there are about it many circumstances that call for the clemency of the Government. I do not think it would apply so much to older sinners, but when a young lad is sent to the penitentiary for a minor crime and shows by his conduct that he is sorry, he might be set at liberty on condition of good conduct, and he can live down the offence. I think this is an excellent Bill, and while I do not think any Government would exercise this pardoning authority indiscriminately, I think it could be utilized judiciously to very good effect.

Mr. FOSTER. In whose hands in England is this power of granting ticket of leave?

The PRIME MINISTER. The Home Secretary, not the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. It strikes me that is an improvement upon the method you have adopted here. If there is one member in the Cabinet who is so jealous of the work of his department that he will permit the least possible political pressure to have any effect upon him, it is the Minister of Justice. All the other Ministers are more liable to the results of political pressure than the Minister of Justice. I am inclined to think that the love of reputation and the high traditions of the Justice Department, and everything that pertains to that would make it a safer medium for the issue of tickets of leave than leave it to be decided by the members of the Council, all of whom are necessarily, to a greater or less extent, swayed by political considerations. But the Minister of Justice would feel that his department was primarily and solely responsible, and he could not shelter himself behind an adverse decision of his colleagues. It would be somewhat as in the case of a judge on the bench a mere matter of justice and clemency. I would suggest strongly for the consideration of the Government whether this should not be put solely upon the responsibility of the Justice Department, without the co-operation of the other members of the Cabinet. Of course, my remarks apply to all Cabinets. We must take into account that political pressure in our country will be a factor much stronger than in the old country. There, the system of patronage is so entirely different that the Home Secretary is absolutely not subject to political pressure, unless in certain political crimes and where international representations are sometimes made, as, for instance, in Mrs. Maybrick's case. I am not averse to trying this experiment. I think the humanitarian side of it should lead us to give every man who has fallen a chance to regain his position and his self-respect in so far as he can. I think this experiment if tried under the best conditions, and if it proves successful, it will be a step forward in our administration of justice in this country.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is a good deal of force in all the objections which have been urged against this Bill—I would not say urged against it exactly—but in what has been said showing the danger to which it may be liable. In the first place, I think there is a good deal of force, and of truth, in the remarks made by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) in so far as political pressure is concerned. There are two classes of men in the prisons of the country; there are the men who are hopeless criminals and there are other men who are the victims of accident rather than of criminal instincts, and it is to these men to which this Bill is to be applied with the

design to giving them a chance to redeem their characters. It is questionable whether a jail or a penitentiary is a place of improvement for a man placed in confinement there. Very often a man goes into a penitentiary who is not a criminal, but he is made a criminal by the associations which in jail become unavoidable. There is no doubt that one of the most serious objections to this measure is that it will subject the Government and Ministers to a strong pressure on the part of political friends. We cannot avoid that: we have that even to-day in the exercise of the pardoning power. There is no doubt that every year, almost, strong political pressure is exercised upon Ministers in order to prevent the carrying out of justice. But this rather favours than militates against the broader and more general view which underlies this measure. Although large powers and vast discretion are given to the party in authority to interfere with a sentence and to prevent a man from incurring the punishment which has been imposed upon him by a court of justice, they are not exercised upon its own responsibility, but under certain rules which guide the discretion of the party in authority. In the administration of the law, judges, in many cases, are vested with almost unlimited powers but these unlimited powers, which rest upon their discretion completely, are not exercised arbitrarily, but according to well understood rules. It must be so in this instance. The party in authority, whether the Minister of Justice or the Government, who has charge of the administration of this Act, will follow the precedents which have been established and will apply the jurisprudence now established in the mother country. It is the intention of the Department of Justice to set down certain rules and regulations which will be at once a bar to a certain class of applications. No doubt applications will come from all parts of the country to have this Act applied to this or that criminal. Three-fourths of these applications will be such that the Minister will be able to say that they do not come within the rule and cannot be entertained. In regard to the party who ought to be in authority, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), suggests that it should be the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice has come to the conclusion that it ought to be the Governor in Council. I believe that we should leave the matter as it is. The Bill which was introduced in the Senate has been carefully considered by the Minister of Justice and his officers, it has been carefully considered by another Chamber, and they have come to the conclusion that it is better to leave the matter as it is. There is a precedent for it. It is in a modified sense the exercise of the pardoning power which is vested in the Governor in Council, but there are rules which govern the exercise of this power by the

Str WILFRID LAURIER.

Governor in Council. The sovereign is not now at liberty to exercise the pardoning power as in the olden times, but he must be advised by his Council and his Council must be advised by the Minister of Justice. I think there is safety in following the same rule here. My hon. friend knows that in a case of murder, for instance, when an application is made for the commutation of the death sentence, it is considered by the officers of the Department of Justice, who go into it very carefully, after which the hon. Minister goes into the case carefully himself and comes to a certain conclusion upon it. If they come to the conclusion that clemency ought to be exercised then the judge who tried the case has to be consulted. The judge gives his own opinion upon it. Then, after the judge has been consulted, after the Minister of Justice has considered the report, he makes his report to Council. I think there is safety in all these precautions, and I think it would be better to follow the same procedure in regard to this measure and to have a settled process for considering the applications of different parties so as to reach, if possible, the best solution under the circumstances. I think that view will appear reasonable to my hon. friend if he gives a moment's consideration to it.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to take up the time of the House, but I hold my view very strongly, and what the right hon. gentleman has said has only deepened that conviction. Let us take what we know as members of the Government sitting around the Council board. What are you going to have when this legislation becomes law? Immediately there is a new impetus given to applications from persons who have friends in the penitentiaries. The pressure that is made upon the Minister of Justice to exercise the pardoning power is now but an atom as compared with the cases that will now be brought up for what may be called an extension of the clemency power. It will take up the time of the Cabinet much more than it does at present. With the multiplicity of business that they have before them—they have just as much as they can do now and more than they can get through with, and you will multiply the vexatious cases that come before them, by a large percentage. That is one idea and if I were a member of the Government I would feel that it was doubtful policy to inject into the Cabinet such questions as this, large in number and of a vexatious character and that will bring a great deal of trouble to Ministers. What happens as a matter of fact? Although there are thirteen men sitting around the Council table it does not occur in one case out of twenty that any of that number, or very few at most, except the Minister of Justice, understand the history and merits of the case.

The PRIME MINISTER. Oh, no.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me go on. There are cases which come to be celebrated, or which come to be eminent cases, which will receive the attention of every member of the Cabinet, or will be looked into by a majority of the Cabinet, but, there will not be the same urgency in these cases. These cases will be more common and in the end, although a case will be submitted to the arbitrament of thirteen men, the history of the crime, the history of the conduct of the prisoner and all these things, which a man in touch with the daily course of the department knows, will be known to the Minister of Justice, but they will not be known to the other gentlemen of the Cabinet who are not living in the atmosphere of the department and are not cognizant of all its daily conditions as they occur. It will therefore happen that the decision will be given after all, either upon the presentation of the case by the Minister of Justice, or it will be given from other considerations by men, the greater number of whom cannot be thoroughly cognizant of the facts and circumstances of the case. If the decision is left with the Minister of Justice every other member of the Cabinet can very well say, when pressure is brought upon him from every part of the country: It is in the hands of the Minister of Justice and I cannot interfere. It is his sole work; he must be responsible and you must not bother me with it. You thus eliminate immediately a great many kinds of cases which otherwise will be brought before you. I am not trying to talk philosophy, but it is the common-sense idea when I say that the further you get away from the idea which is, after all, the main idea in the minds of the people, that justice is a reflex of the Divine law,—that it is, if one objects to that expression, a translation of the law of effect following cause absolutely and certainly—the farther away you get from that, and the more you teach the people generally that after all justice is simply a human device in this country, and a human device that can be worked by politicians and members of the Government, the more you are weakening the effect of justice in the country. I would infinitely rather have an occasional injustice through a wrongful decision of a judge than to have the impression in the minds of the people that the decisions of judges are not final, but that there is a recourse to the politicians afterwards. If that justice, which is personated in the dignity, the decorum and the inaccessibility of a judge, is after all made subject to a final appeal to the party politician you are going a long way towards breaking down in the minds of the people a long-established and fundamental tradition with reference to the administration of justice. That is the peril in the ticket-of-leave system. Therefore, I say, hedge it around all you can, and prohibit it as far as you possibly can the approaches by way of political influence. That is why I am

in favour of giving this power to the Justice Department which, whatever else may be said with reference to our Governments, has generally stood in the country, and uniformly stood, as a department uninfluenced by the varying party politics of the time.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would just like to point out, along the same line as the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, that if the power is put into the hands of the Minister of Justice, then members of Parliament and candidates for Parliament would be free from the pressure to which they are now subject from people who may have friends in prison, to do something for them. If a member or a candidate is in a position to say that this power is exercised by a judicial authority, the Minister of Justice, and by him alone, and that political pressure shall not count for much, he will be saved from a great deal of inconvenience. There is not a man in this House who has not been approached at some time or other by persons who have friends in jail, and who has been told that he would receive certain support if he would use all the pressure he could bring to bear on the Government. It will save members and a candidate from a great deal of inconvenience if they are in a position to say to these people, "We cannot do anything for you; if you have a good case, you must lay it before the Minister of Justice, who will treat it judicially and not politically." Let everything connected with the administration of justice be kept in a judicial position, and do not bring it into the field of politics. If the suggestion of my hon. friend is carried out, I believe the whole country will trust the matter to the Minister of Justice rather than to the Governor in Council which is more subject to political pressure.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not think the Government should press this Bill this session, because the members have not been able to inform themselves—as to the conditions under which the legislation was pressed forward in England. I am unable to conceive a case that cannot be met by our pardoning power, and the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) need not have apologized for introducing philosophy into this discussion. If there is any question into the discussion of which philosophy must enter, it is the question of the deterrent influence of the sanctions attached to crime. What we are asked to do is this. For the sake of a few persons, we are asked to imperil the deterrent efficiency of our punishment. That is what it really comes to, and the right hon. gentleman seems fully aware of the danger himself. So that I think we ought to be in a position to consult the debates which took place in England when this legislation was passed through the Imperial House of Commons; because I think it will

be found that it was intended to meet the case of political offenders, and not the case of the ordinary criminal. To emphasize the danger of this legislation take the speech of my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), an able man and a lawyer, a man who might one day be a Minister of the Crown, perhaps a Minister of Justice. What argument strikes him, although he is a lawyer? The purely sentimental, philanthropic argument—the pity of it that a certain individual who had committed a crime should undergo a severe punishment and lose his liberty for a given period, and not, as the hon. member says, get a chance. The working of the ticket-of-leave system, so far as I have been able to look into it in England, has not been a gratifying success. There is a radical difference, not politically, but socially, between our conditions and those of England. The social position of Ministers of the Crown in England removes them far from such pressure as can be brought to bear on Ministers of the Crown here. I think it is not unreasonable that we should ask the Government to postpone this legislation. No harm can be done by postponing it to another year. A graver subject than this has not been brought before the House of Commons this year, and yet we are here at a time when we cannot discuss it. Half or two-thirds of the House have gone and if any man were to attempt to discuss it with the gravity and at the length it demands, he would be accused of taking up time to lengthen the session. The danger of this legislation is that it will lower the efficiency of our sanctions. Everybody knows that one of the greatest dangers to the efficiency of sanctions is the introduction of the element of uncertainty into punishment. When you do that you give at once to the criminal, who is a criminal partly because his organ of hope is too large, a field for his organ of hope to work in. In doing that I am afraid that you will strike a blow at the efficiency of our system; and you will also, I think, stimulate what is already too strong in our community, the tendency to look at these matters sentimentally.

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot see why we should send these cases to the Governor in Council. When a prisoner is to be pardoned, the question never comes before the Council at all, except in the case of capital punishment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is nothing here said about the Council at all.

Mr. HAGGART. That is what we want eliminated from the Bill, and then the statute would be the same as in England where the Home Secretary is responsible alone and not the Government.

The PRIME MINISTER. We can go through the clauses in committee, and then

Mr. DAVIN.

the committee may rise, and I will confer with the Minister of Justice on the matter.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. HAGGART. Why, there is nothing at all in this clause calling for reference to the Governor in Council?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is what I said and I could not understand the objection.

Mr. HAGGART. We were misled by the explanation of the First Minister.

Mr. FOSTER. Evidently no one has read the clause.

Mr. DAVIN. It would be a scandal to carry a clause of this importance when we find that the leading members on either side have not read it.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have said that we had better pass the clauses and we need not take the Bill out of committee; I will confer with the Minister of Justice and give him the benefit of the discussion to-day.

On section 2,

Mr. FOSTER. Before we go out of committee, I must say I do not understand the modus operandi even now. There may be provision generally as to who is to advise the Governor General, but it is not provided here. The Governor General issues the license or revokes it. He does it by instrument under the hand of the Secretary of State. But who advises the Governor General?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is intended that the Minister of Justice should advise him.

Mr. FOSTER. But is it not provided? And if left unprovided it would really be the Council after all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This does not confer any power, but only regulates it. The Governor General will, of course, in all cases, act under the advice of the Minister of Justice, and not under the advice of any other Minister.

Mr. HAGGART. But he can do it under any Minister.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, but no other Minister, being cognizant of the facts, would interfere any more than he would interfere with my department.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it should be set out.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think you will find it is not necessary.

Mr. FOSTER. Well. I want to say one other word in support of what my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) has said. I ask the Prime Minister to consider if it would not be better to let this mellow for another year? We are here a mere remnant of the House, and this is a very important measure. It would not hurt at all to let it stay over for a year, and, in the meantime, we could, probably, get advice from the judges and others.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and committee rose and reported progress.

#### GRANT TO THE CITY OF OTTAWA

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 187) respecting the city of Ottawa.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose that this would be the proper stage to have a discussion on the Bill. I do not wish to speak at length, but I do think the Government have entered upon what may prove to be a very serious departure from the healthy rule that should govern us in cases of this kind. When we were discussing the resolution, the Minister of Finance stated that the capital city had, above all cities in Canada, a claim upon the Government. I was rather surprised at that. I had been searching in vain for a case in which the very opposite principle is not recognized. We all have great pride in the capital of Canada, and no one would stand in the way of the growth of the city. But I think that if we consider the immense advantages that are given to the capital city, these are a complete offset to any claim that the city may have for any improvements other than those that belong strictly to the Government. I refer first to the city of Toronto, and I appeal particularly to the right hon. First Minister. Toronto is the centre of the province, the Parliament buildings are there, a large number of public institutions are there; and yet there is not a single penny paid in the form of municipal taxation on account of any institution there. That matter was discussed some years ago, and it was thought that if the principle were admitted at all, it would open the door to very serious difficulty. Toronto urged, for instance: We keep up a great public park in which are the legislative assembly buildings, and you contribute nothing towards it. But it was pointed out on the other hand that the buildings were a great adornment to the city, and that the city of Toronto had special advantages through being the capital and through having the public buildings located there. In the province of Ontario a limit is fixed by the legislature to the taxation that may be imposed for municipal purposes.

We have found in the province of Ontario that there is scarcely a town, I might almost say, a village that has kept within the limit of civic taxation which, as the right hon. gentleman knows, is two cents on the dollar, exclusive of what may be raised for debentures and for school rates. I am glad to know that Ottawa is an exception to this position of things. Now, what has happened? The towns and villages throughout the province have been so pressed by making improvements that they have been forced to go to the legislature almost year after year to get their debt consolidated. Now, without entering upon a long discussion, I am unable to see a single reason that can be urged that the city of Ottawa is entitled to compensation to relieve the taxpayer here from municipal taxation. I shall not go into the fact that we are maintaining certain streets and bridges at the expense of the people of the country generally. Wisely, perhaps, the Government has undertaken the maintenance of a handsome park, but after all it is a park for the city of Ottawa. But taking everything into account, I do not see any substantial reason, in consequence of the capital being in Ottawa, why we should relieve the people here from the public purse of a single cent of municipal taxation. I venture to say they have ample compensation in the fact of the Capital being located here. There is not a city in Canada which would not readily take upon itself more than the city of Ottawa is being asked to take upon itself, to have the national Government established in its borders, and that without any bonus. But that is not a question to raise. We must have a capital somewhere, Ottawa is the proper place, and we all feel a pride in it. But we are departing from what seems to me to be a healthy rule. Let us not ask the city to bear one dollar that we should bear ourselves; but on the other hand, let us not open the door to a rule that is manifestly unfair to every city and town in Canada.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am willing, as taking a deep interest in this matter along with my colleague, to leave the case entirely on the ground stated by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). He says that we should not do anything to relieve the people of Ottawa of a single cent of taxation. Now, I am quite willing, as representing Ottawa, that the case should be left on the ground; and if the House will bear with me, I will show conclusively that the hon. member for Bothwell has every reason to support this measure according to his own principle. I agree with him that this is not a party question or a local question, that the whole country has an interest in its capital city. The capital is part of a national trust. I believe that from one end of the country to the other people take an interest in Ottawa as the capital of Canada. That is a sentiment which is not common to this country but

prevails everywhere. Every nation takes pride in its capital, and I believe that every nation in the world has at one time or other contributed something towards making its capital attractive and a credit to the nation. In some countries enormous sums of money have been appropriated towards improving the capital city, notably in the case of Paris.

Mr. CLANCY. It may have been very unwise for France to do so.

Mr. BELCOURT. I think everybody who has visited Paris must have come to the conclusion that it was a very wise thing for the national Government of France to expend the money it did on beautifying that city; and I think everybody acquainted with the facts believes that it was the best investment of money that could be made in France.

Mr. BERGERON. But it was not spent under the same circumstances that we have here; it was spent by Napoleon, not by a parliamentary government.

Mr. BELCOURT. It was spent for the purpose of embellishing the capital.

Mr. BERGERON. But there was no popular parliament sitting in Paris at the time.

Mr. BELCOURT. I hope my hon. friend is not trying to make political capital for the elections. I should be very sorry if any member of this House took that view of it. This is not a party question, surely we can rise above that.

Mr. BERGERON. But he has not chosen a good example; as a matter of history Paris is not a parallel case.

Mr. BELCOURT. Of course my hon. friend and myself cannot agree. I think it is a parallel case, it is at least a precedent, because the money was expended in Paris by the national Government, and I repeat that everybody who visits Paris must come to the conclusion that the money was a good investment for the people of France. I say that the immense sum of money that was expended on purchasing and adorning the Place de la Concorde was the very best investment France could have made. The expenditure made by the national Government in building the Grand Opera is one of the best investments the Government could have made. I grant that this country has done a great deal for Ottawa, and the citizens of Ottawa have done a great deal for it also. But aside from the national considerations I have mentioned, as a matter of justice and fair-play, I am quite willing to rest the case on the ground laid down by the member for Bothwell. If the citizens of Ottawa were asking the Government to contribute towards embellishing this city in order to relieve themselves of their duty in that regard, I would be the first to say that their position was untenable. But that is not

Mr. BELCOURT.

the position. The proposition now is that the Government shall contribute the sum of \$45,000 towards the improvement of the city, while the city contributes \$15,000 out of the \$60,000. As was explained the other day by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), the Government to-day pays the city for water and fire protection a sum in the neighbourhood of \$15,000. The city consents that this sum of \$15,000 shall go to this fund of \$60,000 for the purpose exclusively of improvements to sidewalks and streets. So that not only, as the hon. member for Bothwell puts it, are the citizens of Ottawa not relieved of a single cent of taxation, but they are actually contributing \$15,000 out of the civic grant to join with the Federal Government in this purpose.

Now, I want to give the House some figures which I think will speak more eloquently than I can do.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it not a fact that the Government is keeping up Wellington street and certain bridges and the parks?

Mr. BELCOURT. Yes, I am coming to that in a minute, but I want to show the conditions under which this is done. The municipal assessment of Ottawa is about \$25,000,000, of which \$11,000,000 is Government property.

Mr. MACLEAN. How much of that is taxable?

Mr. BELCOURT. \$25,000,000 is the total valuation, and \$11,000,000 is the assessed value of Government property.

Mr. HAGGART. How much are the other exemptions?

Mr. BELCOURT. They amount to between \$3,000,000 and \$4,000,000 upon religious property and schools. If the Government property paid taxes, the same as the property of other ratepayers, the city would have an annual revenue from it of \$250,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the assessable basis upon which the taxes of the city are levied?

Mr. BELCOURT. \$25,000,000 is the total valuation for taxation purposes.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman does not understand me. The hon. gentleman says that \$25,000,000 is the valuation of property, but when you deduct the exemptions, how much is left upon which taxes are levied? It would be about \$10,000,000.

Mr. BELCOURT. It is more than that. I made a mistake in my statement. The total valuation of property on which the corporation levies taxation is between \$24,000,000 and \$25,000,000. Besides that there is about \$11,000,000 of Government property and between \$3,000,000 and \$4,000,000 of religious property.

Mr. DAVIN. \$25,000,000 is assessable for taxation purposes ?

Mr. BELCOURT. Between \$24,000,000 and \$25,000,000.

Mr. WILSON. What is the rate on the dollar you pay here ?

Mr. BELCOURT. Twenty-one mills, exclusive of local improvements and school rates.

Mr. MACLEAN. Not school rates ; they are in the general levy.

Mr. BELCOURT. My colleague (Mr. Hutchison) corrects me. That rate is exclusive of water rates, local improvements and income tax. The revenue which the city would derive if the Government property paid taxes in the same way that taxes are paid by ordinary ratepayers would be \$250,000. Not only is the Government property exempt, but civil servants are exempt from paying income tax which everybody else has to pay. Moreover, very valuable property, which at one time contributed largely to the civic revenue, has been expropriated by the Government. The property on which the Langevin Block now stands yielded a large amount of taxation, but by the expropriation of that property by the Government, the city lost the revenue from it.

Mr. BERGERON. The Langevin Block is an ornament.

Mr. BELCOURT. Yes, but it is not a source of revenue.

Mr. ROGERS. Did the Government not purchase that ground ?

Mr. BELCOURT. Yes, they purchased it, but by the expropriation of it the city lost the revenue that they derived from it prior to its expropriation.

Mr. ELLIS. Surely the value remains. You have still got the value in money in that property.

Mr. BELCOURT. Yes, but the revenue formerly derived from taxation is lost.

Mr. BERGERON. The people who have sold that property have built somewhere else and are paying taxes to the corporation.

Mr. BELCOURT. The only point I wish to make is that this property at one time contributed to the civic revenue, but by the expropriation of it by the Government, the city has lost the revenue which it derived from it.

Mr. FOSTER. But there is lots of land in the city.

Mr. BELCOURT. The same argument applies to the Museum on Sussex street, the Art Gallery on the corner of Queen and Albert streets, and to other places.

Mr. HAGGART. The hill here was Ordinance land and was exempted anyway.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that civil servants paid no taxes ?

Mr. BELCOURT. I said they paid no income taxes.

Mr. McMULLEN. They pay taxes on their buildings.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am not going for one moment to attempt to minimize the advantage which the city of Ottawa derives from the fact that the seat of Government is here. I quite recognize it, and I rejoice that it is in Ottawa. I believe there is no other place in Canada which was better suited to become the seat of Government than Ottawa. It is situated in the very centre of Canada.

Mr. LARIVIERE. No ; Winnipeg is the centre of Canada.

Mr. BELCOURT. And it is on the boundary between two of the oldest and largest provinces in Canada, a spot which seems to have been created purposely for the erection of buildings such as these. I rejoice that it is so, and I do not, for one moment, minimize the great advantage which it has been to this city that it was chosen to be the capital of Canada. But I take issue with those who say that the growth and development of the capital are due entirely, or largely, to the fact that it is the seat of Government. I say that Ottawa was bound, independently of the fact that it is the seat of Government, to become a very great industrial and railway centre. The resources of the forests and of the mines and the value of the Ottawa River will combine to make Ottawa one of the largest and the most prosperous cities in Canada. Whilst every citizen in Ottawa fully recognizes that it owes a great deal to the fact that it is the seat of Government, the people have not rested upon their oars, and have at no time in the history of the capital, neglected to perform their duties in the direction of civic government. If hon. gentlemen look at it fairly, and see what has been done in other cities, they will come to the conclusion that the citizens of Ottawa have shown a great deal of public spirit and energy, and that they are to-day burdened with very large expense incurred for the purpose of advancing civic improvement. Go about the city, see the number of parks and the number of lawns which are kept up by the citizens. It matters not how small many of the houses are, you will see these lawns around them in every part of the city.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you not see them in any city in Canada ?

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not think so, to the extent as in Ottawa. It requires additional expenditure to keep up these lawns. At the

present moment the city is incurring an expenditure of nearly \$750,000, for the purpose of constructing a main sewer which will have the effect of very materially improving the city. The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) wanted to know something about the bridges. I am going to tell the House something on that subject that is not but ought to be generally known. The fact is that the bridges over the canal and over the Ottawa River, which should have been constructed by the Government, have been constructed and paid for by the city of Ottawa. I think there is no other city in Canada where a bridge has been constructed over a canal or other public work that has not been paid for by the Government.

Mr. BERGERON. The new bridge at the Chaudière has been paid for by the Department of Public Works.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am not speaking of the bridge over the Ottawa River. That is an international bridge. The bridge over the slides at the Chaudière was constructed and paid for by the city of Ottawa. The sum of \$45,000 was expended there. Here is a bridge constructed over public works bringing revenue to the Dominion Government.

Mr. MACLEAN. How much revenue?

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not know.

Mr. BERGERON. Surely they had to build that bridge, or else they would not be able to work their mills.

Mr. BELCOURT. The fact remains that it is a source of revenue to the Government. I do not know that it makes much difference whether that revenue is large or small. The city was not under any obligation to build that bridge, and yet it did so. Then, if we take the Dufferin bridge over the Rideau Canal, I do not think any one will contend that that is a bridge that should not have been built by the Government; yet that bridge was built by the city, and some \$90,000 expended on it. Pooley's bridge, also over the canal, was built by the city, and \$18,000 expended. The Maria Street bridge was built by the city, and \$10,000 expended.

Mr. WILSON. I understood the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), on introducing this Bill, to say that all bridges over canals, not only in Ottawa, but all over the country, were kept up by the Government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My impression is that where a bridge is constructed over a Dominion canal, the Dominion Government constructs and maintains it. I have insisted on that in the case of my own province, and I think the Dominion Government recognizes that principle.

Mr. BELCOURT. Another fact to which I want to direct the attention of the House is that the Major Hill Park was handed over by the city to the Government.

Mr. BELCOURT.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the hon. gentleman prefer the city having it now? Has the city made a sacrifice?

Mr. BELCOURT. That is the very point I am addressing myself to. That park is in the very heart of Ottawa, and is a very valuable property. If the city had chosen to divide that property into building lots, it would have derived not only a great revenue from the sale of the lots, but also a revenue from taxes on the property. Instead of that, the city, after spending \$35,000 on the property, handed it over to the Government.

Mr. CLANCY. Was it forced to do so, or did the city suggest that the Government should take it over?

Mr. BELCOURT. It was a matter of agreement.

Mr. CLANCY. The city wanted to get rid of it, of course.

Mr. BELCOURT. The city lost that property, and lost the revenue which it might have derived from it. In order to allow the Government to improve Wellington street, the strip of ground, which has been valued all the way up to \$40,000, was also given up by the city for nothing. If you take the various amounts I mention, you will have \$223,000 of expenditure by the city of Ottawa which should have been made by the Government. Now, from the fact that these buildings are here, and that they have to be protected against fire and supplied with water, the city of Ottawa has had to construct and maintain a larger number of water mains and a larger number of drains, and has had very largely to increase its fire appliances. By reason of the fire which took place recently in the Western Block, the city of Ottawa almost doubled its annual expenditure for the purpose of fire protection. Before 1898 its expenditure for fire protection was \$28,000; now it is \$45,000. That increase was almost wholly due to the fact that these buildings required better fire protection than the city was able to give prior to 1898. That fact shows conclusively that the city of Ottawa, though it does receive some benefit, and large benefit from the fact that this is the capital of Canada, is also obliged to incur very heavy expenditures. The percentage of expenditure for fire protection on the civic revenue is six and three-tenths per cent in the city of Toronto, seven and two-tenths per cent in the city of Ottawa, almost double that of the city of Toronto; and I assert with confidence that that expenditure is due exclusively to the fact that these Parliament Buildings are here and have to be protected from fire. For water supply, the amount paid by the Government to the city is to-day \$15,000. From actual calculation it is proven that if the Government were to pay at the same rate that I and my colleague and other rate-payers in Ottawa pay, it would pay the

sum of \$45,000 for water alone. I am sure that the House will be astounded when I tell it that the sum paid for water by the Experimental Farm is not more than \$250 a year. If the city received from the Government for water what it receives from other people, it would receive \$45,000, the sum which it is proposed to grant to the city by this Bill. That is the sum the Government would have to pay for fire protection.

I do not want to keep the committee any longer than absolutely necessary, but I thought it would be of advantage in this discussion that the committee should be put in possession of the figures I have submitted. If the House will bear with me a little longer, I would like to point out what is being done elsewhere in the improvement of national capitals. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) says that the case I quoted of the city of Paris is not a parallel one, but I do not think he will say that the cases of London, Dublin and Edinburgh are not parallel. As far as I can see, these cities are not in any different position from Ottawa. Take the South Australian capitals; they are in the same position, and yet in every one of these you will find that the government contribute very largely to the civic expenditure. In the city of London, England, the Government pays the same rate of taxation as other people; also in the city of Dublin. In the city of London the Government contributes, besides, annually towards the maintenance of the fire brigade \$50,000, and towards industrial schools, \$43,000, and it also pays the city the receipts from local taxation licenses. In Dublin, the Government contributes annually a sum amounting to what it would pay, if rated like other property; it pays for water supply at a fixed rate per 1,000 gallons, and it maintains the police force. In the city of Adelaide, South Australia, the government collects all license fees, such as hotels, auctioneers, &c., and pays to the municipality 5 shillings in the pound on all expenditures on streets, bridges and jetties.

Mr. BERGERON. Have they representatives in the House?

Mr. BELCOURT. I think so. In New South Wales the government pays taxes on all its property in the town of Sydney, except that used for railway purposes. It controls the parks and police, and contributes one-third towards the maintenance of the fire brigade. In the Cape of Good Hope the government contributes to the rates in respect of all government buildings in its capital, Cape Town, with the exception of the House of Parliament, and the railway building, and such buildings are duly rated for this purpose. It also pays over half the cost of police maintenance, and contributes annually \$2,500 towards the protection of government buildings from fire. It also aids in maintaining the public gardens.

I shall not refer to case of Washington, because then I might leave myself open to the charge that it was not a parallel case, but if this or any other government will do for this district what the government of the United States has done for the district of Columbia, I would be willing to give up our right to representation.

Mr. FOSTER. You could very safely do it.

Mr. BELCOURT. That remains to be seen. I am not urging this from a local point of view, but have quoted these figures simply for the purpose of showing that we are not asking anything from the Government, save what governments in other countries have recognized as due their capitals, and I base the claims of the capital of the Dominion to the recognition we ask, on broad, national grounds. I believe that this expenditure is one which the country is willing to agree to, and hope the measure will go through without division.

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

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. MACLEAN. I desire to take up the attention of the House for only a very few minutes. I intend to support the vote now before us, but for reasons other than those advanced by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt). We in Ontario have had a great many examples of exemption from municipal taxation; and these exemptions have become so burdensome to the municipalities throughout Ontario that there is a growing agitation to have them removed. We have gradually removed a number of them but still they are burdensome. The principle that ought to govern in these things is that those who enjoy the benefits of civic government, be they individuals or corporations, ought to pay for them in accordance with their means. Every city supplies many things to the people that live within its borders—fire protection, light, water, police protection, the maintenance of court-houses, salaries of judicial officers who are in the service of those who live in the municipalities, and so on. If the Dominion of Canada enjoys these benefits within the city of Ottawa it ought to pay its share for them. The ordinary taxpayer in the city is the man who earns a dollar or a dollar and a half a day, and it is upon him that the burden of these exemptions fall. He gets no benefits from them, but they are a burden to him, and the injustice of it must be seen by every person who is in favour of equitable taxation. I would make corporations whether Government or other, and I go so far as to say even educational institutions, pay their share for the privileges they enjoy through the instrumentality of a civic government. The only persons who

get the benefit of municipal taxation at the present time and do not pay for it are those who own property in a place where real estate is rapidly advancing in value—those who receive what is called the unearned increment. These people get the benefit of the location of the Dominion buildings and of the capital here, but the ordinary man who earns a dollar or a dollar and a half a day is taxed to the utmost on what he can bear to pay for all the benefits of civic government for those who are exempt. I do not say that I would go to the length of taking the value of the Dominion property here and making the Dominion pay 2 cents on the dollar—

Mr. CLANCY. No half-way in the argument.

Mr. MACLEAN. No, no half-way in the argument. I am utterly opposed to exemptions. We have suffered much from them in Ontario and I as a citizen and a taxpayer of Toronto object to being taxed to provide protection, light, good streets and so on for the people of Ontario who have their buildings there. The province of Ontario ought to pay for all the benefits she enjoys. The civil servants, whether of Ontario or the Dominion, if they live in the city and secure the advantages of it, ought to pay their share of the expense. The incomes of the civil servants are exempt, but I have to pay on my income, and I do not see why any one else should not.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the hon. member (Mr. Maclean) pay on his sessional indemnity?

Mr. MACLEAN. No, that is exempt by Act of Parliament; but the moment it comes under the law, I am willing to pay on it. On the general principle that whoever enjoys the benefits of municipal services should pay their share of the expense, I shall vote for the resolution now before the Chair.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I desire to say a word which may facilitate the debate. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) offered a suggestion the other day that the term of this grant was too long and that it might fairly be reduced to ten years. We are prepared to accept that suggestion, so the debate might as well be continued from that basis.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad that the hon. Minister has accepted my suggestion. Changes are so rapid in this country that to have things of this kind fixed for a long term of years is not as advantageous. I cannot approve of this grant under the present circumstances. In the first place, I see by the memorandum that the Minister has been kind enough to furnish me, that there are two classes of expenditure by the

Mr. MACLEAN.

Dominion Government in Ottawa, some being classed as ordinary and some as extraordinary. The ordinary expenditure includes the work performed under agreement—water supply, the maintenance of Major's Hill park, the bridges, maintenance of Wellington street, lighting, sprinkling and snow-cleaning. Extraordinary expenditures include contribution to drain on Wellington street, improvement of Major's Hill park in 1886-87, paving of Wellington street and Dufferin bridge in 1886-87, contribution to the construction of central fire station 1887-88, contribution to a bridge on the Rideau River in 1886-87 and 1888-89, contribution to the approach to the Chaudière bridge in 1893-94, contribution to the asphaltting of the approaches to Sappers' and Dufferin bridges in 1896-97, construction of fence around Major's Hill park, 1897-98 and 1898-99 and extraordinary repairs to Sappers' bridge and construction of a sidewalk on Wellington street the same years. These two classes of expenditures together amounted on the average within the last ten or fifteen years to \$61,000 a year. We propose in addition to that to spend \$60,000 more; that makes \$120,000 a year, or about \$1,250,000 every ten years in the city of Ottawa. Now, it is said the city derives no benefit from the Parliament Buildings being located here. I would like to ask any member of the city council if he would not be willing to give a substantial bonus to-day to any firm of manufacturers to locate here and employ 1,000, 1,200, or 1,500 hands who become wage-earners, and who represent for the most part that number of families. I understand we have about 1,500 civil servants in the city of Ottawa who are wage-earners. It is said that they do not pay taxes upon their income. Well, I think the civil servant pays taxes on his property as well as in other ways, they become taxpayers in the same way as any other individual in the city. The civil servant pays water rates and lighting as well as others. Every civil servant is a consumer of the produce that is made or brought here; in every respect he helps to keep up the revenue of the city except paying taxes upon income. Therefore, the city of Ottawa is not entitled to any great consideration in that regard. I agree with the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) in that I am opposed to exemptions. I would be quite willing if the same principle obtained in every department of life and that Government property should be assessed the same as any other property. I hope to live to see the day that all exemptions will be abolished, and that all property of every nature inside a municipal corporation will be assessed. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) stated that if they imposed the same rate of taxation upon \$11,000,000 worth of Government property in this city as they do upon private property they would realize an additional sum of \$250,000 a year. But

he forgets that if this Government property were made assessable the same rate of taxation which prevails now would be diminished.

Mr. BELCOURT. I said that \$11,000,000 is the ratable value of Government property in Ottawa.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that there is \$25,000,000 worth of taxable property from which taxes are raised now, and if you increase that sum to \$36,000,000, which would include the Government property not now assessed, you would not require to strike as high a rate of taxation to raise the same amount of money; therefore, it would not come to \$250,000, but to about two-fifths of that. I see that there is nothing included for keeping up these grounds in this \$61,447 we are spending now; therefore, there is a very much larger amount of expenditure in the city in connection with Government buildings than is shown here. Then we must take into account all the labourers who are employed on the Government Buildings from time to time, every one of whom becomes a wage-earner and contributes to the advantage of the city the same as a wage-earner contributes to the city of Toronto, or Hamilton, or any other. I am inclined to think that the Premier made a somewhat amusing boast when he said that if his party came into power he was prepared to make Ottawa the Washington of the North. I think he has been twitted so often about that that he wants to get out of it some way, and this proposition is an evidence of it. So far as he is redeeming one of his pledges, I respect him, because he has broken so many that he ought to be given credit if he redeems only one. But how far all the other cities will endorse this additional expenditure is another question. We who live 350 miles from Ottawa—

Mr. BELCOURT. Only six months in the year.

Mr. SPROULE. Now, we come here and we spend money during the six months, while the session lasts, and it all inures to the benefit of Ottawa. That is one of the items that I forgot, and I think my hon. friend for reminding me of it. If I take the number of members in the House of Commons and in the Senate and calculate how much they spend in the city of Ottawa during the session, it amounts to a very large sum, and all this money is a contribution to Ottawa from every other part of the country. This fact makes my argument very much stronger. No other city in Canada has this advantage. There is another item in this Bill that I object to. Clause 7 says:

The committee may purchase, acquire, and hold real property in the city of Ottawa, or in the vicinity thereof, for the purpose of public parks or squares, streets, avenues, drives or thoroughfares.

I do not think this commission should be allowed to hold property at all except as representatives of the Crown. I do not think that they should be allowed to buy property. We have already enough Government property around here. So I say for these reasons that I am opposed to this Bill, and I am satisfied my constituents are opposed to it, and I believe the people in every other part of the country are opposed to it. In addition to all the money we spend here during the session of Parliament, in addition to the fact that about 1,500 civil servants who are residents here, and, with their families, contribute to the advantage of the city. I do not think that we should give \$60,000 a year over and above the \$61,000 we are spending at the present time.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) When this matter first came up for consideration I thought I ought to oppose it on the ground that I could not find any precedent for the Government appropriating Dominion funds to civic purposes. But after weighing the arguments advanced by hon. gentlemen who have spoken in the debate, and in view of the suggestion of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), (who now proposes to make the term 10 years instead of 20), I feel disposed to modify my first impressions. The statement has been made that if the property of the Dominion of Canada, within the city of Ottawa, were taxed at the same rate as other property, it would yield an addition to the income of the city of \$250,000 a year.

I do consider that a legal argument, because we cannot—we dare not recognize the principle that Government property should be taxed. If we do, we will never know where to stop—we will have to pursue that principle in other localities. While that is not a legal argument, I regard it as an equitable consideration—a matter that might fairly be taken into the account—one which would induce us to the conclusion that it would be fair to contribute something, not in the way of a tax, but in the way of something of the nature of a bonus. I do not see any reason, if the federal authorities enjoys the benefit of civic government, of fire and police protection, of the use of streets and sidewalks, why they should not contribute something in return for what they receive. It seems to me, therefore that upon equitable grounds, the Government has a right to contribute something. Then, again, there is the argument in regard to water rates. It is said that if we had to pay for our water supply at the same rate as other property holders, our contribution would be, not \$14,000, but \$45,000 a year. That argument is entitled to consideration. It is also alleged that the citizens and the corporation of Ottawa have gone to greater expense by reason of the fact that the capital is situate here. The citizens have expended more in beautifying their homes and their surroundings, and the corporation have gone to greater expense in

improving their streets and in making Ottawa worthy of the capital of the Dominion. This is also entitled to some consideration. Then, too, weight attaches to the argument advanced by the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), that we ought to regard this matter from a national stand-point. There is but one capital of the Dominion of Canada, and we are all proud and should be proud of our national capital. We ought to be ready to make some slight sacrifice towards adorning that capital—towards making it a city beautiful, surrounding, imposing and magnificent Parliament buildings—a sight which strangers cannot help to appreciate and admire. For these reasons, I think, I think we ought to be prepared to make some reasonable concession to the city of Ottawa. Let me make one suggestion in regard to the salaries of civil servants. In the petition presented to the Government by the city of Ottawa, the statement is made, that \$1,000,000 of the income of the civil service is exempt from taxation. If that \$1,000,000 paid its taxes in the same way as other property, the civic government would derive from that source \$20,000 a year. Now, whatever amount we contribute towards the civic government of the city of Ottawa, we should look to a condition of affairs in future whereby that amount would be reduced by this \$20,000, which this Parliament ought to authorize to be imposed upon the civil service. I have never been able to understand the sense of the exemption. It seems a sort of legal fiction that has no foundation, or, if it has it should be removed. I understand that the local legislature of the province of Ontario has no power to authorize the civic authorities here to impose taxes upon the income of the Dominion employees, and the reason assigned is, that if Ontario had such power, the effect would be or might be to diminish and prejudice the value and efficiency of the service. It has been held by the courts that the power to authorize such a tax is not now vested in the local legislature, and consequently cannot be conveyed by the province to the civic authorities at Ottawa. I am one of those who believes that this condition of affairs should be changed, that this Parliament ought by statute to waive its right to have the salaries of Dominion civil servants exempted from taxation for civic purposes. This Parliament ought not only to waive its right but authorize the local government to enable the civic government at Ottawa to tax the salaries of civil servants for the purpose of supplementing the civic revenue. I hope, in the near future, to see such a measure passed by this Parliament. I trust that it will then reduce the amount of the subsidy which this Parliament is now called upon to pay, by at least \$20,000, or by such sum as the tax upon that \$1,000,000 will amount to.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, in hurriedly looking over the paper which the hon. Min-  
Mr. BELL (Prince East, P.E.I.)

ister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was kind enough to give me, I took the ordinary and extraordinary expenditure, and united them together, whereas in reality they were united. I gave the extraordinary expenditure as \$61,000 a year. As a matter of fact, it is only \$32,000 a year. I used it in my argument, and it was incorrect to that extent. I desire to make the correction.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, it generally falls to my lot to put in a few words after the great lights have had their say. There has been so much reiteration, unfortunately, of what has been said before during this session, to which we have been compelled to listen, that I hesitate to say anything which may be a repetition. I cannot allow this motion to pass without saying a few words in opposition to it. I would not take this ground, if it were not that the expenditure which has taken place upon the public buildings in Ottawa, on parks, and grounds, and upon everything connected with the Government property, had not been such as to make the capital not only a credit to Canada, but to make it such as would be a credit to any part of this continent. If the capital were not in such a condition, I am sure there would be no person who would be more anxious than myself to see it put in that condition. We take pleasure in bringing people from all parts of our own country to this beautiful city, and the people from foreign countries travelling through have spoken of it in terms of the highest admiration, and have marvelled at what \$1,000,000 have been able to do in the way of public buildings. If it were not for all we have done already, there might be some reason for this grant; but I think we ought to be satisfied with reasonable things. Mention has been made of what other cities have done in the way of encouragement to manufactures and other business enterprises. We might call this a manufactory, I suppose, in one sense of the word. We can say, from our experience this session, that it manufactures a good deal of gas, and that the motive power is largely wind; and Ottawa benefits largely from that. Many cities, if they have a civic holiday or other celebration, spend large amounts in the way of attractions.

Mr. MACLEAN. To bring the farmer in.

Mr. WILSON. And take the farmer in.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, and we have many of them visiting Ottawa, being the beautiful and attractive place it is. As an illustration, I may mention that an excursion came from my county, consisting of 300 or 400 men, who spent three days here, and I am sure that while here they spent \$1,000 or \$1,500 to the advantage of the city. That is a daily occurrence, showing the advantage that it is to the city of Ottawa to have the capital here, and the city should not be too greedy. What would Ottawa have been

without the Parliament buildings? What would this straggling hill have been to-day but for the expenditure of the Government? We know that the city has an advantage as a business centre; but see what has been made of it by the capital being here. But for that it would be almost a collection of lumber shanties, as it was before we came here; and it is rather greedy for Ottawa still to clamour for more. My own city of Kingston was a rival for the capital at one time, and I have always felt and feel still that it should have been there. However, since we have had confederation, I am satisfied that it is here, and I believe the whole country is satisfied. I believe the city of Kingston would have offered the Government \$50,000 to come there, and other cities would have done the same, and it would have been to their advantage. The whole gist of the thing is this, that the great taxpayers of Canada, the farmers, who have to bear the great burdens of the country, regard this vote as very objectionable. There is no class of the community who would be more pleased to see the capital in a fine position than they are; but they feel that the Government have done enough for the city of Ottawa. I could not go back to my own constituency and vindicate this measure. I would be glad to see the amount reduced to \$30,000 for ten years. If the Government would cut the amount in two, everybody would be satisfied, and there would be no growling.

Mr. DAVIN. I doubt very much whether, when the people of the west come to look at it, they will regard with favour this large expenditure in the interest of the city of Ottawa. In looking at the bill, I see what seems to me to be a difficulty. You will have two bodies governing Ottawa, and one of these bodies will be under the direct control of the Government of the day. That body will have the power of a body corporate—the power of holding property and doing anything else that a body corporate can do. I foresee a considerable difficulty in that regard. However, there is no use in discussing any proposal at any length under the present circumstances; but I express the opinion of those who sent me here when I say that they view with disfavour at this time this large expenditure in this direction.

Mr. INGRAM. Before the motion carries, I wish to enter my protest against this proposed expenditure. I think the advantages which the citizens of Ottawa have at present in having the public buildings here, and the large number of men employed in those buildings, ought to be sufficient for them without expecting the country to contribute directly to the city funds. I feel quite sure that Toronto, and other prominent cities in the Dominion, instead of asking for a bonus, would be very glad to give one in order to have the advantages which Ottawa has in having the buildings here.

Motion agreed to, on division; Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I move that this section be amended by inserting "ten years" instead of "twenty years."

Motion agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. When the hon. Finance Minister was explaining the Bill, it struck me that the question of permanency was not sufficiently kept in view in the forming of this commission. I think that the strength of a commission of that kind is its permanent character, so that there might be a continuity in the character of the improvements made. If you have as the city's representative an alderman or the mayor appointed, either of whom is likely to go out of office the moment some little difficulty arises between him and his supporters, he may have to go out just as he is getting acquainted with the work, and it does not seem to me that in that way you will get the best man or that, if you do you will be able to retain him. I think that it ought to be arranged that the representative chosen by the city should at least retain office for three years, and then be succeeded by somebody else chosen by the city. If a man is just in for one year and may or may not be appointed another year, he will be inclined to cater to the constituency behind him, which may elect him again or dispense with his services.

Mr. WALLACE. This clause provides that if an alderman or the mayor is appointed a commissioner he shall cease to hold office as such when he ceases to hold office as mayor or alderman. It seems to me that that would prevent the city council if they found him a desirable man, from continuing him in office.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not the intention, and I do not think that would be the construction.

Mr. WALLACE. There should be an opportunity given the council to reappoint him if they desired, and they should not be precluded from doing so.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not intended that they should, and I do not think that the resolution carries that construction. With regard to permanency, I entirely agree with my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Foster). But my hon. friend will see that in some cases this commission and the council may have to work hand in hand, and in order to avoid anything like conflict or confusion, it is desirable that a representative of the council should sit on the board, and we have to assume that its representa-

tive would be either the mayor or one of the aldermen. Besides, if the council sees fit to appoint a private citizen, it can do so, and it is within the discretion of the council to make the appointments either for a period of one year or for a period not exceeding three years.

Mr. BELCOURT. The views expressed by the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) are those to which everybody will agree, but it seems to me that we may well leave to the council the discretion of appointing their representative for a year or longer. If a man whom they do appoint proves satisfactory, no doubt he will be reappointed at the end of the year, and if he should not prove a desirable man he will not be appointed again.

Mr. FOSTER. Have any names been determined on?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. None whatever. The names of various gentlemen have been suggested, but none have been determined on.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the one object of the Government is to have a thoroughly efficient commission, and I hope that will be obtained, otherwise Parliament would be likely to go back on the vote. The permanency of the vote will depend entirely on the way it is managed. The system which has been pursued in this city—though it is rank heresy in this Chamber to cavil about the arrangements of the city fathers—seems to me to show a lack of consecutive design in the way of street improvements, doing a bit here and another there, without any continuity of plan. No doubt the Government feel that the permanency of this vote will depend entirely on the way it is expended, and therefore will be careful to see that the proper men are named as commissioners.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, and I hope the Government will be able to make such appointments as will meet general approval.

Mr. SPROULE. There are no means, under this Bill, of getting rid of the commissioners, once appointed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Governor in Council can remove them at any time; they hold office during pleasure.

Mr. SPROULE. During whose pleasure, their own? I understand the judges are appointed in this way.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, no.

Mr. SPROULE. And if that is so, I should think that any one appointed in the same way as the judges would expect to hold office for life.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was not present when the Bill was introduced and do

Mr. FIELDING.

not know the exact reasons advanced for it. No doubt they were very good reasons. I understand that one of the reasons was that there was a large amount of Government property which under the law paid no taxes to the city.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not advance that view.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Assuming that this is a reason which can be put forward in support of this Bill, I would like to know whether the Government would take into consideration the fact that similar conditions exist in other cities. For instance, in Halifax a very large amount of property is exempt from taxation because it had been acquired by the Government of Canada. Of course, no citizen of Halifax denies that it is an advantage to the city. Very valuable properties have been acquired for the Intercolonial Railway, Post Office Department, Minister of Finance Department, Agriculture Department, and other departments of the Government. Though it is an advantage to the city, still the same conditions apply as apply in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. MACLEAN. The same is true of Toronto. This Government has in the city of Toronto a custom-house, and an Inland Revenue building through which they collect large sums, in fact the main part of their revenue from Ontario. These buildings are on prominent streets, they have to be protected by the police and fire services of the city, and in every way they enjoy the advantages of the city. But the Dominion Government pays nothing on that account, and I say they should pay it.

Mr. DAVIN. In this form?

Mr. MACLEAN. No, in the form of straight municipal taxation.

Mr. DAVIN. The speeches of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden) and East York (Mr. Maclean) go to show where this Bill will land us. Pass this Bill, and from Halifax, from Toronto, and other places you will have demands upon the Finance Minister.

Mr. ELLIS. Why not?

Mr. DAVIN. And from St. John. From St. John to Victoria these demands will be made.

Mr. BERGERON. Even by Regina.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I will not say that. You will have all those places where the Government has a function of any department like a bird's nest from which the mother bird has been long absent—the rustling of a leaf will cause the opening of the mouths of those who hope to get something. Even at this stage, I think the Government ought to ponder whether they should go on. Suppose you yield to the appeal of my hon.

friend from East York, of my hon. friend from Halifax, or my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis), you consider how much you will give to their several cities, are you going to bring forward a similar Bill to this creating commissioners for these respective places and dealing with each city as you are about to deal with Ottawa? For my own part, once we decide to give money that shall be held to be equitably equivalent for the amount of taxes that may be supposed to be due by the Government, once we consider the Dominion property in a city as hypothetically taxable, I would rather vote the money and give it to the corporation. If they do not spend more money than they are spending now, the people of the city would be relieved to that extent. I think that would be a better principle than this. As I hinted on the second reading of the Bill, I see great inconvenience and worse than inconvenience arising out of the appointment of this board of commissioners.

Mr. BERGERON. When the Bill was introduced I had the honour to ask the Prime Minister if the Government intended to consider any other cities, and the answer I received was that none had applied yet. I would ask if the right hon. gentleman has had any applications from cities in which the Dominion has public buildings for the same treatment as the city of Ottawa has received?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have not received any such application. There is but one city of Ottawa in the Dominion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The remarks of several hon. gentlemen who have recently addressed the House might be correct if they were not based upon an error. They are based upon the assumption that we have asked this grant to the city in lieu of a local tax. Now, I was very careful not to put it on that ground, for I realize that if it were based upon such ground it would open up a thousand questions throughout the Dominion not only in cities but in every town and every village where you have a public building or own property, and we have no intention of admitting the principle which would open up so many questions. All I said was, leaving aside the question of general taxation, that if we were not bringing down a measure of this kind. I thought it would be only fair to the city of Ottawa that we should make them some increased allowance in compensation for the water supply. That, of course, stands in a different relation from the ordinary taxation. The public buildings do not pay taxation to the municipalities. I think I am correct in stating that in every place where there is a public building you have to pay the municipality the cost of water. There is no exemption in that respect. Having regard to the vast amount of property occu-

ried for Dominion purposes in the city of Ottawa, I think the water tax we pay is very moderate; and if we were charged an equitable water rate, I think we would be bound to pay more than we do. That was the only point respecting local taxation that I advanced. But the ground on which we have asked this grant is that Ottawa is the capital of the Dominion, and, therefore, has a special claim on the Dominion treasury such as could not be advanced in connection with any other city, no matter how worthy it may be in other respects.

Mr. CLANCY. Though the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) has taken great care to conceal in words the meaning of the Bill, he has not deceived the members of the House, who as he sees, make claims at once. The ingenuity of the Minister of Finance is great, but it is not sufficient in this case. We all know that the Minister of Finance can see very quickly when he wishes to; surely he can see that the question of water rates has nothing to do with the case—that that is a question that stands by itself. If we are not paying enough water rates, let us pay more. If there is anything else that the Dominion Government should pay, let us pay it, and not in a cheeseparing fashion, but fairly and generously. There is only one argument advanced in favour of this Bill, and that is that we ought to be patriotic. I think that is simply empty sentiment, a nice thing in theory, but when we come down to the fact it means relieving the taxpayer of Ottawa to that extent. Let us not conceal that from ourselves. I think the taxpayers of Ottawa should not be put in any better position by the action of this Government than the taxpayers in other cities and towns. I am not going to argue the question on the narrow ground of the benefits that may be derived from the location of the capital buildings here; but we cannot conceal from ourselves that the value of all property is enhanced largely by the fact of the location of public buildings here. I say the principle is an unsound one, bad in essence, and one that should not be adopted. Apart from the sentimental aspect of the question, which I do not think we should allow to enter into this consideration, no reasonable argument can be urged. We are, in fact, entering into a partnership with the city to that extent, although the hon. gentleman has now limited it to a period of ten years. You are entering upon a partnership by allowing this commission to purchase property and hold property in conjunction with the city, and you are entering upon a course that will have no end. The hon. gentleman has had the ingenuity to make it perpetual, while he proposes to limit it to ten years; that will be the result of it.

Mr. MACLEAN. I merely wish to say that I am voting for these resolutions be-

cause I do not believe in tax exemptions; but I am not voting for them in order to make this the Washington of the North.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. One word in regard to the argument of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). He insists that this will relieve the taxpayer of Ottawa. Now, if we were paying this money into the municipal treasury of Ottawa, and leaving the municipal authorities free to do with it as they pleased, then his argument would be correct. But inasmuch as we are not paying a penny into the treasury of Ottawa, inasmuch, on the contrary, as we are taking \$15,000 out of the treasury of Ottawa which we are now annually paying into that treasury, and putting the whole amount into the hands of a commission, who must expend it under the direction of the Government, and upon such works as, in the judgment of the Government, are a proper charge on this fund, then my opinion is, that it will not relieve the taxpayer of one penny, but it will give Ottawa some improvements, in which we will all have pride, and in which the city of Ottawa, already heavily taxed, might not be able to indulge in otherwise. With regard to other cities throughout the Dominion, let it be distinctly understood that the ground upon which we place this vote gives no city any claim to come here. If this Bill has any merits, it must rest upon the ground that we want to do something for the capital city of the Dominion of Canada which we are not in a position to do for any other city throughout the Dominion; and if my own city, for whose welfare I am as anxious as I am for the welfare of any other city, should come here and ask for a grant on these lines, I should simply reply: Well, it is your misfortune that you are not the capital of the Dominion, but you have other good qualities which make up for it, and I think you are a better city than the capital of the Dominion—

Mr. **FOSTER**. And I will give it to you in some other way.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. No, I do not say that I will give it in any other way, but I do say that we ought to be able to recognize the fact that the capital stands in an exceptional position. Be it wise or unwise, that is the ground of our vote.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Let us not hide from ourselves the fact that we are entering into a partnership, and the hon. gentleman is endeavouring to cover it up in this Bill. If we desire to aid in beautifying the grounds in Ottawa, let us make an appropriation for that purpose, and then we will have the control of the matter in our own hands from year to year, and will know where we stand.

On section 5,

Mr. **FOSTER**. With reference to that commission, it may end just as some of the

Mr. **MACLEAN**.

other commissions did—for instance, the civil service commission. If you take a civil servant, who is paid his salary for his work in the department, and make him secretary of this commission, and he devotes his whole time to this commission, then we pay him a salary for which he does nothing.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. There will hardly be business enough to keep him employed all the time.

Mr. **FOSTER**. It will amount to this, that the country will pay to one of its civil servants the secretaryship of that commission. Sixty thousand dollars is a large sum of money, and the work which will be carried on, and all the business in connection with it, will give sufficient work for one man.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. We had in view the idea of charging against this commission no large working expense for either a secretary or a treasurer of the commission. We wanted, if possible, to have the work done as a labour of love. We have been assuming that, perhaps, among the numerous public servants in the city of Ottawa, there would be some gentleman who would be willing to undertake the work which I supposed would involve a more moderate amount of labour than the hon. gentleman seems to think. If the duties are onerous, it may be necessary to have a man paid to perform it, but, I think, we might very well make the experiment and see if there is not, in the civil service, some gentleman who could afford to give some of his leisure time to them without interfering with his ordinary duties.

On section 7,

Mr. **FOSTER**. That puts the Government, as far as that is concerned, in the position of a householder or property holder.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes.

Mr. **CLANCY**. I think that subsection (a) and (b) should not be in the Bill. They go beyond what the hon. gentleman professes in the balance of the Bill to do, in that they allow the commissioners to acquire property wherever they think fit, which will not only become a permanent charge, but will form a permanent partnership. The hon. gentleman will not take the ground that it does not form a permanent partnership. Let me suppose that, during the period of ten years to which this arrangement is limited, a considerable amount of property is acquired that might be justified on any other ground, will he say that the limit of ten years has any meaning? Will he say that at the end of ten years the arrangement will not be permanent? Relations will grow up in the meantime that you cannot put an end to at the end of ten years, because it will be impossible to terminate these relations.

Mr. MACLEAN. Suppose we decide to terminate the arrangement, could the commission sell the land?

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing belongs to the commission.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a matter that we could amend by later legislation, if it were necessary. I do not anticipate that this commission will ever be required to sell anything. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) asks if we expect to be able to put an end to this arrangement at the end of ten years. I will be frank enough to say that if it works well, and to the satisfaction of Parliament, at the end of ten years some further arrangement will, probably, be made on the same lines. I think he magnifies the importance of the clause giving the commissioners the power of acquiring property and erecting buildings. It is necessary that the commission should have these powers, although they will only exercise them to a limited degree. Suppose we wanted to open up a new street or thoroughfare?

Mr. CLANCY. The city can do that now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, unless we give power by this Bill. The commissioners might get power by going to the city council, but we do not want to get mixed with the city council at all.

Mr. BELCOURT. The city council have not the power.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the commissioners want to open up a square and beautify it, why should we not give them power to purchase the land? We do not anticipate that they will erect any very large building, but suppose they wanted to put up a band stand in a square, which would be technically called a building, it would be necessary that they should have this power. That does not appear to be the slightest danger that they will go into any wild speculation.

On section 8,

Mr. FOSTER. What is that for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To give legal authority over any property. This is put in under legal advice, that all works must be declared to be for the general advantage of Canada to bring them under the control of the legislature of Canada.

Mr. POWELL. I have a word to say. It is exceptional legislation, and, probably, may be justified on account of that, but it does strike one that the practice of Parliament in declaring anything that it sees fit, in a purely arbitrary manner, to be for the general advantage of Canada, is simply doing away with the constitution altogether. Here is a matter of police, of local interest, of civic concern, and here is the Parliament of Canada violating the whole spirit of the

constitution by declaring that streets and public squares, which are matters of municipal concern and ownership, shall be for the general advantage of Canada. It is possible that there will follow in the country from this legislation very serious complications. Here we will have an imperium in imperio, a public square in one portion of the city over which the city has not the slightest jurisdiction. It is entirely withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the municipality and municipal regulations are not applied to it. This Parliament is to make a new system of regulations, although the city has, perhaps, power to make by-laws that may meet the case. I appreciate the difficulties that the Government are in. It is not open to them as in the United States to have a portion of the country set apart for the federal city.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That may be a development of this.

Mr. POWELL. I think this is a perfectly hybrid piece of legislation, which is utterly devoid of principle. I am not taking very serious objection to it, of course, because the position of the Government is a very difficult one from the constitutional standpoint. But, to return to what I said, I simply protest against this method of declaring everything that the Government see fit or take it into their head to declare to be for the general advantage of Canada and to so declare by Act of Parliament. It is doing away with the constitutional safeguards that are imposed for the protection of the provinces and of the municipalities.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think this present Government is not open to the charge that it has tried to do much along that line. My own views are very much in accord with those of the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Powell). We have time and again, not, perhaps, so much during the present Administration as in the time of former Administrations, declared works to be for the general advantage of Canada, and in doing so we might seem to have conflicted with the provincial authorities, because the provincial government had an interest in these works. Take, for example, a railway which a provincial government had an interest in. Without consulting the provincial authorities, Parliament calmly declares it to be a railway for the general advantage of Canada. That is a debatable proceeding; it has been done in the past, and it may have to be done again, but it is fairly open to criticism. Here is a case, however, where the works are to be constructed with Dominion money by a Dominion authority, and there can be no reason why they should not be placed under Dominion control. It would be an anomaly that we should create a work and then allow the municipal or provincial authorities to come in and tell us that we have no control over that work at all. I think that this

clause is necessary to give the commission power to carry out its work,

Mr. POWELL. It is understood to be entirely exceptional, and not to be regarded as a precedent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I quite agree with that view.

On section 12,

Mr. CLANCY. Will the expenditures of this commission come under the inspection of the Auditor General?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think technically they would; but I think the hon. gentleman may rely upon our taking care that the matters shall be thoroughly investigated.

Mr. WILSON. What objection would there be to having the accounts come under the supervision of the Auditor General?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. None in the least.

Mr. WILSON. Then, why not put that in the Bill—that the Auditor General shall pass on these accounts as on all others?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not offer any objection, but I cannot think of any form of words that would bring them under the supervision of the Auditor General.

Mr. POWELL. Two or three words at the close of the section would do it—all payments to be subject to audit by the Auditor General.

On section 16,

Mr. CLANCY. Do I understand that the old agreements are still in force, with the simple difference that on Wellington street the Government will maintain the street and all the walks on the north side.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The existing agreement has been understood to oblige the Government to keep the street in repair, including the sidewalks on both sides. We think that is a mistake. We think the property-owners on the south side of the street should have no exemption that is not given to citizens on any other street, but should be obliged to pay their share as property-owners; and provision is made to that effect.

Mr. CLANCY. There is no relief to the Government of Canada beyond what the hon. gentleman states?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is correct. All expenditures by the commission shall be subject to the audit of the Auditor General.

Mr. CLANCY. You should make it subject to the control. The Auditor General has control as regards the legality of all

Mr. FIELDING.

expenditures, and this would only give him the power of mere audit

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the phrase suggested covers the ground. What is needed is to bring the expenditure under the Audit Act.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then, make it read, "all payments shall be deemed payments under the Audit Act."

Mr. WALLACE. There ought to be more control by the Auditor General than he has under the Audit Act. For this expenditure of \$60,000 there is no direct responsibility to this House, so that I think the Auditor General ought to be clothed with more powers as regards this expenditure, than as regards other expenditures for which the Ministers are responsible.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Government cannot be divested of their responsibility. The Auditor General will examine the accounts, and if he finds anything wrong he will point it out in his interesting little blue-book, and if he makes out a charge of mismanagement the Government will be bound to change the condition of things immediately. I would propose this amendment:

All expenditure by the commission shall be subject to the audit of the Auditor General in the same manner as in the case of other public moneys.

The committee rose, and Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

#### GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Bill (No. 156) further to amend the General Inspection Act (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This is to give the Governor in Council power to appoint more than one chief inspector, as two inspectors may be required.

Mr. WALLACE. Is the salary of the additional inspector provided for?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. When we come to the clause in connection with the salaries I shall explain that.

On section 2a,

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This is to provide for a permanent standard fixed by statute.

Mr. WALLACE. It takes power away from the Governor in Council to make any changes. I approve of that.

On section 3,

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I propose to fill in the blank in this section

with the words "five hundred dollars." I think that penalty would not be too much.

Mr. WALLACE. What was the penalty before ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There was no penalty, but we have found it necessary to have a penalty in order to prevent fraud ; and I think that in fixing \$500 as the maximum we are not going too far, while at the same time, we are showing our sense of the seriousness of such an offence as this.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 4,

Mr. CLANCY. With regard to the grading of winter wheat, this Bill provides that No. 1 Red Winter wheat shall weigh not less than 62 pounds to the bushel, and No. 1 White Winter not less than 60 pounds to the bushel ; but No. 1 Mixed Winter wheat must weigh 62 pounds to the bushel. I know that that is the same as the old Act, but the anomaly is evident. The mixture of the two, one at 62 pounds and one at 60 pounds should make a wheat weighing 61 pounds.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. My attention had not been drawn to that. It is logical that we should take an average and make it 61 pounds.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister will see what that would lead to. Suppose the mixture was one-tenth of one kind and nine-tenths of the other, would that do ? It would be better to leave it as it is.

Mr. CLANCY. That shows the anomaly more clearly. Suppose the greater portion of the mixture were white wheat at 60 pounds to the bushel, yet the mixture must weigh 62 pounds.

Mr. MACLEAN. Fixing it at 62 pounds is probably a penalty for mixing.

Mr. HAGGART. The penalty is for the mixing.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Does the committee decide to make it 61 ?

Mr. DAVIN. It will be seen that the suggestion of the member for Bothwell is a sound one, if you look at analogy. No. 2 Winter wheat shall be winter wheat weighing 58 pounds, then No. 2 Winter wheat shall be Red Winter wheat weighing 60 pounds. When you mix these you will have the 59 ; so by analogy it ought to be 61. What does the member for Kent say ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I say let it go as it is. You need not mix the grain, the two kinds don't grow together.

Mr. WALLACE. I would ask the Minister of Inland Revenue whether the various grain sections of the Boards of Trade in Toronto

and Montreal have been consulted with regard to this classification ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. Is this the same classification with regard to hay as was made previously ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will see that the classification there is determined by a mixture of clover. Now, farmers know that timothy is much more important than clover is ; but the classification is made to depend upon the fact of there being a portion of clover with it. Every farmer in the House knows that hay may be discoloured, may be rendered less valuable on that account than if there was no clover in it. I looked over that portion of the hon. gentleman's Bill when it came out, and I was puzzled to know why such a classification should be followed out in every respect as it is there. I do not understand why hay, being dark in colour from the mere fact of having received a shower of rain, or being left out over night, should make it second-class although there was no clover in it.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I took it for granted that this classification was right because it had been adopted for so many years, and I could not see anything objectionable in it. It is difficult for me to argue that point with my hon. friend now. Since he saw that sometime ago, I should have been very glad if he had called my attention to it. I do not see any objection to it.

Mr. DAVIN. Before this clause is adopted, I would like to say that it has been suggested to me by some of the leading farmers in the North-west that in line 33 the word "plump" might be omitted. They hold that any wheat fulfilling the conditions of soundness, being well cleansed and weighing not less than 60 pounds to the bushel, would fulfil all the conditions that would be necessary for No. 1, and they suggest the omission of the word "plump."

Mr. MACLEAN. We must keep up the quality.

Mr. DAVIN. Very well, I will not press it.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question. I notice, on page 2 of the Bill, the following :—

No wheat which has been subjected to scouring or brushing for the removal of awn or other fungoid growth, shall be included in the preceding six grades.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether he has included such wheat any place else ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We have thought it indispensable that the six grades should represent the perfection of western wheat, while the other grades will be classified as commercial grades by the Standard Board. The intention of the Bill is to prevent that ever-recurring yearly variation in the six high grades. If my hon. friend will consent to wait until we get to the clause, he will see the provision that has been made in regard to commercial grades.

Mr. DAVIN. Before we go further, I have to move the addition of a clause of which I gave notice. It is as follows:—

That whenever there shall arise a difference of opinion between the farmers selling wheat and the wheat-buyer as to classification, the farmer, while taking the price offered for his wheat as of lower grade than that to which, in his opinion it belongs, may insist on the buyer with him fixing on a sample, which sample shall be parcelled and sealed and sent to the head inspector at Winnipeg, and if the inspector grades the sample higher than the buyer, then the buyer shall pay to the farmer the difference between what he had already paid and that which he should have paid under the higher grading of the inspection.

Also, in the clause describing No. 1 hard, to omit the word "plump."

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The only difficulty I find in accepting this amendment is, that this Bill is the result of an agreement that was reached after a great deal of consideration at a meeting at which the interests of the farmers, the dealers, the millers and the boards of trade were thoroughly represented. In view of the fact that this Bill is the result of a mutual agreement, I would be sorry to see any change made in it now.

Mr. DAVIN. There was nothing brought up at this meeting that would in any way clash with what is proposed. It is an extraordinary proposition for the hon. Minister to lay down, that we are not to add a clause to a Bill because, forsooth, some people, in no way in evidence here, made an agreement.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. My hon. friend knows that I did not mean to say that the committee has no power over the Bill. I am merely explaining that the Bill is one of such a nature that it is difficult for hon. members in general to understand the merits of it. This is the result of the work of men who understand every part of the question. We ought to think seriously before making any change.

Mr. DAVIN. This clause cannot possibly do any one any harm.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Will it not introduce the element of uncertainty?

Mr. DAVIN. No; it will be an advantage to the farmer. It proposes to protect the farmer from the over-cleverness of the buyer

Mr. WALLACE.

at various points. Suppose the farmer comes to the buyer and says: This is No. 1 Hard, and the buyer says: It is not No 1 Hard—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. While this inspection is going on at Winnipeg, and before the board makes its report, the grain cannot be sold to a third party.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course, it can be. What would happen would be this. A farmer comes in and says: This is No 1; and the other man says: No, it is No. 2. It is probably near No. 1; it is very good wheat, but I cannot pay you for No. 1. The farmer does not want to go back 20 miles with that wheat, and he sometimes sacrifices his wheat. In this case he says: I will take your price for No. 2, although I know very well you are not giving me the full value. We will agree upon the sample, and send it right on.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Suppose the dealer says: It must be determined definitely now, or I will not buy your wheat.

Mr. DAVIN. I want to deal first with the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and then I will come to the hon. Minister of Customs. The money transaction is finished, and then the buyer can do what he pleases. He can hold the wheat, which my hon. friend knows he frequently does. He has control of an elevator, and he will hold it there, or he will send it on to Winnipeg. If the inspector at Winnipeg confirms the grading, the transaction remains; but if he decides that it shall be No. 1 Hard, then the difference between the price paid and the price of No. 1 Hard will have to be made good to the farmer by the buyer.

Mr. WALLACE. Suppose, he says, it is only No. 2, and he puts it into No. 2 bin with No. 2 wheat, what position will he stand in then?

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend evidently has not paid as much attention to grain buying as to most other matters.

Mr. WALLACE. That is my business.

Mr. DAVIN. Then, we must receive my hon. friend's criticisms with doubt. The object of bringing forward a motion like this is to meet the case, not where the buyer would throw the wheat in with No. 2, but where he mixes it with No. 1 Hard, which we know is done. I suppose we ought to say caveat emptor, and the seller has to take the same care; but what we want to guard against is the farmer's wheat being bought at a price lower than its real value in consequence of the peculiar conditions which belong to the buying of wheat. The legislature cannot be too sagacious in exhausting every means open to legislation, to fence the farmer against the possi-

lity of plunder. If the buyer took that wheat and put it in with No. 2, he might bet his life against a red cent that the inspector at Winnipeg would not grade it above No. 2.

Mr. WALLACE. He would lose, then ?

Mr. DAVIN. He would not lose. If the buyer treated that wheat as No. 2, and the inspector at Winnipeg graded it as No. 1, I grant that the buyer would lose ; but such a thing is beyond possibility.

Mr. WALLACE. If the buyer were an honest man, that is what he would do ; he would put the wheat in No. 2 bin, because in his judgment as an honest man that is the classification to which it belongs. If he knows his business, he knows it is No. 2.

Mr. DAVIN. If he knows his business, he will select a sample which is the proper sample of that wheat. He has the means in his elevator of testing what that wheat is graded at ; and he would be very chary of putting it into No. 2 bin. What is being constantly done is this. We have had gentlemen here from Winnipeg Toronto and Montreal, belonging to the leading boards of trade and leading wheat-handlers from Winnipeg ; and the buyers themselves have declared that wrong was being done frequently to the farmers in the very way this clause is intended to guard against. I think you will find that there is not a North-west man here who will not be ready to accept and endorse this clause. As to the fear of the Minister of Inland Revenue that, as a lot of persons interested in the grain trade were consulted with regard to this Bill, this will clash in any way with any interest they were connected with, there is not an atom of ground to stand on for any such contention.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will my hon. friend say how the buyer is to deal with a load of wheat that is brought to him ? He buys it as No. 2, and he runs the risk of this wheat being subsequently declared to be No. 1. In the meantime, he must store it somewhere, either with other wheat of the same supposed grade, or with wheat of a different grade. He runs that risk, and it seems to me that to cover that risk he will adopt an insurance principle, and give a lower price because of the chance he takes of loss.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for West Assiniboa (Mr. Davin) would certainly do no great harm ; but it would be absolutely useless to put it in the Bill. As a matter of use and want in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, this arrangement is daily carried out as between the buyer and the seller on the wheat markets throughout the country. In cases where the buyer declines to enter into such an arrangement of his own free will, you cannot compel him

to buy the wheat. So that the amendment does not help the farmer in any way whatever. As has been stated by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, this Bill gave us a great deal of work. All the different interests were represented—the farmers of Manitoba, the buyers of Manitoba, the millers of Ontario and the exporters of grain. It is a matter of arrangement and mutual trust, and I hope the hon. member will allow it to go through without amendment.

Mr. CLANCY. What the hon. gentleman has said just emphasizes the necessity for this provision. The hon. gentleman points out that you could not force any grain buyer to purchase the grain under such circumstances. I admit that to be the case, but that arises from the want of supervision ? The arbitrary power is put into the hands of the buyer to class the grain at any grade he pleases, and the farmer must accept that grade or go home without making a sale. But let us suppose that the grain buyer is the better judge, which is usually the case. If he has wittingly or unwittingly graded the wheat lower than it ought to be, it ought not to be an excuse on his part to say that the wheat has gone into a third party's hands or into the wrong bin, and the farmer must suffer.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The hon. gentleman is overlooking the fact that you cannot compel the grain merchant to buy the grain.

Mr. CLANCY. I quite conceive that you cannot, but you should surround the transaction with every regulation that will prevent, as far as possible, false grading. Just fancy the position of a farmer coming to an elevator and being told : You must take this classification or go back with your grain. That is an arbitrary power that should not be exercised, and I think that the hon. gentleman's provision goes just this far. The farmer says : I think that wheat grades higher ; the buyer will say no, and may be perfectly right. But if he had any confidence in his judgment, he will consent to its being confirmed by a grain inspector ; and if the decision of the grain inspector goes against him he ought to be made to pay the difference. I do not imagine that you can force the grain buyer to purchase but you can put him under greater restraint with regard to the proper classification than he is under now. At least give the farmer a chance, and if the other man makes a mistake, let him stand the consequences.

Mr. OLIVER. While it may be difficult to insert such a proposition as that of the hon. member for West Assinibola in the Bill at present, and while it is possible that the amendment is not in such form as to enable it to be properly enforced, at the same time I wish to emphasize the necessity that exists for some remedy. At present the great difficulty between the buyer and the seller of grain in the North-west is this question

of grade. There is no question as to price. The price is quoted from day to day in the markets of the world, these prices are just as accessible to the farmer as to the grain buyer, and the farmer knows what his grain is worth according to the market price. But where the difficulty comes in is in the grading, and the farmer says that in this matter he is not dealt with fairly by the buyer. It may be that you cannot get over that difficulty, but I wish to point out that it is a difficulty, and a very serious one, and it is due almost entirely to the fact that the grain trade of the North-west is at present a monopoly. If there were free competition in the buying of grain, this matter of grading might be left to regulate itself. But at present there is not, and I am free to say that the action of this House has not been such as to induce free competition. If we legislate to prevent a free and open market in the North-west, or refuse to adopt such legislation as would secure a free and open market, then the farmers of the North-west are entitled to ask for such legislative protection against unfair grading as it may be possible for us to give them.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What does the hon. gentleman mean by a monopoly? Does he mean that there is only one buyer?

Mr. OLIVER. The grain buying in the North-west is done by a combine of combines. The prices are regulated by this combine, and there is no free competition in the buying of grain by reason of the action taken by the Canadian Pacific Railway, supported practically by this House. That action has not been broken down by legislation, as it should have been.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If it be a fact that there is only one buyer, and if a farmer is not satisfied with the grading, and insists on a sample being sent to Winnipeg to be graded, which would interpose an element of uncertainty into the transaction, and if the buyer says to him: If you insist on that condition, take your grain somewhere else, what is the remedy of the farmer?

Mr. OLIVER. Does the hon. gentleman admit the fact, as was shown before the sub-committee appointed to deal with this question, that not only is there a combine of grain buyers, but that it is supported by a combine of bankers, who came down here to support it.

Mr. WALLACE. What about the House of Commons?

Mr. OLIVER. I will attend to the House of Commons. There is a combine of buyers, and I do not think any member from the North-west will deny it. The hon. Minister of Customs asked what then is the remedy. In case this combine refuses to buy the grain, under the condition suggested. Well,

Mr. OLIVER.

If the grain buyer is fair and honest, and if it is simply a difference of opinion between him and the farmer, our proposition would regulate the matter.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But if he is honest in it, and buys it for No. 2, and puts it in No. 2 bin, if it turns out to be No. 1, he would be the loser.

Mr. OLIVER. Putting the No. 1 in the No. 2 bin could not possibly lower the value of the wheat, but it might have the effect of raising the No. 2 bin to No. 1 price. It is not the grade that gives value; it is the quality. It is the grade upon which the farmer is paid for the grain, but the buyer gets the value according to the quality. As I say, if he puts No. 1 wheat in the No. 2 bin, he may get the price of No. 1 for it. This was, in fact, the foundation reason of this Bill—to prevent that very mixing of grain, by means of which they pay a No. 2 price for No. 1 grain.

Mr. CAMPBELL. So far as this proposed amendment affects the grain grown in Ontario, I see no reason for it. I do not think that there is any demand for it. The buying and selling have proceeded satisfactorily for years. If there is a grievance in the North-west, I probably do not know so much about the matter as hon. members from that section, and so would not say much about it. But I am in a position to dispute what the hon. member from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) says on one point. Every one knows the great milling firms of the North-west, the Ogilvies and the Lake of the Woods Milling Company, and I do not think that any one who knows anything of the facts, believes that there is any collusion between these two firms. They are in bitter opposition, and have their buyers all over the North-west. We know that the prices paid for wheat in Manitoba compare very favourably with the prices paid for grain in other parts of the world. I do not believe there is any need for this amendment, however, and I can see how it would lead to confusion. Suppose there are fifty or sixty farmers coming in with loads of grain. There are different buyers, as they are at all stations. If a man comes to me and says: "My grain is No. 1," and I do not think so, he is free to go to other buyers. If he does not accept my offer, he would be obliged to take it home or sell it elsewhere. If I bought it on the terms proposed by the hon. member for West Assinibota, I have to keep that grain separate, and then, perhaps a week afterwards, the inspectors report that it is worth 2 or 3 cents a bushel more. I must hold that grain, or sell it at a loss, or take chances. The amendment would lead to endless confusion, and I do not think it ought to be adopted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Having given some considerable attention to the grain trade of the North-west, I would like to express an opin-

ion on this amendment. Personally, I see no real objection to the amendment. It is practically harmless, because the Bill makes ample provision to protect the farmer in reference to this whole question of the grading of grain. If a farmer is not satisfied with the grade he is offered by the buyer, he need not accept it. I admit there is a difficulty at that point. What is the farmer to do with his grain? That is the point, and that is why I, for one, insisted upon legislation with regard to flat warehouses. The Bill provides that in case of dispute—and, in fact, the public have acted upon it for years—the grain can be sold subject to inspection at Winnipeg, and, if there is a dispute even with the Winnipeg inspection, the Bill provides that the board of arbitration shall decide the question, which I think ample to protect the public interests. I have no objection to the amendment, because I think it harmless; but I do not see that it is necessary. If we had the privilege, when the farmer is not satisfied, of having provision made by the railway company, or any other company, to put his grain into storage until he has the question of grade decided at Winnipeg, there would be no difficulty or confusion of interests. I think it is not necessary to add the amendment, because I believe that when the hon. member for West Assinibola has gone fully into the Bill, he will find that there is provision made in case of dispute as to the grade.

Mr. HAGGART. But that will apply only to car-loads, will it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not necessarily. It will apply to any question that is submitted to the board of arbitration, whether a car-load or a wagon-load. There is, as I understand it, no restriction of the powers of the board.

Mr. HAGGART. But how would you send a wagon-load forward to Winnipeg?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Send a sample, and keep the grain at home in a storehouse—that is, where a storehouse is provided.

Mr. HAGGART. But you have not got that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. While I am on my feet, I would like to say, in reference to the Bill generally, that it is a Bill of mutual agreements that was reached by parties interested, and if ever there was a Bill before this House that was fully and thoroughly discussed, and every inch of the ground covered by it debated, it is this Bill relating to the inspection of grain. I can assure the House that the miller's interest, the farmer's interest and the exporter's interest were fully considered, and we came to the conclusion that we would give and take, and, if possible, arrive at a common ground for common interests; and that is about the position of the Bill, as presented by the hon. member.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 13; Nays, 29.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, I see that I am face to face with the same forces that betrayed the farmers in the North-west Territories on the Elevator Bill, and I see the same bowing down to those forces on the part of the members from the North-west who, I should have hoped, would support the farmer's claims. I want to give the committee some idea of the way—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. Who is it that calls order? Is it that tadpole Minister of the Interior?

The CHAIRMAN. Order. We are on the schedule of the Bill. The hon. member will please confine himself to the question.

Mr. DAVIN. I am speaking on the schedule. Now, what will happen? We will have the reptile press of the Minister of the Interior sending to the North-west false accounts of what takes place here to-day; and those Ministers who have shown their hostility to the farming interest in the North-west Territories, and those members who have shown their hostility will be held up in every part of Manitoba and the North-west as patriots, and a false view will be given. I will give a sample of it. They sometimes make a mistake, and it goes to an honest paper. The McGregor "Herald" up to a certain time was favourable to the Administration, but it could not stand the Minister of the Interior, it could not stand the extraordinary spectacle of backboneless statesmanship that is manifested by the member for Eastern Assinibola (Mr. Douglas). Here is what the McGregor "Herald" said in regard to one of these letters:

Our Ottawa letter is generally welcome to us as an exposition of political matters from the stand-point of supporters of the Laurier Government at Ottawa. But the editor of the "Herald" always acknowledged his full responsibility for the subject matter that was published. Hence we used the blue pencil liberally and often intentionally omitted to publish it. One paragraph we refused to insert dealt with Mr. Sifton's conduct on the elevator Bill introduced by Mr. Douglas.

The conduct was that when the crucial clause was to be voted on, neither the Minister of the Interior was present nor the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), and other members were absent from the committee. It was easy to see by the list of the committee which had been handed by the Minister of the Interior to the member for Eastern Assinibola, to move that it was to have been a hanging committee. It was a committee to kill the Bill. I will tell my hon. friend what one of his colleagues who was on that committee told me of his own appearance when he saw himself abandoned by the Minister of the Interior and by the member for Saskatchewan, and others. He

said that he looked like a frog in hell with his back broken. That is language worthy of Milton or Dante. The "Herald" goes on :

It will be remembered that the Bill was referred to a special committee, of which Mr. Sifton was a member. At its first session the committee killed the Bill. The absence of Mr. Sifton from that meeting was severely commented on by Mr. Douglas and other western members.

But not in this House. When the Minister of the Interior was giving his crawfish explanations of the extraordinary action of himself as Minister in this Government for the Territories, there sat the member for Eastern Assiniboia as silent as if he was one of the dumb dogs of Jupiter that could not bark :

Mr. Sifton, however, took the first opportunity afterwards to state his position on the question. He said that while favourably inclined towards some portions of the Bill, he was opposed to the clause establishing the right of owners of flat warehouses to equal shipping privileges with elevator owners. In taking this stand, Mr. Sifton does not rightly represent the electors of Brandon constituency, a fact of which he is no doubt well aware by this time. The author of the Ottawa letter comes to the rescue and vainly attempts to convince the farmers of Manitoba that they do not know their own business. He does extremely well when he writes on matters and things within his own ken, but he is a disastrous failure when he undertakes to tell Manitoba farmers how to manage their own business.

That is what the "McGregor Herald" says in regard to that matter, and it sets in vivid light the position of the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west, and the position in this House of their members. The member for Eastern Assiniboia, who I now see before me, through weakness or something worse—but weakness in certain cases is about as bad as anything can be—has thus erred. When, however, he was wooing the voter of his constituency for votes, he told them how he would kick, he was to be a great kicker. Why, Sir, the kicking of the hon. gentleman is about as much as we might expect from a paralyzed rat.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). The schedule of the Bill is before the committee, and the hon. gentleman is not addressing to me a single argument thereon.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the Chairman is under a mistake. If he will look at the 14th clause on the 7th page of the schedule, he will see that it does not go far enough ; and my amendment that has been kicked out of this House by North-west boots, was intended to bring a remedy. My hon. friend the Chairman will see that it is distinctly ad rem that I should dwell upon this matter in urging the interest of the farmers whose conditions have been so well pointed out by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver). My hon. friend declared there was the same dangers to be guarded against

Mr. DAVIN.

that I did. The member for East Assiniboia says he sees no other objection to the amendment than this, that some persons, not members of this House, were consulted in regard to the Bill. He knows very well that in an important matter he was taken in hand by people outside of this House in another case, and moulded as if he was clay in their hands. And here he says every farmer in his constituency is in favour of it, and instead of speaking the opinion of his constituency, he says : Well, the wheat men of Montreal and the wheat men of Toronto and of Winnipeg, those great friends of the farmers are in favour of it. If the calculation were made at the present time of what the farmers have lost in consequence of not having their wheat bought fairly in the Territories, it will be found to be two or three million dollars. The hon. gentleman himself knows it, and the hon. gentleman has stated it on platform after platform. Yet, Sir, when a clause like this is proposed, which the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) says is necessary—

Mr. TALBOT. He did not say that. He said it was harmless, like a bread pill.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot), who does Bellechasse the honour of representing it, says that this is as harmless as a bread pill.

Mr. TALBOT. That is what the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) says.

Mr. DAVIN. What harm can a bread pill do ? If it suits the farmers of the North-west Territories, a bread pill cannot do any injury to those men whom the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) and the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) are afraid of. The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) says it is not necessary, and the hon. member for Alberta says it would do no harm. If it will gratify the people of the North-west Territories, what harm does it do ?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The people of the North-west Territories are neither children nor fools, and I am sorry that an hon. gentleman in this House has been guilty of such an indecent exposure of his mental feebleness as to advance the argument he is advancing in favour of a buncombe resolution such as he has introduced.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. member for Macdonald, seated side by side with the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, playing at Minister of the Interior, rises in his place to give the world the assurance of a man, to show what a broad-browed, magnificent entity the entomological personality that represents Macdonald is. I may be a very weak-minded person—

Mr. DOMVILLE. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. I see that the hon. and gallant colonel (Mr. Domville) agrees with that.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I do.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman, that embodiment of chivalry, agrees with that. However, at present, I have to deal with the hon. member for Macdonald.

Mr. DOMVILLE. You had better get a straight-jacket.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not want to play twin to the hon. gentleman. I know very well that he requires other straighteners than straight-jackets, and I think he has straightened himself pretty well to-day. But I am dealing with the hon. member for Macdonald. I say that this clause would help the farmers of the North-west and it is scandalous to think that a man like the hon. member for Macdonald, who will do any mortal thing that the hon. Minister of the Interior tells him to do, who is the Dog Tray of the Minister of the Interior, the fetch and carry of the Minister of the Interior—

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I think the hon. gentleman is using language that is unparliamentary and that is unjustifiable even from him.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). It is a little bit too strong.

Mr. DAVIN. If it is unparliamentary I will withdraw it, but I can tell my hon. friend that in the English Parliament it would not be considered unparliamentary. It is not flattering to the Dog Tray, I know that. Mr. Chairman, you had better call six o'clock, as I have some more things to say.

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

### After Recess.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a letter that was sent to me by Mr. J. W. Connell, member of the local assembly for one of the districts of Eastern Assiniboia. It is a very long letter, and I will not read it in full. I will just give some idea of what it is. Having sketched a vast combine that was formed in the North-west Territories and Manitoba he says :

In 1897 three large companies came into existence, being composed of a number of small companies. They, together with the Northern Elevator Company, which had been in existence for some years, made the four large companies. These controlled nearly the whole elevator plant of Manitoba and Territories. These companies, having very little hope of squeezing each other out of the trade without heavy loss even to the surviving companies, in 1897 formed what is known as "The Wheat Combine," arranged as follows :—All wheat purchased must be bought at the same price, the price to be paid each day being agreed upon at the Winnipeg Exchange in the morning. One wire to each market was all that was necessary. The buyer to whom the wire was sent gave the price to each of the other buyers. Each then paid the same prices until

fresh instructions were received, but in no case must any buyer break the market. If he did, some of the other buyers promptly wired Winnipeg and the offending buyer was called down. Will any one venture to argue that a market regulated in this way is a market on which there is plenty of competition ?

Another feature in the organization of the combine was : that all wheat purchased at this uniform price was to be sold through the New York agency, and the selling price was to be the same. Each individual company, then, purchased at a uniform price agreed upon by the four companies and sold at a uniform price based on foreign quotations. Still another part of the agreement provided that no man who did not own an elevator would be allowed to buy wheat. That is denied by the grain men, but falsely. I had an agreement with the Manitoba Grain Company before the combine was formed, for space in an elevator ; but as soon as the combine was formed I was told that I could not have space. I applied for space in another combine elevator, but it was refused. I then bought wheat by the load and had the wheat graded and stored in the combine elevator. When the monopolists heard what I was doing, they issued an order to their elevator man not to store wheat for any person but the farmers, who must store in their own name. This, of course, prevented me buying along these lines. I then bought the farmers' tickets.

He goes on to say that they were able, by means of the tremendous power they had with the banks, so to squeeze him that he lost tremendously. Nevertheless, as my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) knows, this gentleman gave in that year 4 or 5 cents a bushel more for the grain than the elevator men were offering. He further says :

Now, I assert, without fear of contradiction, that the wheat has been purchased since the grain combine was organized, two years ago, at 5 cents per bushel less than it would have been bought for under competition, and 5 cents per bushel less than a fair commercial value, as 1½ cents a bushel for buying and 1½ cents for elevator dues is considered a fair profit. Take Fort William price, then the price paid at any local market. The difference is made up by freight and buying profit, and you will find the average has been for buying from 7 to 10 cents per bushel instead of 3 cents, and you must admit that 5 cents per bushel has been forced out of the farmers.

The wheat exported from Manitoba and the Territories for the last two years will reach at least 50,000,000 bushels. The loss to the farmers has been \$2,500,000, or more money than the cost of the entire elevator plant.

They know that to permit any one to buy and ship wheat will not affect the elevator system. But it will place the farmers in this position : They can say to the elevator owners, "Give me a fair commercial price for my wheat, and fair weight, and I will sell to you ; but if you don't, why I can use the flat warehouse. I am willing to give you my wheat for 1½ cents less than the flat warehouse but no more, and as the flat warehouse men must have 1½ or 2 cents per bushel for his work, this will give the elevator men 3 to 3½ cents for handling the wheat." This is just what the combine doesn't want. They want to dictate to the trade. They want 7 or 8 cents for handling the wheat.

Then he describes the bankers' association as being opposed to legislation that will relieve the farmer, and as working in with the elevator men. Now, this gentleman is a North-west public man and a grain-buyer; but he is a public-spirited man, and he knows very well that the way to make the North-west prosperous, and the way to make this whole country prosperous, as sometimes we hear from more than one voice in this House, is to develop the North-west on honest and productive lines; and the productive lines on which to develop and expand the North-west is to secure that the farmer shall have the value of all he produces from the soil. If you secure that, it is possible that the grain-buyers of Winnipeg and other parts of the country may not become as rapidly wealthy, but they will undoubtedly succeed. The farmers, who are not only the bone and sinew, but the flesh and blood of the North-west Territories, will get their sweat, the value of what they produce out of the ground; but at present very frequently, as this gentleman points out, it is the man who is not connected with the farmer who takes his sweat. Now, I greatly regret what we have seen in regard to a motion that would have given relief to the farmer, and which I had hoped the hon. gentleman would have accepted. Now, Mr. Chairman, if you will read the next section.

On the schedule,

Mr. DAVIN. There is an amendment of which I gave notice, but of the fate of which I am very doubtful in view of the fate of my previous amendment. I refer to the amendment of which I gave notice on the 20th June, page 479 of the Votes and Proceedings, and I would like to know whether my hon. friend who has charge of the Bill has been able to see his way to adopt this. I had a conversation with him, and I do not conceal from myself the fact that there would be some difficulty in carrying this out, but the more this amendment has been considered by the farmers of the North-west the more wise it appears to them, and I should like to know from my hon. friend whether he thinks he will be able to adopt it. The amendment provides that:

At each point in Manitoba and the North-west, where there is an elevator, the Department of Inland Revenue shall see that farmers having grain to dispose of may be made acquainted with the price of grain at Winnipeg.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. When my hon. friend spoke to me about this amendment we discussed it, and he appeared to agree with me that it would be exceedingly difficult to carry out his proposal. Since then I have further considered it and have consulted the officers of my department, and have come to the conclusion that it would be practically impossible to give every day the continual variations in the price of wheat, which is continually going up and down in the market, at all

Mr. DAVIN.

the stations along the Canadian Pacific Railway. These quotations are changing all the time, and I do not see very well how it would be possible to put in practice what my hon. friend proposes. If it is found so difficult to do this, even in a large centre, how can my hon. friend expect that we will be able to do it in the scattered villages and stations along the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. DAVIN. Of course, after that statement of my hon. friend, and looking at the vote against my former amendment, which could have been so easily put in practice, there is no use in my pressing this one.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not wish my hon. friend to understand that we have any intention of resorting to the strength of our majority, but I appeal to him whether he did not admit the difficulty himself?

Mr. DAVIN. I know there would be great difficulty.

Mr. DAVIS. I may say, in the first place, that this Bill was before the people for a long time, previous to its being discussed by a committee consisting of representatives from the North-west and of representatives of the grain men from Toronto and Montreal and other centres. Every one interested was notified to be present, and was present, with the exception of the hon. member for West Assiniboia. This Bill was discussed the whole afternoon and through the night until two o'clock in the morning, and thoroughly threshed out in all its phases, and the result arrived at was a matter of compromise. We had to give and take, and an agreement was come to as embodied in this Bill. At that meeting the hon. member never put in an appearance. Had he been present he might then have brought up the suggestions which he has advocated to-day, and if they had any merit they would have been incorporated in the Bill; but after the matter was thoroughly discussed, it is out of place for him to come forward and bring up these clap-trap resolutions. In this, he is simply acting the part of a demagogue.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). I think the word "demagogue" is out of order.

Mr. DAVIS. If it is, I withdraw it, but I would draw attention to the fact that the hon. member for Assiniboia has used some very strong language about hon. members this afternoon. For instance, he called my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) "old dog Tray," and the hon. member for East Assiniboia a broken-backed frog from hell.

Mr. DAVIN. I quoted simply what a Liberal member had said.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. member reminds me of a waste pipe, which I saw sticking out of a mill the other day, and out of which

steam was continually issuing. I asked the proprietor what it was, and he said it was the waste pipe. Well, it seems to me that the hon. gentleman is the waste pipe or the sewer pipe if you like, of that side of the House, from which steam is always escaping. If the hon. gentleman has such a keen interest in the farmers of the North-west, as he pretends to have, he should have been at that meeting.

Mr. DAVIN. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? What committee does he refer to?

Mr. DAVIS. I refer to the meeting of the grain men and the representative farmers of the North-west at which the hon. member was not present.

Mr. DAVIN. Where was this meeting held?

Mr. DAVIS. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say he knows nothing about it? It was held in the committee room and sat all afternoon and night. He must have known about it. He knew enough about it to get the report of the discussion, which was taken down in shorthand, and to digest that report and pick out of it the little resolutions he has proposed to-night. My hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) was there taking a prominent part, as he always does, in an intelligent manner, in everything that interests the farmers of the west, and he was perfectly satisfied with the Bill as well as every other representative present. And after we came to an agreement, I do not see how he could adopt such clap-trap resolutions as the hon. gentleman has proposed, without breaking faith with every one who was at that meeting. I think that the member for West Assiniboia, in addressing hon. gentlemen on this side, might use a little choicer language for he certainly does not gain strength in his own constituency or anywhere else by applying the epithets he has applied to such men as the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) who is highly respected wherever he is known. Nor do I think he will gain by applying such names as he did to the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford). I do not think it is decent language to use to hon. members on this side of the House.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman complains that I was not at a meeting in regard to which he says I have consulted the notes. My hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue gave me notes of the meetings that were held. But to these meetings I was never invited, and I did not at the time know anything about them. The only meeting that I attended in connection with a question of this sort, I heard of by accident. I think I got an informal invitation from the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) must remember that I sent him an invitation.

Mr. DAVIN. I got no invitation whatever to the meeting that was reported, and the report of which I have.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The hon. gentleman was invited to the first meeting.

Mr. DAVIN. I attended one meeting, and formally thanked the hon. Minister for having invited me, and I said that I had heard of other meetings, after they had been held, but had not been invited. But suppose I had heard of these meetings, what has that to do with the question we are discussing? We cannot deprive Parliament of its duty or responsibility by having a meeting in a committee room. I do not know but that the meetings to which the hon. gentleman refers may have been held while I was laid by for some six weeks. In any case, I was invited to no meetings but the one I attended. I think the hon. member (Mr. Davis) said that I had shown that I had mastered all that took place at those meetings. Wherein, then, on the hon. gentleman's own testimony, am I unfitted to deliberate on this question or to discuss it in this House? Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has appeared to-night in the character of 'arbiter elegantiarum.' He lectures me on parliamentary demeanour and epithets. I applied no epithet to the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas). I referred to the fact that the hon. member for East Assiniboia declared that when he came down here he would kick; and I think he said he would kick the shins of the Ministers. I said his kicking showed no more energy than that of a paralyzed rat. There is nothing unparliamentary in that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is nothing very pretty in it.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course, the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) need not expect, nor need the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), that I can rise to the elegancies which mark their style. But I say here, with all the poor capacity that I may have, that that is no epithet, but a simile to the hon. member for East Assiniboia.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is a mighty poor grade of language to use in this House.

Mr. DAVIN :

'Tis sweet to hear the watch-dog's honest bark

Bay deep-mouthed welcome as we draw near home.

I like to hear that voice occasionally. Here is another gentleman come to lecture me on parliamentary demeanour and the use of language. I had a lecture from the hon. gentleman from Macdonald (Mr. Ruther-

ford); and I think he used pretty offensive language. I think it shows a great deal of presumption on his part to use such language, because he belongs to the same class as those who are being exposed in the committee room upstairs.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. May I ask what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) means?

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, yes; oh dear, yes. What I mean is, that he belongs to the same electioneering thimble-riggers as Farr and the rest.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I rise to a point of order. I protest against the conduct of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) this afternoon and at the present time. The hon. member—

Mr. SPROULE. State your point of order.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. My point of order is, that he alluded to me as belonging to a class of political thimble-riggers.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, state your point of order.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I want that hon. gentleman to withdraw that expression. I insist upon his withdrawing, and I insist upon his withdrawing the inference conveyed by it.

Mr. DAVIN. What I will do—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. DAVIN. I suppose we had better go on with the—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has a perfect right to speak to the point of order.

Mr. DOMVILLE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Certainly; he has a right to discuss the point of order before the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. DAVIN. If the expression is unparliamentary, I will withdraw it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. FOSTER. What more do you want?

Mr. DAVIN. Do you want me to withdraw it, if it is not parliamentary?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Go on.

Mr. DAVIN. I intend to go on. I was addressing myself for the moment, as I had a right to do, for the lecture I received as to my demeanour. Now, the hon. member has declared that I had called the hon. member for East Assiniboia a broken-backed frog. I did nothing of the kind. The hon. gentleman cannot be historical. On previous occasions in this House he has tried to convey to the House what I stated on public platforms, and has wholly failed to give a

Mr. DAVIN.

correct representation of what I said. There are some men so constituted that they cannot report correctly, and I dare say that the hon. gentleman from Saskatchewan thought I did call the hon. member for East Assiniboia a broken-backed frog. What I did say was this. I wanted to describe the state of abandonment in which a certain cause in which the North-west is deeply interested, was, and I repeated a description of what took place, as given me by a Liberal member who was present, and who, if he did not call that hon. gentleman (Mr. Douglas) that, said that he was like that. So far as I have been able to read or attend to what has taken place in parliaments, here or elsewhere, I do not consider that that interferes with what is parliamentary, or that is hostile even to the elegancies of debate.

Mr. McMULLEN. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. We hear once more the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). That hon. member need not suppose that his judgment is the judgment in which I intend to glass my parliamentary deamantour.

Mr. McMULLEN. If it was no higher than the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), I would be ashamed of it.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman is quite welcome to that sort of thing. Now, with regard to the criticisms of the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis); what is his elegancy? He said I was a demagogue. I would not complain of that myself; but the Chairman very kindly interfered, and said he did not think it parliamentary. Then, the hon. gentleman described my conduct in regard to this Bill, and I am in the judgment of the House, if I have not shown at least as much knowledge of this subject as hon. gentlemen who have been opposing me. I have given as much attention to this matter, in my humble way, as even such great minds as the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford), who looks down, from his great moral and intellectual altitude, upon such a humble pigmy as I am.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman adopts it?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The hon. gentleman is correct.

Mr. DAVIN. I look up and see its god-head in all its glory there. If his position is as high as his own estimate of himself, it is a pretty elevated one, and we would require a telescope to see where it is. He also lectures me. I have, to the best of my knowledge and zeal, given all the attention I could to this question; I have not confined myself to merely attending the chambers and ante-chambers of Ministers. I have seen the people of the North-west Territories; I have conversed with the people

who are familiar with this question, because I can only learn it second-hand. I am neither a farmer nor a grain buyer, but I have tried to master it. We have an expression here to-night that shows to some extent, at all events, that I have voiced the opinion of the North-west Territories, because, in almost the same language, certainly in the same drift of thought as I have resorted to myself, we have an hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) whose business it is to be a public critic, whose business, not merely as a member of this House, but as the editor of a paper, is to be informed, gets up and endorses the general stand I have taken. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), who is such a marvellous expression of all that is elegant and delicate, of fine and gentlemanly demeanour, and whose whole career illustrates honour in such a noble manner, comes forward to lecture me and says that my dealing with this question, in which I am advocating, to the best of my ability, the interests of the North-west farmer, is clap-trap. It certainly has not received any cheers from the Liberal side of the House here to-night. I think he will find that it is something more than clap-trap, that I have not aimed at cheap cheers. I am only aiming to do all I can for the farmer. I have protested before, and I protest, here now, that we have men sitting on that side of the House, and sitting in high places, who profess to be the friends of the farmers, but who, as in the case of the Elevator Bill, and who, as in other matters, the very moment it comes down to the fine thing, when we want their aid to assist the farmer, cannot be found. Where was the hon. member for Macdonald, who comes forward occasionally with some resolution or other, the other night when the amendment of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) came up? He was afraid to rise up, but at last he rose up and voted with the minority of thirteen. Thirteen! There were thirteen the other night for the amendment of the hon. member for Lisgar, and it will be remembered that it was thirteen—the famous thirteen—that recorded its vote against the late Government, and, absent omen, it seems a dangerous number. I do not want to frighten the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, or his colleagues, by suggesting a danger of that sort. Once again I have to express my thanks to such a master of the elegancies as the hon. member for Saskatchewan, and such a fine gentleman as the hon. member for Macdonald, for giving me a lecture upon manners and parliamentary demeanour.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words in reply to the hon. member for West Assinibola (Mr. Davin), who poses in this House as the farmers' friend. He has tried to pose as the farmers' friend for a great many years. No person can know the record of the hon. gentleman without knowing that, on a certain occasion, he moved a

resolution about free binder twine for the farmers, boomed it in his paper in the Territories, made speech after speech, and when it came to the vote, took to the woods. That is only one case showing how he has been posing as the farmers' friend for a number of years. In connection with this same grain matter, the Grain Exchange of Winnipeg sent a circular to all the North-west members. The hon. gentleman says that he is not looking for cheap notoriety, but we find that he takes this circular, puts it in the Votes and Proceedings of this House, and simply writes his name at the top of it, as if it were his own production. I have the motion in my desk. When the hon. gentleman says that he is not looking for cheap notoriety, I think that such an action as this shows the reverse.

Mr. WALLACE. What is wrong in that?

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman says that he is not looking for cheap notoriety. It appears as if he were looking for cheap notoriety when he is making use of other people's ideas and representing them as his own by placing them on the Order paper. The hon. gentleman has made some insinuations in regard to my career. All I would say to that hon. gentleman is that my career would compare very favourably with his own. I would hate to have such a reputation as the hon. member has. The less he says about that the better, because I do not care to go into these things, but if it is necessary to rake up the hon. gentleman's career, I am sure he will not like it. As far as he says anything about my career, I am willing that it shall be compared with that of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. I see nothing in this Bill that appears to apply to grain in the province of Ontario. It covers the district of Manitoba and extends to Port Arthur, but we have grades that apply to Ontario as well. One of the difficulties we have in Ontario, when grain is bought at Toronto or Owen Sound or North Bay, is that it is sometimes not found up to the grade when it comes from Port Arthur. What redress would the purchaser of Ontario grain have under the provisions of this Bill?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The first idea of this Bill was to provide for the protection of western grain. It does not change anything with regard to the inspection of eastern grain.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought it was desirable to provide for calling these inspectors into use for the inspection of eastern as well as western grain.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We have not repealed the old Act. We have only amended part of it.

Mr. WALLACE. The Bill refers to Manitoba grain entirely. There is no provision at all with reference to Ontario grain.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. The Bill was first framed rather from the western point of view. It was afterwards found that the legitimate complaints of the eastern purchaser had not been sufficiently acknowledged. So the right was given to the eastern purchaser, in case he was not satisfied with the western inspection, to protect himself against a wrong inspection in the west. But I do not think the Bill alters in any way the system of inspection for eastern grain.

Mr. DAVIN. I have been attacked because, on the 21st of March, I put the following notice on the Paper, and there is nothing that I have done since I have been in Parliament that I consider so truly the act of a conscientious and active member of Parliament:

Mr. Davin—On Thursday next—The following proposed resolution:—

That it appears from year to year the unsatisfactory state of grain standards has been formally brought before this House and before the Minister of Inland Revenue, and that the following resolutions have been passed unanimously by the Winnipeg Grain and Produce Exchange:—

You see, I give credit at once to the body from which I got the idea.

"(1) Resolved, that this exchange request the chairman of the Western Grain Standard Board to ask permission of the Minister of Inland Revenue to call together the western members of this board to discuss the advisability of having inspectors grade on the word and meaning of the Inspector's Act, and that the Standard Board from year to year define such commercial grades as may be found necessary.

"(2) Whereas, the evils resulting from the mixing of Manitoba grain at Fort William and other terminal elevators are most injuriously affecting the reputation of Manitoba grain in the European markets; and whereas the Winnipeg Grain and Produce Exchange is most desirous of restoring the reputation of Manitoba grain to its former high standing, that this exchange hereby expresses its positive conviction that no mixing of grain should be permitted in terminal elevators, and also that no mixing of grain should be permitted in a cargo shipment unless the inspection certificate issued therefor shall have written across the face a statement defining the various grades entering into its composition.

"(3) And further be it resolved, that this exchange memorialize the Department of Inland Revenue to secure the enactment of such legislation as may be necessary for the carrying into effect and enforcement of the principle above enunciated."

In view of the foregoing resolutions, it is the opinion of this House that immediate action is demanded on the part of the Government to secure for the wheat of the West that premier position in the estimation of the world to which by its unrivalled excellence it is entitled.

What is to prevent the inference that it was that notice placed on the Paper by me that led to the activity of the Minister? What certainty is there that if some member of Parliament had not put that notice on the

Mr. WALLACE.

Paper, action would have been taken resulting in the conference and this Bill, which is but an elaboration of that notice?

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. Why do you try to obstruct it, then?

Mr. DAVIN. I am not trying to obstruct this Bill. I am trying to amend it. I say the Bill is an elaboration of that notice.

Mr. WALLACE. I think, in view of the statement now read by the hon. member for West Assinibola, that the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) will withdraw the statement he has made. I listened to that hon. gentleman, and I came to the conclusion that the hon. member for West Assinibola had been plagiarizing; but when we hear the notice read, we find that he gives the Winnipeg Board of Trade full credit for the resolution passed by that body. In view of this fact, what are the Government going to do? I have no doubt the hon. member for Saskatchewan will gladly retract his statement.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. At the next sitting of the House.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, so long as he does it, we will not quibble about the time or manner of doing it.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, I have in my hand a statutory declaration:

I, Charles B. Halpin, of the town of Portage la Prairie, in the province of Manitoba, publisher, do solemnly declare:

1. That on the 15th day of April, 1897, and for some time afterwards, I was a partner with John G. Rutherford, we being at that time the owners of the Liberal Printing Company. The said John G. Rutherford is now the member in the House of Commons for the Dominion constituency of Macdonald.

2. On the above mentioned date a by-election was pending in said constituency, in which the candidates were John G. Rutherford, the Liberal candidate, and Kenneth McKenzie, the elder, a Patron and Independent candidate.

3. That on the 15th day of April aforesaid a bogus issue of the "Weekly Review"—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The **CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Campbell). I do not think that has anything to do with the question.

Mr. DAVIN. It is just to justify what I said.

Mr. WALLACE. I think it is in the public interest, after the challenge which was thrown out to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIN. Here is an affidavit to show that the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) issued bogus newspapers, which is as bad as issuing bogus ballots.

Bill reported; read the third time and passed.

**CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE DE-  
PARTMENTS—INCREASE  
IN SALARIES.**

Bill (No. 182) respecting the Departments of Customs and Inland Revenue (Mr. Fielding) read the second time and the House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

**Mr. WALLACE.** I must express my disapproval of this Bill. I remember when hon. gentlemen opposite were in Opposition they condemned the proposed increase of the members of the Government and pledged themselves to reduce the number. They have not reduced the number, but on the contrary have given these members of the Government who were not members of the Cabinet the position of members of the Cabinet. To that I do not object at all, because, considering the fact that these two Departments of Customs and Inland Revenue have more to do with the treasury, perhaps, than any other, it is necessary that they should be represented on the Treasury Board. But I think that the course of the Government should be rather to decrease the salaries than increase them. So far as the right hon. First Minister is concerned, I said in the House, not many days ago, that I thought he should have a higher salary, that his position and the numerous responsibilities connected with it would justify the House in giving him a more liberal salary than he is getting to-day. I know that in the old days, when Sir John Macdonald and the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie were occupying the position of First Minister their salaries were not sufficient to enable them to properly hold up the dignity and the responsibility of that position; but so far as the other members of the Government are concerned, I do not think that any increase in the way proposed is justifiable. I may say for myself that I occupied the position of Controller of Customs, with all the power of a Minister of the Crown, with the exception that I had not a seat in the Cabinet, but I can say that I spent as many hours in performing the duties of the office, with whatever ability I may have possessed as any Minister has done before or since.

**Mr. PRIOR.** More, I think.

**Mr. WALLACE.** I have no doubt that my circumstances and surroundings were such that I could give a large amount of my time to the duties, and did so. I never found fault with the salary of \$5,000, which was paid for the services rendered by the Controller of Customs, and which was the salary allowed by law, and I enter my protest against the Government increasing the salaries of the heads of these two departments of Customs and Inland Revenue from \$5,000 to \$7,000 per annum, and I wish to

place my protest against this increase before Parliament and the country.

**Mr. DAVIN.** I wish to call attention to the meaning of this clause. It says that subsection 2 of section 2 of chapter 18 of the statutes of 1897 is hereby repealed. But what is that subsection? It is as follows:—

The salary of each of the said Ministers shall be \$5,000 per annum, and shall continue at that rate until a readjustment of the departments of the Government shall reduce the number of Ministers holding departments to thirteen or less, whereupon and thereafter the salaries of each of the said Ministers shall be \$7,000 per annum. So that here we have another plank and another promise thrown to the wind.

The history of this question is an instructive one. Originally the salaries of the Ministers were \$5,000 a year, and when, a few years after confederation, Sir John Macdonald brought in a Bill raising the salaries from \$5,000 to \$7,000 a year, he was denounced in the strongest language by the Liberal party of that time. And then they came into power, I think, a year or so after, but Mr. Mackenzie accepted the \$8,000. Of course, I do not think that too much for men like Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Blake, Mr. Brown, Mr. Dorion, or such men. In 1887, an Act was passed respecting the Department of Customs and the Department of Inland Revenue, and creating the Controllershops. Those who heard the discussion at that time will remember that the leaders of the Liberal party deprecated any addition to the burdens of the country, or any increase in the number of Ministers. And it would be very easy to show that it has been held out before the people in official documents that if the Liberal party came into power the number of Ministers would be decreased. A Bill was introduced in 1897 by the present Government, raising the Controllers to the rank of Ministers of the Crown, and giving them seats in the Cabinet. A clause was inserted providing that their salaries should remain at \$5,000 so long as it was not possible to make an adjustment of the Cabinet so as to reduce the number of Ministers to thirteen or less—pointing clearly to the idea that there would be no use in the position of Minister of Trade and Commerce, when the head of the Customs Department and the head of the Inland Revenue Department should have seats in the Cabinet. But this clause of the Bill is now repealed—this safe-guarding clause put in and eloquently commented on and held out just two short years ago to the people as assurance, in the solemn form of a statute, that if the salaries of the Controllers should be increased, the extra Minister would disappear. Now, the extra Minister does not disappear and we have fourteen Cabinet Ministers with full salaries, and we give the two who were affected by this Bill back wages also.

Mr. WOOD. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Does he think that the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches, if they had devoted their time and talents to their several lines of business could not have made double the amount of \$5,000, or the amount of \$7,000 a year. My impression is that men of their education, talents and ability, had they devoted their time to their several lines of business, would have doubled their income; and instead of doing the business of the country for this small pittance, I, for one, would not give my time for twice that money, and I have not one-quarter the ability of any of them.

Mr. DAVIN. As my hon. friend (Mr. Wood) asks the question, I will answer at once, and frankly. First and foremost, I think the hon. gentleman missed my point. I did not say a word about these salaries being high. In the case of any Prime Minister, or any member of the Cabinet who really has the ability to fill the position, \$7,000 a year is a contemptible wage. If I were not speaking in the presence of the Prime Minister, I would speak in the strongest language of the inadequacy of \$7,000 to pay a man of his ability.

Mr. WALLACE. His salary is \$8,000.

Mr. DAVIN. I apply the same to \$8,000. Take a man like the late Sir John Macdonald, or a man like Mr. Blake, of first-class mental ability. If he gave to his profession the time he gave to politics, he would make a great deal more money than he could make out of politics, where, even if he succeeds, he gets more kicks than ha'pence.

The PRIME MINISTER. There seems to be no difference of opinion as to the soundness of the Bill now before the House; nobody on either side expresses the opinion that it is not fair and proper that the Minister of Customs or the Minister of Inland Revenue have the same salary as other Cabinet Ministers. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) put the case very fairly when he said that there was not only no reason why the Minister of Customs or the Minister of Inland Revenue should not be in the Cabinet, but that, on the contrary, there was every reason why they should be in the Cabinet, being at the head of two of the most important departments of the Administration. He has been Controller of Customs, but was not in the Cabinet; but I am sure that the experience he gained as head of the Customs Department caused him to form the opinion he expressed, that the man who has charge of that department ought to be in the Cabinet, because the questions with which he has to deal are among the most important that come before the Government, and that it is only right that he should be in the Council and to participate in the discussion—

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. WALLACE. And Treasury Board.

The PRIME MINISTER. And the Treasury Board as well. And the same is true of the Inland Revenue Department. After the hon. gentleman resigned, his successor was taken into the Cabinet. In my opinion, as I expressed it at that time, this was against the law. I proposed that the law should be amended, as it was amended. At the time, however, no increase was made in the salary of the Controllers, who were thus made Ministers. My hon. friend has expressed the idea, and it has been adverted to on the floor of this House again and again, that in taking the step we are now taking we are going back on the views expressed by the Liberal party. I do not deny that there have been members of the Liberal party who expressed the view that the number of the Cabinet Ministers ought to be reduced. I never entertained that opinion. At no time in my career did I ever express an opinion that the Cabinet was too numerous; on the contrary, as my experience grows the more I hold to the view that, situated as we are, with such a large country to administer, we must have representation from all sections of the country, from the east, the centre and the west. I differ from some of my hon. friends on this question, who thought that we might reduce the number of the Cabinet. I never expressed those views, nor do I entertain them now. I do not see how the present Government nor any other Government could dispense with any member of the Cabinet, nor reduce the number. At the present time there is a complaint against the present representation in the Cabinet that some of the provinces are insufficiently represented. So if we are to be logical in this matter there can be no reason at present why the Cabinet should be reduced; and if the Cabinet is not to be reduced, there is every reason why the gentlemen who hold the positions of Minister of Customs and Minister of Inland Revenue should have an adequate salary. The same salary as the other Ministers are paid. It seems to me that upon this point there can be no difference of opinion. True, in the Liberal party as in many other parties, we do not all hold the same views. It is only yesterday that we saw some hon. gentlemen on the other side supporting a proposition of the Government and others opposing it. But in this matter I beg to say that my opinion has never varied that the Cabinet cannot be reduced from the number which now compose it, and that all the members of the Cabinet shall be treated equally. Now, an opinion prevails, and I have heard it expressed by the hon. member for West York, that the portfolio of Trade and Commerce is one of minor importance.

Mr. WALLACE. I expressed no such view.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then it must have been some other hon. gentleman on

that side of the House. I do not hold that view. The portfolio of Trade and Commerce may not be a heavy one in regard to departmental duties, but the political duties of the Minister of Trade and Commerce are very great.

Mr. FOSTER. What political duties ?

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend knows very well that a Cabinet Minister has not only to administer his own department, but there are numerous political questions to which he has to give his attention. Questions are always arising, trade and commercial questions, which require the attention of the Government ; and certainly the Minister of Trade and Commerce has to give his constant attention to this class of questions. There are the mail subsidies for one thing, which is a very important matter, and he has to look after the extension of the trade of the country, to consider suggestions which are made to him ; so that, though the departmental duties connected with that portfolio may not be great, still there are very important political duties of the nature I have mentioned which engage every moment of his time. At the present time there are three departments in the Government, three portfolios which have no departmental duties, those of the President of the Council, the Secretary of State, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce. These three portfolios have not attached to them any departmental duties, except that of the President of the Council, who has under his charge the Mounted Police. But the portfolio of Trade and Commerce has no important departmental duties attached to it, nor has that of Secretary of State. But for all that, these three Ministers have very important duties to perform, every one of them ; and I am able to say that these three gentlemen, the Secretary of State, the President of the Council and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, are all very busy men, and are constantly occupied with the business of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think there is any difference of opinion in the House as to the gentlemen who hold the portfolios of Customs and Inland Revenue being paid an equal salary with the other members of the Cabinet. Without being invidious, the Minister of Customs has a department which is probably more taxing than that of any other Minister, more taxing by the multiplicity of details and various other things that occur to the mind of any one who understands that department, which make it a very vexatious department, and which keeps the Minister on a tension continuously from the beginning to the end of the year. That of Inland Revenue is more one of routine. There is no use trying to elevate any department out of the proportions which belong to it. The Department of Inland Revenue has a large scope, but it is much

more of a routine department than that of Customs.

The PRIME MINISTER. There are many details in it.

Mr. FOSTER. But the details are in most cases settled by the departmental officers, and do not come before the Minister as in the case of the Minister of Customs, to whom every person thinks he must go as a final resort. When you come to the Department of Secretary of State, that is practically easy, it is all routine. If he has a good deputy, and a good man at the head of the printing department, his life is an easy one. If he is young and vigorous, and takes part in political matters, he may find enough to take up his time. The same may be said of the Department of Trade and Commerce as at present constituted. If its Minister took charge of the two great revenue-collecting departments of the Government, then he would be one of the most hard-worked Ministers. But the moment you give to these two departments responsible Ministers, that moment you take away from the Minister of Trade and Commerce nearly the whole burden of the work which fell upon him. Now, take the Department of Trade and Commerce since the hon. gentlemen have made that change and have made these two former Controllers Ministers, and it has had comparatively nothing to do with either the Customs or the Inland Revenue. True, it had something to do with steamship subsidies, but the gentleman who holds a place in the Cabinet without portfolio has taken the larger part in those negotiations. He has not been very successful, but he has carried them on, and to that extent has relieved the Minister of Trade and Commerce. So far as the departmental execution of work is concerned, the Minister of Trade and Commerce has almost a sinecure. He may have political duties, and a gentleman of the experience and ability of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, holding the position he does in the party, must have large political duties. But I must not discuss him in the light of political duties. Investigations into the extension of trade and of commerce and the like of that, I think, are commercial rather than political duties, and in those the Minister of Trade and Commerce at present has no very large or onerous duties to perform. I just wish to bring one point out, though, in this discussion, and I do not want to pursue it any further. It is a strange position for the right hon. gentleman to take, to say that he never took the position, whatever other members of his Cabinet may have said, that the Cabinet should be reduced in number. Why, this is a strange statement from the right hon. gentleman, and it is a statement which is contradicted by the statute. What more definite pledge could the right hon. gentleman give of his position as Prime Minister and a member

of the Government than the pledge which he embodied in the statute when he expressly declared that :

The salary of each of the said Ministers shall be \$5,000 per annum, and shall continue at that rate until a readjustment of the departments of Government shall reduce the number of Ministers holding departments to thirteen or less, whereupon and thereafter the salary of each of the said Ministers shall be \$7,000 per annum.

You could not give a more sacred, a more solemn, a more binding pledge, of not only your convictions but your actual promises than by embodying in the statute, upon a matter of great public policy, a law in reference to the constitution of the Government. The right hon. Prime Minister cannot, of course, disassociate himself from the Government and from his colleagues when it comes to the passing of legislation, and especially of such legislation, because, if I do not mistake, the right hon. Prime Minister was the member of the Government who introduced this legislation and who has to be responsible for it. Any legislation that has to do with the Ministers and what they shall receive, is legislation which must be introduced by the Premier himself, even though the payment of the money may be in another department than his own. The right hon. gentleman is forced simply to this ground, that, when he was in Opposition he either made a great mistake in reference to this matter, or else he was trying to catch popular favour. And he did catch popular favour. Any leader of a party who goes to the people with the programme inscribed on his banner that he will reduce the number of Cabinet Ministers, goes to the country with a very taking card, with a large number of electors. The right hon. gentleman played that card, and his colleagues played that card. They played it much more strongly than he did, but he himself played it as well, and when he came into the Government he put upon the statute-book his conviction in reference to that policy. Now, then, he got all the benefit from that, and he must either have been playing that card to get popular support or he must confess that in this, as in so many other things, he actually did not read circumstances and events at all right. In numerous other things he has had to confess that already; he confesses it now in reference to the constitution of the Cabinet, and he now recants what he himself and his party declared to be right and proper as a matter of policy. He now publicly recants, but he does it only by saying that he never held that view personally, and that he cannot be held responsible. He has reaped the benefit of that game and of the promulgation of that policy. As to whether the proposition is a reasonable one, I agree with the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) and my hon. friend who spoke here, that the hon. Minister of Customs and the hon. Minister of Inland Re-

Mr. FOSTER.

venue should have the same salaries as the other members of the Cabinet. I do not think you could make a distinction between them and the other members of the Government. If they are Ministers doing the work and members of the Council, they should have the salary attached. But, we cannot allow it to go to the public that the right hon. gentleman did not pledge himself to the policy of the reduction of his Cabinet. He did it by solemn legislation, and he must confess now, as others have to confess, that he made a mistake, that he was young and fresh and enthusiastic for support and he did not see conditions as he sees them now. With many other things it has been exactly the same. This is almost the last one of their pledges and promises which these hon. gentlemen have not undone since they came into power.

Mr. SPROULE. I hold the same views on this question which I held a good many years ago. I remember distinctly the discussion that took place at the time when it was proposed to make these changes in the department by converting the Ministers of Customs and Inland Revenue into Controllers. The ground was very strongly taken then that an increase in the number of offices was being made which was entirely unjustifiable, and that the increase in the burdens of the people which resulted was likewise unjustifiable. At the time the change was made the denunciations of the proposal were very strong. I remember, also, when another proposal was made in 1897 to take the Controller of Customs and the Controller of Inland Revenue into the Cabinet without increasing their salaries. The proposal was moved by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). The Prime Minister has said that he never entertained the view that these Controllers should have smaller salaries than any other Minister of the Crown or that there should be a less number in the Cabinet. I want to draw his attention to what took place at that time, and I think we may accept the statement of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries as fairly voicing the sentiment of the whole Cabinet. That hon. gentleman in moving the resolution, said :

I move to add this clause as part of the Bill which was omitted in the printing by mistake :

"The salary of each of the said Ministers shall be \$5,000 per annum, and shall continue at that rate until a readjustment of the departments of Government shall reduce the number of Ministers holding departments to thirteen or less, whereupon thereafter the salary of each of the said Ministers shall be \$7,000."

I spoke in reference to it in the following language :—

It seems to me this is the proper time to deal with the distribution of the heads of departments. I would like to ask the Minister if it is contemplated to reduce the heads of departments to the same number that it was before. I remember

very distinctly that at different times since the Controllers were appointed, the hon. gentlemen opposite, who were then sitting on this side of the House, objected very strongly to the increase of offices, and to the appointment of a Commissioner of Trade and Commerce. Now, so far as we have any information, it is not the intention of the Government to do away with that office to-day. Might I ask the Minister if they have it under consideration, or if they have decided to reduce the number of Ministers to the same number as before, and to do away with the office of Minister of Trade and Commerce?

**THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** The hon. gentleman is perfectly right. The prevailing impression, I think, on both sides of the House was that a determined effort should be made to reduce the number of Ministers, and that matter has been under the consideration of the Government, and is now engaging their very earnest consideration. The hon. gentleman sees that this Bill now introduced is merely to make the present Controllers in point of fact Ministers, and to entitle them to seats on the Cabinet Board; and the express provision is made on the face of the Bill—not the mere statement that the Government are considering it—but that when the departments are reduced to thirteen, and not until then, their salaries should be the same as those of other Cabinet Ministers.

That is distinct and specific, and may fairly be taken as voicing the convictions of the whole Cabinet. Afterwards he repeated the same statement:

But it is expressly provided that, if in the re-adjustment of departments hereafter, the number is reduced to thirteen or below, then these gentlemen who are called to the Cabinet should receive \$7,000 a year, but not until then.

**MR. WILSON.** Why not make it ten?

**THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** It says thirteen or less, and that embraces ten. I do not think there is any difference of opinion.

This indicates that the Government expressly proposed at that time when the salaries were increased, the number of Cabinet Ministers would be reduced to thirteen. That was a compact made between them and the country. But to-day, without any effort to reduce the number of Cabinet Ministers, they increase the salaries of the two Controllers to the same figures as those of the other Cabinet Ministers. I object to it very strongly on this ground, and I believe the country holds the same view as I do. I admit that these two Ministers are entitled to the same salaries as the others; but you are bound, in fulfilment of your promise, to reduce the number of Cabinet Ministers. There is no just reason for continuing to have a Minister of Trade and Commerce, a Minister of Customs and a Minister of Inland Revenue. It seems to me that you should abolish the office of Minister of Trade and Commerce, which is virtually an artificial or honorary office, and make the present Minister of Trade and Commerce the Minister of Customs; but until they abolish that or some other Cabinet office and reduce the number of Ministers, I do not think the Government are

justified in making this increase to the expenditure of the country. Another feature of this Bill which I object to is that it is retroactive. We generally object to retroactive legislation. The Bill begins the increased salaries of the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue on the 1st July, 1898, and gives them each a year's salary after the financial year is ended. I do not think this is right. I could understand the increase being made to commence now; but there is no justification for going back and paying these men \$4,000 for work for which they have been paid pretty well already. I do not think the country will endorse this Bill or regard the Premier or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as being consistent or honest with themselves in view of the promises they made to the country in 1897 that they would not increase the salaries of these men without reducing the number of Cabinet Ministers to thirteen or less.

**MR. PRIOR.** I do not rise to say a word against the increase of salary to the Minister of Customs or the Minister of Inland Revenue, because I believe that both of these officers have a right to just as large a salary as any of the other Ministers. They are two of the most important members of the Government, and should be paid as well as the others. But I agree with the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat that this Bill should not be retroactive, but should date from the 1st of July of this year. That was not the reason, however, why I rose. I notice that the right hon. leader of the Government did not agree with the remarks made a few days ago by the Minister of Finance in reply to me when I asked for representation in the Cabinet for British Columbia. The Minister of Finance took me to task, and said that it was time that we got over this provincial idea, this sectionalism, of which he accused me. But the right hon. First Minister says there are a good many Ministers required, because every part of the Dominion has to be represented. We might as well understand it at once that there is no sectionalism in this, but that Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island each expects to have one of its own men in the Cabinet to represent it. Such being the case, I think this is the time for me to say once more that I think there ought to be a true British Columbian in the Cabinet to represent his province.

**MR. McMULLEN.** I want to say one word on this clause before it is adopted. This difficulty originated many years ago, when Sir John Macdonald decided to create the two offices of Controller of Customs and Controller of Inland Revenue. On that occasion I opposed the Bill on the ground that it would eventually lead to an increase in the members of the Cabinet. I admit that I was one of those who always opposed in-

creasing the number of Ministers, and I am of the same opinion to-day. I have no personal feeling towards the Minister of Customs or the Minister of Inland Revenue. I am not prepared to say that they do not earn their salaries just as well as the other Ministers do; but I do say that, in my humble opinion, the governmental machinery of this Dominion is too expensive, and should be recast from bottom to top. I think the present conditions are quite unjust. In the first place, the Ministers of the Crown get \$8,000 a year each, while representatives of the people have to sit in this House for four and a half or five months, and, though their business is just as important and their time just as valuable as those of the Ministers of the Crown, we have to stay here for an indemnity of \$1,000 a year. We have got to sit here for \$1,000 a year indemnity, while Ministers get \$8,000. I contend that this should be recast. If Ministers of the Crown earn \$8,000, the members who sit here for four and a half or five months earn more than \$1,000. But I contend some Ministers do not earn \$8,000.

I am opposed to the increase for this reason, that the expenses of the Government are too high, although I am glad to say that the present Government has reduced them. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) laughs at that, but I am prepared to go into an investigation and prove to him that, taking into account the fact of the very large increase in expenditures, owing to the opening of the Yukon country, the expenses of the Government last year were less than they were when hon. gentlemen opposite occupied the Treasury benches. If hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to challenge that statement, I will prove it, because I have the figures here. The Government have made commendable efforts in the direction of keeping down expenses, but at the same time I believe they are still too high, and I am sorry that the Government have decided to make this addition. I would like very much to have the number of Cabinet Ministers reduced; and if they cannot be reduced, I would like to see the salaries reduced or made proportionate to the duties of the offices. The Secretary of State has nothing to do compared with other Ministers, and I would have no objection to seeing his salary reduced to \$5,000, and that of the Ministers of Customs and Inland Revenue raised to \$7,000.

I was rather surprised when the hon. leader of the Opposition, speaking on this question, pointed out the fact that the Ministers of Customs and Inland Revenue had lower salaries, created an invidious distinction. I cannot see it in that light. That hon. gentleman has always admired British precedents, and, therefore, I will give the salaries of the British Ministers of the Crown. The Prime Minister has £5,000 a year; the Lord High Chancellor has £10,000 a year;

the Lord President of the Council only gets £2,000 per year; the Lord Privy Seal gets no salary; the First Lord of the Treasury gets £5,000 a year; the Chancellor of the Exchequer, £5,000 per year; the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster gets £2,000 per year; the Secretary of the Colonial Department, £5,000 per year; the Secretary of the Home Department, £5,000 per year; the Secretary of the War Department, £5,000 per year; the Secretary of the Indian Department, £5,000 per year; the First Lord of the Admiralty, £4,000 per year; the President of the Board of Trade only gets £2,000 per year; the President of the Local Board only gets £2,000 per year; the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, £20,000 per year; the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, £8,000 per year; the Secretary for Scotland, £2,000 per year; the First Commissioner of Works, £2,000 per year; the President of the Board of Agriculture, £2,000 per year. So that very few of them have the same salaries.

Mr. WALLACE. What does the Postmaster General get?

Mr. McMULLEN. £2,500 per year. The House will, therefore, see that there is quite a difference in the salaries of these gentlemen.

Mr. DAVIN. But all those are not in the Cabinet.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, they are. I thought the hon. gentleman was better posted than to challenge that statement.

Mr. DAVIN. Not all those whom the hon. gentleman has read out.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, if the hon. gentleman will go to the Library he will find that they are. There are nineteen Cabinet Ministers in England. There are distinctions in the salaries there, and I do not see why we should not have distinctions here. If the head of one particular department enjoys a mere sinecure, he should not be paid as large a salary as one who has a great deal of work to do. No doubt the Minister of Customs in this country holds a very onerous position and is very closely confined to his office. The same may be said of the Minister of Inland Revenue. But if the duties of these offices are heavy and increasing, the duties of other offices are nothing like so heavy or growing to anything like the same extent. I was honest, when in Opposition, in advocating a reduction in the number of Cabinet Ministers and a reduction in their salaries, and I am honest in doing so to-day. I should be very much pleased if the Government would see its way to allow the matter to stand as it is for the present; and if it will not, I am opposed to the Bill and to having this legislation made retroactive. If the increase is to be given at all, it should be given from now, and not start back from the 1st July, 1898. If there is any one in this House more re-

Mr. McMULLEN.

sponsible for this Bill than anybody else, it is the hon. leader of the Opposition. In 1897, he declared that the difference in salaries was an unfair and invidious distinction and contended that the Ministers of Customs and Inland Revenue should be placed on a par with the other Ministers, and before he went to England he gave expression to the same opinion. But that hon. gentleman is not my leader. So far as the leader of the Government is concerned, I do not know that I ever heard him advocate a reduction in the number of Ministers, but I have done so, and so has the Postmaster General, and so have others, and I do not remember our ever having been taken to task for doing so. I would like that the matter should be allowed to remain as it is until such time as it may be found convenient to make some change in the number.

But in justice to the representatives in this House, if this Bill becomes law, I say that some change should be made in the sessional indemnity. It is unfair to ask members of Parliament to sit here four and a half or five months on an indemnity of \$1,000, when the Ministers of the Crown are paid so much higher salaries, there is an invidious distinction and I am opposed to the provisions of the Bill and shall vote against it. This question shall receive my personal attention during the vacation, and if I live to come back, I shall express my views in the form of a resolution before the House.

Mr. WALLACE. In most of the statements of the hon. member for North Wellington I can cordially agree. I want to say, however, to the right hon. First Minister that I have expressed my opinion that the proposed increase in salaries is not justifiable, not because the Ministers of Customs and Inland Revenue are not entitled to as much salary as the other Ministers, but because the principle has been established and should not be departed from; and if any change should be made, it should be made in the direction of scaling down the other salaries to those of these two Ministers. I was Controller of Customs for three years or more, and I can say that the salary was quite sufficient.

Mr. LANDERKIN. For you.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; it may be that I have not the gigantic intellect of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), whose services have not been recognized by his leaders, I observe, by any promotion, but I can say this, that the proposal now made does not meet with my approval.

With regard to the point raised by the hon. member for North Wellington concerning the indemnity of members of Parliament, as it is called, and which it is time to call a salary, I have this to say. I think it is time to call it a salary. They do that in the United States. It is preposterous that a member of Parliament should spend six

months in the service of his country, working just as hard as a Minister, and get \$1,000 while the Minister, working twice as long, gets eight times as much. The First Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will know how they do it at Washington. There the Cabinet Minister gets \$8,000 a year and the member of Congress or the member of the Senate, who devotes a little more time than our members do to legislative duties—though I do not know—

Mr. FOSTER. A little more, on the average.

Mr. WALLACE. A member of Congress or of the Senate receives \$5,000 a year—I presume on the basis that they spend five-eighths of the year attending to their public duties. In addition to that, a salary is provided for a secretary for each member of Congress and each Senator, to relieve him of laborious work. I would take the responsibility of calling the attention of the Government to the point, and suggesting for their consideration and approval—and it has my approval—that members of Parliament should be furnished with a secretary to assist them in their correspondence. Every member of Parliament is expected by his constituents—and very properly—to send them a good deal of literature. There is, necessarily, also, a great deal of correspondence connected with the position of representative of 20,000 or 30,000 constituents. I see members of Parliament, day after day, spending their time in writing letters to their constituents, addressing documents, and that kind of thing, and on that account, not able to give that attention to their parliamentary duties which they should give. I would not suggest that a secretary be furnished at the high rate of pay fixed in Washington. For a moderate amount secretaries could be employed who would relieve the member of some of the more laborious of his duties and enable him to devote his time to the public business and to his duties in Parliament. I believe the country would save by members attending more closely to their parliamentary duties and being able to give to them more intelligent attention. And we should have more economical legislation and better laws. There is the other point raised by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). He said we work here for six months in the year and get \$1,000, while the Ministers work twice as long and get, not twice as much, but eight times as much. Not only is that true, but the mere fact of receiving more remuneration for services performed carries with it the idea of superiority. I do not think there is very much difference between members of the Government and members of this House, let us say, on the other side, who are not members of the Government. I do not think there is so much difference on this side between members of the former Government and

those who never had the honour of being in any Government. While I admire the abilities of the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), and while this House recognizes his almost unrivalled powers in debate, yet, taking all the members on this side, we do not see the great difference that would justify the payment to one member of \$8,000 for twelve month's work, and to another of \$1,000 for six month's work. As the hon. member for North Wellington suggested, there should be a thorough revision of these matters. But you can hardly get the Government to undertake that, because the Government are enjoying the advantage of it, and they are not likely to give up these advantages to the hon. members who are supporting them.

The PRIME MINISTER. What is the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) with regard to the indemnity of members?

Mr. WALLACE. I would favour a decrease of the remuneration of the Ministers, and an increase of remuneration to the members in the shape of furnishing each of them with a secretary. I would not commit myself much further than that. And I would have it as it is in the United States, where they do not give the money to the member to pay for a secretary, but the secretary is paid by the Government.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think that they have not a secretary for each member, but they have numerous secretaries for the committees.

Mr. WALLACE. No, they have a secretary for each member, and each secretary is paid \$1,200 a year. I think the scale of remuneration extravagant, so far as the salary of the congressmen and senators and their secretaries are concerned. But they proceeded upon the right principle in not making too large a difference in remuneration between the Minister and the ordinary member. The difference we make is quite unjustifiable on its merits.

Now, the right hon. First Minister said that while, in theory, it might be wrong, in practice you had to recognize the representation of the provinces in the Cabinet, and he asked where we could reduce the representation of any province. Well, take his own province of Quebec as it has been represented in the Cabinet for the last three years, previous to the lamented death of one of the members of the Cabinet. There were in the province of Quebec seven members of the Government, if we include the Solicitor General—I am not sure whether he is a member of the Cabinet or not.

The PRIME MINISTER. He is not.

Mr. WALLACE. He is a member of the Government, though not of the Cabinet. Now, take the representation of Ontario as compared with that of Quebec. Ontario has 40 per cent more population than Quebec

Mr. WALLACE.

and 40 per cent more representatives in the House of Commons. Very well, on all rules of fair-play, of intelligence, of wealth, of population, the province of Ontario should have, in round figures, exactly ten members to the province of Quebec's seven. But when you come to examine, you find that Ontario has only five members or, as I contend, four, instead of ten that she should have. We have the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Postmaster General, the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Customs. As to the Secretary of State, I think one-half the year he lives across the river in Quebec. But counting him in the province of Ontario, there are only five, whereas, by the rule of fair-play, there should be ten from Ontario to seven from Quebec.

The PRIME MINISTER. That would be a large Cabinet.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With many other provinces to hear from.

Mr. WALLACE. The suggestion might be that the province of Quebec has just twice the representation that it is entitled to, and that is all.

The PRIME MINISTER. How is it in point of salaries?

Mr. WALLACE. The First Minister, the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Solicitor General receive \$34,000; the Ministers from the province of Ontario receive \$35,000, without counting sessional indemnities in either case.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Except that one from Quebec, the Solicitor General, is not a Minister.

Mr. WALLACE. He is a member of the Government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is not a member of the Government.

Mr. WALLACE. He is a member of the Government, but not a member of the Cabinet. I was a member of the Government by Act of Parliament, but I was not a member of the Cabinet.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is not by Act of Parliament.

Mr. WALLACE. The Prime Minister asked what about the salaries. The salaries are not the only consideration, because he has appointed in the province of Quebec two Ministers without portfolio, one of whom, unfortunately, has gone to his long home. Both these Ministers were members of the Cabinet, they were formulating the policy of the country, and the legislation of the country. They were assisting in conducting the business of the Government, and we find that one of them is taking quite

an active part. I refer to the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell). He is taking so active a part that he is very seldom attending to his parliamentary duties, but is apparently busy as a member of the Government. Now, there is another feature about it. The next clause provides that these two Ministers may be paid at the rate of \$7,000 per annum from the 1st day of July, 1898. Now, was there any bargain made by which these gentlemen should get an increased salary of \$2,000 when they accepted office? Was there a bargain made with them a year ago that they would be recouped for their past services? I would like the First Minister to give an answer to that question.

The PRIME MINISTER. Surely my hon. friend does not expect me to answer such a question as that.

Mr. WALLACE. We will assume that it was not so. However, from some correspondence that occurred when the Minister of Customs got his position, correspondence that came up in North Grey about that time, there is reason to suppose, from a letter written by the First Minister himself, that there was some such understanding. But we will accept the statement of the First Minister that there was no such understanding. Then these gentlemen have been performing their duties in conformity with a bargain made with the Dominion of Canada, they accepted the office for \$5,000 a year. It is proper for Parliament, at any time they choose, to increase the salaries of these Ministers, or of any other Ministers, they receive their salary according to law. But I say that when a Minister, without any previous bargain or understanding receives a salary, whether large or small, this Parliament is not justified in making it retroactive and saying to them: Yes, you made a bargain with the Dominion of Canada, you accepted an office that carried with it a salary of \$5,000 a year, but after the end of your term, after you have performed your duties and received the remuneration that the laws provide, we are going to give you two gentlemen \$4,000 in addition. I say, Mr. Chairman, that that is utterly unjustifiable. Speaking for myself, I am against the increase from \$5,000 to \$7,000, and I am still more strongly opposed to making that retroactive. I do not believe the people will approve such a misappropriation of the public funds. You may say it is only \$4,000. Very well, I think \$4,000 could be put to more useful purposes. These men are not poor men, they are not receiving niggardly salaries, they have been receiving \$6,000 a year of the people's money, each of them, for the last year. I do not think that these hon. gentlemen can justify it. In making these remarks I am quite sure the House will accept my statement that I am not animated by any personal considerations. I have the plea-

sure of regarding both of these hon. gentlemen personally on the most friendly terms, and I would like it to be remembered that when we have discussions in Parliament, they are purely political. I have personally not one word of harshness to say or one harsh thought in my mind against these hon. gentlemen. But regarding it purely as a matter of public business it is wrong to make these two hon. gentlemen a present of \$4,000 and it cannot be justified on any score. If they are entitled to it a year ago why did hon. gentlemen not come down and say: We are proposing to increase the salaries of these two Ministers. I am opposed to the policy of increases altogether; I think the salaries should be toned down and decreased, but I am in favour of paying Ministers fairly. I think it is doing an injustice to the people to vote this \$4,000 to men who have, in accordance with the law, been paid every dollar to which they are fairly and justly entitled.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) who has just sat down, and I must say it did not strike me that this was dated back a year. I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister on what ground he dates it back? I think the ground is pretty strong that has been taken by the hon. member for West York that the law stipulated a salary, that they received that salary and that they worked under it. It is a covenant they undertook to perform, and it strikes me that we ought not, in the face of the law, to go back and give these hon. gentlemen an extra salary for the year past. If, last year, hon. gentlemen thought that these hon. gentlemen should have the same salary as other members of the Cabinet, they should have prepared their legislation last year. But what would the country think of us as legislators, after having been elected under the law which said that we were to get \$1,000 a year, if we should go to work, after we had been here one or two sessions, and voted ourselves \$1,500 or \$2,000 for the preceding years. If we did, I think the country would spew us out of their mouth and do it rightly. It may be that you made a mistake when you thought these gentlemen were worth \$5,000 a year, when you took them into your Cabinet, but you have to take the bitter with the sweet. You ought to pay something for your mistake. I feel disposed to stand strongly against the retroactive part of this Bill. You have made a mistake, and you want to rectify it, but why rectify it backwards. This is a contract; these hon. gentlemen went into it under the law; they accepted the terms. Why should you go back and pay them for the past year? In looking at the Bill I was thinking more of the principle, and it did not strike me that it was retroactive. I think that is a strong feature against it. I do not take any grounds of

virtue, but I say this, that if I were a Minister, if I went in under these conditions and knew the law, I would be disposed to say to my colleagues: I do not want you to make it retroactive. I went in under the law which says \$5,000 is to be the salary until we can get \$7,000 and can change the policy of the Government in regard to it; we cannot make a change of policy now, but we will remedy this later, and in doing it we ought not to go back and make the Bill retroactive.

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend remembers the speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), when he introduced this Bill, he has an answer to his question. The Government intended to bring it in last year. This is the language made use of by the hon. Minister of Finance in introducing the Bill:

We intended to have brought this matter to the notice of the House last session, but in the rush of business which always takes place at the close, it was overlooked, and we have made a resolution to take effect on the 1st of July a year ago.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that the country would take that as a satisfactory reason. The Government has to look after its business. The Government did not choose, for some reason or other, to bring it in. It may be a matter of party policy that it was not brought in. Let them pay for the party policy. It may be that hon. gentlemen did not want to shock the public confidence quite so soon in going back on this thing. Let them pay the bill; it has been worth something to them. Let them pay \$1,000 or \$2,000 each. You have got the advantage, and you should pay for it.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend takes a view, upon this matter, which has to be contradicted. Last year we had intended to bring in this legislation because we had made up our minds that the Ministers of Customs and Inland Revenue ought to be placed on the same footing as their colleagues. The discussion which has taken place has not challenged in any way the justice of that proposition. Nothing has been said this evening in opposition to the view that the Ministers of Customs and Inland Revenue should be placed on the same footing as the colleagues with whom they are associated. Having come to that conclusion the Ministers have given their best services to the country, and although the Bill was not introduced last session, the Ministers have given their best services to the country, and I do not think the country would be indisposed to pay them for the work they have done since the 1st of July, 1898. That is a proposition that ought to appeal to the sense of fairness of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). The proposition has not been challenged that the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue are entitled to the same treatment

Mr. FOSTER.

as any other members of the Government. The hon. gentleman does not say that the Ministers are overpaid. He agrees with us in the position we have taken. Having made up our minds at the time to ask Parliament to give them this increase of salary and the Ministers having given their best services to the country during the year, it seems not unfair to ask that their salaries should be paid for that time.

Mr. FOSTER. My right hon. friend has challenged me on another point, although I have not opened my mouth in reference to it. I am free to say, in regard to this talk about Ministers being under-paid or not, that no salary that you can give here will pay some Ministers for the terrible weight of responsibility that is incurred by them in carrying on the affairs of the Government. That I acknowledge, and the same thing applies to members of Parliament. Yet I am not able to take the view in Parliament that a Minister of the Crown should have more than he gets at the present time. I have been a Minister myself, and I quite well know the amount of responsibility which attaches to the position. I have been a member of Parliament, and I know the responsibility that devolves upon a member who will do his duty. Yet, I am bound to say, so far as members of Parliament are concerned, unless the country is going to grade the salaries and pay people according to what they are worth, I do not see how you can raise the indemnity beyond \$1,000 a year. It is not a salary; but it pays the expenses. The moment you go beyond what pays a member's expenses and make it salary you must pay members according to what they are worth, and that it is impossible to do. In so far as my light goes now, I am not in favour of the payment of larger salaries to Ministers, and I am willing to take my chances, both as a member of Parliament, and if the time ever comes, as a Minister under the present conditions, as far as the salary is concerned.

Mr. SPROULE. If it is right to go back one year, it is right to go back two, and commence in 1897, when the original Act was passed, and when the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) said that it was not intended to give these gentlemen any more salary. They were employed under a contract, just like a hired man; they put in their time, and received their wages, and their work has gone into the history of the past. Now, you go back one year, and say: We did not pay them enough wages. If you did not pay them enough last year, you did not pay them enough the year before; and there is just as much justification for giving them each a bonus of \$2,000 a year for the work they did that year as there is for the work they did last year. They rendered us as valuable services in the one year, as they did in the other. But I do not see any justification

for going back at all. These gentlemen took their positions under the law and at the salaries as they existed; they were quite willing to take them, and I think the country regard them as having been tolerably well paid. I agree with everything the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has said in regard to differentiating the salaries. I am reminded that if that principle is good, the late Controllers should each be presented with \$2,000 a year. There would be as much justice in that, as they did as much work as the present Controllers, and a great deal more in some cases. I have always believed, and I believe now, that every Minister of the Crown should not be paid the same salary. The Secretary of State would be fairly well paid at \$3,000 a year. The same might be said with regard to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. What services does he render to the country, as Minister of Trade and Commerce, for which he should be paid \$7,000 a year? Look at his report, and try to ascertain what he is doing. You will find that he is doing scarcely anything; it is a mere honorary position. I think the country would welcome the time when we would pay salaries somewhat in proportion to the duties and labours of those who receive them. We have to-day seventeen Cabinet Ministers; yet, according to the promise of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) the number was to be cut down to thirteen or less, but the Government has not endeavoured to cut them down. I draw the attention of the country to this, so that it may remember it when these hon. gentlemen go back to the electorate to receive that punishment which I am sure will be inflicted upon them.

Mr. CARGILL. Mr. Chairman, as representing a rural district, in which there are not many people who have an income of \$7,000 a year, I feel it my duty to enter my protest against this Bill. I am glad to find the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) in sympathy with members on this side of the House on this particular subject. I have a very distinct recollection of the criticisms which were made as to the extravagant expenditure of the late Government, in my election in 1896. The hon. member for North Wellington is well and favourably known in western Ontario as having been a very severe critic of the expenditures of the Conservative Government for very many years, and I think he was honest and sincere in doing so. I, therefore, must give him credit on this occasion for sympathizing with members on this side of the House who have raised their voices against these increases which are proposed to be made in the salaries of the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue. I do not see why there should not be a distinction made as to the salaries paid to the different members of the Government. In all posi-

tions in life we find that men are paid according to the services they render, and I do not see why the same rule should not prevail in the Government of the country. I was very much surprised at the remarks made this evening by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood), a gentleman of enterprise and industry. We know that that hon. gentleman has succeeded in accumulating an immense fortune, which he could not have done without being possessed of those characteristics. He said that men possessing the ability of the Cabinet Ministers in this country could easily earn twice \$7,000 a year. I would like the hon. member for Hamilton to mention any business man in this country who is making \$14,000 a year?

Mr. WOOD. Lots of them.

Mr. CARGILL. With no capital?

Mr. WOOD. Are not their brains capital?

Mr. CARGILL. The members of the Government invest their brains, but they invest no capital. I would like to know how much capital the hon. member for Hamilton has invested in his business, and if he is realizing a fair rate of interest on that capital? I am quite sure that he is piling up quite an amount out of his business annually; but, apart from the investment of capital, I know of no business man in this country who is making \$14,000 a year with his brains alone. There may be some lawyers doing so; but these are not business men.

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. CARGILL. I mean to say that they are not engaged in mercantile business. I do think that the Opposition have made a very strong case. I have listened very attentively to the speeches of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and I know that we have the sympathy of several members on that side who are supporters of the present Government, but who, on this particular occasion, do not feel justified in voting for this Bill, and would respectfully ask the hon. Finance Minister to reconsider the matter. This is a growing time, and I hope will continue to grow, and then perhaps, after four or five years of this growing time, when the country is well advanced in prosperity, we may consider the advisability of increasing the salaries of the Cabinet Ministers.

Section agreed to.

On section 3,

Mr. SPROULE. I beg to move in amendment that the words "one thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine" be substituted for the words "one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight."

Amendment negatived: Yeas 14, nays 24.

Mr. POWELL. I desire to withdraw my vote. I did not notice that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis), with whom I have a standing pair, is absent.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am in the same position, and forgot for the moment that I was paired.

Mr. BERGERON. I am also in the same position, being paired with the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot).

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I move the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. I move in amendment that the Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the whole, with instructions to amend the third section by striking out "1898" and substituting therefor "1899."

The House divided on amendment.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bell (Addington),	Martin,
Clancy,	Morin,
Davin,	Prior,
Foster,	Sproule, and
Macdonald (King's),	Wallace.—11.
McMullen,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bazinet,	Hutchison,
Beith,	Landerkin,
Bell (Prince, East),	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Blair,	McCarthy,
Borden (King's),	McGregor,
Bostock,	McGugan,
Copp,	McHugh,
Davies (Sir Louis),	McLellan,
Domville,	Mignault,
Fielding,	Oliver,
Fisher,	Pettet,
Fraser (Lambton),	Rinfret, and
Haley,	Tucker.—27.
Holmes,	

Amendment negatived.

Bill read the third time, on division, and passed.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 178) respecting the Quebec Harbour Commissioners. He said : This is a Bill to enable the Harbour Commissioners of the port of Quebec to guarantee the interest on an issue of bonds to the amount of \$200,000 to be issued by the Great Northern Railway Company, for the purpose of constructing an elevator. The Harbour Commissioners are indebted to the Government, and the object of this Bill is to provide that the bonds now to be issued shall take priority of the Government loan. The House is aware that a large sum is due to the Government for principal and interest for loans and in connection with Quebec harbour.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. WALLACE. How much interest and how much principal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think I am right in saying that the advances amounted to \$3,975,000, and this has accumulated interest until the total is \$5,200,000. Practically, they have been paying no interest. A year ago, we allowed the Harbour Commissioners to make a special issue of bonds for carrying on certain improvements, very much as one would issue a bottomry bond upon a ship, and allowed those bonds to take priority of the Government loan.

Mr. WALLACE. What interest does the Government charge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it is 4 per cent. However, as this has not been an over-profitable investment so far, when one is not getting his interest, he is apt to forget the rate. The Harbour Commissioners have made arrangement with the Great Northern Railway Company to construct an elevator at a cost of about \$200,000. The Harbour Commissioners agree to guarantee 3 per cent interest on the bonds and have asked the Government to permit them to do so, and we have thought it expedient to submit the Bill to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. The Bill, as it purports to be, is quite different from the Bill as it really is.

The PRIME MINISTER. In what respect ?

Mr. FOSTER. What the Government is really doing is going into a system of building elevators in different cities, and this is one for Quebec. Under the guise of allowing the Harbour Commissioners to guarantee the bonds of the Great Northern Railway Company to build an elevator, they are really taking so much of the public money to bonus an elevator in the city of Quebec. Does not my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) see that when you get all this refining off, and get down to the solid matter it is nothing else but what I say. The Quebec Harbour Commissioners owe this country over \$5,000,000, of which nearly \$4,000,000 is principal. Now, the essence of that bargain is that they are to pay the interest on that capital, and the only means they have of paying it is from the revenues of the harbour. They have not been able to pay the interest, and now the Government are not only going to forego the interest, but are going to remove, by this much, the possibility of any interest being paid. As the harbour of Quebec improves, any surplus that the commissioners have over expenses can be applied towards the interest on the Government loan. But the Government forestalls that by allowing them first to pay on the bonds issued by a railway for building an elevator. That is the same as the Government paying for the construction of the elevator. The proposal

is one wound about with verbiage, but that is all that it amounts to. It allows a third party to do the work, but it simply means taking so much public money to aid the construction of an elevator in Quebec. If the Intercolonial Railway, the Government railway, wants warehouses, station houses, lumber yards and elevators, it has a right to build them in connection with the running of the road. But I do not think that in any other case we have bonused or built elevators for cities or corporations. The Intercolonial Railway has no business in Quebec City, the road does not go there. But the Great Northern has business there, and it will build an elevator provided the Harbour Commissioners will guarantee the bonds. But the Harbour Commissioners have no money to be applied to such a purpose, for whatever surplus they get they have to pay interest on the Government loan, which was given to them bona fide. By intermitting the interest and allowing the Harbour Commissioners to guarantee these bonds, you do practically the same as if you asked a vote of this money in Parliament.

So, it is money which would be covered into the treasury ; but, instead of putting it into the treasury, you give it as a bonus to elevators in the city of Quebec. Are you going to build elevators in the city of Toronto or elsewhere ? Are you going into that business amongst other business you have been going into, spending \$70,000 for wharfs where there is neither business nor water ? Building wharfs where there is no customs, with little trade, nothing but a simple mining concern, and voting \$10,000 to do that ? Are you going now into the business of bonusing elevators and guaranteeing the bonds of different railways which will put up elevators on their roads. You have already given to the city of Quebec \$1,000,000 as a bonus to a bridge ; now you are giving them another bonus to enable the Great Northern Railway Company to build an elevator. The Great Northern Company may be a great pet of the right hon. gentleman ; it may be a very deserving road ; but the Great Northern ought not to be subsidized to build elevators by the Government, as will be the effect here, when you boil it down. To resume : the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec are indebted to this Government for interest upon nearly \$5,000,000. They would pay that interest, if the working of the harbour gave sufficient money for it. There is a surplus, but instead of its going to pay that interest, you leave it to them as a bonus to build an elevator on the bonds of the Great Northern Railway Company. So, stripped of its verbiage, it is simply a bonus. I ask again : How far is the Government going in reference to this expenditure ? I think it is straining the goodnature, and generosity, and the sense of fairplay of this Parliament pretty well, when you give a bonus of \$1,000,000 for a bridge,

the *raison d'être* of which was nearly destroyed by previous policies of the Government itself.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am certainly surprised at the speech of the hon. gentleman, and, notwithstanding he air which he put upon it, I must say with due deference, that I cannot believe him to have been serious. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the innuendoes he has made, have no foundation whatever.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not mean to make any innuendoes ; I meant to make my statements straight.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very well ; I accept his statement that he did not mean to make innuendoes ; all I can say is, that he was not very happy in expressing his ideas.

Mr. FOSTER. That is my misfortune.

The PRIME MINISTER. I thought it was worse, but I take it to be a misfortune. Now, what is the position ? At the present time the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec are indebted to the Government in a capital sum of \$3,900,000, or, in round numbers, \$4,000,000, bearing interest, if my memory serves me right, at 4 per cent. Therefore, the Harbour Commissioners have to pay every year to the Government of Canada \$160,000 as interest. I will not refer to what has taken place in the past, nor make any recriminations in regard to it. The Harbour Commissioners of Quebec have received some value, but not to the extent of the capital with which they are burdened. Let that pass, however. My hon. friend knows that this matter came before us last year, and he knows that for ten years or so, ever since this debt was created, the Harbour Commissioners have not paid one cent of interest upon that capital, and they cannot pay one cent. The reason is very obvious ; we discussed it last year. If I remember right, the gross revenues were in the neighbourhood of \$60,000, and all that was absorbed by charges of administration. At all events, I am certain that for years they have not paid a cent of interest, simply because the cost of administration absorbed all the revenues derived by the Harbour Commissioners, with a slight margin. Now, for years the harbour of Quebec had been a very prosperous harbour, up to about 1870. At that time Quebec had the square timber trade of the St. Lawrence, and the harbour was covered every year with large rafts of square timber, and with a fleet of vessels from the other side. At that time the harbour was prosperous, and yielded a good revenue ; but about 1870 it began to fall off, and has been falling off ever since. The trade of Quebec has been decreasing all the time up to last year. Last year the trade commenced to revive, and we then authorized the Harbour Commissioners to borrow \$350,000, and to give a preference to these new bonds over our debt. We

did that in order to give facilities to the Harbour Commissioners to improve their harbour with the money they were authorized to borrow, so as to give better facilities to trade by increasing the equipment at that port. Now, at that time we gave to the Harbour Commissioners power to borrow \$350,000, and we gave the bondholders preference over our own bonds. We did that because otherwise the Harbour Commissioners would not be able to equip their harbour, and it would have rotted from want of use. Now, in order to make our asset good, we did what a creditor often does, we made another advance to the debtor, so as to enable him to give better security. I think it was a wise policy to give the Harbour Commissioners power to borrow \$350,000 to invest in building wharfs, in equipping the harbour, so as to attract trade. It was a wise thing to do, because we gave more value to our asset. Now, we are simply following the same policy. Here is a new railway being built, which is to be a continuation of one of the most important railways that we have in Canada, the Parry Sound Railway. The Parry Sound Railway at the present time has no outlet to the ocean, but it is expected that by the continuation of that road by means of the Great Northern Railway, subsidized yesterday, it will have an outlet to the ocean at Quebec. The Great Northern Railway wants to build an elevator, and it has asked the Harbour Commissioners to guarantee their bonds. Now, the Harbour Commissioners cannot guarantee their bonds, unless we do what we did last year, that is, give a preference to these new bonds over our own debt. If we give that power to the Harbour Commissioners, they will guarantee the bonds of the company, elevators will be built, and our asset will be more valuable than it is to-day.

The reason why we did it is to enable the Quebec Harbour Commissioners to improve the harbour, to bring trade to it, to increase the revenue, and, therefore, to make it possible for the commissioners of the harbour of Quebec to pay back some return to us on our investment. So far as that investment is concerned, it has been an investment only in name. It has yielded nothing. I do not believe the day will ever come when the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec will be able to discharge their whole debt to us, but I believe the time will come, at no distant day, when the Harbour Commissioners will be able to come to Parliament and have a new bargain made for the renewal of their debt upon new terms, and that they will be able to pay some of the interest upon the capital. I believe that at no distant day the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec will be in a position, when these improvements have been made, and when trade has been revived in the Quebec harbour, that instead of having \$60,000 of a revenue they will have \$200,000 or \$300,000, and when they will be able to say to us:

**Sir WILFRID LAURIER.**

We will pay back \$2,000,000 of our \$5,000,000 of debt, so that we will be able to meet our liabilities. In order to bring about that condition of affairs it is essential that we should give to the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec power to equip their harbour so as to secure the trade. My hon. friend ought to take a broader view of this question. He should not say that we are taking this way of subsidizing the building of this elevator. We are doing nothing of the kind, but we are taking the only step which can be taken in order to give some life to that harbour and to secure some return for an investment which has been absolutely unproductive. Do these reasons not appeal to the hon. gentleman? Does he not see that this is a business transaction and one which must appeal to his business judgment?

**Mr. BERGERON.** I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if there is not already, in Quebec, an elevator which was built some years ago, but which has never been used for any purpose?

**The PRIME MINISTER.** Yes.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Is this to be taken to build another one on the same conditions?

**The PRIME MINISTER.** Not on the same conditions.

**Mr. BERGERON.** I have no objection to spending all the money my right hon. friend wishes in Quebec since the public treasury is open. The more we can get the better, but surely we must have some sound reason for doing it. There is no doubt that it is useless to spend money in this way so long as the elevator, which is there, is not used. It should be shown that more elevators are needed, because the money can be spent in some other way and in a better way. The right hon. gentleman should give us some semblant de raison for this proposal, and if there is none, let us spend the money for some other purpose. We have in Montreal, I think, three or four elevators which were built years ago, and which have never been used. I hope when these great improvements in the channel are made, and which are going to cost so much, if the plans of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) are carried out, that they may be used. But until the elevator, which is now in existence in Quebec is used, is filled with grain and put in operation, I think it is improper to spend public money to build another.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** We are not spending any public money; we are not spending a cent of the money of the Dominion of Canada. If it were possible, without this, that we could collect a cent of the interest which is due to us, there would be something in the argument of my hon. friend, but my hon. friend knows very well that we cannot collect one cent from the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a comforting doctrine.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is comforting to this extent, that unless the harbour is equipped, we cannot collect a cent of that money which is owing to us.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not my hon. friend see that the railway companies, which are stretching out for business, should be expected to do something?

The PRIME MINISTER. Exactly. And this something the commissioners are doing.

Mr. FOSTER. But the commissioners are not doing it; this is what we are doing.

The PRIME MINISTER. The commissioners say that they ought to give some help to the railway companies. Now, a word to the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). There is an elevator at Quebec which was built by the Canadian Pacific Railway under an agreement in response to a bargain which was imposed upon them as the result of the cabal in No. 8 in this building. But the Canadian Pacific Railway built the elevator and then never used it. The Canadian Pacific Railway do not undertake to carry wheat to Quebec. I do not know whether they undertake to carry wheat to Montreal. But Mr. Booth, the builder of the Parry Sound Railway, undertakes to carry wheat to the seaboard, and we all hope that his undertaking will be successful. He is now carrying enormous quantities of wheat over his railway. If he is to carry wheat to Quebec he must have an elevator, and it must be on the jetties or wharfs of the harbour of Quebec where the wheat can be brought by the railway and unloaded into the ships. This is the object of this elevator.

Mr. BERGERON. Could he not use the one already built?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think that the one already built would be suitable for that purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is the present elevator?

The PRIME MINISTER. On the Louise Basin.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that not part of the harbour?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, but I am told that it cannot be used.

Mr. SPROULE. The right hon. Prime Minister says that the railways do not carry wheat to the seaboard because it does not pay them, and then says the Booth road proposes to do it and that to enable him to do it, it is proposed to give this subsidy for the building of an elevator. Suppose that it should prove a failure after the elevator is built and that they should not be able to carry on that trade profitably. It is only a

venture and according to the hon. Minister's statement it has not paid other roads. Is there any ground for believing that it would pay the Booth road any more than it did the other roads? If, after the elevator is built, it proves a failure and the elevator is abandoned the money will be wasted. In plain English, this is practically giving a subsidy to the city of Quebec out of the consolidated revenue fund of the country for the building of an elevator. The Harbour Commissioners cannot pay interest on the money which is already borrowed from the country without an additional outlay, and if they have to pay interest, at the rate of 3 per cent on the additional outlay, it will prevent them from paying any interest on the loan we have already made to them. The commission will have to pay interest on the outlay for the elevator, and, therefore, the country will get back none of the money it has loaned for the harbour. We have a number of other towns and cities that are building elevators. Take the town of Midland, which bonused elevators to the tune of something like \$50,000. The railway paid the other portion of it, and the elevator was built. Up to the time that elevator was built, the harbour of Midland did not pay, but by the increased trade brought about by its construction, it is earning more to-day, but not enough to pay interest on the money the Government invested in that harbour. But how can you justify giving assistance to the city of Quebec to build an elevator when you will not give any assistance to the town of Midland? The town of Owen Sound has two elevators, which were built with the assistance of a bonus granted by the town; the debt incurred for that bonus is standing over that town to-day and will not be paid for 17 or 18 years. These elevators were built by the people of the town taxing themselves for the purpose, while the Government propose to tax the country to build an elevator for Quebec. Collingwood is doing the same; it has already given a bonus to build an elevator, and it is proposing to give another as soon as the harbour is sufficiently deepened to enable large vessels to come there. The town of Meaford is negotiating to-day for the building of an elevator, and it proposes to give a bonus of not less than \$15,000 for an elevator of moderate capacity, or a larger bonus for a larger elevator. Goderich is doing the same; Kincardine is proposing to do the same; Wiarton is considering the same question. If we are going to subsidize the building of elevators in the city of Montreal, the city of Quebec and the town of Port Colborne, as the scheme proposed to us the other night contemplates, I cannot see any grounds on which this Government can refuse to apply the same principle to every town in Canada that proposes to build an elevator for the accommodation of the through grain trade from the west. We

have subsidized railways to go to Quebec; we are giving \$1,000,000 for the Quebec bridge; we have granted \$4,000,000 to that harbour on which we cannot hope to receive a single dollar of interest—so the Prime Minister has told us. We may possibly get some interest in the future, but we are not likely to get the principal paid back.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. We are not giving them a cent. We are lending them the money.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Who pays the interest?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The Harbour Commissioners of Quebec.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Where do they get it?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Out of the business of the port.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Suppose they do not get any interest?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Then, nobody pays it.

Mr. **SPROULE**. There is no immediate prospect of their getting it. We cannot get a penny of interest now from them on the loan for harbour purposes, and we have no hope of getting any in the future.

Mr. **WALLACE**. Suppose they do not pay the interest, what follows?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. We do not pay a cent. The man who lends his money takes his risk of that.

Mr. **WALLACE**. Can he not foreclose the property if he takes a mortgage on it?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. He can only foreclose on the elevator. He cannot on anything else.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I am speaking of the \$4,000,000 invested in the harbour. I take it that in the same way we guarantee the interest on the loan to the harbour of Montreal, and will pay it if the Harbour Commissioners cannot pay it out of the business of the port. When these various towns and cities in Canada have to tax themselves to assist in building elevators, how can you justify taking money out of the consolidated revenue to assist in building an elevator in the city of Quebec, after the liberal way in which we have dealt with that city up to the present time? You cannot justify it before the people of Ontario by any kind of reasoning you submit.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. My hon. friend is astray. We do not take one cent to build an elevator in Quebec.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Do you not guarantee the interest?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. No.

Mr. **SPROULE**. What does the Bill say? The corporation is authorized to do it. Whose

Mr. **SPROULE**.

corporation is it? The corporation of the Government. Whose money is it spending? The money of the country, which the hon. Minister told us a moment ago he never expects to get back. If not, the country loses it, and we are subsidizing the city of Quebec to the extent that we are guaranteeing the interest on the outlay. In my judgment, you cannot justify this to the people of any place in this country who are taxing themselves for the purpose of assisting to build elevators. We adopt the principle that where railway companies build bridges that cost \$100,000, we give them 15 per cent of the cost, and you are practically adopting the same principle to-day with regard to elevators. You are telling the people of Quebec that if they build an elevator you will pay the interest on its cost. Go and tell the people of Owen Sound, the people of Collingwood, the people of Midland, the people of Goderich, that you will apply the same principle to them as you do to the people of Quebec. In my opinion, this is not justifiable, and the Government are only starting on a principle that will lead them to trouble, and bring many application from other places for similar assistance in the future.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman evidently misconceives this Bill altogether. If his conception of it were correct, a great deal of what he says would logically follow, and the towns which propose to build elevators out of their own funds would perhaps have good cause of complaint. But we do not vote any public moneys for the construction of this elevator; we are not asked to do so. We do not guarantee the bonds for its construction; we are not asked to do so.

Mr. **SPROULE**. You guarantee the interest?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. We do not. I am going to show you what we do. We have an unproductive debt, which has not paid us interest for ten years, and which cannot under existing circumstances pay us interest in the future; and those who owe us that money say to us: "If you allow us to guarantee the cost of an elevator, and let that guarantee take priority of the debt we owe you, we will be able to increase our revenues so that in all probability you will have a productive debt where you now have an unproductive one." We are asked to postpone the payment of our interest to the payment of the interest on the bonds issued for the building of this new elevator. That is the position we assume, and no town or city in Canada has any ground for opposition to the principle we adopt. If this debt were a live or productive one, and we were asked to give priority to a new guarantee, there would be a great deal of force in

the hon. gentleman's argument, because giving that new mortgage priority would be tantamount to taking it ourselves. But inasmuch as our debt has been non-productive in the past, and there is no possibility of its being productive in the future, unless these new works are built, what we are asking simply is to postpone the payment of our mortgage or bonds to the payment of the bonds for these new improvements. It is not intended to give a dollar by this Act, directly or indirectly, but to effect that which any business man would call a good business transaction. Where a man has a large debt due him, which, under existing circumstances, there is no likelihood of his collecting, and there is a prospect of making it a paying debt, either by advancing fresh moneys from his pocket or enabling the debtor to raise money elsewhere to improve the property on which the creditor holds security, would it not be a good transaction for him to take either course?

Mr. FOSTER. Who is to get the revenue?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It will go to pay the interest on the cost of the elevator, and any surplus revenue will come to us.

Mr. FOSTER. The surplus of what revenues?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The revenues of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is to own the elevator?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It will be owned by the company, subject to the mortgage of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is to get the revenues?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The railway company. But the Harbour Commissioners will derive large revenues from the fact of the elevator being put there. If the railway company meets the interest on its bonds or pays its bonds, there will be no charge either upon the Harbour Commissioners or upon us, but we are looking to the contingency of the company not doing so. And in view of this contingency, are we taking a good business course by allowing the Harbour Commissioners to give a guarantee to the company which will take priority of the guarantee they have already given us, and that so far has proved to be worth nothing? Can we hope to get anything out of that guarantee in the existing conditions? We cannot. Can they improve the existing condition? Yes. Can they improve the existing condition without our giving them this concession, which would allow them to obtain foreign money to build this elevator? The answer is, no. We propose to enable them to introduce foreign money, for the purpose of building

this elevator, and our property will thereby increase in value instead of decreasing.

Mr. SPROULE. The transaction strikes me in this way. You have a debt due you by the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec, out of which you get no interest to-day, but if they improve the conditions and thus enable themselves to earn sufficient money to pay the interest on their debt, you are foregoing your priority and enabling them to pay instead the interest on the cost of the elevator. If that money did not go to pay interest on the elevator, it would go into the consolidated revenues of the country.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But they would not have any revenue.

Mr. SPROULE. How does the hon. gentleman know that? We find private corporations offering to put up elevators in Montreal, and we find that private companies have put up elevators in other places, and is it not just as likely that the company would do the same thing in Quebec, if there was any prospect of a profitable trade being done there, provided they got the assistance from that city which other companies have got from other towns. Then the harbour of Quebec would become a more productive harbour, and the country would be entitled to expect payment of the interest on the money we have invested in that harbour. But we are foregoing that prospect by putting another debt ahead of ours, so that if by any means there should be an improvement that would enable the harbour of Quebec to earn money which would come to us we will lose the interest that belongs to the Dominion, and let that go to the parties who build the elevator. In this we are discriminating in favour of one place against others, where the people have taxed themselves to build these elevators.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The real question is whether the Dominion will have to pay anything for this elevator or not. The ex-Minister of Finance says that we are just simply subsidizing this elevator and providing the money to build it. Certainly, if we were providing \$200,000 out of the Dominion treasury to build it, we would have to pay the interest, and that would be a charge on the treasury. But how is this a charge on the treasury? We are not paying a cent. We are not giving anything, but simply allowing the improvement to be made. Whether or not the company can raise the money in this way is another question, but if the Great Northern Railway Company can raise the money on their bonds, covered by the guarantee of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, it is certain that the Dominion does not contribute a cent. The only possible contingency which could justify the argument would be if this were such a profitable transaction that the Quebec Harbour Commissioners are going

to earn a lot of money which would come to us, and which we are depriving ourselves of. That is not a reasonable supposition. If we are ever to get a cent of interest out of this investment, it must be by doing something to develop the trade of the port. As the matter stands at present, we are not likely ever to get anything, and we are simply permitting the commissioners to make this arrangement with the Great Northern Railway Company, which will not cost us a cent, and which may have the effect of improving the business of Quebec, and thereby improve our chances of getting paid our debt, which there is not the slightest probability of our ever getting paid under present conditions.

Mr. FOSTER. There are two points involved, and we must not lose sight of the one in discussing the other. Here is a railway corporation which is looking for an immense trade from the west down to the seaboard.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Has the hon. gentleman not spoken before?

Mr. FOSTER. I thought we were in committee?

Mr. SPEAKER. I allowed the discussion to go on because it was anticipating the work of the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it is worth while to go into committee to-night, and we might continue this discussion when we go into committee.

The PRIME MINISTER. We can pass the second reading now, and take up the discussion in committee on Monday.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time.

#### THE PRIME MINISTER'S INVITATION TO CHICAGO DEMONSTRATION.

Mr. DAVIN. If you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, there is an important statement in an evening paper attributed to the right hon. Prime Minister, which I think should be brought before the House, and which, with your permission, I will read:

Washington, August 5.—F. M. Fitzpatrick, of the Treasury Department, has returned to Washington from Ottawa, where he went at the instance of the committee of citizens of Chicago, in charge of the ceremonies of laying the cornerstone of that city's great post office building next October by President McKinley, to arrange for the formal invitation and expected acceptance of an invitation from Chicago's citizens to the Governor General and Cabinet of Canada to participate in these festivities. Mr. Fitzpatrick is the assistant United States architect for the Chicago building.

To an Associated Press representative he admitted that his official reception at the Canadian capital was slightly chilly, Sir Wilfrid Laurier very candidly telling him that under the present conditions it would be impossible for him to ac-

Mr. FIELDING.

cept or even consider any social invitations to this side of the border.

Mr. Fitzpatrick says that in substance Sir Wilfrid's voluntary statements and answers to queries were as follows:—"As a friend, in whom I am deeply interested, I am very glad to see you, but, frankly, as a representative of the federal or any local government in the United States your visit could not have been more untimely. When I received your first letter I took up the matter with His Excellency the Governor General, and he expressed a sincere desire to visit Chicago, and seemed anxious to accept the invitation, as I was. We would have been delighted to go, and were looking forward to the day with much anticipation. But since then the tone of your press has been so harsh in dealing with the Alaskan boundary question, such misrepresentations have been made about me, that it would be undignified for us to visit you, and I cannot advise His Excellency to go."

Mr. Fitzpatrick said that Sir Wilfrid intimated that in the present state of public feeling in the United States, as indicated by the press, it would not be entirely safe for the Governor General and himself to visit Chicago, as he feared that they might in a great gathering of such a character as the Chicago ceremony be subjected to some unpleasantness or indignity by thoughtless persons. Sir Wilfrid expressed himself as strongly in favour of arbitrating the Alaskan boundary dispute, and concluded the interview as follows:—

"No, much as I regret it, I could not go to Chicago under present conditions, and shall certainly, however a painful duty it may be, also advise His Excellency to decline the invitation, that I know and feel has so kindly been extended to us by the city of Chicago."

Mr. Fitzpatrick secured Sir Wilfrid's promise, however, to reconsider the matter.

I desire to ask if the right hon. gentleman has been correctly reported.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have nothing to say, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 7th August, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 191) further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

He said: This is simply to provide that when a member of either House belongs to the active militia and is obliged to leave

for the purpose of attending a militia camp, he shall not for that reason have his absence from the House counted against him.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time.

#### POSTMASTER AT PORT GEORGE, ANNAPOLIS.

Mr. MILLS (by Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) asked :

Who is the postmaster at Port George, Annapolis County? Has there been any irregularities in connection with said office that required the services of the inspector? If so, what were they, and what is the situation now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). The postmistress being ill, she required an assistant and the assistant in charge did not promptly remit the money received for money ordered, appearing to think that prompt remittance was not necessary, the postmistress being a woman of ample means. The inspector pointed out the irregularity, and said that any repetition would be followed by a change of postmaster.

#### MAJOR GENERAL HUTTON—RECOMMENDATIONS OR REPORTS.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON (by Mr. Dugas) asked :

1. Has Major General Hutton made any report or recommendation in favour of, or against, the appointment of any person to command the Militia Army Service Corps? If so, the names?

2. What qualifications, if any, will require to be held by the officer to be appointed to command the Militia Army Service Corps?

3. Will the existing regulations in regard to qualification for appointment to the staff or permanent corps be suspended in the case of the officer to be appointed to command the Militia Army Service Corps?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Major General Hutton has not been asked by me to make any report or recommendation with reference to any officer in the militia or elsewhere regarding the militia army service corps. In reply to the second question, I beg to say that the matter is under consideration, and I am not able at present to say what the qualifications are.

Mr. FOSTER. This is scarcely an answer to the question.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is the only one I can give.

#### INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS.

Mr. STENSON asked :

1. How many locomotive engineers (drivers) are employed on the Intercolonial Railway to-day?

2. How many of these have been taken on since 1st January, 1897?

3. Is it a fact that an engineer, whose position was rendered untenable by persecution practised upon him by officers of the road, in 1890, on account of his political opinions, and who consequently resigned, cannot be taken back upon this road upon which his record is excellent?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. The number of enginemen employed on the Intercolonial Railway to-day is two hundred and twenty-five (225). 2. Seven have been taken on since January 1st, 1897, with the transfer of the Drummond County Railway. Thirty firemen were promoted to the position of engine drivers since January 1st, 1897. 3. Nothing is known to the department about this matter, but if such a case has occurred and one of the enginemen voluntarily retired from the service in 1890, on account of his position having been rendered untenable because of his political opinions, it would be difficult to restore him to his position. The arrangements existing between the department and the trainmen entitle the latter to promotion by seniority, and it would not be practicable to put men back to their former places from positions which possibly they may have filled for years in order to make such a restoration as is referred to.

#### ST. THOMAS AND AYLMER WEST— CARRIAGE OF MAILS.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

How many times did the Department of the Postmaster General advertise for tenders to carry the mail between St. Thomas and Aylmer West?

How many persons tendered for the contract each time, and what was the price of each tender? Also the date upon which each tender was received by the department?

What were the dates tenders were to close as advertised each time?

Who has the contract for carrying the mail between St. Thomas and Aylmer West?

On what date was the contract made? Did the lowest tender receive the contract?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Tenders were called for twice. On the first occasion, six were received, and on the second occasion eight were received. On the first occasion, the tenders ranged from \$140 to \$249, all of which, with the exception of the lowest, were received on or before the day fixed for receiving tenders. The lowest was not received within the time fixed, although the tenderer alleges that he had posted it within the time. Each of the tenders, however, was considered excessive, and tenders were again called for. Eight were received, the lowest being for \$25, which was accepted. The contract may be signed, but the department has not yet the information, and it is not usual to give the names of the tenders until the completion of the contract.

### INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to draw attention to the fact that the report of the Minister of Justice to Council in the case of the Queen vs. Skelton, et al., which was promised, has not yet come down.

### DR. PATRICK SCOTT—SAUGEEN RESERVE.

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of the Interior if he can inform the House if the service of Dr. Patrick Scott has been dispensed with in the Saugeen reserve?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not remember hearing the name before, but will inquire and let the hon. gentleman know.

### QUEBEC CARTRIDGE FACTORY.

Mr. CLANCY. I have been requested by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Ingram) to ask the hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) if he is prepared to give the answer promised some days ago with regard to the employees of the Quebec Cartridge Factory?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Minister of Militia is not in his seat at the moment. Will the hon. member bring the matter to his attention when my hon. colleague is in the House?

### YUKON—MR. J. B. CHARLESON.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to renew my request for certain papers, which I have already asked for three or four times. One is the Order in Council, appointing Mr. Charleson and allocating certain moneys towards that service.

### ONTARIO AND RAINY RIVER COMPANY.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to a portion of his remarks in reply to a question put to him by the hon. member for Alberta, and which will be found on page 9776 of "Hansard." The hon. Minister is reported as having said:

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will answer the question of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). He desires an expression of opinion from me as to whether any authority which may control the rates over this line will be compelled to take into account the bonded liabilities of the company. While I would not like to speak for the body that may have to determine a question of this kind, I may say, without pretending to determine it now, that I would feel that it would be proper to consider what amount of means had actually gone into this work. While I say that I think it would be in the power of the Govern-

Mr. MULLOCK.

nor General in Council absolutely to disregard the question of cost at all, whether the company got any dividend or any return at all upon their investments. The Governor in Council could absolutely disregard that consideration, and I apprehend would feel justified in doing it.

The word "not" is evidently omitted. I understood the hon. Minister to have said that the Government could not absolutely disregard that consideration and would not be justified in doing it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what I said.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I moved a motion, based on the Minister's statement, as I understood it. If he had not said, "I apprehend would not feel justified in doing it," my motion would be absurd. However, the Minister has already set the matter right.

### QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he has had an interview with the Minister of Justice concerning the Act relating to the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec, of which I spoke. The right hon. gentleman was to have seen the Minister of Justice and to give us an answer soon; for, if anything is to be done, there is little time to it.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I had an interview with the Minister of Justice on the subject, and find that we have had correspondence upon that particular clause, some in favour of it and some against it; so the Minister of Justice is not able to advise any action to be taken.

Mr. BERGERON. Then, nothing will be done?

The PRIME MINISTER. The Minister of Justice has not advised any action.

### INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BERGERON. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to an address to His Excellency passed by this House on the 24th of April last for some very important documents which were then needed, and are still needed now, but have not yet been brought down—copies of tenders for letting the contracts of certain sections on the Soulanges Canal. It is a very long time, and the return should have been down by this time. It is most important that these papers should be down before the House prorogues, so I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the matter, as I fear it has been forgotten.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it is not forgotten. But I intimated at the time—or, if not at the time, shortly afterwards—that it was a return that would involve a great deal of labour.

Mr. BERGERON. But that is four months ago.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister must be referring to some other documents, because these that are referred to do not require much labour.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) may know—

Mr. WALLACE. I am aware what papers the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) refers to.

Mr. BERGERON. The address to which I particularly refer as passed in this House on the 24th April was as follows :—

Address to His Excellency the Governor General for :

(a.) Copy of tenders for the letting of sections one and two of the Soulanges Canal ; also a copy of advertisement of the same, and a statement of the tenders moneyed out.

(b.) A copy of the tenders for the reletting of sections one and two of the Soulanges Canal ; also a copy of advertisement for the same, and a statement of the tenders moneyed out.

(c.) A copy of all correspondence, or Orders in Council, directly or indirectly relating to the letting or reletting of the above sections.

There was another address on the same date for :

(a.) Copy of all correspondence or Orders in Council relating to the entering into an agreement by the Government, or Department of Railways and Canals, for the operating by the same of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway during the fiscal year 1896, and a copy of the contract governing the same.

(b.) A statement containing the period during which the road was so operated, also the total expenses directly or indirectly connected with such operation, and the total revenue derived from the same.

Also :

Address to His Excellency the Governor General for a return showing all the tenders for the furnishing of oils for Government railways during the years 1896 and 1897, as well as all correspondence and Orders in Council directly or indirectly relating to such tenders.

And also :

Address to His Excellency the Governor General for :

(a.) Copy of tenders for the letting of sections four, five, six and seven of the Soulanges Canal ; also a copy of advertisement for the same, and a statement of tenders moneyed out.

(b.) Copies of tenders for the reletting of sections four, five, six and seven of the Soulanges Canal ; also a copy of advertisement for same, and a statement of tenders moneyed out.

(c.) Copy of all correspondence or Orders in Council directly or indirectly relating to the letting or the reletting of the above sections.

My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) can understand by these motions, as I have read them, that there is not a great deal of labour involved in preparing these returns ; so that is why I think they must have been forgotten.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I am inclined to differ

with my hon. friend as to the amount of work involved, as I think that in these cases the work would be very considerable. The officers of my department are instructed to prepare returns with all possible despatch. We have been under great pressure in the calling for returns. The officers tell me that there has not been the same body of returns called for many years. I have kept the staff busily engaged, and we are getting out the returns as rapidly as it is possible to furnish them.

Mr. WALLACE. I ventured to predict at the time that this motion was made that this return would not be prepared this session—

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Order. There is nothing before the Chair.

Mr. WALLACE. Then I shall discuss this matter later on.

#### I. C. R. EXTENSION TO MONTREAL— AGREEMENT WITH THE G. T. R.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 139) to confirm an agreement entered into by Her Majesty with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada for the purpose of securing the extension of the Intercolonial Railway system to the city of Montreal be read the second time and agreed to.

He said : Before this motion is disposed of, I wish to make a few remarks with reference to the matter. I realize that the period of the session will not favour any extended observations, so I shall condense what I have to say within the closest possible limits. But, in view of the character of the amendments that have been made by the Senate, and that no explanations with respect to them have been made in this House, I think it would be proper for me to avail myself of this opportunity to point out the nature of those amendments. It will be remembered that in the agreement which was submitted during the present session for confirmation by this Parliament, a clause was inserted known as clause No. 40, which provided that the traffic agreement entered into between the representative officers of the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway Company should practically be made part of this leasing agreement, and continue for the term for which the lease was made, and should not be altered except by mutual consent of the parties. The Senate, when proceeding to deal with this Bill, professed to discover that this clause was exceedingly objectionable for several reasons—in the first place, that it confirmed the continuance of this traffic agreement for the whole term of the lease, they said, which was a very unwise thing to do, that its terms were of that nature that the interests of the Government and the Intercolonial Railway were likely to be prejudiced unless there was

an authority somewhere, on the part of the Government, at all events, entitling it, at any time, to bring the traffic arrangement to a termination. And they professed to regard the terms of it in themselves as exceedingly unfavourable because, they said, in its nature, it gave advantages to the Grand Trunk Railway which ought not to have been given, which gave the company practically the right to receive all the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway which reached Montreal and was destined for points in British Columbia and the North-west and Manitoba, in preference to other roads. They said we were thereby seriously injuring what might be the interests of Canadian roads and leading to the carriage of freights from the maritime provinces to the west through United States territory.

They profess to have discovered that this agreement, after it had passed this House, was in the first place a traffic agreement, and, in the next place, that it contained very grave and serious objections. It is only proper, I think, that I should call particular attention to the fact that this traffic agreement was in the possession of this House when the Grand Trunk Railway Bill was under consideration. Not only was it in possession of this House, and copies of that traffic agreement were laid upon the Table and distributed, but it was discussed in this House; and I think it is a surprise to the gentlemen of this House to learn from the statements made in the Senate Chamber, that the nature of this agreement, its general character and effect, had entirely escaped the notice, in the first place, of the Government, and, in the next place, of members of Parliament. So far from such having been the case, the traffic arrangement was the subject of special discussion in this branch of Parliament. The hon. gentleman who is now leading the Opposition, in the absence of the leader, took occasion to move a resolution in which he desired to alter the agreement in one respect; he wished Parliament to express its views against the agreement in the form in which we had presented it. But so far from entertaining the view which led to these amendments which were passed in the other Chamber, he entertained, and this House entertained, a directly opposite opinion. The opinion of the Senate was that this agreement was too permanent in its character, that it had all the elements of durability, that it was going to last through the whole term for which the lease had been made; whereas, in this House, after gentlemen opposite had critically examined this traffic arrangement, they came to the conclusion that the way in which it had been referred to in the lease was not of such a character as to ensure the permanency of the arrangement. It was not that the arrangement was for too long a period, it was not that it was too firm and fixed, but it was that it was possible for the

Mr. BLAIR.

Government to change the arrangement which was so desirable and so much in the interests of the Intercolonial Railway; it was possible for the Grand Trunk Railway, on the one hand, and the Intercolonial Railway authorities, on the other, to agree together to rescind this arrangement and thereby to do a great injury to the public interest. So you will see that there was no omission at all upon the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, or upon the part of the Government duly to consider this question. They did consider it carefully, and came to the conclusion that the traffic arrangement was a beneficial one, and that the more fixed and certain it was, the more it would be in the general interest of the country. So far from this traffic arrangement having been entered into without due consideration, it is proper for me to state that the subject was thoroughly thought out by the officers of the Intercolonial Railway, and so far as I am personally concerned, received the fullest possible consideration which I could give the question. We came to the conclusion that under this arrangement we were receiving, and securing to us a most substantial arrangement; and it was with extreme reluctance, I may say, and after a good deal of negotiation only, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company agreed finally to concede this privilege to us. It was not an advantage to the Grand Trunk Railway Company to enter into such an arrangement, because they thereby committed themselves for all time to come, or, at all events, for the duration of this lease, if the Government choose to hold them to it,—they committed themselves to delivering to us all the traffic that was intended for points on the Intercolonial Railway, irrespective of the amount of traffic which we might be able to give them in return; because, we were aware, as everybody is aware who knows the relative quantity of business which is done by the two roads, that the Intercolonial Railway business, that which originated upon the Intercolonial Railway, and would be destined for points west, would be very small in proportion, as compared with the amount of business which we receive from the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and that the advantages in this respect were on our side rather than on the side of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. These questions, however, do not appear to have received very much consideration in the other Chamber. Those gentlemen seem to have had in view every interest except the interest of the Intercolonial Railway—

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Or at least those of them that were urging this matter seem to have had in view and to be moved by interests outside of the Intercolonial Railway; whereas, the arrangement was made having regard

exclusively to the interests of the Government railway and the public.

Now, Sir, the question which is before the committee is not one which, I presume, will give rise to any controversy at this stage. This amendment will be accepted by the Government. I have no intention of asking Parliament to refuse its assent to it; not, however, because I think it is any improvement upon the arrangement as it was made, not because I think that it is not a disadvantage to the contract as it was submitted to Parliament, but because rather than have the arrangement defeated, rather than have the confirmation of the lease withheld, I think it is better that we should accept the proposed amendments, even though they are a blot upon the agreement which has been entered into. We accept them rather than take the consequences of having the legislation defeated for this year. But when it is alleged that the advantages which are under this agreement going to accrue to the Intercolonial, are of such a nature that we ought rather to hold in our hands the power to terminate this traffic arrangement at any time, and leave it as traffic arrangements ordinarily are left, that is to say, leaving in the hands of the Government power to terminate, it will be, perhaps, of some interest to hon. members, and it may be of some interest to the country, to know just what the volume of business is which originates upon the Intercolonial Railway, and which is intended for points west of Montreal, or, in other words, for points in Manitoba, British Columbia, and on the Pacific coast, because it was upon that view that the argument was chiefly made that this arrangement was not in the interest of the country. It was claimed that if this arrangement was left to stand permanently, freights which otherwise ought to find all Canadian routes to the west, would be diverted through United States territory, and that Canadian railroads would be deprived of the earnings which ought, according to the views these gentlemen put forward, to belong to them in preference to any other road with which the Grand Trunk Railway might have connection. Now, to point out to the House how very unimportant and trifling a consideration that is, I will just show, for a moment, what the volume of that business is. I take the statistics that have been furnished me for the year past, for the full period of twelve months ending on the 31st May, 1899, and I find that all the freights which have been received upon the Intercolonial Railway for shipment to points in Manitoba, the North-west Territories or British Columbia, aggregate only 76 tons, and that the gross earnings of the Intercolonial Railway upon that freight only amounted to \$218.72. Now, imagine an agreement, made after due consideration, after the questions had been weighed and considered from every point of view affecting the interest of the Intercolonial Railway, imagine an agreement of that

kind being set aside for the reason that the business which has originated in the maritime provinces for British Columbia, Manitoba and the North-west Territories would, perhaps, under the operation of this agreement, find its way into those provinces, possibly through some American connection, and for a portion of the distance through American territory when the whole gross tonnage for the past twelve months only amounted to 76 tons, and when, of this 76 tons, four-fifths consisted of settlers' effects. It may possibly be, although I cannot see it, that, in future, and perhaps long before these 99 years shall have elapsed, that condition of things may have changed. There may be an immense increase in the volume of business originating on the Intercolonial Railway and intended for Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia, and the argument that is made is that it would be a very grievous condition of things that for 50, or 100, or 200 or 600 miles of the distance, these freights, so originating on the Intercolonial Railway, should be carried through American territory. I venture to say there is nothing in the argument that has been made. I refer to this agreement and I am justified in saying that upon the face of it, if the business from the Intercolonial Railway for the west should greatly increase, if it should be a thousand times more than it is to-day, there would be no injury to this country or to Canadian railways. I say that for the reason that, under this arrangement, it is in the power of the shippers of those freights to direct the route by which they shall go. It is for them entirely to settle the question of their route, and if, in any particular lines of manufacture, or of goods, there should be a large increase in the volume of business, originating in the maritime provinces and intended for Manitoba, the North-west Territories or British Columbia, it would be the simplest thing in the world for the people who are concerned, to direct the way by which these goods should be routed to the west. They can easily direct that these goods shall be taken over Canadian routes. Even though the freights, originating in the maritime provinces intended for these western points, should be delivered to the Grand Trunk at Montreal, the Grand Trunk has its traffic arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway and can deliver them to the Canadian Pacific Railway at North Bay so that the Canadian Pacific Railway could carry by its own line, through Canadian territory, any shipments which were consigned by it. It appears to me that the objection which was taken to the original arrangement was not well considered, and many of the criticisms that were passed in this House, and elsewhere, upon that arrangement with the Grand Trunk, including the traffic arrangement, which have resulted in the amendment to this Bill, are not well

founded. There is another matter I wish to speak of in connection with this present Bill. We have heard, from the moment that this project was first mentioned, the gloomiest predictions in regard to the result of this policy. They have been made from time to time, and I see that the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), renewed the statement, at Toronto, the other night, that he had previously made. He committed himself to a statement to the following effect, and I will read it in order that I may call more particular attention to it. The hon. gentleman said, as reported in the "Mail and Empire," of August 1st:

Sir Wilfrid Laurier says further that they brought the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal by the Drummond County Railway purchase. Do you think that that makes good the boasts that they have done anything to promote the interests of Canada when I tell you that all that has done for Canada is to make a deficit of the Intercolonial Railway, to be paid out of your taxes, about \$200,000 a year more than it was before.

The hon. gentleman makes this statement in view of what was said in the earlier portion of this session by me, that no deficit would occur on the Intercolonial Railway under the new policy. That prediction was not only made by the hon. gentleman but it was made by other hon. gentlemen opposite, and persistently made, and they declined to acknowledge or admit that the effect of the new arrangement would be otherwise than to add to what is called the normal or usual deficit of between \$50,000 and \$60,000 a year, the amount of the rental we were obliged to pay under this agreement. I am in a position to inform the House as to the actual results, not from a calculation, not by an estimate, but after the accounts for the year have been fully made up, and I think it will perhaps be agreeable to the House to know what the result has been after one year's full operation of the Intercolonial Railway under the arrangement which this Bill will confirm and effectuate in connection with the extension of the road to Montreal. The gross receipts for the year ended the 30th June, 1899, were \$3,738,331.44. The working expenses—I mean the whole outlay for the year ended on a like date, the 30th June, 1899, amounted to \$3,675,686.21, leaving, as a result of the year's operations, a net surplus of \$62,645.23. Now, the usual and ordinary deficit upon the Intercolonial Railway in years past, and until this Montreal extension was brought into operation, was from \$50,000 to \$60,000. I think that this has been the normal deficit within the last eight or ten years. For the year 1897-98 the deficit was much larger than that; it amounted to \$209,000, but I explained, I think, to the entire satisfaction of the House, that, during that year, there was a proper and legitimate reason for the deficit being larger than in previous years. I will not

Mr. BLAIR

repeat that explanation, because I trust it is within the recollection of hon. gentlemen opposite. I expressed the decided opinion to the House that that condition of things would not continue because we were obliged that year to recover from the system of procrastinating and postponing and delaying expenditures on the Intercolonial, which expenditures and outlays should, in the interest of the road, be made in the earlier part of the season.

Mr. HAGGART. Does this include the payments to the Grand Trunk Railway and the Drummond County Railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I shall deal with that. The \$3,675,686.21; the expenditure for the year, includes \$210,000 of rent for the leased lines. Every dollar of that rent is paid; all the charges in connection with our proportion of repairs and maintenance on the Drummond County has been paid, so that we come out at the end of the year, having cleared our debts and having paid our rents, with a net surplus of \$62,645.

Mr. FOSTER. No more than that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No more than that.

Mr. FOSTER. In the growing time?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) says, "no more than that," but I should think that a difference of between \$300,000 and \$400,000 between the amount of the deficit as predicted by gentlemen opposite, and the amount of the surplus which we actually have, ought to be sufficient to satisfy the most rapacious gentleman opposite. The leader of the Opposition predicted that the deficit would be \$260,000, but, as a fact, the surplus is \$62,000, so that that hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) was \$312,000 out, according to his modest calculation. I may take one moment, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize what appears to me to be the value which may be attached to the extension of this railway system to Montreal. It was represented that when the Intercolonial Railway was extended you were getting a worthless piece of road, a road that would produce no business, that had no local value, and that would give no additional earnings. That was represented from the beginning to the end of this controversy, and yet, adding the \$210,000 of rent we paid, the \$62,000 of surplus which we show, and the \$60,000 (in round figures) of the previous deficit, you have nearly \$400,000 difference in the result between the operation of the Intercolonial Railway prior to the extension, and after the extension, within the last 12 months, that the extension has been in force. I intend to furnish proof to hon. gentlemen opposite, so that it will not be open for them to say that this result has been brought about by any

manipulation of the accounts, by any reduction of the expenditures, by any means which would not be proper and legitimate in the natural operation of the railway itself. I think I can prove that by some figures to which I will call your attention. There was one direction in which perhaps it might have been possible to have improved the showing by cutting off expenditures, and that direction would have been in the outlay made upon the maintenance of way and works, which covers all that is done in the way of putting down rails and fastenings, timber repairs, repairs of wharfs and buildings, ballasting, track repairing, and charges of that kind. In all these directions, if the expenditures were scamped, if they were kept down to the lowest possible notch, a saving might be effected, which, while it would not tend to better the property, would have for one year, or perhaps more, a favourable showing on the financial operations of the railway. I want to call the attention of the House to the actual figures for the year which has just passed. I shall state what the expenditure was for maintenance of way and works on that period, and what the similar expenditure was for the last year the Conservative Government were in power. During the past year the amount laid out for this purpose was \$849,322 as against \$774,556 for the year ending 30th June, 1896.

Mr. FOSTER. When the Minister quotes the total expenditure and the total income, does that include the Prince Edward Island Railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. It is the Intercolonial Railway I am speaking of. You will see there is a difference between the amount expended last year, 1898-99, and the amount expended for the year 1895-96, of \$75,000, in round figures. That is to say, we expended \$75,000 more on this account last year than did hon. gentlemen opposite the last year they were in power.

Mr. FOSTER. You might give the receipts and expenditures of the Prince Edward Island Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not got them. I am not dealing with that road.

Mr. FOSTER. That is unfortunate.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think it is at all unfortunate. As the hon. gentleman knows, the accounts of the Prince Edward Island Railway have never been kept in connection with the Intercolonial Railway accounts. They are two totally different roads, and the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal has nothing whatever to do with the Prince Edward Island road. I do not know what the results of last year on the Prince Edward Island road are yet, as the accounts have not reached me. If I had

them I would be glad to produce them if they were asked for, but I would not introduce them in this discussion, because they do not belong legitimately to it, and the result would be simply to confuse matters.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you got the expenditure on capital account for last year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not the expenditure on capital account.

Mr. HAGGART. Pshaw!

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But I have the expenditure for the year on the maintenance of way and works, which is not capital, which is purely revenue. It does not affect the question of the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal in any way to say that we have expended so much money on capital account. True, we have expended money on capital account, but we did not expend very much last year. There is no capital expenditure included in these items which go to make up the \$849,322. What I want to show is, that last year we spent \$75,000 more for the maintenance of our way and works on the Intercolonial Railway than was spent in the year ending 30th June, 1896, and, notwithstanding that we did spend this out of revenue, we have the favourable financial showing of the Intercolonial Railway for last year which I have stated to the House.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Railways does not seem to be anxious to get this Bill through this session of Parliament. The Bill was considered dead and buried, and it had been accepted as such by all parties, and yet the Minister, in moving the adoption of the Senate amendments has taken the opportunity of making a long speech. First of all, he went out of his way to attack the Senate for the amendment they made to the Bill, and he charges that they had the interests of other parties in mind rather than the interests of the Intercolonial Railway. Well, Sir, the Senate were perfectly justified in the ground they took, and the country will support them in their action. The Minister told us that the traffic arrangements were before the House and thoroughly criticized when this Bill was going through. I beg to differ from that statement. We thought the traffic arrangement attached to the agreement was the same as the traffic arrangement attached to the preceding agreement, and we did not know there was any difference until it was drawn out of the Minister (Mr. Blair) by the remarks of the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster).

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me. He was put in personal possession of a copy of the traffic agreement, days before

the question was under consideration in the committee.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) must have had a copy in his hands.

Mr. HAGGART. I was put in possession of the agreement entered into with the Grand Trunk Railway, but the traffic arrangement was not attached to it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was sent in with it.

Mr. HAGGART. Whether it was or not I did not get it; and not until the debate was well on did I know anything about the difference in the traffic arrangement. The hon. gentleman said that when you come to analyse the amount of the Senate's objection to the Bill, you find that it is infinitesimal. The hon. gentleman does not state that one of the Senate's principal objections was the transfer of all the unconsigned freight on the Intercolonial to the Grand Trunk. Every other railway in the country had a right to object to such an arrangement as that. It virtually amounted to handing over the Intercolonial Railway to the Grand Trunk. What better possible arrangement for the Grand Trunk could have been made? It gets all the unconsigned freight of the Intercolonial, and it gets an arrangement by which all its freight is carried over the Intercolonial to the maritime province ports at exceptional rates. The Grand Trunk has this advantage under that arrangement, that the Government work the railway, while the Grand Trunk will not be responsible for any deficits that may occur on it. The hon. gentleman says the Senate committed a serious crime—in what? In providing that the Government need not consider this as a permanent arrangement, but shall have the right to terminate it on giving six month's notice; and that power is given to the Government alone. The Government may continue the arrangement for all time; but what the Senate provides is that instead of being bound by it for 99 years, the Government shall have the option of terminating it at the end of a year. This alteration is very much in favour of the Government. The hon. Minister takes this opportunity of bringing down his statement with reference to the Intercolonial Railway. When the Intercolonial estimates were under consideration, he stated that the figures would show a greater surplus this year than had ever been shown before, amounting to about \$62,000. How are we to judge whether that is an actual surplus or not? The hon. gentleman has been charging to capital account expenditures which have always hitherto been charged to revenue. We do not know what the expenditure for last year on capital account is at

Mr. BLAIR.

all. When we come to analyse the figures, we may find that instead of there being a surplus, there is an actual deficit. If the hon. gentleman expends \$1,500,000 on capital account, a great portion of which I contend should be charged to revenue account, it is very easy for him to show a surplus. The hon. gentleman could easily have given us a statement of the receipts and expenditures on the Intercolonial this year, together with the amount expended on capital account. He does not choose to do it. He comes down in the dying days of the session with a bald statement of the receipts and expenditures, and says there is a surplus of \$62,000. I suppose we have to rest content with these figures, hoping that we may have an opportunity to analyse them at another session. But I object to this kind of proceeding. The hon. gentleman has no right to put that statement before the country without giving the Opposition an opportunity to criticise it. Under this arrangement, the Grand Trunk are in a far better position than they would be if they owned the Intercolonial, because they are to receive from the Intercolonial all the unconsigned freight coming from the maritime provinces, while they will not be liable for the deficits of the Intercolonial, which have been the rule on that railway with the exception of two or three years; and when the Senate tries to protect the interests of the country in some small degree, the hon. gentleman tries to minimize the effect of its amendment, because, in bringing down a statement of the amount of freight which he says will be affected, he confines it to the freight carried to Manitoba and the North-west, while all the freight of the Intercolonial which is delivered at the port of Montreal, will be subject to that arrangement. It is a discrimination against all the other Canadian roads in favour of the Grand Trunk in regard to Canadian freight, and it certainly is a discrimination in favour of American roads in regard to freight that is to be delivered in Manitoba and the North-west.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite clear that it is quite impossible for the hon. gentleman to be fair in a discussion of matters connected with the Intercolonial. I do not desire to lengthen the session one minute more than I think is necessary to reply to the allegations which the hon. gentleman has made. He says that the Minister of Railways should have been able to lay before the House a statement of the expenditure on capital account, in order to enable it to form an accurate idea whether he had not loaded down that account with expenditures that ought to have been charged to revenue. I frankly admit that if the Minister of Railways followed the example of the hon. gentleman and his predecessors, it would be necessary to have the items of the expenditure; for we know that the hon. gentleman loaded the side-tracks at Moncton with cars

that were partly worn out, and left them there without putting them in proper condition to do the work, and brought new ones and charged their cost to capital account, simply because he wanted to reduce the working expenses. We know that his predecessors, when they were running the Intercolonial, charged such items as snowsheds to capital account, in order if possible to show that the Intercolonial was paying working expenses. We know perfectly well that that is the system under which they manage the Intercolonial. Now what are the facts? My hon. friend has said clearly that during the last year he spent over \$73,000 more on permanent way than was spent by his predecessors during the previous year, which is a very good indication that at least the road-bed and the general condition of the road is in an improved condition compared to what it was under the late regime.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman has said that I laid on the sidings old cars and did not repair them, and then bought new ones and charged them to capital account. How that affects the result I do not know, and I would like to know where the hon. gentleman got his information, because I distinctly deny his statement.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will tell the hon. gentleman how it affects the result.

Mr. HAGGART. But the hon. gentleman's statement is not correct.

Mr. McMULLEN. Where you have old cars and in place of getting them repaired and charging the repairs to working expenses, you lay those old cars to one side and buy new ones, which you charge to capital account, you, of course, make the revenue show better to the extent which the repairs to the old ones would have cost and which would have gone against running expenditures.

Mr. HAGGART. All I can say is that the hon. gentleman has been wrongly informed.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister of Railways will be able, through his manager, to ferret out the truth.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman has the facts at his hand. He can turn up the accounts and show whether I charged any new cars to capital account.

Mr. McMULLEN. They do not show the number of cars you did not approve of. With regard to the Senate, my hon. friend says it did very good service to Canada when it interfered with the matter as it did. Nobody has objection to a clause being inserted providing that the Government may terminate the contract at the end of six months or a year, if we could reckon on always having the Government to act in the interests of the country, but if we should have a Government disposed to play into

the hands of other railway companies, or out of pure mischief, with the desire of showing that their predecessors did not do right, give notice to terminate a contract that was advantageous and from year to year would be more advantageous, they could take advantage of that clause. An unscrupulous Government might be influenced by improper motives to terminate a valuable contract that from year to year was growing more valuable. In the second place my hon. friend says that, under this contract, we have covenanted to hand over to the Grand Trunk Railway all the freight. But that applies only to the unconsigned freight.

Mr. HAGGART. That is what I said—the unconsigned freight.

Mr. McMULLEN. The unaddressed freight—that is the freight which it is not stipulated shall go by any particular line from Montreal. But I would like to ask, would that prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway canvassing the maritime provinces for freight? Not at all. They can send their agents to the maritime provinces and along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway and enter into covenant with any shipper to send his freight, no matter of what character, over the Canadian Pacific Railway instead of the Grand Trunk Railway. That only applies to the freight which is not billed to go over any particular line after it reaches Montreal, and in such cases the Government have the right to send it by the Grand Trunk Railway. There is nothing about that except that it clearly shows that Parliament and the Senate are beginning to be influenced altogether too far by railway magnates who come around here and exercise influence in connection with such legislation, and I contend that the day is not far distant when there will be a stop put to the influence exercised by those magnates. The representatives of the people and the Senate should put a stop to that sort of thing and be in a position to act impartially in the interests of the people, uninfluenced by the selfish interests or considerations of these railway companies and enable the country to get fair-play.

I am quite satisfied that the bargain is an admirably good one, and I am quite satisfied that, in the course of a few years, with the advantages we are now enjoying, owing to our connection with the city of Montreal, the Intercolonial Railway will show a far better return and thus establish the wise and statesmanlike conduct of the Government in making the arrangement they have effected. For years we have been losing millions of dollars, but I am confident that in the future, a better showing will be made, and we cannot take this year as a criterion, because there are always expenses in consummating an arrangement such as we have entered into during the first year, which

will not have to be met in the succeeding years.

It is very satisfactory indeed to find the hon. Minister of Railways able to show a surplus of \$63,000 to \$64,000 this year, which can be taken as an indication that every year the surplus will continue to grow, if it is not crippled or limited by mischievous legislation or by interference by the other House. I am confident that the last of our deficits has been seen, and that in future we will enjoy surpluses, which will give some return to the people for the enormous expenditure they have incurred on this road.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman's own admission very largely discounts the force of his argument. He admits frankly that it would be valuable to have information of how much has been expended on capital account and how much on repairs, and if the Minister of Railways had followed the example of his predecessors, we would have had that long before this. The only logical conclusion from the hon. gentleman's remarks is that he has such unbounded confidence in our present railway management that he regards any information as quite unnecessary, and is willing to take everything the hon. Minister says on trust. But if, as he admits, it was necessary that we should have the information as to how much was charged against capital account by the predecessors of the present Minister of Railways, it follows that it is equally necessary at present. If he is desirous of getting at the correct facts, in order to determine that the present arrangement was a good one for the country he must certainly admit that it was essential we should have had that information when discussing that arrangement. That is what occurred to me when the hon. Minister made his statement, but he gave us very little information, and we were utterly in the dark as to how much was expended on capital account and how much on repairs and maintenance.

The hon. gentleman says that we now have the earnings before us, and, therefore, have no grounds for complaint. But we had not these before us when we were discussing the arrangement, although we asked for them a great many times. The hon. Minister has given them to us now, but this is the first time he has given them to the House. He did not give them in the debate we had some two weeks ago.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is in error, if he will allow me to say so. I did furnish the statement of the earnings up to the date we were then discussing, or as nearly that date as the figures were then available for. But what was asked was a statement of the earnings and outlay on a particular part of the road. I could not furnish that, but I furnished the details of all earnings up to the end of May.

Mr. SCHULLEN.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to refer to the aggregate of earnings over the whole road, and not expenses or earnings over that part of the road known as the Drummond County section.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I furnished that.

Mr. SPROULE. If that was given, it was when I was absent, because I had no recollection of it having been given to the House. If the hon. Minister says he gave it, of course, I accept the statement, and take it to be correct. But the difficulties that we had to contend with in the matter, then, could not be effectually overcome with the information at our disposal at the time. I only rose to say that it was necessary, under any management, to have the information of how much was spent on capital account and how much for maintenance, and that it is equally important to have it now, as it was at any other time.

Mr. FOSTER. It is somewhat surprising that at this hour of the session the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) should participate in a debate on Intercolonial Railway matters with half-made statements, which, of course, cannot be allowed to go altogether without remark. It would be as easy for him to bring down a statement of capital expenditure as of expenditure on current account and of revenue. A problem would then have been presented which, in the light of all the statements of the last two or three years, might have been studied with some fairness by the House. Any one who was present when the Intercolonial Railway estimates were going through last year and this year, is aware of the fact that in case after case expenditures which were formerly paid out of revenue, were by the hon. gentleman charged to capital account. We went over the particular cases, and they were threshed out in the House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) admitted in case after case that this was the fact. This year the statements were gone through and criticised by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart), who made it perfectly clear that a very large proportion of the expenditure which the hon. gentleman is seeking this year to expend on the Intercolonial Railway, and is charging to capital account, is for a class of work which formerly were charged to income, and not to capital; and the only excuse the hon. gentleman could give was, that this year he was making larger expenditures than usual on these services throughout the line, and it was impossible to take the money out of revenue account. It is, therefore, an admission that he is pursuing a plan different in many respects from what was pursued before, a plan which destroys entirely the value of deductions from figures as they have been and as they will appear in the public reports. It is impossible for us to get at the truth, unless we know the items

of capital expenditure, so as to be able to see how far things are now paid for out of capital which were formerly paid out of income. And so, the flourish with which the hon. gentleman announces his very moderate surplus of \$62,000 in this growing time, is not justified until we can get at the figures and make the comparison thorough and complete. The hon. gentleman is very glad—and so am I—that he has a surplus of \$62,000. He imputes it all to the fact that he has made the extension to Montreal. But he begs the question entirely, and furnishes no proof of it. The whole history of the year in reference to railway companies is against it. In every other railway in Canada, and, I think, in Great Britain and the United States, there has been this year a very large increase in the receipts, because of the growth in the business of the country and the greater quantity of goods to be moved. My hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Powell) gave from the reports the figures of increases in the great railways. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) and the members of the Government have stated over and over again that the business of the country had largely improved. And we know that it has improved, and that the quantity of goods to be transported is larger; so, it is only fair to believe that the Intercolonial Railway would enjoy some portion of that increase in business, and so secure greater revenues. In all this year of improved business the hon. gentleman is able to show an increase of only a little over \$100,000—that is, he has a surplus of \$62,000, where last year there was a deficit of about \$59,000—altogether a betterment of about \$120,000. If he will consult the railway reports, he will find that, if the increase of receipts on the Intercolonial Railway had been in comparison with that of other railways, he would have made that amount out of the accretion of business and the increase of produce to be transported. So, he begs the question entirely, when he puts the increase down either to his superior management or to the fact that he had made an arrangement with the Grand Trunk and has bought the Drummond County road.

The hon. gentleman went out of his way to attack the Senate. The less he says about that the better; in fact, the less he and his party say about the Senate in the country, the better for them. The sooner they allow the people to forget the extravagant bargain that they proposed, and the extraordinary reduction which the interposition of the Senate has brought about in this bargain, the better for themselves as a party. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this country feels that it owes a debt of gratitude to the Senate for its interference in this matter. That fact had not a little to do with my right hon. friend's (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) shelving of the crusade which was to be undertaken throughout this country against the Senate,

to its final extinction, its utter annihilation. That is laid aside—why? Because the Senate has proved its usefulness, and proved it in a very substantial manner, in relation to this very question, proved it to the discomfiture of my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) and his project, and to the discomfiture of the Government as well. Now, the hon. Minister tried to buttress his position, with regard to the Senate's interference with reference to the traffic clause, with the assertion that that clause was fully discussed in this House. But it was not fully discussed in this House. The hon. gentleman knows that we were kept here one whole day, and a night, and half the next day, in discussion on this Bill, before we came to the traffic section at all, on some of the first sections of the Bill, because of the refusal of the hon. gentleman to bring down information which had been asked for, and which he had promised to bring down—all that long day and night, and the next day of the session—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was eleven o'clock at night before we got into committee.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well, my hon. friend remembers it was a period of some length and of some struggle. My hon. friend, like that celebrated quadruped in the old story, had to come down at last.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I remember very well that when these gentlemen made it clear that what they wanted was a statement of the engine and car mileage on the Intercolonial Railway and on the Grand Trunk Railway relatively, it was too late at night for me to telegraph to the Grand Trunk Railway people to get it, and I did not wire until the following morning. It was eleven o'clock at night before this subject came up.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the hon. gentleman know that fully six days beforehand he took his own pencil and paper and, at the dictation of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), he took down just what was wanted, and if he lost that slip of paper, it was embalmed in the "Hansard," and he could have read it the next day. And yet six days intervened after that day, and when the debate came on the hon. gentleman did not have it. To argue that he did not know what was wanted, is not a compliment to his intelligence. I was going on to state that that long session was taken up entirely with preceding sections of the Bill, and taken up almost entirely in endeavouring to press the hon. gentleman to bring down the information, and when at last an arrangement was made, in the forenoon of the second day, by which the information having been brought down, we were to finish the debate within an hour or so, then it became impossible to give any lengthy investigation to the succeeding articles of that

agreement, and the fact was that they were passed over almost without investigation and debate. I myself, however, brought up the matter of a traffic arrangement. Now, the hon. gentleman tried to induce the House to believe that I and those who voted with me were so enamoured of that traffic arrangement that we proposed to make it impossible to have it changed without the agreement of the House. That cannot be borne out by the "Hansard." I took up but one single feature of that traffic arrangement which struck me; I said that there was one good thing in it as compared with the 1897 arrangement, that is, that the Grand Trunk Railway was to make the transfer point at Montreal instead of at Lévis, and that would give additional carriage. I said: That is one betterment we have got. Now, we have to pay a rental for perpetuity; but ten days after this Bill becomes law the Minister has it in his power to cancel that feature of the traffic arrangement, and to permit the Grand Trunk Railway to transfer at Lévis if they wished. That was the point to which I directed my attention, and the sole point; that was the point I saw quickly, even though I was not an expert. It takes a man who knows more than I do about traffic arrangements, to fathom the subtleties of a traffic arrangement and all its consequences between two great lines of railway. I do not want to weary the House by extracts, but I could read extracts which you will find on pages 5066 and 5067, in the remarks I made on that subject. The sole point I was making was this, that I wanted to preclude the possibility of the Government disturbing that one feature of the traffic arrangement by which we did get a betterment over the past arrangement, ten days or any time after the Bill had become law; and my ground was that we should not change that without the sanction of Parliament. That was all that I argued for, and that was the reason that I argued for it, and any business man can see that that is a cogent reason, and that it would easily strike one. With reference to the other effects of that traffic arrangement, which practically delivered up the maritime provinces for ninety-nine years to the tender mercies of one road, and cut out practically every other road from participation, these were not the features of that arrangement which were discussed in this House, and they were not the features which I was discussing. The hon. member for North Wellington thinks it sufficient if a person consigns freight, and has the power as a shipper of saying which way it will go. It has been acknowledged by the Minister of Railways and Canals, and by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who understand the question, that that is a very inefficient precaution, because the shipper, in the first place, has the disadvantage in making routes, and in the second place, in nine cases out of ten, it never occurs to the shipper to do it.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. McMULLEN. In nine cases out of ten he does.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well, we will leave it that way. When two such eminent authorities as the hon. member for North Wellington and myself disagree, there is no use arguing any longer, we must leave it to the intellect of the House to decide. However, I take my opinion largely from what railway men have said, both inside and outside of the House. Now, that was the feature that I objected to. We tried to cure it on this side of the House by saying that if such a thing takes place and if that is abrogated, at least it should not be done until the Government and the House sanction it. But to say that because of that statement, and the resolution I offered, therefore, this side of the House agreed that the great good of that arrangement was that it should be perpetual, is no proof at all; the right hon. gentleman knows that quite as well as I do. Now, I deprecate starting a live discussion on a dead issue. We did not intend to discuss it at all, and the Minister might very well have taken the little dose so wisely and so gently administered, and said nothing about it. But he has chosen to bring up the subject of the expenditures and receipts of the Intercolonial Railway and its management; and once that is started, no one knows where it will stop.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I just want to make one remark. I notice that all the gentlemen on the other side who have spoken to-day, are particularly dissatisfied with the results which I have been able to show to the House following the operation of the Montreal extension for the last twelve months, not because they are comparatively small, but because they are so large.

Mr. SPROULE. I desire to correct the hon. gentleman, I was not dissatisfied at all.

Mr. FOSTER. I may correct the hon. gentleman by saying that I rejoice with him that they were so much, and I am sorry they have not been more.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman asked me why I did not give more information. I have given to the House all the information which has the slightest connection one way or the other with the operation of the Intercolonial Railway in the past twelve months. I have given a statement of the earnings for the year and of the expenditure for the year, made up exactly as they have been made up through all the years past, so far as I know, and made up as the officers of the department have been in the habit of making them.

I have made no statement here in regard to the capital expenditure of the year, because capital expenditure has no connection in one shape or the other, or in any form, with the matter of income expenditure. If my hon. friends were to be supplied with the

information, which they are now desiring, and which has reference to the capital expenditure, it would not affect the balance as being now compared. My hon. friend, I apprehend, would not propose to add the capital expenditure to the expenditure on revenue account. That would scarcely be fair. It has never been done in the past; it was never done by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) during his regime. It is not done now, and it would be a misleading and unfair course to pursue. I would have no objection if these accounts and facts had been furnished to me, but they have not been. The best I could do was to bring here a statement of the expenditure on revenue account for the past twelve months, which I have furnished to the House, and the House is now in a position in which it can make a complete and fair comparison with past years. I think the result of the comparison is not unfavourable to the administration of the road for the past twelve months. Let me add one other remark to the subject of this capital expenditure. If I had shown an outlay, in respect to maintenance and repairs upon the Intercolonial out of capital during the past year, the hon. gentleman might have said: You have borrowed money on capital account and spent it on repairs and maintenance and added it to your income expenditure. In that case, it might have been material for me to have produced a statement of what the expenditure was on capital account. But that is not the fact. I am not showing a reduced expenditure on revenue account; I am showing an increased expenditure on revenue account, so that, for the purposes of comparison during the last twelve months, it is shown the expenditure on maintenance and repairs was \$75,000 more than was expended by my predecessor. But, every portion of it came out of income. If there had been any expenditure out of capital for maintenance and repairs, and I am not aware that there was, it would have increased the disparity between the years of the administration of my predecessor and the present administration, and I would be justly charged with very great impropriety in attempting to make unfavourable comparisons by improper means. But I did not do it. When I have shown the House what we have taken out of income for the year, and when I say that we have spent \$75,000 more on repairs and maintenance than my predecessor, where does the question of capital expenditure come in? My hon. friends are deceiving themselves if they imagine that this has any bearing upon the question of capital expenditure, and I think further that when the accounts are furnished, showing what the capital expenditure was, they will find that, during the last twelve months, there was nothing laid out which could legitimately be said to have been a class of

expenditure which should come within income charges. I have incurred a good deal of capital expenditure because we have had to provide additional cars and engines and extend the sidings, which extensions and equipment were necessary to handle the increased business. What I say is this, and the argument and inference are irresistible, that these hon. gentlemen, who have been condemning this transaction and saying that the result would be a loss to the country, and that there would be a bigger deficit than ever, must be confounded by the results which are here disclosed. We have shown that there was \$210,000 paid for rent, every dollar of which has come out of the road, and that there was a surplus of \$62,000, which makes \$272,000. The nominal deficit in the past was between \$50,000 and \$60,000, but take it at \$50,000, and that would make \$322,000 of a difference between the result of the operation of the road for the year 1899 and the year preceding four years past.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I understood the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to have stated to this House, on a former occasion, that he could make no exact statement, because the cost of running the Drummond County road and the earnings were not kept separately.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is quite right.

Mr. WILSON. Well, now the hon. gentleman attributes the whole surplus of the Intercolonial Railway to the acquisition of the Drummond County Railway. How can he know what the result has been if he cannot keep track of the earnings of the Drummond County Railway? I think if the hon. gentleman wants to take credit for the Drummond County in that way he should bring the figures down to this House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman must know that, at no time in the past history of the Intercolonial, was there more than \$30,000 or \$35,000 of a surplus and I believe then only once.

Mr. WILSON. This is the growing time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But does the hon. gentleman say that there never was a period in the history of these provinces when the times were as prosperous as they are to-day? During the eighteen years that hon. gentlemen were in power and the Intercolonial was running, do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that there was no time when the Intercolonial was as prosperous or when the general business of the country was as prosperous as it is now? I say we have had prosperous times in the maritime provinces, and we have had times on the in-

tercolonial when business was just as good, so far as the business would be naturally due to the Intercolonial, irrespective of this extension, is concerned. We have had times when the lumber business was a great deal better than it is now and the lumber business makes up a large portion of the business of the Intercolonial, but we have never had such a showing as for the past year. I have told the hon. gentleman, and I think it is only a loss of time to discuss it further, that in the first place we do not keep our accounts separately for sections of the Intercolonial Railway, and that in the next place we could not tell what business was done by the old portion of the road and what was due to the extension. They could not be estimated separately, and we could not make it a matter of accurate calculation. I would not add anything more than to say this, that what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has put forward as to the resolution he moved in the House respecting the traffic agreement, does not at all explain the position in which he stands, or which he took at that time, as compared with the position taken later on by the Senate. The attitude of the Senate was in direct contradiction to the view presented by the hon. gentleman who moved that amendment. The attitude of the Senate was that this arrangement ought to be terminable by the Intercolonial at any time after six month's notice. The argument of my hon. friend is that the Government should have no power to terminate it at all, but that they should come to Parliament to get leave to terminate it. That is utterly and entirely opposed to the contention that was put forward in the other House upon which this amendment has been based. There never was a moment when the Grand Trunk Railway would not be glad to terminate the agreement. We do not want any legislation to authorize us to induce the Grand Trunk to terminate the agreement. They were reluctant to go into it, and they would terminate it at any moment. The hon. gentleman speaks of the iniquity of the traffic arrangement.

Mr. CLANCY. Was the Grand Trunk Railway Company willing to accept the amendment of the Senate in regard to that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, they were willing from the first moment. They were willing that we should absolutely rescind that agreement altogether. They were adverse to going into it, because the scheme was one under which we were receiving more benefits than we gave. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) speaks of the iniquity of this agreement, but if it were iniquitous, he is paying his own ability a poor compliment when he says he did not know anything about it until it was brought before the Senate. I defy him to produce the authoritative statement of any responsible railway man that there was

Mr. BLAIR.

anything in that agreement disadvantageous to the maritime provinces, to the Intercolonial Railway or to the country. The arrangement was made for the benefit of the Intercolonial Railway and it was made because under it we could exchange as much traffic as possible with the Grand Trunk Railway, because the Grand Trunk Railway was at the end of our long haul and the more freight we could exchange the better it would be for the Intercolonial Railway. We are not bound to consider in a matter of this kind the interests of any railway other than the Intercolonial Railway. We are bound to consider our own interests, and that was what the Government had always in view.

Mr. CLANCY. The Minister has been so hard pressed that in the very last throes of this Bill he finds it necessary to try and square himself with the country. He has spoken here for three-quarters of an hour and he has spoken without a single definite fact before him to prove his contention. He claims that there is a small surplus of \$62,000, and he makes the off-hand statement that that entirely results from the Montreal extension, but he is unable to put his finger on a single fact to show that a dollar of it is due to that scheme. The Minister (Mr. Blair) can have just as much surplus as he likes on the Intercolonial Railway if he keeps on adding millions of dollars to capital account and not taking it into the calculation. But he knows, and the country knows, that the people will have to pay the interest on that capital account. The people of Canada are not so dull as to be fooled into believing that you can spend millions of dollars on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway, and still have a surplus, without it costing them heavily in taxes. The Montreal extension as a matter of fact may not have contributed a single dollar to that surplus, and the Minister is now unable to prove that it has. The Minister (Mr. Blair) is very much engaged with the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and he seems to be deaf to the appeals we are making from this side of the House. Let him give me his attention for a moment while I challenge him to point to one single definite fact which shows that the extension to Montreal has added one single dollar to the \$62,000 surplus which he claims. The Minister has the information, or ought to have it, to enable him to accept this challenge. It is no excuse for him to say that the system of book-keeping has been such and such in the past. This is the first time he has had to deal with the existing condition of affairs, and his book-keeping ought to be such that he could show at least one instance to prove that the extension to Montreal has been any benefit whatever to the Intercolonial Railway. The Minister (Mr. Blair) is absolutely without a case, and he stands convicted of having cooked the accounts or having failed to

straighten them out. He stands convicted of having indulged in generalities which are absolutely misleading, and unless he can give us some facts his statement has no weight whatever. If he fails to do so I leave him to choose his position in the country.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Which place will you choose?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Which will you run for?

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell you by and by.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will be better able to judge when I know where you are running.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the Minister of Railways prepared to sit there silent in the face of the challenge I have thrown out to him?

Mr. McMULLEN. Dispense.

Mr. CLANCY. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) would like us to dispense with a great many things which are not palatable to him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I shall not detain the hon. gentleman now.

Mr. CLANCY. It is not a matter of detaining me, but the country is anxious for that statement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will have to take the risk in the country on that.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is taking a good many risks that he will have some difficulty in getting the country to sanction, and he has taken no risk which has less justification behind it than this one. Even at this very last hour, the Minister (Mr. Blair) has found himself so pressed after having faced both ways, that he has made a break at some explanation, but the House I believe sees, that he would be better off if he had said nothing at all. When one gets into a false position the natural result is that he will continue in that false position, for no one can start wrong and come out right.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. Minister started out crooked and he ends crooked. He started out by withholding information and he ends by withholding information. He would have done himself more credit if he had let this matter go in silence than to make the poor show he did.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would no doubt be more satisfactory to the other side if I had remained silent.

Mr. CLANCY. I tell the Minister (Mr. Blair) that if we wanted to make political

capital he is taking the right course. If we want to serve the interests of the country he is taking the wrong course.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then sit down if you are satisfied. We are all happy.

Mr. CLANCY. I tell the Premier, that I would sooner see the interests of this country served than even the interests of a great political party. Even in the very last scene of this drama, the Minister of Railways refuses to bring down information, and in the absence of that information he cannot set himself right before the country or before the House. I am willing, Mr. speaker, to let this case go to the country on that ground alone, and leave the country to judge who is right and who is wrong.

Motion agreed to, and amendments read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. BERGERON. On division.

The PRIME MINISTER. If you do not agree with the Senate, we cannot help it.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not agree with the Government.

Amendments made by the Senate in Bill (No. 133) to authorize the acquisition by the Dominion of the Drummond County Railway read the second time and agreed to.

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

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

#### CONDITIONAL LIBERATION OF PENITENTIARY CONVICTS.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 171)—from the Senate—to provide for the conditional liberation of penitentiary convicts.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

(In the Committee.)

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Since this Bill was before the committee the other day, I have discussed with the Minister of Justice the question raised by the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), and I find that the Minister of Justice agrees altogether with the views expressed by the hon. member for York, and disagrees with mine. The hon. member for York took the ground that the administration of this Act had better be entrusted to the Minister of Justice than to the Governor in Council, while I took the other ground. The Minister of Justice believes that this Bill should follow the procedure which now obtains with reference to the pardoning of minor offences. The power of pardon cannot be exercised by the Governor in matters of murder and other extreme offences except on the advice of his Ministers; but, with regard to all other offences, the power of pardon is now exercised by the Governor on the advice of one of his Ministers, who, according to the rule now obtaining, is the

Minister of Justice. Therefore, I will move an amendment which will meet the views of my hon. friend in that respect—that the following words be added as section 12:

It shall be the duty of the Minister of Justice to advise the Governor General upon all matters connected with and affecting the administration of this Act.

The other day the hon. member for York asked me whether or not such a law as this was in existence in any of the states of the Union. The Minister of Justice has handed me a memorandum which shows that it is to-day in force in perhaps two-thirds of the states of the Union. This is the memorandum:

The following states have adopted the parole or ticket-of-leave system in respect to convicts:—Alabama, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Utah and Wisconsin.

The states of Iowa, Vermont, Virginia and West Virginia have systems of conditional pardons, somewhat different from the parole system which prevails in the states mentioned.

Maryland has a law which permits the court to parole a convict subject to recall for sentence if it is thought well to do so.

The governors of the following states that had not in 1898 adopted the parole system have expressed themselves in favour of it, namely, New Mexico, Oregon, North Carolina and Tennessee.

The private secretary of the governor of Alabama writes:—"Based upon the experience of one year that it has been tried, the governor is very much pleased with its operation and results."

California.—Of 72 prisoners at large on parole, eight have violated the conditions of their parole, leaving 66 who have remained at large and done well. The warden of the state prison reports:—"I heartily approve of the law, and believe that it has done much good already, and will continue to increase its usefulness in the future."

In Kansas, the executive clerk reports:—"On the whole, our experience with this branch of work has been fully satisfactory. We think it affords a means of dealing with the younger criminal element."

In Massachusetts, the secretary of the Prison Board reports:—"As far as possible, the prisoner is placed on his good behaviour in order that he may shorten his sentence. As a rule, this object is attained."

In the state of New York, where the law has been longest in force, the law is most highly praised.

There is nothing whatever in the contention that pressure would be brought to bear upon the Minister of Justice to recommend tickets-of-leave where they ought not to be granted. The pressure for pardon is always great and continuous, but the settled rules upon which the Minister proceeds always furnishes an effectual check against the abuse of power in this regard.

A prisoner on parole, or of ticket-of-leave, is always on his good behaviour, and there is constant motive operating upon him to conform to the law that he may retain his liberty, and thus time is given for the formation of habits and character that are in conformity to the law, and so the prisoner may pass from the condition of

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

the criminal class to the law-abiding class under the operation of this system.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not understand that this qualified the offence. Is it to be for any kind of offence, or only for minor offences?

The PRIME MINISTER. All kinds of offences.

Mr. BERGERON. From murder down?

The PRIME MINISTER. It would include manslaughter, but is not intended to apply to cases of murder, although there is no restriction.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that that is the intention, but that is not so expressed.

Mr. DAVIN. Before this clause is adopted, I wish to say that I understood that this legislation would not be proceeded with this session.

The PRIME MINISTER. Oh, no.

Mr. DAVIN. I may have misapprehended what was said. I have not the least hesitation in saying that I have great objection to adding to the power of the Minister of Justice while that office is administered as it is at present. If the case of the Queen versus Skelton is to be considered as a sample of the way this Act will be administered, it affords a striking illustration of what grave abuses might be perpetrated. Under the present legislation, what have we seen? Two men were tried—

The PRIME MINISTER. I have the papers in that case before me, and they will be laid on the Table to-morrow morning, and then we can discuss that matter by itself.

Mr. DAVIN. Then, I will not refer to it, as we will take it up when the papers are brought down, but I am certainly indisposed to extending the power possessed at present of interfering with the operation of our criminal code by the Minister of Justice. What is the additional ground placed before us in support of this measure? It is the precedent set by certain states of the Union. Well, if there is a country anywhere to which we should not look for guidance or example in criminal legislation, it is the United States, because, by sentimental legislation and by empirical Acts, they have introduced confusion and uncertainty into the administration of their criminal law. The effect of this Bill will be to introduce uncertainty into the administration of our law. At present the man who contemplates committing a crime has before his eyes a certain and effective punishment to deter him, but if this Bill be passed, he will have, instead, the probability that even if he be convicted and sentenced, his friends can use their influence with their member, or some other influential person, or work on the sympathies of some sentimentalists who may hap-

pen to have some influence with the Minister of Justice, and by this means induce the Minister to let him free on a ticket-of-leave, perhaps to return to an honest life, and perhaps to prey upon the public. If there be cases that require the exercise of the clemency of the Crown, we have ample scope for that exercise in the pardoning clauses of the criminal code.

Mr. QUINN. I regret that I cannot agree with my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) in this matter. I think that the Bill is a very good one. Having had some experience in criminal matters, I know that one of the great difficulties in prosecuting young criminals in particular is the certainty of exposing them to the danger of contamination in a penitentiary, and there ought always to be a means by which the errors committed sometimes by judges and juries might be corrected by the investigation of the Minister of Justice and the reports that come from time to time from the wardens of the penitentiaries. I do not think that in this Bill we are following the example altogether of the United States, though it is certainly of great advantage to have the experience of the several states of the Union that have adopted this system, which has been in force in England for many years. We are taking this system, not from the United States, but from England, where it has been in force a great number of years, and, I think, has worked admirably. I can call to mind a number of cases in which, if there had been in force in this country any system providing for the liberation of prisoners, a great deal of good could have been done, particularly in the case of young offenders. The worst possible injury that can be done to a young man is to leave him in the penitentiary for a number of years. Although it is necessary, for the good of society, that severe punishment should be inflicted, there are cases in which convicts ought not to be compelled to complete their full term, and no means has hitherto existed of obtaining their liberation, except by the intervention of the Governor in Council to grant the pardon. We are now providing machinery by which the Minister of Justice may release such persons on their good-conduct parole, which means that they are not free from the consequence of their crime until their term has actually expired, and that, if they are guilty of any other offence in the interval, they will have to complete their term, besides suffering any additional penalty that may be inflicted. I think this is not only a wise, but a generous and humane, thing, and one calculated to advance the best interests of society.

Mr. FOSTER. The main objection I have to the Bill is removed by the amendment of the right hon. gentleman, leaving the matter in the hands of the Department of Justice. I did mention also that, as this was untried hitherto in this country, and as

there were comparatively few of the members present, it might not be a bad thing to allow the Bill to remain over for a year and get the matured opinion of persons who would naturally take an interest in it, and whose interest would be brought to the point of giving an opinion because of the imminence of legislation; and I thought that the First Minister had the committee rise with that idea in his mind. I do not press that strongly. I think it would be well to let the Bill over, as the right hon. gentleman says this legislation has been tried in Great Britain a long while; and though the conditions are different here, it may not be amiss to try it. My impression is, however, that it would not be time lost in the end to lay the Bill over for a year, but I will not press that view.

The PRIME MINISTER. This Bill has received the consideration of the Department of Justice, and moreover, the department have been in communication with lawyers, and especially with the class of lawyers like my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Quinn), who have had experience in these matters. It is after full consideration and consultation that the department have come to the conclusion that this Bill should be passed; and I think that, in view of that, we should take the view of my hon. friend from Montreal and pass the Bill.

Mr. DAVIN. I must say, Sir, that I consider that the worst persons in the world to consult on a subject of this kind are those who are engaged in prosecuting or defending criminals. Those who have been engaged, either in prosecuting or defending criminals all their lives—and I have known a good many of them—develop one or other of two peculiarities. Many of them get such a twist in their minds against the criminal that they come to believe that no man who goes into the dock can be innocent. I remember that I have ventured more than once to tell a jury that Sir William Bodkin, before whom I used to practice when a very young man, that that learned judge could never conceive of a man who was brought into a dock being other than guilty of whatever crime with which he might be charged. Others go to the other extreme. If they happen to be constituted as my hon. and learned friend (Mr. Quinn) is, with a noble mind and great heart, they take an extra-sentimental view of the situation. Therefore, I do not think that men who have been engaged in the administration of the criminal law are especially fitted to give an opinion above others who have studied these things and formed opinions concerning them. If you look to legal studies to enable you to form an opinion on these questions, you should look to studies of criminal legislation and its effects in various countries, and also to go, as my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) did the other day—with some apologies that, however, were by no means needed—to the philosophic basis of cri-

minal legislation. I say that the grand object of criminal legislation is to deter from crime. So far as I have been able to follow the legislation in England and in this House, I have come to the conclusion that laws that have leaned in any way towards sentimentalism, do not help in deterring from crime. What I fear is that legislation of the kind now proposed, instead of helping the young people with whom my hon. and learned friend sympathizes—and if I thought otherwise I would be the first to support his views—and instead of reforming the criminal, will lead to an increase of crime.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

#### RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 85) further to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought this Bill was not going on.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There were two clauses before the Railway Committee which I felt compelled to drop by reason of the opposition that developed. These clauses are not in the present Bill.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. FOSTER. What are these clauses?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These clauses were all assented to by the committee, I think I may say with complete unanimity. They are merely formal.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is very little change from the clauses that have been inserted for a number of years past in the charters that have been passed. This is to make these provisions part of the Railway Act, instead of having the trouble of incorporating them in each Act. They were very well considered in committee, and generally agreed to.

Mr. BERGERON. In fact, there is so little in it, that I do not see why we should pass it at all.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would ask the Minister if this would not be a good opportunity to incorporate in this Bill power by which the Government may take control over the location of railway stations and over traffic arrangements?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had that before the committee.  
Mr. DAVIN.

and that was one of the sections which I proposed to add to the Bill, another section was to confer upon the Governor in Council power to establish uniform rules and regulations for the operation of railways throughout the Dominion. These two clauses were in the Bill as it was considered by the Railway Committee; but when they were reached, objection was taken to them, and I was threatened, I may say, with determined opposition by gentlemen who were opposed to it. The leader of the Opposition, who attended that meeting of the committee, declared that they would not allow this Bill to pass, that a time of the session had arrived when it would be possible to obstruct its passage; in fact, he said he would take the responsibility of preventing those clauses being passed. As a consequence, I felt driven to drop the sections. I think under the arrangement that was arrived at between the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition, it would not be a proper thing for me to re-introduce those clauses. Therefore, I am obliged to take the Bill as it passed the committee.

Mr. WOOD. I cannot sit here and allow this Bill to go through in its mutilated form without raising my protest against the Government allowing the Opposition to be masters of the situation in refusing to pass the two best clauses in the Bill. Clause 4 is really in the interest of the people throughout the western country, for by it companies constructing railways would be prevented from passing by located villages and forming village sites of their own in order to increase the returns from the road. Clause 5 is in the interest of the employees all over the country. Regulations that have been made recently by one of the railroads have been thought by many of the railway employees to be very difficult to understand and to be learned by men even who have been in railway work for many years. When they saw that the Government had taken this matter in hand and prepared to deal with it, they were quite sure the regulations would be reasonable, and several of them told me themselves they were perfectly satisfied that the Government would make such regulations as would give general satisfaction throughout the country. Now, on behalf of these railway employees, I protest against the Government allowing the Opposition to defeat what I contend is a very important clause in the interest of these employees. I regret very much that these honest, hardworking and industrious men are to be subjected to rules and regulations being imposed upon them by men in this House who do not understand the case.

Mr. FLINT. In reply to my hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Wood), I desire to say that there are times when we are obliged to recognize the existence of facts, and one of the facts that the Government is obliged to recognize is that we ought to be

at the end of the session, we ought to pro-  
 rogue to-day according to the understand-  
 ing that was reached between the two par-  
 ties. But we find there is a great deal of  
 business yet to be done. I myself heard  
 the leader of the Opposition say that he  
 proposed to fight these clauses with all the  
 resources available to him.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to a point of order.  
 Is it in order to refer to what has taken  
 place in committee, and to make an argu-  
 ment from it?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand  
 there is a report to the committee of the  
 proceedings of the committee.

Mr. FLINT. I say that I heard the leader  
 of the Opposition state that he proposed to  
 fight these clauses with all the resources  
 available to him as leader of the Opposi-  
 tion, and on that ground the Minister of  
 Railways and Canals dropped the clauses.  
 I think, therefore, the Government may be  
 excused for not insisting upon passing these  
 clauses at this late hour of the session. I  
 think the leader of the Opposition and those  
 who represent him here have resources avail-  
 able to them at this period of the session  
 to defeat the proposition if brought forward  
 again.

Mr. DAVIN. What a most extraordinary  
 spectacle we have now, in a Government  
 standing here and saying they cannot carry  
 on legislation, shrinking from carrying out  
 their own ideas because of an account that  
 is not official, that we have no authority  
 for, of what one member of the committee  
 said. On that committee there is a large  
 majority of Government supporters, yet we  
 are told that the committee decided to drop  
 these two clauses; and then we have a  
 Government coming here and saying: We  
 dropped them, but do not be too hard on  
 us; we dropped them because the leader  
 of the Opposition spoke vigorously against  
 them. I merely comment on this spectacle  
 of helplessness manifested by this Govern-  
 ment in regard to this matter, which has  
 been repeated again and again.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Govern-  
 ment ask for no favour in this matter  
 whatever. This is a matter of great  
 importance, we are now in the dying  
 hours of the session, and the leader of  
 the Opposition did not want this matter  
 to be considered in his absence. There are  
 courtesies which the hon. gentleman appears  
 to ignore in these matters. Perhaps it  
 would be just as well, and better, if there  
 were no courtesies extended from one side  
 to the other, but I am not prepared to admit  
 that doctrine. But we all desire the bless-  
 ing of prorogation, and as this is a highly  
 contentious matter, we think it need not  
 be insisted on at this session, besides it will  
 have to go before another House.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the arrangement  
 was come to between the leaders to  
 facilitate the end of the session; and to-  
 day my hon. friend seems to be not unwill-  
 ing that the courtesies of political warfare  
 should be done away with. I think he had  
 better be discreet, because, in a warfare  
 of that kind, the disadvantage would always  
 be with a Government; anyway, we do  
 not want an armed hostility like that. The  
 only thing I take exception to would be  
 this, that when the Government and the  
 leader of the Opposition practically made an  
 arrangement that in order to facilitate the  
 close of the session these two clauses of  
 the Bill would be dropped, it is quite too  
 bad for hon. gentlemen on the other side  
 to rise up and declare that a good measure  
 is being defeated solely by the obstruction  
 of the Opposition. If I understood the hon.  
 Minister aright, I think there were others  
 besides hon. members of the Opposition who  
 were opposed to these clauses, and under  
 the circumstances, I think it would be bet-  
 ter if the Bill had not been introduced at  
 all, but as it is, I do not think these two  
 clauses ought to be pressed, and I do not  
 think that hon. gentlemen opposite should  
 throw the onus of defeating what they con-  
 sider a good Bill upon the Opposition.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). It should  
 be said that when that statement was made  
 in committee it was also stated that if these  
 two clauses were withdrawn the House  
 would have closed last week, on Friday or  
 Saturday.

Mr. MACLEAN. I was not a party to this  
 arrangement which is now spoken of, and I  
 intend to press an amendment to this Bill  
 which will cover the point, so as to give the  
 Railway Committee of the Privy Council  
 jurisdiction.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND  
 CANALS. I do not know what the hon.  
 member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) means  
 when he says that I had intimated that there  
 were others who were opposed to this clause  
 beside hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side  
 of the House. I am not aware of there  
 having been any opposition developed by the  
 friends of the Government to the measure.  
 There has never been any to my knowledge,  
 nor do I desire to suggest that there was  
 any. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir  
 Charles Tupper), when these clauses were  
 brought up in committee, rose and said  
 that he had very strong objections to  
 them. He considered them of very great  
 importance, and said that they could not  
 have his support, and that he would do his  
 best to defeat them. He gave me to under-  
 stand that he would take the responsibility  
 of defeating them. In view of the attitude  
 of the hon. gentleman, and the late period of  
 the session, I asked the committee if they  
 would allow the matter to stand so that it  
 might be considered in the meanwhile. The  
 hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition,

when he was present in the House, made it very clear that he would not consent to the adoption of these clauses, because he stated that he intended to avail himself of all means within the rules of the House to defeat the Bill if it contained these two clauses.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Mr. Chairman, it is not very often that I do it, but I am obliged to stand by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) on this question. I was present when the whole discussion took place, and I can vouch for it that the hon. gentleman yielded, as he has said just now, to the circumstances. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) left the day after, perfectly convinced that he could rely on the understanding that was made with the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and with the Government. I would be very sorry if anything should be done to interfere with any arrangement which might be made between hon. members on both sides of the House, and I do hope that my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean), who has threatened to make an amendment to the Bill, will not do it.

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** Mr. Chairman, no matter how strongly I might feel in favour of the clauses that it is proposed to insert, in view of the circumstances, the hon. leader of the Opposition having said that he was strongly opposed to the Bill, and intended to use every means in his power to keep it from becoming law, in the shape in which it was before the committee, and in view of the arrangement that was made, I would consider it a dishonourable and improper act if I were, in the absence of that hon. gentleman, to vote for any amendment that was moved, either from one side of the House or the other. This is how I feel personally in regard to a matter of this kind. I am perfectly willing, as a member of this House, to stay here a month or two, if necessary, to fight this thing out, but, after having come to an arrangement, I would feel that I was doing a dishonourable and discreditable act if I were to go back on that arrangement.

**Mr. MACLEAN.** In view of the circumstances, to use the words of the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), and in the exercise of my rights as a member of this House, I now propose as an amendment, namely, that the following words be added to the Bill as clause 4. I propose to move, seconded by Mr. Wallace—

**Mr. WALLACE.** I am going to support the amendment, but I do not desire to second it.

**Mr. MACLEAN.** Well, then, I will move, seconded by Mr. Sproule :

In case it appears to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to be expedient or necessary for the public convenience that a station shall be located at any point on the line of any railway, the committee may make an order requiring the company to place, maintain and operate a station

**Mr. BLAIR.**

at the place named and described therein, and may define the accommodation to be provided in connection therewith, and may order and require tracks to be laid down from and in connection with the company's main line to and from such station and for sidings wherever deemed necessary by the committee ; and it shall be the duty of the company owning or operating the line of railway to carry out the order within the time mentioned therein.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Chairman, before the amendment is put, I beg to say that before the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) left the House, we had some conversation as to what was to be the business of the House, and we agreed, on the part of the Government, to drop certain measures we had in order to facilitate prorogation. The hon. leader of the Opposition, at the same time, was very strong in his opposition against these clauses, and I agreed, so far as the Government were concerned, that we would see that no discussion would take place in his absence. I appeal to the sense of fairness and honour of every hon. member that, when arrangements are made between the leaders on both sides of the House, to carry on the business of the House, these engagements ought to be sacred.

**Mr. McNEILL.** Mr. Chairman, I would earnestly beg my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) to withdraw his amendment. I do not know how we are going to carry on the business of the House if a solemn agreement, entered into by the leaders, on both sides, are to be set at naught. I would earnestly beg my hon. friend to withdraw the amendment. I do not want to multiply words at this time of the session, but these are my views on the question.

**Mr. BOSTOCK.** Mr. Chairman, I am probably one of the members of the House most interested in this particular matter, from the fact of this question having been brought before the Railway Committee this session by myself, on account of two cases of this kind which happen to be in my constituency. I was exceedingly disappointed to find that we were not going to have these clauses passed in the Bill introduced by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. If I had thought it was not going through, I should have taken the opportunity of pressing for a clause of that kind when the British Columbia Southern Railway Bill was before the Railway Committee earlier in the session. Did I understand the ex-Minister of Railways to say that under the law as it at present stands the Minister of Railways has power to deal with the location of stations ?

**Mr. HAGGART.** I do not know that that power would be ex post facto, but in the case of any road subsidized by the Government, the Minister of Railways can approve or disapprove of the line of railway, and, I go so far as to say, of the location of the stations. I may be wrong, but I think it is entirely in the power of the Minister.

**Mr. BOSTOCK.** I am glad to say that the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway has assured me that he will carry out the wishes of the people, and locate the station at Moyie. I have a letter from him in which he states that he has had a siding put in to accommodate the people of that town, and I trust that he will immediately appoint a station agent and operator, as the people of Moyie wish him to do. Although I consider the action of the Canadian Pacific Railway exceedingly slow in the matter, yet they now show a desire to meet the wishes of the people in that case. As to the other matter which I brought before the Railway Committee, this clause will not assist the people in any way, because the location of the line would have to be dealt with and altered. When I wrote to the Minister of Railways last fall, as to the location of the station at Grand Forks, the location of the line was altogether different from what it was subsequently made. Therefore, the fact of the location of the line having been so materially altered, the station cannot be put at the place where I promised the people of Grand Forks I would endeavour to have it put. I believe, however, that in this House we should be bound by the arrangement made between the leaders of both parties, and, although it is really in the interests of my constituents to have a clause of this kind passed, yet I do not feel that I would be justified in assisting to break an arrangement which has been entered into between the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. WALLACE.** I propose to support the amendment of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). I am not responsible for bringing this matter before the House, but it is here now, and, as it is a proper proposal, I shall vote for the amendment. Speaking generally, it may be said that every railway in this Dominion has received subsidies from the Government; and, even if we did not give them a dollar of subsidy, we gave them enormous franchises and powers, and we should retain over them whatever control is necessary in the interests of the public. This amendment proposes to prevent a railway company doing an injustice to communities. We remember that the question was immediately brought before the House in a certain case, where a community had located and built a town, and where the railway company, coming in afterwards, decided to locate the station more than two miles beyond that town. Well, the pioneers in that country, who spend their time, their labour and their money, are entitled to the protection of the Government, and this amendment is a move in the right direction. But what do we see here to-day? Last session and this session we saw the majority behind the Government voting for every proposition made by that Government, but to-day we are told that the Gov-

ernment cannot carry this clause; and why? In deference to the opinions of the leader of the Opposition! It is the first time on record where the Government proposed to legislate, or not to legislate, in obedience to the demands of the leader of the Opposition. Are they afraid to proceed with this clause, and do they want to take shelter behind the leader of the Opposition, or what is the cause? The Government, strong in their majority, should push through the legislation they introduced in this House, if they think that legislation is right. If it were in the best interests of Canada that this legislation should not be proceeded with, we might understand the thing. But they come here, in a humiliating position, afraid to legislate in this direction, and wanting to shelter themselves behind the leader of the Opposition. Such a course is quite unworthy of the Government.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** I must appeal once more to the sense of fairness of the House upon this question. For my part, I am in favour of this legislation, and the Government is in favour of it; but the leader of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) is strongly against it, and I think it is due to a man of his experience, age and position, that his opinions should not be lightly treated.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** When the leader of the Opposition asked that this matter should not be considered in his absence, I agreed with him, amongst other things, that this clause should be allowed to wait until he could express his views upon it.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Hear, hear.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** We are now at the 7th of August, and, in order to permit of prorogation, the leader of the Opposition and I came to a certain arrangement, one detail of which was, that this question should not be taken up in his absence. If we do not accept the amendment, it is not because we share the views of the hon. leader of the Opposition, because we do not share his views, but it is because we want to keep our word with him. We can discuss the matter at the proper time, and it can wait for another session.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I think it is rather peculiar that there should be any gentleman in the House who would not feel under the circumstances that the Government were doing the only right and proper and honourable thing in taking the course indicated by the Prime Minister. I do not rise for the purpose of supplementing anything he has said, but simply for the purpose of saying that I have no doubt that the action of members on this side of the House will not be in any sense misunderstood. For my part I am strongly in fav-

our of the clause which my hon. friend the Minister of Railways introduced, and I would have been quite satisfied, like the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), to stay here another month if necessary, for the purpose of fighting it out and putting that clause on the statute-book; but there are circumstances in connection with deliberative assemblies of this kind in which a man is not always permitted to exercise his own judgment, but is bound by arrangements, which are and must be made from time to time by the leaders on both sides, if the business of the House is to be carried on. Therefore, although I am as strongly in favour of the clause introduced by the Minister of Railways as he is himself, I feel that we are bound by the arrangement made, and it would be altogether dishonourable not to adhere to that arrangement.

Mr. HAGGART. We do not object to carrying out the arrangement made by the leader of the Opposition; but it is rather unfair to say that the leader of the Opposition was going to use every means he possibly could to defeat the clause, and put that forward as the reason for dropping it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is the only reason.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman says that if it were not for the tactics adopted by the Opposition, hon. gentlemen opposite would force this amendment through. They had plenty of opportunity during the last five months to bring it down, and have it passed, if necessary. I doubt very much whether the Minister of Railways would support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). Would the hon. gentleman support legislation which would give him the power of compelling any railroad company in the country to put up sidings and a station wherever he pleased, no matter whether the railway had received assistance from the Government or not? If I remember rightly, the furthest the hon. gentleman went was to support the proposition with respect to railways which had received subsidies from the Government. I think the Minister of Railways has already the power to determine where a station shall be on a subsidized road. The contract with the company has to be approved of by Order in Council, and the Minister can embody any clauses he likes in the contract, including the location of stations. So that the power already belongs to the Minister, except that he wishes it to have some *ex post facto* effect. Would the Minister like to have the power to locate a station on the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific Railway in any part of this country? I think it is a power he would not care to have. He would be liable to receive a petition from the inhabitants of any section of the country who might want a station, putting aside altogether the

Mr. SIFTON.

wishes of the railway company. He has enough of such power on the Intercolonial. No doubt he has plenty of applications from supporters of the Government—I know I had—for stations at particular points. If he granted all these applications there would be a station at every two miles along the road. That is a power which the Minister ought not to ask for or to have. But what I protest against is the dropping of this legislation, and throwing the onus and responsibility on the Opposition because the leader of the Opposition made an arrangement with the leader of the Government that these clauses should not be considered until next session, and the Minister getting up and stating to his followers in the House: "You would have had such legislation if it had not been for the opposition of the leader of the Opposition." If I am not mistaken, he induced my hon. friend from East York to introduce this amendment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know on what authority the hon. gentleman has made the last statement.

Mr. HAGGART. I may be mistaken in the last statement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not conscious of having had any communication with that hon. gentleman on the subject, although, if I were free to vote for such a clause as we had in the Bill before the Railway Committee, I would be prepared to support it and support it heartily. The hon. gentleman has not stated correctly, I think, the position we occupy to-day in respect to this matter. When the Bill came before the Railway Committee, the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, being present, stated that he was strongly opposed to the adoption of clauses 4 and 5. He stated further that he was prepared to exhaust all the facilities the rules of Parliament afforded to defeat these two clauses of the Bill. I made an appeal to the hon. gentleman in every way I could. I pointed out that these clauses had been before the committee for weeks and months, and that the reason they had not been brought up earlier was because I had been urged by gentlemen, I think on both sides, to allow Bills, which they claimed were not contentious Bills, to come before the committee, remarking that this Bill, being a Government Bill, would of course be easily disposed of. As a matter of courtesy to these gentlemen, on several occasions I allowed the Railway Bill to stand over; but I had not, I say most sincerely, the slightest expectation that there was going to be developed any such opposition to these clauses as was subsequently developed. When I stated to the committee that I was not going to press these clauses, I did not state that as a result of any understanding between myself and the leader of the Opposition. I did not say

I was going to abandon these clauses. I had the right, I supposed, to move them in this House. I desired to have the subject thoroughly discussed by the committee, and I was not willing to take any suggestions which hon. gentlemen on either side might offer; but when these causes were withdrawn, I told the leader of the Opposition and the committee that I yielded to compulsion, and the leader of the Opposition said that he was prepared to take the responsibility of these clauses not going through. Therefore, it is only fair to the Government that it should be known to the whole country why these clauses have not been carried—not because the Government was not willing and sincerely desirous of seeing them made the law of the land, but at this period of the session the possibilities of delaying and defeating legislation are numerous, and yielding to the desire of everybody to get away, the clauses were withdrawn, and there is going to be no serious injury resulting to the country. It is quite possible, as the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) has said, and as I myself have said in the committee, for the Government to incorporate, in any contract we may enter into with any company receiving a subsidy from the Government, a clause governing this question of stations, but I thought that did not go far enough, and that we ought to have a clause which would entitle us to determine the location of the stations of any railway subsidized by any province of Canada or by this Government. I wanted to have them all put on the same footing, and therefore desired that such a clause should be incorporated in the Act. It can be introduced any session, and in the meantime the Government will see that in the case of any railways which may receive a subsidy from this Government, a clause to this effect will be embodied in the contract.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the hon. Minister promise that he will introduce such a Bill next session. If so, I will be quite willing to abide by the decision of the right hon. Prime Minister and acquiesce in the arrangement made with the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. HENDERSON. I regret very much that clause 4 especially has been abandoned by the Government, but after what has been stated, I hope that in another session it will be re-introduced. If I properly understand the case, it is not only intended to apply this clause to railways to be built, but also to railways that have been subsidized in past years.

Mr. HAGGART. To all railways whether subsidized or not.

Mr. HENDERSON. The amendment of the member for East York (Mr. Maclean) proposes to deal with all railways, whether

subsidized or not. I would not desire to go that far. It would be perhaps going too far to deal with railways that have not received assistance from the Dominion Parliament or the local legislatures. I regret that any arrangement was made to drop this clause, even if such arrangement should secure an earlier prorogation. We are here now very close on five months, and it would not have made the difference of a day in this long session, if we had had a full discussion of this clause, and I scarcely think the Government should conceal themselves behind an excuse of that kind for dropping it. I am not aware that any arrangement had been made, and was waiting the passage of the Bill to advise one of my constituents that it had become law, in order that an application might be made under it to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I hope that when another session comes round the hon. Minister of Railways will take it up, and either in this or some other well-considered form introduce a clause that will cover the whole ground. In doing this, the hon. Minister will have my hearty support. I can scarcely say that I am prepared to support the amendment of my hon. friend from East York, because it goes a little further than I think it ought to go.

Mr. McMULLEN. As one of those who strongly advocated the introduction of this clause, I was disappointed when it was struck out. Nothing could possibly induce me to vote against the adoption of this clause except the compact entered into by the right hon. leader of the Government with the hon. leader of the Opposition. That compact, I am disposed to accept, and therefore I will vote against the amendment.

Mr. MACLEAN. An effort has been made here to lead the people to believe that it is by reason of the opposition from this side of the House that this legislation has not passed this session.

Some hon. MEMBERS. So it is.

Mr. MACLEAN. Quite the contrary. We were in favour of having that clause passed and ready to vote for it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MACLEAN. Those who are really responsible for this clause not becoming law now are the party opposite.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MACLEAN. If there is a party responsible for trouble in this matter, it is the party opposite who have given the people pledges year after year that they would introduce a railway commission which would govern all these questions. Let us have that railway commission, which the hon. Minister of Railways has promised us session after session. I do not want to have these grievances come up year after

year in this House, when they should be settled at once by a railway commission, if the Government would only bring their measure forward for the appointing of one.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend is a member of the Railway Committee, and ought to know what took place there. His leader (Sir Charles Tupper) took the full responsibility, openly and publicly, of the position he took with regard to this matter. My hon. friend then did not protest nor did the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), nor any other member of the committee, but gave their leader full support in the position he took. Surely the hon. Minister of Railways is entitled to fair-play, because he has extended a great deal of courtesy to members on both sides during the long months of the session, and postponed the consideration of the Government Bill in his name so as to give a chance to private legislation. But the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) is now taking a position quite the opposite of that taken by his leader. In the committee my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) protested to the best of his ability against the withdrawal of the clause, but the majority agreed that the Minister of Railways should discuss the matter with the right hon. First Minister, and after these two gentlemen had an interview with the hon. leader of the Opposition, the Minister of Railways reported the agreement arrived at, and the committee unanimously acceded to it.

Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that there was an agreement between him and the hon. leader of the Opposition to drop these two clauses?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes, and the two clauses only.

The PRIME MINISTER. The two clauses only.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The thing was done openly and above-board, with the knowledge of everybody. It was not a case of the two leaders meeting together and coming to an understanding, but this was done openly, many days ago, to the knowledge of every member of the committee and of the people as well, because it was fully reported in the press, so that any one who objected could have protested before the leader of the Opposition went away. If there is any humiliation in the matter, it is suffered by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), and those who are prepared to go back on the honourable arrangement made with the leader of the Opposition. I wish to make myself clear to the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) and to say that we do not consider that in placing the matter before the House, as the Prime Minister has done, he has done anything contrary to the wishes of or the position taken by the hon. leader of the

Mr. MACLEAN.

Opposition. Because he publicly stated, in reference to the committee that that was the position he wished the House and the country to understand that he took with reference to this matter. If any person else had a different view, that was the place and that was the time for objection to be raised. For myself, I have already stated that, in view of the arrangement made, I would not, under any consideration, do anything that would interfere with the carrying out of that arrangement.

Mr. MILLS. I rise to bear testimony to what has been said by the Prime Minister, the Minister of Railways and Canals and the chairman of the committee. I was in the committee when the arrangement was made, and, without taking into consideration at all the merits of the amendment introduced here, I shall vote against it—not because I am opposed to the subject matter of the amendment, but because I think it is right and honourable that an arrangement of that kind, entered into by the parties, should be carried out. As regards the responsibility of it, as that question has come up, I desire to say a word. I say that the responsibility in connection with this Bill rests upon this Government. There were many weeks in the early part of the session when the time, instead of being partially wasted, as it was, might have been occupied in putting through this legislation. It is a standing disgrace to this Government that such important legislation should be reached and rushed through in the dying moments of the session.

Mr. DAVIS. I desire to say a very few words—

Mr. BERGERON. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIS. If my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) will possess his soul in patience—

Mr. BERGERON. Go on, go on; we are waiting anxiously to hear you.

Mr. DAVIS. I was not in the committee when the arrangement was entered into that has been spoken of; but I cannot understand hon. gentlemen on the other side trying to foist the responsibility of the postponement of this legislation upon this side of the House. It was the leader of the Opposition who compelled them—practically compelled them—to abandon this clause in the Bill for this session, by giving them to understand that it would be obstructed in the House, and that the House would be kept in session for two or three months longer. I am sorry the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) was not in the committee; if he had been there, he probably would have dragooned the leader of the Opposition into allowing this to go through, much as he dragooned him into opposition to the Stikine Railway Bill. But I have supported in this House the principle of this amendment on several occasions, and I believe that it is

only fair that such legislation should be placed on the statute-books, in the interest of the people in the western country particularly. In that country we are expecting new towns to be built up, and we want them to be protected. In the town in which I live, as in other places in the constituency I have the honour to represent, we have suffered a good deal for want of such legislation as this. I desire to tell the hon. member for East York that, as I was not a party to the arrangement spoken of, I am prepared to support his amendment.

Mr. OLIVER. I am very sorry to see this question, which is of such vital importance to the pioneers of the North-west, made a football between the parties. But, seeing it is being made a football, I want to relieve myself from any charge of taking an unfair part in the deliberations of this House by the vote I shall give on the amendment. I was present in the committee when the Minister of Railways and Canals announced that, in view of the position of the leader of the Opposition, he withdrew these clauses. I did not know there was any arrangement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No; that was made after.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand that there is a great difference between withdrawing a section of a Bill under arrangement, and withdrawing it under compulsion. I do not feel bound to support a position which has been taken under compulsion from those who are opposed to what I believe in. Had I known of any arrangement at the time, I would have been able to protest against it, and would have protested against it, as suggested by the chairman of the Railway Committee (Mr. Sutherland). I did not know of any arrangement until now. I understand now that there is an arrangement between the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Government, that this clause should be dropped. In support of that arrangement we, on this side, are asked—I am asked—to vote against the principles that I believe in. I am always willing to stand by an arrangement that is made between myself, or my friends, and my opponents, provided always that my opponents stand by the arrangement, but not otherwise. If the leader of the Opposition is not able to control his followers in this House so that they will stand by an agreement, I certainly think that agreement is not binding upon me, and I shall not act as if it were binding upon me.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me that hon. members who sit behind the Treasury benches, are extremely anxious to throw the responsibility of dropping this clause upon the Opposition, and more especially upon the leader of the Opposition. I think they are placing the members of the Government in a most humiliating position, when they get up, one after another, and tell this

House and the country that the Government were not able to pass a measure that they considered in the interest of the country, simply because one or two members on this side said they did not approve of it. I think it will be within the recollection of many hon. members who are members of the Railway Committee, that on one occasion in that committee, when Sir Charles Tupper was designated as leader of the Opposition, he refused to be called by that name, on the ground that there was no such person as the leader of the Opposition in connection with the work of the Railway Committee—there were no politics there. If that hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) spoke in the Railway Committee, he spoke for himself; he did not speak as leader of the Opposition, having refused to be called the leader of the Opposition in that very committee. Therefore, I say, it is unfair to make this attempt to mislead the House and the country as to the reason for this legislation being dropped at the present time. It has been stated repeatedly by one hon. gentleman after another that there was an agreement that this clause should be dropped. If so, there must have been two parties to that agreement, and if the leader of the Opposition was one party, the Minister of Railways and Canals or the First Minister was the other. I want to know how you can make one party to an agreement responsible for it, without making the other responsible? It seems to me that, upon the statement that has been made, one party to the agreement is equally responsible with the other; and, if the leader of the Opposition has to assume his responsibility for dropping this measure, to my mind, the leader of the Government must share the blame, if blame there is to be.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say a few words on this subject, because I am put somewhat in an anomalous position on account of seconding this motion. Now, the history of this matter that has been given, while probably substantially correct, is not exactly what has occurred. In the first discussion which took place on this Bill, the leader of the Opposition wanted the whole Bill held over until next year, but the force of his argument was directed to clauses 4 and 5. The Minister of Railways and Canals refused to let it be held over, but ultimately intimated that, if objection were confined to these clauses, he would be disposed to consider whether he would allow these to remain over, and report the rest of the Bill. On the ground of the lateness of the session, I myself advocated the holding of the Bill over until next year, because there were other clauses that ought to be more fully considered. But by this time we had reached one o'clock, and there was no understanding come to, so far as I am aware, except that the Minister told the leader of the Opposition that he would consult with his colleagues and see

about it. At the next meeting of the Railway Committee neither the leader of the Opposition nor myself were present, but the Bill was reported upon a suggestion by the leader of the Opposition at the previous meeting, that his objections were largely confined to clauses 4 and 5. I would have remained content and accepted that arrangement as an implied agreement reached between the leader of the Opposition and the Government through the Minister of Railways and Canals, were it not for the fact that to-day the contention is made that the leader of the Opposition is responsible for not allowing those clauses to go through. I think that is most unfair, because if there was any responsibility, both sides were equally responsible for the omission of these two clauses. When the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) moved this amendment, I offered to second it, and I did so because I did not think it was fair to throw upon the Opposition the responsibility for these clauses not going through.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman will recollect that I told the leader of the Opposition in that committee that if these clauses were dropped he would have to take the responsibility of it, because his action was responsible for the defeat of the clauses. He stated his position most unequivocally; and hon. gentlemen will know whether a single member of the Opposition who was present took any exception to the attitude of the leader of the Opposition in respect of this Bill.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I remember that some spoke of the clause when the discussion was going on.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Does the hon. gentleman remember that there was a single voice raised from any member of the Opposition in protest against the action which the leader of the Opposition proposed to take, and which he knew would result in defeating the Bill?

Mr. **SPROULE**. I remember distinctly one or more members speaking in favour of the clause.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think it is very well understood why these clauses were not passed. All I want to add now is that it is the deliberate intention of the Government to introduce this subject again at the next session of Parliament.

Mr. **MCNEILL**. I wish to say in reference to this matter that it is always well to be on the safe side in reference to an agreement, and if there is any doubt about it, it is better to assume that the agreement has been made rather than run the risk of breaking an agreement which has been entered into. I think the question we are discussing is a very much larger question than that con-

Mr. **SPROULE**.

tained within the clauses of the Bill. The jealous keeping of faith between the two sides of the House is indeed an important matter. I would like to say to my hon. friend who has moved the amendment, that if I vote against it I hope he will not think that I desire to do any discourtesy to him. I may say that if the archangel Gabriel had moved the amendment, I would have voted against it.

Mr. **MACLEAN**. If the First Minister will say to the House that he does not hold the Opposition responsible for the withdrawal of this Bill, then I will consent to his suggestion.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I just have this to say, that I made an arrangement with the leader of the Opposition that we would not proceed with these clauses in his absence, and I intend to keep that arrangement. I may say that these two clauses represent the policy of the Government, and they will be re-introduced next session.

Amendment negatived.

On the preamble,

Mr. **SPROULE**. I wish to refer to one clause we have passed, because a paper has been put in my hands, coming from the Mayor of Toronto, which I think should be considered by the committee. It is in reference to subsection two of section two, where it says:

Every person who willfully breaks down, injures, weakens or destroys any gate, fence, erection, building or structure of a company,—

A penalty shall be inflicted. Now, the solicitor for the city of Toronto says this ought to be amended by adding after the word "company" the words "lawfully erected by said company," because, as he says, there might be a trespass fence erected by the company, and there might be no authority to take it down, and any one touching it would be liable to the penalty in this clause.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The words of the section involve the doing of what would be an unlawful act.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Suppose they put up what is practically a trespass fence, and it has remained there for years? This leaves it open to any one, corporation or individual, who takes that fence away, to be liable to the penalty.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Not if they had a lawful right to remove it. If they had a lawful right to remove it, there can be no penalty. I think the hon. gentleman will find it is all right.

Mr. **WALLACE**. It is proposed to insert "lawfully erected by said company." I do not see why the Minister should object to that. If there is a matter in dispute be-

tween a corporation and a railway company, or between a railway company and an individual, the railway company might erect an inclosure which they had no right to erect. The Bill says now that if they erect a fence, it is a criminal act to take it down. There is a case in Toronto under way at the present time in respect to the Lansdowne Avenue crossing, as the Minister of Railways and Canals knows, that refers to this very question. I think the settlement of that question will depend upon the wording of the law.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I may say to the hon. gentleman that that section is the identical language of the law as it is now and as it has been on the statute-book for a long term of years. The only change is in regard to penalties, they are limited.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not disputing what the Minister tells us. But as time goes on we find that that law is unfair. At a recent investigation in the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, when I was present, the Minister's attention was called to the Lansdowne Avenue crossing in Toronto, where a fence had been erected. It was erected, perhaps, lawfully in the first place, but later on a road was put there and the city claim no fence should be put there. If a fence is lawfully erected I do not see why we should hold it sacred, or make it a criminal act to take it down.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The objection would be that you would put it in the power of anybody and everybody to tear down a fence and place the responsibility on the company of establishing that they had a lawful right to erect the fence where they had erected it.

Mr. WALLACE. In reference to the city of Toronto, or any other place, where the fence is on the roadway, it would be the corporation that would take action, and not any irresponsible person.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If you adopted that amendment it would not be an offence for any person who chose to come along to tear down a fence, or any other structure, unless the persons who owned the property could show that it was lawfully erected. You would give any person carte blanche to go around destroying property.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time and passed.

#### P. E. I. RAILWAY—BRANCH TO MURRAY HARBOUR.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 183) to authorize the Government of Canada to construct a branch line of railway from Charlottetown to Murray Har-

bour, in the province of Prince Edward Island, as a public work.—(Mr. Blair.)

(In the Committee.)

On clause 2,

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, before you pass that clause I would like to call the attention of the committee and especially of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to what, in my opinion, is a conflict between this Bill, in regard to the subsidy that is proposed to be contributed by the Government of Prince Edward Island for the bridge, and a Bill passed by the local legislature. This Bill proposes that the Government of Prince Edward Island shall pay annually without rebate \$12,000. A Bill was passed by the local legislature and assented to on the 5th of May, 1899, which contains this clause :

The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may enter into an agreement with the Government of Canada stipulating that should the Government of Canada build a bridge across the Hillsborough River, from a point in or near the city of Charlottetown to a point in or near Southport, and said bridge be so built as to be adapted and suitable not only for railway purposes, but also as a public highway bridge for vehicles and foot-passengers and for general traffic of all kinds,—

This is the point, now :

—the Government of Prince Edward Island will, on the completion to their satisfaction of such a bridge, pay annually to the Government of Canada towards the interest of the money required to build that part of said bridge which will be used for general traffic of all kinds other than for railway purposes, a sum not exceeding \$12,000.

In the Bill now before the committee this is the provision :

And before entering into any contract for the construction of such bridge the Government of Prince Edward Island shall undertake and agree to contribute the sum of \$12,000 a year.

There is no doubt in my mind that there is a conflict between those two clauses. The position is this. It was proposed years ago, and a Bill was introduced into the legislature for building a bridge across the Hillsborough River for traffic only. When the Government of Canada proposed to build a railway bridge it was thought that it would be a saving in the cost of construction if the Dominion and the local Governments should combine and build a bridge for railway and ordinary traffic purposes as well. The intention of the local government, as indicated in the Act I referred to was that they should contribute the share of the cost of the bridge on the basis of the additional costs—consequent on making it a bridge for foot-passengers and vehicular traffic; but under clause of this Bill they would be bound to pay \$12,000 a year absolutely without any reference to the cost of an ordinary traffic bridge. The Government of Prince Edward Island in my opinion intended only

to pay interest on the additional cost entailed by making the bridge a traffic as well as a railway bridge. That additional cost might not exceed \$250,000, and in that case \$12,000 a year would be too much to ask Prince Edward Island to pay. There is another phase of the matter which the committee might well take into consideration. Parliament has been voting, for some days past, large sums for bridges, and if this bridge for local traffic were undertaken by the province, the Dominion of Canada as has been done in other sections of Canada, would be likely asked—and it could not very well be refused—to contribute about 15 per cent. That would be a just claim to put forward by the province. In lieu of that, the Government should have the maintenance of the bridge, and I think the Bill might be amended so that instead of reading:

To contribute the sum of \$12,000,—

It would read as follows:—

To contribute a sum not exceeding \$12,000 for construction and maintenance.

That would, I think, bring the Bill into unison with the views of the local government. If the Bill is passed, in its present form, the local government may come forward, and say: We did not agree positively to pay \$12,000; we only agreed to pay interest on the amount of money that would be required to build the traffic part of the bridge. I think the maintenance of the bridge might be undertaken by the Government of Canada in lieu of the 15 per cent which the Government contribute to bridges in all parts of the country. If that was done and the tolls—if any were imposed—were given to the provincial Government, there might not be any great reason to complain. I have here a list of bridges, which have been subsidized in the last few years. In 1897 the subsidies were granted as follows:

To the Grand Trunk Railway Company, for the rebuilding and enlargement of Victoria Bridge at Montreal, 15 per cent of the amount expended thereon, not exceeding \$300,000.

The Great Northern Railway Company, towards the construction of a railway bridge over the Ottawa River, at Hawkesbury, 15 per cent upon the amount expended thereon, not exceeding \$52,400.

Then, they had a railway and traffic bridge over the Ottawa River at Nepean Point, between Ottawa and Hull, 15 per cent, not exceeding \$112,000, that was voted in 1897. Then, there was voted this year \$1,000,000 for the Quebec bridge, \$50,000 for the Yamaska bridge, \$35,000 for the Richelieu River bridge, \$50,000 for the St. Francis River bridge, \$15,000 for the Nicolet bridge, \$33,700 for the Shubenacadie bridge, \$16,425 for the St. Maurice River bridge, \$15,000 for the Rivière du Loup bridge, and \$15,000 for the Maskinonge bridge; total,

Mr. MARTIN.

\$1,235,125 this year, and total for two years to bridges \$1,692,625. I do not think I will be making a very heavy claim on the Minister if I ask him to insert on the 17th line, after the words:

Prince Edward Island shall undertake to contribute the sum of \$12,000.

I say I do not think I shall be asking too much of the Government if they will make this part of the section read as follows:—

Prince Edward Island shall agree to contribute a sum not exceeding \$12,000 per annum as its share of the cost of construction and maintenance of such bridge, which contribution shall be deducted half-yearly from the sums allowable and payable to the said province, &c.

I think the Government will agree with me that this proposal is only a fair one. The Bill of the local legislature reads in this way:

Shall pay annually to the Government of Canada towards the interest of the money required to build that part of said bridge which will be used for general traffic of all kinds other than for railway purposes.

The intention of the local government is not to aid the Federal Government to build any part of the railway bridge, but their contribution is for the general traffic part of it only. Even in that case, I think the province might fairly ask from the Dominion 15 per cent of a reduction, the same as the Dominion is granting to other bridges. But in lieu of that if the Government would insert in this Bill that this contribution from the province was for "both construction and maintenance," and add the other condition I have named, I think it would be fair both to the province and the Dominion at large. I am afraid that if you pass this Bill as it stands at present, you will find it impossible to make an arrangement with the local legislature, because they will contend that the Bill is in conflict with the Act that they themselves passed. Now is the time to remove all difficulties in the way of a friendly arrangement of this matter, and I hope the Government will do so.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). My hon. friend (Mr. Martin) has, no doubt, the very best intentions in the world, but he will see, on reflection, that there is no necessity for an amendment to the Bill. The local Act is a proposal which the Island Government made to this Government, and the limit of their liability they place in distinct terms not to exceed \$12,000. By the amended Bill of last session, it was agreed that the two governments would enter into an agreement before the contract was let, and this Bill of ours now simply proposes that the Minister of Railways may enter into an agreement with them for the construction of a bridge, they paying the sum of \$12,000 annually, which is equivalent to 3 per cent on \$400,000, and they may make

such further agreement for the regulation and control of the bridge and the highway traffic thereon as to the parties seem just and reasonable. That provision, I think, covers everything the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) wants. I would deprecate hampering the actions of the Government here with any provisions which might tend to prevent the scheme from coming into operation at all. As matters now stand and taking the Bill of the local legislature and this Bill together, I see every hope for an agreement being come to between the parties. The terms on which the \$12,000 a year is to be paid are a matter for agreement between the two governments, and I am in hopes that my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) may see his way clear to deal not only liberally but generously with the province when he comes to make the agreement. What the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) desires is to be found within the four corners of the Bill as it stands, and can be made part of the agreement when the parties come together. I have no doubt that when the Minister (Mr. Blair) comes to make the arrangement he will make it in a manner which will be thoroughly satisfactory.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the cost of the bridge?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The bridge was estimated to cost between \$800,000 and \$900,000. If we were to leave this question open in our legislation, to the extent to which it seems to have been left open in the Prince Edward Island Bill, there would be room for a very great deal of misunderstanding and trouble. My hon. colleague (Sir Louis Davies) is correct in stating that the Prince Edward Island Act is in the nature of a proposal to us, and we cannot accept it legislatively in any other way than we have done under this Bill. It is not capable of being determined with absolute or even approximate accuracy what the proportionate cost of a bridge which is both a railway and a highway bridge in respect of its highway and its railway portion. You have practically to have the same superstructure for the one as the other; it might possibly have to be a little stronger, if built for both purposes; but you cannot adjust the proportions between the two. We have said to the province of Prince Edward Island: Upon the basis of a cost of, say, \$800,000, you pay half and we will pay the other half. Their contribution is fixed and limited, but if the bridge costs more than \$800,000, we will have to take the whole burden of the extra cost, and give them a bridge with all necessary facilities for highway purposes. I do not think anything could be fairer than that, and that will settle the question. There will be no room for further dispute or controversy, as they are willing to pay that. Therefore, as my hon. friend has suggested, there is no reason

why we should not be able to come to a satisfactory agreement with the Government by the Bill.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the Government of Prince Edward Island allowed to charge tolls?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, that is the idea—that it shall be allowed, under proper regulations with the Department of Railways, to charge tolls. The bridge is a highway bridge.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) As I understand it, the legislature of Prince Edward Island has given power to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to make a certain agreement with the Government of Canada. It is clear that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council cannot make any other agreement with this Government than that which is authorized by the local legislature. The power is given and restricted by legislation. That is beyond question. If this Parliament chooses to authorize the Governor General in Council to make another proposition, then it is clear that the minds of the two Governments will not and cannot agree. It is also clear to my mind that there is no authorization on the part of the Government of Prince Edward Island to accept the proposition involved in this Bill. It is as if one man makes an offer to perform a contract. If the other does not accept the offer in the terms in which it is made, there is no contract or agreement; there is no consensus of minds. It seems to me that what we ought to do by our legislation, unless there is a material objection, is to accept the offer of the legislature of Prince Edward Island in the terms in which it is made, because if we do not do that, the result will be that no progress can be made until the Prince Edward Island legislature can meet again and accept your offer to them. Let us look at the offer of the Government of Prince Edward Island, and see what it is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman takes exception to the Bill before the committee?

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) What I am trying to point out is that the legislature of Prince Edward Island has made a certain specific offer for our acceptance.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And it has been practically accepted here.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) If I could see that, I would raise no objection; but I want to point out to my hon. friend that there is a divergence between the Bill now before the House and the Act of the legislature of Prince Edward Island.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In what respect?

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) In the first place, the proposition of the legislature of Prince Edward Island is to pay a fair contribution towards the interest on the cost of construction, not exceeding \$12,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The local government has power to do that, has it not?

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) The local government has the power to enter into an arrangement with the Government of Canada to pay a sum to be agreed on towards the interest on the cost of construction not exceeding \$12,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And may they not agree with the Government of Canada fixing \$400,000 as their share of the cost?

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) No; I do not see that there is any proposition of that kind involved in their offer or authorized by their legislation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How are you going to settle the cost?

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) That, I think, is not intended to be settled by legislation, but is intended to be left in the discretion and adjustment of the Government of Prince Edward Island and the Government of Canada.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does not the proposition of the Government of Prince Edward Island enable them to agree to pay a sum equal to \$12,000 a year towards the cost of the construction of that bridge?

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) No, that is not the way it is put.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is put as interest on the cost. What difference does it make how you phrase it? The amount they have to pay is so much per year; the amount we agree to accept is \$12,000 per year, and if we both agree to \$12,000, it is only splitting hairs about nothing—

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) I do not look on it as splitting hairs. The question is how much interest should the Government of Prince Edward Island pay towards the cost of construction? Interest is a matter which changes from year to year. The amount of interest payable now depends on what amount is agreed on as our fair share of the cost of construction, also on what is now considered as a fair rate of interest. I happen to know a little of the sentiment of the Government of Prince Edward Island, and they do not regard \$12,000 as the settled amount, but they say that is the limit beyond which they are not to pass.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The legislature have given them authority to go up to that amount.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) This Parliament is taking the discretion and the adjustment out of the hands of both Governments and making the payment of the \$12,000 absolute.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Let me ask the hon. gentleman, is there anything in their Bill or in this one which compels the Government of Prince Edward Island to agree to pay the \$12,000 unless they are so disposed? Cannot they refuse to go into the agreement altogether?

Mr. MARTIN. Would the Minister allow me to ask him a question? Can the Government of Canada accept less?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, we cannot accept less, because we know that it is impossible to fix the amount in any way except by agreement between the two governments, and we have made up our minds as to what would be a fair sum at which to estimate the value of that bridge for highway purposes, and we have fixed it at \$400,000. If the amount cannot be settled by us, it cannot be settled at all.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) May I ask the hon. gentleman this question: Is it understood now that the sum of \$400,000 is the portion which the Government of Prince Edward Island is to pay towards the cost of construction?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They may not know, perhaps, at this moment, or until advised by us, accurately what the cost of the bridge will be.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) That is the very point. I am advised that they have not agreed to pay one-half the cost.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Nobody said they did.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) \$400,000 represents the half, or about the half.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, it does not do anything of the kind.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) This debate has been evidently proceeding on that idea, but the Government of Prince Edward Island have certainly not agreed to pay half the cost. They only expect to pay the difference between the cost of a railway bridge and a highway bridge.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Nobody says they did, but they agreed some time ago to contribute \$10,000 a year, and they were told that that was not deemed sufficient. They asked what was sufficient, and they were told by this Government that what this Government deemed sufficient would be \$12,000. Then

they took power from the legislature to make the limit up to that sum. They did not bind themselves to give it, but took the power to give it. The hon. Minister of Railways said he could not go below that sum and the way this section is drafted, the Government of Prince Edward Island can agree to the \$12,000 and so can we. There is no dispute, and I do not know what the hon. gentleman is objecting to, except to the fixing of an arbitrary sum, and not leaving it open to agreement.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) That is the principal element of my objection. Of course, the Government of Prince Edward Island may accept the offer of this Parliament and pay the \$12,000 absolutely, but I do not consider that they have yet arrived at that conclusion. If the hon. Minister says that he cannot do better, I may as well drop further discussion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have given the subject the fullest possible consideration, and I do not see the possibility of reducing the amount below the \$12,000. The cost of the bridge, at the lowest estimate, will be more than \$800,000, and we have to face the fact that, under the existing conditions, the cost of the steel superstructure will exceed our estimate, by reason of the recent increase in the prices of steel and iron.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman says he cannot do better than \$12,000, I do not propose to argue the question further than to say that I think the Government of Canada is making a very hard bargain with the island, under the circumstances. I am bound to say that in view of the arguments used in a former debate, and which I do not now propose to repeat, Prince Edward Island would be entitled, as its proper share of moneys coming from the Dominion, to the total cost of the construction of that bridge, though the whole may cost \$1,400,000. The amount of money which the Dominion Government ought to pay to Prince Edward Island as its fair share, by reason of the excess of expenditure on canals and railways in other provinces, over and above the amount authorized and agreed upon at confederation, and by reason of what this Parliament has expended on local railways, is something over two millions of dollars. That \$1,400,000 would be only a payment on account, even though the Government of Canada were to build the whole of that bridge and railway, and fit up the bridge for highway purposes. If the Government has made up its mind that it cannot do better than \$12,000, it ought then to consider further the proposition that instead of \$12,000 being considered as contribution towards the construction of the bridge, it ought to be considered as the utmost limit we would be expected to pay, not only for its construction but for its maintenance and repair for the time to come.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Nobody has raised that difficulty and why should the hon. gentleman?

Mr. HAGGART. Before the clause is adopted, I would remind the hon. gentleman that the money which the Government of Prince Edward Island expends on the bridge it gets the full benefit of. The whole of the tolls collected are to be paid into the treasury of the island. The hon. gentleman has just raised a point which did not escape my attention. After giving all the tolls and virtually owning the bridge and getting the user of it, they pay nothing towards the maintenance. The Bill provides:

The Minister of Railways and Canals may enter into an agreement with the Government of Prince Edward Island providing that the bridge to be constructed over the Hillsborough River shall be so constructed as to be adapted and suitable as well for the purposes of a public highway as for the purposes of a railway; and before entering—

It makes no provision as to what the agreement with the Government of Prince Edward Island is.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is for a bridge to be constructed suitable for the purposes of a public highway and the railway.

Mr. HAGGART. The word used is "providing." It seems to me that that word is not the proper one to use, but that the word "undertaking" should be substituted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It means that we make provision for.

Mr. HAGGART. That is not the ordinary meaning.

Mr. FOSTER. Substitute "which shall provide."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You could not have a better form of phraseology.

Mr. HAGGART. It is a very uncertain phraseology.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time and passed.

#### RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 190) to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

Mr. CLANCY. This Bill is only printed in the one language.

The PRIME MINISTER. I hope my hon. friend will not insist on his objection.

Mr. CLANCY. I may be permitted at this stage to say this. It is a very important measure, and we should not undertake its

discussion before it is printed in both languages.

The PRIME MINISTER. I hope my hon. friend will not make that objection. If we want to finish the business, surely he ought not to insist on this point. I do not think it would assist him very much if he read it in another language.

Mr. CLANCY. The right hon. gentleman is not holding out much encouragement. There are some clauses that are so vexatious that I thought it my duty to assert the rights of those I represent by at least compelling the Government to follow the proper procedure. I think that the right hon. gentleman, as a matter of right to me, in a certain matter that I have not the right to discuss just now, is prepared to consider the matter. I shall understand by his acquiescence that he will concede what I am sure is only fair and I shall have no objection to the Bill going on.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) is within his right in pressing any objection to the Bill, but surely he will not take advantage of any views which he may have and which he may want to press upon the Government to have the discussion of the Bill stopped for the time. Let us proceed with this Bill and we shall be happy to give to the views of my hon. friend every consideration. But the point raised is a point of order, and the question is whether we shall proceed with the Bill or not. I submit that we ought not at this moment to delay the Bill upon a mere question of procedure.

Mr. CLANCY. I am going now to cast myself on the generosity and fairness of my right hon. friend and help him with the Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am much obliged to my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy).

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself in committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CLANCY. There are many clauses of this Bill that seem to be fairly open to criticism upon the ground of their relation to other clauses, though on the general grounds there might be no objection to them. I am going to state my position on the matter to save time. I probably should be out of order in discussing any clause of this Bill until we reach it, but I may refer to section 49 for the purpose of discussing the general provisions of the Bill. I do not want to leave that discussion until we have passed over every clause that might directly or indirectly be affected by it. So, as we reach these clauses, I propose taking up each of them to show their effect in relation to clause 49.

Mr. CLANCY.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That will come up on the second section of the Bill.

Mr. CLANCY. It arises under several sections, as my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) will see, and I propose discussing it on each to save time.

Mr. MACLEAN. I wish to direct attention to certain statements of the Prime Minister when speaking of this Bill. He laid down his position as follows, speaking of certain members of the House :

They want the Government to build this railway. This is a new policy—that the Government should go into the building and ownership of railways. So far as I am concerned, I have only this to say—I am not in favour of the Government building and owning railways. We have one railway, and that is enough at the present time.

And the Minister of Railways and Canals, later on, speaking on the same question, said :

I understood the hon. gentleman to say that it was a plank in the platform of the Conservative party in Manitoba that the Government should own all the railways. Well, that is a stupendous question, a question of enormous magnitude. It is a question which makes a man dizzy, when he thinks about it. I am sure that my hon. friend for East York has not thought about it.

So we have two members of the Government laying it down as the position of their party that they do not believe in national railways, and we have had enough of them—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) is not quoting me ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I say two prominent members of the Government. We have the leader of the Government, at any rate, saying that we have gone far enough in the construction of national railways—

The PRIME MINISTER. At the present time.

Mr. MACLEAN. And this notwithstanding that one of the Bills before the House provides for an expenditure of a million and a half for the extension of the present national railway. I am in favour of Government railways. I do not take the position that we ought to nationalize all the railways now, but I say that the only way to relieve the country in relation to the question of transportation is to have confidence in our national system of railways, and to extend it. My contention all along has been, not to nationalize all our railways, nor, I believe, is the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) in favour of that course, but we are in favour of extending the present national railway so as to afford a means of regulating all the other railways of the country. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals told the House that we

had only begun an era of railway building in this country, that we would require a very large mileage and that we might require two or three transcontinental lines. I believe that. But we ought to have a national line, one controlled by the Government of this country. As for the Intercolonial Railway, I am not one who is ashamed of that railway; I am not here as an apologist for it. It is the best work in the way of railways ever done in this country. The Conservative party have it to their credit that they started it, and hon. gentlemen opposite ought to take credit to themselves for having improved it; and this House and this country ought to be disposed to extend it, to carry it through to the west, and, by that means to take the most effective way to regulate the other great railways of the country. I think I speak for a large section of the people of this country when I say they are not ashamed of the national railway, but that they believe in extending it; and, when we are voting large sums of money for railways, some portion of that money should be spent in such a way that it will allow an extension of the Government system of railways. That is a reasonable position, and one that is growing in favour in this country. So far as I am concerned, I take the opportunity of reaffirming the idea and declaring that I do not go with the Prime Minister, who was ashamed that we had a national railway and does not propose to extend it, or with the Minister of Railways and Canals, who regards those who are in favour of extending it as visionary.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to one point. In the resolution that I moved as an amendment to one clause the other evening, the following new clause occurred:

That the rates, both passenger and freight, shall at all times be subject to revision and control by the Governor General in Council, provided that whenever such rates produce a net earning of more than 6 per cent on the actual cost of the road and equipment, less the amount of subsidies received from any source, the rates shall be reduced to such point as shall only produce 6 per cent on such net cost.

The Minister objected that 6 per cent was too low, and that such a rate would not be fair to the company. I am not wedded particularly to 6 per cent; any reasonable rate would do me. The point I want to bring out is that the rates on the road should be based not on the enhanced cost or any cost that might be reported, but on the actual cost to the promoters, less all public subsidies which are granted; and if the hon. Minister would say that in exercising control of rates which he may be called upon to exercise, he would see to it that the rates are based on the cost of the road, less the subsidies. I am

sure it would be a great satisfaction to the people of the west and it would be to me. I did not move that as a motion; I merely read it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think, so far as I had any power to express an opinion on the subject, I expressed it the other evening, and it was to the effect—not as reported, but just the reverse—that I thought, in making an estimate, whoever might have to deal with the question of fixing rates hereafter in respect to any of these roads, was entitled to deduct from the actual cost the amount which had been contributed in the way of subsidies by the Government; and I would still adhere to that view.

Mr. SPROULE. That was in striking the freight rate.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, considering whether the rate proposed by the company would be a reasonable rate. Having the information before them as to what the road cost, as to what its earnings were, they would be entitled to take into account only the cost of the railway outside the subsidy.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not wish to detain the House at any length, but I must again put myself on record and enter my protest against the whole of the subsidies in this Bill. The Government propose to vote away not less than \$6,500,000 for the promotion of railways. Now, there are two considerations with reference to this amount. The first is, that in nearly every case, if the road expends \$15,000 or \$21,400 per mile, it will be entitled not only to \$3,200, but to double that amount, \$6,400, per mile. We asked the Minister of Railways and Canals how he would ascertain that, and he said they would inspect it; they would look at the books, and send their engineer. These were the two ways in which he would ascertain that expenditure. But, Mr. Chairman, has not our knowledge of railway matters taught us that the Government, so far as inspecting books is concerned, will be totally at a loss? The railway company makes a contract; they may make a contract with their own friends at any figure they please. The road may cost \$21,000, \$22,000, \$24,000 per mile, including the cost of bridges up to \$25,000 per bridge. In that way they can show that the road has cost more than \$21,400, and that, therefore, they are entitled to the Government subsidy. Well, then, the Government say: We can go on, and send our inspectors. I would like to know machinery the Government has effectively to do this work? They sent their inspector down to investigate the Drummond County Railway, and, as a matter of fact, he never got below Montreal; he never inspected the road. The facilities for inspecting and valuing a road after it is built are of the most unsatisfactory description. So, here we are voting \$6,500,000

on the supposition, in many cases, that the subsidy is \$3,200 per mile. In the case of the Rainy River road and some others, there are \$6,400 voted; if we add, as a rough estimate, 50 per cent to the \$6,500,000, we have \$10,000,000 voted away at this session of Parliament. But there is a further consideration. We are giving a subsidy for 40, 50, 80 or 100 miles of road that is the beginning of a railroad. So that, when they are building the next 50 miles, or the next 100 miles, the Government give them a similar subsidy for a further extension and completion of that road, no matter if it is three or four times the amount we are voting here to-day. So that, in voting this \$6,500,000 directly, we may be voting \$10,000,000 by the increased subsidies we will have to pay, and so, we will be committing the country to the payment of further sums of an unlimited amount for the future. I think that kind of legislation is all wrong. We are going into railroad building throughout the country. In many cases they build parallel lines, for instance, between Montreal and Quebec. In order to give the North Shore line, or the Canadian Pacific Railway, greater facilities, we are building a bridge across the St. Lawrence near the city of Quebec, and we are giving the Canadian Pacific Railway greater facilities to do business on the North Shore. The Grand Trunk Railway is connecting these two cities, and there is the Drummond County Railway, in which we have invested \$7,000,000 in order to have a third road. To-day we are voting large subsidies to the South Shore Railway and to a bridge on that railway, so as to make a fourth line between these two cities. Of course, they say, it is not only the trade between the two cities that you have, but you have the local traffic as well. In the Drummond County Railway that local traffic will amount to very little indeed. The South Shore road is the one that has the most to recommend it on account of local traffic, because it goes through a settled, and populous, and, I am told, a wealthy and prosperous community. So, we have these four lines of railroad. In the case of the Grand Trunk Railway, that is an old road, and the Government has assisted it in the past. In the construction of the others Canada has poured out its money liberally. Now, time and again the attention of the House has been called to the fact that these are parallel lines, and you are now subsidizing other parallel lines. In the case of the Lake Erie road, and of numerous others that we will come to, the Government are subsidizing parallel lines; they are subsidizing railroads in the most populous and wealthy portions of the various provinces, where they have very ample railroad facilities. They say: Here is a village which is seven miles from a railroad; that is a thing that cannot be tolerated, and we must vote them a subsidy to build a road in there. You cannot hope to reach within five miles

Mr. WALLACE.

of every man's farm in the country with a railway. In the province of Ontario there is a perfect network of railways to-day, and the same can be said of portions of Quebec. I have been told, and it seems to me an extraordinary thing, that railways have been built in the province of Quebec with public moneys which are not now in operation. The hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Meigs) gave one case the other day. I am told that there are railways in New Brunswick that do not run more than one or two trains a week. This shows that we have gone beyond the necessities of the country in many places in railway building. There are places and enterprises that are deserving of public consideration, but these are exceptional ones, and they should be treated exceptionally. I object to the policy of the Government as announced by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and in this practical way by the resolutions now before the House, because I think we are going beyond our length. We are going beyond the necessities or the requirements; we are going beyond what we are called upon to do, and I think that we might fairly profit by the experience of our neighbours to the south in this regard, because I am told that they do not now bonus railways. They have ceased bonusing railways, which in that country, are treated as commercial enterprises to be considered on their merits as such, just as we should treat them here. Men will put their money into them with a reasonable prospect of return. Canada has done a great deal of railway building in the past, and the Conservative party are responsible for a large amount of it. It was recognized, I think, by both parties, at any rate it was recognized by the Conservative party that the railway was necessary for the maintenance of our Dominion and for the consolidation and binding together of the different provinces. We have built a railway through the inhospitable regions north of Lake Superior, through what were considered at that time the inhospitable plains of the North-west Territories and through the mountains of British Columbia. Canadians recognized the necessity of building this great railway notwithstanding all the difficulties that had to be encountered, notwithstanding the violent opposition of the Liberal party at every step, from the inception to the completion of the undertaking, and who predicted all sorts of disasters and failures, which predictions have been falsified by the event. Notwithstanding all these things, the Conservative party, believing that great enterprise to be necessary to the integrity of the Dominion, to its consolidation and prosperity, believing it to be necessary to open up that great country, never flinched in their duty to their country, in the face of all the predictions of failure made by the Liberal party, all of which predictions were falsified by the events. The course taken by the Conservative party has

been amply justified by the event, by the success which has crowned the efforts of that party and by the great prosperity which the country has enjoyed in consequence of their patriotism and courage in going on with the construction of this great road. But now we have entered upon a new era ; we have entered upon a period when the Government should treat these matters as commercial enterprises and should not be enticing men into the building of railways by the enormous bonuses given by the Dominion of Canada, by the local legislatures, and in some cases, by the municipalities as well. In the case of the Rainy River Railway, I think, the bonus which is proposed, is wholly unjustifiable. We are told that \$4,000 a mile has been given by the province of Ontario for that portion of the road within the boundary of Ontario ; we have \$6,400 a mile given by this Government, which makes \$10,400 a mile as the contribution of the Government of Ontario and the Government of the Dominion. For that portion of the road which is in Manitoba, and which is called, I think, the South-eastern Railway, they have a still larger subsidy. They have a land subsidy and they have a money subsidy from this Government of \$6,400 a mile and from the local government a subsidy, both in land and money, I am told, more than is sufficient to build the road. Then they have bonding powers. With such splendid subsidies they can go to the money market and they will have no difficulty in raising a large amount of money on their bonds so that the road will be constructed without costing a dollar to themselves. Moreover, in this case, there is no proper Government control. If it is necessary for the Government to build the railway the Government should own it because the only justification for building it would be that it would be an entrance to the whole of the North-west, and it is a matter of vital importance that the Government should have control of one of the entrances at least. But they have not kept control of the road. The Rainy River Railway Company may be the Canadian Pacific Railway, or they may be hostile to the Canadian Pacific Railway. We do not know, and we do not care, but we do know that the Government have no control. It is said that the Government have power to fix the rates. The Government have that power with all the railways of Canada to-day, except the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I would like to ask this Government, or the last Government when they have exercised that power in order to regulate rates. Any railway company in this country can come to Ottawa and make out a plausible case to the Government. The Government apparently have yielded to all their representations, because we never knew of a Government, at any time, having said to a railway company : Your rates are too high ; you are charging the people too much for the ser-

vice you are performing, and, therefore, these rates must be reduced. Demands have been made for many years, but without result. I remember the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy, twelve or fourteen years ago, introduced a Bill providing for the appointment of a commission that would regulate rates, and settle disputes. The object was that that commission should control and regulate rates so that every portion of the community would be treated on fair and equitable terms. That Bill was defeated. I remember that at that time the railway companies filled this Chamber with representatives from every part of this Dominion to oppose Dalton McCarthy's Bill for a railway commission.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Was there a vote upon it ?

Mr. WALLACE. I think there was.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was under the impression that there was not.

Mr. WALLACE. There was a vote in some place ; I do not remember whether it was in this House or the Railway Committee. I voted in favour of the commission, because I was strongly in favour of it then as I am to-day.

The PRIME MINISTER. More to-day than then.

Mr. WALLACE. No, not any more. I had no reason to be less in favour of it then than I am in favour of it to-day. We have this expenditure of six and a half million dollars and a further liability immediately before us of 50 per cent more, amounting in all to \$10,000,000. In addition, there is the contingent liability which this Government have lightly assumed, to vote further bonuses for the extension of these roads, and that liability is almost unlimited. These considerations compel me to put my opposition on record in the most positive manner. This bonusing legislation is inimicable to the best interests of the country, it is creating railways where the circumstances do not justify them, and it then places them beyond our control. We have voted the Rainy River people altogether \$1,700,000. We are practically giving sufficient subsidies to some companies to build the roads without costing them a cent. This Government is squandering the resources of the people and running the country unnecessarily into debt. They are violating every pledge they made to the people. At a time when the giving of subsidies was justifiable they opposed subsidies, and now when the time for subsidizing railways has passed, they are increasing subsidies to an unprecedented extent. I say that the Government are proposing a course ruinous to the country. They justify themselves by saying the country is prosperous, but I can tell them, and every one who has studied the subject knows it, that the pre-

sent prosperity of Canada arises from the well-considered policy of the Conservative party in the past, and the courageous carrying out of that policy in spite of gentlemen opposite. I enter my emphatic protest against this measure.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) came into this House about the same time that I did.

Mr. WALLACE. Excuse me. I was here four years before you, and it is just as well to state that in order that you may be accurate.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, during the time that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) has sat in this House supporting the Conservative Government, he voted bonuses to railways to the amount of \$42,145.76. That was in four Parliaments, or a little over \$10,000,000 a Parliament. Out of that sum there were \$41,890,887 paid. There never was a railway bonus scheme brought into Parliament that my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) did not enthusiastically vote for. Now he is finding fault with anything and everything.

Mr. HENDERSON. You are just the reverse. You found fault with everything when in Opposition, and now you swallow everything.

Mr. HAGGART. Let me correct the figures given by the hon. member (Mr. McMullen). The Subsidy Act came into force in 1882, and we administered it until our exit in 1896. The amount paid on subsidies up to that time was about \$15,000,000, or a little more than \$1,000,000 a year. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) is altogether wrong. I have the Public Accounts here to prove that I am correct.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) spoke of the subsidies voted.

Mr. HAGGART. He said subsidies paid, and anyway there was not anything like that amount voted.

Mr. McMULLEN. I took my figures from the Public Accounts, and I had them checked by an accountaant, so as to be sure they were correct. I repeat that the entire amount voted towards the construction of railways from the inception of the bonus system down to the close of 1897, for which the Conservatives are responsible, was \$42,945,176, and the amount paid was \$41,890,887.

Mr. HAGGART. That includes the Canadian Pacific Railway as the hon. gentleman knows.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, what does that matter?

Mr. HAGGART. It matters a great deal. I now read from the Public Accounts the

Mr. WALLACE.

sums paid for subsidies to railways, and they are as follows:—

1884	.....	\$ 208,000
1885	.....	403,245
1886	.....	2,701,249
1887	.....	1,406,533
1888	.....	1,027,041
1889	.....	846,721
1890	.....	1,678,195
1891	.....	1,255,705
1892	.....	1,248,000
1893	.....	811,000
1894	.....	1,229,000
1895	.....	1,310,000

In the year 1896, the sum voted was \$3,228,745, but before that date they averaged about \$1,000,000 for about fourteen years. The Minister of Finance transferred the amount of the expenditure from 1885, which was paid towards the Canadian Pacific Railway branches in Quebec, and he altered the accounts and he added it to those of 1896, namely, \$2,039,000.

Mr. MACLEAN. How much are you spending this year?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is not the point.

Mr. MACLEAN. It is the point. You are spending six and a half millions under this Bill, and one and a half under a previous Bill, which makes \$8,000,000.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) read out \$208,000 in 1884, and \$403,000 in 1885. That was a heavy year, when there were voted between eight and nine million dollars.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman must know that I disputed that with the leader of the Government. The leader of the Government said that \$9,500,000 was voted in 1884. I denied that it was for subsidies. I might have brought the Public Accounts to prove that, and to prove that the only amount expended was \$404,000. Then, the Finance Minister, when he comes into power in 1896, says that the amounts charged for subsidies in the Public Accounts were wrong—that there was \$2,000,000 more paid in 1884 than the Public Accounts show, and he adds the amount to the Public Accounts of 1896.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What difference does it make in the total, whether it is brought out in one year or in another?

Mr. HAGGART. I will tell you why—because I deny that the amount expended in 1884-85 was for subsidies at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But does not the hon. gentleman acknowledge that, in the Act of Parliament which granted the amounts, they were distinctly declared to be subsidies?

Mr. HAGGART. And does not the Minister of Railways know that the two last

items we had to acknowledge were not subsidies, but additions to the Intercolonial Railway, although the Act of Parliament called them subsidies ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Nothing of the kind. The two last items were declared to be subsidies under the Act.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Why quarrel about the word "subsidies" ? The Act of 1884 provided for aid to railways to the amount of \$9,500,000.

Mr. **HAGGART**. The Minister of Railways argues that because the Act was to authorize certain subsidies and grants for the respective lines of railway therein mentioned, therefore the whole of the money voted was for subsidies ; but, when he came to the grant for the branch of the Intercolonial Railway from Metapedia to Paspebiac, and the branch from Derby Station to Indian Town, although they were classified the same as the preceding clauses, the hon. gentleman had to admit that they were not subsidies.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. The hon. gentleman knows that they were subsidies. Those railways were not built as parts of the Intercolonial, but by companies.

Mr. **RICHARDSON**. I do not think this discussion would be complete without adding that, in addition to the enormous bonuses in cash given by the late Government towards the construction of railways, they gave 40,000,000 acres of land, the value of which, if put at \$3 an acre, would amount to \$120,000,000.

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

### After Recess.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. **WALLACE**. We are not through with clause 2.

Mr. **DEPUTY SPEAKER**. Clause 2 is carried.

Mr. **CLANCY**. It is hardly fair to rush this like a house afire. This is an important Bill. Clause 2, as it is printed in the Bill, includes all the subsections down to No. 51.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I presume the hon. gentleman would not desire all these clauses to be read. They are precisely the same as those that were dealt with by the committee. If there are any matters in the clause to which the hon. gentleman wishes to draw attention—

Mr. **CLANCY**. That is the reason. Clause 2 contains all the important items.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Take them up item by item.

Mr. **WALLACE**. Do I understand that the 52 are in the one clause ?

Mr. **DEPUTY SPEAKER**. Yes, they are in the one clause, and the discussion is on the clause.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Technically, the Chairman is correct ; but we always take these by the items. That is much more convenient, and it will not cause any loss of time.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. There is only the one motion for the whole clause ; but, if any gentleman wishes to call attention to anything in the clause, there would be no objection to have any discussion he desires.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I hope my hon. friend will make no objection to taking them up item by item.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It would take a great deal of unnecessary time.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The easier and quicker way to get through is to take them item by item.

To the Central Ontario Railway Company, for an extension of their railway from, or from near, either Coe Hill or Rathbun Station on the company's railway to or near to Bancroft, not exceeding 21 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chap. 2 of 1892.

Mr. **WALLACE**. What was the subsidy by chapter 2 of 1892 ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I will have to send for the statutes of 1892. I presumed the discussion would be on the general principle, and not on the details, as these were all discussed in the committee the other day. Consequently, I have not my papers or memoranda here.

Mr. **CLANCY**. The hon. Minister knew perfectly well that the discussion was not going through, and now he pretends he has not got his papers.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman quite misapprehends me. I was not referring to the discussion which took place to-day, but to the discussion in committee the other day, and I did not anticipate that we were going over the same particulars that we went through the other night.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Better let the item stand until the hon. Minister gets his papers.

To the Great Northern Railway Company, for a railway between Montcalm and St. Tite Junction, on the Lower Laurentian Railway, Que., not exceeding 53½ miles ; and for a branch from their main line to Shawenegan Falls, Que., not exceeding 6½ miles.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this the company which is to amalgamate with the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway?

The PRIME MINISTER. This is a continuation of the Canada Atlantic.

Mr. BERGERON. Where?

The PRIME MINISTER. It connects with the Canada Atlantic Railway at Hawkesbury, where there is to be a bridge over the River Ottawa. This continues to St. Jerome, Montcalm, St. Tite and the Lake St. John Railway, and it has the right of way over that railway to the harbour of Quebec.

Mr. BERGERON. It is a part of the same concern as is known as the Great Northern.

The PRIME MINISTER. That may be.

Mr. BERGERON. Now, let me ask, as a matter of information, that is a line of which the hon. gentleman spoke, I imagine, when he spoke of the projected elevator to be built in Quebec?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

To the Strathroy and Western Counties Railway, for a line from Strathroy, Ont., via Adelaide and Arkona, to either Forest, Tedford or Park Hill, not exceeding 24 miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by 57-58 Victoria, chap. 4. (Partly revote.)

Mr. FOSTER. Why is that not granted to one railway company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It may be proper to do so, but this is a subsidy merely to the railway.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but you are granting it to an entity of some kind.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It may be so taken, but it does not necessarily follow, though the Strathroy and Western Railway Company is the one to which it would go.

Mr. WALLACE. I object to the phrase, "in lieu of subsidy granted by 57-58 Vic., chap. 4," in this grant. The subsidy granted in 1894 was from St. Thomas, not from Strathroy. This cannot take the place of that subsidy.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, it takes the place of it.

Mr. WALLACE. If I get a charter from Ottawa and afterwards wish to build from Toronto to Kingston, it could hardly be said that my railway was "in lieu of the one first projected."

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The original subsidy was to Forest Station or to Parkhill, 25 miles. This is 24 miles, and, while the original was from St. Thomas, this is from Strathroy to the same point—so it is in lieu of it. There

Mr. FOSTER.

is nothing incorrect in stating that. I would move to insert the word "company."

Amendment agreed to.

To the St. John Valley and Rivière du Loup Railway Company, for a line of railway from Fredericton, in the county of York, N.B., to Woodstock, in the county of Carleton, not exceeding 59 miles. (Revote.)

Mr. FOSTER. What are the prospects of this road being gone on with? This is an old subsidy and revote. Is there any greater prospect of it being built now than there was eight years ago?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is represented that there is a good prospect of it being built. I believe that there are some New York capitalists now connected with the company who, I understand, are going to take the matter up. Of course, I cannot give the House any positive assurance that the road will be built.

For a railway from Port Hawkesbury, on the Strait of Canso, N.S., to St. Peter's, not exceeding 30 miles. (Revote.)

Mr. BERGERON. There is no company's name mentioned in this case.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, this is just for the line.

Mr. BERGERON. So that subsidy may be granted to any company which will build the road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, on the Government being satisfied that the company would carry out the work, a contract would be made.

Mr. BERGERON. Has any charter been granted?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think there are two.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I believe there is some question as to the parties who hold the charter. Two or three separate people are professing to have the authority to build the road.

Mr. FOSTER. Under Dominion charters?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I think, provincial.

For a railway from Windsor, N.S., to Truro, via township of Clifton, not exceeding 58 miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by 57-58 Victoria, chap. 4. (Revote.)

Mr. FOSTER. Is not this being built?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. By what company?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Midland.

Mr. FOSTER. Why not make it so in the Bill?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. There is no question that it means the Midland Company.

Mr. **FOSTER**. It is under contract with them?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes.

For a railway from the village of St. Rémi to Stottsville or some point on the Delaware and Hudson Railway (Grand Trunk) in the parish of St. Paul de l'Isle aux Noix, not exceeding 19 miles, of which 12 miles is a revote.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Has there ever been any work done upon this piece of road? I think this charter was granted many years ago. What is the present condition of the work, and what is hoped to be gained by this subsidy?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. There has been a grant made for a railway from St. Rémi to Napierville. Ten miles of the road has been graded; but, ending at Napierville, the railway ends nowhere, there is no connection with any other railway. The object now is to extend the railway from Napierville to Stottsville.

Mr. **BERGERON**. What distance?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. About eight miles. The road will be twenty miles.

Mr. **BERGERON**. This subsidy, if I understand aright, will cover the whole line, the part that is already graded and that which is to be finished?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Yes.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Then this line will be between that point on the Delaware and Hudson and St. Rémi.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. That point will be between the Grand Trunk Railway at St. Rémi and the Delaware and Hudson at Stottsville.

To the United Counties Railway Company, for a railway from St. Robert Junction to Sorel, 6½ miles, and from Mount Johnson to St. Grégoire Station, 1 mile, not exceeding 7½ miles. (Revote.)

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. When this vote was in the committee the other day we added to it the following amendment:—

This subsidy to be payable only in the event of running rights over the South-eastern Railway between the two points above mentioned not being granted to the first mentioned company on terms to be approved by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

This amendment was added because it was suggested that we were subsidizing a line parallel to an existing railway some few miles away. It was suggested that this might be added so that if running rights could be acquired from the other road to answer the purpose, the subsidy would not be paid.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Has the South-eastern Railway been subsidized by the Government of Canada?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. No, the South-eastern Railway was built between 1871 and 1875. It received no subsidy from the Dominion of Canada, but it was subsidized by the provincial government.

Mr. **CLANCY**. It occurred to me that the right hon. gentleman, in making this amendment, was attempting to make a parallel case in order to sidetrack the case of the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway. The hon. gentleman made a declaration then that that was not his purpose. But if we are to be guided by the trend of the debate, his purpose appears to be that wherever the Government of Canada or the provincial government have subsidized lines of railway, in such cases it is not the policy of this Government to subsidize parallel lines. Is that the purpose of the hon. gentleman?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I will explain to the hon. gentleman our motive in accepting this amendment.

Mr. **CLANCY**. The hon. gentleman will permit to refer to another case for the purpose of elucidating this. I think it was the South Shore road. This is what was said in the debate:

Mr. **BERGERON**. I am not opposing this, but I want the thing to be understood. We will have, for a distance of about 30 miles, five or six railways running in nearly the same direction.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. There will only be three parallel lines.

Mr. **BERGERON**. The Drummond County, the Grand Trunk Railway, the South Shore, the Atlantic and Lake Superior—

The **PRIME MINISTER**. The Atlantic and Lake Superior will never be built in that direction, because it will never have a subsidy. My hon. friend does not suppose that this Parliament is going to subsidize two parallel lines.

Now, I want to ask the right hon. gentleman if the policy of the Government is in no case to subsidize a parallel line, or if the policy of the Government is not to subsidize parallel lines where they have already received aid from either the Dominion or the provincial governments. There are two distinct cases, and I am anxious to know what is the guiding policy of the Government in these two cases.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I have no objection to explain to the hon. gentleman that in so far as the railway to which he especially alludes, personally I agree with him. But I must explain that in regard to the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway and the South Shore Railway, there is no parallel at all with the case he has in his own mind, neither is there any parallel with the South-eastern Railway and the United Counties Railway. In the case of the Atlantic and Lake Superior and South Shore Railways, the Parliament of Canada has granted two

charters to two different companies to cover exactly the same ground. If these two railways were to be constructed, there would not be, perhaps, ten yards of distance between them at certain places. It is the policy of the Government so far as these two railways are concerned, to give the subsidy to the South Shore and not to the Atlantic and Lake Superior.

Mr. CLANCY. What about the Drummond County Railway?

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, the Drummond County Railway is some 20 miles distant.

Mr. CLANCY. That is a parallel line.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, it is not a parallel line: it does not cover the same ground at all. The South Shore Railway covers one set of parishes and the Drummond County Railway covers another set of parishes. The South Shore would cover the parishes situated on the main shore of the St. Lawrence, that is, the parishes of Sorel, St. François du Lac, Pierreville, St. Zéphirin, La Bale du Febvre, Nicolet, St. Grégoire, and Becancour. All these parishes are on the St. Lawrence. The parishes which are to be served by the Drummond County Railway are Gentilly, St. Pierre les Becquets, St. Jean des Chaillons and Lotbinière. There is no connection between the two sets of parishes. The people could not take their produce from one place to another place, because there is no connection between those two sets of parishes. Now I come to the other two railways. At the present time, the United Counties Railway enters the town of Sorel over seven miles or thereabouts of South-eastern Railway. At present they have no line for seven miles to the south of Sorel. We say that there is no necessity then for another railway, there is no demand for it. But it appears that the United Counties Railway have some difficulty, they fear they will not be able to keep the right of way over the United Counties Railway. When we were discussing these subsidies the first night, the member for York asked: What is the objection to building a second road over this seven miles? I must say to the hon. gentleman that if the United Counties were to build a railway to enter the town of Sorel, not only would it be parallel to the South-eastern, but probably there would not be one mile distance between the two. There is no occasion for it at all. We have told the company that we shall give the subsidy only in case they cannot retain their present right of way over the South-eastern. But if it is possible to retain that right of way, as they give us to understand, there will be no necessity whatever for duplicating that railway. Now I come to the case the hon. member refers to, that of the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway. From Ridgeway up to St. Thomas all the local-

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

ties to be served by this railway have given bonuses for its construction. They passed by-laws and voted money. That is altogether putting a new complexion on it, and, so far as I am concerned, I think it is a good reason for subsidizing a railway of this kind.

Mr. CLANCY. I am glad to hear the right hon. gentleman make it clear that he has not made this a parallel case. It is only a small line, six miles long, and it is perfectly satisfactory, as it has no relation to the railway I have in my mind.

Mr. FOSTER. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council has power to give running rights, on application.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, if the road has received a subsidy from the Government of Canada, but I think not, if it has not received a subsidy.

Mr. FOSTER. Is not this a road for the general advantage of Canada?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think the general clause which applies to all railways intersecting the Canadian Pacific Railway or Grand Trunk Railway, would apply.

Mr. BERGERON. I think that the South-Eastern was operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway for a while.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is much doubt whether the general clause classifies railways as being for the general advantage of Canada simply because they intersect either the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific. They have to be specifically mentioned.

Mr. FOSTER. Not specifically mentioned, surely.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Specifically mentioned. I think the decision the courts arrived at was, that the general clause did not have the effect and operation which has been contended for, and as it had been adjudged by some of the courts of the provinces. The opinion was expressed in a case by the judges of the Supreme Court to that effect. This statement of the law by the Supreme Court will bind the provincial courts, and it will be held, I believe, as correct that the general clause is not operative to the extent which has been supposed.

Mr. FOSTER. I asked that, because this provision seems to leave the whole thing entirely to the South-eastern Railway. My view was, that, on application of the United Counties Railway Company to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council for running rights, those running rights could be given absolutely by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council on such terms as they thought reasonable and fit.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think so, in the case of a railway that has not received a subsidy from the Government of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not know that that was a condition precedent to all these railways being considered to be for the general advantage of Canada, and I think it is not so under the general law. However, the right hon. Prime Minister is looking it up, and we will go to the next item in the meantime.

For a railway from a point on the Central Railway in the county of Lunenburg, N.S., to the town of Liverpool via the village of Caledonia, or to the village of Caledonia, via Liverpool, or for any part thereof, the whole distance not exceeding 62 miles. (Revote.)

Mr. MILLS. Is this subsidy for a road that is building now?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I apprehend that if there is a company incorporated to build in that direction, they will be likely to receive the subsidy mentioned in this Bill.

Mr. MILLS. The reason why I ask is, that there are alternative routes provided for:

For a railway from a point on the Central Railway in the county of Lunenburg, N.S., to Liverpool via the village of Caledonia—

I suppose that means Caledonia Corners?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (reading):

—or to the village of Caledonia via Liverpool, or for any part thereof, the whole distance not exceeding 62 miles.

Is it not a fact that a road has been surveyed and is in the process of construction there now? As the hon. Minister of Finance is here, and as he is particularly interested in that portion of the country, I would like to call his attention to the fact that my information, in reference to the wishes of the people of Liverpool and Caledonia, is, that they desire a railway from Liverpool to Annapolis, and that the alternative route rather has a tendency to leave Caledonia, which is my hon. friend's constituency, out in the cold. I may just here say that, since this Government came into power, the country between Caledonia and Annapolis has been sadly neglected in the way of communication with the outside world. It is a fact that for nearly half a century they have had a daily stage-coach, at least, from Annapolis to Liverpool, and it is a fact, further, that if one desires to send a letter now from Annapolis to Maitland, in the southern portion of Annapolis County, it has to go via Middleton, down to Chesley's Corners by the Central Road, cross over to Caledonia, and thence up to Maitland, leaving a portion of about 13 miles, between Maitland and Milford, which has no communication whatever. I want to call the attention of the

Government, and of the hon. Minister of Finance particularly, to this condition of affairs, and to let them know that the people think they have been very badly used in that respect. But if the Government sees fit to subsidize the railway to assist the old projected road from Liverpool to Annapolis, which the people of Liverpool, Caledonia, and Kempt have long been agitating for, and have long desired, their grievance in that regard would be removed, and, instead of being relegated back to the condition of half a century ago, they will be foremost in the modern walks of life. Now they have a miserable one-horse chaise, whereas before they had a spanking four-horse team going daily to and fro between Liverpool and Annapolis. Now they are in the cool shades, as it were. I am not complaining so much as regards the county of Annapolis as I am on behalf of the northern portion of the county of Queen's. The people of Kempt and Northern Queen's complain as much about this matter as the people of Annapolis. I call this directly to the attention of the Government and the hon. Minister of Finance, with the view of having the wishes of the people carried out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) has spoken of two questions, one in reference to the present mail arrangement with North Queen's, and the other relating to a railway subsidy. I may say that it is quite news for me to learn that there is any considerable dissatisfaction in North Queen's regarding the present mail arrangement. Some years ago, Annapolis was the nearest point on the line of railway to Queen's County, and the regular line of communication was from Annapolis by way of the northern district of Queen's down to Liverpool. That was the old mail route, but after the lapse of some years another railway was built in the county of Lunenburg which brought New Germany nearer to the northern district of Queen's than Annapolis; and adapting ourselves to the new condition, the mail route was laid out from New Germany through the northern district of Queen's and down to Liverpool instead of from Annapolis. The Annapolis end of the district no longer enjoyed the through mail route, but local mail arrangements were immediately made under such liberal terms that so far as I know the people along the line are apparently well satisfied. Of course, they suffer the disadvantage that they are no longer on the through line of communication.

With regard to the subsidy to the railway. Some years ago it was assumed that railway communication to open up that section of the country would have to be from Annapolis to Liverpool. In the progress of time that scheme was practically abandoned, and for several years no company has approached, so far as I know, either the Dominion or the provincial governments with a proposal

to build a railway from Annapolis to Liverpool. The railway line, like the mail route, adapted itself to the new conditions, and all recent agitation has been for a railway, either from New Germany down to Liverpool, or from Bridgewater by way of the shore down to Liverpool. I think I am correct in stating that for some years past the project of a railway from Annapolis to Liverpool has not been very seriously discussed, either in this House or the local legislature. Of course, I can understand the desire of my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) representing Annapolis, to have the line go in the way originally projected.

Mr. MILLS. I did not rise with the expectation of succeeding in making any alteration in the route; I am not so ambitious as that. I rose only to call the attention of the Government, and the Minister of Finance in particular, to the state of affairs as I view it in the northern portion of his constituency and in mine. The alternative routes looked rather peculiar without explanation. I do not understand how there can possibly be two roads there. I do not suppose that the Government intend to subsidize more than one: Either one from a point on the Central Railway to Liverpool via Caledonia, which almost turns the corner of a right angle; or to the village of Caledonia via Liverpool, which is almost turning another corner of a right angle in another direction. I suppose the Minister of Railways is thoroughly acquainted with what is being done with reference to what is called the Hervey route and the Robertson route. Which route does this subsidy intend to encourage?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The people of that section of the country became so discouraged at the fights of the rival roads that they reached the conclusion, I believe, that they would be very glad to have either one of these routes.

Mr. MILLS. Rather than none.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes; and several years ago the location of the route was expressed in these words in order that the Government might be free to grant a subsidy to either of these roads, whenever a company should come forward in good faith to do the work. The question of the rival routes remains up to the present moment, except that I understand that recently one of the companies has made a more vigorous effort. I have reason to believe that the company which is working in Lunenburg County near New Germany, with a view of building through to Caledonia and on to Liverpool, has hardly a legal status at the present moment, owing to some difficulty about its charter. It, however, anticipates making such arrangements with the local government as will enable it to obtain its charter rights, and then it will be in a very good position to seek this subsidy. At the

Mr. FIELDING.

present moment, while I am glad to know that both companies are showing signs of activity, I would not care to commit myself as to which of these roads would be built. I have strong hopes before long that the Government will be in a position to make a contract with one or the other. As representing the county, my desire is so strong to get a railway, that I am decidedly inclined to recommend the giving of the subsidy to the first bona fide company that comes along.

Mr. MILLS. I agree very much with what the Minister of Finance has said respecting the desire of the people to get a railway. They have been beyond the pale of civilization in that respect longer than they should have been, and I am pleased to know that they are becoming more modernized in that respect.

For a railway from Indian Gardens, Queen's County, Nova Scotia, to Shelburne, in the said province, a distance of 35 miles.

Mr. MILLS. This subsidy is for part of the same scheme as the last subsidy, and might I ask why it is you divide them?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the shore road were built, as was contemplated at one time, and as some people still contemplate, that section from Indian Gardens to Shelburne would not be built. It forms part of the Nova Scotia Southern Railway scheme, called the Hervey route, Mr. Hervey being president. If that scheme goes on the Indian Gardens portion would be a necessary part of it; but the Indian Gardens line is not necessary for the other project.

The subsidy which the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company is entitled to receive under chap. 4 of 1897, shall be \$6,400 per mile for the 80 miles mentioned in the said Act

Mr. FOSTER. There is no uncertainty as to the amount of this subsidy, and the \$512,000 provided for should be carried out.

Mr. WALLACE. It would be more satisfactory if it were struck out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not see how it can exceed the \$512,000.

Mr. BERGERON. It has always been usual to carry out the figures if we give a lump sum. I move that these words be added:

Not exceeding in the whole \$512,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no objection to that.

Amendment agreed to.

To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for 12 miles of their railway from end of their line at deep water on the Chicoutimi branch of their railway to Ha! Ha! Bay, in lieu of the subsidy for the 12 miles granted by chap. 4 of 1894. (Revote.)

Mr. BERGERON. I called the attention of the committee before to the fact that by a Bill passed this session, the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company is called the Great Northern; and why not call this by the latter name, instead of having the two names, which will be likely to create confusion?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. They have legislation empowering them to carry out the amalgamation, but it has not taken place yet legally.

Mr. BERGERON. As a matter of fact, the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company to-day belongs to the Great Northern Company.

The PRIME MINISTER. As I understand it, legislation has been granted authorizing the two companies to amalgamate; but that legislation must be ratified by the shareholders of the two companies before they will become the Great Northern Railway Company. At present it is not yet law.

Mr. BERGERON. It has gone further than that. The parties most interested in the passing of the Act to change the name, were the Quebec and Lake St. John people. It only requires the signature of the Governor General to be a fait accompli.

The PRIME MINISTER. It requires the assent of the two companies.

Mr. BERGERON. All that has been done, and they only wanted the Act of Parliament to accomplish the thing.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; there is only an understanding. The amalgamation has not been completed yet.

For a railway from Port Hawkesbury, on the Strait of Canso, to Caribou Cove, N.S., a distance of 10 miles.

Mr. BERGERON. There is no mention of any company here. Do I understand that this is to be given to any company which will propose to build the road, and which will be acceptable to the Governor in Council?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

For a railway from Port Clyde to Lockeport, in the province of Nova Scotia, not exceeding 20 miles.

Mr. MILLS. Is this part of the Robertson road?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. How far is that Robertson road built now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is in operation from Yarmouth to Pubnico, a distance of 31 miles; but they are working a considerable distance ahead.

Mr. MILLS. This is a continuation?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a continuation. The subsidy has been voted from time to time, in pieces.

For a railway from a point of the Intercolonial Railway at or near Halifax, to a point on the Central Railway in the county of Lunenburg, not exceeding 20 miles.

Mr. MILLS. What is the object of that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the first step towards the construction of a road from Halifax, by the shore, through the western section of the province. The western portion of the line has been subsidized in various pieces, but there is a link of about 70 miles from Halifax to the Central Railway for which a vote has never been taken. This is a vote for 20 miles of this link. If a company is willing to come forward and construct it, no doubt further grants will be made.

Mr. MILLS. Then, we are to understand that this has nothing to do with the Victoria Beach Railway?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Nothing whatever.

For a railway from Owen Sound, in the province of Ontario, to Meaford, not exceeding 21 miles.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not have the good fortune to be present when this item went through committee, and I did not hear whether an explanation was given of it. Perhaps the Minister of Customs can explain it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This is for a railway from Owen Sound to Meaford, a distance of about 21 miles. The hon. gentleman, I fancy, knows the position of affairs there. The Canadian Pacific Railway runs to Owen Sound, and the Grand Trunk runs from Toronto to Barrie, and then on to Collingwood and Meaford, and stops there.

Mr. WALLACE. Is it decided what company is to have the subsidy?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. WALLACE. It is left open either to the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific Railway?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. To any company that has authority under the law to build it.

Mr. MACLEAN. I understand it is to get competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That will be considered, of course.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there a charter for that line?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know.

Mr. WALLACE. Has the Canadian Pacific Railway or Grand Trunk Railway a charter to build a road there?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not sure. I think there was a charter at one time, but whether it has lapsed or not, I could not positively say.

Mr. WALLACE. Who is asking for the subsidy?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The President of the Board of Trade of Owen Sound.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there no company that has a charter over that line?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not sure that there is.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the use then of voting this money? No charter can be got from this House before prorogation, and one can be got from the provincial legislature.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The people of that town are exceedingly anxious to have the road built, and made application to the Government to offer some assistance and thereby stimulate its construction, by putting them in the position of being able to offer some inducement to a company incorporated, or if one is not incorporated, to people to apply to be incorporated to build the road.

Mr. BERGERON. If there is no charter to any company, there will be plenty time to give the subsidy when the company is incorporated, and let the right hon. gentleman use the money in constructing a bridge for the people of Assomption and Joliette.

Mr. WALLACE. This is simply humbugging the people. There is no charter.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think there is a charter.

Mr. WALLACE. Who has it? There is no charter to construct a road from Owen Sound to Meaford. There could not be one dollar of this money expended until a charter is obtained from either the Dominion Parliament or the local legislature; it could not be obtained from the local legislature, either by the Grand Trunk Railway or Canadian Pacific Railway, because those are federal roads, and the road would only be constructed by one of these companies, presumably the Canadian Pacific Railway, because it would be absurd for a little one-horse local line to attempt to do business there. We are asked to vote the money now, so that the supporters of the Government can say: See what a fine representative the constituency of North Grey has; he can procure a subsidy for an impossible road. But I am afraid that the people will not reelect him notwithstanding the subsidy.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are afraid they will.

Mr. PATERSON.

Mr. WALLACE. It looks as if he was going to try his hand there. My hon. friend's county was cut into two by the Redistribution Bill to give him a chance to get back for that county, but that little game was spoilt, and so he will have to seek re-election in North Grey. The machine gave him 200 of a majority last time, but I am afraid they will not dare to bring that machine into North Grey again. The old fashion used to be for all the neighbours to gather in and assist at the threshing, but under the new plan the outfit travels around with the machine, and the neighbours are not called on at all. A similar revolution has taken place in political matters, and instead of the neighbours doing their own canvassing work and their own political fights, which was quite right, the machine travels around and gets in its fine work. While I do not know that the Minister of Customs himself took an active part in the operations of the threshing machine, he certainly got the benefit of them, and we all know that the hon. Postmaster General spent many anxious days and many jolly nights—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the subject.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sojourning at Owen Sound, and that is the terminus of this road, and I am recounting historical events which occurred at Owen Sound on the site of this proposed line. When it gets to Meaford, it gets into the constituency of North Grey, and as there is no charter, they can go anywhere and the subsidy can be applied either on land or sea. I would appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, to represent matters as they undoubtedly are to those gentlemen, and see if you cannot exert your moral influence to get them to withdraw this proposal. We are voting money that cannot be used, to enable the hon. Minister of Customs to go into Meaford and parade around the fact that he procured a subsidy of \$132,800 for that constituency. I think we ought to cut out this subsidy because it swells up the total of \$6,570,000, which will reduce the amount, to be strictly accurate, to \$6,400,000. Whether it is a good scheme or a bad one, we should have the particulars which are supposed to justify this application. The Minister of Railways and Canals tells us that representations have been made to him through the Minister of Customs, and I think I heard a gentleman over there say that the President of the Board of Trade, presumably of Owen Sound, had made application for this subsidy. Is that correct?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The whole town wants it—both towns, I believe.

Mr. WALLACE. No doubt the whole town wants it. But I would like to see the application made for it so that I may know the grounds for asking this subsidy. That both towns want it goes without saying. Every town wants another railway.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Do I understand that the intention is to extend the Northern Railway down to the dock at Meaford? As those who have been there will know, the railway passes outside the town up on the hill, but it might be run down by the lake to the dock. And would the subsidy be available for that purpose? And if the road goes to Owen Sound, would it go alongside the lake?

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** I am not in a position to answer that. Of course, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) has a right to object to this, and may move to strike it out if he does not approve of it—that is his privilege. But that would be making a distinction between this and other votes. The road is very greatly in the interest of the section of country through which it passes, and, I have no doubt, that it will be built if the vote is given. The road from Meaford to the city of Toronto is within 21 miles of the thriving town of Owen Sound, a place of 8,000 or 10,000 people and a large shipping port. The hon. member for West York counts this a bonus of \$6,400 a mile instead of \$3,200 a mile, which is all, so far as I can see, that the road has asked for. I do not know of any bonus on this paper that is based on better reasons than this one, and I cannot understand objection to its being passed.

**Mr. WALLACE.** On what ground does the hon. Minister say that this is a vote for \$3,200 a mile?

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** Unless it exceeds—

**Mr. WALLACE.** But that is not what the hon. Minister said—he said only \$3,200 a mile was asked for.

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** What is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) quibbling about? He figures the subsidy at \$6,400 a mile. I say that unless the road costs over \$15,000 a mile, which I am not in a position to say, but I do not suppose it will, the subsidy will not be over \$3,200 a mile. And the hon. gentleman is not in a position to say that it will cost so much as to make the subsidy \$6,400 a mile.

**Mr. WALLACE.** The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) quite readily shifts his ground. When I said the subsidy voted was \$6,400 a mile, he said that all that was asked was \$3,200 a mile.

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** I say that is what is here.

**Mr. WALLACE.** I say it is not what is here, and the Minister of Customs either has not read the resolutions or else is not stating them correctly. He should know that clause 2 provides that if the road costs above \$15,000 per mile the subsidy will be more than \$3,200, and if the road costs \$21,400 a mile, then the subsidy will be

\$6,400 a mile. I do not know what the road will cost, nor does the Minister of Railways and Canals know. But the \$6,400 a mile will be available, and that is what we are voting, and when the Minister of Customs says we are voting half that, he is stating what is not correct. Now, there is no company that we know of that has a charter for this road. There is no survey and we have no knowledge what grounds have been presented for this subsidy. We asked for a copy of the request of the board of trade or the president of the board of trade, which, I understand, was presented. We asked for any reports that would show the grounds on which the Government was urged to give this subsidy. I think we are entitled to that.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I would like to know what the inner feelings of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) might be under this development of the subsidy mania by the Minister of Railways and Canals and his other colleagues. I do not suppose there ever was a more patent case of what my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) used to call the abuse of the railway subsidy system, and I wish to quietly call his attention and the attention of the Government to it. Here is a subsidy for a railway to be built in a section of country where no company has charter powers to build.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** What is the evidence of that?

**Mr. FOSTER.** The complete evidence that neither the Minister of Railways and Canals, the Minister of Customs, or any other member can point out the charter. The question was asked, and it is the duty of the Minister of Railways and Canals to say what company had the charter. But no answer has been given, and we can only assume that there is none. There is no company chartered, and it is impossible for any company to be chartered between this and next session of Parliament. When we ask for any information with reference to the necessities for this road, the only information we get is, that there is one town at one end, and another town at the other end, and both these towns would like to have the road. Both these towns, I believe, are on lines of railway, and on lines of water communication. Owen Sound seems to be a town that is pretty well off for railway and transport accommodation; it has the two great lines now. Meaford is also supplied with railway accommodation. There is not a word given as to the country lying between; but simply because both are as large and important towns as some others to which the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) said subsidies had been granted, therefore, these should have subsidies granted to them. I think this is a signal instance of the subsidy mania developed by

hon. gentlemen opposite. Not a single commercial or other purpose has been laid before this House to-night upon which anybody could submit a claim to the people's representatives to make a vote of from \$65,000 to \$120,000. This is the people's money; it is simply being flung, without rhyme or reason, right and left. For what purpose? No object at all can be served by it, no single purpose can be thought of, except simply to dangle something before the eyes of the electors in order to make them well disposed to the party. We are told that the board of trade had asked for this railway, and that both towns wanted it, therefore, it ought to be granted. I submit, this is carrying the thing to an extreme length, and it is one of the things which is driving the people of this country to the conclusion that this system of subsidies ought to stop, that it is being run to the ground, that it is being used, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) used to assert so often, simply as a piece of political enginery, and nothing else. Here is a signal instance of it. Owen Sound is pretty well provided for with the two great trunk lines, without the people of this country being asked to contribute \$127,000 to build another road. Surely, Meaford is pretty well situated with regard to commercial and traffic communication and transport facilities, and can lay no claim to this grant.

Mr. SPROULE. As to the section of country through which this road is to run, there is no finer section to be found. I may say, with regard to this road, that I think they will be able to claim the \$6,400 per mile, because there is a section that it will be pretty heavy to build; there is the Big Head River to cross, which will entail considerable expense. I am satisfied that the Owen Sound people, and the people between the two towns, will be well pleased, if the railway is built, and they get the money spent there. I am sorry to say that there is not a charter in existence, or we might be able to avail ourselves of the subsidy sooner. But I shall not take that by any means as an insuperable objection, because, as long as the money is available, it is an easy matter to get a charter. There was a railway charter, but it expired some two years ago. The people of Meaford are making a strong effort to extend the Northern Railway down to the wharf in Meaford, and if it is extended to Owen Sound, that is, in all probability, the way it would go. If this bonus is available for the purpose of extending it that far on the way, I am sure the people will be generally pleased to have it done, because there was a deputation down here not long ago endeavouring to get the Grand Trunk Railway to assist them to build it, and I think they have some offer of assistance from the Grand Trunk Railway, and the town has offered assistance as well. It is going through an excellent section of country, where a por-

Mr. FOSTER.

tion of the railway will be a little hard to build, but not unusually so. I think it will take the \$21,000 easily enough to build it, but after it is built, it will serve a large number of people.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the railway now in question is to get \$21,400 per mile, you can see that the company undertaking its construction will require to furnish \$15,000 per mile in order to get the maximum subsidy which they are entitled to under this Act; and if people are going to put their hands into their pockets and furnish \$15,000 per mile to build that railway in addition to the subsidy they may get from the Dominion, I think that will afford pretty substantial evidence that the undertaking is regarded by the people who put into their means, as meritorious. I do not think you can have any more satisfactory evidence than that.

Mr. WALLACE. They might get a bonus from the local government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If a subsidy is given by the local government, it is not costing the treasury of Canada anything at all events, and it must be because they think the undertaking is a meritorious one. I know some provinces where they have laws upon the statute-books which are in general terms, and which generally authorize the aiding of railways for which any company is incorporated, to the extent of \$3,200 per mile, on the completion of their line. This is a rule which has been adopted in some of the provinces at all events, and adopted upon the principle that railways in this country, if they can be built on receipt of aid to the extent of \$3,200, it will be a great benefit to the country. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) draws the conclusion that because this grant is not made specifically to a company, and because there may not be any company actually incorporated for the purpose of building this line, that, therefore, it is an undertaking which ought not to be aided by this Parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. There was a company, and the charter has run out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Whether there was a company incorporated for that purpose or not does not appear to be any objection to making this grant. If what the hon. member for East Grey has stated is true, and it is no doubt true, as he has a local knowledge of the country, the undertaking is one which may properly be assisted in this way. If it be an objection to a grant of this kind being given in this form, not to a particular company, but for a particular railway, and if it strikes the hon. gentleman so

strongly now as being open to objection, it is somewhat singular that this form of making grants in aid to railways was a form that was adopted in numberless cases in times past and ever since the subsidy system was introduced. If the hon. gentleman will look back over the list since 1882, down to the last Act, he will find that many railways have been subsidized without the name being mentioned of the grantee of the subsidy. I hastily glanced at the list in 1894, and I find that no less than 20 subsidies were voted not to any particular company at all, but for a line of railway between certain points. Naturally, I assume that there were no companies incorporated, or that there were rival companies as to which the Government had not come to any conclusion and had not determined the subsidy would be paid. In the Act of 1894, there were no less than 20 lines of railway receiving subsidies totalling \$1,300,000 or over a million and a quarter, in regard to which the companies were either not incorporated or, at all events, in which the companies were not named.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has not proved anything. There was no question between the hon. gentleman and myself as to whether you should or should not grant a subsidy to a particular railway and name it, or whether you should not name it. That was not the question. As I have said before, the hon. gentleman has put up a man of straw and knocked it down to his own satisfaction. My contention was that this was a grant of a sum of money which might amount to \$130,000 to no company, and that it was an impossibility in the way of being utilized during the present year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You have a million and a quarter dollars granted by your last subsidy Bill to no company at all.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is making a statement that he cannot substantiate. The only pertinency there would be to a statement of that kind would be if he should say that, in those grants there was no chartered company which could avail itself of the vote which was given. He has not done that because he cannot.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think I could if I took the time.

Mr. FOSTER. But he does not take the time; he has not done it, and therefore there is nothing in his statement. Now, he says, he has given a most satisfactory reason why this vote should be given between Meaford and Owen Sound. He says that if you find people who will put \$15,000 per mile into that road, which is going to cost \$21,700 per mile, it will be the best of evidence that that road ought to be built.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If they do not the subsidy will not be drawn.

Mr. FOSTER. But the hon. gentleman was going to give us evidence upon which to found his claim for this grant. The evidence was that there were people who were willing to put \$15,000 a mile of their own money into the road. The hon. gentleman has not given us evidence of the fact.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) argues as if what is done were absolutely unprecedented, as if it were a wholly new departure in the history of railway grants, and as if subsidies had not been given as they are given to-day in general terms, without the companies being specifically named.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish again to set the right hon. gentleman right. That is not the question. I am arguing against giving a subsidy for a line of proposed road in reference to which no company is chartered that possibly might build it.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then, I will accept the proposition of the hon. gentleman as he modifies it. I say there is no new departure in that. Again and again he, himself, has given subsidies which were not specifically voted to any chartered company. I can show votes for railways to be given to companies which were not chartered. And I can show cases in which the Governor in Council took power to organize and charter companies.

Mr. MILLS. Hon. gentlemen always held that that was wrong.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) says that when they did it there was nothing wrong, but when we do it there is something wrong. The proposition before the committee is to give a subsidy for a line of railway between Owen Sound and Meaford. Here is the statute of 1884:

For a line of railway and bridge between the Jacques Cartier Union Railway Junction with the Canadian Pacific Railway and St. Martin's Junction, connecting the Jacques Cartier Union Railway with the North Railway proper, a subsidy not exceeding in the whole .....	\$200,000
For a line of railway from Richibucto to St. Louis, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole .....	22,400
For a line of railway from Hopewell to Alma, in the province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole .....	51,200
For a line of railway from St. Andrew's to Lachute, in the county of Argenteuil, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole .....	22,400

For a line of railway from Grand Piles, on the River St. Maurice, to Lake Edward, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.. \$217,000  
 For a line of railway from Annapolis to Digby, in the province of Nova Scotia, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... 64,000

There are several like that. This is the provision which follows:—

The subsidies hereinbefore mentioned as to be granted to the companies named for that purpose, shall be granted to such companies, respectively: the other subsidies shall be granted to such companies as shall be approved by the Governor in Council as having established, to his satisfaction, their ability to construct and complete the said railways, respectively.

What was the policy objected to by my hon. friend a moment ago. It was that the Government had kept something back for political purposes, that the Government had reserved this power to themselves. But that is not all. Here is another section of the Railway Act of 1884:—

And whereas it may become necessary for the construction of a railway in conformity with the intention and purpose of the subsidy for the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from its terminus at St. Martin's Junction, or some other point on the said railway to the harbour of Quebec, that a company should be incorporated with the powers requisite for such construction, and for making financial arrangements for the purposes thereof: Therefore it is hereby further enacted as follows:—

For the purpose of incorporating the persons undertaking the construction of the said railway, and those who shall be associated with them in the undertaking, and so soon as a contract shall be made with them by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for such construction, the Governor may grant to them, under such corporate name as he shall deem expedient, a charter conferring upon them the franchises, privileges and powers requisite for the said purposes, which shall be similar to such of the franchises, &c.

In this there is power given to the Governor in Council to organize a charter and create a corporation. If my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) wants to find fault let him attack the policy generally, but let him not attack the policy of following a precedent established by our predecessors. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) must admit that we are not introducing a new system at all. Nobody questions the propriety of building this road. There was a charter which appears to have lapsed; we will suppose that it has, and here is an inducement for the revival of the charter and the building of the railway. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) does not find fault with that. If he condemns the practice he condemns his own course.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has not proved his case.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not to your satisfaction, no doubt.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. FOSTER. Nor to your own, as I can show. The right hon. gentleman has read half a dozen appropriations for a line of railway between such and such points. My contention was against granting it for a line of railway between points with reference to which there was no company under charter, or possible to be chartered. My right hon. friend has not supplied that link in the chain.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why is it not possible within nine months?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has been told that half a dozen of times, and there is no necessity for repeating it. Is it quite possible to make a vote for a line of railway between certain points, not to name the company at all or the railway, and yet you may have three or four companies who have power and charters to build that. You have not decided as to which company, and so you do not say to which you give it—just the same as you, in this list, give subsidies where there are more than one company, and you have not decided which company you give it to. You keep that for the Governor in Council to make the best arrangement you can. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) sees there is one very weak link in his chain of argument.

Mr. McMULLEN. When the Conservatives granted a subsidy for the short line from Montreal to St. John, was there a company in existence at the time?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly there was.

Mr. McMULLEN. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIN. I rather think the country will be somewhat impatient of the kind of excuse which is given for this and somewhat similar votes, and which is: That something like it was done by a previous Government fifteen years ago. Is that a justification? Not at all. The Minister of Trade and Commerce was appealed to from this side of the House, but the Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) remains discreetly silent. I will take this opportunity of reading to him what he wrote not fifteen years ago, but in 1894, just five years ago. On October 1st, 1894, Sir Richard Cartwright wrote to a gentleman connected with the "Farmers' Sun," a very eloquent and exhaustive letter, in which he said:

What are the other planks of the Patron platform affecting Dominion politics? They are these: Economy of administration, purity and independence of Parliament, tariff for revenue only, reciprocal trade, protection of labour from monopoly, no railway bonuses,

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. DAVIN. He goes on:

There is simply no single one of all these objects which the Liberal party have not been fighting for, moving resolutions for, and doing

their best to obtain any time during the last twenty years,

And then, Sir, with a railway subsidy which is to be hung up for electioneering purposes only, looking forward to the possibility of another election; the moment it is pointed out that this policy is vicious, the First Minister gets up and says: What are you talking about? Why, something like that was done fifteen years ago.

Mr. FOSTER. And then failed to prove it was done.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, and even suppose there was something like it done, these are the gentlemen opposite who made night hideous year after year denouncing in this House the misconduct of the Government which voted bonuses. Their chief defence to-day is to say: We have not a new idea, we have not the moral or intellectual courage to make a new departure, but we are the very humble imitators of the men that for eighteen years we denounced. If these hon. gentlemen opposite think that the Liberal party throughout this country is going to be dragged in the mire behind their imitative wheels they will find they are greatly mistaken. Probably the best thing that could happen this country is to have the outrageous spectacle of these estimates piled on to \$52,000,000 expenditure, piled on again another item bringing it up to \$60,000,000—the best thing that could happen is that these gentlemen opposite shall pile up misdoing after misdoing in order to wake the country to the kind of government we have now in Canada. If these hon. gentlemen think they are going to drag respectable Liberalism into the mire after them they make a great mistake. I have here the "Canadian Gleaner," which deals with this very question.

Mr. MACLEAN. Where is it published?

Mr. DAVIN. In Huntingdon. On August 3rd, the "Gleaner" published this article, which will show the people in other parts of Canada how a Canadian Liberal is thinking on a subject like this. He says:

The resolutions providing for bonuses to railways have been laid before the House, and in their nature and amount blast the hopes entertained that Sir Wilfrid Laurier in his policy in that regard was going to turn over a new leaf.

Turn over a new leaf! Why, the whole defence of the right hon. gentleman is that it was done by somebody else fifteen years ago, and that he and his Government are mere paltry imitators.

The sound doctrine advocated by the Liberals when they were in opposition was that if aid was given at all to railways, it ought to be only to those that are national in their character, which link province to province; that local roads are provincial in their character, and to be left with the municipalities and local legislatures.

Of course, that is sound doctrine. If this little bit of a railway is desirable and needed, and as we are told on the high authority of the conscientious—of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair); and on the high authority of the equally conscientious Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson); why should not the province subsidize it? Why should it be subsidized by the Dominion, when it is a purely provincial, nay, a purely county matter? It is all in one county; and, by the way things are going, we shall have railways from one doorstep to another, and we shall have the Minister of Railways coming and saying: What obstructionists you are, thus to criticise our railway policy in building a railway to every man's doorstep.

In the resolutions now before the House, federal aid is given to the most petty of railways—roads connecting not province with province, city with city, or even town with town, but village with village, and even hotels with railway stations. Can a railway from Hawkesbury to South Indian be classed as a federal work, or one from St. Rémi to Stottsville, or from Mount Johnson to St. Grégoire? Why should a quarry company get a railway built to a wharf at the expense of the Dominion, or the ratepayers of Parry Sound be presented with \$16,000 to connect their village with the railway station?

Why, this gentleman seems to have forgotten that we have some 91 items in the Estimates for wharfs, in some places where there is no water. The next thing we shall have will be the Minister of Finance bringing in a Bill, if he has a chance, to build Corinthian porticos to the outhouses of his principal supporters.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Their tastes are classical.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course, they would be, if they were constituents of my hon. friend.

All the abuses complained of under the system introduced by Sir John Macdonald, of bribing constituencies by using federal money to do local work, are illustrated in these resolutions submitted by a Liberal Administration. And, then, look at the large amount so asked—over six and a half million dollars. It is being said, all that will not be paid, that many of the projects to which assistance is promised will not be carried out, but the resolutions themselves refute that, for they include revotes of \$1,597,000 to railways which in the past failed to earn them. They are given another chance, and so will the new companies to whom aid is voted, and beyond all doubt, the country in time will be called on to pay nearly every dollar promised. The pretense that these bonuses are given on conditions different from those under the Conservatives, and therefore are on another footing, will not bear examination.

You see, some excuse has been thrown out to this gentleman, that there is some difference; but there is no such excuse given here to-day.

The companies are liable to pay 3 per cent a year on the subsidies granted them. If the 3 per cent was to be paid in cash the bonuses will

be in the nature of a loan, but the interest is not to be paid in cash. The railways are to be allowed to trade it out in carrying the mails—and volunteers to camp! How, by such petty services, can these companies pay 3 per cent on their subsidies? The plain truth is, these companies are to get from \$3,200 to \$6,400 a mile as a free gift, and when to that amount is added what the provinces and municipalities give, it will be found, in not a few instances, that they are to get enough to pay the actual cost of their roads.

This was proved here by careful calculation in the case of one road at any rate.

Take, as proof of this, the Rainy River road, 140 miles long. The Ontario Government has voted it \$1,120,000. Manitoba has also voted aid, and the Dominion Government proposes to add \$856,000. In the hands of such thrifty contractors as Mackenzie & Mann the bonuses will be sufficient to build the road; the country pays for it, and they will own it—a repetition on a small scale of the history of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

To the six and a half million dollars asked to bonus railways, add the \$52,000,000 of Estimates and the \$1,600,000 for the Drummond County Railway, and the expenditure of public money provided for during the present session of Parliament is seen to be over \$60,000,000. Allowing the population of the Dominion to be 6,000,000, the call is for \$10 a head from every man, woman and child. It is \$1,200,000 a week, it is \$165,000 a day. This is for the Dominion alone. Add to it the expenditure of the provincial legislatures and of the municipalities, and ask: Are the people able to bear such a burden of taxation? Practically it will fall on the farming population,—

I ask the attention of every man here.

—for all our manufactures, mines, forests and fisheries contribute to the national earnings is small compared with what comes from the cultivation of the soil. Fully two-thirds of the money demanded will have to be paid for in cheese and butter, grain and live stock. Are our farmers in circumstances able to bear such a drain upon them? Are they making such profits out of their land that they can afford to pay in taxes—to the Dominion alone—\$10 a year for each member of their families? No man knows the condition of the farmers, knows how small the prices are they receive for what they are to sell, knows how small are the daily wages the land pays them for the labour of themselves, their wives, their sons and daughters, can say otherwise than that they are not able to pay the taxes which the expenditure imposed by the Laurier Government will require, and that if the amount voted by Parliament was made to correspond with the earnings of the farmer it would be thirty instead of sixty millions that would have been authorized. If it be said, it is not fair to represent that all the \$60,000,000 will be collected next year, the answer of the farmer is to hand. The part of the sixty millions that will be borrowed in England will rest as mortgage on his land, and the part of the railway bonuses unearned in the coming year will lie over as a future liability which he will have to meet. In considering the public expenditure, the ability of those who have to pay for it is not taken into account by the Government, but money is voted at the demand of party supporters, of contractors, of speculators in mines and lands, and, like the \$1,000,000 to build a bridge at Quebec or the \$320,000 voted to the South Shore road, to secure constituencies at the coming election.

Mr. DAVIN.

Here is a Liberal writer who declares, as I have declared here, that it is palpable, on the face of these subsidies, just as it is on the face of the supplementary Estimates, that they are electioneering subsidies, just as the Estimates are electioneering Estimates.

The conduct of the Government places Liberals in a difficult position. The Liberal party won the elections in 1896 on the assurance that they would end the reign of extravagance and establish economy at Ottawa. That was the promise; the performance has been an increase of expenditure.

Are the rank and file of the Liberal party going to follow the men who have broken their pledges, or are they going to repudiate them and endeavour to replace them? It is an exceedingly awkward position. To come out in opposition to Laurier and his colleagues is to abandon the leaders of the party, and, on the other hand, to continue to support them is to confess that the professions of the Liberal party that, if given a chance, they would bring the expenditure within the income, and stop the increase of public debt, were false, and a mere ruse to blind the electors to get into office. If our leaders have done wrong, are we to stand by them? If they seek to lead us into paths we have been condemning for a generation, are we to follow them? The Ministers cannot say they have not been fully warned, apart from the warnings of the press. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was waited upon by a deputation that fairly represented the farmers of this province, was told frankly and plainly by farmer after farmer, in earnest speech, of their difficulty in making ends meet, and their desire that he do nothing more to add a single dollar to the public debt. His answer is six and a half million dollars more of bonuses to railways, the largest Estimates ever asked, and a prospective increase of the debt of several millions in the coming year. Are Liberals going to stand by what they asked and believe to be right, or are they going to follow the leaders who have made fools of them? Let the reader come down to hard-pan at once on this subject. If he believes the expenditure imposed by the Laurier Administration beyond his ability and that of his neighbours, is he, for the sake of party, going to hold silence and pay his share? That would be carrying party feeling beyond common sense. Self-interest and the welfare of the country require that a stand be made, and that the men at Ottawa be given to understand that because they bear the name of Liberal they are not going to receive the support of the great body of Liberal electors when they fail to do what is right. It was the Liberals who stayed at home on polling-day who defeated Mercier, and a like fate shadows Laurier. We want a Government at Ottawa that will not be the purveyor of railway, mining or manufacturing companies, that asks for millions in order that its partisans may get big salaries or contracts, but one that will hold steadily in view the average man of the Dominion—and he is the man who earns his bread by the labour of his hands—and having regard for him and his necessities will suit the country's expenditure to his ability to pay his share of taxation.

I see, Sir, that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) has fled. What wonder! What must be his feelings, in the secrecy of his sanctum, with these eloquent words of an indignant

Liberal ringing in his ears—the ears of one who used similar language a few years ago? My hon. friend beside me asked me where is the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). Well, we know where he is, but it would be interesting to hear from the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, and I must say that one has some respect for him. It is more creditable for him to slip out of this Chamber and go to his private room, there probably to shed penitential tears, than to have the brazen effrontery of standing in his place here and defending this Government for a policy which he denounced Conservative Government after Conservative Government for having adopted and followed. I do not care whether Sir John Macdonald proposed this policy or not, I say that this policy of subsidizing little railways is a vicious system, and it is more creditable for the Minister of Trade and Commerce to hide himself in shame in his room than to stand up here in brazen effrontery and say: It is true we are doing this, but the same thing was done in 1884, the same thing was done by Sir John Macdonald and those other men whom we denounced. Is that what the country expected? Is not this the most glaring instance of what we have had again and again to call attention to—the utter treason to their past on the part of hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches—the people bamboozled and the party betrayed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It has been suggested that this subsidy is not required in the interests of the locality in question, but is proposed for some other object. I would just state to the committee, for their information, that whilst it has been alleged that there are two railways uniting at Owen Sound, that does not in itself state the whole case. It will be well to bear in mind that Owen Sound is a very thriving town, having almost attained the proportions of a city, on Georgian Bay. It has a magnificent harbour. There are fleets of vessels plying between it and the ports on the north, and it has a great future before it. Without wishing to discredit other towns on the Georgian Bay, I think I may say that Owen Sound promises to become a very important city. At present its trade is principally with the city of Toronto on the south, and with the lakes and the northern territory in the north. How to-day has it railway communication with the city of Toronto? The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is familiar with the situation, and no one is better able to correct me, and if I should make any misstatement, I hope he will be good enough to do so. Although Owen Sound has two railways between it and Toronto, it is not correct to suppose that these railways are both over a route that is reasonably available for trade with Toronto. It is true that the road formerly known as the To-

ronto, Grey and Bruce runs in a comparatively direct course from Toronto to Owen Sound, but those who have travelled over that road know that it has to ascend great acclivities. It has to climb the Caledon hills, where the grades are so heavy that these hills can only be ascended by a road in the shape of a horseshoe, and the railway is built in that shape a long distance. That I presume in itself makes railway communication by the shorter route between Toronto and Owen Sound extremely expensive for the purposes of traffic. Then, the other railway that is said to connect with Owen Sound is a branch of the western system of the Grand Trunk Railway, from a place called Park Head which is in a north-westerly direction from Owen Sound. Instead of the Grand Trunk route being a direct one between Owen Sound and Toronto, it is a roundabout route, nearly 40 miles longer than the Toronto, Grey and Bruce, so that practically there is no opportunity for competition.

Mr. WALLACE. Which is 40 miles longer?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The road from Owen Sound to Park Head and thence to Toronto in that direction is between 30 and 40 miles longer than the road connecting Owen Sound with Meaford and thence by the old Northern Railway system to Toronto. What is the distance by that road?

Mr. SPROULE. About 135 miles?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Say a little over 130 miles. I believe that when this link is put in between Owen Sound and Meaford, you will have established an excellent line and as direct a one as there is—taking grades into consideration—between Owen Sound and Toronto, at a distance of a little over 130 miles.

Mr. WALLACE. It is 136 miles.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Call it what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) wishes. It is a great many miles shorter than the other route, where you have to go in a north-westerly direction to connect with the Grand Trunk system and get down to the road that terminates at Wlarton, and find your way south-easterly into Toronto.

Mr. WALLACE. And what is the mileage of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Owen Sound to Toronto?

Mr. SPROULE. It is 128 miles.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) surely does not suppose that I am not familiar with the geography of that country. I stated before he came in that, while the Toronto, Grey and Bruce had, geographically, a direct line, there were physical difficulties in the way on account of the steepness of the grades in overcoming the Caledon Hills.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). How steep ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. So steep that you can only ascend by a road going in the shape of a horseshoe. That is familiar to all who travel over that road.

Mr. WALLACE. I think there are—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) permit me to finish my remarks, and then I will answer his questions. So, in view of the roundabout character of the Grand Trunk connection, it may be said that Owen Sound has no outlet except the direct one by the Toronto, Grey and Bruce. Instead of the route between Owen Sound and Meaford producing the comparatively meager return in the form of mail service stated by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin)—the hon. gentleman did not endorse it, but it was in the article read by him—my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) will bear me out in saying that this road would go through a very fertile and well-settled district. The line would connect the thriving town of Meaford, with a population of between 2,000 and 3,000, and the almost city of Owen Sound. There will be a train service several times a day, no doubt, and mails will have to be placed on those trains, and there will be a substantial return for this subsidy in the form of valuable services. If there was no such provision in the Bill as there is, the Government would have to pay cash year by year for the mail service on this branch. So this will be a useful public work. It will be of great service to the trade of Owen Sound, it will be of great service to the trade of Meaford, it will be of great service to the farming community between these towns, and it will bring back a return to the treasury in the shape of indemnity from having to pay for public services over that road. This is in every respect, in my judgment, a worthy enterprise, a useful enterprise, and one not open to fair criticism. It will stand criticism, and I am perfectly certain that my hon. friend from East Grey, having heard what I have said will not take upon himself to challenge the correctness of one statement that I have made.

Mr. WALLACE. Considering the violent speech of the Postmaster General, perhaps we should not be surprised at the extraordinary character of his statements, one of which is that Owen Sound has no outlet. It has an outlet to many places in summer by water ; it has an outlet by the Grand Trunk Railway all the year around to the whole of that great system ; and it has an outlet by the Canadian Pacific Railway by a direct line of 122 miles to Toronto. The line which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) says will be built as a result of this subsidy and which he says is a short line, is 136 miles long, or 14 miles longer than the existing road. He says : Look how much

Mr. MULOCK.

shorter a line would be than going around by Warton or some such place. I did not catch how many miles he said this line would be to Toronto.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think it is between 170 and 180 miles.

Mr. McMULLEN. About 170 miles.

Mr. WALLACE. I would be glad of some definite information. Well, whether it is 170 or 270 miles the object of that line is to reach all the towns in western Ontario. When you reach Palmerston you find branch lines running in all directions, which brings Owen Sound in direct touch with all that part of the country if not with Toronto. And, then, by the Canadian Pacific Railway Owen Sound has a direct connection, at a distance of 122 miles with Toronto, while this so-called short line of the Postmaster General it would be 14 miles longer. That is a specimen of the arithmetic of the Postmaster General. He says that between Owen Sound and Meaford is fertile country. Nobody is going to dispute that ; but what has that to do with the question of the routes to these places ? Owen Sound, no doubt, is anxious to tap the trade of Meaford. But Meaford is not so anxious to have the road go in there, for the reasons that the larger places generally gobble the smaller ones, or do business to the disadvantage of the smaller ones ; and when the Postmaster General tells us that the people of Meaford are breaking their necks or their hearts to get into Owen Sound, I think if he went up and ascertained the truth of the matter, he would find that the very opposite was the case. Now, he says that this scheme is worthy and useful and commendable and proper and desirable—and all the other adjectives he can think of. But the naked fact remains that they are proposing a vote to a railroad which has no existence and which has not been chartered. It is a matter of such supreme indifference to the whole community both in Owen Sound and Meaford, and to all the country lying between those places, and to the two great railway companies, that nobody ever thought it worth while to ask for a charter from the Parliament of Canada or from the local legislature to construct a road between those points. We were told that the president of the Board of Trade of Owen Sound had written. We want that letter of his placed on the Table of the House. We want some information from somebody that somebody wants this railroad built, and we are unable to procure a scrap. But the Minister of Customs, not having a vacancy made for him in the county of Brant, is compelled to look out for another constituency, and expects to buy up North Grey by a bonus of \$134,000 for this road. I do not believe he can do it. The people of North Grey, though it is said that many of them were bulldozed, were humbugged, and bought up by the influence

of this machine to which reference has been so often and so properly made—

Mr. MCGREGOR. We have heard of that before.

Mr. WALLACE. If the member for Essex has heard it before, it has not done him any good as yet, and he is anxious to have the threshing machine in Essex when the elections come on.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Essex is all right.

Mr. WALLACE. The threshing machine can go to some other town then.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It can go down to York.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, I have no doubt it will be in York. They will bring the threshing machine down to North York, and, perhaps, they will take it across the line to West York. But I do not believe the threshing machine will be so profitable as it was before. You know there are some lines of business you can run profitably for a little while, and then the people catch on to it, and after that it is not so profitable. I think this threshing machine, with its outfit, with its organizers, with those who have been manipulating it so much to their own satisfaction in the past, with the chaps here in Ottawa who are telegraphing to keep Farr out of the road—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. I think the hon. gentleman should confine himself to the discussion of the railway subsidies, which is the question before the Chair.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Chairman, I am discussing the railway subsidies.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman wandered from the railway subsidies to discuss something entirely outside of the question.

Mr. FLINT. He was also saying something that was absolutely incorrect when he stated that the election committee were telegraphing to Toronto to keep Farr out of the way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. That question is not before the Chair.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for Yarmouth said something that is incorrect.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I call hon. gentlemen to order. I invite the members of the committee to discuss the question which is now before the Chair, that is, the railway subsidies.

Mr. WALLACE. But in discussing that question, I called attention to the fact that we were voting bonuses, not for the purpose of building railroads, because this bonus from Owen Sound to Meaford cannot build one foot of railroad, this \$134,000, or whatever the sum may be, not a dollar of it can be used for the purpose of building a railroad. Then, I would ask you to inform this

House what this money can be used for. What is the object of this money, which is ostensibly voted to build a railroad, but not one cent of which can be applied for that purpose? There is no charter for a railroad between those two points. Will you tell me what is to be done with this money? You cannot tell me. But I can tell you, Sir, and I shall tell you that if it is for any purpose it is for a corrupt purpose and no other.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This is not the proper way of conducting debate, to put questions directly to the Chair.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, that is the proper way.

The PRIME MINISTER. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. I say, Mr. Chairman, that I am not going to take any advice, even from the Chairman, as to how I shall discuss the question, so long as I keep within the rules of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not going to submit.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order, order.

Mr. WALLACE. Order yourself. You are not going to interfere with my liberty while I am discussing questions properly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must know that he is out of order, when the chairman of a committee calls a member to order that member must sit down while the order is stated. I said the hon. gentleman was not conducting the debate properly when he put his questions to the Chairman instead of through the Chairman to the committee.

Mr. WALLACE. I shall not ask the Chairman any further questions. When I ask a question I am asking it from hon. gentlemen opposite and through the Chair. If the Chairman says we are not to ask questions from him, I shall not ask these questions. I have always kept within the rules of the House and I always intend to. I always intend to have that freedom of debate which is the right of every member of Parliament, and I shall permit neither the Chairman nor anybody else to interfere with my rights and liberties as a member of Parliament.

Mr. FLINT. That is a noble sentiment.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, Sir, I am glad the member for Yarmouth has even that much appreciation of what a proper and noble sentiment is; I had not given him credit up to this time for a proper appreciation of those matters. He also stated that I had made a statement in this House that a member of the committee had sent improper telegrams to Toronto. I made no such statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. I have already ruled this has nothing to do with the question before the Chair. I invite the members of the committee, in order to expedite business, to confine the discussion to the question before the Chair. I know that some interruptions have been made, and I have called to order those hon. members making the interruptions.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. If an incorrect statement is made by an hon. member regarding another, has that member against whom it is made, not a right to get up and deny it?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. If that be the case, and the member for Yarmouth made a statement with regard to the member for West York (Mr. Wallace), I ask if the member for West York, knowing that the statement is not a fact, has not the right to deny it?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. WALLACE. Then, according to your ruling I am within my right in referring to the statement made by the member for Yarmouth?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that this question has been disposed of. A statement was made which I declared was out of order, that it was not within the limits of discussion. I now invite the members of the committee to discuss exclusively the questions which are before the Chair.

Mr. WALLACE. You have ruled in answer to the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that if the member for Yarmouth made a statement against me which was incorrect and untrue, I was to have the privilege of denying it. You have ruled, Mr. Chairman, in reference to the question brought up by the hon. member for East Grey, that when the hon. member for Yarmouth made a statement about me that was incorrect and untrue, I should have the privilege of denying it. It was a self-evident proposition; I do deny it in the most positive terms that I made any such statement.

Mr. FLINT. If I made a remark that is out of order, I certainly withdraw it.

Mr. WALLACE. That ends the matter, and it shows that sometimes the Speaker himself may err as well as others.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. We will return to the question under debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. I was in order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think we will advance the business of the House if the Chairman is going to occupy the whole of the time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I trust the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) will withdraw the statement that the Chairman has erred in his decision.

Mr. WALLACE. The Deputy Speaker prevented me from doing that which, when the point of order was raised by the hon. member for East Grey, he could not deny was right for me to do, and I said that the Speaker had erred in that matter, as we are all liable to err. I am not saying that the Speaker should be infallible, but we all expect him, as we expect ourselves, to pay due regard to the rules of the House. That question is settled, and we will now proceed to the business, and if there are no interruptions we will be able to go on with the discussion of this matter. The hon. Postmaster General has utterly failed to make out his case; the hon. Minister of Customs has utterly failed to make out his case; the hon. member for Yarmouth has acknowledged his own inability in the matter, and so there remains nothing but for the hon. Minister of Railways to give us all the information which he indicated he would give in regard to this road. The hon. Minister said he was chock full of information when the resolutions, providing for the railway subsidies, were before the House and that he was anxious to pour out the information. That is very good as a fable, but, of course, with those hon. members of the House who were here then it will hardly pass muster. I would like the hon. Minister to give us the resolution of the Board of Trade, the letter from the President of the Board of Trade, or some solitary scrap of information, some particle of evidence to show why they are so anxious to have this road built, or some evidence to shew why they are asking the hon. Minister of Railways and the hon. Minister of Customs to make that present of \$134,000 for building this railway through a country which is rich, prosperous and happy, but where a railway is not necessary. If it is not necessary they should be able to tell us why the people of Canada ought to put their hands in their pockets and mortgage their farms to give them \$134,000 in order to secure a seat for the hon. Minister of Customs.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up the time of the House by making any extended remarks, but I want to resent the insult that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) has placed upon the business men, the Board of Trade, the city council, and upon every inhabitant of the town of Owen Sound. He has deliberately said that this vote is put there for the express purpose of corrupting the electors and buying up the

people. I have only to tell him that the business men of Owen Sound will resent any such imputation and will resent any party that acknowledges the leadership, or the partial leadership, of any man who will so wantonly rise up in his place and do what he has done. He will find out from the people of Owen Sound whether this is a corrupt vote or not, whether they have asked for this or not and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) will find, if he does not get up and repudiate these statements, that the men of Meaford will have something to say in reference to this matter. It is past bearing that respectable men, leading business men, can be told in this House, that a proposition that they are in favour of and that they desire to have carried out, is corrupt, and that they are actuated in regard to it by corrupt motives. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee, but I will refer these gentlemen to the full statement in the "Hansard" where they can read what this would-be leader of the Conservative party in this House has to say in reference to them.

Mr. WALLACE. It has been suggested that I move for a medical condition to examine the hon. Minister of Customs as to this outburst.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You need one first.

Mr. WALLACE. As usual the hon. Minister of Customs violates the rules of debate, I am sorry to say, without correction from the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) is mistaken. I said "order."

Mr. WALLACE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I did not hear him. In his fanfaronade the hon. Minister of Customs said that I had insulted the council and the Board of Trade and the citizens of Owen Sound. I had not the slightest intention of insulting any one of these gentlemen. I demanded, I asked, I implored the hon. Minister of Customs and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to give us one scrap of paper, one piece of information, one letter from the President of the Board of Trade, from the mayor of Owen Sound, from the citizens of Owen Sound asking that this money be voted and to give the reasons why they were justified in asking the Parliament of Canada to appropriate \$134,000 for building this road. I only asked for information, and yet, in the face of that the hon. Minister of Customs, who gets out of this House before I rise to speak—

Mr. DAVIS. He has come back again.

Mr. WALLACE. I see he has come back again—accuses me of having insulted these people who, he says, have written and petitioned and asked for this railway. If they have I want to see the documents put

on the Table of the House. I want to see the reasons that these gentlemen have given for asking for \$134,000 for the construction of 21 miles of railway. I ask the hon. Minister of Railways and the hon. Minister of Customs who has not exhibited that serenity of temper that is so desirable, and which is so commendable, why they do not give us some of this information. I heard it stated from the other side of the House that the President of the Board of Trade wanted it. I want the letter of the President of the Board of Trade, and I want the information. Is it unreasonable to ask for that information? I do not think it is. I think it is reasonable and proper that we should be furnished with this information, and yet, day after day, while we are asking for this information we see hon. gentlemen sitting reading their newspapers, or sleeping contentedly in their seats, or, as in the case of our usually amiable hon. Minister of Customs, losing his temper and indulging in a scene.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. WALLACE. I am talking to the question. We want the information. It will not do to give us the information as the hon. Postmaster General has given it to us by saying that that is 34 miles shorter than the Grand Trunk and other lines to Toronto. It does not go to Toronto at all except incidentally, and the Canadian Pacific Railway is 14 miles shorter than this short route of theirs. The other line of the Grand Trunk spreads out in all directions at Palmerston, as the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) very well knows. They are pretty well supplied with railway facilities already, and no reasons have been given why this subsidy should be granted to that road. The Minister of Customs told us that we would have to justify ourselves before the citizens of Owen Sound, but I can tell him that the citizens of Owen Sound are too intelligent to be led away by such clap-trap, although some one was led away by the human devices of the threshing machine and the company connected with it.

Mr. McMULLEN. When the branch was built from Parkhill to Owen Sound on the western side of the harbour, Judge Masson was then the Conservative member and he secured the bonus from this House. No one charged him with corruption then, as the hon. member (Mr. Wallace) charges corruption to-day.

Mr. WALLACE. There was a charter for that road.

Mr. McMULLEN. And there was a charter for this road, although it may have expired.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says it has.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, I presume he is correct. Now, the west side of the harbour requires connection for the reason that if a man in Owen Sound wants to go to Meaford in winter he would have to travel from Owen Sound to Cardwell Junction on the Canadian Pacific Railway and then travel over the Grand Trunk Railway to Collingwood and thence to Meaford. Unless he drove he would have to travel 150 miles.

Mr. WALLACE. I have driven it.

Mr. McMULLEN. So have I, but it would be far more convenient to have a railway. Owen Sound is becoming a very important town, and this link of railway should certainly be constructed. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) knows that the wheat centre there is Owen Sound, and if he were a miller the only way he could bring wheat to Barrie or Orillia would be to carry it away down to Cardwell Junction on the Canadian Pacific Railway and change it there and bring it up on the Grand Trunk Railway. All this proves that that link would be a decided advantage to the people of Owen Sound and the people of Meaford. Owen Sound is growing, the Canadian Pacific Railway are putting in elevators there, and this would be a very desirable connection. If a man now wants to go from Owen Sound up the line to Caledon, towards the north shore of Lake Superior, to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway for Winnipeg, he would have to go in winter from Owen Sound to Cardwell Junction and then take the train back up to Barrie, and then strike out from Barrie in another direction. This link will enable him to take a much shorter route.

Mr. WALLACE. How much shorter?

Mr. McMULLEN. One hundred miles shorter.

Mr. WALLACE. Not half of that.

Mr. McMULLEN. It will be 75 or 100 miles shorter, as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) knows.

Mr. WALLACE. Not half of that.

Mr. McMULLEN. It will be considerably shorter, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) understood the topography of the country, he would not offer opposition to this line.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Customs worked up some righteous indignation because the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) did not commend the item, although I had already given what, to my mind, was a reasonable defence for it.

Mr. WALLACE. You gave the only defence that was given for it.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) was excited and out of temper, and he jumped up without waiting for

Mr. WALLACE.

any one to give it a defence. I can tell him that his tempest in a teapot will not amount to much. I can assure him that I will not ask his assistance to defend my conduct either in this House or elsewhere, nor will it be necessary to have his assistance in defending my conduct before the people of Meaford or before the people of Owen Sound. Such an exhibition on the part of the Minister (Mr. Paterson), to my mind, as a medical man, would indicate something else than righteous indignation, when he spoke of an insult being offered to the board of trade of either Owen Sound or Meaford. If I were asked as a professional man what I thought such conduct indicated, I would say that it looked more like senile softening of the brain than anything else.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But have you any medical knowledge?

Mr. SPROULE. It may be I have not, but after an experience of thirty years I would give that as my judgment. The hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) asked for the memorial sent by the board of trade, and although it would be unnecessary for me to ask for that, as I know the locality well, it was not out of the way that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) should make such a request. I repeat what I have already stated, that this link of railway will connect the western and eastern systems, and that is one of the most desirable needs of the situation. It will also serve with a railway as fine a section of agricultural country as can be found in our part of northern Ontario. I have said that before and I repeat it now. As for the people of Owen Sound, I know, by personal acquaintance with them, that they are anxious to get this railway; but I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Customs to the fact that the most desirable portion of the railway to Meaford is that which would connect the Northern Railway with the harbour, which they would like to have immediately. I asked the hon. gentleman if any portion of this bonus was available for that purpose, and he was good enough to tell me that he did not know. If this is an honest intention to serve the needs of the people, I would imagine that the hon. Minister of Customs would be able to tell me at once whether a portion of this subsidy would be available for that line; but he did not say so, but rather left the impression on my mind that it would not be available for that. If this be the case, the very natural inference would be, that there is some ulterior object to be served by this bonus. I can only say that if the railway is built—and I hope it will be—it will serve a large number of persons. It is a very desirable link, connecting the eastern and western sections of the country, and will enable people to go from Owen Sound, by Collingwood, to the Canadian Pacific Railway, instead of by Cardwell Junction. The distance

would be about 34 miles shorter from Owen Sound. Apart from that, it is a very desirable link of railway, and it will serve an agricultural district which, I believe, has no superior in Ontario. The people will be glad to have it built, especially the people of Owen Sound and those living between Owen Sound and Meaford. The people of Meaford are somewhat divided on the subject; but they would be glad to have a portion of this subsidy applied to extending the Northern Railway to the harbour.

To the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company, for their line of railway in and through the city of Hull, Que., not exceeding 4 miles.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to know about this?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is to complete and continue the line of railway through to Nepean Point.

Mr. WALLACE. Is that the line coming to the new bridge?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

To the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company, for a railway from the town of South Edmonton, N.W.T., to North Edmonton, and thence westerly towards the Yellow Head Pass, a distance not exceeding 50 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Minister if he is prepared now to give any information as to who are the directors of this road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not beyond what I gave before.

Mr. FOSTER. We are asked to give a large subsidy to this company for one of the most important lines of railway ever projected in this country, and I think that before we give the Government power to make a contract with this company for this important line, with a charter privilege, such as they have, we have a perfect right to know who the leading men in the company are.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no further information in regard to the constitution of the company than I had the other day, when I told the hon. gentleman that Mr. McAvity was the president and Mr. Pearson the secretary. If the hon. gentleman would desire me to strike out the words "to the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company," and simply put in "for a railway from the town of South Edmonton," and so on, I am perfectly willing to leave it that way.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the hon. gentleman suppose there would be gained by that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know. I am simply suggesting that.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to appeal to the First Minister whether he thinks that, as representatives of the people, we have a right to that information?

The PRIME MINISTER. Does my hon. friend think any purpose would be served by it?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I do.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, I do not know that any purpose would be served. My hon. friend says he has no further information than he has given, and it seems to me that the object of my hon. friend is accomplished by that. What is the object of my hon. friend? It is to assure himself that this company is able to carry on the undertaking. When a man of the position of Mr. George McAvity comes before the Government, and, in the face of Parliament, says that he is able to carry out a scheme for which he asks the aid of Parliament, for my part, I am satisfied that we have all the guarantee of respectability and ability that we can possibly have.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend cannot even say that. Mr. George McAvity never appeared before this House as the signer of any petition which declared that he was able and willing, and ready to build this road towards the Yellow Head Pass. There was a petition that came before this House. After a long struggle, we got it read. It was signed by Mr. George McAvity and Mr. Pearson, and it asked for three things. It declared that they had capital and were willing to proceed to build on these three lines: One was 4½ miles from the south of the river to North Edmonton; the other was from North Edmonton north to Fort Assiniboine, and the other was north-east towards Fort Saskatchewan.

These were the lines of road that Mr. Geo. McAvity and Mr. Pearson, the president and secretary of that company, asked that the subsidy be given for, and these were the lines which, over Mr. Geo. McAvity's name, they were prepared to go on and build. What has happened? There is no subsidy given them for any one of these, with the exception of a short line between South and North Edmonton, but two or three months after the petition by Mr. Geo. McAvity and Mr. Pearson came in, based on the ground I have stated, a petition is forwarded for the company by Mr. Pearson, asking that a subsidy be given for a road towards the Yellow Head Pass and another subsidy, amounting to a guarantee of \$80,000 for a certain length of time, to another road in a north-easterly direction. There was in that petition no assertion that they were ready or wished to build the Yellow Head Pass road. There was not one circumstance or fact or documentary evidence of any kind with reference to the engineering difficulties or anything else of the road,

there was no commercial reason given why their petition should be granted. I am willing to take Mr. Geo. McAvity for just what he is worth, and in some respects he is worth a great deal, but he is not a railway builder and never has been. My solemn belief is that the gentlemen who have this in charge, are neither railway builders nor do they propose to be railway builders. My solemn belief is that they are vendors of railway franchises, and that is what they intend to be and all they intend to be. Mr. William Pugsley's name has been spoken of as being a guarantee for great capital to build great railways. That is simply nonsense. He never was and is not to-day a builder of railways. He is a promoter of railways, he is a solicitor for railways, he has a perfect right to be both, but to talk about him as a guarantee that a great public work will be built is simply nonsense, and everybody who knows the circumstances will agree with me. What are you doing? There is a suspicious circumstance in this sudden change of front. The Edmonton people got a charter for what? Not to build the Yellow Head Pass road. They got a charter to do certain things for themselves—to join the south and the north and then run on to East Assiniboia and also to join Athabasca Landing and then run up in a north-easterly direction to Fort Saskatchewan. That is what Mr. Pugsley bought, and from that time there is nothing which would show who are the parties for whom Mr. Pugsley acted and in whose behalf he purchased.

According to the first petition from Geo. McAvity and Mr. Pearson, these designs of the Edmonton people, granted to them in their charter, were to be carried out, in this present instance, the designs to be accomplished by that charter are not to be carried out, with the single exception of 4½ miles between South and North Edmonton. Instead of the road going north-east, instead of its going north towards Fort Assiniboine, the road from North Edmonton points directly west to the Yellow Head Pass. Since the time of the purchase of that charter, Mr. Pugsley, who purchased for these gentlemen—whoever they are and of whom we know but two, the president and the secretary—has got an important, priceless franchise from this Parliament, without the cost, comparatively speaking, of one dollar. What are they? He has got the franchise for the Yellow Head Pass and the Peace River country, and he stands there with those important franchises, on the very gateway of the transcontinental road, which according to the Toronto "Globe," is now projected, and which, by votes in this House this year, is subsidized to the extent of 500 or 600 miles in different places. He stands there with a franchise which must be bought out or utilized by this transcontinental road before it can build through the pass and get to British Columbia. There is reason and

Mr. FOSTER.

sense when you take men who are railway builders and contractors and of great worth, such as Mackenzie & Mann, and grant them franchises for portions of that road and subsidies, because you know you are granting it, not to men who are promoting charters, but to the builders and operators of roads. But the moment that great project gets to Edmonton and seeks to get through the Yellow Head Pass or the Peace River country to the ocean, it is met by the holders of this franchise, the only persons of whom we know are Mr. Pugsley, who is the solicitor, and Mr. McAvity, whose name cannot be found as an applicant for this subsidy, and Mr. Pearson who asked for it, as the secretary of the company, without giving any reason why the change should be made.

Starting with the belief, as I do, that these gentlemen are there for the purpose, not of building the road, but of profiting by the sale of the franchises which this House has given to them, I say that it behooves the Minister of Railways and the First Minister to give the information as to who are behind these gentlemen. I cannot find it. I have heard of gentlemen that are behind it. I have heard that there are members in this House who are interested in it and are voting this subsidy for these franchises behind the Minister of Railways and Canals. Is it true? I have heard that a son of the Minister is one of the promoters. Is that true? I know that Mr. Pugsley is a solicitor, and wherever for the last twenty years you have found Mr. Pugsley, you have found the Minister of Railways, and wherever you have found the Minister of Railways, you have found Mr. Pugsley. I say that it is a very serious thing when this Parliament gives into the hands of such gentlemen a priceless franchise, worth hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of dollars, if they simply mean to stand there in the gap and sell that franchise at a profit for themselves. I believe, as I have said, honestly that these gentlemen are not builders of roads but sellers of franchises, and are into this thing for what they can make out of the transfer or sale of their franchise, without building a transcontinental road. Such a road cannot be built and owned and run by different owners. It must be under the directing power of some one great hand, and that hand is, I believe, the gentlemen who are building the larger portion of that and who are heavily subsidized this year. These are the reasons why I think Parliament ought to have the information. It is whispered about the streets of this city, and the whisper has come to me, that there are gentlemen who are in this House, who believe that the discussion which took place the day before yesterday, was worth \$200,000 to their pockets. Why? Simply because they are going to build a transcontinental railway? Not at all, they are not going to do that any more than they are going to build a railway to

the moon, but because this has now taken the aspect of a transcontinental road and consequently their franchises are very valuable.

Now, Sir, I take the responsibility of making these statements; and I believe that what I have stated is just about what will be proved to be the facts of the case. I say that in a case of that kind and with such an important position taken as is taken by the holders of this franchise, there is no reason why this information should not be given to the House. It is the people's money. It is not the money of the Government and the money of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and when the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Government ask for that sum of money they ask it from the people's representatives, and the people's representatives surely should know to whom it is to be entrusted. These are the reasons why I believe I ought to have that information and why the House ought to have it.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is really no reason for any expression of heat in the matter—

Mr. FOSTER. It is not heat, but earnestness.

The PRIME MINISTER. Heat and earnestness, if my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) puts it that way; and, if he permits me to say so, perhaps behind the earnestness we may see something which is not altogether in accord with earnestness, and perhaps a good deal of acting as well. My hon. friend has changed his ground entirely between the question he first asked and the speech he has just made. In the first place, he asked who were the incorporators of this company, who represented it or who were its directors. The information we gave him was that we know the president and secretary, and if the object he has in view is to be assured of the respectability and ability of the company to carry out the undertaking which we entrust to their hands, that object is fully served. The hon. gentleman does not dispute the weight of Mr. McAvity's name. He said Mr. McAvity is a very good man, but that he has not always been a railway builder. Granted. But is it reasonable to suppose that the men to build railways must have been railway builders all their lives? I remember the day when the Parliament of Canada gave \$25,000,000 and 25,000,000 acres of land to men who had not built railways up to that time—Mr. Duncan McIntyre, a dry goods merchant; Mr. Robert Angus, president of a bank; Mr. Donald Smith, as he was at that time, who had been connected with the Hudson Bay Company; and Mr. George Stephen, as he was at that time, a dry goods merchant. These were able business men, who had made pretty large fortunes in their several lines of business, and gone into railway building. If, following in their footsteps, Mr. McAvity, the successful business man of St. John, goes into rail-

way building, what objection is there to that? And why should it be considered to be a detriment to Mr. McAvity that he has not been in the railway business up to this time? Is it a reasonable objection why this vote should not be granted, that Mr. McAvity now steps out from the business he has pursued and goes into other business? He may carry on both. There is nothing in this objection, and my hon. friend himself must admit it. He says that we have not got it over the signature of Mr. McAvity that he is willing to accept this subsidy. He grants that we have a petition signed by Mr. McAvity, as president of the company and by Mr. Thompson, as secretary. But what Mr. McAvity asked was a subsidy from South Edmonton to North Edmonton and northwards. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), who knows that there has been an amended application signed by Mr. Thompson on behalf of the company. It is true that that application has not been signed by Mr. McAvity. But does my hon. friend say that where the secretary of a respectable company makes application on behalf of his company, it would not have the same force as if signed by the president? Are we to attach no weight to the amended application because it bears only the signature of the secretary? Surely my hon. friend is not serious in that. The application is just as official, if it has the seal of the company and the signature of the secretary, as if it had the signature of all the board of directors.

What is my hon. friend's objection? He says he sees something serious in this matter—there are charter-mongers. He sees the hand of William Pugsley, who has obtained valuable franchises, and who has obtained a charter to build a railway towards the Yellow Head. True, Mr. Pugsley is one of the incorporators of a company to build a railway towards the Yellow Head. And by whose hand was that charter granted? By the hand of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). Did he object to Mr. Pugsley getting a charter? Did he raise the objection that Mr. Pugsley was a charter-monger? If not, what objections can he raise now? And because there is a company with a charter further east, is that any reason why this railway should not be built from Edmonton towards the Yellow Head Pass for a distance of fifty miles? At present it is only a local railway. It may be a transcontinental railway in course of time; I hope it may be. But that is in the future. I ask my hon. friend, does he seriously say that because there have been charters granted towards the Yellow Head Pass with which this company may have to amalgamate or to deal later on in order to extend its railway, that that is any objection to this grant? And will he ask this House to refuse this grant because Mr. Pugsley, or anybody else, may have a charter covering ground further on? He cannot be serious in these things. He says: I have

heard whispers and rumours in the streets. Have we come to this, that the Parliament of Canada is to be guided by street rumours? Rumours and whispers cannot affect this Parliament. We are here to give a railway to the people of Edmonton who want to extend a railway westward into a fertile part of the country, and from this railway they expect great advantage locally. This, it seems to me is quite a sufficient reason for what is here proposed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I wish to make one or two remarks in answer to what was said by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). He appears to have spoken with the idea that he could repeat the rumours that he had heard or suggest that rumours of a certain kind had reached him, and, perhaps, by including the names of friends or connections of my own, he might thereby succeed in creating suspicion in the minds of members of the committee or of others outside, that I had some connection with this enterprise. What other object can the hon. gentleman have in making the statement? If that be his object, I wish to say here, in the most emphatic manner, that I have no connection, directly or indirectly, for myself or anybody else, in any shape or form, with this enterprise. I do not know who are the people who are promoting it further than I have stated in this committee. The hon. gentleman states that he hears that my son is connected with it. My son is of age and is doing business for himself, and is entirely free to engage in any business enterprises that may offer. If he is in the slightest degree connected with this enterprise, it is not on my behalf or with my knowledge; and, let me add, that I do not believe he is. I believe there is sufficient confidence between him and myself that he would have intimated it to me if he had any such connection. Therefore, I am free to say that I do not believe he has the remotest connection with this as a business enterprise, except that possibly he may have done some professional work for Mr. McAvity in the matter. That is the most, I believe, that his connection would amount to in the matter. So far as Mr. Pugsley is concerned, the hon. gentleman says that wherever I have been Mr. Pugsley has been, and wherever Mr. Pugsley has appeared I have appeared. I give the hon. gentleman the most emphatic contradiction to any such statement. I had no business connection with Mr. Pugsley, not that I would not be very glad to have, because I have known Mr. Pugsley for many years. I have been professionally engaged against him in case after case, very seldom have we had even professional connection. Knowing him so well, I can say that I know nothing to Mr. Pugsley's discredit. I know him to be an honourable man, and I form that opinion from personal experience and observation in my business transactions with him. If Mr.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Pugsley happens to have some interest in this enterprise, is that not his right as much as of any uncle, or brother, or cousin of the hon. gentleman would have? Just as much. I do not think that there is any embargo laid upon Mr. Pugsley because he and I are friends, or happen to live in the same province, or happen to have resided a number of years in the same town. I think it is childish, puerile, it is even worse, for the hon. gentleman to think that by connecting the names of these gentlemen with my own he can therefore cast suspicion upon me. I have been a good many years in public life, a good many assaults have been made upon me by persons who have been inspired with the same feeling as moves the hon. gentleman, and in every instance they have absolutely failed by any means they could resort to establish any improper act on my part in connection with public affairs. I know my duty in these matters, and I intend to adhere strictly to it, and carefully to avoid any connection with this or any other matter which is not proper and defensible. Now, coming to this particular vote, I cannot see why the hon. gentleman should be so opposed to it. He says he has heard on the street that by reason of this discussion the company are going to make two or three hundred thousand dollars. Is the hon. gentleman envious because he is not going to participate in their two or three hundred thousand dollars? If these gentlemen are able to carry on this enterprise successfully, if they had foresight enough to get power to build a railway, why should they not benefit by it? No other person sought it, Parliament did not refuse anybody else. They came here and got this charter, and got it re-affirmed. I think it has been two or three times before this Parliament. If these gentlemen had business foresight enough to see that there was likely to be a good field for railway enterprise in that direction, and if they got a charter for the purpose, why should they not get any benefits that may accrue from it? Why should it be said that because this might be in a distant future part of a general transcontinental railway, therefore we ought to refuse to encourage the construction of any part of that line as a local line? I cannot at all see any reason in any such proposition. Parliament at this session has freely given them what legislation they asked, and if there is the slightest objection to the Bill in its present form, I would readily consent that, in the event of the Edmonton and Yukon Pacific Railway Company not having sufficient financial strength to carry this work forward within the time authorized by the Act, the clause could be changed so as to strike out the Edmonton and Yukon Pacific Railway Company altogether, and let it stand as a vote for a railway; so that whatever company may take power to carry it forward may be entitled to ask for the

bonus. That change might properly be suggested from the stand-point of anybody who thought that these gentlemen, whoever they are, who are behind Messrs. McAvity and Pearson, whoever constitutes the company of which they are officers, might not be able to carry the work; in that case, some such amendment might be in order.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the Minister give any reason why the subsidy direction was changed from the prayer of the first petition to the second? because the petitioner gives no reason at all. In the first petition there is a very extended reason given, the engineering capabilities of the company are gone into, the ability of the company to construct, what they expect it will cost—all that is gone into as if that was the direction in which they had set their mind. There has been a divergence from this, and while made on the request of a company signed by the secretary, no reason is given. What is the reason that they changed their minds? What is the reason that caused them to carry out the latter rather than the preceding plan, more especially when the preceding one was in line of what the city of Edmonton had wished to have carried out?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understood from Mr. Pearson when he was here and made his application, that he had applied to the Railway Committee and to Parliament to allow his company to construct their line in the direction of the Yellow Head Pass, and that having that authority, they had concluded to follow that route. So far as the cost of the construction of the line is concerned, Mr. Pearson stated that he did not imagine from what information they had that there would be any greater difficulty surrounding the building of a line in the direction of the Yellow Head Pass than there would be by taking the first proposed route. The class of country through which the road passed would be practically of the same description, and would involve no heavier outlay for railway construction. The company authorized the secretary to state to us that he had authority to make this request, and Parliament having authorized the change in the route, adopted this as one of the alternative routes, and the company desiring a subsidy by this route, we did not see that there was any reason why it ought to be withheld, particularly since, as a local road, it goes through a section which is equally fertile, equally good, equally desirable for settlement as if it had gone in a direct northern course. That is the information we had, and which will be sustained by the member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), who, I think, has made a statement to the same effect.

For a railway in extension of the St. Francis Branch of the Temiscouata Railway to the mouth of the St. Francis River, a distance not exceeding 3 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is to build that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That will, no doubt, be built by the Temiscouata Railway, that is the expectation. It is the extension of their road, and is likely to be a very valuable piece of road.

For a line of railway from Paspébiac, Que., to Gaspé in the said province, a distance not exceeding 82 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is to get the subsidy to build that road?

The PRIME MINISTER. There is a charter in existence for the Atlantic and Lake Superior Company, but we have not given the subsidy nominally to that company, because we have to consider whether they have the financial ability to build that road. That is the only reason.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you think it is necessary to look into that matter?

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps so. Of course, the company has been unlucky in many ways, and, without going deeply into that, I may say it would be advisable, before we give a subsidy to any company, to be quite satisfied that they are able to carry it out.

Mr. BERGERON. The Atlantic and Lake Superior are the only company having a charter there, and I see that their engineers are at work on the line. I do not see how you can give it to any other company, and I do not know why their name is not mentioned here.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will be very glad, if that company can satisfy the Government as to their financial standing.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the president of that company?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think, Mr. Préfontaine, but I am not sure.

Mr. BERGERON. I think it is Senator Thibaudeau.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps so.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not my right hon. friend think that Mr. Préfontaine's name as president would be quite good enough guarantee that we should vote the subsidy for that company?

The PRIME MINISTER. If Mr. Préfontaine could give his whole time to it, his name would be quite sufficient. But Mr. Préfontaine is mayor of the city of Montreal, and he cannot devote his time to this enterprise. If Mr. Préfontaine would take it up himself, I am sure he would carry it through.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. McAvity is a wholesale merchant, and he doubtless cannot give his whole time to that railway so far away.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. McAvity is a wealthy merchant and a business man, while Mr. Préfontaine is a lawyer, which is quite different.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh.

To the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company, for a line of railway from Ridgetown, Ont., to St. Thomas, in the said province, a distance not exceeding 44 miles; this subsidy to be payable only in the event of adequate running rights over the Canada Southern Railway between the two points above mentioned not being granted to the first mentioned company on terms to be approved by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. CLANCY. I wish to make a short statement with regard to this, and I will have to repeat much of what I said on a former occasion. In the western peninsula of Ontario there are three trunk lines: the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canada Southern. There was a railway built from the town of Sarnia, on Lake Huron, following the river St. Clair by Wallaceburg, Dresden to Rondeau, on Lake Erie. Following that, there was a railway built, known as the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway, from the town of Walkerville, following to the south very closely the Lake Erie shore, until it reached Ridgetown. These two roads have been amalgamated, and are now under one system, the objective point being the city of St. Thomas, which would connect the traffic of these two roads with the London and Port Stanley Railway, that has been leased by the railway company now owning the Lake Erie and Detroit River, and the Erie and Huron Railway, which are under one charter, covering the ground between Ridgetown and St. Thomas. I shall leave out the aid received from the Dominion and provincial governments, and I will state that for the Erie and Huron Railway, a local road, running at right angles with the Canada Southern, no less than \$257,000 have been voted by the municipalities to that road, exclusive of the sum voted to continue the road from Ridgetown to St. Thomas. There has been \$37,500 voted for the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway between Walkerville and Ridgetown, making in all municipal bonuses of not less than \$344,000. That shows the desire of the people of the municipalities for that road. It is perfectly clear the primary object now is to connect the system that is owned by that company with the road they have already leased. As the Prime Minister has said, we cannot ignore local conditions, and, considering that, this is certainly not a paralleling road, for the simple reason that all these roads must run close together on that narrow strip close to the lake shore. There is only from six to eight miles distance in that whole strip of land between the Canada Southern Railway and Lake Erie to reach St. Thomas. This is not a competing line. It

Mr. FOSTER.

is simply an outlet for these two roads and to connect that system with the London and Port Stanley road. Now, I am going to ask what seems to me a pertinent question: What can be the object of any railway company objecting to that road being built from Ridgetown to St. Thomas? I am not going into the details, but I am going to put this case. Can there be any reason suggested why this Parliament should listen for one moment, to a proposition that that road shall not be bonused except upon the condition that they should go to the Canada Southern Railway Company and ask running powers over their line, and that only, if such powers cannot be agreed upon, this subsidy may be paid over? The people have taxed themselves to an enormous extent with the object of providing themselves with a local road, because the trunk lines, and especially the Canada Southern pay no attention to local traffic. What the people want and what they are willing to pay for is an independent outlet by giving them a connection with the system west, and with the Port Stanley road on the east. I appeal to the right hon. gentleman and I do not desire to enter into a heated discussion, if it is a fair proposition to tie these people up to the Canada Southern Railway Company. It is not a fair thing to the people who have taxed themselves, and who are willing to tax themselves further, to say that no railway company should give them an outlet when Parliament has granted that railway company a charter, and especially in view of the grants which have been passed, among which is this one to build 21 miles of road between Owen Sound and Meaford where there is no charter granted. I am not going to condemn that, but that grant is not tied up in the way this one is. The line between Owen Sound and Meaford is not a paralleling line, and the same may be said of this, because this is not a paralleling line for any purposes of competition. It is not fair to these people to deprive them of the right to build that line with their own money and of carrying through the scheme of extending the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway, with its two branches, one leaving Walkerville and following the lake shore, and the other leaving Sarnia and running across the country, carrying them on to St. Thomas and thence to London. It seems to me to be the baldest proposition that I ever listened to for a railway company to object to a charter being granted, and in the next place to insist that these people should be tied up to the condition that this subsidy shall only be paid if these running rights should not be obtained in accordance with whatever rule the Railway Committee of the Privy Council think best to lay down. The proposition is unjust and unfair, and there is no parallel case to it in the large sums of money which we are voting in these subsidy resolutions. There is absolutely not the

shadow of a parallel case to a proposition of this kind. I will ask the right hon. gentleman if he thinks it is possible that these people can have running powers that would be as satisfactory as an independent line. The proposition is impossible, and the most unreasonable one I ever listened to. It is an unfair one, and I appeal to the fairness of the right hon. gentleman not to tie these people up and to prevent them, who have paid out of their own pockets nearly half a million dollars for railway facilities, from getting the outlet that they desire. I think that I will not appeal in vain to the right hon. gentleman's fairness, because, as I have stated before, I do not think there is a parallel to this case. I hope that he will be able to accede to my request, and that the subsidy will be granted without having such conditions attached to it.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) to explain why running powers over the Canada Southern would not be sufficient to give the people all the railway facilities they require?

Mr. CLANCY. I will tell the right hon. gentleman, and I think, if he will be perfectly frank, he would say that he knows himself. Running powers are always contingent upon the circumstances that may arise. Any independent line can run their trains as they like, and to suit themselves; and for that reason we think that we ought to be placed in the same position as all other roads. I reiterate the statement that it is not a fair question to put. I take the ground that there is no reason why we should be obliged to depend upon any running powers whatever. It is an unfair thing to put us in a position of depending upon running powers; it is an unfair thing to that section of the country that they should be asked to consider such a proposition, which is only laid down in regard to that single road. I have not entered upon the phase of the question in respect to the fact that the Michigan Central Railway is a part of the great Vanderbilt system. This is a road which has never been subsidized, and the Government are not subsidizing a parallel line in granting this subsidy. None of the people are making a demand that this condition shall be imposed. The request comes simply from the Michigan Central Railway, the authorities of which come into Canadian territory and demand that you must give them what they ask, and lay down the conditions upon which Canada is to spend its own money. I think this is an impossible proposition; the people are not asking it; it is simply this railway corporation that is asking it. I hope my right hon. friend will not say that there is any other person making this demand, and of all persons in the world the Michigan Central Railway Company have the least reason to

make it. As I said before, this is not a competing line, but it is only to make a complete connection of these two lines of road. I think this is an unheard of proposition; it is one that has no parallel in the railway history of Canada, and I am sure that it is not a proposition that we should lay down here.

The PRIME MINISTER. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the last body to be considered is the Canada Southern Railway Company. If the interest of the Canada Southern Railway Company comes into conflict with the interest of the people, who want to be served by a railway in that locality, the interest of the people must be considered first. Let us keep that in mind. Now, my hon. friend will agree with me that it is not desirable to have two lines of railway where one will suit the purpose.

Mr. CLANCY. It is absolutely out of the question to say that one will serve the purpose. Everybody knows that one will not serve the purpose.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is a question. It is not a healthy condition of things to have two lines of railway where one will serve the purpose. It is not a healthy condition of things to go to the expense of building a railway, if you can provide for the same traffic upon one line. That is a proposition so plain that I think nobody will dispute it. I understand my hon. friend to mean that a second line of railway is necessary in that locality. That second line of railway would be built not more than two miles from the other line of railway that now exists. What reason can there be for that? I understand that there is only one reason, that the people between the town of Ridgetown and St. Thomas, who are petitioning for this railway, would never have thought of having a second line constructed, if they could have their business done by the Canada Southern.

Mr. CLANCY. It is not those people alone.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no difference between my hon. friend and myself. If a second line is desired there, it is because the Canada Southern has so much to do that it cannot accommodate the public. On the New York Central there are four tracks at the present time from New York to Albany, and perhaps to Buffalo. I understand that the traffic of the locality which is represented by my hon. friend is so heavy that the one line of railway will not accommodate both the through traffic and the local traffic. That fact is the basis of this proposition.

Mr. CLANCY. The right hon. gentleman is not quite stating the case fairly. That is the case between Ridgetown and St. Thomas; but that is only a part, and a small part, of the great evil. The people all along the line

of both of these roads want this line as an independent outlet.

The PRIME MINISTER. Why, as an independent outlet? Because they are not properly served by the existing line.

Mr. CLANCY. True, but they want an independent line, and not to be dependent for running powers upon the Canada Southern. They want a purely local road rather than to be dependent on any of the trunk lines for the purpose of an outlet.

The PRIME MINISTER. After all, there is not much difference between my hon. friend and myself. It simply amounts to this, that in the opinion of the people my hon. friend represents, two lines have become necessary. If that be the case, the necessity will be met by the very language of the resolution, and an additional line would be justified. For my part, I am very strongly with my hon. friend. I have told him that privately and publicly, and I tell him so again. I believe the second line ought to be constructed, but the hon. gentleman knows that it is a very serious undertaking to subsidize 44 miles of railway within a few feet of an existing railway. I believe the conditions exist why a second line should be built. The information which I have on the subject justifies the statement which has been made to me, and which I now repeat, that the existing line is not sufficient to accommodate the traffic in that locality. The through traffic of the Canada Southern is so enormous that it puts aside the accommodation of the public between Ridgetown and St. Thomas. Under the circumstances, I think the Government must come to the conclusion that no adequate running rights could be given to the public over that line, and that a second line should be built. I think my hon. friend should not press the matter more at present. He will have all the guarantee, from the facts he has presented, that a second line ought to be built.

Mr. CLANCY. It seems to me that the Government should not hesitate a moment, after the statement the right hon. gentleman has made, to at once remove that prohibition. If there are only two or three miles between these railways, it is not the fault of the people of that locality, who are asking for an outlet. It is because the Michigan Central has a trunk line through that country, over which the people have no control. They would not care, if the Michigan Central were not there at all. So far as the local traffic is concerned the Michigan Central Company comes to this House and demands that there shall be no railway subsidy given for a line that is already chartered, simply because they have a line there. It is an unfair demand. It is simply a question whether the Michigan Central or the

Mr. CLANCY.

people will rule in this case. I have nothing to say against the Michigan Central Company, beyond this, that they are making an unfair demand; and, as the right hon. gentleman knows, under other circumstances the Government would not hesitate a moment about removing that prohibition. The right hon. gentleman thinks that I shall serve the case just as well by not urging it. I quite understand that the Government is all-powerful, and that no words that I use will have the slightest effect in the matter. But I have presented the case in its true light, and I think, on its bare merits it is as strong as any words of mine can make it. I venture to say that you cannot find a similar condition of affairs in Canada. Why should we be singled out without reason for this kind of treatment? I am puzzled beyond all imagination that a through line, which has failed to serve the people, should come here and say: We will undertake to serve the people in the future, if you will run over our line and do not let another road be built. We did not serve the people in the past, but now that the Government of Canada have given a charter for a line, and have thought it wise and in the interest of the people to grant a subsidy, we say: Do not give them a subsidy, but just see what kind of an arrangement you can make with us. There never could be conceived a more preposterous proposition than that made by the Michigan Central Railway. Every condition that would entitle that railway company to make a demand, is absolutely against it. The Government is strong enough to do justice; I believe the right hon. gentleman is strong enough to do justice, and yield to his own impulse to do what is right, by removing this condition at once. The proposition has not a single recommendation behind it.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no doubt that if the Government were to yield to the entreaties of my hon. friend he would be satisfied, and perhaps the people of the locality he represents would be satisfied as well. But he knows that we are attacked to-day on account of the magnitude of these subsidies. He knows that we are attacked in the House and in the press for paralleling railways, the very thing my hon. friend asks us to do. It may seem very odd at the first glance that the Government should undertake to give a subsidy to a railway paralleling another, but there are circumstances which warrant us in doing so. I maintain the position that I have taken all along, that the Government must give railway accommodation to the people; and if two or three or four railways are necessary, the Government should aid their construction in order to give every citizen the railway accommodation to which he is entitled. But my hon. friend will not find any fault with us in not rushing forward to invite those criticisms and in taking precautions to guard against them, and put

itself in a position to show that if, at any particular time, we should give the subsidy, as I think it ought to be given, we did not decide to do so until we had ample reason.

**Mr. CLANCY.** The only criticism which the right hon. gentleman would receive, if he were to accede to my request, would be from the Michigan Central Railway, and in refusing to accede to it, he lays himself open to the criticism that this railway subsidy should be tied up at the instance of a great railway corporation. The charge that this will be subsidizing a parallel line does not lie in this case, because the local conditions are such that to insist on any such charge would be manifestly unfair, and I am confident none would come from any members on either side of the House.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The hon. gentleman desires that a portion of this 49th clause should be struck out, and that a direct subsidy be given to the Lake Erie and Detroit Railway Company, without any condition attached to it at all. To that request the hon. gentleman has had his answer from the right hon. First Minister, which, I think, will be accepted as the final definite answer which the Government has to give.

**Mr. CLANCY.** No doubt.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** My hon. friend is no doubt a very enthusiastic advocate for a subsidy direct to this company, but he looks at this question solely from one point of view. He does not regard it at all in the light in which it would be regarded by the public generally. If the statement can be made that this Government have given a subsidy to a local road, running for 44 miles and which parallels, within a mile or two, an existing railway, without proper inquiry being made, without being convinced of the necessity of doing it, that would be very much to the prejudice of the Government, as my hon. friend knows. What is the duty of the Government under such circumstances? Is it not to satisfy itself thoroughly before it lays itself open to such criticism, that there was no other course it would properly take in the public interest. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) is not willing to allow the Government to make that proper inquiry and to satisfy itself whether or not this is a case in which the duplication of a line of railway for 44 miles would be warranted.

**Mr. CLANCY.** Will the hon. Minister permit me to ask: Is he laying down a fair proposition?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I am laying down a general proposition.

**Mr. CLANCY.** Will the hon. Minister say he has fulfilled the general proposition in all these railways? Will he say that the Gov-

ernment have been so definite and perfectly satisfied of all other schemes? I am not complaining of the position he took in other cases, but what I am complaining of is his applying a rule to this case he has not applied and cannot apply to others.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I am laying down a general proposition which, I think, the hon. gentleman will fail to show the Government has departed from in any of the cases in this Bill. It is a principle, I am sure, which it is the duty of the Government to follow. The mere fact that it is proposed to put a railway for 44 miles right alongside an existing railway is a proposition which, *prima facie*, ought not to receive favourable consideration.

**Mr. CLANCY.** Is the hon. gentleman frightened of the criticism of the Michigan Central or of the people?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I want to tell my hon. friend that he is wholly mistaken when he says we have incorporated this clause under any pressure from the Canada Southern Railway. I beg to assure him that we have incorporated it under no such pressure.

**Mr. CLANCY.** Will the hon. gentleman say that they did not oppose the granting of a charter over this same territory?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I am not saying that they did or did not. If the hon. gentleman says they did, I accept his statement and do not cast any doubt upon its accuracy. But I have never heard of it until to-night. When this proposition first came before the Government and we were asked to entertain it, a year or two ago, I stated, and the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) will bear me out—I stated to a delegation that waited upon me: Is not this an unreasonable proposition? Is it not unreasonable that we should ask Parliament to subsidize a railway running a distance of 44 miles alongside of and within two miles of an existing road? I said: I think you ought to ascertain whether or not you could acquire running rights on reasonable terms from the other company before you ask Parliament to vote so much money for such a purpose. With that intimation, they went away. I did not make that suggestion at the instance of the Canada Southern Railway, but because it struck my own mind, as it would any person's who was trying to do what was proper in the circumstances. They went away to make inquiries, I believe, and to come to a proper understanding on the subject. Perhaps, no special effort was made to arrive at an understanding. I do not know. But it is none the less the duty of the Government to put itself in a position where it can defend itself, and where, if a subsidy is to be granted, we can feel that we have exhausted every reasonable effort

before we give a bonus to any line of railway under the circumstances. Now, that is not just what the people of that locality call for. But the people of the locality are not the only ones to be listened to. The Government is bound to consider what the people of the locality have to present and give it due weight, but there is a larger interest—the public interest.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman say what is that public interest in this case?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will state what it is. The general public interest is that we shall not take the public money for the purpose of granting the demands of a particular locality, unless there are general public interests that would justify our doing so. If we find, on a proper investigation, that the Lake Erie and Detroit Railway Company can secure from the Canada Southern adequate and sufficient running rights to answer all reasonable purposes of the business of the locality and of the Lake Erie and Detroit Railway Company, we have only one duty to discharge and that is to see, if we can, that these rights are secured. We should then say to the Lake Erie and Detroit Railway Company: Your business and duty is to use the rights the Canada Southern people are willing to give you. That is not so convenient or desirable from the stand-point of the Lake Erie and Detroit Railway Company. I quite acknowledge to the hon. gentleman that it would be preferable from their point of view exclusively that they should have an independent road. No matter what steps may be taken in the matter, and no matter how willing railway companies may be to have their tracks used by other companies, there are always difficulties in the working out of the arrangement, and some friction and even unpleasantness may arise. But, at the same time, I do not think we are in duty bound to subsidize a railway parallel to an existing railway, unless we find that adequate running rights cannot be secured for those who desire them. I am prepared to say further, that since the interview that took place one or two years ago, a partial hearing has taken place.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not completed yet.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, a partial hearing has taken place before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, practically on this question and at that hearing the Canada Southern Company averred their willingness to give to the Lake Erie and Detroit Railway Company running rights over their line upon such terms as the Railway Committee of the Privy Council would adjudge. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council would be without jurisdiction unless the Canada Southern Company would be willing to submit that jurisdiction. The inquiry is now

Mr. BLAIR.

in progress. I do not know what the result may be. Having heard the evidence so far adduced I am not prepared to say that adequate rights cannot be secured; I am not prepared to say that they can. The matter is yet undetermined, and until we can make such investigation of the conditions and circumstances as to enable us to make up our minds on that question, we will be in no shape, I think, to strike out this clause. In fairness to the parties concerned, and to the general public, who must be finally considered, it is our duty to retain this clause until we are in a position to decide the question one way or the other. I sympathize with the hon. gentleman—

Mr. CLANCY. I do not want that; I want the prohibition removed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman does not value the sympathy. I do not think we can reasonably expect that the prohibition can be removed until they have so far progressed with the necessary investigation as to ascertain whether proper and sufficient rights can be found in the Canada Southern.

Mr. CLANCY. I deny the right of the Government to demand from Parliament any such conditions as the hon. gentleman is now exacting. It is a mere pretense to say that the public interest is involved. He is laying down one rule for western Ontario and another rule for the province of Quebec. I tell the hon. gentleman that he is taking into his hands to distribute and dispose of, as he thinks proper, a railway subsidy for 44 miles, that is the plain English of it. I propose now to move that all the words after the word "miles" in subsection 49 of section 2, be struck out.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Since the beginning of the discussion on railway subsidies generally, and having ascertained the name of the company in whose interest this subsidy was proposed, I want to say that my sympathies went toward the granting of this subsidy. I differ with the last speaker on two very important points. I must say that in my long experience I never heard a Premier go further in a courteous way to meet the request of any member of the House than he has gone to-night to meet the wishes of the hon. member who last addressed him.

Mr. CLANCY. In what way?

Mr. COSTIGAN. In giving strong assurances of being able to find a justification to meet his wishes, and without the justification, he would be dishonest if he promised it. I differ with the hon. gentleman also when he stated so positively that it was an unjustifiable thing for a railway corporation to come here to be heard in regard to the building of another line. He says there is no precedent for it. There are precedents for it. It is perfectly right

that an existing railway should look to its own interests, and if it found that a rival road was going to interfere with rights already acquired, they have a perfect right in defence of their own interests to put forward their views. That is all the Michigan Central has done. It is claimed that the construction of this 44 miles would parallel a road constructed by them. They have a perfect right to do that. The hon. gentleman has forgotten that we threshed out this principle before in another place. He must remember that the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company, through Mr. Beemer, their president, and all the influences that it could bring to bear, opposed the passage of a charter in this House on the ground that it was to parallel an existing road. I do not know how the hon. gentleman voted at the time. I think that he sympathized with the existing road and opposed the charter.

Mr. CLANCY. Thinking without knowing.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The point was that the Bristol Company would not even urge its right to come all the way to Ottawa, but wanted to come to Quyon and the proposition was made that they should not parallel any further than Shawville, and I think the hon. gentleman voted to compel them to stop at Shawville.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is all wrong.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will take it back if the hon. gentleman says I am wrong, but that is my impression from having been there, and having voted on that Bill. There is a precedent where a company exercised its right to come here and make itself heard before this Parliament. The question, as a matter of principle, is a sound one. There is a road already built, and upon this new road a condition is put, so that if adequate running arrangements can be made with these people there is no reason why a large amount of money should be spent to build a new line paralleling it. Evidence has been given in addition that with the amount of traffic over the existing line it would be almost impossible for them to give adequate accommodation; so that we may reasonably expect that it will become a matter in which the Government would be justified in expending this subsidy, and assurances have been given in the strongest manner that that would be the result. I advise the member for London (Mr. Beattie), who is interested in this, to accept that assurance as in the interest of the company interested, and I am quite sure if the Lake Erie and Detroit Company were here to speak for itself, it would accept that assurance.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has no right to make such a statement.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I make it on my own responsibility.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I want to say a word or two, as this is a matter with which I am conversant. I think the member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), after the fair and manly statement made by the Premier, has not advanced the cause he seeks to advance by the persistent and extravagant statements he has made. I cannot understand why that hon. member should take such a tremendous interest in the bonusing of this road. All the freight from his county, from Wallaceburg and Dresden, is carried over the Erie and Huron road to Chatham. It crosses the Canadian Pacific at Chatham, and it crosses the Grand Trunk Railway at Chatham, and he wants this road to carry this away around 40 or 60 miles further down to St. Thomas in order that they may hand it either to the Canadian Pacific Railway at St. Thomas, when they could just as well hand it to the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway at Chatham, as they are doing now. Then, he must remember, that this 44 miles which it is proposed to bonus, is running right alongside the Canada Southern road that never got a single farthing of money from this Dominion. They built that road themselves, and you propose now to tax them to build a road right alongside them. I think this is a matter which the Government should well consider. I believe, as the Premier has stated, that there are reasons why this bonus should be given, and I have advocated it. I think that, in the first place, every effort should be made to see that running rights can be obtained from the Michigan Central before you build another road alongside of it. I believe those rights can be obtained. The Michigan Central does an enormous trade, and enormous freight traffic, and I believe that they intend to double-track their road.

Mr. BEATTIE. It is double-tracked now.

Mr. CAMPBELL. When they get their road double-tracked through, then I think that arrangement may be made satisfactory to both companies, and that running rights could be given over this road. I want to see the road extended on to St. Thomas, but not for the reason stated by the member for Bothwell. His part of the country is well served now. They transfer all their freight to the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway at Chatham, and there is no reason why they should carry it on 60 miles further to St. Thomas and then hand it over to the same road. It gives an outlet to the counties of Essex and Kent. I want to see the road extended to St. Thomas, and if satisfactory arrangements can be made with the Michigan Central, I believe it will serve all purposes. But if you strike out that amendment now and give this bonus to the Lake Erie and Detroit road to

St. Thomas to build a parallel line, the Michigan Central and double-track their road and then they will come back here and ask this House to give them a bonus, and we cannot refuse it. They have never received one dollar of bonus, so far, from the Government of Canada. They built that road entirely themselves. I think the proposition is a very wise one, that if a satisfactory arrangement can be made it should be made, but if such an arrangement cannot be made, then, it is time enough to undertake to parallel the road. I do not think that the hon. member for Bothwell is advancing at all the cause that he seeks to advance here to-night, and I think he would have been well advised if he had said a great deal less than he has said upon the subject.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I am, like the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), interested in this road. One end of this road is very near my own city, and it intersects a part of my own riding. That being the case, I want to say that the Canada Southern, or, as it is termed, the Michigan Central, is a line connecting the great west and the great east. It is one of the busiest railroads in Canada; 48 trains daily pass over the road, and there are usually 40 cars on each train, making more than 1,700 cars drawn over the road every day. We feel that it would be almost impossible to make a satisfactory arrangement with the Michigan Central that would be useful to our part of the country. I represent a fruit-growing district. That road is what is termed a meat or cattle road. They take large trains of cattle from Chicago and deliver them at Boston, Philadelphia and New York as rapidly as they run their passenger trains, and the road is congested at certain hours of the day. At some hours you cannot get along with a local train and even passenger trains are sometimes put at one side to allow freight trains to go on. We desire to extend the Erie and Huron Road which runs from Sarnia, and the Detroit and Lake Erie Road which runs from Walkerville, along the lake shore to Ridgetown, the one being 84 miles long and the other 80 miles. What we desire to do is to build a connecting link between Ridgetown and St. Thomas, which would connect the Erie and Huron and the Detroit and Lake Erie with a road that belongs to the Walkers' as well, running from St. Thomas to London and from St. Thomas to Port Stanley, and which would give us, eventually, not only a road to London but a connection with the lake port at Port Stanley. There would be other advantages. Heavy freights, such as iron, wire, nails, &c., would be shipped to Port Stanley from Montreal and elsewhere and carried over this line to their destination. Coal would also be received because boats are crossing every day bringing coal in on cars, and the cars are drawn

Mr. CAMPBELL.

to their destination by the railway. We feel that it is very important to us, as we live in a fruit-growing country, that this extension should be made. Because it is necessary that fruit should reach the place of sale as quickly as possible after it is picked. Even if the Michigan Central would agree to give us accommodation we feel that it would be simply impossible for them to do it. The very large trade of the people living along the line of the projected road, as well as that of those living along the road already constructed, makes it necessary that this extension should be made as soon as possible. That being the position of affairs we feel that it is only justice that we should have this road constructed. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) says that these two roads parallel each other. It is true the two roads are parallel to each other, but the country, as the hon. member for Bothwell has said, is very narrow in that district. If they were to go nearer to the lake than the line of the Michigan Central they would strike deep ravines which would very much increase the cost of construction. If the road is bonused from Ridgetown to St. Thomas a large amount of the bonus will be required for bridging. I thank the right hon. Prime Minister for the kind manner in which he has received the idea, which has been thrown out in reference to this matter. We have advocated the building of this road in committee, we have advocated it before different Ministers at different times and we feel that when we lay our case properly before them the Government will do justice as between our section of the county and these two roads.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose I should be indebted to the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) for the lecture he gave a moment ago, but I think he has his answer from the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. The hon. gentleman will reflect the next time before he is quite so fresh as to declare that he knows all about a matter of this kind. Hon. gentlemen who are accustomed to hear statements from that hon. gentleman always know that he relies upon his imagination when he makes them. When he tells me that I would consult the interests of the people by being silent he has his answer from the hon. member for Essex. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) made a declaration that there was a case of consequential damages, that the Michigan Central Railway might justly come and claim damages by reason of the paralleling their line. I ask the hon. Minister if he approves of a suggestion of that kind?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not understand the hon. gentleman to say that.

Mr. CLANCY. That is exactly what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I did not say anything of the kind.

**Mr. CLANCY.** The hon. gentleman declared that the Michigan Central would have a perfect right to come to Parliament and ask to be recouped for the damages arising from this road being subsidized, and because of the construction of a parallel line.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

**Mr. CLANCY.** By a subsidy.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Has not any company a right to ask for a subsidy ?

**Mr. CLANCY.** Any company has. That does not answer the question. This line has been in existence for years. Is it usual for a company to ask for a subsidy for a line that has been built for years ?

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The hon. member for Kent referred to the building of a new track. If they doubled-tracked their line they would have a right to come and ask for a subsidy.

**Mr. CLANCY.** My hon. friend said that if we paralleled the line, they would have a claim. The hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan) said that we must respect the rights of the Michigan Central. The hon. gentleman has two advocates, and two alone, and both take different ground from what he has taken. I must apologize for any strong words I have used that might in any sense reflect on the course taken by the right hon. First Minister. He has said that he was entirely in sympathy with my contention and that his belief now was, that running powers were impossible. The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) said the same thing. The hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan) stated the same thing. What stronger evidence does the hon. gentleman want than that ? Everything appears to be against the possibility of obtaining running powers that can be utilized in any fair way. So, I have no course open to me but to ask this committee to declare itself on this question.

**Mr. BEATTIE.** Perhaps the constituency which I represent has as much interest in this matter as any other constituency in Ontario. The London and Port Stanley Railway is owned by the city of London. Not one dollar of bonus was given to it by the Dominion of Canada ; but it was built solely by the city of London, the city of St. Thomas and the townships adjoining. The city of London bought all the stock of the road, and own it entirely, but has leased it for a term of years to the Lake Erie and Detroit River Company, and will probably be eventually purchased by that company. The three local lines there, when connected, will amount to about 200 miles of railway, which is equal to a trunk line. The Lake Erie and Detroit River Company have built very large steamers, which run from Port

Stanley across to Conneaut, Ohio, and carry 27 heavy cars loaded with coal each trip. They cross twice a day, so that they bring 54 cars of coal over each day. How are you going to give running powers over the Michigan Central for 44 miles between Ridgeway and St. Thomas ? It would be simply taking a trade from that road which should not be taken from it. It would be dividing the traffic. We all know what running powers mean. The railway company will simply allow the trains to go just when it suits their convenience, and will not allow trains to stop between stations.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** That would not be adequate running powers.

**Mr. BEATTIE.** It would simply mean that the railway over those 44 miles could do no business, and the running powers would be of no use at all. I think the Prime Minister, when he fully considers this question, will deal with it fairly. This 200 miles of railway, I believe, will eventually become a great trunk line. I understand that the Pennsylvania Railway is trying hard to get a line through Canada, and will very likely build from St. Thomas to Buffalo. I do not know that a more just or reasonable bonus has been asked for from this Parliament, and I believe it will be granted, when the question is thoroughly looked into. The line owned by the Lake Erie and Detroit Company is equal to a single line from Suspension Bridge to Detroit. This line will open up a large tract of country, and will enable our merchants in London to ship their goods for 100 miles along the shore of Lake Erie. I hope the Government will take the question into their very serious consideration.

Amendment negatived : Yeas, 7 ; Nays, 34.

To the South Shore Railway Company, towards the restoration and renewal of the railway bridge over the Yamaska River at Yamaska, Que. (Revote) \$50,000

**Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry).** Where is this bridge ? Is it near the Grand Trunk Bridge ?

**The PRIME MINISTER.** No. This bridge is at the village of Yamaska. There was a bridge there formerly, built by the South-eastern Railway Company, but it was washed away about ten years ago. We have voted \$50,000 for its reconstruction, but so far no company has taken advantage of the appropriation. The South Shore Railway Company intends to rebuild the bridge.

**Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry).** Will this be sufficient to complete it ?

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** It is to be hoped it will. It is all the subsidy that is going to be given.

**Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry).** How far is this from the Grand Trunk Bridge across the Yamaska ?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Twenty miles.

Mr. **McLENNAN** (Glengarry). The other bridge was to cost \$300,000.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. This will cost more than that.

On section 8,

Mr. **FOSTER**. Has the hon. gentleman the information with reference to those subsidies?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I made application to the accountant in my department on Saturday, and he said this statement would involve going through the accounts during a long period, and as the staff were busy closing up the accounts for the fiscal year, the information could not be got for many days.

Committee rose and reported progress.

#### EXCHEQUER COURT—RAILWAY DEBTS.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved second reading of Bill (No. 188) respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to Railway Debts. He said: This is to amend an Act passed this session and which received the sanction of His Excellency four or five weeks ago. At present there are certain interprovincial railways which are covered by bonds. Some of these bonds may be in default, and the question is what court should have jurisdiction to enforce their collection. This authorizes the Exchequer Court to act, but in order not to take anybody by surprise this Act will only come into operation on the 1st of August, 1900.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time considered in committee, read the third time and passed.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. At an earlier stage of the session I said that it was not my intention to bring down any more supplementary Estimates except such were necessary to supply some accidental omissions. I wish to adhere strictly to that statement, but have to submit a few estimates, having regard to the indemnities of members of this House who departed this life this session. These are to pay the representatives of deceased members the balance of their indemnity, also to pay Lady Edgar the balance of salary of the late Sir James Edgar up to the 30th June, 1900, and to pay \$5,000 for expenses of committees and witnesses and so on, the total amounting to \$12,451. I beg to present a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. **SPEAKER** read the Message as follows:—

Mr. **McLENNAN** (Glengarry).

**MINTO**.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, further supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1900, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,  
Ottawa, 7th August, 1899.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved that the Message and the Estimates be referred to Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. **FOSTER**. In looking over this, I find it does not contain what I thought was the subject of an Order in Council, that is, the authority for allocating certain sums of money from other votes to be applied to the primary work of Mr. Charleson. That was done, I should think, by Order in Council.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. This is the only Order in Council on the subject. There is one other reference regarding a portion of the funds, but there is no special Order in Council. That is all there is, I am informed by the deputy.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. We will take up the Bills to-morrow morning that still remain on the paper, and then we will go into Supply.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.10 a.m. (Tuesday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 8th August, 1899.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

**PRAYERS.**

#### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS—COMMITTEE ON.

Mr. **FRASER** (Guysborough). Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Sixth and last report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. **WALLACE**. I move, seconded by Mr. Clancy:

That the Sixth Report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, and the minutes of the proceedings of the said Committee be printed in full in the Votes and Proceedings of the House of this day.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will have to ask my hon. friend (Mr.

Wallace) not to move this motion to-day. If he does, I will have to raise a point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that when the report of a committee is presented, it goes on the Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I understand quite the contrary to be the rule. I explained that in committee this morning.

Mr. FOSTER. In this case, there is a report of the majority, and a report of the minority. What we want is to have both printed when the time comes.

The PRIME MINISTER. I must ask, however, that the motion be allowed to stand.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the object of having it stand?

The PRIME MINISTER. No notice has been given, and I wish to look at the motion and the report before deciding whether to support the motion or not.

#### STONY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY INVESTIGATION.

Mr. FOSTER. Before we pass from the order of motions, I would like to call the Prime Minister's attention to the commission of investigation into Stony Mountain Penitentiary, the conduct of the warden there, Mr. Irvine. I would like to have the report—not the evidence—printed. The report is not long.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Was it brought down this session?

Mr. FOSTER. I understand so.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is in the hands of the Printing Committee, then. They can order it printed.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the Printing Committee is not meeting.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Printing Committee has had its last meeting for this session, but this paper can be dealt with by a committee that was appointed consisting of the Chairman for the Senate and a Chairman for the Commons. I do not remember this paper having come before the Printing Committee.

#### THE PRIME MINISTER'S INVITATION TO CHICAGO DEMONSTRATION.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to mention a matter of the first importance. On Saturday night, before the House rose, I called the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to an alleged interview which was said to have taken place between him and Mr. F. W. Fitzpatrick, of the Treasury Department.

Mr. CLARKE. What Treasury Department?

Mr. DAVIN. At Washington. I read the interview and asked if it was correct. But the Premier only replied: I have nothing to say, and moved the adjournment of the House. But, Sir, I find in the "Globe," of August 7th, in a letter from our own correspondent, dated August 6th—that is on the Sunday following the sitting of the House to which I refer—a despatch, which, if we can trust the correspondent of the "Globe," shows that the right hon. Premier took that correspondent into his confidence. The paragraph reads as follows:—

Mr. S. W. Fitzpatrick, the Washington gentleman who visited Ottawa to invite Lord Minto and Sir Wilfrid Laurier to participate in the opening of the new Chicago federal building, has been talking to American newspapers. Mr. Fitzpatrick has stated that Sir Wilfrid informed him that the relations between Canada and the United States were so strained that he would not advise Lord Minto to accept the invitation, and that he would not go to Chicago himself. Mr. Fitzpatrick said other things to his interviewers, and the interviewers doubtless added somewhat to what was told them. The truth about the whole affair is—

This is said emphatically and authoritatively.

The truth about the whole affair is that Mr. Fitzpatrick saw Sir Wilfrid, who told him that the date chosen, October 5th, was so far ahead that it would be impossible for him to accept, and that the time was not opportune. Fitzpatrick is an ex-Canadian, and, in the course of a private conversation, Sir Wilfrid told Mr. Fitzpatrick some things regarding the issues between Canada and the United States. Sir Wilfrid's views thus expressed to Fitzpatrick are by no means new to the Canadian people, for the Prime Minister has given vent to them on the floor of Parliament, and in other places. Evidently, Fitzpatrick, like so many of his fellow-citizens, had a very cursory knowledge of the questions at issue. He was surprised at Canada having the temerity to disagree with the United States, and he went back to Washington still amazed, and to reporters detailed and enlarged upon a private conversation.

So that the "Globe" correspondent really confirms the telegram which, on Saturday night, I read to the House. For instance, we are informed the Prime Minister told the correspondent that the time was not opportune. It is quite evident from what followed that the Prime Minister enlarged on that and gave reasons why it was inopportune. Now, the Chicago "Record," having seen that, has the following:—

Postmaster Charles U. Gordon, who is chairman of the committee having in charge the exercises in connection with the laying of the corner stone of the new federal building, said last night: "I am loath to believe that Sir Wilfrid Laurier has refused to attend the laying of the corner stone, and I shall not believe it until our committee, appointed for the express purpose of inviting him has reported that he will not attend. That committee has not yet been made up, but D. R. Cameron has been made chairman of it. The invitations will not be ready for some time, and it will probably be two or three weeks before the committee can go to Canada and submit the in-

vitiation. As for Mr. Fitzpatrick, he has not been delegated or authorized to extend an invitation to Sir Wilfrid or to any other member of the Canadian Cabinet. So far as the alleged ground for refusal goes, I would say that we are not deciding the international boundary question here in Chicago, but are holding a great and important celebration, at which I hope to see the Canadian Premier as well as other high officers.

It was with no unfriendly feeling towards the Prime Minister I brought this matter forward. I thought it was due to him, not merely as the head of a party Government, but as the Prime Minister of Canada, and due to him as the leader of the House that, at the earliest possible moment, I should bring before his attention, the alleged interview. Because it was of a very extraordinary character, and seemed to indicate on the part of the Prime Minister a peculiar view of what the circumstances demanded of him. You are aware, Mr. Speaker, that in 1874, when international negotiations were taking place between Great Britain, Canada and the United States, Lord Dufferin was invited by some civic functionaries to stop off at Chicago; he was received there with the large hospitality that belongs to the American people, and the social intercourse which took place, and the pleasant words that were interchanged could not but have had the best effect upon the relations between the two peoples. Well, Sir, while there is no man living in Canada more ready to resent the last appearance of dictation on the part of our neighbours towards us, more ready to strive for the rights of Canada, which now has grown to the magnitude of a nation, her position, one of great national eminence, the position of Prime Minister of Canada being one of the great positions of the earth—while I say I would be ready to strive that we should be always held in proper respect, and that none of our rights should be foregone, yet I recognize that everything that can tend to sweeten the relations between the two countries is of the utmost importance. It struck me when I read that alleged interview that we were not at war with the United States, and that the language, if it were true, which was attributed to the right hon. gentleman, was calculated to do harm from an Imperial as well as from a Colonial stand-point.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I must ask my hon. friend to keep himself in order. If my hon. friend wants to put me a question, that is in order.

Mr. DAVIN. I will place myself in order. As the right hon. gentleman appears to have taken the "Globe" reporter into his confidence, and to have given him an explanation of the alleged interview, I think it is due to this House, I will go further and say that I think it is due to the humblest member of this House, that the Prime Minister should take us into his confidence. Now what has been the result of not doing this?

Mr. DAVIN.

We saw in the "Citizen" yesterday, a quotation in which the words of the Prime Minister were referred to and commented on, but had he reproved this misrepresentation on Saturday night it could not have been written. Not only that, but in the press of the United States at the present moment, the subject is discussed in an undesirable manner, as, for instance, in the New York "Sun," there is an article on the subject which I will not read to the House because it is not necessary.

An hon. MEMBER. Dispense.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, I will read it to the House to reply to that "dispense":

#### A GROTESQUE CHARACTER.

If the report is true that Sir Wilfrid Laurier the Canadian Premier, has declined an official invitation to be present at a public function at Chicago next October, to be presided over by the President of the United States, on the ground that he fears he will be ill-treated because of the Alaskan boundary controversy, he is a grotesque character who takes himself altogether too seriously.

This single sentence, which is all I will read, shows the misconception which exists in the United States, and the use that is being made of this interview left unexplained at the present time, which use could not have been made of it if the Prime Minister, when I brought the matter before the House on Saturday night, had taken the House into his confidence. Since the reporter of the "Globe" says that the interview took place and that conversations took place explaining why the Governor General and the Prime Minister of Canada could not accept invitations to social functions and interchange social amenities with our great neighbours; invitations from important persons in a great city like Chicago—since that has been done, we ought to have an authoritative explanation of the whole matter. There is another point. If this interview with the "Record" is correct, in the interview of Mr. Fitzpatrick with the Prime Minister, he seems to have presented no credentials, and it is construable at present that he came here without any authority, as the Chicago "Record" alleges. I think this is very grave, for it is calculated to affect the kind feeling between the United States and ourselves, and it is certainly a matter involving the dignity of Canada, and I think now, as on Saturday night, I am discharging a public duty as well as a duty to the Prime Minister and to his great place, in bringing it before the House. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. Let me say one word, not because the hon. gentleman has brought the matter to the attention of the House, but because several newspapers have taken hold of it. There has been an interview published in a Washington paper attributing words to me of a certain charac-

ter, which the hon. gentleman has just mentioned. I did not take any notice of that interview, and I do not propose to do so. This interview was not published by me, it was an interview with a reporter of the Washington paper, a Mr. Fitzpatrick, and Mr. Fitzpatrick has put words in my mouth for which I do not hold myself at all responsible. If I wish to say anything to the public I will say it myself and in my own way, not through any other party. I have received no invitation so far from the Chicago authorities to take part in the demonstration proposed to be held in the month of October. I understand that one is coming, in fact I have been informed unofficially this morning that one is coming, and whenever it comes I shall certainly treat it with the courtesy that is due to it, not only because of the position I hold, but on account of our relations with our neighbours.

Mr. DAVIN. Before you put that motion I have to say this, that I did not bring this before the House because several papers took notice of it, and I think that the manner in which the Prime Minister treated it when I brought it up on Saturday night, and the petulant tone now adopted is unbecoming his great place.

Nobody can doubt for one minute that it was not right to bring it before the House and of that we have evidence here in the "Globe," or else the reporter of the "Globe" has been guilty of the grossest misconduct towards the Prime Minister. Here is what the "Globe" says. I see the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) who fled the House last night—

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) will preserve decorum. I hope my hon. friend will not indulge in strong language. It is evident from the temper and tone of the House that I have only to ask my hon. friend to avoid extremely strong language.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, this is what the reporter of the "Globe" says :

The truth about the whole affair is that Mr. Fitzpatrick saw Sir Wilfrid, who told him that the date chosen, October 5, was so far ahead that it would be impossible for him to accept, and that the time was not opportune.

This is the language of a man who professes to have been told by the right hon. Prime Minister that he had received an invitation, and that he had treated with Mr. Fitzpatrick as if he were in a position to give an invitation.

Fitzpatrick is an ex-Canadian and in the course of a private conversation Sir Wilfrid told Mr. Fitzpatrick some things regarding the issues between Canada and the United States. Sir Wilfrid's views thus expressed to Fitzpatrick are by no means new to the Canadian people, for the Prime Minister has given vent to them on the floor of Parliament and in other places. Evidently Fitzpatrick, like so many of his fellow citi-

zens, had a very cursory knowledge of the questions at issue. He was surprised at Canada's having the temerity to disagree with the United States, and he went back to Washington still amazed, and two reporters detailed and enlarged upon a private conversation.

I say that the reporter who has written that last part, in making an effort to discredit Fitzpatrick, has used words calculated to do great harm and the reporter for the "Globe" who has written that paragraph, if these words are unauthorized, is responsible to the editor of his paper for a very grave journalistic delinquency. I have no more to say about this matter, but there is nothing that I have ever done in this Parliament which seems to me to be more in accordance with my duty, as a member of Parliament, than what I have done in the premises.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, the House has been in session for nearly five months at great inconvenience and loss to many members of Parliament, and at immense cost to the country. It is a very difficult thing for any hon. member of this House to explain to his constituents, in the country, why we have remained here such a length of time.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), spoke for an hour and a half yesterday.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to take this opportunity of stating to the public that we have had such proceedings as these, which, I suppose, are according to the rules technically permissible, during the whole of the session. For the past five months we have witnessed hon. members, day after day, getting up with some newspaper, some little article, penned by whom, in many cases, nobody knows, and introducing a discussion in the House upon a matter for which there is no serious foundation.

Mr. DAVIN. It seems to me that this has a serious foundation.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Hon. gentlemen bring in these clap trap motions and I think that the public ought to know that one of the principal reasons why we have not been able to devote ourselves to the public business, in the manner that the public interest demands is because of this improper use of the privileges of the House. This practice is only confined to a few members of the House, but almost every time Mr. Speaker has taken the Chair somebody has jumped up with a newspaper. In many cases even the responsibility of a newspaper is not attached to the statements which are quoted by these hon. gentlemen; they take some letter that has been written by some person, or which is supposed to have been written by some person, and undertake to found a discussion upon it. This practice, I may venture to say is one of the chief principal reasons which has contributed to the lengthening of this session almost two months at im-

mense inconvenience to hon. members and at tremendous cost to the country. I do hope that leading members on both sides of the House will try and use their influence to stop this mode of proceeding.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) has chosen a bad time to read a lecture to this side of the House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) who has made this motion, is perfectly within his rights, otherwise Mr. Speaker would have called him to order. It is perfectly within the right of the hon. member to call the attention of the House to a matter of importance; he has done it within the rules of the House, and we must trust Mr. Speaker to say whether the rules have been observed or not. I just simply rise to say that, while we all wish to end this session as quickly as possible, it is unfortunate that an attempt should be made just now to say that two months have been added to the length of the session as the result of the fault of the Opposition.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) ought to be fair. I did not say the Opposition. I addressed myself to both sides.

Mr. FOSTER. The real fault is, if I may be serious, for a moment, that the Government have committed, and it has been the same with too many governments, the fault of keeping very important legislation to the last period of the session. We have this session given up a multitude of things that we ought to have inquired into. We are to-day repressing dozens of inquiries that it is our right, and almost our duty, to make in order to get through the remaining work of the session. I hope that from this time on, we will not read each other lectures but proceed with the business just as rapidly as possible.

Motion negatived.

#### QUEBEC CARTRIDGE FACTORY.

Mr. OLANCY. Mr. Speaker, as I see the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden) in his place, I desire to renew the question I put yesterday on behalf of the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram). It was promised by the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence that he would have the answer to the question of the hon. member for East Elgin respecting the Cartridge Factory at Quebec. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has the answer this morning.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). With the permission of the House I will give the answer. The questions are as follows, the third, ninth and twelfth having been struck out:—

1. What were the Government's reasons for dismissing the members of the labour association, Mechanics' Assembly No. 10061, out of the Quebec cartridge factory?

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

2. How many were dismissed?

4. How many girls and boys have been injured and maimed in the said cartridge factory during the last two years, and to what extent were they injured?

5. What remuneration did they receive while suffering from said injuries, including the time laid up from such injuries?

6. What was the nature of the correspondence which took place between the labour party in the city of Quebec regarding the refusal of the cartridge factory authorities to admit for the purpose of inspection the provincial factory inspectress, Madame Provencher?

7. What was the result of the inquiries made by the Government regarding the said refusal?

8. Who is responsible, the Minister of Militia, the Deputy Minister, or the superintendent of the said factory, for the perpetuation of the sweating system as conducted therein?

10. What is the minimum rate of wages paid to young girls and boys in the said factory?

11. Is the Government aware of the fact that the earnings of some of these employees per week does not amount to more than \$1?

13. Was there a petition presented to the Government or any member thereof, praying for the dismissal of Charles Roy? What were the reasons alleged in the said petition, and whose signatures were attached thereto?

1 and 2. The Government is not aware that any of the employees of the Cartridge Factory belong to any labour association. 4. One boy—hand scalded with melted rosin. 5. \$10 paid for medical attendance. 6. A resolution of the Mechanics Assembly, No. 10061, Nights of Labour, authorizing the secretary to write to the Minister of Militia and Defence and inquire if it was with his knowledge and consent that the Provincial Factory Inspector, Madame Provencher, was refused admission into the Cartridge Factory. This resolution was transmitted to the Minister of Militia and Defence on the 8th November, 1897, and acknowledged on the 10th of the same month. 7. The superintendent of the Cartridge Factory was instructed to send to headquarters, for the Minister's approval, any authority produced by Madame Provencher to visit the factory, but she never applied for permission and nothing more was done in the matter. 8. There is no sweating system in the Cartridge factory. 10. A minimum of 20 cents per day is paid to young girls and boys. 11. It is possible for some persons who may have absented themselves; pay is stopped for absence. 13. A statutory declaration forwarded to the Minister alleging political interference in the last election and signed by J. B. Pelletier.

#### INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS, &c.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like for the last time to renew my request for those papers in regard to the dismissal of Messrs. Belanger and Michaud. There will certainly be trouble when the estimates come if these are not down. I have exhausted all the patience a man can exercise in waiting for them. They are easily accessible, and there seems to be

a determination not to produce them ; here I am left to the last day without them. I wanted those papers from the Minister of Railways and Canals, and I am treated with complete contempt with regard to them.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). I was asked to bring down the papers relating to the ownership of the coal under the Nanaimo Harbour. The officer in the department says that a return has been laid on the Table which contains most of the correspondence, and I have the honour now to lay on the Table the rest of the papers. These are all we have in the department. The hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) also called my attention to a return which had been brought down containing the correspondence relating to liquor permits in the Yukon. There was a reference in one of the letters to a letter from Mr. Copp, asking for permission to take liquor into the Yukon, and that letter did not appear on the file. I find on inquiry that the letter was not addressed to me or to the department, but directed to Mr. Ogilvie, and was sent to the department with the request that it should be forwarded. It was forwarded to Mr. Ogilvie, and no copy of it was kept in the department. It was simply a formal application for permission to take so much liquor, I forget the amount, into the Yukon Territory. There was another letter referred to, one from Mr. Maxwell. That letter was inclosed in an application for a permit made by a gentleman on the coast, and was addressed to Mr. Smart, the Deputy Minister, and was simply an introductory letter. It did not contain any reference to the business and was marked private, and Mr. Smart did not keep any copy of it.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). That disposes of the papers my hon. friend referred to except those relating to Messrs. Belanger and Michaud. I will send word in regard to them to the Minister of Railways. I now beg to place on the Table a copy of the Order in Council relating to the discharge of J. K. Skelton.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I want to call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the papers about which I asked the Minister of Railways and Canals yesterday. They are in answer to an address of the House of the 24th April and relate to contracts and tenders on the Soulanges Canal. The papers cannot be too long to copy, but they are most important, and I would ask the First Minister to see that the Minister of Railways and Canals brings them down. He promised them yesterday, but I think he must have forgotten them. They will shorten the discussion on his estimates if they are brought down.

#### THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** moved second reading of Bill (No. 191) further to

amend the Acts respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

Motion agreed to ; Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. **BOURASSA**. This Bill is an indication of a strange feeling that has developed in this House, especially during this session. I refer to a spirit of great loyalty, I might say jingoism. Of course, I have no objection in maintaining the militia on a good footing ; but at the same time I am sure it does not accord with the public opinion of the day to go too far in that direction. It is all very well to allow members of this House and members of the Senate to go when they please and have a good time in camps ; but there are members of Parliament who occupy public positions outside, such as the mayors of great cities and others, who are called away on business which is quite as important as the camping of these military gentlemen. Therefore, I think it is a bad precedent to bring in a Bill at the end of the session for the purpose of allowing these gentlemen who go and enjoy themselves in camping to draw their whole indemnity as members of Parliament. I do not want to raise any discussion on this matter, but I want to enter my protest against this extreme spirit of militarism, which is entirely out of harmony with the public opinion of this country.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I do not want to follow my hon. friend in his remarks, but I want to call the attention of the House to something else. I think the rule under which members are expected to give the accountant a statement of all their days of absence has of late years been very much forgotten. I do not want to bring any accusation against anybody ; it is none of my business ; but I could not help remarking, in reading over the Auditor General's Report, that there are very few members who do not draw the whole of their indemnity, although as a matter of fact some of them have been absent a great many days from the House. I only mention the fact to show that the law in that respect is a dead-letter, and might as well be struck off the statutes.

As far as this is concerned, it may work injustice to some people, as compared with others, for some people may be scrupulous and mention every day of absence while others will not. This year there is no declaration required, for we have passed the number of days which entitle members to their full indemnity without making any declaration as regards absence, but each year the accountant sends out a declaration to be filled in and signed by each member, showing his days of absence, and the result is that while some may account for every

day of absence others do not, so that some members who may have been in attendance for months are still docked a part of their indemnity, while others, who may have been in attendance only a few weeks, will receive the full amount. It would be better to do away with the declaration altogether than not have the law complied with in every case.

Bill reported; read the third time and passed.

#### SEED GRAIN INDEBTEDNESS, N.W.T.

Bill (No. 189) respecting securities for seed grain indebtedness (Mr. Sifton) read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIN. I beg to move an amendment that the following clause be added to the Bill:—

The Governor General in Council may transfer to the Government of the North-west Territories the claims of the Crown on the principal debtor for seed grain, with instructions to give the principal debtor option to pay the money or its equivalent, provided that statute labour, sufficient at the usual rate to cover the amount, may be taken as an equivalent.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). No.

Mr. DAVIN. I had hoped that the hon. Minister would accept this. It would dispose finally of the question that is very near the heart of the North-west Territories. Those people, who are thus the principal debtors of the Crown, contracted this indebtedness at a time when certainly the great majority of the settlers had not learned how to farm in the Territories, and when many of those who had made the experiment were doubtful whether the territory would prove a farming success or not. These men were unable in those days to get seed grain, and the Crown lent them their seed grain, and they stuck to the country when others left. These are the men who have proved that the country is good for farming, and many of them have had great struggles and hard years. There are not many so poor that they will not pay, but there are some who are poor and who, though they do not wish to avoid paying, would prefer paying in the form of statute labour than cash. The hon. Minister gave, in reply to a question I put to him some time ago, the amount of the indebtedness, and it is not large. It would be much easier for the local government to deal with the people; and as I have proved again and again, the local government has not got all that it is entitled to, considering the population, and it would be a very small matter to transfer that indebtedness to it, I would fain hope—I see that the hon. Minister of the Interior is engaged in a private conversation with the Minister of Railways, and I

Mr. BERGERON.

think he might have abstained for a moment from his conversation while I was drawing his attention and that of the House to this important subject.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was not aware that the hon. gentleman was addressing himself to the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. DAVIN. This is a matter in which a large number of farmers in the North-west Territories is interested, either directly or indirectly, and the solution I propose would not place any of the farmers in the position of having accepted seed grain without paying for it. Most of them would pay in money, but they would pay the local government, and the local government would gain that small amount. But the great thing that would be accomplished would be the giving of an opportunity to some of the farmers, who are in hard circumstances, to pay in statute labour, and the whole debt would be wiped out.

Amendment negatived.

The committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I move the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. DAVIN. I move that the Bill be referred back to committee to add the following clause:—

The Governor General in Council may transfer to the Governor of the North-west Territories, the claims of the Crown on the principal debtors for seed-grain, with instructions to give the principal debtor the option to pay in money or its equivalent, provided that statute labour, sufficient at the usual rate to cover the amount may be taken as an equivalent.

House divided on amendment.

#### YEAS :

##### Messieurs

Beattie,  
Bell (Addington),  
Bergeron,  
Clancy,  
Clarke,  
Cochrane,  
Davins,  
Henderson,  
Hodgins,

Macdonald (King's),  
McNeill,  
Martin,  
Sproule,  
Taylor,  
Tyrwhitt,  
Wallace, and  
Wilson.—17.

#### NAYS :

##### Messieurs

Bazinet,  
Beausoleil,  
Beith,  
Bell (Prince, East),  
Blair,  
Borden (King's),  
Bourassa,  
Bourbonnais,  
Bostock,  
Brodeur,  
Brown,  
Campbell,  
Chauvin,

Joly de Lotbinière  
(Sir Henri),  
Landerkin,  
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),  
Mackie,  
McClure,  
McGregor,  
McGugan,  
McHugh,  
McLellan,  
Marcell,  
Martineau,  
Mignault,

Christie,  
Davis,  
Demers,  
Domville,  
Douglas,  
Dyment,  
Edwards,  
Fielding,  
Fisher,  
Fortin,  
Foster,  
Fraser (Lambton),  
Godbout,  
Graham,  
Haley,  
Harwood,

Morrison,  
Mulock,  
Oliver,  
Parmalee,  
Paterson,  
Pettet,  
Proulx,  
Richardson,  
Rinfret,  
Scriver,  
Sifton,  
Stenson,  
Sutherland,  
Talbot, and  
Tolmie.—56.

Amendment negatived.

Bill read the third time and passed.

### YUKON TERRITORY ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 186) to amend the Yukon Territory Act read the second time and House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. FOSTER. What is the proposition as to bringing that into force?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I may say that the Government has not had an opportunity of giving that matter very careful consideration. The Bill was introduced by the Minister of Justice in the Senate and carefully considered there, and this provision was inserted, looking to the representation of the British subjects in the Territory in the Assembly. But, as to the exact date when it can be brought into force, I am hardly in a position to say what I would advise the Government at this moment. But my disposition is to bring it into force as soon as it can conveniently be done. The objection to immediate action consists simply in not knowing what the permanent population of the Territory is. I wish to move—

Mr. FOSTER. Just a moment. Who introduced this Bill into the Senate?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Minister of Justice.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it not seem a very odd thing that the Government should prepare a Bill and have it introduced by the Minister of Justice into the Senate and have it passed there, and when it comes here a member of the same Government should tell us that they have not given it consideration, and consequently he puts a clause in that they may have some time to consider it before it comes into operation? That is a remarkable kind of legislation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is nothing remarkable about it. I did not say that the Bill had not received consideration; the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster)

is putting words in my mouth that I did not use. I say that the subject that has not received the consideration that we would like to give it is the time when this should come into force, which is a different thing altogether from what the hon. gentleman says. I wish to move:

That subsection 6 be amended to read: "Subsections 3, 4 and 5 of this section shall come into force at such time as the Governor in Council shall think proper and shall fix for the purpose by Order in Council."

The subsection as it now reads is:

This section shall come into force—

And so on. That, of course, will apply to the whole of the section. The portion of the section which it is intended to cover is that portion which applies to the election of two members of Council, and in order to effectuate that intention, it will be necessary to amend it as I suggest, so that it will read: "Subsections 3, 4 and 5 of this section shall go into force."

Mr. DAVIN. Why has it been decided to eliminate judges as ex-officio members of the Council?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are objections upon principle to having judicial officers in a governing body. It has sometimes been found convenient that the judges should be members of the Council, but upon principle, the judicial and the executive or administrative functions of government ought always, if possible, to be separate. The scarcity of officers sufficiently well qualified for the position of members of Council when the Council was originally organized, was a reason why it was suggested in the House, and I assented to the suggestion, although it is not in the original Bill, that the judges of the district should be members of Council. Facts, however, of which members of the House are aware, namely, that the judges' names have been brought into discussion where it is not desirable they should be, and another fact which I mentioned in the House before, that legislative measures were passed upon by the Council at which the judge was present, and were afterwards declared ultra vires by the judge, give a sufficient reason to my hon. friend why the judge should not be a member of the Council.

On section 2,

Mr. FOSTER. I do not understand how you prevent a conflict in that clause where you give the Governor in Council, or the Commissioner in Council power to make regulations in respect, especially to tavern and other licenses, and to impose duties for the issue of the same. You have two powers there who may be doing it three or four thousand miles apart.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The scheme of the Act is the same as the

scheme of the old North-west Territories Act, that the power of the Commissioner in Council is subordinate to that of the Governor in Council; and where the provision is that the Governor in Council or the Commissioner in Council may make certain regulations, then the power of the Commissioner in Council is subject to that of the Governor in Council. The Governor in Council directs the Commissioner in Council to exercise his authority; it may be done to such an extent and under such limitations as the Governor in Council provides. The council being an appointed body, it must be under control of the central authority. The central authority is altogether responsible for what the appointed body does, so that the method of procedure under this will be for the Governor in Council to direct what the Commissioner in Council may do under this Act.

Mr. DAVIN. This enlarges the power of the Council; it gives them power to deal with public health and municipal taxation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They had that before. The enlargement of power is not in regard to jurisdiction over public health or matters of that kind, but in regard to taxation. Before passing from this clause I desire to move a couple of amendments. In the 20th line I move that after the words "public health," there be inserted "or for purposes of local improvement." The work which it is contemplated to do in connection with preserving public health might include everything that is required, but it is not absolutely certain. I move, also, that the words in the 21st and the 22nd line "upon the inhabitants of any such settlement" be struck out. My reason for the last amendment is this: On examination of these clauses it appears to me that it might be open to the construction that the words, "upon the inhabitants of any such settlement" would be held to refer to a poll tax and not to a tax upon property.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one point that strikes me. Here you have a settlement of five or six hundred miners, sturdy, independent men. Suppose that the commissioner takes a notion that certain public improvements ought to be made, a building or something of that kind. Suppose that the sentiment of the settlement is entirely against that, you still give the commissioner power to have that building erected, and to tax the property of the inhabitants for the erection of it. Is that a wise thing to do? It would be imposing a burden sometimes against the will of the people who have to pay for it. It would really be taxation without a voice in it. I think you should have some expression of sentiment from the majority of the people before the commissioner should say that a building should be erected or that certain public works should be constructed for which they are to pay. It would be, I think, too arbitrary. You have no more indepen-

Mr. SIFTON.

dent set of men, and you have no set of men more generous in the matter of making public improvements and paying their shot for it, as they call it. I think it would be a pretty extreme thing for one man to go down and say that a building must be put up or an improvement constructed without consulting the people.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I perfectly recognize the strength of the hon. gentleman's remarks. That was one of the most difficult points in connection with this Bill. It was discussed at very considerable length in the Senate.

Mr. FOSTER. As regards public health, I do not think that would be an objection, but as regards public improvements I think it would be.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It may be that the words "local improvement" may be construed to have a wider meaning than would be desirable, but if we were to confine it to work necessary to promote public health, I do not think the provision would be sufficiently wide. The original provision in the Bill, brought into the Senate, was that this jurisdiction should be exercised only upon the petition of the majority of the inhabitants of the district.

Mr. FOSTER. What kind of public improvements or local works do you contemplate?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We do not contemplate anything, but I suppose a ditch, or a road, or a sidewalk, would probably be the only kinds of works that the commissioner would cause to be constructed.

Mr. FOSTER. If they were only public works necessary for the preservation of public health, such as a drain, there would not be so much objection. But if you are going to construct streets, and sidewalks, I think it should be left at the people's option.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can understand that if the commissioner were reckless, or careless, he might raise a feeling in the minds of the inhabitants of the district that they were not properly treated. Taxation of any kind, without direct representation, is, of course, always necessarily, more or less, offensive. I think in this case you can be certain that the Commissioner in Council would only act upon the urgent representation of the people themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think you ought to legislate upon that assumption. It may be all very well in private administration.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have a state of circumstances in which it is almost impossible to apply ordinary rules, and we have necessarily to leave a considerable amount to the discretion of the commissioner. If these words "local im-

provement" are objected to we might, perhaps, consider an amendment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I think they are necessary.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They strike me as being necessary.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You cannot do anything at all if you do not have these words in. How can you do anything necessary without these words?

Mr. FOSTER. How would it do to amend it by inserting the words in the clause "and in the case of local improvements on a majority vote of the adult inhabitants."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If it were a matter of any weight that might be necessary, but it is a small matter.

Mr. DAVIN. Why is it necessary in the Yukon, to go beyond what were the powers given at a similar stage in the North-west Territories?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Because you have an entirely different set of circumstances. In the North-west Territories there were towns with no municipal organization of any kind and with no governmental interference, with nothing being done except by the people themselves. In Dawson City, and the mining towns of the Yukon, if such a state of affairs went on for another year, the people would die if an epidemic were to break out. It is absolutely necessary that some means should be provided, and this is the means that is being provided, only for the purpose of meeting an emergency that would arise in connection with a lot of people going suddenly to one place, starting up a mining camp and being camped closely together, in regard to which measures would have to be taken to have a road built or a drain constructed, and, perhaps, a sidewalk put down, which, perhaps, the people might not think necessary for the purposes of public health or public convenience. I think it would be hardly safe to simply limit it to the words "public health," and leave the other matters optional. I think the words "local improvements" under the circumstances, are not too wide. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries suggests that the words "this object," in the 23rd and 24th lines, should be changed to "any of these objects," to make the latter portion of the clause consistent with the amendments that have been made. I move that the amendment be made as I have stated it.

Mr. SPROULE. I would suggest that, as the hon. Minister wishes to make some distinction between local improvements and im-

provements necessary for the public health, he should use the term "local improvements for sanitary purposes," so that the provision would apply only to improvements necessary for the public health.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That would not include such improvements as sidewalks.

Mr. DAVIN. The moment you want sidewalks you will have municipalities.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think that a sidewalk could be held to be a sanitary work. It may be necessary to construct a road through the middle of a settlement, which work might not come under the definition of a sanitary work, although it would be necessary for the public health. This provision is due to the fact that we have not in that country a large population of British subjects. If we had, we would provide for immediate municipal organization. But in most of these places that spring up, if we were to provide for municipal organization, there would be no electors, and the organization would be ridiculous. So that we have to provide for something in the nature of an emergency.

Mr. DAVIN. As we provide later on for municipal taxation, does not the Minister think it is giving too much power to the Commissioner in Council to add the words: "for purposes of local improvements." It may lead to a great deal of tyrannical action that is wholly unnecessary. If you have a settlement which is indulging in habits inimical to sanitary conditions, under the clause as it was originally the Commissioner in Council could take steps at once; but under the clause as amended, he will have power to decide to have sidewalks or some other expensive luxury in which the people do not want to indulge. You have personal government there as it is, and by putting in the words: "for purposes of local improvement" you are placing still larger powers in the hands of the commissioners.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This provision, I take it, has reference to that initial stage through which a settlement passes before it is compact and numerous enough to be formed into a municipality. I think we are magnifying the possible difficulties that may arise. We must assume that this power will be exercised wisely and in a proper emergency.

Mr. CLARKE. The commissioner is authorized to levy a tax for the purpose of repaying the cost of local improvements. Is there any limitation to his power as to when that tax shall be levied?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not for the purpose of repaying the cost of local improvements. It is only to provide for the initial stage of the settlement.

Mr. CLARKE. If the repayment of the cost of the local improvement were made payable during the life of the improvement, there would not be so much objection to the provision. I want to guard against property being confiscated by the initiation of a tax to pay the cost of an improvement in one year.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is merely an enabling power given to the Commissioner in Council to take steps in an emergency, before a municipal council is elected, to provide for the needs of the settlement; and when we give him power to frame a municipal Act, we can surely give him the power to provide for local improvements. The suggestion which my hon. friend makes would imply that the Commissioner in Council would desire to destroy the place; but it would be contrary to the principles of legislation for us to assume that he would act in an obviously improper way. If we proceeded on that principle of legislation, we could not confer power on anybody. It is a case in which we are providing for an emergency that may happen before municipal government can be formed, and we have to give more or less extensive powers.

Mr. CLARKE. Even where there is a well-established municipal government, the system of local improvement taxation often leads to grave abuses. In some centres such as Toronto and other places, the property of people has been practically confiscated by the imposition of ordinary taxation for local improvement rates.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This power does not extend to places where there is a municipal organization.

Mr. SPROULE. This applies only to places where there is no local corporation—

Mr. CLARKE. That makes it all the worse.

Mr. SPROULE. It can only apply where local municipalities are not organized. Where municipal organizations exist, I take it that they have the authority, or if they have not, it could be vested in them by the Governor in Council. But where a settlement is suddenly started in a locality without any municipal government, it would apply. But even in that case, it is going a long way to give the commissioner the right to tax for local improvements. I could understand giving him the right to tax for improvements for the promotion of health, but going beyond that is vesting him with a very dangerous power.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the hon. Minister ought not to press that amendment.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The complaint is not, that we do too much, but not enough.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

On section 3,

Mr. FLINT. I would like the control of the importation of intoxicating liquors to be invested in the Governor in Council, rather than in the Commissioner in Council. The House is well aware of the difficulties of regulating that matter in such a distant territory as the Yukon, and I think we would have much more confidence in the Governor in Council in such a matter than in the commissioner. The commissioner is practically beyond our control and criticism. He is not responsible to any legislative body or the people, except in a very indirect way to the Government here. I think that until some further stage is reached in the government of the Yukon, it would be more acceptable to the people to put this matter under the control of the Governor in Council.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one great merit in the present situation, and that is that no one can find out what is being done, when it is being done, and what is the result. We have been trying, during this whole session, to get at certain facts, but have been bandied about between this Government and the government of the North-west Territories, and the commissioner, and the like, and have found it impossible to get any information of what is being done. I think that this Government ought to keep the responsibility solely in itself, on the advice of the Council as an advisory body. In the first place, the ordinances, or enactments, or regulations made here in Ottawa by the Government would have greater force and be more respected than the enactment of a local Council, and there would be less disposition to cavil at and attempt to evade them. Another reason is, that we are here, and the Government is primarily responsible to us, and I think the regulations ought to be regulations passed by the Government here on the best information and advice they can get. What is the intention of the Government with reference to the manufacture of liquors in the Yukon? We are enacting legislation which practically provides that nothing shall be done except on the recommendation of the Government. What is the policy of the Government in this respect?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My advice to my colleagues so far has been not to permit the manufacture of intoxicating liquors in the territory, and I have not seen anything to change that opinion yet.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that to be the policy of the Government?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman cannot expect a definite answer to a question of that kind. That is my opinion so far, and my colleagues have seen fit to concur in it, and nothing has happened to cause us to change that opinion up to the present. But nobody can say what we will do in the future.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Here we are enacting that:

No intoxicating liquor or intoxicants shall be manufactured, compounded or made in the territory, except under regulation of the Governor in Council.

That means that we are giving power to the Governor in Council to permit the manufacture or compounding of liquor in the territory.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** We have that power now.

**Mr. FOSTER.** But we have the practice which has been asserted, and the statement made just now that practically the policy of the Government so far has been not to allow the manufacture of intoxicants in the Yukon. We ought to know whether that is the settled policy of the Government. Otherwise, we may be disposed to move in these enactments something with regard to that. I am entirely of the opinion of the hon. Minister of the Interior, that it is not necessary to manufacture intoxicating liquors in that territory, and I should hope that the policy which he says he has carried out individually, will be carried out by the Government without any enactment, but, if necessary, I could move an amendment to that effect.

**Mr. FLINT.** I beg to move that the words "Governor in Council" be substituted for the words "Commissioner in Council."

Amendment agreed to.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** I move that in the 37th line, after the word "council," the following words be added: "And then only for a medicinal or manufacturing purpose"; and after the word "council" in the 40th line, the same words.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I should prefer if my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) would make his amendment in this way—to leave out all the words after "no intoxicating liquor or intoxicants shall be manufactured, compounded or made in the Territory."

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding).** And are they to be allowed to import them? And if so, why should they not be allowed to make them?

**Mr. FOSTER.** The hon. gentleman has stated his policy, which up to this time has been against the manufacture of intoxicating liquors there; and what I propose is to give effect to that policy. If it was a good policy in the past, it is a good policy for the future. There are arguments, and strong ones, even if you may allow the importation in a guarded way, against allowing the manufacture in a country like that.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** As I understand, my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) moves that in the phrase:

No intoxicating liquor or intoxicants shall be manufactured, compounded or made in the terri-

tory, except under regulation of the Governor in Council.

the words "except under regulation of the Governor in Council" shall be struck out.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Yes.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** And that the hon. member for Leeds moves another amendment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. One o'clock.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Before we rise, let us understand what the amendment is. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has moved an amendment which would allow both the making and importation, but only for these restricted purposes. Under my amendment, no intoxicating liquors would be manufactured in the Territory or imported except by permission of the Governor in Council. And then, under the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) only for medicinal and manufacturing purposes.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** It does not matter under whose permission you are going to limit it to medicinal purposes.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I do not know—"medicinal purposes" has a wide application some times.

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

House resumed at three o'clock.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** As I understand the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) has moved that the words "except under regulation of the Governor in Council" be struck out. This would mean the prohibition of the manufacture and compounding of liquor in the Territory. I am willing to agree to that. Then, the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has moved an amendment prohibiting importation except for mechanical and medicinal purposes. I am not willing to agree to that. The clause is practically the law that was in force in the North-west Territories in former years. It was satisfactorily administered there, and I think we can take the responsibility of dealing with the subject on the same principle in the Yukon Territory.

**Mr. DAVIS.** I do not think the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is practicable. I had a little experience in the North-west Territories in the old days under prohibition, and I am satisfied that the adoption of that amendment would throw the sale of liquor altogether into the hands of the druggists. Any man who wanted to get liquor to drink would go to a doctor, pay him a dollar and get a prescription, which would enable him to go to a drug store and get all the liquor he wanted. In that way the doc-

tors would be able to build up quite an industry. I suppose there are 100,000 people in that country, among whom are very few prohibitionists, and if you prohibited liquor going in, you would have whisky stills all over the country. The consequence would be that in place of having 200 or 300 police, who are able to maintain law and order so well at present, that people returning say that they are safer there than in the streets of Ottawa or Toronto, you would require 1,000 or 1,500 police, and even that number I venture to say would not maintain law and order. I do not think the people of this country would be willing to be taxed to maintain such a force for the purpose of trying to keep down this traffic, when it would be utterly impossible to keep it down. The country is a wild country, and it would be impossible to ferret out the illicit stills. The consequence would be that people would have just as much liquor, but it would not be controlled. By the amendment of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), which has been accepted by the Government, the control of this matter is placed in the hands of the Governor in Council, who will grant all permits for liquor that goes into the country, and I do not see that we require any other safeguard. But I think it would be a great mistake to adopt the amendment of the hon. member for South Leeds.

Amendment of Mr. Foster agreed to; amendment of Mr. Taylor negatived.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to this, that in the Yukon Act of 1898, section 12 reads as follows:—

The sittings of the court, presided over by a judge or judges, shall be held at such times and places as the Governor in Council and the Commissioner in Council shall appoint.

There is no provision made here that judgments shall be pronounced in open court, and there is no provision made here that it shall be in open court. In the old Act it is provided that the sittings shall be in open court, and that judgments shall be pronounced in public.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will consider that in a moment.

On section 11,

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if that implies that the British Columbia judges will have to hold a court alternately in the Yukon district?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, they have no original jurisdiction, it is only an appellate jurisdiction.

Mr. FOSTER. My colleague from Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior) wished to make some remarks upon this when it came up, and as he had to go away he asked me if I would mention the matter, which I am very glad

Mr. DAVIS.

to do. It is this: The judges of British Columbia, owing to this new work being put upon them ought to be considered with reference to an increase of salary because of their additional work.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am astonished that any judges desire to have their salaries increased.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman has his astonishment all to himself. My colleague's statement was, and I suppose it will be true to quite a large extent, that this will throw upon the judges additional work, that they all have very large districts now, but that they have salaries which are smaller than those of judges of other appellate courts; and my colleague wished me to put in a plea for the increase of salary on account of the extra work which will be put upon them.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Does the hon. gentleman concur in his colleague's suggestion?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not state that the judges asked to be considered.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Do you concur in the suggestion?

Mr. FOSTER. I said that I had great pleasure in presenting the case on behalf of my colleague.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) raised the point that in the old North-west Territories Act there was a provision that the courts, when held, should be open courts. My impression was that the common law sufficiently provided for that, and I find a clause in the old North-west Territories Act, but it does not expressly negative that conclusion. I would have no objection to putting a clause in if it were necessary. I have consulted with my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), and we both agree that it is not necessary, and that the common law provides sufficiently that the court, being a court of record, would have to be an open court.

Mr. DAVIN. The common law applied to the North-west Territories at the time this old North-west Territories Act was passed, just as it applies to the Yukon now. The hon. gentleman will admit that at that date it was necessary to put that in. The council will now be without any judges in it, and you will have the commissioner and council sitting without any judge.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will not leave it to argument. If anybody has any doubt about it, I will put a clause in.

Mr. DAVIN. Very good.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. The twelfth clause of the original Bill reads as follows :—

Sittings of the court, presided over by a judge, or judges, shall be held at such times and places as the Governor in Council or the Commissioner in Council shall appoint.

I beg to move that a section be added to this Bill—which will be section 14, reading as follows :—

Section 12 of the said Act is hereby amended by adding the following words :—“And such sittings shall be public.”

Motion agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

### QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSION.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 178) respecting the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.—(Mr. Fielding.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

**Mr. FOSTER.** Mr. Chairman, when we had this Bill under consideration the last time, I was, I think, in the middle of addressing some remarks to the House in reference to it. I do not know quite where I broke off, and so I am afraid I will have to commence anew, but I shall be very brief in saying what I shall have to say, and then the committee can do what it pleases. The object of this Bill is, I contend, to subsidize a railway at the public expense to build an elevator in the city of Quebec on the premises of the Harbour Commissioners at Quebec. We know that a number of years ago, as one of the conditions of the financial arrangement which was made with Quebec, an elevator was to be built at Quebec. That elevator, I believe, was built; it must be there now, and in the first place, I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to say to the committee where that elevator is placed, what its capacity is, if it is workable, and whether a second elevator is necessary in the harbour. As I understand it this elevator has never been used.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The elevator was built by the Canadian Pacific Railway as part of the agreement which was arrived at between the Government of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway after the purchase of the North Shore Railway by the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is on the Long Wharf and on the Louise Basin. It has never been used, so far as my knowledge goes. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has asked me what is the reason that it has not been used. I would rather not state what I believe is the reason, because I am not sure that I would be in the right. What I

understand is, although I may be in error, because I cannot speak with any certainty about it, is that considerable expense would be involved in order to put it in such a condition that a train could unload grain, and that a ship could load it on the other side. That is a condition of things which I believe exists. But as to that I may be astray but one reason for which the elevator has never been used is, that, so far as my information goes, the Canadian Pacific Railway never brought a bushel of wheat to the city of Quebec. I do not believe that they undertake to carry wheat east of Lake Superior, or, if it does, it is in very exceptional cases, and I do not believe that they have undertaken the carrying of wheat as a business, as the Parry Sound Railway does. My hon. friend asks what is the capacity of this elevator and its cost. I could not say what is its capacity, but my impression is, that it cost \$100,000. I cannot speak accurately, however, on that subject, but that is my impression. My hon. friend will ask me why this new company wants to build an elevator at Quebec. He knows that all railway companies at present do not deem themselves properly equipped, unless they have elevators. The new company is making preparation to carry wheat. My hon. friend knows that both the president and the manager of the Canada Atlantic are making great efforts to bring wheat to the seaboard. At present that company has no interest in the city of Montreal. It gets to that city over the Grand Trunk Railway, and I understand it has to pay very heavily for doing so; and its object is to use the Great Northern to bring wheat to the seaboard at Quebec, which, in many respects, would be a harbour free from the blemishes of the harbour of Montreal. Without any disparagement of the harbour of Montreal, I may say that wheat brought to Quebec would avoid the dangers of navigation between Montreal and Quebec. Whether or not the thing can be done is more than I can say at present. This is more perhaps in the nature of an experiment, but at all events, the promoters of the road and the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec have so much confidence in the scheme that they think they can safely undertake the building of an elevator.

The **MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE**. I wish to explain the difference between the new and the old elevator. Though I have not been little in the city of Quebec lately, I know pretty well the locality, and I know that the proposed elevator will be built on ground rented by the Harbour Commissioners near the customs-house. I know enough about the situation of the old elevator to remember that it is completely out of reach of the water, except on one side, and there it is a considerable distance from it, whereas the wharf upon which the proposed elevator is to be built is situated in such a way that

the elevator will be available from three sides, so that three ships may be loaded at once from it.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid that the hon. gentleman has not added very much to the cogency of the reasons for building a second elevator. Let us say that a gentleman has a house, for which he has paid. He would like to have another additional room or two, but I think he will keep to his own house and use it, rather than beg or borrow from his neighbours the money to build a new one, until he is in a position to know whether he can well afford the new one or not. That is a parallel to this case. If there is an elevator at the port of Quebec, it is because the Dominion paid public money to erect it. The Canadian Pacific Railway may have built it, but they got a quid pro quo in the shape of a subsidy arrangement, one of the conditions of which was the building of an elevator in Quebec harbour. That elevator was built, and I do not imagine that business men would put up an elevator where it could not be fairly well used, nor do I imagine that it is an elevator that cannot be used, because it is not of old construction, and certainly is not worn out by use. So that we have an elevator in that harbour on the Louise docks, where railway tracks are laid, and can get to it. The Canadian Pacific Railway is not using it to-day, and my hon. friend says that the Canadian Pacific Railway have never carried grain east of Lake Superior. I do not think that he is correct in that.

Mr. SPROULE. He is entirely astray in that; they bring grain to Owen Sound and Toronto.

Mr. FOSTER. It is sufficient for the argument, if they have not brought wheat to Quebec, although if they can take wheat through to St. John, I do not see why they cannot take it to Quebec and ship it from there. So that we have an elevator built in Quebec in a position where it can be used. Now comes another railway company, which says: We would like to ship grain, but it is an experiment, and we have no elevator. We are a large corporation, with an immense future and large means, and are building this Great Northern Railway, with its connections, and we will go to a body like the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, loaded down with debt—so much in debt that they cannot even pay a moiety of the interest upon it—and we will say to them: Guarantee our bonds, or we will not put up an elevator there for the use of our own road. The Harbour Commissioners are not in a position to guarantee the bonds, but the Government come to their rescue. They owe this Government \$5,000,000, upon which they ought to pay interest, but upon which they never have paid any interest, their excuse being that they have not a sufficient surplus revenue, after meeting expenses, to pay it.

Sir HENRI JOLY DE LOTBINIERE.

But they say to this Government: If you will forego your lien upon us, we will divert our portion of surplus revenue, if necessary—and we must take for granted that it will be necessary, because that is the reason for this legislation—to pay the interest on the bonds necessary to construct this elevator, and give this guarantee as our contribution to the cost. In so far as they take any surplus revenue which ought to come to us on account of their interest, to that extent we remit them their debt. Therefore, in the end, it simply means that it is really the public treasury of Canada which is enabling the Quebec Harbour Commissioners to guarantee those bonds. Three questions are thus brought up. Why in the world is a second elevator necessary, when there is one elevator there already which can be used, and is not used. You say it does not belong to the Great Northern. But that property is lying there idle, and the Canadian Pacific Railway—by the way, who owns that elevator the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Harbour Commissioners.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. The Canadian Pacific Railway is not averse to having its property used in such a way as to get a reasonable compensation for it, if they cannot use it themselves. That would turn something into their treasury, and of course they are ready for a business arrangement of that kind. So, by merely leasing an elevator which is already there, the Great Northern could go on with its shipments through the experimental stage until it had demonstrated its capacity for carrying and handling grain, and it could carry on the business in that way until it was demonstrated that that elevator was not sufficient to accommodate its trade, when it could quickly put up another. Now, why should this country go into helping to build a second elevator where there is one already that is not used? Why should the Government bonus railway companies in this way. The Canadian Pacific Railway is building its own elevators. Go to the city of St. John, and on the west side of the harbour, you will see large elevators. Built by whom? Built by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the city of St. John—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And the provincial government—

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and the provincial government, each of which paid out of its own funds—the city of St. John to an extent which it could not well afford, acting out of public spirit with the desire of extending its trade by improving its transport facilities. But in the city of Quebec, the railway is not going to build the elevator, the provincial government give nothing, the corporation of Quebec gives not a stiver; but they come to the poor, debt-laden Harbour Commissioners, and prevail upon them

to prevail upon the Dominion Government to actually give away its first lien for the money which is due to it, in order that they may subsidize a new elevator. I really do not see the business necessity for it in the first place, nor do I see the principle on which the Government is going in subsidizing elevators on railways which are not owned by the Government; nor do I see that it is good business for the Government to put this debt ahead of our own lien. When we were in power, how we were twitted with this immense amount of money that we had dropped into the harbour of Quebec, for which, it was said, we would never get an adequate return; and we were happy enough when we were able to state that the increase of this capital debt had ceased; there it is, whatever it is; we will get back our money when we can, but, at any rate, the debt has ceased to grow. But now it is going on year after year, and first one sum and then another is being put ahead of the lien upon what is the only security we have for ever getting back a part of our interest. Then, again, does not my right hon. friend think that the railway is sufficient to carry on this venture of itself? Here is a Government that, on the one hand, through its Minister of Public Works, is scooping out the bottom of the River St. Lawrence so that it may be possible for any vessel that traverses the Atlantic to come to the city of Montreal to the central port of the country, and on the other hand, the same Government is adding to the already great sums of money it has put into the harbour of Quebec and doing it in order to help a great railway to put an elevator there. I think this is going very, very far.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not dispute at all the statements and the arguments made by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), if his arguments were founded on facts.

Mr. FOSTER. Take the first point.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very well. The first point is whether a second elevator should be built or not.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is a question as to which there may be a great deal to be said from the point of view of my hon. friend. He says: There is an elevator there which has never been used, so why should another be constructed? I do not say but that, at first blush, there is a great deal to be said in favour of that view. When an elevator has been there for ten or twelve years, and not a bushel of grain has passed through it, it may well be asked: Why put up a second elevator alongside of it? The answer is that people will not build elevators, will not undertake the expense or face the troubles of building, unless there is an object in it. Here are business men who say that they wish to put up an elevator. Mr. Garneau, the president of the railway,

is an able man; Mr. Scott is also an able man. They have proved their competence in more than one way, and they have their railway, in which they have taken a great interest, which they are bringing this year to the harbour of Quebec, and which they intend to equip with an elevator. They consider that an elevator should be built. If the elevator is built, their judgment will be proven to be right or it will prove to be wrong. But, when my hon. friend does not think that a new elevator is necessary, I put the business judgment of these business men against his. They must have some good reasons for the conclusion to which they have come. I agree with my hon. friend, however, that the arguments I now offer would not be satisfactory or conclusive if we were asking the Government of Canada to contribute a single penny for the construction of the work. In that case, it would be my duty to make it clear, abundantly clear, to my hon. friend and to the members on the other side of the House that a second elevator was absolutely necessary. But I must repeat that the Government of Canada is not asked to contribute a single dollar to the work. The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that the Government to which he belonged was often twitted with the creation of that debt, but the time came when they were able to say that the debt had ceased to grow. So it has, and this charge will not increase the debt due to the Government by a single penny.

Mr. FOSTER. But it lessens the chances of repayment.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend must be reasonable in this matter. If, instead of having a debt of about \$5,000,000, we had a debt of \$100,000 or \$200,000, there might be something in his argument. But we have a debt of \$5,000,000 in relation to a property the gross revenues of which are about \$74,000, and this amount has been absorbed in charges of administration and other incidental expenses, and not a cent has gone towards the payment of interest, and not a cent can go towards the payment of interest—

Mr. FOSTER. What are the expenses?

The PRIME MINISTER. The expenses are about the same amount—\$74,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are they going to get the money to pay this interest?

The PRIME MINISTER. Out of the increased trade through this and other new works. Last year a Bill was passed to authorize the commissioners to issue bonds to the amount of \$350,000. This amount has not been completely expended yet.

Mr. WALLACE. What was that for?

The PRIME MINISTER. To improve the harbour by building wharfs giving in-

creased accommodation and so on. We are increasing the value of our security, and today it is worth more than it was. The trade is increasing; and this season will show a much increased trade in the harbour of Quebec, and increased revenue as well. The other day the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) made the assertion that we were contributing to this work out of the treasury. He seemed to be under the impression that the Crown would be liable, whereas such is not the case. The Crown undertakes no liability whatever. The only thing the Crown does is to give a preference over its own debt to be created by the Harbour Commissioners, but if there is a default upon these new bonds, the creditor who purchased them will have to look to the commissioners and not to the Crown. There is absolutely no liability whatever on the part of the Government to come to the rescue of the Harbour Commissioners. The money being expended on the harbour and a new liability being given to that harbour, then, as a consequence, our assets will become more valuable. As I said the other day, I do not expect that the Harbour Commissioners will ever be able to repay the whole \$5,000,000 which they owe to the Government; but I certainly expect that with the revival of business, which is already taking place in the harbour of Quebec, the commissioners will be able to make new arrangements with the Government in order to repay, if not the whole, at all events, a part of the liability which the Government has upon this wharf. But in order to do that we must permit the Harbour Commissioners to equip their harbour. Now, I want to say this to my hon. friend: Here is the harbour of Quebec loaded with a debt of \$5,000,000. In order to improve their harbour they must have new powers of borrowing. At present they are so loaded with debt that unless the Government give them power to borrow money with which to equip their harbour, they can do nothing. The condition of things is such that the Government is forced, not to advance any money, I do not call that a loan, but to give them permission to borrow money so as to make their assets more valuable. But you may say: If you permit the Harbour Commissioners to issue new bonds, you put so much greater obstacle in the way of collecting your debt. That is only a superficial view of it. The true way of looking at it is to consider that if you permit the Harbour Commissioners to create a new liability and to issue new bonds the proceeds of which must be expended upon the harbour, you are simply enabling them to meet the demands of the trade, and at the same time to obtain more revenue than they have at present. That is the reason why it seems to me this demand is perfectly reasonable and just, and in my opinion in this demand there is absolutely nothing at all which will bind the Crown to a cent of money.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is perfectly correct when he says that the railway company have a right to build the elevator as a commercial enterprise. But the right hon. gentleman forgets the whole position in reference to the matter. The corporation that builds this elevator on the Princess Louise docks, issues bonds. After these bonds are guaranteed by the Harbour Commissioners to the full extent of the cost of the elevator, the right hon. gentleman says that the Government has nothing to do with it. He forgets the provisions of the Act for the purpose of defining the powers and limitations of the Harbour Commissioners. If he will turn to the Act for the relief of the corporation and for the improvement of the harbour of Quebec, he will find that clause 34 reads:

For the relief of the corporation and for the improvement of the harbour of Quebec, the Governor in Council may raise, under the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, the sum of \$362,197.58, being the amount, un borrowed and negotiable, of the loans authorized for that purpose by the several Acts.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). That is no new power, it is only recognizing existing power.

Mr. HAGGART. I ask, when the Governor in Council raises a sum of money, is it raised on the credit of the Dominion?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Not for the elevator.

Mr. HAGGART (reading):

The sum so raised shall be advanced from time to time to the corporation to meet payments on account of improvements in the harbour of Quebec, if such improvements have been previously sanctioned by the Governor in Council.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the Consolidation Act of the present session.

Mr. HAGGART. No, it is a new Act respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec. Section 3 says:

All amounts payable by the corporation under the guarantee provided for by the said agreement shall be a charge upon the revenue of the corporation and shall have the same priority of payment as the interest on the debentures or bonds which the corporation is authorized hereafter to issue under the Act.

My interpretation of this clause is that with the consent of the Governor in Council the Government of Canada may raise the sum of \$362,197, which may be applied directly towards the building of this elevator.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The section which the hon. gentleman is quoting is only a consolidation of existing laws, it is not conferring new powers, it enables this money to be raised simply for the special purposes mentioned.

Now, building this elevator is not by this Act mentioned.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Not at all. It is not limited by the purposes of the Act mentioned. Clause 2 says :

Sums so raised shall be advanced from time to time to the corporation to meet payments on account of improvements in the harbour of Quebec, if such improvements have been previously sanctioned by the Governor in Council on the joint report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Public Works, and shall be applied to no other purpose whatever.

There are no limitations under any preceding Act, this is a fresh power of loan given to them.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** No, no.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Is that clause in the other Act ?

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** This is a consolidation of existing statutes.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** It is well known in Quebec that of the old loans which went to the construction of the Quebec harbour docks, there is still the sum of \$375,000 due, which could be applied. But the past Government would not apply it.

**Mr. FOSTER.** It came to the point when the Government of the past said : We have given all that we can give, and that account is closed. But the hon. gentleman has opened it again.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** By referring to the end of the section he will see the citations from the existing Acts of which these sections are but parts.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** The House was informed by the Solicitor General, who had charge of the Act, that these were mere transcripts of existing sections and consolidations of the existing laws, without importing anything new whatever.

**Mr. FOSTER.** But you have power by Order in Council to authorize them to issue the whole of that.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** They did it for many years.

**Mr. HAGGART.** My argument is this, that the guarantee given by the Quebec corporation to this railway company for the purpose of building these elevators, guaranteed payment for a certain number of years, and that is made a charge upon all the sums of money owned and possessed in their order by the Quebec Commissioners.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** Allow me to read section 34 of that Act :

For the relief of the corporation and for the improvement of the harbour of Quebec, the Gov-

ernor in Council may raise, under the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, the sum of \$362,197.58, being the amount, unborrowed and negotiable, of the loans authorized for that purpose by the several Acts, 36 Vic., 43 Vic., 45 Vic., 47 Vic.

And so on. The sum so raised, as my hon. friend knows, is for the purpose of building a graving dock and other works that are named. But that sum of money cannot be applied to any purposes other than those which are mentioned in these Acts.

**Mr. HAGGART.** My right hon. friend and I differ entirely on that ground.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Read subsection 2 of section 34.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** It is just a reproduction of the old Act :

If such improvements have been previously sanctioned by the Governor in Council, on the joint report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Public Works.

These are the improvements referred to by 36 Victoria, 43 Victoria, 45 Victoria, 47 Victoria, and so on. So the hon. Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries have the authority to authorize these works only in so far as they come within the objects contemplated by these Acts, and they cannot do anything else.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** In any case they have no application as to the meaning of this clause at all. This is the old law as it has been on the statute-book for a long time. It is simply a consolidation of powers previously granted as they have been on the statute-book, and it has no bearing on this clause at all.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Section 34 of the Act which authorizes \$362,197 to be expended was passed at the present session.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** We have no shadow of an intention of applying that to the elevator.

**Mr. FOSTER.** But then you have the power.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** No, the legal advice we have is that we have not.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Whose advice ?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) has gone over it very carefully.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** All these statutes describe the character of the improvements to be made, and the elevator does not come within them.

**Mr. FOSTER.** This subsection 2 says authoritatively that the sum so raised, \$362,000, shall be advanced from time to time to the corporation to meet payments. What for ? On account of improvements in the harbour of Quebec.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. That is the improvements referred to in the preceding section.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Not the improvements mentioned in that section, but only improvements in the harbour of Quebec. On what condition :

If such improvements have been previously sanctioned by the Governor in Council, on the joint report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Public Works, and shall be applied to no other purpose whatever.

Therefore, if the elevator is considered an improvement in the harbour of Quebec it would come under that clause.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. My hon. friend is wrong. The Minister of Public Works and Minister of Marine and Fisheries have now power to authorize a loan to the amount of \$362,000 except for the purposes of the works mentioned in the several statutes here. I will call the hon. gentleman's attention to a fact that he knows himself. Last year the Harbour Commissioners wanted to expend \$350,000 on their harbour. We did not authorize them to borrow that money from us. We authorized them to borrow it from the public. We did not contribute a cent.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Yes, that is right ; but you gave a lien.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. We did not claim that we had power to expend one cent out of the public treasury except for the purposes mentioned in these several Acts, the building of the graving dock and some other works. That is the construction that we have put upon the clause, and we intend to act upon it.

**Mr. SPROULE**. I did not take the objection to the Bill that the Government had power, according to that Act, to build an elevator, but the objection that I took to this Bill was that every dollar of the money paid as interest on this elevator lien is a dollar which is not paid for that purpose would be paid on the loan that has already been made to the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec and which would otherwise be paid into the public treasury. Another objection I have is that I regard it as unfair to other cities and towns in Canada which have built elevators at their own expense. If these towns want an elevator they arrange with the railway company or the steamship company and provide the funds. The elevator at Owen Sound was built by the corporation jointly with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The town voted a bonus for it, and the Canadian Pacific Railway, in consideration of the bonus, raised the balance of the money required for the elevator. When they wanted a second elevator at Owen Sound the Canadian Pacific Railway applied to the town, the town gave a bonus, and the company went on and

**Mr. FOSTER**.

raised the rest of the money and built the elevator. No other portion of Canada was called upon to pay a dollar for that building. In the case of the city of Quebec this policy is reversed. The city of Quebec does not pay a dollar. What was done at Owen Sound was also done at Midland, and now an elevator is likely to be erected at Collingwood in the same way. The city of Quebec is relieved of this expenditure and other towns and cities are obliged to tax themselves in order to raise money for the same purpose. In reality the money comes indirectly out of the Dominion of Canada. The statement is made that the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec will not pay out any money belonging to the Dominion of Canada. Why do the Harbour Commissioners guarantee the interest ? It is because they are regarded as better security than any other security that could be put forward. They are regarded as better security because of the large powers conferred upon them by the Dominion of Canada. They have it in their power to retain the money due to the Dominion of Canada, which should be paid in liquidation of their indebtedness, and to apply it on the lien for building this elevator. In this respect I think this proposal is unfair to other towns and cities in Canada. It is unfair that the Quebec Harbour Commissioners should take the money that should be paid to the Dominion of Canada in interest on their indebtedness to the Dominion and expend it for paying the interest on the cost of building an elevator, and which would otherwise go towards paying the interest on the money which they owe to the Dominion of Canada.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman is repeating the argument that he advanced the other night and which was then answered. He is not judging the case fairly when he says that concessions are being made in the case of Quebec which were denied in the case of Collingwood and other harbours on the great lakes. The hon. gentleman knows that Parliament years ago guaranteed payments, or advanced moneys to the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec for improvements in the harbour of Quebec, and that these loans amount to over \$3,000,000, which with interest brings the debt up to \$5,000,000. It is there as an incubus upon them now. Their guarantee would be of no use to any third person as long as the Dominion of Canada held that debt, and was entitled to receive interest first.

**Mr. SPROULE**. Does the hon. gentleman regard the interest at all as a debt to Canada ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I have already stated that they owe to the Dominion some \$3,000,000 as principal and a sum of money as inter-

est, which would bring the total up to nearly \$5,000,000. They cannot do anything to improve their harbour unless with the consent of the Government of Canada, and if you choose to lie back, you can insure for the future that that debt will be as dead as it has been in the past. You have had no interest in the past, and you have no hope of getting any in the future if existing conditions continue. You can play the dog-in-the-manger if you like. You may say to them: "We will not let you take advantage of the growing time or of the improvement of trade, but we will hold you to your bargain." What good would that do? Would you get any more money this year or next year than you have got for the last fifteen years? The hon. gentleman knows that under existing conditions that debt is dead, and that the interest will never be paid; and it is on that ground and that ground only that this is justifiable. If, by permitting the commission to make this guarantee and allowing it to take precedence of our debt, we enable the trade of the harbour to be largely increased, we put ourselves in the position of possibly getting back some of our interest, whereas if we adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend there is no hope of getting any back at all.

Mr. SPROULE. Allow me to put another phase of the question to the hon. gentleman. He says we have no hope of getting our interest under present conditions. We may not; but suppose we refuse this request. It may happen, as it does in other cities and towns, that the railway company wants to carry on trade there and wants the means of doing it. It may have a consultation with the city, and the city may be induced, as Owen Sound and other towns have done, to grant a bonus to the railway company to assist it to build an elevator if this takes place. Will the trade of the harbour not be improved and thereby increase our chances of getting our money? If the railway company and the city conjointly provide the conveniences themselves, the trade of the harbour will be built up just as much as it would be if we provided those conveniences; and in that event, if the trade of the place warrants the payment of this money to the Dominion, the Dominion will get it. Instead of being paid out as interest on the indebtedness for the building of the elevator, it will go to reduce to some extent the debt which Canada holds against the Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. HAGGART. As I understand, the position is this. Last session or the session before, we placed \$350,000 prior to our debt against the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, and now we are placing this new guarantee of \$200,000 in precisely the same position.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Next afterwards.

Mr. HAGGART. At any rate, both of them have priority to our claim. Here is another point. You enter into a kind of lottery with the steamship companies. You say that the first steamship company which comes in to load grain at the elevator shall be entitled to exemption from harbour dues for five years as against all other steamship companies. That is extremely objectionable, and that clause ought to be altered.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would be glad to hear the views of my hon. friend on that point.

Mr. HAGGART. What I object to is giving to any company an exceptional advantage. You say that the company that first loads at the elevator shall be exempt for five years, while every other company shall have to pay harbour dues. That is an exceptional advantage in favour of one company which it ought not to have.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not. It is granted to the company which will make Quebec its terminal point.

Mr. FOSTER. There will be a great race.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think there will be much of a race.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, you should not build a second elevator.

Mr. WALLACE. To listen to the Minister of Marine, one would come to the conclusion that in the harbour of Quebec certain improvements have been started, but never completed, and that, therefore, in order to make that harbour effective for business, we should spend a large amount of money to complete the works already started.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman has misunderstood my argument.

Mr. WALLACE. The whole of the hon. gentleman's argument was in that line. He said that the debt is dead, unless we permit these improvements to be made, and that, by permitting the Harbour Commissioners to give this guarantee, we will secure the moneys we have already expended.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I did not say "secure."

Mr. WALLACE. I took down what the hon. gentleman said. He said we had no hope of ever getting any money at all, unless this expenditure was made. But, as I understood, the harbour of Quebec had been already thoroughly equipped for business. The Harbour Commissioners had got money voted more than liberally by the Parliament of Canada to enable them to have their harbour equipped for all kinds of business. They even had an elevator erected for them, which, it now turns out, has never been

used, after it has been a dozen of years in existence. Now we come to the extraordinary clause in the Quebec Harbour Consolidation Act that has been so much discussed to-day. That Act was considered closed, when the capital sum of \$3,975,000 was voted the harbour of Quebec to thoroughly equip that harbour for its commercial business, and it was stated that no further sums would be required. But now we find that the account is reopened, and that the sum of \$362,000—the right hon. First Minister shakes his head. Does he mean that the \$362,000 is included in the \$3,975,000

The PRIME MINISTER. My meaning is, that out of the sum originally authorized by the several statutes, there still remains the sum of \$360,000, which has not been advanced by the Government to the Harbour Commissioners, as these statutes empowered the Government to do. But there is nothing in that. The account was closed several years ago, and it is not intended to reopen it. So little is that our intention, that last year, when the Quebec Harbour Commission wanted money to build improvements, we refused to advance it, but told them to go into the money market and borrow it.

Mr. WALLACE. The right hon. gentleman has not answered my question. I asked whether this \$362,000 is included in that amount of \$3,975,000 advanced to the Harbour Commissioners by the Government of Canada.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Three million nine hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars was the sum authorized to be advanced, but not the sum expended. The sum actually advanced was—and I wish to correct an error I made last night—\$3,748,519.62.

Mr. WALLACE. Why was not all this money expended on those improvements? Presumably, because they had been completed, and there was no work urgently required that would justify further expenditure. We supposed that the account had been closed, but we are now confronted with \$362,000, and the further expenditure last year of \$350,000. Is that correct

The PRIME MINISTER. Not at all.

Mr. WALLACE. A loan of \$350,000 was authorized to be made by the Harbour Commissioners, which was to have a priority on our claim, and we have now \$362,000 proposed to be expended.

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. WALLACE. The Act reads :

For the relief of the corporation of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, the Governor in Council may raise, under the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, a sum of \$362,927.

It is not proposed to expend all that?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. WALLACE. Then, what is the necessity of putting in the second clause, providing that the sum so raised shall be advanced from time to time to the said corporation?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is the old statute, and this is simply a consolidation.

Mr. FOSTER. That is for a rainy day.

Mr. WALLACE. Then, we come down to the next order of business. They owe us in principal \$4,000,000, and with the interest added, \$5,200,000. The loan of last year, \$350,000, comes in ahead of ours, and we are asked to-day to let another loan come in ahead of us, so that we will have a second mortgage, instead of a first.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The money will be spent to improve the property.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, and we will have the second mortgage. Some money was expended in the same way by the Canadian Pacific Railway to improve the property of the Canadian Pacific Railway right in the same locality, and it has not improved it to the extent of a dollar. I hope there will be some success in the present instance. I would be delighted to see the city of Quebec, of which I have very kindly recollections, go on and prosper. I would be delighted, personally, to see that city resume that prosperity which it once enjoyed in commercial matters, and increase it beyond what it enjoyed in any former period of its existence; but there is the matter of business to consider. We are asked to permit the Harbour Commissioners to give a bonus to a railway company to construct an elevator, and do that at the charge of the people of Canada. When you have a mortgage on a place, and you permit somebody else to take precedence of that mortgage and give it a second place, you thereby create a charge on your property. As the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has told us, other towns recognize that the construction of elevators is a local work, which railway companies, or the city interested, or private individuals should undertake; but we are, in this instance, giving this railway company an advantage at our expense. This company is really a portion of the line of the Canada Atlantic, according to the statement of the right hon. First Minister, which runs from Parry Sound to Ottawa, and on to South Indian, and starts from South Indian. It comes from Parry Sound to the city of Ottawa; thence to South Indian, on the Canada Atlantic Railway; there crosses the Ottawa River, and strikes a bee-line to city of Quebec. It may be, and probably is, a good commercial enterprise. It looks like a feasible undertaking. We are bonusing that railway, every mile of it, to Quebec—I think that is correct. We are contributing the subsidy for the bridge across the Ottawa, and then

we assist that road to construct an elevator—

Mr. FOSTER. When there is one there already—

Mr. WALLACE. When there is one there that can be easily used.

Mr. TAYLOR. And no business for it to do.

Mr. WALLACE. There may be business for it, and we hope that the road will carry enormous quantities of grain to Quebec. But it looks like throwing away our security, our resources; it looks like throwing away money to provide another elevator, when an elevator is there and completely equipped, though perhaps not at the very point they would select, but in a convenient place, as I know. See how it is on Georgian Bay. In the town of Midland the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the town together have built an elevator. The Government of Canada has not contributed a dollar. In the town of Owen Sound the corporation and the railway companies have joined together and built elevators there. Private enterprise in other places along the lakes has erected elevators—in every place where they are competing for this great business, the people are providing elevators at their own expense. But in Quebec, where there is already an elevator that is not used, we are asked to burden the resources of the people of Canada to provide another elevator for a railway company. For my part, I think that expenditure is totally unjustifiable.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, we cannot fight it all day at this period of the session. It is most important, and, I believe, an abuse of legislation. But the session is near its close, and all we can do is to make our protest, and that we do.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If that protest goes on record, I beg to have it understood that the hon. gentlemen who have treated this as a grant to this railway, or to the city of Quebec, are wholly mistaken in their view. If this is to be decided on the question, whether this is a contribution from the Dominion treasury or not, I assert, and it is as clear as noonday, that we do not give one penny out of the Dominion treasury to the construction of this elevator. The Harbour Commissioners of Quebec are in our debt for a large sum. That has been described as a dead debt. It has not paid a penny of interest for nine years. The receipts of the concern are virtually all eaten up in the management. I gave an illustration of this transaction the other day, which I may repeat here, that of a bottomry bond on a ship. Often a man who has a claim upon a ship, must allow a bottomry bond to take priority of his claim, because the proceeds of the loan are going to improve

the property, and may save his own money. In the same way, the money spent in this case goes to the improvement of the property, and may make our security of more value. As we have not received a penny of interest in nine years, and have no prospect of receiving interest at any early day in the future, in what way do we take money from the Dominion treasury, or in what way do we burden the people by allowing arrangements under which money will be spent which may improve the property?

Mr. FOSTER. And when you have subsidized a railway which is stretching out from one end of the country to the other, and when you are giving it in some places double subsidy, what sense is there, when you come to the city of Quebec, introducing, by a transaction through the Harbour Commissioners, the vicious principle of subsidizing elevators for railway companies, when right in that very harbour, usable, capacious, is an elevator for which this Government has paid? You are going to get a lot into the treasury, are not you? In the first place, you give them authority to issue bonds for \$200,000, the interest on which is guaranteed by the Quebec Harbour Commissioners. The Harbour Commissioners get no revenue from that; they get not a cent—

An hon. MEMBER. Yes, they do.

Mr. FOSTER. Wait a minute; I know what I am talking about. They get not a cent of that, beyond the repayment of the 3 per cent they guarantee upon the bonds. And, if the proceeds to the railway go above 6 per cent, not a dollar of that surplus comes to the Harbour Commissioners, but it is deposited in a reserve fund against the day when the elevator may not be able to pay 6 per cent. And so, the Harbour Commissioners get no revenue at all from the elevator. What next? You say to the great railway company which gets this elevator built for it through the postponement of the debt due to this Government: We will do better for you; we will allow the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec to open up a great lottery game for your benefit. The first steamship company sending a vessel that comes and loads at this elevator, shall have free entry into your harbour for five years. With such a bonus, the railway company can make most advantageous traffic terms with an ocean steamship company. They can go to the ocean steamship company and say: Here is a snap for you; send the first ship to load at this elevator, and you will have free access to the harbour of Quebec for five years without any dues, and so you can carry cheaper. And thus the Government afford the means of making advantageous arrangements with one steamship company. But what more do you do? You lead every other steamship company to say: The Que-

bec Harbour Commissioners admit free one of our rivals, but they will not allow us to come in without dues; so, we will not go to Quebec harbour, but we will go to Montreal. And so, you will drive trade and revenue from the harbour of Quebec, rather than bring it there.

Mr. EDWARDS. And, if we have a railway running across the continent, built at the expense of the people of Canada, and if to-day we have an elevator at Quebec which is doing no business, and which has never done business, and if we have a railway under construction which is going to do business at the city of Quebec, why hinder the possibility of doing business there?

Mr. TAYLOR. Why not do business with the elevator that is there?

Mr. EDWARDS. That elevator is the property of a railway company and is not available for the use of the railway that is now building. And if that elevator has never done any business, and if the railway company that owns it has never promoted business at the city of Quebec, why hinder other railways that wish to promote business at the city of Quebec? So far as the harbour of Montreal is concerned, it is the great harbour of Canada, and Montreal is the great commercial city of Canada, and there is not one man in this House who has a word to say against Montreal or its importance. But the harbour of Quebec is one of the great coming harbours of Canada. It is true that in the past it has lost its position as a great harbour, but the day is coming, and I hope it is not far distant, when Quebec will do a large portion of the shipping trade of Canada. Now, I want to know who it is to-day that pays all the harbour dues at Quebec, Halifax, Montreal and other cities. It is not the people using those harbours, but it is the people of Canada, and no harm is done to the people of Canada by giving this privilege to the Harbour Commissioners. If the Government of Canada has an asset that is paying no revenue and if it is possible to make that asset pay interest, the Government is bound to do so. But are the commissioners going to be able to pay interest while the harbour remains in its present condition? Evidently not. The only way to make it possible for the Harbour Commissioners to pay interest is to develop and improve the harbour. I think the opposition to this proposition is the most unjustifiable opposition I ever heard; it is ridiculous. If you have an asset which is valueless and if you can improve the value of that asset, why should you not do so? I say: give the harbour of Quebec a chance. In my opinion the time is coming when larger vessels will be engaged in the Atlantic trade than those now so engaged, and it is in the interest of the producers of grain in Canada to encourage the largest ships to come to our seaports to carry away our

Mr. FOSTER.

produce. Montreal must always remain a great harbour, but it is impossible that these very large vessels can come to the city of Montreal, so the harbour of Quebec must be put in a condition to receive them. By doing this for the harbour of Quebec, you are legislating in the interest of the producers of Canada.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

#### HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS OF MONTREAL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 179) respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I explained this matter at a former stage. By the Act of last session the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal are authorized to pay out of their funds certain sums for public improvements therein set forth, and it was provided that the sum of \$750,000 of the moneys therein referred to should be set apart for improvements in the eastern portion of the harbour, described in the Bill as below St. Mary's current, those improvements including a dry dock. It is proposed this session that the Government shall by a direct vote in the Public Works Department undertake the construction of improvements at the lower section of the harbour below St. Mary's current to the extent of \$500,000; therefore, the proposal that the Harbour Commissioners should do the work at that point to the extent of that \$500,000 is unnecessary, and the purpose of this Bill is to release \$500,000, the sum so set apart of the Harbour Commissioners' funds for improvements below St. Mary's current, and to allow that \$500,000 to be applied by the Harbour Commissioners to other works at the upper part of the harbour, at what is called Windmill Basin. That is the whole purpose of the Bill. In the supplementary Estimates, which we have yet to consider, there is an appropriation of \$500,000 for improvements in the lower part of the harbour. This \$500,000 which has been set apart out of the Harbour Commissioners' moneys will no longer be required for that purpose, and the object of the Bill is to permit the Harbour Commissioners to apply that money to works which they have contemplated at the western portion of the harbour.

Mr. FOSTER. At the western portion of the harbour?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At what is known as Windmill Point Basin.

The Harbour Commissioners will control this sum of \$500,000, which is now released from the work at the lower portion of the harbour and which they are free to apply to the work at the Windmill Point Basin. That money will be expended under the control of the Harbour Commissioners, subject to the general provisions of the law in reference to the harbour of Montreal. The purpose that it is to be applied to is the construction of a pier at the Windmill Point Basin.

**Mr. FOSTER.** What about the dry dock below that?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** It is not proposed that anything shall be done at present in reference to the construction of the dry dock. There is, in the existing Act, a provision made for an expenditure of \$750,000 for improvements, including a dry dock, in that portion of the harbour below St. Mary's Current. We strike out that \$750,000 and substitute \$250,000, the effect of which is that \$250,000 is reserved for any improvements which may be deemed necessary by the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, including the dry dock, although \$250,000 would not be sufficient for a dry dock, and the \$500,000 is applied to the western portion of the harbour. It is to be applied by the Harbour Commissioners for the construction of a pier at a point known as the Windmill Point Basin.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Then, this is a compromise between the Harbour Commissioners and the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). The money can be applied to the construction of two distinct docks in Montreal harbour, one to be constructed by the commissioners at the Windmill Point Basin and the other at the eastern end of the harbour, as proposed by the hon. Minister of Public Works.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The Harbour Commissioners want both of them.

**Mr. HAGGART.** I think they wanted the Windmill dock. My own opinion is greatly in favour of the proposal of the hon. Minister of Public Works. There will be a good deal of useless expenditure in making a dock at the Windmill Point Basin. My own opinion is that, if you want to make Montreal a first-class harbour, the location of the docks below St. Mary's Current is preferable. I may be entirely mistaken, but that is my view.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** My hon. friend is not alone in that view.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Perhaps not. We are going to have a first-class system of docks in Montreal after all. We are going to have two harbours, one at the Windmill Point Basin and one below St. Mary's Current. What does the hon. Minister of Finance intend to do with the \$250,000 which

remains at the disposal of the Harbour Commissioners, as only \$500,000 is transferred?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** We will do nothing with it at present; it will simply remain in the hands of the Harbour Commissioners subject to the terms of the Act. Reference is made to a dry dock. That \$250,000 would not build a suitable dry dock at Montreal, but it will remain as the nucleus of a fund to be used later. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has asked for a sketch of these works, and I have a plan which shows what is proposed.

**Mr. WALLACE.** From the correspondence which we have seen in the newspapers and from the statements made by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), it appears to me that a large portion of this expenditure is quite unjustifiable, and that it is due to a freak of the hon. Minister of Public Works. I have been pretty familiar, for some years, with the harbour of Montreal in a general way. My opinion is that it is not necessary or desirable, that, at the present time, a wharf should be built in the lower part, because the trade of the port is not there. The trade of the port can be managed for many years to come in the harbour proper, which is higher up the river; and if arrangements are made, all the facilities that are presently required should be concentrated where the business is done. You may take the great wharfs and piers down the river, where it is proposed to spend a large part of this money; but the business is not there and will not go there. So that the expenditure is not justifiable. The Harbour Commissioners themselves are the best judges of the requirements of the harbour. They are usually men of commercial experience who have the interests of the port of Montreal at heart, and they should have more control over these matters than they appear to have. It simply looks to me as if the Minister of Public Works, when he could not bulldoze the Harbour Commissioners to carry out every scheme of his, has undertaken to spend a large amount of our money unnecessarily in carrying out schemes that have not met with the approval and support of the Harbour Commissioners.

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher).** I would not like to let the remarks of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) pass without notice, because I can assure the hon. gentleman that he is entirely mistaken in the theory he has advanced. The Harbour Commissioners are quite at one with the Minister of Public Works in regard to the expenditure provided for in this Bill. In fact, the Harbour Commissioners themselves have asked that the harbour works should be completed at the Windmill Point Basin, and it is at their request, made to the Department of Public Works, that this Bill has been introduced. The hon.

gentleman contends that the harbour of Montreal at present is sufficient to accommodate all the traffic. That has been the theory on which we have gone in times past; and the result has been that because we did not take time by the forelock and have the necessary improvements carried out before the demands absolutely came upon us, the harbour of Montreal is not to-day equal to the demands of the trade of Canada, let alone that trade of the western states of which it is the natural outlet. When this work is completed, we shall be able to meet the demands which will be made in the near future in the port of Montreal, and handle the trade expeditiously and properly.

Bill reported.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask that the Bill be not read the third time now, as I have a few questions to ask after having seen the plan of the proposed works.

#### WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 128) to amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière).

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have been informed by some of my friends that they have a few small amendments to introduce; but before taking up those amendments, I would ask the committee to consider the Bill. There is a blank for the date, which I would suggest be made the 1st of July, 1900. When this Bill was the last time before the committee, there was a great objection to the word "veneer," as describing the barrels, and I would ask that that word be struck out, because it is only applicable to cylindrical barrels, so that it is not necessary.

Mr. CLANCY. When this Bill was before the committee on a former occasion, it was pointed out that it would create a great deal of hardship if the provisions of this section were strictly followed, because it would be impossible for the farmers and others who supply a local trade to conform to its terms. I think it was suggested that section 18 should be made to read: "All apples packed in Canada for sale by the barrel for export." That would prevent the difficulty arising where farmers buy sugar barrels, flour barrels, &c., in which to bring apples to the local towns and villages for sale. The hon. Minister on that occasion promised to take this suggestion into consideration. The primary object of this Bill, I understand, is to make stringent provisions against apples being badly packed or packed in inferior packages for export. That, to my mind, is a very laudable object in which both sides will readily concur, but I desire again to

Mr. FISHER.

point out that the provisions of the Bill go further and affect the local trade.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That has always been the law.

Mr. CLANCY. I am quite aware of that, but that does not make it any less undesirable. We should amend the law and get rid of vexatious and useless clauses. I need no better reason than the fact that nobody has ever paid the slightest attention to it. If the hon. gentleman would restrict this to exports only, that would cover the whole case.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I must say that I feel great reluctance to changing a law which has been on our statutes so long, and which has been applied with moderation and not been made the means of persecuting the farmers. There will be time enough to make a change when it is found that it works oppressively.

Mr. MILLS. I would call the attention of the hon. Minister to the words "with a lining hoop within the chimes" since the Bill was, at my suggestion, laid over until hon. members had the opportunity of ascertaining the opinions of those interested, I have had many communications, and while all agree that to have a barrel of a uniform description throughout Canada would be a good thing, a great many are of the opinion that the words I have quoted are useless. They contend that if a barrel is properly made, there is no necessity for an inside lining hoop within the chimes at all, and insisting on this will create some inconvenience.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I hope my hon. friend will not insist upon these words being struck out. This Bill was prepared after we had received a number of petitions from the apple growers of New Brunswick and principally the apple growers of Annapolis valley, Nova Scotia. This clause was particularly insisted upon. I know that it is a trifle, but my hon. friend will admit that a barrel which is not perfect, as a barrel would be made to hold liquid, a hoop within the chimes is really a great strengthening and increases the safety of the contents. This is one of the things strongly recommended in the petition.

Mr. MILLS. By leaving in those words, we would be giving an inducement to have barrels poorly made, because all coopers agree that if a barrel is properly made there is no necessity for a hoop within the chimes. I simply make the suggestion, which I do not intend to follow up with a motion.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it to be inside the head or outside?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Outside. It is put there for the purpose of strengthening and preventing the head coming off in case of shrinkage.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before the Bill is reported, I desire to move that an additional clause be inserted. The hon. member for St. Lawrence, Montreal (Mr. Penny) gave notice in the early part of the session of a Bill—in fact it passed its first reading—embodying the provision contained in this amendment, which I beg to propose in his absence :

1. The standard of measure for buying and selling strawberries, raspberries, blackberries, currants and other small fruits shall be a box or basket of the following dimensions, inside measurements :—

Top— $4\frac{1}{2}$  by  $4\frac{1}{2}$  inches.

Bottom—4 by 4 inches.

Depth of sides— $2\frac{1}{4}$  inches.

2. Any person who sells or offers for sale such boxes or baskets of less size or capacity than those herein described shall be guilty of an offence, and liable, upon summary conviction, to a fine of not less than \$2 and not more than \$10.

3. This Act shall come into force on the first day of May, 1900.

I desire to give a word of explanation. Throughout the province of Ontario, for the past forty years, berry baskets have been made of the dimensions mentioned in the amendment, namely,  $4\frac{1}{2}$  inches square at the top, 4 inches square at the bottom, and  $2\frac{1}{4}$  inches in depth.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Will it be the length of the inside ?

Mr. HENDERSON. The length of the inside.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That will settle the question. If it has a slope, it will not be the same thing as a perpendicular.

Mr. HENDERSON. I may say that these dimensions were agreed upon by the hon. member for St. Lawrence, Montreal (Mr. Penny), who has taken an active interest in this matter, and a practical box-maker from Oakville, in the county of Halton. The measurement, as the hon. Minister will observe, is the length of side of the box— $2\frac{1}{4}$  inches, not the perpendicular depth. I think it is sufficiently explicit in the amendment. I was stating why this amendment is necessary. While this is the standard box that has been used for forty years in the province of Ontario for the shipment of small fruit to the city of Montreal, the hon. member for the St. Lawrence division found that there was another box in use by some dealers in Montreal, a box of the same measurement at the top and of the same depth of side, but only  $3\frac{1}{4}$  inches square at the bottom. The practice had grown up in Montreal of taking the fruit from the boxes as shipped from Ontario, and putting them into the small boxes used by certain dealers. In that way, about five boxes could be made out of three, giving a very large profit to the middleman, but causing a very serious loss to the consumer. I may say this box is known in Montreal as the "shark box."

And in the factory where it is made, in order to designate it properly it is known as the "Montreal fraud." The object of the Bill is to prevent this fraud and prevent the dealers of Montreal from using it instead of the larger one in which they received the berries. That was the object of the Bill of the hon. member for the St. Lawrence division, and he withdrew it with the understanding that he would have an opportunity of moving this amendment when the Bill to amend the Weights and Measures Act should come before the House. I am sure it is in the interest not only of the producer, but in the interest of the consumer of small fruits, that there should be a uniform size of box. The box which is suggested has been approved of by the growers of small fruits, and I know that, at any rate, in the county of Halton, which I have the honour to represent, it is approved by the basket-makers. It is also approved of by those in Montreal who have taken exception to the small box that has been imposed upon them for some years past. I have letters from box-makers who confirm what I say in reference to the size of these boxes, and also conveying to me the report that the fruit-growers are in hearty sympathy with it. I therefore move that the amendment which I have read be made part of the Bill as an additional clause.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I think if my hon. friend will look at the amendment, he will see that if the perpendicular depth is made clear—

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the amendment is well understood. The measurements were put on the box which I have here by a practical box-maker, and were agreed upon when he was present. And I think it would be better to leave it that way than to use any other language.

Mr. COWAN. Before this amendment is put, I would draw the committee's attention to one or two facts. I agree practically with all that has been said by the hon. member for Halton as to the object he wishes to attain. At the same time, if the amendment passes in the form in which it is, it will prove very serious to some manufacturers. It practically states that every berry-box manufactured in the Dominion of Canada shall have a top measurement of  $4\frac{1}{2}$  inches by  $4\frac{1}{2}$  inches and the bottom measurement of 4 by 4 inches. It seems to me that it would meet all the requirements of the case if the amendment should state the number of cubic inches which a berry-box should contain. That would allow each box-maker to use such form of box as he saw fit, so long as he made it of the same cubic capacity. I forwarded a copy of this amendment to a large box manufacturer in my constituency, and I received this answer :

We have been to considerable loss this year, not having sufficient stock to supply our cus-

tomers. Owing to the reports of crop failure and the Government's Bill regulating the size, we were afraid to make up a large stock, expecting they would be useless for another season in case they were not sold this year. So we have been running very close, with the result stated. Our box, though not the dimensions you specify, would hold exactly the same amount, it being  $3\frac{1}{2}$  square at the bottom and 5 inches square at the top, and  $2\frac{1}{4}$  inches deep. Would it not do as well if you specify in your Act a box to contain a certain number of cubic inches, as, if we have to change our machines, some of which are entirely new and cost a great deal, it will be very expensive for us. Besides, fruit put up in a basket of these dimensions suits the trade better.

Yours truly,  
(Sgd.) GARDNER BROS. & CO.

The object of the hon. member for the St. Lawrence division, as stated by the hon. member for Halton, was to get rid of the box which he has characterized as the "Montreal shark box" or "Montreal fraud." Representing as I do a fruit-growing constituency, I can only say the capacity of the box provided in the amendment is satisfactory, both to the box manufacturers and the fruit-growers in my constituency. I have two box manufacturers in my riding, one manufacturing boxes of the exact size and the exact dimensions provided for in the amendment, and the other manufacturing a box of the same capacity, but not of the same dimensions. All the necessities of the case would be met by adopting the suggestion I have made, and at the same time we should avoid practically wiping out the capital that these men have invested in these machines. It would then be left to the manufacturers to cater to the trade, furnish them the box that they found to be the best in the interest of all.

Mr. TUCKER. I desire to say a word in confirmation of what has been said by my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Cowan). The square box would not carry fruit with safety. There are other forms which would carry fruit, even if roughly handled, a longer distance. I quite agree with the hon. member who has just spoken, and endorse the view that by having the internal measurement mentioned it would give the general public an opportunity of using their knowledge with respect to the particular description of fruit they wish to purchase.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have no doubt that this amendment may be necessary in the interest of the fruit-growers. There is a danger, however, that in seeking to remedy an existing evil a new evil may be created. We have already had experience of that in passing hasty legislation. As I understand this amendment, it covers all small fruits, cultivated and wild, wild strawberries as well as domestic strawberries. There are sections of this country where there is a large trade done in wild berries.

Mr. SPROULE. They are bought and sold by the pound.

Mr. COWAN.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes, and by the bushel, by the barrel. I may be under a wrong impression, but I thought, in hearing the amendment read, that it provided for a special sized box for the sale of all such berries, and a penalty is imposed on those who sell otherwise. I will give an instance that came under my own knowledge. In the county that I have the honour to represent, there is no export of cultivated berries, but there is a large export of wild berries, to such an extent that in one season I ascertained that some \$65,000 in cash were paid out to the poor people in that county for wild berries gathered by children and exported, equal almost to the value of the crop of that year. All this money was brought into the country and paid for these wild berries, the fruit of the labour of the children and people not otherwise employed who picked them. If you place any limitation upon that trade you destroy it, the margin is so small. They carry their berries in pails and baskets to the dealers, who ship them in barrels, although they are sold along the line by the pound. I have no objection to the amendment, so far as it provides a remedy where a remedy is required. But it might be well to state that it shall only affect cultivated berries and not wild berries. These remarks will, no doubt, apply to outlying districts in other provinces than New Brunswick.

Mr. HENDERSON. In reply to the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan), I would say that this amendment in no way interferes with the selling of berries by the pound, by the pail or by the barrel. It is only when a small berry-box is used that the Bill applies; consequently, I see no reason for the suggestion made by my hon. friend, as I am quite satisfied the Bill will not at all interfere with that trade in the outlying districts or in any districts of country to which he refers. With reference to the suggestion made by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan), I think were we to adopt two standards we would defeat the whole object of the Bill. The Bill is to prevent fraudulent practices. Now, a person going on the Montreal market to purchase berries can readily determine whether the box is of the specified size or not; but if you have two or three different sized boxes it is impossible for the purchaser to say whether he is getting his proper quantity or not. We can readily tell whether a box is of the proper measurement, but it would be difficult to determine whether it is of the capacity of the one we describe. I hope the committee will see the propriety of confining the standard to one specific sized box, and not only to one specific sized box, but to a box of specific dimensions such as can be readily determined by a person purchasing a box of berries. The fact that this box has been in use for the last forty years, as I am told, is, I think, a sufficient

guarantee why it should be made a standard for the future.

Mr. FLINT. I think the committee ought to be very careful before adopting an amendment of this kind, because I am convinced there must be a number of hon. gentlemen on the committee who do not realize how this amendment would operate in practice. It was not in the Bill laid before the House by the Government, and possibly it did not come under the consideration of hon. members who could communicate with their constituents to ascertain their views upon the proposed measurements and the size of boxes to be a standard. In that portion of the province that I represent the shipments of blueberries have reached as high a figure as \$30,000 or \$40,000 in one season. I have not the slightest idea of the exact dimensions of the boxes in which these are shipped and handled. I know that there are a great number of boxes used. The berries are put into small round boxes, these are packed into large crates and shipped by steamer; and the same with other berries. As a legislator, I would not like to say to the people dealing in these small fruits that after they have been using any sized box for so long a time, in the manufacture of which a considerable amount of capital has been expended, if they use a box which does not tally with the dimensions given in the hon. gentleman's amendment, they shall be liable to a penalty. I would suggest that, as the hon. gentleman has presented this amendment and had it discussed, it be allowed to stand over until another year. The hon. gentleman must be aware that if the change is made it will affect a large number of people, many of them in humble circumstances, and will create an immense amount of discomfort, altogether out of proportion to the benefit likely to arise from the suggested change. Of course, the first clause really applies to the standard for buying and selling. I think you are opening up a question which will most seriously discommode an immense number of people, and I agree with the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan), that it is inadvisable that legislation of this kind, dealing with matters with which many hon. members must be unfamiliar, should be passed this session. Let this matter stand over.

Mr. HENDERSON. A Bill was placed on the Notice paper at the beginning of the session, or nearly at the beginning of the session, with the same object in view, by the hon. member for St. Lawrence, Montreal (Mr. Penny). The Bill remained on the Order paper for some time, until it was withdrawn by the consent of the House, on the assurance that an opportunity would be given to bring up an amendment to this proposed measure. I received notice of the hon. member's amendment at that time, and I communicated it to my

constituents. I have had letter after letter in reference to the matter; in fact, a deputation came here from my county in reference to the matter. The hon. member then had the same notice and the same opportunity of acquainting himself with it that I had. I think, in the interest of the people of Montreal, who have a great deal more interest in it than my constituents, because it is of more importance to the consumers than to the producers, we should adopt this amendment. It is not the producers who are troubled with the small boxes, but it is unfair to the people of Montreal and of other cities where these boxes are used. I am promoting this amendment more on behalf of the hon. member for the St. Lawrence division of Montreal, who is absent; and who requested me to bring the matter up if he should happen to be absent, and more in the interest of the consumer than in the interest of the producer. Boxes of this size have been used for the past forty years—and I am quite sure that no injury will come to any one by making this box the standard for buying and selling small fruits which are sold in boxes.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). My hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) makes it the standard of buying and selling small fruits, that they must be sold in boxes. If a man were to sell fruit by the quart, or by the pint, he would be liable to the penalty under this amendment. The Bill to which the hon. gentleman referred was different from this amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON. The amendment was drawn by the hon. member for St. Lawrence, Montreal.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That may be, but it is not in the terms of his Bill as originally introduced. If the amendment only applied to such fruits as were sold in small square boxes there might have been some reason in it, and if it could be drawn in such a way as to apply in such cases only, I would be disposed to support it, but to apply it to every transaction in these small fruits, I think, is going too far. It might work great hardships under many circumstances.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) does not surely think that a person who sold a quart of berries would be liable to the penalty under this amendment?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This amendment would make them liable if he sold a quart of strawberries.

Mr. SPROULE. I would suggest that we might get over the difficulty by providing that nothing in this Act shall be construed to interfere with the right of selling by the pound, or by bulk, or in any larger quantities.

The **MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE** (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I think it would, perhaps, be better that this proposed amendment should be allowed to stand, so that, between this time and next session, we may see if some measure cannot be adopted that will meet all the requirements of the case; in view of the fact that such serious objections have been urged.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. I would like to say a word in reply to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I have before me the Bill introduced by the hon. member for the St. Lawrence, Montreal, and it reads as follows:—

The standard of measure for buying and selling strawberries, raspberries, blackberries, currants and other small fruits shall be the quart, which shall contain, when even-full, 67 cubic inches.

The first line is identical with the amendment that he proposes. He has changed his proposition, and instead of making it a quart he applies it to the boxes which have been in use for forty years. I really think that the hon. Minister might allow the amendment to go through. A very slight alteration would meet his view, perhaps. If the words "when sold by the box," were inserted, I think, the hon. Minister would find a way out of the difficulty, and a lot of trouble that is going on every year would be avoided. This same measure was brought up last year and was laid over.

Mr. **COWAN**. Box manufacturers in my constituency manufacture boxes which are of the same capacity, but which are not of the same dimensions. What I would suggest to my hon. friend is, if he wants to press the amendment, he should use the words "of equal capacity."

Motion negatived.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. I beg to move the following amendment to the Bill now before the committee:—

That section 16 of said Act be amended by striking out the word "eighty" in the sixth line thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof "seventy."

The matter I refer to is the weight of a bushel of lime. Chapter 30 of the statutes of last year fixed the weights of a bushel of lime at eighty pounds. This weight is entirely erroneous. It was not fixed by this House, but the matter came up after the Bill had left this House, and it was in the Senate that the weight of a bushel of lime was fixed at eighty pounds. It was a mistake, because it is a well-known fact that a bushel of lime does not weigh eighty pounds. Seventy pounds is the proper weight of a bushel of lime. When the Bill came back from the Senate to this House, the error was not detected. The insertion of that clause has created a great deal of confusion amongst the people who are handling this article. About \$650,000 worth of lime, is produced each year in the Dominion of

Mr. **SPROULE**.

Canada, and the custom has been to buy and sell that article by measure. But as the law provides that heaped measure is illegal, the dealers are forced to adopt some other system. As far as can be ascertained, 70 pounds to the bushel is the correct weight, and to force people to deliver 80 pounds on a contract is simply to force them to deliver a great deal more than they are entitled to deliver. I have looked into some authorities on this subject. I find in the library a book entitled "The Busy Man's Hand-book" which on page 474 states that a cubic foot of quicklime weighs 54 pounds. If that be so, a bushel would weigh 67½ pounds even measure; so that if you make allowance for the heaped measure, 70 pounds to the bushel would be a fair weight. The same authority gives the weight of one bushel of quicklime as 70 pounds. Another authority I find in the library is entitled "The Little Giant Cyclopedia and Treasury of Ready Reference," which at page 376 gives a bushel of quicklime as 70 pounds, or a cubic foot of quicklime as 53 pounds, which would make a level bushel 67 pounds. So that making allowance for the heaped measure, a bushel of lime would be 70 pounds. The Ontario Lime Association, whose head office is at Toronto, last year handled 360 cars of lime, which was sold at the rate of 70 pounds to the bushel. By the law they were compelled to abandon that mode of dealing with lime, as they were required to sell it at the rate of 80 pounds to the bushel. Consequently they had to find other methods of disposing of their output, selling by the hundred or in any other way they could until a change should be made in the law. The Ontario Lime Association, the Toronto Lime Company, and others agree that 70 pounds is a fair weight for a bushel of lime. I do not mean to say that that is the exact weight of a bushel of lime in every instance. One lime will weigh more than another, just as some wheat will weigh more than other wheat; but 70 pounds is the recognized standard throughout the province of Ontario, where lime is handled in very large quantities. I therefore ask that the amendment I propose be adopted, and that the word "eighty" be struck out and the word "seventy" be substituted for it.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I think it would be a mistake to adopt that amendment, for this reason, that if lime is not well burned it will weigh very much heavier, whereas if it is well burned, it will weigh very much lighter. Therefore, to sell lime by weight is against the interest of the purchaser.

Amendment (of Mr. Henderson) agreed to.

The **MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE**. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) introduced a Bill to fix the weight of eggs when sold by the dozen. He introduced it last session, but was unable to get

it adopted, and this session he again introduced the Bill, and it was read the first time on the 17th of May. I promised that when the House was in committee on this Bill I would ask the Committee to take it into consideration. The Bill provides as follows :—

Unless otherwise specially agreed upon between the buyer and seller, eggs shall be sold by weight, and the weight equivalent to a dozen shall be one pound and one-half.

I think the hon. gentleman is right in desiring to fix the weight of eggs for exportation. Before the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, Mr. Gilbert, a valuable authority, urged the importance of improving our egg market by establishing a standard for the weight of eggs. He said :

There is an impression abroad, and that impression is perhaps warranted so long as eggs are not sold by weight, that it does not matter what the size of the egg is so long as we get them in numbers. But when eggs are sold by weight, which I hope will soon be the case, it will be of importance to have large eggs.

Therefore, I propose to add the following to the Bill :—

Unless otherwise specially agreed upon between the buyer and seller, eggs for exportation shall be sold by weight, and the weight equivalent to a dozen shall be one pound and one-half.

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

### After Recess.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. During recess I had occasion to meet members on both sides, and I find out that there is serious objection to this amendment. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) has left for home. He is in possession of information in support of his proposal, which might induce the House to adopt his views, which I have not got, and I therefore ask for leave to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment withdrawn.

Bill, as amended, reported, read the third time and passed.

### CRIMINAL CODE.

The PRIME MINISTER. I beg leave to move that Order No. 23 for second reading of Bill (No. 16)—from the Senate—further to amend the Criminal Code of 1892, be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

### RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved third reading of Bill (No. 190) to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of railways therein mentioned.

310‡

Mr. CLANCY. I beg to move in amendment :

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back forthwith to the Committee of the Whole House, with instructions to amend the same by adding to subsection 49 of section 2 the following words :—“Within six months.”

In view of the statement by the right hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Railways, that this is merely a matter of suspension, I move this amendment, and ask the Government to consent to it.

The House divided on amendment (Mr. Clancy).

#### YEAS :

##### Messieurs

Blanchard,  
Broder,  
Clancy,  
Clarke,  
Cochrane,  
Davin,

Ferguson,  
Foster,  
Gullet,  
Henderson,  
Macdonald (King's), and  
Taylor.—12.

#### NAYS :

##### Messieurs

Bazinet,  
Beausoleil,  
Blair,  
Borden (King's),  
Bostock,  
Bourassa,  
Brodeur,  
Brown,  
Campbell,  
Copp,  
Davis,  
Demers,  
Domville,  
Edwards,  
Ethier,  
Flint,  
Fraser (Lambton),  
Godbout,  
Graham,  
Haley,  
Harwood,  
Hutchison,  
Johnston,  
Joly de Lotbinière  
(Sir Henri),

Landerkin,  
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),  
Lewis,  
Mackie,  
McGugan,  
Marcil,  
Martineau,  
Mignault,  
Morrison,  
Mulock,  
Oliver,  
Parmalee,  
Pettet,  
Préfontaine,  
Proulx,  
Rinfret,  
Sifton,  
Scruerville,  
Stenson,  
Sutherland,  
Tolmie,  
Tucker, and  
Turcot.—47.

Amendment negatived.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I desire to have this Bill referred back to the Committee of the Whole, in order to insert a few words in section 8. The object is, by inserting these words to make the meaning and intention of the section somewhat clearer than it is at present.

The PRIME MINISTER moved that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for certain amendments.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move that section 8 be reconsidered, and that the word “and” in the

first line be struck out, and that in the second line, after the word "assigns" the following words be inserted: "And any person or company controlling or operating the railway or portion of railway subsidized under this Act."

Motion agreed to.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported; and read the third time and passed.

#### SUPPLY—INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

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

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to call attention to the fact that these papers that have at last been brought down are utterly useless to me—the Michaud-Belanger papers. There is not a letter here from the Minister, though there is six of his letters referred to—every one carefully taken out. Mr. French's petition is not here, though it is referred to over and over again, and the letter which accompanies the petition. There are other omissions, though these are the principal ones. It shows that there was no attempt to prepare the papers with any other idea than to pitch something on the Table—let him take it or leave it, as he likes. It is absolutely a disgrace for any Minister to deal with an order of the House in this contemptuous way. I do not think there has ever been a report, after months of asking, in such a slovenly manner as this. The report is of no use to me. But I give notice that I am ready to stay here for five months, if I can get anybody to stay with me, if I cannot have a proper return made for the Order of the House. It is not my order; it is the Order of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. What was the date of the Order of the House?

Mr. FOSTER. It was passed in April.

Mr. DAVIN. The return to the Order of the House calling for all the Orders in Council passed since 1896, respecting contracts made without tender, which the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), I fancy, thinks he brought down, has not been brought down. What the right hon. gentleman laid on the Table was simply a return to an Order made last year for all contracts let in the Department of Public Works without tender. And I would just like to say, as I am on my feet, with reference to the Queen vs. Skelton, that the return which has come down is a very elaborate one, and it would be impossible, at this time, to analyze it. But, if my life is spared, and if I have the honour of being a member of the House next session, I will call attention to it.

Mr. BLAIR.

#### SUPPLY—THE BOTHWELL ELECTION, 1896.

Mr. CLANCY. At this stage of the proceedings, one might, under other circumstances, be expected to offer an apology to the House for keeping it a few moments. But, as I desire to call the attention of the Government, but especially that of the right hon. First Minister, to a report which has gone broadcast in the newspapers and very generally throughout the country. I think an apology is hardly necessary for the few remarks I shall make. The report is in relation to the election which took place in the electoral district of Bothwell during the general election of 1896. The "Globe" newspaper, of the 19th of July last, has this to say about it. Speaking of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, it says:

He referred to the defeat of the Minister of Justice in Bothwell at the last general election.

The Hon. David Mills, interrupting, said he had been defeated by ballots being taken out of the ballot-box and other ballots put in. He had some of the ballots in his possession at the present time.

The "Mail" newspaper of the same date has a report almost similar to that, which reads as follows:—

He (Sir Mackenzie Bowell) referred to the defeat of the Minister of Justice in Bothwell at the last general elections.

Hon. David Mills said he had been defeated by ballots being taken out of the ballot-box and ballots being put in. He had some of the ballots in his possession at the present time.

Another report with regard to the election in Bothwell reads this way:

Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL. But as time rolls on changes take place. New electors rise up. Young men come of age, and my hon. friend was defeated, as others have been.

The Hon. DAVID MILLS. No, that is not the way it was done.

Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL. How was it?

The Hon. DAVID MILLS. Ballots were put into the box and ballots taken out, and I have some of them in my possession that were found afterwards.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to treat seriously a matter that, so far as I have any knowledge of it in any shape or form, I believe to be utterly destitute of a single particle of truth. But the statement having been made on the authority of a Minister of the Crown, with the weight that necessarily attaches to a statement coming from that quarter, it has given rise to my being the recipient of a large number of letters, all expressing surprise, and making inquiries as to the correctness of the statement. That being the case, and in justice to myself, and, I think, in justice to the electoral district of Bothwell—

The PRIME MINISTER. I must call my hon. friend to order. He is referring to what took place in another House.

Mr. CLANCY. I am not discussing that at all.

The PRIME MINISTER. He is referring to it, which he has no right to do.

Mr. CLANCY. I am discussing another matter now; I am calling attention to something else. I am not referring to a former debate.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, but to proceedings in another House.

Mr. CLANCY. Nor am I referring to a debate in another Chamber; I am saying now what I deem it my duty to do in view of these statements, that is, not only to give them an absolute denial, but to demand an inquiry. I say, that statement having been made on the authority of a Minister of the Crown, it is due to the good name of Bothwell, and in justice to myself, that an investigation should take place, and that that statement should be made good. I may be told that I have waited till the ballots have been destroyed, and that, therefore, I have no right to make this demand; but I want to say to the right hon. gentleman that the Minister of Justice took good care to make this statement himself when he knew the ballots were destroyed. If there is anything wanting in making a searching inquiry, the fault does not lie with me, but entirely with the gentleman who made the statement. The statement is made, that the Minister of Justice is now in possession of the ballots that were found upon the floor, and that were substituted for ballots that were taken out of the ballot-boxes. In view of that statement, I now ask the right hon. gentleman, in justice to the fair name of that constituency, that it should not lie under any such imputation, and that an investigation should take place.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot give a better answer to my hon. friend than to call his attention to the law upon this subject. If he complains of anything, he complains of something that took place in another Chamber. Here is what our authority, Sir John Bourinot, says upon that subject, page 426:

It is a part of the unwritten law of Parliament that no allusion should be made in one House to the debates of the other Chamber, a rule always imposed by the Speaker with the utmost strictness. Members frequently attempt to evade this rule by resorting to ambiguous terms of expression—by referring, for instance, to what happened in "another place;" but all such evasions of a wholesome practice will be stopped by the Speaker when it is very evident to whom the allusions are made.

When I called the hon. gentleman to order, he said he was not alluding to what took place in another Chamber. Now, the very

basis of his reference and of his request for an investigation is what took place in another Chamber. He will see that he is clearly out of order.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will see that he has not touched the point of order at all. It is too late to take the point of order now.

#### SUPPLY—SALE OF BINDER TWINE.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before you leave the Chair, this matter being disposed of, I purpose to say a few words, in fulfilment of a promise that I made to the Government and to the House, that I would say something before the session was over in reference to the very unbusinesslike manner in which the Government have dealt with the property of the people of Canada. I refer to the binder twine manufactured at the Kingston Penitentiary. I promised to deal with that question, and I intend to do so now, because I always consider my word as my bond. I allowed the Estimates to go through, because the Government were anxious to get the main Estimates closed, but I then promised to bring this matter up before the close of the session. I purpose concluding with a motion, and I will read the motion now, before making my remarks.

Mr. BERGERON. Do not read it now. If you read it now, you will not be able to speak afterwards.

Mr. TAYLOR. As my hon. friend has been the Deputy Speaker, I will take his advice, and not read it now. This Government was elected in 1896. They made a promise to the people of this country that they would conduct the business of the country on business principles. They made a claim that the Government was composed of business men. Now, I make the statement, that if any business firm, any incorporated company, had a board of directors and a president who controlled the property of the company, as this Government is handling the property of the people of this country, that company would very soon call a special meeting to dismiss the president and directors. When this Government were elected, they immediately looked around to see how they could benefit some of their political supporters, and they went up to the Kingston Penitentiary, and discovered there some 500 tons of binder twine lying on hand. They did not call for tenders and sell that binder twine at the highest price. They sold it to private friends. Coll Bros., who purchased 500 tons at a small price. Coll Bros. handed that binder twine over to the Hobbs Hardware Company of London. In the Public Accounts Committee I moved that all the tenders, correspondence and documents referring to the revenues of the Kingston Penitentiary from the sale of binder twine, should be produced. This is the

return I hold in my hands containing the tenders that were received for the sale of binder twine and the correspondence relating to it. The Deputy Minister of Justice writes this letter :

Ottawa, 30th May, 1899.

Sir,—In compliance with the request contained in your letter of the 20th instant, I inclose herewith for the information of the Public Accounts Committee, copies of such documents mentioned therein as this department is able to supply.

I have the honour to be, sir,  
Your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) E. L. NEWCOMBE,  
Deputy Minister of Justice.

N. Robidoux, Esq.,  
Clerk of Public Accounts Committee,  
House of Commons.

We found in the papers that came down this document :

Memorandum of Agreement between William Richard Hobbs, and Thomas Sanders Hobbs, of the city of London, in the province of Ontario, merchants, doing business under the name, style and firm of "The Hobbs Hardware Company," of the first part, and the Warden of the Kingston Penitentiary, of the second part.

Whereas, by a certain memorandum of agreement bearing date the fourth day of September, 1896, Messrs. Coll Brothers, of the city of St. John, province of New Brunswick, merchants, became the purchasers from the warden of the Kingston Penitentiary of 500 tons of binder twine, of which they agreed to take delivery and for which they agreed to pay at the time, and according to the terms and prices set forth in the said agreement, a copy of which is hereunto annexed.

And whereas the said Coll Brothers, by a certain memorandum of agreement, bearing date the 25th day of January, 1897, did assign to the said Hobbs Hardware Company the said hereinbefore in part recited agreement, and the said binder twine therein mentioned, and all their right, title and interest under and by virtue of the said agreement, as will more fully appear by reference to the said last mentioned memorandum of agreement, a copy of which is also hereunto annexed.

I may say here that there is no copy annexed, and that the prices are not given, but they are in a detailed statement, which is furnished, of the receipts of the penitentiary, showing that they sold 500 tons of twine at about 4 cents per pound :

And whereas the warden of the Kingston Penitentiary has agreed to acquiesce in the assignment and to substitute the parties hereto of the first part for the said Coll Brothers as the purchasers of the said twine and for the performance of all and singular the obligations on their behalf in the said first mentioned agreement contained.

This agreement therefore witnesseth that the parties hereto of the first part undertake and agree to and with the warden of the Kingston Penitentiary to well and truly abide by and perform all and singular the agreements, stipulations and obligations in the said agreement of the 4th of September, 1896, entered into and contained by and on behalf of the said Coll Brothers, and to accept delivery of the said twine and pay

Mr. TAYLOR.

therefor according to the provisions of the said agreement, and also at all times until the full performance of the said agreement to maintain the security and insurance therein mentioned.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have set their hands this 16th day of February, 1897.

HOBBS HARDWARE COMPANY.

W. R. HOBBS,  
President.  
T. S. HOBBS.

Witness—

WILLIAM A. EASTWOOD.

W. J. McLEOD.

J. H. METCALFE,  
Warden Kingston Penitentiary.

W. J. McLEOD.

By that agreement Coll Bros. purchased these 500 tons of binder twine in the fall of 1896. and handed it over to the Hobbs Hardware Company of London.

Mr. WOOD. Had they not a perfect right to do that ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, but this goes to prove that there was a ring formed then, which ring is in existence to-day, and before I get through with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood), I think I will prove that the hon. gentleman is in it.

Mr. WOOD. You are mistaken.

Mr. TAYLOR. It just goes to prove that there was a ring formed then and that ring is in existence up to the present time. Binder twine has been sold at 4 cents and 4½ cents a pound by the penitentiary, and this ring has compelled the farmers of Canada to pay from 12 cents to 15 cents per pound during the last two or three years. That is the state of affairs that this Government has brought about. The binder twine manufactory was started at the Kingston Penitentiary by the late Government for the express purpose of giving the farmers binder twine practically at what they could manufacture it for and allow other manufacturers a fair living profit. The late Government disposed of this twine by supplying merchants, all over the country, sending their agents out and forcing other manufacturers to do the same in order to get their goods on the market.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. They never got paid for it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, they did get paid for it. I asked the question of the Government if there was a dollar due for binder twine, and the answer of the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) was that every dollar had been paid.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. This Government must have collected it.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was practically all collected by the late Government. The return brought down was up to the 1st of July. The twine had been sold at four months, and, of course, the merchants had not paid, but they paid their bills as soon

as they became due. There is not a dollar owing to the binder twine manufactory at Kingston Penitentiary by the late Government, as the statement of the hon. Solicitor General proves. The late Government adopted that plan, but they went further. They advertised in the papers that any farmer, or any person who wanted a car-load, or any other quantity, by sending their order to the Kingston Penitentiary would be supplied if the money accompanied the order. They did not allow a ring to be formed, as this Government have done, to force the price up. They established the binder twine manufactory at Kingston in order that the farmers should get their twine practically at first cost. In 1897, the binder twine was sold to the Hobbs Hardware Company, of London. On the 24th of February, 1897, this agreement was entered into, no tender brought down, no tender accompanying the return; therefore, the Government sold the twine in 1897 to the Hobbs Hardware Company at the following prices. The penitentiary sold what was on hand in the fall to Coll Bros., and Coll Bros. assigned it to the Hobbs Hardware Company. Then the Government sold the output from the 1st of August, 1896, to the 1st of August, 1897, to the Hobbs Hardware Company on the 24th February, and this agreement was entered into:

Memorandum of Agreement made in triplicate this 24th day of February, A.D. 1897, between the warden of the Kingston Penitentiary, herein after called the Warden, of the first part, and William Richard Hobbs, of the city of London, in the province of Ontario, and Thomas Sanders Hobbs, of the same place, trading together as hardware merchants under the name, style and firm of the Hobbs Hardware Company, and hereinafter called the purchasers, of the second part, witnesseth as follows:—

1. The warden agrees to sell, and the purchasers agree to purchase, all binder twine now on hand at the Kingston Penitentiary and not already sold, and all binder twine that shall be manufactured at the said penitentiary up to and inclusive of the first day of August, A.D. 1897, the prices to be paid by the purchasers, all f.o.b. cars at Kingston, to be for "Maple Leaf" five and a quarter (5¼) cents per pound, for "Beaver" four and three-quarter (4¾) cents per pound, and for "Sisal" four and two-fifths (4⅔) cents per pound.

2. The twine so purchased is to be delivered from time to time in such quantities as the purchasers may order, provided that the quantities ordered are in stock, and the warehouse is to be cleared of all twine on the first day of August, A.D. 1897.

3. The terms of sale in all cases to be cash on delivery of the twine.

4. The cheque for \$2,397.50 which accompanied the tender of the purchasers, is to be deposited to the credit of the Receiver General of Canada, and the amount thereof is to be retained as security for the faithful performance of this agreement by the purchasers. If the contract is duly performed the amount of the cheque will be credited in the final settlement.

In witness whereof the parties have hereunto set their hands and seals the day and year first above written.

Signed, sealed and delivered.

(Sgd.) J. H. METCALFE,  
Warden Kingston Penitentiary.

Witness—

(Sgd.) W. J. McLEOD.

(Sgd.) W. R. HOBBS.

Witness—

(Sgd.) WILLIAM A. EASTWOOD.

(Sgd.) T. S. HOBBS.

Witness—

(Sgd.) MAIDA McBROOM.

That accounts for all the twine from the 1st of August, 1896, up to the 1st of August, 1897, it having been sold to the Hobbs Hardware Company. Having secured the 500 tons that was on hand in the fall of 1896 from Coll Bros., and having purchased the output from the Kingston Penitentiary for 1897, the Hobbs Hardware Company incorporated two or three companies so as to make farmers believe that there was competition. They had gone up to Toronto and arranged with their friends at the Central Prison to control the output of the factory there, and had made arrangements with the Farmers' Binder Twine Co., of Brantford, and they all sold it at the same price. The Hobbs Company was the agent for the Binder Twine Trust of the United States, and no twine could be purchased by any agent in Canada unless it went through their hands, and they got the commission. Therefore, they practically controlled the market, and the farmers of this country had to pay from 12 to 15 cents a pound for binder twine which this Government put into the hands of Hobbs & Company at an average of 4½ cents a pound. I asked the question early this session:

To whom and at what price was the binder twine manufactured at the Kingston Penitentiary between the first day of July, 1896, and the 30th June, 1897, sold? Were tenders called for?

The answer of the Minister was:

To Hobbs Hardware Company, of London, at the following prices:—Sisal, \$4.40 per cwt.; Beaver, \$4.75 per cwt.; Maple Leaf, \$5.25 per cwt. Tenders were called for.

But in the return brought down, in answer to my motion for the tenders, there was not a tender brought down, and, therefore, I assume that there was no tender. The second question I put on the same paper, was:

2. To whom and at what price was the binder twine manufactured at the Kingston Penitentiary between the first day of July, 1897, and the 30th June, 1898, sold? Were tenders called and in what papers were they advertised?

The reply to that was:

To H. N. Bate & Sons, Ottawa, at the following prices:—Sisal, \$4.15 per cwt.; Beaver, \$4.45 per cwt.; Maple Leaf, \$4.95 per cwt. Tenders were called for by circular addressed to leading dealers throughout the Dominion.

Who were the dealers to whom the circular

was sent? Simply the four or five who composed this ring. There was not a circular sent to the Massey Harris Company, the Frost & Wood Company, to any of the large hardware dealers in Montreal, or to any of the large dealers throughout the country. A circular was sent to the Wood-Vallance Company, of Hamilton, to Ashdown & Company, of Winnipeg, to the Hobbs Hardware Company, to Bate & Sons, and to two or three outside parties.

Mr. WOOD. To Rice, Lewis & Sons, Toronto—a good Grit firm.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, to Rice, Lewis & Sons. Here is a letter dated the 19th of February, from the Minister of Justice:

Referring to the interview between the Minister of Justice and your Mr. H. Allen Bate, I am directed by the Minister to state that he is prepared to consider any definite proposal which you may submit in connection with the manufacture of binder twine at the Kingston Penitentiary.

I may also inform you that we have on hand at Kingston Penitentiary a quantity of three different grades of twine, and the Minister will be glad to receive any offer which you may make in that connection, such offer to be treated confidentially pending a definite decision in reference thereto.

The twine referred to is the produce of the manufacture of the current fiscal year.

That was the letter sent to Mr. Bate, stating that if he would make an offer it would be considered confidential. On the 28th of February, Bate & Sons wrote the Minister of Justice the following letter:—

Ottawa, February 28th, 1898.

To the Hon. David Mills,  
Minister of Justice, Ottawa.

Sir,—Referring to the request contained in yours of the 19th instant, relative to making you an offer for the binder twine on hand, we beg to submit the following:—

For about 60 tons of sisal.....	\$4 50 per 100
For about 120 tons mixed manilla .....	4 95 do
For about 100 tons pure manilla	4 95 do

Subject to cash settlements on dates of deliveries at our option, f.o.b. Kingston, providing of course that the manufacturing is well done and in perfect condition.

We are, awaiting the favour of an early reply.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) H. N. BATE & SONS.

The Government, I have no doubt, then made up their mind that they would hand over that twine to Bate & Sons, because they issued a circular dated the 5th of March calling for tenders. This circular the Prime Minister stated had been sent to all the leading business men of the country. It called for tenders to be in on the 19th, giving only two weeks. The circular could hardly have time to go to Winnipeg and back. Each tender was to be accompanied by a cheque for \$2,000. But no tender was sent in, because it was arranged between the parties that there should be no tender. The circular was sent to the following par-

Mr. TAYLOR.

ties:—John Hallam, of Toronto, a man not in the business at all, but a party heeler; H. Mooers, of Kingston, a man not in the business; J. H. Ashdown, of Winnipeg, a gentleman who ran in the Liberal interest in the last election; Coll Bros., of St. John, N.B., to whom the Government sold the output in 1896; the Farmers' Binder Twine Company, of Brantford, who arranged that their twine would be sold at the same price at which the Hobbs Company sold theirs; Charles Braithwaite, of Portage la Prairie, a farmer who ran in the interest of the Liberal party in the last election; Jas. Elder, of Virden, Man., another farmer; and Bate & Sons, of Ottawa. These compose the leading business men of this country to whom the Prime Minister said he had sent to this circular. I have no doubt it took two or three days for the circular to be written, so that there was only about ten days' notice. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Wood) told me he did not get a circular at all.

Mr. WOOD. I did not see it. I was not there.

Mr. TAYLOR. There was not a circular sent to Montreal or Halifax. This was the twine that was dealt with last year. Then I asked this question about the twine of this year:

To whom and at what price was the binder twine manufactured at the Kingston Penitentiary since the 1st July, 1898, and to be manufactured up to the 10th June, 1899, sold? Were tenders called for?

The Prime Minister replied:

To Hobbs Hardware Company, of London. Tenders were called for by advertisement in the newspapers, and the highest tender accepted.

My hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) put another question on the paper in reference to the same thing, but he asked the question in another way, and the Prime Minister answered differently. The right hon. gentleman told me that it had been sold to the Hobbs Hardware Company, and that the highest tender had been accepted. The hon. member for Halton put this question on the paper:

1. Has the tender of Martin P. Connolly for the current season's make of binder twine, at Kingston, been accepted by the Government? If not, to whom has such twine been sold?
2. What are the prices to be paid to the Government by the purchaser for the different brands of such twine?

The Prime Minister answered:

1. The tender of Martin P. Connolly has been accepted and a contract based upon that tender has been executed with the Hobbs Hardware Company, of London.
2. The prices cannot be given until the output has been marketed by the purchaser.

Whoever heard of such a thing? The Government sell their property by tender, and

they refuse to tell the price until the purchasers, who are the ring, re-sell the goods. The Minister admits in reply to the question that it was sold on the tender of Martin P. Connolly. To me he said it had been sold on the tender of the Hobbs Hardware Company. But it was sold on the tender of Martin P. Connolly, who no doubt handed it over to the Hobbs Hardware Company. They advertised, and I am informed that three tenders came in: the Hobbs Hardware Company, Coll Bros. and Bate & Sons. It was discovered that the Hobbs Company was not quite the lowest, and at five o'clock, I am informed, on the day the tenders were to be received, a gentleman who sits in the Press Gallery carried in another telegram from Connolly offering a little bit more than the highest tender, which was not that of the Hobbs Company. The cheque inclosed in the tender of Martin P. Connolly was a cheque signed on the Banque Nationale by Mr. Purdy, the Hobbs Hardware Company's solicitor; and on the day these tenders came in and for some time before Martin P. Connolly was not in the country at all, but was away down in Mexico. This information I have received, and I believe it is correct. The contract was awarded to Martin P. Connolly, who handed it over to the Hobbs Hardware Company. This plan was taken to keep the twine in the ring. We had a discussion here a few days ago on this subject, and a "Journal" reporter called on Mr. Bate, who showed him that he had sold a certain quantity of this twine to the Massey Harris Company; but he d'd not show that he had sold 200 tons of it to the Wood-Vallance Company, of Hamilton. But he did not say that he shipped 200 pounds of it to the firm of Wood, Vallance & Company, of Hamilton. I received a letter early this spring, dated 25th May:

Dear Sir,—Re binder twine, make some inquiries carefully, and find out if Wood, Vallance & Co. are not the actual tenderers for the binder twine at Kingston last year, and not Bate & Sons, of Ottawa. Bate & Sons' name was only a cloak, if some things I have heard is half-right.

Mr. WOOD. Give us the name.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is no name to it.

Mr. WOOD. Is it not worth much?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, but it is a pointer leading to the fact that 200 pounds were shipped by Bate & Sons from the Kingston Penitentiary to the firm of Wood, Vallance & Co., of Hamilton.

Mr. WOOD. And was paid for.

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly, at an average of 4½ cents, and the farmers from one end of this country to the other had to pay last year 12 to 15 cents per pound. No wonder a little girl made this prayer. A little girl, the daughter of a prominent man in the ranks of the Liberal party, had been taught to pray for everybody, and startled

her mother one evening by her devout prayer as follows:—

Now, O God, take care of yourself, for if we lose you we only have Mr. Laurier to take care of us, and he is not doing as well as papa expected he would.

I think that the farmers of this country have come to the conclusion that he has not done as well as he expected when he sold the binder twine made at the Kingston Penitentiary at 4½ cents per pound to his political friends, who sold it back to the farmers at 12 cents to 15 cents per pound.

Here is a statement of the receipts of the Kingston Penitentiary from the 1st July, 1897, to the 30th June, 1898:

Received from—	
Hobbs & Co.....	\$29,288 01
Bate & Sons .....	38,695 82
Total .....	\$67,983 83
369,866 lbs. Maple Leaf.	
209,823 do Beaver.	
236,725 do Sisal.	
426,771 do Mixed.	
236,750 do Standard.	
1,479,635	

1,479,635 pounds of binder twine were sent out from the Kingston Penitentiary and the money received for it was \$67,000. Calculate that binder twine at 4½ cents per pound, and it comes to \$66,583.27. So that practically the average price received from the Hobbs Hardware Company and Bate & Sons was 4½ cents per pound, of which \$66,583.27 went into the treasury. This binder twine they sold to the farmers at an average of 13½ cents per pound, which comes to \$199,750.72, leaving a profit to the ring of \$133,167.15. That amount was taken out of the pockets of the farmers and put into the pockets of the men who handled this binder twine.

Mr. WALLACE. Who were the men who handled the binder twine?

Mr. TAYLOR. The Hobbs Hardware Company and Bate & Sons. Bate & Sons were the purchasers last year, but the Hobbs Hardware Company had the contract for three years. Bate & Sons did not sell it to the farmers at all, but handed over 200 tons of it to Wood, Vallance & Co., of Hamilton.

Mr. WALLACE. No relation of the hon. member for Hamilton.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know who compose the firm. The Hobbs Hardware Company controlled the output of binder twine manufactured at the Central Prison, Toronto. They have rented the machinery at so much per day, they pay so much per day to the convicts, and furnish the raw materials and control the output. They controlled the output of the Kingston Penitentiary, and also of the Binder Twine Company of Brantford, which, according to the Toronto "Globe," declared a dividend last year of 70 per cent.

Not bad for an industry that is not protected in the tariff. But they had a more effective protection outside the tariff. The Hobbs Hardware Company are the agents for the American Trust Company, and the latter could not sell binder twine in this country at all. Now, we will take the three items. If there was \$133,167.15 profit made out of the Kingston output, there was the same profit on the output of the Toronto Central Prison and the Farmers' Brantford Binder Twine Company, giving a total of \$399,501.45 taken from the farmers, over and above the purchase price which they paid for this twine. The price paid by the Hobbs Hardware Company was 4½ cents per pound on an average, and they sold at 13½ cents per pound on the average, which would leave as a profit on the output of the Kingston Penitentiary of \$133,167.15. Multiply that by three to get at the profit on the output of the three institutions—the Kingston Penitentiary, the Toronto Central Prison and the Farmers' Binder Twine Company of Brantford—and you have a total profit of of \$399,541.42 made by the ring last year, all of which came out of the pockets of the farmers. How true and prophetic were the words of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce when he said, a few years ago, that under the National Policy, for every dollar which went into the treasury, two dollars went into the pockets of the manufacturers. For \$66,583.27 that went into the treasury of this Dominion, \$163,667 went into the pockets of the Hobbs Hardware Company as clear profit.

Mr. WOOD. Nonsense, you know better.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know better, and I know my hon. friend knows that the binder twine was sold by the Government at an average of 4½ cents per pound and that the farmers paid on an average of 13½ cents per pound.

Mr. WOOD. As a business man, you know better than that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I must ask you, Mr. Speaker, to call the hon. gentleman to order. As a business man, I will prove that every farmer paid 13½ cents for his binder twine, and all that the Government got was 4½ cents per pound, showing a clear profit of 9 cents to the ring.

Mr. WOOD. You got some of the profit when you sold the twine. You are making the speech of a demagogue.

Mr. TAYLOR. The farmers of this country know my figures cannot be contradicted. I could go and elaborate further, but as the session is so near its close, and other hon. members will have something to say, particularly my hon. friend from Hamilton, who will have to explain how he got these 200 tons, I do not propose to detain the House longer. The Government have no business selling the twine at a low price

Mr. TAYLOR.

and enabling these people to bleed the farmers as they have done. Binder twine is just as staple an article as sugar and cotton and everything else, the wholesale quotations of which you can find any day in the newspapers. But you cannot find the wholesale prices of binder twine manufactured by this Government. I put the question to the Government this session and they replied: We sold this year to the Hobbs Hardware Company of London; tenders were called for, and the prices cannot be made public, as the binder twine has not been marketed by the purchaser. Why should not the prices be made public? Why protect the purchasers instead of the farmers. The farmers would not begrudge one cent of a pound profit, but what are they paying for the binder twine that the Government sold at 4½ cents per pound? And these parties re-sold it at from 13 cents to 15 cents a pound. A friend of mine from Quebec was asking me how it was that twine was selling at Windsor at 11 cents and at Quebec they had to pay 13 cents for it. That is what we are doing this year, and the Government have repeated the same operation—they have handed over the output of this year at a low price and the farmers are paying a high price, as high, practically, as last year. Therefore, I beg to move seconded by Mr. Sproule:

That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved: That in the opinion of this House the system adopted by the Government for the sale of binder twine on hand on the 1st July, 1896, and manufactured in the Kingston Penitentiary since that date has proved unsatisfactory and detrimental to the best interests of the farmers of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. I second this motion, because I think it is well that the farmers of Canada should know how far this paternal Government may be regarded as their friends. It was often said before the present Government came into power that the farmers were "bled white" by our system of taxation. It was said they were paying too much for their agricultural implements, that they were paying more than they should pay for their binder twine, that they were taxed too much on sugar, and that for all other articles of consumption they were paying more than they should pay. In the first place a motion was made to reduce the duty on binder twine, so that the farmers of Canada might get their binder twine at the lowest possible price. And it was said frequently by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) and by the present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), who had, to a large extent control of the "Farmers' Sun"—the Patron paper then—that if a Reform Government came into power, the farmers of the country could be helped very materially by reducing the cost to them of the binder twine they had to use and the agricultural implements so necessary to them. Now, in

the light of a few years experience, it is important for us to consider how far they succeeded in fulfilling these promises to the farmers. These gentlemen were always pleased to call themselves the paternal friends of the farmers. The first transaction in which they undertook to help the farmer was in connection with binder twine and coal oil. They took the duty off binder twine, it is true. And though the farmers have frequently been told before this time by the then Government that reducing or taking away the duty on binder twine would not reduce the price to the farmers of Canada because a combine in the United States controlled the article there and they would not sell to Canada except under regulations given out by themselves. It was said that the same applied to some other things, but to this more particularly. But the present Government came into power, and to please the farmers and performance of their promise, they took the duty off binder twine. What was the result? I need not ask any farmer in Canada if he got his binder twine any cheaper by reason of the duty being taken off, because every farmer knows that the reverse was the case. It is important to inquire what brought about the increased price of binder twine. We were told last year—and I have heard it said repeatedly by Reformers and by Reform agents who were selling binder twine and conversing with farmers who grumbled a good deal about paying the high price—that the high price was due to the war in Manilla, that this had stopped the importation of the raw material which went into the manufacture of binder twine.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. My hon. friend from North Essex (Mr. McGregor) says "hear, hear." May I tell him, if he does not know it already, that all material that went into that binder twine that was sold last year was bought and paid for before the war commenced, and that the same price was paid for it as was paid for that which went into the binder twine sold the year before at about half the price.

Mr. MCGREGOR. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has just said that binder twine went up. It is just the same as wheat that my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) sells—it often goes up in price after he has sold it.

Mr. SPROULE. After which was sold?

Mr. MCGREGOR. After the binder twine was sold by the Government.

Mr. SPROULE. But why did it go up? Because it went into the hands of friends of the Government who put the price up. Who were they? The Hobbs Hardware Company, one of whose members used to be in the local House and who negotiated for the output of Central Prison, so that the farmer

could not get a pound of it; and H. N. Bate & Sons here, who have been so useful to the Reformers of this country; and Coll Bros., of Halifax; and Wood, Vallance & Co., one of whose members sits on the other side of this House. That is the crowd who joined with the Farmers' Binder Twine Company, of Brantford, which work in harmony with them, except the Montreal one, have the output of all the factories in Canada under control. It is important to inquire how this is brought about and to see why there is no truth in the statement that the increased price was due to the fact that the raw material out of which it was made had increased in price. What was paid for the sisal? The Auditor General's Report says that practically the same price was paid as the year before, and about the same as the year before that—practically the same price every year for three years.

Mr. MCGREGOR. And the Government got for the binder twine they sold what it was worth at the time they sold.

Mr. SPROULE. Of course they got what it was worth, and that was 4½ cents. But did it require the margin between 4½ and 14 cents to cover the profit of the wholesaler and retailer and get the goods into the hands of the consumers? Was not that an exorbitant profit? Why, 1½ cents would be a big profit for the wholesaler, and the same would be a good profit to the retailer. Add that profit to 4½ cents and you get 7½ cents as a fair price for this binder twine. And instead of being sold at that price, it was sold at 14 cents, 15 cents and 16 cents a pound in my part of the country. I know that, because I bought it myself and I know what I paid for it. How was that accomplished? It was accomplished by the way the binder twine sale was effected by the Government. Were notices published in the newspapers throughout the country asking for tenders for this binder twine so that everybody might have a chance to tender? Not at all, a circular was sent out to a few political friends of the Government, united among themselves and arranged that only certain ones were to tender, and no matter who got it it would be distributed to any number of them who desired to sell it as wholesalers, but it would all be purchased from the Government at one price. That was the first step that was wrong. I say that had they put out an advertisement in the papers in 1897 that this binder twine was for sale and invited tenders for it, they never would have brought about what took place. First, they negotiated it by a private letter to parties in Ottawa. Then, after a while there was a circular purporting to be sent to several companies who might desire to purchase this twine, and I am told that the circular did not reach half the firms. But what was the result? They invited tenders on the 5th of March by this private

circular, tenders were to be put in on the 19th of March, and on the 19th of March only one tender was in. The tender was opened and the contract was practically given to one firm. Probably, if there had been public tenders they would have made a better bargain, but there were none, and the result is that it goes into the hands of the H. N. Bate Co., and that company, as I have already said are acting in concert with the Hobbs Hardware Company of London, who purchased from the provincial government in Toronto the whole output of the Central Prison there. The Hobbs Hardware Company goes into an arrangement with the Farmers' Binder Twine Company, of Brantford, and then through the ring they have control of the whole output in Canada. Then, they enter into a combine in the United States, through a firm, for the sale of American binder twine in Canada. The result is that twine is sold to the farmers of Canada at the price of 14 cents a pound. The lowest figures at which you could buy a pound of twine last summer was 14, 15 and 16 cents for the three qualities.

Now, then, in what respect were the Government derelict in their duty to the farmer? How could they have avoided that? They could have avoided it by putting a notice in the paper so that every man might tender for twine in any portion of the country. In the next place, they could have done as their predecessors did to avoid the possibility of a combination being formed, they could have reserved the right to sell to any farmer or to any man in Canada a carload of that twine at the same price that they sold to the parties who bought the output and thereby prevent the price being put up. That is what was done by the previous Government. When they were asked in this House why they did it, the answer was. We did it to prevent them from putting the price too high to the farmers. So, if they put the price too high all the farmer had to do was, through the Patrons of Industry, or through their agent, to order a carload of binder twine and sell it out to the farmers. You can sell it at a fair price, and by that means we will keep the price of it down to the farmers at what it ought to be. There is where they made the mistake, and because they did not do that, they left it in the power of these parties to enter into a combine by which they mulcted the farmers to the tune which was mentioned by the member for South Leeds. That is where I blame the present Government. They sold their binder twine first in a private way, they sold it by sending a private circular instead of making it open for competition by putting notices in the papers. Then, the prices at which the binder twine was sold to these parties by the Government were very much the same as it was sold in previous years, because I find it was sold in 1896 at \$4.83 to Coll Bros., or higher than it had ever been sold since. \$4.83 per 100 pounds would

Mr. SPROULE.

make a little over 4½ cents per pound. But when it was sold at that price it was sold out to the farmers for 7 cents a pound retail. In the year when it was sold for \$4.46, or less than 4½ cents a pound, when the year before it was sold at 4½ cents, it was retailed to the farmers at 7 cents a pound. But next year, when it was sold at \$4.51, or 4½ cents a pound, practically the same prices as the year before, it was sold to the farmers at 14, 15 and 16 cents; whereas the year before it had been sold at 7 cents. Why that great difference? Why did the farmer pay 7 cents a pound more for his binder twine last year than the year before? It did not cost the wholesale man any more, therefore, taking a fair profit out of it, the farmer should have bought it last year at 7 cents and 7½ cents a pound. That was the price he could have bought it for, leaving a fair margin of profit both to the wholesaler and the retailer. But had this binder twine been sold in a proper way, as it was done by the Conservative Government, by reserving the right to sell to any farmer in Canada a carload of that binder twine at the same price that they sold it to the party who bought the output, it would have kept the price down to its normal figure, and the farmers last year would have got binder twine at 7 cents and 7½ cents per pound instead of 14, 15 and 16 cents. That is why I complain of the way this Government has done it. Now, I say it is because no provision was made to keep down the price, it is because this paternal Government had forgotten their duty to the farmers, had forgotten what they told the farmers before they came into power, when they said they were going to make binder twine so much cheaper than it was before; they had forgotten how they cried out that the monopolists and manufacturers of this country were bleeding the people white; they had forgotten that they told the farmers that if they were brought to power they would destroy these monopolists, and they would curtail the bloated manufacturers to that extent, and the people would get what they consumed at a fair living price. But the first thing they did was to put all the binder twine in the hands of that monopolistic ring represented by the Hobbs Hardware Company in London, Bate & Sons in Ottawa, Vallance & Wood in Hamilton, and Coll & Co. in Halifax. These four firms, all thorough Reformers, that were going to do so much for the farmers, received a monopoly of binder twine; this necessity for the farmer was put into the hands of these plunderers, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce used to call them, these bloated monopolists; it was put in their hands by this paternal Government, who were going to do so much for the farmers; and they did it in that case by making the farmer pay about 7 cents a pound more for his binder twine than he would have been obliged to pay had the Conservatives remained in power.

Now, the farmers may calculate for them-

selves what they owe to the Reform party. They can easily calculate it if they ascertain how much binder twine was sold in the country and compare the price of it for the last year with the price paid the year before. It ought to have been sold last year at exactly the same price as the year before, and both the retailer and the wholesaler would have had the same profits; and it could have been sold for what I have stated. I heard the member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) say the other night in defence of the farmers of this country, when he was trying to prove that they were just as smart as anybody else. He said as evidence of it: I need only mention the fact that the Farmers' Binder Twine Company of Brantford—which, by the way, was established a few years ago by the Patrons of Industry to give binder twine to the farmers at the lowest price—he said they made 60 per cent of a dividend on the money invested in their operation, and by that means he was endeavouring to prove to this House that the farmers were as smart as anybody else. A Reform farmer, when he goes into manufacturing, is as smart as anybody else, especially when that farmer has political friends who will help him. Who paid that 60 per cent? The farmers of Canada, and it was an extravagant dividend to be paid. They would not have been able to have taken that 60 per cent dividend out of the farmers of Canada if the Government had reserved the right to supply to any person who wanted it, in any province throughout the country, with a car-load of twine, so that he could furnish the farmers in his own locality with their twine at a reasonable price, and which would have been below the price that they had to pay as the result of the course which the Government have pursued. This was a most unbusinesslike transaction, and it was a most reckless sacrifice of the interests of the great farming population of the country. There are 467,000 farmers in the country who were obliged to pay 7 cents a pound more than it was worth for every pound of binder twine purchased by them last year on account of the way that it was sold by the Government, the result of which was to place the output of the factories under the control of Reform friends of the Government. I have no hesitation in seconding this motion, and I hope that this House will censure the Government for the way in which they conducted that transaction in connection with the output of the binder twine of this country. I have been handed a note saying that the contention is made that the war in Manilla affected the price of raw material for binder twine, and pointing out that there has been a civil war going on in the Philippine Islands for years. I would also point out that there is only a small percentage of the raw material which comes from that portion of the Philippine Islands where the war with the United

States is being fought. The war is not being fought in the locality where sisal is raised, but that this raw material is grown hundreds of miles away from there. It will, therefore, be seen that the war did not interfere with the cultivation, or importation, of binder twine. It did not affect the price one iota, although hon. gentlemen are attempting to delude the farmers of the country into believing that the rise in price was due to a cause over which the Government and their friends had no control. When these facts are known and understood by the farmers in the country, in my judgment, they will not thank this paternal Government for pretending to do for them what they have not done, for acting in this unbusinesslike way, the result of which has been that every farmer in the country has been obliged to pay 7 cents a pound more for his binder twine than he would have been obliged to pay if the Government had done their duty.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, there is very little for me to say in this debate further than to emphatically repudiate any connection with any ring of any description, binder twine, cordage or anything else, since I have been in business. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) says that I, or my firm, form part of any ring, he makes a statement in which there is not a particle of truth. My firm bought 200 tons of binder twine from Messrs. H. N. Bate & Sons—

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). On what date?

Mr. WOOD. About a year ago last May. I have the prices here. I understood from the hon. gentleman that he was going to bring this matter up and to implicate my firm as one of a ring. I told him that I had nothing to do with it, that I never was connected with a ring in my life, and was not in this instance. I telegraphed to my firm to send me down the prices we paid to Messrs. Bate & Sons. The representative of Messrs. Bate & Sons came to my place and my partner, who does most of the buying, bought the twine from him in as straightforward a business way as he would buy it from any other traveller. He knew nothing about Bate & Sons; I do not know that he had ever heard their name, and when he told me that he had bought twine from Bate & Sons, it was the first time I knew that they were dealers in this article. I never knew anything about it, although I see nothing wrong in Bate & Sons tendering for this twine; and as the highest bidders making the purchase.

Mr. TAYLOR. There were no tenders.

Mr. WOOD. The House will readily understand, from the prices quoted by the hon. gentleman, that I had paid Messrs. Bate & Sons a fairly reasonable profit upon their purchase, and if I were a part of the ring I

would not have paid them a profit on their purchase. The prices my firm paid were as follows : Sisal, \$4.90 per 100 pounds ; mixed manilla, \$5.30 ; manilla, \$6.05, f.o.b., cash, 1st October. I paid as soon as the twine was delivered and got the discount. So much for that portion of the matter. I ask the hon. gentleman, if he wishes to do what is fair, to withdraw the statement associating my firm's name with a ring that is favoured by the Government.

An hon. MEMBER. There is no ring.

Mr. WOOD. I know nothing about any ring ; I never heard of such a ring. Hon. gentlemen talk about the Government not seeing that the farmer was supplied—

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. gentleman have any objection to say at what price he sold that binder twine to the retailer for ?

Mr. WOOD. I am coming to that by and by. I cannot exactly say what we sold the binder twine for per pound. The Government did simply what every manufacturer would do before starting in to manufacture binder twine. They would go to the country and ask for tenders for the twine for the coming season. This is what stove manufacturers, reaping machine manufacturers, or any other manufacturing industry would do. They would send their representatives through the country and find out, before manufacturing these articles, if they could sell them at a profit. I bought a very large quantity of wire and wire nails at a low price. If I had kept them until the price advanced I would have made a large sum of money, but my travellers went into the country and sold them at a reasonable advance upon the cost. I have no doubt that the people to whom they were sold made a handsome thing out of them. When we got these 200 tons of twine, our travellers went all over the country and took orders at a reasonable advance on the cost, 7½ per cent to 10 per cent. Our customers could not sell their twine until the harvest came on, and in the meantime, the price had gone up all over the country.

Mr. SPROULE. No, it had not.

Mr. WOOD. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) says that the price of raw material was not enhanced in consequence of the war breaking out in the Phillipine Islands, I would tell him that this manilla is imported by large merchants, and that these merchants thought that, as a matter of course, in consequence of the war, the raw material would advance, with the result that they advanced the price all over the country. The manufacturers advanced the price just as the raw material had advanced. These hon. gentlemen who make these outrageous statements should know that there are other manufacturers in this country.

Mr. WOOD.

There was the Consumers' Cordage Company, of Montreal, which produced more twine than both the Kingston Penitentiary and the Toronto Central Prison, put together. That company sold twine just in the same way as the Government. The Government contracted for all the twine manufactured at a certain price. The Cordage Company contracted for all they could ; but when the price advanced, they also advanced the price. Is it unreasonable to suppose that, when the price advanced with the manufacturer and the wholesale merchant, the retail merchant in the country would not get the last farthing he could out of the farmers ? The Government did not sell to the farmers ; it was not their business to do so ; if they did, the enterprise would soon come to an end. As a matter of fact, the farmers never pay cash for twine. If a farmer were to send to Kingston for any twine without the money, he could not get it. It would be very unwise for the Government to sell to the farmer, or to any one else, at retail.

Mr. SPROULE. As a matter of fact, the farmers always pay cash for twine.

Mr. WOOD. I know better than that. I have been dealing with the farmers much longer than the doctor ; and, if he were a business man, he would not make that statement.

Mr. SPROULE. I have not made one statement that is not correct, and I will take my oath to it.

Mr. WOOD. I say that if the doctor were a business man, doing business throughout the country, either wholesale or retail, he never would make the statement he made to-night. I do not blame him so much as I do the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who is a business man, and knows how business is done. The hon. gentleman knows that he himself would be the very first man to take advantage of an advance on the cost of material and goods of any kind.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the incorrect statement I made ?

Mr. WOOD. That, in consequence of an arrangement made by the Government with the ring, the farmer was compelled to pay 7 or 8 cents a pound more for his twine than he would otherwise have paid.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, and I repeat it.

Mr. WOOD. The statement would be unworthy of the hon. gentleman, if he were a business man ; but, as he is not, I cannot put it home to him as hard as I would like. But the hon. member for South Leeds, who has been a business man for many years, knows as well as any man in this House that when goods advance in price ; every

business man takes advantage of the advance, and he would be a very poor business man, if he did not. As to the circulars, I believe one did come to my firm, but I did not see it. My firm knew quite well that we could not tender to the Government for the purchase of this twine. If I had sent a tender and had purchased the twine, the hon. gentleman opposite would have been the first man to have made an attack upon me under the Independence of Parliament Act, and he would have liked to see me make my exit out of this door; but I was a little too sharp for him and his friends, and I did not send in a tender. I bought the twine in a straightforward business way; I sold it in the same way. A more demagogic speech I never listened to than that made by the hon. member for South Leeds to-night for the purpose of pure clap-trap,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WOOD—for the purpose of trying to influence the farmers and make a point against the Government. The business has been attended to by the Government in a straightforward, business way, a way in which any business man throughout the country would do it. If it had been done in any other way, it would not have been done on business principles.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman did not tell us at what price he sold the twine to the retailer.

Mr. WOOD. When we bought the twine, our travellers went out through the country and sold it at from 7½ to 10 per cent. As the price advanced, we advanced the price in the ordinary way. We took the advantage of the increase in price, just as anybody else did, when the cost of the raw material advanced. Suppose that quinine were sold for \$1 a pound, and the doctor had a large quantity of it, and the price went up to \$2.50, would he continue to sell it at \$1.25? Nobody would blame him, if he took advantage of the increased cost of the article; but he should not try to make a point against the Government where no point exists.

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), in bringing this matter before the House, referred to correspondence between H. N. Bate & Sons and the Minister of Justice. He also referred to the methods by which this binder twine was sold to the farmers. So far as these questions are concerned, I do not at all pretend to deal with them, because they will be dealt with by the responsible Ministers. But as a large user of the article, I desire to say a few words on the matter in a general way. In the first place, let me say that there is no one in this country who would more strongly deprecate any injustice done to the farmers of Canada than I would. But I want to ask the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who have spoken on this question, if

the conditions were such that the price of binder twine was 10 cents or 12 cents a pound, and if afterwards, because of changed conditions, the price went down to 4 cents a pound, would the farmers of Canada consent to pay the high price at which the goods were bought? I think not. As a general business principle, that buyers of goods have to pay the prices, which are governed by the supply and demand. Now, I am a very large user of cordage and a considerable user of binder twine. We buy these goods largely from the Consumers' Cordage Company, of Montreal. Early last spring the prices were lower, I think, than I had ever known them to be before; but before the season closed the prices had more than doubled, the reason alleged being the war in Manilla. Could it be possible that the product of the Kingston Penitentiary would control the price of the article in Canada? The proposition is perfectly absurd. The Consumers' Cordage Company, of Montreal produces many times more of the article than the Kingston Penitentiary, and it is perfectly absurd to make the statement that a firm buying the product of the Kingston Penitentiary could so manipulate things as to fix the price in Canada. I do not myself believe that there was a ring, or anything of the kind, so far as this transaction was concerned. But because of the general advance in cost of the raw material, not only in Canada, but in other parts of the world, this article advanced in price, and those who had the article to sell got the benefit of the advance, just as they would have had to suffer the loss, if the price had gone down.

The statement has been made, that binder twine was sold to the farmers for 14 to 15 cents per pound. All I can say is, that I am largely engaged in agriculture, as well as milling, and buy a very considerable quantity of that article, and last autumn, during harvest time, I bought a very considerable quantity, not direct from the manufacturers, as I generally do, nor from the wholesale merchants, but from the local agent of the Massey-Harris Company, and I paid 11½ cents per pound; so that I cannot understand how it can be said by any hon. gentleman that 14 cents and 15 cents were the prevailing prices; 11½ cents per pound is what we paid to the local agent.

Mr. WALLACE. What brand?

Mr. EDWARDS. The best binder twine.

Mr. SPROULE. There was not a pound sold in our country under 14 cents.

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. gentleman must live in a very benighted part of Canada, and I think it must be a benighted portion which would send a gentleman here to represent the farmers as he represents them. During the time he sat on this side of the House, he was one of those who continually voted for

that iniquitous system of protection, under which the farmers were being bled.

Mr. BERGERON. And you are doing the same.

Mr. EDWARDS. But, having moved to the other side, he is indignant at the way they are treated. The farmers of Canada know to whom it is best to entrust their business, they know who are their friends, and who have been their friends to the extent that they have reduced their burdens, and they look to the present Administration, and will not look in vain, to still further reduce those burdens, as the conditions will admit, during the many years to come in which the present Administration will govern this country.

Mr. DAVIS. I must say that I am surprised at the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who, I am given to understand, is a business man, making the statement he has made to-night. There may be some excuse for the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), because I am informed that he is not a business man, but a doctor, and probably does not understand how these things are done.

An hon. MEMBER. And a statesman, too.

Mr. DAVIS. No doubt, in his own estimation, but, as I understand it, this is a straight business proposition. When this twine was sold to Bate & Sons, it was sold at the current market price. If the hon. members for Leeds and Grey had shown that binder twine was worth 6, or 7, or 8 cents in other portions at the time, and that that Government sold it to their political friends at 4½ cents, they would have made out a case. But the Government did not do that. They sold the binder twine exactly for what it was worth in the market at the time. They sold it at 4½ cents, and it has been shown that Bate & Sons did not make such an amount out of it, because they sold it to the firm of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) and other people at 4-70 cents, which is a very small profit indeed. It was sold in the regular way, and afterwards the purchasers sold it also in the regular way to the retailers at the price which the article was worth in the market. After it passed into the hands of the retailers, the price went up, and naturally they took advantage of that rise and increased the price to the farmers. Any business man would do the same. People in business may buy an article at \$10, and if it goes down to \$8, they make a loss, but if it goes up to \$12, they make a profit. If the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) were a business man, he would understand that. He made the statement that the war had nothing to do with the rise in the price of the raw material, because the raw material had got into the hands of the manufacturers, and the rise occurred afterwards. But I would like to

Mr. EDWARDS.

ask the hon. member for Leeds, as a business man, what difference that makes? Were not the manufacturers who bought that raw material, entitled to the benefit in the rise in price after they bought it? I question if the hon. member, who deals in lumber, had bought 25,000 feet at \$10, and the price had gone up to \$35, whether he would sell it at \$10 or \$12 per 1,000 feet. He would be the last man to do that.

Mr. COCHRANE. But the Government did not get the advantage of the rise. They sold it at 4½ cents.

Mr. DAVIS. If the hon. gentleman will hold his soul in patience, he will have a chance. I would like to draw the attention of the member for Leeds to the fact that, after the war broke out, the price of the raw material did rise materially, and at the same time an advance took place in the price of wheat, so that the farmers got the advantage of the increased price in wheat, which far outbalanced the increased price in binder twine. To try and make a case against the Government because they sold the binder twine for what it was worth at the time in the market, is carrying party politics to an absurd extreme. The hon. gentleman has failed to make out any case. And besides, the binder twine which the Government sold, they were paid for, and it was not sold on credit, as was done by our hon. friends opposite, when they were in power. In the session of 1895 the following question was put by Mr. Martin, and the following reply was given by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper:—

Mr. MARTIN asked :

How much binder twine was manufactured last season at Kingston Penitentiary? How much was sold? How much remained on hand after close of season? How much was realized from sale of twine? Was collection made in full for all twine sold? If not, how much is still owing and names of parties indebted, and amounts? Was any twine sold on credit, and to whom? When was twine sold on credit paid for, and names of parties to whom so sold?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The amount of twine manufactured during the season was 331,316 lbs.; amount sold during the season, 241,016 lbs.; amount sent as samples, 200,000 lbs.; amount remaining on hand at close of season is 90,050 lbs.; sum realized from the sale of twine, \$15,515.62. Collection was not made in full for all the twine sold. Mr. R. Rogers, of Manitou, Man., owes a balance of \$652.75.

I presume the amount given, 200,000 pounds, sent as a sample, must be an error. Surely, hon. gentlemen opposite did not send out to their political friends 200,000 pounds of binder twine as samples. But that is down in "Hansard," and it must have been in election time, if that amount was sent out. Mr. R. Rogers, of Manitoba, owed a balance of \$652.75. I am sure my hon. friends opposite know who R. Rogers was. He is one of the chief pushers of the Conservative

party in Manitoba, and was a candidate a couple of times. I do not know whether he has ever been a member of this House, but I know that he has been a candidate and I know that he is looked upon as one of the leaders of the faithful by hon. gentlemen on that side, and this is the gentleman who is walking around with this \$652.75 of the people's money in his pocket. Now, it appears to me to be a little out of place for gentlemen on the other side to accuse this Government of crooked dealing in connection with the binder twine, considering their own record in this very matter.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is not my intention to dwell at length on this much-vexed question of binder twine. But I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis), who has just taken his seat might have spared the House the pain of listening to a statement which has been made over and over again and refuted over and over again, that under the former Administration, the sum of \$652 was unpaid for binder twine. In my hearing during the present session in this Chamber, and I doubt not, in the hearing of the hon. gentleman himself, the Solicitor General answering a question, stated that there were no arrears for binder twine purchased from the Government that the sum referred to by the hon. gentleman had all been paid and wiped off the books of the Government. Of course, the hon. gentleman is referring to a matter that took place in 1895. The money may not have been actually due according to the terms of the contract, for all I know; and this is only an attempt to throw dust in the eyes of the country by making it appear that the system adopted by the previous Government in disposing of binder twine more directly to the farmers than under the system of the present Government was a bad system, because the Government did not get paid for it, though, as a matter of fact every hon. member in this House except the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) is perfectly aware that that sum was paid.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Does he approve of this Government or any Government selling binder twine to its political friends on credit?

Mr. HENDERSON. I have no hesitation in giving my opinion as to how the Government should sell the twine, in fact that is the purpose for which I rose. I disapprove, I may say, of the whole policy of the Government on the binder twine question. I disapprove of their putting binder twine on the free list, and destroying the industry in this country. I disapprove of the policy of the Government in placing the twine made in Kingston Penitentiary in the hands of a ring in the beginning of the season, say, in the early part of March. I say that the Gov-

ernment ought to hold all the twine they make until about the 1st July.

Mr. WOOD. Oh, oh.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) laughs. He knows that then there would be no opportunity for him to make a profit out of it. By holding the twine, as I have said, the Government would prevent the advance in price which has been made during the last two years. Were the Government in a position on or about the 1st of July to put on the market of this country, say, 500 tons of twine, or even twice that quantity—and I would have no objection to their making twice that quantity—we could rest assured that the manufacturers in this country and those who are importing twine from the United States would not get 10 cents or 12 cents or 14 cents a pound for twine. The industry of manufacturing binder twine in Kingston Penitentiary never was started for the purpose of making money. This Government does not need to enter into speculations of this kind to make money; they can find funds for all their purposes in some other way than by extorting it from the pockets of the farmers. They should hold that twine even if they held it at a loss. Suppose they did lose \$2,500 on the amount to compared with probably \$350,000 filched from the pockets of the farmers of this country by reason of that twine not being held back. Such men as these—I do not wish to mention any names—certain corporations or individuals, year after year in this country, should not be allowed to make an exorbitant profit out of an industry of that kind to the detriment of the great producing class of this country. Better let us take the risk of the Government losing a very considerable sum each year in holding that twine until the 1st of July as a lever to prevent the advance in price which robs the farmer out of a sum, which, when I stated it at \$350,000, I stated it very low indeed.

Now, what does a pound of twine cost? I propose to investigate, in order to see what these people make out of it. It is no secret. They say that Manilla has advanced, and, therefore, binder twine must advance as well. What did the Government pay for raw Manilla. I have it right here in the Government report. They bought 125 tons and paid for it at the rate of 4 cents a pound. The statement also shows that they bought cordage oil at about 10 cents a gallon, 1½ cents a pound. Now, sisal is worth about half the price of Manilla, and, therefore, their sisal would cost them 2 cents a pound. Now, it is a fact that is well known to the manufacturers of binder twine that about 20 per cent of the twine consists simply of oil—cordage oil. Then 32 per cent is sisal and 48 per cent Manilla, in the best brand of binder twine—I refer to the binder twine made by the Farmers' Company, of Brantford. The oil in a pound of twine would cost one-quarter of a cent, the sisal

would cost two-thirds of a cent, the Manilla would cost 2 cents. Now, what would it cost to manufacture it? It can be manufactured for 85 cents per hundred pounds. Mr. Noxon stated in an investigation held a few years ago, according to my recollection, that it could be manufactured at 47 cents per 100 pounds. Adding 23 cents per 100 pounds for baling, we have the actual cost of a pound of binder twine of the best quality that the farmer wants—4 cents. The Government sold it at 4½ cents. They made a fair profit. No retailer in the country expects to make more than half a cent to a cent a pound in selling binder twine. The Government should not have looked for a profit, but should have held that binder twine that cost them 4 cents until about the 1st of July, taking the risk of selling it at 3½ cents, if necessary, in order to prevent the manufacturers and importers of this country from raising the price on the farmer.

Mr. WOOD. Does the hon. gentleman know that if the Government had kept it to the 1st of July they would not have sold it at that season? Twine was all marketed before that time.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman perhaps is not aware that I know a good deal more about binder twine than he does. It is not necessary for the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) to school me in the matter of binder twine. I made a special study of this question long before he handled a pound of binder twine, I have no doubt.

Mr. WOOD. I do not think so. I have been in business a long time before the hon. gentleman was born.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman says that if that twine had been kept to the 1st of July it would not have been sold that season. Well, I would be perfectly satisfied that the Government should carry it over a year if necessary to check the advance in price. As I said, the industry was started in the Kingston Penitentiary for the purpose of keeping the price at a proper level. Of course, the hon. gentleman could not have made his profit out of it. But there are other people than the hardware merchants in the city of Hamilton to be considered: the farmers of this country are to be considered, they should come first.

Mr. EDWARDS. I desire to ask the hon. gentleman this question: If the quantity of binder twine which controlled the market last year and made the price in Canada is withdrawn from the market entirely, then I want to know the price the farmers of Canada will pay for binder twine.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand the hon. gentleman says that if the quantity of twine manufactured in the Kingston Penitentiary were withdrawn from the market,

Mr. HENDERSON.

he wonders what the farmers would pay for twine. Why, Sir, it is only a flea-bite that they make in Kingston, it is only a very small matter compared with the whole. But I tell you it is sufficient for the purpose for which it was designed. Bearing in mind the very large quantity that is sold before the 1st of July, and the fact that the Government holds 500 tons of twine it will prevent any manufacturer in this country from enhancing the price unduly at the time the farmer wants it. Farmers do not buy their twine in April, in May, in June; the bulk of it is bought towards the end of June and in the early part of July; and while the Kingston output is a small quantity compared with the total that is used, it is sufficient for the purpose of maintaining a level of prices, because no manufacturer, knowing that the Government held that quantity of twine and was in a position to throw it on the market the next day, when possibly half the quantity had already been supplied, no manufacturer would take the risk of holding his price at 10 or 12 cents, twice what it was worth, knowing that the Government were in a position to throw upon the market that quantity and supply his customers at a much lower price. Now, I cannot speak of the quantity of twine used in the entire Dominion, but the province of Ontario cuts 4,000,000 acres of crop—fall wheat, spring wheat, barley and oats. Allowing two and one-half pounds to the acre, which is slightly under the average, we find that in the province of Ontario alone they use 10,000,000 pounds of twine. Now, there was imported last year into the Dominion, 6,274,258 pounds under the free list.

Mr. TAYLOR. All that ought to have been made in this country.

Mr. HENDERSON. That was the point I was going to make. I say that not only have the farmers sustained a loss by having the price enhanced, but the manufacturers and the workmen of this country have sustained a loss by reason of the fact that 6,274,258 pounds of twine have been brought into this country free, every pound of which ought to have been made in this country. Now, I find the "Cordage Journal," of New York, gives the quotation of manilla, about 15 years ago, at £58 sterling, or \$290 per ton. In 1897 twine was bought at \$80 per ton, or a reduction of \$210 per ton. We are told that under the old regime, when the duty on twine was 25 per cent, that twine was very high, and how could it be otherwise when the raw material which was brought into the country cost £58 sterling, \$290 per ton? Why, twine at that time ought to have been, under ordinary circumstances, three times the price that it is now. But as the demand for this fibre became known, as it came to be used for the purpose of making twine in immense quantities the people in Manilla seem to have produced and exported a larger quantity, and the re-

sult was that an increased trade increased the output and the price fell from \$290 per ton to \$80 per ton, as it was in 1897. Now, this accounts for the fact that 10 to 15 years ago, under the former Government, when there was a duty on twine that article was very high, but it was not as high then in proportion to the price of the raw material as it is to-day. Now, Sir, we see that 1897 the manilla cost 4 cents a pound, and we are told that on account of the war in the east the price of manilla advanced very materially, and consequently there was an increase in the price of twine. Now, Sir, I searched the American trade returns just to find what manilla cost in the years 1897-98-99. In 1897 manilla was imported into the United States, at a cost of \$3.77 per 100.

Mr. WOOD. What time of the year was that?

Mr. HENDERSON. That is the average for nine months of the year. In 1898, for nine months, the average price was \$3.09 per 100 pounds; in 1898 the average price was \$5.83; or between 1897 and the current year only an advance of 2 cents per pound in the price of manilla. Now, as I have explained already, in the best twine, the twine manufactured at Brantford by the Farmers' Company, there is less than half a pound of manilla in each pound of twine; consequently the increase of the raw material would enhance the twine only 1 cent per pound; therefore, if twine could be manufactured in 1897 for 4 cents, it could be manufactured in 1899 for 5 cents.

Mr. WOOD. I want to ask the hon. gentleman a question. He says that the Farmers' Binder Twine Company, of Brantford, do not manufacture any pure manilla twine, he says there is only 60 per cent of manilla put into the twine.

Mr. HENDERSON. I will very gladly give the answer to the hon. gentleman's question. I have my information from one of the directors, and that director is a member of this House. He tells me that the highest grade of twine they make contains 60 per cent of manilla and 40 per cent of sisal.

Mr. WOOD. Then, the country is deceived, that is all.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not want to give the hon. gentleman's name in this House, but I will give it to the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) privately, if he wishes it. Now, it appears that the binder twine sold by the Government to Bates & Sons in the year 1897-98 was resold, and a portion of it, about 200 tons, was sold at an advance—\$4.90, \$5.30, \$6.05 being paid for the different grades, making an average of \$5.40 per 100 pounds. This was bought by the Bates Company at \$4.50, showing a profit of 90 cents per 100 pounds, or

nine-tenths of a cent per pound. I should say that that was a very good profit, but there is no reason why that profit should go into the pockets of the Bates Company. There is a way of disposing of binder twine, and that way, to my mind, would be absolutely secure to the Government. It would be by getting a little closer to the farmer, not selling to the Bates Company, and then the Bates Company selling to Wood Vallance & Co., and Wood, Vallance & Co. selling to John Brown & Co., and John Brown & Co. selling to John Jones & Co., and John Jones & Co. going around and selling it to the farmers; so that four or five profits are filched out of that twine before it reaches the farmers. In regard to the price of twine for the current year, while it was produced last year for 4 cents a pound, allowing an increase of 1 cent on the manilla that goes into a pound of binder twine—and there will be no increase on the sisal, because there is no war in Texas, and no war in Canada, where we produce the oil—the price at which the Government should be able to sell twine to the farmers would be 5 cents. What they have sold it at, we do not know. The question has been asked repeatedly, what the Government received for the twine they sold last March. They claim that it would not be policy, that it would not be a proper thing, to disclose the price at which they had sold it until the purchasers had succeeded in filching 5 or 6 cents profit out of the pockets of the farmers. The farmers would have risen up in rebellion, if the Government had told them in May that they had sold binder twine for 5 or 6 cents a pound for which the farmers are paying 10 cents and 11 cents a pound now. In my section of the country that is the price they are paying, and I am under the impression that you could scarcely buy twine at two different prices. There is a combination at the present time, without any doubt. There is no doubt that there is an arrangement between the dealers in this country and the American trust on the other side, by which the price of twine will be maintained. Unless a man has a pull with the trust on the other side, he cannot import any twine, and unless he has a pull with the Government, he cannot get any Government twine. Is it any wonder that the Brantford Company were able to obtain a price for their twine that enabled them to pay a dividend of 60 per cent? There is no doubt that they did pay such a dividend. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) admitted that a short time ago. In my own neighbourhood there are farmers who have, on a \$10 stock, got a \$6 dividend, and they only wish that they had \$100 of the stock, instead of \$10. This is the result of the policy adopted by the Government in throwing their twine into the hands of a combination and not keeping it in their own hands as a lever to maintain the balance between the producer and the consumer. This is what enables these men to enhance the price

which is extorted from the farmers. Of course, the few farmers who have stock are perfectly satisfied, because they are making money out of it. Some of the few make enough profit on \$10 of stock to purchase all the twine they want for one year. If they can make 60 per cent on this stock, they are willing to join with the Government and take the profit, notwithstanding the fact that the money is taken out of the pockets of their brother farmers. I do not know that I need say much more on this question. I hope that the Government will take into consideration the interests of the farmers and not the interests of the dealers in twine only; that they will take that question seriously into their consideration, and try to devise some plan by which they can prevent this undue enhancement of the price of twine at the time that the farmers urgently want twine. Five hundred tons is only a small quantity, compared with the requirements of the country, but still, I maintain, it is sufficient for the purpose for which it was designed, the purpose being to maintain the level of prices between the producer and consumer. If the Government find that 500 tons, manufactured in Kingston, is not sufficient to maintain that level, let them increase their output, double the quantity, if necessary, make it sufficient to fulfil the purpose for which it was originally designed. Let the Government drop the idea of making money out of twine. That never was intended. Let hon. gentlemen talk less about the danger of losing money on the manufacture of binding twine. Let us lose it, if necessary. Let us lose \$10,000, \$20,000, \$30,000, or \$50,000 a year on the binder twine we make in Kingston, if necessary, for it would be better to do that than have \$300,000 or \$400,000 filched out of the farmers' pockets by combinations and trusts managing the output and import of binder twine.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House is a motion by which the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) asks the House to censure the Government for the manner in which they have disposed of the twine manufactured at Kingston since they have been in office. I would ask the House to pause a little before assenting to this motion, because, if the House felt disposed to censure the Government for the policy that we have followed, then, I think, it would be in order for the House to direct the Government as to the policy that should be adopted for the disposal of this twine. I do not believe that the House would agree with the suggestion of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), who would shut out binder twine from coming from the American side, and thereby prevent competition, and at the same time put under lock and key the binder twine manufactured at Kingston, and thus prevent the twine from coming from within.

Mr. HENDERSON.

I do not know that the farmers of the country would be helped, if they had not the benefit of the twine manufactured abroad, or of the twine manufactured within. The Government have adopted only one course in regard to the disposal of this twine, and it is that of disposing of it by competition or by auction. I am sorry that the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) did not give me notice of his intention to bring this matter up, because the hon. Minister of Justice had placed in my hands all the papers which give the whole history of the matter since the Government came into office. I suppose, however, that I will have to rely upon my memory to give the facts, and I think I can give them tolerably well for the last two years. For the purpose of the present discussion, I think it will be sufficient to give the facts and figures, as disclosed by the operations of the last two years. In the previous year the twine was disposed of by tenders, invited, not publicly, but privately. The correspondence brought down to the House discloses that in the month of February the firm of H. N. Bate & Sons entered into negotiation with the Government for the purchase of their twine. The Government would not accept the offer then made, and informed Mr. Bate that they would invite tenders; but they retained the offer of Mr. Bate, and required him to deposit with it \$2,000, which was the deposit required of all the other tenderers. Then, tenders were invited by circulars sent to the principal dealers in the country. The names of the parties to whom the circular was sent have been given, but they may be repeated: The Wood-Vallance Co., of Hamilton; the Hobbs Hardware Co., of London; Rice, Lewis & Sons, of Toronto; Henry Moore, of Kingston; Mr. Ashdown, of Winnipeg; Coll Bros., of St. John; the Farmers' Binder Twine Co., of Brantford; Mr. Braithwaite, of Portage la Prairie, and Mr. Jas. Elder, of Virden, Man. This list includes most of the important dealers in the article, with few exceptions, if any. None of them sent in a tender, and the tender of Bate & Sons was accepted at the price, if I remember correctly, of 4 cents and a fraction. Nobody denies that this was the current price at that time. Before I proceed any further, let me offer a word of explanation as to the policy which has been followed by the Government on this question. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), challenged the policy of the Government in placing binder twine on the free list. No man can seriously pretend that the Government made a mistake in that respect. We have not enough articles, I contend, on the free list; but if there is an article which ought to be placed on the free list, it is certainly an article of such importance and necessity to the farmer as binder twine; and when hon. gentlemen contend that it was a mistake to place such an article on the free list,

that it could not help the farmer, but, on the contrary, as was insinuated, though not asserted, that it was an injury to the farmer, I say that is an argument which cannot be taken seriously. What is the argument when it is expanded and put in so many words? Hon. gentlemen say that there is a combine between the producers in the United States and the producers in Canada. I do not know, but so far no evidence of the fact has been adduced. Let us say, however, that there is a combine. If there is a combine between the manufacturers in the United States and the manufacturers in Canada, this fact is not the result of the abolition of the duty. Suppose we had the duty still, there would be still greater facility for the Canadian manufacturers to combine than there is to-day. Therefore, the reasoning of these hon. gentlemen will not stand examination. The hon. gentlemen who say that the Government did not follow a wise policy in taking the duty off binder twine would not dare to censure the Government for doing so, or advocate the duty being put on again. Coming back to the transaction of last year, when the twine was disposed of on the tender of H. N. Bate & Sons, it is stated that there was a combine at that time. Well, suppose there was. No one can say that the Government was aware of that combine. What more can the Government do than invite tenders? And if there are rings formed among the tenderers, and the Government is not aware of the fact, how can the Government be censurable for calling for tenders and giving the contract to the lowest tenderer? Assuredly no blame can attach to the Government. We have laws against combines and have done the best we could to destroy combines. But we cannot always hope to succeed; and it is likely that combines and rings will be formed in order to cheat, not only the Government, but individuals as well. Surely the Government cannot be held blamable for that. It is true, after the firm of Bate & Sons had obtained the contract, the price of twine went up. What was the reason of that? I call the attention of my hon. friend from Halton and my hon. friend from East Grey to this fact. The duty on twine was removed in the spring of 1897. I never heard any complaint made of the prices paid for binder twine in that season. The complaint was made in the season of 1898; and what was the reason of it? Surely it cannot be on account of the tariff. It would be idle to argue that it was. If it had been caused by the tariff, the price would have risen as soon as the tariff was reduced. What is the reason, then, that in the season of 1898 the price went up? What reason could there be except that the country which produced the raw material was at that time devastated by war. That is the logical and reasonable cause. It may be that there was in the country at that time a large quantity of the manufactured article on hand. I am

sure that in May or June, 1898, at the time war was declared, there were large supplies of the twine in Canada and the United States. We are told by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Woods), who is an expert in these matters—though it does not require the knowledge of an expert to come to the conclusion—the moment manufacturers and dealers saw that the raw material was scarce they would put up the price of the manufactured article; and that is what took place. The fact that the Philippines were devastated by war, and that probably a great deal of manilla had been reduced to ashes, accounts alone for the increase in the price. If there had been no increase of price in the last season, we would not have heard a word of the contract awarded to Bate & Sons. Messrs. Bate & Sons purchased at the ordinary prices and under ordinary circumstances; but in view of the criticism directed to the Government for having given the contract to that firm upon private tenders and not public tenders, we determined last year to invite public tenders. Therefore, we invited tenders by public advertisement in some forty papers; I gave a list of the papers some time ago. We published the advertisement as widely as possible all over Canada. In answer to that we received a few tenders, and the successful tenderer was M. P. Connolly. The hon. gentleman who made that motion rather made some insinuations with reference to the transaction which took place. Mr. M. P. Connolly was the successful tenderer, but he assigned his contract to the Hobbs Hardware Company, and the hon. gentleman insinuated that there was something crooked in the transaction. I have this to say to the hon. gentleman. If a member occupying the position he does has any charges to make, he ought to make them, and not deal in insinuations. If he thinks there was a fraudulent transaction of some kind in which the Department of Justice is implicated, it is his duty to make the charges, and it will then be the duty of the Government to have an investigation. The Government has no interest in shielding anybody. Let me tell the hon. member for South Leeds that while I do not know what may have transpired between Mr. Connolly or anybody else, I do not believe that anything wrong or crooked can be established against the Department of Justice. If there has been any crooked transaction between Mr. Connolly and anybody else, I am quite convinced that the Department of Justice was not a party to anything of the kind. So far as that department is concerned, the transaction was fair and above board, and will bear investigation, and if the hon. gentleman thinks there has been anything crooked let him make the charge.

This is the way in which we dispose of the binder twine. We came to the conclusion that the best method to dispose of it

was at public auction, and not in the late season, not in the month of July, as my hon. friend suggests, for I do not think it would be advantageous to the country and especially to the farmers if we were to keep that binder twine under lock and key until the market was supplied.

Mr. HENDERSON. In the province of Manitoba, they have not yet purchased their twine.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, we will see further what is the best policy. For my part, I take the admission of business men as evidence that our method is preferable to that followed in Manitoba. This is the policy we followed last year, and I see no reason for departing from it. The policy we think the best, and which we think the best judgment of the country will approve, is to dispose of the twine manufactured at the opening of the season and dispose of it by tender publicly invited, as we did last year. Is any hon. gentleman opposite prepared to challenge that policy?

Mr. HENDERSON. Would the right hon. gentleman make the price known. Will he sell it by public auction, and let the public know the price at which it is sold?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, I do not think it would be fair to the merchant to do that. We are asked to say by this amendment that the system is not satisfactory but is detrimental to the best interests of the farmers. I take issue on that point. Is any hon. gentleman prepared to say that the system we have followed of disposing of this binder twine by public tender—

Mr. TAYLOR. Since 1896?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, as we have done this year, is not a good policy, or that we should dispose of the twine in any other manner than by tenders publicly invited? Whatever may be the judgment of the House, it is the policy of the Government to continue that system.

The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) asks if we would publish the prices to the world. I want to know whether any business man would tender, if his price were to be made known?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is not reasonable to expect that he would. If the Government have gone into the business, they have done so for the purpose of helping the farmers, and the farmers do not expect that we should follow any other than ordinary business methods. That is the policy we intend to follow, and I can safely leave this question to the judgment of the House.

Mr. CLANCY. I did not intend to take any part in this discussion, but the right hon. gentleman seemed to think that the  
Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

price of binder twine must have advanced as a consequence of the advance in the price of the fibre, and his friends on that side applauded that argument. If it went uncontradicted it would be entitled to some weight, but I would like to ask his attention for a moment to the following facts. The cost of fibre that was imported to the Kingston Penitentiary in 1896 was an average of 3.52, and the twine was sold at an average of 4.25, and the cost of twine imported that year from the United States was 5.15. In 1897, the cost of the fibre imported to the Kingston Penitentiary was less than 3.52, it was 3.29, and the twine was sold at 4.64, and the price at which American binding twine was imported was 5.06. In 1898, the fibre imported for the purpose of manufacture at the Kingston Penitentiary cost 3.58, and the price at which the manufactured article was sold was an average of 4.60, and the cost at which American binder twine imported was 5.65.

The hon. Minister of Customs gave us the figures the other day for the nine months of 1899. The quantity imported—and there could have been no objection in entering it at a low rate because there was no duty to pay—was 4,168,716 pounds, at an average price of 6½ cents. These figures are taken entirely from the Auditor General's Report, with the exception of the last, which was given to us by the Minister of Customs. These are the prices for four years.

The PRIME MINISTER. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) allow me a question?

Mr. CLANCY. Certainly.

The PRIME MINISTER. If he has the quotation before him will he give me the figures for 1898 from January to August?

Mr. CLANCY. I am giving the average price for the whole year—not the prices at certain dates. I have given the average for all kinds of fibre of the year for each and every year. These figures are worth repeating, because they show that there was no substantial advance either in fibre or twine after manufacture. In 1896 the cost of fibre was \$3.25 per hundred; in 1897 it was \$3.39 per hundred, and in 1898 it was \$3.58 per hundred. Now, we take the price at which it was sold. In 1896, it sold at \$4.25 per hundred; in 1897 at \$4.64 per hundred, and in 1898 at \$4.60 per hundred. The right hon. gentleman will see that there is no substantial advance. I will give the prices at which twine was imported for the same three years. And let it be remarked that a part of this was from January, 1898, when binder twine came in free. In 1896 the cost of imported was \$5.15 per hundred; in 1897, \$5.06 per hundred—lower than in 1896—and in 1898 it was \$5.65. To confirm that, I will give the quantities imported for these years. In 1896, we imported 3,023,986 pounds; in 1897 we imported 3,364,840 pounds and in 1898, up to the 1st of January, when

the duty ceased, we imported 2,396,625 pounds. And from that time to the end of the fiscal year we imported an additional quantity of 6,313,618. The average price for these three years was \$5.65. From this we see that in 1898, the year when binder twine became free, we imported the enormous quantity of 8,710,243 pounds, as against 3,364,840 pounds in the previous year. In other words, the American people manufactured for our farmers 5,345,403 pounds more than in the previous year. Now, what does that show? It shows that there was a combine, arising, as has been stated, from the fact that the Government did not take due precautions—they were, in fact, a party to it, playing into the hands of the Hobbs Company, knowing that there was a collusion—and if hon. gentlemen doubt it I will read the evidence of Mr. Stewart, when he declares—

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We will take your word for it.

Mr. CLANCY. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Somerville) will show by his vote that he takes my word for it. If any hon. gentleman denies it, I am prepared to show, on the evidence of Mr. Stewart, the inspector, that he knew there was collusion, that the whole thing was settled here between Coll Bros.—or rather by Mr. Connor, acting for them, because I understand that Coll Bros. were not a factor in it—Coll Bros., Mr. Connor and the Hobbs Bros. arranged the matter here. They put three large quantities together, including that for which Coll Bros. were tenderers, but which they forfeited by not accepting delivery and that under Hobbs Hardware Company's tender, when the whole thing was put in with the quantity made by the Central Prison in Toronto, a combine was formed and the prices rose in this country, not because of any advance in the raw material or for any other cause, but simply because the combine existed. There never was clearer evidence of a combine. There never was more criminal neglect on the part of the Government of Canada or any government than this Government showed when it did nothing to prevent the formation of this combine, although they must have known from what Mr. Stewart tells us that there was collusion. He says he knew there was collusion in the parties trying to get the twine, and when the affair at Toronto was closed up it was closed up practically on the same day and with the knowledge of the Justice Department. The Justice Department was aware of the whole thing, as was shown by the evidence. I shall not read the evidence at this stage, unless some hon. gentleman disputes what I say. But I have the evidence under my hand. I have given the figures to the right hon. First Minister, figures that, I think, he was not in possession of before. They are not my figures, they are taken from the Auditor General's Report. It is

no use for hon. gentlemen to ask what course should be taken. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been making the best defence they could, but there is absolutely no defence. It is not a difficult thing for the people to see that if the Government were not parties to this arrangement, they were, in a sense, criminally neglectful of their duties. If they had taken a proper course, they could have defended the farmers and prevented the twine getting into the hands of one set of associates. There were offers made for twine in small quantities, but they were refused. The Government might have protected the farmers, but they failed to do so. They could have held back this twine and thrown it upon the market in such a way as to keep down the prices. Even if they had had to hold the twine over, surely the public purse is big enough to do that, if it is necessary in order to prevent a combine. Just imagine what the farmers are paying—the difference between what would be 6 cents a pound, probably, all round, with a fair margin of 25 to 30 per cent for the middlemen who handle it—the farmers are paying the difference between that and 12 or 13 cents a pound. It is a monstrous tax. I venture to say that the tax in this respect upon the farmers of this country is larger than the tax per head for customs duty paid on the average within the last two years. I say it is a scandalous transaction, wherever the blame may rest, and it is not hard to draw a conclusion.

Mr. WALLACE. The First Minister has acknowledged that they made a mistake in selling binder twine the way they did last year; he has not acknowledged that in words, but he has acknowledged it in acts, because the Government last year, instead of asking the public to tender for the purchase of public property, sent a circular to a few of their friends. Who were those friends? Some of them were men who had never dealt in binder twine before, and some who had. There were Wood, Vallance & Co., of Hamilton, H. N. Bate & Sons, of Ottawa, concerning whom the member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) tells us that his partner never heard their names before, and, I presume, that Bate & Sons never had dealt in binder twine before that time. But the main fact is this, that that binder twine was purchased from the Government for 4½ cents per pound, and it was sold to the farmers for three times 4½ cents per pound, or 13½ cents per pound, or more. Who got the difference? The member for Hamilton said that he was not in any combine. He told us, in the first place, that he sent out his travellers, and that they asked from 7½ per cent to 10 per cent advance on the cost price, which they considered a fairly good profit. But after he had sat down and was compelled to rise again, what did he say? That they had got 7½ to 10 cents per pound, that

they had sold at an advance of 50 to 100 per cent. They bought at an average of \$5.40, and sold for from 7½ to 10½ cents per pound.

Mr. WOOD. I never said that, the hon. gentleman makes a mistake. I said from 7½ to 10 per cent, not 7½ to 10 cents per pound.

Mr. WALLACE. What were the prices at which it was really sold?

Mr. WOOD. I could not really tell you.

Mr. WALLACE. Then I make no comment on that. The member for Hamilton told us in the beginning of his speech that he would tell us the prices at which it was sold before he sat down, and my hon. friend beside me said that the hon. member had said they were from 7½ to 10½ cents per pound.

Mr. WOOD. I said I would tell what I paid for it. I had the telegram here, and I sent to Hamilton to get what we paid for it.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member said before he sat down he would give the information as to the price he sold it for, but he has not done so. We have no right to ask him unless he is willing to give the information. At any rate, he bought it for less than 5½ cents per pound, showing that he was pretty close up to a ring, if ring there was. The farmer had to pay 8 cents a pound more than the member for Hamilton, he had to pay 100 to 150 per cent more for an article than the member for Hamilton; therefore, the member for Hamilton was in an exceedingly good position in regard to this matter. He said also that the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was guilty of a slanderous statement because he said that on account of the arrangement between the Government and the ring the farmers had to pay an outrageous price. So they did have to pay an outrageous price. They say: Why, there was war in Manilla, and the prices of the raw material had gone up. I think from the statement made by the member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), we see that the prices had scarcely gone up. But the fact remains that the prices of the material out of which the products of 1898 were made, had not gone up to the extent of a quarter of a cent per pound.

Mr. WOOD. I want to ask a question of the hon. member, he is a business man himself. If he bought a keg of nails for \$1.50, and the price in market was \$3.50, in consequence of an advance in the cost of the raw material, would he sell it for \$2.75?

Mr. WALLACE. I answer the question in this way: Merchants, men in business, never yet that I know of, excepting this case, get the full advantage of the rise. They are always satisfied to make a quick sale at a little more than an advance on the usual profit. The Minister of Customs

Mr. WALLACE.

shakes his head at that; perhaps he does not do business like that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, you know that is not a straight answer.

Mr. WALLACE. Now, Sir, who got this advance in price? Somebody got it. H. N. Bate & Sons paid 4½ cents, the number for Hamilton paid 5 cents, but the farmer paid 13½ cents. Now, who got the 8 or 9 cents per pound advance? The member for Hamilton will not say that he got it, so we cannot criticise him. But somebody got it, because the farmer had to pay for it, and the farmer had to pay for it out of the goods made by the Government and supplied by the Government, which they did not give the public an opportunity of tendering for, and which they did not give the people, as they should have given every one in this country who choose, an opportunity of purchasing.

Mr. WOOD. What was it sold for at Woodbridge?

Mr. WALLACE. I think at 13 or 14 cents a pound.

Mr. WOOD. Then, you made a handsome profit.

Mr. WALLACE. We did not sell any last year.

Mr. WOOD. You know, as a business man, that is not a fair argument.

Mr. WALLACE. I think, perhaps, we sold some this year, but this is the first year we ever sold a pound. So I am not speaking from personal knowledge, but I am speaking of what I saw it sold for and what many members of this House have stated they know it to be sold for. I say that there was no justification for raising the price of this article. But how was it raised? They had control of the product of the Kingston Penitentiary; the same parties had control of the Central Prison, the same parties had control of all the American binder twine that came in. Although there was no duty, there was a combine ten times as tyrannical as any protective duty could be. Why, Sir, they combined in that way so as to raise prices from 5, 6 and 7 cents a pound, which would have been a fair, legitimate and a handsome profit and raised them to more than double that amount. They did it, Sir, because they have the machinery for doing it in their own hands, and because this Government assisted in building up the machinery of the combination. This would not have occurred if the duty had been continued as it had been under the Conservative regime, the smallest duty on any manufactured article in Canada, 12½ per cent or about one-half of a cent per pound. That was the duty that had to be paid if binder twine was imported, but it was made in Canada without that one-half of a cent a pound being imposed on the farmers, because that was the practical experience.

It was made all over the country, but when the duty was taken off, when the opportunity was given for the combination to be made, the Canadian manufacturers were practically shut out and they closed down their factories because they could not compete against the American manufacturers, who were able to force their surplus product that was not required in the United States on the market here. One year if they did not have a surplus the price would be raised, and the next year if they had a surplus they would drive the Canadian manufacturer out of the market. Therefore, I say that the Government have been remiss in their duty in making the farmers of this country pay hundreds of thousands of dollars additional for their binder twine more than they should pay for it, because, I say, there was no justification for increasing the price to enable a few friends of the Government to heap up enormous fortunes in one year.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Taylor).

**YEAS :**

**Messieurs**

Bell (Addington),	Gilmour,
Bell (Pictou),	Guillet,
Borden (Halifax),	Haggart,
Broder,	Henderson,
Clancy,	Macdonald (King's),
Clarke,	Sproule,
Cochrane,	Taylor,
Davin,	Tyrwhitt,
Ferguson,	Wallace, and
Foster,	Wilson.—20.

**NAYS :**

**Messieurs**

Bazinet,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Beausoleil,	Lewis,
Beith,	Mackie,
Blair,	McGregor,
Borden (King's),	McGugan,
Eastock,	McHugh,
Bourassa,	McLellan,
Bourbonnais,	Marcell,
Brodeur,	Martineau,
Brown,	Mignault,
Campbell,	Mulock,
Copp,	Oliver,
Davis,	Parmales,
Demers,	Paterson,
Domville,	Pettet,
Edwards,	Préfontaine,
Fielding,	Proulx,
Fisher,	Rinfret,
Fraser (Lambton),	Russell,
Godbout,	Sifton,
Haley,	Somerville,
Harwood,	Stenson,
Johnston,	Sutherland,
Joly de Lotbinière,	Tucker,
(Sir Henri),	Turcot, and
Landerkin,	Wood.—51.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. members for Beauharnois, Annapolis, North Victoria, and Restigouche have not voted.

Mr. BERGERON. I am paired with the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot).

Mr. HUGHES. I am paired with the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Calvert). If I had voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. McALISTER. I am paired with the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne.)

Mr. MILLS. I am paired with the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Angers). If I had voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

**SUPPLY.**

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Public Buildings, Ontario—

New departmental building (Langevin Block), Ottawa—Balance and

interest due contractor..... \$29,811 73

Mr. FOSTER. Explain.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). That is a final adjustment of the account between the Government and Mr. Alphonse Charlebois, contractor of the Langevin Block. When the final estimates was rendered in May, 1890, by the Chief Architect in favour of the contractor, there was a balance which Mr. Charlebois claimed of \$272,186.24. The Government of the day, Sir Hector Langevin being at the time Minister of Public Works, took no action on that claim. In 1895, when the Hon. Mr. Ouimet was Minister of Public Works, the chief architect was instructed to look into the claim, and Mr. Fuller, then chief architect, and his assistant, were engaged for some time in its consideration. At the outset Mr. Fuller put aside items representing the sum of \$128,643 which he considered were not debatable. A number of the items were then take up for consideration, but owing to a difference with the contractor the matter was not prosecuted further. In May, 1896, when the Hon. A. Desjardins was Minister of Public Works, the matter came up again, and he instructed the chief architect to resume the investigation. That investigation took place at Montreal, there being present Mr. Gobeil, the Deputy Minister, Mr. Fuller, Mr. Ewart, the present chief architect, and Mr. Charlebois. In a report made to the then Minister, dated the same month, Mr. Fuller stated that after such examination he had come to the conclusion to recommend the award to Mr. Charlebois of a total sum of \$20,000, and an Order in Council was passed on the 6th July, 1896, authorizing the offer of that sum, plus the sum of \$5,000 representing the probable cost of litigation, &c., in all \$25,000. This Order in Council also provided that should

the contractor not accept that sum, the matter should be referred to arbitrators. The amount in question was never offered, and on the 17th of July of the same year the Order in Council of the 6th was cancelled. Upon Mr. Charlebois again pressing his claim against the department, and finally agreeing—what he had always declined to agree to before—to accept the sum found by the chief architect in full and final settlement of his claims, the matter was referred by the present Minister of Public Works to the present chief architect, who concurred in the recommendation made by his predecessor Mr. Fuller, and made a final report in January, 1898, awarding Mr. Charlebois \$19,874.49 out of his total claim. The matter was again laid before the Privy Council, and an Order in Council was passed on the 3rd of August, 1898, giving authority to place the amount in the supplementary Estimates, this amount, together with interest at 5 per cent from 1st of July, 1889, the date of the completion of the building to the 1st of July of this year, representing the sum now applied for in the supplementary Estimates. Such is the history of this claim.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you get a discharge now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is agreed that Mr. Charlebois shall accept this sum in full of all claims.

Ottawa Public Buildings—

Electric lighting, &c..... \$21,879 96

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is required to pay the balance due in connection with the installation of the electric light in the public buildings of Ottawa. The items are as follows:—For electric wiring, wiring old gas fixtures and the ceiling of the House of Commons, \$18,584.59, out of which we have paid \$10,000, leaving a balance of \$8,584.59; material supplied, not included in contract of Ahearn & Soper, \$4,487.25; electroliers, &c., \$2,532; switch-boards, marble, \$1,713; reflectors for lighting ceiling of House of Commons, \$480; marble switch-board for ditto, \$253.12; luxfer prisms for ditto, \$3,668; shades and holders, \$960.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total amount paid to Ahearn & Soper for the wiring of the buildings? What is the total amount for the lamp fixtures?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Thirty-two thousand seven hundred and thirty-seven dollars and ninety-six cents, less \$3,668 for the luxfer prisms.

Mr. FOSTER. Just for the wiring?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, but it includes not only the electric lights, but the wiring for gas fixtures, marble switch-

Mr. FIELDING.

board, shades, lamps, &c., and the Ottawa post office also is included.

Mr. BERGERON. Were tenders invited?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These are patented, and only one party can supply them.

Mr. FOSTER. We are paying so much per lamp, whether used or not. Have there been any changes made?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. My hon. colleague thought it was better to have a flat rate than a metre rate.

Mr. FOSTER. What is a flat rate?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A fixed rate.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the rate per light per night?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was \$2.25 per light up to 3,000, and for each additional light \$2 per light of 16-candle power. There are 960 lamps, but only of 10-candle power, so that they do not pay the full price.

Mr. FOSTER. We pay for those at the rate of \$2.25 per night for 16-candle power?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes; 600 lights of 16-candle power.

Mr. FOSTER. For every month in the year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the making of the contract, of course, that was an element taken into consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. That appears to be a tremendous price.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. After the discussion the other night, I inquired into the matter. Many of our towns pay much higher prices. One or two cases were cited, in which it was alleged the lights were charged at a lower rate, but these are entirely exceptional. The regular Ottawa rate is \$6.25 per light of 16-candle power, and that applies to stores, which do not use the lights continuously.

Mr. FOSTER. I asked my hon. friend then for a calculation as to the comparative cost of lights upon which the Government must have based their calculations. The department would not have consented to the rates without some basis.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have been furnished with a memorandum, but cannot put my hands on it just now.

Mr. FOSTER. That should be furnished to the House. It seems a large amount, especially when we use but a small proportion of the lights all the year round. In the working departments the night-work is really nothing. There may be one or two rooms in which you have lights for working purposes, but the rule is in summer and

winter very little night-work is done. Yet we are paying \$2 and \$2.25 for every light put in. Then, take the other point. You can go into those rooms, and you will find that they are lavishly furnished with lamps, and, taking all those things into consideration, it strikes me that we are paying a large amount. I do not want to find fault with anything reasonable, but at the same time we ought to try and regulate our lights here as we should in our own house.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not understand that I was to submit a return to the House, but simply to give the information, and I have a statement, but cannot just now find it. The total number of electric lights now in use in the Parliament Buildings, in the East and West Blocks, the Langevin Block, the city post office, the Supreme Court and in the offices over the bank of Ottawa is 5,716. In the Parliament Buildings there are 2,186 16-candle-power lamps, equal to 2,786 16-candle power lamps. The general length of a session of Parliament is 90 days, and the current used in preparing for a session during the balance of the year is estimated at 15 days, or a total of 105 days. 2,786 lamps for 185 days makes 292,530 lamp days, which, burning an average of seven hours a day, would make 2,047,710 hours. Now, the departmental buildings, including the Langevin Block, the city post office, the Supreme Court and the Ottawa bank building, have 2,914 16-candle power lamps. This multiplied by 365 equals 1,063,610 lamp days. Taking these at an average of 1½ hours per day would equal 1,595,415 lamp hours. At the metre rate of 1 cent per hour, less 40 per cent, for a total of 3,643,125 lamp hours, would mean \$21,858.75. That is the architect's estimate of what it would cost by the metre system.

Mr. WALLACE. How many days does he count for the departmental lamps?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He estimates that they would burn an hour and a half on the average for every day in the year. It is estimated that gas by the metre system would cost also \$21,858.75. The electric light under contract is estimated at \$2.25 per light for 3,000 lights, making \$6,750, and \$2 per light for 2,700 lights, \$5,400, a total estimated cost for the electric light system of \$12,150, against \$21,858.75, which is the estimated cost of gas or electric light by the metre system.

Mr. FOSTER. Who pays for the lamps?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We purchase the lamps and pay for repairs. Of course, we have to bear that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What does the hon. gentleman estimate as the ordinary length of the session?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Ninety days is the figure here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That shows that the statement is absolutely unreliable.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But it shows that it is a very conservative estimate—this session we should burn much more than is here set down.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We have been here a good deal over four months.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) must not do it again.

Mr. BERGERON. Are you going to do away with gas altogether?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It has been done away with gradually. I am informed that there is now no gas burned for light.

Mr. WALLACE. What is it used for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For heating.

Ottawa Military Buildings—

New store ..... \$25,000

Mr. CLARKE. I desire to ask the hon. Minister of Militia again with respect to the proposed addition to the Toronto drill-shed. I understand that a deputation was down to interview the Minister last week, and I would like to know what the intention of the Government is with regard to the matter.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The mayor of Toronto was here to see me about a different matter, but this, perhaps, was incidentally mentioned. I did not understand that he came to press that question particularly. In the original plan of a drill-shed at Toronto, certain additions to the building as it now exists were to be made. But this involved considerable expenditure, and we have not been able to take it up yet. It will be taken up at a future time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As to this vote, I may explain that, as will be recollected by hon. gentleman, there is a building which was used for military stores, but under the arrangement made some years ago with Mr. Booth, of the Canada Atlantic Railway, it was provided that when he took possession of the property he should have the option of giving up the building or of paying the Government \$10,000, and taking the building. I understand that he has intimated that he will pay the \$10,000 and keep the building. So the Militia Department will need a new store building, and this is to provide for it.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is it to be placed?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Probably in rear of the drill-shed on Cartier Square.

Mr. SPROULE. What will be the cost of it?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think that the \$10,000, together with this vote, will construct the building.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it to be constructed by tender?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the little park between the old building and Sparks street to be handed over to the railway company?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not speak definitely, but I think that is part of the property that passes to Mr. Booth.

Ottawa Astronomical Observatory..... \$16,000

Mr. CLARKE. It has been said that it was the intention of the Government to remove most of the officers of the meteorological department in Toronto. I desired to know if any of the officers at present stationed in Toronto in connection with the geological branch, are to be removed to Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I think not. This is a vote for the Department of the Interior. I do not think it touches the meteorological service at all.

Mr. FOSTER. What is it for?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. An astronomical observatory.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will let that stand until the Minister of the Interior is present.

To complete reconstruction of portion of Western Departmental Block, destroyed by fire on the 11th February, 1897 ..... \$12,000

Mr. FOSTER. How much has that cost now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total expenditure up to the 7th of March, 1897, at which date this memorandum was prepared, was \$183,738.38, to which will be added the present appropriation.

Public Buildings, Nova Scotia—  
Halifax, new public building..... \$25,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been no public building, except a drillshed, erected in Halifax for Dominion purposes since confederation. The public offices are still so far as possible in a building which was erected before the union. The consequence is that as the business has expanded a number of places all over the city have been rented. The proposal is to erect a new building adapted for the service, and we take this vote to start with. The building will correspond with what is usual in a city of the size of Halifax.

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman not made an estimate of what it is proposed to do with this money?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is proposed to buy a site with this vote. We cannot go beyond that, because there is no more than money enough to buy a site. From my information, we cannot more than get in the city of Halifax any land suitable for such a building for this sum. Indeed, for a property which was offered and which was under consideration of the late Government, the owners asked nearly the whole sum. I do not mean by that to say that we have agreed to purchase that property, but land in a favourable position in the city of Halifax, and suitable for a public building, is somewhat expensive. At present, as I say, there are several offices scattered all over the city of Halifax. The customs-house and the post office are both in one building, whereas in most large cities they are in separate buildings. The marine offices are partly in the northern part of the city, the savings bank had to move out for want of room. The customs department examining warehouse is in another part of the city—in fact, we have scattered all over the city quite a number of places.

Mr. FOSTER. What do you propose to do with that building?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. One of these buildings will become the post office and the other the customs, though each one may contain another branch. The idea is to concentrate the Dominion business in two structures, that is, the old one and a new one. A site was offered to the late Government concerning which I have had some information. I know it was before the late Government, for a letter written by one of the ex-Ministers has been submitted to me. That property is still offered to us.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is the old city market property?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This item of \$25,000 will not do very much in the way of affording accommodation, I suppose it is only intended for to purchase a site?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is only about enough to buy a site. The building will be a considerable one. Before going on with it, I think we ought to come to Parliament and ask for a further vote.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman understands what the necessities are at present. The Board of Trade have taken the matter up and have made representations which I had the honour of bringing to the attention of the Minister of Public Works some time ago, and he said the matter was then under consideration. I suppose this is the result of the consideration which he was at that time giving. As a matter of

fact, the city of Halifax, so far as post office accommodation is concerned, is not as well off as any ordinary country town in the province of Nova Scotia. The Marine and Fisheries offices in that building are very insufficient; in fact, the circumstances under which public business is carried on in Halifax make it absolutely necessary that the Government should take active steps if they desire to give the public anything like adequate accommodation. I am somewhat surprised that a sufficient sum is not being provided, at least, to commence a building during the present year, because the necessities are very urgent.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to express my concurrence in the views that my colleague has put before the House. The Government have been made aware of the extreme necessity of the case. Perhaps I do not feel as exigent about it as my hon. and learned friend does, the city having survived so many years without any step at all being taken in this direction. However, I think we may now congratulate ourselves at what is being done.

Halifax, quarantine station on Lawlor's Island ..... \$12,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is for boring an artesian well for supplying fresh water, and for general repairs, renewals and improvements to the quarantine buildings. At present the water is taken down to the quarantine on Lawlor's Island by boat, it has to be carried over in tanks.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Whenever there is any number of people at the place, there is not enough water. There is enough water for the caretaker, but not for the others.

Mr. FOSTER. What leads you to suppose that you will get it with an artesian well?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They have got it in other places in the neighbourhood in the same way.

Springhill public building..... \$500

Mr. FOSTER. What is this for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Springhill is one of the largest towns in the province of Nova Scotia. It has 6,000 people, with a very considerable business, and I do not think there could be any serious question about the justification for the erection of a public building there.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not exceeding \$20,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Will it be let by contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will be let by contract.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the building for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For the purposes of the Dominion—post office, customs-house, &c.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the revenue?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The post office revenue is \$2,561, and the customs revenue, \$2,752.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the accommodation there now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no accommodation at all. There is no post office building. The postmaster has an allowance of \$120 a year for rental.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the post office a commodious place?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is in the postmaster's private house, I presume. Usually, the man who holds the office has an allowance and furnishes the building himself.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it simply a dwelling house?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I could not say, positively. Although I have been in the place frequently, I do not recall it.

Mr. FOSTER. We cannot, by any chance, judge as to how you are going to expend that money, unless we have some information. You are now renting a place which serves the purpose of the post office, for \$120 a year. If the accommodation is reasonably good, I think that a revenue of \$2,600 from the post office is not sufficient to warrant the erection of a public building. The customs revenue is only \$2,000, and that is still less of an argument why you should go to this expense. Why should you put down \$20,000 in a building, and then fit it up?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, that includes land, fitting up and everything.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, suppose this \$20,000 includes everything; you must have a caretaker, and there will be repairs and everything of that kind, and it will cost you certainly \$1,200, year in and year out. I venture to say you are getting all your accommodation there now for less than \$300, and I dare say the people are getting their letters in a businesslike kind of way. Have we the money to spare to put up a \$20,000 building under circumstances like that? Everybody knows that you can get commodious premises, stores, halls, and other places, rented there by the postmaster. The next thing, if you put up this building, will be that the postmaster will want a larger salary, and you will have to squeeze it out.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You set such a bad example.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, a bad example; but of all the thunderers against such things,

the hon. Postmaster General was the most thunderous thunderer. Now he sits there, and he cannot get up and say to this committee that the accommodations there are not fairly commensurate with the wants of the place. Why fix this amount of money in a public building for a post office with a small revenue like this? It has been done, and it will be done again, I suppose; but is it not time that we should stop it, especially in a \$60,000,000 year?

Mr. SPROULE. I have always considered that it was the best policy, if the Post Office Department could rent a building for a reasonable figure, to rent it, instead of erecting a building. It costs very much less, and it does not require a caretaker or entail other expenses upon the country.

Digby post office, custom-house, &c. . . . . \$ 5,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is that a new building?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Digby is the shire town, which was recently destroyed by fire, and the main buildings on the principal street were destroyed, including the post office. This is a place of considerable importance, where a large business is done, and it is a place to which a large number of people go during the tourist season. It is rather a show place, and that is one item that we should take into consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the revenue?

Mr. COPP. The revenue of the post office is \$3,081.78, and of the customs-house, \$3,706.39.

Mr. McALISTER. What is the population?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. According to the census of 1891, it is over 3,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the estimated cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will be the same amount as that stated for Springhill—not exceeding \$20,000. It ought to be a shade less.

Mr. FOSTER. That is for 3,000 of a population?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In both of these cases, if the sites can be obtained at moderate prices, the buildings should not exceed \$18,000 each.

Mr. SPROULE. Why should you put up a post office costing \$20,000 in a town with 3,000 population, and refuse year after year to build a post office in Owen Sound, one of the live towns of Ontario, with a population of about 10,000?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. While Owen Sound is a proper place in which to erect a building of this kind, there is a good deal of public expenditure going on there in connection with the harbour, so that the

Mr. FOSTER.

Government can attend to the wants of other districts.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask the Postmaster General, does he approve of putting up a \$20,000 building in a village less than 3,000 people? My hon. friend knows that if the Public Works Department in cold blood say that it will take \$18,000, when they get their enthusiasm excited, and all the little extras put in, such as travelling expenses, the engineer and clerk of works, it is more probable that both of these buildings will cost nearer \$25,000 than \$18,000. I know the Public Works Department of old. It is a department which will spend money just as fast as you give it to it, and it will spend it more lavishly than its estimates indicate. If you put up these expensive buildings in all these little towns in the maritime provinces, you will have to do the same in the other provinces. You are doing what we tried not to do, and what in the latter part of our regime we did not do to a large extent. I am not going to say that this is contrary to Liberal professions, but it is contrary to a businesslike administration of the finances.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The trouble is the bad example you set.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you going to the devil because somebody else started to go there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think I can give my hon. friend the assurance that neither of these buildings will exceed \$18,000. I do not think they ought to.

Mr. FOSTER. Neither of these buildings should go above \$12,000. A private party can easily put up as good a dwelling as you or I ought to have for \$10,000 or \$12,000—as good a building as Digby and Springhill ought to have. All you want is a place for a post office and a custom-house; but you cannot get it into the head of a Public Works engineer that he can put up any kind of a building for less than \$20,000 or \$25,000. Mr. Coste was the same, Mr. Fuller was the same, and those now in the department are the same. You are going all through this country to lock up the people's money in expensive buildings, which will be an increased expense every year.

Mr. COPP. The town of Annapolis is not by any means equal in size to Digby. Its revenue at the present time is \$2,851, but in 1889 it had a public building at a cost of \$24,000. Lunenburg has a revenue of \$2,929, and a public building that cost \$30,000. Lachine, in Quebec, with a revenue of only \$1,548, has a post office that cost \$17,000. Richmond, N.S., with a revenue of \$2,653, has a building that cost over \$20,000. Rimouski, which has a revenue of only \$2,117, has a building that cost \$21,000. Rivière du Loup, with \$1,637 of revenue, has a building that cost \$23,000. Almonte, in Ontario, with a revenue of \$4,643, has a public building

that cost \$28,000. Digby, which has a larger population and a very much larger revenue than Annapolis, should not have a smaller building. Last year we had statistics to show that over 50,000 people passed through the town of Digby. The town of Digby is one of the most flourishing in Nova Scotia. To show how its business has increased in the last few years, I will give you the returns of the wharfage paid on Digby pier: in 1891, \$764; in 1892, \$830; in 1893, \$746; in 1895, \$743; in 1896, \$1,516; in 1897, \$2,195; in 1898, \$2,116; in 1899, \$2,368, more than three times as much as it was in 1895. The population has increased proportionately. Therefore, I think that a building in Digby should be one that would meet the requirements of the town, and I do not see why it should cost less than a building at Annapolis, Lunenburg, Richmond, or any of the other shire towns in Nova Scotia.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the misery of it. It is not what is adequate to the needs of the town, but it is that a member should have just as much as any other members have got. That is the sum and substance of the whole thing. It gratifies the political pride of a member to be able to say to his friends and supporters; I got you as good a thing—no, not as good a thing, because that is the last idea which enters into his mind—but as costly a thing as Annapolis has got; and if he could get a bell or a tower put on it, which would make it cost \$1,000 more, he would be a still better man than the member for Annapolis. The last thing he thinks of is what are the post office and customs wants of his town. Take Digby, for instance, which is a lively place and whose people are very fine people; will any one pretend that it requires a public building costing over \$12,000 to accommodate its post office and customs work. But of course with a building of that modest cost, it could not hold up its head alongside Annapolis, which has a \$20,000 building, and would be still more cast in the shade by Lunenburg, which has a \$23,000 building.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If I were to follow the hon. gentleman's advice we would be able to distinguish the shire towns of Conservative counties from those of Liberal counties by the magnificent public buildings in the one and the modest public buildings in the other.

Mr. FOSTER. You would demonstrate your good sense, if you could.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman had taken that view a little while ago, and not set the bad example he did, we might have been spared a good deal of this discussion. But, as Artemus Ward says, there is a good deal of human nature in man, and if the hon. member for Digby wishes to have his shire town adorned by a fine public building, that is a very human sentiment, which, no doubt, exists also in

the minds of its inhabitants. I do not say that we ought to be lavish in our expenditure but we ought to try and put up the proper kind of building on the expenditure of a moderate sum of money. We know the tendency of engineers is to spend money liberally and do their work handsomely, and we have to prevent that tendency having its full fling, and have buildings put up which are respectable, and not extravagant.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. Minister is going to build post offices in every town or village of 3,000 inhabitants he can go through Ontario and build them by the dozen, for he will find lots of towns there of that size and larger which have no public buildings. I understood that last year the Government intimated that in future they would not put up any public buildings in places where they could rent suitable buildings at a moderate sum, except in towns of a reasonable size. But they seem to have started off again on the same principle as they did last session. If this principle is to be acted on, it seems strange that a town like Owen Sound, with 9,000 or 10,000 of a population, is not also given a post office. The hon. Postmaster General said the Government were spending money there improving the harbour and that was quite sufficient, but in 1896, when the hon. Postmaster General was there helping to return the Minister of Customs to Parliament, he went around the town looking at some sites, and said they were admirable places there on which to erect a post office, and that Owen Sound ought to have a post office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. SPROULE. He also looked around to find a place suitable for a dry dock. Now, because of the moderate expenditure going on in the harbour, the Government will do nothing in the way of erecting a public building. But why did the hon. Minister lead the people there to believe that if his party were successful, they would immediately build a post office. In the maritime provinces the Government is putting up public buildings in every little town with a population of \$3,000.

To complete reconstruction of portion of Western Departmental Block, destroyed by fire 11th February, 1897..... \$12,000

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In explanation of this item I wish to read a report from the chief astronomer of the department:

With reference to the Ottawa Astronomical Observatory, I have the honour to report that the principal use of the present establishment on Cliff Street is the termination of time and longitude. It is the basal point from which have been determined a number of telegraphic longitudes, including a series extending across the continent to Victoria.

These telegraphically-determined longitudes have been of use in many ways : as affording a series of points upon which the Dominion Land survey in the railway belt of British Columbia have been based ; in connection with the Dominion Land surveys in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories ; in connection with the international boundary, as in the case of the determination, in 1896, of the longitude of Port Stanley, on the north shore of Lake Erie ; the inter-provincial boundary between Ontario and Manitoba ; and in connection with distant exploration, such as Mr. Ogilvie's survey of part of the shore of Hudson's Bay in 1890.

For all such astronomical determinations, Ottawa, as the capital of the Dominion, forms the natural centre, and it is anticipated that it will be found advisable in future to extend the system of longitude into eastern Canada. Such determinations should form an essential part of any scheme of geodetic survey.

The observatory is used also for the determination of local time, the rating of chronometers (for use in exploratory surveys, &c.), the practising of observers, the determination of their permanent equations, &c.

Besides the transit instruments, with the auxiliary apparatus used in the above work, the observatory is furnished with a reflecting telescope for the observation of star occultations, &c., and as an exhibition instrument for the use of visitors to the observatory.

Unfortunately, the situation of the building is very poor ; there is a clear view to the north and south only ; to the east the view is cut off by the adjacent stable, which is further most objectionable from the danger of fire and in other ways. To the south, buildings and the smoke of the city destroy the view of the most interesting portion of the sky, as the observatory stands on ground much lower than Vittoria and Wellington streets. The lot, moreover, is so narrow that there is not space alongside for the erection of a room which can be warmed in winter—very necessary accommodation, both for the observer preparing for his observations and for keeping the electric batteries by which the recording apparatus is worked. Artificial heat cannot be used in the observing-room itself. Hence the observatory cannot be used in winter at all, or for observations of precision.

On these grounds I recommend the erection of a new building upon a better site. At the same time, I would point out the desirability of improving the equipment of the observatory, so that, besides geographical work (i.e., longitude, &c., spoken of above), something could be done in the direction of the modern investigations in physical astronomy. The special instrument for this purpose, which would have to be procured, is an equatorially-mounted telescope, driven by clock-work, and fitted with attachments for micrometric measurements and for spectroscopic, photometric and photographic work.

The usefulness of such an instrument, from a public stand-point, may be briefly indicated as follows :—

1. The scientific value of the observations which would be made with the instrument ; also, the collateral assistance which would be afforded to investigators in the many branches of science which are closely related to astrophysics.

2. Stimulus to science throughout the Dominion. The development of our resources calls for application of science. The advancement of even "pure" science, often so-called in contradistinction to "practical" science, means public benefit in many directions, benefit which may be quite unforeseen by the scientific investigators, but

Mr. SIFTON.

which the history of industrial development shows is sure to follow. A Government cannot well afford to leave its interests in this direction wholly in the hands of foreign investigators, for each country has its own special problems to solve. Hence the advancement of science is a matter of national concern, worthy of careful consideration on the part of the Government.

Now astronomy is a science which so touches other sciences that an increase of public interest in it forwards the others, and, again, there is nothing else so capable of arousing public interest as the exhibition, through a good telescope, of the wonders of the skies. A national observatory at the capital will assist to this end in a paramount degree, for Ottawa is a centre to which come the leaders of public opinion from all parts of Canada, so that the interest aroused will permeate all parts of the Dominion.

Astronomical investigation has been hitherto greatly neglected in Canada, although its importance is recognized everywhere else, especially in the United States, where many princely endowments of observatories have been made by wealthy men. To illustrate the attention paid to astronomy, I append a list of 85 observatories in the United States, and a list of 252 observatories elsewhere. These lists, I believe, are tolerably complete. The United States list shows the results of the widespread popular interest in this branch of investigation.

The following estimates of costs have been prepared after consulting the catalogues of many British instrument makers, and with the advantage of personal consultation with Mr. Brashear, one of the foremost instrument makers of the United States, who spent a day in Ottawa last summer. The bases of the calculations is a telescope, object glass 10 inches in diameter, which appears to be a suitable size for the objects aimed at.

The cost of the telescope, with mounting, all attachments, is.....	\$ 5,360
Clocks and minor instruments, and setting-up the instruments, say.....	640
	<hr/>
	\$6,000
Instruments .....	\$ 6,000
Building .....	16,000
	<hr/>
	\$22,000

The \$6,000 for instruments is not included with the \$16,000, because it will not be required until the building is finished. I have discussed this matter with Mr. King, who is a very efficient officer, and this is in accordance with his recommendation. I might say to the committee that the competency of our officers has already been tested and they have been found to be extremely competent, even with the chances they have had. Mr. Ogilvie was connected with this department, as also is Mr. Klotz, who is a very competent man. In connection with the survey of the Alaskan boundary, the skill of our officers was very closely tested by the survey of the 141st meridian under Mr. Ogilvie. And it is a source of satisfaction to know that their work stood the test of an examination alongside the work of the officers from the United States who have given special attention to this subject. I think this should stimulate us to furnish them with proper appliances to carry on their work. It has been proposed to erect

this building on that portion of the grounds behind the Western Block, it is the highest portion of the grounds and from it the best view can be obtained. That has not been finally decided, but is the best conclusion we have been able to come to thus far. Mr. King says :

In the estimate for the building, provision has been made for office accommodation, besides the tower and pier for the large telescope, and the house for the transit instruments. The material is brick. Stone would probably increase the cost.

The cost of the site has not been included in the estimate.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the diameter of the lens would be ten inches. That would be very small, would it not ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I understand it would be a very fair telescope.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman spoke of an observatory here. Where is it ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I would like my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) to go and see it. One might be here a long time without knowing anything about it. Taking it altogether, I think it is probably the most disgraceful thing in connection with the public affairs of Canada. It is a little building down near the Supreme Court. It is nothing but a packing box—a little bigger than that table. The instruments in it are fairly good and the work done is good, but the idea of having men undertake scientific work in such a place is simply laughable.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the idea ever been considered of combining the observatory with the museum building ? Would not that be a good idea ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That has been considered. But there are objections. A tower must be constructed, and to make one sufficiently strong and heavy to avoid oscillation would add very considerably and disproportionately to the expense. Besides, the site suggested for the museum building is in Major's Hill park, and the trains coming in there would be likely to cause oscillation. The least oscillation of the ground utterly destroys the value of the setting of the clock work.

Mr. SPROULE. If an observatory is to be built, it ought to be a fairly good one, because being at the capital, a great many people will visit it. I must say that I think a ten-inch lens telescope would not be suitable. When attending the University of Michigan as a student, we used there an instrument with a 17 or 18-inch lens, if I recollect aright. I think the site spoken of is as good as could be had on these grounds. But I think it would be well even to go some distance from these grounds if a more suitable locality could be had. Without wishing to interfere with Toronto, I have always

thought that the observatory ought to be here rather than there. This being the capital and Parliament meeting here, the work of the observatory could be made of use to more people throughout the country, than it can be if located in any other city.

Public Buildings—New Brunswick—  
St. John quarantine station, improvements ..... \$25,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is this vote for ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). This is in consequence of the fact that passenger travel in the winter time through the port of St. John is growing. At present if a vessel arrives with the contagious disease aboard, there is no accommodation for the passengers in quarantine.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is it proposed to build this station ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. On the old site, on the Island.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you a supply of water there ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Part of this money is to go for a supply of water by boring artesian wells, the same as was done for one of the asylums in the neighbourhood of St. John.

Victoriaville, public building ..... \$8,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is this ?

The PRIME MINISTER. This is in the county of Arthabaska. The town itself is not very large, but it is growing. It has a population of between 2,500 or 3,000. It has two banks, the Molson's Bank and the Quebec Bank. It has large saw mills, a furniture factory and a tobacco factory. It is an outport of the port of Richmond. The post office revenue is about \$1,900, and the customs about \$700. The inland revenue is \$25,000. At the present time the post office is in the city hall and pays a rental of \$200. The rental paid for inland revenue is \$60, and \$40 is paid for the custody of arms. This new building will be a very modest one, costing only \$8,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The outside estimate is \$10,000 ; that will take in the fittings.

Mr. FOSTER. I knew we would pick up such items as this at every other step. The population is 2,500, a quiet kind of people, and you got \$696 from the customs, and you get \$1,900 from the post office ; yet you are going to put up a public building in Victoriaville, simply because you happen to have a tobacco factory there, and it gives you some inland revenue. But the tobacco factory does not make any more people, the people are 2,500 in number. The post office revenue is small. Now, you are going to spend \$10,000 or \$12,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not more than \$10,000.

Mr. FOSTER. A little later on there is the Buckingham public building. I fancy you will find before we get through that there never has been an estimate brought down to the House which has had so many of these big buildings in little places, against which the Hon. David Mills, when he was in this House, and all the Opposition, including my hon. friend, after days and nights of discussion, moved a resolution which they founded on reasons that could not be jarred, that you should have a principle in these matters, and the principle would cut out just such as these. Sir John A. Macdonald took that principle, and from that time out I can say with reference to the last Administration, that they simply finished up the buildings that they already had commenced, and with one or two exceptions went no further in that line. I fully agreed with the idea, and did my best to keep within that principle, finishing those that we had already started. We did try to keep out of the business of putting up these large buildings in little places. Now that is all smashed to pieces, and the Hon. David Mills is all knocked into a cocked hat, so to speak, so far as his traditions were concerned. But that is nothing. It is an indefensible thing to take the taxes of the people for that kind of object.

The PRIME MINISTER. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that nothing can be more absurd than to put up big buildings in small towns, big stone buildings with high towers, such as we have seen in small towns like Victoriaville. Certainly, I would not consent to putting up such a building in those localities. But I think a modest building, not to exceed \$8,000 in cost for a town like Victoriaville is the least we can do. We pay \$300 to-day for rent, so that there will be no charge at all upon the revenue.

Mr. SPROULE. Will there not have to be a caretaker?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think we can manage it without a caretaker, I think the postmaster can take care of it himself.

Mr. SPROULE. At Collingwood, at Orangeville, and in many other places, there are moderate public buildings, but every one of them has to have a caretaker, who is paid about \$400 a year to look after the building, which is more than the rental.

Mr. FOSTER. What about the Buckingham business?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The population of Buckingham in 1891 was 2,339. The postal revenue for the last year was \$20,775.26; money orders issued, \$15,812. There is no custom-house there, the building will be practically the same as the Victoriaville one, not exceeding \$8,000.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to know, in reference to these buildings at Digby, Springhill, Victoriaville and Buckingham, if you have to buy the land in all these cases?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In most cases we have, although the municipality of Buckingham has offered a site free. The other sites will have to be purchased.

Mr. FOSTER. Is land very valuable in Victoriaville?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think it is very valuable in any of these places.

Mr. FOSTER. They have not public spirit enough to offer you a site?

Removing old and placing new wires in Parliament Building and Library..... \$7,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is that for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For removing the old electric wire and apparatus that were put in when these buildings were first lighted with electricity, and replacing the same with new wire.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the electric lights in there now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are electric lights on the old wire, but the underwriters have condemned the wire, and it is necessary to remove it.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought the Parliament Building was wired by Ahearn & Soper.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Only a portion of it.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it proposed to do that work by contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no arrangement yet made. We will take tenders for it.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood, when the discussion was going on regarding the lighting of this building, that Ahearn & Soper had put in all these lights; and, if they put in the lights, they must have put in the wires as well. It cost something between \$2 and \$3 a light.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This was not included. They did not put in any wires in this portion.

Mr. SPROULE. They put in lamps, which cost something like \$18,000, and now there is \$7,000 more required for wires.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That includes the other buildings as well.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, they will be put in by contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Ottawa Departmental Buildings—  
East and West Blocks, concrete floors,  
cleaning and painting passages, lin-  
oleum, &c..... \$7,500

Mr. FOSTER. How do you get that lin-  
oleum ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The last  
lot was imported from England by the de-  
partment.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the rule in refer-  
ence to the painting ? Do you ask for ten-  
ders for it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is done  
by the men employed by the department.

Mr. FOSTER. How many men are there  
down in that house below the bank ? It  
seems to me that most of Ottawa lives there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There  
are 125 workmen in the shops. Besides  
there are 84 in the elevator, water and gas  
service, &c.

Mr. FOSTER. You have 125 men in that  
workshop, at a cost of how much per year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have  
the rates of wages paid to the men. The  
superintendent gets \$3 a day ; foreman car-  
penter, \$2.50; carpenters, \$2; foreman paint-  
er, \$2.50 ; painters, \$2 ; labouring men, \$1.25  
a day ; masons, \$2.50 per day ; one roofer  
at \$2 a day, one at \$1.75 per day ; carters,  
\$2.25 per day.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a great pity that we  
have not a little time to go into that. One  
hundred and twenty-five workmen are kept  
in and around these buildings, and, besides,  
there is scarcely anything that you do on  
the buildings that you do not have to get  
another vote of money for.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is the number any  
greater than it used to be ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am in-  
formed that it is not.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. How many hours a  
day do these men work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, there  
is no increase. The men work nine hours.

St. Catharines drill hall..... \$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DE-  
FENCE (Mr. Borden). The old drill hall  
was blown down, or destroyed, and it is  
necessary to have this.

Mr. FOSTER. When was it blown down ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DE-  
FENCE. About a year ago. It was injured  
so that it could not be used, and we have  
had to rent another building for the artillery  
there.

Mr. FOSTER. What rent do you pay ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DE-  
FENCE. Between \$250 and \$300.

Mr. FOSTER. What are you going to  
spend ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DE-  
FENCE. I think this is the full amount  
required.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, this  
is not the full amount. I think it will cost  
\$20,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the rule about  
drill-sheds ? Has the department any rule,  
or is it just political influence ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND  
DEFENCE. Political influence has nothing  
to do with it.

Mr. FOSTER. Not with the Minister of  
Militia. No one would suspect him ; but  
what is the rule ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND  
DEFENCE. The rule is the requirements  
of the militia at the particular point where  
the drill hall is to be constructed.

Mr. FOSTER. For instance, at this place ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND  
DEFENCE. There is artillery and infantry,  
and the plan of this structure is made in  
accordance with the requirements of the  
force.

Mr. FOSTER. How much infantry and  
how much artillery ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND  
DEFENCE. There is a battalion of infant-  
ry—about 340 men. I do not know how  
many artillery.

Mr. FOSTER. And wherever you have ar-  
tillery and infantry in these numbers, you  
build a drill hall.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND  
DEFENCE. In some cases there is cavalry  
as well, and also stores and sometimes  
horses.

Toronto Post Office—  
Improvements, including automobile  
cars ..... \$12,500

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is  
for improvement in the heating apparatus,  
plumbers' work, repairs to roof, cleaning  
and repairing interior of the building, \$7,000  
is for general improvements, and \$5,000 for  
the purchase of automobile cars.

Mr. FOSTER. How many cars will that  
purchase ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think  
two.

Rideau Hall—  
Additional wing to Government House,  
and furnishing ..... \$14,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is  
to build an additional wing 52 x 38 feet, two

stories and basement, built of brick on a stone foundation. It will add 19 rooms to Government House with a toilet and bathroom to each floor. It is represented by the occupants of Rideau Hall that it is still very defective in accommodation, and the Minister of Public Works became satisfied that some increase was necessary.

Mr. FOSTER. Was not the general impression that the household of Lord and Lady Aberdeen was the largest ever here? It does seem to me that 19 more rooms, in addition to the large menage there already, is a considerable addition.

The PRIME MINISTER. I may say that the complaint is that there are no rooms for visitors, and I think the expenditure is really necessary.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is this wing to be built?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On the eastern side of the house, between the conservatory and the chapel. This covers the total cost.

Mr. WILSON. It seems to me that it would have been an advantage if the house had been destroyed. I certainly would be opposed to voting any more additions to that old house. I think it is big enough and ugly enough as it is.

Public Buildings, Ottawa—

Western Departmental Block—New furniture to replace that destroyed by fire, electric wiring, &c..... \$5,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A considerable portion of this is for material for draughting tables used by the officials. These are made in the department. The remainder is for furniture of a general character, which is obtained in the usual way.

Mr. FOSTER. How much is for draughting tables?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is \$719 of this required for material for draughting tables for the Marine Department, together with cupboards, pigeon-holes, shelving, &c., for the storing of papers.

Mr. HAGGART. Then there is no vote for the men?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, no special vote, but the labour is charged against each of the works.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a most vicious system. It was practised before, but it ought to be changed. We should have a special vote for the work of the men. You should know how many you want and take a vote for them. I know the officials do not want that and the hon. Minister of Public Works would no doubt object to the proposal, but it is the only way we can keep any check on the expenditure. I hope the hon. Minister will change that system.

Mr. FIELDING.

Brockville drill hall..... \$10,000

Mr. HAGGART. Is there not a drill hall in Brockville?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think not.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that in fulfilment of the understanding come to last election, when it was rumoured that the Minister promised, if his candidate was returned, to build a drill hall. We ought to be thankful that the Government are fulfilling one of their pledges.

Alexandria Reformatory—

Balance of award, including interest.. \$1,233 05

Mr. BERGERON. Who gets that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Joseph Bourque, in connection with his contract.

Mr. BERGERON. How much does that reformatory cost the country?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. \$14,758.

Mr. BERGERON. How much was paid for the land?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. \$5,000.

Mr. HAGGART. You took a vote for the purpose of settling this claim last year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was none last year. There was a vote in the main Estimates, which is not sufficient, and this is in addition.

Mr. BERGERON. The reformatory will not be built there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Kingston Royal Military College—

Additional building..... \$8,000

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is to build a hospital in connection with the college. At present the only hospital is in the basement, which is not suitable, and the boys have to be sent to the general hospital. There are \$3,000 for that and \$5,000 for a gymnasium.

Mr. HAGGART. It is not a couple of years since you got a vote for the hospital.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We did not spend it.

Mr. SPROULE. This is another illustration of how these buildings count up, when we put up our own public buildings. Every year something new is required. Last year there was a granolithic pavement laid down inside the yard, where it was not wanted at all, and \$600 was spent on it.

Public Buildings, Ottawa—

East Block, elevator ..... \$3,000

Mr. BERGERON. Is it the intention to have an elevator in this house?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not decided on yet, but there has been some talk about it.

Mr. CLARKE. When the main Estimates were up, the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) asked if it was the intention of the Government to put an elevator in the Toronto custom-house. There is no public building, I am sure, in which it is more needed. There are many people visiting the building every day, and the stairs are very steep. It would be a great convenience to the public if an elevator could be put in.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We shall have to take it into consideration along with other matters. There is no vote for it.

Mr. CLARKE. I thought I heard the Minister say that an elevator had been put in the Eastern Block without an appropriation, and thought perhaps the same could be done in this case.

Public Buildings—Ontario—

London—Drill hall and armoury site.. \$10,000

Mr. BERGERON. What is this?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The city of London has a claim against the Government on account of sewerage put in, which serves the military depot there known as Wolseley barracks. The city's claim has not been adjusted. In that city we have an old drill-shed which is unfit to use without very considerable expenditure and the city object to its being used as a drill-shed, as it is in the residential portion of the city. It is proposed to adjust the differences between the Government and the city by transferring to the city the site and building we have there now, and they will provide the Government with a site and the Government will pay a certain amount of money toward it. These matters, it is proposed, are to be arranged on the basis of a settlement of the claim of the city against the Government. No definite arrangement has yet been arrived at. The mayor of the city has been here and some of my colleagues from Ontario, who are better acquainted with the matter than I am, particularly the Minister of Justice, heard the deputation along with myself, and we decided that this vote should be taken, with a view, if possible, to carrying out the compromise.

Mr. WILSON. How much is the total cost?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is only to provide for the site?

Mr. HAGGART. The explanation of the Minister is that the Government have a site which is perfectly good, but objectionable so far as the city is concerned on account of it being in a residential portion. The city will furnish a site which will not be so valuable, and the Government will pay the difference in consideration of getting a less valuable site.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) probably did not hear me say that the city had a claim of \$20,000 or so against the Government.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that; but the Minister said that the city were going to furnish him a site and he was going to pay the difference between the site he gave and the site was given to him.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. With their claim—whether it is a just one or not, I do not say.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you any idea of what the building will cost?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I believe about \$35,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What about the armoury?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is all one building.

Public Buildings—Ontario—

Windsor drill hall ..... \$6,000

Mr. FOSTER. How much is this to cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That will be the total cost.

Public Buildings—Ontario—

Sarnia public buildings ..... \$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. What will this cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will cost \$25,000 exclusive of the site.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population of Sarnia?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. According to the last census, 6,693.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the post office revenue?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The postal revenue is \$11,015; customs, \$123,857.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we might adjourn now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is one item reserved—the automobiles for Toronto, which the Postmaster General will explain.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). There is a total amount of \$12,500. Owing to the growth of postal business in Toronto, we need additional accommodation. I have it in contemplation to try to obtain permission from the Grand Trunk Railway to provide an elevator system near the Union Station, so that we can obtain access to the cars at the latest moment. We have in contemplation also the rearrangement of the post office at Toronto. We propose also to test the automobile system by acquiring one or two automobiles, perhaps more, to be used in connection with the late delivery, and also in connection with the collection of mail

matter, and perhaps taking the letter carriers to their several beats.

Mr. FOSTER. Will that enable you to do with fewer letter carriers?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It will facilitate the work, I have no doubt.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the other item?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have obtained possession of a large room for sortation, which is being fitted up.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for Victoria, B.C., (Mr. Prior) asked me to bring down certain papers in relation to the dry dock at Esquimalt, without formal motion. I now ask leave of the House to submit these papers, and make a motion to that effect.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.35 a.m. (Wednesday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 9th August, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 179) respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Fielding.)

### SUPPLY—CONDUCT OF TROOPS IN THE YUKON.

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

Mr. HUGHES. I desire, in justice to some of the soldiers of the Yukon force who have been charged in a publication called the "Canada Militia Gazette," with misconduct, to contradict in the most emphatic manner the statement published broadcast throughout this country that there has been any serious misconduct on the part of the men of the field force. There are three men whose names have been placarded before the world as having been guilty of serious offences in the Yukon. They are private soldiers, but a private soldier's reputation is as dear to him as any other man's, and the officers are anxious that the facts should be made pub-

Mr. MULLOCK.

lic. The facts are that soon after the troops reached the Yukon, three men committed slight offences, or offences that were not serious, for which they were properly punished, and they have led most exemplary lives for seven months, as I have the assurance of those who are in the best position to know. But on the 25th of June they find themselves placarded before the world in the manner I have described, and the aspersions cast upon the character of these men are reflected as being the general character of the whole field force. These men are far distant from civilization, and have no means of defending their character; and I take this opportunity to state that I think it absolutely and manifestly unfair that any publication should slander soldiers as these men have been slandered.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Montreal Harbour—Improvements below St. Mary's current.....	\$500,000
Montreal Harbour—Grain elevator and storage .....	250,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I may inform the committee that we do not propose to proceed with this item of \$250,000 for a grain elevator at Montreal: that is a matter which will be laid aside for the present. But we ask the committee to consent to the vote of \$500,000 for improvements in the Montreal harbour below St. Mary's current.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the condition of this grant? Is it to be a subvention by the Government for some work in the Montreal harbour?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, it is a gift like any other work in the Public Works Department. We discussed the matter somewhat yesterday in connection with the Montreal Harbour Bill, so I cannot add very much information to what was then given. This vote is intended to build one additional pier below St. Mary's current, between the two piers already constructed by the Montreal Harbour Commissioners. The vote is deemed to be sufficient to construct the work.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this given to the city of Montreal or to the Harbour Commissioners?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not given to the commissioners, but, like any other public work, it will be the property of the Dominion Government. But I think it will be necessary to make an arrangement between the Public Works Department and the Harbour Commission for having a common management, as I cannot conceive that there should be a dual management. This will be arranged between the hon. Minister of Public Works and the Harbour Commission. I understand that they

are working quite harmoniously and that they are desirous that this appropriation shall be made. This will be an appropriation by the Government for a Dominion public work and will not be under the control of the Harbour Commissioners unless an arrangement be made between the hon. Minister of Public Works and the Harbour Commission.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this to be added to the \$250,000 which remain of last year's vote of \$750,000 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, because the \$250,000 remain under the control of the Harbour Commission, while this will be an appropriation under the control of the Public Works Department. The \$250,000 remain as a part of the commission's fund to be disposed of under the terms of the Act, and although both will be available for works below St. Mary's Current, the two items are entirely distinct.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a word as to the wisdom of the course which the Government is pursuing. Montreal is a great port, and the city is a great commercial centre. No one outside of Montreal can probably have a better idea of Montreal's necessities in the way of trade and as to the best way of meeting them than the business men of Montreal. The policy adopted by the Government heretofore has been to have Montreal harbour under the consecutive and sole management of the Harbour Commission, a part of which body is appointed by the Government, and another part by various public interests in the city of Montreal. That policy has been in operation for a long series of years. The Government has authorized its issues of bonds, and these have been issued and have been made charges as far as the interest goes, on the revenues of the harbour. That is the way in which the arrangement has been carried on so far. In that way we have had a consecutive control; the Government has been relieved of the unending and unedifying spectacle of political pulling and hauling that will inevitably take place the moment the Government sticks its nose into the affairs of a great harbour like that of the city of Montreal. What reason was there why this Government should interfere to make a divided authority and a divided expenditure in reference to a great harbour like that of Montreal? On the face of it, is it business-like that you should have a double authority, one subject entirely to political influences and the other, certainly, appointed by and working in pursuance of the business interests of the city? The two influences are totally different. In the city of Montreal you have divergent interests, the particulars of which I shall not go into now, but this emphasizes what I say as to the political pressure that will be brought upon the Government. I take leave to say that I would

rather trust the representatives of the commercial and business interests of Montreal than I would the hon. Minister of Public Works. The hon. Minister of Public Works is a creation of a party; he may be the creation of a faction; he is not a man, in the very nature of things, who is well versed in commercial matters, and especially in all those matters which appertain to the works necessary to adequately carry on the business of a great city like that of Montreal. That is not his business. He is the head of a political party; he is the head, to a certain extent, of a political department, and to that extent, his training, his surroundings and all those conditions and circumstances, fit him, in the least possible degree, to be an authority upon the progressive works that should be undertaken in Montreal in order to serve its business interests. Now, they say that Montreal has burdened itself nobly and well with the expense of carrying on that harbour and improving, not only the harbour, but the River St. Lawrence and that it has been inadequately aided by the Government. I have sympathy with a plea of that kind, I do not think you could find another case in the history of Canada where the business men of a city have gone so fairly and nobly to work to improve their transport facilities. I do not think you could instance a case in the Dominion of Canada at all equal to that of the city of Montreal. They have taken pride in their work; they have gone about it like business men and capitalists, as they are, and they have evinced a public spirit which is in striking contrast with a great many other portions of this Dominion that I might mention. Now, they make the plea that it is a great national highway, that Montreal is a great national port and that they should not be overburdened. I think their plea is good, but the Government can help them in a far better way than by sticking the hon. Minister of Public Works down there in the midst of their progressive improvements, of their transport facilities with his politics and party and everything like that, open to a thousand influences that business men are not open to, and swayed by a thousand influences that business men would be entirely impervious to. Make this commission as representative as it is necessary to be; make it such as to be in every way adequate to the circumstances of the case, then give it a subvention and let it apply that subvention to the harbour of Montreal, or relieve them of a portion of the burden which is exactly the same thing in order that their plea that the expenses of the harbour may not be made too large and thus interfere with the proper development of trade and so place their port at a disadvantage with other ports. That can be done without injecting piece work machinery like this into the improvement of that harbour, and I venture to say that the business men of Montreal are, in their hearts opposed, not to a grant

of public money by this Dominion Parliament in aid of their harbour, but to the method in which it is given. They do not want to say too much about it, because, otherwise, they might not get the grant at all. They would rather have this \$500,000 expended by the hon. Minister of Public Works, than not have their harbour benefited by it at all, but my view would be that the policy for this Government to pursue would be to keep itself out of that business, to keep itself out of that complication and to give the Harbour Commission the subvention it proposes here. Oh, but you say, the hon. Minister of Public Works represents the Dominion, and the Dominion has interests there. The business men of Montreal represent the Dominion and with adequate transportation and harbour facilities its trade ought to grow in relative proportion to that of the Dominion of Canada. The business men of Montreal are not merely local in their interests, but they are as cosmopolitan as you can get men in this country. But, you say, that you can get the great engineering force of the Department of Public Works. I would put those engineers aside entirely in preference to the engineering force which the commission can get whenever they want it. If they need expert advice they can get it a great deal better than they can by asking it from a set of routine officials who have to do with a certain kind of construction in the Dominion of Canada, and whose advice I would not take to be equal to the advice of experts upon that kind of engineering construction which is necessary to the development of a great harbour. These are my views expressed roughly; and I do deplore that the Government is going to interfere, by this piece-work machinery, with the development of a great harbour. Give it a subvention in aid if you think proper, but let us have one management, and that a business and not a political management.

Mr. SPROULE. The general consensus of opinion outside of this House, among those who have given any attention to the subject, is that since the present Minister of Public Works got control of the Public Works Department, there has been a conflict between the Harbour Commissioners and the Minister of Public Works and one of the members for the city of Montreal, and that the large expenditure which is being made in that harbour, part of which is proposed in this item, is more for the purpose of benefiting politicians than for the promotion of the best interests of the harbour of Montreal. Now, I have heard considerable about some interested politicians who invested money in property near where this expenditure is about to be made, and that it was expected to enhance the value of that property. This opinion is prevalent in the country, and if the Government cannot give some information to disabuse the public mind of that impression, this expenditure will be re-

Mr. FOSTER.

garded as not made in the best interests of the shipping trade of the country, but rather in the interest of politicians.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is, or rather there was, some rumor to the effect mentioned by the hon. gentleman. We heard a good deal last fall, through the newspapers and on the street, about certain interested politicians having purchased property, with a view to unloading it on the Harbour Commission or on the Government through the Minister of Public Works. But the hon. gentleman should have said also that we have had something more than rumours. He should have said that we have had the open statement made by the Minister of Public Works that he would not have that property at all. He should have stated that fact as well as the rumour.

Mr. SPROULE. I have not heard it.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has not heard it, he ought to have been informed of it. He should not take the rumours of the street to blacken the character of a man who has stated that these rumours are not true. He should inform himself as to the fact instead of making insinuations against an absent man when there is not a shadow of truth in those insinuations. We had also a statement of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) a moment ago that there has been interference by politicians in this matter. The position we take at the present time is simply this. The harbour of Montreal for many years has taken a position which is a great credit to itself. The business men of Montreal have shown an energy and an enterprise unparalleled in the history of the country, in improving the natural advantages of the harbour of Montreal, and in making it what it was intended by nature to be—the point of junction between lake and ocean navigation. But at the present time there is a consensus of opinion, which is not denied by any one in this House that Montreal is more than a mere local harbour—that it is the great national harbour of Canada. All the pride of the country is centered in it, and not only the pride, but all the best interests of the country. We know that when we are improving the harbour of Montreal we are benefiting every farmer, every grower of wheat, every shipper of natural products, west of the harbour of Montreal. It is certainly not unfair, when the Government are voting \$500,000 directly for the improvement of the harbour, that the Government should retain some control of the expenditure since it is to be a national harbour, and since the Government represents the nation. If that be true, no exception can be taken to the conduct or the policy of the Government in this instance. But my hon. friend says, "If you do that, you are going to import poli-

tics into the management of the harbour of Montreal; and you should leave matters as they are." Is my hon. friend absolutely certain that when he was sitting on this side of the House, and when his party controlled the Montreal Harbour Commission, that the harbour of Montreal was altogether free from politics? If there ever was a time when there was politics in the harbour of Montreal it was at that very period. The Minister of Public Works, who I am sorry to say is not here to defend himself, and who could do it very successfully if he were here, has come into conflict with some of the business men of Montreal in connection with the expenditure to be made in the harbour; but what has been the result? The result has been that the policy which has been introduced by the Government this year has not been criticised by any business man in Montreal; and I was glad yesterday to hear the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) state, on the floor of this House, within the hearing of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), that on this matter he sympathized altogether with the views of the Minister of Public Works. The Minister of Public Works has not carried out his views to the fullest extent; but there has been a compromise on certain points, as there must always be when rival interests are contending, wherein the views of the Minister of Public Works and those of the business men of Montreal have been reconciled, and the result has received the approval and support of the hon. member for South Lanark. Such being the case, it seems to me that the position we have taken is one which ought to commend itself to the judgment and approbation of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Mr. BERGERON. I think we all agree that the port of Montreal is to-day regarded, as the right hon. gentleman has said as the port of the whole Dominion of Canada. I do not understand that any criticism is offered by this side of the House, so far as that is concerned. We all agree that that port should be made a good port, and should be provided with all modern facilities. What we contend—and I think my right hon. friend has just touched the spot in his few last words—is that the work is not done as it ought to be done. My right hon. friend says there has been politics in the Harbour Commission of Montreal in the past. I admit it, and I regret it. There has been; but there should not be any more. My right hon. friend, when he came into power, was to put an end to all the bad things that had been done under the Conservative Administration. I have always believed, since I have been in Parliament—and I am more convinced now than ever—that the Harbour Commission of Montreal is a wheel within a wheel. I remember twenty years ago that a gentleman sitting in this House asked the Minister of Public Works what was the ex-

penditure on the harbour of Montreal. What was the answer? "We have nothing to do with it; you have to apply to the Harbour Commission." That seems to me to be an anomaly.

Where do we find ourselves? Last year the Government of Canada authorized the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal to borrow \$2,000,000, but they attached a condition, and that is where the politics of the Minister of Public Works came into play. Out of that \$2,000,000 which the Government authorized the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal to borrow, and on which they guaranteed the interest—no doubt contemplating the probability that the Harbour Commissioners would never pay it—the commissioners were to spend \$750,000 to build a dry dock in the eastern part of Montreal. What did the commissioners reply? They travelled between Montreal and Ottawa in deputations to the Government urging the Government not to impose that condition. They said: If we borrow the \$2,000,000, let us spend it where the expenditure will be in the best interests of the harbour and not sink \$750,000 of it in a farm. But the Minister of Public Works said to them: You shall not have a cent, you can go home without anything, unless you accept our rider and spend \$750,000 in the eastern part of the city. It was then that the charges and accusations, to which my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) referred, were freely circulated throughout the city. It was then on the tip of everybody's tongue that a syndicate had bought a large farm, and that \$750,000 of public money was to be squandered in building a dry dock on the site of that farm. The thing created a scandal during the whole summer. Every citizen reading the newspapers was shocked at what was going on. It was a fight between the Harbour Commissioners and the press of Montreal on the one side and the Minister of Public Works on the other; and we had the Minister of Public Works promenading the city, going to the city councillors and the Harbour Commissioners and saying every where: I do not care what you say, and you, the Harbour Commissioners, must do as I tell you. And he threatened to dismiss the Harbour Commissioners, who were appointed by the Government, if they did not carry out his behests! What was the result? The Minister got his own way. I said to some of the Harbour Commissioners: I would be ashamed to occupy the position you do. Although I have never approved of that commission, in the old days the Harbour Commissioners were somebody. They were supposed to be great merchants, men of wealth, men of energy, but to-day, I said to them: You are the mere puppets of the Minister of Public Works. They replied: What can we do, we must yield or the harbour will not get a cent.

I am glad to see that hon. members on this side from all parts of the Dominion

admit that Montreal is the national harbour of Canada, but if we are to improve that harbour, we ought to expend money there as it is spent on public works in other parts of the Dominion. We ought to expend it in the best interests of the harbour. My hon. friend says he is going to build a wharf between two piers belonging to the commission. I cannot understand what he means, and I would be glad if he would explain. I do not know of any two wharfs belonging to the Harbour Commissioners between which there is room to build another.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman can see the plan showing the point where it is to be built.

Mr. BERGERON. I know the place well, and I cannot see how a wharf can be built there, but of course when I see the plan I may change my view. I reply to my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) the hon. Minister said a moment ago: It is true that rumors were floating around Montreal about the Government wishing to help some syndicate interested in a farm, but the Minister of Public Works has denied ever wishing to do anything in that part of the city. Why, that is mere bluff. His plan was abandoned, for what reason I do not know. But there is a change somewhere. It was understood that \$750,000 were to be spent in the eastern part of Montreal on a dry dock. But my right hon. friend has been besieged by people from the western part of the harbour, who said to him: You need not show your face again in the western portion of the city, if you squander \$750,000 in the eastern part and abandon the western part. Then the sunny ways came into play again at the expense of the country, and the right hon. gentleman said: We will take \$500,000 from that \$750,000, and instead of forcing you to spend the \$750,000 in the eastern part we will take \$500,000 and spend it at Windmill Point, in the western part of the harbour. That was to satisfy the western portion, and conciliate the right hon. gentleman's friends in that quarter, but is that expenditure necessary? What will they do with it? Will they dig in a place, to the depth of 25 or 30 feet, where any one now can walk across. Or is this meant to be purely and simply put on paper so that the western division will see it in print and then nothing will come of it? Then what are the Government going to do with the other \$250,000? The right hon. gentleman says it is not to be spent on a dry dock because the fact that it is not to be expended on this farm shows that the dry dock scheme has been abandoned. My right hon. friend can tell us what they are going to do with it, but the hon. Minister of Finance does not know and I cannot blame him. I suppose it will create another row between the Harbour Commissioners and the press and the department of Public Works, and the outcome of the whole thing is that the

Mr. BERGERON.

harbour is in a worse condition to-day than it was five years ago. How long is this state of things going to last? For the best interests, not only of the city of Montreal, but of all politicians, both Liberal and Conservative, the only proper system is to do away with this commission and have the money sent by the department, which is responsible to Parliament for that expenditure. Do away with the commission, if it has not the manliness, energy and pluck to stand up like men and insist on the work being done where it ought to be done in the best interests of the harbour.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The hon. gentleman's speech shows more heat than knowledge. If he had examined the plan, he would have more knowledge than he has shown by his speech. There is a great difference of opinion between him and his colleague, the ex-Minister of Finance. The ex-Minister of Finance urges that the money ought to be expended by the Harbour Commissioners, but the hon. gentleman contends that it ought to be spent by the department over which we have direct control.

The hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) thinks this money ought to be put in the hands of the Harbour Commissioners and not in the hands of the Minister of Public Works. I leave these gentlemen to reconcile their differences of opinion. For myself, I think the people can control expenditures under a Minister of the Crown who is a member of the Government, responsible to the Parliament of Canada, better than they can by commissioners who are citizens of Montreal.

The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has spoken of the \$500,000 which was transferred from below St. Mary's current to Windmill Point Basin. He wants to know how this it to be expended, and what is to be done with it. The hon. gentleman has not followed the plans or the discussion upon this matter. It was explained that that money was to continue the dredging in the Windmill Basin and build a pier on the south east side of the basin. At the present time this basin, which is in the western end of the harbour of Montreal, outside the entrance to the Lachine Canal, is dredged along one side only, and only on one side is there a wharf. On the other side is the dump of dredged material which has been excavated from the harbour, along which dump there is no wharf, and alongside of which there is shallow water, which must be dredged, if that side of the basin is to be utilized. At present vessels find difficulty in entering at the basin, and hardly more than one can pass at a time.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, pass the guard-pier.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, inside, between the guard-pier and the entrance to the Lachine Canal.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is the entrance—east or west?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The entrance to the Windmill Point Basin is at the down-river end. A portion of it, as the hon. gentleman will see by the plan, is dredged, and a portion not dredged. The expenditure of this \$500,000 is to dredge out the rest of the basin and put the dredged material upon the dump on the south-east side of the basin, and build the wharfs along the dump, and level it, so as to make it available for wharf purposes. The expenditure of that money has been placed, as it was before in the hands of the Harbour Commissioners. The Harbour Commissioners are carrying on the new works with the expenditure of the borrowed money of last year. This expenditure contemplates great improvements, which are necessitated by the increased trade of the port of Montreal, and we expect still further improvements will be necessitated. If this is the national port of Canada, and if the national trade of Canada is going to increase by leaps and bounds, as in the past few years—as we believe it will—we venture to believe that the port of Montreal will require greater facilities than ever. The reason why the export trade of Canada goes largely to United States ports, as we believe, is, that the port of Montreal has not been equipped to handle cheaply, easily and quickly the trade, and the people of Canada look to the Government of Canada to see that the national port is put in a position to handle cheaply, easily and quickly the trade of the country. Until that is done, our trade must go, and will go, through United States ports. This is what is to be done with the \$500,000 which has been transferred by the Bill lately passed, from the part of the harbour below St. Mary's current to the other.

Mr. FOSTER. Why has the dry dock system been sacrificed? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) might explain that. Last year that was to be the salvation of Montreal.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was a demand last year on the part of a good many, that a dry dock should be built in Montreal. Various schemes were proposed for the purpose of meeting that demand. Amongst others, it was suggested that property be bought on the east end on which the dry dock should be built. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) who has just sat down, has gone into that matter at considerable length. He has practically accused the Minister of Public Works of having dickered with people, and of having gone about the city of Montreal threatening this one, that one, and the other. I do not know the details of these schemes. They were largely discussed in the public press, and denied, and asserted over and over again. I never was able, for my part, to come to any

conclusion in regard to these schemes, and know nothing about them. But I venture to say that if there were such schemes, if there were such attempts to steal public money, we may thank the Minister of Public Works for the fact that these schemes were foiled; and it was because the Minister of Public Works would not allow the public treasury to be pillaged, that these schemes fell to the ground.

Mr. FOSTER. How about Pacaud and Whelan?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know anything about these schemes. For my part, I do not think there were any such arrangements to pillage the public treasury; but it is evident, from what the hon. gentleman has said, that if there were, it was the Minister of Public Works who foiled them—it was through him that the public treasury was saved. As a matter of fact, the suggestions to build a dry dock there have been reconsidered; and while there is still a hope that, when the necessity arises for building a dry dock in the port of Montreal, a dry dock will be built there. At the present time the circumstances of the harbour of Montreal indicate that there is a greater need for the building of piers and the provisions of more berths of ships in the harbour than there is for the building of a dry dock. And the proposition is, that this \$500,000 of the public money voted to the harbour of Montreal shall not be devoted to a dry dock, but to the building of a pier below the St. Mary's current, which shall provide for accommodation alongside, that is, between the two old piers which were built there by the Harbour Commissioners some years ago. I may say to my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule), who referred to the rumour of property to be purchased last year in the scheme then proposed, in this case there is no purchase of property involved. The pier will be built on Government property, the front of the harbour which is in the hands of the Harbour Commissioners. So, the hon. gentleman may disabuse his mind of the suspicion to which he refers. The work to be done by the Public Works Department is work in the improvement of the harbour, just as the improvement of other harbours is carried on by the department. Being done by the department, the responsibility of the Minister of Public Works and the Government are a safeguard to the public interest. If it were placed in the hands of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, we should not have the same control as we have now. The Harbour Commissioners of Montreal are greatly occupied, and the harbour engineer has his hands full in the work which he is doing in the upper part of the harbour, work which is progressing, I am glad to say, very favourably. The work is being done most excellently, and would progress more rapidly,

were materials available. I had the opportunity of visiting the work a little while ago with the secretary of the harbour board and the harbour engineer, and was told that the main obstacle in the way of the work was that of finding the necessary material. The timbers were so scarce and so difficult to find that he had some delay, but notwithstanding these delays the work was progressing most favourably. I do not intend to be a judge of that kind of work, but looking at it from a layman's point of view it appeared to be of most excellent character, and to be carried on very successfully. If there is any other information in regard to the details of the work which hon. gentlemen desire to have, I shall be glad to supply it so far as I am able.

Mr. BERGERON. The light which the hon. gentleman has thrown on the subject does not make it look any more favourable, in fact he has confirmed what I have said. There is one fact which no discussion can change and that is that last year, out of the \$2,000,000 which were to be spent by the Harbour Commissioners for the improvement of the harbour of Montreal, \$750,000 were to be spent in the eastern part of Montreal; that is admitted. It is also admitted, as my hon. friend intimated a moment ago, that there was so much quarrelling between the Harbour Commissioners, the Minister of Public Works, the city council and the press of Montreal, that we laymen could hardly understand anything about it. The consequence was that very little work was done last year. Now what do we find? We find that in consequence of the deadlock created by the fact that \$750,000 were to be spent in Montreal east against the wishes of the Harbour Commissioners and of the people in the west end of the city, the Government have yielded, the coon came down, and we find to-day that \$500,000 are to be taken from this \$750,000 to go into Windmill Point on the western end of the harbour to satisfy those who were opposed to the improvements in the east; and \$250,000 still remain for the eastern end. Now, where the hon. gentleman wants to do work at the Windmill Point, according to his plan here, he will have to spend an immense amount of money. Can he tell us what will be the estimate for that work?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The engineer of the Harbour Commissioners told me within the last few weeks that \$500,000 would complete the dredging of the Windmill Point basin, and complete the pier I have spoken of. The basin is to be 250 feet wide. The end pier is to be extended about 1,000 feet. On the south-east side of Windmill Point basin there is a short space which has not been dredged out to the full depth. Beyond that is the dump. That dump is to be faced up with timber, and the material taken out of the basin is to be put behind the timber so as to make a proper

Mr. FISHER.

wharf. This wharf will be utilized for track-laying and for the purposes of the Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. BERGERON. So far as the eastern portion of the harbour is concerned, the Minister representing the Minister of Public Works told me they were going to build a wharf between the two piers of the harbour. Well, this \$500,000 which we are called upon to vote and the \$250,000 remaining, will make \$750,000 available.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, the \$250,000 remain in the hands of the Harbour Commissioners to be used by them for whatever purpose they see fit below St. Mary's current.

Mr. BERGERON. That is a club that still remains exhibited before the electors of Montreal east, and it may not be spent. Now, you may spend all the money you wish in the harbour of Montreal, and if you improve it as it should be improved, I would not say anything against it, on the contrary, my impression is that everybody will be satisfied. But if you spend money for nothing, whether you do it in Montreal or anywhere else, I would be the first man to oppose it. Now, where are you going to spend the \$500,000? I call upon the right hon. gentleman to go down to the city of Montreal and he will find there about a mile of wharfs, most beautiful wharfs, the finest in the country, and he will not find one vessel there. Last year you might go that distance along the wharfs belonging to the Montreal Harbour Commissioners, and if you can prove that five vessels were anchored there from the wharf of the Longueuil ferry boat down to the lower end, then I will admit that all this money will be a good investment. You have there acres of wharfs which are not used. Now, why are they not used? My hon. friend knows that it is because they are so far away from the central part of the harbour of Montreal that the merchants cannot use them, and they require the navigation companies to go up as far as possible toward the centre of the city. I have met some of them who told me that it cost them as much to cart their goods from the long wharf to their warehouses as to pay the freight from Liverpool to Montreal. If that is the case, and we are bound to accept the word of those gentlemen who are the principle men of Montreal, why should we go and spend money that will be absolutely useless? Now, take these two wharfs between which my hon. friend wants to spend \$500,000. Now, I will say a word about expending money through the Harbour Commissioners; I am not only blaming the present Government, but I say that this way of spending money has lasted too long. The old Government did the same thing. What is the consequence? Look at the guard pier in Montreal; it is an eyesore, it is a disgrace. Whoever recommended it, whoever invented it, must have been

blind, and the Minister of the Crown of whatever Government who sanctioned it, could not have known what he was doing. I say it has been badly managed in the past, and we ought to try to do better now. Take the management away from those who have been guilty of these blunders in the past and let the Government of Canada do the work themselves; then we shall know where we are.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is endorsing exactly what we are doing.

Mr. BERGERON. But you are going to do it in the same way the late Government did.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The work is to be done, not by the Harbour Commissioners but by the Government. The hon. gentleman is condemning the guard pier which was started and completed, so far as it is completed, by the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal whom he has just eulogized as being able men.

Mr. BERGERON. I said they were supposed to be able men.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is only giving hearsay evidence as to their capacity, and is willing himself to condemn the action of the Government at that time. I leave this question to be decided between him and the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster). The hon. member for York has just told us that we should do this work through the commissioners of Montreal. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) tells us that the Harbour Commissioners have been doing the work for many years past.

Mr. BERGERON. But the hon. Minister of Public Works will not allow them to do it, and that is a different matter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It must have been the hon. gentleman's own Minister of Public Works, because, when the guard pier was built and finished, the hon. gentleman's own party was in power. The Harbour Commissioners who had control of the work were appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite. They supported hon. gentlemen opposite, and it was their Minister of Public Works who authorized the expenditure just as the hon. Minister of Public Works is authorizing this expenditure to-day. I would rather appeal to the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart), who must have had to do with this matter, because the railway lines were going down to the harbour, then as they are now, and who would probably understand it better than the hon. member for Beauharnois. The hon. gentleman's colleague, the hon. Minister of Public Works, has submitted to him and he endorsed the scheme of the guard pier which

the hon. gentleman has characterized in such strong terms.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is the Minister of Public Works now?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Unfortunately, the Minister of Public Works is on the Atlantic. If he were here he would be able to answer the attacks which are being made on him by the hon. member for Beauharnois.

Mr. BERGERON. I am not talking about the present Minister of Public Works. I asked: Where is the Minister of Public Works who did that?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think he is on the bench, appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite. I am not quite sure, but I think it was Mr. Ouimet; possibly not.

Mr. BERGERON. The answer to all the hon. Minister of Agriculture has said is given in the way the people of Montreal voted at the last election, and if hon. gentlemen continue the same work they will find where they will land.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I understand that the people of Montreal voted for this Government.

Mr. BERGERON. That is what I say. The result was shown in the way they voted.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. And that out of six representatives, there are four supporting the Government.

Mr. BERGERON. If you continue the same policy you will land in the same place.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. But we have changed that policy. We are taking a portion of this work out of the hands of the commission, and propose to carry it on under the control of the Government.

Mr. COCHRANE. Coming from the province of Ontario, it is a very sad spectacle to me to see this enormous sum of money that we are willing, from an Ontario point of view, to have spent in the port of Montreal, being dealt with in the way that it is being dealt with this morning. It is a humiliating spectacle to any member of this House to see a Minister of the Crown bandying words as to what the Conservative party did in the past. Ministers are responsible for their own conduct, and not for the conduct of a Conservative Minister who is past and gone. I am surprised that an intelligent man will get up, after denouncing the Conservative party for eighteen long years, and after telling me, as a supporter of that party, that the policy of that party was wrong, and justify his conduct by the conduct of the Conservative party. Hon. gentlemen will go back years to find a transaction which is hoary with age, in order to hunt up something that will justify their misconduct in

reference to their present expenditures, in order that they may say: You Tories did it. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) sits complacently by and sees millions of money thrown away, when he used to tell us that the farmers of the country were being bled white. If he can find anything to whisper to a colleague, to turn the tables on an opponent, he will do it, but he will not get up and justify the course of the Government, and when he cannot defend the course of the Government, he will get up and leave the House. What is the history of this Montreal harbour? The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) gets up to explain it as if we did not know anything, and as if his cranium were full of knowledge. When he gets up, everybody else must subside and listen to his words of wisdom. He says that because this harbour has not been properly equipped, the trade of Canada has passed into other hands. I deny that statement; it has had something to do with it, but not all. When we know that Sir William Van Horne told us that it cost us ninepence more than double to ship a ton of butter from Canada to Great Britain, and double the price to ship a ton of cheese, it shows that, if we have lost the trade, it is not entirely due to the absence of proper equipment in the harbour of Montreal. Hon. gentlemen say that there is no heart-burning and jangling in their party. If so, why was this money not spent last year? If it is necessary that the harbour should be equipped, that dredging should be done and wharfs built—the money was at the disposal of the hon. Minister of Public Works—why was not the work done last year? The reason, to my mind, is that there was so much jangling and trouble and turmoil in the party that they could not expend the money until they had settled that question. Now that the question is settled, they are prepared to go on and spend the money. As a member of this Parliament, representing a constituency in Ontario, I am prepared to vote the sum of money that is sufficient to properly equip the harbour of Montreal, but I want to know that this money is being properly expended. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce who used to shed crocodile tears over the money that was being thrown broadcast over this land, has now not so much sympathy with the farmers as he had in those days. But, in the interest of the farmers of this country, I want to know that their money is being properly expended. We do not want hon. Ministers to get up and make political speeches when they are asked for information, and give us no information. The Ministers that I used to support when they came down to the House—the hon. Minister of Agriculture laughs. It is an insignificant laugh that shows that there is not a great deal of brains behind it. The Minister of Public Works that I used to support, when he came down to the

Mr. COCHRANE.

House, brought plans to show how a vote of Parliament was to be expended, and I may tell the hon. gentleman, who is so ready to grin, that, if he wants to get his Estimates through the House he must come down with some definite and well-prepared plan that he is ready to explain, and not make political speeches, and then sit down, leaving the House no wiser than when he got up.

Mr. HAGGART. I may, perhaps, venture a few words upon this subject, as I was one of the committee of the Privy Council to which was referred the matter of the Montreal Harbour improvements. I am a good deal of the opinion of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), in reference to the expenditure that is being made at the Windmill Point Basin. Although that expenditure was authorized by a colleague of mine, the former Minister of Public Works, I think it is one which will not be of a great deal of use to the harbour of Montreal. The further expenditure of \$500,000, which the Government have authorized in the same direction, is an expenditure which, I think, will be practically useless. These improvements will not do a great deal to increase the facilities of the harbour. I am aware that the commissioners are in favour of this work at the Windmill Point Basin. I am aware that most of the people in whose hands the carrying trade of that port is, are largely in favour of the plan of constructing this work at the Windmill Point Basin.

If the port of Montreal is to be the important port it ought to be, it requires more facilities than it has at present. The quantity of grain at present going through that port is between 30,000,000 and 40,000,000 bushels. To handle this quantity of grain tests the capacity of the harbour to the fullest extent at present; and while that is the case, there is no use of talking about diverting the grain trade of the west to the port of Montreal. The cost of transporting grain from Montreal to Liverpool is about the same as from New York or Boston to Liverpool. While the rate of insurance on the St. Lawrence route is about  $\frac{1}{4}$  cent a bushel higher than from Boston or New York, it costs about  $\frac{1}{4}$  cent a bushel less to bring grain from the west to Montreal than to New York or Boston. Therefore, you are in a position at present to carry grain from the west to Liverpool via Montreal at exactly the same rate as via New York and Boston. That is the reason why our railroads are able to make arrangements in Chicago for this trade.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Will my hon. friend excuse me for a moment? I would like to know on what authority he makes the statement that the present cost of transport to Liverpool via Montreal is the same as the cost via New York or Boston?

Mr. HAGGART. I got the information from the Canada Atlantic authorities no

later than yesterday. I inquired how it was that they were able to export grain as cheaply via Montreal as via Boston and New York, and they told me that the ocean freights to Liverpool were exactly the same from Montreal as from New York or Boston. The distance from Montreal is a little shorter; but the rate of insurance on the St. Lawrence is a little greater, largely owing to the neglect of the Department of Marine to light the St. Lawrence properly. But the shippers say that the present facilities of the port of Montreal are tested to their fullest capacity. There will be less grain delivered in Montreal this season than there was last season. If a greatly increased trade from Chicago were brought to Montreal, it would be impossible to handle it, owing to the want of harbour facilities. That was a matter for consideration when I was a member of the Government; and I came to the conclusion along with my friends who were on the Commission, that the only way to remedy that was by an extensive system of docks which would be the terminal of the different railways coming to Montreal, on which they would be able to run their tracks beside elevators. A difference of  $\frac{1}{2}$  cent a bushel will divert the carrying trade of grain or any other produce from the west to one port rather than another. The only practicable means by which it appeared to me the shipping facilities of the port would be made adequate to the trade, was a system of docks such as was proposed to the Minister of Public Works some time ago. But I regret that the control of the port remains as it has always been, and that the picayune system of expenditure for the purpose of keeping up the value of property in the front of the city is continued. The Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway authorities advised me, when I was a member of the Government, that the only possible plan of providing the harbour with modern facilities was to build an extensive system of dockage such as is to be found in all modern and live cities in other parts of the world, or to provide below St. Mary's current facilities which it is impossible to provide by the present expenditure up at the bridge.

Mr. BRITTON. I want to correct an understatement which I made the other night in reference to the quantity of grain that came down through the Welland and St. Lawrence canals. It will be remembered that the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) stated that the quantity of grain coming through the Welland Canal was 10,000,000 bushels. On the spur of the moment I said it was 15,000,000 bushels. I want now to correct that understatement made by me. Although I knew that the quantity was greater than he had stated, I did not know the exact quantity. I now find that the quantity of grain that came through the Welland Canal to Kingston last year was 12,714,333

bushels; the amount that came to Ogdensburg was 6,500,000 bushels; and the amount that came to Prescott was 5,500,000 bushels. That makes the total which came through the Welland Canal, leaving Oswego out of the account, 24,714,150 bushels. Some of the grain which came to Ogdensburg was no doubt sent to the Eastern States for home consumption or for export. I estimate that about two-thirds did not find its way from Ogdensburg through the St. Lawrence canals, or about 4,000,000 bushels. This would leave 20,381,000 bushels to go through the St. Lawrence canals if all that came to Kingston went through. But I know that all did not go through. A little of it was for home consumption; so that it would be fairly correct to say that 20,000,000 bushels went through the Welland Canal and through the St. Lawrence canals to Montreal for export. The ex-Minister of Railways is no doubt correct in his estimate of the quantity of grain that was shipped through Montreal, because both the railroads, I fancy, would carry about 10,000,000 bushels; so that you would have between 30,000,000 and 40,000,000 bushels going through that port.

Mr. FOSTER. I just want to say one word more. This is a grave statement which has been made, and it has not been met at all. The statement has been made that between the Windmill Point and the eastern section where the \$500,000 worth of work is to be done, there is a magnificent wharfage system, with two well-built and magnificent wharfs going off into the water, and that these two wharfs last season were practically useless and unused.

Now, you go to work and put between these two jutting wharfs, \$500,000 more expenditure. Have you any guarantee that that will be used any more than these two wharfs? And if not, are you not going to expend half a million dollars between two wharfs, which have not been used and which they say are practically unusable. Why? Simply because they have no railway facilities, and railway men say it is impossible to make a railway system which you can work to advantage, with wharfs jutting out from the shore. What you want is a system of docks to run in and have their switches and approaches to the warehouses and the transport companies and the like, so that you can load right off from your train into your vessel. I am not a practical man on these points, but that is the statement that is made.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.  
Who makes it?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend to my left (Mr. Bergeron) and my hon. friend here (Mr. Haggart), who sympathises a good deal with the view of having dockages and is opposed to this expenditure at Windmill Point. He says that the present system is comparative-

ly useless for the reasons I have given. Why do the Government go on spending \$500,000 more, a mile away from the business portion of the city, in the very midst of wharfs which are lying there unused, except to a trifling extent?

Mr. BERGERON. They are used only by barges.

Mr. FOSTER. Surely we are not going to spend that money in order to afford conveniences for cordwood barges, instead of trying to make a harbour fit for ocean steamers.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that there is a long stretch of wharfs along the shore between the upper and lower harbour which are not utilized.

Mr. FOSTER. From the point where the Canadian Pacific Railway comes in, as described on that map.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The reason is that the current is so swift that vessels cannot be properly moored there, and the current also brings in, constantly, silt, which makes the channel very difficult to dredge out.

Mr. FOSTER. At the jutting wharf, would the current be any more free from silt?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, because it will be diverted to the main stream.

Mr. FOSTER. Why were these wharfs not used?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because, up to the present, they have not been properly equipped with railway tracks. The hon. gentleman says they cannot, and suggests in preference to these wharfs jutting out into the stream, a system of basins inside the shore and docks running in. Well, the docks running in would cost probably three or four times as much as these wharfs out into the stream. And there would be involved in this scheme that which the hon. member for Beauharnois is so much afraid of. He alluded to all sorts of schemes for the purchase and sale of property, out of which would arise various bootling transactions. Well, the proposition of the hon. member for York would be more likely to lead to that sort of thing, because it would involve the heavy purchase of property in that part of the city, while the building of wharfs into the stream would not involve any purchase of property, and, consequently, could be done much more cheaply and provide the requisite accommodation. In that respect, the building of wharfs out into the stream would be much more economical and effective. The hon. gentleman says that the reason why the inland basins are better than wharfs out into the stream is because the latter cannot be reached by railways. But, as a matter of

Mr. FOSTER.

fact, a survey has been made which shows that they can be reached by railways, and it is proposed that the new wharf shall be reached by the railway companies. Those who understand the harbour, know perfectly well that the Canadian Pacific Railway comes into the eastern or lower end below the city, and the Grand Trunk Railway comes into the western end, and these two corporations both utilize the tracks laid on the front wharfs of the city by the Harbour Commissioners, which are open to any railway company that chooses to use them. Take the cattle shipments of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the wharfs in the centre of the city are those from which the steamships take these cargoes. The Grand Trunk Railway yards are at Point St. Charles, in the west, and that company puts its animals on lighters in the Windmill Point basins, and lighters them to the vessels and loads them from the lighters to the vessels. The Canadian Pacific Railway has its cattle yards at Outremont, several miles away from the harbour, and brings them down in trains. The cattle, on reaching the yards, have to be unloaded and kept there some time before they can be shipped. They are then loaded into the Canadian Pacific Railway train and brought down to the wharfs in the centre of the city and across the wharfs on these tracks, and thence loaded into the steamers. That is a most unhandy and, in many cases, dangerous arrangement. These wharfs below would be ideally situated for the purpose of shipping cattle to Europe, and, when properly constructed and equipped, the whole of the Canadian Pacific Railway export cattle trade will be done from them, and the vessels, which have been loaded with their heavy cargo up above, will come down to these wharfs and take the cattle there near the cattle yards.

Mr. WALLACE. Where are the wharfs where the cattle will be loaded?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Below St. Mary's current—these wharfs we are talking about. At present that cannot be done, because there are no tracks on them.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the Canadian Pacific Railway the intention of putting tracks there?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Canadian Pacific Railway will not do it, but the Harbour Commission will, and the railway will utilize them, but until that is done, the railway companies cannot take their trains down to the ships.

Mr. BERGERON. Why was not that done before?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman seems to think that because a thing was not done in the past it will not be done in the future, or because a thing was not needed in the past it will not be needed in the future. I endorse fully what

the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) said, when he said that the port of Montreal was not equipped in such a way that our trade can pass through it to Europe.

It is chiefly because of the ineffective and inadequate equipment of the port of Montreal that such a large proportion of our export trade, the grain trade especially, goes to the American ports. We have facilities through our railways and canals to bring that grain and other products of the west to Montreal. The reason why the trade has not gone to Montreal is not that there is no berth room, or that there is not a channel from Montreal to the sea, or even, as the hon. member suggests, because there is a heavier insurance rate, but simply that when a vessel comes to Montreal, instead of unloading and loading again in a day or a day and a half, it takes four days to unload the cargo and reload. In the United States ports, a vessel can unload in one day, load in another, and within 48 hours at the longest be off again. What the Minister of Public Works has been aiming at in all his plans in regard to the port of Montreal is to provide these means for quick and effective handling of cargo.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose that was what he was aiming at when he proposed this \$700,000 for a dry dock?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The dry dock was another part of the question of the navigation of the river. Representations were made by the people of Montreal, by the Harbour Commissioners and the Board of Trade urging the building of a dry dock there. However, since that time, in consequence largely of the discussions that have arisen in the country that plan has been changed. The Minister of Public Works, who has investigated this question of transportation, I venture to say, more than any other man in Canada, and who has been more instrumental in creating the revolution which has occurred in public opinion in reference to the importance of the Montreal Harbour—

Mr. FOSTER. Cut it short. Let us have the facts, and we will take the eulogies for granted.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I shall be glad to cut it short. If I had not been interrupted I should have finished much sooner. I do not know that there is anything more that I can say. The result of the work below St. Mary's current as above it, will be, as the trade of Montreal develops, these improvements will be fully used. This will demonstrate their utility. And not only that but another result will be that there will be an immediate demand for more extension of the work in the harbour, which will further justify the appropriation.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not believe there is room between Notre Dame Street and the river for the carrying out of the improvements which the Minister of Agriculture has outlined. The whole system, that part of it, I think will be abortive. The scheme that they have to make a dry dock will be a waste of public money, in my opinion. I wish to put myself on record in protest against appropriations such as these, which, I believe, will fail of their object. Every one desires to see the port of Montreal brought up to date, so that it may be prepared for a much larger amount of business, which we are expecting from various sources and as a result of various causes.

The River St. Lawrence ship channel—

To provide for additional work ..... \$78,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The chief engineer states that, owing to the time lost during each session and to the fact that the dredges cannot be kept at work more than seven months, it has been decided to provide each dredge with an electric light plant, so that dredging may be continued during the night. The appropriation is required to fit six dredges with electric light plant and to provide maintenance so that we may have a double service.

Mr. FOSTER. Will these electric plants be bought by tender and contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Tenders have been called for already.

Mr. HUGHES. I desire to draw the attention of the Minister to a matter which has just come to my notice. I am only voicing the sentiments of navigators of the St. Lawrence when I say, that in the channel which the Government is opening up, I think on this side of Sorel, they are taking what is regarded as not the better channel but the longer and more crooked one, and the one that in the past has been very prolific of accidents.

The PRIME MINISTER. What information has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) on the subject?

Mr. HUGHES. I have the word of men who navigate the river. Another matter is in connection with the survey of the river, now being carried on. The draughting has been done in the city of Ottawa, whereas this should be done at the place where the work is done, so that any mistakes, which are sure to arise, may be corrected. If the Government will act upon the hint I have given and investigate these matters they will find that what I say is in accordance with the facts.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand, the Government are going to equip six dredges with electric light? How much will that cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About \$18,000.

Mr. FOSTER. And what is the balance of \$60,000 for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For maintenance. You are going to have a double service and will have two crews to pay instead of one.

Enlarging Lévis Graving Dock..... \$117,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is proposed to be done here ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The graving dock at Lévis is the property of the Dominion Government. At present its length is 488 feet. Hon. gentlemen are well aware that in recent years larger ships are used, and we now have ships coming to the St. Lawrence which cannot be admitted to the Lévis Graving Dock. If we are to have facilities for repairing vessels on the St. Lawrence we must have a dock fitted to the increasing size of the ships.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the graving dock employed the year round ? What is the amount of the business done, and how many vessels were docked ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The revenues last year were \$19,839.

Mr. FOSTER. What has been the total cost of the dock ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the report of the chief engineer, page 175, it is stated that the amount expended is \$1,001,490, which is made up of \$910,000 construction, and \$91,490 for maintenance and repairs.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the expense compared with the receipts ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The expenditure is \$6,148.32. The number of vessels docked was seven.

Mr. FOSTER. How much of the dockage time is taken up with active work, supposing the dockage time to last seven months in the year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course, different vessels would represent different times. The report does not state the number of days here. I can get the return if the hon. gentleman desires it.

Mr. FOSTER. It is desirable to know whether the present dock was engaged to its utmost capacity, or what idle time it had.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised the dock was busily employed. Before concurrence I will get a memorandum of how many days these ships were in.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the people of Lévis will deliver up that endorsed note when this \$117,000 is expended, a note which the Minister of Public Works gave just before the elections down there. He gave them a note signed by his own hand, and I

Mr. FIELDING.

think it was endorsed by the Minister of Railways and Canals. Whether he was there to append his signature, or only promised to do it, I am not quite sure. But I am sure that the note was drawn and signed by the Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will make it worth while for the ex-Minister of Finance to produce any evidence he may have in support of the statement he now makes, because I have never known or heard of such a transaction before.

Mr. FOSTER. I have only the evidence of the Minister of Public Works himself.

Public Works—North-west Territories—  
Lieutenant-Governor's residence at Regina—Improvements, drainage, &c..... \$2,500

Mr. FOSTER. There does not seem to be any end to that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A demand was made for somewhat more extensive repairs and it was cut down to \$2,500. This is chiefly for drainage.

Mr. DAVIN. I may say that Government House is in bad need of works in connection with drainage. The sidewalk is a long one and extends from Government House to the gate, and then from the gate along the Government property in the direction of the Government buildings ; and it is absolutely necessary in the winter time in order to travel down between the Government House and the Government building.

British Columbia—  
Rossland, public building..... \$15,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the estimate of that building ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will cost \$20,000, and will be used for all Government offices.

New Westminster, public buildings..... \$15,000

Mr. FOSTER. How is that being done ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is to be done by contract.

Nelson, public buildings..... \$15,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is proposed there ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is the same as Rossland, the cost is about the same.

Kamloops, public building (revote)..... \$3,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It cost altogether \$6,000. There are \$3,000 in the main Estimates, and this \$3,000 will complete. It was a vote last year unexpended.

Vancouver, drill hall (revote)..... \$8,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is work of an expensive character. The contract was awarded for the sum of \$65,658.

Viau & Lachance are the contractors. The work is now going on.

Mr. CLARKE. How much did the land cost ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy informs me that this land belongs to the Militia Department, and we did not have to purchase it.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this near that famous spot called Deadman's Island ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. I am now told that the site was given free of cost by the provincial government.

Gas and electric light, public buildings, Ottawa, including lights and roads and bridges—additional amount required.... \$5,500

Mr. BERGERON. I thought you were doing away with the gas.

Mr. FOSTER. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This refers to the lights on roads and bridges outside of public buildings.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the items in the estimate ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Twenty-six arc lights on roads and bridges at \$85 per year, making \$2,200. There is a further sum for the consumption of gas \$1,200, and renewals, lamps and fitting, \$600, which make \$5,000.

Mr. WALLACE. That only makes \$4,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then there is a further sum for the general purposes of lighting of \$1,000. In the main Estimates there is a sum of \$13,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be much better to have all these items together, and then we would know what it costs for lighting, because we cannot form a correct idea when the items are scattered all through the Estimates.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the hon. gentleman's argument is a reasonable one and I will suggest to the deputy to follow that plan in the next Estimates.

Mr. WALLACE. When we have items of \$13,000, \$7,000 and now \$5,000, for lighting, I think it shows that this is not a business-like method of preparing these Estimates for discussion by Parliament.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the items ought to be collected together, if possible.

Department of Agriculture—  
Steel shelving ..... \$700

Mr. BERGERON. What is that steel shelving for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is steel shelving for the Department of Agriculture.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). This is for the archive records which have been transferred recently to the Langevin Block. The archives used to be in the Western Block, but I gave up these rooms to the hon. Minister of Customs in whose department these records were, and Dr. Brymner has transferred his books and records to the Langevin Block.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Government satisfied itself that this steel shelving is being supplied at a fair price ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are two firms engaged in the work, and the deputy assures me that the price is reasonable.

Mr. FOSTER. Have tenders been called for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They have both been asked to submit prices.

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

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

Yarmouth Bar, Nova Scotia—

To complete breakwater..... \$1,000

Mr. BERGERON. How much will that cost ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not the figures of the total cost. This covers the work entirely.

Arcadia—

Removal of obstructions, Cheboque River \$1,000

Mr. FLINT. This river, when the tide is in, has a depth of 12 or 13 feet, and small vessels go to the wharf near the bridge at the head of navigation. This obstruction has been called to the attention of the Government for the last eight or nine years. A railway has been constructed and passes very near Arcadia, and its business has increased lately. There are one or two large rocks which obstruct navigation, and this is to remove them.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the length of navigation in general in that river ?

Mr. FLINT. From the bridge to the sea, about ten or twelve miles.

Mr. FOSTER. This will make it navigable that length ?

Mr. FLINT. Yes.

Cheggogin—

Extension to breakwater ..... \$600

Mr. FOSTER. Where is this outlandish place ?

Mr. FLINT. It is a very important point on the coast between Yarmouth and Digby. The breakwater there was built by the local authorities, and is a very strong, good work, but does not quite meet the purposes for

which it was designed, and the Government have concluded to extend it a bit for the benefit of the people. It is a large fishing neighbourhood, and this water protects the entrance to a small stream inside of the breakwater where vessels anchor.

Lockeport breakwater ..... \$3,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is in the county of Shelburne. It is rendered necessary by the fact that the harbour is filling up. We have had dredging done on several occasions, but the engineer came to the conclusion that continued dredging operation, without building a breakwater, would be an unprofitable expenditure. It will cost probably \$4,000, so this vote will not finish it.

Gunning Cove, wharf..... \$1,600

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is in the county of Shelburne.

East Ragged Island, wharf (revote)..... \$1,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is for the balance of work now under contract, and is in the county of Shelburne.

North River—St. Annes—

Wharf at Seymour Point (revote)..... \$1,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is in the county of Victoria, and is for balance of work under contract.

Clifton, wharf repairs..... \$350

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is in Colchester County, and is the whole thing. We own the wharf.

Black Rock, Victoria County—

Boat harbour ..... \$500

Meat Cove—

Boat harbour ..... \$500

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These are in Victoria County. These two items are for the removal of rock in boat harbours on the northern coast of Victoria, in the island of Cape Breton.

L'Ardoise—

Repairs to breakwater, to complete.... \$1,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is in the county of Richmond, to complete work now under construction. It is stone concrete work. This is to repair damages sustained by the breakwater during the storm. It is an old work which was damaged by storms, and this is to repair it.

Gabarus Bay, breakwater ..... \$8,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This has been asked for quite a long time. Gabarus is in the county of Cape Breton, represented by the hon. leader of the Opposition. The work has been delayed in consequence of its being somewhat expensive. At that time the engineers reported that the work would cost \$40,000, and in consequence of that the department did not undertake it. It has been represented by the people that

Mr. FLINT.

it was quite possible to put a work there for half the money, and we have taken this appropriation. If we can get it done for about \$20,000, we shall proceed with the work; but if it should cost the larger amount, we will not proceed with it.

Mr. FOSTER. What is there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a large fishing settlement on the south coast of Cape Breton.

Mr. WALLACE. The chief importance of the place is historical rather than commercial. It is the place, I understand, where the force landed which marched on Louisbourg. It is a customs port from which a revenue of \$32.82, with 72 cents of extras is derived. Therefore, as a commercial enterprise I do not see how this vote can be justified. If the Minister were going to erect a monument to commemorate the place where Wolfe landed, he could get the vote without much trouble.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Suppose we call it Wolfe breakwater, would that settle it?

Mr. WALLACE. I think the Minister will have to give us a little further explanation before he can justify the vote.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I hope the hon. gentleman is not going to apply the test of customs revenue to the erection of a breakwater. In dealing with public buildings, where you want to know the extent of a town, customs revenue may be considered; but it has certainly nothing to do with the construction of breakwaters, which may be required for the protection of vessels at places where there is very little customs revenue, but it is a place of considerable trade in the passing to and fro of vessels.

Mr. WALLACE. In what respect is it a place of considerable trade?

Mr. MORRISON. I happen to know this locality very well. All the shipping from Halifax to the mines and also the shipping going up the St. Lawrence, together with large fleets of outside fishing vessels, pass that way. At times these ports on the eastern coast of Nova Scotia are simply packed with shipping, especially when the equinoctial gales come on in the fall. Gabarus is a most important port of call for the local shipping trade, particularly since Louisbourg has become such an important port. During stormy and foggy weather, I suppose it would have as many ships in it as the harbour of Halifax. If on no other ground than as a harbour of refuge, for the sake of the shipping this expenditure is justifiable.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the depth of water in this harbour? I understand that a vessel drawing more than four feet of water cannot get near the harbour?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, there is a depth of 14 or 15 feet of water.

Porter's Lake—

Dredging and breakwater at entrance of channel ..... \$9,000

Mr. BERGERON. Where is that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In Halifax County. This lake would be navigable, but that a bar forms at the entrance from time to time. The entrance was formerly navigable, and various small expenditures have been made by the Government to keep it open, but the engineers report that it is useless to spend a small sum, and that a substantial work must be constructed if we are to keep it open.

Mr. FOSTER. What is around the lake ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is surrounded by a fishing, farming and lumbering section.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the population of the whole county of Halifax outside of the city ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About 40,000.

Mr. WALLACE. Have you plans of this work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have an estimate of the work to be done, as follows : earth excavation and dredging, 40,000 cubic yards, \$4,200 ; cribwork, \$3,200 ; swing bridge, \$800 ; contingencies, \$800 ; making a total of \$9,000.

Mr. WALLACE. This work is at the entrance of the lake ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, entirely at the entrance.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the size of the lake ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is seventeen miles long.

Mr. FOSTER. What depth do you get in the channel ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The channel we propose will give four feet at low water, and as the tide rises six feet, there will be ten feet at high water.

Mr. WALLACE. How far is that from Halifax ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Fifteen or sixteen miles.

Mr. WALLACE. This is an expenditure that cannot be justified, because when the work is done there will only be four feet at low water, and ten feet at high water. What depth of water is there now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The outlet is closed, and, as a consequence, the whole country is flooded for miles around in the spring.

Mr. WALLACE. Then there is practically no access to it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been, but it is now closed up at low water.

Mr. HUGHES. Then the object is to do some draining for Halifax County which should be done by the municipality. Considering the lighthouses, wharfs, and a few things like that, which are round the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Fielding) county—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) should approach this in a more generous spirit. Hon. gentlemen from Ontario ought not to make remarks of these expenditures in the maritime provinces. In proportion to the amount that we spend—wisely and usefully spend—in other provinces, the grants to the maritime provinces are not extravagant.

Mr. WALLACE. I object to the dictum of the Minister of Finance, that no hon. member from the province of Ontario is to be allowed to criticise—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, that is what the hon. Minister says. He says we must put this through because of some covert threat he makes that the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) is getting some questionable votes in his constituency. Even if that be the case, the same does not apply to all the members from the province of Ontario. We hold ourselves open to criticise any vote, whether in Nova Scotia or Ontario. We have criticised some enormous subsidies in Ontario which we have declared to be utterly unjustifiable and which we in the province of Ontario have never asked for and will continue to condemn. So we are not going to have ourselves shut up by the Minister of Finance in this way. His explanations seem to amount to this : Here is a lake which has no outlet to the ocean except when the tide is high. The Government are going to make a channel which, when it is dredged out, I suppose to the rock, will not be more than four feet deep. Vessels will be able to come in only when the tide rises, and the same in going out, though that will be more easily regulated. I do not think that this explanation justifies the expenditure of \$9,000.

Mr. HUGHES. The Minister of Finance is evidently very touchy, when he flares up at my reference to this little matter. It does not worry me. Any vote that I approve of, whether it is to be expended in Ontario or the maritime provinces, I am prepared to justify without getting touchy about it. The Minister of Finance does not seem to have got past all twinges of conscience and does get a little touchy at references to expenditures in his locality.

Mr. FOSTER. This seems to me an extraordinary vote. You have here no travelled line of communication. From what the Minister of Finance says this is a lake which is now closed and the water floods the surrounding country. It is deemed necessary to drain the lake and give access from it to its outer waters and the sea, and the simple plan is adopted of getting the Government to undertake it as a public work. It seems to me that is not a thing we can do. If you expend \$9,000 which is a large amount of money, you will, after all, only get a channel which will not be useable at all times, and there is no suggestion that it can be made a travelled line for communication. If we undertake that kind of thing there will be no end to it in the interior of the country.

Mr. RUSSELL. If I might be permitted, I would like to say that this is a matter really of very great importance. At one time it was proposed to spend some \$35,000 or \$40,000 on this work. I have seen elaborate plans, which were prepared some ten or twelve years ago by the engineer of the department in Halifax, the object of which was to restore this harbour to what it was thirty or forty years ago. I do not know the reason that it is choked up, but I have heard that it was due to wrong methods used to keep the channel clear. This is really a harbour, and formerly there was a good deal of shipping there—fishing vessels of all kinds. Of course, incidentally to the good results to flow from this improvement of navigation and fisheries, which comes within the purview of this Parliament, there is also the consideration that it will relieve three important bridges, which have their abutments and approaches at certain seasons under water. These bridges carry roads that are really the arteries of communication from the eastern end of the county—and indeed from the eastern parts of the province—to the city. I admit that that is not a matter that comes within the purview of this Parliament. At the same time, it is an advantage that will be conferred upon the people by the expenditure of this money. I am sure that my hon. colleague (Mr. Borden, Halifax), who has just entered the Chamber will support me in what I have said.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) spoke this seemed to be an improvement which the municipality ought to undertake, but now it is evident that there is a very large interest of the provincial Government—

Mr. RUSSELL. I say that that is incidental.

Mr. FOSTER. The provincial government has an interest in these expensive bridges, the life of which is imperilled by the channel being filled up. Then, added to that you have the draining of the lake

Mr. HUGHES.

and the consequent benefit to the lands of those who live on it or near it. When you go to the other consideration, it never has been and never can be a travelled route of general communication, so the interest of this Dominion Government is altogether subordinate. Now, there is a bridge, I understand, to be taken off the hands of the local government, and is to be maintained now by this Government. It is a provision for building a swing bridge, and that swing bridge will certainly be needed on a new line of communication, and it will take up one of the lines of communication as at present.

Mr. RUSSELL. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, there is a provision of \$800 for a swing bridge.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is where the channel is to cross.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a channel there now and a bridge there now.

Mr. RUSSELL. It was called a canal in the earlier stage.

Mr. FOSTER. But the Minister says it was open at high water. The whole discussion shows that this is a provincial and municipal matter entirely. How is this work to be done?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will be done by contract. The item for the bridge was \$800; earth excavation, \$4,200; cribwork, \$3,200; a swing bridge at Graham's road, \$800; contingencies, \$800. Graham's road is a travelled road. There is a bridge there at present.

Mr. FOSTER. What justification is there for taking up a bridge belonging to the provincial government, erecting a new structure and maintaining it for ever afterwards? We have not only got to build a bridge, but we have got to put a man there to swing it at a salary.

Mr. RUSSELL. This cuts through some private property, therefore they have to put a bridge there for the owner to cross. The engineer in Halifax explained his scheme to me in that way, and said he could cut through this channel.

Mr. FOSTER. I move that the item be reduced by \$800, and that no swing bridge be built there.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; do not do that. It should have been \$10,000, and \$1,000 has been cut off already.

Amendment negatived.

Salmon River, Halifax County—

Freight-shed on wharf..... \$500

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Salmon River is a village 100 miles east of Halifax. It is proposed to put a shed on the wharf. The wharf is close by one of the most im-

portant gold-mining districts in Nova Scotia, and there is considerable travel to it.

Mr. BERGERON. Cannot the people themselves build a shed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a public wharf, and we could not allow the people to put a shed on it. It is owned by the Dominion Government. The shed will protect the freight.

Mr. FOSTER. Is not \$500 an enormous sum to put a shed there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The officials inform me that \$500 is not more than enough to put up a respectable freight shed, and there is to be in connection with the same a waiting-room. It is a place where steamers call to and fro. In stormy weather there should be some accommodation of that nature for the public.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the shed is desirable. But I have been informed by a resident of the locality that the title of the land had not been vested in the Crown before the wharf was built.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that the lot on which the inner end of the wharf rests was part of a public roadway. It is public property, undoubtedly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would suggest that before any more expenditure is made here the department should first ascertain that the title to the land is properly vested in the Crown. I was also informed that the expenditure on the wharf was not by public tender.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it was not done by contract.

Mr. FOSTER. What did it cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The wharf has cost \$1,646.

Young's Landing, wharf..... \$900

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is in the county of Lunenburg. This sum will complete the wharf.

Mr. FOSTER. What line of travel is it on? What stops there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a settlement of about 1,500 people. It is not far from the town of Lunenburg, between Lunenburg and Mahone Bay.

Saw's Pit, wharf..... \$900

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is also in the county of Lunenburg, on the inner harbour of Lunenburg town. This will complete the work.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not understand the policy of building these wharfs.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, there is no new policy in it.

Mr. FOSTER. I never recollect going into wharf building of that kind. What we did was to try and take care of the wharfs handed over to us by the provincial governments. That was the extent of our work. But here is a multiplication of little wharfs all over the coast which afterwards have to be kept up, and which is certainly an extension of Dominion expenditure.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will find he is mistaken. He will find that quite a number of wharfs were built along the coast of Quebec and the maritime provinces, and I have no doubt, very properly built. There is no new policy in this. We are simply doing what has been the policy of many governments for many years.

Jordan Bay East—

To complete repairs to breakwaters.... \$1,200

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Jordan Bay is in Shelburne county. This is to repair the breakwater, an extensive work constructed some years ago, which has been very much damaged. There is a considerable lumber business done there. We have expended a sum of money on it, and this is to complete it.

Newellton, Cape Island—

Wharf ..... \$2,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a new wharf in Shelburne County.

Mr. FOSTER. Why is it being built?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Newellton is on Cape Island. It is proposed to build a wharf 150 feet long, 20 feet wide, with a depth of 7 feet of water at low tide. There is a large fishing industry all along that coast.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population of Newellton?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The population of the island is about 3,000. It would not be right to say the population of Newellton is 3,000, but Newellton is part of the island.

Shag Harbour, wharf ..... \$2,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Shag Harbour is also in the county of Shelburne. This is a place of about 600 people, eight miles west of Barrington village, and it is a place of some local importance.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this a new work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What does it accommodate?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a fishing section, a fairly well settled country, and there is no wharf in the vicinity.

Mr. FOSTER. Will these be toll wharfs?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this be the full cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. The votes for almost all these works in Shelburne and Queens will complete the works.

Mr. DAVIN. How did the fishermen get along before this?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They got on, but if we expect the fishing population to remain at home, we have to make their lot a little better, because we cannot expect the young people to be content with the discomforts that their fathers submitted to. I think we cannot do a better service than to provide wharfs here and there along the coast in the maritime provinces where the fishing industry is an important one.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, there is some exodus going on yet. I thought the policy of the Government was retaining the people in Canada.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not stop to say whether it is due to the policy of the Government or some other cause, but it is a fact that the exodus has been, to a considerable extent, checked. There has been a strong tendency on the part of the fishermen of the maritime provinces to go away, principally to Massachusetts, and we are trying to see whether we cannot, by such improvements as these, make the conditions of the people along the coasts of the maritime provinces somewhat better. There is still some exodus, but there is less than there was before.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. Minister has spoken with praiseworthy frankness. The information we had at the beginning of the session was that the exodus had been entirely stopped.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. While I will say that the conditions in the Dominion generally have very much improved, particularly in the western provinces, they have not improved in the maritime provinces so much as they have in the west. I hope hon. gentlemen will be considerate towards the efforts we are making to improve conditions along the coast.

Chebogue River—

Town Point wharf, repairs..... \$1,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the county of Yarmouth.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it a new wharf?

Mr. FOSTER.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is to repair an old work.

Mr. FOSTER. Do we own the work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. FLINT. Town Point wharf is one of the oldest wharfs in that part of the country. It was a very well built wharf; I cannot remember the date when it was built, but it must have been fifty or sixty years ago. Town Point Wharf was built in the western portion of Nova Scotia when that country was first settled. The first settlers landed there and proposed that that should be the location of the settlement, but the population subsequently moved away to Yarmouth. However, Town Point and its neighbourhood remained a very flourishing place, and the whole of the country near the mouth of the river is largely populated and is a flourishing section. This is one of the properties which, whether it was in the schedule or not, was handed over to the Dominion. It has never been any expense to the Government, although, I think, within the last seven or eight years, the Government ought to have expended some money there. The people were anxious to have an expenditure made there, but they endeavoured to get along as well as possible by making such local improvements as they could afford. The wharf has now reached a stage where these improvements are necessary, and it is advisable to put it in proper condition. This is an excellent point for landing goods, and the wharf serves the interests of a very large population.

Belliveau—

Repairs to breakwater..... \$2,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that, and what is accomplished when the breakwater is complete?

Mr. COPP. This breakwater is in the western portion of the county of Digby. The firm of Jones Bros. are situated there; they do an extensive West Indian trade, and also a coasting trade between Digby and the United States. This is a work that must have cost \$100,000 in the beginning. We spent \$3,500 last year on repairs, but we were not enabled to complete them. This \$2,000 is asked for to complete the repairs.

Trout Cove—

Breakwater, new block..... \$700

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that?

Mr. COPP. This is in Digby County. The year before last we spent \$9,000 on this work. It is a very important place. Last year, during a storm, the approach to the new work was washed away, and this \$700 is required to repair the approach to the breakwater.

West Berlin, beach protection works.... \$1,500

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that? What is being done?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is in Queen's County. This is required to build beach protection works 1,600 feet long, 10 feet wide and 5 feet high, where the beach has been gradually washed away. This is a new work, and this will be the whole cost. West Berlin is situated east of Liverpool, and is a fishing village of 400 inhabitants. The only harbour there is a small cove, protected by a shingly beach.

Parker's Cove, extension of wharf..... \$3,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In Annapolis County.

Mr. MILLS. I congratulate the Minister on making this expenditure, which is highly necessary. I presume it is done in response to a petition from parties in that section. I understand that it will be a direct benefit not only to the locality where the money is to be expended, but also to the fishing industry up and down the bay. It has, I understand, a direct reference to the establishment of the extensive fish-drying factory of Collas, Whitman & Co., who are doing a large business, not only in Annapolis, but in Halifax and other ports of the maritime provinces, as well as in Boston and Newfoundland. If all the expenditures will be of as much benefit to the business of Canada as this at Parker's Cove, the money will be well spent. While we are at this item, I could, with a good deal of propriety, call the Government's attention to another matter ; but, as the time is very short, and all of us wish to get away, I will only make a casual reference to it. I referred to the same matter when the Conservatives were in power ; that is, a necessity for a harbour of refuge at Margaretville. This not a local matter, but a maritime province matter. It has been asked for in a petition signed by the leading merchants and maritime men of all classes, from all the constituencies around the Bay of Fundy. The merchants and ship-owners of St. John, the ship-owners of Canning, the ship-owners of Parrsboro', and all the towns and cities around the Bay of Fundy and in the counties of Digby and Annapolis, have petitioned for a deep-water stone pier at Margaretville. As we are in growing times, when money is plentiful, when millions are being spent in other portions of Canada, now is the time for a deep-water stone pier at Margaretville. It is necessary upon numerous grounds. It is necessary, first, for the preservation of life and property. From Digby to Five Islands there is not a harbour of refuge on that rock-bound coast. If a harbour had been placed at Margaretville, hundreds of lives would have been saved in the last twenty-five years. I took the trouble in 1892 of getting all the disasters from the Marine Department that had occurred on that coast, and in "Hansard" of 1892 will be found the list which I gave of those disasters, showing

the tremendous loss of life and property that had occurred. One resulted in the loss of the Government steamer "Princess Louise," together with a number of lives. Men of experience, such as captains, merchants and ship-owners, who understand the rise and fall of the tides and winds on the rock-bound coast of the Bay of Fundy, have all given their opinion, that if a harbour of refuge had been within eight or ten miles of Margaretville or of Digby Gut, the "Princess Louise" would not have been lost. I only make mention of that as a single instance. I could bring before this House, if necessary, something like fifty disasters. Not a season goes by without some disaster of more or less magnitude occurring on that coast. Suppose it would require \$150,000 or \$200,000 to put a harbour of refuge there, it would be money well expended, and a million have been voted here on works of far less consequence. Seventy thousand dollars was voted here the other day, to be expended on a wharf where there was no water at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not voted.

Mr. MILLS. At all events a great deal of discussion took place with reference to it. But here is a matter of the utmost importance to the people of the maritime provinces as regards the preservation of life and property. I will not go into the details as time is short, but I refer to this matter, so that I will have it to say that at least I brought it to the attention of the Government. I can put it also on another ground. If a deep water stone pier were placed at Margaretville, the Nova Scotia Central Railway would extend its road there, which would increase the commercial importance of that locality and the country round about. I hope that because I happen to be a Conservative, the Government will not be influenced by that consideration, for let me tell you, Sir, that there is no place in the county of Annapolis where I have so few political friends. I do not suppose I have ten there, and I have gone there, time and again, and told the people that I did not care a snap of my finger whether they voted for me or not. But the building of a stone pier there is of the utmost importance to the whole country round and to the Bay of Fundy. The town of Annapolis is interested, the people of Granville are interested, the people of Digby are interested, all of the maritime men around the Bay of Fundy are deeply interested in this work.

Harbourville, extension of wharf..... \$2,500

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This covers the whole cost.

Wolfville, harbour improvements..... \$4,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a new work, and this will be the whole cost. Wolfville is in King's County and the site

of the Acadia University and one of the most beautiful towns in the lower provinces.

Parrsboro', dredging ..... \$5,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This dredging work was begun some years ago and the harbour is filling up again. It is an important shipping centre in Cumberland County, the place from which the Springhill mines ship their coal, and the centre of a large lumber industry.

Brulé, wharf repairs ..... \$1,200

Mr. SPROULE. My information is that \$250 would complete the whole work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have here an estimate, giving all the details amounting to \$1,200, but I shall ask my deputy to see that the divisional engineers is called on to make another examination. I am confident, however, that the hon. gentleman's information is not correct.

Tatamagouche, wharf repairs ..... \$350

Mr. SPROULE. I am told that \$50 would be an outside estimate.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend's informant is mistaken. It cannot be possible that the divisional engineers would report that \$350 were required if \$50 would do the work. Here is their estimate :

9,760 feet of plank .....	\$136 64
1,760 feet plank .....	93 64
2,040 stringers .....	31 00
2,376 stringers .....	23 00
Renewing outer end of crib.....	25 00

This is in the county of Colchester.

Malignant Cove, breakwater..... \$5,000

Mr. COCHRANE. Are all these in Nova Scotia ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I ought to apologize for modesty when we are spending on one harbour in Ontario more than twice as much as all the harbour and river works in Nova Scotia.

Mr. CLARKE. What harbour ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Port Colborne.

Mr. FOSTER. You have not explained this Malignant breakwater ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to open up a channel of 320 feet long by 30 feet wide to a depth of 3 feet below low water level, to afford access to the boats of fishermen. It is estimated that this will cover the entire cost of the work.

Harbours and Rivers—

Brooklyn, wharf ..... \$2,500

Mr. FOSTER. Where is Brooklyn ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is in Queen's County.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this a new wharf ?

Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. There is a large work there which is to cost a great deal of money, and for which the people have been asking for some years. We think the construction of this small work will serve some of the purposes of the other. This will be the entire cost of the wharf.

Harbours and Rivers—

Chezzetcook, wharf..... \$3,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is in the county of Halifax—the eastern part. There is a large French section there.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this cover the whole cost of the work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. How many of these works in Nova Scotia are new works ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot give the information at the moment, but I will look them over and let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) know. In the case of nearly all the works in Nova Scotia, particularly those in my own constituency, they are works of small cost—the items we have given will, in nearly every case, finish the work.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sure that the righteous soul of that severe economist, J. Israel Tarte, will be much disturbed when he returns and looks over these Estimates. He will view with dissatisfaction the riotous extravagance with which—I was going to say hundreds, but that would be a slight exaggeration—of places in Nova Scotia are provided with all kinds of works. There are some commendable works, but we have not been able, and we are not able, at this period of the session, to make a proper investigation or criticism of these votes. The hon. Prime Minister is anxious to push us out of the House. He spoke the other day of that glorious time of prorogation. Though he has been congratulating the country on having men in Parliament who will give us righteous legislation, as he says, yet he seems to be very anxious that legislation should cease and that we should leave this House of Commons for our homes. We are voting millions after millions, putting mortgages on every farm in this country, and loading the country down with liabilities of every description that will have to be explained to the people—

Mr. MCGREGOR. We will explain from his little constituency, fifteen votes in this section alone.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) will do much explaining. He is about ready for the nice job that is waiting for him. He has not the slightest intention of explaining.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Yes, I have ; you come up there and see.

Mr. WALLACE. He will leave explanations to his successor. We are patting through these Estimates in a prefatory way, with only the slightest explanation if any at all. It looks as if the Government did not know what to do with the people's funds, but shovelled out the money to every person who asked for it, or, as we have found in many cases, when it has never been asked for at all.

Mr. FOSTER. It is refreshing to find that, in this hurly-burly, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), as usual, never loses sight of himself. I find that there are for his little constituency, fifteen votes.

Mr. COCHRANE. You do not say so.

Mr. FOSTER. Last year some one on the back benches intimated that they thought the Minister of Finance was a little selfish in making appropriations, and having got the reputation, I suppose he now wants to justify it.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is it true, that he has 137 miles of railway, too?

Mr. FOSTER. I was not talking about the inland. These are just his coast defences; these are the outskirts. When you come to the internal parts, there are arteries and veins in every direction.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I ought to be obliged to my hon. friend for bearing testimony to my zeal on behalf of my constituents, but I am afraid he is giving me some credit that I ought not to claim. He has taken every little appropriation for repairs to wharfs, and treated the whole thing as if amounting to a very large sum. He will find that most of these expenditures are for extensions or repairs of old works. He will find but few new works in the two counties, because there are two counties I represent, stretching along on a most exposed part of the Atlantic coast for 120 to 150 miles. If you follow the sinuosities of the coast, you have a coast line of 150 miles. The cost of the new works proposed in the two counties of Shelburne and Queen's will be less than the cost of one new work which we have undertaken to do in the county of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to know the number of places where money has been spent in order to secure the Minister of Finance a seat in this House? We ought to know just how much he is costing the country.

Mr. COCHRANE. I want to ask the Minister of Finance if this money is to be all expended by day's work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the new works, as a rule, ought to be done by public tender, unless the engineers report exceptional circumstances to the contrary.

That is my own desire, and I shall endeavour to carry it out.

Mr. COCHRANE. Because, although you have no machine there, as they have in Ontario, if you have all that done by day's work, it will be a machine that will do effective work for the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid the hon. gentleman cannot conceive the possibility of anybody being elected except by these devious ways to which he refers. I have no expectation of obtaining any credit from the counties of Shelburne and Queen's, except that which comes from doing something for the general good of the community. No individuals are to benefit from these works. These new works, so far as possible, will be done by public tender and contract, and the contracts will probably be taken, as in so many cases, by people outside of the county altogether.

Prince Edward Island—

Pier or breakwater at Rocky Point, Lot  
15 ..... \$1,500

Mr. FOSTER. We want a full explanation of this.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This wharf is to be built at the south-east entrance of Egmont Bay. There is a large number of fishermen in that locality, and they have no protection from the south-east gales from the sea. The wharf is to be built at the intersection of two ridings, East and West Prince, in township 15, where it almost joins with township 13. It is a modest structure, strongly recommended by Senator Yeo, who lives near the locality, and who understands all about it, and has been pressing for it for some years.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, he still takes an interest in such things.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, he takes an interest in all sorts of good enterprises, and, as my hon. friend knows, he is one of the most estimable men that I think any county could be blessed with, because he is absolutely unselfish.

West Point Pier—

Extension ..... \$4,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is a pier built some years ago at West Point. It has been a great boon to the fishermen and those who were engaged in shipping in that locality. But it was found that about 100 feet from the end of the present pier there is a shallowing of water. It was at first proposed to dredge through that, but the proposition was abandoned as impracticable, it extending 180 or 200 feet.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this to be done by contract and tender?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Canoe Cove, breakwater ..... \$10,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is a work which has been for many years, almost since I have been a member of the House, petitioned for by the people. Canoe Cove is on the south side of Prince Edward Island. It is the only work I have ever managed to get for my constituents. It is 18½ miles from Charlottetown, lying between Charlottetown and the town of Crapaud. It is a thickly-settled community, with not only very large farming interests, but there are many lobster and codfish fishermen. They are entirely exposed, without protection, to the sweep of the sea, when the wind blows from the south-east and the south-west. Three projects were started. One was to build a small independent breakwater, not connected with the land at all, which would afford simply protection for the boats, and would not afford anything in the nature of accommodation for the farmers to ship from. The other was a more ambitious project, to build a lengthy breakwater, running out into the sea, and also making it a pier; but it would cost so much money that I did not feel like recommending it to Council. The third proposition was more modest, and that was for the construction of 500 feet of breakwater, which at high tide and half tide would give a depth of water sufficient to enable the steamboat which runs from Charlottetown to Crapaud, to call, and give accommodation to the farmers to get on the steamboat there and carry their produce to the Charlottetown market, while at the same time affording excellent protection to fishing boats. The local engineer estimates that it would cost about \$13,000. We have only taken a vote for \$10,000, under the belief that ordinary timber, such as we use in that part of the country, not creosoted, would be amply sufficient for the purposes intended.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that teredo work there?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, to some extent; not so much as the engineers fear, except around the wharfs in cities. It has been very injurious to the wharfs. This will be a great accommodation to the farmers in the district, and will enable them to have communication with the Charlottetown market by sending their produce by the steamer which runs twice a week between Charlottetown and Crapaud. It will also supply a very large need, and will be a protection to the fishermen engaged in fishing on that coast.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Sir Louis Davies), if he has taken into consideration a petition from

Mr. FOSTER.

the people of Wood Islands for the extension of the breakwater there?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries who seems to have charge in regard to items for Prince Edward Island, if he proposes any expenditures on the Wood Island breakwater. The hon. Minister told me a year or two ago when I applied for a grant for the Bell River breakwater, that it was the intention of the Government to put the wharf at Wood Islands in good repair to test it and see whether or not it could be made a useful harbour, and thus obviate the necessity of making a harbour at Bell River. I have understood that engineers have been down there making surveys, but I see nothing in the Estimates indicating that the Government intend to do anything. When the hon. gentleman was on this side of the House he pressed upon the Government the necessity of doing something there. The late Government spent some money there, but the hon. gentleman has admitted himself that there is still a great deal to be done. I am sorry that this harbour has been overlooked. The Government two years ago refused to make improvements at Bell River at the request of a large number of farmers who are dependent for shipping their products in having the wharf at this point in good repair, and now I find that both of these works are neglected. I asked a question of the hon. gentleman some time ago in regard to a petition for the dredging of Pinette Harbour. The hon. gentleman said he had received no petition. I am advised that a petition has been forwarded to the Government. I am astonished at the hon. Minister stating that no petition has been received. As far as this whole southern section of Prince Edward Island is concerned, it has received very little attention since this Government came in. I think, considering the urgent demand that the hon. gentleman made on the late Government for wharf improvement in the southern section of the Island, it is rather surprising that he should treat this portion of the Island in this way by neglecting these works.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As far as I can make out what the hon. gentleman has been saying, I understand that he is asking whether we intend to make some appropriation to further improve the Wood Islands breakwater. Nobody appreciates the desirability of improving this harbour more than I do. It is an important point and the question is whether the present breakwater should be extended. If it is extended we will have to extend it on both sides, and that will necessitate the expenditure of a large amount of money, but that is no reason why it should

not be done. As far as I am personally concerned, I did not know that there was a report from a local engineer during this past season, but I will make it my business to inquire at the public department about it. In regard to Pinette Harbour, I have received no petition from anybody. The matter was under discussion some years ago, and it was contended that the rocky bottom could not be dredged to a sufficient extent to justify the large expenditure that would be incurred. I will make it my special business to go to the Public Works Department and see if there is a petition. I have not lost sight of the southern portion of the Island. We have obtained from the Government a very respectable vote for a railway that is needed for the shipment of the produce in that portion of the Island. I admit that they have been at a disadvantage along that coast, but we are trying to improve the conditions there and to overcome these disadvantages. I will do everything in my power to see that the Wood Islands breakwater is improved to the fullest extent possible. I have made a visit there nearly every year and inspected it personally. The work we have built there is in very good condition so far as it is concerned. It may be that that will be extended on both sides so as to form a channel through which the water would rush and give a greater depth, or it may be that dredging would be required. If it required to be dredged it would be impossible for the dredge to go there this year, because it is already pledged to other places. When we have ascertained what is best to be done, I will apply myself to see if the plan agreed upon cannot be carried out.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) can shelter himself behind the small grant of money that Prince Edward Island has received for a few miles of railway in the southern portion of the Island. I think if the hon. gentleman will look over the amounts that have been voted since his party has been in office for railways, canals and bridges he will find that a very small share has fallen to Prince Edward Island.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That has nothing to do with the vote before the committee. Do not let us open up that question now.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman himself has opened up that question by saying that on account of the proposed expenditure on a few miles of railway in Prince Edward Island there was no money to keep piers and wharfs in repair. These hon. gentlemen boast that they have voted \$250,000 for a piece of railway in Prince Edward Island, but I find that over \$30,000,000 has been voted by this Parliament for railways and canals since 1896, and I believe the sum is at least \$32,000,000. If we had a fair share

of the current expenditure it would not be \$250,000 that would go to Prince Edward Island, but \$750,000 or \$800,000. I think the hon. gentleman has made the statement himself, before his party came into power, that Prince Edward Island was entitled to expenditure of \$2,000,000, so far as the debt expenditure goes. Since this party came in we have not got our fair share of the current expenditure and the claims for \$2,000,000 remains intact. Prince Edward Island has received a much smaller amount for wharfs and piers than she is entitled to, and I am astonished that the hon. Minister should make the statement he has made.

North Cardigan, repairs to pier..... \$300

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Before that item passes I would like to ask whether arrangements have been made for repairs and extensions to Chapel Point wharf, to which I referred last session?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. An arrangement has been made in that direction.

Mr. MACDONALD (P. E. I.) These repairs are going on this season?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

St. Nicholas River, wharf..... \$1,500

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). In Kent County. It is proposed to erect this wharf near the mouth of the river. It is an important point for the outlet of the lumber and other products about there.

Campobello, New Brunswick—

Breakwater, repairs and extension.... \$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. Does this complete the work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, the estimate is \$19,900.

Mr. FOSTER. What will be done?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Some 200 or 300 feet of extension is required, and the whole work may have to be renewed. It is in very bad shape.

Mr. FOSTER. How will this work be done?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If it has all to be renewed, it will have to be done by tender and contract. If it is not all renewed, I do not know that that will be practicable.

Hopewell Cape, New Brunswick—

Wharf ..... \$6,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is this a new wharf?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a new wharf. Application has been made by the people of Hope-

well for an extension and repairs of the existing wharf. The wharf is a very necessary and useful one to the people who use the river from Moncton down. This is the only point in the neighbourhood where access can be had to the shore, and there is an urgent necessity for the extension of this wharf to deeper water. I understand that the estimates made by the department of the cost of the work are very much in excess of this sum, running up to \$27,000. Upon ascertaining that, I had a communication with the member for the county and with other people resident in the county as to whether or not equally good facilities could not be provided a little further up the river, at a reasonable and moderate cost. The opinion entertained by the people in the locality is that further up the river a wharf can be built for not more than \$8,000 or \$9,000, which will answer every purpose, and will not have to be built so far out into the river in order to reach deep water. That would be much cheaper and more economical than to undertake to extend the existing wharf. In that view, I have asked that the appropriation for the work should be included in the present vote. If that should prove to be impracticable, I would not feel, without further inquiry, like asking the department to expend so large an amount as \$27,000, even extending over a period of years, for this purpose.

St. John River and Belleisle Bay, N.B.—

New wharfs ..... \$2,500

Mr. FOSTER. Where are these to be placed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are, I think, two of them in Belleisle Bay, and one or two along the river. These were inserted at my request—but just at what points they are I am not sure. They are in the counties of King's, Queen's and Sunbury. They are built under arrangement with the provincial government, which contributes half the cost.

Cape Tormentine—

Repairs to breakwater (revote \$2,500).. \$7,500

Mr. FOSTER. Will that put Cape Tormentine in a good state of repair ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. By no means a perfect state. The proposal is to place a stone embankment around the place to prevent the further displacement of the walls. But this is by no means sufficient to restore the work.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not understand that there was any displacement of the work. I understood that the trouble was with the borer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These borers weaken the timbers and make them much more subject to the action of the sea. It is thought that by placing stones along the base of the

Mr. BLAIR.

wharfs they would be strengthened and kept in place and enabled to resist the action of the water, and therefore resist displacement. The expenditure is very moderate in comparison with the needs.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the worm still go on ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is some fear that it may.

Mr. MILLS. There was an agitation in the Public Works Department to have a sort of factory for the manufacture of a composition of timber and creosote which resist the ravages of the worm.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That matter is still under consideration, and the project is considered very desirable, but quite costly.

Mr. MILLS. It is very desirable that such a thing should be accomplished, because all the works around the Bay of Fundy get wrecked in a very short time by this worm.

Main River—

Wharf ..... \$3,800

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is required for the construction of a wharf 150 feet long, 310 feet wide, and 18 feet deep, on the Main River bridge, two miles from the sea, on the Richibucto River. This, with the revote of \$200 in the main Estimates, will make \$4,000 required for the construction of this wharf.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is the centre of a very fine tract of country, which produces lumber on quite a large scale, and it is from that particular point the surrounding country distributes its products.

Mr. FOSTER. Does any line of steamers go there ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Shippegan, wharf ..... \$5,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is at a point on Shippegan Island, where there is a large fishing village. There are at least forty vessels there engaged in the fishing business, without any wharf accommodation, and it is estimated that at the outside the cost will not exceed \$8,000. I am in hopes that it will be brought down below that figure.

Mr. McALISTER. Was there not a grant of \$4,000 last year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The expenditures last year was on the breakwater and there was none on the wharf.

Campbellton—

Repairs to ballast wharf, further amount required to complete (revote) ..... \$1,000

Mr. McALISTER. Is that all the repairs intended to be made this year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a vote in the main Estimates also.

Mr. McALISTER. The town of Campbellton is a large shipping port, where large steamships go to load with lumber for Europe, besides a number of square-rigged vessels. With the present accommodation, it is almost impossible for the merchants to ship from there with any degree of convenience at all. Last year the hon. Minister of Public Works was down and examined the place, and he said he had no idea whatever of its importance, and admitted that the facilities were not at all adequate to the business done. After looking over the whole situation, he told the people that they had been sadly neglected in the past, and promised to send a dredge down to dredge out the river. The ferry wharf, which is of no use whatever, was to be immediately put in shape so that the ferry boat could land there. The ferry boat lands at a private wharf, and should the owner of that wharf refuse permission, the ferry boat could not land at Campbellton at all. The shipping merchants as well as other business people of the town of Campbellton, and also the town of Campbellton, memorialized the Government last winter for a grant to take over the private wharf, which could be purchased and repaired for about \$7,000 or \$8,000. The public wharf, as it is, is of no use, because you can only get at it, as the engineer knows, by going over the private wharf.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is that the Mowat wharf?

Mr. McALISTER. Yes; it is owned now by Mr. Shives. I was told that the Minister promised to take over this wharf. I did not hear him say so himself. He promised that the appropriation of last year, \$2,500, would be spent on the wharf, and I was present when he promised to have the ferry wharf put in repair. But nothing has been done, and either the Minister has forgotten or else he did not intend to carry out his promise. We have a case where \$70,000 was voted for a wharf where there was no water and no business. It seems too bad that an important place like Campbellton, a place, which as the Minister of Public Works said, had been sadly neglected, should be still overlooked, while places of less importance received liberal grants.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With regard to the wharf to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. McAlister) has referred as having been the subject of an appropriation of \$70,000, I may as well explain that that vote is not being proceeded with. As to the present item we have an estimate of \$750, and now \$1,000, a total of \$1,750 available for the work. I admit that that is not enough. The previous vote, unfortunately, was allowed to lapse. We had expected to be able to buy the material with that vote. That not having been done, it will be neces-

sary to provide the materials out of this vote. The total sum available is less than will be required, and we shall have to see if we cannot devise means to add something to it.

Harbours and Rivers—Quebec—

Black Brook, wharf ..... \$2,500

Mr. FOSTER. Is that in Northumberland County?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, on the Miramichi River. There is a 9 feet depth of water at low tide. The estimated cost is \$5,270. I have asked the engineers if they cannot cut that down, and they demur a little, but I suppose we can try.

Harbours and Rivers—Quebec—

New Carlisle, repairs to wharf ..... \$2,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that?

The PRIME MINISTER. In Bonaventure County.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it near Maria?

Mr. McALISTER. It is about nine or ten miles away.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to renew the old flooring and to replace some of the stringers.

Mr. McALISTER. This work is necessary.

Harbours and Rivers—Quebec—

Carleton, extension of landing pier..... \$8,400

Mr. BERGERON. Where is that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is in Bonaventure. My hon. friend from Restigouche (Mr. McAlister) knows about it.

Mr. McALISTER. The steamer lands at this wharf going up and down. The present wharf is entirely inadequate to meet the requirements of the place.

Mr. FOSTER. Will this finish the work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Harbours and Rivers—

Newport, breakwater..... \$3,000

Mr. BERGERON. Where is that?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is in Gaspé; a new wharf is being built there.

Mr. FOSTER. What will it cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The estimated cost is \$6,500.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that work to be done by tender?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I know of no reason why it should not be.

Mr. BERGERON. I am glad to hear the Minister say that. But we can understand the awkward position the employees of the department are in. It is not the habit of the Minister of Public Works to have these things done by contract, but it should be so, and I am glad that the Prime Minister

and the Minister of Finance have said it is their opinion that it should be. But they should make a definite promise, and hold the Minister of Public Works to it when he comes back.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In new works especially, the work should be done by tender and contract, unless the engineers advise to the contrary for exceptional reasons.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand then, that this is a statement that this work will be done by tender and contract?

The PRIME MINISTER. I understand that all these works should be done by tender and contract, unless there is a reason which can be stated to Parliament and appreciated by Parliament.

Mr. BERGERON. That is right.

Mr. McALISTER. Did the department receive a memorial from the council of the township of Mann in the county of Bonaventure, asking for \$5,000 to build a ferry wharf at Grosse Point?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, there was such a memorial.

Mr. McALISTER. Is it the intention of the Government to make an appropriation towards the building of a wharf there this year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not at present. The engineers estimate that it is a work that would cost a considerable sum and we are not in a position to make any appropriation this session.

Mr. McALISTER. The municipality asked for \$5,000, if they got that they would be satisfied, because it would place the wharf in such a shape that the ferry boat could land there with some convenience. At present there is no landing place whatever, and at low tide the ferry boat has to anchor out from the shore. Teams can only cross at certain stages of the tide. At low spring tide passengers have to run ashore for quite a distance in a small boat, and after that to be carried to the beach. The state of the landing is in a shameful condition. I think the people living there had an engineer examine it, and he came to the conclusion that \$5,000 would put it in such a shape that it would serve the purpose for the present. I know that the Minister of Public Works stated last year that it would cost over \$30,000, but the engineer who surveyed it estimated that \$5,000 would put it in a fit shape for use. I may say that this place is not in my constituency. This is an important place, and has a station on the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway immediately back of it. A great many people coming from the lower part of Bonaventure County come across there to Campbellton to do business, and stay there all night. The next morning they

Mr. BERGERON.

go across, taking the train at this place for home. Even if it cost \$30,000 or \$40,000, it would be money well spent. At present passengers can only land conveniently during high water. If they are in a hurry, they very often lose their passage altogether from the fact that they cannot cross at low tide.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall ask the department to take note of my hon. friend's remarks. It is a common occurrence that the people of a district assume that a work could be done for a small sum and when we send an engineer he discovers that the popular impression is entirely erroneous. Such seems to be the case in this particular matter. The engineer states that the local opinion that this work could be done for a small sum is a mistake. However, the importance of the work may be such as will amply justify a larger expenditure, and this will have to be considered hereafter.

Mr. McALISTER. It would amply justify the expenditure of \$30,000 or \$40,000, or even more than that. This is not in my constituency, it is opposite Campbellton. The municipal officers of the township of Mann have been corresponding with me about it and asked me to assist the member of that county towards securing a grant for it. I speak from personal knowledge of the situation, and I know there is great need for a public landing there.

Cacouna—

Extension to wharf, to complete..... \$5,000

Mr. BERGERON. What vessels go to the wharf at Cacouna?

The PRIME MINISTER. None at all so far, because there is no wharf; but when there is a wharf vessels will call there.

Mr. BERGERON. Do you mean to say that vessels coming from Rivière du Loup now will stop at Cacouna?

The PRIME MINISTER. Cacouna is further down the river. I do not think the boats of the Richelieu Company will use this wharf; it will be used by local boats.

Mr. FOSTER. There is nothing there, it is only a summer resort, and people cannot use that wharf. It is all dry land when the tide is out, with fishing brush weirs and the like of that here and there. It is absolutely impossible for vessels to come within two or three miles of that, except at very exceptional stages of the tide. I have walked all over these flats and know them well.

The PRIME MINISTER. There may be a good deal of truth in what my hon. friend says; but he remembers that this work was commenced by the Government of which he was a member, and was not completed. In order to make available the money he has expended there, we must expend a little more.

Mr. BERGERON. There may be something useful there, but I do not think a wharf can be useful. If I remember right, there is a pier or block. If it has been of any use in the past, it has only been as a refuge in case of thick fog.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not a wharf in the proper sense of the word.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed by the engineer that there is a block which has been there for some years, and this is to extend it to the shore.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the distance between that block and the shore?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Three hundred and four feet. This block occupies a place of splendid isolation.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the best thing the Government can do is to leave it in its splendid isolation.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not see any use for this wharf, except that it may be useful as a place of refuge. It certainly is of no use for anything else.

Mr. FOSTER. Anyway, there is no fishing done there to any extent. Cacouna is not noted as a fishing place.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Deputy Minister informs me that this block has been extended from year to year, and that this is to continue a work that was commenced years ago.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, it has not been a good work.

Les Eboulements—  
Repairs to wharf, to complete..... \$800

Mr. BERGERON. What boat calls there?

The PRIME MINISTER. All the Richelieu boats stop at Les Eboulements.

Cap à L'Aigle—  
Addition to wharf and general repairs (including revote of lapsed amount, \$1,245)..... \$1,500

Mr. BERGERON. What boats call there?

The PRIME MINISTER. The Richelieu boats stop at Cap à L'Aigle every day.

Mr. BERGERON. Since when?

The PRIME MINISTER. Cap à L'Aigle is on the other side of Murray Bay, and there are just as many tourists on that side as on the other.

Mr. BERGERON. I know that, but I did not know that the boats stopped there.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Will that finish the work?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Ste. Irénée—  
Completion of wharf to shore (including revote of balance, 1898-1899, \$776.50).. \$1,200

Mr. BERGERON. Where is that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is in Charlevoix County, west of Murray Bay, and it is the amount required to complete the wharf.

Mr. BERGERON. Do the steamers stop there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The steamers will stop there.

Kamouraska—  
Construction of an "L" (revote)..... \$2,300

Mr. BERGERON. What steamer goes there? No Richelieu boats go there.

The PRIME MINISTER. The boats between Quebec and the lower ports of the south shore stop there.

St. André de Kamouraska, wharf..... \$7,000

The PRIME MINISTER. This is a new wharf, which will cost, to complete, \$13,000.

Mr. BERGERON. It will be done by tender, I suppose.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, it comes within the rule.

Mr. FOSTER. What is there at St. André de Kamouraska?

The PRIME MINISTER. There is a prosperous village and a large manufactory of agricultural implements.

Isle aux Grues, North Shore—  
Construction of wharf and purchase of land ..... \$6,200

Mr. BERGERON. That is a new wharf.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is in Montmagny. It is some little distance from Grosse Isle, and it has one hundred or two hundred families. They have no accommodation whatever, and this work is proposed, so that they may have the service of the steamboats.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the land been bought?

The PRIME MINISTER. No; nothing has been done yet.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The land will cost only \$200, and this vote will cover everything.

St. Jérôme, Lake St. John—  
Wharf ..... \$5,000

Mr. BERGERON. What is the estimated cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This will cost \$8,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Will it be done by tender?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have said that so very often.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, during the last two or three years the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) has intimated that works would be done by tender, and we have found that most of them were not done by tender. We are all interested in seeing that these works do not cost the country any more money than they should.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

St. Gédéon, Lake St. John—

Wharf ..... \$3,000

Mr. BERGERON. This is a new wharf. How much will it cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Seven thousand dollars.

Baie des Honfleur, Lake St. John—

Wharf ..... \$500

Mr. BERGERON. You are going to cover that lake with wharfs.

Mr. FOSTER. I know it will do no good, but I will enter my protest against this. There is an inland lake, that has no communication with the outside at all. It is not a lake around which any large business is carried on, and you are placing about that inland lake, inhabited but slightly, without any towns, \$5,000 to \$20,000 wharfs, sowing them in every direction. I never saw such an absolute carnival of expenditures in this line in my life. I can tell the hon. Prime Minister that if he undertakes to put these votes into effect, and he may depend upon it that it will be made patent to the country, he will regret it. If the people of this country knew it, they would rise in rebellion against it. There is no doubt about that. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) knows that what I am stating is true. Here you are studding the shores of a little inland lake, sparsely inhabited, with little boats going around it, with wharfs that would grace the sea-port towns and the towns along the great lakes in Ontario. And the local government and the municipalities have nothing to do with them. This Government supplies all the money.

The PRIME MINISTER. At the present time there is one line of steamers going around the lake.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the tonnage?

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot say, but I know that that line is doing a great service there. A great deal of what my hon. friend has said is true; but Lake St. John is an inland sea, and if there is a portion of the country where the Government ought to come to the help of the people it is there. If, as the hon. gentleman says, the Government is to be called to account for this, I am quite able to take the responsibility before the country for what we

Mr. BERGERON.

have done, not only in that section, but in other sections, to encourage the people to help themselves.

Knowlton Landing, repairs..... \$750

Mr. BERGERON. What is this for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is required for repairs. The flooring is much decayed and dangerous.

Mr. BERGERON. By whom was that wharf built at first?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is a wharf on Lake Memphramagog, built by our predecessors. It has got into bad order and is dangerous for carriages. The wharf is touched at regularly by a large steamer which plies on the lake, both for business and tourist travel. Lake Memphramagog is one of the most beautiful lakes in the country, if not on the continent, and is navigated by large vessels which touch at this wharf.

Mr. BERGERON. Why does the country pay for this wharf for these tourists?

The PRIME MINISTER. The objection of the hon. gentleman would have come in well at the proper time. But the wharf has been built, and this is to repair it.

Mr. BRITTON. A very different principle seems to have been adopted for the lower provinces from what has been applied in the province of Ontario. We have no such thing in the province of Ontario, with very rare exceptions.

Sabrevois, wharf..... \$5,500

Mr. BERGERON. Will the hon. gentleman explain this?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This vote is to be applied in the construction of a wharf at Sabrevois on the east side of the Richelieu River. It will consist of pile work, 108 feet long by 30 feet wide, parallel to the shore, with an ice-breaker on its upstream end, and an approach, also of pile-work, 120 feet long by 24 feet wide, connected with the shore by a stone and gravel embankment, 200 feet long and 24 feet wide on top. There will be a depth of eight feet along the outer face of the wharf at extreme low water. The sum of \$5,500 covers, besides the pile-work and earth embankment, the cost of erecting a freight shed.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is a wharf and a freight shed erected by the Government on this little river running through the province of Quebec. What is the business at this place, and what steamers call at it?

The PRIME MINISTER. What my hon. friend calls a little river is the second largest river in the province of Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. I am talking of a river for navigation purposes.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. If there is a busy river in Canada, it is that river.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What lines of steamers ply on it?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I do not know, but I know that it is covered by steamers.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I think the right hon. gentleman does know a great deal about this particular scheme. This is part of a scheme, and a very bad one. First of all, the Government of Canada have leased an island there called Isle aux Noix, on which we have fortifications and barracks, which might be used for holding camps or for keeping troops. It is a very nice island, on which there are immense works which were built years ago by the Imperial Government. The Government of Canada have leased the island to a company of St. Johns, Que., in the county of the hon. Minister of Public Works. They are fixing up these barracks, and the Government of Canada is paying for a great deal of the repairs. They are fixing up the place for a summer hotel. It has a club-house, and the friends of the Minister of Public Works have steam yachts and sailing yachts there. The Government built a wharf last year at Iberville, which cost \$10,000, and at which only one barge has called since it was built. Otherwise, it has been used for tourists. The Government are building another wharf at St. Johns, where there is no traffic at all. It is built at the end of the property of a friend of the Minister of Public Works. And now they are asking for \$5,500 for a wharf at Sabrevois, where there is no possibility of traffic, but the wharf will be for the convenience of the gentlemen from l'Isle aux Noix. I do not think we have ever been called upon in this House to vote anything which so much deserves the condemnation of Parliament as this. There is no reason for it. We are simply voting money to a club of gentlemen who are rich enough to build a wharf for themselves. This vote is wholly indefensible and the right hon. gentleman cannot defend it.

Mr. **FOSTER**. If the assertion is true, and this committee swallows that vote, we might as well disband and go home and let people of this kind run riot with the finances of the country. For my part, I would feel like doing that. It is an outrage. We cannot describe it by any less strong term. There is no trade there, but there is a club composed of friends of the Minister of Public Works, who are going to run the place and have a high old time. They have their yachts, and the Department of Public Works puts before the committee a scheme of this kind to provide them with a wharf. And yet we are asked to have confidence in the administration of that department. From the Minister down I have not the slightest confidence in the administration, when they put such things before us as the

wharf at Maria and this one. It is a perfect outrage, and I am surprised that the right hon. First Minister will lend his sanction to it.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. There is no call for all this extravagant declamation.

Mr. **FOSTER**. If it were your money there would be.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. It is neither mine nor my honourable friend's, but the money of the public, of which we are the trustees. Before coming to a conclusion and using this harsh language, the hon. gentleman ought to have something more than the mere word of the hon. member for Beauharnois who has drawn largely on his imagination.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Ask your department.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Yes, and I will give the hon. gentleman the information which I have from the department, which will show him that there is no connection at all between this appropriation and the invention of the hon. member for Beauharnois. The motive set down for this vote is not at all to help the gentlemen who at present, as the hon. gentleman says, have established a club on that island. That may be true, but I know nothing about it. If the Government have let that property as a pleasure ground, which has been idle for years, I do not know that they have done anything wrong or that the scheme is not a meritorious one in itself. It is a beautiful place, and was of great importance before we had steam navigation, because it commanded the entrance of the Richelieu. It was fortified at the beginning of the century, but as everybody knows, would now be worth very little in case of invasion, because if the country should be invaded, it would not be by the Richelieu. There was a time when any invasion from the south came by that river and a fortification there was necessary, but now that we have lines of railway between Canada and the United States, at all points on the frontier, it is no longer of any importance. It may be that the Government have leased that island, but of that I have no recollection at this moment, and it may be that it has been converted into a pleasure ground. But this wharf is not to be on Isle aux Noix; it is on the east shore of the river, and, therefore, we may discard altogether the fancies conjured up by the hon. gentleman in connection with this vote. The building of a wharf there is another question, which we can discuss, but let us discuss it upon its merits and not upon any fanciful ground, simply to try and make an attack on the Minister of Public Works. What is the object of the vote? Mr. Morin, the proprietor of the land on which the wharf is to be built, will give a very large roadway, 40 feet wide, leading to the proposed structure.

From Sabrevois there are large shipments of butter, cheese, eggs, oats, hay, potatoes and cattle every season. Will the hon. member for Beauharnois deny that that valley of the Richelieu is a rich farming country, from which large shipments of agricultural products are made? This wharf is to be built, so as to give the farmers of that section the means of shipping their produce by the boats which ply on that river, and it is for that purpose it was built, and not at all for the convenience of gentlemen who have a pleasure ground at Isle aux Noix.

Mr. BERGERON. My right hon. friend knows nothing about it. I would like to know if a boat can go there? I do not think that a boat can go there except some yachts which do not draw much water. Where did these people, who are shipping this butter and cheese and other products go before? They would not go that way. Last year the hon. gentleman allowed his Government to spend \$10,000 at Iberville on a wharf, and only one barge has gone there since it was built.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. How does my hon. friend know that?

Mr. BERGERON. I know it from the people of the place.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman pledge his word that only one barge went to that wharf last year?

Mr. BERGERON. I will. I rely upon the man who told me. I am not speaking of yachts, but of barges that carry produce. This wharf will be exactly in the same position. What difference does it make to me personally whether the Minister of Public Works spends the public money uselessly or not, but I criticise this expenditure because I am here to do so and to see that the public money is not improperly expended.

The PRIME MINISTER. I give the hon. gentleman's statement a flat contradiction, and I base it on the authority of the engineer's report. There is no use for the hon. gentleman to try and get away from the position. This wharf is to be built on a section of the river where there is a large farming population, and when he says it cannot be approached by steamers I take issue on that point.

Mr. BERGERON. How far is it from Isle aux Noix?

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot say.

Mr. BERGERON. You can find out from your engineer.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, find out.

Mr. TAYLOR. Neither this nor any other Government has any right to deal differently with one province than with another. There are lots of islands in the St. Lawrence, in

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

the province of Ontario, where wharfs might be built. There is Howe Island, for instance. Has the Government ever spent a dollar around that island, and from that island there are large shipments of produce. But there the farmers united with the township for the purpose of building wharfs. Take the Rideau Canal from here to Kingston, on which millions have been spent by the British Government, and on which there are lakes three or four times the size of the lakes here. Take Rideau Lake and Portland, the docks at these places were erected by the municipalities. Westport erected its own docks. The business men of the place and the council joined together and built the wharf, and the Government never spent a dollar on wharfs through all that chain of lakes from here to Kingston. Why treat Ontario different from Quebec and Nova Scotia? Why should they not build these at Howe Island, Wolfe Island or Garden Island? These are large farming islands, comprising municipalities, and the Government never came to the rescue of the farmers of these islands who want to ship their butter, pork, cheese and eggs. But if a few farmers in Quebec want to send out a little produce, the Minister of Public Works must come down with a vote of \$5,000 or \$10,000 for a wharf, so that a steamboat may take the produce away. Why treat one section differently from another? It is simply a job on the part of the Minister of Public Works. I agree with the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), and I am sure he would not object to a vote for his own province if it was in the interest of the country. You may go the length of the St. Lawrence and Lake Ontario, from Montreal to Hamilton, and you will not find a place where the Government has put up a wharf. Where has there been any such expenditure in such places as Deseronto, Picton, Belleville, and so on? Private enterprise has put up the wharfs, and those using the wharfs are charged dockage. This method that the Government follows is simply spilling money into one province and making the other pay for it.

Mr. BERGERON. I wish to ask for a few items of information, which the hon. First Minister can look up before we meet at eight o'clock. What is the population of Sabrevois? What is the width of the river where this wharf is to be built? How far is it from where the wharf is to be built to Isle aux Noix? How was the trade of this place done before? What is the number of vessels that pass there? The attempt has been made to give certain information. I do not want to say anything against the officials of the department, but my impression is that if the Minister wants something done, he can always get an official who will report that it is necessary. It is not as it was in the good old times, when the employees were independent enough to give

their own opinions. But, now, every one of them, from the head of the department to the lowest officer, is so much afraid of the Ministers and the Government that they will do anything that the Minister wants them to do. So, before accepting any report, we should probe to the bottom of the scheme. If my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will get the information in answer to the questions I have asked, he will convince himself that this expenditure is not needed.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I want to say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) that the employees who are in the department to-day are the same as were there in the good old days that he speaks about—there has been no change. And I say for the honour of these gentlemen that I believe that in the good old days as in these days they were conscientious enough to do their duty without fear or favour, and that even in the old times when the hon. gentleman's friends were in office, they could not impose upon them or bambozzle them or bulldoze them. As to the remarks of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), he could not resist the temptation to raise a sectional cry. Why, if the Government to-day is building wharfs on the Richelieu River and other rivers—I will not say but that, perhaps, there may be occasion to revise that policy—complaints from the hon. gentleman comes a little late. He has supported the same policy for more than twenty years. We have just passed two votes to improve wharfs at Magog and Knowlton which were built under the same conditions. If there was a reason to build these wharfs at Magog and Knowlton, there is the same reason to build the wharf at Sabrevois.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). My hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) should be aware that we have expended a considerable amount of money in improving just such places as Cobourg, Port Hope, Whitby, and others, to say nothing of the large sums we have expended in improving the harbours of Toronto and Hamilton. And not only have large amounts been spent on the shores of Lake Ontario, but considerable expenditure has taken place also on Lake Erie. Very heavy expenditures have been made, as he knows very well, along the entire line of Lake Huron—at Goderich, Southampton, Kincardine, Collingwood, Owen Sound, and many other places.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. For dredging, not for dock building.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Very large expenditures indeed for the harbours—

Mr. **TAYLOR**. For wharfs?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Yes, for wharfs, and in connection with the improvement of the harbours. The

hon. gentleman and his friends are perfectly in order in criticising any expenditure that may be made for which no good cause can be shown. I have not a word to say against that. But I would say that it would not be desirable for us to introduce a sort of ward appropriation system, under which, if a sum of money is given to one particular province every other province claims a ratable proportion. Nothing could be worse than that, and I would advise my hon. friend and the members on both sides of this House, if they desire the welfare of the country, as far as possible to avoid the comparing of the expenditure in any year in one province with the expenditure in another. It will not tend to economy or to the public good.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. I am not making any such reference, but I say the Government are taking up works such as they have not done in Ontario. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) knows Howe Island, Wolfe Island and Garden Island as well as I do, and he knows that they are better entitled to have a dock built at the Government's expense than some of the places for which votes are now being given. I agree with him that we have spent large sums in dredging different ports that he has mentioned, but we have not built docks in any of these places.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE** (Mr. Fisher). If the hon. gentleman will refer to the Estimates of this year, he will find that he is in error. There are votes for such places as—

Mr. **TAYLOR**. I know there are political jobs introduced this year.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. This is only in continuation of the system which was commenced before. There are votes for Point Pelee on Lake Erie, and Keene on Indian River, and other places in the province of Ontario—just such wharfs as this.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. Just such jobs as are put up in the province of Quebec to help supporters of the Government.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. No, but in continuation of the same system that has been carried on for years.

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

### After Recess.

(In the Committee.)

Sabrevois, wharf ..... \$5,500

Mr. **BERGERON**. When the committee rose at six o'clock, I had asked the hon. gentleman to give me the population of Sabrevois, to say how far it is from Isle au Noix, the depth of the river at that place, and how the people bring their produce to market.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I have procured a memorandum which I think will cover the points raised by the hon. gentleman. Sabrevois is 7 miles above St. Johns and 5 miles below Isle aux Noix. The river opposite the village is 3,200 feet wide. The people of the surrounding district ship to Montreal, by boat and by rail, in large quantities, butter, cheese, hay, oats, potatoes, cattle and sheep. Sabrevois has one of the largest butter factories in the province of Quebec, with a daily output of 700 pounds, part of which is shipped to Montreal by rail, but it will be entirely shipped by boat, when proper landing facilities are provided. There is a daily line of steamboats between Lacolle and Montreal, with Sabrevois as a daily port of call. The proposed wharf will be devoted entirely to commercial purposes. The yacht club is at Isle aux Noix, 5 miles above Sabrevois. The average depth of water is 8 feet.

**Mr. SPROULE**. What kind of boats would you have calling in 8 feet of water?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. River boats which draw less than 8 feet.

**Mr. TALBOT**. Some of the finest boats running on the St. Lawrence River from Quebec down to Montréal draw 5 feet of water. We have splendid boats running between St. Antoine and Lotbinière drawing 5 feet of water and less. These boats carry as many as 500 or 600 people on excursions, and tons and tons of freight besides.

**Mr. BERGERON**. How far is Sabrevois from the upper part of the canal at St. Johns?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Seven miles above the entrance of the canal. There is only 7 feet of water in the canal; therefore, the depth of water in the Richelieu is greater than that in the canal. The population of the village of Sabrevois is 200. Of course, there is a large district of country outside the village served by that wharf. People come from some miles around the district to the Sabrevois wharf with their produce.

**Mr. BERGERON**. I understand there is no wharf there now. How do they ship their eggs and dairy products from Sabrevois to-day?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. There is an old landing, which is used to some extent now, and some of the trade goes by rail.

**Mr. BERGERON**. Is there any boat plying there now?

**Mr. SCRIVER**. I may inform my hon. friend that a new boat has been constructed at Toronto this year, which, I understand, is to run from St. Johns to Lacolle, touching at this wharf on the way, going and returning. The distance between St. John and Lacolle is about 20 miles. The boat running

**Mr. BERGERON**.

between those two points often carries excursionists to Isle aux Noix, and no doubt it will be largely used in the future for the same purpose. My hon. friend indulged in some extravagance, when he spoke of the magnificent structures at Isle au Noix. The fortress that was built there years ago by the British Government, is no longer in existence, as he would know, if he had been there himself; and he would know, further, that the whole island has been leased for pasturage for some years past at a comparatively small sum. The arrangement with the Government by which the company has undertaken to construct a hotel and to beautify the island, has been an advantageous one in every respect. Such structures as are on the island are sadly dilapidated now, and the improvements that this company will undertake will, no doubt, be of very great advantage to the surrounding country. As to the produce likely to be shipped from this wharf, I fancy that it is now hauled by vehicles to St. Johns by way of Iberville, where there is a railway station.

**Mr. BERGERON**. I am afraid my hon. friend was not here the other night, when we had a statement from the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence.

**Mr. SCRIVER**. I was not.

**Mr. BERGERON**. The hon. Minister's information was, that the fort is not in a bad condition at all. The walls, I think, are about 4 feet thick. The hon. Minister said that there were some repairs to be made by the Government, because the Government is interested in seeing that the structure does not deteriorate. As far as the dividing up of the fort into a hotel is concerned, that work will be done by the company. The fort is in such a condition that there will be very little to be done to make it a very good summer resort. I admit—and it was the first time that I had heard of this matter—that the old arrangement for the lease of the island was a very bad one. It was leased for \$40 a year, and the man who leased it made \$400 or \$500 out of it from pasture. We have been losing money. I have no doubt about that, and this is a better arrangement, as we are to get \$150 a year for twenty-one years. But what I object to is the building of these wharfs, purely and simply for pleasure purposes, and not at all to meet the requirements of business. I have proof that only one barge last year went to a wharf that cost us \$10,000. I am under the impression that this wharf, proposed in this vote, will not be used for the purposes of business. A barge or two may go there, but it will not be used for trade, but simply by pleasure-seekers.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. My hon. friend is altogether astray, and the information which he has, as he will see by looking at the map, cannot be accurate. He tells us

that this wharf is 7 miles above Isle aux Noix.

Mr. BERGERON. We were told, 5 miles.

The PRIME MINISTER. Suppose you say 5 miles. If the wharf is 5 miles from Isle aux Noix, it cannot serve for pleasure tourists at Isle aux Noix. There has been for a long time an old landing place at Sabrevois, where the people have been in the habit of shipping their produce.

Mr. BERGERON. We are not asked to make repairs, but to build a new wharf.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is an old landing place which does not belong to the Government, which has been put there, I do not know how, for the convenience of the people belonging to that neighbourhood. This is a convenient place to put a wharf in order to distribute the produce of the people at that place.

Mr. BERGERON. This is only the commencement of it. What is the estimated cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This vote of \$5,500 covers everything.

Mr. SPROULE. In reference to the statement made by the right hon. Prime Minister before six o'clock, and practically repeated by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, to the effect that the same thing was being done in the Georgian Bay right along, I wish to say, as one who knows something about that part of the country and the wharfs that have been built there, that there is no comparison in any way between the expenditures that have been made there and those that are being made here. There are steamers going into those harbours in the Georgian Bay and the upper lakes drawing 15, 16 and 17 feet of water, and a wharf is of little use unless it gives 15 feet of water. These hon. gentlemen forget that there is an immense trade on the great lakes, which is not at all to be compared with the trade that is done at these little places along a river. There is an immense trade passing between Ontario, the Manitoulin Islands, Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and is constantly increasing. This trade is carried by these large steamers, and, therefore, it became a matter of necessity that the country should provide conveniences for these steamers to land and load and unload their freight. When the people on the Georgian Bay want little wharfs, where there are 4 or 5 feet of water, at which to land their skiffs or yachts, they build them themselves, and they do not think of asking the Government to do it for them. It is for the accommodation of these large vessels which are doing this immense trade, that these wharfs are built on the Georgian Bay, Lake Huron, Lake Erie and Lake Superior. There is no comparison between that and what has

taken place in Quebec and the maritime provinces. I understood the hon. Minister of Finance to say: You are sectional in your views. Would you deprive us of this expenditure in the maritime provinces and Quebec, when you are getting it in Ontario? We are neither getting it, nor do we expect it, and, in the few cases where such expenditures have been made, we have condemned them, because we regard this thing as an innovation which will lead to unlimited abuse in the expenditure of public money. If it can be shown that a place is of sufficient importance, that trade is to be done at it, and that the people require the convenience of the landing of a boat to do that trade, there is no objection to spending public money. I would not object to it, no matter what part of the country it is in. But it is because this expenditure is taking place all over the country for the construction of these new wharfs, where there is practically no trade to be done, that we object to it as injurious to the country and altogether unjustifiable. I repeat again, that there is no comparison between the expenditures which we have sanctioned in the votes that we have passed for the maritime provinces and Quebec, and the votes that have been passed for expenditures on wharfs on the Georgian Bay and the upper lakes.

Mr. GUILLET. I would like to know whether there is a customs officer at this port, and what the population is?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no town, but there is a small settlement and a scattered population. The argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) appears to be, that because one section happens to be favoured with deep water, and another is no so favoured, the latter should not be allowed to carry on their business. Is that the argument?

Mr. SPROULE. It depends on the trade to be done.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Surely, the hon. gentleman would adapt the votes of public money to the commercial necessities of the different districts. If there is a population that desires to get their produce to market, the fact that the water was only 4 or 5 feet deep, is no reason why they should not have a wharf at which to ship their produce.

Mr. GUILLET. I am told that they do the marketing by wagon.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a very considerable amount of produce carried up and down that river on the boats. I have no doubt that if the facilities are provided, the people will use them.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to point out to my hon. friends that they are only laying up dangers for themselves in the future. The argument of the hon. Minister of Fi-

nance means that, wherever you have a little farming community on an inland river or lake, you are going to have them coming and asking you for \$5,000 or \$8,000 wharfs. Let a man put on a boat of very small capacity to skirt the lake, and he has a right to come down to you through his representative and say, "I want three or four wharfs there at \$3,000 or \$4,000 or \$5,000 per wharf," and he will get them, according to the invitation given to-day by the Finance Minister and the First Minister. Are the constituents of any member of this House living on a little river along which little boats of four feet draft can run? Though it has never hitherto been dreamed of, people are now notified that if they ship a few eggs or a few pounds of butter, no matter how small the population may be, they have a right to come to this Dominion, and the Dominion treasury is open to them. I warn the Finance Minister and the First Minister that they are opening up a system of paths setting towards the Dominion treasury which once opened up it will be very difficult to close. By what right can you stuff Lake St. John full of wharfs to the tune of \$10,000 or \$12,000, and refuse the same thing for any inland lake in the province of Ontario or the province of British Columbia or any other part of this Dominion? You cannot possibly do it. The invitation is out, and the people will avail themselves of it. My only wonder is that the staid members of the Government, who do have some idea of financial expenditure and the lines on which it should go, assent to votes of this kind. The Opposition used to demand strenuously—and they were right in doing so—some commercial basis for expenditures of this kind. That wharf which was built at Iberville last year belongs, I suppose, to the Dominion?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, your wharfinger makes reports, no doubt, to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and I will ask the Minister, before we come to concurrence, to bring down the returns of his wharfingers on this wharf at Iberville and on the wharfs in Lake St. John for the last season, and we will just see what comes of this expenditure. I do not want to talk in an embarrassing or party sense; but as one who has had something to do with some of the expenditures of this country, and who may at some time again have something to do with them, I want to join hon. gentlemen opposite in coming near some well-defined line of expenditure; otherwise, we shall gradually drift into this condition that the provinces and the municipalities and private enterprise will all want to unload themselves on to the Dominion treasury, and through political influence they will be successful. If we could only consent on both sides of the House to come to a

Mr. FOSTER.

well-defined line of expenditure, it would be a great gain. My right hon. friend will see that there is no line at present, but just get it as you can, and the successful one wins. If sufficient pressure is brought, as by the hon. gentleman from the Lake St. John district, who has political necessities, and if he and his constituents are pertinacious enough, and have a yielding compatriot to go to, they will get their demands; but if it is another Minister who is approached, he will reason with them, and say, "You know we do not go into that kind of expenditure; please do not ask me for it." Unless you agree to some well-defined line, you establish a precedent, and you obliterate all lines of distinction between federal, provincial and municipal responsibility.

Mr. COCHRANE. I want to say a few words in reference to a remark made by the Finance Minister about Port Colborne when I referred to the nine wharfs in his constituency. I was astounded that a gentleman occupying the position of Minister of Finance should compare the nine wharfs in his constituency with a great port like Port Colborne, on which the expenditure of money has been of a national character, with the view of attracting the trade and commerce of the great North-west. When I spoke of so many wharfs in his constituency, the hon. gentleman replied to me by saying that there is more money spent at Port Colborne than in Nova Scotia. I do not care where the money is spent if it is spent for the benefit of Canada as a whole. For instance, take my own constituency. It is bordered on the south by Lake Ontario. There is a town in my riding named Brighton, situated on the best natural harbour on Lake Ontario, and there are three wharfs there built by private enterprise. We have a village of 1,200 inhabitants called Colborne, which has a wharf built by private enterprise, hundreds of feet long in Lake Ontario; and I will venture the assertion that there has been more grain shipped from any one of these wharfs than there has been from Prince Edward Island in any one year in the last fifteen or twenty years. In saying that I know what I am talking about why should a farming community in the province of Nova Scotia or in Prince Edward Island, living by a little river or an inland lake have money voted by the Dominion Parliament to build wharfs, and the same rule not be applied to other provinces? My riding has been represented by Liberals and Conservatives; yet there has never been such a thing dreamed of as to ask for a vote to build wharfs in it. There has been no such thing in the province of Ontario as a demand on the Dominion Government to build wharfs, unless it is an important place. We do not complain of the expenditure of money in the maritime provinces. As I say, I do not care where the money is expended if it is spent in the

best interests of Canada ; but I join with the hon. member for York in asking the Government where this thing will lead to. It is most absurd to say that because there is an inland river and a few settlers along it, that money should be spent building a wharf at that place. Why, people in my riding drive 18 or 20 miles, and I have known them to draw grain 30 or 40 miles to market, and they never suppose we would grant them federal money to open up and develop these little places which private enterprise and local enterprise should develop. I would call the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine to the returns in his department, and will venture this assertion that from one-third of the wharfs in the province of Quebec there is not a dollar return.

The PRIME MINISTER. How much is paid the collectors ?

Mr. COCHRANE. If the wharf gets nothing, it is because the wharf is not used; or if the wharf is used and he makes no return, it is because he is stealing the money. I am not speaking against Quebec, but trying to convince the Government that it is a mistake to spend money in that way. In Ontario the wharfs that the Government own pay about \$120 apiece. The argument of my hon. friend from Grey was that the wharfs on the Georgian Bay and Lake Huron are of national importance, and, therefore, deserving help from the federal exchequer, but these little paltry wharfs in the maritime provinces and the province of Quebec of which the ex-Finance Minister speaks, are only of local importance.

Mr. McMULLEN. I certainly hope that the picture which the ex-Finance Minister has drawn is not true to nature. We are entirely at the mercy of the Government. Hon. members coming from Ontario are not supposed to know what wharfs should be built or should not be built in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, and must rely on the representations of the Ministers, and I am prepared to accept those representations until I have proof that they are not true. I cannot take the word of hon. gentlemen opposite, because I had too many evidences, when they were in office, of what little faith we could put in their representations. In a year or two, when the returns from these wharfs come in, we will be able to have some idea whether the money was prudently spent or not, and if it is then shown that money has been thrown away, I shall be prepared to give my opinion on such expenditure. So far as Ontario is concerned, we endeavour to act prudently, and I am not advocating expenditure on any wharfs in that province, where they are not necessary or where they should not be built as Dominion works, nor am I aware that other hon. gentlemen from that province are doing so. But we know that the policy

followed by the late Government was to go round peddling these wharfs in return for political support. A constituency which returned a member in opposition to the Government had not the slightest chance of having any expenditure on public works in it, no matter how urgent the necessity, whereas those which returned supporters of the Government were treated in a most liberal manner; and we cannot but expect that constituencies which for eighteen years were left without the expenditure of a single dollar on any public improvement, because they were faithful to their principles, should now say to their friends in power: It is time you should do something for us. I repeat that until I have some evidence that the picture drawn by the ex-Finance Minister, which I consider highly exaggerated, has any basis in fact, I shall continue my confidence to the present Administration in this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. If I were to tell the hon. gentleman all that I know about this miserable juggling with wharfs for the last 20 years in this country, the hair would stand up on the top of his head.

Mr. McMULLEN. It did stand up on the top of my head a good many times when the hon. gentleman was in office, and it will stand up again if hon. gentlemen on this side can be shown to have done the things which he says they are going to do.

Mr. COCHRANE. If the hon. gentleman was as assiduous at present in studying the Auditor General's Report, as he was when on this side of the House, he would know more about the public expenditure than he apparently does. He is at present prepared to take everything the Government does on faith. He has even faith enough to believe that he can go back to the electorate and persuade them that he is acting in their interests, as he did when on this side of the House. Was it the hon. gentleman or the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce who said, when the late Government was in power, that the maritime provinces were the wet-nurse of boodlers. I see the Minister of Trade and Commerce assents to it. He was the gentleman who said that the maritime provinces were the wet and dry nurse of boodlers. If ever there was truth in that, he has it illustrated around him to-day. He is there and is dealing out milk copiously to help the wet nurse to sustain these boodlers.

Mr. McMULLEN. I admit that I gave a good deal of attention to the Auditor General's Report, when I was on the other side, and hunted up many things that I found fault with. My hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) feels sore to this day for some of the things I found. But I am not on the other side now, and it is the duty of hon. gentlemen opposite to find these things in the Auditor General's Report. If they will hunt up such

irregularities as I found—as a member selling out jobs for taking care of canal gates, and getting a cow from one man, a horse from another, and a pig from another—we will give them credit for it.

Mr. COCHRANE. If the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is making that statement with reference to me, if he says he found any such thing in the Auditor General's Report relating to me, then, if it were parliamentary, I would say it was a lie. But, as it is not parliamentary, I cannot say it. But I will say this, that if he tells me such a thing outside, I will slap his chops for him. You mention that to me tomorrow, and I will break your nose.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to comment on the principle enunciated by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) with regard to the expenditure of public money in the maritime provinces and in Quebec, as shown in the supplementary Estimates. He said that if there was a farming community with produce to sell, and water communication by means of which it could be carried to market, even if the depth of water was only 3 or 4 feet, it was the duty of the Government to provide them with a wharf. This, he said, applied to any part of the country. How would that apply to the case I am about to state? Take Manitoulin Island; it is 180 miles long, and has about 400 miles of coast. Mr. Chairman, I wish you would call upon hon. gentlemen to preserve order.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Essex seems to have taken charge of the House. He has taken charge of the Public Accounts of late, and now he seems to think he has been promoted to take charge of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. On that long line of coast there are many places where there is a sufficient depth of water for the large boats of the lakes to call. There are a hundred places with good settlements in close proximity, where the farmers might avail themselves of the opportunity of shipping, if public money were expended to provide them with a wharf. But in all that length of coast there are only nine or ten places where the boats can call to-day. The Government have refused to spend a dollar on that long line of coast, except at two or three places. It cannot be said that there is no trade to be done. I have here a list of the products shipped last year from that island, from which I take the following items:—

Horses .....	306
Head of cattle .....	3,430
Sheep .....	8,163
Swine .....	1,666
Poultry .....	2,809
Pounds of hides .....	48,575
Sheep skins .....	1,866
Tubs of butter.....	3,656
Cases of eggs .....	856

Mr. McMULLEN.

Cases of bread .....	52
Baskets of cranberries .....	525
Baskets of blueberries .....	11,298
Tons of fish .....	782
Pounds of beef .....	43,808
Bags of potatoes.....	7,102
Tons of hay .....	879
Bushels of wheat .....	7,202
Bushels of oats .....	18,563
Bushels of pease.....	25,072
Bushels of rye and barley.....	495
Pounds of wool.....	79,095
Pounds of cheese .....	34,350
Pounds of dressed hogs.....	38,750
Shingles .....	5,190,000
Feet of lumber .....	2,984,000
Laths, bundles .....	20,000
Posts .....	575,786

Also ties, cordwood and other articles. But on all this long line of coast the Government have hardly thought it worth while to spend a dollar to enable these people to reach the outside world, but on these small rivers, where there are 2 or 3 feet of water, they spend \$8,000 or \$10,000 to make a harbour, and think nothing of it. In one county we have twelve or fourteen cases of that kind. But in this large island the people can get their produce as best they can over 20, or 30, or even 40 miles of bad roads in order to have it shipped. The First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said, with regard to the principle that they adopted in the bonusing of railways—

Mr. MCGREGOR. Oh, give us a rest.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) has done nothing but rest for the last three weeks, except to interrupt the proceedings of this House, and that is not much trouble for him.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am ashamed of you.

Mr. SPROULE. And I am ashamed of the hon. member (Mr. McGregor). And his constituents should be ashamed of him. I am endeavouring to do my duty here, and he is not. A gentleman from the Manitoulin district writes to me:

You may have a recollection of our deputation to Ottawa, a year or two ago, on the revote of the subsidy on the Manitoulin Railway. We got a promise that it would be among the first given.—

I note that the leader of the Government says that where the farmers of the older sections of Ontario are 40 miles from market, it would be inhuman to withhold aid to them for railways.

—We are shut out in winter, and the inclosed will show you what we have done under adverse circumstances. Would you, and if you could not do so honestly in your own constituency's interests, ask Mr. Klock or Bennett to ask the Government why this subsidy was withheld from the isolated people of Manitoulin.

Here is what they say. There is not a dollar given for that railway of ours, though we have to carry our produce over 40 miles, at the same time that railways are being

subsidized all over Quebec. This is the statement, he says, of the First Minister. Had he carried out the very principle which he enunciated in the House, and had he carried out the promises given to us last year, surely we would have something for the building of that railway in aid of our farmers on the Manitoulin Islands, who are in some instances 40 miles from market, and who have few harbours where boats can run to take their produce to market. Surely he would have thought it worth while to expend a few dollars to bring to their doors the conveniences of life that he is giving to the people down in the maritime provinces and Quebec, where there are only a few farmers to support or use the wharf. There is one principle applied down there and another principle applied to Ontario, and it will be a difficult task for him and his party to square themselves with the people living up in that distant island, when they know that he is spending money so lavishly down there on every little harbour where there is eight feet, five feet, and some times only three feet of water; while the people in the Manitoulin Islands have been for years neglected.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Why did not your party help them when they were in power?

Mr. SPROULE. They did assist, and were going on to assist, and at the very time that they went out they were prepared to assist that railway. There was a promise of aid to that railway, and when the hon. gentlemen opposite came in they refused it, denied the poor farmers of that country the accommodation that they were entitled to, and which had been promised to them. I say it will be hard for the right hon. gentleman and his friends to satisfy these poor people up there who are in such urgent need, that this Government are doing equal justice all round. When they pick up the reports they see that large sums of money have been spent for many harbours down in the maritime provinces and Quebec, along the rivers and along the lakes, and along the bays, starting new harbours here and there where there are perhaps only 100 or 200 people, while up in Ontario the people have been labouring under these disadvantages for many years, and although they have made appeal after appeal to the hon. gentleman for the expenditure of a few thousand dollars to enable them to carry on their business, the Government has turned a deaf ear to them all. I say these poor farmers will not understand that even-handed justice has been meted out to them, and that the same favour has been accorded to them that has been lavishly accorded to other portions of the country where they see so many small harbours bonused with grants of money for the purpose of building up little villages in the maritime provinces and along the St. Lawrence River. What excuse has the Government for neglecting these people on

whose behalf I am speaking? It is not for want of trade, it is not for want of settlement, it is not for want of large and important villages. All these things are there; yet the Government have neglected them, and they will attempt to justify their expenditures on little harbours down in Quebec as they have been doing this afternoon from time to time, that is to say, offering no justification at all. On the other hand, the people living in the Manitoulin Islands have no assistance given them to carry their produce to the markets of the world. It is a matter of indifference to this Government how great their hardships are, and how sadly they are in need of a remedy. They will be anything but pleased with the Prime Minister himself and the members of the Government who control the purse-strings to-day.

Mr. DYMENT. I must say that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has put in a very eloquent plea for the two items that the Government have been good enough to put in the supplementary Estimates for two wharfs on the Manitoulin Islands this year. There is an item for \$3,300 at Sheguiandah, and another for \$4,000 at Providence Bay on the south shore of Manitoulin Island. All that the hon. member has said with regard to the people there and the fertility of that island, I can heartily endorse. I do not think that there is a population in any portion of Canada that deserves assistance any more than the people of this island. They number about 15,000, and the population is rapidly increasing. Unfortunately, they have no railway communication, and I think the Government are doing a very praiseworthy thing this year in putting these two items in the supplementary Estimates. I hope the very forceful speech of the hon. member has convinced his colleagues on the Opposition side of the House of the importance of these two works, and that there will be no opposition to them. I may say with regard to the railway the hon. gentleman referred to that we have been looking forward very anxiously—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). I think the hon. gentleman had better confine himself to the subject under discussion.

Mr. DYMENT. I only mentioned it because the hon. member referred to it himself.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) seemed to be in doubt as to the advisability of voting these Estimates as proposed. In his heart I am sure he had very much more than a doubt. He said he supposed that after this money was voted, and after the returns began to come in two or three years hence—but which never come as a matter of fact—then he thought we might be justified in expending this money. Is not that a fine business proposition? It reminds me

of the way to distinguish between a mushroom and a toadstool. It is said that if you want to know the difference between them, you must eat them, and if you eat a mushroom you will live, but if you eat a toadstool you will die.

Rivière du Lievre—

Lock and dam, extraordinary repairs.. \$1,600

Mr. BERGERON. What is to be done there ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Cribwork to be constructed on both sides of the river. Details of the item are given, the total being \$1,600, which is the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. FOSTER. What are you getting out of that work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About \$250 a year.

Beauport, wharf ..... \$4,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Government originally purchased this wharf years ago and began adding to it. This is to make a further addition.

Mr. BERGERON. What depth of water will you have at that wharf ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will give 14 feet of water at high water.

Ste. Anne de Bellevue—

Extension to wharf ..... \$2,500

Mr. BERGERON. I thought that work was done lately ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. This is to increase the width of the wharf to 30 feet and to make the length 100 feet.

Coteau Landing—

Dredging (revote \$2,500)..... \$6,000

Mr. BERGERON. How is this to be expended ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is required to dredge a channel from the docks of the Canada Atlantic Railway at Coteau Landing to the entrance of the Soulanges Canal, 100 feet wide and 14 feet deep, 1,000 feet in length.

Mr. BERGERON. How much has been spent ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. \$17,000 has been spent in dredging.

Mr. BERGERON. And you want \$6,000 more ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, to complete it.

Mr. CLARKE. Is that work done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was done by a hired dredge at so much per hour.

Mr. CLARKE. How much per hour.

Mr. WALLACE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. \$8 per hour.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to give my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) the history of how this contract was given, and the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) will please listen to this. It is no wonder that we are always very anxious, when we are passing any vote, to have the assurance of the hon. Minister of Public Works that the work will be done by tender, so that we can keep it in check. This is a most extraordinary way of proceeding. It may take a few moments to state the facts, but I am bound to put them before Parliament and the country to show how this was done. It was brought out last year that Mr. Gauthier, who had the contract, is the father-in-law of Mr. Tarte's son. This is a work which involves an expenditure of \$23,000, because it will cost that amount when it is finished. We have spent \$17,000 and we are now asked to vote \$6,000 more. At the commencement of this transaction the following letter was written from the Department of Public Works, Ottawa, on the 15th March, 1898. It is as follows :—

(Translation.)

Department of Public Works,  
Ottawa, 15th March, 1898.

Sir,—I am directed by the hon. the Minister of Public Works to inform you that the department is ready to enter into negotiations with you for the undertaking of the dredging required this year at Laprairie and Coteau Landing. Of course a dredge will be required at each place.

Would you kindly let us know at your earliest convenience whether you are willing to undertake that work, and whether you have on hand the necessary plant, and also, if you are ready to start dredging upon the adequate opening of the navigation season. The rate paid by the department for that kind of work, when the dredges have the ordinary normal capacity, is \$8 per working hour.

An early reply will greatly oblige.

I have the honour to be, sir,  
Your humble servant,

(Signed) A. GOBEIL,  
Deputy Minister.

Thomas Gauthier, Esq.,  
Montreal, Q.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Mr. Gauthier a dredging man ?

Mr. BERGERON. No, Mr. Gauthier is a real estate dealer. Mr. Gauthier got that cinch, that splendid work in which he has nothing to do. The letter was written by the department to him on the 15th of March, and on the 25th of March, ten days after it, Gauthier wrote to the Minister of Public Works as follows :—

(Translation.)

Montreal, 25th March, 1898.

The Hon. Minister of Public Works,  
Ottawa, Can.

Hon. Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 15th instant, from your department, I beg to say that

I am willing to undertake the dredging at Laprairie and Coteau Landing at the prices mentioned in your letter, namely, \$8 per working hour.

I have at my disposal a first-class plant, and I will be ready to start dredging immediately upon receipt of your instructions. Of course, the dredges will be subject to inspection by the officers of your department.

As far as Coteau Landing is concerned, as I am told that the work admits of no delay, I would suggest that I might be allowed to begin operations on Monday, the 20th April next.

He was in a hurry to commence.

The dredge I have at my disposal for that place is dredge "No. 5," belonging to Manning & McDonald, and it is near the work.

Hoping that the same will meet with your approval, and that I may receive a favourable reply.

I remain, sir,  
Your humble servant,

(Signed) THOS. GAUTHIER.

Manning & Macdonald were working for the Department of Railways and Canals, at the head of the Soulanges Canal, and they had dredges there doing nothing. They had required these dredges for the opening of the canal, but they were not working at that time, and as they were under heavy expense, they were quite satisfied that these dredges should be kept busy. Here is a second letter, and I am at a loss to understand why it is here, because it is almost word for word the other letter of Gauthier. It is dated the 1st of April, and it purports to be about the same thing. Here is a copy of letter No. 191307. The Minister of Public Works makes his offer on the 15th March. Gauthier answers on the 25th of March, and on the 5th of April a letter is written by the Deputy Minister of Public Works to Mr. Roy, secretary of the department, and this is what it contains:

(Translation.)

Department of Public Works,  
Ottawa, 5th April, 1898.

Mr. Roy,—Please prepare a report to Council stating that the Canada Atlantic Railway Company have asked the department to undertake dredging around their wharfs and grain elevator at Coteau Landing; the original representations being to the effect that this dredging would require the expenditure of \$6,000; that from the surveys made, we have obtained more satisfactory data with reference to the cost of the work, which is estimated at \$18,000, to give the depth of 14 feet applied for.

The Order in Council ought to point out in a general way the enormous importance to the trade of the St. Lawrence of allowing easy access to such an elevator, where is to be stored the grain brought by rail from the west, and that it is highly desirable to make such an expenditure which though seemingly considerable, will result favourably to the trade in general.

(Signed) A. GOBEIL,  
Deputy Minister.

E. F. E. Roy, Esq.,  
Secretary, P. W. D.

There must have been something forgotten, because on the 13th of April the Deputy Minister again writes to Mr. Roy:

(Translation.)

Department of Public Works,  
Ottawa, 13th April, 1898.

Mr. Roy,—Did I forget to ask you to prepare a report to Council stating that the dredging which the department has undertaken to perform at Coteau Landing, in order to allow easy access to the elevator of the Canada Atlantic Railway Company, will cost \$21,000—

He had said before that it would cost \$18,000.

(Translation.)

—and to ask for a special appropriation in the supplementary Estimates of this year and those of next year, to meet this expenditure?

(Signed) A. GOBEIL,  
D.M.P.W.

E. F. E. Roy, Esq.,  
Secretary, P.W.D.

The secretary of the department puts himself into communication with the chief engineer, to whom he writes as follows:—

(Copy of No. 109162, letter sent.)

Ottawa, 6th April, 1898.

Sir,—I am directed to inform you that the Minister authorizes you to accept Mr. Thomas Gauthier's offer in No. 191010, herein inclosed, to undertake and execute the dredging required at Laprairie and Coteau Landing, Que., at \$8 per working hour.

I have the honour to be, sir,  
Your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) E. F. E. ROY,  
Secretary.

The Chief Engineer,  
Public Works Department, Ottawa.

To give a colour to the work and to show that it is absolutely necessary, something must have happened that we have not got here; but we can infer it from the letter which I shall read. It had to be shown to the Council that the work was necessary, and that some people there were interested in it. This is a copy of the letter:

(Copy of letter received, No. 191193.)

Ottawa, Ont., April 6th, 1898.

Dear Sir,—I am directed to state, in answer to yours of the 5th instant, with reference to the possible damage which might result from the dredging at Coteau Landing, that the foundations of our elevator wharfs at Coteau Landing will not be affected by your dredging around them to a maximum depth of fourteen (14) feet below low-water level, as stated in your letter; consequently, no damage can arise thereby.

Yours truly,  
(Sgd.) A. W. FLECK,  
Secretary-Treasurer.

A. Gobeil, Esq.,  
Deputy Minister of Public Works,  
Ottawa, Ont.

Here is another letter which explains what we can infer of the doings that were going on behind the door:

(Copy of letter received, No. 191772.)

Depot Harbour, Ont., April 23rd, 1898.

A. W. Fleck, Ottawa.

Four vessels in port now, and we expect the "Lynn" to-morrow morning, with six thousand tons of corn, all for Montreal. See letter to me from our traffic manager relative to situation at Coteau Landing.

(Sgd.) E. J. CHAMBERLIN.

All this was done to show that it was necessary to have fourteen feet of water at the Canada Atlantic wharfs for the vessels coming down. I pointed out to the committee last year that there was no use of deepening the water to fourteen feet of water, because no vessels drawing more than nine feet of water would go there until the Soulanges Canal was completed, because all the vessels coming through the Beauharnois Canal drew only nine feet of water. There is another letter from Mr. Chamberlain to Mr. Fleck, saying that it is very important that large barges should be able to come to that wharf; and there is a memorandum which must have been sent with the letter, giving the number of barges and the amount of grain they carry. The following is the report of Council:—

Extract from a Report of the Committee of the Honourable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency on the 25th April, 1898.

On a report dated 19th April, 1898, from the Minister of Public Works, stating that the Canada Atlantic Railway Company, who are building a large elevator at Coteau Landing, have asked the Department of Public Works to undertake the necessary dredging to allow of boats reaching the wharf upon which said elevator is being built, and that from casual information obtained by them the railway company have represented to the department that the dredging in question to be performed will require the expenditure of some \$6,000.

That he, the Minister, having in view the great importance of allowing easy access to the elevator in question, agreed to perform the dredging required, and made arrangements to have the same put in hand immediately upon the opening of the present season.

That meanwhile, in order to obtain more satisfactory data with reference to the quantity of dredging to be performed, he, the Minister, sent one of the engineers of the Department of Public Works to make a survey and report upon the work necessary to be done.

That the engineer now states that in order to give the depth of 14 feet applied for, dredging will require to be done of at least 200,000 yards, at an estimated cost of \$21,000 (twenty-one thousand dollars).

The Minister, in view of the result of the survey above referred to, and of the fact that the amount actually to be expended to provide the depth required will largely exceed the amount which it was originally intended to expend, recommends that Parliament be asked to make provision for the appropriation of the sum required.

The Committee submit the above recommendation for His Excellency's approval.

(Sgd.) JOHN J. MCGEE,

Clerk of the Privy Council.

To the Honourable  
The Minister of Public Works.  
Mr. BERGERON.

Now, it seems that there was some difficulty in obtaining dredges, because here is a letter signed by the Minister addressed to Mr. Gauthier:

(Copy of letter received, No. 191647.)

Ottawa, April 25th, 1898.

Thomas Gauthier, Esq.,  
157 St. Denis St., Montreal.

I understand that you intend using the Kingston dredge at Laprairie. Do you know whether there is another dredge available at Coteau now? Please wire immediately.

(Sgd.) J. I. TARTE.

(Copy of letter received, No. 191637.)

Ottawa, April 26th, 1898.

Thomas Gauthier, Esq.,  
157 St. Denis St., Montreal.

For how long can you secure second dredge now at Coteau Landing? Please wire immediately.

(Sgd.) J. I. TARTE.

Here is a copy of a letter signed by the Deputy Minister, addressed to Mr. Roy, secretary of the department:

(Copy of letter received, No. 191637.)

Department of Public Works,

Ottawa, April 27th, 1898.

Secretary,—Please notify the Chief Engineer that the hon. the Minister authorizes the employment of a second dredge to do the work required at Coteau Landing. That dredge is to be the "No. 6," now at Coteau Landing, and is to be set to work immediately by the Chief Engineer making the necessary arrangements therefor with Mr. Thomas Gauthier, of Montreal. The price to be paid is to be the same as that now paid for the other dredge, namely, \$8 per hour for a working day of 10 hours.

(Sgd.) A. GOBEIL,

Deputy Minister.

E. F. E. Roy, Esq.,  
Secretary, D.P.W.

Here is another extract from a report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency on the 22nd June, 1898:

Extract from a Report of the Committee of the Honourable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency on the 27th June, 1898.

The Committee, on the recommendation of the Minister of Public Works, advise that the Order in Council dated 23rd March, 1880, be set aside in so far as it can relate to the payments which will have to be made to Mr. Thomas Gauthier, in connection with dredging being executed by him at Coteau Landing, Que., the dredging in question having been authorized to be performed by an Order in Council dated the 25th April, 1898.

(Sgd.) H. G. LAMOTHE,

Asst. Clerk of the Privy Council.

The Honourable  
The Minister of Public Works.

Now, we have a statement of the amount of work done:

DREDGING AT COTEAU LANDING.

Number of cubic yards dredged, 129,850=  
1,505,950 cubic feet.

Then, we have a statement of the amounts expended :

COTEAU LANDING.

Amounts expended in 1897-98 and 1898-99, and to whom paid.

1897-98.

F. W. Cowie, travelling expenses .....	\$ 22 30
J. H. Lalonde, rope, &c.....	3 92
Alexandre Méthot, inspector..	218 00
Thomas Gauthier, dredging..	8,245 00
	<hr/>
	\$ 8,489 22

1898-99.

J. H. Lalonde, rope, &c.....	\$ 2 90
Alexandre Méthot, inspector..	353 50
Thomas Gauthier, dredging..	8,458 00
	<hr/>
	8,814 40

Total ..... \$17,303 62

A. G. KINGSTON,  
Accountant, D.P.W.

The next return we have is a statement of the amount of work done :

shows that the hon. Minister of Public Works wanted to give some work to Mr. Gauthier. He writes to Mr. Gauthier that he wants some dredging done at a certain place, and asks Mr. Gauthier if he could not find some plant, knowing well that he had none. And to give a colour of necessity for that work, to show his colleagues that it was necessary to spend the money, he gets a letter from the authority of the Canada Atlantic saying : You may dredge at our wharf down to 14 feet. We are not afraid that you will injure the foundations of our wharf by dredging at that depth.

He gets Mr. Chamberlain to write down that four barges are coming down with 6,000 tons of wheat, and it is very necessary to have dredging done—when we know very well that vessels drawing more than 9 feet of water could not get down to Montreal. And, although he had got a report that the whole thing could be done for \$6,000, he prepares for Council a report to say that he has received information that it would cost

MEMORANDUM RE DREDGING AT COTEAU LANDING, QUE., DURING 1898.

COTEAU LANDING, April 7, 1899.

Dredge.	Time.	Hours.	Rate per Hour.	Quantity Dredged.	Average Cost per Cubic Yard.	Total Cost.
			\$ cts.	Cub. yds.	Cts.	\$ cts.
No. 6 ...	April 11 to October 29 ..	1,732 $\frac{3}{4}$	8 00	108,450	Less than 13 $\frac{1}{2}$	14,262 00
No. 5 ...	May 2 to 21 .....	223	8 00	17,200	" " 10 $\frac{1}{2}$	1,784 00
No. 4 .....	May 24 to June 1, inclus.	41	8 00	2,100	15 $\frac{1}{2}$	328 00
No. 4 .....	June 6 to June 10 ..	47	7 00	2,100	15 $\frac{3}{4}$	329 00
	Total .....	2,093 $\frac{3}{4}$	.....	129,850	Slightly over 12 $\frac{1}{2}$	16,708 00

We know that the dredges which did that work belong to Mr. McDonald, who was the contractor for the Soulanges Canal. We have here a memorandum, signed by the acting engineer, which is not quite complete but which I will read to the House and the House can draw its own conclusion. It seemed that these dredges, for which the Government were paying \$8 an hour, could not perform the work.

On the 1st of June it was verbally reported to the hon. the Minister of Public Works that the operations of dredge "No. 4" were not sufficient to warrant the payment of \$8 per hour. The superintendent of dredging was, therefore, ordered to stop the dredge from working. On June 6th, by order of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, the dredge was again allowed to resume work, but at a reduced rate of \$7 per hour. As the amount of work performed by the dredge was again not considered satisfactory, its services were finally dispensed with on the 10th June.

(Sgd.) EUGENE D. LAFLEUR,  
Acting Chief Engineer.

All this was found out when the money was paid, and the result of the whole thing

\$18,000 for that work. But this is not sufficient, and he pretends to get more information, and the Deputy Minister writes to the secretary. Have I forgotten to tell you that it is not \$18,000 but \$21,000 that will be required for that work? The report is sent to Council and accepted, and Mr. Gauthier answers—we know how these things are done, they have talked it over—certainly I can do the work; I have dredges. And he gets the dredges of Manning & McDonald, the contractors on the Soulanges Canal. These dredges were idle some days—that always happens—and Gauthier got these dredges. And if we had an investigation—and I think next session we shall have one—we will find that Mr. McDonald got a good deal less than \$5 an hour for those dredges, and Mr. Gauthier pocketed the difference. All this was done without tender—entre amis. The two fathers-in-law talked the matter over and decided that \$21,000 would be a good sum to spend at Coteau, the job to be given to Mr. Thomas Gauthier. The right hon. Prime Minister need not be surprised, under these circumstances, if, when money is to be entrusted to the present

Minister of Public Works, we require every possible assurance that the work shall be done by tender in the ordinary business way—an open call—so that everybody may send in a tender. In my opinion that work was not necessary. It will be a long time before a depth of 14 feet is needed at that place. And where that work was done or should have been done there was an immense vessel which used to carry the cars from Coteau Landing to Valleyfield before the construction of the bridge. So there must be 10 or 12 or 14 feet of water there already. I do not know whether all the papers have been brought down, but I have them here in return to an order of the House passed on the 24th April. There is enough here, at any rate, to show that we cannot take too many precautions before voting our money to be expended under the charge of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. McMULLEN. We know that for years tenders were asked for dredging, and I believe it was ascertained and generally admitted that for a properly constructed dredge, \$8 an hour was a fair price. And that price was fixed and was paid by hon. gentlemen opposite as well as by the present Government. I do not know the gentlemen to whom the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has referred. But if that gentleman supplied a dredge and the dredge did that work efficiently up to the standard required, it makes little difference to Parliament or to the people of this country who does that work. I do not care whether he is tailor or a shoemaker, if he supplies the dredges and does the work, he should be paid for it. But if the work is done in an inefficient way, that is a proper question for investigation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) says he is going to hold an investigation, and I hope he will, for it is right to get to the bottom of these things. But in my humble opinion, as the Minister of Public Works is away and very ill, it would have been an act of courtesy on the part of the hon. gentleman to postpone any reference to the matter until he is present to take part in the investigation and until the Minister is here to defend himself. He says that Mr. McDonald may have furnished these dredges at \$5 an hour. That is not a matter of importance to us, if the work was efficiently done. If next session the hon. gentleman calls for a committee of investigation, he has a right to have it.

Mr. DAVIN. Nothing in connection with the Public Works Department has made a more painful impression than the question exposed by the hon. member for Beauharnois and defended by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen).

Mr. McMULLEN. I have not defended it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) was not listening to me.

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. DAVIN. I will prove that I was listening by repeating what the hon. gentleman said. If I misquoted him, he can correct me. He said it did not matter to Government or to Parliament whether the work was done by the man who got the contract or not.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, I did not say that.

Mr. DAVIN. I understood the hon. gentleman further to say that there were just two questions—whether the work was done well, and whether it was done at the rate which had at one time been settled. My hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) nods his head—what I say is correct. I understood him further to say that if the man worked for Mr. Gauthier for \$5 an hour, that is no concern of Parliament.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend is astray again.

Mr. DAVIN. Will my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) say what he said?

Mr. McMULLEN. I said that if Mr. McDonald supplied the dredge for \$5 an hour, that is no concern to us. The questions we are interested in are: First, did the dredge perform an amount of work to entitle the proprietor to \$8 an hour and did it perform that work up to the standard; and, second, was the work necessary?

Mr. DAVIN. I apprehend, and the people of Canada will apprehend that there is another question. Are not the people of Canada entitled to whatever difference there was between the amount of the contract of Mr. Gauthier and the amount he paid to the man who did the work?

Mr. McMULLEN. No. The rate was to be paid was established by the recent Government—\$8 an hour was fixed as a rate for a dredge doing work up to a certain standard. Now, I contend that if Mr. Gauthier actually has been able to hire that dredge for \$5 an hour in place of \$8, or if he got it for nothing, it is a matter of no consideration for us, as long as the work is done in the place where it is wanted.

Mr. DAVIN. The new doctrine of Liberalism, therefore, is this: That in administering the affairs of the Public Works Department we must not seek by means of tender to get work done at the lowest rate that it can be done for efficiently. My hon. friend nods his head to that. What that means is this: That it is of no consequence to the people of Canada what rake-off any friend of a Minister may have. So it is a policy of plunder and a doctrine of rake-offs. Why, Sir, what you want to countenance a policy and conduct like that is what we have, a Government with chemical principles and cotton-batting consciences. Every gentleman on that bench, the whole fourteen of them, have cotton-batting consciences and chemical principles, because they can be changed, the

least actual ingredient of interest that is added, changes the character of their principles. The people who have to pay have consciences, they take note of right and wrong, they have got a financial conscience in their pocket which takes note of extravagance, favouritism, public plunder and mismanagement. The people of Canada will not accept the doctrine of the new Liberalism, that it is all right to give contracts to people who know nothing whatever about the work, and who have to farm it out, as was done in the case of Mr. Gauthier; and then to be told what we were told by the Minister of Public Works when it was brought up before. He could make no defence of it. When it was dragged out of him that Mr. Gauthier was a relative of his—because, when first he was accused of having given it to a relative, he indignantly denied it—but when he was asked: is he not your son's wife's father? He raised his shoulders and blinked his eyes and answered: How can I help it if my sons do have fathers-in-law? Now, Sir, I greatly regret that the Minister of Public Works is ill. But the Government knew the nature of the serious illness that, to my regret, as to the regret of every man who knows him, necessitated his going across the Atlantic to get medical treatment. They knew his to be a most serious complaint. I say that the Government has not been true to its responsibilities to the people of Canada, nor true even to the Minister of Public Works himself, in not having relieved that gentleman from the grave responsibilities and anxieties of office, and given him a lighter office, making him, for instance, President of the Council or Secretary of State. I say in regard to these estimates that we have dealt with here, that if we had the actual Minister of Public Works, whether my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Tarte), or any other member, he could not have got these extravagant and monstrous estimates through this House. The only way they have been got through is by the Minister of Finance, who is acting Minister of Public Works, saying to us again and again, as he has said: Well, really, I don't know what the real Minister will do under the circumstances—when we have asked him what will be done in any case—Well, I do not know; I am not the Minister of Public Works. The chivalry of Parliament shrinks from holding the acting Minister of Public Works, weighted down with two great departments, when he comes here shouldering the burdens of another Minister—the chivalry of Parliament shrinks from dealing out to him the same amount of criticism, the same treatment that would be perfectly justifiable if he was directly responsible for the Public Works estimates. I say that if the actual Minister of Public Works were here these Public Works estimates could not have been got through Parliament.

Now, Sir, I say with regard to this job—you cannot call it anything else—it smells of the same scent as the Edmonton bridge job, it smells of the same scent as the Goderich harbour job. What have we heard from the bench immediately behind the Minister of Trade and Commerce? I forget whether it was in 1898 or 1897, when we were pressing home stringent criticisms of a job like this, the Minister of Public Works said to us: It is all very fine for hon. gentlemen to talk in that way; but if I accept these principles, how can I put money into the pockets of my friends? I do not want to put money into the pockets of Tories. When he was asked why he did not give a dredging contract in Ontario to men who owned dredges, he said: The men who own dredges are all Tories, and if I call for tenders they will tender, and they will get the contracts. Now, if there are numbers of people who own dredges, and if we call for tenders, is it not palpable that at a time when mechanical cheapening is going forward, when mechanical power is increasing, when the cost of living is being lowered—is it not certain that if tenders were honestly called for we should have lower tenders than a tender for \$8 an hour? Is it not a monstrous thing for any person representing the Department of Public Works to come here and say: Our defence for throwing aside the sound principles of calling for tenders, our defence for violating every sound principle of administrative management, is this: Years ago it cost \$8 an hour to do this work, and if under a system that is reeking with a suspicion of jobbery, we can assure our own consciences that \$8 an hour work is being done, to the winds with sound principles of administration, and let us throw to one side the Act of Parliament and the Order in Council providing that tenders shall be called for? It is a shameless defence, and a defence like that would never be made except that some kind of madness had smitten the brains of the men in authority in the Liberal party. They think the people will tolerate anything from that party. They think that the Liberal party will bear with anything, but we were shown here the other night, and there is abundant evidence coming to us from every part of the country, that the respectable members of the Liberal party will not bear long to be dragged after obscurantist political misdemeanants. There is the Goderich harbour job of a similar kind, and at an earlier period of the session I went over a number of instances in which the conduct of other departments, not alone that of the Department of Public Works, shows that this Administration hates like poison to call for tenders. Only yesterday a return that I called for last year was brought down, and it showed that, in the department where it was the usage and wont, from time immemorial, to call for tenders, a contract was given without ten-

der. We can go into the Department of Trade and Commerce and into other departments and find the same thing. I hope we will wake up the country; I hope the country is alive to what is going on, and if we can only turn the eyes of the people to what is being done in this House, they will condemn the course of hon. gentlemen. Sometimes when we go into the country the people tell us that it is only a short time ago that they woke up to what is being done here. They did not realize what was taking place. It would take, not newspapers of seventy or eighty columns, but it would take newspapers of one hundred columns, to bring out fully what has been dragged to light this session, the damning evidence of incompetency and worse than incompetency on the part of this Government.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. member for North Wellington what is the necessity of expending this money at Coteau Landing for deepening the channel to 14 feet of water, when a boat drawing more than nine feet of water cannot get into the place or away from the place. Is that not proof positive that there was a necessity for looking up a job for the father-in-law of the son of the hon. Minister of Public Works, that he might make some money out of it? The fact is, that a boat loading at the elevator cannot go down the canal drawing more than nine feet of water. Where was the necessity of spending this money or of getting water of that depth there two years before the canals are opened to a greater depth?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The canals are being deepened to 14 feet and it would be unseemly if we were to assume that we were not going to have boats going through them drawing more than nine feet of water. The dredging of this channel was done to 14 feet to correspond with the navigation of the canals. That work is not only done for to-day, but for the future as well.

Mr. TAYLOR. But we did it two years before it was wanted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is another question. In the first place, it has not been done two years before it was required, because it is not finished yet.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was started two years before it was required.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, it is not finished yet. The question is that the rate of dredging has been \$8 per hour for all dredges taking out 600 yards a day.

Mr. CLARKE. When was that rate established, by whom, and by what authority?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that there has been no dredging done under the late Government or the present Government, by dredges with a capacity

Mr. DAVIN.

of 600 yards a day for less than \$8 per hour. An application was recently made by one of the great railway companies to an American dredging company to do some work at Midland and the lowest rate asked, for ten hours a day, was \$100 a day, instead of \$80 a day where 600 yards is a day's work. More recently, in consequence of not being able to get dredges, an application was made to see if we could get some American dredges to do some work in the lower provinces, and the lowest quotation that was received was \$250 a day. I am satisfied that the rate we are paying is a fair rate. The dredging at Coteau is costing 12½ cents a yard, which is a fairly reasonable price.

Mr. HAGGART. How many yards are still to be dredged at Coteau?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About 45,000 yards.

Mr. HAGGART. There are 129,000 yards dredged, and this 45,000 will make about 170,000 yards. The hon. Minister of Public Works, in his statement here last year, said that he wanted this work done. As to the necessity of it, my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is perfectly correct, because if the water had been dredged to a depth of 14 feet, it would not be utilized by any barges. There are no barges on the river that draw more than nine feet of water, which are used for transporting cargoes down to Montreal. I remember perfectly well that the hon. Minister of Public Works stated last year that Mr. Gauthier had come to him and stated that he had a dredge and asked him if he wanted any work done. Here are the words:

Mr. Gauthier came to me, as he had a perfect right to do, and as every other man has a right to do. He offered me a dredge, and I asked him how much he wanted.

When the correspondence comes down, it is seen that the suggestion did not come from Mr. Gauthier at all, but that the hon. Minister of Public Works sent a letter to him in reference to it. I asked him the quantity of dredging to be done, and he said 200,000 yards was the estimate. He also said that he had got it done cheaper than it had ever been done in Canada before:

I asked him how much this dredge could do. Now this dredge is doing 800 to 1,000 yards a day, and I say that dredging which costs 8 cents per yard is very cheap dredging indeed. No man who knows anything about dredging will dispute that. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals will testify that he has paid as high as 20 cents and 25 cents.

There is the statement made by the hon. Minister of Public Works in this House last session. He says that Mr. Gauthier came to him offering to do the dredging for him, whereas when the correspondence comes down we find that it was nothing of

the kind, that the suggestion came from the Minister to a man who never owned a dredge in his life, for the purpose of dredging this place, when there was no necessity at the moment for that dredging, because two years elapsed since it commenced, and there was plenty of water at Coteau Landing. When the information comes to the House, we find that the dredging costs nearly 13 cents a yard, which is a very high price for dredging at that point. This is wrong in principle. The hon. Minister ought to have come and stated the necessity to the House, and he ought to have got his vote for the work before the work was done. Instead of that, he gets an Order in Council passed, and immediately sends to his relative who never had a dredge in his life, and who immediately procures a dredge from parties near the work, who I am sure would have done it for less; and then the Minister tells this House that he is getting it done for 8 cents a yard, whereas we find that the work is not up to the standard, and that it is costing the country nearly 13 cents a yard.

Mr. CLARKE. Before this item passes I desire to enter a most emphatic protest against the practice which it appears has obtained in the Public Works Department respecting the letting of dredging work. I must also express my astonishment at hearing a gentleman who was such a staunch advocate of having public work let by public tender as the hon. member for North Wellington was when in Opposition, get up and defend this transaction. I asked the Minister of Finance a few minutes ago at what date the Department of Public Works determined that for the future it would ask for no tenders for dredging, and that \$8 an hour was a fair price to pay under ordinary circumstances; but I have not had any answer yet. I mean to say that it is not in the public interest, and is not in accordance with sound business principles, when a large quantity of dredging is to be done at Coteau or at Toronto or at any other place, to give out the work without competition or tender, and to fix the arbitrary sum of \$8 an hour for the work. In the documents read to the House to-night by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), we find sufficient evidence to demonstrate how faulty such a plan of operation is. If I understood the statements read by that hon. gentleman, there were three or four dredges employed in this work, and the dredging done by some of these dredges cost 10 cents or thereabouts per cubic yard, while the dredging done by some others cost from 12 to 15 cents; and yet the department was paying for dredges that only did two-thirds as much as other dredges, exactly the same price per hour; and one of the dredges was found to be so inefficient that the department, for very shame's sake, had to cease paying \$8 an hour, and reduced the price to

\$7, and finally put the dredge out of commission altogether. I appeal to the Minister of Finance if this disgraceful condition of things is going to continue until this contract is concluded?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Was it not right to reduce it?

Mr. CLARKE. It was, but it would have been much better to have ascertained the capacity of that dredge before it was started to work, and when it was found that it could not earn more than \$7, it was an outrage to allow \$8 for its use. I find in the report of the Auditor General for 1897, at page 128—Q, a statement regarding the dredging done in Toronto harbour under contract, showing that up to the time that statement was made 685,633 cubic yards of dredging was done at a cost of 12 cents a yard. I do not know whether that cost was excessive or not; but that work was done after public tenders had been called for, and the Government of that day relieved itself from any responsibility for the work by giving public notice that the work was to be done and asking for tenders. But as soon as the present Administration got into office, the practice of calling for public tenders was abandoned as far as Toronto harbour was concerned, and what is the result? On February 14, 1898, I took the opportunity of asking the Minister of Public Works about this dredging, and I give my question and his reply:

1. What sum was expended by the Government in 1896 and 1897, respectively, for dredging in connection with the works for the protection of Toronto harbour?

2. Was the work of dredging awarded each year by public tender?

3. What was the price paid per yard for dredging in 1896 and in 1897, respectively?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Nothing expended in 1896 for dredging in Toronto harbour. In 1897 the sum of \$5,310.26 was expended. 2. The work was not awarded by public tender. 3. The price paid the contractor was at the usual rate paid by the Government for work of that kind, namely, \$8 per hour actual working time. The contractor worked from the 29th June to the 26th November, dredging 37,214 cubic yards, the cost per cubic yard being 14½ cents.

I think it surely ought to be sufficient to draw the attention of the Minister in charge of the department to this state of facts, and to urge that in future the public who have dredges and who are in the habit of doing dredging, when the Government have any work of that kind to be done, should be given an opportunity of putting in a tender for it. In the spring of 1898 a bid was put into the Department of Public Works to do the dredging at Toronto at \$6 per hour for which the Government of Canada gave a contract at \$8 per hour without tender; and if the bid above referred to had been accepted the people of Canada would have saved \$2 per hour on that work. I say it

is nothing short of a public scandal that this work should be done at the arbitrary price of \$8 per hour.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Is the hon. gentleman speaking of his own knowledge?

Mr. **CLARKE**. I am speaking from a statement made by the hon. gentleman's own colleague within the last half hour, and if the hon. gentleman had listened he would have heard it.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman has made another statement.

Mr. **CLARKE**. I would ask the hon. gentleman to sit down. I have the floor.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I ask the hon. gentleman if he will permit me to ask him a question?

Some hon. **MEMBERS**. Order.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Will the hon. gentleman permit me—

Some hon. **MEMBERS**. Order, order.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What is the use of having a chairman?

The **CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Campbell). The hon. Minister asked the hon. member for Toronto if he would allow him to ask a question.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The hon. member for Toronto refused, and said: "I have the floor," but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries persisted, while the Chairman sat as dumb as an oyster.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. member for Toronto did not refuse to allow me to ask a question.

Mr. **CLARKE**. I did not refuse to allow the hon. gentleman to ask me a question. If he will take his seat for a moment, I will give him any permission he wants. The Minister interrupted me by asking me a question, and I answered by saying that if he had been paying attention to what his colleague had said within half an hour, he would have heard that the statement I made was gleaned from a statement made by his colleague. He jumped up to contradict me. If the hon. Minister has any question to put, I shall be glad to answer him.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The question I wished to put, when I was rudely interrupted by the hon. member for Assiniboia and others, was whether the hon. gentleman was making the statement that an offer had been made for the dredging of the harbour of Toronto at \$6 an hour to his own knowledge.

Mr. **CLARKE**. I made the statement in such a way that every one could under-

Mr. **CLARKE**.

stand. I said I believed—and I take the responsibility of saying it—

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Crawling down.

Mr. **CLARKE**. I am not in the habit of crawling down. I stated that I believed that in the month of April, 1898, a letter was mailed containing a tender addressed to the hon. Minister of Public Works, offering to do the dredging in Toronto harbour for \$6 an hour. But that is aside from the question we are discussing. I have drawn attention to the fact, from the report of the Auditor General for 1897, and the "Hansard" of 1898, that while in the case of Toronto harbour, this dredging, done under contract, cost 12 cents per cubic yard, when it was given out to a political friend, who did good service in the by-elections of 1897, without contract, it cost, according to the statement of the hon. Minister of Public Works, 14½ cents per cubic yard. I am appealing to the business administration that is in office, as strongly as I can, to adopt business methods in carrying on the affairs of the country. There is no reason under Heaven for paying 14½ cents per cubic yard to one man for dredging done in Toronto, Owen Sound or any other place, when another man, who has the plant, declares he is prepared to do it at 12 cents per cubic yard. The most satisfactory way that we know of at present of ascertaining the real value of the work is to give those engaged in dredging an opportunity, by calling for tenders, of putting in their bids, and when conditions are equal, giving the contract to the lowest tenderer. I have brought his matter of dredging again and again before the committee and the House, and when such methods are adopted by the Minister of Public Works, so long as I have a seat in this House, I shall consider it my duty to enter an emphatic protest. There is an item for dredging Toronto harbour in these Estimates to be considered later on, and I hope that \$8 an hour will not be given for the work, but that tenders will be invited and the work given to the lowest tenderer, provided he can give the necessary assurance that he can do the work.

I deem it my duty to express my profound astonishment that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who had made such an enviable record as an honest critic of the administration of public affairs, should countenance in any way the practise of giving out work by the hour, no matter to whom it might be given, without any opportunity being given the public to tender for that work. I am astonished that that hon. gentleman should have given expressions to the views he did to-night, and it is because of what he said that I deemed it my duty especially to take up the time of the committee at the length I did.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. What was the quantity of dredging done at 12

cents per yard, and what was the quantity at 14 cents per yard, if the hon. gentleman has the facts at hand?

Mr. CLARKE. I am reading from part Q, page 128, of the Auditor General's Report. This is a contract for dredging that had been going on for years.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that the quantity of work which was done at 12 cents and a fraction was 630,000 cubic yards, which was a large quantity, whereas in the other case the quantity done was some 45,000 cubic yards, and it is well known that you can get a large quantity of work done at a lower rate than a smaller quantity. That is perfectly reasonable explanation.

Mr. CLARKE. I read from the Auditor General's Report of 1897, August 15th, 1896, Murray & Cleveland, dredging, 685,633 cubic yards, at 12 cents, and if you will only give the present contractor time enough he will do all the dredging required. And at page 482, volume 1, of the "Hansard" of 1898, under date February 14th, the hon. gentleman will find the information vouchsafed by the hon. Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman, will see the point I desire to make. The work done under contract was a large quantity, extending over a series of years; the total amount done was between 600,000 and 700,000 cubic yards, whereas in the other case the dredge was employed temporarily. You cannot make a contract for the temporary employment of a dredge on the same terms as for dredging a large quantity of work over a series of years. The hon. gentleman has stated that he believed—I do not know whether he said that he knew—that an offer was made to the department to do the dredging at \$6 an hour. The officials now present assure me that no such offer ever came to the department.

Mr. BERGERON. The Minister put it in his pocket.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is away and I cannot answer for him. So far as I have information, I cannot ascertain that such an offer was ever made. If such an offer had been made and was not accepted, there would be some ground for the hon. gentleman's criticism.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would not take up any more time, if it had not been for the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) putting words into my mouth that I never said. He sought to lead the committee to understand that I was opposed to calling for tenders for dredging.

Mr. CLARKE. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. McMULLEN. I say that tendering is the proper method, and I would like to see

everything let by tender. But some years ago the Minister of Public Works stated in this House that tenders had been asked for, and whether it was owing to a combine or some arrangement entered into by those who had dredges or not, the average price asked was \$8 an hour, and he took that as the lowest at which dredging could be done, and the work was let at that price. I believe it would be better to let everything that can be let by tender; and I would further say to the hon. member for Beauharnois that when work is let by tender, the price tendered at which the work is let should be adhered to. He is now long enough in this House to know that after dredging was let by tender by the late Government, and before much work was done, the price was raised from 24 cents to 34 cents. We have had the dredging done at Montreal harbour let at a price, and then had the price raised from 24 and 25 cents to 35 cents. Was that right? Hon. gentlemen opposite should have been prepared to condemn wrong when it was done.

Mr. BERGERON. They have been punished for that.

Mr. McMULLEN. That was done and should not be repeated.

Mr. DAVIN. We are not responsible for that.

Mr. McMULLEN. Tenders should be asked for and the lowest accepted, if the lowest tenderer is able to do the work, and he should be made to adhere to his tender.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister of Finance, who is in charge of the Department of Public Works, said that a large quantity of work was being done in Toronto harbour, and on that account it could be done a great deal cheaper. I suppose the same principle would apply to this work. Last session when we asked the Minister what the cost was, he said it was 8 cents a yard. How many yards had been done? Over 10,000 yards. But when it comes to 129,000, we find it costs over 13 cents a yard.

Mr. BERGERON. As much as 17.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has gone out. I do not wish to misrepresent his position. I am afraid he and the Minister of Finance have become advocates of a very bad principle, and one I believe the House, and I am certain the country, will not admit. The hon. member for North Wellington said, it makes no difference whether the work was done by a tailor or a dry goods merchant, if you get it done at a reasonable rate. Where does that argument lead to? It is the very basis of the great abuses that have been carried on in the world from the farming system of Roman times down to these times of Thomas

Gauthier in 1898 and 1899. We have hundreds of lighthouses in this country. Would the Minister of Marine and Fisheries allow a man appointed to keep a light on Lake Ontario to carry on his business as a dry goods merchant in Toronto and hire a person to keep a light at \$100 less a year and pocket the difference? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries would bounce the man who did that the moment the fact came to his knowledge. The Postmaster General wants the mail carried over a route, say, of sixty miles in the county of Grey. He does not care whether the work is done by a tailor or by a road-man, so long as it was well done and done at what he considers a living rate. But would he allow a broker in Montreal to take the contract, carry on his business in Montreal, and hire a man to do it at half a dollar a day less?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Certainly. If he is the lowest tenderer, why not?

Mr. FOSTER. Let it be understood that the principle defended by members of the Government and members who support them is that it makes no matter how many middlemen you have, so long as the work is done and done at a fair rate—

Mr. MCGREGOR. Let me ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Surely the hon. gentleman sees the difference between the case of a postmaster and that of a man who carries a mail along a road. The lowest tenderer should have it.

Mr. FOSTER. But that is exactly what you prevent. The man who does the work does it, let us say, for \$60 a year. But your broker lives in Montreal and gets \$160 a year. The lowest tenderer is not getting the work. Lighthouse-keepers in my time were dismissed when the charge was brought that they were not doing the work, but farming it out at a less rate. They were told: You must attend to the lighthouse yourself or give up the job. And in the same way Mr. Gauthier, who knows nothing about dredging, is asked by the Minister of Public Works if he would like to take a job at \$8 an hour. He finds he can get Macdonald's dredges at \$5 or \$6 an hour, and writes: Certainly, I will take all you can give at that rate. The man who does the work does it for the \$6, the country pays the \$8, and the go-between pockets the \$2. Should not the country have the saving? And yet the hon. member for North Wellington says it makes no difference whether the dredging is done by a tailor or a shopkeeper, so long as it is done at \$8 an hour and good work is done.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) wants to be fair.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I do.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do not put it too strong.

Mr. FOSTER. I will spare my hon. friend.

Mr. McMULLEN. What I said was that it matters nothing to the country whether a tailor or a shoemaker does the work, if he does the required amount of work, does it well, and does it at the tender price. What difference can it make if done at the tender price? That price was fixed by the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Foster's) Government.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend was defending the Gauthier transaction. He defended it on this ground: The Minister of Public Works has decided that \$8 an hour is a fair remuneration for a dredge that will do a certain quantity of work in a day. Then he says to his friend Gauthier: I have decided that \$8 an hour will be paid, will you undertake some of this work? Gauthier replies: I am not accustomed to it, let me think it over. Then, afterwards: Yes, I will do it; and so he takes a contract from the Minister of Public Works to take out 129,000 cubic yards at the rate of \$8 per hour for each dredge. Then, he steps across the way to the man who owns the dredge, and who has not had this chance from the Minister of Public Works, and says: What will you do this for? And the answer is: \$6 an hour.

Mr. McMULLEN. How does the hon. gentleman know that they supplied the dredge at \$6 an hour?

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman think that Mr. Thomas Gauthier has no sense in his head? Does he think he will take a contract at \$8 an hour, and take all the trouble of making an arrangement with a man who is to do the work, and then pay him \$8 an hour?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). That is not the point. You said he got \$6 per dredge.

Mr. FOSTER. I am assuming that it was \$5, or \$6, or whatever it was; it may be \$7.90, if you like; the principle is the same; it is the principle of the go-between. My hon. friend would be right, if the Minister of Public Works had not decided that of himself, but had decided it upon the basis of tenders actually received in answer to a call. Then, if the lowest tenders were \$8 an hour, the Minister had a right to decide that is what he would give. But he precludes tenders, and decides for himself that \$8 an hour is what he will give, and he gives it to a man who farms it out to another at a less rate, and who pockets the difference as his own profit. Now, I say the member for North Wellington will not defend that.

M. DAVIN. I want just to put the thing before the people as it is. Here is Mr. Gauthier, a real estate agent in Montreal, a

father-in-law of the son of the Minister of Public Works, and the Minister thinks it would be a very nice thing to help Mr. Gauthier, and suggests to him what to do. What have we now? We have about \$8,000 paid out in the months of April, May and June, and we have Mr. Gauthier sitting, slippers on, cigar in mouth, light wine from the south of France by his side, enjoying himself, taking two or three thousand dollars of the \$8,000—

Mr. McMULLEN. You are thinking of the Curran bridge now.

Mr. DAVIN. No, I am not. I am not even thinking of the prostitution of a politician that used at one time to howl for economy here, and now is abandoned as no man in public life has ever been abandoned before. He sits there now, complacently sanctioning every job that can be perpetrated, and then gets up and in a craw-fish style defends what he has denounced. Such an example of political prostitution has never been seen in the history of public life. Here is the picture: On the one hand the farmers of this country, who have to work hard. They have some good years and some bad years. They have to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. Look at the farmer after he has cleared a farm, with his bowed shoulders, his hands browned with toil, his face wrinkled with labour. These are the men who pay the taxes. Look also at the workingman, who has to work his ten hours a day, or perhaps eight hours, whose wages are cut down sometimes to a very low figure, who gets \$1 or \$1.50 a day, and sometimes 90 cents. This man also pays taxes, because in every country it is the many who pay, and in every country the many will be the toilers. Now, is it to be borne, that you are to wring the sweat out of the farmer and wring the blood out of the workingman, in order that the Gauthiers in Montreal, the McGillicuddys in Goderich, and some other fellows in Toronto, who have done heeler's work, shall be able to sit in their arm-chairs, smoke their cigar, and drink their light wines, with their Scotch and soda, or whatever else may suit their luxurious palates, and for every \$8,000 that is paid out by this Government, pocket \$3,000, and with their hands in their pockets, swell around, thinking themselves fine fellows? Is that to be borne? Do you think the people of the country will stand it? Sir, the people of the country would not stand it an hour, if they knew it. If the people of this country knew what is going on here, what is going on in the Public Works Department, what is going on in every department, they would not wait for a general election; they would march on the capital, and they would deal out summary and indignant justice to the fourteen Ministers who have betrayed them.

Mr. BERGERON. I see, by the Auditor General's Report, that the inspector of that

work, from the 11th of April to the 30th, was paid \$2 a day. Then, I find, in the month of May, that for 52 days he was paid \$3.50 per day. I want to know what is the cause of the difference?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At the beginning he was in charge of one dredge; subsequently he was in charge of two or three dredges.

Mr. BERGERON. Could he really take charge of two or three dredges?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He supervised two or three dredges, and made daily returns.

Mr. WALLACE. Before this item is adopted, I wish to make a remark or two, and first, with reference to the statements made by the hon. member for North Wellington, to which I had not an opportunity of replying before six o'clock had arrived. He said I had voted for \$41,000,000 for railway subsidies, and was now kicking against \$6,500,000, which was an insignificant amount, compared with the \$43,000,000. By the Public Accounts which I have in my hand, I see a statement showing the railway subsidies granted by the Dominion Government, with the mileage of the same, and I see that there was cash paid under these items of \$42,966,000, and among them there was \$25,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway, which would leave for all other purposes, including a large proportion of the Crow's Nest Pass grant, but outside the Canadian Pacific Railway construction, \$18,000,000 for, say, eighteen years, or a million dollars per year. Of course, there were other payments to railways by mileage, such as that provided for in the contract with the Calgary and Edmonton road, but it does not come exactly under this category. There were \$43,000,000 of which \$25,000,000 was paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway and there is a balance of \$18,000,000. The hon. Minister of Public Works during this session laid it down as a proper plan to have no contracts for public works at all so that he could plunder the country. We have found out, in reference to the various public works that have come under our notice, that that system has been carried out in direct violation of the law, and of those principles of good government and economy which should guide Governments in conducting public affairs. I do not think we are exaggerating when we say that these hon. gentlemen are not only providing for their friends, but that they are providing for themselves. When we see the carnival of corruption that is prevailing in the departments, when we see the gorgeousness which is displayed by hon. gentlemen who, before they came into the Government a few years ago, were not noted for their wealth, now rolling in wealth and splendour, I think there is ground for this suspicion.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Give the name. You do not dare to do it.

Mr. WALLACE. What about the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) himself?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am not in the Government. You cannot get out of it in that way. It is a low, mean insinuation.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order, order.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Yes, it is a low, mean insinuation.

Mr. FOSTER. We should have the ruling of the Chair as to that.

Mr. WALLACE. Oh, no; the Chair only looks to one side.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to ask you, Mr. Chairman, if the observations of the hon. gentleman are within the rules of Parliament, because, if not, he is entitled to withdraw them.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes, I called the hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) to order, and, I suppose, he will withdraw the expression he has used.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I withdraw the expression if it is against the rules. I may do a good deal of thinking, may I not?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) will withdraw the expression he has used also concerning the Chair.

Mr. WALLACE. If it is contrary to the rules of the House, I shall not violate any rules of the House. I was proceeding to say—

Mr. MCGREGOR. Would you kindly name the gentleman?

Mr. WALLACE. When the proceedings were interrupted I was proceeding to say that there seems to be no regard for the law of the land. Contracts are given out without asking for public tenders, and we find that a worse system prevails than even that pursued by the hon. Minister of Public Works. We are told by the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence or some other Minister: We asked for tenders, and, therefore, everything was done all right and fairly. Then we proceed a little further and find that public tenders were not invited in the newspapers, but that they wrote letters to a few parties. When the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence wanted some groceries, or dry goods, or clothing, he wrote to two parties in each line of business. Is that making purchases by public competition or is it a proper way of expending the people's money? It is not; it is an improper way and it opens the door to every kind of dishonesty, favouritism, to extravagance and to the squandering of the people's money. The Ministers seem to lose sight of the fact that they are only the trustees of the people's

Mr. WALLACE.

money. The hon. Minister of Public Works speaks as if public business were a personal matter and that his ipsi dixit must prevail. The Government appear to have abandoned the righteous and proper system of bringing all matters before the Government in Council, where they can be properly considered and disposed of. This system conduces to good government, because not only are seventeen men likely to come to a wiser conclusion than one man, but seventeen men will represent interests that one man could not possibly know. We have seen conflicts between various branches of the Government that have cost the people untold amounts of money, and that have cost the people reputation as well. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), corresponded with those who had a charter from the Parliament of Canada to construct a telegraph line into the Yukon country. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was in communication with them; he assured them not only of his sympathy with the project, but of the support and assistance of the Government in every way that they could possibly help them. But, Sir, at the time he was giving that company these assurances and telling them: "Go on with your enterprise, raise your money, sell your stock, buy your appliances for the purpose of building this telegraph line," another member of the Government was plotting and planning and contriving to undermine him. I suppose that one did not know what the other was doing. Instead of bringing the matter to the council board and having it considered there, and having the united opinions of the Government expressed upon it, each member was working at his own sweet will. While the Minister of Railways was writing to those men in England, and telling them to go on, that the Government was at their back, the Minister of Public Works was sending out his expedition, and it was actually under way before the Order in Council was passed. Before he was authorized to spend a single dollar, Charleson and the men with him were on their way to the Pacific coast; they had purchased their supplies from Charleson here, had made their arrangements, had drawn their money, and Charleson had a letter of instructions which authorized him to spend money without limit. He was authorized to dredge rivers, to build wharfs or harbours, to improve navigation, to buy steamers, which we see he has done, and to expend money in every possible direction and for any purpose. Such a letter of instruction, I suppose, was never before given to an official. It authorized Mr. Charleson to draw on the Government of Canada without stint and without limit for money for any enterprise he chose to go on with. This is the kind of administration of affairs which we are asked to approve of in Parliament, and which we have been combatting for the last five months; and now that we have to go to the country, we shall find it

our duty to expose to the people what we have been exposing on the floor of Parliament.

Portsmouth, Ont.—

Repairs to wharf ..... \$2,000

Mr. WALLACE. Give us some information about this ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is for general repairs of Portsmouth wharf in the county of Frontenac, a short distance from Kingston.

Mr. WALLACE. Who constructed the wharf ?

Mr. BRITTON. It is a dock that was built by the late Government at the time Mr. Kirkpatrick was the member for Frontenac, and it was no doubt built owing to the influence which he was able to bring to bear upon the Government of that day. Apart from what might be said of it, that it was necessary to improve the harbour of Portsmouth and to make it a better harbour of refuge, it was as indefensible as many of these items which I certainly feel a little like complaining about, and which have been the subject of so much criticism in this House. But the dock is there, and it needs repairs, and unless the Government is prepared to abandon it and to say that the late Government in building it there did wrong, I suppose it will have to be kept in repair.

Mr. WALLACE. I will second a motion of the hon. member for Kingston to strike out this item.

Scugog River—

Dredging channel ..... \$5,900

Mr. FOSTER. Is this being done by contract ?

Mr. McHUGH. I may say that I expect that work will be done by the Government dredge which is there. It is to widen the channel in the river coming up to Lindsay.

Otonabee River—

Improvement of navigation ..... \$2,500

Mr. WALLACE. Has any money been expended there before ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. There is no record of any previous expenditure.

Mr. WALLACE. Whereabouts is this to be expended ?

Mr. McHUGH. There are very few here who are not familiar with the importance of the navigation of the Otonabee River which comes into Peterborough. It is a very important river, and there is a great deal of steamboat traffic upon it. I do not see either of the Peterborough members present, but I know the river very well, and I know that there is a great deal of steamboating and lumbering carried on there.

Mr. WALLACE. Is it above or below Peterborough ?

Mr. McHUGH. It is below Peterborough—between Peterborough and Rice Lake.

Toronto Harbour—

Diversion of Don and dredging in the harbour ..... \$50,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is this work now going on ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mu- lock). No. The Don River enters the harbour at the east side, and it has been discharging large quantities of silt along the front of the city, filling up the slips. The Toronto authorities have come to the conclusion that it was a complete mistake to allow the Don to discharge its waters into the bay. There was also a cutting made, running east and west, which facilitated the flow of the water westerly and the consequent deposit of silt into the bay. It was an engineering mistake, which could only be proved by experience. It is now recommended by the Toronto authorities that a channel be cut through the marsh land at the east end of the bay, which will divert the waters of the Don into Ashbridge's Bay, where any deposits, instead of doing damages, will do good by making land. The work will not be a very expensive one. The city wanted about \$75,000 of work done this year, but owing to the advanced season it will be impossible to spend that now.

Mr. FOSTER. What will become of the old Don habitat ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The stream above the bay, except for a short distance, will continue in its own channel.

Mr. WALLACE. How will a vessel get up the Don ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have never seen a vessel go up the Don. There are fixed bridges there. This work is very necessary, but it is useless to proceed with dredging along the front of the piers or out in the bay until precautionary steps are taken to divert the Don, so as to prevent further accumulations. It may cost \$25,000 to divert the Don. It would not be an expensive work and will be put up to tender, and done in a businesslike way. The channel will be cut through a marsh of soft land, and whatever of this vote is left over, after the Don is diverted, will be spent on the dredging. We will have to dredge first where it will be most necessary, namely, westerly of a level drawn from the easterly pier northerly to the mainland. This line will strike about at the foot of Parliament Street.

Mr. WALLACE. Northerly ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. North-westerly, until you come to the shore. The city's plan is to utilize the dredgings to make land, and save the expense of sending the dredging too far out into the lake.

Mr. **WALLACE**. Is there any further amount to be expended on the Toronto harbour?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. In the main Estimates there is an item of \$75,000 to extend the western pier out into the lake. At present that pier is a good deal shorter than the easterly pier, and the seas from the west wash up against the easterly pier and deposit silt in the mouth of the channel. It will be extended into deep water and settle down into the sand, and we will have to keep on building up the top of the pier until it settles down to its final resting place.

Mr. **CLARKE**. I am glad to hear that this work is to be done in a businesslike manner. Has the department approved of the plan of the engineer and will that plan be adhered to? Also, what depth is it intended to dredge the channel?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The Mayor and representatives from the Board of Trade and the council appeared with their plan, which is in the department, and will in all probability be carried out. The engineers have been instructed to make surveys and have an agreement with the city. I think it would be proper to have an agreement with the city, so as to define exactly the liability of the Government. The city claims with some force that the Crown is responsible for the deposit of silt in the bay on account of the Government some years ago having cut a channel westerly into the bay and facilitated the flow of water into the bay, and the city claims that the Crown is responsible. Whether there is any legal liability or not, the navigation was impaired so that vessels are not able now to approach some of the piers at the east end at all. I believe the water has got as shallow as five or six feet in some places.

Mr. **CLARKE**. Less than that in some places.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The scheme will be carefully considered and carried out on these lines.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Will the work be let by tender?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. If possible, and I expect it will.

Mr. **CLARKE**. Will tenders be invited for the dredging?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Of course, but we cannot proceed with the dredging until we divert the Don, except beyond the range of the Don. We will have to

Mr. **MULOCK**.

see what the contract for diverting the Don will amount to, and whatever amount remains over will be applied to dredging this fall.

Mr. **CLARKE**. Have any steps been taken with respect to the eastern extension of the eastern part and constructing drawings? There was one or two drawings placed by the officers of the department as an experiment, and one placed by the city; is there any information from the officers of the department as to the effect the placing of these drawings to the south of the island has had for the protection of the island?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The engineer states that the drawings did not extend far enough out to produce the results desired. They have not protected the washing away of the island.

Mr. **CLARKE**. Will there be any further experiments tried in that direction? Drawings have been placed in other places with most beneficial effect. They have protected parts of the island and have resulted in a lot of land being made. Do the officers intend placing one or more drawings this season?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The easterly pier extends some distance into the lake, and the effect has been to check the flow of sand, and a good deal of land has been made to the east of the island, and, no doubt, when the westerly pier is extended into deep water, as it will be some 800 feet further south, that will check, to a large extent, the flow of water, and may result in causing the sand in solution to precipitate on the shore and make land. It will serve as one groyne at least.

Mr. **CLARKE**. Will the work of extending the pier be let by tender?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Of course.

Point Pelee Island--

Wharf ..... \$5,000

Mr. **CLANCY**. Can the hon. Minister of Finance give any information as to whether there is any likelihood of dredging being done in the river Sydney this year?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. There is an appropriation in the main Estimates, but we have no dredge at present available.

Providence Bay--

Wharf ..... \$5,000

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. This is in Algoma, Manitoulin Islands.

Sheguiandah--

Landing pier ..... \$3,300

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. This is in the same place.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Are the two wharfs in the same place?

Mr. **SPROULE**. They are 34 miles apart.

Mr. FOSTER. Ask the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule).

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the hon. member for East Grey this evening gave us a very strong argument in favour of these two votes. And he was quite right: these are good appropriations.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this a new pier ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before leaving the Ontario items, I desire once more to make an appeal to the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fielding) on behalf of the small harbour to which I drew his attention a month or two ago, the harbour at Bronte, about midway between Hamilton and Toronto. Bronte is a very old place, and at one time a very large amount of business was transacted in that harbour. It was formerly an Indian reserve, and is of some historical note. A considerable amount of fruit is raised in this section, and there is a large fishing industry, because this village is the home of the cisco, the fishing of which gives employment to a very considerable number of people. With fruit-growing and fishing, there is a considerable amount of produce to be shipped from the port, if only some little improvements were made. I have listened very carefully to some of the statements made by the hon. Minister. I have not interrupted him, but have noted what he said with regard to the various appropriations, more especially those for Nova Scotia. I do not desire to draw a distinction as to the appropriations for one province and those for another, for we feel that all provinces are entitled to some consideration. But I feel that the reason that he gave for the grants to many of these small harbours in the maritime provinces, apply exactly to the case to which I now refer. The people there are industrious and have considerable money invested in their fishing and fruit industries. They need a grant to assist them in dredging out the harbour and improving the old pier, which was built there many years ago. This harbour was private property, but the municipal council of the township in which the village lies, I am informed, recently purchased the harbour, with the idea that when it became public property, they could appeal to the Government for aid. A deputation waited on the Minister of Public Works during this session, and asked for aid for the harbour. I do not know what answer was given; but I am sure the Minister will take this into consideration, and, if he has any surplus money from the appropriation for harbours generally, he will do something for the people in the manner suggested. It is of great importance that the water communication be kept up at such places as Burlington, Bronte and Oakville, because fruit can be shipped so much more cheaply than by

rail, creating competition and causing a considerable saving to the people engaged in these industries. The friends of the hon. gentleman are pressing this matter as well, and I should be glad if he would do something for this harbour.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have no appropriation; so, we can only make a note of the hon. gentleman's remarks for future consideration.

New Dredging Plant—

Maritime Provinces.....	\$50,000
For British Columbia .....	25,000
	<u>75,000</u>

Mr. FOSTER. Give us some explanation of this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the case of the maritime provinces, it is proposed to get a new elevator dredge at \$50,000. As respects the British Columbia item, it is for a construction of a stern-propelling dredge and scow, and other items.

Mr. FOSTER. Where do you get the elevator dredge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The one for the maritime provinces will probably be made at Sorel, and the other in British Columbia.

Mr. MORRISON. Surely, this is only an instalment. The dredge for British Columbia will cost more than \$25,000. I understood that it would cost \$60,000 or \$70,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The estimate placed in my hands gives the cost of the dredge contemplated as \$25,000. It is probably not the dredge to which the hon. gentleman refers. This is for a stern-wheel dredge, \$15,000, and other items, making it up to \$25,000.

St. Maurice District—

Improvement to booms between Pointe Marchesseault and Pointe à Bernard, in the St. Maurice River.....	\$4,500
---	---------

Mr. FOSTER. Is this for the lumbermen?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What are we going into now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is for the improvement of booms already in existence, and which are a source of revenue.

Roads and Bridges—

Belly River Bridge—Aid to the N.W.T. Government towards the construction of bridge at Pace's Crossing.....	\$3,000
--	---------

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is \$3,000 for the North-west Territories Government for the construction of steel truss bridge and approaches, estimated to cost \$7,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Who does the building of that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The North-west Government.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you explain that ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This road became necessary for the settlement of the Swan River district. We have been promoting immigration there, and a large number of settlers have been pointing that way, but it has been impossible for them to get in. After a considerable amount of discussion, I told the Manitoba Government I would recommend a refund of half the amount of the \$4,000 if they would expend it on the colonization road.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we will have to protest against that. We have gone a long distance, and surely we will not go so far, when we are spending Dominion money lavishly to get citizens for the province of Manitoba, as to go to work and build roads for the province which lead into the settlements that these settlers are to live upon. I am surprised at the Manitoba Government putting in that claim, and still more at its being allowed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend is under a misapprehension. It was not what could be called a permanent work for the benefit of the province at all ; it was a road up into the Swan River district, where a railroad was going to run in the following year, and is now going. This is not work which would be of any permanent benefit to Manitoba, but it was for the purpose of enabling the settlers to get in there. They could not have got in otherwise, they would have been simply blocked had not that road been constructed.

Portage du Fort Bridge—

Aid towards reconstruction, provided the Quebec and Ontario and Quebec Governments contribute each \$5,000. \$20,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is an interprovincial bridge across the Ottawa, constructed some years ago under a joint arrangement between the Dominion and the provincial governments of Ontario and Quebec. The bridge has fallen into decay, one span is now down. It is proposed to renew the bridge on these terms, the Dominion Government to receive \$5,000 from each of the two provinces.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the contribution of the different governments on the bridge construction before ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think the renewal is in the same proportion as the first construction.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Minister have his officers find out before concurrence ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING.

Telegraphs—

Cheticamp and Meat Cove telegraph line ..... \$5,200

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is at present a gap in that line of 40 miles between Cheticamp and Meat Cove. The estimated cost is \$1,200 per mile.

Mr. FOSTER. When it goes away from Cheticamp, where does it go ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Meat Cove is the extreme northern point of the island of Cape Breton, and is the point at which the cable leaves the Magdalen Islands.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the purpose of building this ? The Meat Cove line that runs to the Magdalen Islands, of course, we know what that is for ; but this seems to be local.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it follows the north-west coast from Cheticamp. It is practically an extension of the existing line in Cape Breton, running up the north-west coast and getting round to Meat Cove in that way.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It connects with the Magdalen Islands telegraph instead of going round by Sydney.

Mr. FOSTER. We want to know if the Government has now a connection with Meat Cove, and then with the Magdalen Islands that serves all the purposes of the Government for marine information and the like of that. What need have you now for building local lines there ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy informs me that the Minister visited the locality, and the fishermen there were very anxious to have a line along that section, and the Minister was persuaded it was a good thing, and he put the item in the Estimates. The telegraph in that section of the country is entirely in the hands of the Government. I suppose no company would come in and build that little section.

Anticosti Island—

Renewal of line wire between Becksie River and English Bay ..... \$1,200

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the report of the district superintendent, Mr. H. Pope, dated October 19th, 1898 :

For some time past we have found an increasing resistance on the line between here and Long Point ; I consequently instructed our repairer to examine that section very carefully, and he reports as follows :—“The line, especially between Becksie River and West Point is very badly rusted, especially in the joints and at the tie-wires, in some places the line being entirely eaten off. He removed some of the worst places but found he could not remove them all without a great outlay of time and material, besides making many more joints in the line.

In view of this and the increasing traffic on that section, which will also increase more as the north shore line extends eastward, the General

Superintendent suggests that the section between be strung with new No. 6 wire during the coming season.

It will require about 30 miles of wire.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to know something about the position of the ownership of Anticosti Island and the treatment that is being meted out to the settlers there. Propositions have been made to drive the settlers out of that island, although they have been settled there for many years, and it seems to me that a great injustice has been done to them.

The PRIME MINISTER. Although the subject is hardly relevant to the item before the committee, I have no objection to giving the hon. gentleman the information he has asked for.

Mr. FOSTER. It has caused a great deal of discussion.

The PRIME MINISTER. In the early part of the session, the Government brought down a return moved for by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), I think, which gives the whole history of the case. It has been stated that Mr. Mernier, the present owner of the island, had not a title to it. The papers which I brought down, show that Mr. Menier has an unbroken chain of title coming down from the French King in 1640 or 1660. There are some settlers, or rather fishermen, who have been squatters upon the island for twenty years or so. The question of the ownership of the island is now before the court. As these fishermen are not rich enough to undertake the cost of their own defence, it has been undertaken by the Quebec Government; Mr. Davidson, a gentleman connected with the bar of Quebec, has been retained as their counsel, and he has been paid by the government of Quebec. In the meantime, these people are not disturbed in their possession. A Methodist clergyman came to me to ascertain whether it was not possible to remove them and give them land in the North-west Territories. Without consulting my colleagues, knowing very well that I could speak in their behalf, I said that I would be very glad to favour anything that could be done to give them land in the North-west Territories. These men had been chiefly fishermen all their lives, and it was thought that we might give them land on the shore of Lake Winnipeg, where they could pursue an avocation similar to the avocation that they had followed for generations, and where they might have an opportunity of going into farming.

Mr. WALLACE. As I have been told the story, it differs very materially from that told by the right hon. gentleman. He has told us that Mr. Menier has an unbroken title from sixteen hundred and something to the present day.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is my belief.

Mr. WALLACE. That is a matter that is in dispute, and it is now before the court. These men have rights, as well as Mr. Menier.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. And stronger rights, because they have been here, as citizens of Canada and British subjects, for twenty years. They originally came from Newfoundland, having been invited by the owner of the island at that time, and they came on the terms of settlement that were well understood to prevail throughout the province of Quebec. This is a part of Quebec, and, as such, it is amenable to the laws of Quebec and of the Dominion. But, under the present circumstances, this man has assumed the right, not only of ownership, but of kingship. Mr. Menier is the king and ruler of the island. Mr. Menier, a foreigner, not living in Canada, not a British subject, appoints a governor to rule over this island, and he does rule over it in truly despotic style. The first thing that they do is to deprive the people of the rights they undoubtedly possess.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Are the courts not open to them?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, the courts are open to everybody. An attempt was made to turn these men off the island in November, or late last season, and a Dominion policeman—not a Dominion policeman, but a provincial policeman—went there to arrest them, although the hon. Minister of the Interior, with his usual sneer, asks if the courts were not open to them. Where were the courts then? Here were men going to arrest these people and put them in confinement, if they did not clear out.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that a Dominion policeman went to arrest them?

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman can hear what he wants to hear, but he cannot hear what he does not want to hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That does not alter your statement.

Mr. WALLACE. The first statement I made was, that it was a Dominion policeman, but I corrected myself, and said that it was a provincial policeman. The question is asked: Could these men not go to the courts? Where was the opportunity for these men to go to the courts, with not a dollar in their pockets, in the fall of the year, scores of miles away from the mainland, with the probability of their homes being burned, in their absence, and their families being left unprovided for? The whole case, to my mind, is one of hardship, of brutality, and of interference with the rights of Canadian citizens and British subjects, settled upon British soil. We passed

a resolution the other day, sympathizing with British citizens who went into a foreign country, and who claimed to have the rights of British subjects extended to them under British suzerainty.

But, Sir, such a storm was raised that the Government of Quebec was compelled to step in and give legal assistance to these men, and to pull off the provincial police who were sent down to arrest them. The whole machinery of the Government of Quebec apparently was being used at first to obey the demands of Mr. Menier and take away the rights of these British subjects and Canadian citizens who were settled on the Island of Anticosti. The statement is made that they were criminals of the deepest dye, and had done deeds which should have consigned them to the penitentiary if not to the gallows. It has been proved, I think, to the satisfaction of anybody who desired satisfactory proof, that these charges were baseless, slanderous and untrue, and that these men were a God-fearing, law-abiding class of citizens. What is the charge made against them? A gentleman who went to Anticosti as a minister of the gospel, a leading member of the church to which these people belonged, says:

Will you allow me to call attention to a statement recently made by the Hon. Mr. Tarte on the floor of the House of Commons, in which he states that "the twenty Methodist families at Fox Bay, Anticosti, are professional wreckers—men who lure ships by displaying false lights: that they may possess themselves of the resulting spoils." Allow me to assure you that I have the most reliable and unimpeachable evidence that this statement is not in accordance with the facts, that it is utterly false and malicious. The men who have lived among these ten or twelve—not twenty—families as teachers and missionaries, and who have no motive to speak other than the truth, declared them to be honest, hard-working people.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not in order. First, he is referring to a previous debate.

Mr. WALLACE. Who said it was a previous debate?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The statement made by the hon. gentleman—

Mr. WALLACE. I said nothing of a previous debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that the hon. gentleman is quoting from a previous debate. I ask him if he is?

Mr. WALLACE. I reply no.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will accept the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. WALLACE (reading).

There seems to have been a determined effort to traduce these people, and to destroy their character, that they may be more easily banished. Every article that has been written against them has been inspired by Mr. Menier or his friends, and has had but one object—to discredit these

Mr. WALLACE.

people in order to ruin them. The advice of Mr. Menier's counsel in serving them with an action in ejectment, summoning them to appear in court hundreds of miles from their island home, and to show cause for their continuance in homes built by them and their fathers in good faith as permanent residences, twenty-six years ago, and sending the citation by the last mail and boat to touch at that port for the season, was a piece of practice worthy of the most barbarous ages.

And yet, Sir, the Minister of the Interior gets up and says: "Why don't they go to the courts? Why wasn't the law open to these men?" In the statement I have read, made by a distinguished citizen of Canada, the hon. gentleman has his answer:

If it is not because of "rule" or "religion" that these men are maligned, which we doubt, it is a case of the strong attempting to crush the weak by the meanest of all expedients—illegal process and defamation of character. Mr. Tarte should have known these people better before he proceeded to defame them. If reports are true, even to a small degree, he has traduced men with a more honourable record than his own. If his slander of these defenceless people, who live in poverty, and for five months in the year without any postal communication with the outside world, is a fair sample of his conduct with other people, it is high time the prefix now associated with his name should be substituted by one of a different significance.

The Methodist church does not need to apply to such a source for her ethics, or a credential of character, or for a testimonial regarding her missionary work. This church will bear favourable comparison with the one at whose shrine the hon. gentleman bows, and she will on occasion most assuredly know her duty towards the man who presumes to slander her in the Parliament of our country.

This is not the first time Mr. Tarte has gone out of his way to insult Methodists, and it has been endured in silence, but longer silence might be deemed cowardice or sin.

With that statement of the case, which I believe is an accurate one, with the statements which have been made defaming these men's characters, with the facts of the case, as we know them, that these men have been basely persecuted, maltreated and threatened, and that they have had a charge made against them for the purpose of dispossessing them and depriving them of their rights and privileges at a time when they could not bring in their defence, we find in the province of Quebec men who will defend the men who are making the charge which they have never attempted to prove that these men were luring vessels by false lights in order that human life might be destroyed and that they might have a chance of plundering the vessels. If that is true, it is the duty of the men who make the charge to bring forward the proof and protect the country from such miscreants as these men would be. But in face of the fact that the characters and reputations of those men, as proved by the missionaries who have been among them during all these years—

Mr. DAVIS. I rise to a point of order. I think the question under discussion is a vote

of \$1,200 for the construction of a wire between Bessie River and English Bay on the Island of Anticosti, and the speech which the hon. gentleman is making has nothing to do with the question. I ask your ruling.

**Mr. WALLACE.** With regard to the point of order raised by the hon. member, the Island of Anticosti, every acre of it, is said by the First Minister to be the private property of Mr. Menier, and we are asked to approve of a vote of public money for the construction of a telegraph line on that island, in which Mr. Menier probably claims much more than the right hon. Minister says he has a right to. I might have moved an amendment in going into Supply or waited for this vote to come on, and I chose to take the milder course of bringing the matter before the attention of the House when some vote was up that would justify a reference to it.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** I thought that there was a great doubt whether the question was in order, but did not press the point, because, if we are to have a discussion, we may as well have it now as later. The hon. gentleman could have brought this up on a motion to go into Committee of Supply, and that would have been perfectly regular, but I doubt whether he is in order in bringing it up on this vote.

**Mr. DAVIS.** I shall not press the point of order.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** I tell the hon. gentleman that Mr. Menier claims the ownership of the whole island, and he apparently claims it with a good title. But, of course, my judgment goes for nothing in that matter, and the courts will have to determine finally the value of his title. It is quite true, he is not a British subject, but he has bought his land from a British subject, who had bought it at a sheriff's sale, under the authority of Her Majesty, and has all the rights of a British subject to the island. It is true, that he has given the title of governor to his manager, which is a very pompous, but very inoffensive, title. He recognizes fully the laws of Her Majesty, and has shown the best recognition of those laws by being a suitor in our courts. He also pays our customs dues, and has never thought of claiming any title, except under the suzerainty of Her Majesty.

As to these men whom he is attempting to eject, it is only fair to say an attempt at a compromise was made, and on its failure, he went before the courts. What more can be done in a British country than, in the case of a failure to come to an agreement, between two contending parties, to have their difficulties settled by the courts? These men are poor, and Mr. Menier is a millionaire. These men, therefore, could not have gone into court on equal terms, but their case was so strong that the government of Quebec came to their rescue, and engaged

counsel, and they are being defended by a counsel of their own selection, Mr. Davidson, who is paid by the province of Quebec. Surely, nothing could be fairer. As to the character of these men, I never heard anything said against them, except some references on the floor of this House, but if anything was said against them, it was not at all because they were Methodists, and it will be found that the gentleman who made the remarks, stated that there were on the island French Canadians and Irishmen, presumably Catholics, as well as Protestants, and although a certain reputation was attached to them, I do not know anything about it, and will not countenance anything of the kind. But I disclaim any desire, on the part of my hon. colleague the Minister of Public Works, to attack any religion. His words do not warrant anything of the kind. Moreover, I may say that, for all I know of these men, I never heard a word to their detriment in Quebec.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The reference my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) made to me, causes me to say a word or two, not however by way of explanation of this matter, because the right hon. First Minister has explained it very clearly, and I have no personal knowledge of it at all, but simply to explain that when I asked the hon. member (Mr. Wallace) whether the courts were not open, I did so in perfect good faith, because it seemed to me that the proper remedy would be found in the courts, and I wanted to know whether there was any sound reason why that remedy was not open to these men. We have the statement of my right hon. friend, that, on account of their poverty, which made it difficult for them to appeal to the courts, the government of Quebec came to their rescue, and, in doing so, they did what has never been done in any other case that I know of, and that is, pay counsel to defend the rights of private individuals to property they claim in a private way. With regard to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Public Works, to which the hon. member for West York referred, when he said that the Minister of Public Works had gone out of his way to insult the Methodist Church; I happen to be a member of that denomination myself, and I was very close to the Minister of Public Works when he made that speech, and I am bound to say that I utterly failed—though I listened to him very carefully—to find in it the slightest indication that he intended in any possible way to reflect on any denomination. Anybody who knows that hon. gentleman, knows that, however, bluntly he may express his opinions, he would be the last man to attack any particular denomination. I heard the remarks he made in the House, and I think that the gentlemen in the Methodist Church who, no doubt in good faith, expressed their opinion that he made an attack on that church, and was animated by

hostility to it, gathered an altogether erroneous idea from the perusal of his remarks, and I am satisfied that no gentleman in the House at the time he spoke, had any opinion of that kind. The opinion of these gentlemen must have arisen from an incorrect report of what he said, taken in connection with the circumstances that a clergyman of the Methodist Church was specially interested.

Mr. BOURASSA. As this matter has been discussed, not only in the press of this country, but also in the British press, and as references to it are now going into the pages of "Hansard," I wish to state a few facts of which I have personal knowledge. I happen to be personally acquainted with some of the gentlemen who have taken an interest in the legal dispute, as well as in the settlement of the island. It has been said that Mr. Menier is a foreigner. That is true, but I hope that other foreigners will come to Canada and spend as much money as he is doing, and give our people the same benefit of their expenditure. He has made a special point, by instructions to his manager, to induce, as much as possible, Canadians to settle on the island. To his manager he has given the title of governor, but this gentleman is none the less simply a manager. The title of governor is one which is often given to persons holding similar positions on large private estates, both in England and France, and in the French colonies. The settlers brought on the island since Mr. Menier is its proprietor, are, without exception, all British subjects, and all the expenditure made on the island has been made in favour of Canadian interests. Canadian building materials and supplies have been purchased to a large amount for the island at Quebec and Montreal. I may say, further, that when Mr. Commettant came to the island, he made it a special point to go and see all the settlers, including those of Fox Bay and English Bay, and offered them titles of occupancy from Mr. Mernier, on the same conditions as those on which titles are offered to all other settlers there. And a good many Protestants as well as Catholics, Englishmen, Frenchmen and Irishmen have accepted those titles. Others have refused to accept them claiming that they had titles of their own. Then, Mr. Menier, before taking any proceedings, sent Mr. Commettant to Quebec. Mr. Commettant notified the Attorney General of Quebec, and asked what were the proper proceedings to take in order to have the question settled before the courts. He was advised, as I understand it, to take the proceedings that have been taken with the understanding that the Government would appoint a counsel to appear for the settlers. So that this question of delay which was brought up by the hon. member for West York as though it were an act of persecution against the settlers, is really nothing of the kind.

Mr. SIFTON.

A counsel has been appointed to appear for them and the case will be heard. So Mr. Menier has not only dealt fairly with them, but has taken every trouble to put himself in the proper position to have his rights tested before the Canadian courts.

Mr. WALLACE. Would it be better if he had the defence as well as the prosecution in his own hands?

Mr. BOURASSA. He took the trouble to ascertain what were the proper proceedings to take. What more could he do? Those people claimed the right to stay there, and he had to proceed as he would against people who attempted to settle on his property without leave. So when the writ of ejectment was served on them they had to appear and plead that they were owners. The writ of ejectment was to be served by a bailiff, but no bailiff dared to go there because of the reputation of these people—justly or unjustly deserved—unless he was accompanied by force. The object was not to put them out, but to serve them with a writ. After it was served, it was understood that the case would be discussed before the courts, Mr. Menier to be represented by his counsel—a Canadian counsel—and the so-called settlers to be represented by their counsel appointed by the province of Quebec. No matter when the writ was served, nothing would be done before the case was dealt with in the courts.

Mr. WALLACE. That is very good. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) says that some people accepted the title and some others did not. But he has not told us what those titles were.

Mr. BOURASSA. Certain titles of occupancy.

Mr. WALLACE. Shall I read them, as the hon. gentleman has failed to do so:

Mr. Menier made false charges against these people, the provincial police were sent down to tear down their homes, and expel them from the island, not because they were pirates or invaders, but because they would not be subject to Mr. Menier as absolute sovereign of the island and its waters. He demanded not only the seigneur's fee for right of occupation, but a title of wild animals captured. He forbade any one to leave the island or to land upon its shores without his permission. He forbade them to trade with the outside world, or the outside world to trade with them. They must sell all to him, and buy all from him or forfeit their residence on the island. After twenty-seven years' freedom on Canada's free soil, they refused to sacrifice their manhood to be made serfs.

Mr. BOURASSA. May I ask if the hon. gentleman is quoting from the text of the title furnished by Mr. Menier or from a letter by the gentleman—

Mr. WALLACE. I am quoting from a letter written by a gentleman who was a missionary for a long time, and who knew what he was writing about.

Mr. BOURASSA. I do not discuss the good faith of the gentleman who wrote the letter, but the accuracy of his report of the title.

Mr. TAYLOR. Twenty years peaceable possession gives a title.

Mr. BOURASSA. That question has to be settled by the courts, whose authority is greater than that of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor).

Mr. WALLACE. I have here some of the history of these people.

The north shore coasting steamer "Otter" arrived up here from the gulf on Monday, bringing among her passengers two men named Edward Osborne and Hoyles Whiting from Fox Bay, Anticosti, delegated by their brother settlers there to appear and answer for them at Murray Bay, the judicial chef-lieu of the district of Saguenay, to as many actions taken out against them by Mr. Menier, and calling upon them to show cause in the Superior Court there to-morrow why they should not be ejected from the Island and their homes and buildings thereon demolished. In their natural alarm at the terrors of the law and the fate overhanging them, these two poor men, owing to the impossibility of getting to Quebec otherwise at this advanced stage of the season, had been obliged to make the journey from Fox Bay to Esquimaux Point, on the north shore, a distance of 95 miles, in an open boat, and from Esquimaux Point, where they caught the coasting steamer, to Quebec as deck passengers, exposed to all the inclemency of the weather, and virtually without sleep since their departure from Fox Bay, over a week ago; but time and tide wait for no man, and the poor and penniless must perforce suffer inconvenience and hardships which more fortunate humanity can scarcely realize. In their case, however, their little all in this world was at stake, and what dangers and discomforts will men not cheerfully face under these circumstances? And no finer specimens of hardy, modest, unassuming manhood it would be difficult to find.

It describes the men, and goes on:

They say that in the spring of 1873, while living at their homes in the channel, Port au Basque, Newfoundland, they or their parents in some cases received from Mr. Forsyth, the then owner of Anticosti, paper signed with his own name, inviting them and other Newfoundland fishermen to go and settle on Anticosti, where, he stated, he had houses, boats and fishing gear for them at four different stations, namely: Ellis Bay, McDonald Cove, South-west Point, and Fox Bay, and that they could settle at whichever of these places they chose for and could build, fish and hunt. As fishing was just then poor on the Newfoundland coast and the prospects held out by Mr. Forsyth at Anticosti were brighter, they accepted the invitation and, disposing of their homes and belongings in Newfoundland for whatever they would bring, devoted the proceeds to the purchase of a schooner and two months' provisions, arriving, some thirty persons in all, at Fox Bay, on August 23rd, only to find that they had been deceived; that Mr. Forsyth was not there; that there were no houses or provisions awaiting them, nothing but a few fishermen from the South Shore, who had merely erected little huts on the beach for their own convenience. On August 24th, a heavy gale sprang up, which drove their schooner ashore, and which left them in a

still more hopeless condition, as they were unable to go elsewhere. Some of them made two trips around the island in small boats, but found no aid, while the others sheltered themselves on the beach or in the bush as best they could.

Then it gives their history in this matter, and it says:

We were in too poor circumstances to pay for newspapers and were, moreover, so situated that we only got the mails from the outside five times a year, from June to October. So that we had very little opportunity to know what was going on in the outside world. When the English company wanted us to pay rent and come under their rules, we told them of our rights from Mr. Forsyth, and they could not and did not dispute them. But since Mr. Menier has become the owner of the island it seems to be a different thing.

In the spring of 1896, Mr. Menier made his first appearance amongst us with Mr. Commettant, the governor and manager on the island. They made us a great many promises, for which, in return, we made some promises to them. But before one year had passed they broke some of theirs, which we can prove. During the same season (1896), Mr. Menier went away, leaving Mr. Commettant in charge as manager, and a hard manager we have found him to be.

Last spring (1898), he came to Fox Bay with a police force from Quebec, and ordered us to get ready to leave the island within 24 hours, on board the "Savoy," which would land us on the north or the south shore, whichever we chose. We told them that we could not leave on such short notice, whereupon they stated that, if we did not go, they would handcuff us and take us by force, and that if they could not take us alive they would take us dead, burn our houses on the spot and also handcuff and take the females. Seeing that this threat did not have the desired effect, they surrounded us with police, armed with revolvers, clubs, &c., and compelled us to sign a paper that we would leave at our own expense and of our own free will.

Yet, we are told that the Quebec Government is looking after the interest of the people, protecting them and getting lawyers to defend their cause before the courts. That may be true to-day, but this is the course the government of Quebec took in the first instance. They sent their provincial police to drive out these men, to threaten to murder them, to threaten to burn down their houses.

Mr. BOURASSA. I made the statement that before any proceedings were taken it was perfectly understood that the government of Quebec would appoint counsel, that was understood at the time of the serving of the writ. Therefore, the hon. gentleman should accept my statement before saying that it was the force of public opinion that compelled the Quebec Government to adopt that expedient.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not wish to deny a statement of the hon. member as to the facts within his own knowledge. But I understand that the situation was different from what he states it, that while they did that later on, they did not do it in the initial proceedings. The initial proceedings

were to carry out the wishes and desires of Mr. Menier, and to that end they sent the provincial police—

Mr. BOURASSA. Only to protect the bailiff in serving the writs, otherwise he did not want to go.

Mr. WALLACE. There is no law that authorizes a bailiff to burn houses. He says they had orders to.

“Take us by force, and that if they could not take us alive they would take us dead, burn our houses on the spot, and also handcuff and take the females.”

Mr. BOURASSA. That is the romantic part of it.

Mr. WALLACE. That is the brutal and unjustifiable part, and it will not do to have a laugh, and to say that is the romantic part to these poor men who are threatened, in the fall of the year, with no means to keep them over winter, with the destruction of their homes, if they did not consent to the cruel demands of Mr. Menier. It was not romantic—

Mr. BOURASSA. I call it romantic because it exists only in the imagination of the gentleman who wrote it.

The PRIME MINISTER. Were they manacled?

Mr. WALLACE. No they were not, apparently. The report says:

A statement in writing to this effect, and in very much the same terms, which they called “A statement of their rights and grievances,” was drawn up and signed at the time by the settlers in their own simple unadorned way, and this statement, Osborne and Whiting, the two delegates, have brought to Quebec, together with the following letter of recommendation or introduction.

Then follows a letter of the Rev. Mr. Argue, the Fox Bay missionary, among those people, who denies all the statements that have been made as detrimental and injurious to the character of these men. I will read an extract or two:

They are having a great deal of trouble owing to Mr. Menier, who is endeavouring by very harsh and, no doubt, unjust means to route them as well as many others of our people out of their hard and honest-earned moneys.

There is the religious question here, which I will leave out, because I do not want to mix that up with it, more than is absolutely necessary. But I say that these men were cruelly treated, I do not care what their religion was, nor what was the religion of the man who ill-treated them. This letter by the Rev. Mr. Argue is dated September 30th, 1898. He is the missionary on the ground, whose statements must be considered trustworthy:

Some three months ago, by Mr. Menier's authority, armed police endeavoured to bluff and frighten the people out of the place; but, failing

Mr. WALLACE.

in their attempt, they then compelled the people to sign documents agreeing to leave the island by September 10. And since that time he has entered the case in law to try to force the people out, summoning them to appear in the Superior Court, Saguenay, within twenty days from September 24. They are on their way, and any assistance you can give them in the way of advice, sympathy, or recommending them to a good lawyer, will be gratefully received. \* \* \* Many of them have been living in their houses here for twenty-five years, and if Mr. Menier gets his ends accomplished, the result will assuredly be that scores of our brethren will be homeless. Already the matter has given us untold trouble and anxiety, but we hope that Christian patriotism will manifest itself and that the citizens of Fox Bay will be allowed to dwell together in peace.

Yours fraternally,

REV. A. B. ARGUE,  
Fox Bay, Anticosti.

Now, this is the statement of their case. It shows a most extraordinary state of affairs. I would like to ask the Government in connection with it some other questions. Mr. Menier comes in from France with his own vessel; where does he make entry of customs?

The PRIME MINISTER. In the city of Quebec.

Mr. WALLACE. Does he make entry at the city of Quebec before he lands on his own island?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think so. All the information I have leads me to that conclusion.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sorry the Minister of Customs is not here, who has that matter in charge.

Mr. BOURASSA. Mr. Menier has two boats; he has one boat, the “Savoy,” making regular trips between Anticosti and Quebec, and that never goes to France. All the goods transported to the island are transported from Quebec by the “Savoy.” Mr. Menier has already expended on the island millions of francs in Canadian goods, or goods imported into Canada on which customs has been paid. The only boat that comes over from France is the private yacht of Mr. Menier, which simply brings what he requires for his trip.

Mr. WALLACE. The vessel going from one Canadian port to another, of course, that is all right. But the other one coming from France—

Mr. BOURASSA. It has come twice in three years.

Mr. WALLACE. I have a letter asking me to get information where that vessel makes its customs entry, who examines the cargo, if the customs regulation are complied with. If I am correctly informed, there is no customs officer at Anticosti.

The PRIME MINISTER. If the hon. gentleman puts those questions. I may say

that if he will give me a note of them I will get him the exact information. In the meantime, speaking subject to correction, I make bold to say that all the entries are made at Quebec.

Mr. WALLACE. But the law could not be complied with even if the entries were made at Quebec, because the law says they are to go to the customs-house within 24 hours. They are not to land goods at any place except at a customs port. They are not to land goods on the island of Anticosti at all, because if they do they violate the customs law.

The PRIME MINISTER. My pretension is that they do not do it.

Mr. WALLACE. In coming from France they must not go to the port of Quebec without calling at Anticosti. Do they do that?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is it.

Mr. WALLACE. That is not the information I have from the parties on the island. But I will be glad to get definite information about that. Then, Mr. Menier appoints a governor. The governor rules in an arbitrary, despotic and tyrannical manner.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He is the manager.

Mr. WALLACE. Some governors are managers, and some governors have not quite as much power as managers. The Governors of our provinces have responsible Ministers who advise them, but this governor has no responsible ministers. He is the manager, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries tells us. He takes the whole matter in his own hands, and in the style that I have described to this House. Then, there is the fact that the Imperial Government recognizes that there was something of national importance in Mr. Menier, this celebrated Frenchman, getting possession of the entrance to the St. Lawrence. I will quote a paragraph here:

Mr. Menier, a few years ago, during one of the Francophile manias which periodically sweep over this province, purchased from the provincial government the Island of Anticosti, which, as any one who will take the trouble to look at the map will see, commands the entrance to the River St. Lawrence just as effectually as the French Islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon command the entrance to the Gulf of St. Lawrence. His object, as stated then, and many times since, was to provide for himself and his friends a game and fishing preserve where they might spend their summers with profit after the exacting duties of chocolate-making in Paris.

He got possession of this island, which commands the entrance to the St. Lawrence, and which, in the event of war between Britain and France, would be an invulnerable point for an enemy of Britain and Canada. What was his first act?

To warn the English-speaking settlers on the island that they must move, that they had

no longer any rights there, that all their years of labour in making a home for themselves and families must go for nothing. He had no use for any one on the Island of Anticosti who could speak English. They might prove troublesome in some future time.

And so the English-speaking settlers of Fox Bay received notice from Mr. Commettant, who was appointed "Governor" of the Island of Anticosti by Mr. Menier, and who has been given social rank by the Lieutenant-Governor of this province, although he is no more in the eyes of the law than a steward upon an Irish landlord's estate), that they must leave. It was nothing to him that these poor people had made their homes out of the wilderness of this barren island, that their children had been born there, and their old folks buried there—in a word, that they had made it their home—what was that to him? He had simply to carry out his orders, which were to remove every English-speaking man, woman and child from the Island of Anticosti. Mr. Menier, the chocolate man, did not want anybody who spoke English to be a witness of his sport.

This discloses a very unsatisfactory state of affairs. It is not satisfactory to find a foreigner coming in and claiming what no citizen of Canada ever claimed in any part of this Dominion, what no British subject has ever claimed—an extensive right of ownership, as if he were the king or the sovereign of that possession.

Mr. BOURASSA. Simply the owner, just as you would be of a property you had bought.

Mr. WALLACE. Simply the owner! It is nonsense to say that because, whether these men have the right or not to their possession, because although they had been there for 25 years, Mr. Menier recognizes no right. He got the assistance of the provincial police and set the machinery of the law in motion, for driving these men out without going to the courts. It is true that afterwards the local government did step in when public opinion became aroused. Our hon. friend says that the government were doing right before that. I will not dispute that, but they did wrong in the first instance without a doubt, because afterwards they had to retrace their steps. To me it appears that a gross outrage has been perpetrated on loyal British subjects, men either born here or born on the island of Newfoundland. When a member of our Canadian Government described them as murderers, he was bound to prove that statement or be condemned for making such an assertion against men who have been proved to be a law-abiding and peaceable community by their missionaries and teachers. The course which the Dominion Government, or a member of the Dominion Government, took in regard to that matter was most reprehensible. Whoever permitted a foreigner to exercise such tyranny over the Canadian subjects of Her Majesty are responsible, and their conduct has been most reprehensible. Whatever is the result of the trial of this case in court, under technical rules, I am quite sure that public senti-

ment will not permit foreigners to drive them out of their homes without assisting them to obtain new homes in Canada, but better still to retain the homes, surrounded by many hardships as they are, where they have settled and where they have lived for the last 25 years.

Yukon District—

Trails, roads and bridges ..... \$175,000

Mr. FOSTER. We want an explanation of this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The estimated cost of the work from Cariboo Crossing to Selkirk is placed at \$100,000, in accordance with the following estimated details :—

Cariboo to Tagish Post, 25 miles at \$300...	\$ 7,500
" to Takhini River, 65 miles at \$300.	19,500
Takhini to Caramacks Landing, 100 miles at \$200 .....	20,000
Caramacks to Selkirk, 70 miles at \$300.....	21,000
260 miles .....	68,000
6 Supply Depots at \$500 .....	3,000
12 Relay Stations at \$200 .....	2,400
Branch to White Horse, 10 miles at \$300...	3,000
Surveyor's outfit.....	3,500
	79,000
Bennett to Cariboo, 26 miles at \$500.....	13,000
Bridges and contingencies.....	7,100
	\$100,000

Mr. FOSTER. What sort of a road are you building ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. A party has been sent up under the supervision of Mr. McArthur, a surveyor connected with my department, who has been exploring that country for the last two or two and a half years. His instructions are to make a trail from Bennett to Dawson by as direct a route as possible. He has already explored a trail up the valley of the river which runs on the west side of Lake Bennett, coming out at Rink Rapids. His instructions are to make a trail which will answer for an express trail in winter time and be open to foot travelling in summer. The object is to have a route which will be open when the ice breaks up in the river in the fall and in the spring. For a couple of months in the fall, and also in the spring, the ice breaks and forms again, so that it makes travel along the river impossible. In order to have continuous communication, it is necessary to have a road by land, and this trail is for that purpose. The instructions are to make as good a trail as possible, and to construct small buildings fifteen or twenty miles apart for the accommodation of people using the trail.

Mr. FOSTER. What kind of a road ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Just such a road as is made for opening up a bush country. The idea is to have a road

Mr. WALLACE.

that will be practicable as soon as the snow falls.

Mr. FOSTER. Not a road that you can take a wagon over ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not in the first instance. According to our estimate, it would not be possible except at great expense to make a good wagon road. If heavy traffic were taken over it, the road would get into ruts in a short time. An attempt to make a good wagon road in that country at the present time would be absurd ; it would be almost as cheap to build a railway. The route would have to be drained out first, and it would be enormously expensive ; in fact practically impossible, to make such a road. All we hope to have is a road by which, as soon as the water communication is closed, communication can be had by sled.

Mr. FOSTER. Tell us about the mechanism you are using to control this money and do the work ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. McArthur is there in an advisory capacity. He has nothing to do with the money.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has to do with the money ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Charleson is the general manager of the business.

Mr. FOSTER. Tell us what Charleson is doing ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is doing the work described in this estimate, constructing a telegraph line over the route I have just given, with a party of men who accompanied him from Ottawa for that purpose. What more does my hon. friend wish me to say ?

Mr. FOSTER. What is your mechanism for paying the supplies and everything like that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The supplies are being obtained from the North-west Mounted Police, and that department will be recouped the amount. Mr. Charleson received a certain amount in advance, but no further money has been paid to him.

Mr. FOSTER. What force of men has he got ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He took 18 from Ottawa.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are these men engaged on the work in question ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I presume they are still on the work. We know nothing to the contrary.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am credibly informed that they are all prospecting.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have no information of that kind.

Mr. WALLACE. Has Mr. Charleson a son and a brother who went out on that expedition?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Neither of these persons was taken from Ottawa by him. He has a son who was engaged in the Atlin district, and we have no information whether he is working with his father or not.

Mr. WALLACE. Is he on the pay-list?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The pay-lists are on their way down, but not received.

Mr. FOSTER. What time did Mr. Charleson get to work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He left Ottawa on the 13th March and reached Skagway the 30th, and started work at Bennett the first week in April.

Mr. FOSTER. And no pay-list received yet?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. An arrangement was made that the families of the men who lived at Ottawa might receive money on account here. Some have claimed it, and others have not.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not explain why, when you have ten days communication from Vancouver to Bennett, you have no pay rolls or reports.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There were two parties. The first went to take charge of the telegraph line, and the second party left here about the 10th or 12th July.

Mr. FOSTER. How many had Charleson in the first party?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About 18 from Ottawa. Mr. McArthur, who took the second party, had about the same number.

Mr. FOSTER. Then you have Charleson leaving here with a party of 18 men, and he got there about the 1st April, and has been at work four full months now. It seems almost incredible that he has not sent in his monthly pay roll.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It does seem remarkable, but the officials of the department inform me that they have not received any.

Mr. FOSTER. That argues badly for Charleson. His instructions were explicit to send in his reports and pay rolls promptly. When you send out a man and entrust him with the expenditure of money in the neighbourhood of \$400,000 or \$500,000 and give him explicit instructions, and when the whole Government is here and liable to be called to account for this expenditure, and when you have not, although four months have elapsed, received any report at all, I

think that looks very badly for Mr. Charleson. Has any inquiry been made?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the deputy has called his attention, both by letter and telegraph. He replied that he is forwarding the pay sheets by a man returning to Ottawa.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there not a mail. Surely he is not going to send his papers by a man who happens to be coming to Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. One of the men of the department is returning. He might as well have sent his papers by mail.

Mr. FOSTER. Better, because the mail is more safe. You do not know what may become of the man. He might get drunk.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The mails get lost, too, sometimes.

Mr. FOSTER. But there is not anything like the same risk. What reports have been received?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. None later than those I brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. That is equivalent to none at all. Had he not entered on his work then?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. There must be three months of work done in that case, and yet you have neither report nor financial statement nor pay roll. Have you any reliable man alongside Charleson who keeps the time of the men or the accounts?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is an officer of the department with him for that purpose, Mr. Harding.

Mr. FOSTER. What was his work here?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He was a clerk in the accountant's office. He left two weeks ago.

Mr. FOSTER. The department evidently became thoroughly alarmed. This man, who, like Joshua, was going to lead into the promised land, who was sent out entrusted by the Government, has not sent in any report after having been on the ground for four months, and it is only two weeks ago that the department became frightened and sent out a man to find out what is the matter. If this had been in the early time, when we had no communication, or if it had been in a different season of the year, there might be some excuse, but here is the best season of the year for communication and when it is fairly quick. What amount of money was sent to Mr. Charleson altogether?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He received advances to the amount of \$12,500, and has forwarded accounts to the amount of \$43,813.11.

Mr. BERGERON. Did he send that by special messenger or by mail?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. By mail. It is a fortnight or thereabouts since his last accounts were received.

Mr. WALLACE. Up to what date did they amount to \$43,000?

Mr. FOSTER. The accounts would be dated.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But we have not the accounts themselves at hand. I will have the accounts brought down. It would be probably a month ago they amounted to this sum.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it all left with Mr. Charleson?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, construction is in the hands of the technical officers.

Mr. BERGERON. But he signs everything and sanctions everything.

Mr. WALLACE. They must obey his orders.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He has general instructions and must certify all accounts.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the items of these accounts for \$43,000?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Here is a memorandum showing some items: Freight paid to the White Pass Yukon Railway Company, \$1,686.84; H. A. Munn, on account of freight, \$500; Upper Yukon Trading Company, purchase of steamer, \$1,800; C. Racine, building scow, \$1,400; Victoria Yukon Trading Company, scows, \$3,987.68; Parson's Produce Company, provisions, \$199.75; W. H. Roger, drugs, &c., \$253.92; Bilobeau & Wise, board of men, \$70; Jas. W. Woods, sundry supplies, \$374.66; Dominion Express Company, expressage, \$8.45; T. W. Fuller, on account, \$1,500; sundry persons on account of wages—these are payments made in Ottawa to wives and their representatives of employees in the Yukon district, \$2,283.50.

Mr. FOSTER. These accounts come in certified by Mr. Charleson and the department pays them here by issuing cheques?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The accounts for the river work are certified by the engineer, Mr. Taché, and countersigned by Mr. Charleson. For the telegraph work, the accounts are certified by Mr. Robertson, who is in charge of the construction of the telegraph, and countersigned by Mr. Charleson; they are forwarded, and on this they are paid.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to the men here whose families are paid, you have not received a pay roll and do not know that they are still in the employ. How, then, can you advance to their families?

Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They have been paid up to the 15th of June, but the deputy informs me that in the absence of pay-rolls, he has declined to make further payments.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am credibly informed that a large proportion of them have located and staked claims, and some are prospecting. I have that from a party who returned from the Yukon a few days ago.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have no information.

Mr. BERGERON. Would it not be a good thing to find out if it is true?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, if we had any means of finding out.

Mr. BERGERON. If you do not send him any more money he will probably write or do something to enable you to know where he is.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He does not receive a penny of money except on certified accounts.

Mr. BERGERON. But Charleson himself certifies.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But he must get the certificate of the technical officer.

Mr. BERGERON. He can get that easily.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He cannot get it easily, if they are capable and independent officers.

Mr. FOSTER. Besides the money that he took with him, has he sent drafts on the Government to the banks?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No drafts except those accompanying the certified accounts to which I have referred.

Mr. FOSTER. How does he make drafts on the Government? The Government would send cheques with these accounts to the parties to whom the money is due, would it not? Surely you do not send the money to Mr. Charleson and ask him to pay the bill?

Mr. WALLACE. He is authorized by his letter of instructions to draw.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, there have been no cheques sent out. Mr. Charleson makes drafts to the amount of the accounts, which are certified, and these drafts pass through the bank. They are paid when the accountant certifies the accounts.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, Mr. Charleson certifies to the bills there and sends them on here?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The accounts are attached to the drafts, they pass through the hands of the bank, and the draft is presented by the bank accompanied by the

account, presented by the bank through its agency here, and the deputy informs me that the certified account to the amount of the draft is attached to it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The draft is paid up there. the draft is made through the bank up there.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to find out whether Mr. Charleson has drawn for \$43,000, has received that money under the supposition that he has paid these bills.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Charleson has a letter of credit on the authority of the Government that he is to draw money at any bank or from any Government officer who has a dollar up there, on his personal authority.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Charleson has got the drafts cashed by the bank in Dawson, and a draft has been forwarded here and paid here, so that he drew the money on the draft.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand that the draft that is made by this gentleman is attached to these certified accounts. Then, is it a fact that these certified accounts are presented to the Government here through the bank?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the deputy informs me that the drafts go through the bank that way.

Mr. CLARKE. So the Government have the first intimation of these certified accounts through the bank which has paid the money, and presents it to its agency here?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If it is all right we accept the draft; the bank has paid it on Mr. Charleson's draft; but if it is not all right, the Government do not pay it.

Telegraph lines in British Columbia and Yukon district—From Bennett to Dawson, and branch to Atlin City..... \$147,500

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The telegraph line is constructed now from Bennett to Little Salmon River, a distance of 216 miles. It is expected to be on to Selkirk by the 26th of August, as Mr. Charleson reports, and by the 15th of October through to Dawson. Mr. Charleson has charge of the telegraph and the river improvement. The amounts to which we have been referring relate to the telegraph, because the road party has not been long enough away. We have a telegram this past week from Mr. Charleson from Bennett.

Mr. WALLACE. We would like to have the instructions to Mr. Charleson.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They were laid on the Table some time ago. The hon. gentleman will find them in the "Hansard."

Mr. FOSTER. How much has been spent on telegraph lines?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. \$24,701,-43 for 1898-99, and in the current year, \$4,551.69; making a total expenditure on that part of the work of \$29,253.11. Then, on the telegraph line up to the 30th of June, \$12,560.

Mr. FOSTER. What are your last reports from Mr. Charleson?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have no reports from Mr. Charleson except the telegram of last week.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you no report of his progress from day to day?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There were some reports which I brought down earlier, but there are no recent reports.

Mr. FOSTER. That is most incomprehensible.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is strange, I confess.

Mr. FOSTER. You have a man here in charge of expenditures amounting to \$350,000, he has been away nearly five months, and the department cannot lay its hand upon formal reports of progress from week to week by this gentleman.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you an estimate of what this 216 miles are going to cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. \$225 to \$250 a mile.

Mr. HAGGART. Then, your estimate is about double what it ought to be.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That refers to the portion already constructed. There is a large portion yet remaining, there is the line to Quesnel, not included. The total is 660 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you 216 miles already constructed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So it is reported.

Mr. CLARKE. How much has been paid on account of these 216 miles?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I read this statement a moment ago. There was \$43,813, including \$2,000 for the roadway, and besides there is an advance made to Mr. Charleson of \$12,500.

Mr. CLARKE. That figured out comes to \$225 a mile for 216 miles, and the total would amount to \$48,600. There have been accepted drafts amounting to \$43,813. \$2,000 expended on account of the roadway, and this sum is in addition to the \$12,500 given to Mr. Charleson when starting.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On account of the telegraph line, \$12,560 has been paid to Mr. Charleson. The other items refer to the improvements of rivers.

Mr. BERGERON. Those are the accounts that are coming and that are expected.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The accounts include both the improvements to the rivers and the telegraph line, but they are separated, and the only items we have are those in connection with the telegraph line on account of which there has been paid \$12,560.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the department received any accounting for the money advanced to Mr. Charleson?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is on the way.

Mr. FOSTER. Five months after the man started.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has the one draft of \$43,000 been the only draft presented by the bankers?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There were several drafts, but this is the amount. There was this \$43,000 and then the advance of \$12,500 made to Mr. Charleson.

Mr. BERGERON. How much has he cost us?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. \$43,813.11 includes the payments on various drafts advanced to Mr. Charleson, and an advance of \$2,000 to Mr. McArthur.

Mr. BERGERON. Were the accounts he incurred before he started paid out of that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, they have been forwarded to Mr. Charleson to be certified, and they have not been paid.

Mr. FOSTER. Were the accounts for the supplies he got before he left here all sent away up to the Yukon? Have you not a supply officer to make these purchases?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Charleson bought his supplies himself.

Mr. BERGERON. Who was the wire bought from?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. W. G. Charleson.

Mr. BERGERON. Who were the provisions bought from?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. From Bate & Sons.

Mr. FOSTER. When you have a supply officer in your department why did you not let him buy these supplies if you were not going to buy them by tender instead of letting Mr. Charleson buy these supplies, passing over the supply officer, the clerks, the Deputy Minister and the Minister, sending the accounts all the way to Bennett and Selkirk, and waiting until they come back again? You seem to go out of the way, over half of the globe, to put everything in Charleson's hands, when you ought to keep

Mr. FIELDING.

as much as possible out of Charleson's hands. Would it not be a more business-like way to have the accounts made out and certified to by Mr. Charleson, sent to the department, and then have the cheque to the department issued in payment of them?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think the hon. gentleman's suggestion is practicable at this time. That is the ordinary way of doing business where there is no difficulty about banking facilities. I am speaking of the purchase of supplies up there.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is he getting his supplies there now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. From the Mounted Police at present.

Mr. FOSTER. And paying for them?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, we will have to arrange with the Mounted Police.

Mr. FOSTER. What is he getting that he is paying for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I read a series of articles showing the nature of the expenditure. One item was the board of the men.

Mr. FOSTER. When you take up each item of supplies you will likely find that they are such as the large trading companies would furnish. These companies are quite well satisfied to sell to the Government, send in their bills and get their cheques from the Government in the course of thirty or sixty days. Would it not be far better to have it arranged in that way, so that bills could be certified to and the department's cheques issued? It seemed to be necessary that every single thing should be transmuted into dollar bills, and that they should be passed through Charleson's hands. He lets his department go five months and sends not one single report in reference to what he is doing.

Mr. CLARKE. Were tenders asked for the wire for this telegraph line?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Invitations were sent to three parties, and Charleson's being the lowest tender, it was accepted.

Mr. CLARKE. Who were the other parties?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Lewis Bros., of Montreal, and Wurtele, of Ottawa.

Mr. FOSTER. If the lowest tenderer got it why are you sending the accounts up to Charleson to be certified?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The goods were delivered out there, and Mr. Charleson had to certify to their receipt. They were delivered at Vancouver and

they charged freight. The accounts have not been paid and will not be paid until Mr. Charleson certifies.

Mr. BERGERON. What were the prices of the other tenderers?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not remember the figures, they were given in a previous debate.

Mr. FOSTER. When Mr. Charleson is taking the place of the supply officer, the deputy, the secretary and the accountant of the department, and it is in his hands to purchase this wire, if he determined to buy it from his son he would buy it from his son if he asked for five thousand tenders.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No matter what price you pay.

Mr. FOSTER. No matter what price you pay. His son will very easily know what price to charge.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that is very unfair.

Mr. FOSTER. The department put itself in that position when it went out of its way, when it put the purchasing of supplies into the hands of Charleson instead of in the hands of the purchasing officer.

The PRIME MINISTER. I understand from the deputy that the inference of the hon. gentleman is all wrong. The department itself sent circulars for tenders to the three firms mentioned—Mr. Charleson, Mr. Wurtele and Mr. Lewis—the department got the tenders, and the tenders were opened by the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why were these circulars sent to retail stores? Why was one not sent to the Dominion Wire Company?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is not the question at present. I understood the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) to state that Mr. Charleson got a tender from his own son, the inference being that Mr. Charleson and his son had been conniving, while the truth is, that the circulars were sent, not by Mr. Charleson, but by the department, and the three tenders were opened by the department.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not the information we got, when discussing this matter before. I asked if these materials were bought by the supply officer, and the information I got in the House was, that Mr. Charleson had bought them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a mistake. What I said was, that there was no supply officer for the provisions, and that Mr. Charleson had made the arrangement for them; but for the wire, I stated that the department had invited tenders from the three parties mentioned, and gave the contract to the lowest.

Mr. FOSTER. We might have the tenders.

The PRIME MINISTER. We will have them on concurrence.

Mr. CLARKE. The names of three firms in Toronto present themselves to my mind, at the moment, who are in the business of supplying wire for such a purpose: Rice Lewis & Son, who have a reputation as wide as the Dominion; M. & J. Vokes, another large firm, and Aikenhead & Co.—the three largest firms doing business in wire supplies in Toronto. Would it have been unreasonable for a Government that was going to invest a large sum of money in wire for these telegraph lines, to have sent a circular to these three firms by mail, and ask them to tender by telegraph the next morning? Is there any good reason why the firms in Toronto and Montreal who are in this business legitimately, were not given an opportunity to tender?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman's view may be quite correct as to what ought to be, but the fact is, that the tenders were invited from the parties named. I think myself that in a case of that kind it is desirable to have public tenders and a sufficiently broad competition to insure a fair price.

Mr. CLARKE. Two of these firms were retail firms, and it was not fair that other firms should not have had an opportunity to tender. It was not fair to the Government itself.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to know whether the Government are going to take any efficient steps to see that track is kept of that expenditure? It has transpired that Mr. Charleson, under the most positive orders to report regularly and fully, has been away from this city for five months, and that there is not a report that can be laid before this House yet received from him. There are two telegrams and some scraps, I believe, but there is no weekly statement of his disbursements; neither has a single payroll been received by the department. Are the Government going on with an expenditure of about \$500,000 in Mr. Charleson's hands in that way, or will they take some efficient steps? What ought to be done. I think, is to send an officer of the Auditor General, or some one appointed under his authority, to examine the accounts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a vote in the Estimates to enable the Auditor General to send an officer out to inquire into all the Yukon accounts, and that officer, I believe, is now on his way out. The hon. gentleman is not correct in saying that there have been no reports from Mr. Charleson. There have been reports, but not recently. I agree with the hon. gentleman, however, that reports should be sent regularly. Mr. Charleson has wired that reports are on the

way. If these reports are not satisfactory, it may be necessary to send some one out.

Mr. FOSTER. I think a policeman should be sent out.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman says these accounts ought to be audited by the Auditor General. I quite agree with that, and we have taken steps to have the Auditor General send out an officer to audit all the Yukon accounts. If those of Mr. Charleson are not included, they ought to be.

Mr. BERGERON. Why would Mr. Charleson mind the officer from the Auditor General's Department any more than he minded the instructions of the Department of Public Works? He does not care a snap for the department or for anybody.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have known Mr. Charleson for twenty years, and if he turns out anything but an honest man, I shall be very much surprised. If he has not sent his reports, there is something to be accounted for; but I think we should wait before condemning him. At present I refuse to accept any insinuation against him.

Mr. FOSTER. But he has condemned himself, because he has not taken any steps to carry out the instructions of the department and to send these reports.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman is in error. No doubt, we have not the reports from Mr. Charleson that we ought to have. That may be voluntary or accidental, criminal or innocent, regular or irregular; but at the present time I refuse to believe there is anything wrong. I think it is premature to condemn Mr. Charleson.

Quesnelle to Atlin, B.C., via Stikine River and Teslin Lake, about 900 miles of telegraph lines..... \$225,000

Mr. FOSTER. Who is doing this?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This has not been done at all yet. Mr. Charleson and the men with him are building the line from Selkirk to Dawson and a branch line to the foot of Atlin lake. This proposal is to extend the line from the foot of Atlin Lake to Quesnelle, where it will be connected with the existing line reaching to Ashcroft, on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Nothing has been done, however, beyond the foot of Atlin Lake up to the present, but the desire is to push that work this fall.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be gained?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It gives us connection with the existing telegraph lines in British Columbia, and affords us direct communication with Dawson City.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the estimate for this 900 miles?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is \$250 a mile.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. BERGERON. What does the department rely upon on making that estimate?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The estimate is made by the superintendent of telegraphs in the department at Ottawa.

Mr. BERGERON. What does he know about that part of the country?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that Mr. Hosmer, of the Canadian Pacific telegraph, who has knowledge of constructing telegraph lines out there, has confirmed that estimate.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the hon. Minister that in writing?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, I am informed that there is a letter from Mr. Hosmer giving that as his opinion.

Mr. BERGERON. Can that be brought down?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. On this whole item, I wish to call attention to the unconstitutional course pursued by the Government to take advantage of Parliament. Parliament never authorized the Government to go into the business of constructing a telegraph system to the Yukon. The Government never had the courtesy to ask Parliament whether it would favour that policy.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Is my hon. friend sure of that?

Mr. FOSTER. I think so. And as I am reminded by my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor), Parliament, when it was deliberating did grant a franchise for the construction of these lines by private company. And it was supposed and hoped by Parliament—and believed also, or Parliament would not have granted the franchises—that these companies would undertake and carry out the work. No subsidy was granted to either of the companies incorporated. The members of the Government expressed themselves in written letters in favour of these companies taking up the work and carrying it out. Such letters are on record, dated but a short time before a different course was decided upon. But suddenly, a few days before Parliament met the Government decided to build the line themselves. Money was filched from votes from which it should not have been taken, as the Prime Minister himself had to acknowledge in this House, and Mr. Charleson was hurried off with a part of that filched money in his pocket just before the members of Parliament showed their faces in Ottawa. And so an expense was undertaken for which we are now taking votes of \$400,000 or \$500,000, and it may run up to much more. There is an example of a Government forcing the hand of Parliament against the express policy of Parliament, so far as it could express it by granting franchises to companies to build these

telegraph lines. And we have not yet heard any reasons as to why the Government felt itself necessitated to enter upon a course of that kind. There was no war, there was no urgency which would prevent the Government waiting for two or three days to meet Parliament and lay its plans before Parliament and get the assent of Parliament to enter upon this expenditure. If a Tory Government had undertaken such a thing, Liberals might say that they were surprised, and rightly so; but that a Liberal Government should undertake it seems to be very much a matter of course.

The PRIME MINISTER. We have discussed this question once before. I do not care to renew the discussion, but it may be worth while to refresh the memory of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). He says Parliament was not consulted. I say Parliament was consulted, that he had an opportunity to speak and did not speak; and if my hon. friend's memory is so defective, I will refresh it. Parliament was convened on the 16th March, and on that day the Speech from the Throne contained this sentence:

Much information has been obtained since you last met relative to the extent and value of the deposits of gold and valuable minerals in the Yukon and other parts of Canada. The returns from the Yukon have so far proved sufficient to meet the heavy expenditure it was found necessary to incur for the purpose of preserving law and order, and it has been thought expedient in the public interest to authorize the construction of a line of telegraph for the purpose of maintaining speedy communication with the people of those distant territories.

To this there was an Address moved in answer, which Address contained this paragraph:

We are glad to learn that much information has been obtained since we last met relative to the extent and value of the deposits of the gold and valuable minerals in the Yukon and other parts of Canada, and that the returns from the Yukon have so far proved sufficient to meet the heavy expenditure it was found necessary to incur for the purpose of preserving law and order, and also that it has been thought expedient in the public interest to authorize the construction of a line of telegraph for the purpose of maintaining speedy communication with the people of those distant territories.

That Address was debated for six weeks and an amendment was moved, but one that did not refer to this subject. Except for this amendment, the Address was approved in its entirety. The hon. gentleman had then an opportunity to condemn the policy of the Government which frankly announced to Parliament that it had taken the precaution to build a system of telegraph to the Yukon. But the hon. gentleman never opened his mouth upon it. And why? Because there is not a man who will condemn the building of a line of telegraph to the Yukon, for it is a most necessary improvement. The hon. gentleman said that charters had been granted to companies to build

the line. That is true, and we would have been glad to have them build these lines. But these companies allowed months to elapse without doing anything, and the Government determined not to lose another year, but to build a line of telegraph during the season.

Mr. FOSTER. This is one of the most amusing things I have seen yet. The very ground of my complaint was that the Government had notified Parliament after it had done the business. Does my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) think that he has met the constitutional requirements by showing that, after the back of Parliament was turned, he and his colleagues decided to build this line, they took this money to start it and sent out their men, and then called Parliament together, and notified Parliament what their high lordships had done? He says we could have challenged it then. Yes; and we can challenge it now. And it would have been as fruitless to challenge it then as it is now, because the Government had actually commenced the work, without a single line of approval from Parliament, without their having courtesy to consult Parliament as it is their duty to do in a matter of such vast concern. Why, on the very same principle, my hon. friend some time this autumn could authorize the building of a Government road from Ottawa to the Pacific, send out surveyors, take this money from votes not appropriated for that purpose, start the whole arrangement, send out his paymaster, and tell him to draw on the Government for whatever was necessary. Then when Parliament met the right hon. gentleman could notify Parliament and would consider that he was fulfilling the constitutional requirement of getting the authority of Parliament before undertaking the work. That is exactly what he has done. He has forced the hand of Parliament, relying upon his subservient majority to see him through no matter what he does. That majority may be subservient in this Parliament, but there is a majority behind it which I do not think will be quite so subservient in the country. My hon. friend says that the private company did not do as it should have done. That is not the reason. He was forced by the master of the administration, who laid this whole plan to do this. The Minister of Railways and Canals was informing certain gentleman that the Government in general, and he in particular, were anxious that it should be built by a company, and that his company was the chosen one, and that he was going to be watch dog for it and see that no rivals would get ahead of it; but after the Minister of Public Works had prepared his plan and had chosen his men, and had started it into operation without even going to Council. That company did everything which a company could do, and was more expeditious than most of the companies with which my hon. friend has had to do.

I remember that the Petersen firm were given a broker's contract to get a fast line of steamers. They did not do it, and yet they were continued, and the right hon. gentleman himself and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, and the travelling Minister of the Cabinet, all declared for years in this House that it was all right, that Petersen should be given one more chance, and still one more, and more time was given him. But when this company was performing its part of the work and pushing its operations with the help of the Government itself, through the Minister of Railways and Canals, all at once the Master of the Administration brought down his scheme which he had prepared beforehand, having chosen his men and got them booted and spurred for the journey, and said: This is my plan, that other arrangement you have entered into must be set aside, and I am going to have this carried out by Charleson. Some conscientious member of the Government might have said, Parliament has not sanctioned it, but he replied: Parliament does not count, we will do it and then notify Parliament.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The main point of the criticism of the hon. gentleman is that Parliament was not consulted. It is an awful thing, he said, to commit the Dominion to an expenditure without the authority of Parliament, but it was only a few days ago that his attention was drawn by the right hon. Prime Minister to a case in which the hon. gentleman committed the Government to an expenditure behind the back of Parliament. In the year 1896, the hon. gentleman had barely left Parliament, when he entered into a bargain with an American company to do certain work in the harbour of Port Dover. That was a bargain made, without any authority of Parliament, without even going through the formality of an Order in Council. He gave the assurance to a brother Minister, who gave it to the American company, that he would authorize an expenditure of \$25,000, chargeable to the Government of Canada. There are cases where urgency may be pleaded, and I presume he thought that was one of them. In this case there was also urgency, the construction of this telegraph line was urgent, and the preliminary expenses were paid out of another appropriation. Without any authority the hon. gentleman opposite made this bargain with an American steamship company that he would spend \$25,000 in the harbour of Port Dover. I presume it was a justifiable expenditure, and we have evidently thought so, since we have undertaken to implement the bargain made, but when the hon. gentleman remembers that, he ought to be a little more considerate.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is quick in getting out at what he thinks is a parallel but he is very unfortunate if he thinks that

Mr. FOSTER.

what he has quoted is a parallel. What did I do? When the hon. gentleman brought down millions of dollars of Estimates, did he go behind the back of Parliament? Does he go behind the back of Parliament, when he brings his Estimates down? It was to bring an estimate down.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But the hon. gentleman did not.

Mr. FOSTER. But the hon. gentleman would if he had remained in power. The arrangement was simply this, that the company were going to a large expense in a productive trade between a port on the United States side of the lake and a port on this side. For their business they were fitting up the harbour on this side. They were putting a large expenditure in the harbour, and they approached the Government with this proposition: If we expend so much money in that harbour, will you give a subvention of so much. After consulting the Council, we came to the conclusion to recommend it as an estimate to the House, and that was all we did. There was not any money filched from other votes, and a man was not sent down to Port Dover to spend the money. There was no expenditure of money beforehand, and the two cases are not parallel at all.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman would preserve the respect which the committee would like to have for him as ex-Minister of Finance, if he would simply admit the facts instead of making the lamest possible explanation. He says that he agreed to submit an estimate to Parliament. That is all this Government has done. If Parliament did not pass the estimate, we would be able to go on and construct a telegraph line. The hon. gentleman says we have got a majority. The hon. gentleman expected to have a majority, and that is the reason why he made the promise. The point is this: The hon. gentleman entered into a contract which committed the Government of Canada to the expenditure of \$25,000. He did that without parliamentary authority. The transaction is so simple that any attempt to explain it simply exposes the fact more clearly that the hon. gentleman did it. I do not blame him in the slightest. Cases of urgency will arise, and if the circumstances were such that the Government, after consideration, decided that this company was going to do the work, and that a refusal to promise might affect substantially the question of whether the work would be done, and the Government was prepared to take the responsibility of doing it. I do not say that that would in itself be a reason for the Government not doing it. But I say the hon. gentleman is unfair when he ignores the question of urgency. Nobody suggests that, under ordinary circumstances, and without any extraordinary

reason of urgency, it is proper for this Government to incur a large expenditure of public money. No member of this Government undertakes to assert any such proposition. But every member of this Government undertakes to say that the construction of a telegraph line this season to Dawson City was a matter of urgency, and that to that end it was necessary that a party should be sent out as early in the season as possible, and in order that that might be done, it was necessary that an expenditure should be incurred before we were in a position to get an estimate from Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman will allow the question of the respect that will be given to me in Parliament to rest upon my own action and the good sense of Parliament. But we have heard the hon. gentleman before. We heard him two years ago about that matter of urgency, when, in the face of the members of Parliament, on their way to Ottawa, he shut the doors on every public offer and closeted himself with chosen contractors with whom he had very intimate operations before; he chose to shut the doors against every reputable financial man in the world, and behind closed doors, with the tramp of the feet of members of Parliament coming to Ottawa sounding in his ears, he chose to make a contract which proposed to give away millions of the best gold land this country possessed, and to commit this Parliament to a large expenditure. The hon. gentleman says that I made a contract, that I went behind the back of Parliament, and that his case in this respect is no worse. I want to show what the difference is. With reference to the appropriation for Dover harbour, there was no contract, no understanding with the other party, but only that we would recommend to Parliament an estimate for it. They took all the risks in the case if the estimate was not presented, or if it was not granted by Parliament. They spent their own money, and the Government did not spend a single dollar of money. In this case it is quite different. These hon. gentlemen, without any urgency worth the name, brought this country into an expenditure of five or six hundred thousand dollars, and commenced the expenditure beforehand, and did it within two or three days of the meeting of Parliament. Would the country have gone to ruin if they had waited for three weeks longer and got the authorization of Parliament? They would have had their telegraph line through. They started two days before Parliament met, and they are going to have the line through in October.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I made the remark when I rose to reply to what I took to be an argument of the hon. gentleman, that we would have had higher respect for him if he had confined himself

to the argument. I think I may now say that when a gentleman in this committee is met with an argument and he turns to make a contemptible insinuation against a member of this committee in the nature of a personal attack, he does not strengthen his position in this House. He turned to make contemptible insinuations in connection with my action in the proposed Yukon Railway contract, by saying that I closeted myself with a contractor.

Mr. FOSTER. So you did.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman means anything by that, let him get up and say it, let him have the courage, let him have the manliness, to say so openly. I say that I closeted myself with my colleagues who were instructed by Council to hold consultation in regard to making the contract, it was made by the members of the Government and was submitted to this Parliament, and was submitted by this Government for reasons which they conceived to be sufficient and proper. I am bound to say that my hon. friends on the other side of the House did not distinguish themselves in answering the arguments which were presented to this House. And I have this to say that we have the spectacle of the leader of the Opposition the other day proposing to this Parliament that, instead of this railway which we speak of being constructed without the cost of a dollar to the people of Canada, as it would have been had we been able to carry our Bill through the Upper House, he submitted the proposition that that railway should now be constructed out of the public exchequer at a cost of millions of dollars. The hon. gentleman is not happy in being compelled, in a discussion about a very simple matter, to resort to a personal attack in the effort to try and draw a herring over the scent, and to repeat an objection to a policy which has been abandoned by the hon. leader of the Opposition himself. I only rose to make these few remarks because the hon. gentleman was drawing a red herring over the scent by introducing a matter that has nothing to do with the discussion of this telegraph line. The hon. gentleman took what seemed to be a most unfair course, a course that was altogether unjustifiable, in returning to matter which has been fully discussed, and which does not require to be discussed again, although we are prepared to discuss it at any time that it may be necessary.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton), with his usual unfairness, has stated that we have been driven to back up his position, and that the hon. leader of the Opposition accepted it, and bound his party to it, only a few days ago. The hon. leader of the Opposition, standing in his place in this House, and making the statement that he did, no more confirmed that proposition,

that immoral proposition, from a patriotic sense, which was brought forward by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, than I am affirming it now. It only shows the unfairness of the hon. gentleman and the keenness with which he appreciates the position in which he and his party are placed before the country, when he is driven into the necessity of attempting to torture the statement made by the hon. leader of the Opposition into an acceptance of the outrageous proposition that the hon. gentleman, after having closeted himself with the contractors, brought down and tried to force through this House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It was passed through this House.

Public Buildings—

Yukon district ..... \$152,500

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I beg to move that this item be reduced to \$134,700.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this work going to be done under the direction of Mr. Charleson?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, Mr. Charleson has nothing to do with it.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be built with this money?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is proposed building at Dawson City a post office, costing \$13,500; Gold Commissioner's office, \$10,000; commissioner's house, \$10,000; Crown timber land office, registry office, with rooms above, \$10,000; commissioner's and controller's office and council chamber, \$10,000; house for commissioner, controller, timber and land agent, legal adviser, and register, \$7,000; house for officials, \$6,000. Stewart River: house and offices for Crown timber and land agent and mining records, \$6,000. Dominion Creek: house and office, \$2,500. Teslin Lake: house and office, \$2,500. Fittings generally, \$15,000; fuel and light, \$6,000; buildings, \$15,000; fuel, \$12,000; rent, \$3,700, furnishings, \$4,000, making \$134,700.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these to be built by tender and contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know whether we can build them by tender and contract out there. I am told that Mr. Ogilvie had some buildings constructed by tender and contract. If it is possible at all, I think they should be done in that way, but I cannot say. Conditions are peculiar out there.

Mr. BERGERON. What amount of royalty have we received for the last year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have just passed the turning point of the year, where we pass from one year into the other.

Mr. FOSTER.

We have received on this season's operations between \$400,000 and \$500,000 up to the 30th of June, but considerable sums were probably paid in immediately after that. I cannot possibly give a full statement at present.

Mr. FOSTER. It is stated that the clean-up this year will be \$20,000,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think it will be as much as that. I think the statements in the newspapers are somewhat exaggerated.

Mr. BERGERON. How much have we received since the country was opened up?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot remember at the present moment.

Mr. BERGERON. How is it received?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is deposited in the Bank of Commerce at Dawson City, and accounted for to the Finance Department, like any other bank in any other part of Canada.

Mr. WALLACE. How can the Government erect these buildings by a private arrangement or by day's labour? It appears to me that, of all places in the world, this is the place where this work should be done by public contract. There are more reasons for doing it in that way in the Yukon than in the city of Ottawa, because here the Government have a staff in the Public Works Department, and they have inspectors and workmen, besides which, materials can be purchased at well-established prices. The proper way for the Government to have this work done in the Yukon is to ask for tenders. There are tens of thousands of people in the country, there are men who have all kinds of qualifications—carpenters, builders, painters and contractors—some of whom have been building houses in Dawson City, and who are in a position to know what a building would cost. The Government is in no position to undertake this work. In fact, they have undertaken more than they have successfully carried through. Their officials, we are told, are overworked. They have proved, in the special work they have undertaken to do, that they are utterly incapable, and their direction from here has been of the same incapable character. Therefore, there is every reason why the Government should not undertake another task and add to their long list of blunders in this direction. It is the duty of the Government, in regard to every building for which they are asking for an appropriation from Parliament, to give us the assurance that they will ask for public tenders and have the work performed by open competition.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not sufficient knowledge to say whether that can be done or not; but I think it ought to

be done, if that is the practice in Dawson, and there are contractors there who have been in the habit of doing work of this kind.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister knows that the city has been built up by mechanics and contractors of every description who have the material and the skill necessary for this work; and, therefore, there would be no justification for the Government undertaking to do it by day's work, and leaving the door open to all kinds of crooked work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the committee will accept the assurance that these works ought to be done by tender and contract, and that they will be so done if it is found feasible.

Trail from Edmonton towards Yukon district (revote)..... \$14,700

Mr. FOSTER. Are you going on with that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. The North-west Government is doing the work. This money has been actually expended by the North-west Government, but they did not make the application in time to prevent the vote lapsing.

Mr. SPROULE. How many miles were built last year?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Work was done on the trail between Edmonton and Athabasca Landing. It crosses the Smoky River, and goes to a place called Peace River Crossing, where there has to be a ferry. The work done was scattered over 300 or 400 miles.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that about 200 miles were built before that, and that this expenditure was to extend that road further?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman may be right as to the part between Edmonton and Athabasca Landing. I think that had been completed before this vote was taken.

Customs ..... \$23,000

Mr. WALLACE. I am sorry the Minister of Customs is not in his place to-night, because I had intended challenging this vote and the accuracy of the statements the Department of Customs has made. I shall take occasion to do so on concurrence.

Mr. FOSTER. I have a matter that I want to discuss in customs also; and we might pass this item with the understanding that on concurrence we can discuss one or two matters as though we were in committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Very good.

Amount to pay Mr. J. B. Brousseau for services and expenses as commissioner to investigate alleged irregularities in connection with the election of chiefs for the Abenakis Indians of St. Francis, Que..... \$1,052 81

Mr. BERGERON. What is that paid for?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Brousseau was appointed commissioner to inquire into complaints with regard to alleged irregularities in connection with the election mentioned. I received petitions, and found it utterly impossible to come to any conclusion with regard to the merits, and I appointed Mr. Brousseau commissioner to investigate, and he took the evidence and made a report. It is a very voluminous report, more exhaustive than I expected, but it had the effect of satisfying everybody, and we have had no more trouble about the election.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is Brousseau?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He is a lawyer at Sorel. The investigation lasted longer than I thought it would, but it satisfied the people, and there has been no further complaint.

Additional amount for boarding-school... \$4,860

Mr. FOSTER. Is this distributed over different boarding schools?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It includes a building for the Pine Creek boarding school, \$2,500, and an allowance for five additional pupils at \$72 each. The building was insufficient, and the church authorities agreed to put up a new building that would cost \$6,000 if the Government would contribute \$2,500.

Additional amount for industrial schools.. \$1,000

Mr. SPROULE. Is this spread over several industrial schools?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is for one school, and is for the purpose of putting hot water apparatus into the building. It is under the charge of the church, and they will probably do the work themselves under the supervision of the inspectors of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the size of the school?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It has 225 pupils.

Travel and expenses of commissioners and staff negotiating new treaty, from which payments can be made to the Hon. D. Laird and J. A. J. McKenna, Indian Treaty Commissioners, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act..... \$16,500

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The time of the commissioners is calculated from the 3rd of May to the 30th September. Hon. David Laird has \$6 per day, \$906; Mr. McKenna at \$6 per day, \$906; Father Lacombe at \$10 per day, \$1,516; the secretary

at \$6 per day, \$906; C. H. Wood, physician, at \$6 per day, \$906; clerks, \$500 and \$675, and \$1,500 allowed for an interpreter and two servants. Travelling expenses from Edmonton and return, \$2,000.

To purchase provisions for half-breeds and Indians during treaty negotiations. \$10,480

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** This is for the purpose of feeding the Indians when making the treaty. When they are gathered together for the purpose of meeting the commissioners, they must be fed. These provisions were purchased after tenders were advertised for, and the Hudson Bay Company was the lowest tenderers.

To pay veterinary surgeons of the North-west Mounted Police for services rendered by them to the Department of Indian Affairs, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ..... \$100 00

**Mr. SPROULE.** Is not the veterinary-surgeon employed by the year and paid by the year?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The veterinary surgeons of the Mounted Police force sometimes render services to the Department of Indian Affairs for which they claim payment. It has been customary to pay them, and for this purpose, to take a small vote. I confess, I have not looked into this particular vote before.

**Mr. SPROULE.** They are employed by the department?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Not the same department. The Mounted Police is a branch under the President of the Council.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Still, they are in the employ of the country and paid by the year.

**Mr. DAVIS.** These veterinary surgeons are members of the North-west Mounted Police, and paid so much for their services as such. Occasionally some cattle on the Indian reserves get sick and the veterinary surgeons are asked to go. It is no part of their duty and they are allowed a small fee for their services.

**Mr. SPROULE.** But it may be that a man is paid \$1,000 a year, and has no more to do than a man could easily do in two weeks. Because he does extra work, surely he should not be paid extra.

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** These veterinary surgeons do constable service as well as veterinary work.

To meet cost of probable elections under the Canada Temperance Act..... \$1,000

**Mr. SPROULE.** Where is this probable election?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** In the county of Westmorland, they may probably have one. I understand an attempt will be made to repeal the Act.

**Mr. SIFTON.**

Printing Dr. Rand's English-Micmac dictionary ..... \$750

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** This dictionary was prepared some time ago at the instance of the Government and was partly printed. It is in possession of the library, and the object is to complete the printing.

To take to the Privy Council the case of Wentworth vs. Mathieu, in order to test the powers vested in the courts by the Dunkin Act ..... \$8,000

**Mr. FOSTER.** What is the explanation of this?

**The PRIME MINISTER.** The Dunkin Act has been in force in the county of Richmond for many years. Mr. Wentworth, who represents the Dominion Alliance in the county, has taken several prosecutions against one Mathieu, who was alleged to be an inveterate and persistent liquor-dealer. Prosecution was taken and Mathieu was condemned to pay a fine. He continued to sell and another prosecution was taken. At last there were twenty-six prosecutions taken against him, and he took out twenty-six writs of certiorari, and the Superior Court of the District of St. Francis maintained the certiorari and quashed the prosecutions on legal grounds. If this is maintained it will render the Dunkin Act absolutely nugatory. The Dominion Alliance applied to us and we thought it better to take the case to the Privy Council.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Where else is the Dunkin Act in force?

**The PRIME MINISTER.** Nowhere else than the county of Richmond, I believe.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Is it not an obsolete Act? I mean if it were repealed in any county it would not be taken up again, but the Scott Act would be taken up.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** I think so.

**Mr. FOSTER.** It seems a large amount of money to use for a purpose that does not seem to have any after effect.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** It has this effect, that the people of the country believe in the Dunkin Act. They have had it for many years. There have been three or four attempts to have it repealed, but the people would not vote for repeal. As this decision, if maintained, will render the Act absolutely nugatory, we thought it better to have a judicial authority and determined to carry it to the Privy Council.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Has it ever been tried in the lower courts and the Supreme Courts?

**The PRIME MINISTER.** Under the law of the province, it would not have been carried to the Privy Council either from the Supreme Court or from the court of appeal. It has to be taken to the Privy Council as a matter of grace.

Mr. BERGERON. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say it is before the Privy Council now ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Who are the lawyers acting for the Government and for the Alliance respectively ?

The PRIME MINISTER. There are no lawyers acting for the Government, but we have determined to pay for the counsel on both sides. Mr. Smith, who acts for the Alliance, and Messrs. Panneton and Belanger, who are acting for Mr. Mathieu.

Mr. BERGERON. I was told that the Quebec Government had engaged Messrs. Belanger and Panneton.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, this Government.

Mr. BERGERON. And the Quebec Government has nothing to do with it ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Amount required to pay Mr. Charles Bremner, of Bresaylor, for value of furs entrusted by him to Dominion Government authorities at Battleford on the 26th May, 1885, and never returned to him ..... \$5,364 50

Mr. FOSTER. Why is this being paid ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) does not want an explanation of the circumstances, because the matter was investigated by a committee of the House, and it was discussed at great length in the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the finding of the committee ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not remember. The hon. gentleman, I believe, was here when the report was presented. The late Minister of the Interior, either Mr. Daly or Mr. Dewdney, made a report in favour of paying \$3,500. There does not appear to be any reason why the full amount should not be paid.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is going to reimburse the Government for that money ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The officers of the Government of Canada received this property, and they should have rendered it up. When property is taken forcibly from the hands of a subject, the Government of Canada ought surely to hold itself responsible for the value of the property that is placed in their hands.

Mr. BERGERON. I think there was a report on that matter. Where is that report ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I believe a report was made in 1889 or 1890. I do not

exactly remember the tenor of the report, but I have a strong impression that it was to the effect that this man had been illegally deprived of his furs, and that the furs had been taken by officers of this Government.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I have some recollection of the causes which led the late Government to resist the payment of this claim. The chief reason was that this man having participated in the rebellion, having taken an open part against the country, he was not entitled to any compensation. However, as the members of the present Government sympathized with the late rebellion, I am not astonished at their paying this claim.

To make good to persons in Prince Edward Island amount of duties paid to the United States customs on fish and fish oil, being amount paid by Messrs. Hall and Myrick..... \$15,029

Mr. FOSTER. This is a matter which will cause a good deal of discussion ; and there is another matter here which will cause a good deal of discussion, that is the matter of the Ryan claim for \$210,000. We have some papers that were ordered and brought down, with the exception of the evidence. Those papers are not at all, in our opinion, favourable to the payment of that claim. My suggestion to the right hon. leader of the Government is this : That that be left over until another session, and until we have an opportunity of looking at the evidence. It is a monstrous claim, \$211,000, arising out of a case in which final estimates were certified to by the engineer, in which the first Order in Council takes it away from the place to which it ought to go, namely, to the Exchequer Court, and sends it over to the arbitrator ; where afterwards there is a second Order in Council which varies the conditions in order to make it more favourable for the claimant before the arbitrator. Then, the sum, which is not certified to by the engineer, which is outside entirely of the final progress estimates certified to, mounts up to a sum of \$210,000. I submit that there is not evidence enough before the committee to justify us in voting that. It has been kept so long it will not harm to keep for another year. I should like to see that and the Maria wharf business go over for another session.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will take the hon. gentleman's suggestion into consideration.

The committee rose and reported progress.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2.50 a.m. (Thursday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 10th August, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## INSPECTION OF CATTLE AT MONTREAL.

Mr. FEATHERSTON (by Mr. Davis) asked :

Has the Government received any communication, by letter, telegraph or otherwise from Gilchrist & Munroe, cattle shippers and shippers' agents at Montreal, or any person else, complaining of the present system of inspecting cattle at that port ?

If so, what reply has been sent, or is the Government going to make any change in the regulations which will be more satisfactory to those who are interested in the welfare of the cattle trade of Canada ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The Government has received a communication from Gilchrist & Munroe complaining of the system of inspecting cattle before they are put on the ships at the port of Montreal. The Government has replied to that by requesting a report upon the condition of affairs from the chief inspector of quarantine at Montreal. That report has recommended the adoption, somewhat modifiedly, of the recommendations of Gilchrist & Munroe, and the orders of the department have been issued in accordance therewith.

## PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I should like to say to the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), as I do not see the Chairman of the Privileges and Elections here, that I think there ought to be some motion in reference to the report that the committee gave in two directions. Has my right hon. friend thought of that subject at all ? I think the members would like to have copies of it for their use and something ought to be done to keep the committee alive until the next session of Parliament.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I think, Mr. Speaker, that the only motion we could make is that the report be printed. That would be quite proper. As to making any motion to keep the committee alive I do not think that is feasible. That will be a matter for the next session. I beg to move :

That the evidence given by the witnesses who were examined before the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be printed for the use of members of the House.

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

## INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to mention to the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), that the return to the order of the House for all copies of Orders in Council respecting contracts made without tender has not been brought down.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I brought down those for my department. I will take a note of the matter.

Mr. DAVIN. The order was passed early in the session for copies of all Orders in Council respecting contracts made without tenders having been called for.

## PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another committee which reported to the House, the Committee on Public Accounts, and I would like to have the same motion made in reference to it—that the report of the evidence be printed for the use of members.

The PRIME MINISTER. The report has been printed in the Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. FOSTER. Merely for the journals of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no objection that the report be printed for the use of members. I therefore beg to move :

That the report of the Committee on Public Accounts, together with the minutes of evidence, be printed for the journals and proceedings of the House.

Motion agreed to.

## STENOGRAPHERS' FEES AT PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE.

Mr. SPROULE. There is another motion that was left over in connection with the fees of the shorthand reporters of the Privileges and Elections Committee. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), desired a little delay that he might look into the matter. Has he done so in the meantime, because the question which was raised seemed to me to be one of some importance ? It would really mean the employment of three men, whereas we never employed more than two and I think that only one was paid, and that he arranged for the other.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The motion that was made is quite proper, and the exception that was taken was not justifiable. The motion was simply to have the usual fee paid, nothing else.

Mr. FOSTER. You had better dispose of it.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I beg to move :

That the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be adopted.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I think the adoption of the second report would mean the paying of three stenographers.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** No, the report said distinctly that it was simply to pay the usual fees.

Motion agreed to.

#### LIGHTKEEPER AT WOOD ISLANDS.

**Mr. MARTIN.** Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) a question in regard to the dismissal of William D. McMillan, lightkeeper at Wood Islands, and also in regard to the appointment of his successor. The hon. Minister told us that an investigation was to be held, or was being held, in regard to the dismissal of William D. McMillan, or in regard to the appointment of his successor. I called his attention to the fact that there was evidence that the new appointee to the position was over sixty years of age. I would like to know if the investigation is concluded, or what arrangements have been made in regard to the appointment that he has made. The appointment is clearly an illegal one, and I would be glad to know the position of affairs now. I would remind the hon. gentleman that I asked for this return some time ago, that it was passed on the 16th of June, and I would like to know if the hon. gentleman proposes to bring it down?

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies).** I told the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) yesterday that I would speak to my deputy about the return, and if I had not been detained so long in the House I would have spoken to him, but as the hon. gentleman knows I was here until half past three this morning and I could not get over to the department. As soon as I can get down to the department I will see about the matter.

**Mr. MARTIN.** It was not yesterday, but the day before yesterday that I mentioned the matter to the hon. gentleman.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** I got a note from the hon. gentleman across the floor of the House yesterday, and I sent it down to the department. I gave instructions to have the return prepared. I promised the hon. gentleman that I would see about it, as I could not understand the delay. I will see about it to-day whenever I have five minutes to go down to the department, or whenever my deputy comes up here.

**Mr. MARTIN.** I sent the note across the floor of the House day before yesterday.

Will the hon. gentleman say whether the appointment which has been made of a man who is clearly over age, and which is illegal, is to be continued?

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** I have not seen the report I was told that the agent had reported, but I have not seen the report yet.

#### SUPPLY—POSTMISTRESS AT SINTULATA.

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

**Mr. DAVIN.** I would like, as this is the last opportunity I shall have, to mention the case of the postmistress at Sintulata. I asked the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) about her dismissal a few days ago, and he told me that the reason she was dismissed was that it was found that her husband was a hotel-keeper and that it was inconvenient. As I am informed the hon. Postmaster General must be mistaken about that, because she has held the position since 1890. Since the change of Government in 1896 various efforts have been made to have her dismissed on political grounds; but these efforts were unsuccessful, I am informed, because the officers of the department reported, what was really the truth, that she was an excellent postmistress, most attentive, and that nobody had any complaint to make against her. I believe the reason why efforts were made to get rid of her was, not that her husband was a hotel-keeper, but that he was a Conservative, of which there is no doubt. At this time of day, when passions have cooled, it seems more harsh than anything that was done in 1896, when passions were violent, to dismiss a person on political grounds furnished not by that person, but by a relative; and my information is that her husband has not made himself offensive as a politician. This is the history of the case as given to me, and I have some little knowledge of it myself:

The postmistress, Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe, of St. Sintulata, has been very recently dismissed from the position she has occupied for eight years under such circumstances that I think it would properly make a subject for discussion in the House. Mrs. Rowe has held the position since 1890, and I am informed that no complaint of any kind has been made against her. Immediately after the election of June, 1896, a cry was raised for her dismissal, and complaints sprung up, the reason given being that her husband was a Conservative. Recently, however, a new aspirant of the same political kidney as the Rev. Mr. Douglas, the member for Eastern Assiniboia, seems to have been more successful in pressing his claim for recognition than others. The first intimation Mrs. Rowe had of her dismissal was the inclosed order instructing her to hand over the office to Mr. Cairnes, the inspector. The officials of the Post Office Department have frequently expressed their appreciation of the manner in

which the post office at Sintulata has been conducted by Mrs. Rowe, and her dismissal, without any fault having been found with her, seems to be cruel and unwarranted, and an explanation is certainly called for.

There was a summary intimation from Mr. McLeod, the inspector at Winnipeg, to Mrs. Rowe that Mr. Cairns would call on a certain day and take over the post office from her. I am sorry that the Postmaster General who seemed to have got a little ahead of the vengeful condition of mind that was universal in 1896, has lent himself to the dismissal of this deserving woman, and on no ground except that her husband is a Conservative. I may say to my hon. friend that the papers of the Queen vs. Skelton have been brought down, and while I do not intend to go into them from the point of view of the administration of justice, I find, on reading them, that the Department of Justice does not allow the least standing ground for the action of my hon. friend in regard to Mr. Mercier, the postmaster at Battleford. If my hon. friend will send for those papers, he will find on reading them that the affidavit that was made by Skelton and others calling on him to dismiss Mr. Mercier was not true, and the position taken by the Department of Justice is that while the allegations are not true, the deponents believed them to be true. So that the dismissal of Mr. Mercier from the postmastership of Battleford was a very gross injustice. I do not know whether at this time the Postmaster General can repair his error and correct the wrong which he committed at that time; but having before his eyes the fact that in so solemn a matter as an affidavit he was deceived, he should do something. I think my hon. friend and the Government might lay to heart the lesson that it is not always wise to act on the advice of supporters in this House who may be impelled by rancorous feeling rather than by wise conceptions of the situation.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I cannot find the answer I gave, but my recollection is that it was to the effect that it was not advisable to have a post office in a hotel and public opinion was against it. It is not right that children and others should have to go into a hotel for their mail, and besides the office was conducted in a very negligent manner. There was not the slightest tinge of politics in connection with the dismissal of this postmistress, but she was dismissed purely from the stand-point of post office efficiency.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Department of Justice—Increase of salary,  
J. Mullin, second-class clerk..... \$ 50 00  
Increase of salary, T. Pickens, messenger 30 00

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the right hon. First Minister what progress has

Mr. DAVIN.

been made with regard to the claim of Thomas Meagher, who was arrested and his boat siezed and sold by the customs authorities of the United States? Since his release some considerable correspondence has taken place. I understand that he has made a claim through the Justice Department for compensation for the loss of his property, and that he sent in his claim some time ago. Can the hon. gentleman inform the House whether that claim is now being considered by the Department of Justice with the view of seeking compensation through the proper channel. There is not much chance of his getting compensation for his arrest and brutal treatment, but he certainly ought to be compensated for the loss of his property.

If the Department of Justice has taken any steps to secure to Meagher payment for the boat that was seized, I shall be glad to learn that fact.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I will very gladly give the information I have before me at this moment. I am sorry, however, that my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) did not send in particulars as to the nature of the questions he wanted to have answered, for I am afraid that I cannot give the information to the full extent that he desires. I can only say, speaking generally and broadly upon the case, that it is a fact of public notoriety that this Mr. Meagher was arrested by an officer of the United States Customs Department on the River St. Clair and he was no doubt very badly treated. Meagher complained that the arrest was illegal and that, in fact, he had been arrested in Canadian waters. Whether he had been arrested in Canadian waters is not very clear though the balance of opinion is that he was. But the best defence that could be made by the American officer was that he had arrested Meagher in American waters but that Meagher had attempted to evade arrest, and had steered his boat toward the Canadian shore, and that there had been a continuous arrest and therefore it was legal. The Department of Justice protested that there was a breach of international law, and, in my judgment and, as practically admitted by the United States authorities, it was contended successfully that the arrest had been illegal. And in the month of January last, Sir Julian Pauncefote, Her Majesty's Ambassador at Washington, transmitted to His Excellency the Governor General a letter he had received from the Secretary of State, which is as follows:—

Department of State,  
Washington, 21st January, 1899.

Excellency:—

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Note of the 5th instant, inclosing a memorandum from the Minister of Justice of Canada, in relation to the case of Thomas Meagher.

After due consideration of this case, I take pleasure in saying that your request will be granted and the said Meagher will be discharged

from the arrest made and from the bail given by him for his appearance. This will relieve him from the necessity of any further action on his part, as it leaves him at liberty.

In reference to the other suggestion made in regard to Mr. Avery—

Mr. Avery was the United States customs officer.

—I beg to say that as this Government is advised the facts are not precisely stated in the memorandum of the Canadian Minister of Justice, that this Government is persuaded that even on the facts stated in the memorandum, there was no felonious intent on the part of Mr. Avery, the deputy collector of customs, and if he did the act complained of yet, as this Government understands the facts, he did not commit any intentional violation of British sovereignty, and if such violation was committed, it was done involuntarily and unintentionally in the endeavour of the deputy collector to effect an arrest which in his judgment, he had a right to make and which he believed was undertaken within the territory of the United States.

This Government disavows any act of force, if any was executed, against Meagher in Canadian territory, and regrets the unfortunate occurrence; and in view of the sentiments of friendship existing between the two Governments, it is hoped that these explanations and expressions of regret will be accepted as a satisfactory conclusion of the incident.

I have, &c.,

(Sgd.) JOHN HAY.

H. E.

Sir Julian Pauncefote.

So far as the international feature of the case is concerned, this is as satisfactory as could be. Now as to the feature of the case to which my hon. friend has called my attention—the remedy to which this man who, undoubtedly, has been illegally arrested and who, in my judgment, has been rather severely treated—to put it very mildly—is entitled. The papers that have been placed in my hands do not disclose whether Mr. Meagher has or has not placed any claims in the hands of the Department of Justice. My hon. friend says that he has, and I presume it is so. What action has been taken by the Department of Justice upon this question I am not in a position to say at this moment.

Mr. CLANCY. There is another point than those to which the hon. Prime Minister has referred. There is not only the question of reparation for the ill-treatment and arrest, which probably might be somewhat difficult to deal with, but it will be remembered that the man's boat was seized at the same time and sold, and he has never received any compensation. I understand that the claim particularly made is for payment for his property taken on that occasion. That is what I desire to call the right hon. gentleman's (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) attention more particularly, and I would be glad if it would be possible for him to give some intimation on the subject even yet, before the House closes.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will send a note to the Department of Justice at once.

Department of North-west Mounted Police—  
To provide for the appointment of a 2nd  
class clerk..... \$100

Mr. DAVIN. Is this here or in the west?

The PRIME MINISTER. This is to provide for the promotion of a clerk in the accountant's office here. Mr. Galwey is the officer, a very good officer. This is strongly recommended by the Controller.

Administration of Justice—Ontario—

Judge for an additional Provisional Judicial District Court, Ontario.....	\$2,000
Travelling allowance to Judge .....	500
	<hr/>
	\$2,500

Mr. BRITTON. I observe that there is nothing in the Estimates for the revision or consolidation of the statutes. I called attention to the need for this work early in the session, and now can do nothing more than express regret that the revision is not provided for. The last revision took place in 1886. The usual course prior to this was to have a revision every ten years—we had one in 1876 and one in 1886, and, in the natural order should have had one in 1896, but so far nothing has been done. This is a matter that calls for the earnest attention of the Government, and I hope that next session provision will be made for another revision of the statutes.

Mr. SPROULE. I have already asked for what district the new judge was to be appointed.

The PRIME MINISTER. Manitoulin Island district.

Mr. SPROULE. That will be the whole district?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, so far as I can judge from the papers before me.

Administration of Justice—North-west Territories.  
Office for Clerk of the Court and  
Judges' Chambers, Prince Albert..... \$240

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior a question in relation to the position of librarian at Regina. The librarian was appointed by Order in Council some years ago. On the change of Government, some intimation was given him that his services might be dispensed with, or that the salary might not be paid, or something like that. His services have never been dispensed with and he is still librarian, and, as I am informed, there has never been an Order in Council passed rescinding the Order by which he was appointed. There should be an arrangement to pay him until the Government appoints a successor. At the present time these duties of the librarian are discharged by Mr. Dixie Watson. He was appointed librarian some years ago by Order in Council. There are a large number of valuable books there which cannot be left without a librarian to guard them, and to be responsible for them. I

think the man should be paid for his services up to the present time, as he has been doing the duty; and if the Government does not wish him to continue doing it, then they should appoint another librarian. But the hon. gentleman will see that the Government is liable. The Government never perfected its intention, they just intimated to him that they did not intend to continue this. The consequence is that he has been going on and doing the work in the ordinary way.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** This is a matter of which I cannot speak with knowledge, as I was not aware the hon. gentleman was going to bring it up. According to my recollection, when the subsidy to the North-west Government was increased by \$40,000 two years ago, it was arranged between the members of the North-west executive and myself that they should pay the librarian.

**Mr. DAVIN.** If that arrangement was made, they would have to pay him.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I am satisfied that was the arrangement, they were to pay the librarian and arrange with him.

**Mr. DAVIN.** But technically this Government is liable?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I am satisfied that Mr. Watson has not made any complaint to me, otherwise I would have looked into it.

**Mr. DAVIN.** I do not think he has made any complaint. The fact is that Mr. Watson is a generous, kindly, easy-going man, but that is no reason why, if the money is due him, it should not be paid.

Enforcement of the alien labour law... \$ 5,000

**Mr. CLARKE.** Where has this alien labour law been enforced, and to whom has this money been paid? It is news to the working people of Canada to learn that this law is being enforced. The Minister of Justice, in reply to a communication sent to him last fall complaining of the dereliction of duty on the part of the officers appointed in Toronto, and of their failure to enforce the law, said it was not the intention of the Government to enforce the law. There have been flagrant violations of the alien labour law, and I am surprised that any sum is asked for the enforcement of it. Certainly in the city of Toronto the law is not enforced.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** I have had occasion to state to the House already that pending negotiations between the Canadian and the United States Commissioners it was not our intention severely to apply the alien labour law; but there may be occasions where it is advisable to do so. As I stated to the House some time ago, during the pre-

**Mr. DAVIN.**

sent session, there had been between the American Commissioners and the Canadian Commissioners a tacit understanding that on both sides of the line we would discharge as far as we could the putting in force of that law. We could do nothing more than come to a general understanding, because, until the treaty was concluded and ratified by the Parliament of Canada and the Congress of the United States, we could not interfere with the laws actually on the statute-book. Our intention was simply to discourage its enforcement as far as possible. Now representations have been made to me that there may be cases where it would be advisable to enforce the law. I can see that a case of that nature would be this: If a strike occurred, and if an attempt were made by the employers to import labour from the United States on such an occasion I think it would be advisable that we should exercise the power we already have, on application, to put the law in force. During the strike which took place some time ago on the Grand Trunk Railway, the statement was made on the floor of this House that the Grand Trunk Railway authorities were at that time importing labour from the United States to replace the labourers who were on strike. I immediately communicated with the Grand Trunk Railway authorities to ascertain the facts, and was told that it was not so, that the Grand Trunk Railway authorities had not imported a single man from the United States to take the place of those who were on strike. But other strikes took place, though luckily they were not carried very far, and no great mischief was done—because all strikes are fraught with more or less disturbance. But in the meantime I may say that I entered into correspondence with Senator Fairbanks upon this subject, and advised him that if a strike took place we would feel ourselves justified in enforcing the law, and I have had a reply from Senator Fairbanks acknowledging that it was quite proper. I shall lay the correspondence on the Table of the House.

**Mr. CLARKE.** I should be the last member of this House to ask the Premier to violate any arrangement or agreement that might have been made, pending a settlement of the matters in dispute between Canada and the United States, and so far as any agreement was made and observed by both parties I have nothing to say. But it is a notorious fact, patent to every person who takes any interest in the affairs of organized labour in this country, that the Alien Labour Law of the United States has been enforced just as if no such arrangement had been arrived at to which the Premier has referred. That being the case, I submit that the Premier and the authorities in this country are relieved from the duty or obligation imposed upon them not to enforce the Act. Resolutions have been

passed by the Trades and Labour Councils of the province of Ontario in various places, drawing the attention of the Government to the unsatisfactory way in which this law has been administered, and to the enforcement of the alien labour laws which exist in the United States. I think there ought to be some limit to the time within which this agreement made between the Canadian Commissioners and the American Commissioners should continue. If the alien labour law commissioners in the United States persist in enforcing this law against Canadian workmen, I hope the Prime Minister will see to it that Canadian workmen on this side of the line are protected by the provisions, poor and miserable as they are, of the alien labour law being put into force.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no objection to the Government protecting Canadian labourers; but let me tell the hon. member from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) that in my opinion he is making a mistake in trying to make popularity for himself in the city of Toronto with the labouring and manufacturing classes by calling attention to the non-enforcement of this Act at the present juncture. I know myself cases where very great inconvenience and persecution have been submitted to by manufacturers, owing to the fact that they had got into a little tangle with some of their men. I do not want to interfere to prevent the labour men securing their just rights, but, at the same time, I think that the law should not be used for the purpose of persecution rather than for the purpose of securing justice for those whose rights are interfered with. If ever the Alien Labour Law is brought into force again, I hope that it will be amended, and that the labour organizations themselves will assume the responsibility of enforcing the Act instead of placing all the responsibility upon the Government in regard to who shall be prosecuted under the Act and who shall not. My own opinion is that the Alien Labour Law as it now stands is entirely objectionable, and ought to be amended.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Chairman, I have been identified with labour organizations of this country for thirty years; I have had the honour and privilege of membership in the oldest labour organization in Toronto, the Toronto Typographical Union, for more than thirty years, and whenever I rise in this House to advocate the cause of organized labour, I do not rise for the purpose of obtaining popularity amongst the working people of Toronto. I have lived amongst the working people of Toronto nearly all my life. I think I have enjoyed the confidence of a majority of the working people of Toronto all my life, and that I enjoy their confidence to-day, and it is because the Government, supported by just such hon. gentlemen as the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has professed to do simple justice to these men, and to others, in other parts of

Canada, by the passage of an Alien Labour Law and has then allowed that law to become a dead letter, that I have been compelled, as a matter of duty to those whom I represent, to rise up from time to time and protest against the conduct of the Government. If the hon. member for North Wellington had any real sympathy with the working classes of this country he would rise in his place and insist that this law should be either repealed or enforced. It is a matter of gross injustice to the workmen of Canada, that, while they are debarred from going across the border to seek employment, American workmen, especially in cases of strikes, are permitted to come into Canada and take the places of those who have had differences with their former employers. I am astonished that the hon. member for North Wellington should charge me with having a desire to obtain some cheap popularity, because I have felt it to be my duty, again and again, to bring this matter to the attention of the House. My hon. friend knows it to be a fact, that while what professes to be an alien labour law to protect Canadian workmen, was placed on the statute-book at the present time, that law is a dead letter. The hon. gentleman admits that it is a dead letter. Why should that law not be enforced? If it cannot be enforced it ought to be repealed, and the workmen should not be given to understand that a law has been passed by the Parliament of Canada to give them that reasonable measure of protection that they are entitled to when that law is permitted to fall into desuetude.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) knows that the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has stated clearly the reasons why the law in the meantime remains a dead letter. The hon. gentleman, in his previous remarks, sanctions the course that the Government have taken and which has been taken simply because the Government are trying to negotiate a treaty that may possibly do away with the necessity of the law altogether. While the hon. gentleman has been connected with the labour organizations in Toronto for thirty years, and while he has been an active member of the Conservative party, how is it that he never secured an alien labour law from that party and that it remained for the Liberal party, when they came into power, to pass such a law? How is it that he never exercised his influence to relieve the associations in which he has been prominent for so many years and to secure the passage of such a law by the party to which he belongs?

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) suggests that the Government should amend the law and leave it for the labourmen to enforce. He voted against the Bill that I introduced in regard to which the Government got the

hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) to supplant him. The right hon. Prime Minister promised to give the workingmen a law word for word as it existed in the United States, and I had such a Bill before the House for several sessions. But the Government put up the hon. member for South Essex to supplant me. He brought in a Bill which the hon. member for North Wellington supported, taking away from any individual, who saw an infraction of the law, the right to enforce it, and placing that duty upon the Government, or upon the Solicitor General, so that the law could not be brought into operation, except by the action of the Government. The hon. gentleman voted against my Bill, and supported one which was placed on the statute-book and which has proved a delusion and a snare, as far as the protection of the workingmen of this country is concerned. To-day he says that the Government ought to change the law and put it upon the lines of the Bill that I introduced year after year.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, I did not say so.

**Dominion Police—**

To increase pay of force..... \$2,250

Mr. FOSTER. Is this a general increase ?

The PRIME MINISTER. There are two police forces in the city of Ottawa, the Dominion and the city police force. The rate of pay of the two forces is not the same. The police force of the city receive larger pay, although they do not do more duty. We are asking a vote of \$2,250 to increase the pay of the force, to be distributed as follows: One inspector, who now receives \$2.50 a day, to receive \$2.65 a day; three sergeants, \$1.90 a day, increase to \$2.15; fourteen grade A police constables, \$1.65, to \$1.90; eight first-class constables, \$1.65, to \$1.80; two second-class constables, \$1.50, to \$1.65; five third-class constables, \$1.25, to \$1.30.

Expenses in connection with printing the voters' lists ..... \$34,000

Mr. FOSTER. Would the right hon. gentleman give us an idea of what he proposes to do with the voters' lists.

The PRIME MINISTER. We propose, as fast as we can, to have them collected from the different provinces and to keep them printed for delivery to members who may ask for them.

Mr. FOSTER. Under the terms of the law ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Under the terms of the law.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the trouble ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I will take the province of Quebec, with which I am more familiar than with the other provinces, and perhaps the condition of things that prevails there will prevail in other provinces. The

Mr. TAYLOR.

lists are prepared, first of all, by the secretary-treasurer of the municipal council, and they are revised by the municipal council in public sittings. The work has always been very smoothly and correctly done, and there although there will be an appeal here and there to the courts, there are very few of them. The councillors know every child in the parish; they know every man who comes in, and the lists can thus be correctly prepared. But while the lists are well prepared, the secretary-treasurers are very negligent in complying with the law in sending them to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery at Ottawa. We must get the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to write and write again to these officials to collect as rapidly as they can all the lists from the province of Quebec. The same thing will apply to all the other provinces. As soon as the lists come in, they will be printed, and any member who wants them will have to apply to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Mr. SPROULE. Does that apply to the lists of this year or the lists of last year ?

The PRIME MINISTER. All the lists do not come into force at the same time. In the province of Quebec they come into force in the month of April, immediately after revision.

Mr. SPROULE. In the province of Ontario our lists are being revised now. Is it the new list which the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is collecting, or the old one ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The new list. I suppose the list was revised last year, and printed with the necessary corrections made. The work will be to revise it and add the names that should be on, or take away the names that should be dropped.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the right hon. gentleman state what lists were received last year, because I understand that very few were received ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Some weeks ago I gave a list, which I obtained from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, of the lists that were received. I do not know whether any others have been received since that time.

Mr. FOSTER. If the right hon. First Minister can tell us what lists have been received, that will enable us to tell what lists are not in. What strikes me is this, from a practical point of view: suppose the Governor General were to insist on the dissolution of the House now. What state would we be in with reference to the electoral lists ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think there is any difficulty. We have been accustomed to have our lists printed at Ottawa, and we have been depending on that. But previous to 1886 the lists were not

printed. Suppose the Governor General were to dissolve Parliament to-day, my hon. friend asks in what condition we would be in. Candidates could get from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery what lists we have. I dare say that at present the supply would not be very large but they could get from the municipal authorities in the respective counties the lists they required. The system is pretty uniform in every part of the Dominion that the lists are prepared by the municipal authorities, and it is an easy thing to get these lists. But it will be more simple to have them in Ottawa, and we purpose to collect them as far as possible.

Mr. HAGGART. That would not be the legal list for an election.

The PRIME MINISTER. Absolutely legal. The list that is legal in the province is legal here; but for greater convenience we have taken the power to have the lists brought here and printed.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to call the attention of the committee to one or two facts which obtain in the province of Nova Scotia in connection with the provincial lists. I do this in view of an observation made by the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) last session, and repeated by him to a certain extent this session, that there never was any complaint with reference to the preparation of the voters' lists in the province of Nova Scotia, and that the machine was not in working order there. Now, though very briefly, I intend to call his attention to the facts which I will put before the House, so that hereafter he cannot be in a position to truthfully make any such assertion as that. Last summer I paid particular attention to the preparation of the voters' lists for the county of Annapolis, and by the greatest exertion we succeeded in getting a much better list as a local list than ever obtained before in that county. But at the same time there have been a great many gross iniquities perpetrated. For example, there was one court where the commissioners were Dow, I. Morse, Arthur Burns and William McBride. All these courts for the revising of the lists convened in one day, and there was something like six or seven of them throughout the county. I succeeded in having every one of them attended by a good legal authority, and the court I refer to was attended by a lawyer on behalf of the Liberal-Conservative party. Dow, I. Morse was absent in New York at the time, and the court was run by Arthur Burns and William McBride. It was proved conclusively that four voters were proved to have no right to be on the list at all, and that was admitted by the commissioners, who adjudged them there and then to be taken off the list. The lists have been printed—and I must here express my satisfaction at having obtained my list quite early from the printing bureau—and these names are now on the

list. As soon as I got the list, I wrote to William McBride and to the attorney who attended that court. Both of them expressed their great surprise that these names should be on. William McBride, the commissioner, wrote to me stating that he signed no list with those names upon it. We have no recourse. The time for the appeal to the sheriff has passed by, and I may here remark that the appeal to the sheriff is a blooming farce. It purports to give a remedy for a wrong; but it is a hypocritical remedy; it is no remedy at all.

I believe the sheriff acted in a fair and impartial manner and I am satisfied with his conduct, but it is the law I complain of. He carried out the law, which is a hypocritical law that purports to give a remedy and gives none whatever. Here is an iniquity in one division of at least four or five names being on the list, that had no more right to be on it than Zulus or Hottentots. I could go further into details, but want to be brief. I could tell you what occurred in other counties, in each of which some ten or dozen names, that were judged to be off, were allowed on. That is the result of this hypocritical law. I understand that the right hon. First Minister gave his pledge that if the Senate would allow the last Franchise Bill to go through, he would use all his influence with the local Government to have the law so amended that an appeal would be given to the judges, who are the proper authorities to deal out justice. It is a burning shame and disgrace to any province to have such a partisan law on the statutes. I call this emphatically to the attention of the Minister of Finance, so that he will not be in a position to say, with any show of truth, that his attention was never called to the fact that matters are not going along smoothly with reference to the franchise law in the province of Nova Scotia. However, we have a great deal better list in the county of Annapolis to-day, owing to the determined fight that was put up in that county during the last revision, to have the lists properly made out, but still there are many iniquities perpetrated which would not be perpetrated if this hypocritical law were not on the statute.

Mr. FLINT. I would ask the hon. gentleman how it is, if the sheriff of the county of Annapolis is the respectable and high-minded gentleman he describes him to be, that an appeal to him is so ineffective?

Mr. MILLS. There is no chance of an appeal in the case of these parties that were judged by the courts to be left off and were left on the list.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am satisfied, so far as my own knowledge and observation goes, that the Nova Scotia franchise law is thoroughly fair and just and eminently suited to the people of Nova Scotia. It is very strange, if there are these

iniquities, that we never hear anything about them in the legislature of the province of Nova Scotia and only hear of these complaints in this House, some 1,500 miles distant from that province. You can take the fairest law under heaven, and find some men who will abuse it, but that proves nothing. I regret that the hon. gentleman so persistently endeavoured to discredit the beautiful county of Annapolis. If the condition of affairs he describes exists in that county, it can only be through the barbarism of the people, for no intelligent, honest, God-fearing people, as I believe the people of Annapolis to be, would allow such a state of things to exist.

Mr. MILLS. That is mere clap-trap.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am willing to leave the people to judge whether that is clap-trap. When this matter was discussed a year ago, the hon. gentleman's ground of complaint was that the sheriffs were partisans and not to be trusted.

Mr. MILLS. I say so still.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To-day he is obliged to admit that the sheriff is an honest man, anxious to carry out the law honestly. The law was designed to give an appeal, which would not be used very often, but would be the means of preventing a partisan revising officer from exercising his partisanship. The chief purposes of all courts of appeal is not so much to try cases as to prevent the necessity for trying them by letting men know that there is such a court which will reverse judgments if wrongly given. This was a court of appeal, which would serve as a warning to revising officers that if they allowed their partisanship to lead them astray their decisions would be reversed. But the hon. gentleman says that after the appeal was taken and judgment given two names were found on the list, which the revising officers said should not have been on.

Mr. MILLS. I said there were four, and was entirely within the mark.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, four names were on the list, which had no right to be there, and were on contrary to the decision of the revising officers and after the list had passed through the sheriff's hands. The only logical deduction is that the custodian of the list inserted these names, but could he not do that just the same after its revision by a judge as after its revision by the sheriff?

Mr. MILLS. I do not care what it means, there are the facts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman admits the logic; that is what it means.

Mr. MILLS. I do not admit any such thing.

Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The charge he makes is one against the custodian of the list, who is the municipal clerk of the county of Annapolis, and who, if he did put these names on, was guilty of fraud. And if, after having committed such frauds he is retained in office, it is only because there is a condition of things in the county of Annapolis, which would not exist among civilized, intelligent and God-fearing people, and I do not believe that condition exists in that county. If the statement of the hon. gentleman were true, he should have taken his complaint to the local legislature and the local Government, if he had any complaint to make against the sheriff. And if he could show that the clerk of the municipality of the county of Annapolis had been guilty in that particular, he should take his complaint to the municipal council and demand that the clerk be dismissed. All that the hon. gentleman has said applies, not to the law, but even if his statement be correct, it applies to an abuse of the law. For my part, I do not believe that that abuse has been committed. But even if it is committed, it does not in the slightest degree affect the law, for it is a good law.

Mr. MILLS. I did not wish to go into the particulars of this matter. I said before that I only wanted to touch upon it briefly so as to call the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Fielding's) attention to it. But if he desires to go into the matter fully, I am prepared to do it and show it up in every particular. The hon. Minister says that I am very anxious to talk about matters in Nova Scotia when I get twelve or fifteen hundred miles away from Nova Scotia. Let me tell the hon. Minister that I have always been taught, and I have always felt, that Nova Scotia was not twelve or fifteen hundred miles away from Canada. This is the capital of Canada. I have always felt that Nova Scotia was here, a part of Canada and not separated from it. The contrary may have been the idea in the mind of the Finance Minister at one time; and he has not got over it yet, although the Liberals in Nova Scotia, and he among them, have been tumbling over one another in their anxiety to get at the loaves and fishes here at Ottawa, after having preached secession, repeal, and even annexation for eighteen or twenty years. The hon. Minister says I have nothing to complain of as to the sheriff being in the position in which he is. I make the same complaint to-day as I did last session. The sheriff is a partisan—there is not the slightest doubt about that. I said that last session, and I say it now. These men have not legal minds and cannot interpret the Franchise Act. That Franchise Act is an intricate law. We have had sheriff's courts in Annapolis lasting three or four days, with all the lawyers of the county of Annapolis attending those courts; and even the leading lawyer on the Libe-

ral side admitted that he could not understand the Act, and did not understand it. He is an eminent lawyer, and when such a man cannot understand the law how is a partisan sheriff going to interpret it? When he is in doubt, he gives his party the benefit of that doubt—and I am not saying a word against the honesty and integrity of these men when I say that. But what the Finance Minister has said about the county of Annapolis is mere clap-trap, only used to blind the eyes of some partisan individual. I care not a snap of my finger for such talk as that. He asks: Why not take the complaint with reference to names being left off the list to the legislature? I did not know it until a month ago, when the list was placed in my hands by the Queen's Printer. And let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, that steps are being taken at this moment for the very thing that he suggests. I said to the people of Annapolis when I went through the county: Do not think I am going through this country for fun; I mean business. And as a result, we got a far better list in the local than we had before. And we are going to get a better one next year. But what I complain about is the farcical law. It is a mere hypocritical farce worthy of emanation from the mind of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding); for, take his career from the start and it has been a hypocritical career—purporting one thing and being another.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) is going a little too far—

Mr. MILLS. I have not said that the hon. gentleman is hypocritical now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. At the request, I think, of the hon. leader of the Opposition, the other day, when a similar expression was used, I had it withdrawn. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) should do the same thing.

Mr. MILLS. If I called the hon. gentleman hypocritical at this time, I would withdraw it. But surely I am not asked to withdraw the expression that his former course was hypocritical—he may have reformed—he may have reformed since last night.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw the expression.

Mr. MILLS. I have no wish to transgress the rules of the House and I withdraw the expression. Leaving that portion of the subject, I desire to point out that we have not heard from the Prime Minister with reference to his pledge that he was going to lay the matter before the local legislatures and use his influence to have an appeal allowed to the judges and not to the

sheriffs. I am very much mistaken if that is not the understanding, and I would be glad to know what has been done?

The PRIME MINISTER. That was the understanding. I communicated with Mr. Murray; but my desk has been in such a condition, I have fumbled papers so, that I cannot find the correspondence.

Mr. COCHRANE. I desire to know if I understood the Prime Minister correctly with regard to the voters' list. For instance, in the riding I represent, the revision of the voters' list will be taking place from a fortnight to a month hence. In my riding there are four townships, and we have a court in each municipality. The voters' list from one township is in my hands to-day and in a month from to-day the list will be revised. I had a case last year where the list in a municipality was not revised for a month afterwards. If an election were to take place say on the 1st January in that constituency, what list would be used?

The PRIME MINISTER. My answer would be—suppose an election for the provincial legislature were to take place in that riding, what list would be used. The same list is in force for the Dominion as for the provincial elections.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to inquire from the Prime Minister if I understood him to say that the lists, as soon as printed, would be ready to deliver to the parties entitled to them when they called for them. I understand the law to be that certain copies are to be sent to certain persons. Is it obligatory on those who have the right to these lists to go and ask for them? Also, I would like to ask if I am credibly informed that the list for some of the constituencies in Quebec are being printed in the "Herald" office in Montreal?

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) may have been informed, but not credibly informed, because no lists are printed outside of the Printing Bureau. As to the other point, subsection 4 of section 10 of the Act says:

Immediately after printing such list, the Queen's Printer shall send, by registered mail, twenty copies thereof to the sitting member for the electoral district to which the list belongs, and twenty copies to the defeated candidate at the last Dominion election therein; and the Governor in Council may, by regulation, provide for the issue to members and candidates of such additional copies as are thought proper.

The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and the Queen's Printer shall supply copies of any lists so printed to any person applying therefor and paying for them a price proportionately sufficient to cover the cost of printing them.

Mr. COCHRANE. I want to draw the Premier's attention to the opinion I got from him a few minutes ago. If a local election took place in our province under the circumstances to which I referred, it would be

held under a list prepared by the municipality, the last one revised. But I understand the Premier to read now from the statute that applies to Dominion elections, according to which the lists are printed here, and it is the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to furnish the lists to hold the election on. The law that applies to an election in Ontario cannot possibly apply to that clause of the statute.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** The hon. gentleman is in error. As soon as the election list comes into force in Ontario, or any other province, that list has to be transferred to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and when it is printed, that is the list upon which the election takes place. But suppose that before the list comes into force in Ontario, and before it has been printed, then the list mentioned in subsection 10 of section 10, would be the list in force in the province :

So long as and whenever, for any reason, a certified copy of any list of voters as finally revised has not been transmitted to or received by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery pursuant to the provisions of this section, the original and legal list for Dominion elections shall be the same as that for provincial elections.

**Mr. CLANCY.** I would like to call the Premier's attention to what may lead to serious difficulty. He will see that, in having the lists standing in type here at Ottawa, and new lists coming in to be corrected upon them, there is a chance of errors creeping in. Now, we have found ourselves in difficulty on account of the delay that occurs here in consequence of the mere fact of furnishing additional lists. Now, if it were necessary to pay a larger sum to the municipalities where the lists are finally revised and completed, and the only thing to be sought afterwards is an additional list for convenience, let that additional sum be paid, and let the final list be made up in the municipality, and so do away with the printing here. There would then be no chance of making what is almost a revision here. I say such a thing is possible, though I do not mean to say that it is done. It seems to me that would be a step in the right direction. I do not think that it would cost the country as much as it does now, because these lists are already in type.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** I must say that the views of the hon. gentleman are largely my own views. But last year, in accordance with wishes which were expressed in the House, we put in that clause to have the lists printed here.

**Mr. DAVIN.** Is this sum for the payment of the officers referred to under section 10 ?

**The PRIME MINISTER.** The sum of \$34,000 is only for printing. We have provided another sum to pay for the custodian of the lists.

**Mr. COCHRANE.**

**Mr. DAVIN.** I understand that very few returns have been made by this provincial custodian. Has there been any attempt to put that subsection 3 of section 10 into force ?

**The PRIME MINISTER.** Not so far.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Do I understand that this first item of \$5,000 is struck out ?

**The PRIME MINISTER.** Yes.

**Mr. CLARKE.** I desire to ask the Premier a question. When this Franchise Act was being considered by the House, it was pointed out that, so far as cities were concerned, this provision of section 9 which provided that if the registered list for the provincial assembly was not more than a year old, it would be used for a Dominion election, if such took place, and, under that condition, if the provincial law was not amended, hundreds of registered voters would be disfranchised. The Solicitor General, I think, stated that the attention of the provincial authorities of the province of Ontario would be drawn to this condition. I would like to ask the Premier if such has been done. The provincial law is very stringent with regard to the residence of these men who register within thirty days before the holding of an election for the provincial assembly. As the registered list would be used not more than twelve months old for an election to this House, these registered voters who move from one subdivision to the other, although still in the constituency, would be disfranchised. I think the Solicitor General was seized of the fact that it would be a great cause of inconvenience and trouble, and that hundreds of men would be disfranchised, unless an amendment was made to the law ; and I think he promised to draw the attention of the provincial authorities to that fact. Has that been done ?

**The PRIME MINISTER.** I am not aware at this moment that such a promise was made by the Solicitor General. So far as I am personally concerned, I stated that we would communicate with the governments of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick with regard to the appeal, and this I have done myself.

**Mr. CLARKE.** There will be hundreds of these enfranchised votes disqualified, unless the necessary amendment is made by the provincial authorities.

**Mr. COPP.** I may say, in reply to the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), that if we do not defend the provincial law, it is because we do not wish to take up the time of the House, not because we consider it a bad law, because it is a good law, and is satisfactory to the people of Nova Scotia. I think the members of the House on both sides will be satisfied that the complaint made by the hon. member is purely imaginary.

Allowance to C. Barnett, 120 days at \$2.50  
per day ..... \$300

Mr. BERGERON. This would be a good item on which to express an opinion. I do not remember since I have been in Parliament that the restaurant down stairs has been so inferior. At the commencement of this Parliament we were to be so good that the restaurant was to be simply a place for obtaining sandwiches, ginger ale, and so on. We might as well say it openly, what we all know. If there is one thing I hate more than another it is hypocrisy. In spite of the fact that it goes out to the public that we have no liquor in the House of Commons, it is well known that any member can go down stairs, ring the bell, and that the boy goes over to the Senate side, and brings back anything a gentleman may want. So far as this is concerned, we are no better to-day than we were before. But the fact is that, as a result of the present system, the place down stairs is very badly kept, and it cannot be taken otherwise. It is necessary for us to pay \$300 to the man in charge who should be able to make money in doing what is required of him down stairs. If the place were kept as it should be we would have a real restaurant down there where we could go at any hour and get something to eat. During the late sittings that have taken place within the last two months, we have found the need of the restaurant to a greater degree than at other times. I have gone down stairs without being able to get anything to eat, because we are starving the restaurant by the conditions that we are imposing upon the caterer. This man should be able to make the restaurant pay. He has no rent to pay; we furnish everything necessary to a first-class restaurant, and still we have to pay \$300 to the man who keeps that place when he should be in a position to make money out of it. I see Mr. Speaker is in the House, and I would call his attention to the fact that a change should be made in the restaurant. During the twenty-two sessions that I have been here, previous to the adoption of the system which now prevails, we had a good restaurant and we were never called upon to pay an extra allowance to the man who keeps it. We should go back to the old system, and do away with this hypocrisy which seems to be so prevalent amongst some hon. gentlemen here. Let us have a good restaurant, well kept. There is no use of having a restaurant if it is to be run as it has been run during the last two or three sessions.

Mr. DAVIN. I occasionally use the restaurant for my meals, and I may say that the cooking at the present time is better than it has been for some years. The cooking leaves nothing to be desired, and this is a very important thing, because, in the past, and for this the present Government is not responsible, that restaurant has been destroyed by political appointments. There was a time when we had a very poor caterer

there, but that was when the man was appointed on political grounds. I refer to a time before hon. gentlemen came into office. A man was appointed on political grounds as caterer, and he thought he could do just as he pleased. Then, people kept away from the restaurant. Another man came and he was no better than his predecessor, but the present man's cooking leaves nothing to be desired. It is an important thing, when we are kept here late and require any food, that we should be able to get it properly cooked. The condemnation the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) makes of the restaurant does not apply to the way the food is cooked.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I, too, have been a frequenter of the restaurant since 1837, and my experience is much the same as that of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). I believe the cooking has been better this year than during the term of the predecessor of the present occupant of the office. In regard to the allowance given him, I am not prepared to express an opinion. I think the present caterer is one of the best men we have had during my experience of the restaurant. He is a man of extensive experience; he was butler to the dowager Duchess of Dufferin, and several other people in England, and he was brought out here by the Grand Trunk Railway Company to superintend their restaurants. In my opinion, he is a first-class man. He has paid high salaries to his cooks, this and every year, and he has employed these people at high salaries chiefly for the convenience of the Speaker. He and the late Speaker were on the best of terms, and if the late Speaker were the occupant of the Chair to-day, I feel confident that he would retain the services of Mr. Barnett.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not blame Mr. Barnett; I have said nothing against him. What I have spoken against is the system. I believe, as far as Mr. Barnett is concerned, he is the best caterer we have had for some time back, but we have clipped his wings, and he has to come before the House and ask to be paid for occupying the position in which he would be able to make money if the system were changed. In so far as the food is concerned, I cannot speak, as I have never taken a meal there, but I have gone down there during late sittings of the House, very often, and found that the service was very bad. I have been obliged to wait half an hour before I was served.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) has just stated that he never took a meal there.

Mr. BERGERON. I never took a regular meal there. I have gone down at night to get something to eat, but I would not call that a meal. I have gone down for a sandwich, or something like that. It may be that the regular meals are all right, but I

have not tried them. Upon going down at one or two o'clock, during a late sitting, for a sandwich, I have had to wait a long time. I do not blame the caterer, but I do blame the system that is in force, and I would be glad if it were changed.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. It cannot be the fault of the system, because the restaurant was worse in former times when the system was different.

Mr. **CLARKE**. I have taken most of my meals down stairs in the restaurant of the House, and I can bear testimony to the fact that the meals served during this session are equal to the meals served in any hotel, or restaurant, in the city of Ottawa. If complaints are made as to the method of conducting the restaurant, the fault certainly does not lie with the caterer. Sometimes not more than three or four will take breakfast in the restaurant, and sometimes not more than three or four will go to lunch. Yet this man has been compelled, in order to maintain the reputation he made, when he served as the butler to the dowager Duchess of Dufferin, to maintain a well-qualified chef. The character of the food is indicated by the appearance which the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt) presents after his stay in Ottawa of four or five months. I understand that a movement is on foot to displace that gentleman from the position which he occupies, but, I think, it would be well to proceed slowly before removing him, and I think if hon. members would patronize the restaurant they will find that the quality of the food has improved in comparison with what it was before. It is hardly fair to compel the caterer to keep a staff of waiters, cooks and assistants, when at some meals not more than three or four members avail themselves of the privileges of the restaurant.

Additional French translation during recess ..... \$500

Mr. **SPROULE**. What is the cause of this increase for French translation ?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I cannot exactly say, but I believe it is due to the increase in the volume of "Hansard."

Additional amount required for stationery. \$5,000

Mr. **SPEAKER**. The House has had an unusually long session. It will be remembered that it was recommended that hon. members should be placed on the same level as the Senate in regard to the supplies of stationery. There was not an appropriation sufficient to cover that expenditure for supplies except by taking the stationery from the stock that was furnished ordinarily to the members by the stationery department. The result has been that the stock has been depleted, and this additional amount is recommended to bring the stock up to the average.

Mr. **BERGERON**.

Library of Parliament—

Payment of two sessional messengers during the session of 1900..... \$500

Mr. **DAVIN**. What are the names of these two gentlemen ?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. One is Micklejohn and the other Bordeleau.

Mr. **DAVIN**. I would be very sorry to say anything individually in regard to a vote like this ; but I must say that those who are responsible for appointments for the library should take care that any persons they recommend shall not interfere with the work of members when they go there to study. There have been times when it was not possible to carry on any reading or work in the library by reason of the talk going on, not between the superior officers of the library, but between the recently appointed messengers. I do not want to say anything harsh of these persons, but for the efficiency of the library we must insist that the messengers shall not hold a little conclave of their own while members of Parliament are trying to do the work of the country.

Mr. **SPEAKER**. I should think that difficulty might be obviated by calling the attention of the Librarian to the matter.

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

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

Paris Exhibition ..... \$175,000

Mr. **FOSTER**. We want a complete and full explanation of how this will be expended.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE** (Mr. Fisher). The hon. gentleman will remember that last year I obtained a vote of \$20,000 for preliminary work in connection with the preparations for the exhibition. In the winter arrangements were made for an organization to bring about a proper representation of Canada at the exhibition, and it was decided to appoint a commission, which was done. This commission was composed of four officers of the civil service—Dr. Dawson, of the Geological Survey ; Prof. Saunders, of the Experimental Farm ; Prof. Robertson, the Dairy Commissioner ; and Mr. Gourdeau, the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries. With these four, who have some expert knowledge in particular branches, we join four gentlemen, one of whom is supposed to represent the province of Ontario, in order to collect exhibits, give explanations, and see would-be exhibitors from that province.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Who is the gentleman for Ontario ?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. Mr. Jardine, of Toronto. Mr. J. X. Perreault, of Montreal, was appointed for the

province of Quebec; Mr. A. H. Gillmor, of St. Stephen, N.B., for the maritime provinces, and Mr. W. B. Scott, of Winnipeg, for the western part of the country. These eight gentlemen have been holding meetings steadily, and laying out plans to see that Canada is properly exhibited. We have advertised throughout the country, calling for exhibitors, and announcing in what way they would have to make applications for space, and giving all the information we had received from the Imperial commissioners in England, through whom only we can work. We have also laid out a scheme for the proper representation of Canadian natural products at the exhibition. For instance, Dr. Dawson is preparing a thorough representation of Canadian mineral products; Prof. Saunders is preparing a thorough representation of fruits and agricultural products; Prof. Robertson is working in his department; and Mr. Gourdeau is preparing a careful representation of Canadian fishery and sports-and game products. We have been obliged to give a great deal of information to applicants for space at the exhibition, and this has been the work that has been done up to the present time. I may say that the rules of the exhibition require that all applications for space should be sent into the Imperial commissioners before the 30th of June, and we have sent in the great bulk of these applications. Since that time some others have been received, and we are now in negotiation in hope that these also will be admitted, although the rules of the exhibition are very strict. We have obtained space to the extent of 25,000 square feet in what is known as the British Colonial Building, and 12,000 square feet amongst the Imperial exhibits. In the latter case the Canadian exhibits, like all others, are divided into groups and classes, according to the quality and character of the exhibit, and lot according to the country from which they come. Under these circumstances, our exhibit amongst the Imperial exhibits will rank with the other exhibits from all over the world in that particular group. In our own sectional building, we group them to suit ourselves.

Mr. CLANCY. Are these exhibits supposed to be duplicated in the Canadian department?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. Certain classes have been put into one building and certain classes into the other. Commissioners have had a great deal of trouble in arranging them; but eventually have classed that as seemed to be best. We have consulted with intending exhibitors to try to meet their views; but we are strictly bound by the rules of the exposition and the restrictions that have been imposed upon us by the authorities in Paris through the Imperial commissioners.

Mr. FOSTER. What proportion does the space bear to the exhibits offered?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have not nearly enough space for the demands of applicants. We have had to tell the applicants that they cannot get the space asked for, and we give them as much as we can. Up to the present applicants have accepted the space we have given them.

Mr. FOSTER. Will that have the effect of making our exhibits less representative?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, I hope not. We have been able to give space to all applicants, but not as much as has been asked for. I know that some applicants have asked for more space than they expected to get, on the principle that if they asked for a great deal, they would get some; but when we have begun to discuss the matter with them, they have been content with a great deal less space than they asked for.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the applications that are now in fairly representative of the advanced interests of the country?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, fairly so. I have here a list of all the applicants, but, of course, the House does not care to hear that, but I can go over the classes generally. In the first place, we are to have an educational exhibit, to be prepared by the educational departments of the different provinces. There will be an exhibition of musical instruments, one of photography and literature and processes relating to them; one of machine tools; an electrical exhibit; agricultural implements, a large exhibit. Forestry, sports and fisheries are grouped together. Of food products we have a large exhibit. There will be a very fine exhibit—prepared by Dr. Dawson—of mineral productions; a small exhibit of internal decorations of buildings; a large exhibit of heating apparatus, stoves, &c.; a large exhibit of the chief textile fabrics, cottons and woollens; a very fine representation of our pulp and paper industry—one of the most important, I think. We have a small exhibit of tobacco and its manufacture. Then, we have a number of smaller lines of manufacture. We have a large exhibit of bicycles; another of agricultural implements in the Imperial space; a good display of horticultural and fruit products; and a good exhibit of forestry; an exhibit of metal-working, and a very considerable exhibit of furniture. These are the main groups.

Mr. BERGERON. Are the local governments working through the Department of Agriculture here?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. We are working under the Imperial commissioners, and they will only deal with

the Dominion Government. I have entered into communication with the provincial governments, and asked their co-operation, and have received from them their support; and in a number of instances, such as forestry, the departments in the various provinces are working with the commissioners here, and, as a matter of fact, are preparing exhibits for us.

Mr. BERGERON. At their own expense?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia, and, I think, one or two of the maritime provinces, have voted sums of money to prepare for the exhibition, and are bearing the expense so far as these votes will allow them.

Mr. BERGERON. How much money has been voted besides this?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was \$20,000 voted last year, and then there is this \$175,000. I may say frankly that it is not at all certain that this will pay the whole of our expenses in connection with the exposition.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the estimate?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have not completed the estimate of the whole expenditure yet. We have a careful estimate made that this total of \$195,000 will cover the expenses to the 1st July. As we work on we shall say what further will be required. I hope it will not be more than \$50,000.

Mr. FOSTER. When does the exposition open?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think it is on the 1st or the 15th of April, and it lasts until the 1st of November.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these gentlemen whom you appointed last year those who are to represent us at Paris?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The four commissioners appointed outside of the department—yes. Whether any departmental officers will go will depend upon the work. I must say, in regard to that, that I propose to appoint a chief commissioner. Up to the present time, I have been acting as chairman of this commission. But I propose that we appoint a commissioner to go to Paris and stay all the time as the official representative and head of the Canadian commission.

Mr. BERGERON. At what salary?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not fixed that.

Mr. BERGERON. Would it be a Minister of the Crown?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No; some gentleman who could go to Paris before the exposition and remain there to

Mr. FISHER.

represent Canada and deal with the other commissioners and represent Canada there.

Mr. BERGERON. What are the names of our commissioners?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. J. X. Perrault for Quebec, Mr. Gillmor for the maritime provinces, Mr. Jardine for Ontario, and Mr. W. B. Scott for the western country.

Mr. BERGERON. These besides the local men?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I gave the names of the others a few minutes ago.

Mr. FOSTER. Have these men had experience in exhibition matters?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. J. X. Perrault has had a good deal of experience. I do not think that the other gentlemen have had a great deal.

Mr. WALLACE. Is Mr. Perrault the gentleman who was connected with the Centennial Exhibition at Philadelphia?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The man who can crack the champagne bottles?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know about that; I was not then in public life. He seems to have thorough experience in connection with exhibition work. The other commissioners I found to be extremely satisfactory.

Mr. WALLACE. Where is Mr. Jardine from?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. From Toronto.

Mr. WALLACE. Is he the grocer?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not sure what his business was.

Mr. McMULLEN. He was in commercial life.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My recollection is that he was connected with the boot and shoe trade.

Mr. SPROULE. What experience would he have to fit him for this position?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He was generally well acquainted with commercial life and of the manufacturing industries, especially of Ontario.

Mr. BERGERON. Does he speak French?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He lived in Montreal, and for some time before he went to Toronto and has a fair acquaintance with French.

Mr. BRITTON. I have been requested to ask whether, if central Ontario prepared

a special mineral exhibit, it would be possible to have that placed in the exposition on the application of the Dominion Government?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** The whole exhibit is intended to be a national, and not a local one or a group of exhibits. We have had a good many applications from different parts of the country, asking that each locality should keep its own exhibit without reference to the rest of the country, but the whole scheme of the exhibition is, that the exhibits should not be grouped according to localities, and we have tried to carry out that idea in our Canadian exhibits and group the whole of them together, so as to make a national exhibit, without reference to the particular localities. In that way we believe that we will make a better impression for the national character of our products than in any other way. That will give every opportunity, and the arrangement is to give every opportunity to each locality to be represented, and each exhibit will have a proper description of not only what it is, but the locality from which it comes.

**Mr. WALLACE.** The Government is proposing to expend \$175,000 in this enterprise, they should demonstrate to us that, as a commercial undertaking, as a matter of business—for that is the only view in which we ought to regard it—that the expenditure is likely to have some commensurate result. It may be quite true that people will go to that exhibition from all parts of the world, but none the less it is largely an exhibition of the city of Paris and the surrounding country. Like every other exhibition of that kind, it partakes largely of a national character, and is supported largely by the nation. People from other countries will come in as visitors, perhaps to do business, but we do not know that they will. What is our business with France to-day? Of the products of the mine, we send them \$150 worth. Of the products of the fisheries, we send them \$381,000, and of the forests, \$315,000 worth, or, in round numbers, \$700,000 worth of these two, showing that we are doing a very small trade, although that is the bulk of the trade we do with that country. As regards the products of the forests, Canada commands the markets of the world. We have not to go and beg a market for them, but Canada can send them anywhere and everywhere. We have the best pine timber perhaps to be found in the world, and would find a ready market in any country, so that we are not under any compliment to any country which takes the products of our forests, and the same may be said of our fisheries. What else do we send? Animals and their products, \$4,479; agricultural products, \$154,000, or about one-sixth of a million of the products of the farm, as compared with the tens of millions which we

send elsewhere. Last year we sent, in round numbers, \$160,000 worth of manufactures, and of miscellaneous articles, none at all; and our total export to that country was \$1,015,612. We send seventy or eighty times as much to Great Britain, and thirty or forty times as much to the United States. This is all we send to France, notwithstanding the fact that we have had a commercial treaty with that country for a number of years, and that we have been courting assiduously reciprocal trade and business with it. We purchased from that country \$3,975,000 worth last year, or nearly four times as much as it bought from us. To my mind, a wiser and more judicious expenditure could be made of that money in promoting the trade of the country in other ways. If the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce were to carry out a well-considered and a wisely extended scheme of promoting trade with other countries, and we should find it necessary, not to expend \$175,000 in one year, because that would be a very large sum, but sufficient money for that purpose, that would be a much better way of utilizing our revenues than this means of largely throwing away this amount for fancy purposes, for the purpose of enabling some people to sport around the city of Paris, which is certainly a very beautiful and attractive city.

But I do not believe we would be justified in expending the money of the people of Canada where they cannot point out more tangible results that would be likely to flow from it than we can see from that expenditure. I say that of this million dollars, the great bulk of it, nearly three-fourths of it, are the products of the sea and the products of our forests, products for which we can obtain a market anywhere without difficulty, because they are in demand all over the world. But for all the other products, the miserable sum of less than one-sixth of a million of the products of our farms go to France. We can produce cereals, animals and the products of animals, butter, eggs, cheese, &c., and yet, though we are exporters of those products to the extent of tens of millions of dollars to Great Britain, we do not send one-sixth of one million to France. Therefore, while it may be considered necessary that we should put in an appearance at Paris and take part in that exposition, I say we are doing it on too prodigal a scale, and where results are not in sight, or any reasonable return for the money to be expended. I, therefore, say that the Government, in proposing to expend \$175,000 in this regard, are wantonly throwing away a large portion of that money that might be devoted to promoting our trade otherwise with greater advantage than that expenditure will do. Then with regard to the parties to be entrusted with this expenditure, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) tells us he is going to appoint a commissioner. Well, commissioners have been appointed

before. We have had knowledge of Mr. Perreault at the Philadelphia exposition of 1876. He is quite a number of years older since that time and may have gained wisdom, yet his extravagant expenditure there, producing no results for the benefit of Canada, were a scandal to this country. History may repeat itself, and history probably will repeat itself, and we will have a recurrence of those extravagant expenditures which we condemned in 1876. Now, Mr. Jardine, of Toronto, is selected by the Minister of Agriculture to represent the province of Ontario. I do not know that Mr. Jardine has had any manufacturing experience, as the Minister has told us, further than the grinding of spices. He may, however, have the qualifications that would fit him for the position. I presume the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) or some other person will be able to give us a little information concerning his qualifications. But I say that the expenditure of \$175,000 for having a carnival in Paris is not a justifiable expenditure of our money, and that money could be expended much more profitably in opening up markets in other ways for Canadian trade, and I would advise the expenditure of larger sums than the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) thinks necessary for that purpose.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). There is one point I think my hon. friend has overlooked. My own impression is that we will not, probably, to a very great extent, extend our trade with France, although we may do more in that respect than he expects. But the House will remember that at such an exhibition as that which is proposed to be held in Paris the whole world and his wife will be present; every conceivable nation will be represented there, and we will have an opportunity of exhibiting the products of Canada and the progress we have made, not merely to the people of France, although that is an important thing in itself, but to every European nation, and probably to all the nations of the world. Comparisons will be made by them of our products with the products of other countries. It is, therefore, of considerable importance, if we appear at this exhibition at all, that we do so in a manner fitted to maintain the reputation of Canada. It is quite true that the great bulk of our trade has been and probably always will continue to be with the remainder of North America and with the British Islands and their dependencies. Still, there are a good many places where we hope to extend, and I think will succeed in extending our trade. Now, representatives from all these countries will be flocking to Paris, and a careful examination and comparison will be made by these people of the products of Canada.

Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. WALLACE. I pointed out that while people will go there from other countries, they will go more largely for pleasure than for business.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They will be there for pleasure no doubt, we all know what Paris is. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has taken that city in in his peregrinations. He may probably be sent there one of these days to examine. But apart from that side of the question, which some members of the House may be better qualified to speak of than I am—or more recently qualified—it is to be remembered that when Canada appears at the Paris Exposition she will find herself literally in the presence of all the nations of the world, and I think we may assume that however on pleasure bent, they will be on business bent too, and that very considerable results may be expected to accrue to us from the exhibition of our products if properly carried out, and I am certain that my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture will take pains that our part in it will be attended to properly and well. It would not be at all prudent that any undue stint should be manifested by us if we appear there at all. There is no doubt that, particularly as regards the Mediterranean littoral, which is a portion of Europe where I am in some hopes of extending our trade, no place could well be selected where more representatives of the people could well be found than in Paris; and for that reason I think there is fair grounds to believe that the sum expended on this exhibition will fully repay itself in proper time.

Mr. FOSTER. I think everything will depend on the manner in which this display is carried out, and a great deal of that will depend on the kind of men we choose to represent us there, not only as being able to represent the life, and intellect, and peculiar spirit of Canada, but also from a business point of view. We want a man who is able not only to make things go but to make them go in the right way. You have, I dare say, fairly good men, but I doubt if the men you have chosen so far have the experience necessary for taking part in an exposition as large and important as that in Paris. I think that very great care should be taken to get the right man as commissioner. I do not believe, if you are going to do it at all, in doing it with a stinted hand, but I would not like that to be taken as any excuse for extravagant expenditure. I am favourable to the exposition in Paris, not so much that we hope to make our trade very large with France, because we have not any considerable trade with France, but because Paris is probably the greatest show place on earth and at this exposition probably a larger number of representative men from every quarter of the globe will be congregated there than you could get together in

any other place in the world. I think, in that respect it would be remarkable, and remarked, if Canada were left out, and if we make a thoroughly representative exhibit, the opportunity is one which may rebound greatly to the benefit of our country. The dependence is chiefly on the representative nature of the exhibit and upon it being thoroughly Canadian. There are some things which every country does, and does well, but there are some certain things which Canada is able to do better than any other country, and special prominence ought to be given to those things. If that is done, and if a proper exhibit is made, Canada will advertise herself to the world.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture who Mr. W. B. Scott is, whom he intends to send as one of the representatives; what has been his previous occupation, and what qualifications he has for his work.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Mr. Scott was recommended to the hon. Minister of Agriculture by myself. I am thoroughly familiar with his character and qualifications. He was early in life connected with the land department of the Canadian Pacific Railway in Winnipeg; he had some years' experience in the office there, and had experience in travelling around the western country, which gave him a very considerable knowledge of that country. About ten years ago he entered the employ of the Manitoba Government in the immigration branch, and has been superintendent of their immigration work for about ten years. He had charge of their Toronto office, and from time to time during the last ten years he has had charge of the preparation of all the exhibits which the province of Manitoba has sent to different places. Many of these exhibits have been sent to Europe and different parts of the United States, and exhibits have constantly been made at the Industrial Fair at Toronto and other places. Mr. Scott was the best man that I knew of for that work, because he had had a very wide experience in it. He is a thoroughly good office man, experienced in connection with the preparation of exhibits, and knows the western country well. In addition, he is an active, capable, pushing man, and I think is the proper man in every way for the purpose.

Mr. DAVIN. What arrangements have been made up to the present time to secure a good exhibit from Manitoba and the North-west Territories?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. After the few months' experience I have had with Mr. Scott, and after having come in contact with him, I can thoroughly endorse what the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has said in regard to him. Mr. Scott seems to be, not only thoroughly well ac-

quainted with the whole of the western country, but he understands the necessities in preparing an exhibit, and thoroughly understands the business connected with that kind of work. To reply to the hon. gentleman's question, I would say that Mr. Scott has already twice visited the whole of the western country; that we have made arrangements with the Department of Agriculture of Manitoba to prepare an exhibit of agricultural products; that we have made arrangements with the government of the North-west Territories—Mr. Peterson, I think, is the name of the gentleman in charge of the agricultural department—for a similar exhibit, and also the same arrangement with British Columbia. In addition to that, the three experimental farms in Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia are growing special crops this year for the purpose of being able to select the best varieties of grains and other products to exhibit. The reason is not that the experimental farms will grow these crops so very much better than others, but the managers of these farms have been accustomed for years to prepare the exhibits of agricultural products for exhibitions, and we desire to secure fine specimens of these products. We also hope to get representations of the forestry and mineral products of the western country.

Mr. SPROULE. What arrangement has been made for the collection and transportation of the goods from each district?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have issued a complete list of the classes and grades of the exhibits, and in a supplement to that we have given instructions as to how exhibitors shall proceed to get their exhibit entered, packed and delivered. Speaking from memory, the goods will have to be delivered at either Montreal, Quebec or Halifax for shipment. The present proposition is, that we shall get one of the Government vessels to take the goods over to Rouen, a port of France, on the Seine River, at what we may call the head of ocean navigation, and they will be taken in lighters from Rouen to Paris.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, all exhibits will be sent to Quebec?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. To Montreal or Quebec.

Mr. SPROULE. Are they collected there, or collected at some other place and sent there?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Exhibitors will deliver their goods at the ports of Montreal or Quebec. The vessel will go to Montreal, as well as Quebec.

Mr. SPROULE. What arrangement has been made for the transportation of goods from the locality from which the goods are sent?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. Speaking from memory, I think that exhibitors are expected to deliver the goods at the port of shipment at their own expense, but we take charge of them there, carry them free of charge to France, see that they are put up in the exhibition, and return them, if they are such things as require to be returned, free of charge.

Mr. **SPROULE**. What check will there be on the expenditure in connection with the exhibition?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. All the accounts will go through the accountant's and the Auditor General's office.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Will it be under the control of your commissioner? I take it that you will have a commissioner, who will have charge of the whole exhibit.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. Up to the present I have been acting myself as chairman of the commission, but I hope soon to appoint a commissioner, who will be the chairman of the commissioner, or chief commissioner, who will be at the head of the whole business, and who will look after the expenditure. There is a secretary of the board of commissioners, who looks after all these expenditures which have been going on; but so far the accounts have been submitted to myself, and have been initialled by me. The chief commissioner, when appointed, will take that duty off my hands. That is one of the reasons why I want to have the commissioner appointed as soon as possible.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I think it would be very important to appoint a commissioner who would have some regard for economy, as well as for display, because the history of the past in connection with these exhibitions is, that the accounts are, in many respects—I will not say, scandalous—but very extravagant, to say the least. I think it would be well to have a commissioner who has some regard for economy, and who would not allow any sub-agent to spend whatever he likes because he is drawing upon the treasury.

Mr. **WALLACE**. Would the hon. Minister say what space Canada has now received, and what this space costs?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. We have in the colonial building 19,000 square feet net, exclusive of the main alleyways and passages of the building, and amongst the Imperial exhibits, 7,625 feet net, making a total of 26,585 feet net. With regard to the expense, we are obliged to contribute our proportion of the cost to the colonial building, according to the plans submitted by the Imperial Commission, which will amount to \$85,000. Then, we have to pay four shillings a foot for the gross space in the Imperial buildings, which will amount

Mr. **SPROULE**.

to about \$12,000. That makes a total of \$97,000 which we have to pay for space. It seems an enormous charge, but we have not been able to change it.

Mr. **WALLACE**. Are the exhibits returned to Montreal or Quebec, or to the exhibitors' residences?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. The first arrangement was to pay just the sea transport. There was afterwards some discussion in regard to the payment also of the land transport of exhibits from the far west; but I am not quite sure what the decision was in regard to that.

Mr. **WALLACE**. I understood the Minister to state that the producers, at their own expense, were to send the articles to Montreal or Quebec.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. Or Halifax.

Mr. **WALLACE**. I presume that it will be Halifax, because they will be sent away before the opening of navigation at Montreal.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. No, we hope that the vessel will be loaded at Montreal with all the products from the west, go on to Quebec and take up what is there, and then go on to Halifax. On their return the Ontario manufacturer and the Manitoba producer will have to pay for the return of their products from Montreal to their places.

Mr. **WALLACE**. It looks to me as if the expenditure was not divided in the proper proportions; for \$97,000 is to be paid for the space in the buildings, and only \$78,000 for all the other expenses. From our experience in the past, we know that quite a large staff is required to manage and control the exhibits in order to give them due prominence. I would like to ask the Minister if he is going to produce detailed statements of the expenditure?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. Certainly, that is the intention. Some of the details of former exhibitions made more trouble than the lack of them.

Sault Ste. Marie Canal—

To pay Messrs. H. Ryan & Co. amount of award on claims in connection with their contract for the construction of a canal and lift-lock at Sault Ste. Marie, Ont., referred to W. Shanly, Esq., C.E., as arbitrator.... \$211,505

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. As the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) has intimated that he desires to go more fully into the papers in regard to this item, I think the probability is that we may not press that item. The Government have looked into it and are satisfied that the report of the arbitrator entitles Ryan & Co. to this amount; but the hon. gentleman thinks the papers are incomplete and wishes to look over them. The estate of Ryan & Co., is probably, not

in need of money ; but if we have to carry the matter over for another year, it means another year's interest which they will have to receive if their claim is ultimately paid.

Mr. FOSTER. Even that is better, I think, than the feeling that we did not have all the information before us.

To pay Heney & Borthwick extras in connection with their contract for drainage works, reported in their favour by Mr. Walter Shanly.....\$8,932 86

Mr. FOSTER. What is the meaning of this ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I thought that had been explained. It is a recommendation made by Mr. Walter Shanly in accordance with the reference to him, and I was under the impression that the papers had been submitted and explained by the Minister of Railways.

Mr. HAGGART. It was not explained. It was for a bridge made to connect the town of Lachine with the little river there, and this claim was for extras. Before the late Government went out of office, an Order in Council was passed giving them power to refer to the Exchequer Court.

The PRIME MINISTER. Instead of referring it to the Exchequer Court, we referred it to Mr. Walter Shanly, and this is to carry out his report.

Mr. FOSTER. Would my right hon. friend not think it would be more satisfactory, in the long run, to have these claims sent to the Exchequer Court. There is nothing in the argument that because such claims involve questions of engineering they should be sent to an engineer, because in every one of these cases before the Exchequer Court the judge must avail himself of the best expert evidence. We instituted the Exchequer Court for the purpose of settling these claims against the Government, and we did so because we had been mulcted in an immense amount of money for damages by arbitrators, and Parliament came to the conclusion that a court properly constituted would be the best tribunal to settle them.

The PRIME MINISTER. I largely agree with my hon. friend. Many of these cases will have to be judged finally by an engineer, but it is probably better that the reference to an engineer should be made by the court itself.

Rainy River, Ont.—

Lock and dam ..... \$25,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The navigation of the Rainy River is difficult and dangerous at a point called the Long Sault, where there is a mile of rapid water, and above which there is another rapid. How best to overcome that has not yet been determined. I need not point out the importance of improving the navigation of that

river. Between Fort Frances and Lake of the Woods it is some 85 miles in length, and flows through rich agricultural lands, and beyond Fort Frances and along Rainy Lake there is large mineral wealth. The work is one which no doubt will be productive of great advantage. At present the machinery and supplies brought into that district are brought in at great expense and great inconvenience, for the most part in scows, involving a portage of 25 miles across the neck of land between Vermillion waters and Rainy Lake. As to how best to overcome these rapids, I do not think the engineers have agreed. One possible way would be to erect a dam, which would give a uniform depth of water of 7 feet from the foot of the Sault to Fort Frances locks, but would cost about \$225,000. Another plan would be to remove the obstructions, but the opinion prevails that, apart from the expense, such a proceeding would have the effect of facilitating the flow of water and rendering the stream not navigable at all. At present vessels are wharfed up the river, past these rapids, where the Government has constructed piers. The vessels are dragged up with a great deal of toil and trouble, and take the best part of the day to overcome the rapids. Another possible plan would be the erection of wing dams, which is adopted on some rivers. This money will be expended on whatever may be considered the best plan to meet the case.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has struggled manfully with generalities, and I admire his skill. I strained my ears to find out what was the plan on which this money is to be expended, but could not, and I do not suppose that either my hon. friend or the department knows. If there is any idea of spending \$200,000 or \$250,000 to overcome these difficulties of navigation, that will be an expenditure which I do not think could be justified. There is no sensible man who lives there who would think of asking for an expenditure to that extent, because when the railway is built it will go right through the whole of that agricultural section, and take a large part of the traffic, but these little river boats can stop anywhere at the bank, wherever there is a basket or barrel to put on and do a peddling business for the farmers that front on the river. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that there was an idea of utilizing Fort Frances Canal ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not refer to that.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, that would only be possible by a large expenditure, but when you would have it done you would find there is absolutely no traffic for it nor will there ever be any. What can be done and what is best to do, to overcome these two rapids, would be to erect a wing dam and try and

raise the volume of water somewhat. Even then, it is difficult to say whether that would be sufficient, because the larger volume of water that runs over, the greater power it will have against the vessel going up. But that seems about the only thing that will help. It does not take long to get over the rapids. You can warp over them in an hour or an hour and a half. There is one feature about it that, probably, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) would be very loath to have interferred with if he knew of it. The ropes for warping the vessel over the rapids are taken to the pier and put around a post by Indians. It is a very pleasing exhibition to see the Indians trooping to the spot ready to get hold of the rope, for which they always get a bag of flour as the vessel goes past. It would be a painful thing to the Minister, no doubt, to have that taken away, but if we could secure a great improvement in navigation, perhaps we could compensate the Indians in some other way.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The Government has not been committed to this proposition. But vessel men give the advice that my hon. friend refers to, and the advice has been used with success in other rivers, notably the Rhine.

To pay salary and expenses of experts to gather information and prepare a uniform code of rules and regulations for the railways of Canada..... \$2,000

Mr. **FOSTER**. Is that necessary now ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The Minister of Railways and Canals had included in a Bill a clause which would give power in relation to this. We have dropped that clause, but I think the desirability of collecting the information still exists, and hope that the House will vote this item.

Mr. **HAGGART**. It is the same as in the classification of freight. The proper way is to have the representative of the Government and the great railway companies meet and draw up, by mutual consent, a system of rules and regulations. There is no necessity to get experts for this purpose.

St. Andrew's Rapids—

Red River ..... \$150,000

Mr. **FOSTER**. Let us have an explanation of what is to be done.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. This is to make a canal in the Red River, some miles below Winnipeg, for the purpose of permitting the continuous navigation from Lake Winnipeg to the city of Winnipeg. A portion of the river is somewhat shallow and at low water the river is not navigable. This improvement will be a great advantage to commerce. The matter is one which has been agitated for many years, and has been brought before successive Ministers and Governments. It was several times brought before the late Government, but, until 1896, that Government never signified any inten-

Mr. **FOSTER**.

tion of doing anything with it, though, from time to time, it was under consideration. The necessity of the work was brought to the attention of the Minister of Public Works in the year 1896, and he made a personal inspection of the work, and also sent an engineer to make an inspection. It was afterwards examined by an officer of the department and the plans and specifications were prepared. The estimate of the work is about \$650,000. It will, when completed, afford seven feet of water from the mouth of the pier to the city of Winnipeg. I may say that Sir Charles Tupper, when in the city of Winnipeg, declared his intention of proceeding with this work. I do not give this as a justification for the work, if it is not otherwise justifiable, but state it as the position taken by the late Government. This facility to commerce will conduce very materially to the trade of Winnipeg and the surrounding district. Lake Winnipeg has a length of forty miles, and there is at present a very considerable trade done upon that lake ; and a very much larger trade will be done when navigation is continuous to the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. **DAVIN**. Before the item passes, I desire to express my great pleasure in seeing this amount in the Estimates this year. The leader of the Opposition had promised these great improvements to the people of Manitoba ; and if that Government had been sustained at the polls, long before this, this work would have been done. I am very glad to see the work here now.

To defray the expense of procuring the attendance of witnesses in inquiries before Railway Committee of the Privy Council into charges of discrimination in rates by railway companies..... \$2,000

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). I explained to the House, when the main Estimates were before us, that I expected to have to pay this additional \$1,000. We got the service a little cheaper one year, but on asking for tenders again, we are obliged to pay the usual amount, to make up which this \$1,000 is necessary.

Steam communication during the season of 1899, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation between Pictou and Cheticamp ..... \$2,000

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. This is the vote that usually appeared in the main Estimates for a number of years.

Steam communication from April 1, 1899, to March 31, 1900, daily between Port Mulgrave, Arichat and Canso ; three times a week between Port Mulgrave and Guysboro', and from the opening of navigation in 1899 to Nov. 30, 1899 ; twice a week between Port Mulgrave and Port Hood, such trips to be extended once a week to Margaree and Cheticamp ..... \$8,000

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. This is also a vote which usually appeared in the main Estimates, but was held over for some slight alterations.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What changes have been made in the running ?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Very little, except that, I think, some alterations have been made in the extension of the trips to Margaree and to Cheticamp. I wish to alter the wording. It is provided here "from the opening of navigation in 1899 to November 30th, 1899." I wish it to read "from the opening of navigation in 1899 to the close." Sometimes the season extends beyond the 30th of November, and we wish to give the people the benefit of it.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Does not the hon. Minister intend to drop that soon? When we built that Cape Breton road it was understood that these subsidies should be dropped.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. The people there object strongly to dropping this.

Mr. **HAGGART**. I am confident that this is one that was to be dropped.

Steam communication from July 1st, 1899, to June 30th, 1900, between Quebec and Gaspé Basin, touching at intermediate ports ..... \$2,500

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. This, I may explain, is an additional vote to the \$5,000 taken in the main Estimates. We were unable, on tendering, to obtain a single offer which was not in excess of the sum already asked. For \$7,500 we can get this service done, but not for less.

Mr. **FOSTER**. How often are the trips ?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Three round trips per month. The boat is the "London," of the North American Company. The hon. gentleman is aware, I suppose, that this is the only means of communication the people of that peninsula have got.

Mr. **BERGERON**. If the hon. gentleman means during the summer, the "Admiral," I believe, goes there.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. No, it does not call at any of these small ports.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. The service the "Admiral" performs is on the Baie des Chaleurs, from Dalhousie to Gaspé. This is a line of steamers serving the north shore of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. **BERGERON**. The "Campana," of the Quebec Steamship Company, passes there every week.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. This vessel will make three round trips each month, calling at probably some 25 or 30 places which are not served by the "Admiral."

Steam communication between Halifax, N.S., and the Island of Porto Rico..... \$8,000

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. This is a service which has been earnestly petitioned for by a number of gentlemen in the maritime provinces, in the hope of securing and regaining a portion of the trade which subsists between those provinces and Porto Rico. As the hon. gentleman knows, the coast trade there has been kept open for us by the efforts of the English Government, and if it is to be done we must have a service there. The most we expect to get will be eight trips a year.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I may add that the trade of Porto Rico with the maritime provinces has always been considerable, but owing to the new conditions arising out of the Spanish war, there is considerable anxiety lest that volume of trade may be reduced if not destroyed, and the people down in that section have been talking about steamship communication. Two parties approached the Government. One of them wished to contract for several years at a much larger sum, according to my recollection it was \$24,000 a year; the other party was willing to give us an experimental service, eight trips at \$1,000 each. The Government decided that the experiment was worth making. The gentleman who made the offer was Mr. J. T. Hamilton, mayor of Halifax, with whom a number of other gentlemen are associated. This is only an experiment, and the amount is not very large. We thought, in the interest of the West India trade, particularly in its present fitful condition, the effort was worth making.

Steam communication between Murray Bay and River Ouelle ..... \$5,000

Mr. **BERGERON**. We want full explanations of that.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. My hon. friend knows that the county of Charlevoix is a judicial district, the chef-lieu of which is at Murray Bay. In the summer time there is good communication between Murray Bay and all parts of the country, but in the winter time Murray Bay and the county of Charlevoix are absolutely cut out from communication by water as well as by rail. There is no railway nearer than 60 miles at least to Murray Bay. Therefore, the object of this vote is to give them steam communication in winter with River Ouelle. It is intended that there shall be six trips a week. River Ouelle is almost exactly opposite Murray Bay, the width of the river at that place is at least 45 miles.

Mr. BERGERON. When this communication is established it will no longer be necessary to carry the mails by land as before. Why not use the money we are voting to carry the mails from that part to River Ouelle where they strike the Intercolonial Railway?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is a suggestion which is worthy of consideration, and which can be embodied in the contract.

Mr. BERGERON. This will afford a great deal better communication than we have now. The parishes nine miles above Murray Bay and the parishes around and below, will be better served by this boat than by land.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We take power in our contracts to use the service for mails.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population of Murray Bay in winter?

The PRIME MINISTER. I will not say of the hamlet itself, but the population of the parish of Murray Bay must be three or four thousand.

Mr. BERGERON. I know of a case where a judge in that district I think has taken 10 days to go from one place to another in winter. No doubt this is needed.

The PRIME MINISTER. I may say that this is an experiment which was attempted some years ago, I think between 1879 and 1882, but it did not succeed. My hon. friend knows that we are putting a permanent light at the Traverse, and I think it will be possible to have navigation all the year around with the aid of that light.

Mr. FOSTER. This is an extension of the bonusing system which is entirely new. My hon. friend knows of one instance, a long while ago, which was not a success. This means that we are going to establish a system of bonusing ferries to run from one side to the other in the winter season.

The PRIME MINISTER. These are very exceptional circumstances. As to the width I was in error. I understand it is thirty miles.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the right hon. gentleman think he can possibly run a ferry from Murray Bay to Rivière Ouelle in winter time. I am afraid he will find that he will require a steamer like that plying between Prince Edward Island and the mainland to go through the ice, and that the expenditure will be enormous in order to succeed.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend may be right or he may be wrong. At all events, we do not intend to give more than this item. The money will be available, and if we find that it cannot be done with

Mr. WILFRID LAURIER.

the money we will have to drop it. As to the character of the ice in the St. Lawrence, my hon. friend is entirely mistaken. The ice is moved from one side of the river to the other, and it will not offer as great an obstruction as the hon. gentleman thinks. The difficulty before was that there were no lights, but with the help of the new light that we are providing we hope that this service will be a success.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the provincial government give any aid to it?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Ferries in the provinces are under the provincial governments. Are we going to undertake to go into the subsidizing of ferries. It may be very grateful to the gentleman who represents or wants to represent, a strip of territory on each side of the river, but my right hon. friend will see that the step he is taking will go forward, and it must simply be that you are undertaking a system of bonusing ferries in the different provinces.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is mistaken. This is a case that is absolutely exceptional.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if he has any information to communicate to the committee respecting the progress of the negotiations for the fast Atlantic steamship line. It has been repeated from time to time that negotiations are in progress between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway looking to the establishment of a fast line by that company. Is the right hon. gentleman in a position to say how far these negotiations have proceeded?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry to say that I cannot give any information today to my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke).

Mr. FOSTER. How many trips has this boat to make?

The PRIME MINISTER. Six trips a week.

Mr. FOSTER. What vessel is going to get it?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know yet. It will be a passenger steamboat.

Mr. MORIN. Will the right hon. First Minister say whether the mail carrier will be paid by the month, or season, or trip, for crossing?

The PRIME MINISTER. We will give \$5,000 a year for the service.

Mr. MORIN. I would suggest that the Government pay by the trip, because if they know that they will get a certain amount for the year, they will not make a trip every day, whereas, if they are paid by the trip they will carry out the arrangement. I

know that country well, and I know the difficulty that will be experienced in crossing the river during the winter on account of ice. Even between Baie St. Paul and Isle au Coudre, which is only two miles across, the ice packs to such an extent in the winter time that people have to cross on snowshoes. It is impossible to establish a ferry route between Murray Bay and Rivière Ouelle.

The PRIME MINISTER. We will see whether it is a success or not.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Morin) is an eminently wise one—divide your trips into 5,000 and pay so much a trip.

The PRIME MINISTER. The rule of the department, when they bargain for a certain number of trips is that they are paid for by the trip.

Mr. MORIN. It does not make any difference about the bargain.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It makes a good deal of difference.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this service to be done by tender ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Revote being part of construction cost to pay fifth instalment on new steamer "Minto" ..... \$42,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total cost of the "Minto" ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. With extras, including Capt. McElhinney's expenses and the furnishings, \$185,368, \$5,000 more than the vote.

Removal of old piers in Bear River, Digby County, N.S. .... \$1,000

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills), before he left to-day, desired me to say that he was very glad to see this amount of money placed in the Estimates. It is most important that these piers should be removed. But he expressed the desire that the Government should take into consideration damages which have been claimed for three or four years by Capt. Norman Chute. His vessel was damaged by one of these piers which the Government find that they were morally obliged to remove. I mention the fact now because I am inclined to believe that my hon. friend will bring the matter up later. He asked me to mention the matter to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and to express his belief that, since money is to be expended upon this work, there should have been embodied in the vote, at the same time, what would have been compensation to Capt. Chute for the loss he has sustained. It will be a small amount for the Government, compared to the loss of that man, which would be about \$1,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know anything of the facts, and I would not express an opinion which might commit the department.

Mr. BERGERON. Then, my hon. friend has not received any claim ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I am perfectly ignorant of the matter.

Further amount required for the construction of a permanent pier and lighthouse at the Traverse, to replace lightship..... \$20,000

Mr. FOSTER. Would my hon. friend tell me whether that cribwork has been started from Quebec to Traverse ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It has started out from Quebec, and I am very happy to tell the hon. gentleman that its transfer was, very fortunately, a complete success. I have the report of Mr. Anderson in my hands. I think it was on the 3rd of July, but at all events it was in the first week in July. He wrote the report on the 5th, saying that he had got the cribwork down, and described how it had been transferred, giving the number of steamers employed to tow it and telling how it was put in its place, as well as the expense up to that time.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it on the 3rd of July ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The 2nd or 3rd of July. It was in the first week of July. On the 5th of July he reported that it was in place.

Mr. FOSTER. Did they have any difficulty in putting it in its place ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, a good deal. There was very stormy weather at first ; but they took advantage of a lull between two heavy blows, and, having five steamers, they loaded it down with stone and got it sunk exactly in position. Col. Anderson was there himself from day to day. It held until the tide came, when it rose 8 feet ; but, having other batteaux loaded with stone, they threw in stone until the pier was permanently fixed. The fixing of it was a complete success.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the cost ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Up to that time, \$19,329.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether his department has finally shut down on all inquiries respecting Hudson Bay ? Has the report which was given of the very ineffective exploration that was made, finished the matter with the Government ? I see no signs of any activity of any sort respecting this much-needed route. In all the subsi-

dies I seen nothing that looks in that direction. It seems as if the department of my hon. friend, since that report, had gone to sleep.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I do not quite understand what my hon. friend is driving at. There is nothing in the estimates before us with reference to Hudson Bay. The report was brought down last year, and my hon. friend had an opportunity to study it. I have not heard any one in this House this session to intimate that he desired any discussion in regard to it. If my hon. friend had given me the slightest notion of his desire to discuss the matter, I would have posted myself. The hon. gentleman knows what the report was. So far as the bay is concerned, there is not much controversy, because the bay itself is capable of navigation every month in the year; but the great question was in regard to the straits.

To assist in the establishment, maintenance and inspection of cold storage for bait for deep-sea fishermen, under conditions to be fixed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries..... \$25,000

Mr. MARTIN. Where will this expenditure be made?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. This vote is asked for from Parliament to endeavour to meet a danger, which is increasing every year, respecting the bait required by our fishermen for deep-sea fishing. The matter has engaged the attention of the department for some years. In 1893 some reports were made by Commander Gordon, who made an investigation into the subject, on the request of the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He reported the necessity of providing fresh bait in some way or other; but what was known on the subject of cold storage was crude, compared to what is known to-day. Since then we have applied cold storage to agricultural products, and the same principle has been applied commercially by merchants engaged in the fishing business, for the purpose of transporting fish to where they are consumed, and not only the fish of Lake Winnipeg and the other lakes in the Northwest Territories, but also the fish of the maritime provinces. The department does not in any way contemplate touching the commercial aspect of the case. This vote has nothing to do with the cold storage of fish taken for sale or transportation. It simply has to do with the question of bait. This question of bait is becoming from year to year a very serious one. Very many of our fishermen in the maritime provinces depend largely on the bait they get from Newfoundland; but the Newfoundland Government, having come to the conclusion that it was not in the interest of their people to permit fish to be exported for any other pur-

Mr. DAVIN.

pose than for food, our fishermen are now precluded from getting bait there. In the spring of the year nature furnishes the maritime provinces bountifully with bait, which fill our rivers, and bays, and creeks; and our fishermen along the coast take them in very large quantities. During the time these small fish last, the fishermen are amply supplied with bait. But the question is, how are they going to get fresh bait in the summer season, after the run of small fish goes by? We think that trouble will be solved, if the fishermen can be induced to build small cold-storage buildings, where the same plan which has been so successful in regard to agricultural products, can be applied in regard to bait. It is proposed that our officials should visit the different localities and inform the fishermen of the necessity of co-operation, that is, that in every small village or settlement the fishermen should have pointed out to them the easy means at their disposal, not only of getting bait in ample quantities in the spring, but of keeping it fresh through the summer months by means of cold storage bait houses. These would be built on somewhat the same lines as those on which farmers have built their cheese factories. There should be so many fishermen partners in the association, and the building put up by them under their control and under the supervision of an officer of the department. It is proposed that the department should offer some inducement to the fishermen to form themselves into these associations, and the intention is that the Government shall pay one-half the original cost of the building, and also that a very small assistance should be given for the purpose of running each factory, amounting to about \$50 per year, for a period of not more than three years. After going into the matter thoroughly with Prof. Robertson, we concluded that the only mode of assisting the fishermen is in the direction I have indicated. He is of the opinion, in which Prof. Prince concurs, that these buildings could be put up at a cost of from \$500 to \$600 each, and the Government would contribute to the extent of 50 per cent of that cost. These buildings would be 150 feet square, with a floor ten by fifteen, and would be capable of holding, say, ten tons of fish. The ice part of the building would have to be about 200 square feet, and be 15 by 18, and the building would be about 9 feet high, so that the entire building would be 9 feet high, 15 feet wide, and 30 feet long, and would cost on an average, according to Prof. Robertson, 15 to 20 cents per cubic foot. The inspector would submit plans, and from time to time inspect each building as it was being constructed, and one member of the association would have to be appointed to receive the bait and deliver it. If fifty freezers should be erected, the Government contribution would come about to \$12,500, and the expenses connected with the inspection and

with the actual working operation of the bait freezers would largely increase that amount.

Mr. MARTIN. Has the hon. Minister any idea where those are to be erected?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They will be erected wherever associations are formed for their erection.

Mr. MARTIN. Are they to be for the exclusive benefit of the deep sea fishermen?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Any fishermen.

Mr. MARTIN. Then, why use the words "deep sea fishermen"?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Because we do not want this to apply to any other.

Mr. MARTIN. You do not apply it to any but deep sea fishermen?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) In the case of parties who have started institutions of this kind, will they be considered as well as those who propose to start such institutions?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have considered that point. Individuals have started commercial institutions for the purpose primarily of freezing fish for sale, and attached to that they also have appliances for the freezing of bait. But they are not associations of fishermen to which only this is intended to apply. They are simply commercial institutions, built by private parties for their own personal benefit. Of course, where there is any such institution we will not encourage the building of a cold storage bait house in opposition to it.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) The hon. Minister made reference to Captain Gordon, who was a very efficient officer, and I may say that I myself brought the matter under his notice, and like the intelligent man he was he agreed that if such a thing could be done, it would be a step in the right direction. What the Minister says is correct; early in the season we have an abundance of bait, but as the season advances, the bait goes off the shore, and, for want of bait, the fishermen cannot make a catch. I am much in favour of anything of this kind, as it will be a benefit to the fishermen. I suggest the advisability of not losing any time inaugurating the system.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am only waiting for the vote to pass.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Time is required to organize the system, and the fishermen require to know beforehand in order to arrange for the construction of buildings

and to be ready, when the winter comes to lay in their ice. Private enterprise has gone into this matter in some sections of the province of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia. Particularly is this the case in Canso, where it has been gone into quite extensively. If it is put fairly before the fishermen, they will be inclined to go into it much as the farmers have gone into the cheese business. It will not require a great deal of money, but it is well that the Government should give assistance in starting it. It is one of those things that only require to be started and there will be little trouble about it. I heartily commend the Minister for taking this matter up. It is a step in the right direction.

Mr. McALISTER. The item respecting fish hatcheries escaped my notice. If I may be allowed, I would like to ask the Minister if steps have been taken to erect a fish hatchery at Restigouche?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Within the last week, I received notice that our fish hatchery at Restigouche had been burnt down—the work, my officers report, of an incendiary. I have arranged with my deputy that instructions are to be sent—and I suppose they have been sent—to Professor Prince, who is at present engaged in the biological fish observatory at St. Andrews to proceed to the spot, investigate the case, and, if possible, ascertain who was the culprit and place his prosecution in the hands of the officers of the law, and also to take immediate steps for the reconstruction of the building. Until I have his report, I cannot do more.

Mr. McALISTER. It might be worth while to examine the situation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I omitted to say—and perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. McAlister) will allow me—I gave express instructions to examine the conditions of the locality to see whether the fish hatchery should be rebuilt in that locality or in some other.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Is there any intention to have fish hatcheries around Prince Edward Island for the propagation of the lobster?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not at present. The fish hatchery at Pictou supplies the wants of the Island as well as if it were situated on the Island. It is in contemplation to combine at Gaspé the salmon and lobster hatchery together, so that we may have one on the east and one on the west.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Are the young lobster fry put in the water on the coast of the Island?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, they are put in about 10 miles outside of Pictou.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Would it not be better to place them somewhat further from the hatchery—along the coast of the bays of Prince Edward Island the natural home of the lobster?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No; I have consulted Mr. Ogden who has had charge of the hatchery since it was built, and it is his opinion—concurring in by Prof. Prince that the best place to deposit the lobster fry is in the centre of the Straits. The main object is to disperse them so that the natural enemies may not devour them. The more and quicker they are dispersed by wind and tide the better. They remain at the surface for six or eight days, when, as they develop, they drop to the bottom.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Without pretending to be an expert, I must say that that is rather contrary to what I should suppose, because it is well known that the lobsters come into the shallow water for the purpose of depositing their spawn. I should think, therefore, that the shallow water, particularly in Sandy Bay, would be the natural home of the young fry.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am very anxious for information, and would be glad to know if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) is sure that the lobsters go into the shallow water to deposit their eggs? I do not think that has been proved.

Amount required to pay Mr. Charles Bremner, of Bresaylor, for value of furs entrusted by him to Dominion Government authorities at Battleford on the 26th May, 1885, and never returned to him ..... \$5,364 50

The PRIME MINISTER. This is a very old claim, going back to the year 1885. In 1890, Charles Bremner presented a petition to this House, and on the presentation of that petition a committee of the House was appointed to investigate it. That committee was composed of Messrs. McNeill, Chairman, Tisdale, Wood (Westmoreland), Girouard, Weldon (St. John), Casgrain, Holton, Lister and Kirkpatrick. They reported unanimously in this way:

The Select Committee appointed to inquire into the statements made in reference to furs taken from Charles Bremner, a half-breed, residing at Battleford, beg leave to report unanimously:

1. That during the North-west rebellion of 1885, and on the day of the surrender of the Indian chief, Poundmaker, who had been in arms against the Government of Canada, a number of half-breeds came into Battleford, among whom was Charles Bremner, a half-breed trader and farmer, a resident of Bresaylor, 22 miles from Battleford, having in his possession a large quantity of valuable furs.

2. General Middleton being in command of the Canadian forces engaged in the suppression of the rebellion, and being in Battleford, and having information that these half-breeds had come

in from Poundmaker's camp, and that the furs being carried, gave orders that they should be put in charge of the Dominion Mounted Police, and they were accordingly placed in the police barracks at Battleford for safe-keeping.

3. Some weeks later, while General Middleton was at Fort Pitt, Mr. Hayter Reed (a member of his staff), who had then just returned from Battleford, called attention to the furs, and reminded General Middleton that the person from whom they had been taken was said to be a rebel. Thereupon, after consultation with Mr. Reed and Mr. Bedson (another member of his staff), General Middleton assumed to confiscate the furs.

4. At the time of the confiscation General Middleton directed Mr. Reed to send an order in writing to the police officer at Battleford who had charge of the furs. The exact wording of this order cannot be clearly established, as it was destroyed a few days after it was written. But it is proved to have been of the following tenor:—

That General Middleton had confiscated the furs, and had ordered that two packages of them should be put up for himself, one for Mr. Hayter Reed, one for Mr. Bedson, and one for another member of his staff, selecting the best; and that receipts should be taken for, or a memorandum made of, the furs thus distributed.

5. Packages were put up in conformity with this order—two for General Middleton, one for Mr. Hayter Reed, and one for Mr. Bedson. The furs thus put up were in quantity about one-eighth of the whole, but of much larger proportionate value.

6. It has been proved before your committee that the furs put up for General Middleton and Mr. Bedson were placed on board the steamer which conveyed General Middleton and Mr. Bedson from Battleford to Winnipeg. But it would appear that Mr. Bedson, who had promised to give a receipt for the furs, refused to do so, alleging that they had not reached Winnipeg; and your committee find that the packages of furs so shipped for General Middleton were not received by him.

7. The furs put up by Mr. Hayter Reed were forwarded to Regina and received by him there. He subsequently returned the package unopened to the police authorities at Battleford, alleging as his reason for so doing that the propriety of the confiscation was questioned.

8. Your committee consider the confiscation of the furs unwarrantable and illegal; and in his evidence General Middleton admits that he has recently become satisfied it was not legally justifiable. Your committee are further of opinion that, if the confiscation had been legal, the confiscated property vested in the Crown; and, while your committee believe that General Middleton acted under an unfortunate misconception as to his powers, they are of opinion that the appropriation of any portion of the property, under such circumstances, by General Middleton to his own use, and that of the members of his staff, was highly improper.

9. On behalf of Bremner it was stated to your committee that he was willing to accept \$4,500, inclusive of interest, in compensation for his loss, and this your committee consider a fair compensation.

This is the basis of the vote we now ask from Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the action of the House on that?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. No action was taken. That was the unanimous report of the committee.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Was it not referred to a commission appointed for the purpose of inquiring into the North-west rebellion claims ?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. No. A commission was appointed to investigate the losses suffered from the rebellion, but they did not inquire into this matter at all. The furs were confiscated on the pretext that Bremner was a rebel. Now, this was altogether disproved before the committee, at least the proof was made somewhere that he was not a rebel. Bremner was a trader in furs. He had spent all the winter in the north, trading with the Indians, and was coming back home with a package of furs valued at \$20,000 or over. He fell in with the camp of Poundmaker, and, being found with him, was taken to be a rebel. But it was obvious that a man who had spent all winter trading with the Indians, and had come back home with such a valuable supply of furs, would not take any part in the rebellion.

Mr. **FOSTER**. It is unfortunate that this comes at a time when we cannot look into it. The only thing I know about it is that report of the committee.

To make good to persons in Prince Edward Island amount of duties paid to the United States customs on fish and fish oil, being amount paid by Messrs. Hall & Myrick..... \$15,029

Mr. **FOSTER**. I hope my hon. friend will not push that at this time of the session. I think that might well go over to another year.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I think I can convince the hon. gentleman that it should be paid, at least it must be disposed of one way or the other. Parliament has already settled the principles connected with the payment of these claims. The facts out of which they arise, are these : Some years ago the American Government applied to the Dominion Government and to the Prince Edward Island Government, then separate, for liberty to use the waters surrounding the shores of the Dominion and the Island, pending certain negotiations which were then going forward for a settlement of the fishery question. The Home Government wrote a despatch to the Dominion Government, and a separate despatch to the Island Government, strongly urging them to accede to the wishes of the American Government, the American Government expressing at the same time their desire, not only to obtain these privileges, but promising that if they were given, they would urge upon Congress, at the end of the session, the remission of the duties which were then charged upon Canadian

fish exported to the United States. The Prince Edward Island Government, at the instance of the Imperial Government, accepted the offer made by the United States Government, or the offer supposed to be made by the United States Government. The Dominion Government at that time did not accept that offer, and the American fishermen used the waters surrounding the province of Prince Edward Island during those years before the Washington Treaty came into force, irrespective of the restrictions contained in the old Treaty of 1818, and used them at the request of the Imperial Government, conveyed in consequence of the application made by the American Government to them. They could not use the waters of the rest of the Dominion, because the Dominion would not accept the offer. Now, the merchants in Prince Edward Island, assuming they would get, in pursuance of the promise made by the American Government, a return of the duties, went on purchasing fish which was caught that year, for export, and paying a price for it to the fishermen on the assumption that they would get a refund of the duty. As the season went on, disquieting rumours were circulated, to the effect that there was a doubt whether they would get that duty refunded to them ; and Messrs. Hall & Myrick addressed an official communication to the Lieutenant-Governor of Prince Edward Island, calling his attention to these disquieting rumours, and asking whether there was anything in them, and whether they would be safe in going on and purchasing fish on the assumption that these duties would be refunded to them. The Lieutenant-Governor of Prince Edward Island replied to Messrs. Hall & Myrick's application officially, one paragraph of which reply I will read.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What is the date of that ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. September 9th, 1871 :

The Lieutenant-Governor is of opinion that your apprehensions are unfounded. An arrangement, sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government, has been entered into between the Governments of the United States and Prince Edward Island ; and the Lieutenant-Governor does not apprehend that the action of Canada, in withholding her assent from a similar arrangement, will be attended with the prejudicial result which you have recently been led to anticipate.

With this official statement from the Lieutenant-Governor that there need not be any fear, that their apprehension was unfounded, that the agreement would be carried out, that they would have the moneys refunded to them—

Mr. **FOSTER**. It does not go that far.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I think so. The Lieutenant-Governor says that he thinks their appre-

hension unfounded; that, inasmuch as Canada did not join in the agreement with the United States and would not carry it out, therefore, they would not get a refund of the duties. That is the official way of saying that there were no grounds for their fears at all, in the Lieutenant-Governor's opinion. Coming from the source it did, this document was published in all the Island papers, and all those engaged in commercial pursuits in Prince Edward Island, and in the fishing business, acted upon it in good faith, purchasing fish on the assumption that they would get a refund of the duties. At the end of the year they were notified that they would not get a return of the duties, because Canada had not become a party to the arrangement. The proposition that was made by the United States was made on their part on the assumption that Canada would respond. Inasmuch as only a small part of Canada, namely, Prince Edward Island, had responded, they were not disposed to carry out the arrangement. Time went on and an arbitration was held at Halifax to determine the amount which should be paid by the Americans for the user of our waters between 1873 and 1886. Before the commissioner appointed on behalf of Canada came these gentlemen to press for a refund of this money upon the commissioners. The commissioner pointed out that it was not possible to press it upon the commission, because it did not come within the purview of the reference, and it would have to be claimed diplomatically through the respective Governments. It was not submitted to the commission, and they afterwards came to the Dominion Government. The Dominion Government, in 1883, agreed to indemnify those claimants who were British subjects for the moneys which they had outlaid. A vote was brought down containing lengthy reasons why they should have this money, and Sir John Macdonald said: We have received \$5,000,000 from the Americans for the use of these fisheries, and although strictly and technically speaking, the damages which these people have incurred should not be considered to form a part of the award, still we have received it, and in equity it may be said that we can afford to be generous and to pay out of this award the money—

Mr. FOSTER. As a matter of grace to our own citizens.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. Then I asked for the names of the parties who were to be paid. Sir Leonard Tilley, who was Finance Minister, gave the names, among which were those of Hall, Myrick & Co., and two or three others. I asked him expressly and specifically whether they were to be paid, and as a result of the discussion which took place in 1883 the vote was withdrawn. In 1884 a vote was again brought down, and the discussion which took place resulted in the

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

Government refusing to give any statement that Hall, Myrick & Co. and H. M. Churchill, who had incurred these losses, would be paid.

Mr. FOSTER. They were both United States citizens.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Technically they were citizens of the United States, but they were men who had lived in Prince Edward Island, who had conducted their business in Prince Edward Island, and whose employees were all British subjects. They were merely the conduit pipes through which the actual fishermen sell their fish to the United States. They were agents for the fishermen.

Mr. FOSTER. They were more than conduits; there was a certain amount of precipitation in the process.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hall & Myrick claimed the indemnity that was paid to British subjects in Prince Edward Island. In 1884, that vote was again asked by Sir John Macdonald, and he was again pressed to state to whom this money was to be paid. He said he would appoint a commissioner. I thought it was a very proper proposal that a commissioner should be appointed. Mr. Justice Fitzgerald was appointed a commissioner, and he went into all the claims, which amounted to \$54,000. Mr. Fitzgerald held court in different places, received evidence and made a report to the Government as to the claims that should be paid and those that should not be paid. In regard to the claim of \$20,000 made by Hall, Myrick & Co., he reported in favour of allowing \$15,029. His report went on to say:

Some of the merchants, previous to the inquiry, opened their books of account to the fishermen for examination that they might obtain information as to the quantity of fish sold and the price received. Notable among these gentlemen was Mr. Myrick, of the late firm of Hall, Myrick & Co., who kept his book-keepers in constant attendance at the court of inquiry to afford this information. But, unfortunately, the books of this firm, in Queen's County, entirely, and in King's County, partly, were consumed by fire some years ago.

Other merchants refused to do this, and only after the fishermen had given their testimony was this information given to the court.

If to this amount is added—

That is the \$24,120.63 to other parties.

If to this amount is added the claim of C. C. Carleton and of Messrs. Hall & Myrick, as found by me to be correct, viz., the sums of \$208.50 and \$15,029 respectively, it will appear that a total amount of \$54,213.15 will pay off every legitimate claim brought before me—for both years, as in 1872, by the express declaration of Mr. Myrick, his firm can have no claim for that year.

If, without exceeding my duty, I may recommend this full settlement, it is only done, bearing in mind the fact that with the last-named claim-

ants have been doing business in this province for many years, and that the large business done by Messrs. Hall & Myrick, now extending over some thirty years, has greatly stimulated the industries of the province, and that, though American citizens, their citizenship has in no way affected their commercial relationship with its people.

The matter went on, and when Mr. Fitzgerald's report came down, a vote was brought down to the House for \$38,086.34. The matter simmered, and in 1885 and in 1886 constant demands were made by Hall, Myrick & Co., Churchill and Carleton, to the Government for recognition of their claims in the same manner as Parliament had recognized other claims. In 1887, the then Government came down to Parliament with a vote of \$10,200 for the payment of all the other claims, including the claim of H. M. Churchill. I asked why the claim of Messrs. Hall & Myrick was made an exception, and Sir John Macdonald's answer was that we would deal with that claim when it came before us. There is no doubt that Parliament took a generous view of the matter when they paid the other claims; and the view that Parliament took can be defended. In view of the fact that we received such a large amount for the fishery award, it was only right that these people, who had suffered so severely in the pocket by reason of the failure of the American Government to carry out their obligations, should be reimbursed for their losses. Be that as it may, Parliament voted the money to all the other claimants except Messrs. Hall & Myrick. The matter remained in abeyance until the present Government came into power, when a memorial was submitted to them by Messrs. Hall & Myrick. It was referred to a committee of Council. I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Minister of Finance, and the Prime Minister were members of that committee. After listening to all the facts, we determined that there was no ground for refusing payment to these men in view of the fact that all the others had been paid. No interest was added because it was not a debt on which interest would accrue; but Parliament, out of its generosity, was to indemnify them for the loss they had sustained. In all the circumstances of the case, I think in equity and justice this is a grant that should be voted by Parliament.

Mr. HAGGART. I know nothing about this case, except what I have learned from the statement made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; and if his statement is correct, it seems to me that it is a claim that ought not to be paid by the Parliament of Canada. The hon. gentleman states that under a treaty arrangement made between the Imperial Government and the United States, it was agreed that certain fish products should be taken free into the United States. The Lieutenant-Governor of Prince Edward Island, who was an Imperial officer,

announced to the inhabitants of that colony that this would be the case. The Imperial authorities have kept faith in the matter. The United States authorities said: "No; as the whole of Canada did not come into the arrangement, we will not continue it with Prince Edward Island." Then, it became a question of grace with the people of Prince Edward Island and the people of Canada. It was only a question of faith, which could only be applied to British subjects. Why should they indemnify the inhabitants of the United States or the subjects of a foreign Government, because that Government did not keep faith with the Imperial authorities? To me it is the most ridiculous proposition in the world.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Why did you do it in 1887, then?

Mr. HAGGART. I have no evidence of our doing it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The evidence is before us. Here is the item:

To make good to persons in Prince Edward Island amount of duties paid the United States customs on fish and fish oil, including amount paid by H. M. Churchill.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Mr. Churchill was naturalized.

Mr. HAGGART. I am taking the report of Mr. Fitzgerald, the officer who reported on the claims, and he reported that Hall & Myrick were American citizens.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Churchill was an American citizen when he was paid the money?

Mr. FOSTER. No, you are mistaken in that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I am not. He was an American citizen in 1871 and until 1884; and for the purpose of getting this payment, he went into court and became naturalized a day or two before it was paid. The right of all these men to be paid was discussed and settled by Parliament in 1887, and it would be a most monstrous thing to refuse to pay Hall & Myrick after having paid the others. I admit that there would be good argument for not doing it in the first place, but Parliament has done it in the other cases.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know anything of what was done in 1887. I am dealing with the evidence produced by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries before this committee for this payment. The only reason assigned by the judge why these men were not paid was that they were American citizens. Look at the absurdity of the hon. gentleman's claim—that we are to indemnify American citizens for losses sustained in consequence of a customs regulation the

control of which was entirely in the hands of the United States Government. To me it is no justification of it to say that Mr. Churchill was also an American citizen. I think it would be monstrous to pay him, even if he did take the oath of allegiance after the losses were incurred.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Were you not a member of the Government when that was brought down?

Mr. HAGGART. I was not in the Government in 1887, and I never heard of it. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has made no case whatever for his proposition to pay American citizens, because their own Government did not keep faith.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Of course, my hon. friend understands that Hall & Myrick, though not British subjects, have been residents of Prince Edward Island for forty years, and have been carrying on a large business there and employing many British subjects.

Mr. HAGGART. That may be; but the hon. gentleman has made no case at all that would justify this Parliament in paying this claim. At any rate, it was a debt that accrued in Prince Edward Island before confederation. The amount should be charged against the Prince Edward Island government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was another point.

Mr. HAGGART. The whole amount should be charged against that Government. It was a debt of that Government to these individuals, if it is a debt at all, and should have been taken into consideration when settling the terms of confederation. The hon. gentleman said it was an account of the handsome award we got in the Washington Treaty that we dealt generously with these people. But we have disposed of that. After all it was a matter of grace that should only apply to our own people, and there can be no justification in applying it to American citizens.

Mr. McLELLAN. To all intents and purposes Mr. Myrick is a British subject, although technically he is not. All his interests are in this country, where he has been doing business the past forty years, and the men employed by him are British subjects. The ex-Minister of Railways is mistaken when he says he is a foreign resident.

Mr. HAGGART. I did not say he was a foreign resident at all. I took the statement from the Minister of Marine, who read the report of Mr. Fitzgerald, who said that Hall & Myrick were American subjects.

Mr. McLELLAN. Yes, but a part of the firm is composed of British subjects, and as pointed out by the hon. Minister of

Mr. HAGGART.

Marine, the firm was led to pay this duty to the fishermen of Prince Edward Island on the understanding that they would be recouped. They had more than one reason to believe that they would. They had, first, the promise of the American Government, which was afterwards violated, and then the assurance of the Lieutenant-Governor of Prince Edward Island, which led them to understand that the money paid by them would be refunded. This money was actually paid out by them to the fishermen, and it is only fair that it should be refunded. It is useless now to go into the question as to whether this money should be paid by Prince Edward Island or not, or whether it should be paid at all or not. As a matter of fact, the other shippers in the island were refunded the duties paid by them or such as they could prove before the commissioner they had paid to the fishermen from whom they bought the fish, and Mr. Myrick, who is the largest dealer in fish in the Island, remains to this day unpaid, and there is not the slightest reason why he should not receive the justice dealt out to the other shippers in the Island. As the hon. Minister of Marine has pointed out, an American by the name of Churchill was paid the refund.

Mr. FOSTER. Not when an American subject?

Mr. McLELLAN. It is true, he was not an American subject when he was repaid, but he only came a British subject for the purpose of receiving this money. What difference does it make in justice whether he became a British subject in 1883 or 1884 or not. I do not see any weight in that argument.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not myself.

Mr. McLELLAN. We must bear in mind that this firm proved before the commissioners that they had actually paid this \$15,029 to the people from whom they got the fish, and that every cent of it was paid to British subjects, and in all justice, they are entitled to get the money back. They had the word of the Lieutenant-Governor of Prince Edward Island as a guarantee that they would be repaid, and I think in all fairness we should put them on an equal basis with those who received the refund years ago.

Mr. MARTIN. I am sorry I cannot agree with my hon. friend. This is a claim which this firm have actually against the United States. As a matter of grace, as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has said, British fishermen were paid by the Canadian Government, but I do not think at all that there is any obligation on our part to pay American fishermen. When the hon. gentleman says that we paid one American fisherman, that is not in accordance with the facts. When Mr. Churchill was paid he had become naturalized.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Would that make any difference in the case? The ex-Minister of Railways has just said that it makes no difference, either in justice or equity.

Mr. **MACDONALD (P.E.I.)** It is a matter of grace, like the rest.

Mr. **MARTIN**. Let me quote the language of the hon. Minister himself, which he used in 1883 on the subject. In "Hansard," page 1381, I find that hon. gentleman reported as saying:

Those gentlemen have a good claim against the United States. If an American citizen has a good claim against the United States, that is the place for him to collect it.

Sir Leonard Tilley, on page 1382, said:

American citizens fishing in Canadian waters should not be paid out of the funds of the Dominion, and should look to their own country for payment.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. These men were not fishing in Canadian waters at all.

Mr. **MARTIN**. I think they were. Sir Charles Tupper drew the distinction very fairly and squarely between the positions of those who were American citizens and those who were British subjects. In 1887, the present Minister of Marine again said:

There was no legal or moral obligation on the part of Canada to pay those men at all.

But because the money was paid to British subjects, as a matter of grace, the hon. gentleman presumes to ask us to pay an American citizen, and an American citizen who went before that Halifax Fishery Commission, as a special witness in the interest of the United States Government to depreciate the value of the fisheries of Canada. I hold in my hand the report of the Halifax Commission of 1877. I find on page 2854, No 71:

Isaac C. Hall, of Charlottetown, P.E.I., and Winthrop, Massachusetts, fish merchant, called on behalf of the Government of the United States, sworn and examined.

The hon. gentleman knows that Mr. Hall was for years the consular agent of the United States, and if he will follow the evidence that Mr. Hall gave, he will see that Mr. Hall tried to depreciate the value of our fisheries.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. **MARTIN**. I will read it for the hon. gentleman. Here is the first question asked:

By Mr. Foster:

Q. You are a citizen of the United States?—

A. Yes.

Q. You have a house in Charlottetown?—A. A commercial house.

Q. And you live part of the year at Charlottetown, and part of the year at Winthrop, Massachusetts, near Boston, Suffolk County?—

There is one distinction between Churchill's claim and Hall's claim. Churchill lived in Prince Edward Island.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. He lived every winter in Boston.

Mr. **MARTIN**. The hon. gentleman is by no means correct.

Mr. **MACDONALD (P.E.I.)** Not every winter.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I have known him all my life and he is in the same position as Hall exactly.

Mr. **MARTIN**. The hon. gentleman says Mr. Hall did not attempt to depreciate the value of the Canadian fisheries. At page 2857 the question is asked and answered as follows:—

Q. As a matter of observation, do they usually fish in as far as the boats do?—A. They don't, they fish further out.

Making it appear that they fished beyond the three-mile limit. Then, the hon. gentleman who was counsel before the commission corrects him in giving his evidence—page 2859:

By Mr. Davies:

Q. I think you are wrong about that year?—A. The catch on the American coast in 1870 was the great catch.

This gentleman, in order to make a case for the country to which he belonged, actually misquoted one year for another. I do not wish to detain the committee, but I think that it is wrong for the hon. gentleman to come before this House with this vote. Some years ago, he stated, dealing with this case before the House, that this man was a strong Liberal, and that, I believe, is the best reason he can give the committee for this vote.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Perhaps that is the reason why he was not bracketed with Churchill in 1887.

Mr. **MARTIN**. We expected this item in the Estimates last session, at least it was rumoured, because Hall & Myrick exerted themselves for the Liberal party in the by-election in West Prince the vote would be made. That is one of the most forcible arguments that the hon. gentleman could bring forward. But I do hope that a vote which cannot be justified on any good ground, will not be pressed.

Mr. **McMULLEN**. I have never before heard of this claim, though I have sat in this House for many years. I am not going to challenge the payment of it, if it is an honest claim. It is said that this man is an American citizen, though he has lived in Canada for years. But the fact that

he is an American is no reason why he should not be paid anything he is justly entitled to. If the claim is not a just one, it should not be paid on any account. If the claim is justly due by the United States, Canada has no right to pay it. I was not present at the commencement of the explanation by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. But if this man was refused payment of his claim because he was an American citizen, an injustice was done him. He is accused of having given evidence favourable to the United States in the fishery dispute. That is no reason why he should not be paid. I presume the Government have looked into this claim and have come to the conclusion that it is just, and, if it is just, it should be paid.

Mr. SPROULE. I have always looked with suspicion on these old claims. They seem to be brought forward when half the people who know the circumstances are dead and gone. The information given by the hon. member for East Queen's (Mr. Martin) is very important and suggestive. It seems that the hon. Minister is now advocating a claim similar to one which formerly he opposed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not oppose it. When the matter came before the House I said there was no legal claim upon the Dominion of Canada, but if we choose to take out of the award a certain sum, and, in our generosity refused the money, these men had been deprived of, we ought to do it fairly all round, and to admit one while excluding another. One claim was paid in 1887 to Mr. Churchill, but Mr. Hall was not paid.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. Minister admits that there is no legal claim. That is a very strong reason for believing that there is no moral claim. This is an affair which happened, I believe, before confederation. At what time in the life of the country shall we have these ante-confederation claims settled up. If there is moral claim, let Prince Edward Island pay it. We are told that the claim stands against the United States. Then, if generosity should be exercised in any quarter, it should be exercised by the United States. The fact that this claim has been left so long is enough to arouse suspicion, and the acknowledgment that there is no legal claim is another strong reason why we should refuse to recognize it.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. member for West Prince (Mr. McLellan) said that the United States owed this money. And the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) was quoted by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Martin) as having said the same. Well, Sir, these Estimates are generous Estimates. They cover many doubtful claims. But, for Canada, with five millions

Mr. McMULLEN.

of people, to undertake to pay the debts of the United States—why, it is simply wanton. If the hon. gentlemen go to the country, they should inscribe upon their banner: We have swallowed all our principles; we appear in Tory clothes; we ask for votes because we masqueraded in characters that we denounced for eighteen years, and we pay the debts of the United States.

Mr. McLELLAN. Mr. Chairman—

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. FOSTER. No, it is impossible to carry it. I wish to speak, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLellan) does not.

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

### After Recess.

(In the Committee.)

To make good to persons at Prince Edward Island amount of duties paid to the United States customs on fish and fish oil, being amount paid by Messrs. Hall & Myrick.....	\$15,029
--	----------

Mr. SPROULE. I move that this item be struck out. I think it is only giving away public money we have no legal right to give away, and I do not think we have any equitable right.

Mr. FOSTER. One can hardly see why this is brought up at this particular time of the session. It is an illustration of what is deplorable, that important and debatable claims are left to the last hours of the session. In what way can we get a representative opinion upon this claim which is before us now, a claim which dates back to 1871 for its foundation, and which from that time up to this has lain, with the exception of one or two occasions, entirely dormant? What possibility is there that we can get a representative opinion upon this claim at a time when we are wishing to go into concurrence and to close up business? I think that my hon. friend would do well to take that fact into consideration, and, as this has already kept so long, it could keep one year more, and let him bring it up at the next session, when we would be better disposed to give a fair consideration to the claim. I would like to hear from my hon. friend in that respect.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We must decide it one way or the other.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, the claim is one which the hon. gentleman himself has uttered an opinion upon. It is not a difficult matter to get to the ground-work of the claim. An agreement was supposed to be possible between the Imperial Government and the United States, whereby certain pro-

ducts taken from Canadian waters should go into the United States market free of duty. That agreement was not carried out. The parties in question were buyers of fish, or fishermen. If they were simply buyers of fish—and the hon. gentleman seemed to think there was something to be gained by stating that they were not fishermen themselves, but were simply buying fish caught by Canadian fishermen, and, therefore, were, so to speak, doing a favour to Canadian fishermen by buying their fish. But, of course, these gentlemen were there on a business speculation, and they were buying raw material at the cheapest rate they could. Their market was the United States. They were looking for a profit. If the duties were taken off, their goods went in free of duty, and their profit would be greater; if they had to pay duty, it would by that much reduce their profits. These gentlemen were United States citizens, and were living mainly in the United States, being in Prince Edward Island only as a basis for operations. For the purposes of their business, they were in Prince Edward Island, and for the purposes of domicile, they were citizens of the United States.

Some stress has been laid upon the fact that these parties took the opinion of the Governor of Prince Edward Island at that time. Evidently, the Governor could not give an opinion which bound to damages or payments, nor did he, in that opinion. He was simply asked: What do you think the prospects are? Very naturally, he said: Why, it would seem to me that if Great Britain and the United States have practically made an agreement, that will be carried out, and your risk will be very small in the matter. Therefore, I do not think that binds anybody; but if it does bind anybody, it binds Prince Edward Island, and not the Dominion of Canada, because Prince Edward Island at that time was not a part of the Dominion of Canada. I do not argue, however, that that bound anybody; it was simply an expression of opinion, in answer to a request; and it was an opinion which almost any person would have given, because the idea was general at that time that the United States would carry out the agreement. Now, the United States did not carry out the agreement; they exacted the duty, and the duty was paid into the United States treasury; that is, a United States citizen had to pay into the United States treasury the impost upon his imports into that country. Against whom was the grievance? Not against Great Britain. Great Britain was willing to carry out the agreement, and anxious to do so. Not against Canada, because Canada was not a party to the arrangement. He could really only have his grievance, as a citizen of the United States, against the government which got his money, and which mulcted him in the amount of the impost put upon his fish. My hon. friend is of that

opinion. He has been quoted, and when, in 1883, the matter came up, it was expressly set out in a resolution, the words of which could not be plainer:

To make good to those merchants of Prince Edward Island, who were British subjects, the amount of duties paid by them to the United States customs on fish and fish oil in the year 1871, under the arrangements entered into in advance of the legislation necessary to bring the Treaty of Washington into force, by which arrangement United States fishermen were granted liberty to fish in the territorial waters of Prince Edward Island on the understanding that the President of the United States would ask Congress to refund these duties, which arrangement the President subsequently declined to carry out, on the ground that the proposal contemplated the united action of all the British North American colonies, which was not had, and that it would not be practicable to separate the colonies or carry into effect for one what the President was willing to effect for all, it not having been deemed advisable in the general interest of the British case to put forward and press the claim of these merchants before the Halifax Commission.

Now, the whole grounds are set out. The United States fishermen had a privilege in Canadian waters; they availed themselves of that privilege, for which they paid nothing. The United States refused to carry out the agreement, and so these fishermen and traders took their product to the United States, to which Government they paid duty. Both of them had grievance, if anywhere, against the United States. They had no legal or moral grievance against Great Britain or the Island of Prince Edward. They carried out their part of the contract, allowed them to fish without restriction in Canadian waters. So that they had a grievance, if they had any, simply and solely against the United States Government. The United States Government refused to listen to the grievance, whether the persons who were aggrieved were British subjects or United States citizens. What did the Dominion of Canada do? They said, simply as a matter of grace: Here are British subjects, Canadian citizens, who have been mulcted in the manner in which they have been, by reason of an agreement which was practically on at that time. The United States has violated that agreement; there was an agreement made, and the United States has received the money; the United States ought to pay the claim, if anybody, but these are our subjects; the United States will not do it, therefore, we will as a matter of grace, pay these Canadian citizens and British subjects the amount of the duties they had to pay having worked under an agreement which they supposed guaranteed them from these duties. There was no legal or moral claim; there was none before; there was none after. The Dominion of Canada could have said: If there is any grievance Prince Edward Island should bear it, but the Dominion did not say that. They simply

said, as a matter of favour, we will not discuss that question with Prince Edward Island, but rather than that these men should suffer the loss we will pay out of the treasury a sum sufficient to recoup our own people. This was done and my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries took strong ground at that time. One of his arguments was that these people might have put their claims before the commission at Halifax. My hon. friend said there is no case, and there was no case. I do not suppose that it would have been laid before that commission. It was not a germane claim and my hon. friend said that there was no claim to be pressed there. He said that there was a claim against the United States and that that was the power which ought to pay it. What he is quoted as saying in the "Hansard" of 1884, is as follows:—

There is no claim that could have been put before the Halifax Commission. \* \* \* \*

These gentlemen have a good claim against the United States; there is no doubt about that.

That was the opinion of my hon. friend then, and I suppose it is his opinion still. Sir Leonard Tilley, in speaking in the subject, said:

The Government arrived at the conclusion that American citizens fishing in Canadian waters should not be paid out of the funds of the Dominion Treasury a debt which should have been paid by their own government.

That was exactly at one with the contention of my hon. friend to this extent, that if they had a claim it was against the United States. Mr. Mills, of Bothwell, now the Minister of Justice, said:

The mere fact that one of the parties became a British subject, by being naturalized, would not revive a claim that had no value prior to that time.

His contention is two fold, but he proves my contention in this respect, that they had no claim, as American citizens, against Canada, and it should not be revived. Mr. Mills said, even though they had become naturalized. But he is clear and emphatic on the point that they had no claim. Sir Charles Tupper said:

We cannot pay this money, except to British subjects.

The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries said:

I said there was no legal or moral claim on the part of Canada to pay these amounts at all. \* \* \* These claims were presented, which had no moral or legal sanction. \* \* \* It was charity we were dealing out. \* \* \* There was no legal or moral claim, and I said their being American citizens should not put them (Hall & Myrick and Churchill) beyond the claim of our charity. \* \* \* He is paying the money of Canada to an American citizen.

The first contention, and still the contention of the hon. gentleman was that they

Mr. FOSTER.

had a claim against the American Government. He says that we might treat them with charity anyway, even though they be American citizens. Sir John Macdonald is quoted as saying:

If the others are not British subjects, they will stand in the same position as Hall & Myrick. \* \* \* The United States has committed the wrong on them, and as citizens of the United States they can go to their own government and get redress.

We were all clear, so far as that: I do not think there was a dissenting voice in Parliament with the exception of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries who was friendly with Hall & Myrick, and would not like to see them placed beyond the charity of the Government, but the opinion in this House at that time was, that being American citizens they had no right to come to the Dominion of Canada to have their claim paid, but that their claim was against their own Government which had made their grievance and which had mulcted them in the impost upon their imports. My hon. friend relies upon another argument, leaving that for a moment. But in 1887, he says, we paid Churchill, who was, in 1871, a United States citizen and not a British subject.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And up to 1886.

Mr. FOSTER. That although in 1871, when the grievance culminated, when the basis was given for it, Churchill was an American citizen he was paid, while Hall & Myrick who were plainly American citizens and not naturalized, were not paid in 1887. There was a vote which paid Churchill. There may be two opinions about that. You may hold the opinion unjustly that Churchill was an American citizen in 1871, when that transaction took place, and thereby was barred from making any claim on the grace or charity of the Dominion, that he never could become an applicant for that claim no matter whether he had changed his allegiance, because the transaction did not take place after he had become a naturalized subject. There is a good deal of strength in that position. It really does not in so far as the equity is concerned, in so far as the moral claim is concerned, affect the case a single iota, but when a man becomes a citizen of our own country, becomes naturalized, incorporates his public life with ours, becomes a fellow-citizen with ourselves, he has a greater claim upon the charity and grace of the Government than he would have if he remained in the position of a subject of a foreign power and did not identify himself with the citizens of this country. That was the view that was taken, that as he had become a naturalized British subject, joined his fortunes with those of our own people, had become one of ourselves, that though he had made the loss when he was not a naturalized citizen, grace and clemency should be extended to him because he had identified himself with

the life of the Dominion and had become a British subject. Then it was that Parliament said to him : We will extend our grace and charity to cover this man because he has become one of our own people and we will treat him as we treated the others. You may have whatever idea you like of how far that should have been allowed to have force, but that it did have force there is no doubt.

If Hall & Myrick were to-day naturalized citizens of this country, I, for one, could not oppose the payment, I would not oppose it, and I do not think there would be any question of it in Parliament. But they are not naturalized citizens. They are citizens owing allegiance to another country, the country that wronged them, if they were wronged, the country that got their money, and the country that ought to pay them. They cannot claim from this time forth that they have become members of our community, so far as the rights and duties of citizenship are concerned. They are just where they were before, and they have not established the claim—one of secondary character, I grant you, but still of some weight—that they have become naturalized British subjects, and in that respect they have not the same claim that Churchill had, and there is no doubt that they have not the claim that British subjects had in 1871, to the grace and charity of this Parliament. That is the reason why amongst others I oppose this claim. I do not think we ought to pay it. I do not think there is any ground, legal or equitable, why we ought to pay these gentlemen. They are citizens of a foreign country, respectable citizens ; they have cast their lot among us to a certain extent for business purposes, and we are glad to have them ; but they are not part and parcel of ourselves, and, therefore, cannot have a claim upon the grace and charity of this Parliament.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). I have no fault to find with the manner of the hon. gentleman's argument. But I do not think he put his case fairly, or that the conclusions he reached will be the conclusions of the House, and I think he himself was cognizant of the great weakness of his argument when he attempted to draw a distinction between men who are American citizens to-day and men who were American citizens at the time the claim occurred and for fifteen years afterwards, and who in 1886 became naturalized for the purpose of getting payment.

Mr. **FOSTER**. That is an assumption which I would not agree with—that they became naturalized for that purpose. That is hardly fair.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman has stated fairly enough that there was no legal

claim against the Dominion or against anybody. The money was voted by Parliament because an international wrong had been done and these parties were sufferers. The original intention of Parliament was to confine the payment to British subjects ; but after the matter had been threshed out three times in the House, Parliament departed from that basis, and eliminated the words confining the payment to British subjects, and so far as Parliament knew Mr. Churchill was not a British subject.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The hon. gentleman himself in that debate acknowledged that he had been naturalized.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I acknowledged that he had been a few months before, because I was in court and heard his naturalization papers read. I said : " You are going to pay a man who for fifteen years after the claim has been an American citizen, and I am perfectly satisfied that you should pay him if you put every other man who has a claim in the same category." I said : " You are drawing a distinction because one is a Conservative and the other a Liberal," for Hall & Myrick are a strong Liberal firm. I do not believe that in his heart and soul my hon. friend, who can be just as well as generous, believes that that is an honest ground for refusing payment. If the hon. gentleman turns to the debate of 1884, he will see that this very question was before the House, and Sir John Macdonald admitted that these gentlemen could not be fairly refused payment. He said :

I think these gentlemen have in fairness a claim for consideration. The hon. gentleman, as a guardian of the rights of Prince Edward Island, has pressed very strongly the view there should be a specified sum handed over to the island out of the \$5,000,000 that were awarded ; we agree with the hon. gentleman as far as this vote is concerned, by giving those people a certain portion of it.

Sir John Macdonald placed the matter solely on this ground : " An award of \$5,000,000 has been made and paid over to the Dominion, and these people have a good and equitable claim, though not a legal one, and we will extract from the \$5,000,000 a sufficient sum to pay that claim."

Mr. **FOSTER**. As a matter of fact, the money did not come from the award, but was a vote of Parliament from the consolidated fund.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. On the same occasion, Mr. Blake said :

But I do not suppose it was ever presented, because, I fancy, in the strict letter of the law, it has been recognized that the United States, in this matter, have no quasi-legal liability. Then, if the case is so weak as has been brought forward, if, in point of fact, it is an act of generosity, if it is to be bolstered up by the statement

that Canada has received a large award, and that it is not unreasonable, under the circumstances, that she should make good the loss, I think the hon. gentleman has some difficulty in meeting the argument of my hon. friend behind me, because he finds that the very gentleman who made the application to the Lieutenant-Governor, who received the Lieutenant-Governor's assurance that such and such would be the result, and upon the faith of that assurance invested his money, is to be cut out on account of his technical citizenship of the United States, while he is making a present to all these other worthy gentlemen.

There are the two leaders of the House placing the payment on that ground. Mr. Blake said he saw no reason why the mere technical fact of a man being a United States citizen should debar him from the generosity which Parliament was exercising. What was the fact? Hall & Myrick did business in Prince Edward Island; they were domiciled there; they had their homes and their families and children there; they were accepting and discharging all the duties of citizenship.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Why not?

Mr. FOSTER. They could not.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Their sons do, I suppose. They were discharging the duties of citizenship in that respect, and the moneys they paid were paid to British subjects, who could have forwarded the goods and got the return payment. But Parliament adopted the view of Sir John Macdonald, and having adopted it and paid the men who were British subjects in 1871, Parliament decided in 1887 not to confine the payment any longer to British subjects, and voted a sum to pay Mr. Churchill, although he remained an American citizen for fifteen years after the claim. Parliament having adopted that principle and paid Mr. Churchill, there is no reason why Parliament should refuse to pay Messrs. Hall & Myrick. The thing will not bear argument before any tribunal in the world. I do not complain of the manner in which my hon. friend has presented his argument, because I acknowledge that if the case were to come before Parliament for the first time, his argument would be cogent; but it did not convince Parliament in 1884 or in 1887. Sir John Macdonald did not himself repudiate the claim of Hall & Myrick. He simply said: "We cannot pay these men without a new message."

Mr. FOSTER. That was with reference to the part of the proceeding which was criticised by my hon. friend.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The two men, Myrick and Churchill, were both living in Prince Edward Island, both buying the same goods, both sending them to the States, and both

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

paying the same duty. Can you justify paying one of those men and withholding payment from the other? You cannot do it. It would be injustice of the grossest kind. Parliament, having come to the conclusion to pay the one is bound in honour, equity and justice to pay the other.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman deals differently with the members of his own family, I am sure, than with the members of his neighbour's family. One who may be an alien to a family at one time may become a member of it afterwards, and then the relations change. The relations between the members of the one family and the family itself are far different from those between the family and aliens. It is no generic difference at all; it is a difference simply of relationship. The state is a family, of which the subjects or citizens of the state are members and the citizens of foreign countries are aliens. If an alien transfers his allegiance, then he becomes a member of the family, and he will be treated on the same footing, and the duties of the state towards him are different. You may be as cosmopolitan as you like, but you cannot ignore the sympathies that ought to exist between the citizens of the state, and you cannot pretend that the state does not owe more to its own citizens than the citizens of a foreign country. That does not imply that you need be unjust while giving a preference to your own people.

Mr. SPROULE. If we make this payment we will be establishing a very bad precedent, namely, the payment of old claims against the provinces before they came into confederation. This claim has been running since 1871, and Prince Edward Island came into the confederation in 1873. This claim, therefore, is twenty-eight years old, and by the statute of limitation, it should have run out four times, but, unfortunately, we have no statute of limitation against the Crown, or we would have nothing to do with such a claim. The Minister admits that we are neither legally nor morally bound to pay this claim, and the only ground on which he urges the payment is the ground of charity. I could understand that if we were dealing with the heirs of some parties who had suffered by the state and who were in abject poverty, but this firm is wealthy, and, therefore, the payment cannot be defended on that ground. This is really a claim set up by some parties who think they ought to be paid this money, although the judgment of this country for twenty-eight years has been that they ought not. If hon. gentlemen force this vote through, they will not hear the last of it, and will be called to account for it in the future.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is one of a class of claims introduced in Parliament in 1883 and recognized by Parliament in 1894.

Mr. SPROULE. Why did Parliament not pay it them ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Because Parliament chose to confine it to British subjects, but in 1887, Parliament authorized payment to Churchill, who was exactly in the same category as this gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. No, he was a naturalized citizen.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In 1871 he was an American citizen, and remained an American citizen until 1887.

Mr. WALLACE. The bald statement of the case is quite enough to condemn the very idea of paying this money. This was a debt due by the United States if due by any one. They repudiated it. That created a case of hardship, and Canada, having taken Prince Edward Island into confederation, without regard to the fact that if there was any claim it ought to be against that province, in a fit of generosity, as an act of grace, paid the amount lost by our Canadian fishermen and our Canadian business men. But that we should pay the claims of American citizens is so utterly preposterous, so opposed to all ideas of fair play, that there can be no possible justification for it. The hon. Minister of Marine says that this is exactly the same case as a claim paid since. He knows better. While there may be a question as to whether Parliament should have paid that claim or not, no one can pretend that the two cases are on all fours. The other case is that of a British subject. Even in that case the claimant became a British subject after the event, he, at any rate, threw in his fortunes with us. He became one of us, he took the solemn oath of citizenship and became a Canadian citizen, with his duties and obligations. I do not know why he did not become a Canadian citizen before nor do I care ; I do not know whether his domicile or residence had been here before nor do I care. All I know is that he became a Canadian citizen. The hon. Minister says he became a Canadian citizen in order to strengthen his claim, but that is a mere statement advanced without any shadow of proof. At any rate, he was a Canadian citizen when he received the money, and the present claimant is not, notwithstanding the long years he has been doing business here. According to the Minister of Marine, he has his domicile here and has been making his fortune here and yet has not become a citizen. Therefore, he still further forfeits any claim he might have on the people of Canada. To think that the hard-earned money of our farmers, artisans and fishermen, and the other classes of this country are to be handed out to an American citizen, who has no claim legally or morally or of any kind whatever against us, except the fact stated by the hon. Min-

ister, that he is a strong supporter of the party opposite. I would consider it an act of impudence for a foreigner coming to this country to interfere in the political affairs of this country, and instead of that being an argument in his favour it is another argument against him. They have not produced a single reason or a single particle of evidence that would justify the people of Canada in consenting to their representatives voting away \$15,029 of their hard-earned money to pay to aliens, whose Government had acted so unfairly in this matter that Canada came voluntarily forward as an act of grace and relieved her own citizens who had been wronged by the Government of the United States.

Mr. MARTIN. There is another phase of this question. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has told us that this firm is only the medium through which the fish are bought and shipped to the United States.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, not exactly that.

Mr. MARTIN. But I have here the words of the hon. gentleman, and that is exactly what he said in 1884. When these firms bought these fish, they bought it, less the duty, and if the duty was to be refunded, the British fishermen should get the refund. Now, how is this to be voted ? Is it to be voted absolutely to Hall & Myrick, and if so, where are those who caught and sold this fish years ago ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Surely, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) is only talking. He has not posted himself. He ought to know that there was a commission issued, as I explained, to Mr. Justice Fitzgerald. He took the evidence, and went through Mr. Hall's books, and every British subject who had a claim, came in, and if he had not been paid the full amount, his claim was passed upon and reported. And Mr. Justice Fitzgerald reported to the Government that, in his judgment, the claim of Hall & Myrick for \$20,000 should be reduced to \$15,000, as the amount properly payable to them—and that is the amount we ask Parliament to pay.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. Minister is at sea. I have the "Hansard" of 1884 here, and, on page 313, I find a statement by himself, that there was a claim by Hall & Myrick for British subjects of \$9,983.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman will permit me—

Mr. MARTIN. I would ask the hon. Minister to permit me to ask him a question. What has become of the claimants of this \$9,983 ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They were reported in their

own names by Mr. Justice Fitzgerald, and paid.

Mr. MARTIN. That makes the case much clearer to me. British subjects have been paid. This American citizen has a claim against his own government—let them pay it. I do not think that any Minister of the Crown has the right to stand up and propose such a motion as this. The Minister himself has stated time and time again that this is a claim against the government of the United States. And yet he appears before the Parliament of Canada now, and says that we should pay this claim of an American citizen, who has a good claim against his own government. This man has not been domiciled in Prince Edward Island, and never resided there continuously. He came there during the fishing season, and remained in his own country during the greater part of the time. He has done the work of his government in Prince Edward Island for years. He did the work of the United States Government before the Halifax Commission. And yet, after having been in the service of the United States, and done all he could against the just claims of Canada, he comes here and asks for money that should be paid him by his own government. It is most surprising to me that a Minister of the Crown can propose such a thing.

Amendment (Mr. Sproule) negatived: Yeas. 9; Nays, 14.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to point out that there are five Ministers who carried that.

Mr. BERGERON. Seven Ministers.

Administration of Justice—

Additional judge of the Yukon Territorial Court ..... \$4,000

Mr. BERGERON. Who is the new judge?

The PRIME MINISTER. He has not been appointed.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the salary of Judge Dugas?

The PRIME MINISTER. Four thousand dollars.

Mr. BERGERON. And perquisites? What is there besides salary?

The PRIME MINISTER. He has living expenses.

Mr. BERGERON. How much does that amount to?

The PRIME MINISTER. Up to the present we have given him maintenance, like all our officers, from the store of the Mounted Police. But now that the country is getting more advanced, the officers demand to have their living expenses; and I think we are asking a sum for that purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. What he gets is \$6,000. Here is another item: "Living expenses

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

for two judges in the Yukon territory, \$4,000."

Mr. BERGERON. Were all Judge Dugas's travelling expenses paid from Montreal to Dawson?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think so, but am not sure.

Mr. BERGERON. Could we not find out?

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly. If my hon. friend had let me know that he wanted this information, I would have had pleasure in getting it for him.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the state of the courts there, that they require two high-class judges? Have they a stipendiary magistrate, or any such officer, in Dawson?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Would it not be well to have something like a police magistrate and a judge?

The PRIME MINISTER. The Mounted Police have discharged the duties of police magistrate, so far, at Dawson City. But in the vast extent of territory that we have now it is necessary to have a second judge, because he must go on circuit, he cannot distribute justice at Dawson only, he must travel about a good deal. For instance, there is a place for holding court at Bennett and such establishments are scattered along the rivers of the Yukon system. My hon. friend cannot think it extraordinary that in a country of that extent one judge is not sufficient to administer justice to the active population who are living there.

Mr. FOSTER. The Mounted Police still do the work of a judge.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, a judge of petty jurisdiction.

Mr. DAVIN. I think it would not be necessary to have stipendiary magistrates. I suppose the state of things is something analogous to what we had in the North-west Territories. I think it is to be regretted that the early judicial system of the North-west Territories was not adopted, which was to have police magistrates with power of a judge of a superior court. I suppose, however, that these judges do the work of a stipendiary magistrate, of a county court judge, and of a superior court judge. But even if the present judge does that, he will not have too much to do. I cannot myself realize conditions that make it necessary to have more than one judge there. Judge Dugas, or any other competent judge in Dawson, could go a distance of 30, 40, 50 or 100 miles, come back, and go somewhere else, because we are familiar with that condition of things in the North-west Territories, where one judge has been accustomed to take charge of a vast area, an area of some 600 miles by 600 miles; and

in the early days one stipendiary magistrate did a great deal more than that.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Suppose a judge took ill.

The **PRIME MINISTER.** Occasions may arise where a judge will be busy holding a court at one place and another judge may be required in another part of the territory. Two judges in a country like that are certainly not too many, because they may have to discharge the initial duties of a superior court judge and also the duties of a county court judge. Having therefore to administer a good deal of petty justice, they have to go about a good deal.

Mr. **BERGERON.** Under what law do the judges act there?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** The common law of England.

Mr. **BERGERON.** I asked that because Judge Dugas is trained in the laws of the province of Quebec, except in the criminal law, which is of course that of England. Does he have to exercise jurisdiction in civil matters as well as criminal matters?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** Yes.

Mr. **DAVIN.** In the North-west Territories we thought at first that Judge Rouleau, because his education had been in civil law, would be unequal to administering the common law, but we found in a short time that he is one of our best judges.

The **PRIME MINISTER.** The record of Judge Dugas in the Yukon speaks for itself.

Mr. **FOSTER.** Is there any report upon the administration of justice there being in a crowded state, upon which this is based?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** I do not know whether there is a report upon which the Minister of Justice has based this request.

Amount required to make the salary of the Clerk of the Territorial Court, Yukon territory, \$2,000 per year..... \$1,500

Mr. **DAVIN.** Is not that a high salary for a clerk?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** We have heard the statement made during this session by a prominent gentleman on the other side of the House that all our salaries in the Yukon were inadequate.

Mr. **BERGERON.** I think so.

Living expenses for two judges in the Yukon territory ..... \$4,000

Mr. **DAVIN.** Who will administer justice there?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** I presume it will be the commissioner and his council.

Mr. **DAVIN.** Miscellaneous justice in the North-west Territories has always been administered by the Lieutenant-Governor.

The **PRIME MINISTER.** I presume in this case it would be the commissioner and his council.

Mr. **BERGERON.** Have instructions been given to these judges that they are not to speculate in mining claims?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** They are not to buy claims, I am sure of that.

Mr. **BERGERON.** Because, I saw in the newspapers that one judge there wrote that he had bought some claims in an ordinary way on the market in which he thought there was no harm. He said it openly, there was no concealment. But it might be dangerous to allow judges to go into that business, it might be dangerous for the litigants.

The **PRIME MINISTER.** I am sorry the Minister of the Interior is not in his seat this moment, because he could give my hon. friend more information than I can.

Mr. **BERGERON.** But the opinion of the right hon. gentleman is that they should not buy claims?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** Decidedly.

Mr. **FOSTER.** The right hon. gentleman must know, if he reads the papers, that one of these judges wrote a letter which appeared in one of the Montreal papers, in which he stated that he was very sorry that he had not made as much wealth up there in mines as had been credited to him; he had made some purchases of interests and the like of that in mines, but if he only had all that was credited to him he would be very proud of it, and he would be willing to get up on the top of Notre Dame and proclaim it.

The **PRIME MINISTER.** I do not think it would be proper for a judge to record claims, but whether he should be allowed to trade in properties in the market, is another question. We have passed an Order in Council upon this subject giving directions to our officers, but at this moment I cannot speak accurately of its terms. The Minister of the Interior may give the information later on.

Mr. **CLANCY.** As this may be the last opportunity, I would like to ask the First Minister if he can give me an answer to the question I asked him this afternoon.

The **PRIME MINISTER.** Yes; my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) is referring to the Meagher claim. Looking over the record of the case which was placed in my hands by the hon. Minister of Justice to-day, I have to tell my hon. friend that on June 21st, 1899, Mr. Cowan wrote to the Department of Justice in these terms:

Dear Sir,—I desire to draw your attention to the wrongful arrest and subsequent imprisonment of Thomas Meagher, a Canadian citizen, by an American customs officer named Avery, and to ask you to take immediate steps to secure from the American Government damages for this unwarranted outrage, also the value of his boat, which was appropriated by the officer immediately after the arrest. The papers were brought down, asked for some time ago, and they have been brought down.

Yours truly,  
M. K. COWAN.

The following day this reply was sent by the Department of Justice to Mr. Cowan :

22nd June, 1899.

Sir,—Referring to your letter of 21st instant, asking this department to take steps to secure from the American Government damages for the arrest of Thomas Meagher and the value of his boat, I have the honour to request that you submit for the consideration of the department a statement showing in detail the nature and amount of the damages claimed, including the value of the boat, and stating also the circumstances of the seizure and sale of the boat. No reference has, I think, been made to the latter subject in the previous correspondence.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) E. L. NEWCOMBE,  
Deputy Minister of Justice.

M. K. Cowan, Esq., M.P.,  
House of Commons, Ottawa.

I am not informed that the desired statement has yet been placed in the hands of the Department of Justice.

Mr. CLANCY. Then there was no further correspondence or claim made.

The PRIME MINISTER. So far as I can see nothing more has been done.

Mr. CLANCY. I understood a few days ago that a claim had been made to the Department of Justice.

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. CLANCY. According to the statement the right hon. gentleman has made I understand that no action can be taken until a statement is made to the department.

The PRIME MINISTER. Our attention was called to the illegal arrest, unfair and rather cruel treatment to which Thomas Meagher had been subjected, but the claim for any damages arising out of the seizure of his boat or, as I understand, for any damages, has not been placed in the hands of the Department of Justice, except on the 21st of June, 1899.

Required to pay cost of maintenance of prisoners in Yukon territory ..... \$15,000

The PRIME MINISTER. The statement I have from the Department of Justice in regard to this vote, is as follows:—

We have an agreement with the Controller of the North-west Mounted Police to pay \$1 per day for the maintenance of prisoners in the Yukon district, but the Controller represents that the

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

actual cost is about \$1.30 per day. During the past winter the average number of prisoners confined in the guard-room was 60, and it is estimated that \$15,000 will be required for the maintenance of prisoners there during the ensuing year.

To pay his legal representatives the balance of sessional indemnity of the late Senator Sanford ..... \$258 80

Mr. FOSTER. How does this come to be a revote ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been no administration of the estate and in order to make it effective it is necessary to vote the money to the widow.

To pay Lady Edgar balance of salary of the late Sir James D. Edgar to 30th June, 1900 ..... \$3,666 67

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total salary ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. \$4,000.

Mr. WALLACE. I think that Sir James Edgar died on the last day of July and would be entitled to salary for a month. This is a proposition that he shall be paid for the eleven months following. This is a matter that deserves consideration. Will the Government say why they propose to vote this amount ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think there are several precedents for making the grant to the widow of the deceased member of prominence. There are certainly precedents in the case of deceased members of the Cabinet.

Mr. WALLACE. There was a grant made to the widow of the late Thomas White, I think. But this is a proposal to pay the balance of the salary.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, it is the same thing ; it is a grant.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think the form it took in the case of the late Mr. White was a grant of a certain number of months' salary. Probably the hon. ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) will remember. I think it was analogous to this, and that we paid a certain number of months' salary.

Mr. DAVIN. I think it was.

Mr. FOSTER. How is the Auditor General going to pay two salaries ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If we vote two salaries he will pay them. We will vote one by the general statute and one by this.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to say that there is no item that can be passed that I would more heartily vote for than an item of this sort. The late Sir James Edgar gave his whole life to the service of his country, according to the best of his lights, and for a long life spent this is a very small return.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the case of the Speaker of the House and the case of a Minister is not analogous with the case of a Minister, because a Minister devotes his whole time to the public service, while the Speaker of the House devotes just as much time as a member of Parliament does.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, a member of Parliament devotes his time.

Mr. WALLACE. The Speaker may do a little more. He comes down two days before we do and stays a day longer than we do. The Speaker of the House, so far as I know, has no more arduous work than a member of the House who conscientiously performs his duties, and he has not nearly so hard a task nor so much responsibility. A member of Parliament who attends conscientiously to his parliamentary duties physically goes to the limit, because he has to be in constant attendance at committees of the House, while the Speaker never attends committees, and he has to be at his duties here in Parliament incessantly, while the Speaker is not here when the House is in committee.

A member of Parliament who performs his duties like my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), or like my hon. friend the late Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), performs more arduous duties than any Speaker can possibly be called upon to perform. Therefore, I do not see a justification for a grant in this case of eleven-twelfths of a year's salary for the family of the late Speaker. I do not wish to speak personally, and I speak with a good deal of hesitation on that account. But we are voting away the people's money; we are not disposing of our own; and while Ministers may very readily vote away the people's money, I have never seen any of those gentlemen who are so ready to expend their own money in such a reckless fashion as they are spending the money of the people. I think this is hardly a justifiable expenditure—I do not wish to say anything further than that—for the reasons I have stated, that the Speaker has no arduous duties to perform, either mental or physical, that he receives a salary of \$4,000 a year in addition to his sessional indemnity; and that he does not perform those severe duties that fall to the lot of a member of Parliament; and why at his decease his family should be given eleven-twelfths of his year's salary, I cannot very well make out.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How much did you vote to Lady Thompson?

Mr. WALLACE. The State undertook to provide for the widow of the late Sir John Thompson, under a straight consideration of the question. If the state proposed in a case of this kind to make a grant, for certain understood reasons, that would be another consideration; but this is simply voting a

further salary. It is not a good way to put the case, and it is hardly justifiable.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not notice at the first that the amount was \$1,900, and the Chairman may remember that I asked him what the whole salary was, because it struck me that the amount was large for the balance of the salary. I took for granted that it was for the salary of the year just expired, and I was raising no objection to it at all. I do not wish to discuss this vote with reference to any names at all; but it does raise a principle. The sympathy and good will which we feel on the death of a colleague binds us to a certain extent to be generous with the money at our disposal; but, after all, when you come to think of it, what does it mean? We might have lost a colleague sitting on either side of this House, a man who got for his indemnity \$1,000 a year, who sacrificed three-fourths of his business in order to come here and attend to his public duties, who left his family when he died without any very large means of subsistence, who worked here faithfully all the hours of the session, who attended to a very large correspondence, who looked after committees which, if a man does it well, is a great tax upon him, who had no person that he could put in his place for a single moment to act as his deputy to do his work and allow him to rest even for a moment. Is there not a stronger claim on our sympathy for a man in that case than there is in the case of a man who does not have those duties to perform, who gets five times the amount of salary, and who has a deputy to relieve him to a certain extent of the hard part of his duties. These are considerations which will occur to the public, and which we ought not to lose sight of. The mere fact that a man dies when we are here does not alter the case at all. This brings up the whole question how far we can go in these cases without making a rule, and are prepared to make a rule? I do not know how the subvention to the widow of the late Thomas White was voted; but I would much rather see this voted, not as a salary, but as a direct vote, because this is not, correctly speaking, salary. Next year we shall have to pay a salary to the occupant of the Chair. I hope that no one will misunderstand my position in discussing the question. It is a delicate question to discuss; but we are within our rights in discussing it.

The PRIME MINISTER. It seems to me that it would be a very false conception to place the position of the Speaker of the House on a level with that of an ordinary member of the House. The Speaker is the first Commoner of the land. He has not only important duties to perform, but he has a station to maintain; and I differ altogether from the view just expressed by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). The duties of the Speaker are, in my estimation, of the highest importance. They are as important

as the duties discharged on the floor of this House by anybody. The gentleman who has to sit in this Chair and maintain the even scales of justice between the two parties has duties the burden of which is of the greatest magnitude, and it requires a man of very extraordinary qualities to discharge those duties successfully. He has to study the rules of the House and the history of parliamentary procedure; he has to be prepared at all times to decide on all questions that may arise, and he has to maintain the dignity of the office. He has to entertain largely—to offer the hospitalities of the House to the members and others. All these duties are a heavy drain upon him, and for my part I would be sorry to weigh too nicely the question of the services on one side and the remuneration on the other. We have not been accustomed to consider the position in that way. If we are expected to defend this appropriation upon any logical rules, I say at once that it would be hard to find any such rules; but the sense of justice which is within the heart and conscience of every man has impelled the Parliament of Canada on certain exceptional occasions to deal exceptionally with cases of this kind. Such was the case of Lady Cartier, to whom, after the death of her husband, we paid a pension during her life. Such has been the case of Mrs. White, whose husband died and left her in rather destitute circumstances. Such has been the case of Lady Thompson, to whom Parliament voted an appropriation—an appropriation which I supported without any reluctance, but, on the contrary, feeling that I was discharging a public duty. Such is the case of Lady Edgar on this occasion; and I believe that when this matter is scanned, the best sense of the country will justify this vote. As to the technical suggestion of my hon. friend in regard to the form of the vote, I, for my part, will have no objection to accept it.

Mr. DAVIN. A very wide and important question which has been discussed in the British Parliament in modern and less modern days by such great men as Mr. Burke and Mr. Gladstone, has been raised on this occasion—the economy to the public of keeping the minds of men who happen to serve the public in high offices free from anxiety regarding, either their own fate when they may be past the power of work, or the fate of those who are dear to them. It is quite clear, that if you have before the mind of men occupying, say, a high position in Parliament, such as my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) referred to, and before the mind of men in office, the fear of destitution, they may be exposed to temptation, which they never would be exposed to, if a generous State took care that servants having served them faithfully, should not be forgotten when beams are broken and sails shivered in the stress of public life. Now, although it is late, may I, on so important a question, read what Edmund

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Burke said—for it is really the same question, though they deal with it in a much better way in England, and there must come a time when we shall deal with it better in Canada:

Conceiving it to be a fundamental part of the constitution of this country and of the reason of state, that there must be means of rewarding public service, those means will be incomplete and indeed wholly insufficient for that purpose if there should be no further reward for that service than the daily wages it receives during the pleasure of the Crown. \* \* \* Indeed, no man knows when he cuts off the incitement to a virtuous ambition and the just rewards of public service what infinite mischief he may do his country through all generation. Such saying to the public may prove the worst mode of robbing it. The Crown, which has in its hands the trust of the daily pay for national service ought to have in its hands also the means for repose of public labour, and the fixed settlement of acknowledged merit. There is a time when the weather-beaten vessels of the state ought to come into harbour. They must at length have a retreat from the malice of rivals, from the perfidy of political friends, and the inconstancy of the people. Many persons who in all times have filled the great offices of state have been younger brothers, who had originally little, if any, fortune. These offices do not furnish the means of amassing wealth. There ought to be some power in the Crown of granting pensions out of the reach of its own caprices.

The time must come in Canada when, in loyalty to the people, and in order to secure the best kind of service, this whole question will be considered and put on a logical basis. My hon. friend from York raised the question of men giving long life of service in Parliament, yet never holding an office under the Crown. Well, I believe in such a case, even, there ought to be, in a scientific machinery of government, a means of giving harbourage in which such a ship might come to anchor. But especially ought it to be the case where service has been rendered in high office. When I spoke of the services of the late Speaker, I was thinking of him as a prominent member of party—which I regard as part and parcel of our constitutional government—and as a member of Parliament in one of the great parties, active and prominent. And, under the circumstances, I cannot but feel, accepting our system of government heartily, as I do, as the best possible under our conditions, that any man who serves so prominently as the late Sir James Edgar, must have laid the state and the people of this country under obligation to him.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I propose to change the wording, so as to make it correspond with previous cases, making it read: "gratuity equal to the balance of salary of the late James D. Edgar."

Amendment agreed to.

To pay the legal representatives of the late Hon. John F. Wood his sessional indemnity ..... \$1,000

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I regret that I am obliged to ask to drop the item to pay the indemnity of the late Hon. Mr. Wood. At the time it was inserted, I was under the impression that Mr. Wood had died during the session of Parliament—and that was the rule adopted, that we should pay those who died during session. I have since been informed that he died before the beginning of this session. It is a pity we inserted it, under the circumstances, but, as the precedent has always been clear, I think it should be withdrawn.

Mr. **FOSTER**. This shows how arbitrary a distinction may be. I do not think I am violating any confidence, when I say that the late Hon. Mr. Wood was the sole support of some members of his family. In his attention to his public duties, his practice has been utterly destroyed.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Under the circumstances, even though some day it may be quoted as an inconvenient precedent, I will ask leave to withdraw the motion, and let the item stand.

Mr. **WALLACE**. Is it well to make this amount payable to the legal representatives?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The object is, that the grant should go directly to the immediate family of the deceased.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Better leave it to be determined by the Treasury Board.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I move that it be amended to read: "to pay the representative of the late Hon. John F. Wood, as may be directed by the Treasury Board."

Amendment agreed to.

The committee reported resolutions.

#### SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

The House proceeded to consider and concur in resolutions reported by the Committee of Supply.

#### Railways and Canals—

Beauharnois Canal..... \$5,600

Mr. **BERGERON**. I am sorry the Minister of Railways and Canals is not here when we are on the item of canals. I want to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that there have been a good many accidents on the Beauharnois Canal the last couple of years. This year there have been two very bad breaks. One was at lock No. 7, at which time I drew the attention of the First Minister to the fact that damages had been done there, and it was important that an inspector should be sent to make a valuation of those damages. They are to be paid by the steamboat company, but through the Government. Since then there has been another break at lock No. 5, which,

I am told, is causing a good deal of damage. I want to point out that there have been more accidents during the last three years than ever before. I have no doubt that it is due to the fact that good employees, men who had been on the canal for many years, and who were performing their duties with thorough efficiency, were dismissed because it was supposed that they were political opponents of the present Administration. They were replaced by men who know nothing at all about the work and who, no doubt, are less efficient than their predecessors. It shows how injudicious it was for the Government to dismiss these capable employees without cause, and to replace them by men who cannot do the work properly.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. What is the nature of the accidents?

Mr. **BERGERON**. Boats going through carried away the gates.

#### Civil Government—

The Post Office Department..... \$203,055

Mr. **FOSTER**. I want to ask the Postmaster General if he can give me information as to the amount of money that has been received from newspaper postage?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I can give that information for five months up to the 1st of June. It showed over \$19,000, or supposing it to be \$22,000 for six months, that would be \$44,000 for twelve months. That was at the rate of a quarter of a cent per pound. It will amount to about \$75,000 a year, commencing the 1st of July, assuming that newspapers continue to be sent by post.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could have his officer give me a statement for each month—and have it tomorrow before the Supply Bill goes through.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I will try and get it.

Amount required for mail service..... \$103,000

Mr. **FOSTER**. I asked for a return showing the time of the departure of the mails from Vancouver and Victoria for Dawson, and the departure from Dawson for Vancouver and Victoria, over the period that was mentioned in the report. The Minister said he had not got the information, and I wish he would inquire again and have it brought down.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. It is not possible to give the date of the arrival of a mail. We can give dates of the departures and dates of the arrivals, but we cannot identify the bags that arrive so as to say when they left, because there have been changes. We cannot say that a bag left on a certain day and arrived on a certain day. They were laid up during that

period when they could not be moved at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Another question was brought up with reference to newspaper or parcels for Dawson that were intercepted on the way and sent back to persons who transmitted them. I wanted to ask the Minister if that is still being done. For instance, I send a parcel to Dawson by parcel post, is it thrown out on the way or sent back to me?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. During the period of navigation all mailable matter goes forward to its destination, but when navigation closes we can only carry letters, there is no way of carrying anything beyond a certain number of pounds. When I was passing my Estimates I stated that I was hesitating to take the mails entirely away from the Mounted Police during the winter, although I was desirous of divorcing the mail service from the police as rapidly as possible. We advertised for tenders for carrying the mails for four years during the winter. Several tenders were received, among them one from the Canadian Development Company, a large steamboat company, the manager of which is Mr. Maitland Kersey, a very enterprising man, and the company possesses a great deal of credit. They tendered for the service for four years, not only for a winter, but for a summer service as well. They tendered for a weekly service during the winter, and they also tendered for a twice-a-week service at least between Bennett and Dawson and between Bennett and Atlin, and as more frequently as the steamers plied between these respective points. Their tenders covered the period we asked for and they also covered a period that was not asked for in the advertisement, namely, the summer. Their tender for the year round was \$75,000. The lowest tender for the winter service was \$64,000, \$49,000 for the service between Bennett and Dawson and \$15,000 for the service between Bennett and Atlin. We are paying now at the rate of about \$14,000 for the summer service by a special contract made last winter for the same service between Bennett and Dawson and between Bennett and Atlin. That was the result of the tender. So that I had to determine whether to accept this tender at \$75,000 which embraced the winter service for which we had asked tenders and the summer service for which we had not asked tenders. I concluded, after very careful consideration that it would be safe to risk the service with that company, and that it would be better performed by this company, because having steamboats on the river they will be able to continue the service later in the fall when the ice is forming and begin earlier in the spring when it is thawing and places are being opened up in the river. I made a contract with the approval of the Government with the company for four

Mr. MULOCK.

years. This is a strong company financially. They have a number of vessels; they are building huts, procuring supplies and they are identified with the trade of the country. They are catering for the passenger and freight traffic, and this will offer an inducement to them to give a good service to the department.

Mr. FOSTER. With all these improvements going on you may have a railway service in there in four years.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is a clause in the contract making it terminable.

Mr. SPROULE. I noticed in the paper, I think, to-day, that the last mail got there in six days from Victoria and in ten days from Ottawa. Was that carried by this company?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was by the Development Company.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it expected that they can make their usual trips in that time during the season of navigation?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, there are dangerous places. We allow them five days from Bennett to Dawson.

#### Railways and Canals—

Income ..... \$4,741,100

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Speaker, before we go from the items on Railways and Canals there is one matter that I would like to bring to the attention of the House. I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) is not here, because it puts me in rather a difficult position. I want to bring to his notice and to the notice of the House a case, which I think, is a very hard one—a dismissal which took place at Rivière du Loup. I also notified the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau), that I would bring this case up because he is concerned in it, but he is not here. It may be that I could have done it before, but I had not the occasion. I do not know whether I should go through the whole case or simply put the facts before the House and leave it to be discussed at another session. We may be here very soon again, because we are going away so late, and if the Government carry out this new idea that has been broached so often of calling the session earlier we may be here at an early date. This case is one which refers to a man named Bernier, a blacksmith, employed in the shops at Rivière du Loup. This man Bernier has always done his duty and has been looked upon as a good man. Trouble arose last spring when they were making the electoral lists for Temiscouata. The workers for each party were at the municipal hall and they were preparing the lists when somebody said: There is a young man by the name of Bernier who wants to be put on the list, the son of the employee of whom

I spoke. His name was put down, but some objection was made to this. Somebody said that he was not 21 years of age, and that consequently he could not be on the list. It was suggested that his father, who was working not far away should be called in and asked to say whether his son was 21 years of age or not. This idea was accepted, and the father came and declared that his son was 21 years of age, and that he was in a position to be put on the list. For that reason, a few day afterwards the father was dismissed for political partisanship. This created a certain uneasiness amongst the people of the place. The man was known to be a very respectable man, and a very good worker. The papers, of course, took hold of the matter, and there was some correspondence. In "Le Courrier du Canada" the facts were mentioned, and a letter appeared, signed "A Liberal," which I want to read and put in "Hansard," so as to show how these matters of partisanship are looked upon by our Liberal friends in the district of Quebec. It has gone very far in the province of Quebec. I think the word "tyranny" is not too strong to express what has been done by the Liberal workers in that province, particularly in that part.

Mr. LAVERGNE. What is the name ?

Mr. BERGERON. There is no name.

Mr. LAVERGNE. It is written by a Conservative.

Mr. BERGERON. I said I notified the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) that this letter, signed "A Liberal," was believed to have been written by him. It is not my fault that the hon. gentleman is not here ; but, when he reads this another session, he will declare whether it was written by him or not. This is the letter—I will read it in English :

To the Editor.

As there seems to be a desire to make some noise in Temiscouata anent the dismissal of Mr. Nap. Bernier, permit me as a friend of the Liberal party, cognizant of the facts, to put the matter in its true light.

Mr. Bernier, an employee in the Intercolonial Railway shops, is a Conservative, like many of his fellow-workmen in the Rivière du Loup shops.

Desiring to enter his son on the voters' list, he had the bad luck to apply to Mr. S. C. Rioux, the grand Conservative leader of the town, in order to carry out his purpose. It was not until after a contestation that he made oath that his son was 21 years of age.

Hence he was not dismissed solely for having taken the oath, but for having intrusted his case to one of our opponents.

He should have known that parties are sharply divided at Frazerville, and that being an employee of a Liberal Government he was rash in applying to the opposite party in order to make another Conservative voter in his family.

This is most unfortunate for him ; but is it not still more so to see the fathers of families who have been life-long Liberals wanting the means of earning their bread and finding no em-

ployment whatever, whereas in common justice they ought to have a share of the positions of those whom their friends have placed in the shops after discharging a host of good Liberal workmen ?

Naturally the Conservatives will seek to make political capital out of this dismissal, but fortunately their past history is there to afford us an unanswerable defence, and when the day of reckoning comes it will be easy to strike a balance between us.

Naturally, also, our member, Mr. Gauvreau, comes in for his share of the blame ; and "Le Courrier du Canada," with other papers, at the instigation of one who is well known, attacks the member for Temiscouata in relation to his dismissal.

We are convinced he will be none the worse of the attack, and that he will continue to promote the interests of his county, and to make like examples as often as circumstances justify him in making them.

In cases of dismissal, Hon. Mr. Blair, on the affidavit of citizens of the county, promptly gives orders to Moncton to carry out his decisions—orders which are not always executed with promptness, but which are executed in the end, all the same, in the interest of the party, in the several counties traversed by the Intercolonial Railway.

In the case of Mr. Bernier, Hon. Mr. Blair found the charges sufficiently weighty to order his dismissal, which is now irrevocable—and it must be so, for a Minister who orders a dismissal must do it with knowledge of the case, and there are few cases of precedent here where a Minister has revised a previous decision, unless where he has been deceived as to the facts, and this is of rare occurrence.

By the way, is it not strange to see so much ado about the dismissal of one Conservative, when we know that some twenty more of them might have justly been so treated, but have been spared for reasons which it would be too long to enumerate. When the proper time comes, our member will give an answer on all points to all.

A LIBERAL.

I may say that there is another letter here, which I will not read. The whole story is denied. Mr. S. C. Rioux, the Conservative lawyer who was accused of putting this man on the list, denies that he did so. The man had his name brought there by some of the workers, and the story is, that the father went in and swore that his son was over twenty-one years of age, and for that reason the father, who is a blacksmith, occupying a very ordinary position in the shops at Rivière du Loup, was dismissed. I was asked to bring the matter before the House, and it was my duty to do so. This will go on record with the other cases of dismissal for which the Government are answerable.

Customs ..... \$399,090

Mr. WALLACE. I wish to make a few remarks on the subject of the customs ; and at this late stage of the session, I shall make them as brief as possible. I regret that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) is not here. I left this matter over last night because of his absence ; but as he is not here now, there is nothing for me now but to go on with the statement I have to make. It

is a matter of the utmost importance that the Trade and Navigation returns should be a correct statement of the business affairs of the country so far as we can ascertain the facts. In the past, they have been fairly accurate. In the case of our exports to the United States, we have added ten per cent, as that seemed to be a fair addition in view of the fact that some who were exporting to the United States did not make the customs entry. In our statements of the business of the country, imports have been divided into two classes—imports for home consumption, and imports of goods in transit through the country. Our exports have likewise been divided into exports the product of Canada and exports not the product of Canada. In the Trade and Navigation returns for the year ending 30th June, 1898, we have statements which are very wide of the fact. If you turn to page 539 of these Trade and Navigation Returns, you will find that the imports of Indian corn are given: Imported, 19,770,000 bushels; entered for home consumption, 19,771,000 bushels. The value in round figures is \$7,000,000. I need hardly say that that is not a correct statement. Members on this side during the present session have asked questions about this matter, and members on the other side have said: Do you know that these 19,000,000 bushels were entered for home consumption, but were simply in transit. That is actually the state of the case. When we look to the exports, at page 666, we find we have exported Indian corn, not the product of Canada, 14,330,000 bushels, valued at \$5,165,000. So we retained for home consumption the difference between 19,770,000 and 14,330,000, or say, 5,500,000 bushels in round figures. But the Trade and Navigation returns, in order to impress the people of Canada, and of the world with the size of Canada's trade, put forth a statement which is absolutely false and misleading. The imports of Canada for home consumption are given at \$130,000,000. But this item alone reduces them by over \$5,000,000. When an article is brought in for home consumption, the money of the people is used to purchase it, and it is converted into something that produces wealth, or goes to the sustenance of the people. It is an addition to the wealth of the nation. But this corn that went through the country cannot be classed in that way. A great part of it came over the Parry Sound and Canada Atlantic Railways from Parry Harbour to the harbour of Montreal, and the only advantage that Canada got from it was the few cents a bushel earned in transferring it from the vessel at one end over the line and into the vessel at the other end. Then, there were other means: some of it came down the Grand Trunk Railway, and the same would apply to what came down by the Grand Trunk Railway. But part of this American corn came from Chicago, from Milwaukee, from Duluth, in American vessels, down the great lakes, through the Welland Canal, down the St. Lawrence, and

Mr. WALLACE.

were transferred in Montreal; and Canada did not get a dollar's worth of benefit out of a thousand bushels of this grain that was landed in ships in the port of Montreal. In that case, this \$7,750,000 that are credited to Canada as the trade of Canada, represented simply articles passing in transitu in American vessels from the port of Chicago to the port of Montreal, where they were landed on ocean vessels. Thus, the statement which says that this was part of the trade of Canada and part of the goods of Canada, entered and used for home consumption, is entirely misleading. But the Minister of Customs said: Oh, look at my explanatory notes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course, my hon. friend knows these goods were entered for home consumption, and if they were entered for home consumption, and the exporter saw fit to export them afterwards, how would you deal with that?

Mr. WALLACE. They were not entered for home consumption at all, because there was a through bill of lading; they were only in transitu, and should be so entered.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He knows that in former years, when they were dutiable, it was necessary to enter them that way. But the corn being now free, how can you oblige a man to enter it in any other way than for home consumption?

Mr. WALLACE. For this reason, that the corn which comes through now, was exactly the same corn and under the same conditions as in former years. This was not a through entry; it was not an entry at all. Does the hon. gentleman tell me that that corn that came from Duluth, or Milwaukee, or Chicago, in an American ship, down through the lakes, and through the canals, and was loaded on a vessel in Montreal—that it was entered for home consumption in Canada?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the book says so, I say it is correct.

Mr. WALLACE. I say the facts are not so, and the hon. gentleman knows that the facts are not so, and the books cannot state a falsehood—the customs officers cannot permit a falsehood to be inserted. The Minister of Customs found that out, and he put some explanatory notes in the Trade and Navigation Returns for this year. He says:

In General Statement No. 37, of imports and goods entered for consumption, the term "entered for consumption" is the technical term in use at the custom-house, and does not imply that the goods have been actually consumed in Canada, but that they have passed into the possession of the importer, and that duty has been paid on that portion liable for duty.

What does that mean? Simply that they were entered for consumption, a term which we thought indicated, and was the barometer of, the business of this country. The

Minister of Customs tells us now that it has no meaning at all, that it is a technical term used by the customs officials for their own convenience. He says: Look at General Statement No. 37. Suppose we look at General Statement No. 37, page 609. We find there: Total value of imports entered for home consumption, \$130,000,000; imports of goods in transit and not entered for home consumption, including all the imports, \$140,000,000. So, what we could justly regard as the business of the country, goods entered for home consumption, amounts to \$136,698,000. But the Minister of Customs tell us: Do not regard what I said about that; do not regard that solemn statement entered here on page 609. Set that at naught, because it is only a technical term used by the customs officials. Well, thousands of people who use this book as a book of reference to calculate the trade and business of the country—yes, and the Ministers themselves—tell us: See how our trade has grown, the greatest in the history of the country. Our imports for home consumption are \$130,000,000, when at the same time they know that they are only \$125,000,000, when by their own statements the trade is only \$125,000,000. Sir, that statement is not to be regarded as accurate, as meaning what it may be taken as saying. But what about the other statements? In general statement No. 37 you are warned that this does not give an accurate statement of the business of the country. What about pages 626 and 627? What do we find there? We find another somewhat similar statement of the goods entered, an abstract of the countries and the provinces, dutiable and free goods entered for consumption. We find they are stated to be \$130,698,000. We turn to page 626, and find another case of misleading the public. We find there: "Imported from the United States and entered for consumption a total of dutiable goods of \$38,000,000; of free goods, \$40,000,000, or a total of \$78,000,000. We know, by the statement I have made with regard to the importation of corn and its exportation, that there are 5,000,000 bushels of corn carried through the whole book, through all the statements, misleading the people; so that, instead of \$130,000,000 worth for home consumption, there are only \$125,000,000. Then, you turn up statement No. 1, on page 1, and you find the same extraordinary state of affairs. There you will find entered for consumption in 1898 \$130,698,000, which should be reduced by \$5,160,000. In No. 2, on page 2, you find the same incorrect statement of affairs: you find there a total of imports and of exports which is misleading. In No. 5, page 5, you find the same inaccuracies prevailing, the same old figures, \$130,698,000, entered for home consumption, and purporting to be consumed in this country, when the Minister himself announces that it has not been consumed in this country, that we did not import and

consume in this country 19,725,000 bushels of American corn in the year 1898, and that 14,000,000 of that went out of the country, leaving 5,000,000 only to be consumed here. Then you find the same misstatements occurring in statement No. 10, page 21, in statement No. 3, page 24, in statement No. 18, page 126, and in several places through the book. This book that we have been supposed to regard as giving a fairly accurate statement of the business of the country is misleading and untrue in that respect. Hon. Ministers boast that the percentage of duty is at a certain figure, that on the total value of goods entered for consumption, dutiable and free, in 1898, it was 16.95 per cent. But, Mr. Speaker, deducting that \$5,165,000 worth of corn, which was not used in this country and which had no right to be classified as having been entered for home consumption, you will find that instead of having 16.95 per cent, you have 17.65 per cent. In making a comparison for the last five years, 1892 to 1896, inclusive, it will be found that the average rate of duty on goods dutiable and free was 17.47 per cent. In 1898, the average rate of duty is given as 16.95, or a little less. But, deducting this \$5,165,000, it gives 17.65 per cent, a little more than the average of the last five years. The percentage of taxation is an important factor because hon. gentlemen will say: We have reduced the taxation of the people. That statement conclusively proves that they have increased the burdens of the people. The average rate of duty on the imports entered for home consumption and consumed by the people, dutiable and free, was 17.47 per cent for the last five years of the Conservative Administration and 17.65 per cent, or one-fifth of 1 per cent more during the year 1898, and for 1897 still more than that, being 17.87 per cent, according to their own statement. There are many reasons why there should be accuracy, correctness and exactness in the preparation of these returns, but they have made them inaccurate and inexact for the purpose of swelling up the trade returns and making the trade of the country appear larger than it is, although it is larger, I have no doubt, than it was before. They surely ought to be satisfied without making an incorrect statement of the business of the country. The total imports of corn in 1892 were 3,700,000 bushels; entered for home consumption, 1,685,000, and exported, not the produce of Canada, 2,050,000, showing that of the 3,700,000 bushels not more than 1,685,000 were entered for home consumption, remained here and paid duty and that 2,050,000 bushels were exported again. The same state of affairs is shown in 1893. Of the total imports, 5,100,000 bushels, 2,131,000 bushels were entered for home consumption and 2,969,000 were exported, not the produce of Canada, making pretty nearly the same fig-

ures and accounting for all the corn that came into the country. One-half of it was entered for home consumption and paid duty, and the other half was sent out of the country, passing through simply in transit. If you come down to the year 1896 you find total imports amounting to 6,050,000 bushels, 2,763,000 entered for home consumption and 2,489,000 exported, not the produce of Canada, accounting pretty nearly for the amount that was imported, almost one-half of it simply passing through in transit. When you come to 1898 you have 19,770,000 bushels of imports, 19,771,000 entered for home consumption, valued at about \$7,000,000, and there was exported, not the produce of Canada, 14,330,000 bushels at a valuation of \$5,165,000. What we claim is that you should have accuracy in these matters, that you should have a proper statement of the case and that you should not put in this return statements which are not only misleading, but are inaccurate and untrue. Another matter closely allied to this that I called the attention of the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to last year, was the statement that the wheat exported from Canada was, in many instances, counted twice for export, that it was returned at such ports as Duluth or Fort William, and that it was again counted at Montreal, or at some other point where it made its exit from the country. I told the hon. Minister of Customs then that I thought it was a duty that he owed to Parliament to make a close investigation into this matter, and to ascertain the truth of that statement as to which I had pretty reliable information. So far as I can learn from the hon. Minister he has made no examination into that statement which, if it were true, would swell the exports of our products beyond what they should properly be, and I have no doubt they have swelled these exports to make them appear larger than they are to-day. At any rate, our imports entered for home consumption are something like \$5,000,000 more than they should be, and the same inaccuracy, I have no doubt, prevails in regard to the exports of the country. I call the attention of the House and the country to these facts, because I think it is important that we should realize that the Trade and Navigation Returns should be a reliable statement of the business of the country and not a misleading statement. Business men base their anticipations of the future and conduct their business on the assumption that the Trade and Navigation Returns are a correct representation of the business of the country. If their faith in those returns is shaken, as it will be if they look at them, and if they find that they are not a correct representation of the trade of the country there will be a suspicion of them in other respects, and the people will not have that confidence which it is desirable they should have in

Mr. WALLACE.

official statements made by the Government.

Mr. SPROULE. I would just like to say, since this subject has been brought up, that in looking over that book very carefully, I have noticed pretty much the same thing. It has been a great mystery to me why a book like that should not be made up in such a way that it can be understood by ordinary business men. It seems to indicate a lack of business intelligence on the part of those who get it up. To say that the importations for home consumption are not importations for home consumption is something that seems to me to be absurd. It is confusing and misleading, and does not enable the business community to understand exactly how the trade of the country is.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) started to attack the Minister of Customs for the unfairness of his report; but all he has proved is that the Minister was so anxious to have it fair and just that he rather went out of his way to insert explanations in it that would prevent misunderstanding. If this corn is entered for home consumption by the people who import it, I do not know whether we have any means of preventing their doing so. Years ago when duties had to be paid on corn, of course it was in the interest of the importer to discriminate carefully between corn in transit for export and corn for home consumption, because corn for home consumption had to pay duty and corn in transit for export was free of duty. But when corn was made free, it was a matter of no consequence so far as the revenue was concerned, whether the importer entered it for home consumption or for export. But it appears from the hon. gentleman's statement that so careful was the Minister to guard against misunderstanding that he discriminated the corn imported for export from the corn entered for home consumption. So that my hon. friend, who started in to curse the Minister of Customs, has had to end by blessing him.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sorry the Minister of Customs is not in his place, especially as some returns have been brought down, and I had his promise that he would consider this matter when the returns were brought down. It is in itself probably not a matter of great magnitude, but since it affects the rights of the civil service and the citizens of Canada, the amount of dollars and cents involved does not determine the importance of the question. I refer to the dismissal of Mr. Caldwell. I will read a report that has been made, and I will ask whether in all fairness a sufficient reason has been given for dismissing this man and depriving him of the sum of money which he would be entitled to have recouped to him from the superannuation fund. It is a serious thing

to deprive a man of his position, but it is still more serious to deprive him of what little he has paid into the superannuation fund, and still more serious when you consider his dismissal as a violation of a sound principle. This report was made on the 3rd of March, 1897, by Mr. Colcock, a gentleman who was only a short time in the service, and who, when making this report, seems to have felt that he was skating on official thin ice, and that he might go down himself. Although his own head has come off since, I confess I am not greatly grieved that he went down with those to whom he did not do justice. He says:

Amherstburg has a preventive station under its survey named Anderdon, which I visited on the 25th February ult., and have the honour to report thereon as follows:—

The customs office at Anderdon is the ticket office of the old depot of the Michigan Central Railway at that place, and is situated on the river bank. The waiting-room of the depot is generally open for some time before the arrival of trains to accommodate passengers, and the railway company supply the heat and arrange for a man to look after the building and keep it warm and clean.

It was about 2.30 p.m. when I arrived at the customs office, and found it locked. Procuring a key from the caretaker of the building, I entered the office and found everything in a very disorderly and apparently abandoned condition. No care had been taken of the books, papers, &c. In fact, the books did not appear to have had any entries made therein for some time, and such as had been made did not conform to the regulations.

I subsequently learned that Officer Caldwell was very seldom at his post of duty, most of his time being spent in the town of Amherstburg on other business than customs matters. In his present position, therefore, his services are of little or no value to the department.

No railway business is done at Anderdon that requires the attention of a customs officer, and there does not appear any necessity for an officer to be permanently located there during the winter season. True, there is a long stretch of frontier (some seven miles up the river from Amherstburg), and the river is only about a mile and a half to two miles wide; but from all I could gather there does not appear to be much if any smuggling attempted. During the season of navigation a few small vessels require to report at the dock called "Texas Landing," just above Anderdon. It is the opinion of the collector at Amherstburg that the work at Anderdon could be done as cheap as at Colchester, viz., \$50 per year.

In view of the above, I deem it in the interests of the department to suggest that a change be made at the above station, and would recommend that the office be closed during the winter months and arrangements made for the employment of a temporary officer at that point during the season of navigation, the cost not to exceed \$50.

Officer William Caldwell was 64 years of age last October. He first entered the service on the 27th October, 1882, and received his appointment as a preventive officer 5th May, 1886. He is, to all appearances, a strong, healthy man, and thoroughly able for active work. His disposition, however, is not active, and when left to himself takes no interest in his work. If he were trans-

ferred to a port where he would be under a first-class officer, his services, no doubt, could be utilized to advantage.

I ask if that is a sufficient reason for dismissing an officer and depriving him of his superannuation allowance? I am going to ask the Minister of Finance to give Mr. Caldwell an investigation. It is not safe to take the tittle-tattle you hear on the streets against an officer. Mr. Colcock was called on to make another report. He simply confirms this report, so far as it is any confirmation, merely on street talk. He gets his information from a man who was known to be on bad terms with Mr. Caldwell. I am not going to discredit the report, but it is not the kind of evidence on which a man should be dismissed. I think in all fairness that Mr. Caldwell should have a proper trial, and if he has done no wrong he should be reinstated. If it was thought well to dispense with his services, that would be another matter. The department has every right to economize and to close up a port if necessary, but I understand that another officer was appointed there, notwithstanding Mr. Colcock's recommendation. I am now going to ask the hon. Minister of Finance not to deal with Mr. Caldwell in a summary manner, but to give him an opportunity to defend himself, and deal with him as any Canadian citizen ought to be treated.

**THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I shall draw the attention of my hon. colleague the Minister of Customs to my hon. friend's remarks, and he cannot expect me to do more, under the circumstances.

**MR. CLANCY.** Unless there is grave reason for his absence, the Minister of Customs ought to be here. I admit that the hon. Minister of Finance cannot say more, but he must agree that what he has said is not sufficient, and I take it for granted that he will press the matter on the Minister of Customs and endeavour to have Mr. Caldwell fairly dealt with.

**MR. SUTHERLAND.** If the hon. Minister is not here, it is because he was unexpectedly called away on private matters of great urgency, and we are all likely to be called off on family business. It was with great regret he found himself compelled to leave.

**MR. CLANCY.** The hon. gentleman must acknowledge that I made no charge at all.

**MR. SUTHERLAND.** I quite agree that on general principles the Minister should be here.

Salaries of agents and employees in Canada, Great Britain and other foreign agencies ..... \$90,000

**MR. WALLACE.** I beg to move that this item be reduced by the amount of \$3,000, being the amount of Mr. Preston's salary. The disclosures that have been made and the dishonour that would attach to Canada by retaining in our employ, without making

him to come here and justify his conduct, a man who is so deeply implicated in occurrences that have come before the courts and the committee of this House, compel me to make this motion. We would be derelict in our duty and disloyal to the best interests of Canada, if we were to allow this item to go through without entering our emphatic protest, and I hope that the Government will accept the proposal, and thus show that they are sincerely desirous of purging the public service of men who have thus besmirched the record of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. I regard it as a matter of great importance that civil servants should keep out of politics. This man Preston has been the handman of the party opposite for a number of years. He has been in and out of the civil service of the province of Ontario, according as it suited his party. At the time he was employed as librarian he would resign his office and present himself as a candidate, and when defeated would be restored to his office again. He is always at the head of the organization that carried on the elections for hon. gentlemen opposite, and which has been shown to have been guilty of so many discreditable transactions. As head of that organization, Mr. Preston must shoulder the fullest responsibility. It was he who carried on the elections, and he was always available for that purpose, notwithstanding the fact that he was on the civil list of the province. Three years ago the provincial government passed a resolution, that it was vicious in principle for any civil servant to be engaged in election contests, yet, despite that resolution, here was a man, right in the employ of that government, taking part in these contests. Evidently there was an understanding between him and the leaders of his party or he would not have been able to thus violate the law. And at the very time that he was likely to be called on to be examined before the courts in connection with election cases, he was conveniently appointed immigration agent and sent out of the country, where he could not be subpoenaed. That may not have been intentionally done, but the coincidence was remarkable. Though ostensibly in the civil service, during election time he was found constantly attending to the conduct of elections, and drawing a salary at the same time that he was paid for doing his party's work. The sooner we come to an understanding that any man in the employ of the Government shall not take part in elections, the better it will be for the good reputation and pure administration of this country, and the proper conduct of elections. I strongly support this motion, and will welcome the day when such shabby people and shady transactions are banished from public life.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have been over this question before, and it is only necessary for me to state that when any-

Mr. WALLACE.

thing is proved against Mr. Preston, inconsistent with his duties as an official, then my colleague the Minister of Justice will deal with him.

Mr. SPROULE. How can you do that when you allow him to leave the country?

Mr. WALLACE. Is that telegram of his sufficient proof?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is nothing in that telegram to justify the charges made against Mr. Preston. Hon. gentlemen opposite would have us adopt the old familiar method of hanging a man first and trying him afterwards.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the hon. gentleman propose to try him?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Whenever there is necessity we will, but he will not be hanged first.

Mr. WALLACE. He will not be tried either. Hon. gentlemen opposite dare not try him.

The House divided on amendment (Mr. Wallace.)

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bell (Addington),	Macdonald (King's),
Broder,	McAlister,
Clancy,	Morin,
Davin,	Sproule,
Foster,	Tyrwhitt, and
Gullet,	Wallace.—13.
Hodgins,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bazinet,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Borden (King's),	Lavergne,
Campbell,	Mackie,
Copp,	McClure,
Edwards,	McGregor,
Fielding,	McGugan,
Fisher,	McLellan,
Fraser (Lambton),	McMullen,
Graham,	Marcil,
Hutchison,	Martineau,
Johnston,	Mulock,
Joly de Lotbinière	Pettet,
(Sir Henri),	Rogers, and
Landerkin,	Stenson.—27.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.

Opposition.

Madore,	Monk,
Rutherford,	Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Christie,	Roddick,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Tupper (Sir Charles
	Hibbert),
Snetsinger,	Reid,
Featherston,	Carscallen,
Hutchison,	Klock,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Cowan,	Montague,
Britton,	Cargill,
Penny,	Quinn,
Gibson,	Corby,
Ellis,	Powell,

Sutherland,  
Savard,  
Dyment,  
Ratz,  
Logan,  
McLennan (Inverness),  
Russell,  
Calvert,  
Fitzpatrick,  
McInnes,  
Maxwell,  
Hurley,  
Costigan,  
Macdonell,  
Meigs,  
Bell (Prince, East),  
Flint,  
Paterson,  
Godbout,  
Somerville,  
Beith,  
Morrison,  
Sifton,  
Heyd,

Taylor,  
Dugas,  
McCormick,  
Ingram,  
MacLaren,  
Gillies,  
Borden (Hallfax),  
Hughes,  
Casgrain,  
Earle,  
Robinson,  
Craig,  
LaRivière,  
Roche,  
Ganong,  
Hale,  
Kaulbach,  
Wilson,  
McLennan (Glengarry),  
Bell (Pictou),  
Henderson,  
Cochrane,  
Bergeron,  
Osler.

Amendment (Mr. Wallace) negatived.

Administration of Justice ..... \$93,755

Mr. BERGERON. I think this the proper occasion for me to say a few words with reference to a discussion which took place some time ago in this House concerning our judges. I had expected an opportunity to say what I have to say on the Bill relating to the administration of justice that has been standing 'on the Order paper in the name of the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) for three months past, but the right hon. Prime Minister has dropped that Bill. I speak as a representative of the province of Quebec, and I think it is only right that I should say a word in justice to our judges. It has been intimated that the salaries of our judges were not high enough to attract the best men, and so our judges were not first-class lawyers. There has been some correspondence in the press arising out of this matter, and some hon. gentlemen have felt themselves called upon to give some explanations in the House. I am sure that the right hon. First Minister will feel it his duty to concur in what I am about to say. I will not touch upon the question whether the judges' salaries are high enough—that is a question that could not be fairly discussed unless it were treated at a length which would not be acceptable to hon. members at this period of the session. As a matter of fact, whether the salaries are high enough or not, I think the judges we have are as good as we could have, even though we paid more. My impression is that we have on the bench the best lawyers that are to be had. That may be a reason why the salaries have not been increased before now. I do not make any distinction. I have known some of them long before they were appointed to the bench, and I have known them since, and the opinion I have heard expressed on all sides is that our judges work hard, that they are learned in the law, and that their reputation is above

reproach in every respect. So far from anything being said against their capacity, they are universally respected for the work they do and the knowledge they display. We know that to-day there are very few things remaining which enjoy public respect, as for politics, they have ceased to be respected long ago. But there is one thing that the masses of the people still respect, and that is the bench, and it would indeed be a sad thing if the time should ever come when the people ceased to respect the bench. I have thought it my duty to say this much in justice to our judges in the province of Quebec, than whom no better men could be found for the position.

Militia ..... \$77,199 30

Mr. FOSTER. I wanted to ask a question of the Minister of Militia and Defence. What time do the 8th Hussars go into camp?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think it is the 12th of September.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there any changes yet?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The general is absent, and is expected back here on Tuesday. The changes the hon. gentleman refers to are going to be made within the next week.

Public Works—Quebec—

Victoriaville, public building, &c..... \$8,000

Mr. FOSTER. As a protest against the appropriation of money for building post offices and public buildings in small places with very small populations and very small revenues, I beg to move:

That the amount of the vote for the Victoriaville public building be reduced by the sum of \$8,000.

Motion negatived on the same division as the last.

Harbours and Rivers—

Nova Scotia ..... \$108,050

Mr. DAVIN. I wish here to enter my protest against this long string of wharfs which appear, on the face of them, to be electioneering votes. I will not, at this late hour, divide the House. I beg to move:

That the appropriation for Cribbon's Point, repairs to breakwater, be reduced by \$1,000.

Mr. SPEAKER. I declare the motion lost.

Mr. FOSTER. On the same division.

Mr. ROGERS. Why should it be declared lost on the same division, as one of the members has left and gone home? How can it be on the same division?

Mr. SPEAKER. Lost on division.

## Harbours and Rivers—

Quebec ..... \$113,450

Mr. BERGERON. I move :

That this resolution be reduced by \$5,500, being the appropriation for Sabrevois wharf.

Motion negatived on division.

Mr. WALLACE. I beg to move that this resolution be struck out.

The House divided on motion to concur in the resolution :

## YEAS :

## Messieurs

Bazinet,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Brodeur,	Mackie,
Campbell,	McClure,
Copp,	McGregor,
Fielding,	McGugan,
Fisher,	McLellan,
Fraser (Lambton),	McMullen,
Graham,	Marcil,
Hutchison,	Martineau,
Johnston,	Mulock,
Joly de Lotbinière (Sir Henri),	Pettet,
Landerkin,	Rogers, and Stenson.—25.

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Bell (Addington),	Hodgins,
Broder,	Macdonald (King's),
Clancy,	Morin,
Davin,	Sproule,
Foster,	Tyrwhitt, and
Gullet,	Wallace.—12.

## PAIRS :

## Ministerial.

## Opposition.

Madore,	Monk,
Rutherford,	Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Christie,	Roddick,
Davies (Sir Louis)	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Snetsinger,	Reid,
Featherston,	Carscallen,
Hutchison,	Klock,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Cowan,	Montague,
Britton,	Cargill,
Penny,	Quinn,
Gibson,	Corby,
Ellis,	Powell,
Sutherland,	Taylor,
Savard,	Dugas,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Ratz,	Ingram,
Logan,	MacLaren,
McLennan (Inverness),	Gillies,
Russell,	Borden (Halifax),
Calvert,	Hughes,
Fitzpatrick,	Casgrain,
McInnes,	Earle,
Maxwell,	Robinson,
Hurley,	Craig,
Lavergne,	McAllister,
Costigan,	LaRivière,
Macdonell,	Roche,
Meigs,	Ganong,
Bell (Prince, East),	Hale,
Flint,	Kaulbach,

Mr. SPEAKER.

Paterson,  
Godbout,  
Somerville,  
Belth,  
Morrison,  
Sifton,  
Heyd,

Wilson,  
McLennan (Glengarry),  
Bell (Pictou),  
Henderson,  
Cochrane,  
Bergeron,  
Osler,

Resolution concurred in.

## EXPROPRIATION ACT.

Bill (No. 185)—from the Senate—to amend the Expropriation Act, read the second time, considered in committee, read the third time and passed.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Friday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 11th August, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

## PRAYERS.

## THE PRIME MINISTER'S INVITATION TO CHICAGO DEMONSTRATION.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to call the attention of the House to a newspaper statement that is made this morning, to the following effect :—

Chicago, Aug. 10.—In a personal letter to H. H. Kohlsaat, of the Chicago "Times-Herald," Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Canadian Premier denies the truth of an interview recently given out by F. W. Fitzpatrick, of the Treasury Department, Washington,—

And so on.

In his letter Premier Laurier says : " You are at liberty to say that I have paid no attention to an interview published recently in a Washington paper, in which the reporter purported to give to the public words not spoken to him by me, but somebody else. Life is too short for a busy man to take notice of this kind of hearsay evidence. If I had any communication to make to the public I would prefer to make it directly and in my own words. It seems to me that I need hardly add that the invitation of the Chicago authorities will receive from me the most courteous consideration."

I should like to ask the right hon. gentleman whether that is authentic ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I would not say to every word, but the substance of it is authentic.

### REVENUE FROM WHARFS.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to remind the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he was to bring a statement of the revenue of certain wharfs.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I may say to my hon. friend that I asked my officers for that, and they say that the wharfs have been just completed, but have not yet been handed over to the department.

Mr. FOSTER. The wharfs of Lake St. John must be completed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The information I have from the deputy accountant is that they are not.

Mr. FOSTER. All I can say is that the deputy accountant must be wrong. There have been wharfs on Lake St. John for years. There may not have been fees collected, but there should have been.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The memorandum I have is that the wharfs on Lake St. John are not under the control of our department, as they have not yet been transferred by the Department of Public Works, and, therefore, there is no return of fees.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister had better look into that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will, of course.

### DISTURBANCE IN THE LIBRARY.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders are called, I should like to make mention of a circumstance in order to do no wrong to any one. I asked the Premier the names of two messengers for whom a vote was taken, and in connection with that I made the statement that the peace of the library had been very much disturbed. It is barely possible that the inference may have been drawn that one of the messengers mentioned by the Premier was responsible for that disturbance. I have identified the persons mentioned by the Premier, Bordeleau and Meiklejohn. I have to say that Meiklejohn is a most exemplary servant, not only a good messenger, but whenever I have asked him to find books for me he has shown intelligence. The offender undoubtedly is Bordeleau. I have been called to task by some members of the House for not having earlier called attention to Bordeleau's conduct, but I did not like to do it. He has time now to consider how he will act.

### THE GASPE ELECTION.

Mr. FOSTER. There are two matters which I have informed the right hon. gen-

tleman I would bring before the House, and while we are waiting we might as well dispose of them now. The first is with reference to an officer of the Customs Department, and I am sorry the hon. Minister of Customs is not present. I have been asked to bring the matter before the House, but have not brought it up previous to a request being made repeatedly to the Government itself to take it up and investigate it, and it is because the Government has not taken the matter up that it has been placed in my hands to bring before the House. I could not do this better than by reading a copy of the statement made by Mr. Thomas Ennis, a physician of Grand River, in the county of Gaspé, who was a candidate in the constituency of Gaspé at the last election against the present member (Mr. Lemieux). I gave notice that I would bring this up, and Mr. Lemieux was informed of my intention, but he is busily engaged in Montreal, and I held the matter over yesterday, hoping he might be here to-day, but as he is not, and as this is the last day of the session, I am obliged to bring it up now, although I did not decide to do so until after consultation with the right hon. First Minister.

The accusation is that a gentleman in the employ of the Customs Department was guilty of a grave offence during the elections of 1896, at which the complainant, Mr. Ennis, was a candidate in the Liberal-Conservative interest. A copy of the declaration made by Mr. Ennis is this :

CANADA.  
Province of Quebec.  
County and District  
of Gaspé.

I, the undersigned, Thomas Ennis, physician and surgeon of Grand River, in the county of Gaspé above named, do hereby solemnly declare as follows :—

That I have copied the hereunto annexed letter purporting to be one sent by Samuel E. St. O. Chapleau, Clerk of the Crown in Chancery of Canada, to Lawyer Auguste Beaudry, of Percé, Gaspé County, from the original now in the possession of the said Mr. Beaudry.

That the name of Mr. H. A. Lamirande, mentioned in that letter, is the false and assumed name taken by H. A. Lemieux, Esq., of Montreal, assistant inspector of customs, who, in June, 1896, made himself so known during an electoral campaign in Magdalen Islands.

That the said Mr. H. A. Lemieux was at that time a clerk in the Montreal customs office, but played the role of an active political partisan by working and canvassing in the political interests of his son, Rodolphe Lemieux, now a member of Parliament, and at that time a candidate for election to Parliament.

That on the 23rd day of June, 1896, the said H. A. Lemieux acted as representative of his son at poll No. 41, Basin, Magdalen Islands, and took the required oath of such representation, which he signed as H. A. Lamirande, whom he personated.

That in the presence of witnesses, Mr. R. Lemieux, M.P., called his father by the name of Lamirande, whilst the father called him Lemieux,

in order to conceal his identity, and that the Government of Canada has been made aware of his active political partisanship and the personation which he has been guilty of on that occasion.

That I have repeatedly brought this serious matter to the notice of the Government of Canada, by letter and solemn declaration sent to the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Hon. Mr. Paterson, and to the Hon. David Mills, Minister of Justice.

That notwithstanding the gravity of the offences charged against H. A. Lemieux, the Government refuses and neglects to investigate the same, whilst they have dismissed, at the bidding of Mr. R. Lemieux, M.P., a great number of office-holders in Gaspé County on the ground that they had been active political partisans.

And that I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and having the same force and effect as if made under oath, and I make it under authority of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

(Sgd.) THOMAS ENNIS.

Signed before the undersigned, one of Her Majesty's justices of the peace in and for the district of Gaspé, at Grand River, in the aforesaid county of Gaspé, on the 23rd day of June, 1899.

(Sgd.) M. J. AHERN, J.P.

The letters to which Mr. Ennis refers are as follows:—

Office of the Minister of Justice,  
Ottawa, 4th October, 1898.

Dear Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter, and in reply beg to say that the subject to which it refers is not one within the jurisdiction of my department. The inspector of customs is an officer of the Minister of Customs, and if any action is called for in respect to his conduct it is for the Minister of Customs and not for the Minister of Justice to act. I have forwarded your letter of the 28th ultimo to the Minister of Customs for his consideration.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) DAVID MILLS.

Thomas Ennis, Esq.,

Grand River, Gaspé County, P.Q.

The following is a translation of the letter referred to, as well in the declaration:—

Office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery,  
Ottawa, 14th September, 1897.

A. Beaudry, Esq., Percé, Que.

Sir,—In answer to your letter of the 9th instant, I must say that H. A. Lamirande appears to have taken his oath as the representative of one of the candidates at the election of the 23rd June, 1896, at polling booth No. 41.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your humble servant,

(Sgd.) SAMUEL E. ST. O. CHAPLEAU,  
C.C.C.

I do not propose to make any comments upon these, further than simply to say that here is a solemn declaration made by a gentleman who, from all the information I have, is a thoroughly reputable and honourable man. He was a candidate in the election at which this occurrence is declared to have taken place. He has himself personal knowledge of what took place, and the House has heard the declaration which

Mr. FOSTER.

he made and to which he appended his signature. The person charged with the offence was an assistant inspector in the Customs Department. At that time he was not performing the duties of his office at Montreal, but was in the county of Gaspé, as a political partisan and acting, as is stated as the representative of the Liberal party in that election. That itself constitutes, I think, a gross offence. It ought to, at least in the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite, but the larger, the graver offence is the charge made that Mr. Lemieux, inspector of customs, absenting himself from his duties in Montreal and vicinity, and taking the part of a political worker in Gaspé County, represented the present Government at poll No. 41, and represented it under the name of H. A. Lamirande, and signed the declaration "H. A. Lamirande," instead of his own name. That is the offence which, if proved—and I have read the allegations made by Mr. Ennis—constitute an offence which deserves not only dismissal from office, but something more than that. The attention of the Minister of Justice is called to it. He washes his hands of all responsibility—he transfers the question to the Minister of Customs. The attention of the right hon. Premier is called to it. He washes his hands of all responsibility, he says it is a matter within the province of the Minister of Customs. And the Minister of Customs does nothing. No, I am wrong in that, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Customs does do something; for I am credibly informed, that since that time and with a knowledge of this allegation, this gentleman has not only not been dismissed, but has actually been promoted in the service of the department. Now, I leave that case with the House, more especially with the Government, most especially with the Minister of Customs and the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government. I say from my place in the House that it is a matter which when brought before the House, which demands serious and instant investigation; and if the charge made is true, it demands instant and speedy punishment.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am not familiar with the matter that the hon. gentleman has laid before the House, in fact I have now heard this affidavit for the first time. Unfortunately, the Minister of Customs has been called away by some urgent business, and it is rather difficult to say in his absence what action has been taken. Of course, the matter will be brought to his attention now that the hon. gentleman has mentioned it here. It is just possible that the Prime Minister who, I think, had some conference with the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) on the subject, may know something more about it than I do. All I can say is that I will call the atten-

tion of the Minister of Customs at once to the statement made by the hon. gentleman.

#### INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. MARTIN. I desire to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), when I may expect the return that I asked for—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). It has been brought down. I promised the hon. gentleman yesterday, or the day before, that I would send over for it. I sent over for it, and it is in the Clerk's hands.

Mr. MARTIN. I made inquiry and was told that it was not there.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All I can say is that it was presented by my own hand.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—INSPECTION ACT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the House goes into committee, I desire to say, very briefly, one or two things. I wish to say how gratified, and at the same time somewhat pained I am by what recently took place in regard to the North-west Territories in this House. It will be remembered that when the Bill to amend the Inspection Act was before the House, I moved to add a clause. That clause was vehemently opposed by the North-west members on that side, with the exception of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), and when it came to vote, the whole Liberal party, with the exception of the hon. member for Alberta, voted against me. Shortly after that—it is now common property—the Government acknowledged that what I proposed to do was the right thing to do, that the Bill needed such a clause to complete it. I may explain that the clause I moved was necessary in justice to the small farmer, for whom no provision had been made in the Bill. Now, the Bill goes up to the Senate, and in the Senate the very clause that was voted down here is adopted; and back the Bill comes and is approved. I am very gratified to know that the clause which was so much needed became part of the Bill by reason of the action of the Senate and of this House. You, Sir, as a man with great agricultural knowledge, will be interested in a brief explanation of the matter. The clause of which I am now speaking, which I am glad to say will now become part of the law of the land, is, as I say, a clause to meet the needs of the small farmer. Section 14 of the schedule would meet the case of a large farmer who would have a whole car-load of wheat to ship. But when the small farmer comes in with a load or two loads, what happens is this: Two or three buyers rush

for their lives to reach him, and the first buyer who gets up on the load looks at the grain and probably calls it No. 2. No other buyer will dissent from that. More than that, he will probably tell the farmer exactly what price he will get for it, and the other buyers will not dissent from that. And for this reason—that a telegram comes from Winnipeg every morning fixing the price. It was to meet that case that I wanted to put in the clause, which there was no use whatever in attempting in the face of what had occurred to the clause providing for a sample being sent to Winnipeg. I want to point this out, that the reason given—and I can prove it—why that clause was not allowed to go through in this House was not because the conscience and opinion of this Government were against it, but because the North-west members, namely, the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), the member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), and the member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford)—the members for Saskatchewan and Macdonald, those two charming specimens of humanity, and the member for Assiniboia—did not want this reform, which they admitted was necessary, to pass in this House, forsooth, because Davin had proposed it and because Davin would get the credit of it. Why, if the old Government had acted in that way, and if this Government for the four sessions it has been in power acted in that way, and would not do anything that Davin proposed because he proposed it, no matter how good it was, then some very necessary reforms which have taken place would still remain to be accomplished.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—LOST POSTAL NOTES.

Mr. BERGERON. I desire to ask the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) a question. I have a letter here addressed to a colleague of mine, who is absent, explaining that the writer lost through the mail two months ago two bons de poste, and wants to know if duplicates will be issued or the money refunded?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose those are postal notes?

Mr. BERGERON. I do not know. I can send the letter to my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock).

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does he state the amount?

Mr. BERGERON. No.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the letter refers to postal notes, the rule of the department is that at the expiration of three months, if they are still missing, we issue duplicates. Postal notes are another form of money order, representing sums from 30 cents up to \$5.

Mr. BERGERON. He does not mention the date, but the letter is dated 28th of July.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At the end of one month more, we will issue duplicates, if the postal notes do not turn up.

Mr. BERGERON. I will answer this man.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Send me that letter, and I will attend to it for you.

Mr. WALLACE. I would ask the Postmaster General if members of Parliament have the right to send parliamentary documents from their homes during recess.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The privileges of members are determined by the Post Office Act, and it is not in the discretion of any Minister or the Government as a whole to give those rights.

Mr. WALLACE. Is there anything definite in the Act on that point?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If my hon. friend wants me to give him a legal opinion, of course I will have to refer him to the statute. I think there is a clause in the Post Office Act saying that all documents published by order of Parliament or any provincial legislature, are entitled to transmission free.

#### VIOLATIONS OF INLAND REVENUE ACT.

Mr. BERGERON. There is a question I want to ask the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue about some tobacco seizures, which took place on the 16th of February, 1898, from Joseph Hudon and Alfred Lafontaine, at St. Paul de Chester; and on the 7th of March, 1898, from one Contant, a merchant of the village of Warwick. A demand was made upon Mr. Simpson, collector of revenue at Sherbrooke, to proceed against those people, and the answer was given that he had done everything in his power, but no instructions had been received from Ottawa, and he could do nothing more about it. I want to know why, if such orders have been given, proceedings against these people have been stopped.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). There was a seizure made against Lafontaine for one pound of smuggled tobacco that he had bought from a passing peddler. In the case of Hudon, 46 pounds were seized, and in the case of Contant, 48 pounds were seized. In all these cases the parties asserted in the most positive manner that they had got that tobacco from a peddler, a man with whom they were not acquainted, who went about the country selling that tobacco. I may mention, what the hon. gentleman will readily understand, that seizures are one of the greatest difficulties we have to

Mr. MULOCK.

contend with. When a seizure is made for illicit distillation, I do not hesitate for a moment to take proceedings at once, and to impose the full penalties of the law, but in cases like these I have mentioned, I must say that I consider I have a right to exercise my judgment. In the cases of these seizures for such small quantities of tobacco, I could not bring myself to apply the law. The statute says that in such cases the penalty should be \$200, there is no discretion to make it any less. I may add that I confiscated the tobacco, but I could not bring myself to impose that penalty.

#### REVIEW OF THE FINANCIAL SITUATION.

Mr. FOSTER. At the risk of taking up a little time before a small and impatient audience, I am obliged, out of considerations of public duty, to make a few remarks with reference to matters that have been more or less before the country for the last three years, and especially during this session of Parliament. Just on the eve of passing the Supply Bill, I do not think it would be without service to the country that a fair statement should be made from the point of view of the Opposition with reference to matters appertaining thereto; and I intend to end the few remarks I make with a motion which will represent, I think, very fairly the views of the gentlemen on this side of the House with reference to these matters. It would take an acute power of analysis and the tongue of more than one Demosthenes adequately to investigate and portray the lapses, and omissions, and the wrongful commissions of this Government since they have come into power. Lacking both of these, I will have to content myself with a plain and simple statement.

Now, Sir, in the first place, what do I find? I find that the Liberal party went to the country with certain well-defined principles, which, bound together, constituted what they called their policy, and upon which they appealed to the country for support, for a change of administration, and for the elevation of themselves and their party to the seats of Government in this country. Without taking all these into account, briefly, these principles of their policy were as follows: First, a reduction in the taxation of the country; second, a decrease in expenditure; third, a diminution in the public debt, or at least that the public debt should hereafter cease to grow; again, the extermination of the principle and practice of protection; again, the independence of Parliament and the purity of the electorate. They also were in favour of the abolition of railway bonuses or subsidies, and they were in favour of, and pledged themselves to, an honest and economical and business administration. Well, Sir, let us take up, briefly, the different principles enunciated by the party as I have

stated them to-day, and see what the outcome has been. First, with reference to customs taxation. We find by the public accounts that the average customs taxation from 1882 to 1896, inclusive, was \$19,839,684. That takes in the period of the last five years of Liberal-Conservative administration. In 1896, the last year of that Administration, the customs taxation was \$20,219,037. These gentlemen came into power in 1896. In 1898, during the first full year of their tariff, they took as customs taxation, \$22,157,788, and for the year 1899 the unrevised figures stand at \$25,157,931. That relates to customs taxation alone. It is a well-known fact that the two branches of taxation are customs and inland revenue taxation. If you take the two branches of taxation, customs and inland revenue, the average for the period from 1892 to 1896 was \$27,710,432. For 1896 it was \$27,759,285; for 1898, \$29,576,456. The unrevised figures for 1899, taking in only eleven months of excise taxation, amount to \$33,805,374. Making an estimate of \$700,000 for the twelfth month of excise, it gives a total of \$34,505,374. So that the total taxation, customs and excise, in 1899, raised by a party which was pledged to reduce the volume of taxation is, in round figures, \$6,000,000 more than it was on an average from 1892 to 1896.

Another way of looking at it is the percentage rate of duty. The rate per cent of duty collected on dutiable goods entered for home consumption, on the average, from 1892 to 1896, was 30.25 per cent; in 1896 it was 29.94 per cent; in 1898, 29.22 per cent, and in 1899, 28.74 per cent, a reduction, measured in that way, of only about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent in the rate of taxation which is collected upon dutiable imports. But perhaps a fairer way would be to measure the imposts upon all goods imported for home consumption, whether they were dutiable or free, and if you take that basis, the figures run as follows:—From 1892 to 1896 the average rate was 17.47 per cent, while for 1898 and 1899 the average rate is 16.76 per cent, or just  $\frac{1}{100}$ th of 1 per cent, as a reduction from the average for the years 1892 to 1896. If you measure the amount of total customs and excise taxation on a per capita basis, you will find that the average rate per head of taxation from 1892 to 1896 was \$5.63. In 1896 it was \$5.42; in 1898, \$5.63, and in 1899, about \$6.50, or an increase in 1899 over 1896 of \$1.08 per head of the population. When you take the total revenues which are collected from the pockets of the people in all ways, the figures stand as follows:—The average for the period from 1892 to 1896 was \$36,412,378. In 1896 the amount collected was \$36,618,591. In 1898 it rose to \$40,555,238, while for 1899 the unrevised figures are \$44,698,155, or an increase over 1896 of a little over \$8,000,000, in round figures. Taking the rate per head,

we find that the average rate per head of the total revenue collected from 1892 to 1896 was \$7.27; in 1896 it was \$7.14; in 1898, \$7.73, and in 1899, at least \$8.41 per head, or an increase of \$1.27 per head over the average from 1892 to 1896. So, we find that the planks of the platform which declared for reduced taxation, for a reduced rate of impost and reduced expenditures, have been completely disproven, after three years of administration, by the astounding figures which I have read before this House to-day.

When we come to the total expenditures, must I read again something that has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite, lest they forget? Then, I shall have to do it, and I will commence with the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), at one end of the scale, who declared, and it is a sample of many of his declarations:

I believe we could reduce the expenditure of this country by five or six millions if the Government were only ready and willing to consent to it.

I shall take one step further, and quote what the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said:

The Liberal party, if in power, could at once reduce the public expenditure, and effect other savings to the extent of \$5,000,000 per annum, without impairing the efficiency of the public service.

I will go one step further, and quote what the hon. leader of the Opposition then, the right hon. leader of the Government now (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said, speaking before a Toronto audience at that time:

The Conservatives say to us, "If you were to come to power you would not be able to decrease the expenditure and practice economy." I do not believe that that would be a difficult task. It would not be difficult to economize one, two, or three millions. Mr. Mills declared to his constituents the other day that it would be quite possible to diminish the expenditure by four millions annually.

Going still another step up the ladder of financial genius, I quote from the present hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who declared in this House:

I say it is a disgrace and a shame to the Government that has been intrusted with our affairs that they come down to us and ask for an expenditure of \$38,000,000 a year for federal purposes. Sir, the thing is utterly unjustifiable. I have said before, and I repeat it, that \$38,000,000 is in my judgment a monstrous sum for this people to be called on to provide.

These hon. gentlemen acceded to power; they took the reins of government; they cut out the lines of expenditure, and with the result that I am going to name now. The total expenditure on all services and all works, which is one of the fairest ways of taking it, was, on the average, from 1892 to

1896, \$42,141,763. In 1896 it was \$41,702,383; in 1898, \$45,334,281, and in 1899, though the figures are not revised yet, it will be in the neighbourhood of \$50,000,000. Now, if you take the expenditure per head, it shows in this way: From 1892 to 1896, \$8.41; in 1896, the last year of the Conservative Administration, \$8.14; in 1898, \$8.64, and in 1899, \$9.40 per head of the population. New counsels have prevailed, new masters have arisen, and I will now go to the apex of that ladder, that ascending scale, of which the bottom rung is the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and I will read from the authority who is to-day perched upon the apex, to wit, the hon. Minister of Public Works, the Hon. J. Israel Tarte, whose latest deliverance is this:

Thank God, I am not one of those who believe that a country can become great with a decreasing public expenditure. It is only big fools who use such language as this.

What will become of gentlemen who are shrinking and cowering on the bottom rungs of this ladder, when from the apex, their master, and evidently the director of this extravagant expenditure, says to those persons below him, looking down on them, "You are big fools; I am not; I am a wise man; my belief is that no country can ever become great with decreasing expenditures." So much with reference to the plank of the party with regard to decreased expenditures.

With reference to the public debt, that was to decrease, or at least was not to increase; but whereas in 1896 the net debt was \$258,497,432, it is now at least \$264,283,937, or an increase in the neighbourhood of \$6,000,000 in the time that these gentlemen have been in power. So that every one of the financial planks of hon. gentlemen opposite, which they made the essential planks in their platform, on which they stood before the people and asked the people to entrust them with government—all these principles, in the practise of three short years, have been repudiated and utterly thrown to the winds, and a progress has been made in the opposite direction as astounding as it is grave and alarming for the future of this country.

These hon. gentlemen had another plank. They were going to exterminate the principle of protection, and were going to eliminate its practice from the tariff and fiscal system of this country; and what have they done? Why, instead of bringing in the era of free trade as it is in England and a tariff for revenue only, they have—led again by gentlemen who are stronger than perhaps the majority of the Cabinet—incorporated the principle of protection into their Tariff Acts of 1897 and 1898; and, as a result, as the figures which I have read show, whereas under Liberal-Conservative rule the rate of customs taxation upon dutiable and free imports for home consump-

tion into this country from 1892 to 1896 was 17.47 per cent, it has come down now, comparing 1898 and 1899 to the average which I have mentioned, an insignificant reduction of 72-100 of 1 per cent.

The independence of Parliament and the purity of the electorate was a favourite plank in the platform of hon. gentlemen opposite. In what way have these hon. gentlemen illustrated the independence of Parliament and the purity of the electorate? They have done it by an open traffic in seats in both Houses of Parliament. When the present Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), cannily waiting till the results were decided before he imperilled the position he held in the province of New Brunswick, was called to the Government here, and had perforce to find a constituency for himself, that Minister, like a true peripatetic, went from one end of the province of New Brunswick to the other, seeking rest and finding none—seeking, by means as unworthy of the public life of this country as they ought to be humiliating to himself, to induce men who had been elected to support the principles of the opposite party, to sell out their constituencies in order to give him a place on which he could rest the soles of his feet. No Liberal-Conservative could be seduced, and what happened? By a shuffle, a gentleman who had been elected by his constituents to represent them in this Parliament, the member for Queen's County, was induced to give up his seat, with the promise that he should get a seat in the Senate. The Senate was to be used as the machinery for securing a position in order that the Minister called to the Department of Railways and Canals might find a constituency for himself. But there was no vacancy in the Senate, and one of its members, for the consideration of the governorship, was induced to make a place in the Senate for Mr. King, and Mr. King, in consideration of a senatorship, made a place for the Minister of Railways and Canals in the constituency of Queen's and Sunbury. N.B.

Take the professions of hon. gentlemen opposite and contrast them with this action, and you will easily see how hollow were their professions, and how far they had retrograded and backslidden since they came into office. The same thing with reference to the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). He did not get a constituency at the general election. He wanted one, and how was he to get it? Again the machinery of the Senate was put into operation, and the member-elect for a county was offered and given a seat in the Senate in order to make a vacancy for the present Minister of Public Works. Again, a traffic in the seats of this Parliament. Why should I go further? The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was also one of those canny ones who did not intend to jump into the breach until he found which side would be victo-

rious ; and after he saw the smoke of battle had cleared away, so that none of its grime even might soil his immaculate self, he acceded to the pressing request of the present Prime Minister and became Minister of Finance, much to his surprise, and much, I think, to the surprise of another hon. gentleman who sits to-day close beside him. He had no constituency ; when should he get one ? And the simple expedient was again to traffic in public offices. By the simple expedient of giving first a hundred-dollar preventive office, and afterwards a judgeship, to a gentleman who was better qualified for a judgeship by the work that he had done for his party than by his reading or experience in law, this hon. gentleman obtained a seat for himself ; and he sits to-day in this House because the machinery and emolument of an office was used to get him a place which otherwise he could not get. And yet this hon. gentleman—to make a personal allusion—had the poor grace to retail a story with reference to my last electoral contest in King's County as devoid of foundation as it is possible for anything to be—to retail it from a source which he knows himself he would not trust in a financial or any other matter ; no, not for a single shadow of an instant—and in which there was absolutely no truth. It is by traffic such as this that these hon. gentlemen are lifting the standard of the independence of Parliament and the purity of elections. Why should I speak of appointments to office that have been made over and over again with nothing but party advantage and interest in view ?

But to go still further, the Prime Minister himself has set the example, which those under him are only too ready to follow, and the little spark of natural depravity which is inherent in man, has been, by the force of that great example, fanned into a flame which, at times, has absolutely destroyed the better principles of the men who yielded to this pernicious influence. What has the Prime Minister done ? He who held for the independence of Parliament, he who threw back the lapels of his coat and bared his breast in the city of Toronto, as he declared : Put out these corrupt men and put me into power, and, at least, I will give you pure government and honest methods of administration, and I will elevate public morals above the low plane to which they have fallen. He did this—how ? By promising, before those words were cold from his mouth, to Mr. Francois Langeller, of Quebec, that if he would do so and so, he would reward him. Reward him—how ? By giving him something from his own pocket, something that cost him any sacrifice ? No, but he would traffic with him in judgeships and governorships ; and if Mr. Langeller would only do so and so, he would give him a judgeship or the governorship of his province ? Mr. Langeller took the bribe, and kept the promise in his pockets for two years. Find-

ing that the promise was not likely to be quickly performed, he raised such a storm among the faithful old guard in the province of Quebec and hit so hard that this promise had to be implemented, nearly two years after it was made, and after Mr. Francois Langeller had sat in this House and voted faithfully for the Government, many times against his own convictions, as he himself has indicated.

Further still, and I will shock still more my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards), by going against his favourite doctrine and having something to say in matters not affecting directly the province from which I come. There is a member of Parliament who has a seat in this House—but is not sitting here to-day, he has gone—who got a written promise from the Prime Minister, and who retailed that promise on the hustings in the county of Quebec, in which the Prime Minister pledged himself, over his own signature, to have certain subsidies granted to railways in that county, and used it as an electoral machine. This is the way in which the independence of Parliament, the purity of the electorate, and the general standard of public morals is elevated by the present Administration.

What more ? They have practically repudiated the sound principle, the old-time principle, of awarding contracts for public works and services after public competition and tender. Need I give any instances ? They are everywhere. What have we seen this session in this House ? From the Prime Minister down to the most insignificant member of the Cabinet, not one of them, in the absence of the Minister of Public Works dared stand up and give a straight answer to the question as to whether they would put such and such a work up to public tender. What was the subterfuge ? They said : It ought to be done, I think it should be done, other things being equal it will be done. But behind it all was the reservation : We cannot promise, because the Minister of Public Works is not here. Had the Minister been here, he would have said very quickly, as he did last year : I take the responsibility of doing this by day's work, let the Opposition say what they like.

Shall I take another instance ? There is the instance of militia supplies—\$37,000 worth of supplies in one bunch, given without a shadow of public competition and tender. Then there is the clothing contract, given under the assumption that the anti-sweating Act was incorporated in it, but \$1,960 was paid for one particular item, which the man who got the contract had full liberty to have made outside of the sweating clause.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). That is not the fact. He had not liberty except to the extent of getting 500 garments made, which it was absolutely necessary, in the public interest, should be made before the men began their drill.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very glad my hon. friend has substantiated my statement. Tenders were called for, and the contract was awarded in September, before there was an attempt to make one of these great-coats, and between that and January all these were made and permission given by the Minister to have them made outside the sweating clause.

Shall I give another instance?—that of Thomas Gauthier, the father-in-law of Mr. Tarte's son? There was some dredging work which was possible; it is not on the public records that the Canada Atlantic, or anybody else, ever asked or pressed for it. It is within the knowledge of Parliament that that dredging was not necessary for two or three years. It is on the papers brought down that the first step taken was a letter from Mr. Tarte to Mr. Gauthier, who was not engaged in that business at all, asking him if he would like to have the dredging to do at so much per hour. Mr. Gauthier took the work, and farmed it out, and pocketed the difference between what the owners of the dredges got and what the Government paid him. That stands clear upon the records of Parliament and is indisputable. The Minister of Public Works defended it by saying: Well, I had to do something for our friends; the Tories had all the dredges, and consequently I could not get any patronage into the hands of our friends unless we accepted the farming out system. This is the way in which this principle of having works done after competition and tender has been repudiated.

But what have this Government done in the bonusing of railways. The Minister of Trade and Commerce in the office-seeking days stood straight and clear—what for? For the abolition of bonuses and subsidies to railways. He formed an alliance with the Patrons, and that was one of the links in the chain of the alliance. Their election literature got out under the sanction of the party and as authoritative as any literature could be distinctly stated that one of the principal planks in the Liberal policy was to do away with this corrupt system of bonusing railways. That was read only a day or two ago in the House by the hon. member for Assiniboia, and is in "Hansard"; I shall not take up time by quoting it again. This declaration was made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and also by the Postmaster General, and also by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who said that this principle had been fought for by him and by others in this House and the country, without any rebuke from the leaders of his party, and, therefore, was assented to by them. But what are we doing now in railway bonuses? Why, in what you may call general railway bonuses, this is the banner year in the history of Parliament. \$6,500,000 is the minimum sum voted for subsidizing railways, all and sundry, between the Rocky Mountains and the Atlantic coast, in the

Mr. FOSTER.

non-settled and well-settled and other portions of the country, running parallel, running crossways, running every way, unnecessary in many cases, laudable some of them in some respects, but administering to that party, from its own acts, the sternest and strongest rebuke that could be given to their past policy, their past principles and their past professions.

Well, Sir, they promised to maintain an honest, economical and businesslike Administration. How have they illustrated that? By entering upon enterprises involving expenditure of large amounts of money, without having the slightest authority of Parliament to undertake them, and providing the initial expenditures in some cases from votes which had been solemnly passed by Parliament for other and well-defined and well-known services of the country. You may instance this Yukon scheme as an example of entering into prospective expenditure of a vast amount without any authority from Parliament, and binding the Government by a solemn contract a few days before Parliament met. The same thing took place with reference to the Drummond County and Grand Trunk arrangement, in which an expenditure capitalized at \$7,000,000 was undertaken by this Parliament without any previous authorization by Parliament, and but a few days in advance of the meeting of Parliament. And, this year, this Government which was pledged, if it could be pledged at all, to the building of telegraph lines into the Yukon by private companies to which Parliament had given franchises, suddenly and within three days of the assembling of Parliament enters into the initial expenditure of a Government telegraph line under the most extraordinary circumstances, and proceeds with the work to-day at an expenditure, which, in the end, will amount to over half a million dollars at the lowest calculation.

Another plank in the platform of the party, as regards its economical administration, was that in small towns and villages care should be taken that large expenditure for public buildings and public wharfs should not be made. When they were in Opposition and the Liberal-Conservatives were in power they challenged us on that principle with reference to the expenditure of public money. To-day what do we find? There is a perfect carnival of expenditure upon public buildings and public wharfs in small and comparatively insignificant places, where there are no revenues, where there is no public necessity on which to base a claim for these expenditures. We can come to no conclusion other than that these are expenditures meant for party purposes. We know that they are expenditures which should be left to municipal and provincial and private enterprise, if they are necessary at all, and not to the subventions of this

Government. As a case in point, let me take the village of Victoriaville, not because I wish to single out one in the Premier's constituency, but for the sake of illustration. Victoriaville has how many people? Only about 2,200—it is a mere village. It has a customs revenue to the magnificent amount of \$696; it has a post office revenue rising into the astounding sum of \$1,900 per year. And yet this village of 2,000 inhabitants with its insignificant revenues and little trade, this village, by the grace of the Prime Minister is to be bedecked with a public building, which at the lowest will cost \$8,000, but more probably, from \$12,000 to \$15,000.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) does not mention the Inland Revenue, which is very considerable, amounting last year to over \$10,000, and this year to about \$20,000.

Mr. FOSTER. And will my hon. friend (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) say what in the world the erection of a tobacco factory in this little village, which manufactures the tobacco for a large part of the surrounding country and yields a large revenue to the Government, has to do with the necessity and construction of a public building in that community?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The hon. gentleman mentioned the revenue for customs and post office as showing the locality had really not contributed to the revenue of the country. Since he has mentioned the post office and the customs, I wondered that he did not think well to mention the excise revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell my hon. friend why I did not mention it, if he does not understand. I mentioned the customs revenue, because the customs office is a place in which the general commercial and trading public must do business, and, of course, you require a reasonable place in which to do it—

Mr. LAVERGNE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will allow me, I will correct an error into which he has fallen. The hon. gentleman says that the customs revenue was \$696. It was really \$7,300 for the fiscal year ending 30th June last. The excise is \$23,000 and the postal revenue is \$1,900. Moreover, the Government was paying \$200 a year for a building for post office purposes, the lease under which that was having been made by the Government of which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was a member.

Mr. FOSTER. Not being able to look up everything myself, I am obliged to have recourse to the information given me in this House. The information given me by the gentlemen who are putting the vote through was that the customs revenue was \$696. I find, on looking at page 31 the 16th state-

ment of customs duties in the last report, that Victoriaville is given as an outpost and its customs duties are stated to be \$696.08. I was in error—by 8 cents.

Mr. LAVERGNE. But that does not cover the latest returns—

Mr. FOSTER. I do not doubt the honesty of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lavergne's) contention, but I can only go by the printed returns and the information given me by the Ministers. If they have made a mistake I am not responsible, and if the hon. gentleman is right, no one will be better pleased than I. This is an example of how public buildings are being scattered over different parts of the country and wharfs are being built on inland lakes and rivers everywhere, to quote the expression used by the Minister of Finance where you find some commercial or manufacturing or industrial or agricultural community which has something to market and which wants facilities for marketing it. These are samples of the expenditure of public money which under this Government has grown to alarming proportions and has taken a course and tendency which, I fear, it will be impossible for this Government or any incoming Government to withstand after the impetus which has been given to it. The knowledge of those things spreads quickly from community to community. It is absolutely impossible that the people of the province of Ontario who, with their private or municipal funds have been building the wharfs along the lakes and rivers, managing them as commercial ventures—it is impossible that that intelligent people shall long be ignorant of the fact that all they will have to do is to approach the Government and have these works paid for out of the funds of the Dominion, as is done in other sections of the country.

With reference to the Yukon management I am not going to dilate upon that. That has been sufficiently discussed, possibly, in this House during the present session. I merely wish to say that in my opinion, and I think it will be the opinion of the country, what has transpired in the Yukon has been of sufficient gravity and sufficient weight to have induced the Government, in justice to themselves, in justice to the country, and in justice to the officials whose names have been mixed up in it, to undertake and facilitate an independent judicial inquiry into those charges; nor do I think that the public sentiment of this country, or of any country which is cognizant of the facts, will come to any other conclusion. Men reason this way: If the Government were not guilty, why do they fear an inquiry? If these things were done, why do they for a moment hesitate to clear the skirts of Canada from the opprobrium which, an account of the alleged maladministration of that country attaches to her? One thing or the other must be true; and the conclu-

sion that will be come to by many people in this country is that the Government refused an investigation because they were afraid of the consequences, and because they did not care to face the consequences. That will all the more be the case because people are quick to see that when there was a party advantage to be gained in Manitoba the Prime Minister gave his promise to a man who was the Attorney General of another province, and dipped his hands into the public treasury without authority or warrant, to the tune of \$19,000 or \$20,000. To do what? To undertake political prosecutions in the province of Manitoba which should have been undertaken solely and entirely by the province itself. They did it because they wished to clear the good name of the public life of this country from possible wrongdoing in the elections in one of its provinces! But to-day in Dominion elections in this country, and in provincial elections in the province of Ontario, the most undoubted facts of corruption and ballot-box stuffing, and ballot-stealing, have been brought to light, yet you do not find either this Government or their right hand in the province of Ontario, taking any official steps towards punishing the wrong-doers and towards bringing the malefactors to justice. Rather than that, they single out the originator, the prime and sole manager of that machine which the Toronto "Globe" now repudiates in advance of the feeling of its leaders, they single out the originator and manager of that infamous machine as the man to whom they will give the largest salary in the gift of the immigration department, giving him the widest mission in Europe and other countries, on their behalf, providing at one end for the man who did the work on behalf of this Government and of the Ontario party which is the right hand of this Government, as was stated by the right hon. gentleman in a speech made by him in Ottawa at the last local elections.

I do not want to prolong this unduly, but I must touch upon one other thing, and that is the failure of this Government in many ways in a business point of view. We have been in this session five months. Some gentlemen were here the first day and are here now; and I call to witness these gentlemen, from this year's experience and their knowledge of the history of Parliament in this country, if there ever was a Parliament which was called and kept in session for so long a time and which accomplished so little that was of any good to the country as this present Parliament. What is my argument from that? My argument from that is this: That, in the first place, this Government lacks the business ability to properly conduct the affairs of Canada in Parliament. They have been unready, they have been fitful, they have been vacillating, they have been dilatory, they have shown neither tact nor management in conducting the business of the House. It

Mr. FOSTER.

has drifted out from under their hands again and again, and the business of the House has been allowed to go to loose ends. What is more, they started with two principal measures. Where are these two principal measures now? One was a redistribution of the seats, in which they put themselves in the grave position of violating the spirit of the British North America Act, and of introducing into this country an innovation which, if kept up by other political parties, would make of every Parliament a machine of the party which, by virtue of its majority, would fix the districts for the elections upon which that party expected to go to the country. Once in ten years we have to meet that difficulty and overcome it as best and as fairly as we can. Difficult indeed to do it fairly with two parties in the House, even once in every ten years; but if you are going to adopt the idea that any year, whether it is one year before the census or two years after the census, you can undertake a redistribution of seats in the interest of the dominant party, you will bring the public life and the party politics of this country to a condition which will conduce neither to the fair fame nor to the good government and best interest of this country. That measure they have failed upon. The other was a crusade against the Senate. That they have withdrawn.

Another important measure they have been trying to get through this House for two or three years; they passed it this year but they had to revise it of many of its objectionable features, and had to admit here that they were contemplating a bargain which they declared to be a good bargain, but which they had to revise to the extent of saving to this country in expenditure something near three-quarters of a million dollars at least. What have these gentlemen done? What legislation have they passed this session for the good of Canada? Where is the fast Atlantic service? Where is the boon of insolvency legislation? Where is the settlement of those vexed international questions which they were to solve when they came into power, and not one of which is yet solved? Where is this mutual preferential trade that the Prime Minister pledged himself, on the basis of a mutual and common preference, to get for this people if he possibly could, a promise made before the elections? Where is a single market anywhere in this wide world which has been opened up to the people of this country for their products, by any advantage, by any reciprocal tariff, or in any other way, since these gentlemen have come into power? The finger cannot be put upon any one.

Sir, I think the people of this country may be trusted to feel that there is something like honour in politics and something like good-faith that is required of public men; and that despite the majority at present in the House, the arbitrament, after all,

is to be before the great tribunal of the people, and the honest heart and intellect of the people in this country will not be satisfied to condone a party which promised one thing in order to gain a seat and repudiated that promise the moment it got the coveted seat. One thing do I say? No, it promised many things and repudiated them all when once it gained the coveted place. There is a spirit among a certain class of men that will allow smartness to take the place of principle, the old fashioned British principle of good faith, but that does not constitute the majority of the people of this country. You may meet a man now and then you will say: The Liberal party got into power, they tricked you, they showed superior smartness. But, after all, what does it matter? They showed that they were more clever than you were. That represents one set of opinions, but there is an old-fashioned honesty, a feeling of British honour in this country which will demand an accounting from men who gained power by pledging themselves solemnly to economy, to lessened expenditure, to lessened taxation, pure administration, independence of Parliament and the purity of the electorate, and who, as soon as they came into power, forgot these promises, who have pursued most diligently the opposite course, and who have sought advantage for themselves by pursuing an opposite course. At this hour, I do not propose to take up any more of the time of this House, but I wish simply to put this statement before the House, and I desire to conclude my remarks by moving the following motion:—

That the following facts with reference to the taxation, revenue, expenditure and public debt of Canada are established from the official records:—

That the Liberal party went to the country in 1896 with a policy declaring, among other things, for:

- (a) Reduction in taxation.
- (b) Decrease in expenditure.
- (c) Diminution of the public debt.
- (d) The extermination of the principle and practice of protection.
- (e) Independence of Parliament and purity of the electorate.
- (f) The abolition of railway bonuses or subsidies.
- (g) An honest, economical and business Administration.

That comparing 1899 with 1896, the amount of customs and excise taxation has been increased by nearly \$7,000,000, or by over \$1.30 per head of the population, and the total amount collected from the people by over \$3,000,000, or about \$1.50 per head.

The total expenditure has been increased by about \$8,000,000, or over \$1.50 per head, whilst the total amount, not including next year's supplementary voted for the year 1899-1900, reaches the astounding sum of \$51,796,344, or \$13,000,000 more than was voted, and \$14,847,197 more than was expended for the year 1896.

The net debt has increased about \$6,000,000, and must be seriously augmented by the enormous expenditures authorized at the present session of Parliament.

That instead of exterminating protection and establishing a system of free trade, or tariff for revenue only, they have incorporated the principle of protection into the Tariff Acts of 1897 and 1898, and the results of the year 1898-99 showing that they have imposed a rate of 28.74 per cent on all dutiable goods imported for home consumption as compared with 29.94 per cent in 1896, or upon dutiable and free imports for home consumption of 16.57 per cent as compared with an average of 17.47 per cent for the years 1892-96 inclusive.

That the independence of Parliament and the purity of the electorate have been illustrated by the traffic in seats in both Houses of Parliament for purely party purposes; by the arbitrary and indefensible dismissals from and by interested and unnecessary appointments to public offices in all branches of

	Average 1892-96.	1896.	1898.	1899.
Customs taxation.....	\$19,839,684	\$20,219,037	\$22,157,733	\$25,157,931
Rate per cent on dutiable goods for home consumption .....	30.25	29.94	29.34	28.74
Rate per cent on dutiable and free.....	17.47	18.28	16.95	16.57
Customs and excise taxation.....	\$27,710,432	\$27,759,285	\$29,576,456	*\$33,805,374 †700,000
Rate per head.....	5.63	5.42	5.63	\$34,505,374 6.50
Total revenue collected.....	\$36,412,378	\$36,618,591	\$40,555,233	\$41,698,155
Rate per head.....	7.27	7.14	7.73	8.41
Total expenditure.....	\$42,141,763	\$41,702,382	\$45,334,281	\$50,000,000
Expenditure per head.....	8.41	8.14	8.64	9.40
Net public debt.....		\$238,497,432	\$263,956,338	\$264,283,937

\* Eleven months Excise returned. † One month estimated.

the service. By the written and authorized promises of office, emoluments and subventions given to members of Parliament and others by the Premier and other members of the Government for electoral and party purposes; by the practical repudiation of the safe principle of open competition—tender and contract as applied to the expenditures of public money, and the giving of contracts by private arrangement to party friends, who thus make profit for themselves at the expense of the country.

That instead of abolishing the system of bonus and subsidies to railways, they have this year, in addition to the payment of \$1,600,000 for the Drummond County Railway, and \$140,000 yearly for ninety-nine years as rental to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, authorized the expenditure of not less than \$6,500,000 for general railway bonuses, in many instances for unnecessary and parallel lines.

That the promise to maintain an honest, economical and business-like Administration has been illustrated by:

(a) The entry upon enterprises unauthorized by Parliament, and for which no appropriation had been made, which involved the expenditure of millions of dollars, and the diversion of moneys specifically voted for distinct and well-defined services to these purposes, thus setting at naught the constitutional principle of parliamentary sanction and appropriation.

(b) By undertaking the construction of public wharfs and buildings which are either totally unwarranted on grounds of public necessity, or which should be left to provincial, municipal or private enterprise.

(c) By an extravagant, inefficient and useless expenditure proposed and carried out in the Yukon district, and a management of affairs there which has exposed the whole system to general suspicion and provoked charges seriously affecting the character and efficiency of the Administration and its officials, and compromising the good name of Canada, which have been refused thorough and adequate investigation before an independent judicial commission.

(d) By its inefficient conduct of the business of Parliament, its failure to achieve much-needed legislation for the good of Canada, to secure a fast Atlantic service, to settle any of the vexed international questions at issue, to induce any mutually preferential trade with other portions of the Empire, or to open up a single new market under improved conditions, reciprocal or otherwise, in any quarter of the world.

That this House is of the opinion that the violation of public pledges, made definitely and solemnly by a party when seeking to change the Administration of the country, is corrupting to public morals, and reprehensible in the highest degree, and, in the case of the present Government, calls for the severest condemnation.

That the astounding increase in all manner of expenditures by that Government, and in the indefensible nature of many of these expenditures, enhancing as they do the already too heavy burdens of taxation, is cause for anxiety and alarm, and threatens great public danger.

That the extravagance, lack of principle and incapacity shown by the Administration calls for censure by this House and the country.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, the spectacle of the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) delivering a homily upon public morality is a very delightful one, and it affords a most inviting subject, if time only permitted. I am going

Mr. FOSTER.

to make a suggestion. As we are all anxious to facilitate the business of the House, and as the Supply Bill ought to be sent to the Senate, and there are one or two other matters, I am going to ask the House to permit me, after the luncheon recess, to make a few observations in reply to the hon. gentleman. In the meantime, I suggest that we use the few remaining minutes before one o'clock to dispose of the business of the House and send it to the Senate; and, after the House resumes, I may be permitted, on a motion to adjourn, to make a few observations in reply to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection as to that, so far as I am concerned. Of course, we shall have to dispose of this motion now, and the hon. gentleman can take his chances on the motion to adjourn.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Foster:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bell (Addington),	Macdonald (King's),
Broder,	Martin,
Davin,	Morin,
Foster,	Rosamond,
Guillet,	Tyrwhitt, and
Hodgins,	Wallace.—12.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Blair,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Borden (King's),	Mackie,
Bourbonnais,	MacPherson,
Brodeur,	McClure,
Casey,	McGregor,
Copp,	McLellan,
Edwards,	McMullen,
Ethier,	Marcil,
Fielding,	Martineau,
Fisher,	Proulx,
Fraser (Lambton),	Rogers,
Graham,	Scriver,
Johnston,	Stenson,
Joly de Lotbinière	Tolmie, and
(Sir Henri),	Tucker.—30.
Landerkin,	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.

Opposition.

Madore,	McNk,
Rutherford,	Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Christie,	Roddick,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Tupper (Sir Charles
	Hibbert),
Snetsinger,	Reid,
Featherston,	Carscallen,
Hutchison,	Klock,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Cowan,	Montague,
Britton,	Cargill,
Penny,	Quinn,
Gibson,	Corby,
Ellis,	Powell,
Sutherland,	Taylor,
Savard,	Dugas,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Ratz,	Ingram,
Logan,	MacLaren,

McLennan (Inverness),	Gillies,
Russell,	Borden (Halifax),
Calvert,	Hughes,
Talbot,	Bergeron,
Fitzpatrick,	Casgrain,
McInnes,	Earle,
Maxwell,	Robinson,
Hurley,	Craig,
Lavergne,	McAlister,
Costigan,	LaRivière,
Macdonell,	Rocche,
Meigs,	Ganong,
Gauvreau,	Merin,
Bell (Prince, East),	Hale,
Flint,	Kaulbach,
Paterson,	Wilson,
Godbout,	McLennan (Glengarry),
Somerville,	Bell (Pictou),

Mr. BERGERON. I wish to say, if the pairs are not to be recorded, that I am paired with the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. TALBOT. I am paired with the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). Had I voted, I would have voted heartily for the amendment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I may say that I have made a full list of the pairs, so far as they are furnished, and have sent them to "Hansard." If they will not print them, it is not my fault.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am glad the hon. gentleman has mentioned the pairs. I paired very early in the session with Sir Hibbert Tupper, and I have noticed that in fifteen or twenty divisions no mention is made of the pairs.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the pairs should be abolished.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Since attention has been called to the pairs, I may say that I am paired with the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière). If I had not been paired, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I am paired with the hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. McAlister). If I had voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. SAVARD. I am paired with the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Dugas). If I had voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to; resolution considered in committee, read the second time and concurred in.

#### SUPPLY BILL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No.

192) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1900, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second time, considered in committee, read the third time and passed.

#### PROROGATION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I beg to inform the House that I have received a letter from His Excellency's secretary to the effect that His Excellency will proceed to the Senate Chamber to prorogue this session of the Dominion Parliament on Friday, the 11th inst., at four o'clock p.m.

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

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

#### DISMISSAL OF RABBI VELDT.

Mr. BERGERON. I wish to know if it is true that Rabbi Veldt has been dismissed as chaplain of the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary. I do not see the right hon. First Minister here, but, perhaps, the hon. Minister of Marine can give me the information.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no information whatever.

Mr. BERGERON. Then I will give the information. Rabbi Veldt has been dismissed and replaced by a gentleman who is not a British but an American subject. I do not suppose that his nationality will impair his spiritual advice, but the fact remains that Rabbi Veldt was dismissed without cause and replaced by an American citizen.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Are there three chaplains in St. Vincent de Paul?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, Roman Catholic, Protestant and a rabbi.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Paid by the Government?

Mr. BERGERON. Paid very little, but paid something.

#### REVIEW OF THE FINANCIAL SITUATION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). We are at the close of a very long and laborious, and I am sure we will all now say, somewhat tiresome session, and at this moment, even if the time were at our disposal, I do not think the House or the country

would be disposed to encourage any very long speeches. The House has had its fair share of long speeches this session, and those hon. members who have done us the honour to remain here until the end, and the long suffering public outside, will, no doubt, feel relieved to be given a rest from parliamentary speech-making.

The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) undertook to review, from the Opposition standpoint, the work of the session. Doing so he covered very considerable ground, some of it, perhaps, somewhat hastily and necessarily so, but he opened up a wide range of questions, each one of which, if time permitted, would invite reply. I desire now, in the short time at my disposal, to devote myself chiefly to presenting to the House some facts and figures bearing on the financial position of the country, which, I am sure, will tend to assist those who wish to make an intelligent study of the subject. I shall be obliged, therefore, to refer only hurriedly to some other questions to which the hon. gentleman alluded, and yet I would not pass these questions altogether.

The hon. gentleman quoted the utterances of a number of members of the Liberal party, and then proceeded to claim that the policy of the Government had not been in all respects in accord with these utterances. Well, every man who knows anything of parliamentary government knows that the gentlemen in Opposition have always a wider latitude than those on the Government side. The responsibilities of Government do not rest upon hon. gentlemen to the left of the Speaker. They will always, no matter which party may be in power, claim a wider range of discussion and opinion than is liable to be claimed by those charged with the responsibilities of Government; and it would not be surprising, no matter which party was in power, that hon. gentlemen in Opposition should be found expressing opinions that represent their own political ideas, but not necessarily the views of the party at large. Then, it is the very essence of the Liberal party that there shall be liberty among its members to differ on many points, provided they be united on the main questions. Look at what we find in this House to-day. We find hon. gentlemen opposite on great questions differing widely. We find the hon. leader of the Opposition announcing at one moment that a certain policy brought down in relation to the opening of the Yukon was a good policy; and so anxious to endorse that policy that, not content to wait for its parliamentary announcement, or for a newspaper reporter to come and interview him, he actually sent for a reporter in Montreal, to whom he unbosomed himself, and declared that, in his judgment, the contract for building a railway to the Yukon was an excellent measure, and the contractors who had undertaken the work were, perhaps, the one set of men in the

Mr. FIELDING.

whole Dominion to put through a project of that character. But a little while afterwards, we find him in this House, under the whip of the lash of the hon. member for East York (Mr. McLean), entirely changing his policy and declaring that the whole thing was most ruinous for the country.

We found on vital questions this session the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) advancing one view and the hon. members sitting around him advancing another. We found the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) laying it down as a grave principle that in dealing with the great harbour of Montreal, it would be an unsound policy for this Government to do anything directly, but everything should be done through the Harbour Commissioners. A few minutes later the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) came in and declared, as warmly and eloquently as he could, that it was entirely unsound to do anything through the Harbour Commissioners, and that everything should be done direct by the Government. If, by and by, in the dim and distant future, these two gentlemen should come into power and have to deal with the commission and harbour of Montreal, how would they square themselves one with the other? Each one might be quoted as having announced the policy of the party. So it was with a number of other questions. We found the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who, I believe, for the first time, is not in his seat this sitting—

Mr. WALLACE. We must give him the medal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, he deserves a medal for assiduous attendance. He also repeatedly expressed views differing from those of his associates. I refer to these things to show that in Opposition there are always somewhat wider differences of opinion than exist in the ranks of the Government. It would not be strange if, during all the years the Liberal party sat in Opposition, there had been some differences of opinion among its members with regard to public questions. No one will say that it is a fair criticism to quote the utterance of some particular member of the party, and then say that because the policy of the Government has not exactly complied with the lines of that quotation, therefore, the party has been false to its pledges.

The policy of the Liberal party, Sir, was declared in a formal way. In the convention which was held in Ottawa in 1893, certain resolutions were passed. These were the policy of the Liberal party and by these the party is to be tried. And I venture to say that, in the whole history of parliamentary government in Canada, there never was a political party which carried out so fully in so short a time the pledges

with which they went to the country. By one of these resolutions we pledged ourselves to reform the tariff. The tariff has been reformed; it has been reformed so that hon. gentlemen opposite, though they talk about it, though they denounce it, have never dared to come before this House and place on the Journals of the House a resolution condemning it. It has been reformed to the satisfaction of the Liberals of the country, while fair-minded Conservatives from ocean to ocean have acknowledged that the change which has taken place has been proved to be adapted to the industries of the country, and that under that change Canada has prospered as never before. The Liberal party promised to introduce a Redistribution Bill. They have fulfilled that promise; and if that Bill is not on the statute-books of the country today it is not the fault of the Liberal party. You may take the whole range of matters discussed at the Liberal convention at Ottawa, and you will find that in almost every instance the pledge given by the Liberal party has already been fulfilled by them in letter and in spirit. The hon. gentleman today referred again, for the thousandth time, to the Yukon matter. Sir, there is no part of the administration of this Government on which we are prouder to appeal to the country than our administration of the Yukon district. If hon. gentlemen will but think—as I am sure fair-minded people outside will think—of the difficulties that had to be encountered in the administration of the government of that country, I am sure there will be a general belief that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who is particularly charged with the responsibilities of government in that section of the Dominion, deserves the highest credit for the manner in which he has carried on public affairs there. It is easy for us here, thousands of miles away, to talk of things that went wrong out there in the Yukon. It would have been a marvel indeed, if, with all the disadvantages, with all the difficulties of distance, the absence of railways, telegraphs or other means of communication, you had had a perfect human government in Dawson City. You do not get a perfect human government even in Ottawa, with all the advantages you have, with an organized civil service and the thousand and one facilities for carrying on a Government. When you consider the difficulties, the only marvel to my mind is that so few things occurred in the Yukon district of which the Government or the people have a right to complain. However, hon. gentlemen opposite harp on what they call the refusal to investigate. Sir, the thing that greatly troubles these hon. gentlemen is, not that we refused to investigate, but that we did investigate and showed that there was no foundation for the statements made. There was an investigation, an in-

vestigation by a man capable in the highest degree of carrying on that investigation in such a country as that. What was the class of people with whom he had to deal? A mining population, largely a rough and rugged people accustomed to the ways of the mining camp. They want to feel that the man they are dealing with is a man of independence and sturdy integrity. I venture to say that the average miner in the Yukon district would far sooner have an investigation of any matter in which he was concerned by such an honest, independent, fearless man as William Ogilvie, whom they had known for years and whom they had honoured and esteemed, than by the ablest judge of the Supreme Court that Canada could send out there. What were the charges? Charges against minor officials, such as might occur in any country. When these matters were brought to the notice of the Minister of the Interior, they were investigated, and the trifling irregularities are not to be considered for a moment in judging of the administration of the country. The investigation proved that the Minister of the Interior has every reason to congratulate himself upon the results of his administration of the Yukon district. There was one phase of the subject that was not investigated. And it was not investigated because hon. gentlemen opposite took very good care not to permit us to have an investigation. They endeavoured by every insinuation, by reference to rumours and stories and tell-tale talk, by reference to what somebody said on an ocean steamer, and what somebody else had whispered on the streets of Vancouver, and what somebody else was reported to have said elsewhere—by such means they endeavoured to convey the impression that the Minister of the Interior was in some way affected in his position as a Minister of the Crown and as a man by the transactions of the Yukon district. But when that suggestion was made, the Minister of the Interior and his colleagues on his behalf met it with the demand: If there is one man in this Parliament of Canada who knows of or believes that he can establish any facts against the reputation of a Minister of the Crown, let him stand up in his place and say that he can establish those things before a committee of the House, and the committee shall be granted, an investigation shall take place and justice shall be done to the fullest degree. But not a member opposite was prepared to make a charge. They continued to suggest, to insinuate, to whisper, to retail what had been said here, there, or elsewhere; but when the demand was made, as the hon. Minister had a right to make it on the floor of Parliament, that an investigation should take place before his peers, before a committee of this House, before that tribunal which the principles of Parliament

have established as the proper tribunal for the trial of a Minister of the Crown, his demand was met by silence on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. And so we are able to sum up this Yukon matter, that the charges made affected no member of the Government, and when they were subjected to an investigation by an honest, independent, fearless inquirer, it was fully established that in no material matter was there anything wrong in the administration of the Yukon district. Small irregularities occurred—I do not pretend to deny it—but it would be a marvel if such had not been the case. The only wonder is that there were not more. If we wish to be fair, we must acknowledge that the Minister of the Interior met his accusers in a fair, honourable and manly way, and that hon. gentlemen opposite, though they were ready to insinuate and to suggest, failed completely to establish one iota that would reflect upon the honour of the hon. Minister or lessen his reputation or usefulness as a Minister of the Crown.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) had much to say about money having been spent without due parliamentary authority. I thought we had threshed that out pretty well. But for the hundredth time, the hon. gentleman told us, that in connection with the initial proceedings of the Yukon telegraph, money voted by Parliament for other purposes was improperly used. I shall make but a brief reference to this, because it is an old story. The Government, recognizing that there was urgent need that immediate steps should be taken to construct a telegraph line to the Yukon district, authorized the Minister to appoint an officer and a party of men to go there and take the initial proceedings; and for that purpose they advanced him, out of the public funds, a sum of \$10,000 or \$12,000. Now, suppose there was absolutely no foundation in parliamentary authority for that, suppose it could be shown that there was not a shadow of foundation, is it an offence for which this Parliament or the people would be disposed to condemn any Minister? No man questions the urgency. If ever there was a question of urgency, it was that we should proceed to open up telegraphic communication in that country. I do not think it would be necessary to refer to any fact at all to give such a vindication of the action of the Minister of Public Works in that respect as would be accepted by the country at large. But, as I had occasion to point out to the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) the other night, that such a charge comes very strangely indeed from him when we have upon the records of this House the fact that at the close of the session of 1896, no sooner was Parliament prorogued than the hon. gentleman, without any law, without any Act of Parliament, without going to Council and getting an Order in Council,

Mr. FIELDING.

as the Minister of Public Works did, entered into a bargain whereby this country was committed to pay \$25,000, twice as much as the Minister of Public Works advanced to Mr. Charleson, to pay \$25,000 to an American company for harbour work in the harbour of Port Dover. I say there was not a shadow of authority for the position the hon. gentleman took. If you want to look over the whole range of our parliamentary affairs and select a public expenditure, or a committing of the Government to a public expenditure, without a vestige of authority, that one item is the one which would be selected above all others. Yet we have not condemned the hon. gentleman for it; we have accepted his own plea, that it was an urgent matter. All we have done is to say that, in the light of that transaction, it would be strange indeed, if the hon. gentleman should come here and ask us to condemn the Minister of Public Works because he made an arrangement, not with a foreign steamship company, not with some persons to do work in a harbour that might possibly have been delayed for a few months without serious consequences, but because he advanced to a public official some \$10,000 or \$12,000, in order to start at once the construction of a telegraph line which will give us communication to that distant section of Canada.

Then, the hon. gentleman had very much to say about giving contracts, and doing the work by day labour. Now, as I have repeatedly stated in this House, I am disposed to think that, in dealing with public moneys, the safer policy will be, as a rule, and subject to the necessary exceptions, to do public work by public tender and contract. I believe that is so to a very large extent indeed. But let us not run away with the idea that tender and contract is a perfect system. Tender and contract not infrequently puts works into the hands of irresponsible and incapable people, people who, at the time they undertake the work, persuade you that they are capable and responsible. But it often happens that the result of your giving that contract is that you give the work to people who are not able to do it satisfactorily, and the result is very serious delay and injury to the public service. There may be exceptional circumstances which will justify a departure from the tender and contract system, and my opinion is, that in many cases the public interest might be advanced by doing the work by day labour, if you are quite sure of getting thoroughly independent, honest and capable men to put in charge of the work. I do not say that we are laying it down as a principle, that we should abandon tender and contract; on the contrary, I advocate the reverse policy; I think, as a rule, as I have said before, it is a sound principle, it is a safer principle, notwithstanding its disad-

vantages. But there is another point to which I would like to call the attention of the House, concerning what has been said with regard to the doing of work by the Minister of Public Works without tender and contract. No instance has been given, so far as I can remember, where, as a result of that, the people of Canada paid one cent more than a fair and honest price for anything that was done. Whether or not, as a theory, it was better to have done the work by contract and tender, is fairly open to discussion, and my own judgment leans towards the tender and contract system. But let it not be supposed for a moment that in these departures from that system by the Minister of Public Works there has been any evidence whatever that the public interest has suffered.

The hon. gentleman went into the West Huron election case, and undertook to show, although that committee has only made a partial report of that investigation, and that investigation is not completed, although but little has been established there which proves anything—notwithstanding that, the hon. gentleman treated it as a fixed and settled fact that there had been gross wrongs in the West Huron district by the officials, because it is only with the officials that we have to deal. It is rather a curious fact that the hon. gentlemen interested in West Huron did not avail themselves of the privileges that were open to them in the courts. It has been established before this committee that all the facts which they have now brought to the notice of this committee were in their possession before the time had expired for presenting a petition. It is a very strange thing, and not without its significance, that the hon. gentlemen who are now so much interested in West Huron, did not avail themselves of the machinery of the courts. However that may be, they have seen fit to neglect the courts and to bring the matter before this House. I say that if the right hon. the Prime Minister had refused that investigation, when it was demanded, he could have done so with very much justice on his side. He could have pointed to the fact that they had the courts open to them, and they had neglected them. But so anxious was the right hon. the Prime Minister to remove the shadow of doubt from any action on the part of the Government, or on the part of the officials in connection with West Huron, that he immediately assented to the proposition, and so we have had the investigation.

Curiously enough, however, Mr. Speaker, while these gentlemen are declaring that great wrongs had been done in West Huron, and that these wrongs should be punished, they have devoted a large part of two sessions to the work of covering up the wrongdoing that occurred in the province of Manitoba in connection with the ballot-box stuff-

ing in that district. For a long time last session, and for a considerable time this session, the hon. gentlemen opposite have been trying their best to cover up the wrongs that took place there, and to condemn the Government because the Government applied public moneys to the punishment of the wrong-doers. That matter has been fully investigated by the committee, and here is the report which the committee has presented to the House on the Manitoba case. I will only quote a single passage, and it is worth placing on record :

That the evidence laid before the committee conclusively proves that there was an organized system of tampering with the ballots in said election, in said district, and that in the opinion of your committee the circumstances referred to amply justified the expenditure of the sums disbursed by the Government, and the Government was acting in the public interest in the course which it has pursued in regard thereto.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman read the report of the minority committee ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am reading a single sentence from one report. I am willing at once to assume—I do not want to detain the House by reading it—but I am willing at once to say that the minority of the committee dissented from that finding. But still the fact remains—for I was present, as a member of the Public Accounts Committee, and heard most of the investigation—I say that the evidence produced before that committee was most conclusive as to the rascalities that took place in the district of Macdonald. I say that, with that knowledge before them, with all these facts before them, produced by themselves, the hon. gentlemen opposite have spent a very considerable part of the last two years in trying to condemn the Government for applying a portion of public money for the exposure and punishment of the persons concerned in that rascality.

The hon. gentleman had much to say to-day regarding the action of certain Ministers in connection with elections to this House at the beginning of the present Parliament. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, he said, had actually endeavoured to obtain a vacancy through the retirement of an hon. member who was elected on the other side. The hon. member also stated that when I, in assuming the position to which I had the honour of being chosen, to a Minister of the Crown, required to obtain a seat in this House I did so by trafficking in public offices, and had given an hon. member of this House the promise of a judgeship in order to obtain my seat. Sir, there is not the shadow of foundation for the statement. If we are both spared to come back here again, I challenge the hon. member to bring the matter up before any committee of this House, and if he can show

that I ever gave any person a promise of a judgeship to obtain my seat in this House. I will not hold that seat for a single day. But suppose that was correct.

Mr. FOSTER. There was a wicked partner.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, there was no wicked partner. The hon. gentleman has had more to do with wicked partners than I have. But suppose it were true, suppose it were as true as it is untrue, in what position would the hon. gentleman be, or anybody opposite be, to assail an hon. member of this House on that ground? Does he forget that he sat in the Ministry with a Minister, who subsequently became Prime Minister, who obtained a seat in this House by inducing a member to take a place on the bench in order that he might obtain his seat? Does he forget that an hon. member of a different political party from his own was approached and induced to resign his seat for the gentleman who was then appointed to be Minister of Justice?

Mr. BERGERON. That is very hard upon the hon. member for Antigonish.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for Antigonish resigned his seat. I make no complaint against him; he had a perfect right to accept a judgeship if hon. gentlemen offered it to him. I am not dealing with the question of the hon. member for Antigonish, because he had a perfect right to accept an honourable position on the bench when hon. gentlemen opposite offered it to him. But the hon. gentleman opposite, if he is now sincere, was not in a position to approach that hon. member to ask him to vacate his seat and take a position on the bench. And, so, with that fact in the mind of the hon. gentleman, I venture to think that it might have been wiser if he had not referred to any trafficking in public offices on the part of the Government.

But I prefer to devote the little time we have to the financial question, and necessarily one must hurry over it very rapidly. I have noticed that there is a disposition on the part of hon. members in this House, and of their press, to repeat an old trick of theirs, and it is that of grouping together all the expenditures of the year, all the estimates of the year, capital, income, railway subsidies and everything else, and placing them in comparison with the expenditures on consolidated fund account of the late Government in the last year that they were in office. The hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) did not do that to-day. He is too keen a critic to do that here because he knows that it would be instantly seized upon. But it has been done in the House by other hon.

Mr. FIELDING.

gentlemen, and it has been done by the press outside. It is well to remember that the sum of something less than \$37,000,000, for which they say the late Government carried on the affairs of the country in 1896, was not the total sum of their expenditure, but only the sum of their expenditure on consolidated fund account. They are constantly quoting their expenditure for that year at \$36,000,000 or \$37,000,000—it was nearly \$37,000,000, but they generally speak of it as \$36,000,000—and placing it in comparison with the total expenditures of this Government, while the fact is, that, instead of expending \$36,000,000 as they claim they had in that year an expenditure of \$43,959,198. In one year these honest, economical gentlemen, who now talk of extravagance, and who now roll up all these items together and place the total in comparison with their expenditure of \$37,000,000 or less in 1896, submitted to this House in 1884 votes of various characters, capital, income and supplementary, aggregating \$53,500,000. Yet, hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends outside will constantly refer to the expenditure of the country as being \$36,000,000 in 1896, and they will place that against the total votes and appropriations of this Government, including all the various charges. Hon. gentlemen have a great deal to say about increases in the expenditure, but they have given the best evidence of not believing in what they say, because, while they have constantly talked about these expenditures, with the exception of one or two paltry items to which I will refer later on, they never mustered up courage enough to challenge it by a vote of the House. These hon. gentlemen have responsibilities; if we are expending extravagant sums of money, if we are lavish in the money voted for railway subsidies, wharfs and public buildings, why do not these hon. gentlemen take the responsibility which attaches to their position? Their responsibility is to select the items which they say are not warranted, to call the attention of the House to them and to challenge them with their votes. They do not deny that responsibility, they have accepted it, and now, when we are at the close of the session, when they say the public money is being lavishly squandered, out of \$50,000,000 odd laid on the Table of the House, they have ventured to challenge with their votes \$32,000. They ventured to challenge a vote of \$8,000 for a public building in one instance; they challenged a vote of \$5,000 for a wharf in another instance; they challenged a vote of \$1,000 for another wharf; they challenged a vote of \$3,000 in connection with immigration, and they challenged a vote of \$15,000 in connection with the payment to Hall & Myrick, a claim which is due, not by virtue of any principle that we ask the House to adopt, but by virtue of a principle that hon.

gentlemen opposite adopted and established long ago. Without discussing the merits of that matter, I want to call the attention of the House and of the public to this, that while these hon. gentlemen make speeches, and while they arraign this Government for an expenditure of \$50,000,000 or more, when they were brought face to face with the items of this expenditure, they were not in a position to proclaim their opposition by embodying it in a vote and placing it on the journals of the House. I think I am correct when I say that a reference to the journals of the House will show that they only challenged the soundness and propriety of items amounting to \$32,000 out of a total expenditure of \$53,000,000. These hon. gentlemen are not likely to be accepted by the public as economists. While they have challenged the soundness of no votes except these paltry sums—paltry in proportion to the total aggregate—amounting to \$32,000, again and again, they themselves have made proposals involving the country in additional millions of expenditure. When the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) brought down liberal and generous estimates, he was assailed by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) who said that instead of \$20,000 in one item, he ought to vote \$100,000. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) said a day or two ago that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) ought to have brought down much larger appropriations to extend the trade of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. What I said was, Mr. Speaker, that instead of \$175,000 for the Paris Exposition that money could have been more prudently and properly used, or a portion of it, by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce in promoting the interests of trade.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, I will accept the hon. gentleman's statement. The hon. gentleman attacked the vote for the Paris Exposition, but he had not the courage to challenge it by a division of the House.

Mr. WALLACE. Is that the only way to challenge a vote?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the way my hon. friend challenged a vote of \$3,000 in connection with immigration expenses.

Mr. WALLACE. Cannot I challenge a vote by my voice, and did I not do so?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman cannot chal-

lenge a vote by his voice and then shirk the responsibility of placing a motion on record because I tell him if he had made that motion the hon. gentlemen around him would not have supported it, and he would have been alone in this House in voting for it.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman is not a good prophet.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the hon. gentleman will find that I am right. But when the hon. gentleman attempts to assail this Government for placing \$175,000 in the Estimates for the Paris Exposition, it is another indication of the nagging politics of that hon. gentleman, but he is not prepared to challenge the vote and let us see how the House stands on the question, and whether he has the support of his party in condemning this Government for co-operating in the Paris Exposition.

Mr. WALLACE. I will have to take the opportunity of correcting the hon. gentleman again. The hon. gentleman made a statement of which he could not positively know the truth.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend can accept either horn of the dilemma that he pleases. His opposition to the Paris Exhibition is either his individual opinion, and, therefore, only entitled to the respect which is due to that of one hon. member, or it is the policy of his party, because my hon. friend claims, and perhaps with some justice, to be one of the leaders of his party, and if that be the case we must hold it responsible for his utterances. The hon. gentleman had much to say on another point. He asked us: Why do you not give us a fast Atlantic line? There is much to be said in favour of a fast Atlantic line, but a fast Atlantic line, according to the estimates of hon. gentlemen themselves, must mean an expenditure of three-quarters of a million per year. Thus again their complaint is, not on our side, of a lack of economy, but it is that we do not expend \$750,000 more. A leading member in the Opposition ranks rose, when we proposed to vote \$25,000 for a public building in one of the cities of the Dominion, not to condemn it, but to complain that we had not brought down a vote of \$100,000 or \$200,000. These, and I have only given a few instances, are some of the many evidences of economy that we have received from hon. gentlemen opposite. Nor is that all. Do we forget that after opposing the Government's proposal of last session for building a railway to the Yukon district, although that proposal would not have cost the country a penny, the leader of the Opposition gravely rose in this House this session, and proposed that we should spend millions of dollars of the public money

to build that very railway together with 200 miles more down to Kitimat Arm? The hon. gentlemen when brought face to face with the expenditures of this Government, could only find in the whole range of the \$50,000,000 odd, \$32,000 which they were prepared to challenge; because my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) did not take a vote on the appropriation for the Paris Exhibition. Yet hon. gentlemen were willing to throw across the House suggestions which, if we had adopted them, would have led the country into an expenditure of many millions more than we proposed.

Mr. FOSTER. Did we not offer many suggestions for economies in other votes?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I decline to have any regard for the hon. gentleman's suggestions for economy when he is afraid to follow them with a division in the House. What the hon. gentleman wants to do is to pose in this House and before the country generally as an economist, and then go to various parts of the country interested in these expenditures, and say: "Support me, dear friends, because I did not oppose these votes for your part of the country; I only occupied time in the House to talk against them; I did not vote against them, as I admit these to be great improvements for the country." The hon. gentleman said this was the banner year in the matter of railway bonuses. It was not, because as I have shown, in 1884 the hon. gentleman proposed railway bonuses to the amount of \$9,176,000; and having proposed these, he comes into the House and declares that we are extravagant. The hon. gentleman says that many of these railways are unnecessary. Which of them? He must have known, and if so his duty as a servant of the public was to have come before this House with a motion to strike out any railway bonus which he regarded as unnecessary. But the hon. gentleman did not do it. He knows that he would not dare to do it. He knows that railways are not unnecessary, but great factors in the development of the country. But he says some hon. gentlemen in the Liberal party opposed the bonusing of railways. Whether the bonusing of local railways was a wise policy to enter on in 1883 is a fair matter of debate; but after that policy has been pursued for many years, and many millions have been voted for railways in many sections of the country, are we to be told that it is now to stop? Is there any inconsistency in saying that as this has been the fixed policy of the country, and as you have scattered your millions in building railways in many sections of the country, it is only fair that other sections should receive their share of these appropriations? The hon. gentleman had much to say with regard to the new policy of voting money for the building of wharfs. This is

Mr. FIELDING.

not a new policy. This Government is but carrying out the policy which former Governments had followed for years. The hon. gentleman has charged us with adopting the new policy of building wharfs on Lake St. John. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman's own Government built wharfs on Lake St. John and in many other parts of the country years before this Government came into power. The hon. gentleman is not above trying to raise a little sectional feeling by saying that this policy of building wharfs ought to be condemned because it happens to be applied more in one part of the Dominion than another. That was an attempt to appeal to sectionalism which was not creditable to some hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. FOSTER. It was the member for Kingston (Mr. Britton).

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it was not the member for Kingston. It was some hon. gentlemen opposite who complained that we were not applying that policy to the western portions of the Dominion. The Estimates show that where the necessities arise in the central and western portions of the Dominion, they are met; but because some sections of the country by nature require more than other sections, is that a reason why the requirements should be denied? If some one in New Brunswick should say to us: "You do not build canals in New Brunswick; why should they have canals in Ontario?" That would be considered rather absurd. It so happens that the conditions of the country are such that a certain class of public works are needed in one section and another class in another section; and what the Government should do is to see that these different sections are provided for according to their needs, and that the public money is fairly and equitably expended. The hon. gentleman had something to say about public buildings. He could not approve of the building of a small structure at Victoriaville, which he says has only 2,200 inhabitants. After the hon. gentleman has succeeded in having a handsome building in every Tory town in Canada, he is going to mark the Liberal towns of the country by an absence of public buildings. I do not think that is a policy that would commend itself to the people of this country. The hon. gentleman has said that in this matter he reformed in his later years. He did not do anything of the sort. One of the last acts of the hon. gentleman, before going out of office, was to place before this House an appropriation of \$8,000 for a public building in Marysville, a little village in his own county of York. Victoriaville, he says, has only 2,200 people. Marysville had only 900 people, and the hon. gentleman brought down an appropriation for a public building

for that town, not in the olden time when they were wicked, but in the last year of his Government, 1896, in those Estimates which did not get through Parliament. Does the hon. gentleman deny it?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman denies that he made an appropriation?

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will tell him just what I deny.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman wishes to contradict me, I will give way. Does he deny the statement that he brought down an appropriation of \$8,000 for a public building in Marysville?

Mr. FOSTER. I am denying the statement.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is the hon. gentleman saying that statement is not true? I will not give way to the hon. gentleman unless he denies my statement.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman dare not give way. He knows that he is misrepresenting the fact.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If there is any man within the sound of my voice who wants the information, here are the Estimates; and if the item is not in the Estimates which were brought down by the hon. gentleman, then I am wrong, and if he will call my attention to the matter next session, I will publicly apologize.

Mr. BERGERON. We will give it to you next session.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall be here next session; I do not know whether my hon. friend will be here or not. So I might follow my hon. friend through all the moods and tenses of his speech. I am reminded that there was a town called Cayuga, with only 500 people, and that the hon. gentleman had a large sum of money voted for a public building there. I have not the pleasure of knowing the place; and as I did not want to make references to the other provinces, I preferred to cite cases in the maritime provinces and in the hon. gentleman's own county; and his own actions show that the ground he now takes is not sincerely and honestly taken. With regard to the public expenditure, I have shown that in this growing time there is need for large expenditures on the part of the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman talks of the total expenditure of years ago and the total expenditure now. He takes no account of the growth that has taken place in Canada

during these years. I venture to say—it is only a matter of opinion, but an opinion with which I believe most thoughtful observers will agree—that Canada has made more progress in the last three years than it had done in any ten previous years. It was necessary that we should meet these growing conditions with growing expenditures; but the volume of the expenditure is to be judged in proportion to the burden it imposes on the people. What is the fact? Though we have had an increased expenditure, we have had a reduction of taxation. We present to the country the proud record of a Government which has met all the obligations of a great and growing time, which has spent money liberally, hon. gentlemen opposite say lavishly, on useful public works for the development of the country, and which is able to point to the fact that these large expenditures for good purposes are accompanied by the very unusual sight for the hon. gentleman of a reduction in the rate of taxation. The hon. gentleman quibbled about the rate of reduction, but the very figures he submitted to the House today recognized the fact that there was a reduction in the rate of taxation. If you take out the increases which have been made on some articles of luxury, and look at the reduction of taxation on the great list of articles which the masses of the people need and consume, you will find that there has been an enormous reduction of taxation.

Sir, in this House, not long ago, I presented a statement showing, item by item, what the reductions in taxation were, comparing the old and the new tariff, and what was going to be the result at the next stage of the new tariff, and the result, now that the tariff has come to its fulness—

Mr. DAVIN. Is discrimination against the farmers..

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no discrimination against the farmers. We have shown that we have reduced the rate of taxation, and at the same time have met all these enormous burdens on the country.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to alarm the country on the question of the public debt. They talk constantly about its increase. Well, I have here a statement showing the increases in the public debt from 1879 down to the year 1896, covering the last term of the Conservative regime, the total increase of debt was \$118,135,353, and the average increase—

Mr. FOSTER. Put it all in "Hansard."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Very good; I shall adopt the hon. member's suggestion.

## STATEMENT of Average Increase of Net Debt of Canada.

	Net Debt.	Increase of Debt.	Decrease of Debt.	Total Increase of Debt.	Average.
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
1879.....	142,990,187	2,628,117			
1880.....	152,451,588	9,461,401			
1881.....	155,395,780	2,944,191			
1882.....	153,661,650		1,734,129		
1883.....	158,466,714	4,805,063			
1884.....	182,161,850	23,695,135			
1885.....	196,407,692	14,245,841			
1886.....	223,159,107	26,751,414			
1887.....	227,314,775	4,155,668			
1888.....	234,531,358	7,216,582			
1889.....	237,530,041	2,998,683			
1890.....	237,533,211	3,170			
1891.....	237,809,030	275,818			
1892.....	241,131,434	3,322,403			
1893.....	241,681,039	549,605			
1894.....	246,183,029	4,501,989			
1895.....	253,074,927	6,891,897			
1896.....	258,497,432	5,422,505		118,135,353	6,563,075
1897.....	261,538,596	3,041,163			
1898.....	263,956,398	2,417,802			
*1899.....	265,056,398	1,100,000		6,558,965	2,186,321

\* Approximate—accounts not closed.

The net result was this. In the eighteen years under Conservative rule the average increase in our public debt was \$6,563,075 per year. In our three years the average increase was \$2,186,321.

Mr. BERGERON. Wait until we see you next year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has been crying that out for the last three years. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in the first session, said that we were going to plunge into lavish extravagance and create enormous deficits. But instead of deficits, we have handsome surpluses. We have carried on the public service and enormous public works with a reduced taxation and the smallest perceptible addition to the public debt. I stated several months ago that we would come out of the year, closing on June 30, 1899, with an increase of debt of only about \$1,700,000, as against an average of \$6,500,000 in every year under the administration of hon gentlemen opposite. Though the accounts are not closed, and I can only present an approximate statement today, I can say that the statement I made, namely that the increase of debt would only be \$1,700,000, which was regarded by the House as eminently satisfactory, will be found well within the mark. And I venture to predict that when the Public Accounts are laid on the Table next session, we will

Mr. FIELDING.

have the satisfactory exhibit of having carried these great public works with a reduced rate of taxation and an addition to the public debt of, not \$6,500,000, but very little more than \$1,000,000.

If time would permit I would like to call the attention of the House to the question of the per capita rate.

Mr. DAVIN. May I ask a question? Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he has increased the debt by only \$1,000,000?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I say that the increase of debt during the year just closed, for which the accounts are not absolutely complete, but which are in a condition that enables me to speak with approximate accuracy, instead of being \$6,500,000, as it was under hon. gentlemen opposite, will be a little more than \$1,000,000. I say that, and I venture to say that it is a statement which will have a very strong effect on the public mind of Canada, when the people remember the heavy burdens we have had to bear and the great public works we have carried on.

My attention has been called to the vote for Marysville building in the year 1895, \$5,000. I said \$8,000. I have not the later Estimates, but my impression is that the vote was increased to \$8,000.

Mr. BERGERON. How much was spent?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I do not think any was spent. It was the fashion to make appropriations and leave them dangling before the people.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Will my hon. friend say when the first one was?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. My hon. friend distresses his soul about an appropriation of \$8,000 in the village of Victoria-ville with a population of 2,200, but is quite prepared to vote for a public building in the little village of Marysville, which has less than 900 inhabitants.

If you have a population of 5,000,000, you can bear an expenditure of, say, \$40,000,000, which is \$8 a head. If you have a population of 6,000,000 you could bear an expenditure \$48,000,000, and there would be no greater burden on the people. The question is, what is the per capita expenditure? If I had the time, I would like to go into this and show that the expenditure per head of the population has been well kept down. We had \$7.39 per head in 1898, chargeable to consolidated account. The year just closed the total expenditure will be about \$7.77, an apparent increase, but if you take out of that the Yukon expenditure, which is entirely exceptional, and the additional expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway, consequent upon its extension to Montreal—both of which are profitable investments, bringing back more money into the treasury than was paid out—leave out these two exceptional expenditures, and you will find that the expenditure of 1899 is approximately \$7.31, which is lower than the usual expenditure of the late Government for a long period of time. I do not propose to keep the attention of the House further, but if time permitted I would be able to give at every point most ample vindication of the expenditure which this Government has made. In this growing time, the demand of the people is not for niggardly economy. That is true economy which adapts itself to the new and growing conditions of the country. If the people of Canada, above all, if the Liberals of Canada, could be shown that there had been expenditure made through corrupt means and for corrupt purposes, they would be prepared to condemn the Government. But, so long as these expenditures can be shown to have been made for the development of the country—honestly and faithfully made—I have no fear of the criticism which the public will bring to bear upon us for these expenditures. The hon. gentleman to-day ventured, Sir, to read us a lecture upon public morality, upon faith and honour. Surely, the hon. gentleman was not serious; surely, with the record of the Ministry of which he was a member, surely, with the record of the events in which he was a prominent figure, he will not venture to call public men in question on the point of their public morality, or of faith, or honour. The

hon. gentleman sat in a Ministry, and acted with a party, which for a quarter of a century pursued a policy of plunder, a policy of corruption. Why, they do not deny it. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), in this House, when reference has been made to these matters, says: Oh, but these men were punished. True, they were punished. They were expelled from office, and will remain out of office a long time. But, when they come forward and talk of faith, and honour, and public morality, we have some reason, I think, to call attention to the position in which they stand.

### PROROGATION.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

Mr. **SPEAKER**:

His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate presence of this House in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

### IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act incorporating the Imperial Loan and Investment Company of Canada.

An Act to further amend the Post Office Act.

An Act to amend the Unorganized Territories Game Preservation Act, 1894.

An Act further to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.

An Act respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act respecting the Department of the Interior.

An Act respecting the Témiscouata Railway Company.

An Act respecting the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company, Limited.

An Act respecting the Manitoba and South-eastern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Atlas Loan Company.

An Act to incorporate the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.

An Act respecting La Banque du Peuple.

An Act respecting the Canadian Railway Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to the Dominion Fire Insurance Company.

An Act respecting the General Trust Corporation of Canada, and to change its name to the Canada Trust Company.

An Act respecting the Nova Scotia Steel Company, Limited.

An Act respecting the Dominion Permanent Loan Company.

An Act for the preservation of health on Public Works.

An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Penberthy Injector Company.

An Act respecting the Edmonton District Railway Company, and to change its name to the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Algoma Central Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Company.

An Act for the relief of Abraham Aronsberg.

An Act respecting the Montreal Island Belt Line Railway Company, and to change its name to the Montreal Terminal Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Birkbeck Investment and Savings Company.

An Act further to amend the Insurance Act.

An Act to provide for the Administration of Criminal Justice in the territory east of Manitoba and Keewatin and north of Ontario and Quebec.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Department of the Geological Survey.

An Act further to amend the Customs Act.

An Act further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

An Act to amend the Criminal Code, 1892, with respect to Combinations in restraint of Trade.

An Act respecting bounties on Steel and Iron made in Canada.

An Act respecting Loan Companies.

An Act respecting the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.

An Act to incorporate the Zenith Mining and Railway Company.

An Act to amalgamate the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company and the Canada Atlantic Railway Company under the name of the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Great Northern Railway Company, and to change its name to the Great Northern Railway of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Yale-Kootenay Telegraph Company, Limited.

An Act to amend the Companies Clauses Act and the Companies Act.

An Act to further amend the Winding-up Act.

An Act further to amend the Penitentiary Act.

An Act to provide for the establishment of direct submarine telegraphic communication between Canada and Australasia.

An Act to encourage the construction of Dry Docks.

An Act to amend the Act respecting the Sale of Railway Passenger Tickets.

An Act to authorize the acquisition by the Dominion of the Drummond County Railway.

An Act to confirm an agreement entered into by Her Majesty with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, for the purpose of securing the extension of the Intercolonial Railway system to the city of Montreal.

An Act for the relief of Isaac Stephen Gerow Van Wart.

An Act to provide for the conditional liberation of Penitentiary Convicts.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Protection of Navigable Waters.

An Act to amend the Act passed at the present session of Parliament, intituled: "An Act re-  
Mr. FIELDING.

pecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to Railway Debts."

An Act to amend the Yukon Territory Act.

An Act respecting the Departments of Customs and Inland Revenue.

An Act to authorize the construction of a branch railway from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour as a public work.

An Act respecting securities for Seed Grain Indebtedness.

An Act further to amend the Railway Act.

An Act respecting the Safety of Ships.

An Act respecting the city of Ottawa.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

An Act respecting the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.

An Act to amend the Weights and Measures Act.

An Act respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

An Act to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

An Act to amend the General Inspection Act.

An Act to amend the Expropriation Act.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting roads and road allowances in the province of Manitoba.

Then the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General as follows:—

May it please Your Excellency :

The Commons of Canada have voted certain Supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the public service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency the following Bill:—

An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1900, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

To this Bill the Royal Assent was signified in the following words:—

In Her Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks Her loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill.

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the Fourth Session of the Eighth Parliament of the Dominion with the following

SPEECH :

*Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :*

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons :*

In relieving you of your duties during this protracted session, I desire to thank you for the diligent attention you have given to the many important measures which have been submitted for your consideration.

I am glad to observe that the action of Canada in deciding to unite with the mother country

---

and the Australian Colonies in the construction of a Pacific cable has met with general approval.

I congratulate you on the evidence of continued prosperity that prevails in all parts of the Dominion, and which has stimulated the formation of so many companies having for their object the development of enterprises that must tend to increase the wealth of the country.

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons :*

I thank you in Her Majesty's name for the Supplies you have granted for the public service.

*Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :*

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons :*

In bidding you farewell, I desire to express the hope that Canada may long continue to enjoy the prosperity that at present prevails.

The SPEAKER of the Senate then said :

*Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :*

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons :*

It is His Excellency the Governor General's will and pleasure, that this Parliament be prorogued until Monday the eighteenth day of September next, to be here held, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until the eighteenth day of September next.

# INDEX.

## FOURTH SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT, 1899.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; \*, without remarks or debate; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adj., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-west Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y.N., Yeas and Nays; Names in *Italic* and parentheses are those of the mover.

### Beattie, Mr. Thomas, *London.*

- Business of the Hse. (remarks) 8999 (iii).
- Coal Oil, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) to place on Free List, 2005 (i).
- on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2124 (i).
- Customs Act 'Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6455 (ii).
- Employees Limitation of Working Hours (B. 82) 1°, 2036 (i).
- Huron, Ontario Loan and Savings Co. (B. 74) 1°, 2029 (i)
- London Letter Carriers and Street Ry. Transportation, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 4483, 4995 (ii).
- Ry. Passenger Ticket (Sale) Act Amt. (B. 32) 1°, 895; 2°, m., 1875 (i); in Com., 4323 (ii).
- Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9491; in Com., 9833 (iii).
- Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6802 (ii).
- Rifles, Sale of by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 1817 (i).
- SUPPLY:
  - Civil Government*: Post Office, 7348 (iii).
  - Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8613 (iii).

### Beausoleil, Mr. Cleophas, *Berthier.*

- Debates, Official Rep., 1st Rep. of Com., conc. (M.) 337 (i).
- 2nd Rep., on M. to conc. (objection) 1071.
- 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc. (Amt.) 1738; neg. (Y. 40, N. 89) 1752 (i).

### Belcourt, Mr. N. A., *Ottawa.*

- Canadian Ry. Fire Insurance Co., Change of Title (B. 140) 1°, 4259 (ii).
- Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5931 (ii).
- Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. *Poupore*) for Papers respecting, 4300, 4859 (ii).
- Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Ry. Co. and Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Amalgamation (B. 145) 1°, 4804 (ii).
- Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9610; in Com., 9627 (iii).
- Ottawa Electric Ry. Co's (B. 18) in Com., 2150.
- (M.) to ref. back to Sel. Com., 2284 (i).
- Records and Public Buildings, Safety of, Rep. of Commission (M. for copy\*) 1878 (i).
- SUPPLY:
  - Arte, Agriculture, &c.* (archives) 8224 (iii).
  - Legislation* (distribution of blue books to Law Associations) 5738 (ii).
- Yukon River and Atlin Lake Improvement Co.'s incorp. (B. 165) 1°, 6120 (ii).

### Bell, Mr. J. W., *Addington.*

- Grain exported from Can. Ports, Number of Bushels, &c. (Ques.) 3075, 3256 (i).
- SUPPLY:
  - Militia*: 5457; (Royal Military College) 5464 (ii).
  - Post Office* (mail contracts) 5830 (ii).

**Bell, Mr. J. W.—Con.**

Sydenham Postmaster, Irregularity in Accounts (Ques.) 6935 (ii).

Vanluven, Peter, *vs.* Dom. Bank, Action of Govt., Cor., &c. (Ques.) 9178 (iii).

**Bell, Mr. A. C., Pictou.**

Address, The, on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1514 (i).

Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4979 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Investigation by Commissioner, Reps., &c. (M. for copies\*) 1878 (i).

I.C.R., Drawbacks on Freight Charges on N.S. portion since 1898 (M. for Ret.\*) 5945 (ii).

— Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition, B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3739 (ii).

— G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4419, 4641 4668 (ii).

— Newspaper Agencies, Lessees, &c. (Ques.) 1971 (i).

Ogilvie, Mr., Connection with British Goldfields Co., Refusal of Min. to read letter in answer to question, 3819 (ii).

Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 9193 (iii).

Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7955 (iii).

Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 7649 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9330 (iii).

Return, Inquiry for, 3759 (ii).

— Crow's Nest Pass Ry., 3314 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Civil Government* : Post Office (salaries, Dead Letter Branch) 5038 (ii). Public Works (contingencies) 7555 (salaries) 7551 (iii).

*Immigration* (agents, &c., salaries, &c.) 8481 (iii). *Indians* (N.S.) 7486 ; N. W. T. (annuities, &c.) 5698 (ii).

*Miscellaneous* : Yukon District (hospital grant) 6378 (ii).

*Railways* : I.C.R. (uniforms) 7459 (iii).

Trueman, Mr. W. H., Appointment to Rys. and Canals Dept. (Ques.) 4483 (ii).

Voters' Lists, Printing, &c. (remarks) 6827 (iii).

**Bell, Mr. J. H., East Prince (P.E.I.)**

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 9 (i)

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5898 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892), Seduction and Abduction B 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 3°, 2928 (i).

— B. 36 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for °, 2171 (i).

G. T. R. Trackmen's Strike, Settlement, on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4540 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries Protection, Regulations *re*, on M. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) to Com. of Sup., 7679 (iii).

**Bell, Mr. J. H.—Con.**

Ottawa City, Grant of Money, Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9622 (iii).

Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 18 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 2150 ; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2290 (i).

Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7894 (iii).

P.E.I. Ry., Murray Harbour and Charlottetown Authorization B. 183 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9754 (iii).

— Winter Mail Service, Contracts, &c., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) for Copies, 3132 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8869 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6524 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Civil Government* : Post Office 7345 (iii).

*Collection of Revenues* (Telegraph Lines P.E.I.) 8181 (iii).

*Fisheries* (salaries of Inspectors) 4022 (ii).

*Public Works* : Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 7757 ; (Wharves, N.S.) 7704 (iii).

*Railways* : I.C.R. (uniforms) 7456 ; P.E.I. (Murray Harbour, &c., construction) 9219 ; (removal of curves) 7400 (iii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. *Roddick*) to Com. of Sup., 6300 (ii).

**Bennett, Mr. W. H., East Simcoe.**

Address, on The, 594 (i).

Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4983 (ii) ; in Com., 7641 (iii).

Cars, Official or Private, Number, Cost of Construction (Ques.) 1835 (i).

Civil Service (Dismissal of Officials) Act Amt B. 50 (Mr. *Monk*) on amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 2236 (i).

Collingwood Harbour, Assignment of Contractors (Ques.) 1893 (i).

Contracts let without Tender since June, 1896, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for O.Cs., 5336 (ii).

County Court Judges, Ont., Retirement, &c., Legislation respecting (Ques.) 1970 (i).

Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8936 (iii).

Galt Postmaster, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3824 (ii).

Giant's Tomb Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1834 (i).

Hope Island Lighthouse Keeper, Name, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1834 (i) ; 5486 (ii).

Humberstone Post Office, Charges against Postmaster (remarks) 6594 (ii).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4458 (ii).

Judges and Political Preferences (Ques.) 4484 (ii).

McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., and Farm Lands, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) 4494 (ii).

Midland Harbour, Amount of dues collected (Ques.) 1834 (i).

**Bennett, Mr. W. H.—Con.**

- Miller, Mr. R. C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1974 (i).  
 Moonstone, Ont., Postmaster, Name, &c. (Ques.) 1957 (i).  
 Orillia Public Buildings, Caretaker, Name, &c. (Ques.) 1957 (i).  
 Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 9197 (iii).  
 Port Colborne and Port Dalhousie, Harbour Improvements, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCleary*) 3234 (ii).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6106, 6116 (ii).  
 Quick, Mr. James, Dismissal as Lighthouse-keeper, par. in *Windsor World*, 7223 (iii).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 3476; on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 6629; in Com., 6763, 6810 (ii).  
 — on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn. Deb., 5305.  
 Saw Logs, Exportation, Prevention by Govt. on Indian Reserves, &c. (Ques.) 1834 (i).  
 Simcoe Lake, Lowering of Water, Requests, &c., made to Dept. (Ques.) 2192 (i).  
 — (remarks) 2248 (i).  
 Spinks, County Court Judge, B.C., Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4226 (ii).  
 Stikine-Teslin Route, Survey, Rep. of Engineer (Ques.) 1885 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

- Administration of Justice* : Yukon (maintenance of prisoners) 5468 (ii).  
*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Experimental Farms) 8263 (iii).  
*Canals* : Trent (construction) 7300 (iii).  
*Civil Government* : Interior (clerical assistance) 5022 (ii); Justice (salaries) 2068 (i); Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5026 (ii); Secretary of State (P. Mungovan's salary) 5854 (ii).  
*Dominion Lands* (Chief Inspector's salary) 9014.  
*Fisheries* (Noble Bros.) 4244 (ii); (salaries of Inspectors) 4014, 4045 (ii); Protection Service (repairs, &c.) 5180 (ii).  
*Harbours and Rivers* : Dredging (new plant) 5203.  
*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8576, 8586 (amt.) 8578 (iii).  
*Indian Affairs* (Ont.) 5669, (ii).  
*Inspection of Staples* (salaries, &c.) 5586 (ii).  
*Legislation* (distribution of Blue Books to Law Associations) 5738, (ii); (voters' lists) 2281 (i).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, &c.) 5120, 5177 (ii).  
*Militia* (arms, equipment, &c.) 9145 (iii); (military stores) 5424 (ii).  
*Public Works* : Buildings (N.S.) 7613, 7615 (iii); Ont., 7625 (iii); (Patent Office) 5094; Ottawa (electric lighting) 5196 (ii); (repairs, &c.) 7690, 7693 (iii). Dredging (plant) 8137 (iii). Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 8081 (iii). Wharfs (N.S.) 7698, 7709 (iii); Ont., 7967, 8003 (iii); (Port Colborne) 9255, 9264 (iii); Que., 8136 (iii); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 7561, 7571, 7585 (iii); Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 5204 (ii).  
*Railways*—I.C.R. (accommodation, St. John) 7170.

**Bennett, Mr. W. H.—Con.**

- Yukon Administration, Charges against, par. in *North British Daily Mail*, on M. (Mr. Davin) to Com. of Sup., 8062 (iii).  
**Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Beauharnois.**  
 Address, on The, 1197 (i).  
 Anticosti Island, Pub. Works Inspection Trip, Name of Str., &c. (Ques.) 1880, 2188 (i).  
 — Cost of Trip (M. for Rep.\*) 2789 (i).  
 See Pub. Works.  
 Baie de Chaleurs Ry. Agreement, Contract, Expenses, &c. (M. for Cor., O.Cs., Stmt.\*) 2028.  
 Beauharnois Canal, Damage to Farm Lands by overflowing (remarks) 4859 (ii).  
 — Dismissals, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5411 (ii).  
 — Lock Labourers, Appmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3267 (i).  
 — Water Power, Improvement of (Ques.) 1883 (i).  
 See Valleyfield.  
 Beet Root Sugar, Bounty for Manufacture, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4844 (ii).  
 Colpron, Mr. Jos. N., Claims against Govt. for services performed, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 2191 (i).  
 Companies Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8775 (iii).  
 Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 171 (Sir *Wilfred Laurier*) in Com., 9728 (iii).  
 Coteau Landing, Contract for Dredging, Papers, Letters, &c. (M. for copy \*) 2026 (i).  
 Counterfeit Bills, Circulation, &c. (remarks) 5206 (ii).  
 Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 36 (Mr. Britton) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 2162 (i).  
 Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. B. 182 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 8753 (iii).  
 Dep. Speaker, Delegation of Powers, out of order, 5483, 5491 (ii).  
 Dry Docks Construction B. 177 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8758 (iii).  
 Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 118 (Mr. *Savard*) in Com., 6971 (iii).  
 Grenville Canal, Toll Collector, Appmt. and Dismissal (Ques.) 2532 (i).  
 Inland Fisheries, Issue of Licenses by Local Govt. (remarks) 2910 (i).  
 Inland Revenue Act, Violation *re* Seizure of Tobacco (remarks) 10227 (iii).  
 Insolvency Legislation, Cor. from Boards of Trade (remarks) 4997 (ii).  
 — (M. for cor., &c.\*) 5944 (ii).  
 I.C.R., Cars constructed and purchased by Govt., Name of Firm, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3945, 4179 (ii).  
 — Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4367, 4374, 4405, 4434, 4472, 4622 (ii).  
 — Order, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4449 (ii).

**Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—Con.**

- I.C.R. Reading Bill clause by clause, 4647 (ii).  
 ——— Tenders for Oil, &c., (M. for Ret. \*) 2028.  
 Langevin, August, Purchase of Land from, &c. (Ques.) 6561 (ii).  
 McDonald, A. R., Inquiry for Papers respecting Dismissal, &c., 8757 (iii).  
 McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., and Farm Lands, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) 4497 (ii).  
 ——— Letter read by P.M.G., Violation of Rules of House, 5006 (ii).  
 Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. Lemieux) on amt. (Mr. Monet) 6098 (ii).  
 Montreal Judicial District, Additional Judges (remarks) 7235 (iii).  
 Ottawa City, Indemnification, &c., and Govtl. intention to other cities, &c. (Ques.) 6379 (ii).  
 ——— Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 9611; in Com., 9629 (iii).  
 Personal Explanation, par. in *La Patrie*, 1953.  
 Postal Notes, Lost through Transmission (remarks) 10226 (iii).  
 Preferential Trade with Great Britain, on amt. (Sir Charles Tupper) to Com. of Sup., 7950 (iii).  
 Printing Com., 3rd, 4th and 5th Repr. of Com. (stationery) on M. (Mr. Gibson) to conc., 5381.  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, Discussion, &c. (remarks) 9466 (iii).  
 Pub. Accounts Com., Delay in Meeting (Man. Election Frauds) on M. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to adjn., 3242 (i).  
 Pub. Works, Inspection, Expenses of Tour, &c., Name of Str., &c. (Ques.) 1886 (i).  
 See Anticosti.  
 Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 7670 (iii).  
 Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 178 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 9688 (iii).  
 Quebec Harbour Commissioners Bill, Injurious Legislation (remarks) 9596 (iii).  
 ——— Opinion of Min. of Jus. (remarks) 9700.  
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 9731.  
 ——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 9315, 9423, 9470, 9494, 9517, 9553; in Com. on Bill, 9771 (iii).  
 Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 1°, 3471; in Com., 6803, (ii); 6940, 6947, 6963, 6983 (iii).  
 Returns, Inquiry for, 9700, 9845 (iii).  
 St. Lawrence Channel, Protection to Navigation (remarks) 3343 (ii).  
 Senate and House of Commons Act Further Amt. B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9846 (iii).  
 Soulanges Canal, Amount expended in construction to 1899 (Ques.) 2117 (i).  
 ——— (Secs. 1, 2) Contracts, Advertisements, &c. (M. for Cor., O.C.'s, &c. \*) 2028 (i) 9701 (iii).  
 ——— (Secs. 4, 5, 6, 7) Contracts, Advertisements, &c. (M. for Cor., O.C.'s, &c. \*) 2028 (i).

**Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—Con.****SUPPLY:**

- Administration of Justice*: Yukon (additional Judge) 10191; (living expenses) 10194; conc., 10217 (iii).  
*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (archives) 8224; (experimental farms) 8262; (Paris Exhibition) 10142; (year book) 8226 (iii).  
*Canals*: Beauharnois (steel bridge, surveys, &c.) 7450, conc., 10201; Cornwall (enlargement) 7298; Galops (enlargement) 7445; Lachine (enlargement) 7297; Lake St. Louis (deepening) 7298; Rapide Plat (enlargement) 7299; Soulanges (construction) 7295 (iii).  
*Civil Government*: Geological Survey (salaries) 2106; Justice (salaries) 2065 (i); Post Office, 7330; (contingencies) 7358 (iii); Public Works (contingencies) 7554; (salaries) 7536, 7545 (iii); Privy Council (salaries) 2060; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 2107 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues* (letters of credit) 8191; (repairs, &c., to dock) 8179 (iii).  
*Customs*: B.C. (contingencies, &c.) 8460 (iii).  
*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8496; (St. Paul des Métis, seed grain, &c.) 9030, 9036 (iii).  
*Indians*: Ont. and Que. (Mr. J. B. Brosseau, services, &c.) 10110 (iii); (Que.) 5699 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (restaurant keeper) 10137 (iii); (voters' lists) 2295, 2306 (i).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (salaries, &c.) 3527 (ii).  
*Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions* (G. B. and Can.) 8668; (Murray Bay and Ouelle River) 10159; (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 10157 (iii).  
*Militia* (annual drill) 5414, 5418 (ii); (armouries) 9129; (arms, equipment, &c.) 9145, 9149; (clothing) 7101, 7115, 7119, 9127; (compensation to Octave Oulette) 9128 (iii); (military properties) 5421; (salaries) 5421 (ii); (stores, &c.) 7097 (iii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Chas. Bremner, compensation, &c.) 10113; (Wentworth vs. Mathieu, litigation) 10113 (iii).  
*Ocean and River Service* (Bear River, removal of old piers) 10161 (iii).  
*Penitentiaries* (B.C.) 5480; (Dorchester) 5475; (St. Vincent de Paul) 5477 (ii).  
*Post Office* (mail service) 7366; Yukon mail service) 7360 (iii).  
*Public Works*: Buildings (N.S.) 7618 (iii); Ont., 7626; (Alexandria Reformatory) 9660; (electric lighting) 9940; (elevator Eastern Block) 9960; Ottawa, (lighting, repairs, &c.) 9969; (repairs, &c.) 7690; (Rideau Hall) 7692; (steel shelving) 9969; (Que.) 7619; Dredging (plant) 8137; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Salmon River freight shed) 9997; (Wharfs), 7705; (Yarmouth breakwater) 9999; Ont., 7991; (Kaministiquia) 7611; (Toronto Harbour) 10067; Que., 8103; (Beauport wharf) 10039; (Caouans wharf) 10016; (Cap à L'Aigle wharf) 10017; (Coteau, dredging) 10039; (Gédéon wharf) 10019; (Isle aux Grues, wharf, &c.) 10018; (Kamouraska wharf) 10018; (Knowlton Landing) 10020; (Montreal Harbour improvements) 9964, 9969, 9975; (Newport breakwater) 10014; (Rivière du Lièvre) 10039; (Ste. Anne de Bellevue wharf) 10039; (Ste. Irénée wharf) 10018; (St. Jerome wharf) 10018; (Sabrevois wharf) 10020, conc. (amt.) 10219; St. Lawrence ship

**Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—Con.**

**SUPPLY—Con.**

**Public Works—Con.**

channel) 7557, 7579, 7662; Yukon (buildings) 10107; (Lewes and Yukon river improvements) 8192; Telegraph (B.C. and Teslin Lake) 10100 (iii); (Telegraph lines) 5616, 5624, 5644, (ii); 10095 (trails, roads and bridges) 10091 (iii).

**Railways—I.C.R. (accommodation at St. John) 7272, 7401, 7416; (A. R. McDonald, dismissal, &c.) 7276, 9168; (dismissal of Bernier) conc. 10204; (increased station accommodation) 9163; (rolling stock) 7434; (St. John elevator) 9163; P. E. I. (removal of curves) 7396 (iii).**

**Yukon Provisional District: Militia (food, clothing, transportation, &c.) 9067, 9089, 9096; (salaries, &c.) 8658 (iii).**

**Travelling Expenses of Minister of Public Works and Private Secretary (Ques.) 1880 (i).**

**Tuberculosis Inspection in Chicoutimi County, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 5097 (ii).**

**Valleyfield Customs Collector, Charges against, &c., on M. to Com. of Sup., 5501 (ii).**

**Valleyfield, Lease of Land, &c. (Ques.) 1815 (i).**

— **Public Buildings, Erection of (Ques.) 1882 (i).**

— **Water Power, Deepening of Bay (Ques.) 1882 (i).**

*See Beauharnois.*

**Veldt, Rabbi, Dismissal as Chaplain St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary (remarks) 10246 (iii).**

**Veterans of 1864-65, Issue of Medals, &c. (Ques.) 1853 (i).**

**Voters' Lists, Printing, &c. (remarks) 6827 (iii).**

**Votes and Proceedings, Typographical errors (remarks) 6120 (ii).**

**Winding Up Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8781 (iii).**

**Bernier, Mr. M. E., St. Hyacinthe.**

**Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 18) 1<sup>st</sup>, 700 (i).**

**Bertram, Mr. G. H., Centre Toronto.**

**Address, on The, (amt.) to amt. (Mr. Clarke) 1514; agreed to (Y. 101; N. 48) 1811 (i).**

**Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com., 4980 (ii).**

**Can. Birkbeck Investment and Savings Co. incorp. (B. 106) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2529 (i).**

**Canadian Inland Transportation Co.'s incorp. (B. 51) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1352 (i).**

**Canadian Power Co., Change of Title (B. 77) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2029 (i).**

**Grain Elevators, N.W.T., on M. (Mr. Davin) to Com. of Sup., 5500 (ii).**

**Guarantee and Pension Fund Society of Dom. Bank, Change of Title (B. 100) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2409 (i).**

**Nipissing and James' Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 33) 1<sup>st</sup>, 974 (i).**

**Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 6719 (ii).**

**Bertram, Mr. G. H.—Con.**

**SUPPLY:**

**Canals: Trent (construction) 7313 (iii.)**

**Trade Mark and Design Act Amt. (B. 39) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1073; 2<sup>o</sup>, n., 1947 (i).**

**Bethune, Mr. J. L., Victoria, N.S.**

**Baddeck, N. S., Erection of Drill Shed (Ques.) 2111 (i).**

**Militia, 94th Battalion, Increase of Force (Ques.) 2111 (i).**

**SUPPLY:**

**Militia and Defence (annual drill) 5059 (ii).**

**Quarantine (prevention of tuberculosis among cattle) 8344 (ii).**

**Victoria Co., N.S., Patronage on M. (Mr. Mc Dougall) to adjn., 5403 (i).**

**Blair, Hon. A. G., Sunbury and Queen's.**

**Arichat Breakwater, N. S., Repairs, &c., Amount expended from 1891 to 1896 (Ans.) 5485**

**Babin's Cove Wharf, Arichat, N.S., Cost of Construction, &c. (Ans.) 5496 (ii).**

**Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co., Amounts paid by Govt. (Ans.) 1843 (i).**

**Balsam Lake, Removal of Stone Piles (Ans.) 2333 (i).**

**Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. Préfontaine) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 3487 (ii).**

**Beauharnois Canal, Lock Labourers, Appmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3268 (i).**

**Business of the House (remarks) 9177 (iii).**

**Canada Eastern Ry., N.B., Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 1814 (i); 3554, 3824 (ii).**

**Cars, Official or Private, Number, Cost of Construction (Ans.) 1835 (i).**

**C. P. R. Act (1881) Powers respecting Branch Lines, &c. (remarks) 3315 (i).**

**C. P. R. and Great North-west Central, Survey of Branch line (Ans.) 2532 (i).**

— **Tariff on Hay, Straw, &c., Approval by O.C. (Ans.) 4057 (ii).**

— **Powers, &c., respecting Branch Lines (Ans.) 9309 (iii).**

**Chambly Canal, Emplmt. of Geo. Peppin by Govt. (Ans.) 3821 (ii).**

— **Investigation (Ans.) 3553 (ii).**

**Cornwall Canal, Award of Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1853 (i).**

**Coulombe vs. The Queen, Enforcement of Conviction, &c. (Ans.) 4479 (ii).**

**Crow's Nest Pass Ry. and C.P.R., Rates and Tolls, Revision of by Gov. in Council (Ans.) 2331 (i).**

**Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. Paterson) in 1<sup>st</sup> Com., 6446 (ii).**

**Descousse Wharf, N.S., Cost of Construction, &c. (Ans.) 5486 (ii).**

**Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. Casey) on M. to ref. B. to Sel. Com., 2155, 2930 (i); (amt.) withdn., 3849 (ii).**

**Blair, Hon. A. G.—Con.**

- Dredging in Richmond Co., N.S., Amount expended from 1891 to 1896 (Ans.) 5485 (ii).
- Drill Hall Vancouver, B.C., Contract, Cost &c. (Ans.) 5487 (ii).
- Drummond County Ry., on Inquiry (Sir *Charles Tupper*) for papers, 2697 (i).
- on Inquiry for Ret., 2973 (i).
- Drummond County Ry. See "I.C.R."
- Dry Docks Construction B. 177 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8758 (iii).
- Dunn Avenue, Ry. Crossing, Toronto, Protection to (Ans.) 1858 (i).
- Eastern Extension, Claims of N.S. Govt. (Ans.) 3551 (ii).
- Elevator at Halifax, Construction and Completion (Ans.) 2332 (i).
- General Inspection Act. Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 9639 (iii).
- Govt. Rys., Working Expenses for May and June, 1898 (Ans.) 4810 (ii).
- Grand River Floods, Govt. Report (remarks) 2536 (i).
- G. T. R. Trackmen's Strike, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to Com. of Sup., 3775 (ii).
- on M. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) to adjn., 3968.
- on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4506 (ii).
- Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. *Macpherson*) on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) to M. for 3°, 4196 (ii).
- Grenville Canal, Compensation for Damages, &c. (Ans.) 4992 (ii).
- Maintenance of Roadways on Farms (Ans.) 6049 (ii).
- letter of Mr. G. S. Conway (Ans.) 6381.
- Toll Collector, Appnmt. and Dismissal (Ans.) 2532 (i).
- I. C. R., Addition to Workshops at Rivière du Loup (Ans.) 4480-81 (ii).
- Alba Section, Number of Employes (Ans.) 5310 (ii).
- Appnmt. of Supt. W. A. Dubé, Removal of Headquarters (Ans.) 2533 (i).
- Blanchette, Mr. Eugène, Reinstatement by Govt. (Ans.) 5859 (ii).
- Cars built and purchased, Name of Firm, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3553, 3946, 4479 (ii).
- Contract for Ties, Names of Tenderers (Ans.) 5308 (ii).
- Delay in furnishing Cars, Complaints, &c. (Ans.) 1853 (i).
- Demers, Dr., Ry. Bicycle Riding, &c. (Ans.) 5309 (ii).
- District Supt. Oulette, Suspension, &c. (Ans.) 1859 (i).
- Employees, Wages, Working hours, &c. (Ans.) 1860, 1974 (i).
- Employees at Lévis, and Provincial Election, Transfer, &c., Instruction to Mr. Desjardins, &c. (Ans.) 3260 (i).
- Engine and Car Mileage, &c., (Ans.) 4811.

**Blair, Hon. A. G.—Con.**

- I. C. R., Expenditure on Capital and Revenue (Ans.) 2531 (i).
- Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) prop. Res., 1949; M. for Com. on Res., 2792; agreed to (Y. 80, N. 38) 2842; in Com. on Res., 2843 (i); 3351, 3700; 1°, m., 3765; 2°, m. 3907, 4152, in Com., 4165; 3°, m., 4733, 4899, 4920, 4925; 3°, agreed to (Y. 91, N. 40) 4965.
- on Inquiry for Papers, 2249 (i).
- on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 2809 (i).
- G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*), prop. Res., 3946; in Com. on Res., 4062; (M.) to conc. in Res., 4170; 1°, 4170; 2° m., 4171; in Com., 4353-76, 4554-4711; 3° agreed to (Y. 91, N. 40) 4967 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9702 (iii).
- amounts accrued and paid to G.T.R. since July, 1898 (Ans.) 4478 (ii).
- papers respecting Car Mileage (presented) 4891 (ii).
- revenue collected, &c. (Ans.) 1856 (i).
- Flour Rates and Car Mileage, &c., Papers laid on the Table, 4730 (ii).
- Fraserville Station Accommodation, Pets. from Board of Trade, &c. (Ans.) 1974 (i).
- pets., &c., re Disorderly Conduct (Ans.) 2899 (i).
- Freight carried from 1897-9, Number of tons and receipts (Ans.) 3257 (i).
- Freight Rates on Flour, 1896-8 (Ans.) 3549 (ii).
- Gillis, Frank A., Station Agent at Tracadie, N.S., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4056 (ii).
- Gosselin, Mr. F., Emplmnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3827 (ii).
- G.T.R. Combined Engine and Car Mileage, Expenditure, &c., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Ret., 5314 (ii).
- Green Sand Castings, Tenders, Price, &c. (Ans.) 5860 (ii).
- Gross Earnings and Expenses (Ans.) 1849 (i).
- Harris, Mr., Agreement with as Traffic Manager (Ans.) 1975 (i).
- Headquarters at Lévis, Transfer, &c. (Ans.) 3551 (ii).
- LeBlanc, Mr. A. T., Emplmnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1964 (i).
- Locomotive Engineers, Number employed, &c. (Ans.) 9698 (iii).
- McDonald, Mr. A. R., Dismissal as Supt. (Ans.) 1971 (i), 4812-3; 5098 (ii), 8757 (ii).
- McDougall, Mr. Bruce, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 7194 (iii).
- Machinery at Rivière du Loup, Application by Supt. for Additions, &c. (Ans.) 4481 (ii).
- Michaud, Mr. Eugène, Granting of Ry. Pass, &c. (Ans.) 2904 (i).

**Blair, Hon. A. G.—Con.**

- I. C. R., Morrison, Mr. Hugh, Riverside, Claim for Damages (Ans.) 5310 (ii).
- Newspaper Agencies, Lessees, &c. (Ans.) 1971 (i).
- New Time Table (Ans.) 4781 (ii).
- Number of Employees, Wages Paid, &c. (Ans.) 2332 (i).
- Passes issued since Aug., 1896, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1860 (i).
- Pichette, Mr., Privileges at Lévis Station (Ans.) 4993 (ii).
- Receipts and Expenditures, Stmt. of Acts. (remarks) 2791 (i).
- Removal of Shops from Rivière du Loup to Lévis (Ans.) 2533 (i).
- Reynolds, Capt., Str. "Mulgrave," Complaints against (Ans.) 5309 (ii).
- Roberge, Cyrille, Dismissal of (Ans.) 1857 (i).
- Rolling Stock Expenditure (remarks) 6562 (ii).
- Running Privileges for C.P.R. between St. John and Halifax (remarks) 2247 (i).
- Salaries of Employees at Rivière du Loup Workshops (Ans.) 4481 (ii).
- Snow Shovelling, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 1964 (i).
- Steel Rails, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 1814, 2328 (i).
- Valcouer, Octave, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5309 (ii).
- Lachute and St. Andrews Ry. Cor., Contracts, Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. *Christie*) for Copies, 4809 (ii).
- Lake St. Louis, Removal of Shoals, Representations from Shippers, &c. (Ans.) 2331 (i).
- Langevin, August, Purchase of Land from, &c. (Ans.) 6561 (ii).
- Lévis, Purchase of Property, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 8468 (iii).
- McDonald, A. R., on Inquiry (Mr. *Bergeron*) for papers respecting Dismissal, 8757 (iii).
- See I. C. R.
- McLaren's Creek, Construction of a Roadway (Ans.) 3257 (i).
- McLaughlin, R. J., and Farmers of Lindsay *re* Damages by Floods, &c. (remarks) 4485, 4490, 5002 (ii).
- McNeill, Stephen, Beaver Cove, Rental charged by Govt. (Ans.) 3944 (ii).
- Military Stores, 8th Hussars, Sale of by I. C. R. (Ans.) 1858 (i).
- Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co's B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on amt. (Mr. *Monet*) 6094 (ii).
- Northern Commercial Telegraph Co. and Cor. with Ministers of the Crown, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to Com. of Sup., 5527, 5536 (ii).
- Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co., Correction in Speech 9700 (iii).

**Blair, Hon. A. G.—Con.**

- Personal Explanation, par in Montreal *Star re* Wharf at St. John, 7326 (iii).
- (Mr. *Prior*) *re* Vote on Kettle River Ry. Bill, 9596 (iii).
- Pigeon River Swing Bridge, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2480 (i).
- Port Colborne and Port Dalhousie, Harbour Improvements, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCleary*) 3282 (i).
- Powers, Mr. Thos., Lease of Govt. land at Lévis, &c. (Ans.) 3259 (i).
- P. E. I. Ry. and Murray Harbour (B. 183) 1<sup>o</sup>, 8989; in Com., 9753 (iii).
- straightening Curves at North Wiltshire, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1854 (i).
- Quebec Bridge, Tenders for Construction, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2112 (i).
- Ry. Act. Amt. (B. 85) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2108 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 3503 (ii); in Com., 9731 (iii).
- Commissioners, Establishment of a Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 3870 (ii).
- Deptl. Rep. (presented) 249 (i).
- Legislation *re* Working Rules (remarks) 5748 (ii).
- Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Ry. Cos., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4745 (ii).
- Regulations, American Standard, Adoption by Can. Rys. (Ans.) 1969 (i).
- Subsidies (B. 190) in Com. on Res., 9197, 9311-9459, 9467-9594; 1<sup>o</sup>, 9597; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 9758; in Com., 9760, 9815; (M.) to ref. back to Com. of the Whole (amts.) 9894; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 9893 (iii).
- Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6941, 6956, 6974 (ii).
- Roche Fendue and Calumet Dams, Claims for Damages, &c. (Ans.) 1855 (i).
- Rosedale Swing Bridge, Expenditure, Amount contributed by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 2333 (i).
- Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. *McDougall*) 4997 (ii) 7772 (iii).
- Northern Telegraph Co., and Cor. with Ministers, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 5409 (ii).
- Returns, on Inquiry for, 9310, 9700 (iii).
- St. Francis Lake, Channel Improvements (Ans.) 1853 (i).
- St. Ours Lock, Dismissal of Supt. Coderre, &c. (Ans.) 3552 (ii).
- St. Peter's Canal, Amount expended from 1891 to 1896, &c. (Ans.) 3255 (i).
- Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Facilities, Res. of N.W.T. Assembly (Ans.) 3255 (i).
- Secord, Mr. T. R., Supt. on Welland Canal, Charges against (Ans.) 1833 (i).
- Soulanges Canal, Amount expended in Construction to 1899 (Ans.) 2117 (i).
- Arbitration, Land Valuators, Appnmts. and Dismissal (Ans.) 2333 (i).
- Stock, David, Relief B. 88 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3490 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

## SUPPLY :

*Canals*: Beauharnois (steel bridge and surveys, &c.) 7450; Chambly (surveying property, &c.) 7454 (iii); (telephone lines) 5783 (ii); Cornwall (enlargement) 7298; (payment to A. P. Ross) 9176 (iii); (repairs to locks) 5784; Faran's Point (enlargement) 5779 (ii); Galops (enlargement) 7299, 7443; Lachine (Atwater Avenue wall) 9173 (iii); (deepening River St. Pierre) 5781 (ii); (enlargement) 7297; (Heny & Borthwick claim) 9173; Lake St. Louis (deepening) 7298; Murray (Landing Station) 7454 (iii); (North Channel) 5779 (ii); Rainy River (lock and dam) 9173; Rapide Plat (enlargement) 7299; Rideau (Kilmarnock Cut) 7454; Soulanges (construction) 7295; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 7296; Sault Ste. Marie (Ryan & Co.'s claims) 9237; Trent (construction) 7299 (iii); (gratuity to W. Quinn) 5782 (ii); (rebuilding Cowan's Bridge) 9172; (Rosedale Bridge) 7318; Welland (bridges, &c.) 7454 (iii); (rebate to Forwarding Co.) 5794; (refund for damages to lock) 5792; (remission of arrears of rental) 5790 (ii); (repairs, &c.) 7463 (iii).

*Civil Government*: Railways and Canals (salaries) 2250 (i); 6383 (ii).

*Customs*: B.C. (contingencies, &c.) 8458 (iii); (suspense account, Montreal) 5592 (ii).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (voters' lists) 2296 (i).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (supplies, &c.) 3537 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions* (St. John and Liverpool) 8671 (iii).

*Militia* (stores, &c.) 7096; (Yukon supplies) 7046 (iii).

*Miscellaneous* (International Commission) 5852 (ii).

*Post Office* (Mail service) 7336 (iii).

*Public Works*: Buildings, Ottawa (electric lighting) 5192 (ii); Harbours and Rivers, N.B., 7763; (Campobello breakwater) 10010; (Cape Tormentine breakwater) 10011; (Hopewell wharf) 10010; (Main River wharf) 10012; (St. John River and Belleisle wharfs) 10011; (St. Nicholas wharf) 10010; (Shippegan wharf) 10012; N.S. (wharfs) 7737; Que. (Lévis dock, enlargement) 9968; Ont. (Port Colborne) 9292; Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 8148 (iii).

*Quarantine* (cattle, salaries, &c.) 5084 (ii).

*Railways*: C. P. R. (land damages) 7153; I. C. R. (accommodation, St. John) 7155, 7242, 7401 (iii); (A. R. McDonald's dismissal, &c.) 7276 9168; (car couplers) 9171; Miscellaneous (code of rules) 9175; (elevator, Halifax) 9172; (freight rates) 7457; (increased siding accommodation) 9156; (increased station accommodation) 9163; (Indian town Branch, Mr. Snowball's claim) 9165; (installation of Pintsch gas) 9172; (land damages) 7154; (original construction) 7155; (passenger coach) 9172; (Point Tupper improvement) 9171; (refrigerator care) 9172 (iii); (rolling stock) 5754 (ii); (rolling stock) 7432, 7461; St. John accommodation) 9164; (St. John elevator) 9163 (iii); (shops at Moncton) 5753 (ii); (telegraph service) 9171; (uniforms) 7456; miscellaneous, 7455; (expenses of Ry. Com. of P.C.) 9175; (Ottawa river) 9176 (iii); (repairs to "Victoria") 5785; (subsidies to Central Ry. Co.) 5789 (ii); P.E.I., 7462 (iii); (Mount Stewart wharf) 5754, 5771 (ii); (Murray

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*SUPPLY—*Con.**Railways—Con.*

Harbour, &c., construction) 9211; (removal of curves) 7389 (iii).

*Yukon Provisional District*: Militia (clothing contract) 9111; Railways (surveys, &c.) 8700 (iii).  
Tate's Dry Dock, Montreal, Rent, Lessees, &c. (Ans.) 1832 (i).

Trent Canal, Jordan, Mr. Wm., Claims for Land Damages (Ans.) 1977 (i).

— Land Valuations, Complaints, &c. (Ans.) 5311 (ii).

— Payments to Mr. F. D. Moore by Govt. (Ans.) 5311 (ii).

— Payment of Workmen (Ans.) 1977 (i).

— Purchase of Land for Dam at Nassau (Ans.) 1857 (i).

Trueman, Mr. W. H., Appmt. to Rys. and Canals Dept. (Ans.) 4483 (ii).

Valleyfield, Lease of Land, &c. (Ans.) 1815 (i).

Borden, Hon. F. W., *King's, N.S.*

Active Militia Force, Resignation of Majors (Ans.) 5488 (ii).

Ammunition, Amount issued to 7th Battalion, London (Ans.) 1957 (i).

Annapolis Public Buildings, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 2701 (i).

Baddeck, N.S., Erection of Drill Shed (Ans.) 2111 (i).

Biggar, J. L., Appmt. by Govt., Qualifications, &c. (Ans.) 3550 (ii).

Bliiss, Maj. D. C. F., Positions held under Govt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3261 (i) 3335, 3552 (ii).

Boston and Alaskan Transportation Co., Contract with Can. Govt. (Ans.) 1829 (i).

Brevet Promotions, Permanent Force, Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 3550 (ii).

Can. Service Medals, Delay in issuing, Board of Claims, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 2699 (i).

— Recommendation by Militia Dept. Terms &c., (Ans.) 3945 (ii).

See "Gen. Service Medals," &c.

Deadman's Island, Lease, &c., 1640 (i).

— Ret. laid on Table, 3959 (ii).

See "Stanley Park," &c.

Demers, Major, Claims against Govt. (Ans.) 1833 (i).

Dom. Rifle Association, Annual Grant by Govt. of Transport and Fees to Limited Number, on prop. Res. (Mr. Hughes) 2360 (i).

Domville, Lt.-Col., Charges against (Ans.) 1840, 1845 (i).

— Leave of Absence from Command of 8th Hussars (Ans.) 2898 (i).

— par. in St. John Sun (Ans.) 2899 (i).

Fredericton Military School, Recommendations for Admission and Instruction &c. (Ans.) 3795.

General Service Medals, Date of Royal Warrant, Govtl. Action, &c. (Ans.) 8630 (iii).

See Can. Service Medals.

**Borden, Hon. F. W.—Con.**

- Imperial Service and Can. Brigade and Can. Seamen, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2350 (i).  
 — MacAuley Point, B.C., on Inquiry for Papers, &c., 5489 (ii).  
 Lévis Forts, Contract for Cordwood, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3083 (i).  
 Lévis Military Camp, Qualifications of Officers, Percentage, &c. (Ans.) 8632, 9309 (iii).  
 McKenzie, Francis, and Instructions at Fredericton Military School (Ans.) 2485, 2699, 2899 (i).  
 Medals, Can. Service, Notice in Can. *Gazette* re Clasps, Ribbons, &c. (Ans.) 3083 (i).  
 — Claims allowed by Commission, Distribution, &c. (Ans.) 5869 (ii).  
 — Regulations respecting (Ans.) 7320 (ii).  
 See "Can. Service Medals."  
 Military School, Fredericton, N.B., Admissions for Instruction, Recommendations, &c. (Ans.) 3335 (ii).  
 Militia Act Amt., Intention of Govt. (Ans.) 3551 (ii).  
 — Age Limits, Service of Lt.-Cols., Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 1852 (i).  
 — Army Service Corps, Recommendation or Repts. of Maj.-Gen. (Ans.) 9697 (iii).  
 — Battalion 94th, Increase of Force (Ans.) 2111 (i).  
 — Hussars 8th, N.B., Annual Allowance (Ans.) 3073 (i).  
 Military Canteens and Sale of Liquor, par. in *Ottawa Citizen* re Ont. Alliance, Ques. of Privilege, 7322 (iii).  
 — names of Contractors, &c. (Ans.) 4807 (ii).  
 — Deptl. Rep. (presented) 421 (i).  
 — Force, Artillery Instruction in Eng., Examinations, &c. (Ans.) 2330 (i).  
 — Force, Officers appointed in 1898, Requirements as to Qualifications (Ans.) 2329 (i).  
 — List and Certificates of Qualification (Ans.) 2329 (i).  
 — Officers at Lévis Camp, Number passed Qualifying Exams. (Ans.) 8632, 9309 (iii).  
 — Regulations re French and English Language, Enforcement, &c. (Ans.) 8631 (iii).  
 — Permanent Corps, Pension System, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2719 (i).  
 — Regulations as to Age Limit for Lt.-Cols., Retirements, &c. (Ans.) 2183 (i).  
 — presented to Parl. (Ans.) 3550 (ii).  
 — Stores, 8th Hussars, Transfer, Orders from Dept., &c. (Ans.) 2898 (i).  
 Permanent Force, Appointment, Qualifications, &c. (Ans.) 3550 (ii).  
 Plains of Abraham, Expiry of Lease, Memorials, &c. (Ans.) 1835 (i).  
 Powers, Mr. Thos., Lease of Govt. Land at Lévis, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 3082, 3259 (i).  
 Quebec Cartridge Factory, Dismissal of Labourers, &c. (Ans.) 2186 (i); 9843 (iii).

**Borden, Hon. F. W.—Con.**

- Regimental Establishments, Lists submitted to Parl. (Ans.) 3550 (ii).  
 Returns, on Inquiry for (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3558 (ii).  
 Rifle Ranges, B.C., Applications and Pets., &c. (Ans.) 5485 (ii).  
 Rifles, Sale of by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 1817 (i).  
 Royal Military College Inspection, Regulations, re (Ans.) 3796 (ii).  
 — Clothing Contract (Ans.) 6722 (ii) 6933 (iii).  
 Samson, Mr. Pierre, Caretaker at St. Joseph de Lévis Fort, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3082 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

- Civil Government*: Customs (contingencies) 2984  
 Militia and Defence (contingencies) 2266 (i); (clerical assistance) 5012 (ii); (armouries) 9125 (iii); (annual drill) 5060, 5414 (ii); 7062; (armament, &c.) 7152 (iii); (arms, &c., accoutrements) 5466 (ii); 9142 (iii); (clothing) 5443 (ii); 7099, 7110, 9126; (compensation to Mrs. F. E. Stewart) 9131; (compensation to Mrs. Maxwell) 9131; (compensation to Octave Oulette) 9127; conc., 30218 (iii); (defence scheme) 5465 (ii); (Esquimaux defence) 7151; (Govt. Cartridge Factory) 7151 (iii); (Hamilton rifle range) 5465 (ii); (litigation expenses) 9127 (iii); (London property) 5165 (ii); (MacAuley Point claim) 9141 (iii); (military properties) 5421; (military stores) 5423 (miscellaneous and unforeseen) 5451, 7148 (ii); (monuments) 7152; (pay allowance) 7002, 7153; (properties) 7088; (provisions, &c.) 7126; (rifle ranges) 9144 (iii); (rifle range, B.C.), conc., 6389; (Royal Military College) 5464 (ii); 7024; 7140; (stores, &c.) 7091 (iii); (salaries) 2070 (i); 5420 (ii); 7076 (iii); (transport) 5451 (ii); 7130 (iii); (unforeseen expenses) 5357 (ii); (Yukon supplies) 7038 (iii) (contract for supplies) 6321; (transportation, &c.), 6321; (transportation and supplies) 6339-6360 (ii).  
*Public Works*: Buildings, (N.S.) 7614; Ont.) London drill hall) 9961; (Royal Military College) 9960; (St. Catharines drill hall) 9957; (Ottawa military store) 9942.  
*Railways*: I.C.R. (accommodation, St. John) 7157, 7177, 7179, 7188 (iii).  
*Yukon Provisional District*: Militia (food, clothing, transportation, &c.) 9066, 9092 (iii).  
 Stanley Park and Deadman's Island, O.C.'s, Cor., &c., between Can. Govt. and B.C. on M. (Mr. *Prior*) for Copies, 2335 (i).  
 See "Deadman's Island."  
 Strathy, Mr. J. A. L., Reinstatement as Lt.-Col. (Ans.) 2329 (i).  
 Sussex, N.B., Erection of Drill Shed (Ans.) 1857 (i).  
 Veterans of 1866 and 1870, Issue of Medals, &c. (Ans.) 1848, 1854, 2114 (i).  
 — Volunteers organized in Chicago, Eligibility for Medals (Ans.) 2704 (i).  
 — of 1885, Issue of Scrip and Medals, Applications, &c. (Ans.) 2701 (i).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3894 (ii).

**Borden, Hon. F. W.—Con.**

- Wolseley Barracks, London, Land purchased, Price, &c. (Ans.) 1840 (i).  
 Yukon, Freight Transportation, Guarantee by Contractors, &c. (Ans.) 2902 (i).  
 ——— Militia, Strength of Force, Cost of Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 1831 (i).  
 ——— Cost of Transportation, &c. (Ans.) 1842; 1892 (i).

**Borden, Mr. R. L., Halifax.**

- Address, on The, 885, 895 (i).  
 Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Peterson, Tate & Co.'s Bond, Payment to Govt. (Ques.) 2481 (i).  
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 3763 (ii).  
 Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 3313 (i); on M. for 3°, 3486 (ii).  
 Brockville and West Huron Elections, Notice of M., 6595 (ii).  
 ——— (M.) to place Documents, &c. on Table of Hse. for ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 6723 (ii); 6821 (iii).  
 Clement, Mr. W. H. P., Restrictions and Instruction by Govt., as Legal Adviser to Yukon Council (Ques.) 2322 (i).  
 Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 36 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for 2°, 2172 (i).  
 Deadman's Island, Leases, Value, &c. (Ans.) 1816 (i).  
 Eastern Trust Co's (B. 54) 1°, 1352 (i).  
 Elevator at Halifax, Construction and Completion (Ques.) 2332 (i).  
 Halifax Harbour Lightship and Resolution of Board of Trade (remarks) 8920 (iii).  
 I.C.R. Extension to Montreal-Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3408, 3425, 3560, 3747; on M. for 3°, 4951 (ii).  
 ——— G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4356, 4380, 4399, 4435, 4445, 4562, 4571, 4601, 4689, 4710 (ii).  
 ——— Ques. of Order, Documents quoted, must be laid on Table, 4445 (ii).  
 ——— Starr and De Wolfe's Contract, Rep. of Mr. Shanly, C.E. (M. for copy\*) 2962 (i).  
 Newfoundland Regulations *re* Live Bait (remarks) 2194, 2696 (i); 6938 (iii).  
 Nova Scotia Bank and Jamaica, Issue of Notes Authorization (B. 53) 1°, 1352 (i).  
 Order, Ques. of (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Members abusing Privilege of Ms. to adjn., 6593 (ii).  
 Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9627 (iii).  
 Pub. Accounts Com., Delay in Meeting (Man. Elections Fraud) on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to adjn., 3249 (i).  
 Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 7667 (iii).  
 Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Consolid. Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3928 (ii).

**Borden, Mr. R. L.—Con.**

- Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6650 (ii).  
 Return, Inquiry for, Newfoundland Regulations *re* purchase of Bait by Canadians, 2696 (i).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Civil Govt.*: Customs (contingencies) 2981 (i); Fisheries (contingencies) 5023; Inland Revenue (clerical assistance) 5014 (ii); Post Office, 7340 (iii); (salaries, Dead Letter Branch) 5040, 5054 (ii); Privy Council (salaries) 2052 (i).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (voters' lists) 2298 (i).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service*: (salaries, &c.) 3526 (ii).  
*Militia*: (compensation to Mrs. Maxwell) 9131 (iii).  
*Ocean and River Service*: (maintenance) 3033; (masters and mates) 3059; (wreck investigations) 3064 (i).  
*Public Works*: Buildings (N.B.) 7616; N.S., 9944; (Halifax Quarantine Station) 5089; (Salmon River freight shed) 9997; Ottawa (electric lighting) 9941 (iii).  
*Railways*: I C. R. (rolling stock) 7461 (iii).  
 Tidal Survey, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3521 (ii).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3897 (ii).  
 Winding Up Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com., 4316 (ii).  
 Yukon District, Instructions, &c. to Mr. Ogilvie (M. for Rep.\*) 2027 (i).  
 ——— Liquor Permits to Mr. Peters (M. for cor.\*) 2027 (i).  
 ——— Liquor Permits, Cor. between Mr. Martin and Min. of Int. (M. for papers\*) 2027 (i).  
 ——— Mail Service (1898-99) Efficiency of Contractors, Reps., &c. (M. for cor.) 2705 (i).  
 ——— Registered Letters, &c., Policy of Govt., 3794 (ii).
- Bostock, Mr. H., Yale and Cariboo.**  
 B. C. Legislation *re* Chinese and Foreign Immigration, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 6893 (iii).  
 Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 2646; on amt. (Mr. *Oliver*) to M. for 3°, 2938 (i).  
 Northern Telegraph Co's. Incorp. (B. 7) 1°, 618 (i).  
 Pacific Cable between Australia and Can., Agreement B. (Mr. *Mulock*) on prop. Res., 8372 (iii).  
 Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 7664 (iii).  
 Railway Act. Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9736 (iii).  
 ——— Commissioners, Establishment of Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 3849 (ii).  
 ——— Passes to Members and Senators (B. 37) 1°, 1073; 2° m., 2195 (i).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6681 (ii).  
 Spinks, County Court Judge, B.C., Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4236 (ii).

**Bostock, Mr. H.—Con.**

## SUPPLY:

- Collection of Revenues* (telegraph lines, B. C.) 8188.  
*Customs* (salaries, &c., Yukon) 559 (ii).  
*Public Works: Harbours and Rivers* (B.C.) 8086.

**Bourassa, Mr. J. H. N., Labelle.**

Address, on The, 619 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1932 (i).

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc., 1748 (i).

Fairlie, Mr., Dismissal from Rupert's Land Industrial School (Ques.) 2532 (i).

—— (M. for Reps., Cor.\*) 2788 (i).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) Order (Ques. of) 4651 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8891 (iii).

Senate and H. of C. Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9846 (iii).

## SUPPLY:

- Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8538 (iii).  
*Public Works: Telegraphs* (Anticosti Island) 10079.  
 Ville Marie Bank Suspension, Inspection by Govt. (remarks) 8755 (iii).

**Britton, Mr. B. M., Kingston.**

Address, on The, 311 (i).

Business of the Hse, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take in Mondays, 6280 (ii).

—— (remarks) 7769 (iii).

Calvin Co.'s (B. 9) withdn., 2897 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1929 (i); in Com., 5920 (ii).

Combinations in Restraint of Trade Prevention Act Amt. B. 40 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2°, 1946 (i).

Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2526 (i).

—— (1892) Act Amt. (B. 36) 1°, 974; 2° m., 2160; on Order for 2°, 2527 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 81 (voting machines) 1°, 2035 (i).

Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1921; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2932 (i).

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. *Macpherson*) on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) to M. for 3°, 4197 (ii).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4568.

Joint Stock Companies Act Amt. (B. 114) 1°, 2790 (i).

Naval Brigade Reserve, &c., organized by Can. Govt., Cor., with Imp. Govt., &c. (Ques.) 6048 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. (B. 19) 1°, 700; 2° m., 1862; in Com. (amt.) 1896 (i).

**Britton, Mr. B. M.—Con.**

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Calvert*) in Com., 5354 (ii).

Pacific Cable between Australia and Can. Agreement B. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 8384.

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 173 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8764 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6110 (ii).

Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 7661 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9440, 9494, 9590 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6715 (ii).

Revision of the Statutes, Appnmt. of Commission (Ques.) 1881 (i).

Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 2760 (i).

## SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Paris Exhibition) 10144.  
*Canals—Galops* (enlargement) 7449 (iii); Welland (rebate to Forwarding Co.) 5796; (refund for damages to lock) 5793 (ii).  
*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8572 (iii).  
*Justice, Administration of* (Additional Judge in Ont.) 10122 (iii).  
*Legislation: (stationery supplies)* 5737 (ii); (Voters' Lists) 2308 (i).  
*Militia* (arms, equipment, &c.) 9142; (clothing) 7107; (pay, allowance) 7029; (Royal Military College) 7141 (iii).  
*Post Office* (postmasters' salaries) 5808 (ii).  
*Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont.* (Portsmouth Wharf) 10065 (Port Colborne) 9283 Que., 8123; (Knowlton Landing) 10020; (Montreal Harbour Improvements) 9981 (iii). Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5616 (ii).  
*Quarantine* (cattle, salaries, &c.) 5081 (ii).  
 Winding Up Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 2°, 1874 (i); in Com., 4317 (ii).

**Broder, Mr. A., Dundas.**

Address, on The, 290 (i).

Brockville Election, Name, &c. of Dep. Returning Officer (Ques.) 2322 (i).

Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7961 (iii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8856 (iii).

## SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (illustration stations) 8309 (iii).

**Bruneau, Mr. A. A., Richelieu.**

## SUPPLY:

- Public Works: Harbours and Rivers* (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 7603 (iii).

**Calvert, Mr. W. S., West Middlesex.**

Ammunition, Amount issued to 7th Battalion, London (Ques.) 1956 (i).

Controverted Elections Act: Registrar's Fees, (remarks) 8348 (iii).

**Calvert, Mr. W. S.—*Con.***

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Co.'s incorp. (B. 69) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1949 (i); (M.) for Com., 5042; on M. for Com., 5254 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9441 (iii).

Wolseley Barracks, London, Land purchased, Price, &c. (Ques.) 1840 (i).

**Campbell, Mr. A., *Kent, Ont.***

Address, on The, 1061 (i).

British Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co's (Change of Title)—(B. 57) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1431 (i).

Can. Life Insurance Co. (B. 89) withdn., 4477 (ii).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5935 (ii).

Dom. Permanent Loan Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 6875 (iii).

Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2959 (i).

General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henry Joly*) 9637, 9644 (iii).

Grain Standards, Legislation *re* Inspection, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3835 (ii).

Meagher, Thos., Seizure by U.S. Authorities, on M. (Mr. *Cowan*) for Ret., 2751 (i).

Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com. (amt.) 6327, 6337 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9443; in Com. on Bill, 9830 (iii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Quarantine* (cattle) 8339 (iii).

*Weights and Measures* (inspection) 5580 (ii).

**Cargill, Mr. H., *East Bruce.***

Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4986 (ii).

Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. B. 182 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9681 (iii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (illustration stations) 8318

*Militia and Defence* (military stores) 5434 (ii).

*Post Office* (Mail Service) 7378 (iii); (postmasters' salaries) 5818 (ii).

*Public Works*: Buildings (Ottawa, electric lighting) 5198 (ii).

**Carroll, Mr. H. G., *Kamouraska.***

Address, on The, 509 (i).

**Carscallen, Mr. A. W., *North Hastings.***

Interior, Minister's Travelling and Living Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 1818 (i).

Mint, Govt., Establishment in Can. (Ques.) 2190 (i).

— on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3123 (i).

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir Richard, G.C.M.G., *South Oxford.***

Address, on The, 152, 159 (i).

Allan S.S. Service and Govt. Contract, Names of Vessels sailing from St. John, 1897-8 (Ans.) 3258 (i).

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—*Con.***

Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) on M. for Com., 3299 (i).

Brockville and West Huron Elections, on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to ref. Documents, &c. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 6743 (ii).

Budget, The, 2571 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 3323 (i).

Combinations in Restraint of Trade, Prevention Act Amt. B. 40 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1944 (i).

Commercial Treaties with British W. Indies, &c., on M. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) to Com. of Sup., 8177.

Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 36 (Mr. *Britton*) on Order for 2<sup>o</sup>, 2527 (i).

Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act. Amt. (B. 182); in Com. on Res., 8939 (iii).

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., on M. to conc., 1071.

Gaspé Customs Officer and Election, Charges against (remarks) 10224 (iii).

German Discriminating Duties on Can. Imports (Ans.) 1851 (i).

G.T.R. Trackmen's Strike, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to Com. of Sup., 3777 (ii).

Insurance Rates in Mar. Provs., Advancement in Price (remarks) 8923 (iii).

Loan Companies B. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8476 (iii).

Magdalen Islands Mail Service, Contractor's Name, Terms, &c. (Ans.) 2113 (i).

Medals, Can. Gen. Service, Design approved by Can. or Imp. Authorities, &c. (Ans.) 3266 (i).

Naturalization Act. Amt. B. 37 (Mr. *McInnes*) Resuming adjd. deb., on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 2527 (i).

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 173 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8767 (iii).

Privilege, Ques. of, par. in *Montreal Star*: remarks, 701 (i).

Public Accts. Com., &c., Reduction of Number of Members (remarks) 4347 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9544 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 3481 (ii).

S.S. Service between W. Indies and S. America Res., 2<sup>o</sup>, 9597 (iii).

— S.S. Subsidies between St. John, Halifax and London, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 2900 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

(Res. for Com.) 1813 (i).

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Paris Exhibition) 10147 (iii).

*Civil Government*: Aud. Gen.'s Office (contingencies) 2269; Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office (contingencies) 2265; Privy Council (contingencies) 2265; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 2276; Sec. of State (contingencies) 2269; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 2277; (salaries) 2262 (i).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (debates) 2280 (i); (gratuity to Lady Edgar) 10196 (iii); (voter's lists) 2281 (i).

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

*Mail Subsidies and S. S. Subventions* (Baddeck, &c. and East Bay) 8692; (Can. and S. Africa) 8692; (Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie) 8685; (Gaspé Basin and Quebec) 8687; (Grand Manan) 8684; (G.B. and Can.) 8661; (Halifax and Porto Rico) 10158; (Halifax, Nfld. and Liverpool) 8672; (Margaree and Cheticamp) 10157; (Murray Bay and Ouelle River) 10159; (Pictou and Cheticamp) 10156; (Pictou, &c., and Montague Bridge, &c.) 8686; (Port Mulgrave, &c., and Irish Cove) 8693; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 8687; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 8683; (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 10157; (Quebec and Manchester) 8695; (St. John and Minas Basin) 8686; (St. John, &c., and Yarmouth) 8686; (St. John and Digby) 8673; (St. John and Glasgow) 8672; (St. John, Dublin and Belfast) 8672; (St. John, &c., and W. Indies; &c.) 8675; (St. John, Halifax and London) 8673, (Magdalen Island) 8678 (iii).

*Post Office* (mail service) 7374 (iii).

*Public Works* Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 8108; (Sabrevois wharf) 10025; (Montreal Harbour improvements) 9980 (iii).

*Trade and Commerce* (commercial agencies) 8698 (iii).

Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1860 (i).

U. S. Customs and Can. Vessels, Regulations, &c., re entering at American Ports (remarks) 2528 (i).

Veldt, Rabbi, Dismissal as Chaplain St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary (remarks) 10246 (iii).

*Ways and Means* (Res. for Com.) 1813 (i).

Yukon Administration, Charges against, &c., par. in *North British Daily Mail*, on M. (Mr. Davin) to Com. of Sup., 8035 (iii).

**Casey, Mr. G. E., West Elgin.**

Address, on The, 194 (i).

Brockville and West Huron Elections, on M. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to ref. Documents, &c., to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 6745 (ii).

Can. Ry. Accident Insurance Co.'s (B. 21) 1<sup>o</sup>, 803 (i).

Drainage Across Ry. Lands (B. 24) 1<sup>o</sup>, 803; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1917, 1922; (M.) to ref. B. to Sel. Com., 2139, 2153, 2931, 2949 (i).

Edmonton and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4307, 4849 (ii).

Govt. Business, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 3647 (ii).

G. T. R. Trackmen's Strike, Settlement, &c., on M. (Mr. Maclean) to adjn., 4505 (ii).

Militia Permanent Corps, Pension System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Hughes) 2712 (i).

Mint, Govt. Establishment in Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. McInnes) 3115 (i).

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. Poupore) for Cor., &c., 5360 (ii).

Ontario and Quebec Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 22) 1<sup>o</sup>, 803 (i).

Order (Ques. of) 1555 (i).

**Casey, Mr. G. E.—Con.**

Pacific Cable between Australia and Can. Agreement B. (Mr. Mulock) on prop. Res., 8373 (iii).

— between Vancouver and Australia, Cor. between Imp. and Colonial Govts. (M. for copies\*) 1879 (i).

— Communications, &c. (M. to print papers) 2963 (i).

Prohibition Plebiscite, Ret. of Votes polled, Papers respecting, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 2044 (i).

Public Accts. Com., Postponement and Hours of Meetings, &c. (remarks) 4347 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res. 9443 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 3470 (ii).

Royal Military College, Expenditures since Foundation, Regulations, Number of Graduates, &c. (M. for Stmt. \*) 1879 (i).

## SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 8728; (illustration stations) 8302, 8330 (iii).

*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8498; (St. Paul de Métis, seed grain, &c.) 9043 (iii).

*Public Works*: Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5617 (ii).

**Casgrain, Mr. T. C., Montmorency.**

Address, on The, 258 (i).

Berthier (en haut) Postmaster and Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 2702 (i).

— Public Building, Purchase of Site, &c. Postmaster's Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1893 (i).

— Public Works, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2703 (i).

Bilodeau, Mr. Job., Postmaster at Chambord, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1962 (i).

— Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3336 (ii).

Blais, Mr. J. C., Amount paid to by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3545 (ii).

Boivin, Gédéon, Contract for Stone at Rivière La Pipe Wharf. (Ques.) 4061 (ii).

Bourget, P. A., Postmaster at Lévis, Increase of Salary (Ques.) 4059 (ii).

Cattle Inspection for Tuberculosis at Hebertville, Cor. &c., in connection with Appnmt. of Dr. Hall, (M. for Ret. \*) 5944 (ii).

— Cor. between Govt. and Dr. J. A. Duchesne, of Chicoutimi, since June, 1896 (M. for copies\*) 5944 (ii).

Chamberland, Mr. F. F., Charges against, Letter from Achille Lebel (Ques.) 1884, 2900 (i).

Chambord Customs Office Salaries, Collections, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 1850 (i).

Chicoutimi, Postmasters Dismissed, Pets., Cor., &c. (M. for copies\*) 2408 (i).

Clareau, Mr. J. A., Claims for Material for Construction of Chicoutimi or Ste Anne's Wharf (Ques.) 3336 (ii).

Constantin, Dr. Jules, Emplmt. by Govt., Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 1847 (i).

**Casgrain, Mr. T. C.—Con.**

- Coulombe v. The Queen, Trial Proceedings, &c. (Ques.) 3946 (ii).
- Enforcement of Conviction, &c. (Ques.) 4479 (ii).
- Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., on M. to conc., 1073.
- Demers, Major, Claims against Govt. (Ques.) 1833 (i).
- Donahue, W., Contract for Timber for Dredge at Roberval, &c. (Ques.) 4060 (ii).
- See "O'Donoghue, Roberval," &c.
- Duchesne, Dr. J. A., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1887 (i).
- Complaints *re* Appmnt. of Dr. Hall (Ques.) 3337 (ii).
- Dupuis, P. C., Prosecution for selling liquor to Indians (Ques.) 4060 (ii).
- Fluhman, Dr., Medical Officer to Indians at Point Bleue, Pets. *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 4060 (ii).
- French Canadian Repatriation from U.S. (Ques.) 1844 (i).
- Gauthier, Jean, Postmaster at Metabetchouan, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4059 (ii).
- Hall, Dr., Appmnt. as Inspector of Cattle at Chicoutimi (Ques.) 3336 (ii).
- I. C. R., McDonald, Mr. A. R., Dismissal as Supt. (Ques.) 1971 (i).
- investigation into charges against, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 4812 (ii).
- suspension and Salary, &c. (Ques.) 4811, 5098 (ii).
- Michaud, Mr. Eugène, Granting of Ry. Pass &c. (Ques.) 2904 (i).
- Pichette, Mr., Privileges at Lévis station (Ques.) 4992 (ii).
- Quebec City Mail Service, Memorials &c., from Board of Trade and City Council (M. for copies\*) 1879 (i).
- Labreque, Mr. C. O., Emplmt. by Govt. Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1846 (i).
- Larouche, Mr. Wm., Postmaster at Lake Bouchette, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1962 (i).
- Lebel, Mr. Wenceslas, Customs Official and Revision of Electoral Lists, par. in *Le Soleil* (Ques.) 1888 (i).
- Lévis Mail Service, Names of Carriers, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 3554 (ii).
- Liquor sold to Indians, Prosecutions, &c. (Ques.) 1850 (i).
- Man. School Question, Cjr. with the Holy Father, Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 1822 (i).
- Martel, Mr. P., Postmaster at St. Prime, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1964 (i).
- Mistassini and Ste. Méthode Storehouses, Construction, &c., Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 1888 (i).
- See "Ste. Méthode."
- Murray Bay and Quebec Mail Service, Complaints of Delay, &c. (Ques.) 1960 (i).

**Casgrain, Mr. T. C.—Con.**

- O'Donahue, Mr. W. T., Caretaker at Roberval, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3335 (ii).
- See Donaghue, Roberval, &c.
- Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 18 (Mr. Belcourt) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2289 (i).
- Pednault, Mr. P., Emplmt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3338 (ii).
- Plains of Abraham, Expiry of Lease, Memorials, &c. (Ques.) 1835 (i).
- (M. for copy\*) 2026 (i).
- Quebec Harbour Commission Consolid. Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3917; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 3985, neg. (Y. 40, N. 80) 3989 (ii).
- Quebec Superior Court, Additional Judges, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1845 (i).
- Returns, Inquiry for, 1073, 3253 (i).
- Rivière du Loup Wharf, Charges against Mr. Chamberland (Ques.) 1884, 2900 (i).
- Rivière La Pipe Wharf, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1891.
- Peribonka Wharfs, Emplmt. of Labourers, &c. (Ques.) 3337 (ii).
- Roberval, Dredging Scows, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1888 (i).
- Harbour, Dredging, Mr. Donaghue's Contract for Scows, &c. (M. for cor.)\* 2028 (i).
- See "Donaghue, O'Donaghue."
- St. Jerome Postmaster, Dismissal, Charges against, &c. (Ques.) 2182 (i).
- St. Joseph d'Alma, Postmaster, Increase in Salary (Ques.) 1847 (i).
- St. Joseph de Lévis Graving Dock, Lengthening (Ques.) 1882 (i).
- St. Méthode and Mistassini Wharfs, Construction of Sheds, &c. (M. for cor.)\* 2028 (i).
- (Ques.) 1888 (i).
- Senate Reform and the Provinces (Ques.) 1821 (i).
- SUPPLY:
- Legislation: House of Commons (voters' lists) 2282, 2290 (i).
- Telegraph Lines North Shore of St. Lawrence, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1890, 1891, 1963 (i); 3336.
- Verrault, Jos., Emplmt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3555 (ii).
- Champagne, Mr. L. N., Wright.**
- Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc., 1744 (i).
- Ottawa and Gatineau Ry. Co.'s (B. 17) 1°, 700.
- Charlton, Mr. J., North Norfolk.**
- Business of the Hse. (remarks) 7769 (iii).
- Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction (B. 2) 1°, 421; 2° m., 1898; in Com., 2525; 3° m., 2911, 2919; agreed to (Y. 68; N. 29) 2930.
- Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8924 (iii).
- Erie and Huron Ry. Co., and Lake Erie and Detroit Ry. Co.'s Amalgamation (B. 60) 1°, 1540 (i).
- Pacific Cable between Australia and Can. Agreement B. (Mr. Mulock) on prop. Res., 8369 (iii).

**Charlton, Mr. J.—Con.**

- Preferential Trade with G.B., on prop Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 8754, 8755 (iii).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8814 (iii).  
 Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9549 (iii).  
 Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c. (M.) for Sel. Com., 2755, 2770 (i).  
 Stock, David, Relief B. 88 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3489 (ii).

**Chauvin, Mr. L. A., Terrebonne.**

- Address, on The, 504 (i).  
 Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries Bill (Ques.) 1852 (i).  
 ——— B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1928 (i); in Com., 5918 (ii).  
 Gouin, Mr. Lomer, Speech *re* Subsidies to Provs. (Ques.) 1951 (i).  
 Jésus River, Construction of Fishway, Plans, &c., on M. (Mr. *Fortin*) for Copies, 3274 (i).  
 Montreal and Labelle Mail Service, Appnmt. of Mail Conductor (Ques.) 1966 (i).  
 Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 7661 (iii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (illustration stations) 8335.  
*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8560 (iii).

**Christie, Mr. T., Argenteuil.**

- Lachute and St. Andrews Ry., Cor., Contracts, Reprs., &c. (M. for copies) 4808 (ii).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8822 (iii).

**Clancy, Mr. J., Bothwell.**

- Address, on The, 541 (i).  
 Alien Labour Law, Appnmt. of Agent at Wallaceburg (remarks) 5492 (ii).  
 Apples, Fraudulent Packing, par. in *Toronto World* on M. (Mr. *McMillan*) to adjn., 3754 (ii).  
 Binder Twine imported in 1899 (Ques.) 8218, 8990 (iii).  
 ——— Sale of by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 9931 (iii).  
 ——— on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 7214 (iii).  
 Bothwell Election, Speech of the Hon. Mr. Mills in the Senate (remarks) 9896 (iii).  
 Brantford Postmaster, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1968 (i).  
 ——— Salary, Commission, &c. (Ques.) 8464 (iii).  
 Business of the Hse. (remarks) 5745 (ii).  
 ——— on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take in Mondays, 6281 (ii).  
 Coal Oil, Reduction of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2128 (i).  
 Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 171 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 9600 (iii).  
 Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6444 (ii).

**Clancy, Mr. J.—Con.**

- Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8946 (iii).  
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6425 (ii).  
 Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Cusey*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2954 (i).  
 Farran's Point Canal, Tenders for 1897, &c. (M. for copies\*) 3873 (ii).  
 General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 9637, 9883 (iii).  
 Indian Corn, Quantity Imported for Home Consumption, &c. (Ques.) 8217, 8632, 8990 (iii).  
 Inspection Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. *Penny*) on M. for 2°, 3872 (ii).  
 I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4443, 4561, 4600; Sen. Amts., 9723 (iii).  
 ——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 4448, 4452 (ii).  
 Justice, Deptl. Rep., Inquiry for. 4899 (ii).  
 Meagher, Thos., Seizure by U.S. Authorities, on M. (Mr. *Cowan*) for Ret., 2753 (i).  
 Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9609; in Com., 9630 (iii).  
 Prohibition Plebiscite, Ret. of Votes polled, Papers respecting, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2043 (i).  
 Quebec Cartridge Factory, Employees, Number, &c. (Ques. 9699 (iii).  
 ——— Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 9843 (iii).  
 Quick, Mr. James, Dismissal as Lighthouse-keeper, par. in *Windsor World*, 7221 (iii).  
 Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9489; on M. for 2°, 9758; in Com., 9759, 9819; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 9894 (iii).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6493; in Com., 6760, 6777, 6906, 6913 (iii).  
 Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 2766 (i).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Administration of Justice* (Alien Labour\* Law enforcement) 5471; (Exchequer Court) 5474 (ii); (Meagher's claim against U.S.), 10119, 10194; Yukon (living expenses) 10194 (iii).  
*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (dairy commissioner) 8269; (experimental farms) 8237, 8254; (illustration stations) 8283, 8297; (Paris Exhibition) 10140; (year book) 8233 (iii).  
*Civil Government*: Customs (contingencies) 2988; (salaries) 2092; Finance (salaries) 2091 (i) 5018 (ii); Interior (salaries) 2082 (i); Justice (salaries, &c.) 10119 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5026 (ii); Militia and Defence (salaries) 2071; Privy Council (salaries) 2052 (i).  
*Customs*: B. C. (contingencies, &c.) 8458; conc., 10212; N.S. (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 8408 (iii); Yukon (salaries, &c.) 5599 (ii).  
*Dom. Lands* (Chief Inspector, salary) 9009, 9018 (iii).

**Clancy, Mr. J.—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

*Excise* (preventive service) 4789; (salaries of officers) 4787 (ii).

*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8607; (St. Paul des Metis, seed grain, &c.) 9045 (iii).

*Indians* (Ont.) 5689 (ii).

*Insurance* (general expenses) 7464 (iii).

*Justice* (Meagher, claim against U. S. Govt.) 10119 (iii).

*Legislation: House of Commons* (voter's lists) 2316 (i); 10135 (iii); (stationery supplies) 5734 (ii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, &c.) 5123, 5123 (ii).

*Militia* (military stores) 5424; (miscellaneous and unforeseen) 5459 (ii); (annual drill) 7063 (iii); (clothing) 5444 (ii); (pay, allowance) 7027; (salaries) 7075, 7082 (iii); Yukon Force (transportation and supplies) 6352 (ii); (supplies) 7041 (iii).

*Miscellaneous* (Dom. and Ont. arbitration) 8702 (iii).

*Ocean and River Service* (maintenance) 2999, 3021 (masters and mates) 3061 (i); 5196 (ii); (removal of obstructions) 3066 (i).

*Penitentiaries* (Manitoba) 5479; (St. Vincent de Paul) 5477 (ii).

*Public Works: Dredging* (plant) 5204 (ii); 8144 (iii); Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 8079; (Ont.) 7993, 8014 (iii); (Point Peles wharf) 10063; Wharfs, (N.S.) 7714, 7728; (P.E.I.) 7757 (iii); Miscellaneous (purchase of oil paintings) 8151; (surveys) 8149; Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 8148 (iii); Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5614 (ii).

*Quarantine* (cattle) 8339 (iii); (cattle, salaries, &c.) 5482; (slaughtered hogs, &c.) 5065 (ii); (tuberculosis, prevention among cattle) 8344 (iii).

*Railways: I.C.R.* (accommodation, St. John) 7172; (car couplers) 9171; (increased siding accommodation) 9161; Indiantown Branch (Mr. Snowball's claim) 9167; Miscellaneous (Ottawa River) 9176 (iii).

*Weights and Measures* (inspection) 5578 (ii).

*Yukon Provisional District: Railways* (surveys, &c.) 8700 (iii).

See "Administration of Justice," "Customs," "Militia," "Public Works."

Sydenham River, Dredging, Amount expended (Ques.) 3820 (ii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. Roddick) to Com. of Sup., 6317 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir Henry Joly) in Com., 3885 (ii); 9883 (iii).

**Clarke, Mr. E. F., West Toronto.**

Address, on The, 1463 (amt.) 1499 (i).

Alien Labour Law, Enforcement, par. in Toronto Star (remarks) 2907 (i).

— Instructions to Agent (Ques.) 3084 (i).

B. C. Legislation re Chinese and Foreign Immigration, on M. (Mr. Prior) to adjn., 6864 (iii).

Canadian Emigration to U. S., par. in Montreal Star (remarks) 1895 (i).

Can. Service Medal, Delay in Issue, Board of Claims, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 2699 (i).

— Recommendation by Mil. Dept., Terms, &c. (Ques.) 3945 (ii).

See Gen. Service, Medals, &c.

**Clarke, Mr. E. F.—Con.**

Companies Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8775 (iii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Investigation, Rep. of Com. (Ques.) 1967 (i).

Customs House, Toronto, Employees, Names, Date of Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 1849 (i).

Dom. of Can. Guarantee and Accident Insurance Co.'s (B. 76) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2029 (i).

Dom. Permanent Loan Co.'s (B. 104) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2409 (i).

Dunn Avenue, Ry. Crossing, Toronto, Protection to (Ques.) 1857 (i).

General Service Medals, Date of Royal Warrants, Govtl. Action, &c. (Ques.) 8630 (iii).

See "Can. Service, Medals," &c.

Govt. Contracts, Prohibition of Sweating (Ques.) 1975 (i).

— Number of Contracts awarded, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 2961 (i).

G. T. R., Trackmen's Strike, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3774 (ii).

— on M. (Mr. Maclean) to adjn., 4539 (ii).

— Inquiry for Papers re Settlement, 4858 (ii).

— Rumoured Settlement (remarks) 5206 (ii).

Greater Britain Exhibition, Canadian Representation of Mineral Exhibit, &c. (Ques.) 1959 (i).

Immigration Agents, Bonuses to (Ques.) 1975, 2191 (i).

Immigrants, Arrival in 1898, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3553 (ii).

— Inducements to settle in Can., &c. (Ques.) 3076 (i).

Insolvency Legislation (remarks) 3252 (i).

I. C. R., Cars purchased, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 3553 (ii).

— Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 4612, 4639 (ii).

Kingston Penitentiary, Superannuations, &c., since 1899 (Ques.) 6379 (ii).

Medals, Canadian Service, Notice in Can. Gazette re Clasps and Ribbons, &c. (Ques.) 3083 (i).

— Claims allowed by Commission, Distribution, &c. (Ques.) 5860 (ii).

— Design approved by Can. or Imp. Authorities, &c. (Ques.) 3266 (i).

See Can. Service, Gen. Service.

Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112, in Com. on amt. (Mr. Campbell) 6333 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Calvert) on amt. (Mr. Landerkin) 5047; in Com., 5354 (ii); Sen. Amts., 7577 (iii).

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 173 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 8772 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 1<sup>st</sup>, 5096; in Com., 6105, 6117 (ii).

Printing Com., 3rd, 4th and 5th Reps. of Com. (stationery) on M. (Mr. Gibson) to conc., 5384.

Ry. Legislation re Working Rules, &c. (remarks) 5748 (ii).

**Clarke, Mr. E. F.—Con.**

Ry. Regulations, American Standard, Adoption by Can. Rys. (Ques.) 1969 (i).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 3458, 3484; on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 6702; in Com., 6768, 6782, 6796 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Administration of Justice*: Miscellaneous (Alien Labour Law) 10123 (iii).

*Civil Govt.*: Customs (contingencies) 2980, 2989 (i); N. S. (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 8408; Ont., 8452 (iii); Post Office (contingencies, Dead Letter Branch) 5069 (iii).

*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8494, 8508, 8563, 8619 (iii).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (restaurant-keeper) 10139; (voters' lists) 10136 (iii).

*Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions* (Murray Bay and Ouelle River) 10160 (iii).

*Militia* (annual drill) 5067; (military stores) 5429; Yukon Force (transportation and supplies) 6347 (ii.)

*Ocean and River Service* (maintenance) 2991 (i.)

*Post Office* (Postmasters' salaries) 5813 (ii)

*Public Works*: Buildings (astronomical observatory) 9943; Buildings (B. C.) 9989; (lighting, &c.) 7697; (Ont.) 7626, 7629; (elevator, East Block) 9961; Ottawa (military store) 9942; Dredging (plant) 8143; Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 7763; Ont., 7966, 7977, 8003; (Toronto Harbour) 10067; (Port Colborne) 9296, 9301; (P. E. I.) 7757; Que., 8136; (Coteau, dredging) 10039, 10053; (Wharfs, N. S.) 7706, 7730, 7748; Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 8147; Yukon (telegraph lines) 10094; Telegraph Lines (North Shore St. Lawrence) 8149; Yukon (trails, roads and bridges) 10093 (iii.)

*Miscellaneous* (National Art Gallery) 8149; (purchase of oil painting) 8150; (statue of Her Maj.) 8150 (iii.)

*Railways*: P. E. I. (Mount Stewart wharf) 5778; (private cars) 5788 (ii.)

Toronto P. O., Appnmts. by Govt., Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1981 (i).

— Appnmts. since 1896 (M. for Ret.) 2905 (i).

Yukon Provisional District Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. Sifton) in Com., 9854 (iii).

— Liquor Permits, Cor. between N. W. T. Govt. and Int. Dept. (M. for copies\*) 1878 (i).

— Transportation Cos. employed by Govt., Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1958 (i).

**Cochrane, Mr. E., East Northumberland (Ont.).**

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. Richardson) in Com., 5941 (ii).

Edmonton and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4304, 4311 (ii).

Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on amt. (Mr. Campbell) 6334 (ii).

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 173 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 8772 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 9321, 9470 (iii).

**Cochrane, Mr. E.—Con.**

## SUPPLY :

*Civil Government*: Customs (contingencies) 2885 (i); Public Works (salaries) 7549 (iii).

*Customs*: B. C. (contingencies, &c.) 8453 (iii).

*Dom. Lands* (Chief Inspector, salary) 9023 (iii).

*Immigration* (agents, &c., salaries, &c.) 8485, 8495, 8515 (iii).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (voters' lists) 10134 (iii); (stationery supplies) 5735 (ii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, &c.) 5160; (supplies, &c.) 3537 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions* (G. B. and Can.) 8668 (iii).

*Militia*: Yukon Force (transportation and supplies) 6350 (ii).

*Ocean and River Service* (maintenance) 2990, 3024 (i).

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Chez-zetcook Wharf) 10005; (Malignant Cove Breakwater) 10003; Que., 8129; (Sabrevois Wharf) 10032; (St. Lawrence River Channel) 7562; (Montreal Harbour Improvements) 9978; (Wharfs, N.S.) 7707, 7737 (iii).

*Railways*: I. C. R. (accommodation, St. John) 7415 (iii); P. E. I. (Mount Stewart Wharf) 5778 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt B. 128 (Sir Henry Joly) in Com., 3892 (ii).

**Copp, Mr. A. J. S., Digby.**

Can. Mining and Metallurgical Co.'s incorp. (B. 113) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2790 (i).

Ottawa River Water Power, Lease, Terminations, &c. (M. for stmt.\*) 2961 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Legislation*: House of Commons (voters' lists) 10136 (iii).

*Public Works*: Buildings (N.S.) 9947; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Belliveau Breakwater) 10000; (Trout Cove Breakwater) 10000 (iii).

**Costigan, Hon John, Victoria, N.B.**

Christie, Mr. W. J., Dismissal from Inland Rev. Dept., O.C.'s, Reps., Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Roche) for Copies, 2406 (i).

Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 26) 3<sup>o</sup> m., 2934 (i).

McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., Letter read by P. M. G., on Order, Ques. of (Mr. Foster) 5010 (ii).

Personal Explanation, Change of Attitude towards his Party, 3555, 3647 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 9507; in Com. on Bill, 9828 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. Mulock) in Com., 6952 (iii).

## SUPPLY :

*Fisheries* (Noble Bros.) 4251 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir Henry Joly) in Com., 9887 (iii).

**Cowan, Mr. M. K., South Essex.**

Beet Root Sugar, Bounty for Manufacture, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 4837 (ii).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. Richardson) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1932 (i).

**Cowan, Mr. M. K.—Con.**

- Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6455 (ii).  
 Meagher, Thos., Seizure by U.S. Authorities, (M. for Ret.) 2742, 2754 (i).  
 Quick, Mr. James, Dismissal as Lighthouse-keeper, par. in *Windsor World*, 7219 (iii).  
 Ry. Act Amt. (B. 97) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2247 (i).  
 Ry. Subsidies, &c., Order (Ques. of) Unparliamentary Language, 9208 (iii).

## SUPPLY :

- Administration of Justice* (Exchequer Court) 5474 (ii).  
*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (illustration stations) 8286 (iii).  
*Immigration* (agents, &c., salaries, &c.) 8477 (iii).  
 Temperance Act (1864) Amt. (B. 134) 1<sup>st</sup>, 3874 (ii).  
 Tobacco Experimental Station, Establishment in Essex Co., (Ques.) 2496 (i).  
 — Foreign Leaf, Percentage required under Regulations (Ques.) 2485 (i).  
 — Grown in Essex Co., Excise Duties, &c., par. in *Ottawa Citizen*, 2117 (i).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 9886 (iii).

**Craig, Mr. T. D., East Durham.**

- Address, on The, 275 (i).  
 — on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1772 (i).  
 Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) on M. for Com., 3308 (i).  
 Budget, The, 2590 (i).  
 Binder Twine Contract, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to a Jn., 7205 (iii).  
 Bounties on Iron and Steel B. 161 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7644 (iii).  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 3326 (i).  
 Combinations in Restraint of Trade Prevention Act Amt. B. 40 (Mr. *Sprout*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1946 (i).  
 Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2526; on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 2914 (i).  
 Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8940 (iii).  
 G. T. R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement, on M. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) to adjn., 3979 (ii).  
 Pacific Cable between Australia and Can. Agreement B. (Mr. *Mulock*) prop. Res., 8370 (iii).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flinn*) 8864 (iii).  
 Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 2761 (i).

## SUPPLY :

- Civil Government*: Customs (salaries) 2093; Inland Revenue (salaries) 2101; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 2103; Militia and Defence (salaries) 2971 (i).  
*Immigration* (agents' salaries) 8352 (iii).

**Craig, Mr. T. D.—Con.**

- Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3896 (ii).

**Davies, Hon. Sir L. H., K.C.M.G., West Queen's P.E.I.**

- Address, The, on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1598 (i).  
 Alien Labour Law, Enforcement at Toronto, Instructions to Agent (Ans.) 3084 (i).  
 Annapolis and Digby Basin, Repts. re Buoys, &c. (Ans.) 4993 (ii).  
 — Buoy Service, Expiration of Mr. McCarthy's Contract for Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 4057 (ii).  
 Beauharnois Water Power, Improvement of (Ans.) 1883 (i).  
 See "Valleyfield."  
 Behring Sea Arbitration, Cost to Govt., &c. (Ans.) 2186 (i).  
 Berthier (en haut) Public Building, Purchase of Site, &c., Postmaster's Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1893 (i).  
 — Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2703 (i).  
 Bilodeau, Mr. L. P., Employment by Govt. (Ans.) 3336 (ii).  
 Brockville Election, Mailing of Voters' Lists, (Ans.) 2482 (i).  
 — Ballot Papers, Printing and Distribution (Ans.) 3074 (i).  
 Brothies' Ledge Lighthouse, Completion and Operation (Ans.) 2331 (i).  
 Brown, Barth., Campobello, N.B., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4482 (ii).  
 Canadian Coast, Surveys of Currents, &c. (Ans.) 1824 (i).  
 Canadian Fishermen and American Fish Trusts, Complaints, re and Official Repts. (Ans.) 4993.  
 Chamberland, Mr. F. F., Charges against, Letter from Achille Lebel, (Ans.) 1884, 2900 (i).  
 Chemainus, B.C., Pilotage Limits (Ans.) 5312 (ii).  
 Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5900, 5910, 5921 (ii).  
 Clareaux, Mr. J. A., Claims for Materials for Construction, Chicoutimi or Ste. Anne's Wharf (Ans.) 3335 (ii).  
 Cold Storage for Fish Transportation from Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 1978 (i).  
 — Preservation of Bait for Fishermen (Ans.) 1978 (i).  
 Collingwood Harbour, Assignment of Contractors (Ans.) 1893 (i).  
 Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 171 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 9608 (iii).  
 Contracts let without Tender since June, 1896, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for O. Ca. 5334 (ii).  
 Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. (B. 168) 1<sup>st</sup>, 6397 (ii).  
 — B. 36 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 2162, 2175 (i).

**Davies, Hon. Sir L. H.—*Con.***

- Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6446 (ii).
- Dick, Isaac, Fishery Guardian, N.B., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 7765 (iii).
- Dolphin*, Fishery Cruiser, Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 1856 (i).
- Dom. Rifle Association, Annual Grant by Govt. of Transport and Entrance Fees to limited number, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2360 (i).
- Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. to ref. B. to Sel. Com., 2159 (i).
- Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 700 (i).
- Fishery Officers, Leeds Co., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1818 (i).
- Fourchie Harbour, Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 2904 (i).
- Fraser River (B.C.) Miller's Landing Improvements, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 2701 (i).
- Fraser and Skeena River Fish Hatcheries, Erection by Govt. (Ans.) 4058 (ii).
- Gabarus Breakwater, Inspection, &c., by Govt. (Ans.) 2698 (i).
- Gallant, W. A., Engineer Point Lepreaux Fog-alarin, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4806 (ii).
- Gananoque Public Buildings, Heating, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 1881 (i).
- Giant's Tomb Lighthouse-keeper, Salary, &c., (Ans.) 1834 (i).
- Glass, Jas., Fishery Guardian at Charlotte, N.B. Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4482 (ii).
- Goderich Harbour Improvement, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 1881 (i).
- Governor Pingree* and *J. B. Lowe*, Strs., Registry in Csr. (Ans.) 1856 (i).
- Grey, Robert, Lighthouse-keeper at Entrance Island, Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 7319 (iii).
- Hope Island Lighthouse-keeper, Name, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1834 (i).
- Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5487 (ii).
- Hudson Straits, Navigability, Cost of Expedition, &c. (Ans.) 3338 (ii).
- I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*), in Com. on Res., 3408 (ii).
- G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4597, 4639 (ii).
- Order, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Hilbert Tupper*) 4455.
- *Harris*, Mr. A. H., Duties, &c., as Traffic Manager (Ans.) 1980 (i).
- Inland Fisheries, Issue of Licenses by Local Govt. (remarks) 2910 (i).
- L'Ardoise Breakwater, Amount expended by Govt. (Ans.) 1886 (i).
- Chapel Cove Breakwater, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 2905 (i).
- Lenoir, Fishery Overseer, Ret. laid on Table, 4268 (ii).
- License Fees for Fishing Traps, Issue of (remarks) 2047 (i).

**Davies, Hon. Sir L. H.—*Con.***

- Lighthouse Service, B.C., Adjustment of Salaries (Ans.) 3821 (ii).
- Lobster Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 2319 (i).
- (remarks) 2249, 2909 (i).
- Pets. *re* Extension of Fshing Season (Ans.) 6122, 6561 (ii).
- On M. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) to Com. of Sup., 7681 (iii).
- Regulations (remarks) 3960 (ii).
- Seizure of Traps, &c., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) to Com. of Sup., 5505 (ii).
- McKeen's Point, Construction of Storm Signals, cost, &c. (Ans.) 3083 (i).
- Marine, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1165 (i).
- Midland Harbours, Amt. of Dues collected (Ans.) 1834 (i).
- Milltown, N.B., Appnmt. of Fishery Guardian (Ans.) 4482 (ii).
- Mistassini and Ste. Méthode Storehouses, Construction, &c., Name of Contractors, &c. (Ans.) 1888 (i).
- Naturalization Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. *McInnes*) on M. for 2°, 2178 (i).
- Naval Brigade Reserve, &c., organized by Can. Govt., Cor. with Imp. Govt., &c. (Ans.) 6048 (ii).
- Navigable Waters Protection Act. Amt. (B. 137) 1°, 4150; 2° m., 6118 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9597, (iii).
- B. 19 (Mr. *Britton*) in Com., 1897 (i).
- Newfoundland Regulations *re* Live Bait (remarks) 2194, 2696 (i).
- Regulations *re* Export (remarks) 6938 (iii).
- Supply of Bait, Cor., &c. (remarks) 9465 (iii).
- O'Donahue, Mr. W. T., Caretaker at Roberval, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3335 (ii).
- See "Roberval," &c.
- Oyster Beda, B.C., Claims of Nanaimo Ry. Co. (Ans.) 3821 (ii).
- Pednault, Mr. P., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3337 (ii).
- Penberthy Injector Co.'s Patent Relief B. 141 (Mr. *McGregor*) in Com., 6878 (ii).
- Personal Explanation, par. in *Montreal Star*, 618, 701 (i).
- Petit de Grat Breakwater, Amount expended by Govt., Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 1896 (i).
- P.E.I. Ry. and Branch Lines, Pets., Res., &c., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) 2384 (i).
- P.E.I. and G.B., Cold Storage and SS. Communication (remarks) 5493 (ii).
- Murray Harbour and Charlottetown Authorization B. 183 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9752 (iii).
- Winter Mail Service, Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) for Copies, 3142 (i).
- Prohibition Plebiscite, Ret. of Votes polled, Papers respecting, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2041 (i).

**Davies, Hon. Sir L. H.—Con.**

- Prohibition Plebiscite, Expenses in Montreal City, Amounts unpaid, &c. (Ans.) 5312 (ii).  
 ——— Poll-books, Voters' Lists, on M. (Mr. Moore) for Copies, 2906 (i).  
 Pub. Accounts Com., Meetings (remarks) 2965 (i).  
 ——— Delay in Meeting (Man. Election Fraud) on M. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) to adjn., 3258 (i).  
 Public Works (Preservation of Public Health) B. 105 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 7674 (iii).  
 ——— Inspection, Expenses of Tour, Name of Str., &c. (Ans.) 1881 (i).  
 Quadra, Str., Payment of Crew and Officers (Ans.) 3076 (i).  
 Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Consolid. Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 5930 (ii).  
 ——— B. 178 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 9692; in Com., 9868 (iii).  
 Quick, Mr. James, Dismissal as Lighthouse-keeper, par. in *Windsor World*, 7222 (iii).  
 Ry. Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Rys. Cos., on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) to Com. of Sup., 4750 (ii).  
 ——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 9767 (iii).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 in Com., 6924, 6940, 6963 (iii).  
 Restigouche Boom Co.'s B. 65 (Mr. McAlister) on Order being called for 2°, 2152, 2°, 2649 (i).  
 Return, on Inquiry, Newfoundland Regulations *re* purchasing of Bait by Canadians 2696 (i).  
 Returns, Inquiry for (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3499, 4151 (ii).  
 ——— *re* P.E.I., on Inquiry for, 3878 (ii).  
 ——— (Mr. Gillies) 4552 (i).  
 ——— (Mr. Martin) 6319 (ii).  
 ——— Inquiry for, 10225 (iii).  
 Richelieu River, Placing of Buoys, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3796 (ii).  
 Rivière du Loup Wharf, Charges against Mr. Chamberland (Ans.) 1884, 2900 (i).  
 Rivière la Pipe Wharf, Cost of, &c. (Ans.) 1892 (i).  
 ——— and Peribonka Wharfs, Emplmt. of Labourers, &c. (Ans.) 3337 (ii).  
 Roberval Dredging Scows, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1888 (i).  
 Safety of Ships (B. 170) 1°, 6929; 2° m., 9598 in Com., 9599 (iii).  
 Shamrock, Tug, Amount paid John C. Kaine, &c. (Ans.) 5666 (ii).  
 St. Joseph de Lévis Graving Dock, Lengthening (Ans.) 1882 (i).  
 St. Lawrence, North Shore Telegraph Line, Contract for Poles, &c. (Ans.) 3335 (ii).  
 ——— Channel, Protection to Navigation (remarks) 3343 (ii).  
 See Telegraphs.

**Davies, Hon. Sir L. H.—Con.**

- Skelton *vs.* The Queen, on Inquiry (Mr. Davin) for Rep. of Min. of Jus. *re* Release (remarks) 7441, 8171 (iii).  
 ——— on Inquiry (Mr. Davin) for Papers, 7770  
 Soulanges Canal, Contracts, on M. (Mr. Taylor) for Cor., Notices, &c., 1861 (i).  
 Steamship Service between P. E. I. and Liverpool, par. in *Examiner*, 3543 (ii).  
 Steveston, B.C., Tidal Lands, Claims for Leases, &c. (Ans.) 3822 (ii).  
 ——— Applications for Leases, 1892, &c. (Ans.) 4058 (ii).  
 Stikine-Teslin Route, Survey, Rep. of Engineer (Ans.) 1886 (i).  
 Stock, David, Relief B. 88 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 3491 (ii).  
 Supply (M.) for Com., 3997 (ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Administration of Justice*: Yukon (additional Judge) 10193 (iii).  
*Civil Government*: Customs (contingencies) 2931; Finance (contingencies) 2277; Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 2276 (i), 5024 (ii); (salaries) 2102; Privy Council (salaries) 2054 (i); Public Works (printing, &c.) 5072 (ii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 2107 (i).  
*Fisheries* (Behring Sea expenses) 5180, 5181 (ii); (cold storage for bait, &c.) 10163 (iii); (dismissal of Capt. Babb) 4256; (gratuity to Com. Wakeham) 5183; (jurisdiction) 4242; (oyster culture) 4241; (Noble Bros.) 4244; (professional services to Mr. Hall) 5183; (salaries of Inspectors) 4013; Protection Service, 4719; (repairs, &c.) 5180 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2278; (voter's lists) 2281, 2292 (i); (Wood, Mr., late M.P., sessional indemnity) 10201 (iii).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, &c.) 5116; (gratuities) 5179; (salaries, &c.) 3523 (ii); (Traverse lighthouse) 10162 (iii); conc., 6385 (ii).  
*Marine Hospitals* (care of sick seamen) 4009; (shipwrecked seamen) 4013 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (refund of duties on fish, &c., P.E.I.) 10169, 10185 (iii).  
*Ocean and River Service* (Bear River, removal of old pier) 10162 (iii); (Bird Rock) 6384 (ii); (life-saving rewards) 3064; (maintenance) 2989 (i), 5101 (ii); (masters and mates) 3058 (i); ("Minto" construction) 10161 (iii); (registrations) 3065; (removal of obstructions) 3065; (wreck investigations) 3065 (i).  
*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 8083; (Ont.) 7980; (N.S.) 5200 (ii); P.E.I. (Canoe Cove breakwater) 10007; (Rocky Point breakwater) 10006 (iii); (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 5087 (ii), 7601; (West Point Pier) 10006; Que., 8112, 8121 (Coteau dredging) 10055; Telegraphs (Cheticamp and Meat Cove) 10072 (iii); Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5623, 5644 (ii).  
*Railways*: I. C. R. (accommodation, St. John) 7169 (iii); P. E. I. (Mount Stewart Wharf) 5755 (ii).  
*Scientific Institutions* (Toronto Observatory) 5179.  
*Steamboat Inspection* (Dom. Steamers and Fog Alarms) 4240, 4714 (ii).

**Davies, Hon. Sir L. H.—Con.**

Telegraph Lines, North Shore, St. Lawrence, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 1890, 1891 (i).

See St. Lawrence.

Tidal Survey, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3516 (ii).

— Can. Waters, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 3795 (ii).

— Stmt. of Min. as to remarks of Allan SS.

Captains, Rep. of Capt. Spain, &c., 3262 (i).

Toronto P. O., Appnmts. since 1896, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Ret., 2906 (i).

Travelling Expenses of Minister of Pub. Works and Private Secretary, &c. (Ans.) 1880 (i).

U. S. Fishing Vessels and *Modus Vivendi* Licenses, Concessions granted, &c. (Ans.) 2331.

Valleyfield Public Buildings, Erection of (Ans.) 1883 (i).

— Water Power, Deepening of Bay (Ans.) 1882 (i).

Veldt Rabbi, Dismissal as Chaplain St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary (remarks) 10246 (iii).

Victoria, B.C., P. O., Safes, Elevators, &c., Tenders for (Ans.) 1887 (i).

Wharfs Revenue, &c., Stmt. promised (remarks) 10221 (iii).

Yukon Provisional District Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. Sifton) in Com., 9853 (iii).

Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to Com. of Sup., 6226 (ii).

— Letters from Americans *re* Administration (Ans.) 3823 (ii).

— Messrs. Coste and Lafontaine's Instruction (Ans.) 1893 (i).

— Skagway and Dawson Telegraph Line, Construction by English Co. (Ans.) 3073 (i).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir Henry Joly) in Com., 3887 (ii).

Wood Island, P.E.I., Lightkeeper, Charges against, Rep. of Commissioner, &c. (Ans.) 2327 (i).

— on M. (Mr. Martin) for Copies of Cor., &c., 4817 (ii) 10117 (iii).

**Davin, Mr. N. F., West Assiniboia.**

Address, on The, 338 (i).

— on amt. (Mr. Bertrain) to amt. (Mr. Clarke) 1807 (i).

Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duty, (prop. Res.) 5861, 5893 (ii).

Agriculture, Minister of, Travelling and Living Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 1825 (i).

Binder Twine Contract, on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 7206 (iii).

B. C. Legislation *re* Chinese and Foreign Immigration, on M. (Mr. Prior) to adjn., 6865, 6879 (iii).

Business of the Hse., on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Mondays, 6280 (ii).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. Richardson) in Com., 5925 (ii).

**Davin, Mr. N. F.—Con.**

Coal Oil, on prop. Res. (Mr. Davis) to place on Free List, 1999 (i).

— on prop. Res. (Mr. Moore) 2125 (i).

Commercial Treaties with British Indies, &c., on M. (Mr. Kaulbach) to Com. of Sup., 8175 (iii).

Contracts let without Tender since June, 1896 (M. for O. C.'s,) 5314, 5348 (ii).

Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 171 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 9601, 9728 (iii).

Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8932; in Com. on B. 9662 (iii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Sifton) on M. for 1°, 4894; in Com., 6404, 6410, 6424; on M. for 3°, 6459 (ii).

Dry Dock Construction B. 177 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8757 (iii).

Elevator Restrictions and C. P. R., Legislation respecting (Ques.) 2903 (i).

Galician Settlement at Saltcoats, Commissioner's Investigation (remark) 6935 (ii).

— Outbreak of Scarlet Fever (remarks) 4895.

General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir Henry Joly) in Com., 9637, 9646, 9651 (iii).

Grain Elevators, N.W.T., par. in *Winnipeg Tribune* (M.) to Com. of Sup., 5494 (ii).

Grain Standards, Legislation *re* Inspection, &c. (prop. Res.) 3829 (ii).

— Transit, Man. and N.W.T. Regulation B. 15 (Mr. Douglas) on M. for 2°, 1910 (i).

G. T. R. Trackmen's Strike, Settlement, &c., on M. (Mr. Maclean) to adjn., 4536 (ii).

Homestead Law in N.W.T., Interest on Pre-emptions, Memorial from Settlers, &c. (Ques.) 3080 (i).

Inspection (Wheat) Act. Amt. B. 156 (Sir Henry Joly) on M. for 1°, 5100 (ii).

— on M. for Com. of Ways and Means (remarks) 10225 (iii).

I.C.R., Extension to Montreal—G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 4677 (ii).

— Rolling Stock, Additions to, par. in *Moncton Star*, 6319 (ii).

— expenditure (remarks) 6562 (ii).

Klondike Official Guide, Preparation by Mr. Ogilvie (Ques.) 1827 (i).

Library of Parliament, Disturbance by Messengers (remarks) 10140, 10221 (iii).

Mail Bags, Contracts between Govt. and Ottawa Supply Co. (Ques.) 2185 (i).

Mining Claims and Homestead Entries by Govt. Officials, O.Cs., &c. (M. for copies\*) 1877 (i).

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. Poupart) for Cor., &c., 5370 (ii).

Mounted Police Pension Act Amt. (B. 79) 1°, 2029 (i).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. McInnes) on M. for 2°, 2179 (i).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Britton) on M. for 2°, 1866 (i).

**Davin, Mr. N. F.—Con.**

- N.W. Mounted Police, Special Constables, Number, &c. (Ques.) 1843 (i).
- N.W.T., Abandoned Homesteads, Dewdney District, Cancellation by Govt. (Ques.) 3074 (i).
- Grant Entry to W. C. Middleton, by Agent at Yorkton (M. for cor., &c. \*) 1877 (i).
- Seed Grain Indebtedness, Cancellation, &c., (M.) 2015, 2023 (i).
- Seed Grain Indebtedness Security B. 189 (Mr. Sifton) on M. for 1°, 9465 (iii).
- Ocean Freight Rates (M. for cor., reps., &c.) 1861 (i).
- Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 9613, 9625; in Com., 9628 (iii).
- Ottawa Supply Co. and Contracts with Govt. (Ques.) 2185 (ii).
- Personal Explanation, par in Man. *Free Press*, 1952 (i).
- par. in *United Canada* re Application for Mr. Costigan's seat, 3845 (ii).
- Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 173 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 8763 (iii).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 1°, 5097; on M. for 2°, 6103; in Com., 6107.
- Preferential Trade with G.B., on amt. (Sir Charles Tupper) to Com. of Sup., 7874 (iii).
- Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6938 (iii).
- Prime Minister's Reply to Invitation to Chicago Demonstration, par. in Newspaper, 9695.
- (M. to adjn.) 9837 (iii).
- Letter of Prime Minister to H. H. Kohl-saat (remarks) 10220 (iii).
- Privilege (Ques. of) Insertion of remarks in *Hansard* by Min. of Pub. Works, 421 (i).
- par. in *Daily Patriot*, P.E.I., re Sweating Clause, 9594 (iii).
- Privileges and Elections Com., Absence of Ministers (remarks) 9182.
- Order (Ques. of) 1982.
- Stenographers' Fees, 9462 (iii).
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. Flint) 8896 (iii).
- Plebiscite, Ret. of Votes polled, Papers respecting, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 2043 (i).
- Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 7654; in Com., 7674 (iii).
- Ry. Act Amt. (B. 72) 1°, 1952 (i).
- B. 85 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 9733 (iii).
- Ry. Commissioners, Establishment of a Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. Rutherford) 3859, 3861 (ii).
- Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 9208, 9337, 9429, 9468, 9486, 9518, 9530; in Com. on Bill, 9792 (iii).
- Returns, Inquiry for, 8753, 9595, 9699, 9695, 10116 (iii).
- Roads and Road Allowances in Man. B. 175 (Mr. Sifton) on M. for 1°, 8152 (iii).

**Davin, Mr. N. F.—Con.**

- Rowe, Mrs. Elizabeth, Postmistress at Sintulata, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 8468 (iii).
- Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Facilities, Res. of N.W.T. Assembly (Ques.) 3255 (i).
- Scrip issued to Half-breeds, par. in Calgary *Herald*, 7196 (iii).
- Seed Grain Indebtedness B. 189 (Mr. Sifton) in Com., 9847; (amt.) 9848 (iii).
- Liens, Cancellation, Legislation *re*, Res. from N.W. Council (Ques.) 2903 (i).
- Sintulata Postmistress, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 8468 (iii).
- on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 10118.
- Skelton *vs.* The Queen, Inquiry for Rep. of Min. of Jus. *re* release (remarks) 7441 (iii).
- Rep. of Min. of Jus., 8171 (M.) 8217, 8346 (iii).
- Inquiry for Papers, 7770 (iii).

**SUPPLY :**

- Administration of Justice* (additional Judge) 10192; (N.W.T.) 10122; Yukon (living expenses) 10193 (iii).
- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 8739; (Paris exhibition) 10149 (iii).
- Canals* (St. Andrew's Rapids) 10156 (iii).
- Charges of Management* (printing Dom. notes) 7001 (iii).
- Civil Govt.*: Interior (contingencies) 7467; (salaries) 7467; Post Office, 7330; Public Works (contingencies) 7555; (salaries) 7552 (iii).
- Collection of Revenues* (telegraph lines, N.W.T.) 8183 (iii).
- Dominion Lands* (Inspectors, agents, &c.) 7528; (scrip for half-breeds) 7501, 7514; (seed grain) homesteads, &c., N.W.T.) 7525 (iii).
- Geological Survey* (artesian borings) 7468 (iii).
- Government of N.W.T.* (schools) 7499 (iii).
- Harbours and Rivers*: N.S. (amt.) conc., 10218.
- Immigration* (agents, &c., salaries, &c.) 8484, 8498, 8536, 8562, 8571, 8590, 8656 (iii).
- Indians*: N.W.T. (annuities, &c.) 5694 (ii); (Industrial schools) 7487, 7493 (iii); Man. and N.W.T., 5691; (implements, &c.) 5716 (ii).
- Legislation*: House of Commons (gratuity to Lady Edgar) 10197; (Library, messengers, &c.) 10140; (restaurant keeper) 10137; (voters' lists) 10135 (iii).
- Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, &c.) 5172 (ii); (Traverse lighthouse) 10162 (iii).
- Militia* (pay, allowance) 7018 (iii); Yukon Force (contract for supplies) 6321 (ii).
- Miscellaneous* (refund of duties on fish, &c., P.E.I.) 10179; (roads, &c., Banff, N.W.T.) 7531 (iii).
- Post Office* (Yukon mail services) 7365 (iii).
- Public Works*: Buildings—N.W.T. (improvements, &c.) 9988; (N.S.) 7614; Ottawa, Rideau Hall) 7691; Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Shag Harbour) 9999; (Wharfs) 7703; Que. (Coteau dredging) 10047, 10060; (St. Lawrence River ship channel) 7559, 7574, 7579, 7605; Roads and Bridges (Edmonton bridge) 8198; (Ottawa) 8147.
- Railways*: I.C.R. (accommodation, St. John) 7160.
- Yukon Provisional District* (salaries, &c.) 8959 (iii).
- Wade, Mr., Emplmt. by Govt. (remarks) 7442 (iii).

**Davin, Mr. N. F.—Con.**

- Yukon Provisional District Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 9850 (iii).  
 — Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6262 (ii).  
 — par. in London *Times* (M. to adjn.) 6562, 6585, 7535 (iii).  
 — par. in *North British Daily Mail*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 8020 (iii).  
 — Bennett Hospital, Matron and Medical Supt., Names, &c. (Ques.) 1979 (i).  
 — Bourassa, Mr., Postmaster at Dawson City (Ques.) 1833, 1958 (i).  
 — Fawcett, Mr., Dismissal as Gold Commissioner (M. for cor.\*) 1878 (i).  
 — Lafontaine, Mr. E., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1958 (i).  
 — Militia Force, Mr. Justice Dugas' representations (Ques.) 1842 (i).  
 — strength of Force, Cost of Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 1831, 1841 (i).  
 — Professional Immorality, Taxes imposed, &c. (Ques.) 1842 (i).  
 — Teslin Lake Ry. Route, Rep. of Engineer (M. for Copy\*) 2026 (i).  
 — Wade, Mr. F. C., Instructions or Permission to stake claims, &c. (M. for Copies\*) 1877.

**Davis, Mr. T. O., Saskatchewan.**

- Address, on The, 422 (i).  
 Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 5886 (ii).  
 Binder Twine Contract, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 7217 (iii).  
 — on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 9919.  
 B. C. Legislation *re* Chinese and Foreign Immigration, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 6883 (iii).  
 Coal Oil and Free List (prop. Res.) 1982 (i).  
 — Amt. (Mr. *Fielding*) agreed to (Y. 68; N. 30) 2014 (i).  
 — on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2130 (i).  
 Dom. Permanent Loan Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 6875 (iii).  
 Edmonton and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4847 (ii).  
 General Inspection Act Amt B. 156 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 9652 (iii).  
 Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. *Macpherson*) on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) to M. for 3°, 4198 (ii).  
 Half-breeds, N.W.T., Cor. between Mr. McDowall and Govt., *re* Reserve (Ques.) 2186 (i).  
 McKay, Thos., Indebtedness to Govt. for Timber Dues, Collection, &c. (Ques.) 2486 (i).  
 — Emplmt. by Govt., Salary paid, &c. (Ques.) 2487 (i).  
 Man. and North-western Ry., Miles Constructed, Land Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 2900 (i).  
 Moody, Inspector of N. W. Mounted Police, Charges against (Ques.) 8219 (iii).

**Davis, Mr. T. G.—Con.**

- Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert (B. 10) 1°, 618 (i); (M.) for Com., 3842 (ii).  
 N.-W. Mounted Police, Barracks at Batoche, Supplies for Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2487 (i).  
 — Rebellion (1885) Claims Commission (M. for ret.) 3084, 3102 (i).  
 — Seed Grain Indebtedness, Cancellation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Davin*) 2019 (i).  
 Order, (Ques. of) Irrelevancy of Debate 10076 (iii).  
 Prince Albert Mounted Police Barracks, Date of Erection, &c. (Ques.) 8467 (iii).  
 — Registry Office, Date of Erection, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 8468 (iii).  
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9744.  
 — Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9393, 9586, 9588 (iii).  
 Sproule, R. J., Postmaster at Flesherton, Ont., Complaints against (Ques.) 9179 (iii).

## SUPPLY :

- Dom. Lands* (seed grain indebtedness) 9015 (iii).  
*Immigration* (agents' salaries, &c.) 8548, 8602; (St. Paul des Metis, seed and grain, &c.) 9041.  
*Indians* (Man. and N.W.T.) 5692 (ii); (Veterinary surgeons) 10111 (iii).  
*Miscellaneous* (well-boring machine, N.W.T.) 9056.  
*Public Works*: Roads and Bridges (Edmonton bridge) 8208 (iii); Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5650 (ii).  
*Railways*: P.E.I. (Murray Harbour, &c, construction) 9215 (iii).  
 Yukon Territory Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 9858 (iii).

**Desmarais, Mr. O., Montreal (St. James).**

Address, on The, 1245 (iii).

**Dobell, Hon. E. R., West Quebec.**

Quebec Harbour Commission Consolid. Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3920 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, &c.) 5119, 5124 (i).

**Domville, Mr. James, King's, N.B.**

Address, The, on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1793 (i).

Business of the Hse. (remarks) 7770 (iii).

Donville, Lt.-Col., Charges against (Ques.) 1839.

— Evidence before Pub. Accta. Com., &c. (Ques.) 1845 (i).

— Leave of Absence, par. in St. John Su (Ques.) 2899 (i).

Military College, Kingston, Militia Staff Amount expended from 1867 to 1889 (M. ret.\*) 2029 (i).

Militia Act Amt. (B. 135) 1°, 4055 (ii).

Militia, 8th Hussars, N.B., Annual Allowance (Ques.) 3072 (i).

— Stores, Sale of by I. C. R. (Ques.) 1858 (i).

— Transfer, Orders from Dept., &c. (Ques.) 2897 (i).

**Donville, Mr. James—Con.**

N. W. T. Rebellion (1885) Claims Commission, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3099 (i).

Parker, Mr. Charles H., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1972 (i).

Personal Explanation, par. in *Mail and Empire* re Yukon Charges, 1167 (i).

Preferential Trade with G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 8647 (iii).

Pub. Accts. Com., 3rd Report of Com., on M. to conc., 4148 (ii).

Ry. Policy of Govt. re Yukon Rys., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4757 (ii).

— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9509 (iii.)

St. John Battalion, 8th Hussars, Charges against Commanding Officer, Repts. re Investigation, &c. (M. for cor. \*) 2026 (i.)

## SUPPLY :

*Immigration* (agents, &c., salaries, &c.) 8482 (iii).

*Militia* (arms, equipment, &c.) 9151 (iii).

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 7985.

*Railways*: I. C. R. (accommodation at St. John) 7257 (iii).

Sussex, N. B., Erection of Drill Shed (Ques.) 1857 (i).

Yukon Administration, Charges against, par. in *North British Daily Mail*, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. of Sup., 8064 (iii).

— Council, Names, Appnmt, &c. (Ques.) 1832 (i).

— Miners' Rights to cut Timber, &c. (Ques.) 1836 (i).

— Officials, Appnmts. by Govt., Names, &c. (Ques.) 1832 (i).

— Steamboat Owners, Permits to cut Timber, &c. (Ques.) 1836 (i).

— Timber Regulations, Issue of Permits, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1836 (i).

**Douglas, Mr. J. M., East Assiniboia.**

Grain Seed Indebtedness in Man. and N. W. T. Securities (B. 16) 1<sup>st</sup>, 618 (i).

— Trade in Man. and N. W. T. Regulation (B. 15) 1<sup>st</sup>, 618 (i); 2<sup>d</sup> m., 1901; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2195 (i).

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. *Macpherson*) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup> (amt.) 4189 (ii).

North-west Territories, Expenditure on Capital Account (M. for ret. \*) 1878 (ii).

Seed Grain Indebtedness, Cancellation, &c. on M. (Mr. *Davin*) 2024 (i).

Yukon Liquor Permits, Number, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1843 (i).

**Dugas, Mr. L. E., Montreal.**

Crow's Nest Pass Commission, French Translation of Rep. (Ques.) 1852 (i).

Experimental Farm, Establishment in St. Jacques (Ques.) 2110 (i).

I. C. R., Demers, Dr., Ry. Bicycle Riding, &c. (Ques.) 5308 (ii).

**Dugas, Mr. L. E.—Con.**

I. C. R., Labelle, Mr. L. V., Emplmt. by Govt., (Ques.) 1887 (i).

— Valcouer, Octave, Emplmt. by Govt., (Ques.) 5309 (ii).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Bergeron*) Reading Bill in both Languages, 4649 (ii); 8744 (iii).

Pariseau, Mr. C. D., Postmaster at St. Esprit, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1962 (i).

Public Buildings, Ottawa, Tower Clock and Post Office Clock Lighting, Change of Method, &c. (Ques.) 6381 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (illustration stations) 8305.

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Sabrevois wharf) 10038 (iii).

Tobacco, Canadian and Foreign, Excise Duty paid since 1898, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 3075 (i).

**Dyment, Mr. A. E., Algoma.**

Algoma Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 71) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1949 (i).

Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s (B. 121) 1<sup>st</sup>, 3150 (i).

Sudbury and Wahnapiatae Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 115) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2899 (i).

**Earle, Mr. T., Victoria, B. C.**

## SUPPLY :

*Canals* (Wharfs, &c.) 5798 (ii).

*Indians*: B. C. (reserve commission) 5727 (ii).

*Militia* (annual drill) 5067; (clothing) 5443; (military stores) 5424 (ii); (pay, &c.) 7037 (iii);

Yukon Force (supplies) 6323, 6342-60 (ii); 7037, 7057 (iii).

*Post Office*: Yukon District (mail service) 6364 (ii).

*Public Works*: Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5606, 5630 (ii).

**Edwards, Mr. W. C., Russell.**

Binder Twine, Sale of by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 9917 (iii).

Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4978 (ii).

— B. 161 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7644 (iii).

Central Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1540 (i).

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. *Poupore*) for Cor., &c., 5368 (ii).

Preferential Trade with G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 8643 (iii).

Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9879 (iii).

Russell, Dundas and Grenville Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 59) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1540 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8493 (iii).

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 7988 (iii); Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5644, 5661.

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. *Roddick*) to Com. of Sup., 6298 (ii).

**Ellis, Mr. J. V., St. John City, N.B.**

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 3764 (ii).

B.C. Legislation *re* Chinese and Foreign Immigration, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 6897 (iii).

Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4982 (ii).

Canadian Northern Railway Co's (B. 151) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5096 (ii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. (B. 125) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3335 (ii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. *Maxwell*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, Ques. of Order, 4338 (ii).

Coal Oil, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) to place on Free List, 1996 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6447 (ii).

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc., 1744 (i).

—4th Rep. (presented) 2529 (i).

Dry Docks Construction B. 177 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8474; in Com. on Bill, 8762 (iii).

Excise, Inspection of Sealed Food Packages, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 2705 (i).

Imperial Service and Can. Brigade and Can. Seamen, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2349 (i).

Mint, Establishment by Govt. in Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3124 (i).

Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert B. 10 (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Com., 3842 (ii).

Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 9613 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6104, 6114 (ii).

Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 7664 (iii).

Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Consolid. Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3922 (ii).

Railway Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9591 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6949 (iii).

Safety of Ships B. 170 (Sir *Louis Davies*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 9599 (iii).

SS. Subsidies between St. John, Halifax and London, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 2900 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Fisheries* (protection service) 4720 (ii).

*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8554 (iii).

*Legislation* (stationery supplies) 5733 (ii).

*Public Works* : Dredging (plant) 8142; Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 7997 (iii).

*Ocean and River Service* (maintenance) 2992, 3012

*Railways* : I.C.R. (accommodation, St. John) 7164, 7179; P.E.I. (Murray Harbour, &c., construction) 9221 (iii).

**Erb, Mr. D. K., South Perth.**

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. *Roddick*) to Com. of Sup., 6317 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Post Office* (postmasters' salaries) 5308 (ii).

**Ethier, Mr. J. A. O., Two Mountains.**

Criminal Code (Execution of Death Sentence) (B. 80) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2032 (i).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4665

## SUPPLY :

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (illustration stations) 8314 (iii).

**Featherston, Mr. J., Peel.**

Cattle Inspection, Montreal, Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 10115 (iii).

## SUPPLY :

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 8742 (iii).

*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8605 (iii).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S., Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.**

Address, The, on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1640 (i).

Annapolis Co., Port George Harbour, Pier, &c. (Ans.) 7532 (iii).

Aronsberg, Abraham, Relief B. 144 (Mr. *Landerkin*) in Com., 7575 (iii).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, and Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (Ans.) 1883, 2481 (i).

Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (presented) 1165, 2180 (i).

Banking Act Amt. (B. 127) 1<sup>o</sup>, 3497; in Com., 3763 (ii).

Beet Root Sugar, Bounty for Manufacture, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4840 (ii).

Benevolent Societies incorp. (B. 87) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2109 (i).

Bounties on Iron and Steel (prop. Res.) 4150; (M.) for Com. on Res., 4967; in Com., 4989 (ii).

— (B. 161) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5744 (ii); in Com., 7638 (iii).

Budget Speech and Estimates (remarks) 1952 (i).

— (date of delivery) remarks, 2249 (i).

— Financial Statement, 2410 (i).

Burns, Mr., Priv. Sec. Min. of Fin., Appmt. to Permanent Force (Ans.) 8469 (iii).

Business of the Hse. *re* Estimates, 2025 (i).

— (remarks) 9177 (iii).

Can. Permanent and Western Can. Mortgage Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Oster*) in Com., 4846 (ii).

Central Railway, Cor., &c., in Dept., on Inquiries for, 5667 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. Bill (Ans.) 1956 (i).

Clarke vs. The Queen, Claims against Govt., on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 5752 (ii).

Clark, H. W., Services as Engineer on Dredge "Canada" (Ans.) 8630 (iii).

Coal Oil, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) to place on Free List, 1998 (i).

— on Prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2126 (i).

Colborne and Maitland Ports, Harbour Improvements, Reps., &c. (remarks) 8633 (iii).

— on Inquiry (Mr. *Montagu*) for Reps. of Engineers, &c., 7771 (iii).

*See* Port Colborne.

Combinations in Restraint of Trade Prevention Act Amt. B. 40 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1945 (i).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.—Con.**

- Commercial Treaties with British W. Indies, &c., on M. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) to Com. of Sup., 8173 (iii).  
 Companies Act Amt. (B. 160) in Com., 8774 (iii).  
 Counterfeit Bills, Circulation, &c. (remarks) 5206 (ii).  
 Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6446 (ii).  
 Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) prop. Res., 8753; in Com. on Res. 8924; 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 8947; in Com., 9676 (iii).  
 Dep. Speaker's Delegation of Powers, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5483 (ii).  
 Dom. and Ont. Accounts, Indebtedness of Dom., 1898 (Ans.) 3545 (ii).  
 Drill Hall, Vancouver, Contract for Construction, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 6122 (ii); 7765 (iii).  
 Dry Docks Construction (B. 177) prop. Res., 6123 (ii) 8472; in Com on Res., 8473 (iii); 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 8474; in Com., 8757 (iii).  
 Dry Dock, Victoria, B.C., Pets. *re* Reduction of Charges, &c. (Ans.) 7766 (iii).  
 Estate Duty, Cor. incomplete (remarks) 8221 (iii).  
 Estimates, Year ending 1900 (presented) 2026 (i).  
 ——— Suppl. (Ans.) 4147 (ii).  
 ——— ending 1899 (presented) 4857 (ii).  
 ——— Suppl. 1900 (remarks) 6459 (ii).  
 ——— (remarks) 7242, 7442 (iii).  
 ——— ending 1900 (presented) 7638 (iii).  
 ——— Further (presented) 9835 (iii).  
 Esquimalt (B.C.) Dry Dock, Reduction, &c., Rates, Pets. against, &c. (Ans.) 6122 (ii).  
 Financial Situation (reply) to Mr. Foster, 10246.  
 Friendly Society Insurance, Govt's. Policy *re* Legislation (remarks) 3342 (ii).  
 Govt. Property, B.C., Lease, &c., Cor. respecting (Ans.) 8466 (iii).  
 Halifax Harbour Lightship and Resolutions of Board of Trade (remarks) 8921 (iii).  
 Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Co's B. 74 (Mr. *Beattie*) in Com., 4846 (ii).  
 Insurance Act Amt. (B. 86) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2108 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 3504 (ii); M. for Com., 6391; in Com., 6391 (ii) 7001 (iii).  
 ——— Rates, Mar. Provs., Advancement in Price (remarks) 8922 (iii).  
 I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3734; on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 3769 (ii).  
 ——— G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4125; in Com., on Bill 4597, 4635, 4705, 4711 (ii).  
 ——— Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Bergeron*) reading Bill in both languages, 4649 (ii).  
 ——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden*, *re* Halifax) 4446 (ii).  
 Iron Doors for Public Buildings, Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 4273 (ii).  
 Loan Companies (B. 164) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 6120; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 6391; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Banking and Commerce, 6391 (ii); in Com., 8475 (iii).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.—Con.**

- Members (Picton) Mileage Allowance (Ans.) 6722 (ii).  
 Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 2026 (i) 7638 (iii.)  
 Mint, Govt., Establishment in Can. (Ans.) 2190 (i).  
 ——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3111 (i).  
 Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com. on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) 6336 (ii).  
 Montreal Harbour Commissioners (B. 179) 1<sup>o</sup>, 8752; in Com., 9880 (iii).  
 Northern Commercial Telegraph Co. and Cor. with Mins. of Crown on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to Com. of Sup., 5562, 5563, 5567 (ii).  
 North Shore Ry., Payment to Quebec Govt. by legislation of 1884 (Ans.) 3080 (i).  
 Ont. Provincial Debt. Reduction of Interest (Ans.) 3074 (i).  
 Order (Ques. of) withdw. the word "impertinent," 5607 (ii).  
 Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization (B. 187) in Com. on Res., 9186; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 9609; in Com. (amt.) 9626 (iii).  
 Parlt. Buildings, Tower Clock, Change in Mode of Lighting, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6121 (ii).  
 ——— Name of Contractor and Inventor (Ans.) 6381 (ii).  
 Petroleum Refineries, License Fees (prop. Res.) 3647 (ii).  
 Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, Contract, &c. (remarks) 9310 (iii).  
 Port Maitland Harbour, on Inquiry (Mr. *Montague*) for Repts., &c., 9185 (iii).  
 ——— *See* Colborne.  
 Prince Albert Mounted Police Barracks, Date of Erection, &c. (Ans.) 8467 (iii).  
 ——— Registry Office, Date of Erection, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 8468 (iii).  
 Privilege, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 9181 (iii).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, Royal Commission, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1885 (i).  
 ——— Plebiscite, Amount paid and Balance due (Ans.) 5859 (ii).  
 ——— Bagot Co., Unpaid Claims, &c. (Ans.) 1967 (i).  
 Pub. Accounts Committee, Meeting (remarks) 2604 (i).  
 Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Consolid. Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3940 (ii).  
 ——— (B. 178) 1<sup>o</sup>, 8751; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 9683; in Com., 9868 (iii).  
 ——— Amount expended and Loans advanced by Govt. (Ans.) 5309 (ii).  
 Ry. Subsidies in Pub. Accounts, 1898, Sums paid to Prov. of Quebec (Ans.) 3267 (i).  
 ——— Resolutions (remarks) 8633, 8922 (iii).  
 ——— B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) prop. Res., 8914; in Com. on Res., 9444; in Com. on Bill, 9768, 9778 (iii).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S. — Con.**

- Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. Mulock) in Com., 6941, 6979 (iii).  
Returns, Incomplete (remarks) 9836 (iii).  
Ste. Geneviève, Land Damages, &c., Rep. of Commissioner (Ans.) 6934 (iii).  
St. Louis Lake, Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 8219 (iii).  
Senate and H. of C. Act Amt. (B. 191) 1°, 9696; 2° m., 9845; in Com., 9846 (iii).  
Subsidies. See Rys.

**SUPPLY:**

- (M.) for Com., 2047, 2250 (i), 4171, 6281, 6462 (ii); 7001, 7675, 7773, 8172, 8221, 10118 (iii).  
On M. (Mr. Foster) that Com. rise, 5481 (ii).  
*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 8730 (iii).  
*Canals:* Lachine (Honey & Borthwick's claims) 10153; Sault Ste. Marie (Ryan's claim) 10152 (iii); Welland (remission of arrears for rental) 5792 (ii).  
*Charges of Management* (agents' salaries) 5012; (printing Dom. notes) 5012 (ii) 7002 (iii).  
*Civil Government:* Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 2086; Customs (contingencies) 2981; Finance (salaries) 2090 (i) 5016 (ii); Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 2047 (i); High Commissioner's Office (contingencies) 8749 (iii); Inland Rev. (clerical assistance) 5015 (ii); Interior (salaries) 2078 (i); N. W. Mounted Police (salaries) 2083 (i); Public Works (contingencies) 7554 (iii); (printing, &c.) 5072; (printing, stationery, &c.) 5085 (ii); (salaries) 7536, 7547 (iii); Printing and Stationery (salaries) 2077; Privy Council (salaries) 2051 (i); Railways (salaries) conc., 6382 (ii); Sec. of State (Mungovan, P., salary, &c.) 2076 (i), 5019, 5853 (ii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 2107 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues* (letters of credit) 8191 (iii); (Public Works Agency, B. C.) 8190; (repairs to docks, &c.) 8178; St. Lawrence (telegraph and cable) 8181; Slides and Booms (salaries, &c.) 8178; Telegraph Lines, (B. C.) 8184; (N. W. T.) 8183; (Pele Islands) 8188; (P. E. I.) 8180 (iii).  
*Customs:* B. C. (contingencies, &c.) 8459; N. S., 8405; conc., 10208 (iii).  
*Excise* (commissions on stamps) 4795 (ii).  
*Harbours and Rivers:* N. S. (Saw's Pit, wharf) 9997 (iii); (Hantsport wharf) 5198 (ii); (Jordan Bay) 9998; (Newellton wharf) 9998; (Salmon River, freight shed) 9996 (iii); (Ont.) 5203; Dredging (new plant) 5203; (Mar. Provs.) 5201 (ii).  
*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8599 (iii).  
*Indians:* (B. C.) 5709 (iii); (St. Régis lockup) 5711 (ii).  
*Insurance* (general expenses) 7463 (iii).  
*Legislation:* House of Commons (gratuity to Lady Edgar) 10196 (iii); (voters' lists) 2298 (i) 10130 (Wood, Mr., late M. P., sessional indemnity) 10201; Senate (Senator Sanford's sessional indemnity) 10196 (iii).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (supplies, &c.) 3535, 3538 (ii).  
*Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions* (Halifax and Porto Rico) 10158; (Magdalen Islands) 8682 (iii).  
*Militia* (annual drill) 5067 (ii); (compensation to Mrs. Maxwell) 9133 (iii); (miscellaneous and unforeseen) 5458 (ii); (pay, &c.) 7035; (properties, &c.) 7089; (Royal Military College) 7026; (stores, &c.) 7095 (iii); Yukon Force (transportation and supplies) 6352 (ii).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S. — Con.****SUPPLY—Con.**

- Miscellaneous* (Academy of Arts) 8705 (iii); (claim for translation of Liquor Traffic Rep.) 5851 (ii); (*Canada Gazette*) 8703; (classification of old records) 8702; (Dom. and Ont. arbitration) 8702; (election under Can. Temp. Act) 10111; (extra clerks, &c.) 8705 (iii); (International Commission) 5852 (ii); (printing) 5850 (ii) 8703 (iii); (Printing Bureau Plant) 8703 (iii); (professional services, Mr. C. J. R. Bethune) 5471 (ii); (publication of documents of Mining Institute) 8702; (Rand's English-Micmac Dictionary) 10112; (Regulation Code for railways) 10155; (Royal Society grant) 8706 (iii); (West Indies Relief fund) 5852; Yukon District (hospital grant) 6378 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries* (Kingston, investigation) 5073 (ii).  
*Pensions* (Fenian raid) 8750 (iii).  
*Public Works:* Buildings (B. C.) 9988; Experimental Farm, 7688; (N. B.) 7616; (N. S.) 7613, 7615, 9943 9945 (iii); (Halifax Quarantine Station) 5089 (ii); N. W. T. (improvements, &c.) 9988; (Rossland building) 9988; (Ont.) 7622; (Alexandria Reformatory) 9960; (Astronomical Observatory) 9943; (Sarnia Post office) 9962; (Toronto Post office) 9958; (Windsor Drill Hall) 9962 (iii); Ottawa (Electric Lighting) 5183 (ii) 9939 (iii); Conc., 6386 (ii); (Elevator, East Block) 9960; (Langevin Block) 9938; (Lighting, Repairing, &c.) 9989; (Military Store) 9942 (iii); (Patent Office, photographic establishment) 5091 (ii); (repairs, &c.) 7689; (repairing, &c. East and West Blocks) 9957; (rewiring Library) 9956; (Rideau Hall, additional wing) 9958; (Rideau Hall) 7692; Ottawa (steel shelving) 9989 (iii); (Western Deptl. Block) 5089 (ii); (furnishing &c. 9959; Que., 7619 (iii); (repairs, &c.) 5090 (ii); (Victoriaville P. O.) 9954; Dredging (Mar. Provs. and B. C.) 10070; (plant) 8137; Harbours and Rivers (B. C.) 8085; (generally) 8102; (Man.) 8077; N. B. (Black Brook wharf) 10014; (Campobello breakwater) 10010; (Campbellton wharf) 10013; (Cape Tormentine breakwater) 10012; (Main River wharf) 10012; N. W. T., 8084; N. S. (Berlin protection works) 10001; (Brooklyn wharf) 10003; (Brulé wharf) 10003; (Chezzetcook wharf) 10004; (Clifton wharf) 9991; (Gabus breakwater) 9991; (Gunning Cove wharf) 9991; (Harbourville wharf) 10002; (L'Ardoise breakwater) 9991; (Lockeport breakwater) 9991; (Malignant Cove breakwater) 10003; (Parker's Cove wharf) 10001; (Parrsboro' dredging) 10003; (Porter's Lake, dredging, &c.) 9993; (Ragged Island wharf) 9991; (Seymour Point wharf) 9991; (Shag Harbour wharf) 9998; (Tatamagouche) 10003; (Town Point wharf) 9999; (Victoria county wharfs) 9991; (wharfs) 7699; (Wolfville harbour) 10002; (Yarmouth breakwater) 9990; (Young's Landing wharf) 9997; Ont., 8012, 7966-8019; (Kaministiquia) 7611; (Otonabee improvements) 10065; (Point Pelee wharf) 10068; (Portsmouth wharf) 10065; (Port Colborne) 9250; (Providence Bay wharf) 10068; P. E. I., 7751; (Cardigan pier) 10010; Que., 8103; (Beaumont wharf) 10039; (Cacouna wharf) 10017; (Carleton pier) 10014; (Coteau, dredging) 10039; (Isle aux Grues wharf, &c.) 10018; (Knowlton Landing) 10020; (Lévis dock, enlargement) 9987; (Montreal Harbour improvements) 9964; (New

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.—Con.****SUPPLY—Con.****Public Works—Con.**

Carlisle wharf) 10014; (Newport breakwater) 10014; (Rivière du Lièvre) 10039; (Sabrevois wharf) 10020; (Ste. Anne de Bellevue wharf) 10039; (St. Gédéon wharf) 10019; (St. Irénée wharf) 10018; (St. Jérôme wharf) 10018; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 5086. (ii) 7557, 7579, 7539, 9986 (iii); Miscellaneous (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's statute) 8150; (National Art Gallery) 8149; (purchase of oil paintings) 8150; (Statue of Her Maj.) 8150; (surveys) 8149; Roads and Bridges, N. W. T., 10070: (Edmonton bridge) 8196 (iii); (Ottawa) 5204 (ii) 8147; Que. (Portage du Fort) 10071; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice District) 10070; Telegraph Lines (Anticosti Island) 10072; (B.C. and Teslin Lake) 10099; (Cheticamp and Meat Cove) 10072; (North Shore St. Lawrence) 8149; Yukon District, 10107; (Edmonton trail) 10109; (Lewes and Yukon river improvements) 8192 (iii); (telegraph lines, letter of instructions to Mr. Charleson, read) 5653; (telegraph lines) 5604, 5612, 5653 (ii) 10093; (trails, roads and bridges) 10087 (iii).

**Railways:** I.C.R. (accommodation, St. John) 7162, 7171, 7245, 7259 (iii); P.E.I. (Mount Stewart wharf) 5762, 5777 (ii); (repairs to Gov. Gen.'s Car "Victoria") 8751 (iii).

Supply (B. 169) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 6464 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com., 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 6596 (ii).

— (B. 192) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2<sup>o</sup>, 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 10246 (iii).

Tobacco Grown in Essex Co., Excise Duties, &c., par. in Ottawa *citizen*, 2118 (i).

Travelling Expenses, &c., of Fin. Minister and Private Secretary (Ans.) 1880 (i).

— Foster, Hon. Geo. E., ex-Fin. Min. (Ans.) 1885 (i).

— Tupper, Sir Charles, ex-Minister and High Commissioner, &c. (Ans.) 1885 (i).

Vanluven, Peter, vs. Dom. Bank, Action of Govt., Cor., &c. (Ans.) 9178 (iii).

Victoria Co., N.S., Patronage, &c., on M. (Mr. *McDougall*) to adjn., 5390 (ii).

— Order (Ques. of) Member (Sir *Charles Tupper*) asked to withdraw. Statement, 5394 (ii).

Ville Marie Bank Suspension, Inspection by Govt. (remarks) 8756, 9066 (iii).

**Ways and Means, The Budget (Financial Stmtnt.)** 2410 (i).

— (Res. for Com.) 6463 (ii); 10225 (iii).

Wharfs and Piers in different Provs., Number constructed, Maintenance, &c., 1867 to 1899 (Ans.) 5861 (ii).

Winding Up Act Amt. (B. 163) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 6120 (ii); in Com. 8780 (iii).

Yukon Administration, &c., par. in *North British Daily Mail*, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. of Sup. 8046 (iii).

— Telegraph Line, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 6047, 6120 (ii).

**Fisher, Hon. S. A., Brome.**

Address, on The, 1432 (i).

Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1352 (i).

— Minister's Travelling and Living Expenses (Ans.) 1825 (i).

Apples, Fraudulent Packing, on M. (Mr. *McMillan*) to adjn., 3755 (ii).

Archives, Canadian, Rep. (presented) 4061 (ii).

Beet Root Sugar, Bounty for Manufacture, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4842 (ii).

Belœil Public Works, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3828 (ii).

Bubonic Plague and Quarantine of Pacific Steamers at B. C. (remarks) 5989 (ii).

Cattle Inspection, Montreal, Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 10115 (iii).

Duchesne, Dr. J. A., Complaints against Dr. Hall (Ans.) 3336 (ii).

— Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1888 (i).

Experimental Farm Establishment in St. Jacques (Ans.) 2110 (i).

— Rep. (presented) 3070 (i).

Hall, Dr., Appmt. as Inspector of Cattle at Chicoutimi (Ans.) 3336 (ii).

Illustration Stations, Fruits, Cereals, &c., Govt. Action (Ans.) 2110 (i).

Labelle, Mr. L. V., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1887 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 179 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9882 (iii).

Paris Exposition, Can. Commissioners, Space, &c. (Ans.) 1829 (i).

Plebiscite, Speech of Min. of Agriculture at Ottawa Convention (Ans.) 1826 (i).

Poultry Feeding Experiments, Govt. Action (Ans.) 2110 (i).

Spraying Fruit Trees, Govt. Action (Ans.) 2111.

**SUPPLY :**

**Arts, Agriculture, &c.** (agricultural societies) 8237; (archives) 8224; (cold storage) 8706; (dairy branch) 8268; (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 8337 (iii); (experimental farms) 5073 (ii) 8249; (farm bulletins, printing, &c.) 8264; (general statistics) 8236; (illustration stations) 8280, 8320, 8745 (iii); (N.W.T. exhibition) 5074; (Omaha exhibition) 5074 (ii); (Paris exhibition) 10140 (iii); (Patent office, library) 5074; (*Patent Record*) 5074 (ii); (year book) 8226 (iii).

**Civil Government:** Agriculture (contingencies) 2271 (i); 5027 (ii); (salaries) 2257, 3027 (i).

**Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions** (P.E.I. and G.B.) 8689 (iii).

**Public Works:** Buildings, N.B. (Quarantine stations) 9954; (N.S.) 9945 (iii); Ont. (Patent office, photographic establishment) 5090 (ii); Ottawa (steel shelving) 9990; Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Knowlton Landing) 10020; Montreal Harbour improvements) 9972; (Sabrevois wharf) 10026 (iii).

**Quarantine** (amount transferred to Pub. Works) 5075 (ii); (cattle) 8340 (iii); (salaries, &c.) 5075 (ii); (Tracadie Lazaretto) 8338; (tuberculosis, prevention among cattle) 8344; Winnipeg, hospital) 8338 (iii).

**Fisher, Hon. S. A.—Con.**

- Sydenham River, Amount expended for Dredging (Ans.) 3820 (ii).  
 Tobacco Experimental Station, Establishment in Essex Co. (Ans.) 2486 (i).  
 Tuberculosis Inspection in Chicoutimi County, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 5097 (ii).  
 ——— Prevention of, on M. (Mr. *Roddick*) to Com. of Sup., 6301 (ii).  
 Victoria Harbour, Rep. of Resident Engineer, &c. (Ans.) 3828 (ii).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 9890 (iii).

**Fitzpatrick, Hon. C., Quebec County.**

- Administration in the Yukon, Living Expenses of Judges Dugas and McGuire, Instruction re, &c., 5490 (ii).  
 Alien Labour Law, Appmt. of Agent at Wallaceburg (remarks) 5492 (ii).  
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 3764 (ii).  
 Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 3310 (i).  
 Binder Twine, Kingston Penitentiary, Sale of, Names of Tenderers (Ans.) 3944 (ii).  
 British American Bank Note Co. vs. the Queen, Action by Govt. (Ans.) 6050 (ii).  
 B.C., Chief Justice McColl, Judicial Residence, &c. (Ans.) 3546 (ii).  
 Choquette, Mr. Justice, Place of Residence, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 5097 (ii).  
 Clarke vs. the Queen, Claims against Govt., on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 5751 (ii).  
 Companies Act Amt. (B. 160) 1<sup>st</sup>, 5744 (ii).  
 Coulombe vs. the Queen, Trial Proceedings, &c. (Ans.) 3946 (ii).  
 Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 36 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 2165, 2172 (i).  
 ——— B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 2918 (i).  
 Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2949 (i).  
 Exchequer Court and Railway Debts (B. 159) 1<sup>o</sup>, 5385; in Com., 6101 (ii).  
 I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4567 (ii).  
 Judges and Political Preferments (Ans.) 4484 (ii).  
 Martin, Mr. Justice, Judicial Residence, B.C. (Ans.) 3546 (ii).  
 Meagher, Thos., Arrest, &c., Claims on U. S. Govt. for further compensation (remarks) 5492 (ii).  
 ——— on M. (Mr. *Cowan*) for Ret., 2752 (i).  
 Quebec Harbour Commissioners Consolid. Act Amt. (B. 91) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2182 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 3914, in Com., 3915; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 3985, on amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3988; Sen. Amts., 6100 (ii).  
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Commission, Total Cost, Claims Unpaid, &c. (Ans.) 5484 (ii).

**Fitzpatrick, Hon. C.—Con.**

- Schafheitlin & Fitzgibbon, Customs Infraction (Ans.) 2190 (i).  
 Spinks, County Court Judge, B. C., Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4217 (ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Administration of Justice* (Alien Labour Law, enforcement) 5472; (circuit allowance, B.C.) 5471; (Exchequer Court) 5473; Yukon (law books, &c.) 5469; (living expenses, one Judge) 5469; (maintenance of prisoners) 5468; (supplies for Judge Dugas) 5469; (stationery, &c.) 5470; (travelling expenses for Judge Maguire) 5469 (ii).  
*Civil Government: Justice* (salaries) 2063 (i).  
*Customs* (contingencies) 5856 (ii).  
*Fisheries* (protection service) 4724 (ii).  
*Legislation* (distribution of blue books to Law Associations) 5740 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Canadian Law Library, London, Eng.) 5470; (Chief Justice Strong's expenses in Eng.) 5471 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries* (B. C.) 5479; (Dorchester) 5478, 5480; (Manitoba) 5479; (St. Vincent de Paul) 5477 (ii).  
*Post Office* (legal expenses) 5802 (ii).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3890 (ii).  
 Yukon District, Appmt. of Sheriff, &c. (Ans.) 3943 (ii).

**Flint, Mr. T. B., Yarmouth.**

- Address, The, on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1692 (i).  
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. (B. 109) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2604 (i).  
 Coal Oil, Reduction of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2137 (i).  
 Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6444 (ii).  
 Hudson Bay and Yukon Ry. and Nav. Co. (M.) to receive Pet., 2182 (i).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors (prop. Res.) 8782 (iii).  
 ——— (remarks) 5359 (ii).  
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9732 (iii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S.* (Chegozin breakwater) 9990; (removal of obstructions, Chebogue river) 9990; (Town Point wharf) 10000; (wharfs) 7742 (iii).  
*Legislation: House of Commons* (voters' lists) 10130 (iii).  
*Militia* (salaries) 7081 (iii).  
*Ocean and River Service* (maintenance) 3050 (i).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 9889 (iii).  
 Yukon Territory Act. Amt. B. 186 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com. (amt.) 9857 (iii).

**Fortin, Mr. T., Laval.**

- Champ de Mars, Lease, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 2143 (i).  
 Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1926 (i); in Com., 5903, 5918 (ii).

**Fortin, Mr. T.—Con.**

- Coal Oil, Reduction of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Moore) 2121 (i).  
 Jesus River, Construction of Fishway, Plans, Papers, &c. (M. for copies) 3269 (i).  
 Le Chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord incorp. (B. 29) 1<sup>st</sup>, 895 (i).  
 Montreal Judicial District, Additional Judges, &c., Personal Explanation *re par.* in Montreal Gazette, 7632 (iii).  
 ——— (remarks) 7227 (iii).  
 Priv. and Elections Com. (M.) to employ shorthand writer, 7193 (iii).  
 ——— (M.) to print evidence, 7194 (iii).  
 ——— (M.) to sit concurrently with sessions of the Hse., 7771 (iii).  
 ——— 2nd Rep. (presented) 9461 (iii).  
 ——— Stenographers' Fees, 9461 (iii).  
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Rep. of Commission, Printing and Distribution (M.) 1879 (i).  
 SUPPLY :  
     Yukon District: Militia (clothing contract) 9091 (iii).  
 Winding Up Act Amt. (B. 31) 2<sup>nd</sup> m., 1867; in Com., 4314 (ii).

**Foster, Hon. G. E., York, N.B.**

- Active Militia Force, Resignation of Majors, &c. (Ques.) 5487 (ii).  
 Address, Closing of Debate (remarks) 975 (i).  
 ——— on The, 109 (i).  
 ——— on amt. (Mr. Bertram) to amt. (Mr. Clarke) 1622 (i).  
 ——— Her Majesty *re* Transvaal Question (seconded) 8995 (iii).  
 Allan SS. Service and Govt. Contract, Names of Vessels sailing from St. John, 1897-8 (Ques.) 3258 (i).  
 American Bank Note Co., Dies, Plates, &c., Duties collected, &c. (M. for Ret.) 3828 (ii).  
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1<sup>st</sup>, 3498 (ii).  
 British American Bank Note Co., Claims for Balance due (M. for cor. \*) 2180 (i).  
 Brockville Election, Mailing of Voters' Lists (Ques.) 2482 (i).  
 Budget Speech and Estimates (remarks) 1952 (i).  
 ——— The (Date of delivery) remarks, 2249 (i).  
 ——— (reply) 2537 (i).  
 Business of the Hse. (remarks) 2247 (i).  
 Canada Eastern Ry., N.B., Purchase by Govt. (Ques.) 3554, 3824 (ii).  
 ——— (M. for cor., &c. \*) 3873 (ii).  
 Central Ry. Co. of N.B. and Dept. of Rys. and Canals, Cor., &c., *re* Subsidies (M. for copies \*) 2788 (i).  
 ——— Cor. in Dept., Inquiry for, 5667 (ii).  
 Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. Richardson) in Com., 5902 (ii).  
 Coal Mining under Nanaimo Harbour, Leases, &c. (Ques.) 8991 (iii).

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—Con.**

- Commissions *re* Investigations against Govt. Employees, Names of Commissioners, Allowances, &c., Dismissals, &c. (M. for stmt. \*) 2180 (i).  
 Contracts let without Tender since June, 1896, on M. (Mr. Davin) for O.C.'s, 5327 (ii).  
 Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 171 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 9600, 9729 (iii).  
 Clark, H. W., Services as Engineer on Dredge Canada, &c. (Ques.) 8630 (iii).  
 Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8924; in Com. on Bill, 9665, 9678 (iii).  
 Dawson and Vancouver Mail Service, Arrival, Despatch, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 2961 (i).  
 Dom. and Ont. Accounts, Indebtedness by Dom., 1898 (Ques.) 3544 (ii).  
 ——— Election Act (Voting Machines) Amt. B. 81 (Mr. Britton) on M. for 1<sup>st</sup>, 2036 (i).  
 ——— Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Sifton) in Com., 6400, 6412, 6419; on M. for 3<sup>rd</sup>, 6461 (ii).  
 ——— Notes, Number of Sheets, Back and Tint Plates, Delivered to Govt. (M. for Ret. \*) 1878.  
 Drummond Co. Ry. (Inquiry for Ret.) 2972 (i).  
     *See "I. C. R."*  
 Dry Docks Construction B. 177 (Mr. Sifton) in Com. on Res., 8474; in Com. on Bill, 8758 (iii).  
 Edgar, Sir James, late Speaker, Decease of (remarks) 9061 (iii).  
 Estimates, Suppl. (Ques.) 4147 (ii).  
 ——— Suppl. for 1900 (remarks) 6458 (ii).  
 Financial Situation (Amt.) on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 10228 (iii).  
 Franchise Act Amt. (P.E.I.) Bill, not on Order Paper (remarks) 9309, 9464 (iii).  
 Gaspé Customs Officer and Election, Charges against, 10222 (iii).  
 Geological Survey Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. Sifton) in Com., 6396 (ii).  
 German Discriminating Duties on Can. Imports (Ques.) 1851 (i).  
 Govt. Rys., Working Expenses for May and June, 1898, &c. (Ques.) 4810 (ii).  
 Immigration Agents, Appnmts. since Aug., 1896, Names, Salaries, &c. (M. for List) 1877 (i).  
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 124 (Sir Henry Joly) in Com., 3759 (ii).  
 Inspection (Wheat) Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir Henry Joly) on M. for 1<sup>st</sup>, 5099 (ii).  
 Insurance Act Amt. B. 86 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6392 (ii).  
 I.C.R. and C.P.R., Running Privileges between St. John and Halifax (remarks) 2247 (i).  
 ——— Drawback, Payments of on Freight Charges, Amount paid for Jan. and Feb., 1899 (M. for Ret. \*) 3149 (i).  
 ——— Earnings, Gross, and Working Expenses from 1898 to 1899 (M. for Ret. \*) 2027 (i).  
 ——— Extension to Montreal, Amount Accrued and paid to G.T.R. since July, 1898 (Ques.) 4478 (ii).

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—Con.**

- I.C.R. Car Mileage *re* Victoria Bridge, Incomplete Ret., 4858 (ii).
- Extension to Montreal, Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2793; on M. for 2°, 3908, 4152; in Com., 4165; on M. for 3°, 4733, 4899 (ii).
- on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 2811 (i).
- G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4067, 4144; in Com. on Bill, 4354-4476, 4554-4711; on M. for 3°, 4966 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9716 (iii).
- Order, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4450.
- G.T.R. Engine and Car Mileage, &c. (Ques.) 4811 (ii).
- Expenditure, &c. (M. for Ret.) 5313 (ii).
- Gross Earnings and Expenses (Ques.) 1849.
- Papers *re* Car Mileage (remarks) 4891 (ii).
- Passes issued since Aug., 1896, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1860 (i).
- Trois Pistoles, Dismissal of Pierre Michaud and F. Belanger, Cor., &c. (M. for copy\*) 5945 (ii).
- Interior Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6398 (ii).
- International Commission between G.B. and U.S., Persons connected therewith, Names and Expenses, &c. (M. for stmnt.\*) 2180 (i).
- Loan Companies B. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8475 (iii).
- Manitoba Lake, Drainage, &c. (Ques.) 1965 (i).
- McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., and Claims for Land Damages by Farmers of Lindsay, Letter read by P.M.G., Ruling asked for, 5006 (ii).
- Militia, Age Limits, Service of Lt.-Cols., Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 1852, 2183 (i).
- Montreal Harbour Commissioners' B. 179 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9880 (iii).
- Island Belt Line Ry. B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 6327 (ii).
- Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. *Britton*) in Com., 1896 (i).
- Northern Commercial Telegraph Co. and Cor. with Minister of the Crown, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to Com. of Sup., 5561 (ii).
- North Shore Ry., Payment to Quebec Govt. by Legislation of 1884 (Ques.) 3080 (i).
- Ogilvie, Mr., Connection with British Gold Fields Co. (M. to adjn.) 3801 (ii).
- Ont. Provincial Debt, Reduction of Interest (Ques.) 3074 (i).
- Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Fielding*) Definition of the Word "impertinent" 5608; Appeal to Speaker 5610 (ii).
- Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 9187; on M. for 2°, 9612; in Com., 9626 (iii).
- Pacific Cable between Australia and G.B. Agreement B. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 8383.
- Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 173 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8763 (iii).

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—Con.**

- Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection B. 131 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3884 (ii).
- Postal Notes, Contract, Cost, &c. (M. for Copy) 1982 (i).
- engraving, printing, &c., Tenders, &c. (M. for Cor., O.Cs., &c.) 1877 (i).
- Cards, issued by P. O. Dept., Quality, &c. (M. for Cor. &c.\*) 1879 (i).
- Stamps, Cards, &c., issued since Jan., 1897 (M. for stmnt.\*) 1877 (i).
- Prime Minister's Reply to Invitation to Chicago Demonstration, par in Newspaper, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn., 9843 (iii).
- Printing Com., 3rd, 4th and 5th Reps. of Com. Stationery, &c., on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) to conc., 5378 (ii).
- Privileges and Elections Com., Stenographers' Fees, 9462 (iii).
- Rep. of Committee (remarks) 10115 (iii).
- Prohibition Plebiscite, Amount paid and Balance due (Ques.) 5859 (ii).
- Ret. of Votes polled, Papers respecting (M. to adjn.) 2037 (i).
- request that they be laid on Table 1894, 1955 (i).
- Pub. Accounts Com., Meeting (remarks) 2604, 2965 (i).
- Delay in Meeting (Man. Election Frauds) on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to adjn., 3233 (i).
- Postponement and Hours of Meetings, &c. (remarks) 4344 (ii).
- 6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to print, 9837 (iii).
- Report of Com. (remarks) 10116 (iii).
- Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3917 (ii).
- B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9684; in Com., 9861, 9878 (iii).
- Queen's County (P.E.I.) Appnmt. of Judge (remark) 9001 (iii).
- Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9731 (iii).
- Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Ry. Co.'s, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4746.
- Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9311, 9332, 9469, 9500, 9561; in Com. on Bill, 9770, 9786, 9810 (iii).
- Subsidies in Pub. Accounts 1898, Sums paid to Prov. of Que. (Ques.) 3267 (i).
- Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3457 (ii).
- Returns, Incomplete, 9836 (iii).
- Inquiry for (Central Ry. of N.B.) 5387.
- Michaud and Belanger Papers, incomplete (remarks) 9844, 9895 (iii).
- Returns (inquiry) 1432 (i); 4171, 6320, 6596 (ii); 8075, 8224, 8386, 8754, 9310, 9595 (iii).
- Royal Military College, Clothing Contract (Ques. 6722 (ii); 6932 (iii).

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—Con.**

- St. Lawrence River and Canals, Deepening of Navigation, &c., Contracts entered into, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 2788 (i).  
 Safety of Ships B. 170 (Sir *Louis Davics*) on M. for 2, 9599 (iii).  
 Schafheitlin & Fitzgibbons, Customs Infraction (Ques.) 1889, 2190 (i).  
 Scugog Indians, Liquor sold, Cor. between Dept. and Mr. A. Soper (M. for copies\*) 3149 (i)  
 Smith, Mr. Abner, Postmaster at Rusagornis, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3256 (i).  
 Speaker, late Sir James Edgar, Decease of (remarks) 9061 (iii).  
 Stamps, Jubilee and Greater Empire, Stamp Plates, Cost, Number, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 2028.  
 Stony Mountain Penitentiary Commissioner's Rep. (remarks) 9837 (iii).  
 Sugar Imports from British West Indies, Quantity and Value (Ques.) 2327 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

- Res. in Com., 6462 (ii).  
 (M.) that Com. rise, 5481 (ii).  
*Administration of Justice*: Yukon (additional Judge) 10191; (living expenses) 10194 (iii).  
*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (archives) 8224; (dairy commissioner) 8265; (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 8337 (iii); (experimental farm) 5073 (ii); (farm bulletins, printing, &c.) 8264; (general statistics) 8236; (illustration stations) 8279; (iii); (N. W. T., exhibition) 5074; (Omaha Exhibition) 5074 (ii); (Paris Exhibition) 10140 (iii); (Patent Branch Library) 5075; (patent record) 5074 (ii); (year book) 8227 (iii).  
*Canals*: Chambly (telephone lines) 5783; Lachine (deepening river St. Pierre) 5782 (ii); (Heny and Borthwick's claims) 10153; Man. (St. Andrews Rapids) 10155 (iii); (North Channel) 5780 (ii); Rainy River (lock and dam) 10154; Sault Ste. Marie (Ryan's & Co.'s claim) 9240 (iii); Welland (remission of arrears of rental) 5790 (ii).  
*Charges of Management* (agents' salaries) 5012; (printing of Dominion notes) 5012 (ii).  
*Civil Government*: Agriculture (contingencies) 2270; (salaries) 2256; Aud. Gen.'s Office (contingencies) 2269; (salaries) 2086; Customs (contingencies) 2973, 2986; (salaries) 2093; Finance (contingencies) 2277; (salaries) 2090 (i) 5017 (ii); (Geological Survey (salaries) 2104; Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 2047; Indian Affairs (salaries) 2083 (i); Inland Revenue (contingencies) 2270; Interior (clerical assistance) 5023 (ii); (salaries) 2077; Justice (salaries) 2063; Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 2266, 2276; (salaries) 2070, 2102 (i); (clerical assistance, &c.) 5012 (ii); N.W. Mounted Police (salaries) 2063 (i); Post Office (contingencies) 5068; (contingencies, Dead Letter Branch) 5069 (ii); (Post Office Dept.) conc., 10202 (iii); Printing and Stationery, 2077; Pub. Works (Printing, &c.) 5072, 5085 (ii); Privy Council (contingencies) 2265; (salaries) 2048; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 2276; (salaries) 2250 (i); 6382 (ii); Sec. of State (contingencies) 2269 (i); (P. Mungovan's salary) 5019, 5853 (ii); (salaries) 2076; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 2277; (salaries) 2107, 2262 (i).

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—Con.****SUPPLY—Con.**

- Collection of Revenues* (repairs, &c., to docks) 8182; telegraph lines (B.C.) 8184; (N.W.T.) 8183; (Peleo Island) 8188; (P.E.I.) 8180; (St. Lawrence cable) 8181 (iii).  
*Customs*: B.C. (repairs to cruisers) 5602, (contingencies) 5856 (ii); N.S. (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 8392 (iii); Ont. (salaries) 5595; (stationery, &c., B.C. and Yukon) 5600; (suspense account, Montreal) 5588; Yukon (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 5596 (ii), 10109 (iii).  
*Dominion Lands* (Chief Inspector, salaries, &c.) 9006, 9019; (surveys, printing plans, &c.) 9053 (iii).  
*Excise* (allowance to Customs Officers) 4790; (commissions on stamps) 4791; (preventive service) 4788; (salaries of officers) 4770 (ii).  
*Fisheries* (Behring Sea expenses) 5181; (dismissal of Capt. Babb) 4256; (gratuity to Mr. Venning) 5183; (gratuity to Com. Wakeham) 5183; (repairs, &c.) 5189 (ii).  
*Geological Survey* (salaries) 5663 (ii).  
*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8494, 8509, 8648; (St. Paul des Métis, seed grain, &c.) 9029 (iii).  
*Indians*: B.C. (reserve commission) 5726; (*Vigilant*) 5729; (liquor traffic, suppression) 5710; (Man. and N.W.T. annuities) 5711 (ii); (boarding schools) 10110 (iii); (general expenses) 5722; (implementations, &c.) 5712; (Sioux) 5721; (surveys, &c.) 5721; N.W.T. (annuities, &c.) 5695; (Oka Reserve) 5709; (Ont.) 5674; (St. Regis Lockup) 5711; (surveys, &c.) 5710; (Inspectors and agencies) 5730 (ii).  
*Inspection of Staples* (salaries, &c.) 5587 (ii).  
*Interior*: Yukon District (general expenditure) 6367 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Debates) 2280; (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2278 (i); (gratuity to Lady Edgar) 10190 (iii); (sessional clerks) 2280; (stationery supplies) 2278 (i), 5731 (ii); (voters' lists) 2302 (i), 8750, 10127; (Wood, late M.P., sessional indemnity) 10201 (iii).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, &c.) 5139; (salaries, &c.) 3524; (Traverse lightship conc., 6384 (ii), 10162 (iii).  
*Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions* (Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie) 8685; (Gaspé and Quebec) 8686; (Grand Manan) 8684; (G.B. and Can.) 8662; (Magdalen Islands) 8681; (Murray Bay and Ouelle River) 10159; (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 10157; (St. John, Halifax and London) 8673; (St. John and Liverpool) 8671; (St. John and Minas Basin) 8686; (St. John, &c., and W. Indies, &c.) 8675; (St. John, &c., and Yarmouth) 8686 (iii).  
*Militia* (annual drill) 5067, 5415 (ii); (arms, equipment, &c.) 9145; (armouries) 9125 (iii); (clothing) 5445 (ii), 9126; (compensation to Octave Ouelette) 9127; conc., 10218 (iii); (defence scheme) 5466; (Hamilton rifle range) 5465; (London property) 5465; (military properties) 5421; (military stores) 5431; (miscellaneous and unforeseen) 5451, 5857; (rifle range, B.C.) conc., 6390; (Royal Military College) 5464; (transport) 5451; (transportation and supplies) 6323 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Canadian Law Library, London, Eng.) 5470 (ii); (Chas. Bremner, compensation, &c.) 10113, 10169 (iii); (Crow's Nest Commission expenses) 5831 (ii); (Half-breed claims commis-

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*SUPPLY—*Con.**Miscellaneous—Con.*

sion) 9056 (iii); (Half-breed claims expenses) 5832; International Commission) 5852; (printing) 5851 (ii); (Refund of Customs duties, on fish &c. P.E.I.) 10114, 10169, 10180 (iii); Translating Rep. of Liquor Commission) 5852 (ii); (well-boring machine, N.W.T.) 9056; (Wentworth vs. Mathieu, litigation) 10112 (iii); Yukon District (contingencies) 6376 (ii).

*N. W. Mounted Police* (service) 5832; (Yukon service) 5834 (ii).

*Ocean and River Service* (Pird Rock) conc., 6383; (maintenance and supplies) 5103 (ii); ("Minto" construction) 10161 (iii).

*Penitentiaries* (St. Vincent de Paul) 5477 (ii).

*Post Office* (inspector's salaries) 5798; (inspector's salary) conc., 6387; (legal expenses) 5801 (ii); mail service) 10202 (iii); (Rainy River service) 5826; (refund for stamps stolen) 5800; Yukon District (railway mail service) 6360 (ii).

*Public Works*: Buildings (B.C.) 9988; (Rossland building) 9988; N.B. (St. John Quarantine stations) 9954; N.W.T. (improvements, &c) 9988; (N.S.) 9944; Ont. (London drill hall) 9962; Ottawa (Astronomical Observatory) 9953 (iii); (electric lighting) 5184 (ii) 9939, 9989; conc., 6386 (ii); (furnishing &c., Deptl. Buildings) 9959; (Langevin Block) 9939; (military store) 9942; (Patent office) 5092; (repairing &c. East and West Block) 9957; (rewiring Library) 9956; (Rideau Hall, additional wing) 9959; (steel shelving) 9990 (iii); (Western Deptl. Block) 5089; (ii); (St. Catharines Drill Hall) 9957; (Sarnia Post Office) 9962; (Windsor Drill Hall) 9962 (iii); Que. (repairs, &c.) 5090 (ii); (Victoriaville P.O.) 9954; (amt.) conc., 10218; Dredging (Mar. Provs.) 10070; Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 8085; (generally) 8102; (Man.) 8077; N.B. (Campobello breakwater) 10010; (Cape Tormentine breakwater) 10011; (Hopewell wharf) 10010; (Main River wharf) 10012; (St. John River and Belleisle wharfs) 10011; (N.W.T.) 8084; N.S. (Belliveau breakwater) 10000; (Berlin protection works) 10000; (Brooklyn wharf) 10003; (Cheggogin breakwater) 9990; (Cheztecocook wharf) 10005; (Gabus breakwater) 9992; (Malignant Cove Breakwater) 10003; (Newellton wharf) 9998; (Porter's Lake, dredging &c.) 9993; (removal of obstructions Chebogue River) 9990; (Salmon River freight shed) 9997; (Saw's Pit wharf) 9997; (Shag Harbour wharf) 9998; (Town Point wharf) 9999; (Young's Landing wharf) 9997; Ont., 7966, 7989, 7987; (Port Colborne) 9256, 9290; (Toronto Harbour) 10066; P.E.I. (Canoe Cove breakwater) 10007; (Rocky Point breakwater) 10006; (West Point Pier) 10006; Que., 8104; (Baie des Honfleur wharf) 10019; (Cacouna wharf) 10016; (Carleton pier) 10014; (Coteau, dredging) 10058; (Lévis dock, enlargement) 9987; (Montreal Harbour improvement) 9964, 9982; (New Carlisle wharf) 10014; (Newport breakwater) 10014; (Rivière du Lièvre) 10059; (Sabrevois wharf) 10020 (iii); (St. Lawrence River channel) 5086 (ii) 9986; Roads and Bridges (N.W.T.) 10070; (Portage du Fort) 10071; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice District) 10070; Telegraphs (Anticosti Island) 10073; (B.C. Atlin, &c.) 10099; (Cheti-

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*SUPPLY—*Con.**Public Works—Con.*

camp and Meat Cove) 10072; Yukon District (buildings) 10107; (Edmonton trail) 10109; (river improvements) 8194 (iii); (telegraph lines) 5606, 5612, 5623, 5637 (ii) 10093; (B.C. and Teslin Lake) 10100; (trails, roads and bridges) 10087 (iii).

*Quarantine* (Tracadie Lazaretto) 8338; (Winnipeg hospital) 8338 (iii).

*Railways*: I. C. R. (Indiantown Branch Mr. Snowball's claim) 9167 (iii); (rolling stock) 5754 (ii); (Point Tupper improvement) 9171 (iii); (repairs to Car Victoria) 5785 (ii); (shops at Moncton) 5753; (telegraph service) 9171 (iii); P.E.I. (Mount Stewart Wharf) 5754; conc., 6387 (ii); (Murray Harbour, &c., construction) 9229 (iii); (subsidies, Central Ry. Co.) 5788 (ii).

*Yukon Provisional District* (customs) 8747; (salaries, &c.) 8966, 9002 (iii); Militia, clothing, transportation, &c.) 9072, 9109; (salaries, &c.) 8661 (iii).

Valleyfield Customs Collectors, Charges against, on M. (Mr. Bergeron) to Com. of Sup., 5503 (ii).  
Voters' Lists, Delay in sending in Revision, (Ques.) 2530, 2698 (i).

— N.B., Printing, &c. (Ques.) 2530 (i).

Wharfs, Revenue, &c., Stmt. promised (remarks) 10221 (iii).

Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, par. in *North British Daily Mail*, on M. (Mr. Davin) to Com. of Sup., 8038 (iii).

— On M. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to Com. of Sup., 6192 (ii).

— Charleson, Mr. J. B., O. C., Appointing, &c. (remarks) 9699 (iii).

— Administrator and Officials, Instructions, &c. (M. for copies\*) 1877 (i).

— Appnmts. by Govt. since Aug., 1896, Names, Salaries, &c. (M. for Stmt. \*) 1876 (i).

— Dom. Police, Number, Distribution, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1965 (i).

— Dredging for Minerals, &c. (Ques.) 3079 (i).

— Investigation, Inq. for Rets., 4341 (ii).

— Mr. Ogilvie's Rep. (M.) to print, 3877 (ii).

— Liquor Permits and sanction of Min. of Int. (Ques.) 1859 (i).

— (cor. \*, &c., Inquiry for) 5667 (ii).

— names of Coa., &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 1877 (i).

— quantity, &c. (M. for stmt. \*) 1876 (i).

— Mail Service between Dawson and Vancouver, &c. (Ques.) 1966 (i).

— carriage of Registered Matter (remarks) 4352 (ii).

— Mining Regulations: Inquiry for Ret., 2248 (i).

— Ogilvie's, Mr., Letter re Connection with British Can. Goldfields Co. (M. to adjn.) 3799 (i).

— Permanent Militia, Number, Cost of Transportation, &c. (Ques.) 1892 (i).

— Rumours re conflict between U. S. and Can. Customs (remarks) 975 (i).

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—Con.**

- Yukon Telegraph Lines, Construction by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 6047, 6120 (ii).  
 — Territory Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. Sifton) in Com., 3849 (iii).

**Fraser, Mr. D. C., Guysborough.**

- Address, on The, 939 (i).  
 Adulteration Act Amt. B. 123 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3995 (ii).  
 Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 171 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 9601 (iii).  
 Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction, B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 2926 (i).  
 Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6453 (ii).  
 Dowding, Annie Inkson, Relief (B. 136) 1<sup>st</sup>, 4147 (ii).  
 Militia Clothing, Tenders, &c., (M.) for Copies to be ref. to Pub. Accounts Com., 3874 (ii).  
 Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co's. B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com. on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) 6332 (ii).  
 N.W.T. Rebellion Losses (1885) Claims Commission, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3099 (i).  
 Nova Scotia Steel Co's. (B. 139) 1<sup>st</sup>, 4259 (ii).  
 Pacific Cable, par. in *Citizen* re Conference of Sec. of State for Colonies, and High Commissioner 3268 (i).  
 Personal Explanation, par. in *Montreal Gazette*, 2036 (i).  
 Pub. Accounts Com., Meetings (remarks) 2965 (i).  
 — Delay in Meeting (Man. Election Frauds) on M. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) to adjn., 3246 (i).  
 — Postponement and Hours of Meeting, &c. (remarks) 4344 (ii).  
 — 3rd Rep. of Com., conc., 4147 (ii).  
 — (M.) to refer papers re *Christie, Mr. W. J.*, to Com., 4477 (ii).  
 — Delay in Meetings (remarks) 7195 (iii).  
 — Meetings during Sitzings of House (M.) 8780 (iii).  
 — 6th. Rep. of Com. (presented) 9836 (iii).  
 Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 7653 (iii).  
 Ry. Act. Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9734 (iii).  
 — Policy of Govt. re Yukon Rya Cos., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4749 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (year book) 8229 (iii).  
*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8543; (St. Paul des Métis, seed grain, &c.) 9047 (iii).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, &c.) 5163 (ii).  
*Post Office* (Postmasters' salaries) 5616 (ii).  
 Victoria Co., N.S., Patronage, &c. on M. (Mr. *McDougall*) to adjn., 5396 (ii).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3900 (ii).

**Fraser, Mr. J., East Lambton.**

- Address, on The, Omission of Name from Division List, 1861 (i).  
 British American Bank Note Co. vs. The Queen, Action by Govt. (Ques.) 6050 (ii).  
 Coal Oil, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) to place on Free List, 1986 (i).  
 — on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2134 (i).  
 London Mutual Fire Ins. Co. of Canada (B. 68) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1949 (i).

**Frost, Mr. F. T., Leeds and Grenville.**

- Address, on The, 1386 (i).  
 Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9389 (iii).

**Ganong, Mr. G. W., Charlotte.**

- Address, on The, 1095 (i).  
 Brown, Barth, Campobello, N.B. Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4482 (ii).  
 Dick, Isaac, Fishery Guardian, N.B., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 7765 (iii).  
 Fishing Weirs, Charlotte Co., Licenses Issued, Dates, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 2962 (i).  
 Gallant, W. A., Engineer Point Lepreaux Fog-alarm, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4806 (ii).  
 Glass, Jas., Fishery Guardian at Charlotte, N.B., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4482 (ii).  
 Lepreaux, N. B., Customs Officer, Name, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 5313 (ii).  
 Lobster Fisheries Protection, Regulations re, on M. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) for Com. of Sup., 7686 (iii).  
 Milltown, N.B. Appnmt. of Fishery Guardian (Ques.) 4482 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

- Civil Government* : Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5028 (ii).  
*Public Works* : Dredging (plant) 8140; N.S. (Wharves) 7718; (Ont.) 8003 (iii).  
*Post Office* (mail services) 7373; Postmasters' salaries) 5626 (ii).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. (B. 143) 1<sup>st</sup>, 4477 (ii).

**Gauthier, Mr. J., L'Assomption.**

- Tobacco (Can.) Manufacture, Number of Factories, Memorials, &c. re Duty (M. for stmt. \*) 2027 (i).

**Gauvreau, Mr. C. A., Temiscouata.**

- Address, on The, 1336 (i).  
 Fraserville Harbour and Board of Trade Resolutions (Ques.) 1968 (i).  
 I.C.R., Addition to Workshops at Rivière du Loup (Ques.) 4480 (ii).  
 — Appnmt. of Supt. W. A. Dube, Location of Headquarters (Ques.) 2533 (i).  
 — Delay in furnishing Cars, Complaints, &c. (Ques.) 1853 (i).  
 — Employees Working Hours, Complaints, &c. (Ques.) 1974 (i).

**Gauvreau, Mr. C. A.—Con.**

- I.C.R. Fraserville Accommodation, Pets. from Board of Trade, &c. (Ques.) 1972 (i).  
 ——— pets., *re* Disorderly Conduct (Ques.) 2899 (i).  
 ——— Headquarters at Lévis, Transfer, &c. (Ques.) 3551 (ii).  
 ——— Machinery at Rivière du Loup, Application by Supt. for Additions, &c. (Ques.) 4481 (ii).  
 ——— New time-table (Ques.) 4481 (ii).  
 ——— Removal of Shops from Rivière du Loup to Lévis (Ques.) 2533 (i).  
 ——— Roberge, Cyrille, Dismissal of (Ques.) 1857 (i).  
 ——— Salaries of Employees at Rivière du Loup Workshops (Ques.) 4480 (ii).  
 Legris, Mr., Postmaster at Ste. Eulalie, Investigation, Rep., &c. (Ques.) 4272 (ii).

**Gibson, Mr. W., Lincoln and Niagara.**

- Can. Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 62) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1753 (i).  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 61) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1753 (i).  
 I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res. 4135 (ii).  
 Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for Com. 5250, 5256 (iii).  
 Printing Com. 3rd Rep. of Com. (presented) 5745 (ii).  
 Printing of Parl. 3rd, 4th and 5th Repts. of Com., conc. (M.) 5378 (ii).  
 ——— 7th Rep. of Com., conc. (M.) 8913 (iii).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. Mulock) in Com., 6777, 6803 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

- On M. (Mr. Foster) that Com. rise, 5482 (ii).  
 Canals : Trent (construction) 7301 (iii).  
 Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8614 (iii).  
 Legislation (distribution of blue books to law associations) 5738 (ii).  
 Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5130 (ii).  
 Militia (clothing) 7103; (monuments) 7152 (iii).  
 Public Works : Harbours and Rivers (Wharfs, N.S.) 7744; Ont., 8006; (Port Colborne) 9282, 9274 (iii).  
 Railways : I.C.R. (accommodation, St. John) 7157, 7180, 7189 (iii).  
 Welland Power and Supply Canal Co.'s (B. 67) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1949 (i).

**Gillies, Mr. J. A., Richmond N.S.**

- Arichat Breakwater, N.S., Repairs, Amount expended from 1891 to 1896 (Ques.) 5485 (ii).  
 Babin's Cove Wharf, Arichat, N.S., Cost, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 5486 (ii).  
 Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. Richardson) in Com., 5916 (ii).  
 Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 2 (Mr. Charlton) on M. for 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2916 (i).

**Gillies, Mr. J. A.—Con.**

- Descousse Wharf, N.S., Cost of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 5486 (ii).  
 Dredging, Richmond Co., N.S., Amount expended from 1891 to 1896 (Ques.) 5485 (ii).  
 Fourchie Harbour, N.S., Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 2904 (i).  
 I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 4680 (ii).  
 Jerome Point Lighthouse, Inquiry for Ret., 3669.  
 L'Ardoise Breakwater, Amount expended by Govt. (Ques.) 1886 (i).  
 ——— Construction by Govt. (Ques.) 2904 (i).  
 Little River, N.S., Breakwater, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 3944 (ii).  
 McNeil, Stephen, Beaver Cove, Rental charged by Govt. (Ques.) 3944 (ii).  
 ——— Lighthouse-keeper at Richmond, Papers Respecting, Inquiry for Ret., 4732 (ii).  
 Newfoundland Fisheries and French Shore, Rep. of Royal Commission, Inquiry for Ret., 3070.  
 Petit de Grat Breakwater, Amount expended by Govt., Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 1886 (i).  
 Ry. Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Ry. Co.'s, on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) to Com. of Sup., 4752 (ii).  
 Returns, Inquiry for, 4552 (ii).  
 St. Peter's Canal, Amount expended from 1891 to 1896, &c. (Ques.) 3255 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

- Administration of Justice (Exchequer Court) 5472.  
 Fisheries (salaries of Inspectors) 4050 (ii).  
 Indians : B. C. (reserve commission) 5728; Man. and N. W. T. (implements, &c.) 5718 (ii).  
 Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries, &c.) 3528.  
 Militia (miscellaneous and unforeseen) 5456 (ii).  
 Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 5478 (ii).  
 Post Office (Postmasters' salaries) 5820 (ii).  
 Steamboat Inspection (fog alarms) 4240 (ii).  
 Tobacco, Reduction of Duties (prop. Res.) allowed to stand, 4813 (ii).  
 Travelling Expenses, &c., Finance Minister and Private Secretary (Ques.) 1880 (i).  
 Wharfs and Piers in different Provs., Number constructed, Maintenance, &c., from 1867 to 1899 (Ques.) 5861 (ii).  
 ——— (M. for Ret. \*) 6939 (iii).  
 Victoria Co., N.S., Patronage, on M. (Mr. McDougall) to adjn., 5490 (ii).  
 Yukon District, Harper, Mr. F., Postmaster at Dawson City, Issue of Notice (Ques.) 1961 (i).

**Gilmour, Mr. J., East Middlesex.**

- Apples, Fraudulent Packing, on M. (Mr. McMillan) to adjn., 3756 (ii).  
 Binder Twine Contract, on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 7218 (iii).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. Mulock) in Com., 6999 (iii).  
 Settlers from Eastern Can. to N. W. T., Aid by Govt. (Ques.) 2534 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

- Arts, Agriculture, &c. (illustration stations) 8317.

**Graham, Mr. D., North Ontario.**

Trent Valley Canal, Land Valuations, Complaints, &c. (Ques.) 5311 (ii).

Mr. F. D. Moore, Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 5311 (ii).

**Guillet, Mr. G., West Northumberland (O.)**

Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 98) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2318 (i).

Printing Bureau and Sunday Labour (remarks) 3879 (ii).

Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Pontiac, Change of Title (B. 108) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2529 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

*Immigration* (agents' salaries, &c.) 8487, 8589 (iii).

*Indians* (N.S.) 7490 (iii).

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 7933; Que. (Sabrevois wharf) 10030 (iii).

**Haggart, Hon. J. G., South Lanark.**

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 3765 (ii).

Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) on M. for Com., 3299; in Com., 3308 (i); Sen. Amts., 7578 (iii).

Bounties on Iron and Steel B. 161 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7639 (iii).

Business of the Hse. (remarks) 3253 (i) 9177 (iii).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5920, 5933 (ii).

Contracts let without Tender, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for O. C's, 5335 (ii).

Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 171 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 9607 (iii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6434 (ii).

Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1920 (i).

Drummond County Ry. Res., Inquiry for Papers, 2249; 2973 (i).

See I.C.R.

General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 9637 (iii).

Great Northern Ry. Co's B. 118 (Mr. *Savard*) in Com., 6970 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 124 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3761, 3881 (ii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6392 (ii).

I.C.R., Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry., Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3345; on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 3771.

— on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 2821 (ii).

— G.T.R. Agreement; B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4069, 4113; on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 4164; in Com., 4357, 4370, 4685, 4712 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9710 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 179 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9881 (iii).

— Island Belt Line Ry. Co's B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com. on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) 6336 (ii).

**Haggart, Hon. J. G.—Con.**

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. *Britton*) in Com., 1896 (i).

Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 9612 (iii).

Penberthy Injector Co.'s Patent Relief B. 141 (Mr. *McGregor*) in Com., 6878 (iii).

P.E.I. Ry., Murray Harbour and Charlottetown Authorization B. 183 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9758 (iii).

Prohibition Plebiscite, Ret. of Votes polled, Papers respecting, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2040 (i).

Public Works (Preservation of Public Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 7673 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Tenders for Construction, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2112 (i).

— Harbour Commissioner B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9868 (iii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9736 (iii).

— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9319, 9458, 9468, 9472; in Com. on Bill, 9767 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6904, 6941 (iii).

Restigouche Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *McAlister*) on Order for 2<sup>o</sup>, 2650 (i).

Returns, Inquiry for, 8076 (iii).

**SUPPLY:**

*Canals*: Chambly (telephone lines) 5784; Cornwall (repairs to locks) 5784; Farran's Point (enlargement) 5779 (ii); Galops (enlargement) 7442; Lachine (Atwater Avenue wall) 9173; (Heney & Borthwick's claim) 9173, 10153; Murray (landing stage) 7454 (iii); (North Channel) 5779 (ii); Rideau (Kilmarnock cut) 7454; Sault Ste. Marie (Ryan & Co., claims) 9235; Welland (Port Colborne) 7454 (iii); (remission of arrears of rentals) 5791 (ii); (repairs, &c.) 7463 (iii).

*Civil Govt.*: Interior (contingencies) 7468 (iii); Militia and Defence (salaries) 2073 (i); Post Office 7354 (iii); Privy Council Office (salaries) 2058; Railways and Canals (salaries) 2250 (i).

*Collection of Revenues* (Telegraph lines, B.C. 8186; (Pelee Island) 8189 (iii).

*Customs* (Suspense account, Montreal) 5593 (ii).

*Geological Survey* (Artesian borings) 7473 (iii).

*Insurance* (General expenses) 7463 (iii).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (voters' lists) 2281 (i).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Construction, &c.) 5133 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Margaree Cheticamp) 10157; (Murray Bay and Ouelle River) 10159 (iii).

*Militia* (rifle ranges) 9144, 9154 (iii).

*Miscellaneous* (Chas. Bremner, compensation, &c.) 10169; (refund of duties on fish. &c., P.E.I.) 10173; (Regulation Code for railways) 10155 (iii).

*Public Works*: Buildings (N.S.) 7615, 7619; Ont., 7625, 9960; (Alexandria Reformatory) 9930; (London drill hall) 9961; (Ottawa electric lighting) 9940; (furnishing, &c., Deptl. Buildings) 9969; (Ottawa, heating, &c.) 7693; Royal Military College) 9930; Harbours and Rivers

**Haggart, Hon. J. G.—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

*Public Works—Con.*

(Man.) 8078; Ont. (Kaministiquia) 7612; (Port Colborne) 9252, 9277; (Wharfs, N.S.) 7700; Que. (Coteau, dredging) 10052; (Montreal Harbour improvements) 9980; (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 7562, 7580, 7593; Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 10071; Yukon-Telegraph (B.C. and and Teslin Lake) 10100; Lewes and Yukon river improvement) 8194; (telegraph lines) 10094.

*Railways* (increased station accommodation) 9163; I.C.R. (freight rates) 7458; (increased siding accommodation) 9156; (Indiantown Branch, Mr. Snowball's claim) 9165; (Halifax, elevator) 9172; (passenger coach) 9172; (rolling stock) 7432; (telegraph service) 9172; (St. John, accommodation) 7404, 7420, 9164; St. John, elevator) 9163 (miscellaneous) 7455 (iii); (repairs to "Victoria") 5784; P.E.I. (Mount Stewart wharf) 5755, 5773 (ii); (Murray Harbour, &c., construction) 9228; (removal of curves) 7398 (iii).

*Yukon District: Militia* (clothing contract) 9112 (iii); (N.W. Mounted Police) 6388 (ii).

Walker, Postmaster at Ailsa Craig, Charges against (M. for cor. \*) 3873 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 9890 (iii).

Yukon Administration, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn., 6580 (ii).

**Harwood, Mr. H. S., Vaudreuil.**

I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4653 (ii).

**Henderson, Mr. D., Halton.**

Address, on The, 1075 (i).

Aronsberg, Abraham, Relief B. 144 (Mr. *Landerkin*) in Com., 7575 (iii).

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 3498 (ii).

Binder Twine, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1837 (i).

— on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 7208 (iii).

— on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 9921 (iii).

Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4987 (i).

Consolidation of the Statutes of Can. (Ques.) 4270 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6443 (ii).

Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8938 (iii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6437 (ii).

Dom. Permanent Loan Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 6876 (iii).

Edmonton and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4848 (ii).

Goderich Harbour Improvements, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1881 (i).

Grain Exports to Germany in 1898-99, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 8990 (iii).

**Henderson, Mr. D.—Con.**

G.T.Ry. Trackmen's Strike, &c. on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4523 (ii).

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. *Macpherson*) on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 4198; to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 4780 (ii).

I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4439, 4628 (ii).

— Order, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4450 (ii).

Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s Pet. (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com. on Standing Orders, 1948 (i).

Members of the Govt., Absence from Ottawa, (Ques.) 1819 (i).

Mint, Establishment by Govt. in Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3118 (i).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Calvert*) on amt. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 5043 (ii).

Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert B. 10 (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Com., 3844 (ii).

Order (Ques. of) 6778 (ii).

Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 18 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 2152 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6105 (ii).

Preferential Trade with G.B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7915 (iii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8908 (iii).

Quebec Ry. Light and Power Co.'s B. 84 (Mr. *Carroll*) in Com., 5042 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9741.

— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9548; in Com., 9767 (iii).

Registered Letters, stolen off C.P.R. train (Ques.) 1829 (i).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 3465 (ii); in Com., 6972, 6993 (iii).

Stock, David, Relief B. 88 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3491 (ii).

## SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Experimental Farm) 8257; (illustration stations) 8256; (Paris exhibition) 10149; (year-book) 8226 (iii).

*Canals: Trent* (construction) 7314 (iii).

*Charges of Management* (printing Dom. notes) 7002 (iii).

*Civil Govt.: Post Office*, 7356 (iii).

*Customs* (suspense account, Montreal) 5595 (ii).

*Fisheries* (salaries of inspectors) 4040 (ii).

*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8557, 8607 (iii).

*Indians: Man. and N.W.T.* (implements, &c.) 5719 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (St. John and Digby) 8673 (iii).

*Militia* (annual drill) 7062 (iii); (clothing) 5443 (ii); 7115 (iii); (military stores) 5426 (ii); (salaries) 7079; (Yukon supplies) 7050 (iii).

*Post Office* (postmasters' salaries) 5805 (ii).

**Henderson, Mr. D.—Con.**SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Public Works*: Buildings (Ont.) 7623; Harbours and Rivers, Ont., 8002, 8013; (Sheguiandah pier) 10069; Que., (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 7610 (iii); Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5620 (ii).  
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3896 (ii); 9885 (iii).

**Heyd, Mr. C. B., South Brant.**

Budget, The, 2682 (i).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6550 (ii).

## SUPPLY:

*Excise* (commissions on stamps) 4792 (ii).  
*Immigration*: (agents, salaries, &c.) 8597, 8611 (iii).  
*Indians* (Ont.) 5685 (ii).  
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3898 (ii).

**Hodgins, Mr. W. T., Carleton, Ont.**

Civil Service Employees, Names of Employees who have received their Statutory Increases since 1896 (M. for Ret. \*) 5943 (ii).

Iron Doors for Public Buildings, Purchase by Govt. (Ques.) 4273 (ii).

Ottawa and Cyrville Mail Service, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 8991 (iii).

Post Office Deptl. Employees, &c., Names of Employees who have not received Statutory Increases since 1896 (M. for Ret. \*) 5943 (ii).

Ry. Mail Service, Supt. and Staff, Salaries and Travelling Expenses (M. for Ret. \*) 5944 (ii).

Steel Boxes, Int. and Indian Depts., Purchased by Govt., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 4482, 4995 (ii).

**Holmes, Mr. R. West Huron.**

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3322 (i).

Combinations in Restraint of Trade, Prevention Act Amt. B. 40 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2°, 1943 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *F'int*) 8905 (ii).

## SUPPLY:

*Public Works*: Buildings, Ottawa (electric lighting, &c.) 5185 (ii); Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 8011 (iii).

**Hughes, Mr. S., North Victoria, Ont.**

Address, on The, 631 (i).

Balsam Lake, Removal of Stone Piles (Ques.) 2332 (i).

Can. Troops for the Transvaal, par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (remarks) 7328 (iii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Death of Mr. Thornbury (Ques.) 1976 (i).

Devlin, Mr. James, Prosecution by Dept. of Justice (remarks) 7218 (iii).

Dibblee and Dupont, Messrs., Claims against Govt. (Ques.) 2114 (i).

**Hughes, Mr. S.—Con.**

Dom. Rifle Association, Annual Grant by Govt. of Transport and Entrance Fees to Limited Number, (prop. Res.) 2358 (i).

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 35) 1°, 974 (i).

— Yukon Route, Instructions to Messrs. Dibblee and Dupont (Ques.) 2114 (i).

Fenelon Falls, Construction of Slides (Ques.) 1978 (i).

G. T. R. Trackmen's Strike, Settlement, &c., on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4541, 4547 (ii).

Imperial Service, and Canadian Brigade and Can. Seamen, (prop. Res.) 2335, 2352 (i).

Indian Agent at Rama, Payment of Witnesses *re* Inquiry (Ques.) 2114 (i).

McLaren's Creek, Construction of a Roadway (Ques.) 3257 (i).

McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., Amounts paid by Govt. Services, &c. (Ques.) 1976, 2321 (i).

— Farmer of Lindsay *re* Damages by Floods, &c., (Ques.) 4485 (remarks) 4486, 4499 (ii).

— Claims for Land Damages by Farmers of Lindsay, 5000 (ii).

Military Canteens and Sale of Liquor, par. in Ottawa *Citizen re* Ont. Alliance (remarks) 7326 (iii).

Permanent Corps, Pension System, (prop. Res.) on Order being called, 2487, 2706 (i).

Noble, Mr., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ques.) 2184 (i).

Ontario County Court Judge, Name, Appmt., &c. (Ques.) 1848 (i).

Pigeon River, Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 2191 (i).

— Swing Bridge, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2480 (i).

Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°, 974.

Pub. Accounts Com., Delay in Meetings (remarks) 7195 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9460, 9543, 9579 (iii).

Rama Indian Agent, Charges against, Cost of Inquiry, &c. (Ques.) 1976 (i).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6955 (iii).

Rosedale Swing Bridge, Expenditure, Amount contributed by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 2333 (i).

Scugog River, Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 2191 (i).

Stamped Envelope, 2-cent purple, Number issued and distributed, &c. (Ques.) 2187 (i).

— Number purchased in Toronto, Issue of and Distribution (Ques.) 2189 (i).

## SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (general statistics) 8237; (year book) 8230 (iii).

*Canals*: Trent (construction) 7299, 7305; (Rosedale bridge) 7318 (iii).

*Civil Government*: Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 2089; Customs (salaries) 2094; Geological Survey (salaries) 2105; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 2103 (i); Post Office, 7331 (iii).

**Hughes, Mr. S.—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

*Dominion Lands* (Chief Inspector, salary, &c.) 9022 (iii).

*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8494, 8585, 8603, 8626; (St. Paul des Métis, seed grain, &c.) 9023, 9042 (iii).

*Militia* (annual drill) 7063; (armaments, &c.) 7153; (armouries) 9126; (arms, equipment, &c.) 9150; (clothing) 7100; (miscellaneous) 7148; (pay, allowance) 7027; (properties, &c.) 7088; (provisions) 7130; (Royal Military College) 7140; (salaries) 7078; (stores, &c.) 7098; (transport, &c.) 7131 (iii).

*Public Works: Buildings Ont.*, 7627; (Ottawa military store) 9943; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Gabarus breakwater) 9992; (Porter's Lake, dredging, &c.) 9993; Que., (St. Lawrence ship channel) 7579, 9986 (iii).

*Railways: I.C.R.* (accommodation, St. John) 7432; (rolling stock) 7434.

*Yukon District: Militia* (food, clothing, transportation, &c.) 9067 (iii).

Trent Canal, Jordan, Mr. Wm., Claims for Land Damages (Ques.) 1977 (i).

— Payment of Workmen (Ques.) 1977 (i).

Veterans of 1866 and 1870, Issue of Medals, &c. (Ques.) 1848 (i).

Volunteers of 1866, Granting of Medals (Ques.) 2114 (i).

Yukon District, "Bench" and "Creek" Claims, Disputes pending, &c. (Ques.) 3077 (i).

— Militia Force, Charges against *re* Misconduct: on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 9963 (iii).

**Hurley, Mr. J. M., East Hastings.**

Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s Bill (M.) to extend Time for receiving Pet., 5384.

— B. (No. 162) 1<sup>o</sup>, 5945 (ii); in Com., 7480.

**Ingram, Mr. A. B., East Elgin.**

Atlas Loan Co's (B. 30) 1<sup>o</sup>, 895 (i).

Canada Southern Ry. Co's (B. 43) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1165 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 142) 1<sup>o</sup> 4341 (ii).

— Request to have placed on Govt. Orders, 7218, 7322 (iii).

G. T. R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement, on M. (Mr. Ross Robertson) to adjn., 3982 (ii).

— on M. (Mr. Maclean) to adjn., 4519, 4544 (ii).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 4616 (ii).

— on Ques. of Order (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4453 (ii).

Knights of Labour and Mechanics Assembly, Cor., &c. (M. for copies\*) 3149 (i).

Montreal Judicial District, Additional Judges (remarks) 7241 (iii).

Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 9612 (iii).

Quebec Cartridge Factory, Dismissal of Labourers &c. (Ques.) 2186 (i).

**Ingram, Mr. A. B.—Con.**

Ry. Passenger Tickets (Sale) Act. Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Beattie) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1876 (i).

— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res. 9442, 9493, 9570, 9777 (iii).

St. Thomas and Aylmer Mail Service, Advertisements for Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 9698 (iii).

Spinks, County Court Judge, B.C., Charges against, on M. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to Com. of Sup., 4237 (ii).

## SUPPLY:

*Canals: Welland* (bridges &c.) 7454 (ii).

*Civil Govt.: Marine and Fisheries* (contingencies) 5026 (ii); Post Office 7332, 7347 (iii).

*Excise* (salaries of officers) 4770 (ii).

*Fisheries* (oyster culture) 4241; (salaries of Inspectors) 4014, 4045 (ii).

*Legislation: House of Commons* (voters' lists) 2302 (i).

*Militia* (armouries) 9129 (iii).

*Post Office* (mail service) 7368 (iii).

*Public Works—Buildings Ottawa* (electric lighting) 5186; Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 5203 (ii); Roads and Bridges (Banff) 5204 (ii).

*Railways: I.C.R.* (accommodation, St. John) 7430; (rolling stock) 7433; (uniforms) 7459 (iii).

*Yukon District: Militia* (clothing contract) 9124.

**Ives, Hon. W. B., Sherbrooke.**

Address, on The (remarks) 1447, 1462 (i).

Adulteration Act Amt. B. 123 (Sir Henri Joly) in Com., 3992 (ii).

Agricultural and Colonization Com., 2nd. Rep., on conc., 3441 (ii).

Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. Préfontaine) on M. for Com., 3308 (i).

G. T. R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement, on M. (Mr. Ross Robertson) to adjn. 3971 (ii).

— on M. (Mr. Maclean) to adjn. 4508 (ii).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 4612, 4699 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co's B. 69 (Mr. Calvert) on amt. (Mr. Landerkin) 5043 (ii).

Port Colborne and Port Dalhousie, Harbour Improvements, on prop. Res. (Mr. McCleary) 3293 (i).

Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Consolidated Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3917 (ii).

Ry. Passes to Members and Senators B. 37 (Mr. Bostock) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 2199 (i).

## SUPPLY:

*Civil Government: Trade and Commerce* (salaries) 2263 (i).

*Indians* (Ont.) 5679 (ii).

*Legislation: House of Commons* (stationery) 2278.

**Johnston, Mr. T. G., West Lambton.**

Coal Oil, on prop. Res. (Mr. Davis) to place o Free List, 2006, 2013 (i).

**Joly de Lotbinière, Hon. Sir H., K.C.M.G.,***Portneuf.*

- Adulteration of Food Act Amt. (B. 123) 1<sup>o</sup>, 3335; in Com., 3990 (ii).
- Allaire, Mr. J. P. O., St. Boniface, Man., Claim against Govt. (Ans.) 1894 (i).
- Apples, Fraudulent Packing, on M. (Mr. *McMillan*) to adjn., 3758 (ii).
- Atlin District, Brewery Licenses issued (Ans.) 5484 (ii).
- Buffalo and Crystal Beach Ferry Service, License and Privileges Granted, &c. (Ans.) 4994 (ii).
- Christie, Mr. W. J., Dismissal from Inland Rev. Dept., O.C.'s, Reps., Cor., on M. (Mr. *Roche*) for Copies, 2406 (i).
- Civil Service (Dismissal of Officials) Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. *Monk*) on amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 2231 (i).
- Coal Oil, Reduction of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2127 (i).
- Costigan, Hon. Mr., on Personal Explanation, 3667 (ii).
- Cor. between Dept. laid on Table, 3875 (ii).
- Curless, Chas. H., Preventive Officer, Grand Falls, N.B., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4056 (ii).
- Excise, Inspection of Sealed Food Packages, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 2705 (i).
- Financial Situation, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 10237 (iii).
- General Inspection Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. *Penny*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 3872 (ii).
- (Petroleum and Naphtha) Act Amt. (B. 131) 1<sup>o</sup>, 3749 (ii).
- (Wheat) Act Amt. (B. 132) 1<sup>o</sup>, 3751; M. to withdrw. Bill, 5098 (ii).
- (B. 156) in Com., 9636, 9651 (iii).
- Grain Exports from Can. Harbours during 1898 (Ans.) 3075 (i).
- Grain Standards, N.W.T., Legislation *re* Inspection, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3837 (ii).
- Inland Revenue Act, Violation *re* Seizure of Tobacco (remarks) 10227 (iii).
- (B. 124) 1<sup>o</sup>, 3335; in Com., 3759, 3881 (ii).
- Inspection of Wheat, Deputations, &c. (remarks) 1540 (i).
- (Wheat) Amt. (B. 156) 1<sup>o</sup>, 5099 (i).
- Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 173 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8769 (iii).
- Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection (B. 131) prop. Res., 3885; in Com., 3884 (ii).
- Potash Inspection and Montreal Board of Trade (Ans.) 1858 (i).
- Quebec Harbour Commissioners' B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9862 (iii).

## SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (illustration stations) 8294, 8306 (iii).
- Civil Government*: Inland Revenue (contingencies) 2270 (i); (printing and stationery) 5013 (ii); (salaries) 2100 (i); Public Works (salaries) 7554 (iii).
- Dominion Lands* (Chief Inspector's salary) 9026 (iii).

**Joly de Lotbinière, Hon. Sir H.—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

- Excise* (allowance to Customs Officers) 4790; (commissions on stamps) 4790; (preventive service) 4788, 5578; (salaries of officers) 4770, 4787; (special translation) 4803 (ii).
- Inspection of Staples* (salaries, &c.) 5586 (ii).
- Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 8105 (iii).
- Weights and Measures* (inspection) 5578; (salaries, &c.) 4803 (ii).
- Tobacco, Duties collected (Ans.) 1818 (i).
- Foreign Leaf, Percentage required under Regulations (Ans.) 2486 (i).
- Excise Duty paid since 1898, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 3075 (i).
- Weights and Measures Act Amt. (B. 128) 1<sup>o</sup>, 3544; in Com., 3885 (ii), 9883 (iii).
- B. 143 (Mr. *Ganong*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 4478 (ii).
- Yukon District, Liquor Permits issued by Mr. Ogilvie, Disallowance by Govt., 3790 (ii).

**Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., Lunenburg.**

- Commercial Treaties with British W. Indies, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 8077, 8172 (iii).
- I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 4152 (ii).
- License Fees for Fishing Traps, Issue of (remarks) 2046 (i).
- Lobster Fisheries Protection, Regulations *re*, on M. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) to Com. of Sup., 7687 (iii).
- Newfoundland and Canadian Fishermen, Supply of Bait, Cor., &c. (remarks) 9465 (iii).
- Ry. Subsidies Resolutions (remarks) 8921 (iii).
- B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9452, 9488, 9580 (iii).

## SUPPLY :

- Lighthouse and Coast Service* (salaries, &c.): 3523 (ii).
- Ocean and River Service* (maintenance) 2996 (i).
- Post Office* (Postmasters' salaries) 5811 (ii).
- Public Works*: Buildings (N.S.) 7616; Dredging (plant) 8140; Harbours and Rivers (wharfs, N.S.) 7728, 7750 (iii).

**Kendry, Mr. J., West Peterborough.**

- G. T. R. Trackmen's Strike, Settlement, &c. on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4543 (ii).
- Trent Valley Canal, Purchase of Land for Dam at Nassau (Ques.) 1857 (i).

**Klock, Mr. J. B., Nipissing.**

- Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Ship Canal, on M. (Mr. *Poupore*) for Papers respecting, 4878 (ii).

**Kloepfer, Mr. C., South Wellington.**

- International Commission between Can. and U. S., Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1815 (i).
- Medals for Long Service, Regulations respecting (Ques.) 7320 (iii).

## SUPPLY :

- Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8556 (iii).

**Landerkin, Mr. G., South Grey.**

Aronsberg, Abraham, Relief (B. 144) 1<sup>o</sup>, 4730 (ii); in Com., 7480 (iii).

Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s Bill, on M. (Mr. Hurley) to extend Time for receiving Pet., 5385 (ii).

Imperial Loan and Investment Co.'s incorp. (B. 150) 1<sup>o</sup>, 5096 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Culvert) on M. for Com. (amt.) to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 5042 (ii).

Order (Ques. of) Member repeating Private Conversation; on Mr. Speaker's ruling, 5406 (ii).

Private Bills, Extension of Time (M.) 2182 (i); 5378 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 9400 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 3461; on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 6636 (ii).

Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s (B. 92) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2246 (i).

## SUPPLY:

*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8608 (iii).

Van Wart, Isaac Stephen, Relief (B. 180) 1<sup>o</sup>, 8913 (iii).

Yukon Administration, Charges against, on M. (Mr. Davin) to adjn., 6577 (ii).

**Lang, Mr. J., East Peterborough.**

Havelock and Oak Lake Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3824 (ii).

Lang P. O., and Ry. Station, Carriage of Mails, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3823 (ii).

## SUPPLY:

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers (Wharves, N.S.) 7703 (iii).

**LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., Provencher.**

Allaire, J. P. O., St. Boniface, Man., Claim against Govt. (Ques.) 1894 (i).

Aronsberg, Abraham, Relief B. 144 (Mr. Landerkin) in Com., 7576 (iii).

Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. Préfontaine) on M. for Com., 3301, 3306 (i); Sen. Amts., 7578 (iii).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. Richardson) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1934 (i).

Committees of the Hse., Meetings at same hour (remarks) 2320 (i).

Debates Official, 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc., 1746 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Sifton) in Com., 6405, 6435 (ii).

Edmonton and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4310 (ii).

Man. Legislation, Disallowance by Dom. Govt., Pets., Memorials, &c., from Executive Council, protesting against (M. for Ret. \*) 2788 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Culvert) in Com., 5351 (ii).

Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 9614 (iii).

**LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C.—Con.**

Printing Com., 3rd, 4th and 5th Reprs. of Com. (stationery) on M. (Mr. Gibson) to conc., 5380 (ii).  
Return, Inquiry for, 1753 (i).

—— Non-production (remarks) 3071 (i).

St. Norbert, Inundations of Red River, Claims of Owners (Ques.) 1894 (i).

## SUPPLY:

*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8514 (iii); (St. Paul des Métis, seed grain, &c.) 9036 (iii).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (distribution of blue books to Law Associations) 5742 (ii); (voters' lists) 2293 (i).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G., East Quebec.**

Address, on The, 84 (i).

—— consdn. (M.) 6 (i).

—— Closing of Debate (remarks) 975, 1016 (i).

—— Reply to, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 2963 (i).

—— to Her Maj. *re* Transvaal Question (M.) 8992 (iii).

Adjournment for Ascension Day (M.) 2790 (i).

—— Deceased Members (M.) 6; (remarks) 7 (i).

—— Easter (M.) 531 (i).

—— Queen's Birthday (remarks) 3340, 3379 (ii).

—— (M.) 3440 (ii).

Agricultural and Colonization Com., 2nd Rep., on conc., 3442 (ii).

Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 5877, 5894 (ii).

Alaskan Boundary, American rumours *re* Canada's Contention on, M. (Mr. Prior) to adjn., 3846 (ii).

—— *modus vivendi* (remarks) 1074, 1166 (i).

—— and Pacific Cable, Announcement of Agreement (remarks) 5386 (ii).

*See International Commission.*

Alien Act, B.C., Cor. with B. C. Gov. respecting (Ans.) 8220, 8466, 8757 (iii).

—— Disallowance by Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 7768 (iii).

—— Labour Law, Enforcement, par. in Toronto *Star* (remarks) 2907 (i).

—— Enforcement at Hamilton (remarks) 3880 (ii).

Anticosti Island, Cor. between British Govt. and Can. (Ans.) 1841 (i).

Appnmts. by late Govt., Communication from Sec. of State for Colonies, on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) for Cor., 2734 (i).

—— Members to Offices, par. in Victoria *Colonist*, 6382 (ii).

Auditor General's Rep., on Inquiry for (remarks) 532, 700, 803 (i).

Ball, Mr. W. D., Postmaster at Bath, Ont., Dismissal, on M. (Mr. Wilson) 2393 (i).

Banque du Peuple, B. 6 (Mr. Préfontaine), on M. for Com., 3306; in Com., 3312 on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 3485 (ii).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.**

- Batiscan Post Office, Charges against Postmaster, Rep. of Inspector (Ans.) 1967 (i).
- Benefit Association, Insurance and Assessments (remarks) 1353 (i).
- Binder Twine, Output of Kingston Penitentiary, Tenders, Price, &c. (Ans.), 825, 1837 (i).
- Advertisements for Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 6934 (iii).
- on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 7205 (iii).
- on M. (Mr. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 9927.
- Bonds or Securities registered as provided by Statute, Preparation for Parliament (Ans.) 4991 (ii).
- B. C. Fishermen, Seizure of Nets, &c., by Americans, par. in *Victoria Daily Colonist* (remarks) 8634 (iii).
- Anti-Chinese and Japanese legislation, Govt. policy *re* Fourteen Statutes already in force (Ans.) 5860 (ii).
- disallowance, &c., on M. (Mr. Prior) to adjn., 6844 (iii).
- Statutes for 1899, Date of receiving by Sec. of State (Ans.) 5666 (ii).
- See "Chinese, &c."
- Brockville Election, Name, &c., of Dep. Returning Officer (Ans.) 2322 (i).
- Brockville and West Huron Elections, on M. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to ref. Documents to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 6736 (ii); 6823 (iii).
- Burrard, Member for, Speech *re* Amounts paid Vancouver Liberals by Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 1838.
- Business of the House (remarks) 802, 2247 (i), 8217 (iii).
- Budget Speech (remarks) 2318 (i).
- Morning Sittings (M.) 7768 (iii).
- Redistribution Bill (remarks) 2535 (i) 3845, 3875 (ii).
- Senate Resolutions (remarks) 7321, 7442.
- *re* Unopposed Returns (remarks) 6938 (iii).
- See "Govt. Business."
- Cabinet Ministers, Names of, &c. (Ans.) 1818 (i).
- Canadian Emigration to U.S., par. in *Montreal Star* (remarks) 1895 (i).
- Canadian Troops for the Transvaal, par. in *Ottawa Citizen* (remarks) 7329 (iii).
- Champ de Mars, Lease, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Cor., 2144 (i).
- Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Maxwell) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ellis) 4339 (ii).
- anti-Legislation in B.C. and Govt.'s Action (Ans.) 1837 (i).
- See "Disallowances, &c."
- Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries Bill (Ans.) 1852 (i).
- B. 38 (Mr. Richardson) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1924 (i) 5375 (ii).
- B. 50 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 2215 (amt.) 6 m.h., 2218 (i); agreed to (Y. 64, N. 39) 2244 (i).
- List (presented) 421 (i).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.**

- Colonial Securities and Imperial Tax (remarks) 1639, 1813 (i).
- Commissions under the Great Seal, Regulations respecting (Ans.) 4483 (ii).
- Companies Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8775 (iii).
- Consolidation of the Statutes of Can. (Ans.) 4270.
- Contracts let without Tender since June, 1896, on M. (Mr. Davin) for O.Cs., 5346 (ii).
- Controverted Elections Act, Registrar's Fees (remarks) 8348 (iii).
- Convicts, Conditional Liberation (B. 171) 2<sup>o</sup> m., 9599; in Com., 9600, 9726 (iii).
- Copyright Bill and Govt. Action (Ans.) 1981 (i).
- County Court Judges, Retirement, &c., Legislation respecting (Ans.) 1970 (i).
- Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Investigation, Rep. of Com. (Ans.) 1968 (i).
- Death of Mr. Thornbury (Ans.) 1976 (i).
- Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8925; in Com. on Bill, 9663, 9679 (iii).
- Deadman's Island, par. in *Montreal Witness re* Lease, 1353 (i).
- Debates, Official Rep., Sel. Com. (M.) 6 (i).
- 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc., 1744 (i).
- Devlin, Mr. James, Prosecution by Jus. Dept. (remarks) 7218 (iii).
- Disallowance of B.C. Legislation *re* Japanese and Chinese, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 5408, 5489, 5745 (ii).
- See "Japanese, &c."
- Dom. Census and B.N.A. Act Amt., on prop Res. (Mr. McInnes) 2388 (i).
- Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Sifton) in Com., 6407 (ii).
- Dorothy*, Seizure by U.S. Customs Authorities at Skagway, par. in *Ottawa Citizen* (Ans.) 2367.
- Doukhobors, Quarantined at Grosse Isle (remarks) 4550 (ii).
- Drainage Across Ry. Lands, B. 24 (Mr. Casey) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1917; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2933, 2952 (i).
- Dry Docks Construction B. 177 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8760 (iii).
- Edgar, Sir James, late Speaker, Decease of (remarks) 9060 (iii).
- Election Act Amt. B., on request (Mr. Ingram) to place on Govt. Orders, 7219, 7322 (iii).
- Electoral Lists, N.S., Printing and Distribution (Ans.) 1979 (i).
- Estate Duty, Cor. incomplete (remarks) 8221 (iii).
- Exchequer Court Act Amt. (B. 184) 1<sup>o</sup>, 9178; 1<sup>o\*</sup>, 9309; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 9835 (iii).
- Expropriation Act Amt. (B. 185) 1<sup>o\*</sup>, 9178 (iii).
- Foster, Hon. Geo. E., ex-Minister, Travelling and Living Expenses (Ans.) 1834 (i).
- Franchise Act Amt., Amendments by N.B. Govt. (Ans.) 2630.

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.**

- Franchise Act Amt., Schedules (remarks) 1074 (i).  
 — (P.E.I.) Bill, not on Order Paper (remarks) 9309, 9464 (iii).  
 Gagne, Hon. Mr. Justice, and Connection with Lake St. John Ry., Delay and Inconvenience to Litigants (Ans.) 2190 (i).  
 Geoffrion, Hon. Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 7630 (iii).  
 Gouin, Mr. Lomer, Speech *re* Subsidies to Provs. (Ans.) 1981 (i).  
 Govt. Business, Precedence on Thursdays (M.) 2409 (i).  
 — on Wednesdays (M.) 3555, 3647 (ii).  
 — on Mondays (M.) 6279 (ii).  
 — Delay in bringing down (remarks) 8221.  
 Grain Transit, Man. and N.W.T. Regulation B. 15 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. for 2°, 1917 (i).  
 G.T.R. Trackmen's Strike, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).  
 — on M. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) to adjn., 3962.  
 — on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4502, 4512 (ii).  
 — Cor. respecting (Ans.) 4730, 4858 (ii).  
 — Rumoured Settlement (remarks) 5206 (ii).  
 Hubert, Miss Annabella, Claims for Injury to Property, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 2535, 3256 (i).  
 Huron, West, Representation, Vacancy, &c. (remarks) 9597 (iii).  
 Immigrants in Quarantine, par in *Ottawa Citizen*, 2193 (i).  
 Insolvency Legislation (remarks) 3253 (i).  
 — Cor. with Boards of Trade (remarks) 4997 (ii).  
 I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2794 (i); on M. for 1°, 3773; on M. for 3°, 4733 (ii).  
 — On M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 2823 (i).  
 — G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4369, 4432, 4470, 4575, 4687 (ii).  
 — on Appeal (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) from Chairman's ruling to Speaker, 4449 (ii).  
 — Harris, Mr. A. H., Appnmt. by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Pope*) for Cor., 2905 (i).  
 — Lévis Station Improvements, Amount expended (Ans.) 8220 (iii).  
 International Commission, Alaskan Boundary and Rumoured Compromise, par in *Montreal Gazette* 4739 (ii).  
 — par. in *Montreal Star*, 4169 (ii).  
 — par. in *Ottawa Citizen* (remarks) 6937 (iii).  
 — Alaskan Boundary Protocols (presented) 4259 (ii).  
 — on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 8165 (iii).  
 — Cost, &c., of Commission (Ans.) 1815 (i).  
 — par. in *Montreal Gazette re* Negotiations 3341 (ii).  
 — par. in *London Times re* Settlement of Questions, 3668 (ii).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.**

- International Commission, Business of the House, on Proposal (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to expedite, 3786 (ii).  
 — Rumoured Cancellation of Meetings at Quebec (remarks) 2908 (i).  
 Ives, Hon. Mr., late M. P., Decease of (remarks) 7533 (iii).  
 Japanese Anti-Legislation in B.C., Disallowance of Bill (remarks) 2536 (i); 4344 (ii).  
 — (M. to print cor.) 4477 (ii).  
 — Cor. between B. C. Govt. and Dom. Govt. (remarks) 5207 (ii).  
 Kingston Penitentiary, Superannuation, &c., since 1899 (Ans.) 6379 (ii).  
 Library Committee, Joint (M.) 531 (i).  
 Liberation, Conditional, of Convicts (B. 171) 1°, 7000 (iii).  
 See Convicts, &c.  
 Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co's. Pet., on M. (Mr. *Henderson*) to ref. to Sel. Com. on Standing Orders, 1948 (i).  
 Lotteries (art unions) in Montreal, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 2324 (i).  
 Lumber imported into U. S. from Can. (remarks) 1638 (i).  
 McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., Amounts paid by Govt., Services, &c. (Ans.) 1976, 2321 (i).  
 — Farm Lands, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) 4487 (ii).  
 — Letter read by P.M.G., on Order of Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 5007 (ii).  
 Man. Election Frauds, on Inquiry for Ret., 3876 (ii).  
 — on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to ref. Papers to Pub. Accts. Com., 4055 (ii).  
 Man. School Question, Cor. with the Holy Father, Settlement, &c. (Ans.) 1822 (i).  
 Members of the Govt., Absence from Ottawa (Ans.) 1819 (i).  
 Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 158 (i).  
 Ministerial Responsibility *re* Transaction of Official Business, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4003 (ii).  
 Montreal Judicial District, Additional Judges (remarks) 7230 (iii).  
 — on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Fortin*) 7637 (iii).  
 Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Poupore*) 4298 (ii).  
 Montreal Postmastership, Vacancy, &c. (Ans.) 5859 (ii).  
 — Post Office, Resignation of Postmaster (Ans.) 1827 (i).  
 Moody, Inspector N. W. Mounted Police, Charges against (Ans.) 8220 (iii).  
 Morning Sittings (M.) 7768 (iii).  
 See Business of the House, &c.  
 Naturalization Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. *McInnes*) on M. for 2°, 2179 (i).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.**

- Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1866 (i).  
 North-west Mounted Police Rep. (presented) 4995 (ii).  
 ——— Constables, Number, &c. (Ans.) 1843 (i).  
 North American Transportation Co. and Govt. subsidies, &c. (remarks) 5666 (ii).  
 Northern Commercial Telegraph Co. and Cor. with Ministers of Crown, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to Com. of Sup., 5554 (ii).  
 N.W.T. Dual Language, Opinion of Min. of Jus. (Ans.) 2188 (i).  
 ——— 1885 Rebellion Losses, Claims Commission, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3104 (i).  
 Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1<sup>o</sup>, 4; *pro forma* (i).  
 Ocean Freight Rates, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for Cor., Reps., &c., 1861 (i).  
 Ogilvie, Mr., Refusal of Min. of Int. to read Letter in Ans. to Question, 3800, 3812 (ii).  
 Ontario County Court Judge, Name, Appnt., &c. (Ans.) 1848 (i).  
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. *McDougall*) Unparliamentary Language, 5406 (ii).  
 ——— on Member being asked to withdraw. Word "cowardly," 6158 (ii).  
 ——— Members abusing the Privilege of M. to adjn., Authorities quoted, 6591 (ii).  
 ——— Ref. to Deb. in Com. of the Hse., 6826 (iii).  
 ——— Reference to Debate in another House, 9897 (iii).  
 ——— Ref. to past Debate, 6753 (ii).  
 Ottawa City Indemnification, &c., and Govt. intention to other cities (Ans.) 6379 (ii).  
 ——— Govt. Grant (prop. Res.) 5098 (ii).  
 Pacific Cable, Communication from B. C. Govt. (remarks) 2697 (i).  
 ——— par. in *Citizen re* Conference between Sec. of State for Colonies, and High Commissioner (remarks) 3268 (i).  
 ——— (remarks) 1352 (i).  
 Penitentiaries Act Amt. (B. 173) 1<sup>o</sup>, 7873; in Com., 8763 (iii).  
 ——— Printing by Convicts (Ans.) 1832 (i).  
 Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) *re* par. in *Montreal Star* on Purchase of Wharf at St. John, 7328 (iii).  
 Poaching on the Pacific Coast (remarks) 8347 (iii).  
 Pointe Claire Wharf, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 4806 (ii).  
 Preferential Trade with G. B., Govt. Intention (remarks) 8469 (iii).  
 ——— on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7790 (iii).  
 ——— on prop. M. (Mr. *McNeill*) 8222, 8347, 8633 (iii).  
 ——— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) 9755 (iii).  
 Prime Minister's Reply to Invitation to Chicago Demonstration, par. in Newspaper, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn., 9840, 10220 (iii).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.**

- P. E. I. and Mainland Mail Service, Arrangements, &c. (Ans.) 1838 (i).  
 Printing Bureau and Sunday Labour (remarks) 3879 (ii).  
 Printing Committee, Joint (M.) 531 (i).  
 ——— 3rd, 4th and 5th Reps. of Com. (Stationery) on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) to conc., 5382 (ii).  
 Privilege, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 9181 (iii).  
 Privileges and Elections Com., Absence of Ministers (remarks) 9184 (iii).  
 ——— Stenographers' Fees, 9463 (iii).  
 ——— (M.) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 10116 (iii).  
 ——— Rep. of Com. (M.) to print Evidence, 10115 (iii).  
 Prohibition Plebiscite, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1814 (i).  
 ——— Number of Votes polled, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2321 (i).  
 ——— Poll-books, Voters' Lists, &c., on M. (Mr. *Moore*) for Copies, 2906 (i).  
 ——— Leeds Co., Rep. of Returning Officers (Ans.) 1848 (i).  
 ——— Ret. of Votes polled, Papers, &c., (remarks) 1894 (i).  
 ——— on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2039, 2045 (i).  
 ——— Quebec Counties, Reps. asked for, 5748 (ii).  
 ——— Discussion, &c. (remarks) 9466 (iii).  
 ——— on M. (Mr. *Flint*) remarks, 5359 (ii).  
 Pub. Accounts Com., Meetings (remarks) 2964 (i).  
 ——— Postponment and Hours of Meetings, &c. (remarks) 4345 (ii).  
 ——— on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to print 6th Rep. of Com. (objection) 9836 (iii).  
 Rep. of Com. (M.) to print Evidence, &c., 10116 (iii).  
 Public Works, Preservation of Health (B. 105) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2604 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 7645, 7665 in Com., 7667 (iii).  
 ——— (remarks) 7241 (iii).  
 Quebec Cartridge Factory, Employees, Number, &c. (remarks) 9699 (iii).  
 ——— Harbour Commissioners B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 9686; in Com., 9861 (iii).  
 ——— Injurious Legislation (remarks) 9596 (iii).  
 ——— Opinion of Min. of Jus. (remarks) 9700 (iii).  
 ——— Superior Court, Additional Judges, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1846 (i).  
 Queen's County (P.E.I.) Appnt. of Judge (remarks) 9000, 9064 (iii).  
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9733 (iii).  
 ——— Commission, Appnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1890 (i).  
 ——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 3868 (ii).  
 ——— Passenger Tickets (Sale) Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. *Beattie*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1875 (i); Sen Amts., 9461 (iii).  
 ——— Passes to Members and Senators B. 37 (Mr. *Bostock*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 2202 (i).  
 ——— Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Ry. Cos., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4742 (ii).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.**

- Railways Subsidies (remarks) 9064, 9185 (iii).  
 — B. 190 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 9204, 9337, 9366, 9435, 9450, 9471, 9478, 9492, 9512, 9543, 9551; on M. for 2°, 9759; in Com., 9760, 9771, 9813 (iii).  
 Reading Room, Ventilation, Light, &c. (remarks) 975 (i).  
 Reciprocity between U.S. and B. West Indies, par in Chicago Record, 4552 (ii).  
 Registered Letters stolen off C.P.R. train (Ans.) 1829 (i).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. Mulock) 1° m., 3442, 3456, 3466; on M. for 2°, 5207; in Com., 6758, 6797 (ii); 6910; (amt.) 6927; (M.) to ref. back to Com. of the Whole, 6940; (amt.) 6940; in Com., 6943, 6966, 6984.  
 — on M. (Mr. Wallace) to adjn. Deb., 5299 (ii).  
 Restigouche Boom Co.'s Incorp. B. 65 (Mr. McAlister) on M. to ref. back to Com. on Private Bills, 6825 (iii).  
 Returns, on Inquiry for (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3558 (ii).  
 — on Inquiry for, 8753, 8920, 9845, 10116 (iii).  
 — Ministerial Responsibility (remarks) 5410 (ii).  
 Revision of the Statutes, Appnmt. of Commission (Ans.) 1881 (i).  
 St. Joseph d'Alma Postmaster, Increase in Salary (Ans.) 1847 (i).  
 St. Norbert, Inundations of Red River, Claims of Owners (Ans.) 1894 (i).  
 Scott Act Repeal, Brome County, Applications for (Ans.) 2187 (i).  
 — Delay in Voting (Ans.) 3547 (ii).  
 Sec. of State's Deptl. Rep. (presented) 421 (i).  
 Select Standing Coms. (M.) 6 (i).  
 — (M.) to prepare Lists, 153 (i).  
 — Lists (presented) 525 (i).  
 Senate Reform and the Provinces (Ans.) 1821 (i).  
 — Resolutions. withdn., 8752 (iii).  
 Skelton vs. Queen, Rep. of Min. of Jus. (remarks) 8217 (iii).  
 Speaker, late Sir James Edgar, Decease of (remarks) 9060 (iii).  
 — Hon. Thos. Bain, Election of (M.) 9062.  
 — Mess. from His Ex., 9064 (iii).  
 Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c., on M. (Mr. Charlton) for Sel. Com., 2767 (i).  
 Stony Mountain Penitentiary, Rep. of Commissioner, Printing, &c. (remarks) 9837 (iii).  
 Superior Court Judges, Quebec, Sums paid for Travelling Expenses, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Stmt., 2148 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

- (Res. in Com.) 6463 (ii).  
 Administration of Justice (additional Judge in Ont.) 10122; (Alien Labour law enforcement) 10123; (Meagher's claim against U.S.) 10120, 10194; Yukon (additional Judge) 10191; (clerk's salary) 10193; (living expenses) 10193; (maintenance of prisoners) 10195 (iii).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.****SUPPLY—Con.**

- Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 8224; (illustration stations) 8307 (iii).  
 Canals: Lachine (Honey and Borthwick's claim) 10153 (iii).  
 Civil Govt.: Customs (contingencies) 2886 (i); (Gov. Gen's office) 5012 (ii); Privy Council (salaries) 2049 (i).  
 Collection of Revenues (Telegraph lines, N.W.T.) 8183 (iii).  
 Customs (suspense account, Montreal) 5594 (ii).  
 Dominion Lands (scrip for half-breeds) 7517 (iii).  
 Dominion Police (increase of pay) 10127 (iii).  
 Immigration (St. Paul des Metis, seed grain, &c.) 9034, 9046 (iii).  
 Legislation: House of Commons (gratuity to Lady Edgar) 10193; (Library, messengers) 10140; (Restaurant keeper) 10138 (iii); (sessional indemnity to Mr. Beattie, M.P.) 5782 (ii); (voters' lists) 8750, 10127 (iii).  
 Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Murray Bay and Onelle River) 10158; (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 10157 (iii).  
 Militia (annual drill) 5418; (London property) 5465 (ii); (pay allowance) 7011; (stmt. re Bate & Co.'s contract) 7117; (transport, &c.) 7133 (iii).  
 Miscellaneous (Chas. Bremner, compensation, &c.) 10113, 10167 (iii); (claim for translation of Rep. of Liquor Commission) 5852; (International Commission) 5852 (ii); (Paris Agency) 8704; (Wentworth vs. Mathieu, litigation) 10112 (iii).  
 N. W. Mounted Police (salaries) 8746, 10122 (iii); (service) 5832 (ii).  
 Pensions (Fenian raid) 8750; (rebellion, 1885) 8750 (iii).  
 Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Rideau Hall, additional wing) 9959; Que. (Victoriaville P.O.) 9954; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Port Colborne) 9255; Que., 8103, 8117, 8135; (Baie des Honfleur wharf) 10019; (Cacouna wharf) 10016; (Cap & L'Aigle wharf) 10017; (Isle aux Grues wharf, &c.) 10018; (Kamouraska wharf) 10018; (Knowlton Landing) 10020; (Les Eboulements) 10017; (Lévis dock enlargement) 9987; (Montreal Harbour improvements) 9968; (Newport breakwater) 10014; (New Carlisle wharf) 10014; (Sabrevois wharf) 10021; Roads and Bridges, Que. (Portage du Fort) 10071; (Anticosti Island) 10073; Yukon (telegraph lines) 10097; (B. C. and Teslin Lake) 10100 (iii).  
 Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation at St. John) 7281; (suspension of Mr. McDonald) 7281, 7288 (iii); P.E.I. (Mount Stewart wharf) 5766; (Private Cars) 5788 (ii).  
 Yukon Provisional District: Militia (clothing contract) 9116 (iii).  
 Tanner, John, Claims against Spanish Govt. for Detention, &c. (Ans.) 4306 (ii).  
 Tobacco, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Gillics) allowed to stand, 4813 (ii).  
 Tupper, Sir Charles, Birthday Congratulations, 6382 (ii).  
 — Expenses whilst Minister and High Commissioner (Ans.) 1835 (i).  
 Turner Administration, B. C., Dismissal by Lt. Gov., Papers laid on Table, 3959 (ii).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.**

Voters' Lists, N.B., Delay in sending in Revisions (Ans.) 2530, 2698 (i).

—— Printing, &c. (remarks) 6827 (iii).

—— Revised Copies, &c. (Ans.) 1820 (i).

Winding Up Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Fortin) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1871 (i); in Com., 4320 (ii).

Winnipeg Electoral Division, Vacancy, Issue of Writ (remarks) 8040, 8469 (iii).

—— Lists, Preparation, &c. (remarks) 2908 (i).

—— Representation (Ans.) 1830 (i).

Yukon Provisional District Administration Act Amt. (B. 186) 1<sup>st</sup>, 9178 (iii).

—— Charges against, Proposal to adjn. Deb., 6100 (ii).

—— on M. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to Com. of Sup., 6180 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. Davin) to adjn., 6567 (ii).

—— Appellate Court, Establishment, &c. (Ans.) 5308 (ii).

—— Bonds, Securities, &c., registered under R.S.C., Preparation for Parlt. (Ans.) 4805, 4991 (ii).

—— British Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co., Claims against Govt. (Ans.) 2905.

—— Expedition of Mr. Coste, Rep., &c. (remarks) 5360 (ii).

—— Investigation, Mr. Ogilvie's Rep. and Papers *re* (remarks) 2410 (i).

—— on inquiry for Rets., 4341 (ii).

—— Ogilvie's Rep., Printing Evidence (remarks) 5307, 5360 (ii).

—— (remarks) 5747 (ii).

—— received by Govt. (remarks) 3795 (ii).

—— Liquor Importation, Disallowance of Ordinance (remarks) 1638 (i).

—— permits issued by Mr. Ogilvie and cancelled by Govt. (remarks) 2909 (i); 3791 (ii).

—— Militia Force, Mr. Justice Dugas' Representations (Ans.) 1842 (i).

—— Representation in Parlt. (Ans.) 2902 (i).

—— U. S. Vessels and Can. Registry, Fraudulent Valuation, on M. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) for Ret. 3298 (i).

**Levergne, Mr. L., Drummond and Arthabaska.**

Arthabaska Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 46) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1165 (i).

Financial Situation, on M. (Mr. Foster) 10237 (iii).

**Legris, Mr. J. H., Maskinongé.**

Address, on The, 1344 (i).

Nicolet River Public Works, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 3549 (ii).

**Lemieux, Mr. R., Gaspé.**

Address, on The, 234 (i).

Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s (B. 112) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2789 (i); on M. for Com., 5898; in Com. on amt. (Mr. Campbell) 6332 (ii).

—— Judicial District, Additional Judges (remarks) 7229 (iii).

**Lemieux, Mr. R.—Con.**

Paris Exposition, Can. Commissioners, Space, &c. (Ques.) 1829 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

*Legislation* (distribution of blue books to Law Associations) 5742 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions* (Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie) 8685; (Gaspé Basin and Quebec) 8686; (Magdalen Islands) 8679; (Port Mulgrave and Irish Cove) 8693 (iii).

**Logan, Mr. H. J., Cumberland.**

Alaska-Yukon Co.'s (B. 5) 1<sup>st</sup>, 617 (i).

G. T. R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement, on M. (Mr. Ross Robertson) to adjn., 3984 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. Flint) 8909 (iii).

**Livingston, Mr. J., South Waterloo.****SUPPLY:**

*Militia* (Yukon supplies) 7047 (iii).

**Macdonald, Mr. P., East Huron.**

Address, on The, 1278 (i).

Adulteration Act Amt. B. 123 (Sir Henry Joly) in Com., 3995 (ii).

Aronsberg, Abraham, Relief B. 144 (Mr. Landerkin) in Com., 7576 (iii).

Beet Root Sugar, Bounty for Manufacture, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 4837 (ii).

Home Life Association of Canada (B. 13) 1<sup>st</sup>, 618.

N. W. T. Rebellion (1885) Claims Commission, on M. (Mr. Davis) for Ret., 3097 (i).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 6615, 6704, 6706, 6707 (ii).

Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c., on M. (Mr. Charlton) for Sel. Com., 2763 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8577, 8593 (iii).

*Militia* (clothing) 5444 (ii).

**Macdonald, Mr. A. C., Kings (P.E.I.)**

Address, on The, 1264 (i).

Cardigan Bridge, P.E.I., Bonded Warehouse, Pets., Cor., &c. (M. for copies\*) 2961 (i).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 4611, 4633 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries Protection, Regulations *re*, on M. (Mr. McLennan, Inverness) to Com. of Sup., 7684 (iii).

Magdalen Islands Mail Service, Contractor's Name, Terms, &c. (Ques.) 2113 (i).

Morris, Dr., Postmaster at Dundas, P.E.I., Resignation, &c. (M. for copies of cor.\*) 3873 (ii).

Neufrage Pond, P.E.I., Survey, Repa. (M. for Ret.\*) 3873 (ii).

P.E.I., Fishing Bounties, Names of Persons receiving, Amount Paid, &c. (M. for Ret.) allowed to stand, 5861 (ii).

—— Ry. and Branch Lines, Pets., Cor., Res., &c., on M. (Mr. Martin) 2386 (i).

**Macdonald, Mr. A. C.—Con.**

P.E.I. Winter Mail Service, Contracts, &c., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) for Copies, 3140 (i).

Queen's County (P.E.I.) Appmnt. of Judge (remarks) 9000, 9064 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3449 (ii); in Com., 6924.

Scrimgeour, J. G., Grant of Bonded Warehouse, Date, Lease, &c. (Ques.) 2113 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (illustration stations) 8293.

*Civil Government: Mar. and Fisheries* (contingencies) 5025 (ii).

*Collection of Revenues* (telegraph line, Pelee Island) 8190; (telegraph lines, P.E.I.) 8180 (iii).

*Fisheries* (cold storage for bait, &c.) 10165 (iii).§

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, &c.) 5159 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Magdalen Islands) 8679; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 8691; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 8684 (iii).

*Militia* (arms, equipment, &c.) 9143 (iii); miscellaneous and unforeseen 5459 (ii); (stores) 7094.

*Miscellaneous* (refund of duties on fish, &c., P. E. I.) 10174 (iii).

*Ocean and River Service* (maintenance) 2994, 3019 (i).

*Public Works: Dredging* (plant) 8140; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Wharfs) 7738; (P.E.I.) 7753, 7756; (Cardigan Pier) 10010 (iii).

*Railways: P.E.I.* (Murray Harbour, &c., construction) 9231; (removal of curves) 7391 (iii).

**Maclean, Mr. W. F., East York (Ont.)**

C.P.R., Mileage Tariff on Hay, Straw, &c., Approved by O.C. (Ques.) 4057 (ii).

Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 171 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 9606 (iii).

General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 9637 (iii).

G. T. R. Strike, Cor. respecting (Ques.) 4730 (ii).

—— Rumoured Settlement (remarks) 5206 (ii).

—— (M. to adjn.) 4501 (ii).

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) to M. for 3°, 4776 (ii).

Huron, W., Representation, Vacancy, &c. (remarks) 9597 (iii).

Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9612, 9618; in Com., 9628 (iii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9731; (amt.) 9735 (iii).

—— Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Ry. Co.'s., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4769.

—— Subsidies B. 159 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9323, 9362, 9382; in Com. on Bill, 9760.

Toronto, East, Postmaster, Recommendations for Vacant Position (Ques.) 4272 (ii).

**Macpherson, Mr. T. H., Hamilton.**

Atlantic and North-west Ry. Co.'s (B. 8) 1°\*, 618 (i).

**Macpherson, Mr. T. H.—Con.**

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) 1°\*, 2182 (i).

Preferential Trade with G.B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7945 (iii).

**Macdonell, Mr. J. A., Selkirk.**

Committee Meetings, Accommodation in Rooms (remarks) 3314 (i).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9355 (iii).

## SUPPLY :

*Public Works: Harbours and Rivers* (Man.) 8079 (iii).

**McAlister, Mr. J., Restigouche.**

Address, on The, 1144 (i).

Canadian Mutual Benefit Advertising Co. in-corp. (B. 99) 1°\*, 2318 (i).

Emigration to U.S., para. in Newspapers (Ques.) 2115 (i).

Manitoba and South-Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 157) 1°\*, 5205 (ii).

Penberthy Injector Co.'s Patent Relief B. 141 (Mr. *McGregor*) in Com., 6879 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6978 (iii).

Restigouche Boom Co.'s in-corp. (B. 65) 1°\*, 1949; on Order for 2°, 2649 (i); M. to ref. to Com. on Private Bills, 6824 (iii)

## SUPPLY :

*Fisheries* (cold storage for bait, &c.) 10166 (iii).

*Post Office* (Postmasters' salaries) 5822 (ii).

*Public Works: Buildings* (Ont.) 7623; *Dredging* (plant) 8144; Harbours and Rivers, N.B., 7763; (Campbellton wharf) 10012; (Shippegan wharf) 10012; (N.S.) 9947; Que., 8104, 8123, 8133; (Carleton Pier) 10014; (New Carlisle wharf) 10014; (Newport breakwater) 10015; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 7571 (iii).

*Railways: P.E.I.* (Murray Harbour, &c., construction) 9224, 9234 (iii).

Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s (B. 166) 1°\*, 6120 (ii).

—— Pet. (M.) to present, 5746 (ii).

U. S. Fishing Vessels and Modus Vivendi Licenses, Concessions granted, &c. (Ques.) 2330 (i).

—— Names, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 2788 (i).

Venner, Dr., Indian Agent, Commissioner's Expenses *re* Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 1858 (i).

**McCarthy, Mr. L. G., North Simcoe.**

Address, on The, 1002 (i).

Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Costigan*) on amt. (Mr. *Oliver*) to M. for 3°, 2940 (i).

Contracts let without Tender since June 1896, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for O. Ca., 5326 (ii).

G. B. and Russia, Treaty of 1825, Protocols, &c. (M. for copy\*) 6939 (iii).

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 90, (Mr. *MacPherson*) on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) to M. for 3°, 4785 (ii).

**McCarthy, Mr. L. G.—Con.**

Hogg, W. A., Customs Officer at Collingwood, Charges against, Commissioner's Rep., &c. (M. for copy\*) 2788 (i).

Patent Commissioner Power of Relief of G. L. Williams (B. 12) 1<sup>o</sup>, 618 (i).

Ry. Commissioners, Establishment of a Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 3865 (ii).

— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9544 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 6690; in Com., 6811 (ii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 8076 (iii).

Stock, David, Relief (B. 88) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2604 (i); in Com., 3489 (ii).

SUPPLY :

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, Ont., 8004; (Port Colborne) 9297 (iii).

U. S. Trade Relations Treaty of 1874 (M. for copy) 6939 (iii).

Winding Up Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8780 (iii).

**McCleary, Mr. W., Welland.**

Alien Labour Law, Enforcement at Hamilton (remarks) 3879 (ii).

Buffalo and Crystal Beach Ferry Service, License and Privileges granted, &c. (Ques.) 4994 (ii).

— (B 96) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2247 (i).

G.T.R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement, on M. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) to adjn., 3973 (ii).

Humberstone Post Office, Charges against James O. Rose, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 6562 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Calvert*) on amt. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 5050; on M. for Com., 5256 (ii).

Port Colborne and Port Dalhousie, Harbour Improvements (prop. Res.) 3276 (i).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6780, 6802 (ii).

Secord, Mr. T. R., Supt. of Welland Canal, Charges against (Ques.) 1833 (i).

SUPPLY :

*Canals*: Welland (bridges, &c.) 7455 (iii).

*Public Works*: Buildings, Ottawa (electric lighting) 5191 (ii); Harbours and Rivers (Port Colborne) 9260, 9285 (iii).

Welland Canal, Entrance at Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements on M. (Mr. *Montague*) to Com. of Sup., 4001 (ii).

**McClure, Mr. F., Colchester.**

Address, on The, 497 (i).

Aronsberg, Abraham, Relief B. 144 (Mr. *Landerkin*) in Com., 7576 (iii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8840; (amt.) 8850 (iii).

SUPPLY :

*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8595 (iii).

*Militia* (salaries) 7085 (iii).

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (wharves) 7740, 7749; (Ont.) 7989 (iii).

**McCormick, Mr. G., Muskoka and Parry Sound.**

Duceis Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Timber Limits, Removal of Indians (Ques.) 2700 (i).

James Bay Ry. Co. (B. 73) 1<sup>o</sup>\* 2029 (i).

Rama Indians and Statute Labour, Govt. Aid to Maintenance of Roads and Bridges, &c. (Ques.) 2700 (i).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9457, 9494 (iii).

**McDougall Mr. H. F., Cape Breton.**

Address, on The, 1354 (i).

Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4976 (ii).

Cabinet Ministers, Names of, &c. (Ques.) 1818 (i).

Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8944 (iii).

Eastern Extension Ry., Claims of N.S. Govt. (Ques.) 3551 (ii).

Fredericton Military School, Recommendations for Admission and Instruction, &c. (Ques.) 3795 (ii).

Gabarus Breakwater, Inspection, &c., by Govt. (Ques.) 2698 (i).

Hubert, Miss Annabella, Claims for Injury to Property, *re* (Ques.) 2534, 3256 (i).

I.C.R. and Sunday Traffic, par. in newspaper (remarks) 3877 (ii).

— Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com on Res., 3743; on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 3765 (ii).

— G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4415, 4692, 4710 (ii).

— Freight carried from 1867-9, Number of Tons and Receipts (Ques.) 3257 (i).

— Freight Rates on Flour, 1896-8 (Ques.) 3549 (ii).

— Gillis, Frank A., Station Agent at Tracadie, N.S., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4056 (ii).

— Harris, Mr. A. H., Appnmt. by Govt. (M. for cor.) 2905 (i).

— McDougall, Mr. Bruce, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 7194 (iii).

— Rates on Flour, &c. (Ques.) 4731 (ii).

— Restaurant at Grand Narrows, Cor. *re* Contract, &c. (M. for copy\*) 5149 (i).

Lobster Fishery Regulations (remarks) 3960 (ii).

McKeen's Point, Construction of Storm Signals, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3083 (i).

McKenzie, Mr. Francis, and Instructions at Fredericton Military School (Ques.) 2485, 2699, 2899 (i).

Margaree and Orangedale Mail Service, Changes, &c., *re* Contractors (Ques.) 3261 (i).

Marine Insurance Rates, Mar. Prova., Advancement in Price (remarks) 8922 (iii).

Military School, Fredericton, N.B., Admission for Instruction, Recommendations, &c. (Ques.) 3334 (ii).

*See* "McKenzie."

**McDougall, Mr. H. P.—Con.**

North Sydney Postmaster, Rumoured Dismissal (remarks) 4899, 4996 (ii).

Order (Ques. of) Unparliamentary Language, 5404 (ii).

Prohibition Plebiscite, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1814 (i).

Returns, Inquiry for, Grand Narrows, Lease of Property, &c., 4997, 5410 (ii).

— Inquiry for, 4151, 6595 (ii); 7771 (iii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 8727; (dairy branch) 8275; (illustration stations) 8323; (year book) 8226 (iii).

*Civil Government: Marine & Fisheries* (contingencies) 5024; *Post Office* (salaries, Dead Letter Branch) 5032 (ii).

*Customs: N. S.* (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 8449 (iii).

*Excise* (commissions on stamps) 4793 (ii).

*Fisheries* (protection service) 4719; (salaries of Inspectors) 4036 (ii).

*Immigration* (agents, &c., salaries) 8477, 8493 (iii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, &c.) 5138, 5176 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions* (Port Mulgrave and Irish Cove) 8693 (iii).

*Marine Hospitals* (care of sick seamen) 4012 (ii).

*Militia* (annual drill) 5056; (miscellaneous and unforeseen) 5455; *Yukon Force* (transportation and supplies) 6348 (ii).

*Ocean and River Service* (maintenance) 2992, 3025 (i); 5102 (ii); (registration) 3065 (i).

*Post Office: Yukon District* (mail service) 6364 (ii);

*Public Works: Harbours and Rivers.* (Mar. Provs.) 5201; (N.S.) 5198 (ii); 7715, 7742; (Ont.) 7980; (Que.) 8123; *Roads and Bridges* (Edmonton bridge) 8200; *Yukon District* (river improvements) 8194 (iii).

*Quarantine* (cattle, expenses, salaries, &c.) 5079 (ii).

*Tobacco*, Duties collected (Ques.) 1818 (i).

*Tuberculosis*, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. *Roddick*) to Com. of Sup., 6305 (ii).

*Victoria County, N.S.*, Patronage, &c., par in *North Sydney Herald* (M. to adjn.) 5388, 5398.

*Voters' Lists*, Printing, &c. (remarks) 6827 (iii).

*Weights and Measures Act* Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3900 (ii).

*Yukon Mail Service*, Carriage of Registered Matter (remarks) 4353 (ii).

— Registered Letters, &c., Policy of Govt., 3792 (ii).

**McGregor, Mr. W., North Essex.**

*Aronsberg, Abraham*, Relief B. 144 (Mr. *Landerkin*) in Com., 7576 (iii).

*Beet Root Sugar*, Bounty to Manufacturers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4837 (ii).

*B. C. Legislation re Chinese and Foreign Immigration*, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 6901 (iii).

*Dom. Lands Act* Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6440 (ii).

*G. T. R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement*, on M. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) to adjn., 3981 (ii).

**McGregor, Mr. W.—Con.**

*Penberthy Injector Co.'s Patent Relief* (B. 141) 1<sup>o</sup>, 4340 (ii).

*Postage Stamps*, Reproduction of Facsimilies by *Bank Note Co.* (Ques.) 2901 (i).

*Ry. Subsidies B.* 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9831 (iii).

*Representation in the H. of C.*, B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 3475 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (illustration stations) 8300 (iii).

*Customs: B.C.* (contingencies, &c.) 9460 (iii).

*Collection of Revenues* (telegraph line, Pelee Island) 8189 (iii).

*Fisheries* (Noble Bros.) 4248; (protection service) 4723 (ii).

*Militia* (annual drill) 7071; (pay, allowance) 7021; (*Yukon supplies*) 7047 (iii).

*Public Works: Harbours and Rivers* (Man.) 8080; N.S. (*Chezzetcook wharf*) 10004; (Ont.) 7990; Que. (*Coteau, dredging*) 10059 (iii).

*Quarantine* (cattle) 8342 (iii).

*Railways: I.C.R.* (accommodation, St. John) 7423 (iii).

*Yukon Provisional District: Interior* (salaries, &c.) 8983 (iii).

**McHugh, Mr. G., South Victoria (O.).**

*Customs Act* Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6456 (ii).

*G. T. R. Trackmen's Strike*, Settlement, &c., on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4549 (ii).

*Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Co's.* (B. 66) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1949 (ii).

*McLaughlin, Mr. R. J.*, and *Claims for Land Damages by Farmers of Lindsay*, 4496, 5004 (ii).

*Ry. Subsidies B.* 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9447 (iii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Canals: Trent* (construction) 7310 (iii).

*Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont.* (*Otonabee, navigation*) 10065; (*Scougog, dredging*) 10065 (iii).

**McInerney, Mr. G. V., Kent, N.B.**

*Address*, on The, 676 (i).

*Franchise Electoral Act*, Amendments by N. B. Govt. (Ques.) 2530 (i).

*Gross, Mr. Boaz*, *Harbour Master at Hillsboro*, *Papers Respecting*, Inquiry for Ret., 4732 (ii).

*Hillsboro, N. B.*, *Harbour Master*, *Charges against*, *Evidence and Commissioner's Rep.*, &c. (M. for copy\*) 2027 (i).

*I.C.R. Steel Rails, Tenders, &c.* (Ques.) 2328 (i).

*Lachine Canal*, *Evidence taken before Royal Commission* (M. for copies \*) 5944 (ii).

— *Final Estimate of Section 3, Enlargement of 1875-80* (M. for copy\*) 5944 (ii).

— *Rep. of Commission on Wellington and G. T. R. Bridges* (M. for copy\*) 5944 (ii).

— *Royal Commission of Investigation*, *Exhibits, &c.* (M. for copies\*) 5944 (ii).

— *Plans, Profiles, &c.* (M. for copies\*) 5944.

**McInerney, Mr. G. V.—*Con.***

Lobster Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 2319 (i).  
 ——— (remarks) 2909 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

*Legislation*: House of Commons (voters' lists)  
 2282 (i).  
*Ocean and River Service* (maintenance) 2989 (i).

**McInnes, Mr. W. W. B., *Vancouver.***

Atlin District, Brewery Licenses issued (Ques.)  
 5484 (ii).

Beaumont, Wm., Claims for distributing Mail at  
 Maple Bay prior to Confederation, &c. (Ques.)  
 3820 (ii).

Bedlington and Nelson Ry. Co.'s (B. 107) 1<sup>st</sup>,  
 2529 (i).

Brochies Ledge, B.C., Lighthouse, Completion  
 and Operation (Ques.) 2331 (i).

Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. (B. 111) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2696 (i).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. and C.P.R. Rates and  
 Tolls, Revision of by Gov. in Council (Ques.)  
 2331 (i).

Dom. Census and B.N.A. Act Amt. (prop. Res.)  
 2386 (i).

Dom. Permanent Loan Co.'s B 104 (Mr. *Clarke*)  
 in Com. (amt.) 6868 (iii).

Edmonton District Ry. Co.'s Change of Title (B.  
 158) 1<sup>st</sup>, 5384 (ii).

Grey, Robert, Lighthouse-keeper at Entrance  
 Island, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 7319 (iii).

Immigration Restriction (B. 48) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1165 (i).

Japanese Labour Exclusion Bill, B. C. Legisla-  
 tion, Disallowance by Dom. Govt. (remarks)  
 4343 (ii).

Lighthouse Service, B.C., Adjustment of Salaries,  
 &c. (Ques.) 3821 (ii).

Mint, Establishment by Govt. in Can. (prop.  
 Res.) 3106 (i).

Naturalization Act Amt. (B. 37) 1<sup>st</sup>, 974; 2<sup>nd</sup> m.,  
 2176; on resuming adjd Deb. of 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2527 (i).

Oyster Bed, B.C., Claims of Esquimalt and  
 Nanaimo Ry. Co. (Ques.) 3821 (ii).

Rifle Ranges, B.C., Applications, Pets., &c.  
 (Ques.) 5484 (ii).

Rothwell's Rep. *re* Settler's Claims, Transmission  
 to B. C. Govt. (Ques.) 2531 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

*Indians* (B.C.) 5703; (salaries) 5725 (ii).

Yukon Territory Act Amt. (B. 64) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1813 (i).

**McIsaac, Mr. C. F., *Antigonish.***

Behring Sea Arbitration, Cost to Govt., &c.  
 (Ques.) 2186 (i).

Bronson and Weston Lumber Co., Change of  
 Title (B. 70) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1949 (i).

I.C.R., Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co.  
 Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on  
 Res., 3577 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers (Wharfs,  
 N.S.) 7732 (iii).

**McLellan, Mr. B. D., *West Prince, P.E.I.***

I. C. R., Employees, Wages, Working hours, &c.  
 (Ques.) 1860, 2332 (i).

P. E. I. Lobster Fishing, Pets. *re* Extension of  
 Season (Ques.) 6122 (ii).

—— Winter Mail Service, Contracts, &c., on  
 M. (Mr. *Martin*) for Copies, 3138 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

*Miscellaneous* (refund of duties on fish, P.E.I.)  
 10175 (iii).

**McLennan, Mr. R. R., *Glengarry.***

Address, on The, 1402 (i)

Apples, Fraudulent Packing, on M. (Mr. *Mc-*  
*Millan*) to adjn., 3758 (ii).

I. C. R., Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co.  
 Ry. Acquisition, B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on  
 Res., 3689 (ii).

—— G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*)  
 in Com., 4357, 4372, 4418, 4589 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on  
 Res., 9456; in Com. on Bill, 9834 (iii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (illustration stations)  
 8333 (iii).

*Militia* (arms, equipment, &c.) 9148 (iii).

*Pensions* (rebellion, 1885) 8750 (iii).

*Public Works*: Buildings (Ont.) 7622; Harbours  
 and Rivers, Ont., 7992, 8006; (Kaministiquia)  
 7613 (ii).

*Railways*: I.C.R. (accommodation at St. John)  
 7429 (iii).

**McLennan, Mr. A., *Inverness.***

Adulteration Act Amt. B. 123 (Sir *Henry Joly*)  
 in Com., 3996 (ii).

I. C. R., Alba Section, Number of Employees  
 (Ques.) 5310 (ii).

—— Morrison, Hugh, Riverside, Claims for  
 Damages (Ques.) 5310 (ii).

—— Reynolds, Capt., Str. "Mulgrave," Com-  
 plaints against (Ques.) 5309 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries, Protection, Regulations *re*  
 on M. for Com. of Sup., 7675 (iii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (dairying commissioner)  
 8268 (iii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Magdalen  
 Islands) 8678; (Port Mulgrave and Irish Cove)  
 8694 (iii).

**McMillan, Mr. J., *South Huron.***

Apples, Fraudulent Packing, par. in Toronto  
*World* (M. to adjn.) 3753 (ii).

Binder Twine Contract, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to  
 adjn., 7211 (iii).

C. P. R. Act (1881) Power respecting Branch  
 Lines, &c. (remarks) 3315 (i).

Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on  
 M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2957 (i).

Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Sir  
*Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7861 (iii).

**McMillan, Mr. J.—Con.**

Ry. Commission, Appmnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1890 (i).

— Establishment of Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 2498 (i).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6813 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 8736; (dairy commissioner) 8265; (experimental farms) 8238; (illustration stations) 8285, 8299, 8326; (year book) 8233 (iii).

*Civil Government* (Post Office) 7348 (iii).

*Fisheries* (protection service) 4719 (ii).

*Quarantine* (cattle, salaries, &c.) 5082 (ii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. *Roddick*) to Com. of Sup., 6297 (ii).

Tupper, Sir Charles, Expenses whilst Min. and High Commissioner (Ques.) 1835, 1885 (i).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. (B. 122) 1°, 3254 (i); in Com., 3904 (ii).

**McMullen, Mr. J., North Wellington.**

Adjournment, Queen's Birthday (remarks) 3340 (ii).

Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duty, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 5878 (ii).

Apples, Fraudulent Packing on M. (Mr. *McMillan*) to adjn., 3757 (ii).

Beet Root Sugar, Bounty for Manufacture, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4841 (ii).

Binder Twine Contract, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 7207 (iii).

C. P. R. Contract with A. Onderdonk, Awards by Arbitrators, *re* Value of Rolling Stock, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 5944 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. Bill (Ques.) 1956 (i).

— B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1931 (i); in Com., 5901 (ii).

— (B. 63) 1°, 1753; 2° m., 3316, 3324 (i).

Coal Oil, Reduction of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2135 (i).

Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. B. 182 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8930; in Com. on Bill, 9670 (iii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6438 (ii).

Foster, Hon. Geo. E., ex-Minister, Travelling and Living Expenses (Ques.) 1834 (i).

Funeral Wreath, late Sir John Thompson, Question dropped, 1849 (i).

General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 9656 (iii).

General Trust Corporation of Can. Co.'s (B. 129) 1°, 3646 (ii).

G. T. R. Trackmen's Strike, Settlement, &c., on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4538 (ii).

I. C. R., Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4168, 4582, 4620; on M. for 3°, 4961 (ii)

— G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4128 (ii) Sen. Amts., 9712 (iii).

**McMullen, Mr. J.—Con.**

I. C. R. M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 2816 (i).

— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) 4447 (ii).

— St. Charles Branch, Claims for Expropriation or Purchase of Land, &c., (M. for stmt. \*) 3873 (ii).

McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., and Farm Lands, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) 4491 (ii).

Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com. on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) 6329 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Culvert*) on amt. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 5043; in Com., 5257 (ii).

Ogilvie, Mr., Connection with British Goldfields Co., Refusal of Min. to read Letter in ans. to Question, 3812 (ii).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Fielding*) "impertinent" not parliamentary language, 5610 (ii).

Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9614 (iii).

Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 18 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2289 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Delay in Meeting, (Man. Election Frauds) on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to adjn., 3216 (i).

— Postponment and Hours of Meeting, &c. (remarks) 4345 (ii).

Privileges and Elections Com., Absence of Ministers (remarks) 9182 (iii).

— Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Davin*) 9182 (iii).

Prohibition Plebiscite, Ret. of Votes polled, Papers respecting, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2044 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9742 (iii).

— Commissioners, Establishment of a Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 3864 (ii).

— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9375, 9546; in Com. on Bill, 9767, 9806 (iii).

— Passes to Members and Senators B. 37 (Mr. *Bostock*) on M. for 2°, 2199 (i).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6481 (ii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 3072 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Administration of Justice* (Alien Labour law enforcement) 10125 (iii).

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (illustration stations) 8834; (Paris exhibition) 10144; (year book) 8230 (iii).

*Civil Govt.*: Aud. Gen's Office (salaries) 2066; Customs (contingencies) 2977 (i); Finance (salaries, &c.) 5016 (ii); Justice (salaries) 2067; Militia and Defence (salaries) 2072 (i); Public Works (salaries) 7542 (iii).

*Dom. Lands*: (Chief Inspector salary) 9025 (iii).

*Indians*: Man. and N. W. T. (implements, &c.) 5716 (ii).

*Legislation* (distribution of blue-books to Law Associations) 5739 (ii).

**McMullen, Mr. J.—Con.**

SUPPLY—Con.

*Militia* (clothing) 5445 (ii); (pay, &c.) 7030 (iii).  
*Miscellaneous* (refund of duties on fish, &c., P.E.I.) 10178 (iii).  
*Ocean and River Service* (maintenance) 3044 (i).  
*Post Office* (postmasters' salaries) 5819 (ii).  
*Public Works*: Buildings (B.C.) conc., 6386 (ii); Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Coteau, dredging) 10047; Que. (Sabrevois wharf) 10033 (iii); Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5643 (ii).  
*Railways*: I. C. R. (accommodation, St. John) 7178; P.E.I. (Murray Harbour, construction) 9220, 9223 (iii).  
*Yukon Provisional District*: Interior (salaries, &c.) 8952 (iii).

Travelling Expenses, &c., of Hon. Geo. E. Foster, ex-Fin. Min. (Ques.) 1885 (i).

**McNeill, Mr. A., North Bruce.**

Address to Her Maj. *re* Transvaal Question (remarks) 8996 (iii).  
 Alaskan Boundary, and Pacific Cable, Announcement of Agreement (remarks) 5387 (ii).  
 Atlantic Fast SS. Service and Govtl. Action (remarks) 4740, 5410 (ii).  
 Beauharnois Canal, Dismissals, on M. (Mr. Bergeron) to Com. of Sup., 5414 (ii).  
 B. C. Legislation *re* Chinese and Foreign Immigration, on M. (Mr. Prior) to adjn., 6853, 6896 (iii).  
 Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com., 4988 (ii).  
 Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. Richardson) in Com., 5923, 5934 (ii).  
 Companies Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8777 (iii).  
 Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction, B. 2 (Mr. Charlton) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 2915, 2926 (i).  
 G. T. R. Trackmen's Strike, &c., on M. (Mr. Maclean) to adjn., 4509 (ii).  
 Imperial Service and Can. Brigade and Can. Seamen, on prop. Res. (Mr. Hughes) 2355 (i).  
 I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. Blair) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 2839 (i).  
 Order (Ques. of) member imputing motives to another *re* vote, 5881 (ii).  
 ——— Speaker's ruling asked, 7213 (iii).  
 Pacific Cable between Can. and Australia Agreement B. (Mr. Mulock) prop. Res., 8381 (iii).  
 Personal Explanation *re* Militia Expenditure, 1354 (i).  
 Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, Contract, &c. (remarks) 9310 (iii).  
 Preferential Trade with G.B., Govtl. Intention (remarks) 8469 (iii).  
 ——— on amt. (Sir Charles Tupper) to Com. of Sup., 7809 (iii).  
 ——— (prop. Res.) 8633, 8634 (iii).  
 ——— (remarks) 8221, 8347 (iii).

**McNeill, Mr. A.—Con.**

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. Flint) 8851 (iii).  
 Public Accounts Com., Delay in Meeting (Man. Election Frauds) on M. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to adjn., 3233 (i).  
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 9736 (iii).  
 ——— Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Ry. Cos., on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) to Com. of Sup., 4760 (ii).  
 N. W. T., Rebellion Losses, 1885, Claims Commission, on M. (Mr. Davis) *fer* Ret., 3102 (i).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 3458; on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 6596; in Com., 6789, (ii), 6907, 6942, 6962 (iii).  
 ——— on M. (Mr. Wallace) to adjn. Deb., 5302.  
 Saugeen Indian Reserve, Medical Supt., Patrick Scott, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 9699 (iii).

SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 8732; (dairy commissioner) 8265; (experimental farms) 8263; (year book) 8226 (iii).  
*Civil Govt.*: Privy Council Office (salaries) 2055 (i); Public Works (salaries) 7538, 7550 (iii).  
*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8506; (St. Paul des Metis, seed grain, &c.) 9029, 9037 (iii).  
*Legislation* (distribution of blue-books to Law Associations) 5741 (ii); House of Commons (voters' lists) 2296 (i); stationery (supplies) 5737 (ii).  
*Militia* (arms, equipment, &c.) 9141 (iii); (clothing) 5444 (ii).  
*Post Offices* (postmasters' salaries) 5805 (ii).  
*Public Works.*: Harbours and Rivers (Port Colborne) 9257; (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 7609 (iii).  
*Railways*: I. C. R. (accommodation St. John) 7174; 7182 (iii); P. E. I. (Mount Stewart Wharf) 5772 (ii).  
*Weights and Measures* (inspection) 5583 (ii).  
 Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to Com. of Sup., 6245 (ii).

**Mackie, Mr. T., North Renfrew.**

Contracts let without Tender since June, 1896, on M. (Mr. Davin) for O.C.'s., 5325 (ii).  
 Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. Poupore) for Cor., &c. 5366 (ii).  
 Railway Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 9449 (iii).

SUPPLY:

*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8513 (iii).  
*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 7990 (iii).

**Madore, Mr. J. A. C., Hochelaga.**

Address, on The, 666 (i).  
 Hamilton Powder Co.'s (B. 78) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2029 (i).  
 Montreal Judicial District, Additional Judges (remarks) 7224 (iii).

**Malouin, Mr. A., Quebec Centre.**

Quebec Steamship Co.'s (B. 14) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 618 (i).

**Marcil, Mr. J. E., Bagot.**

- I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4409 (ii).
- Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6988 (iii).

**Marcotte, Mr. F. A., Champlain.**

- Address, on The, 516 (i).
- Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co., Amounts paid by Govt. (Ques.) 1843 (i).
- Batiscan, Charges against Postmaster, Rep. of Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 1966, 2320 (i).
- Obstructions to Navigation, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 3552 (ii).
- Salary of Postmistress (Ques.) 1970 (i).
- Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1933 (i).
- B. 50 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 2213 (i).
- Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act. Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8934 (iii).
- Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc., 1751 (i).
- Guay Post Office, Revenue, Salary paid to Postmaster Verrault, &c. (Ques.) 3260 (i).
- Immigrants, Doukhobor, Finland, &c., Number, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2481 (i).
- I. C. R., Blanchette, Mr. Eugene, Reinstatement by Govt. (Ques.) 5859 (ii).
- Employees at Lévis, and Provincial Election, Transfer, &c., Instruction to Mr. Desjardins, &c. (Ques.) 3260 (i).
- Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4646 (ii).
- Lévis Station, Improvements, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 8220 (iii).
- Lévis Forts, Contract for Cordwood, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3082 (i).
- Purchase of Property, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 8468 (iii).
- Ouellet, Mr. Agapit, par. in *Le Soleil*, Emplmt. by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3259 (i).
- Parliament Buildings, Tower Clock, Change in Mode of Lighting, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 6121 (ii).
- Powers, Mr. Thos., Lease of Govt. Land at Lévis, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 3082, 3259 (i).
- Prohibition Plebiscite, Bagot Co., Unpaid Claims, &c. (Ques.) 1967 (i).
- Quebec Harbour Commission Consolid. Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3924 (ii).
- Repatriation of Canadians from U.S., Number, &c. (Ques.) 3078 (i).
- Samson, Mr. Pierre, Caretaker at St. Joseph de Lévis Fort, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3082 (i).
- SUPPLY :
  - Militia* (salaries) 7085 (iii).
  - Yukon, Miners' Grievances against Companies buying Water Grants (remarks) 3315 (i).

**Martin, Mr. A., East Queens, P. E. I.**

- Belle River, P. E. I., Seizure of Fish Traps (M. for cor. \*) 2787 (i).

**Martin, Mr. A.—Con.**

- Brookside, P. E. I., Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 1969 (i).
- China Point Pier, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2485 (i).
- Reconstruction, Amount paid, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 3148 (i).
- Clifton Postmaster, P. E. I., Cor., Pets., &c., *re* Appmnt. (M. for copies \*) 5377 (ii).
- Cold Storage for Fish Transportation from Mar. Provs. (Ques.) 1978 (i).
- Franchise Act. Amt. (P. E. I.) Bill, not on Order Paper (remarks) 9309, 9464 (iii).
- “Illustration Stations,” Fruit, Cereals, &c., Govt. Action (Ques.) 2110 (i).
- Lobster Fishing, Extension of Season in P. E. I. (Ques.) 6561 (ii).
- Seizure of Traps, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5504 (ii).
- Mount Albion, P. E. I., Mail Service, Pets. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1969 (i).
- Pinette Harbour, P. E. I., Pets. *re* Dredging (Ques.) 2112 (i).
- Poultry Feeding Experiments, Govt. Action (Ques.) 2110 (i).
- P. E. I. and Grand View Mail Service, Proposed Change, Cor., Pets., &c. (M. for copies \*) 5377 (ii).
- Dominion Govt., Delegation *re* Questions at Issue, Claims, Stmnts., &c. (M. for copies \*) 1879 (i).
- G. B., Cold Storage and S.S. Communication, &c. (remarks) 5493 (ii).
- Grand View, Changes in Mail Services, Pets. against (Ques.) 4994 (ii).
- Lobster Fishery, Infraction of Regulations, Fines imposed, Cost of Prosecutions, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 5377 (ii).
- Mail Service between I. C. R. and Cape Tormentine, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2325 (i).
- Mainland Mail Service, Arrangements, &c. (Ques.) 1838 (i).
- Murray Harbour Branch, B. 183 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9750 (iii).
- Ry. and Branch Lines, Pets., Cor., Res., &c. (M. for copy) 2364, 2368 (i).
- Straightening Curves at North Wiltshire, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1854 (i).
- Winter Mail Service, Contracts, &c. (M. for copies) 3124 (i).
- Queen's County (P. E. I.) Appmnt. of Judge (remarks) 9000 (iii).
- Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6913 (iii).
- Returns, Inquiry for, Pub. Works, P. E. I., &c., 3878 (ii).
- Inquiry for, 1953 (i); 6319 (ii); 10225 (iii).
- Souris Breakwater, P. E. I., Claim for Damages by Messrs. Mellish and Wrightman (Ques.) 4270 (ii).
- Spraying Fruit Trees, Govt. Action (Ques.) 2110 (i).

**Martin, Mr. A.—Con.**

## SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (dairy branch) 8275; (year book) 8236 (iii).

*Civil Govt.*: Post Office, 7351 (iii).

*Fisheries* (cold storage for bait) 10163 (iii).

*Mail Subsidies, &c.* (P.E.I. and G.B.) 8687; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 8683 (iii).

*Miscellaneous* (refund of duties on fish, &c. P.E.I.) 10176 (iii).

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 7751, 7757; (Canoe Cove breakwater) 10007 (iii).

*Railways*: P. E. I., 7462 (iii); (Mount Stewart wharf) 5762 (ii); (Murray Harbour, &c., construction) 9212; (removal of curves, &c.) 7389. (iii).

*Yukon Provisional District*: Interior (salaries, &c.) 8956 (iii).

Wood Island Light-keeper, Dismissal of D. McMillan, Cor. Pets., &c. (M. for copies) 4813 (ii).

— Dismissal of Wm. D. McMillan, 10117 (iii).

— Light-keeper, Dismissal and Charges against, Rep. of Commissioner (Ques.) 2326 (i).

**Martineau, Mr. P. R. L., Montmagny.**

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 21 (i).

**Maxwell, Mr. G. R., Burrard.**

Address, on The, 1016 (i).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. (B. 49) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1165 (i); 2<sup>d</sup> m., 4323 (ii).

Klondike Mining and Ry. Co.'s (B. 103) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2409 (i).

Members' (Pictou) Mileage Allowance (Ques.) 6722 (ii).

Northern Commercial Tel. Co., and Dept. of Pub. Works (M. for cor.\*) 3873 (ii).

## SUPPLY:

*Fisheries* (salaries of Inspectors) 4030 (ii).

**Meigs, Mr. D. B., Missisquoi.**

Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 9437 (iii).

**Mignault, Mr. R. M. S., Yamaska.**

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 4663 (ii).

**Mills, Mr. J. B., Annapolis.**

Address, The, on amt. (Mr. Bertram) to amt. (Mr. Clarke) 1716 (i).

Annapolis and Digby Basin, Rep. re Buoys, &c. (Ques.) 4993 (ii).

— Mr. McCarthy's Contract, Expiration of, for Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 4056 (ii).

— Port George Harbour, Pier, &c. (Ques.) 7532 (iii).

— Post Office, Irregularities, &c. (Ques.) 8989, 9179, 9697 (iii).

— Public Buildings, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 2701 (i).

— Tenders for Painting (remarks) 2410 (i).

**Mills, Mr. J. B.—Con.**

Bounties on Iron and Steel B. 161 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7638 (iii).

Electoral Lists, N. S., Printing and Distribution (Ques.) 1979 (i).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 4678 (ii).

Port George, Annapolis Co., Postmaster, Irregularities in Office (Ques.) 9179, 9697 (iii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 9744.

— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 9777 (iii).

## SUPPLY:

*Customs*: N. S. (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 8451.  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (voters' lists) 10129 (iii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, &c.) 5132 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (St. John and Digby) 8674 (iii).

*Public Works*: Buildings (Ont.) 7626; Harbours and Rivers, N. B. (Cape Tormentine breakwater) 10012; N. S. (Parker's Cove wharf) 10001 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir Henry Joly) in Com., 3893 (ii); 9884, 9887 (iii).

**Monet, Mr. D., Laprairie and Napierville.**

Address, on The, 532 (i).

Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. Préfontaine) on M. for Com., 3302 (i).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 4654.

Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for Com. (amt.) 6091, 6404 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 9446 (iii).

**Monk, Mr. F. D., Jacques Cartier.**

Address, on The, 241 (i).

Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. Préfontaine) on M. for Com., 3304; in Com., 3311 (i).

Belœil Public Works, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3827 (ii).

Canada Accident Assurance Co. (B. 3) 1<sup>st</sup>, 617.

Canada Plate Glass Insurance Co. incorp. (B. 4) 1<sup>st</sup>, 617 (i).

Canadian Coast, Survey of Currents, &c. (Ques.) 1824 (i).

Chambly Canal, Emplmt. of Geo. Peppin by Govt. (Ques.) 3821 (ii).

— Investigation (Ques.) 3553 (ii).

Champ de Mars, Lease, &c. (M. for cor.) 2141 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 50) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1264; 2<sup>d</sup> m., 2204 (i).

Coal Oil, on M. (Mr. Davis) to place on Free List. 2010 (i).

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc., 1750 (i).

Insolvency Legislation and Boards of Trade, Cor. with Govt. (M. for copies\*) 5377 (ii).

**Monk, Mr. F. D.—Con.**

- I. C. R., Contracts for Ties, Names of Tenderers (Ques.) 5308 (ii).  
 Jacques Cartier County, Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 6934 (iii).  
 Lake St. Louis, Removal of Shoal, Representations from Shippers, &c. (Ques.) 2331 (i).  
 Lotteries (art unions) in Montreal, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 2323 (i).  
 Mail Service, Jacques Cartier County (Ques.) 6933 (iii).  
 Montreal Harbour Improvements, Plans, &c. (Ques.) 2187 (i).  
 — Post Office, Repairs, &c., Advertisement *re* Tenders (Ques.) 2112 (i).  
 — Repairs, &c., Name of Contractor (Ques.) 1974 (i).  
 Naturalization Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. *McInnes*) on M. for 2°, 2177 (i).  
 N. W. T. Dual Language, Opinion of Min. of Jus. (Ques.) 2188 (i).  
 Penitentiaries, Printing by Convicts (Ques.) 1832 (i).  
 Point Claire Wharf, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2111 (i); 4806 (ii).  
 — (M. for Ret. \*) 2962 (i).  
 Postage Stamp Dies, Number ordered by Govt., Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3943 (ii).  
 Postmasters, Jacques Cartier County, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 6933 (iii).  
 Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9442, 9544, 9555, 9577 (iii).  
 Return, Inquiry for, 5747 (ii).  
 Richelieu River, Placing of Buoys, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3796 (i).  
 Ste. Geneviève, Land Damages, Rep. of Commissioner (Ques.) 6934 (iii).  
 St. Louis Lake, Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 8219 (iii).  
 St. Ours Lock, Dismissal of Supt. Coderre, &c. (Ques.) 3552 (ii).  
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Commission, Total Cost, Claims Unpaid, &c. (Ques.) 5484 (ii).  
 Soulanges Canal Arbitration, Land Valuators, Appnmts. and Dismissal (Ques.) 2333 (i).  
 Superior Court Judges, Quebec, Sums paid for Travelling Expenses (M. for stmt.) 2145 (i).  
 — Travelling Expenses to 1899 (M. for stmt. \*) 2245 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

- Canals*: Lachine (Atwater Avenue wall) 9173 (iii).  
*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8527, 8542 (iii).  
*Indians* (B.C.) 5708 (ii).  
*Legislation* (distribution of blue-books to Law Associations) 5742 (ii); (voters' lists) 2306 (i).  
*Militia* (arms, equipment, &c.) 9144; (compensation for injuries) 9130 (iii).  
*Railways*: Miscellaneous (Ottawa River) 9176; I. C. R. (passenger coach) 9172 (iii).  
*Yukon District*: Militia (clothing contract) 9092; 9124 (iii).  
 Tate's Dry Dock, Montreal, Rent, Lessees, &c. (Ques.) 1831 (i).

**Monk, Mr. F. D.—Con.**

- Ville Marie Bank Suspension (remarks) 9065 (iii).  
 Walmsley, Alex., Superannuation as British Mail Clerk (Ques.) 3797 (ii).  
 Yule Bridge, Richelieu River, Arbitrators' Award, &c. (Ques.) 3827 (ii).

**Montague, Hon. W. H., Haldimand.**

- Address, on The, 1037 (i).  
 Adulteration Act Amt. B. 123 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3993 (ii).  
 Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 3313 (i).  
 Benefit Associations, Insurance and Assessments (remarks) 1353 (i).  
 Binder Twine Contract, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 7212 (iii).  
 Business of the House (remarks) 9177 (iii).  
 Cattle Embargo, Cor. between Can. and Imp. Govts. (M. for copies\*) 1877 (i).  
 Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5924, 5936 (ii).  
 Colborne and Maitland Ports, Harbour Improvements, Reps., &c. (remarks) 7771, 8633 (iii).  
 Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6443 (ii).  
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6400, 6422, 6431 (ii).  
 Franchise Act Amt. (P.E.I.) Bill, not on Order Paper (remarks) 9308 (iii).  
 Friendly Society Insurance, Govt.'s Policy *re* Legislation (remarks) 3342 (ii).  
 Grand River Floods, Govt. Rep. *re* (remarks) 2536 (i).  
 G. T. R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement, on M. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) to adjn., 3970 (ii).  
 I. C. R., Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138, in Com., 4573, 4579 (ii).  
 — Order (Ques. of) "humbug" not parliamentary, 4643, 4669 (ii).  
 McLaughlin, R. J., and Farm Lands, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) 4486, 4498 (ii).  
 Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on amt. (Mr. *Monet*) 6097 (ii).  
 Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) *re par.* in Montreal *Star* on Purchase of Wharf, St. John's, 7328 (iii).  
 Port Maitland Harbour, Inquiry for Reps., &c., 9185 (iii).  
 Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7946 (iii).  
 Quarantine Service, Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 3826 (ii).  
 Quebec Ry., Light and Power Co.'s B. 84 (Mr. *Carrol*) in Com., 5042 (ii).  
 Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9315 (iii).  
 Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3466 (ii).

**Montague, Mr. W. H.—Con.**

Returns, Inquiry for (Papers *re* cattle embargo) 3253 (i).

Superannuations in Agriculture Dept., Appnmts. made, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 3873 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (experimental farm) 5073; (N.W.T. Exhibition) 5073; (patent record) 5074 (ii).

*Canals*: Galops (enlargement) 7299; Lake St. Louis (deepening) 7298; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 7296 (iii).

*Civil Government*: Agriculture (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 5020; Inland Revenue (printing and stationery) 5014; Interior (clerical assistance) 5023; Militia (clerical assistance) 5013 (ii); Post Office, 7330 (iii); (salaries, Dead Letter Branch) 5033; Public Works (printing, &c.) 5072; Sec. of State (P. Mungovan's salary) 5020 (ii).

*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8561, 8604, 8615, 8624, 8648 (iii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, &c.) 5129, 5139, 5165 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (St. John and Liverpool) 8671 (iii).

*Militia* (armouries) 9126, 9128; (clothing) 7108, 9127; (miscellaneous) 7150; (monuments) 7152; (Royal Military College) 7140; (stores, &c.) 7098 (iii).

*Miscellaneous* (*Canada Gazette*) 8703; (classification of record) 8702; (commutation of duties) 8704; (Dom. and Ont. arbitration) 8702; (extra clerks) 8705; (Paris Agency) 8705; (printing) 8703; (Printing Bureau plant) 8703; (Royal Society publications) 8705 (iii).

*Ocean and River Service* (maintenance and supplies) 5105 (ii).

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, Ont., 7968, 7998; (Port Colborne) 9252, 9270 (iii).

*Quarantine* (cattle, salaries, &c.) 5075 (ii).

*Railways*: C. P. R. (land damages) 7153; I. C. R. (accommodation, St. John) 7156, 7242; (increased siding accommodation) 9157; (installation of Pintsch gas) 9172; (land damages) 7154; (telegraph service) 9171 (iii).

*Yukon District*: Militia (food, clothing, transportation, &c.) 9070, 9079, 9116; Railways (surveys, &c.) 8700 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3886 (ii).

Welland Canal, Entrance at Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3997 (ii).

**Moore, Mr. A. H., Stanstead.**

Address, on The, 319 (i).

Coal Oil, Reduction of Duty (prop. Res.) 2118, 2127, 2130 (i).

Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 2922 (i).

Plebiscite, Speech of Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa Convention (Ques.) 1826 (i).

— Vote and Quebec Counties, Reps. asked for, 5748 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6111, 6117 (ii).

**Moore, Mr. A. H.—Con.**

Preferential Trade with G.B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7846 (iii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8823 (iii).

— Poll Books, Voters' Lists, &c. (M. for copies) 2906 (i).

Scott Act, Repeal in Brome Co., Delay in Voting, &c. (Ques.) 3547 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (experimental farms) 8262; (year book) 8232 (iii).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (voters' lists) 2281 (i).

*Militia* (annual drill) 7072 (iii); (clothing) 5448 (ii).

*Post Office* (postmasters' salaries) 5805, 5826 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3897 (ii).

**Morin, Mr. J. B., Dorchester.**

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3744; in Com. on Bill, 4666 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9569 (iii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Dom. Lands* (Chief Inspector, salary, &c.) 9023 (iii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Murray Bay and Ouelle River) 10160 (iii).

*Militia* (miscellaneous) 7149 (iii).

**Morrison, Mr. A., New Westminster.**

Address, The, on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1754 (i).

Brandon and South-western Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1165 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 52) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1322 (i).

Domville, Lt.-Col., Leave of Absence from Command of 8th Hussars (Ques.) 2898 (i).

Glenora Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 101) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2409 (i).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3383 (ii).

Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) M. for Com., 6091, 6095 (ii).

Northern Commercial Telegraph Co.'s (B. 152) 1<sup>st</sup>, 5096 (ii).

Ottawa Suburban Ry. Co.'s Incorp. (B. 117) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2966 (i).

Pacific Cable, Communication from B.C. Govt. (remarks) 2697 (i).

Spinks, County Court Judge, B.C., Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4232 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (illustration stations) 8328 (iii).

*Fisheries* (salaries of inspectors) 4048 (ii).

*Legislation* (distribution of blue-books to Law Associations) 5739 (ii).

**Morrison, Mr. A.—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

- Militia* (pay allowance) 7013; (salaries) 7075; (Yukon supplies) 7050 (iii).  
*Ocean and River Service* (masters and mates) 3062 (i).  
*Public Works*: Dredging (Mar. Provs. and B.C.), 10070; Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 8089; N.S. (Gabarouse breakwater) 9992 (iii).  
 Yukon—British Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co., Claims against Govt. (Ques.) 2905 (i).  
 — Gold Commissioner, Appnmt. (Ques.) 1823 (i).  
 — Legal Adviser, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1823 (i).  
 — Mining, Trading and Transportation (B. 94) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2246 (i).  
 — O.C.'s regulating Mining Claims by Officials, &c. (Ques.) 1824 (i).  
 — Officials in Gold Commissioner's Office, Nationality, &c. (Ques.) 1823 (i).  
 — salaries, cost of living, &c. (Ques.) 1824.  
 — Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 102) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2409 (i).  
 — Timber Inspector, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1823 (i).  
 — Walsh, Maj., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1823 (i).

**Mulock, Hon. W., North York, Ont.**

- American Bank Note Co., Plates, Dies, &c., Duties collected, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 3828 (ii).  
 Annapolis Co., Port George Post Office, Irregularities, &c. (Ans.) 8989 (iii).  
 Batiscan Post Office, Charges against Postmaster, Cor., *re* (Ans.) 2321 (i).  
 — Salary of Postmistress (Ans.) 1970 (i).  
 Beaumont, Wm., Claims for distributing Mail at Maple Bay prior to Confederation (Ans.) 3820 (ii).  
 Berthier (en haut) Postmaster and Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 2703 (i).  
 Bilodeau, Mr. Job. Postmaster at Chambord, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1962 (i).  
 Bourget, P. A., Postmaster at Lévis, Increase of Salary (Ans.) 4059 (ii).  
 Brantford Postmaster, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1968 (i).  
 — Salary, Commission, &c. (Ans.) 8465 (iii).  
 Brookside, P.E.I., Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 1969 (i).  
 Dargavel, Mr. J. R., Postmaster at Elgin, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1955 (i).  
 Distribution of Political Speeches (remarks) 1166 (i).  
 Franking Privilege to Legislative Reps., &c. (Ans.) 3823 (ii).  
 Galt Postmaster, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3825 (ii).  
 Gauthier, Jean, Postmaster at Metabetchouan, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4059 (ii).

**Mulock, Hon. W.—Con.**

- General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir Henry Joly) in Com., 9641 (iii).  
 Govt. Contracts, Prohibition of Sweating (Ans.) 1975 (i).  
 Guay Post Office, Revenue, Salary paid to Postmaster Verrault, &c. (Ans.) 3260 (i).  
 Havelock and Oak Lake, Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3824 (ii).  
 Humberstone Post Office, Charges against James O. Rose, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 6562 (ii).  
 — (remarks) 6594 (ii).  
 Inverness Post Offices, Change of Locations, Appnmt. and Dismissals (Ans.) 3825 (ii).  
 Jacques Cartier County Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 6934 (iii).  
 Lang P. O. and Ry. Station, Carriage of Mails, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3824 (ii).  
 Larouche, Mr. Wm., Postmaster at Lake Bouchette, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1962 (i).  
 Leake, Mr. J. R., Postmaster at Morton, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1963 (i).  
 Legris, Mr., Postmaster at Ste. Eulalie, Investigation, Rep., &c. (Ans.) 4272 (ii).  
 Lévis Mail Service, Names of Carriers, &c. (Ans.) 3554 (ii).  
 London Letter Carriers, and Kingston Street Ry. Transportation, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 4483, 4995 (ii).  
 Mail Bags, Contracts between Govt. and Ottawa Supply Co. (Ans.) 2185 (i).  
 Mail Service, Jacques Cartier County (Ans.) 6933 (iii).  
 — Pacific Coast, Facilities by Govt. (Ans.) 3254 (i).  
 Margaree and Orangedale Mail Service, Changes, &c. *re* Contractors (Ans.) 3261 (i).  
 Martel, Mr., Postmaster at St. Prime, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1965 (i).  
 McKenzie P. O., Man., Pets. *re*, Name of Postmaster (Ans.) 2185 (i).  
 McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., and Claims for Land Damages by Farmers in Lindsay, Letter of Mr. McLaughlin (read) 4998, 5005 (ii).  
 Montreal and Labelle Mail Service, Appnmt. of Mail Conductor (Ans.) 1966  
 — Post Office, Dismissals and Appnmts., Names, &c. (Ans.) 6047 (ii).  
 Moonstone, Ont., Postmaster, Name, &c. (Ans.) 1957 (i).  
 Mount Albion, P.E.I., Mail Service, Pets. *re*, &c. (Ans.) 1969 (i).  
 Murray Bay and Quebec Mail Service, Complaints of Delay (Ans.) 1960 (i).  
 North Sydney, Rumoured Dismissal (remarks) 4899, 4996 (ii).  
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. Bergeron) Reading Bill in both Languages, 4649 (ii).  
 Ottawa and Cyrville Mail Service, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 8991 (iii).

**Mulock, Hon. W.—Con.**

- Ottawa Supply Co., and Contracts with Govt. (Ans.) 2185 (i).
- Ouellet, Mr. Agapit, par. in *Le Soleil*, Emplmt. by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 3259 (i).
- Pacific Cable between Australia and Can. Agreement (B. 176) prop. Res., 1950 (i); 8348; in Com. on Res., 8383 (iii).
- Pariseau, Mr. C. D., Postmaster at St. Esprit, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1962 (i).
- Port George, Annapolis Co., Name of Postmaster, Charge of Irregularities, &c. (Ans.) 9179, 9697 (iii).
- Postage Stamp Dies, Number ordered by Govt., Cost., &c. (Ans.) 3943 (ii).
- Reproduction of Facsimiles by Bank Note Co. (Ans.) 2901 (i).
- Postal Notes, Contract, Cost, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for copy, 1982 (i).
- Lost through Transmission (remarks) 10226 (iii).
- Post Office, Jacques Cartier County, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 6933 (iii).
- Rep. (presented) 159 (i).
- Post Office Act Amt. (B. 155) 1°, 5096; 2° m., 6102; in Com., 6104 (ii).
- Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Sir Charles Tupper) to Com. of Sup., 7835 (iii).
- P. E. I., Grand View, Changes in Mail Service, Pets. against (Ans.) 4994 (ii).
- Mail Service, between I. C. R. and Cape Tormentine, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2325 (i).
- Prohibition Plebiscite, Ret. of Votes polled, Papers respecting, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 2043 (i).
- Purple Stamped 2-cent envelopes, Error in Printing, Circulation, &c. (Ans.) 3798 (ii).
- See "Stamped Envelopes."
- Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 9797; in Com. on Res., 9337, 9356, 9431, 9480, 9587.
- Representation in the H. of C. (B. 126) 2° m., 5207; in Com. (amt.) 6763, 6820 (ii) 6905, 6910 (iii).
- Returns, on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) 6320, 6596 (ii).
- St. Jérôme Postmaster, Dismissal, Charges against, &c. (Ans.) 2182 (i).
- St. Thomas and Aylmer Mail Service, Advertisements for Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 9698 (iii).
- Singleton, Mr. W. R., Postmaster at Delta, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1956 (i).
- Sintulata, Dismissal of Postmistress, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 10119 (iii).
- Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 8468 (iii).
- Smith, Mr. Abner, Postmaster at Rusagornis, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3256 (ii).
- Sproule, R. J., Postmaster at Flesherton, Ont., Complaints against (Ans.) 9179 (iii).
- Stamped Envelopes, 2-cent Purple, Number issued and distributed, &c. (Ans.) 2187 (i).
- 2-cent Green, Number purchased in Toronto, Issue and Distribution (Ans.) 2189 (i).

**Mulock, Hon. W.—Con.****SUPPLY :**

- Canals* : Rainy River (lock and dam) 10153 (iii).
- Civil Govt.* : Post Office, 7330; conc., 10202 (iii); (contingencies) 5068 (ii); 7359 (iii); (salaries, Dead Letter Branch) 5032, 5053 (ii).
- N. W. Mounted Police* : (Yukon service) 5837 (ii).
- Post Office* (Inspectors' salaries) 5798; conc., 6387; (legal expenses) 5801 (ii); (mail service) 7366; conc., 10202; (miscellaneous) 7388 (iii); (Postmasters' salaries) 5803; (Rainy River service) 5827; (refund for stamps, &c., stolen) 5800; Yukon District (railway mail clerks) 6360; (mail service) conc., 6390 (ii); 7359 (iii).
- Public Works* : Buildings (B.C.) conc., 6385 (ii); (N.S.) 9947; Ont. (Sarnia Post Office) 9962; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Toronto Harbour) 10066; (Port Colborne) 9256; Que. (Sabrevois wharf) 10023 (iii).
- Railways* : I.C.R. (accommodation at St. John) 7247 (iii).
- Yukon District* : Militia (clothing contract) 9075, 9082, 9101 (iii); (N. W. Mounted Police) conc., 6388 (ii).
- Sydenham Postmaster, Irregularity in Accts. (Ans.) 6935 (iii).
- Toronto, East, Postmaster, Recommendations for Vacant Position (Ans.) 4272 (ii).
- Appnmts. by Govt., Names, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1981 (i).
- Vancouver Island S.S. Service, Subsidy by Govt. (Ans.) 3797 (ii).
- Verrault, Jos., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3555 (ii).
- Victoria, B.C., Letter Carriers, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1960 (i).
- Walmsley, Alex., Superannuation as British Mail Clerk (Ans.) 3797 (ii).
- Waltham and Chapeau, Mail Service, Pet. from Pontiac County Council (Ans.) 2330 (i).
- Yukon, Administratron of, Charges against, on M. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to Com. of Sup., 6267 (ii).
- Bourassa, Mr., Postmaster at Dawson City (Ans.) 1958 (i).
- Harper, Mr. F., Postmaster at Dawson City, Issue of Notice (Ans.) 1961 (i).
- Mail Service between Dawson City and Vancouver, &c. (Ans.) 1966 (i).
- contracts, advertisements, &c., on M. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) for Copies, 2706 (i).
- efficiency of Contractors, Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) for Cor., 2705 (i).
- Registered Letters, &c., Policy of Govt., 3793 (ii).
- Registered Parcels, &c., returned from Dead Letter Office (remarks) 4352 (ii).

**Oliver, Mr. F., Alberta.**

- Address, The, on amt. (Mr. Bertram) to amt. (Mr. Clarke) 1804 (i).
- Alberta Irrigation Co. Change of Title (B. 23) 1°, 803 (i).

**Oliver, Mr. F.—Con.**

- Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co. (land subsidy), Amount selected and still due, &c. (Ques.) 2326 (i).
- C. P. R. Commission, Appnmt. by Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Richardson*) 2785 (i).
- Coal Oil, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) to place on Free List, 2008 (i).
- on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2126 (i).
- Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. (amt.) 2645; on M. for 3<sup>c</sup> (amt.) 2934; (Neg. Y. 14; N. 61) 2949 (i).
- Edmonton District Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 93) 1<sup>c\*</sup>, 2246 (i); in Com., 4303, 4847, 4852 (ii).
- General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 9642 (iii).
- Great North-west Central Ry. Co. B. 90 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) 4785 (ii).
- Hudson Bay and Yukon Ry. and Nav. Co.'s (B. 110) 1<sup>c\*</sup>, 2696 (i).
- Mint, Establishment by Govt. in Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3122 (i).
- N.W.T. Seed Grain Indebtedness, Cancellation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Davin*) 2022 (i).
- Mounted Police, Issue of Scrip, Pets, &c., *•rc* (Ques.) 2484 (i).
- Rebellion (1885) Claims Commission, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3096 (i).
- Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 7655 (iii).
- Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9745 (iii).
- Commissioners, Establishment of a Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 3367 (ii).
- Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9372, 9435, 9454, 9495, 9504, 9529, 9593 (iii).

## SUPPLY :

- Dominion Lands* (scrip, &c.) 7520 (iii).
- Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8520; (St. Paul des Métis, seed grain, &c.) 9047 (iii).
- Indians* (industrial schools) 7490 (iii).
- Miscellaneous* (half-breed claims commission) 9059 (iii).

- Veterans of 1885, at Edmonton, Issue of Scrip and Medals, Applications, &c. (Ques.) 2701 (i).
- Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6275 (ii).

**Osler, Mr. E. B., West Toronto.**

- Address, on The, 307 (i).
- Can. Permanent and Western Can. Mortgage Corporation Co.'s incorp. (B. 75) 1<sup>c\*</sup>, 2029 (i).
- I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4619 (ii).
- McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., and Farm Lands, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) 4501 (ii).
- Mint, Establishment by Govt. in Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3121 (i).
- Pacific Cable between Australia and Can. Agreement B. (Mr. *Mulock*) prop. Res., 8371 (iii).

**Osler, Mr. E. B.—Con.**

- Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7944 (iii).
- Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9363 (iii).
- Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 6718 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 8721 (iii).
- Civil Government*: Post Office 7350 (iii).
- Indians* (Ont.) 5680 (ii).
- Legislation* (stationery supplies) 5735 (ii).
- Post Office* (postmasters' salaries) 5814 (ii).
- Public Works*: Building (Rideau Hall) 7695; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Wharfs) 7700, 7735, 7740; Ont. Port Colborne) 9253 (iii).

**Parmalee, Mr. C. H., Shefford.**

- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8852; (amt.) 8856 (iii).

**Paterson, Hon. W., North Grey.**

- Address, on The, 1167 (i).
- Agricultural Implements imported from U.S., Bases of Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 6048 (ii).
- American Bank Note Co., Dies, Plates, &c., Duties collected, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Ret., 3828 (ii).
- Binder Twine imported in 1899 (Ans.) 8218, 8990 (iii).
- Budget, The, 2637, 2650 (i).
- Busby, Mr., Customs Collector at Skagway, Date of Appnmt. and Salary, (Ans.) 4805 (ii).
- Chambord Customs House, Collections, Salaries, Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 1851 (i).
- Coasting Laws, Enforcement, Cor. respecting (Ans.) 3257 (i).
- Rep. of Capt. John Irving *re* Enforcement, &c. (Ans.) 3258 (i).
- Customs Act Amt. (B. 154) 1<sup>c\*</sup>, 4991; in Com., 6443 (ii).
- Customs House, Toronto, Employees, Appnmts., Dates, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1849 (i).
- General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 9643 (iii).
- Grain exported from Can. Ports, Number of Bushels, &c. (Ans.) 3256 (i).
- to Germany in 1898-99, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 8990 (iii).
- Indian Corn imported from 1896-99 (Ans.) 8217 (iii).
- imported for Home Consumption, &c. (Ans.) 8632, 8990 (iii).
- Iron Bounties, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 1828 (i).
- John C. Barr*, Valuation by Customs Authorities (Ans.) 2700 (i); 8219 (iii).
- Ownership, &c. (Ans.) 8469 (iii).
- Lebel, Mr. Wenceslas, Customs Official and Revision of Electoral Lists, par. in *Le Soleil* (Ans.) 1889 (i).
- Lepreaux, N.B., Customs Officer, Name, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 5313 (ii).

**Paterson, Hon. W.—Con.**

*Pingree and Lowe Strs., Undervaluation, &c.*  
(Ans.) 8219 (iii).<sup>t</sup>

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9768,  
9782 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*)  
on M. for 2°, 5280; in Com., 6762, 6802 (ii).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 8077 (iii).

Schafheitlin & Fitzgibbon, Custom, Law Infrac-  
tion (Ans.) 1889 (i).

Scrimgeour, Mr. J. G., Grant of Bonded Ware-  
house, Date, Lease, &c. (Ans.) 2113 (i).

Sugar Imports from British W. Indies, Quantities  
and Value (Ans.) 2327 (i).

## SUPPLY :

On M. (Mr. *Foster*) that Com. rise, 5482 (ii).

*Civil Govt.* : Customs (contingencies) 2973; (sal-  
aries) 2091 (i).

*Customs* (contingencies) 5855; (B. C. and Yukon)  
stationery, &c., 5600 (ii); (contingencies, &c.)  
8453 (iii); B.C. (revenue cruisers repairs) 5602 (ii);  
Man. (contingencies, &c.) 8453; N. W. T. (con-  
tingencies, &c.) 8453; N. S. (salaries, contin-  
gencies, &c.) 8390; Ont. (contingencies, &c.) 8452  
(iii); (salaries, &c.) 5595; Que. (suspense account,  
Montreal) 5588; Yukon (salaries, &c.) 5596 (ii).

*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8614 (iii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (supplies, &c.) 3541  
(ii).

*Militia* (pay, &c.) 7037; (Yukon supplies) 7045 (iii).

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 7979  
(iii).

*Yukon Provisional District* (customs) 8746; (sal-  
aries, &c.) 8658 (iii); (telegraph lines) 5620, 5642  
(ii).

U. S. Vessels registered at Dawson, Names, &c.  
(Ans.) 2700 (i).

Wheat exported from Montreal, St. John, Fort  
William and Winnipeg, Quantities (Ans.) 2702  
(i).

Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on  
M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of  
Sup., 6248 (ii).

— Post Office, Emplmt. of Mr. *Bourassa*  
(Ans.) 1833 (i).

— Rumours *re* Conflict between U. S. and  
Can. Customs (remarks) 975 (i).

— U. S. SS. *John C. Barr*, Undervaluation,  
&c. (Ans.) 3266 (i).

**Penny, Mr. E. G., Montreal, St. Lawrence.**

Committee Meetings, Accommodation in Rooms  
(remarks) 3314 (i).

Criminal Code, Cruelty to Animals (B. 116) 1°,  
2963 (i).

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French  
Translator, on M. to conc., 1741 (i).

Inspection (Fruit) Act Amt. (B. 56) 1°\*, 1352;  
on Order for 2°, 3316 (i); 2° m., 3872; withdn.,  
5360 (ii).

Inspection Act Amt. (B. 55) 1°\*, 1352 (i); 2° m.,  
3871; withdn., 5360 (ii).

Potash Inspection, and Montreal Board of Trade  
(Ques.) 1858 (i).

**Penny, Mr. E. G.—Con.**

## SUPPLY :

*Administration of Justice* (Exchequer Court) 5476  
(ii).

**Pettet, Mr. W. V., Prince Edward.**

Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 152  
(Mr. *Hurley*) in Com., 7480 (iii).

Military Canteens and Sale of Liquor, par. in  
*Ottawa Citizen re* Ont. Alliance, 7326 (iii).

## SUPPLY :

*Canals*: Trent (construction) 7299 (iii).

*Public Works*: Buildings (Ont.) 7623 (iii).

**Pope, Mr. R. H., Compton.**

Address, on The, 398 (i).

Budget, The, 2672 (i).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co.

Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for  
2°, 4158 (ii).

— Govt. Rys., Cars, Locomotives, Number,  
Cost, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 2028 (i).

— Harris, Mr., Agreement with as Traffic  
M'gr. (Ques.) 1975, 1980 (i).

— (M. for cor., &c. \*) 2961 (i).

— Tariffs, Special Rates, Reps. of Mr. Harris  
(M. for copies \*) 2961 (i).

Magdalen Island Mail Service, Terms of Con-  
tract, &c. (M. for cor. \*) 2789 (i).

Scott Act Repeal, Brome County, Applications  
for (Ques.) 2187 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Fisheries* (salaries of inspectors) 4016 (ii).

**Poupore Mr. W. J., Pontiac.**

Canadian Pacific Ry. and Hull Electric Co.'s

Confirmation of Agreement (B. 25) 1°\*, 895 (i).

Contracts let without Tender on M. (Mr. *Davin*)  
for O. Cs., 5326 (ii).

Davis, Edward, Slide Master at Coulonge, Dis-  
missal, &c. (Ques.) 3946 (ii).

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal (prop.  
Res.) 4273, 4884 (ii).

Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 18 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on  
M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2289 (i).

Portage du Fort and Bristol Branch Ry. Co.'s  
(B. 42) 1°\*, 1165 (i).

Roche Fendue and Calumet Dams, Claims for  
Damages, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 2789 (i).

— (Ques.) 1854 (i).

Waltham and Chapeau Mail Service, Pet. from  
Pontiac County Council (Ques.) 2330 (i).

Zenith Mining and Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 20) 1°\*,  
803 (i).

**Powell, Mr. H. A., Westmorland.**

Address, on The, 1124 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr.  
*Richardson*) in Com., 5906, 5914, 5942 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 36 (Mr. *Brit-  
ton*) on M. for 2°, 2168 (i).

**Powell, Mr. H. A.—Con.**

- Franchise Act Schedules (remarks) 1073 (i).  
 G. T. R. Trackmen's Strike, &c., on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4514 (ii).  
 I. C. R., Expenditure on Capital and Revenue (Ques.) 2531 (i).  
 — Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3413 (ii).  
 — on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 2825 (i).  
 — G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3600, 4077, 4123 ; in Com., 4392, 4686, 4707 (ii).  
 — Chaudière to Montreal, Revenue collected, &c. (Ques.) 1856 (i).  
 — (M. for Ret. \*) 2027 (i).  
 — Expenditure, Revenue, from 1898 to 1899 (M. for Ret. \*) 2789 (i).  
 — Leblanc, Mr. A. T., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1964 (i).  
 — Snow Shovelling, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 1964 (i).  
 Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com. on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) 6334, 6405 (ii).  
 Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9633 (iii).  
 P. E. I. Winter Mail Service, Contracts, &c., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) for Copies, 3145 (i).  
 Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 7659, 7674 (iii).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6695 (ii) ; in Com., 6948, 6973 (iii).

## SUPPLY :

- Canals*: Chambly (telephone lines) 5783 (ii) : Trent (construction) 7306 (iii). ; Welland (refund for damages to lock) 5793 (ii).  
*Fisheries*: Protection Service (repairs, &c.) 5180 (ii).  
*Insurance* (general expenses) 7464 (iii).  
*Interior*: Yukon District (general expenditure) 6373 (ii).  
*Ocean and River Service* (maintenance) 3030 (i).  
*Post Office* (mail service) 7379 (iii).  
*Public Works*: Buildings, Ottawa (electric lighting) 5196 (ii).  
*Railways*: I. C. R. (accommodation, St. John) 7409, 7424 ; (rolling stock) 7434 ; P. E. I. (Murray Harbour, &c., construction) 9220 ; (removal of curves) 7398 (iii) ; (repairs to car "Victoria") 5785 (ii).  
 Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir *C. H. Tupper*) to Com of Sup., 6256 (ii).  
 — Lynch, Mr. W. H., Emplmt. by Govt., Reps., &c. (Ques.) 1847 (i).

**Prefontaine, Mr. R., Maisonneuve.**

- Banque du Peuple (B. 6) 1°, 618 ; (M.) for Com., 3298 (i) ; 3° m., 3485 (ii) ; Sen. Amts., 7577 (iii).  
 Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on amt. (Mr. *Monet*) 6097 (ii).

**Prefontaine, Mr. R.—Con.**

- Potash Inspection at Montreal, Board of Trade, Res., Pets., &c. (M. for cor. \*) 1878 (i).  
 Richelieu and Ontario Nav. Co.'s (B. 27) 1°, 895 (i).

**Prior, Hon. E. G., Victoria, B.C.**

- Address, on The, 975 (i).  
 Alaska Boundary and Customs Officials, Difficulties with Mounted Police (remarks) 2193 (i).  
 — American Rumours *re* Canada's Contention (M. to adjn.) 3846 (ii).  
 Alien Act B. C., Cor. with B. C. Govt. respecting (Ques.) 8220, 8466, 8757 (iii).  
 — Disallowance by Dom. Govt. (Ques.) 7768 (iii).  
 Anti-Japanese Legislation, Cor. between B. C. Govt. and Dom. (remarks) 5206 (ii).  
 — Motion dropped, 5313 (ii).  
 — Govt. Policy *re* Fourteen Statutes already in Force (Ques.) 5859 (ii).  
 Appmt. of Members to Offices, par. in *Victoria Colonist*, 6381 (ii).  
 Ashcroft, B.C., Sale of Ry. Lands, &c. (Ques.) 1855 (i).  
 — Cor. with Dom. Govt. (M. for copies \*) 2408 (i).  
 Boston and Alaskan Transportation Co., Contract with Can. Govt. (Ques.) 1828 (i).  
 Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4985 (ii).  
 B. C. Fishermen, Seizure of Nets, &c., by Americans, par. in *Victoria Daily Colonist* (remarks) 8633 (iii).  
 — Lt. Gov. and Turner Administration and Can. Govt. (M. for cor.) 2362 (i).  
 — Legislation *re* Chinese and Foreign Immigration, Disallowance, &c. (M. to adjn.) 6828, 6902 (iii).  
 — Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 28) 1°, 895 (i).  
 — Statutes for 1899, Date of receiving by Sec. of State (Ques.) 5666 (ii).  
 Bubonic Plague and Quarantine of Pacific Strs. at B. C. (remarks) 5989 (ii).  
 Burrard, Member for, Speech *re* Amounts paid to Vancouver Liberals by Dom. Govt. (Ques.) 1838 (i).  
 Chemainus, B.C., Pilotage Limits (Ques.) 5312 (ii).  
 Anti-Chinese Legislation in B. C. and Govt.'s Action (Ques.) 1837 (i).  
 Customs and Inland Revenue Depts., B. 182 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9670 (iii).  
 Deadman's Island, par. in *Montreal Witness re Lease*, 1353 (i).  
 — Leases, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1640, 1815 (i).  
 — Cor. between Dom. Govt. and B. Haigh & Son (1880) *re* Application for use, &c. (M. for cor. \*) 2788 (i).  
 — O. Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 2334 (i).  
 — Forfeiture of Lease by Mr. Ludgate (remarks) 4739 (ii).

**Prior, Hon. E. G.—Con.**

- Deadman's Island and Stanley Park (M. to print papers) 3959 (ii).
- Disallowance of Anti-Japanese Legislation, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 5408, 5491 (ii).
- Dorothy*, Seizure by U. S. Customs Authorities at Skagway, par. in *Ottawa Citizen* (Ques.) 2367 (i).
- Drill Hall, Vancouver, B.C., Contract, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 5487, 6122 (ii), 7765 (iii).
- Dry Dock, Victoria, B.C., Pets. *re* Reduction of Charges, &c. (Ques.) 7766 (iii).
- Esquimalt, B.C., Dry Dock, Reduction of Rates, &c., Pets. against, &c. (Ques.) 6122 (ii).
- Fraser and Skeena River Fish Hatcheries, Erection by Govt. (Ques.) 4058 (ii).
- Govt. Property, B.C., Lease, &c., Cor. respecting (Ques.) 8465; Rental, &c. (Ques.) 8991 (iii).
- Governor Pingree* and *J. B. Lowe*, Strs., Registry in Can. (Ques.) 1856 (i).
- Indians, Yale and Cariboo, Medical Attendance, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 8630, 8989 (iii).
- International Commission and Alaskan Boundary, par. in *Ottawa Citizen*, 6936 (iii).
- John C. Barr*, Undervaluation, &c. (Ques.) 8218, 8469 (iii).
- Letter Carriers (B.C.), Number, Salaries, &c., from 1895 to 1899 (M. for Ret.\*) 2789 (i).
- Macaulay Point Fortifications, Claims for Compensation, &c. (M. for cor., &c.\*) 3874 (ii).
- Inquiry for Ret., 5489 (ii).
- Militia Permanent Corps, Pension System, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2715 (i).
- Northern Commercial Telegraph Co. and Cor. with Mins. of the Crown, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5510 (ii).
- Non-Production of High Commissioner's Telegram, 5747 (ii).
- Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *Victoria Daily Times*, 6051 (ii).
- Pacific Cable between Can. and Australia Agreement B. (Mr. *Mulock*) prop. Res., 8373 (iii).
- Parlt. and Deptl. Buildings, Ottawa, Electric Lighting, &c. (Ques.) 5308 (ii).
- Personal Explanation *re* Vote on Kettle River Ry. Bill, 9595 (iii).
- Pingree* and *Lowe*, Strs., Undervaluation, &c., (Ques.) 8218 (iii).
- Poaching on the Pacific Coast (remarks) 8347 (iii).
- Prohibition Plebiscite, Number of Votes Polled, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2321 (i).
- Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 7673 (iii).
- Quadra*, Str., Payment of Crew and Officers (Ques.) 3076 (i).
- Quebec Harbour Commissioners, Amount Expended and Loans advanced by Govt. (Ques.) 5309 (ii).
- Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9406, 9499 (iii).

**Prior, Hon. E. G.—Con.**

- Returns, Inquiry for (Commercial Tel. Construction Syndicate) 3752 (ii).
- Cor. between Ministers and Northern Tel. Co. (remarks) 5409, 5746 (ii).
- Inquiry for, 8387 (iii).
- Songhee, Indians (B. C.) Removal from Reserve, Settlement with B. C. Govt. (Ques.) 3797 (ii).
- Cor. between Dom. and Provl. Govt. (M. for copies) 3873 (ii).
- (Inquiry for Ret.) 4713 (ii).
- Strathcona*, Str., and Relief of Destitute Miners, Arrangement with Govt. (Ques.) 9179 (iii).
- SUPPLY :
  - Administration of Justice* : Yukon (maintenance of prisoners) 5468 (ii).
  - Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (illustration stations) 8309 (iii).
  - Canals* : Cornwall (payment to A. P. Ross) 9177 (iii); Welland (rebate to Forwarding Co.) 5795 (ii).
  - Civil Govt.* : Agriculture (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 5030; Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5026 (ii); Post Office, 7331 (iii); (contingencies, Dead Letter Branch) 5071 (ii); Public Works (salaries) 7553 (iii).
  - Collection of Revenue* (telegraph lines, B. C.) 8184 (iii).
  - Customs* (contingencies) 5856 (ii).
  - Fisheries* (Behring Sea legal expenses) 5181 (ii).
  - Indians* (B.C.) 5704 (ii).
  - Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, &c.) 5140 (ii).
  - Militia* (annual drill) 5065 (ii); 7071 (iii); (arms, &c., accoutrements) 5466 (ii); (Macaulay Point claim) 9133; (pay, allowance) 7027; (properties, &c.) 7089 (iii); (rifle range, B.C.) conc., 6389 (ii); (salaries) 7077; (Yukon supplies) 7040 (iii).
  - Miscellaneous* (half-breed claims commission) 9059 (iii); (professional services, C. J. R. Bethune) 5471 (ii); (relief of Canadians in foreign countries) 7529 (iii).
  - N. W. Mounted Police* (service) 5833; (Yukon service) 5839 (ii).
  - Post Office* (Inspectors' salaries) 5799; conc., 6387; (Postmasters' salaries) 5807 (ii).
  - Public Works* : Buildings (B.C.) 8085, 8090; conc., 6385 (ii); (N.B.) 7764; (N.S.) 7613 (iii); (Ottawa electric lighting) 5187 (ii); (Ont.) 7994; Yukon Distric. (Lewes and Yukon river improvements) 8192 (ii); (telegraph lines) 5622, 5658 (ii).
  - Quarantine* (cattle, salaries, &c.) 5078 (ii); (salaries and contingencies) 8338; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 8338 (iii).
  - Yukon Provisional District* (salaries, &c.) 8658 (iii).
- Valleyfield Customs Collectors, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to Com. of Sup., 5501 (ii).
- Vancouver Island S.S. Service, Subsidy by Govt. (Ques.) 3797 (ii).
- Victoria Harbour, Rep. of Resident Engineer, &c. (Ques.) 3828 (ii).
- Victoria, B.C., Letter Carriers, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1960 (i).
- Post Office, Old Site, Ownership, &c. (Ques.) 4269 (ii).

**Prior, Hon. E. G.—Con.**

- Victoria and Montreal Harbours, Grants by Dom. Govt. (M. for Stmtt.\*) 1877 (i).  
 — P. O., Safes, Elevators, &c., Tenders for, &c. (Ques.) 1887 (i).  
 Wade, Mr. F. C., Emplmt., Amounts paid to by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 1830 (i).  
 Yukon, Alien Labourers at Lake Bennet, and Govtl. Action (Ques.) 1859 (i).  
 — Appellate Court, Establishment, &c. (Ques.) 5308 (ii).  
 — Liquor Permits issued by Mr. Ogilvie and cancelled by Govt. (remarks) 2908 (i); 3789 (ii).  
 — Skagway and Dawson Telegraph line, Construction by English Co., &c. (Ques.) 3073 (i).

**Quinn, Mr. M. J. F., Montreal, St. Ann's.**

- Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 171 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 9729 (iii).  
 Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6449 (ii).  
 Insolvency Legislation and Boards of Trade, Pets., &c. (M. for copies\*) 5945 (ii).  
 Isle au Noix, Militia Property, Lease, Rental, &c. (M. for stmtt.\*) 2961 (i).  
 Montreal Postmastership, Vacancy, &c. (Ques.) 5859 (ii).  
 — Post Office, Dismissals and Appnmts., Names, &c. (Ques.) 6047 (ii).  
 Newspapers, Issued and Mailed in Toronto and Montreal, Weight, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 2787 (i).  
 Prohibition, Plebiscite Vote, Expenses in Montreal City, Amounts unpaid, &c. (Ques.) 5312 (ii).  
 Purple Stamped 2-cent envelopes, Circulation, Error in Printing (Ques.) 3797 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

- Administration of Justice* (Exchequer Court) 5476 (ii).  
*Customs* (suspense account, Montreal) 5592 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (voters' lists) 2308 (i).  
*Penitentiaries* (Dorchester) 5478, 5480; (Manitoba) 5479; (St. Vincent de Paul) 5477 (ii).  
 Yukon District, Messrs. Coste and Lafontaine's Instructions (Ques.) 1893 (i).

**Ratz, Mr. V., North Middlesex.**

- Coal Oil, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) to place on Free List, 2011 (i).

**Reid, Mr. J. D., South Grenville.**

- G. T. R. Trackmens' Strike, on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4541 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 8721 (iii).  
*Pensions* (Fenian raid) 8750 (iii).

**Richardson, Mr. R. L., Lisgar.**

- Address, The, on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1787 (i).  
 C. P. Ry. Commission, Appnmt. by Govt., prop. Res., 2773 (i).

**Richardson, Mr. R. L.—Con.**

- Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries (B. 38) 1<sup>st</sup>, 974; 2<sup>d</sup> m., 1923 (i) 5374; in Com., 5900, 5912, 5923, 5929, 5940 (ii).  
 Coal Oil, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) to place on Free List, 2009 (i).  
 — on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2126 (i).  
 Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Cos-tigan*) on amt. (Mr. *Oliver*) to M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 2947 (i).  
 Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator (M.) to conc., 1738, 1739 (i).  
 — 2nd Rep., conc. (M.), 2180 (i).  
 — 5th Rep., conc. (M.) 5665 (ii).  
 — 6th Rep., conc. (M.) 8913 (iii).  
 Edmonton and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4309, 4856 (ii).  
 Grain Transit, Man. and N.W.T. Regulation B. 15 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1912 (i).  
 Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) to M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 4528, 4771 (ii).  
 Ont. and Rainy River Co., Correction in Min. of Rys. speech (remarks) 9699 (iii).  
 Personal Explanation, par. in *Mail and Empire* re Speech at Picton, Ont., 5375 (ii).  
 Printing Com., 3rd, 4th and 5th Reprs. of Com. (stationery) on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) to conc., 5384 (ii).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8889 (iii).  
 Pub. Accounts Com., Delay in Meeting (Man. Election Frauds) on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to adjn., 3219 (i).  
 Ry. Act. Amt. R. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9741 (iii).

- Commissioners, Establishment of Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 2515 (i).

- Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9206, 9349 (amt.) 9363, 9425, 9531; in Com. on Bill, 9761 (iii).

- Shannon, Thos., dismissal, (M. for papers\*) 3333 (i).

## SUPPLY :

- Canals*: Trent (construction) 7308, 7315 (iii).  
*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8552 (ii).  
 Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6276 (ii).

**Rinfret, Mr. C. I., Lotbinière.**

- Usury (B. 174) 1<sup>st</sup>. 8217 (iii).

**Robertson, Mr. J. Ross, East Toronto.**

- Address, on The, 1013 (i).  
 Biggar, J. L., Appnmt. by Govt., Qualifications, &c. (Ques.) 3549 (ii).  
 Brevet Promotions, Permanent Force, Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 3550 (ii).  
 Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Cos-tigan*) on amt. (Mr. *Oliver*) to M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 2936.  
 Copyright Bill Govt. Action (Ques.) 1981 (i).

**Robertson, Mr. J. Ross—Con.**

- Costigan, Hon. Mr., on Personal Explanation, 3666 (ii).
- Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6451 (ii).
- Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6411 (ii).
- G.T.R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement (M. to adjn.) 3960, 3984 (ii).
- on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4534 (ii).
- I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3423 (ii).
- International Commission, par. in London *Times* re Settlement of Questions, 3668 (ii).
- Militia Act Amt. Intention of Govt. (Ques.) 3551 (ii).
- Army Service Corps, Recommendations or Reqs. of Maj. Gen. (Ques.) 9697 (iii).
- Artillery Instruction in Eng., Examinations, &c. (Ques.) 2330 (i).
- Officer appointed in 1898, Requirements as to qualifications (Ques.) 2329 (i).
- list and certificates of Qualification (Ques.) 2329 (i).
- Regulations Presented to Parlt. (Ques.) 3550 (ii).
- Patent Commissioner Power of Relief of Thos. Robertson (B. 11) 1<sup>c</sup>\*, 618 (i).
- Permanent Force Appointments, Qualifications, &c. (Ques.) 3550 (ii).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6107 (ii).
- Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 7647 (iii).
- Ry. Commissioners, Establishment of Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 2512 (i).
- Passes to Members and Senators B. 37 (Mr. *Bostock*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 2202 (i).
- Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9343 (ii).
- Regimental Establishments, Lists submitted to Parlt. (Ques.) 3550 (ii).
- Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 3462; on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 6539.
- Royal Military College Inspection, Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 3796 (ii).
- Strathy, Mr. J. A. L., Reinstatement as Lt. Col. (Ques.) 2329 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

- Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8654 (iii).
- Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (G.B. and Can.) 8664 (iii).
- Militia* (Dom. Cartridge Factory) 7151; (miscellaneous) 7147; (transport, &c.) 7132 (iii).
- Miscellaneous* (Academy of Arts) 8705; (Royal Society Grant) 8706 (iii).
- Public Works*: Buildings (lighting, heating, &c.) 7694; (Ont.) 7626 (iii) (patent office, photographic establishment) 5090 (ii).
- Veterans of 1866, Volunteers organized in Chicago, Eligibility for Medals, &c. (Ques.) 2704 (i).

**Roche, Mr. W. J., Marquette.**

- Address, on The, 454 (i).
- C.P.R. and Great North-west Central Ry., Survey of Branch Line (Ques.) 2532 (i).
- Christie, Mr. W. J., Dismissal from Inland Rev. Dept., O.C's, Reqs. Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 2393 (i).
- (M.) to ref. papers to Pub. Accts. Com., 3341 (ii).
- Dickson, Mr. R., Immigration Agent, Appmt. by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 1855 (i).
- Elkhorn Indian School, Printing Plant, Lease to W. J. Thompson, &c. (Ques.) 3076 (i).
- Govt. Lands. Man., Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 1856 (i).
- Great North-west Central Ry. Co's B. 90 (Mr. *Macpierson*) on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 4194 (ii).
- Hudson's Straits, Navigability, Cost of Expedition, &c. (Ques.) 3337 (ii).
- Jerome, Mr. Martin, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6723 (ii); 7194 (iii).
- Land Transfers in Man. and Govt. Agents Speculations (remarks) 4735 (ii).
- McKenzie P.O., Man., Pets. re, &c., Name of Postmaster (Ques.) 2185 (i).
- Martin, Mr. A. F., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 7534 (iii).
- Portage La Prairie Post Office, Name and Salary of Caretaker (Ques.) 2485 (i).
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8901 (iii).
- Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 6685 (ii).
- Virden, Man., Inland Rev. Office, M. for Cor., dropped, 5313 (ii).
- Winnipeg Electoral District and Representation (Ques.) 1830 (i).
- Issue of Writ (remarks) 8469 (iii).
- Winnipeg Grain Exchange and Fort William Harbour, Cor. with Pub. Works Dept. (M. for cor. \*) 1879 (i).

**Roddick, Mr. T. G., Montreal, St. Antoine.**

- Adulteration Act Amt. B. 123 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3990 (ii).
- Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6282 (ii).

**Rogers, Mr. D. D., Frontenac.**

- Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4989 (ii).
- Calvin Co., Limited (B. 9) 1<sup>c</sup>\*, 618 (i).
- Civil Service Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 3321, 3330 (i).
- Coal Oil, Reduction of Duty on, prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2125 (i).
- Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 9624 (iii).
- Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7931 (iii).

**Rogers, Mr. D. D.—Con.**

Ry. Passes to Members and Senators B. 37 (Mr. *Bostock*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 2197 (i).

— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9395, 9583 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6786 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (gold storage) 8723 (iii).

*Canals* : Trent (construction) 7316 (iii).

*Civil Govt.* : Customs (contingencies) 2987 (i); Post Office) 7342 (iii).

*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8516 (iii).

*Public Works* : Harbours and Rivers, N.S., conc., 10218 (iii).

*Quarantine* (cattle, salaries, &c.) 5081 (ii).

*Weights and Measures* (inspection) 5584 (ii).

**Rosamond, Mr. B., North Lanark.**

N. W. T. Settlers, from Ont., Privileges granted by Govt. (Ques.) 2902 (i).

Ont. Settlers in N.W.T., Privileges granted by Govt. (remarks) 6051 (i).

Order, (Ques. of) member using word "insinuation," 5617 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Yukon District* : Militia (clothing contract) 9100 (iii).

**Russell, Mr. B., Halifax.**

I. C. R., Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3633, 3669, 3707 (ii).

— Order, Ques. of (Sir *C. H. Tupper*) 4453 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries, Commissioners' Report (remarks) 2249 (i).

Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 18 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2286 (i).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 6660 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (salaries, &c.) 3530 (ii).

*Ocean and River Service* (maintenance) 3028 (i).

*Public Works* : Buildings (N.S.) 9945; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Porter's Lake, dredging, &c.) 9995 (iii).

Tanner, John, Claims against Spanish Govt. for Detention, &c. (Ques.) 4805 (ii).

**Rutherford, Mr. J. G., Macdonald.**

C. P. R., Powers respecting Branch Lines, &c., (Ques.) 9309 (iii).

General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 9641 (iii).

Grain Transit, Man. and N.W.T. Regulation B. 15 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1905 (i).

Northern Pacific and Man. Ry. Co's. (B. 83) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2107 (i).

Order (Ques. of) *re* the use of the word "thimble-riggers," 9655 (iii).

Ry. Commissioners, Establishment of Board, prop. Res., 2488 (i).

**Rutherford, Mr. J. G.—Con.**

Railways Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9383 (iii).

## SUPPLY :

*Yukon Provisional District* : Interior (salaries, &c.) 8987 (iii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. *Roddick*) to Com. of Sup., 6288 (ii).

**Savard, Mr. P. V., Chicoutimi and Saguenay.**

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1934 (i).

Gagné, Hon. Mr. Justice, and Connection with Lake St. John Ry. Co., Delay and Inconvenience to Litigants (Ques.) 2189 (i).

Great Northern Ry. Co.'s Change of Title (B. 118) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2966 (i).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4664 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Public Works* : Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 8117 (iii).

**Scriver, Mr. J., Huntingdon.**

Aronsberg, Abraham, Relief B. 144 (Mr. *Landerkin*) in Com., 7577 (iii).

Private Bills Com., Meeting during Sitting of the House (M.) 8751 (iii).

— Reduction of Time for posting (M.) 6119 (ii).

— Com., Sel. Standing, Reduction of Quorum (M.) 4729 (ii).

— Extension of Time (M.) 894 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (dairy branch) 8265 (iii).

*Public Works* : Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Sabrevois wharf) 10027 (iii).

*Weights and Measures Act* Amt B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3897 (ii).

**Semple, Mr. A., Centre Wellington.**

## SUPPLY :

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (illustration stations) 8290; (year book) 8226 (iii).

*Civil Govt.* (Post Office) 7351 (iii).

**Sifton, Hon. C., Brandon.**

Address, on The, 800, 806 (i).

Administration of Justice in Man. and Keewatin (B. 167) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 6279 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 8171 (iii).

Alaska Boundary and Customs Officials, Difficulties with Mounted Police (remarks) 2194 (i).

Ashcroft, B.C., Sale of Ry. Lands, &c. (Ans.) 1855 (i).

Bauer, Mr., *re* Examination Papers, &c. (remarks) 4998, 4996 (ii).

British Can. Goldfields Co., Ret. laid on Table, 3959 (ii).

B. C. Legislation *re* Chinese and Foreign Immigration, Disallowance, &c., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 6850 (iii).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co. (Land Subsidy) Amount selected and still due (Ans.) 2326 (i).

**Sifton, Hon. C.—*Con.***

- Clarke, Jos., Emplmt. by Govt. in the Yukon (Ans.) 5486 (ii).
- Clement, Mr. W. H. P., Restrictions and Instructions by Govt. as Legal Adviser to Yukon Council (Ans.) 2322 (i).
- Coal Mining under Nanaimo Harbour, Leases, &c. (Ans.) 8991 (iii).
- Colpron, Mr. Jos. N., Claims against Govt. for Services performed, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 2191 (i).
- Constantin, Dr. Jules, Emplmt. by Govt., Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1847 (i).
- Crow's Nest Pass Commission, French Translation of Rep. (Ans.) 1852 (i).
- Dibblee and Dupont, Messrs., Claims against Govt. (Ans.) 2114 (i).
- Dickson, Mr. R., Immigration Agent, Appnmt. by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 1855 (i).
- Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 148) 1°, 4894; in Com., 6400, 6410, 6426; 3° m., 6459 (ii).
- Dom. Lands, Man., Fraudulent Transactions by Officials, par. in *Winnipeg Telegram* (remarks) 4995 (ii).
- Duceis Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Timber Limits, Removal of Indians (Ans.) 2700 (i).
- Dupuis, P. C., Prosecution for selling Liquor to Indians (Ans.) 4060 (ii).
- Edmonton-Yukon Route, Instructions to Messrs. Dibblee and Dupont (Ans.) 2114 (i).
- Elevator Restrictions by C. P. R., Legislation respecting (Ans.) 2904 (i).
- Elkhorn Indian School, Printing Plant, Lease to W. J. Thompson, &c. (Ans.) 3076 (i).
- Emigration to U. S., pars. in Newspapers (Ans.) 2116 (i).
- Fairlie, Mr., Dismissal from Rupert's Land Industrial School (Ans.) 2532 (i).
- Fawcett, Mr., Advice *re* recording Mining Claims, &c. (Ans.) 3822 (ii).
- Fluhman, Dr., Medical Officer to Indians at Pointe Bleue, Pets. *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 4030 (ii).
- French Canadian Repatriation from U. S. (Ans.) 1844 (i).
- Galicians and Doukhobors, Number brought into Can., Names of Agents, &c. (Ans.) 2481 (i), 8467 (iii).
- Immigrants at Saltcoats, Outbreak of Scarlet Fever (remarks) 4896, 4996 (ii).
- Commissioner's Investigation (remarks) 6936 (iii).
- Game Preservation Act (1894) Amt. (B. 153) 1°, 4991; in Com., 6442 (ii).
- Geological Survey Act Amt. (B. 146) 1°, 4891; in Com., 6396 (ii).
- Govt. Lands, Man., Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 1856 (i).
- Grain Elevators in N.W.T., par. in *Winnipeg Tribune*, on M. (Mr. Davin) to Com. of Sup., 5497 (ii).
- Grain Transit, Man. and N.W.T. Regulation B. 15 (Mr. Douglas) on M. for 2°, 1915 (i).

**Sifton, Hon. C.—*Con.***

- Greater Britain Exhibition and Canadian Representation of Mineral Exhibits, &c. (Ans.) 1959.
- Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 90, on amt. (Mr. Douglas) to M. for 3°, 4782 (ii).
- Half-breed, N.W.T., Cor. between Mr. Macdowall and Govt. *re* Reserve (Ans.) 2486 (i).
- Homestead Law in N.W.T., Pre-emption, Interest, Memorial from Settlers, &c. (Ans.) 3080 (i).
- Immigrants, Arrival in 1898, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3553 (ii).
- Doukhobor, Finland, &c., Number, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2481 (i), 8467 (iii).
- from Europe, Number and Distribution (Ans.) 1980 (i).
- from G. B., Inducements to Settle in Can., &c. (Ans.) 3077 (i).
- Number sent by Agents from G. B. and U. S. (Ans.) 2192 (i).
- from U. S., Number and Distribution (Ans.) 1979 (i).
- Bonuses, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1975, 2191 (i).
- Indian Agent at Rama, Charges against, Cost of Inquiry, &c. (Ans.) 1976, 2114 (i).
- See Rama.*
- Indians, Yale and Cariboo, Medical Attendance, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 8630, 8989 (iii).
- Inquiry (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) for Ret., 4713 (ii).
- Interior Act Amt. (B. 147) 1°, 4892; in Com., 6398 (ii).
- Interior, Minister's Travelling and Living Expenses, &c., 1819 (i).
- Jerome, Mr. Martin, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6723 (ii), 7194 (iii).
- Klondike Official Guide, Preparation by Mr. Ogilvie (Ans.) 1827 (i).
- Labreque, Mr. C. O., Emplmt. by Govt., Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1846 (i).
- Land Titles Act Amt. (B. 149) 1°, 4895; in Com., 6442 (ii).
- Land Transfers in Man. and Govt. Agents' Speculations (remarks) 4737 (ii).
- Liquor sold to Indians, Prosecutions, &c. (Ans.) 1850 (i).
- McKay, Thos., Indebtedness to Govt. for Timber Dues, Collection, &c. (Ans.) 2486 (i).
- Emplmt. by Govt., Salary paid, &c. (Ans.) 2487 (i), 5487 (ii).
- Maguire, Mr. Justice, Arrival and Departure from Dawson (Ans.) 4062 (ii).
- Man. and North-western Ry., Miles constructed, Land Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 2900 (i).
- Martin, Mr. A. F., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 7534 (iii).
- Miller, Mr. R. C., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1974 (i).
- Noble, Mr., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ans.) 2185 (i).

**Sifton, Hon. C.—Con.**

- N. W. Mounted Police, Issue of scrip, Pets., &c., *re* (Ans.) 2484 (i).  
 — Barracks at Batoche, Supplies for Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2487 (i).  
 N. W. T., Abandoned Homesteads, Dewdney District, Cancellation by Govt. (Ans.) 3074 (i).  
 — Rebellion Losses (1885) Claims Commission, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3103 (i).  
 — Seed Grain Indebtedness Security (B. 189) 1°, 9464 (iii).  
 — cancellation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Davin*) 2020 (i).  
 — Settlers from Ont., Privileges granted by Govt. (Ans.) 2903 (i).  
 Ogilvie, Mr. W., Relationship to Min. of the Int. (Ans.) 1841, 2704 (i).  
 — Connection, &c., with British Goldfields Co., on refusal to read Letter in ans. to Question, 3810 (ii).  
   *See* Yukon.  
 Ont. Settlers in N. W. T., Privileges granted by Govt. (remarks) 6051 (ii).  
 Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6938 (iii).  
 Privileges and Elections Com., Absence of Ministers (remarks) 9182 (iii).  
 — Stenographers' Fees, 9462 (iii).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8879 (iii).  
 Quarantine Service, Employees, Salaries, &c., (Ans.) 3827 (ii).  
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9738 (iii).  
 Ry. Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Ry. Cos., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4761 (ii).  
 — Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9357, 9467, 9473 (iii).  
 Rama Indians and Statute Labour, Govt. Aid to Maintenance of Roads and Bridges (Ans.) 2700 (i).  
 Repatriation of Canadians from U. S., Number, &c. (Ans.) 3079 (i).  
 Returns, on Inquiry (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) for, 415 (i); 3500, 3559 (ii).  
 — Incomplete, Tels., &c., from Archer Martin (remarks) 4731 (i).  
 — on Inquiry for, 9845 (iii).  
 — laid on Table 3560 (ii).  
 — Ordered by Hse., non-compliance by Govt. on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 2972 (i).  
 — on Inquiry for, Non-production (remarks) 3071 (i).  
 Roads and Road Allowances in Man. (B. 175) 1°, 8151; in Com., 8470 (iii).  
 Rothwell's Rep. *re* Settlers' Claims, Transmission to B. C. Govt. (Ans.) 2531 (i).  
 Saugeen Indian Reserve, Medical Supt. Patrick Scott, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 9699 (iii).  
 Saw Logs, Exportation, Prevention by Govt. on Indian Reserves, &c. (Ans.) 1835 (i).

**Sifton, Hon. C.—Con.**

- School Lands, Sale of, Stmtnt. (read) 6461 (ii).  
 Scrip issued to the Half-breeds, par. in *Calgary Herald*, 7196 (iii).  
 Seed Grain Liens, Cancellation, Legislation *re*, Res. from N. W. T. Council (Ans.) 2903 (i).  
   *See* N. W. T.  
 Settlers from Eastern Can. to N. W. T., Aid by Govt. (Ans.) 2534 (i).  
 Songhees Indians, Removal from Reserve, Settlement with B. C. Govt. (Ans.) 3797 (ii).  
 Steel Boxes, Int. and Indian Depts., Purchased by Govt., Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 4482 (ii).  
 Steveston, B. C., Transfer of Property (Ans.) 3544 (ii).  
*Strathcona*, Str., and Relief of Destitute Miners, Arrangement with Govt. (Ans.) 9179 (iii).  
 SUPPLY:  
   *Administration of Justice* (N.W.T.) 10123 (iii).  
   *Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Paris exhibition) 10149 (iii).  
   *Canals* (St. Andrew's Rapids) 10155 (iii).  
   *Civil Govt.*: Geological Survey (salaries) 2104; Indian Affairs (salaries) 2083 (i); Inland Rev. (clerical assistance) 5015; Interior (clerical assistance) 5022 (ii); (contingencies) 7467 (iii); (salaries) 2077 (ii), 7466 (iii).  
   *Dom. Lands* (arrears of salaries) 5849 (ii); (Chief Inspector's salary) 9007 (iii); (gratuities) 5850 (ii); (Inspectors, Agents, &c.) 7528; (scrip, &c.) 7501; (seed grain, homesteads, &c.) 7527; (surveys, printing plans, &c.) 9053 (iii).  
   *Geological Survey* (artesian borings) 7469 (iii); (salaries) 5668 (ii).  
   *Government of N. W. T.* (schools) 7499 (iii).  
   *Immigration* (agents, &c., salaries, &c.) 8478, 8485, 8558, 8583, 8648; (St. Paul des Métis, seed grain, &c.) 9027, 9046, 9049 (iii).  
   *Indians* (B. C.) 5703; (reserve commission) 5727; (salaries) 5725; (*Vigilant*) 5729; (Industrial schools) 7488; (Man. and N.W.T.) 5691; (annuities, &c.) 5694, 5711 (ii); (boarding schools) 10110 (iii); (general expenses) 5722; (implements, &c.) 5712 (ii); (industrial schools) 10110 (iii); (saw mills and grist mills) 5722; (surveys) 5721; (Sioux) 5721 (ii); (Treaty negotiations, provisions, &c.) 10111; (Treaty negotiations, travelling expenses, &c.) 10110; (Veterinary surgeons) 10111 (iii); Indians (N.S.) 5691 (ii); 7480 (iii); (Ont.) 5873 (ii); (Mr. J. B. Brossseau, services, &c.) 10110 (iii); 5699; (suppression of liquor traffic) 5710; (surveys, &c.) 5710; (St. Regis lockup) 5711; (Removal of Oka band) 5709 (ii).  
   *Interior*: Yukon District (general expenditure) 6366 (ii).  
   *Militia*: Yukon Force (transportation and supplies) 6363 (ii).  
   *Miscellaneous* (Chas. Bremner, compensation, &c.) 10113 (iii); Crow's Nest Commission expenses) 5831; (destitute half-breeds, N.W.T.) 5830 (ii); (Govt. expenses, Keewatin District) 7529 (iii); (half-breed claims commission) 5832 (ii) 9056; (relief of Canadians in foreign countries) 7530; (roads, &c., Banff, N.W.T.) 7530; well-boring machines, N. W. T.) 9055; (wharf, Banff Park) 9055 (iii); Yukon District (contingencies) 6373 (ii).

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Con.*SUPPLY—*Con.*

- N. W. Mounted Police* (Yukon service) 5835 (ii).  
*Public Works*: Buildings (Astronomical Observatory) 995; Yukon (Edmonton trail) 10109; Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 8078; Roads and Bridges (N.W.T.) 10071; Telegraphs (Anticosti Island) 10078 (iii); Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5614 (ii), 10096; (B. C. and Teslin Lake) 10104; (trails, roads and bridges) 10087; Interior (salaries, &c.) 8953, 9002, 9016; (salaries, &c.) 8658 (iii).  
 Venner, Dr., Indian Agent, Commissioner's Expenses *re* Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 1859 (i).  
 Wade, Mr. F. C., Emplmt, Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ans.) 1831 (i).  
 — (remarks) 7242, 7320, 7442 (iii).  
 Walsh, Maj., Instructions as Commissioner by Govt., Rep. of Interview at Skagway, &c. (Ans.) 3078, 3258 (i).  
 — Authority for Commission issued, &c. (Ans.) 4269 (ii).  
 — Philip, Relationship to Major Walsh. (Ans.) 3823 (ii).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3888 (ii).  
 Wright, Wm., Official in Recorder's Office at Dawson, Relationship to Editor of the *Globe* (Ans.) 4270 (ii).  
 Yukon Provisional District Act Amt. (B. 186) 1\*, 9178; in Com., 9849; (amt.) 9850 (iii).  
 Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6124 (ii).  
 — on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn., 6581 (ii).  
 — Alien Labourers at Lake Bennett and Govtl. Action (Ans.) 1860 (i).  
 — Appnmt. of Messrs. Wade, McGregor and Norwood, Date of Arrival at Dawson, &c. (Ans.) 3081 (i).  
 — Appnmt. of second Judge, &c. (Ans.) 3081 (i).  
 — Appnmt. of Sheriff, Commission, Bond, &c. (Ans.) 4269 (ii).  
 — "Bench" and "Creek" Claims, Disputes pending, &c. (Ans.) 3078 (i).  
 — Bennett Hospital, Matron and Medical Supt., Names, &c. (Ans.) 1980 (i).  
 — Bonds given by Officials, Record or List of Names (Ans.) 5310 (ii).  
 — Commissioner Maj. Walsh, Alterations in Rep. (Ans.) 2704 (i).  
 — Commission of Inquiry, Request from Mr. Ogilvie to extend his Powers, &c. (Ans.) 3081 (i).  
 — Council, Names, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 1832 (i).  
 — ordinances received from Council, Number, &c. (Ans.) 2703 (i).  
 — Dom. Police, Number, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1965 (i).  
 — Dredging for Minerals, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3079 (i).

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Con.*

- Yukon Gold Commissioner, Appnmt. (Ans.) 1823.  
 — on Inquiry for Ogilvie's rep., 4713 (ii).  
 — Instructions to Walsh (Ans.) 3258 (i).  
 — Investigation, Mr. Ogilvie's Reps., Purport, &c. (Ans.) 3820 (ii).  
 — laid on Table, 3876 (ii).  
 — papers Respecting (M.) to print, 4730 (ii).  
 — protest from Miners' Committee, Cor., &c. (Ans.) 2329 (i).  
 — returns, on Inquiry for (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4340 (ii).  
 — Klondike River Bridge, Owner, Tolls, &c. (Ans.) 2902, 3074 (i).  
 — Legal Adviser, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1823 (i).  
 — Liquor Permits, Number, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1843 (i).  
 — sanctioned by Min. of Int. (Ans.) 1859 (i).  
 — issued by Archer Martin, on inquiry for Ret., 3875 (ii).  
 — issued by Maj. Walsh (Ans.) 2481 (i).  
 — rep. *re* (Ans.) 2704 (i).  
 — issued by Mr. Ogilvie, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3077 (i).  
 — cor., &c., on Inquiry for, 5667 (ii).  
 — Lynch, Mr. W. H., Emplmt. by Govt., Reps., &c. (Ans.) 1848 (i).  
 — Maguire, Mr. Justice, Appnmt. and Arrival at Dawson, &c. (Ans.) 3258 (i), 3960 (ii).  
 — Miner's Grievances and Mr. Ogilvie's Rep. (Ans.) 2531 (i).  
 — Miner's Right to cut Timber (Ans.) 1836 (i).  
 — Mining Regulations, Publication, &c. (Ans.) 1841 (i).  
 — Ogilvie, Mr., Reps. *re* Investigations, &c. (Ans.) 3548 (ii).  
 — presented to Parlt., 3795 (ii).  
 — Ogilvie, Mr., Connection with British Can. Goldfields Co. (Ans.) 3799 (ii).  
 — O. C.'s, regulating Mining Claims by Officials, &c. (Ans.) 1824 (i).  
 — Officials, Appnmts. by Govt., Names, &c. 1833 (i).  
 — salaries, cost of living, &c. (Ans.) 1824 (i).  
 — nationality, &c. (Ans.) 1823 (i).  
 — Professional Immorality, Taxes imposed (Ans.) 1842 (i).  
 — Registrar of Titles, Instructions and Restrictions by Govt. (Ans.) 2324 (i).  
 — Steamboat Owners, Permits to cut Timber, &c. (Ans.) 1837 (i).  
 — Survey of Lands, &c. (Ans.) 3547 (ii).  
 — Timber Inspector, Appnmt. by Govt., (Ans.) 1823 (i).  
 — regulations, Issue of Permits, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1836 (i).  
 — Transportation Cos. employed by Govt. Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1958 (i).  
 — Wade, Mr. F. C., Date of Arrival at Dawson (Ans.) 3546 (ii).

**Sifton, Hon. C.—Con.**

- Yukon, Walsh, Maj., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1824 (i).  
 — Repts., Number sent in and laid on Table (Ans.) 3798 (ii).  
 — Water Front, Dawson, Lease, &c., to Morrison and McDonald (Ans.) 3547 (ii).  
 — Willison, Mr. J. W., Crown Timber Agent (Ans.) 3823 (ii).  
 — Relationship to Editor of the *Globe* (Ans.) 4270 (ii).  
 Yule Bridge, Richelieu River, Arbitrators' Award, &c. (Ans.) 3827 (ii).

**Snetsinger, Mr. J. G., Cornwall and Stormont.**

## SUPPLY:

- Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, &c.) 5172 (ii).

**Somerville, Mr. J., North Wentworth and Brant.**

- Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1936 (i).  
 Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com. (presented) 1071; conc. (M.) 1071 (i).  
 — 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc., 1742 (i).  
 Quebec Montmorency and Charlevoix Ry. Co., Change of Title (B. 84) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2108 (i).  
 Red River Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 119) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2966 (i).

**Speaker, Mr. (Sir JAMES D. EDGAR) West Ontario.**

- Address, on The, Omission of Name from Division List, 1862 (i).  
 — Reply to, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 2963.  
 Adjournments of the Hse. Motions (ruling) 3816-7 (ii).  
 Appeals from ruling of Chairman to Speaker in Com. of the Whole Hse, Stannt. and Authority quoted, 4553 (ii).  
 Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (notification) 6928; Mess. by Black Rod, 6930 (iii).  
 Brockville and West Huron Elections, Attendance of Clerk of the Crown in Chancery with papers, &c., 6821 (ii).  
 Burrard, Member for, Use of Reverend in Ques. (ruling) 1838 (i).  
 Business of the Hse.: Remarks *re* Introduction of Bills, 618 (i).  
 Controverted Elections, Judges' Reps. (read) 1 (i).  
 Demoustration in Galleries of Hse. checked, 2897 (i).  
 Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) ruling, 2157 (i).  
 Elections, Certificates received during Recess (read) 1 (i).  
 Emigration to U.S. (ruling) as to answer of Question, 2117 (i).

**Speaker, Mr.—Con.**

- Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., Res. of Condolence, Reply to (read) 3 (i).  
 I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) ruling, 4448.  
 — Order, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) ruling, 4449, 4455 (ii).  
 Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 158 (i).  
 International Com., Alaskan Boundary Protocols, Minister may move to lay Communication on Table, according to English Practice, 4264.  
 Irrelevancy of Debate, 2794, 2805 (i); 7635 (iii).  
 — (ruling) 6741 (ii).  
 Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 6 (i).  
 McLaughlin, R. J., and Farm Lands, Claims for Damages, &c. (ruling) as to form of Ques., 4485, 4492, 4497 (ii).  
 — Letter read by P.M.G., Irregularity of Procedure (ruling) 5006, 5011 (ii).  
 Members addressing Chair (ruling) 7214 (iii).  
 Members asked to formulate their Questions so as not to make statements of fact, 4483 (ii).  
 — asked not to interrupt speakers, 1175 (i).  
 — asked to keep within the Motion before Hse., 4816 (ii).  
 — asked to speak to the Motion before Chair, 1565, 1574 (i).  
 — asked to withdraw statement, 1020, 1177, 1555 (i); 4006 (ii).  
 — breaking Rule on calling Orders of the Day, 3558 (ii).  
 — cannot refer to previous Deb. in asking Questions (ruling) 3262 (i).  
 — cannot speak twice on same Motion, 3777, 5375 (ii).  
 — can only make Personal Explanation not a Speech, 5376 (ii).  
 — Motion not in Order, 3342 (ii).  
 — must confine himself to M. before Hse., 4780, 5402 (ii).  
 — must conclude with a Motion, 3754 (ii).  
 — must not interrupt without permission of Speaker, 6170 (ii).  
 — must not quote from previous Debate, 7196 (iii).  
 — making Speeches out of Order, must make a Motion, 3846 (ii).  
 — New, Certificates of Ret. (notification) 1, 338 (i).  
 — remarks checked, 47, 167, 1871, 1953, 1954, 2733, 2734, 2742, 2830, 2837, 3193 (i); 3557, 6315, 5493 (ii).  
 — Resignation of (notification) 3 (i).  
 Mess. from His Ex. (read) 158, 2963 (i); 4858 (ii); 7638, 9835 (iii).  
 M. *re* Procedure for Rets. (ruling) 3560 (ii).  
 Order, Ques. of, Member asked to apologize for the use of the word "beast," as applied to Members of the Hse., 6225 (ii).

**Speaker, Mr.—Con.**

Order, Ques. of, Member asked to withdraw Statement, 989 (i) ; 5394 (ii).

—— (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Member imputing motives (ruling) 6230 (ii).

—— (ruling) 390, 1606 (i).

—— Members requested not to interrupt, 427, 1447 (i).

—— (Mr. *McNeill*) Statements made generally (ruling) 7213 (iii).

—— (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Ref. to Deb. in Com. of Hse. (ruling) 6826 (iii).

Ogilvie, Mr., Refusal of Min. to read letter in ans. to a question (ruling) 3800, 3814 (ii).

Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 18 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2290 (i).

Parlt., Opening, Mess. by Black Rod, 1 (i).

Personal Explanation (Mr. *Davin*) *re* Application for Mr. *Costigan's* seat, 3845 (ii).

Petition, Dufferin County, *re* Increase of Militia Grant, ruled out of Order, 1071 (i).

—— Essex County, *re* Increase of Militia Grant, ruled out of Order, 803 (i).

—— Lanark County, *re* Increase of Militia Grant, Ruled out of Order, 1639 (i).

—— Irregularity of (remarks) 421 (i).

—— Rule of Procedure, 1737 (i).

Printing Com., 3rd Rep. of Com., on conc., 5745 (ii).

Privileges and Elections Com., Absence of Members (Ruling) 9183 (iii).

Procedure on calling Orders of the Day (ruling) 2118 (i).

Procedure for Wednesdays, Attention of Members called to, 3269 (i).

Prohibition Plebiscite, Ret. of Votes polled, Production of Papers (ruling) 2041, 2045 (i).

Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (notification) 10246 (iii).

Public Accts. Com., Postponements and Hours of meeting, &c. (remarks) 4351 (ii).

Questions, Form of asking (remarks) 2322, 2484 (i).

Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, Precedence in Deb., 6464 (ii).

Speaker, Dep., Delegation of Powers, &c. (ruling) 5492 (ii).

Speech from the Throne (rep.) 4 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

*Legislation* : House of Commons (sessional clerks) 2280 ; (stationery, &c.) 2279 (i) ; (stationery) 5730 (ii).

Unparliamentary language (ruling) 5406 (ii).

Vacancies (notification) 1, 617, 700 (i).

Votes and Proceedings, Typographical Errors (remarks) 6120 (ii).

Winnipeg Electoral District, Vacancy (remarks) 619 (i).

**Speaker, Mr. (Hon. T. W. BAIN) S. Wentworth.**

Agricultural and Colonization Com., 2nd Rep. (printing of evidence) conc., 3440 (ii).

Huron, West Representation, Vacancy, &c. (remarks) 9597 (iii).

London and Canadian Loan and Agency Co.'s (B. 130) 1<sup>st</sup>, 3647 (ii).

Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert B. 10 (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Com., 3843 (ii).

Quebec Ry. Light and Power Co.'s B. 84 (Mr. *Carroll*) in Com., 5250 (ii).

Speaker, Election of (remarks) 9063 (iii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (illustration stations) 8331 (iii).

*Dom. Lands* (Chief Inspector's salary) 9019 (iii).

*Legislation* : House of Commons (Library Messengers) 10140 ; (stationery) 10139 (iii).

*Public Works* : Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 8000 (iii).

**Speaker, Deputy (Mr. L. P. BRODEUR) Rouville.**

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. *Maxwell*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Ellis*) ruling 4339 (ii).

Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) (ruling) 2934, 2949 (i).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (ruling) "humbug" as applied to Language not out of Order, 4644 (ii).

Irrevelancy of Debate, 8451, 8577, 8744 (iii).

Member asked to withdraw objectionable expression, 10133, 10063 (iii).

—— called to order—must address the Chair, 5162 (ii) ; 9647 (iii).

—— cannot interrupt without the consent of the h. m. making speech, 3226 (i).

—— cannot move adjnmt. twice on Orders of the Day being called, 4551 (ii).

—— checked in discussing Speaker's rulings, 2820 (i).

—— discussing items generally in supply (ruling) 7033 (iii).

—— may speak to M. to go into Sup., 8644 (iii).

—— moving reading of B. (ruling) 2918 (i).

—— must conclude with a motion, 3499 (ii).

—— must not impute unfair motives to Chairman, 5616 (ii).

—— must not refer to previous Debate, 3328 (i); 10075 (iii).

—— Remarks checked, 3224, 3225 (i) ; 4626 (ii) ; 10038 (iii).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Fielding*) appeal from Chairman's decision (ruling) 5611 (ii).

—— (ruling) 242 (i) ; 5608, 6778 (ii) ; 7303, 8810 (iii).

—— Irrelevancy of Deb., 8921, 9481, 9348 (iii).

—— Members abusing privilege of Ms. to adjn., 6594 (ii).

**Speaker, Deputy—Con.**

- Order, Ques. of (Mr. *McNeill*) one member imputing motives to another member *re* vote (ruling) 5832 (ii).
- member may ask question if h. m. will allow it, 10055 (iii).
- Members must obey the Chair, 9802, 9803 (iii).
- member must withdraw the word "cowardly," 6157 (ii).
- Reading bill clause by clause (ruling) 4647 (ii).
- Reference to Newspaper report, 1236 (i).
- Ref. to past Debate (ruling) 6753 (ii).
- Ruling of the Chair must be respected, 7073-4 (iii).
- Unparliamentary language, 8603, 8609, 8615, 9044, 9208 (iii).
- Word "demagogue" is unparliamentary, 9655 (iii).
- Plebiscite Vote, Prov. of Que., Poll Books, &c., Ret. laid on Table, 7320 (iii).
- Preferential Trade with G.B., prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) withdn. by consent of Hse., 8755 (iii).
- Reference to previous Debate (ruling) 7081 (iii).
- Rutland and Noyan Ry. Co.'s Incorp. (B. 120) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3149 (i).

**Sproule, Mr. T. S., East Grey.**

- Address, on The, 469 (i).
- on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1675 (i).
- Alaska and North-western Ry. Co.'s Incorp. (B. 44) 11<sup>o</sup>\*, 1165 (i).
- Apples, Fraudulent Packing, on M. (Mr. *McMillan*) to adjn., 3757 (ii).
- Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) on M. for Com., 3299 ; in Com., 3309 (i).
- Binder Twine, Sale of by Govt. &c., on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 9908 (iii).
- Beet Root Sugar, Bounty for Manufacture, &c. (prop. Res.) 4823 (ii).
- Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4978 (ii).
- Brockville and West Huron Elections, on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to ref. Documents, &c., to Com of Privs. and Elections, 6749 (ii).
- Business of the Hse., on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take in Mondays, 6281 (ii).
- Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1929 (i).
- B. 50 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 2211 (i).
- B. 63 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 3321 (i).
- Coal Oil, Reduction of Duty, prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2138 (i).
- Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 26) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 895 ; on amt. (Mr. *Oliver*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 2944 (i).
- Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 36 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 2175 (i).
- Combinations in Restraint of Trade (B. 40) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1073 ; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1936 (i).

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.—Con.**

- Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) in Com, on Res., 8945 ; in Com. on Bill, 9668 (iii).
- Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. on M. to conc., 1073 (i).
- Dolphin* Fishery Cruiser, Sale of, Purchaser, &c. (Ques.) 1855 (i).
- Dom. Census and B.N.A. Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 2389 (i).
- Drainage Across Ry. Lands, B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1919 ; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2933, 2950 (i).
- Dry Docks Construction B. 177 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8757 (iii).
- Edmonton and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4307 (ii).
- General Inspection (Wheat) Act Amt. B. 132 (Sir *Henri Joly*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 3751 (ii).
- B. 156 (Sir *Henri Joly*) 9658 (iii).
- Grain Standards, N.W.T., Legislation *re* Inspection, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3835 (ii).
- Immigrants in Quarantine, par. in *Ottawa Citizen*, 2192 (i).
- Imperial Service and Canadian Brigade and Can. Seamen, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2347 (i).
- Insurance Act Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 2109 (i).
- I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn. 2817 (i).
- G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4378, 4390, 4670 (ii) ; Sen. Amts., 9715.
- Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s Pet. on M. (Mr. *Henderson*) to ref. to Sel. Com. on Standing Orders, 1948 (i).
- McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., and Farm Lands, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) 4498 (ii).
- Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in amt. (Mr. *Monct*) 6093 ; in Com. on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) 6328 (ii).
- Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. *Poupore*) for Papers respecting, 4883 (ii).
- Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Calvert*) on M. for Com., 5253 ; on amt. (Mr. *McLean*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 5535 (ii).
- Northern Commercial Telegraph Co. and Cor. with Mins. of Crown, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to Com. of Sup., 5536 (ii).
- Ogilvie, Mr., Connection with British Goldfields Co., Refusal of Min. to read Letter in ans. to Question, 3817 (ii).
- Order, Ques. of (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Members abusing privilege of Ms. to adjn., 6593 (ii).
- (Mr. *Rutherford*) Member must withdw. the word "Thimblerriggers," 9655 (iii).
- Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 121 (Mr. *Dyment*) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 4302 (ii).
- Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 9193 ; on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 9619 ; in Com., 9627 (ii).

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.—Con.**

- Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 18 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 2151; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2284, 2287 (i).  
 — (remarks) 2318 (i).  
 Personal Explanation, par. in *Toronto World*, 6825 (iii).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6103; in Com., 6109 (ii).  
 Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7852 (iii).  
 Private Bills Com., Select Standing, on M. (Mr. *Scriver*) to Reduce Quorum, 4729 (ii).  
 — on M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) to extend Time, 5378 (ii).  
 Privileges and Elections Com., Absence of Ministers (remarks) 9185 (iii).  
 — Stenographers' Fees (remarks) 10116 (iii).  
 Prohibition Plebiscite, Ret. of Votes polled Papers respecting, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2040 (i).  
 Public Accounts Com. Delay in Meeting (Man. Election Frauds) on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to adjn., 3221, 3227 (i).  
 — Postponements and Hours of Meeting, &c. (remarks) 4350 (ii).  
 — (remarks) 2965 (i).  
 Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 7649; in Com., 7667 (iii).  
 Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9689; in Com., 9863, 9871 (iii).  
 Queen's County (P.E.I.) Appnmt. of Judge (remarks) 9002 (iii).  
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9746 (iii).  
 Rys., Canals and Telegraph Lines, 22nd Rep. of Com. on conc., 9210 (iii).  
 — Policy of Govt. re Yukon Ry. Co.'s, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4769 (ii).  
 — Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9205, 9328, 9468, 9485, 9544; in Com. on Bill, 9785, 9807 (iii).  
 Reading Room, Ventilation, Light, &c. (remarks) 974 (i).  
 Regimental Meetings of 8th Hussars, Annual Rep. (M. for copy\*) 3873 (ii).  
 Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3468, 3496; on M. for 2°, 6673; in Com., 6758 (ii) 6912 (iii).  
 St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s incorp. (B. 45) 1\*, 1165 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

- Administration of Justice* (additional Judge in Ont.) 10122 (iii).  
*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Paris exhibition) 10144 (iii).  
*Canals*: Welland (rebate to Forwarding Co.) 5794; refund for damages to lock) 5793 (ii).

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.—Con.****SUPPLY—Con.**

- Civil Government*: Agriculture (contingencies) 2270; (salaries) 2258; Aud. Gen.'s Office (contingencies) 2269; (salaries) 2086; Customs (salaries) 2091; Finance (salaries) 2091; Geological Survey (salaries) 2104; Interior (salaries) 2077, 2082; Indian Affairs (salaries) 2063; Inland Revenue (salaries) 2100; Justice (salaries) 2364; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 2102; Militia and Defence (contingencies) 2268; (salaries) 2070; Privy Council (contingencies) 2265; Railways and Canals (salaries) 2253; Sec. of State (contingencies) 2269; (salaries) 2076; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 2277; (salaries) 2107, 2264 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues* (St. Lawrence telegraph and cable) 8182; (telegraph lines, B. C., 8186 (iii).  
*Customs*: conc., 10212 (iii).  
*Dom. Lands* (Chief Inspector, salary) 9003 (iii).  
*Fisheries* (protection service) 4728 (ii).  
*Immigration* (agents, &c., salaries, &c.) conc., 10215; (St. Paul des Métis, seed grain, &c.) 9030, 9038, 9046 (iii).  
*Indians*: Man. and N. W. T. (general expenses) 5722; (implements, &c.) 5713 (ii); (industrial schools) 10110 (iii); (saw-mills) 5721 (ii); (Veterinary surgeons) 10111 (iii); (Ont.) 5676; (removal of Oka band) 5709; (surveys, &c.) 5710 (ii).  
*Inspection of Staples* (salaries, &c.) 5587 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (distribution of blue-books to Law Associations) 5743 (ii); (stationery) 2278 (i); 5733 (ii); (voters' lists) 2282, 2310 (i); 10128 (iii).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, &c.) 5140, 5177 (ii).  
*Militia* (annual drill) 7061, 7066 (iii); (arms, &c., accoutrements) 5467; (clothing) 5444; (military stores) 5424; (miscellaneous and unforeseen) 5452, 5461 (ii); (pay, allowance) 7016; (properties, &c.) 7090; (salaries) 7074; (stores, &c.) 7097 (iii); (Royal Military College) 5464 (ii); 7026, 7140 (iii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Can. Temp. Act, cost of election) 10111; half-breed claims commission) 9059; (refund of duties on fish, &c., P.E.I.) 10179, 10188; (well-boring machine, N. W. T.) 9056; *Wentworth vs. Mathieu*, litigation) 10112 (iii).  
*Ocean and River Service* (maintenance) 3041 (i).  
*Penitentiaries* (B. C.) 5480; (Dorchester) 5477 (ii).  
*Post Office* (Inspectors' salaries) 5798; (legal expenses) 5801 (ii); (mail service) conc., 10204 (iii); (Postmasters' salaries) 5803 (ii).  
*Public Works*: Buildings (N.S.) 9945; Ont., 9960; (London drill hall) 9962; (Ottawa, Astronomical Observatory) 9953 (iii); (electric lighting) 5185 (ii); (repairs, &c.) 9989; (rewiring Library) 9956; (Royal Military College) 9960; Que. (Victoriaville P. O.) 9955; Dredging (plant) 5203, 8138 (iii) Ont., 5203 (ii); Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 7764; N.S. (Brulé wharf) 10003; (Chesetcook wharf) 10004; (Shag Harbour wharf) 9998; Tatamagouche wharf) 10003; (wharfs) 7705, 7711; Ont., 7967, 7971, 7983; (Port Colborne) 9255, 9299; Sheguisandah pier) 10068; (P.E.I.) 7761; Que., 8112; (Montreal Harbour improvements) 9967; (Sabrevois wharf) 10027, 10035; Miscellaneous (statue of Her Majesty) 8150; (statue of the late Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) 8150; Roads and Bridges

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

*Public Works*—Con.

(Ottawa) 5204 (ii); 8148; Yukon (Edmonton trail) 10109 (iii).

*Railways and Canals*: I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5754; (shops at Moncton) 5754 (ii); P. E. I. (construction, Murray Harbour, &c.) 9211, 9233 (iii); (Mount Stewart wharf) 5763 (ii).

*Weights and Measures* (inspection) 5581 (ii).

*Yukon Provisional District*: Interior (salaries, &c.) 8950, 9004, 9016 (iii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. *Roddick*) to Com. of Sup., 6292 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 9884 (iii).

Yukon Provisional District Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 9853 (iii).

Yukon Administration, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn., 6578 (ii).

— par. in *North British Daily Mail*, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. of Sup., 8069 (iii).

— Liquor Importation: par in *Montreal Witness* (remarks) 1638 (i).

**Stenson, Mr. M. T., Richmond and Wolfe.**

Address, on The, 250 (i).

I. C. R., Gosselin, Mr. F., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3827 (ii).

— Locomotive Engineers, Number employed, &c. (Ques.) 9697 (iii).

## SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (illustration stations) 8291 (iii).

**Sutherland, Mr. J., North Oxford.**

Address, The, on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1541 (i).

Belleville, Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B., on M. (Mr. *Hurley*) to extend Time for receiving Pet., 5385 (ii).

Binder Twine Contract, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 7216 (iii).

British American Pulp and Paper Co.'s Incorp. (B. 172) 1<sup>st</sup>, 7441 (iii).

Edmonton and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4302, 4306 (ii).

G. T. R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement, on M. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) to adjn., 3971 (ii).

Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 118 (Mr. *Savard*) in Com., 6970 (iii).

Great North-west Central Ry. (B. 90) 3<sup>rd</sup> m., 4189, 4193; on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) 4780 (ii).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4643 (ii).

Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for Com., 5897; on amt. (Mr. *Monet*) 6093, 6405; in Com. on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) 6327 (ii).

**Sutherland, Mr. J.—Con.**

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Calvert*) on amt. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 5048; in Com., 5352; on amt. (Mr. *Maclelan*) to M. for 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5535 (ii).

Ont. and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. *Dymont*) on M. for 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4302 (ii).

Prime Minister's Reply to Invitation to Chicago Demonstration, par. in Newspaper, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn., 9842 (iii).

Printing Com., 3rd, 4th and 5th Reprs. of Com. (stationery) on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) to conc., 5381 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, Royal Commission, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1885 (i).

Pub. Accounts Com., Meetings (remarks) 2964 (i).

— Postponements and Hours of Meeting, &c. (remarks) 4349 (ii).

— 6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to print, 9837 (iii).

Quebec Ry., Light and Power Co.'s B. 84 (Mr. *Carroll*) in Com., 5041, 5249 (ii).

Rys., Canals and Telegraph Lines, 22nd Rep. of Com. (presented) 9209 (iii).

— Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9731, 9743, 9781 (iii).

— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9500, 9518, 9539, 9583 (iii).

## SUPPLY:

*Customs*: conc., 10214 (iii).

*Militia* (military stores) 5439 (ii); (Yukon supplies) 7045 (iii).

*Public Works*: Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5615, 5621 (ii).

*Yukon Provisional District*: Interior (salaries, &c.) 8981 (iii).

Yale-Kootenay Telegraph Co. (B. 7) Sen. Amts., 8822 (iii).

**Talbot, Mr. O. E., Bellechasse.**

Address, on The, 273 (i).

Customs and Inland Rev. Depts. Act Amt. B. 182 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8933 (iii).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4403, 4405 (ii).

## SUPPLY:

*Militia* (salaries) 7086 (iii).

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Sabrevois Wharf) 10027 (iii).

*Railways*: I. C. R. (suspension of Mr. McDonald) 7294 (iii).

**Tarte, Hon. J. I., St. John and Iberville.**

Address, on The, 570 (i).

Annapolis Public Buildings, Tenders for Painting (remarks) 2410 (i).

Anticosti Island, Pub. Works Inspection Trip, Name of Str. (Ans.) 2188 (i).

Batiscan River, Obstructions to Navigation, &c., Pets. re (Ans.) 3552 (ii).

**Tarte, Hon. J. I.—Con.**

- Blais, Mr. J. C., Amount paid by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 3545 (ii).
- Boivin, Gideon, Contract for Stone for Rivière la Pipe Wharf (Ans.) 4061 (ii).
- China Point Pier, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2485 (i).
- Contracts let without Tender since June, 1896, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for O. C.'s, 5320 (ii).
- Davis, Edwd., Slide Master at Coulonge, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3946 (ii).
- Donahue, W., Contract for Timber for Dredge at Roberval, &c. (Ans.) 4061 (ii).
- Fenelon Falls, Construction of Slide (Ans.) 1978 (i).
- Fraserville Harbour and Board of Trade Resolutions (Ans.) 1969 (i).
- Little River, N.S., Breakwater, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 3944 (ii).
- Manitoba Lake, Drainage, &c. (Ans.) 1965 (i).
- Montreal Harbour Improvements, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 2187 (i).
- Post Office, Repairs, &c., Advertisements *re* Tenders (Ans.) 2112 (i).
- Repairs, &c., Name of Contractor (Ans.) 1974 (i).
- Nicolet River Public Works, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3549 (ii).
- Orillia Public Building, Caretaker, Name, &c. (Ans.) 1957 (i).
- Parker, Mr. Charles H., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1972 (i).
- Parlt. and Deptl. Buildings, Ottawa, Electric Lighting, &c. (Ans.) 5308 (ii).
- Pigeon River Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 2191 (i).
- Pinette Harbour, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Dredging (Ans.) 2112 (i).
- Pointe Claire Wharf, Estimated Cost, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2111 (i).
- Portage La Prairie Post Office, Name and Salary of Caretaker (Ans.) 2485 (i).
- Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Davin*) remarks, 421 (i).
- Returns, on Inquiry for (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4997 (ii).
- Returns *re* P.E.I., on Inquiry for, 3878 (ii).
- Scugog River, Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 2191 (i).
- Simcoe Lake, Lowering Waters, Requests, &c., made to Dept. (Ans.) 2192 (i).
- Souris Breakwater, P.E.I., Claim for Damages by Messrs. Mellish and Wrightman (Ans.) 4271 (ii).
- Steel Boxes for Indian Dept., Number supplied, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 4996 (ii).
- Telegraph Lines, North Shore, St. Lawrence, Construction, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 1963 (i).
- Victoria, B.C., Post Office, Old Site, Ownership, &c. (Ans.) 4270 (ii).
- Yukon District, Lafontaine, Mr. F., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1958 (i).

**Taylor, Mr. G., South Leeds.**

- Address, on The, 207 (i).
- Anticosti Island, Cor. between British Govt. and Can. (Ques.) 1841 (i).
- Binder Twine Contracts, Advertisements for Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 6934 (iii).
- Kingston Penitentiary, Sale of, Names of Tenderers (Ques.) 3944 (ii).
- Output of Kingston Penitentiary, Tenders, price, &c. (Ques.) 1825 (i).
- on M. for Com. of Sup., 9898 (iii).
- Brockville Election, Ballot Papers, Printing and Distribution (Ques.) 3074 (i).
- Busby, Mr., Customs Collector at Skagway, Date of Appnmt. and Salary (Ques.) 4805 (ii).
- Civil Service Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. *Monk*) on amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 2221 (i).
- B. 63 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3327 (i).
- Choquette, Hon. Mr. Justice, Place of Residence, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 5097 (ii).
- Cornwall Canal, Amts. &c., paid to Mr. Rubidge, C.E., since Jan. 1897, Expenses *re* Strs. *Alert* and *Alaska*, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 1878 (i).
- Award of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1853 (i).
- Curless, Chas. H., Preventive Officer, Grand Falls, N.B., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4056 (ii).
- Dargavel, Mr. J. B., Postmaster at Elgin, Dismissal (Ques.) 1955 (i).
- Debates Official, 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc., 1743 (i).
- Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6440 (ii).
- Farran's Point and Iroquois Canal, Locks at, Reps. of Mr. Shanly, C.E., and Mr. Keefer, C.E., (M. for copies\*) 1878 (i).
- Fishery Officers, Leeds Co., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1818 (i).
- Franking Privilege to Legislative Reps. &c. (Ques.) 3823 (ii).
- Galicians and Doukhobors, Number brought into Canada, Names of Agents, &c. (Ques.) 8466 (iii).
- Gananogue Public Building, Heating, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1881 (i).
- General Inspection (Wheat) Act Amt. B. 132 (Sir *Henri Joly*) on M. for 1°, 3751 (ii).
- G. T. R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement, on M. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) to adjn., 3966 (ii).
- on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4520 (ii).
- Letter from Mr. Deane (read) 4786 (ii).
- Grenville Canal, Compensation for Damages, &c. (Ques.) 4992 (ii).
- Maintenance of Roads, &c., Letter of Mr. G. S. Conway (Ques.) 6380 (ii).
- (Ques.) 6048 (ii).
- I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) (M. to adjn.) 2795 (i).
- G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4475, 4590, 4607 (ii).

**Taylor, Mr. G.—Con.**

- I. C. R., on Ques. of Order (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4451 (ii).  
 Leake, Mr. J. R., Postmaster at Morton, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1963 (i).  
 ——— Rep. of Inspector, Cor., &c. (M. for copies\*) 2962 (i).  
 ——— Inquiry for Ret., 3150 (i).  
 Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 95) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2246 (i).  
 McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., and Farm Lands, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) 4491 (ii).  
 Montreal Post Office, Resignation of Postmaster (Ques.) 1827 (i).  
 Ogilvie, Mr., Relationship to Min. of the Int. (Ques.) 1841 (i).  
 Personal Explanation *re* Binder Twine Contract, par. in *Ottawa Journal*, 7197 (iii).  
 ——— (M. to adjn.) 7205 (ii).  
 Plebiscite Voters, Leeds Co., Rep. of Returning Officers (Ques.) 1848 (i).  
 Prohibition Plebiscite, Ret. of Votes polled, Papers respecting, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2045 (i).  
 Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 3474 (ii).  
 St. Francis Lake Channel Improvements (Ques.) 1852 (i).  
 ——— Survey and Services of Strs. *Alert* and *Alaska* (M. for Ret.\*) 1878 (i).  
 St. Lawrence River Improvements, North Channel, Contracts, Plans, &c. (M. for copies\*) 1877 (i).  
 Singleton, Mr. W. R., Postmaster at Delta, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1956 (i).  
 Soulanges Canal, Contracts (M. for cor. notices, &c.) 1861 (i).  
 Stony Mountain Penitentiary, Commissioner's Rep., Printing, &c. (remarks) 9837 (iii).

## SUPPLY:

- Administration of Justice* (Alien Labour law enforcement) 10126 (iii).  
*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 8734; (illustration stations) 8745 (iii).  
*Canals*: Chambly (telephone lines) 5783 (ii); Lachine (enlargement) 7297 (iii).  
*Civil Govt.*: Agriculture (salaries) 2261; Customs (salaries) 2098 (i); Interior (clerical assistance) 5023; Mar. & Fisheries (contingencies) 5025; Post Office (salaries, Dead Letter Branch) 5053; Sec. of State (P. Mungovan's salary) 5021, 5854 (ii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 2107 (i).  
*Customs*: B. C. (contingencies, &c.) 8458; Man. (contingencies, &c.) 8453 (iii); (suspense account, Montreal) 5591 (ii).  
*Excise* (allowance to Customs officers) 4802 (ii).  
*Fisheries* (protection service) 4719; (repairs, &c.) 5180; (salaries of Inspectors) 4035 (ii).  
*Immigration* (agents, salaries, &c.) 8497 (iii).  
*Legislation* (sessional indemnity to Mr. Beattie, M.P.) 5782 (ii); House of Commons (voters' lists) 2280, 2314 (i); 10134 (iii).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (salaries, &c.) 3524, 3534 (ii).

**Taylor, Mr. G.—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

- Militia* (Bate & Co.'s contract) 7041, 7118; (clothing) 7106, 7125; (miscellaneous) 7148; (pay allowance) 7030; (properties, &c.) 7091; (provisions) 7129; (Royal Military College) 7147; (salaries) 7076, 7080; (stores, &c.) 7091; (transport, &c.) 7135; (Yukon supplies) 7041 (iii).  
*Ocean and River Service* (maintenance) 2996, 3001 (i); 5104, 5136 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries* (general vote) 8750 (iii).  
*Post Office* (mail service) 7380 (iii); (Postmasters' salaries) 5823 (ii).  
*Public Works*: Buildings Ont., 7622 (iii); (Ottawa electric lighting, &c.) 5183 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 7693; (Que.) 7620; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Wharfs) 7704; (Ont.) 7977; Que., 8110, 8131; (Coteau, dredging) 10051; (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 7593, 7602; (Sabrevois wharf) 10023; Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 8148 (iii); Yukon Provisional District (telegraph lines) 5629, 5633 (ii); 10095; (trails, roads and bridges) 10088 (iii).  
*Railways* (repairs to private cars) 5785 (i).  
*Weights and Measures* (rent, fuel, stationery, &c.) 4804; (salaries, &c.) 4804 (ii).  
*Yukon District*: Militia (clothing contract) 9114 (iii).  
 Valleyfield Customs Collectors, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to Com. of Sup., 5502 (ii).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3898 (ii).  
 Yukon Provisional District Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com. (amt.) 9857 (iii).  
 ——— Mail Service, Registered Letters, &c., Policy of Govt., 3792 (ii).  
 ——— Registered Parcels, &c., returned from Dead Letter Office (remarks) 4351 (ii).

**Tisdale, Hon. D., South Norfolk.**

- Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) on M. for Com., 3304 (i).  
 Business of the Hse. (remarks) 7769 (iii).  
 Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5938 (ii).  
 Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Costigan*) on amt. (Mr. *Oliver*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 2942 (i).  
 Combinations in Restraint of Trade, Prevention Act Amt. B. 40 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1945 (i).  
 Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 2923 (i).  
 Drainage Across Ry. Lands, B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1918; on M. to ref. B. to Sel. Com., 2156, 2932 (i).  
 Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lenieux*) on amt. (Mr. *Monet*) 6099 (ii).  
 Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt B. 19 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1863; in Com., 1897 (i).  
 Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 7674 (iii).  
 Quebec Ry. Light and Power Co.'s B. 84 (Mr. *Carroll*) in Com., 5249 (ii).

**Tisdale, Hon. D.—Con.**

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3463 (ii).

Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 2764 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Militia* (armaments, &c.) 7153; (clothing) 7115 (iii).

Winding-up Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 2°, 1868 (i).

**Tucker, Mr. J. J., St. John City and County.**

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6951 (iii).

## SUPPLY :

*Railways*: I.C.R. (accommodation. St. John) 7177, 7187 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 9887 (iii).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, Bart., Cape Breton.**

Address, on The, 26 (i).

—on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1553 (i).

Adjournment, Deceased Members (remarks) 7 (i).

—Ascension Day and Friday's sitting, 2706 (i).

—Queen's Birthday (remarks) 3340 (ii).

Adulteration Act Amt. B. 123 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3992 (ii).

Agricultural and Colonization Com., 2nd Rep., on conc., 3442 (ii).

Alaskan Boundary, American Rumours *re* Canada's Contention, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 3848 (ii).

—*Modus Vivendi*, Rumoured Arrangements (remarks) 2535 (i).

—Pacific Cable, Announcement of Agreement (remarks) 5386 (ii).

—rumoured compromise, par. in *Montreal Gazette*, 4738 (ii).

—*Modus Vivendi* (remarks) 1074, 1166 (i).

See International Commission.

Appnmts. by late Govt., Communication from Sec. of State for Colonies (M. for cor.) 2724, 2728 (i).

Auditor General's Rep., Inquiry for, 531, 700 (i).

Beet Root Sugar, Bounty for Manufacture, &c., on prop Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4837 (ii).

Birthday Congratulations from Premier, 6382 (ii).

Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4974; in Com. on Res., 4990 (ii); in Com. on Bill, 7639 (iii).

Brockville and West Huron Elections, on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to ref. Documents, &c., to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 6738 (ii).

Budget, The, 2605 (i).

Business of the Hse. and Redistribution Bill (remarks) 3844 (ii).

—Senate Resolutions (remarks) 7321, 7442 (iii).

—Redistribution Bill (remarks) 2535 (i).

—(remarks) 801 (i) 7769, 8216 (iii).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, Bart.—Con.**

Can. Troops for the Transvaal, par. in *Ottawa Citizen* (remarks) 7329 (iii).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1924 (i).

— B. 50 (Mr. *Monk*) on amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 2218 (i).

Colonial Securities and Imperial Tax (remarks) 1639 (i).

Commercial Treaties with British W. Indies, &c., on M. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) to Com. of Sup., 8177.

Companies Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8776, 8926 (iii).

Costigan, Hon. Mr., on Personal Explanation, 3660 (ii).

Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. B. 182 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 8753; in Com. on Res., 8926 (iii).

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., on M. to conc., 1072 (i).

Distribution of Political Speeches (remarks) 1166 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6400, 6409 (ii).

Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1917; on M. to ref. B. to Sel. Com., 2154 (i).

Dry Docks Construction B. 177 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8473; in Com. on Bill, 8758 (iii).

Estate Duty, Cor. incomplete (remarks) 8220 (iii).

Estimates, Suppl. (remarks) 7242, 7442 (iii).

Geoffrion, Hon. Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 7631 (iii).

Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take in Monday, 6280 (ii).

— on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take in Wednesdays, 3647 (ii).

— Precedence on Thursdays on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2409 (i).

Grain Transit, Man. and N. W. T. Regulation B. 15 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. for 2°, 1916 (i).

G. T. R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement, on M. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) to adjn., 3964 (ii).

— on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to Com. of Sup., 3776 (ii).

Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 118 (Mr. *Savard*) in Com., 6970 (iii).

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) to M. for 3°, 4781 (ii).

I.C.R., Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2793 (i); in Com. on Res., 3377, 3703, 3738, 4164; on M. for 2°, 3907; in Com., 4165; on M. for 3°, 4961 (ii).

— on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 2795 (i).

— papers, Inquiry for, 2697 (i).

— G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4065; on M. for 2°, 4171; in Com., 4635 (ii).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, Bart.—Con.**

- I.C.R., A. H. Harris, Appamt. by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Pope*) for Cor., 2905 (i).  
 — District Supt. Ouelette, Suspension, &c. (Ques.) 1859 (i).  
 — Receipts and Expenditure, Stmt. of Accts. (remarks) 2791 (i).  
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 124 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3761 (ii).  
 International Commission-Alaskan Boundary (M. to adjn.) 8152 (iii).  
 — Protocols, on Presentation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4264 (ii).  
 — par. in *Montreal Star*, 4169 (ii).  
 — and Business of the Hse., Proposal to expedite, 3779 (ii).  
 — Rumoured Cancellation of Meetings at Quebec (remarks) 2908 (i).  
   *See* Alaskan Boundary.  
 Ives, Hon. Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 7532 (iii).  
 Japanese Anti-legislation in B.C., Disallowance of Bill (remarks) 2536 (i).  
 Judges and Political Preferments (remarks) 4484 (ii).  
 Loan Companies B. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 6391 (ii).  
 Lumber imported into U. S. from Can., par. in *Toronto Globe* (remarks) 1638 (i).  
 McLaughlin, R. J., and Farm Lands, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) 4488 (ii).  
 Military Canteens and Sale of Liquor, par. in *Ottawa Citizen* re Ont. Alliance (remarks) 7325 (iii).  
 — Officers, Regulations re French and English Language, Enforcement, &c. (remarks) 8632 (iii).  
 — Permanent Corps, Pension System on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2722 (i).  
 Ministerial Responsibility re Transaction of Official Administration, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4002 (ii).  
 Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on amt. (Mr. *Monet*) 6093, 6095 (ii).  
 Montreal Judicial District, Additional Judges (remarks) 7240 (iii).  
 — on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Fortin*) 7635 (iii).  
 Northern Commercial Telegraph Co., and Cor. with Mins. of the Crown, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to Com. of Sup., 5553, 5542 (ii).  
 Ogilvie, Mr., Letter re Connection with British Goldfields Co., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) adjn., 3799.  
 — Rep. and Evidence, Inquiry for, 8387 (iii).  
 Order, Ques. of, on being asked to withdraw the word "cowardly," 6157 (ii).  
 — reference to newspaper report, 1256 (i).  
 — (Mr. *McDougall*) on ruling of Mr. Speaker, 5405 (ii).  
 — h. m. (Sir *Louis Davies*) impates motives, 6228 (ii).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, Bart.—Con.**

- Order, Ques. of (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Members abusing Privilege of Ms. to adjn., 6592 (ii).  
 Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 9190 (iii).  
 Pacific Cable between Australia and Can. Agreement B. 176 (Mr. *Mulock*) M. for Com. on prop. Res., 1951 (i) 8358 ; in Com. on Res., 8383 (iii).  
 — (remarks) 1352 (i).  
 Personal Explanation (Mr. *Davin*) re Application for Mr. Costigan's seat, 3845 (ii).  
 — (Sir *Louis Davies*) remarks, 618, 701 (i).  
 Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 173 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8766 (iii).  
 Petroleum Refining License Fee, on prop. Res. (Sir *Henri Joly*) 3885 (ii).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6102 (ii).  
 Preferential Trade with G. B. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7773, 7789, 7840, 7942, 7953 (iii).  
 — on prop. M. (Mr. *McNeill*) 8222 (iii).  
 — on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 8639 (iii).  
 — (remarks) 8754 (iii).  
 Printing Com., 3rd, 4th and 5th Reps. of Com. (stationery) on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) to conc., 5383 (ii).  
 Private Bills Petitions, on M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) to extend Time, 5378 (ii).  
 Privileges and Elections Com., Absence of Ministers (remarks) 9183 (iii).  
 Privilege, Ques. of, par. in *Winnipeg Free Press* re Appamt. of McGregor and Norwood, 9180 (iii).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8805 (iii).  
 Pub. Accounts Com., Meetings (remarks) 2964 (i).  
 Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 7665 (iii).  
 — (remarks) 7241 (iii).  
 Quebec Harbour Commission Consolid. Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 3914 (ii).  
 — B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 8752 (iii).  
 Ry. Commissioners, Establishment of a Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 3854 (ii).  
 — Passes to Members and Senators B. 37 (Mr. *Bostock*) on M. for 2°, 2196 (i).  
 — Policy of Govt. re Yukon Ry. Cos. (remarks) 4738 ; on M. for Com. of Sup., 4740, 4744 (ii).  
 — Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9198 (iii).  
 — (remarks) 8633, 8755, 9064, 9185 (iii).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3449 ; on M. for 2°, 5234, 5262 (ii).  
 — on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn. Deb., 5299 (ii).  
 — in Com., 6759 (ii); 6981 (iii).  
 — on Ques. of precedence in Deb., 6464 (ii).  
 — (remarks) 2364 (i).  
 Returns, Inquiry for, 8753, 8920 (iii).  
 Roads and Road Allowances in Man. B. 175 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 8470 (iii).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, Bart.—*Con.***

Senate Reform Resolutions, withdr. by Govt. (remarks) 8752 (iii).

Speaker, Hon. Thos. Bain, Election of, 9063 (iii).

— attention called to member's speech out of order, 3754 (ii).

**SUPPLY**

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 8707; (dairy branch) 8271; (illustration stations) 8238, 8308, 8329 (iii).

*Canals*: Farran's Point (enlargement) 5779 (ii); Galops (enlargement) 7443 (iii).

*Charges of Management* (printing Dom. notes) 7001 (iii).

*Civil Government*: Public Works (salaries) 7536, 7543 (iii).

*Customs*: N.S. (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 8392 (iii).

*Dominion Lands* (scrip, &c.) 7511 (iii).

*Immigration* (agents, &c., salaries, &c.) 8482, 8490 (iii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (G. B. and Can.) 8661; (St. John and Liverpool) 8672; (St. John, &c., and W. Indies, &c.) 8678 (iii).

*Militia* (annual drill) 5417 (ii); (clothing) 7099; (pay allowance) 7002; (Royal Military College) 7022; (stores, &c.) 7094 (iii).

*Miscellaneous* (Paris agency) 8704 (iii).

*Ocean and River Service* (Bird Rock) 6384 (ii).

*Post Office* (mail service) 7374 (iii).

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence ship channel) 7563 (iii).

*Railways*: I. C. R. (accommodation at St. John) 7277; (freight rates) 7457 (iii); P. E. I. (Mount Stewart wharf) 5750, 5774 (ii).

*Yukon Provisional District*: Interior (salaries, &c.) 8947, 8975; Militia (food, clothing, transportation, &c.) 9067, 9069 (iii); (N. W. Mounted Police) conc., 6388 (ii); (salaries, &c.) 8652 (iii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. *Roddick*) to Com. of Sup., 6286 (ii).

Turner Administration, B. C., Dismissal by Lt.-Gov. (M. to print papers) 3959 (ii).

Victoria Co., N.S., Patronage, &c., on M. (Mr. *McDougall*) to adjn., 5392 (ii).

Ville Marie Bank Suspension, Inspection by Govt. (remarks) 8756 (iii).

Wade, Mr., Emplmt. by Govt. (remarks) 7242, 7320 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3889 (ii).

Winnipeg Electoral District, Issue of Writ (notification): Remarks, 619, 804 (i).

Yukon Administration, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn., 6569 (ii).

— par. in *North British Daily Mail*, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. of Sup., 8028 (iii).

— Expedition of Mr. Coste, Rep., &c. (remarks) 5360 (ii).

— Investigation, Mr. Ogilvie's Rep. and Papers *re* (remarks) 2409 (i).

— Mail Service, Registered Letters, &c., Policy of Govt., 3793 (ii).

— Ogilvie's Rep., Printing of Evidence (remarks) 5307 (ii).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, Bart.—*Con.***

Yukon Administration, received by Govt. (remarks) 3794 (ii).

— U.S. Vessels and Can. Registry—Fraudulent Valuations, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) for Ret., 3298 (i).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert, *Pictou.***

Address, on The, 701 (i).

— closing of debate (remarks) 1016 (i).

Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) on M. for 3°, 3488 (ii).

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 3763 (ii).

Bliss, Maj. D. C. F., Positions held under Govt., Date of Appmnt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3261 (i), 3335 (ii).

B. C., Chief Justice McColl, Judicial Residence (Ques.) 3546 (ii).

— Judgeships, Appmnt., Minutes of Council, Commissions, &c. (M. for cor., &c.\*) 1879 (i).

— Supreme and County Court Judges, Cor. between B. C. and Can. Govt. *re* Administration of Justice in B. C. (M. for cor.) 2362 (i).

Bonds, Securities, &c., registered under R. S. C., Preparation for Parlt. *re* Yukon District (Ques.) 4804 (ii).

Bauer, Dom. Land Surveyor, B. C., Examination of Papers, &c. (remarks) 4061, 4313 4713, 4898.

Burns, Mr., Priv. Sec. Min. of Fin., Appmnt. to Permanent Force (Ques.) 8469 (iii).

Business of the Hse., on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take in Mondays, 6281 (ii).

Can. Eastern Ry. Co., Sale, &c. (Ques.) 1814 (i).

Canadian Fisheries and American Fish Trusts, Complaints *re* and Official Reps. (Ques.) 4993 (ii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. *Mazwell*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Ellis*) 4338 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3329 (i).

— Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5905 (ii).

Clarke, Jos., Emplmt. by Govt. in the Yukon (Ques.) 5486 (ii).

Clarke *vs.* The Queen, Claims against Govt., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5750 (ii).

Coasting Laws, Enforcements, Cor. respecting (Ques.) 3257 (i).

— Rep. of Capt. John Irving *re* Enforcement (Ques.) 3258 (i).

Commissions under the Great Seal, Regulations respecting (Ques.) 4483 (ii).

Coste, Mr., Expedition to Eng., Instruction, Cor., Reps., &c. (M. for Papers\*) 3334 (i).

Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 3°, 2911 (i).

Crown Timber Office, New Westminster, B. C., Complaints, Instructions and Rep. of Mr. Archer Martin (M. for copies\*) 3149 (i).

Dom. Census and B. N. A. Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 2389 (i).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles H.—Con.**

- Doukhobors, Quarantine at Grosse Isle (remarks) 4550 (ii).
- Fawcett, Mr., Advice *re* recording Mining Claims, &c. (Ques.) 3822 (ii).
- Fraser River (B.C.) Miller's Landing Improvements, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2701 (i).
- Geological Survey Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. Sifton) on M. for 1°, 4892 (ii).
- Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take in Wednesdays, 3555 (ii).
- Inland Fisheries, Issue of Licenses by Local Govt. (remarks) 2910 (i).
- Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 124 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3883 (ii).
- Inquiry for Ret., 4713 (ii).
- I. C. R. and P. E. I. Rys., Steel Rails, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1814 (i).
- (M. for copies\*) 1876 (i).
- I.C.R., Extension to Montreal—G.T.R. Agreement B. 138, in Com., 4673 (ii).
- Order (Ques. of) Appeal from Chairman's ruling to Speaker, neg. (Y. 65; N. 20) 4448, 4457 (ii).
- on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 4446 (ii).
- Green Sand Castings, Tenders, Price, &c. (Ques.) 5860 (ii).
- Interior Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Sifton) on M. for 1°, 4893 (ii).
- Inverness Post Offices, Change of Location, Postmasters, Appmt. and Dismissals (Ques.) 3825.
- John C. Barr* Str., Valuation by Customs Authorities (Ques.) 2700 (i).
- Lynch, Mr. W. H., Rep. referred to by Min. of Int. (M. for copy\*) 3874 (ii).
- McKeown, E., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 5487 (ii).
- McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., Letter read by P. M. G., on Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) 5009 (ii).
- Mail Service, Pacific Coast, Facilities by Govt. (Ques.) 3254 (i).
- Man. Election Fraud, Inquiry for Ret., 3876 (ii).
- (M.) to further consider proceedings in Pub. Accounts Com., 2479 (i).
- (M.) that Papers be ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 4054 (ii).
- Evidence, &c. (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 2246 (i).
- Martin, Mr. Justice, Judicial Residence, B.C. (Ques.) 3545 (ii).
- Militia Clothing Contract, &c., and Cor. with Mr. Workman (M. for copies\*) 5377 (ii).
- Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 4806 (ii).
- Ministerial Responsibility *re* Transaction of Official Administration, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4006 (ii).
- Motion *re* Procedure for Rets., on ruling (Mr. *S. Baker*) 3560 (ii).
- Ogilvie, Mr., Refusal of Min. to read letter in ans. to a question, 3811 (ii).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles H.—Con.**

- Ogilvie, Mr., Relationship to Min. of Int. (Ques.) 2703 (i).
- Pacific Cable and Govt. of B. C., Offers respecting (M. for cor.\*) 3873 (ii).
- Personal Explanation, par. in *Globe re* Mr. Fred. Peters and Yukon Charges, 3337 (ii).
- *re* Question as to Mr. Mark Workman, 4990 (ii).
- Printing Com., 3rd, 4th and 5th Reps. of Com. (stationery) on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) to conc., 5384 (ii).
- Public Accts. Com., Postponement and Hours of Meetings, &c. (remarks) 4344 (ii).
- (remarks) 2965 (i).
- Delay in Meeting (Man. Election Frauds) (M.) to adjn., 3150 (i).
- Quebec Harbour Commission Consolid. Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 3914; in Com., 3921; on amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to M. for 3°, 3988; Sen. Amts., 6101 (ii).
- Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3492 (ii).
- Restigouche Boom Co.'s Incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *McAlister*) on Order for 2°, 2649 (i).
- Returns, Incomplete, Yukon Charges and Man. election frauds (remarks) 3313 (i).
- Incomplete, Tels., &c., from Archer Martin, &c. (remarks) 4731 (ii).
- Inquiry for Coasting Regulations, Enforcement of, 2696 (i).
- Inquiry for Mr. Coste's Rep. *re*, 4997 (ii).
- Ordered by Hse., Ministerial Responsibility (remarks) 5410 (ii).
- non-compliance, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2966 (i).
- non-production (remarks) 3071 (i).
- Cor. between Mr. F. Peters and Ministers, Personal Explanation *re*, 4896 (ii).
- Returns, Inquiry for, 3498, 3555, 3752, 4151, 4313 (ii).
- St. John, N.B., Deep Water Terminal Facilities (M. for Specifications, Plans, &c.\*) 1876 (i).
- Shamrock* Tug, Amount paid John C. Kaine, &c. (Ques.) 5666 (ii).
- Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Special Com., 2769 (i).
- Spinks, County Court Judge, B.C., Charges against, on M. to Com. of Sup., 4172, 4201 (ii).
- Steamship Service between P. E. I. and Liverpool, par. in *Examiner*, 3543 (ii).
- Steveston, B.C., Tidal Lands, Application for Leases, &c. (Ques.) 3822, 4058 (ii).
- O. Cs., Cor., Plans, &c. (M. for copies\*) 3873 (ii).
- Transfer of Property, &c. (Ques.) 3544 (ii).
- SUPPLY:
- Administration of Justice* (circuit allowances, B.C.) 5471; (Exchequer Court) 5473; Yukon (living expenses of one Judge) 5469 (ii).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles H.—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

- Civil Govt.*: Customs (contingencies) 2980 (i); Interior (clerical assistance) 5021; Post Office (salaries, Dead Letter Branch) 5034, 5053; Public Works (printing, &c.) 5085 (ii).  
*Fisheries* (dismissal of Capt. Babb) 4256; (jurisdiction) 4242; (Noble Bros.) 4246; (salaries of Inspectors) 4013 (ii).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, &c.) 5116; (salaries, &c.) 3523 (ii).  
*Marine Hospitals* (care of sick seamen) 4009; (shipwrecked seamen) 4012 (ii).  
*Militia* (miscellaneous and unforeseen) 5452; (military stores) 5441 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Can. Law Library, London, Eng.) 5470; (Chief Justice Strong's expenses in Eng.) 5470; (professional services, Mr. C. J. R. Pethune) 5471 (ii).  
*Ocean and River Service* (life-saving rewards) 3064; (maintenance) 2989 (i); (maintenance and supplies, &c.) 5101 (ii); (masters and mates) 3058; (removal of obstructions) 3065 (i).  
*Penitentiaries* (B. C.) 5480; (Dorchester) 5481; (Kingston, investigation) 5073 (ii).  
*Public Works* (St. Lawrence River channel) 5088; Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5605, 5613 (ii).  
*Quarantine* (cattle, salaries, &c.) 5080 (ii).  
*Railways*: P.E.I. (Mount Stewart wharf) 5766 (ii).  
*Steamboat Inspection* (Dom. Steamers, &c.) 4713; (fog alarms) 4240 (ii).  
Tidal Survey, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3505 (ii).  
—— in Can. Waters, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 3795 (ii).  
—— Stmt. of Min. as to remarks of Allan SS. Captains, Rep. of Capt. Spain, &c. (Ques.) 3262 (i).  
U. S. Boats registered at Dawson, Names, &c. (Ques.) 2699 (i).  
—— Customs and Can. Vessels, Regulations, &c., re entering at American Ports (remarks) 2528 (i).  
Voters' Lists, revised copies, &c. (Ques.) 1819 (i).  
Votes and Proceedings, Typographical errors (remarks) 6120 (ii).  
Walsh, Maj., Authority for Commission issued, &c. (Ques.) 4269 (ii).  
—— Instructions by Govt. as Commissioner, Rep. of Interview at Skagway, &c. (Ques.) 3078, 3258 (i).  
Walsh, Philip, Relationship to Major Walsh (Ques.) 3823 (ii).  
Weights and Measures Act Amt B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3886 (ii).  
Willison, Mr. J. W., Crown Timber Agent, Yukon District (Ques.) 3823 (ii).  
Winding-Up Act Amt B. 31 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com., 4315 (ii).  
Wood Island Light-keeper, Dismissal of D. McMillan, on M. (Mr. *Martin*) for Cor., &c., 4819 (ii).  
Wright, Wm., Official in Recording Office at Dawson, Relationship to Editor of *Globe* (Ques.) 4270 (ii).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles H.—Con.**

- Yukon Act, Reps. from Yukon Council (remarks) 2536 (i).  
Yukon, Administration of, Charges against (M.) (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 5945, 6053; (amt.) 6022, 6268; (amt.) Neg. (Y. 32; N. 82) 6278 (ii).  
—— personal Explanation re Judge Dugas, 6158 (ii).  
—— Appnmt. of Sheriff, &c. (Ques.) 3943, 4268 (ii).  
—— Appnmt. of Sheriff, and Clerk of Court, O. C.'s, Bond Certificates, &c. (M. for copies\*) 3149 (i).  
—— Appnmt. of Messrs. Wade, McGregor and Norwood, Date of arrival at Dawson, &c. (Ques.) 3081 (i).  
—— Bliss, Maj., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 3552 (ii).  
—— Bonds given by Officials, Record or List of names (Ques.) 5310 (ii).  
—— Hunker Creek, Klondike Mining, applications and grants for hydraulicing (M. for copies\*) 2962 (i).  
—— Commissioner, Maj. Walsh, Instructions and Cor. from Govt. of Can. (M. for copies\*) 2787 (i).  
—— Commissioner Ogilvie, Instruction and Cor. with Dom. Govt. (M. for copies\*) 2787 (i).  
—— Commission of Inquiry, Request from Mr. Ogilvie to extend his powers, &c. (Ques.) 3080.  
—— Council, Ordinances received, Number, &c. (Ques.) 2703 (i).  
—— Expedition, Mr. Coste's Expenses, &c. (M.) to ref. Papers to Pub. Accts. Com., 5489 (ii).  
—— inquiry for Mr. Coste's Rep. on Expedition, 5408 (ii).  
—— Documents, &c. asked for, 3067 (i).  
—— Freight Transportation, Guarantee by Contractors, &c. (Ques.) 2902 (i).  
—— Instructions and Cor. between Dom. Govt. and Yukon Council (M. for copies\*) 2787 (i).  
—— Instructions to Walsh (Ques.) 3258 (i).  
—— Investigation, Protest from Miners' Committee, Cor., &c. (Ques.) 2329 (i).  
—— reps. from Mr. Ogilvie, Purports, &c. (Ques.) 3820 (ii).  
—— Mr. Ogilvie's Report, Printing, &c. (remarks) 5359, 5746 (ii).  
—— inquiry for Mr. Ogilvie's Rep., 4713 (ii).  
—— on M. (Mr. *Sifton*) to print Papers, &c., 4730 (ii).  
—— Returns, Inquiry for, &c. 4340 (ii).  
—— Judicial District, Appnmt. of second Judge, &c. (Ques.) 3081 (i).  
—— Klondike River Bridge, Owner, Tolls, &c. (Ques.) 2902, 3073 (i).  
—— Letters from Americans re Administration, &c. (Ques.) 3822 (ii).  
—— Liquor Permits, issued by Archer Martin (remarks) 3875 (ii).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles H.—Con.**

- Yukon Liquor Permits issued by Maj. Walsh (Ques.) 2481 (i).  
 — re (Ques.) 2704 (i).  
 — (M. for copies\*) 2789 (i).  
 — issued by Mr. Ogilvie, Number, &c. 3077 (i).  
 — disallowance by Govt., 3791 (ii).  
 — Living Expenses of Judges Dugas and Maguire, &c., Instructions *re* &c., 5489 (ii).  
 — Maguire, Mr. Justice, Arrival and Departure from Dawson, 3258 (i); 3959 (ii).  
 — Mail Service, Contracts, Advertisements, &c. (M. for copies) 2705 (i).  
 — Mining Regulations, Publication, &c. (Ques.) 1841 (i).  
 — Miners' Grievances and Mr. Ogilvie's Rep. (Ques.) 2531 (i).  
 — Officials, Bonds or Securities registered (Ques.) 4991 (ii).  
 — Ogilvie, Mr., Reports *re* Investigations, &c. (Ques.) 3548 (ii).  
 — Ogilvie, Mr., Connection with British Can. Goldfields Co. (Ques.) 3799 (ii).  
 — Registrar of Titles, Instructions and Restrictions by Govt. (Ques.) 2324 (i).  
 — Representation in Parl. (Ques.) 2901 (i).  
 — Russell, Mr., Inspector of Steamboats, Dismissal, Reps., &c. *re* (M. for copies\*) 3334 (i).  
 — Survey of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 3547 (ii).  
 — Telegraph Line from Skagway and Dawson, Communications between Ministers and English syndicates *re* construction (M. for copies\*) 3334 (i).  
 — U. S. Vessels and Can. Registry, Fraudulent Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 3266 (i).  
 — U. S. Vessels and Can. Registry, Fraudulent Valuation, &c. (M. for Ret.) 3296 (i).  
 — Wade, Mr. F. C., Date of arrival at Dawson (Ques.) 3546 (ii).  
 — Walsh, Maj., Reps., Number sent in and laid on Table (Ques.) 3798 (ii).  
 — alterations in Rep. (Ques.) 2704 (i).  
 — Water Front, Dawson, Lease, &c. to Morrison & McDonald (Ques.) 3547 (ii).  
 — Willison, J. W., Crown Timber Agent, Relationship to Editor of *Globe* (Ques.) 4270 (ii).

**Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., South Simcoe.**

- Lévis Military Camp, Qualification of Officers, Percentage, &c. (Ques.) 9309 (iii).  
 Militia Officers, at Lévis Camp, Numbers passed Qualifying Exams. (Ques.) 8632 (iii).  
 — Regulations *re* French and English language, Enforcement, &c. (Ques.) 8631 (iii).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 6717 (ii).

**SUPPLY:**

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (year book) 8235 (iii).  
*Dom. Lands* (Chief Inspector, salary) 9022 (iii).

**Tyrwhitt, Mr. R.—Con.****SUPPLY—Con.**

- Immigration* (agents, &c., salaries, &c.) 8481 (iii).  
*Legislation: House of Commons* (Restaurant keeper) 10138 (iii).  
*Militia* (annual drill) 5417 (ii); (annual drill) 7072 (iii); (clothing) 5450; (military stores) 5429 (ii); (provisions) 7130; (salaries) 7082; (transport, &c.) 7137 (iii); (unforeseen expenses) 5858 (ii); (Royal Military College) 7144 (iii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Chas. Bremner, compensation, &c.) 10114 (iii).  
*Post Office* (Postmasters' salaries) 5802, 5829 (ii).

**Wallace, Mr. N. Clarke, West York, O.**

- Address, on The, 172 (i).  
 — *re* Transvaal Question (remarks) 8998 (iii).  
 Agricultural Implements imported from U.S., Bases of Valuations, &c. (Ques.) 6047 (ii).  
 Alaska Boundary and Pacific Cable, Announcement of Agreement (remarks) 5387 (ii).  
 See "International Commission."  
 Aronsberg, Abraham, Relief B. 144 (Mr. Landerkin) in Com., 7480 (iii).  
 Atlantic Fast SS. Service, and Messrs. Peterson, Tate & Co's Deposit (Ques.) 1883 (i).  
 Aud. Gen's Rep., Inquiry for, 803 (i).  
 Binder Twine, Sale of by Govt., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 9934 (iii).  
 B. C. Legislation *re* Chinese and Foreign Immigration, on M. (Mr. Prior) to adjn., 6890 (iii).  
 Brown, Marion, Commutation of Death Sentence, Pets., Cor. &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 6939 (iii).  
 Bounties on Iron and Steel B. 161 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7640 (iii).  
 Business of the Hse. (remarks) 5744 (ii).  
 — Unopposed Returns (remarks) 6938 (iii).  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. McMullen) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 3331 (i).  
 — Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. Richardson) in Com., 5926 (ii).  
 Coal Oil, Reduction of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Moore) 2131 (i).  
 Combination in Restraint of Trade, Prevention Act Amt. B. 40 (Mr. Sproule) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1944 (i).  
 Contracts let without Tender since June, 1896, on M. (Mr. Davin) for O. Cs., 5340 (ii).  
 Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. B. 182 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9661 (iii).  
 Dom. Permanent Loan Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 6872 (iii).  
 Edmonton and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4312 (ii).  
 General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir Henri Joly) in Com., 9636 (iii).  
 Georgian Bay and Toronto Ship Canal, Pets. Applications, Cor., &c. (M. for cor.) 4819 (ii).  
 G. T. R. Trackmen's Strike, on M. (Mr. Clarke) to Com. of Sup., 3777 (ii).  
 — on M. (Mr. Muelan) to adjn., 4512 (ii)

**Wallace, Mr. N. Clarke—Con.**

- I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2795 (i).  
 — on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 2828 (i).  
 — G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4401, 4584, 4602, 4636, 4687 (ii).  
 — on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 4448 (ii).  
 International Commission Alaskan Boundary Protocols, on Presentation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4268 (ii).  
 — par. in Montreal *Gazette re* Negotiations, 3340 (ii).  
 Iron Bounties, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 1827 (i).  
 See "Bounties."  
 Mint, Establishment by Govt. in Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3118 (i).  
 Montreal Harbour Commissioners' B. 179 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9882 (iii).  
 Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Louis Davies*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 6118 (ii).  
 Northern Commercial Telegraph Co. and Cor. with Minister of Crown on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to Com. of Sup., 5573 (ii).  
 Ogilvie, Mr., Connection with British Goldfields Co., Refusal of Min. to read Letter in ans. to Question, 3813 (ii).  
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Casey*) 5617 (ii).  
 — (Mr. *Fielding*) use of the word "impertinent," 5608 (ii).  
 — (Mr. *McNeill*) one member imputing motives to another member, 5882 (ii).  
 Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 9187; in Com. on Bill, 9626 (iii).  
 Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 173 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8767 (iii).  
 Personal Explanation in ref. to Remarks on Coal Oil Prices, 2247 (i).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6113 (ii).  
 Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7905 (iii).  
 Pub. Accounts Com., Delay in Meeting (Man. Election Frauds) on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to adjn., 3242 (i).  
 — Postponements and Hours of Meeting, &c. (remarks) 4348 (ii).  
 — 6th Rep. of Com. (M.) to print in Votes and Proceedings, 9836 (iii).  
 Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 9684; in Com., 9874 (iii).  
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9737 (iii).  
 Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, 22nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 9210 (iii).  
 — Commissioners, Establishment of Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 2509 (i).  
 — Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Ry. Co.'s on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4766 (ii).

**Wallace, Mr. N. Clarke—Con.**

- Railway Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9312, 9398, 9467, 9479, 9532, 9567; in Com., on Bil., 9762, 9783 (iii).  
 Reciprocity between U.S. and B. W. Indies, par. in Chicago *Record*, 4550 (ii).  
 Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 3458; on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 6464; in Com., 6806 (ii), 6941, 6945, 6967 (iii).  
 — (M.) to adjn. Deb., 5299; Neg. (Y. 18; N. 23) 5305 (ii).  
 Returns, Inquiry for, (remarks) 5410 (ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
 Arts. Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 8718, 8745; (illustration stations) 8331, 8745; (Paris exhibition) 10144 (iii).  
 Canals: Sault Ste. Marie (Ryan & Co.'s claims) 9238 (iii).  
 Civil Govt.: Agriculture (contingencies) 2272; (salaries) 2261; Customs (contingencies) 2974 (i); High Commissioner's Office (contingencies, &c.) 8748; Interior (salaries) 7466 (iii); Militia and Defence (contingencies) 2267 (i); Post Office, 7334, 7352 (iii); Railways and Canals (salaries) 2251 (i).  
 Customs: B. C. (contingencies, &c.) 8456 (iii); (repairs to cruisers) 5603; B. C. and Yukon (stationery, &c.) 5600 (ii); conc., 10206; Man. (contingencies, &c.) 8453; (N.S.) 8387 (iii); (Ont.) 5595; (suspense account, Montreal) 5590; Yukon (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 5597 (ii), 10109 (iii).  
 Dom. Lands (Chief Inspector's salary) 9025; (scrip, &c.) 7522; (Inspectors, agents, &c.) 7529 (iii).  
 Excise (commissions on stamps) 4790 (ii).  
 Geological Survey (artesian borings) 7469 (iii); (salaries) 5668 (ii).  
 Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8492, 8578, 8620; conc., 10214 (Amt.); (St. Paul des Métis, seed grain, &c.) 9028, 9039 (iii).  
 Insurance (general expenses) 7464 (iii).  
 Legislation: House of Commons (gratuity to Lady Edgar) 10196 (ii); (seasonal clerks) 2280 (i); (stationery supplies) 5732 (ii); (voters' lists) 2282, 2294, 2312 (i); (Wood, Mr., late M.P. seasonal indemnity) 10201 (iii).  
 Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5130 (ii).  
 Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Can.) 8663; (Quebec and Manchester) 8695; (St. John, &c., and W. Indies, &c.) 8676 (iii).  
 Militia (annual drill) 5416; (clothing) 5450 (ii), 7106 (iii); (military stores) 5440; (miscellaneous and unforeseen) 5454 (ii); (pay allowance) 7029; (stores, &c.) 7094; (transport, &c.) 7131 (iii); (transportation and supplies) 6346 (ii); (Yukon supplies) 7040 (iii).  
 Miscellaneous: (commutation of duties) 8704; (Paris agency) 8704; (refund of duties on fish, &c., P. E. I.) 10189 (iii).  
 Ocean and River Service (maintenance) 3046 (i).  
 Post Office (mail service) 7375; (miscellaneous) 7388 (iii); (Postmasters' salaries) 5812 (ii); (Yukon mail service) 7360 (iii).

**Wallace, Mr. N. Clarke—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

*Public Works*: Buildings, Ottawa (electric lighting) 9941; (lighting, repairs, &c.) 9989; (repairs, &c.) 7690; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Chezzet-cook wharf) 10004; (Gabarus breakwater) 9992; (Ont.) 7973; (Otonabee navigation) 10065; (Port Colborne) 9251, 9281; (Porter's Lake, dredging, &c.) 9993; (Portsmouth wharf) 10065; (Toronto Harbour) 10066; Que. (Coteau, dredging) 10062; (Montreal Harbour improvements) 9984; (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 7597; (Sabrevois wharf) 10038; Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 5205 (ii); Telegraphs (Anticosti Island) 10073; Yukon (buildings) 10108 (iii); (telegraph lines) 5605, 5627, 5648 (ii), 10093; (trails, roads and bridges) 10089 (iii).

*Railways*: P. E. I. (Murray Harbour, &c., construction) 9211, 9217 (iii).

*Trade and Commerce* (commercial agencies) 8698 (iii).

*Yukon District* (customs) 8747; Interior (salaries, &c.) 9005; Militia (clothing contract) 9077, 9122 (ii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. Roddick) to Com. of Sup., 6305 (ii).

Valleyfield Customs Collector, Charges against, on M. (Mr. Bergeron) to Com. of Sup., 5502 (ii).

Wheat exported from Montreal, St. John, Fort William and Winnipeg, Quantity (Ques.) 2702 (i).

Winnipeg Electoral Lists, Preparation, &c. (remarks) 2908 (i).

Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to Com. of Sup., 6165 (ii).

— Mail Service, Carriage of Registered Matter, 4352 (ii).

— Policy of Govt., 3793 (ii).

**Wilson, Mr. U., Lennox.**

Address, on The, 1320 (i).

Ball, Mr. W. D., Postmaster at Bath, Ont., Papers, &c., re Dismissal (M. for copies) 2390 (i).

Bath Postmaster, Dismissal, inquiry for Ret., 3877 (ii).

Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 171 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 9601 (iii).

Herns, John, Caretaker Napanee Public Building, Cor. re Dismissal, &c. (M. for copies \*) 5377 (ii).

**Wilson, Mr. U.—Con.**

Immigrants from U. S., Number and Distribution (Ques.) 1979 (i).

— Europe, Number and Distribution (Ques.) 1980 (i).

— Number sent by Agents in G. B. and U. S. (Ques.) 2192 (i).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—Agreement with G. T. R. B. 138 (Mr. Blair) Sen. Amts., 9722 (iii).

Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9190; on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 9613; in Com., 9635 (iii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. Flint) 8883 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 9330, 9578, 9585 (iii).

## SUPPLY:

*Immigration* (agents, &c., salaries, &c.) 8480, 8486, 8618 (iii).

*Indians*: Man. and N. W. T. (implements, &c.) 5714 (ii).

*Public Works*: Buildings (N.S.) 7614; (Ont.) 7623; (London drill hall) 9961; (Rideau Hall, additional wing) 9959; Dredging (plant) 8143; Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 8087; (Man.) 8079; Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 8147 (iii).

*Railways*: I. C. R. (accommodation, St. John) 7414 (iii).

**Wood, Mr. A. T., Hamilton.**

Binder Twine, Sale of Govt., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 9914 (iii).

Can. Life Assurance Co.'s (B. 89) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2182 (i).

Customs and Inland Revenue Depts., B. 182 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9663 (iii).

G. T. R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law, Enforcement, on M. (Mr. Ross-Robertson) to adjn., 3975 (ii).

Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. Lemieux) on amt. (Mr. Monet) 6096; in Com. on amt. (Mr. Campbell) 6328 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Calvert) on amt. (Mr. Landerkin) 5043 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 9355, 9401 (iii).

— B. 85 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 9732 (iii).

## SUPPLY:

*Fisheries* (protection service) 4723 (ii).

*Militia*: Yukon Force (transportation and supplies) 6324, 6345 (ii).



# INDEX—PART II

## SUBJECTS

- ABENAKIS INDIANS, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 10110 (iii).
- ACCOMMODATION AT LÉVIS: in Com. of Sup., 9163 (iii).
- ACADEMY OF ARTS: in Com. of Sup., 8705 (iii).
- "ACADIA," STR., REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5180 (ii).
- ADDITIONAL JUDGE, YUKON TERRITORY: in Com. of Sup., 10191 (iii).
- ADDRESS, THE, IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: con-  
sult., M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 (i).
- moved (Mr. *Bell*, P.E.I.) 9; seconded (Mr. *Martineau*) 21 (i).
- Deb. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 26, 1553; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 84; (Mr. *Foster*) 109; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 152, 159; (Mr. *Wallace*) 172; (Mr. *Casey*) 194; (Mr. *Taylor*) 207; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 234; (Mr. *Monk*) 241; (Mr. *Stenson*) 250; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 253; (Mr. *Talbot*) 273; (Mr. *Craig*) 275, 1772; (Mr. *Broder*) 290; (Mr. *Oster*) 307; (Mr. *Britton*) 311; (Mr. *Moore*) 319; (Mr. *Davin*) 338, 1807; (Mr. *Pope*) 398; (Mr. *Davis*) 422; (Mr. *Roche*) 454; (Mr. *Sproule*) 469, 1675; (Mr. *McClure*) 497; (Mr. *Chauvin*) 504; (Mr. *Carroll*) 509; (Mr. *Marcotte*) 516; (Mr. *Monet*) 532; (Mr. *Clancy*) 541; (Mr. *Tarte*) 570; (Mr. *Bennett*) 594; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 619; (Mr. *Hughes*) 631; (Mr. *Madore*) 666; (Mr. *McInerney*) 676; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 701; (Mr. *Sifton*) 800, 806; (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 885, 895; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1002; (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 1013; (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1016; (Mr. *Montague*) 1037; (Mr. *Campbell*) 1061; (Mr. *Henderson*) 1075; (Mr. *Ganong*) 1095; (Mr. *Powell*) 1124; (Mr. *McAlister*) 1144; (Mr. *Paterson*) 1167; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1197; (Mr. *Desmarais*) 1245; (Mr. *Macdonald*, P. E. I.) 1264; (Mr. *Macdonald*, Huron) 1278; (Mr. *Wilson*) 1320; (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1336; (Mr. *Legris*) 1344; (Mr. *McDougall*) 1354; (Mr. *Frost*) 1386; (Mr. *Fisher*) 1432; (Mr. *Clarke*) 1463; (Amt.) 1499; (Mr. *Bertram*) (Amt.) 1514; agreed to, Y 101, N. 48, 1811; (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 1514; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1541; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1598; (Mr. *Foster*) 1622; (Mr. *Fielding*) 1640; (Mr. *Flint*) 1692; (Mr. *Mills*) 1716; (Mr. *Morrison*) 1754; (Mr. *Richardson*) 1787; (Mr. *Domville*) 1793; (Mr. *Oliver*) 1804 (i).
- CLOSING OF DEBATE: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 975, 1016 (ii).
- REPLY TO, MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2963; read (Mr. *Speaker*) 2963 (i).
- ADDRESS, OMISSION OF NAMES FROM DIVISION LIST: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 1861 (i).
- TO HER MAJ. *re* TRANSVAAL QUESTION: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8992 (iii).
- ADJOURNMENTS, MS.:
- ASCENSION DAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2790 (i).
- AND FRIDAY'S SITTING: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2706 (i).
- EASTER: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 531 (i).
- QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3340; M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3440 (ii).
- MOTIONS: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3816, 3817 (ii).
- CHICAGO DEMONSTRATION, PRIME MINISTER'S REPLY TO INVITATION: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 9695; (M. to adjn.) 9837 (iii).
- LETTER OF PRIME MINISTER TO H. H. KOHLSAAT: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 10220 (iii).
- G. T. R. TRACKMEN AND ALIEN LABOUR LAW ENFORCEMENT: (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3960, 3984 (ii).
- INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION. ALASKAN BOUNDARY: (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8152 (iii).
- MEMBERS DECEASED: (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 (i).
- YUKON—OGILVIE'S LETTER *re* CONNECTION WITH BRITISH GOLDFIELD Co.: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Foster*) 3799 (ii).
- Administration of Criminal Justice in Keewatin, &c., B. No. 167 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 6279 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup>, 8171; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 8172 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 47.)
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 10122 (iii).
- ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 10122 (iii).
- YUKON DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 5468 (ii), 10191; conc., 10217 (iii).
- LIVING EXPENSES OF JUDGES DUGAS AND MA-GUIRE, INSTRUCTIONS, &c.: (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5489 (ii).
- Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4; *pro formd.*
- Adulteration Act Amt. B. No. 123 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3334; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, and in Com., 3990, 3996; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3997 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 26.)
- AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS:
- ACADEMY OF ARTS: in Com. of Sup., 8705 (iii).
- AGRICULTURAL AND COLONIZATION COMMITTEE, 2ND REP. OF COM., PRINTING OF EVIDENCE: Conc. (Mr. *Bain*) 3440 (ii).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

- AGRICULTURE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2256, 2270 (i); contingencies, 5028 (ii).
- DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 1352 (i).
- MINISTER OF, TRAVELLING AND LIVING EXPENSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1825 (i).
- AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS IMPORTED FROM U. S., BASES OF VALUATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 6047 (ii).
- REDUCTION OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 5861, 5893 (ii).
- SOCIETIES: in Com. of Sup., 8237 (iii).
- ARCHIVES: in Com. of Sup., 8224 (iii).
- ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 8224 (ii).
- BUBONIC PLAGUE AND QUARANTINE OF PACIFIC STEAMERS AT B. C.: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 5989 (ii).
- BULLETINS, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8264 (iii).
- CATTLE EMBARGO, COR. BETWEEN CAN. AND IMP. GOVTS.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Montague) 1877 (i).
- Inquiry for Returns (Mr. Montague) 3253 (i).
- CATTLE INSPECTION, &c., AT HEBERTVILLE, COR. re APPOINTMENT OF DR. HALL: M. for Ret\* (Mr. Casgrain) 5944 (ii).
- FOR TUBERCULOSIS, COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND DR. J. A. DUCHESNE OF CHICOUTIMI SINCE JUNE, 1896: M. for Copy\* (Mr. Casgrain) 5944 (ii).
- MONTREAL, REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques., 10115 (iii).
- QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5075 (ii), 8339 (iii).
- COLD STORAGE FOR FISH TRANSPORTATION FROM MAR. PROVS.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1978 (i).
- PRESERVATION OF BAIT FOR FISHERMEN; Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1978 (i).
- DEEP SEA FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 10163.
- COLD STORAGE ON STEAMSHIPS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8706 (iii).
- CONSTANTIN, DR. JULES, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT., AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1847 (i).
- DAIRYING AND AGRICULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8265 (iii).
- DAIRYING INTERESTS, ADVANCES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8337 (iii).
- DUCHESNE, DR. J. A., COMPLAINTS re APPNMT. OF DR. HALL: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3336 (ii).
- EXPERIMENTAL FARM, BALANCE DUE ON PROPERTY: in Com. of Sup., 5073 (ii).
- ESTABLISHMENT IN ST. JACQUES: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 2110 (i).
- FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 8237 (iii).
- FARM, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 7688 (iii).
- GREATER BRITAIN EXHIBITION, CANADIAN REPRESENTATION OF MINERAL EXHIBIT: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1959 (i).
- HALL, DR., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF CATTLE AT CHICOUTIMI: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3336 (ii).
- HOG CHOLERA, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5085 (ii).
- "ILLUSTRATION STATIONS," FRUIT, CEREALS, &c., GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2110 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 8279, 8745 (iii).
- NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 8149 (iii).
- OMAHA EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 5074 (ii).
- PARIS EXPOSITION, CAN. COMMISSIONERS, SPACE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1829 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 10140 (ii).
- PATENT OFFICE, Library: in Com. of Sup., 5074 (ii).
- PHOTOGRAPHIC ESTABLISHMENT: in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

- "PATENT RECORD," PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5074 (ii).
- PLEBISCITE, SPEECH OF MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AT OTTAWA CONVENTION: Ques. (Mr. Moore) 1826 (i).
- POULTRY FEEDING EXPERIMENTS, GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2110 (i).
- P. E. I. AND G. B., COLD STORAGE AND SS. COMMUNICATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Martin) 5493 (ii).
- QUARANTINE SERVICE, EMPLOYEES, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Montague) 3826 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 5075 (ii).
- ORGANIZED DISTRICTS: in Com. of Sup., 8338 (iii).
- STATION, HALIFAX: in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii).
- WILLIAM'S HEAD: in Com. of Sup., 8090 (iii).
- REFRIGERATOR CARS: in Com. of Sup., 9172 (iii).
- SPRAYING FRUIT TREES, GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2110 (i).
- STATISTICS, GENERAL: in Com. of Sup., 8236 (iii).
- YEAR BOOK: in Com. of Sup., 8226 (iii).
- STEEL SHELVING, DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 9989 (iii).
- SUPERANNUATIONS IN AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPNMTS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Montague) 3873 (ii).
- TOBACCO EXPERIMENTAL STATION, ESTABLISHMENT IN ESSEX CO.: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 2486 (i).
- TUBERCULOSIS EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5075 (ii).
- INSPECTION IN CHICOUTIMI COUNTY, AMOUNT PAID &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 5097 (ii).
- PREVENTION OF: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Roddick) 6282 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 8344 (iii).
- ALASKAN BOUNDARY, AMERICAN RUMOURS re CANADA'S CONTENTION: M. to adjn. (Mr. Prior) 3846 (ii).
- CUSTOMS OFFICIALS, DIFFICULTIES WITH MOUNTED POLICE: Remarks (Mr. Gillies) 2193 (i).
- MODUS VIVENDI: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 1074, 1166 (i).
- RUMOURED ARRANGEMENTS: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 2635 (i).
- PACIFIC CABLE, ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGREEMENT: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 5386 (ii).
- Alaska and North-western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 44 (Mr. Gillies) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1165; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1389 (i).
- Alaska-Yukon Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 5 (Mr. Logan) 1<sup>st</sup>, 617; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 933 (i).
- ALBA SECTION, I.C.R., NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. McLennan, Inverness) 5310 (ii).
- Alberca Irrigation Co.'s B. No. 23 (Mr. Douglas) 1<sup>st</sup>, 803; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1113; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2152 (i). (62-63 Vic., c. 93.)
- ALEXANDRIA REFORMATORY: in Com. of Sup., 7622 (iii).
- Algoma Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 71 (Mr. Dymont) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1949; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2152 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 6879 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 50).
- ALIEN LABOUR LAW, APPNMT. OF AGENT AT WALLACEBURG: Remarks (Mr. Clancy) 5492 (ii).
- ALIEN ACT, B. C., COR. WITH B. C. GOVERNMENT: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 8220, 8466, 8757 (iii).

- ALIEN ACT, B.C., DISALLOWANCE BY DOM. GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 7768 (iii).
- LABOUR LAW, ENFORCEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 5471 (ii) ; 10123 (iii).
- ENFORCEMENT AT HAMILTON : Remarks (Mr. *McCleary*) 3879 (ii).
- ENFORCEMENT AT TORONTO, INSTRUCTION TO AGENT : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3084 (i).
- ENFORCEMENT, PAR. IN TORONTO *Star* : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 2907 (i).
- LABOURERS AT LAKE BENNETT, AND GOVTL. ACTION : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1859 (i).
- ALLAIRE, J. P. O., ST. BONIFACE, MAN., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1894 (i).
- ALLAN SS. SERVICE AND GOVT. CONTRACT, NAMES OF VESSELS SAILING FROM ST. JOHN, 1897-8 : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3258 (i).
- AMERICAN BANK NOTE COMPANY, DIES, PLATES, &c., DUTIES COLLECTED, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 3828 (ii).
- AMMUNITION, AMOUNT ISSUED TO 7TH BATTALION, LONDON : Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 1956 (i).
- ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY BUOY SERVICE, EXPIRATION OF MR. MCCARTHY'S CONTRACT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 4056 (ii).
- ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY BASIN, REPORTS *re* BUOYS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 4993 (ii).
- ANNAPOLIS CO., PORT GEORGE HARBOUR, PIER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 7532 (iii).
- POST OFFICE, IRREGULARITIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 8989, 9179 (iii).
- PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 2701 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Mills*) 2410 (i).
- ANNUAL DRILL : in Com. of Sup., 5055, 5414 (ii) ; 7002 (iii).
- ANSE À BEAUFILS, HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 8103 (iii).
- ANSE AUX GASCONS, BREAKWATER ; in Com. of Sup., 8103 (iii).
- ANTICOSTI ISLAND, COR. BETWEEN BRITISH GOVT. AND CAN. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1841 (i).
- PUBLIC WORKS INSPECTION TRIP, NAME OF STR., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2188 (i).
- M. for Rep.\* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2789 (i).
- TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 10072 (iii).
- ANTI-JAPANESE LEGISLATION, COR. BETWEEN B. C. GOVT. AND DOM. : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 5206 (ii).
- Motion Dropped (Mr. *Prior*) 5313 (ii).
- INCOMPLETE RETURN : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 5408, 5491 (ii).
- GOVT. POLICY *re* FOURTEEN STATUTES ALREADY IN FORCE : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5859 (ii).
- ANTLER AND MOOSE MOUNTAIN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916 ; in Com., 9467 (iii).
- APPEALS FROM RULING OF CHAIRMAN TO SPEAKER IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE, STMT. AND AUTHORITY : Quoted (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 4553 (ii).
- APPELLATE COURT, ESTABLISHMENT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5308 (ii).
- APPLES, FRAUDULENT PACKING, PAR. IN TORONTO *World* : M. to adjn. (Mr. *McMillan*) 3753 (ii).
- APPNMTS. BY LATE GOVT., COMMUNICATION FROM SEC. OF STATE FOR COLONIES : M. for Cor. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2724, 2738 (i).
- APPNMTS. BY GOVT., YUKON DISTRICT, SINCE AUG., 1896, NAMES, SALARIES, &c. : M. for Stmnt.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 1876 (i).
- MESSRS. WADE, MCGREGOR AND NORWOOD, DATE OF ARRIVAL AT DAWSON, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hubbert Tupper*) 3081 (i).
- SECOND JUDGE, YUKON JUDICIAL DISTRICT, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hubbert Tupper*) 3081 (i).
- SHERIFF, &c., YUKON TERRITORY : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hubbert Tupper*) 3943, 4268 (ii).
- YUKON TER., CLERK OF COURT, O. CS., BOND CERTIFICATES, &c. : M. for copies\* (Sir *Charles Hubbert Tupper*) 3149 (i).
- ARBITRATION, DOM. AND ONT., COST OF : in Com. of Sup., 8702 (iii).
- ARCHIVES : in Com. of Sup., 8224 (iii).
- ARCHIVES, CANADIAN : Report Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 4061 (ii).
- ARCHAT BREAKWATER, N.S., REPAIRS, &c., AMOUNT EXPENDED FROM 1891 TO 1896 : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5485 (ii).
- ARMOURIES, CONSTRUCTION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9125 (iii).
- ARMS, AMMUNITION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5466 (ii) ; 9141 (iii).
- ARMY AND NAVY IMPORTATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 8704 (iii).
- Aronsberg, *see* "Divorce."
- Arnprior, &c., *see* "Canada Atlantic."
- Arthabaska Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 46 (Mr. *Lavergne*). 1<sup>st</sup>\*, 1165 ; 2<sup>nd</sup>\*, 1389 ; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>\*, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 51.)
- ARTESIAN BORINGS, N. W. T. : in Com. of Sup., 7468, 9055 (iii).
- ARTILLERY, FORTRESS ARMAMENT : in Com. of Sup., 7152 (iii).
- ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS : in Com. of Sup., 8224 (iii).
- ASCENSION DAY : M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2790 (i).
- ASSENT, *see* "Bills."
- ASHCROFT, B. C., SALE OF RY. LANDS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1855 (i).
- RY. LANDS PURCHASED BY ASHCROFT WATER AND ELECTRIC CO., COR. WITH DOM. GOVT. : M. for Copies\* (Mr. *Prior*) 2408 (i).
- ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY, OTTAWA : in Com. of Sup., 9943 (iii).
- ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE AND GOVTL. ACTION : Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 4740, 5411 (ii).
- PETERSON, TATE & CO.'S BOND : Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2481 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 1883 (i).
- ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8915 ; in Com., 9450 (iii).

- Atlantic and North-west Ry. Co.'s B. No. 8** (Mr. *Campbell*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 618; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1113; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2152 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 52.)
- Atlas Loan Co.'s B. No. 30** (Mr. *Ingram*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 895; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1113 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5792 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 94.)
- ATLIN DISTRICT, BREWERY LICENSES ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 5484 (ii).
- ATWATER AVENUE, REBUILDING WALL: in Com. of Sup., 9173 (iii).
- AUD. GENERAL'S REPORT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 2180 (i).
- OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2086, 2269 (i).
- REP. PART I: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1165 (i).
- Inquiry for (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 531, 700 (i).
- Inquiry for (Mr. *Wallace*) 803 (i).
- Australasian and Canada Submarine Tel. Co.'s B. No. 176** (Mr. *Mulock*) prop. Res., 1950, 8348; in Com. on Res., 8383; 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 8386; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 8475 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 3.)
- Deb. on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 8348, 8383; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8358, 8383; (Mr. *Charlton*) 8369; (Mr. *Craig*) 8370; (Mr. *Oster*) 8371; (Mr. *Bostock*) 8372; (Mr. *Prior*) 8373; (Mr. *Casey*) 8373; (Mr. *McNeill*) 8381; (Mr. *Foster*) 8383; (Mr. *Britton*) 8383 (iii).
- AUTOMOBILE CARS, TORONTO POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9958 (iii).
- BABIN'S COVE WHARF, ARICHAT, N. S., COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5486 (ii).
- BADDECK, EAST BAY, & C., MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8692 (iii).
- N. S., ERECTION OF DRILL SHED: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 2111 (i).
- BAIE DES CHALEURS RY. CO., AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1843 (i).
- AGREEMENT, CONTRACT, EXPENSES, & C.: M. for Cor., & C.\* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2028 (i).
- BAIE DES HONFLEUR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10019 (iii).
- BAIE ST. PAUL: in Com. of Sup., 8104 (iii).
- BAIN, HON. THOS., ELECTION AS SPEAKER: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9062 (iii).
- BALL, MR. W. D., POSTMASTER AT BATH, ONT., DISMISSAL, PAPERS, & C.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Wilson*) 2390 (i).
- BALSAM LAKE, REMOVAL OF STONE PILES: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2332 (i).
- BANFF SPRING, ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii).
- Bank Act Amt. B. No. 127** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 3497; 2<sup>o</sup>\* and in Com., 3763; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3985 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 14.)
- Bank of Nova Scotia Authorization B. No. 53** (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1352; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1585 (i); withdn., 6047 (ii).
- Banque du Peuple B. No. 6** (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 618; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 934: on Order for Com., 3003; in Com., 3298 (i); 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3485 (ii); Sen. Amts., 7577 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 123.)
- BARNETT, C., ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 10137 (iii).
- BATE & CO.'S CONTRACT *re* YUKON SUPPLIES: in Com. of Sup., 6339 (ii); 7036, 7124 (iii).
- BATH POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 3877 (ii).
- BATISCAN POST OFFICE, CHARGES AGAINST POSTMASTER, REP. OF INSPECTOR, & C.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1966, 2320 (i).
- SALARY OF POSTMISTRESS: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*, 1970 (i).
- OBSTRUCTIONS TO NAVIGATION, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3552 (ii).
- BAUER, MR., DOM. LAND SURVEYOR *re* EXAMINATION PAPERS: Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 4713 (ii).
- Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4061, 4313, 4713, 4898 (ii).
- BAY OF QUINTE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8915; in Com., 9489, 9551 (iii).
- BEAR RIVER, REMOVAL OF OLD PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 10161 (iii).
- BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., conc., 10120 (iii).
- DAMAGE TO FARM LANDS BY OVERFLOW: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4859 (ii).
- DISMISSALS: M. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5411 (ii).
- LOCK LABOURERS, APPOINT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3267 (i).
- STEEL BRIDGE, & C.: in Com. of Sup., 7450 (iii).
- WATER POWER, IMPROVEMENTS, & C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1883 (i).
- BEAUMONT, WM., CLAIMS FOR DISTRIBUTING MAIL AT MAPLE BAY PRIOR TO CONFEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3820 (ii).
- Bedlington and Nelson Ry. Co.'s B. No. 107** (Mr. *Bostock*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2529; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2650 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3996 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 53.)
- BEE TROOT SUGAR, BOUNTY FOR MANUFACTURE, & C.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4823 (ii).
- BEHRING SEA ARBITRATION: in Com. of Sup., 5180 (ii).
- COST TO GOVT., & C.: Ques. (Mr. *McIsaac*) 2186 (i).
- Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 162** (Mr. *Hurley*). M. to introduce, 5384; 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5945; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 6338; in Com., 7479; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 7480 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 95.)
- BELLEVILLE PRINCE EDWARD BRIDGE CO.'S BILL: M. to extend Time for receiving Pet. (Mr. *Hurley*) 5384 (ii).
- BELLE RIVER, P.E.I., SEIZURE OF FISH TRAPS, & C.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Martin*) 2787 (i).
- BELLEY RIVER BRIDGE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 10070 (iii).
- BELGIL PUBLIC WORKS, TOTAL COST, & C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3827 (ii).
- "BENCH" AND "CREEK" CLAIMS, YUKON DISTRICT, DISPUTES PENDING, & C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 3077 (i).

- BENEFIT ASSOCIATIONS, INSURANCE AND ASSESSMENTS: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 1353 (i).
- Benevolent Societies Incorp. B. No. 87** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°, 2109 (i); withdn., 3748 (ii).
- BENNET HOSPITAL, YUKON DISTRICT, MATRON AND MEDICAL SUPT., NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1979 (i).
- BERNIER, MR. N., DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., conc., 10204 (iii).
- BERTHIER POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7619 (iii).
- PUBLIC BUILDING, PURCHASE OF SITE, &c., POSTMASTER'S SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1893, 2702, 2703 (i).
- BETHUNE, MR. C. J. R., PROFESSIONAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 5471 (ii).
- BIGGAR, J. L., APPOINT. BY GOVT., QUALIFICATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3549 (ii).
- BILODEAU, MR. JOB, POSTMASTER AT CHAMBORD, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1962 (i).
- BILODEAU, MR. L. P., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3336 (ii).
- BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, COM. FROM GOV. GEN'S. SEC.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 6928 (iii).
- BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*.)  
1°, 4; *pro formâ*.
- BILL (No. 2) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, so as to make more effectual provision for the punishment of Seduction and Abduction.—(Mr. *Charlton*.)  
1°, 421; 2°m., 1898; in Com., 2525; 3°m., 2911; agreed to (Y. 68; N. 29) 2930 (i).
- BILL (No. 3) Respecting the Canada Accident Assurance Company.—(Mr. *Monk*.)  
1°, 617; 2°, 933 (i); in Com. and 3°, 5042 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 98.)
- BILL (No. 4) To incorporate the Canada Plate Glass Assurance Company.—(Mr. *Monk*.)  
1°, 617; 2°, 933 (i); in Com., 5042; 3°, 5249 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 102.)
- BILL (No. 5) To incorporate the Alaska-Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Logan*.)  
1°, 617; 2°, 933 (i).
- BILL (No. 6) Respecting La Banque du Peuple.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*.)  
1°, 618; 2°, 934; on Order for Com., 3003; in Com., 3298 (i); 3°m., 3485 (ii); Sen. Amts., 7577 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 123.)
- BILL (No. 7) To incorporate the Yale-Kootenay Telegraph Company.—(Mr. *Bostock*.)  
1°, 618; 2°, 934; in Com. and 3°, 3003 (i); Sen. Amts., 8822 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 131.)
- BILL (No. 8) Respecting the Atlantic and North-west Railway Company.—(Mr. *MacPherson*.)  
1°, 618; 2°, 1113; in Com. and 3°, 2152 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 52.)
- BILL (No. 9) Respecting the Calvin Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Britton*.)  
1°, 618; 2°, 934; withdn., 2897 (i).
- BILL (No. 10) Respecting the Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert.—(Mr. *Davis*.)  
1°, 618; 2°, 934 (i); in Com., 3842; 3°, 3996 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 119.)
- BILL (No. 11) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Thomas Robertson.—(Mr. *Ross Robertson*.)  
1°, 618; 2°, 934; in Com. and 3°, 2644 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 127.)
- BILL (No. 12) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George L. Williams.—(Mr. *McCarthy*.)  
1°, 618; 2°, 934; in Com. and 3°, 3003 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 130.)
- BILL (No. 13) Respecting the Home Life Association of Canada.—(Mr. *Cowan*.)  
1°, 618; 2°, 934; in Com. and 3°, 2698 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 114.)
- BILL (No. 14) Respecting the Quebec Steamship Company.—(Mr. *Malouin*.)  
1°, 618; 2°, 934; in Com. and 3°, 2697 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 125.)
- BILL (No. 15) To regulate the trade in grain in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Douglas*.)  
1°, 618; 2°, 1901 (i).
- BILL (No. 16) Respecting joint securities for seed grain indebtedness, Manitoba and the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Douglas*.)  
1°, 618; withdn., 9893 (iii).
- BILL (No. 17) Respecting the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company.—(Mr. *Champagne*.)  
1°, 700; 2°, 934; in Com. and 3°, 2524 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 83.)
- BILL (No. 18) Respecting the Ottawa Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)  
1°, 100; 2°, 934; in Com., 2150; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2284 (i); in Com. and 3°, 3842 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 82.)
- BILL (No. 19) To amend the Act respecting certain works constructed in or over navigable waters.—(Mr. *Britton*.)  
1°, 700; 2°, 1862; in Com., 1896; 3°, 2153 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 32.)
- BILL (No. 20) To incorporate the Zenith Mining and Railway Company.—(Mr. *Poupart*.)  
1°, 803; 2°, 1113 (i); in Com., and 3°, 7577 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 92.)
- BILL (No. 21) Respecting the Canadian Railway Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)  
1°, 803; 2°, 1113; in Com. and 3°, 2697 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 106.)
- BILL (No. 22) To incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)  
1°, 803; 2°, 1113 (i).
- BILL (No. 23) Respecting the Alberta Irrigation Company, and to change its name to "The Canadian North-west Irrigation Company."—(Mr. *Douglas*.)  
1°, 803; 2°, 1113; in Com. and 3°, 2152 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 93.)

- BILL (No. 24)** Concerning drainage on and across the property of Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Casey*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 803; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1917; M. for Sel. Com., 2153, 2930, 2949 (i); ref. to Sel. Com., 3849 (ii.)
- BILL (No. 25)** To confirm an agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Hull Electric Company.—(Mr. *Poupore*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 895; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1113; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2320 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 59.)
- BILL (No. 26)** Respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Costigan*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 895; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1389; in Com., 2645; 3<sup>o</sup>m., 2934; agreed to (Y. 61; N. 14) 2949 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 63.)
- BILL (No. 27)** Respecting the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 895; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1113; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3003 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 126.)
- BILL (No. 28)** Respecting the British Columbia and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Prior*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 895; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1113; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2644 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
- BILL (No. 29)** To incorporate "Le Chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord."—(Mr. *Bourassa*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 895; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1389; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 62.)
- BILL (No. 30)** Respecting the Atlas Loan Company.—(Mr. *Ingram*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 895; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1113 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5792 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 94.)
- BILL (No. 31)** To amend the Winding-Up Act.—(Mr. *Fortin*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 895; 2<sup>o</sup>m., 1867 (i), 4314; in Com., 4314; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4859 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 42.)
- BILL (No. 32)** To amend the Act respecting the sale of railway passenger tickets.—(Mr. *Beattie*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 895; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1875 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4323 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9461 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- BILL (No. 33)** Respecting the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bertram*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 974; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1389 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3842 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 78.)
- BILL (No. 34)** Respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Poupore*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 974; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1389; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2152 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 84.)
- BILL (No. 35)** To incorporate the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—(Mr. *Poupore*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 974; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1389; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 66.)
- BILL (No. 36)** To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. *Britton*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 974; 2<sup>o</sup>m., 2160, 2527 (i).
- BILL (No. 37)** To amend the Naturalization Act.—(Mr. *McInnes*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 974; 2<sup>o</sup>m., 2176, 2527 (i).
- BILL (No. 38)** Respecting the attachment of salaries of public officers and employees of the Government.—(Mr. *Richardson*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 974; 2<sup>o</sup>m., 1923 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>, 5374, in Com., 5898 (ii).
- BILL (No. 39)** To provide for the issuing of railway passes to members of the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. *Bostock*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1073; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 2195 (i).
- BILL (No. 40)** To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, with respect to Combinations in Restraint of Trade.—(Mr. *Sproule*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1073; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1936 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4859 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 46.)
- BILL (No. 41)** In further amendment of the Trade Mark and Design Act.—(Mr. *Bertram*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1073; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1947 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3849 (ii).
- BILL (No. 42)** Respecting the Portage du Fort and Bristol Branch Railway Company.—(Mr. *Poupore*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1165; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1389 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4857 (ii).
- BILL (No. 43)** Respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ingram*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1165; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1389; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2152 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 56.)
- BILL (No. 44)** To incorporate the Alaska and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Gillies*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1165; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1389 (i).
- BILL (No. 45)** To incorporate the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. *Tisdale*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1165; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1389; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3003 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 128.)
- BILL (No. 46)** To incorporate the Arthabaska Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lavergne*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1165; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1389; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 51.)
- BILL (No. 47)** Respecting the Brandon and Southwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1165; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1389; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2290 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 54.)
- BILL (No. 48)** To impose certain restrictions on Immigration.—(Mr. *McInnes*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1165 (i).
- BILL (No. 49)** To amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—(Mr. *Maxwell*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1165 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 4323 (ii).
- BILL (No. 50)** To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. *Monk*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1264; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 2204; Amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 m. h. agreed to (Y. 64; N. 39) 2245 (i).
- BILL (No. 51)** To incorporate the Canadian Inland Transportation Company.—(Mr. *Richardson*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1352; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1585 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 104.)
- BILL (No. 52)** To incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1352; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1862 (i).
- BILL (No. 53)** To authorize the Bank of Nova Scotia to issue sterling notes for circulation in the Island of Jamaica.—(Mr. *Borden*, Halifax.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1352; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1585 (i); withdn., 6047 (ii).
- BILL (No. 54)** Respecting the Eastern Trust Company.—(Mr. *Borden*, Halifax.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1352; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1585 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 110.)

- BILL (No. 55)** Further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Penny*)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1352 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>, 3871; withdn., 5360 (ii).
- BILL (No. 56)** To define the size of small fruit packages.—(Mr. *Penny*)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1352; on Order for 2<sup>o</sup>, 3316 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>, 3872; withdn., 5360 (ii).
- BILL (No. 57)** Respecting the British Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company, and to change its name to the British Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1431; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1862 (ii).
- BILL (No. 58)** Respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. *Edwards*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1540; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1862; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 60.)
- BILL (No. 59)** To incorporate the Russell, Dundas and Grenville Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. *Edwards*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1540; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1862; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 87.)
- BILL (No. 60)** To authorize the amalgamation of the Erie and Huron Railway Company and the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. *McGregor*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1540; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1862 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3492 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 67.)
- BILL (No. 61)** Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Gibson*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1753; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1955 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4189 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 58.)
- BILL (No. 62)** Respecting the Canada Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. *Gibson*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1753; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1955 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3689 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 99.)
- BILL (No. 63)** To amend the Act respecting the Civil Service of Canada.—(Mr. *McMullen*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1753; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 3316 (i).
- BILL (No. 64)** In amendment of the Yukon Territory Act.—(Mr. *McInnes*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1813 (i).
- BILL (No. 65)** To incorporate the Restigouche Boom Company.—(Mr. *McAlister*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1949; on Order, 2152, 2524, 2648; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2698 (i); ref. back to Sel. Com., 6824 (ii); withdn., 8989 (iii).
- BILL (No. 66)** Respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. *McHugh*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1949; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2290; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 73.)
- BILL (No. 67)** Respecting the Welland Power and Supply Canal Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Gibson*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1949; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2290; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3003 (i). (22-63 *Vic.*, c. 129.)
- BILL (No. 68)** Respecting the London Mutual Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Calvert*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1949; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2152 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 4189 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 118.)
- BILL (No. 69)** To incorporate the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—(Mr. *Calvert*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1949; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2152 (i); M. for Com., 5042, 5250; in Com., 5262, 5351; 3<sup>o</sup>, 5535 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 77.)
- BILL (No. 70)** Respecting the Bronsons and Weston Lumber Company, and to change its name to the Bronson Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1949; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2152; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3003 (i); Sen. Amts., 7577 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 96.)
- BILL (No. 71)** To incorporate the Algoma Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dymont*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1949; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2152 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 6879 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- BILL (No. 72)** Respecting Railways.—(Mr. *Davin*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 1952 (i).
- BILL (No. 73)** Respecting the James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hughes*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2029; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2290 (i); in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3842 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 71.)
- BILL (No. 74)** Respecting the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company.—(Mr. *Beattie*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2029; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2290 (i); in Com., 4302; 4846; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4846 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 115.)
- BILL (No. 75)** To incorporate the Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Corporation.—(Mr. *Oster*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2029; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2320 (i); in Com., 4302, 4846; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4846 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 101.)
- BILL (No. 76)** Respecting the Dominion of Canada Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Oster*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2029; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2290 (i); in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4302 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 108.)
- BILL (No. 77)** Respecting the Canadian Power Company, and to change its name to the Ontario Power Company of Niagara Falls.—(Mr. *Bertram*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2029; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2290; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3996 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 105.)
- BILL (No. 78)** Respecting the Hamilton Powder Company.—(Mr. *Penny*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2029; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2290 (i); in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 138.)
- BILL (No. 79)** To amend the Mounted Police Pensions Act, 1887.—(Mr. *Davin*.)  
1<sup>o</sup> m., 2029 (ii).
- BILL (No. 80)** Further to amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. *Ethier*.)  
1<sup>o</sup> m., 2032 (i).
- BILL (No. 81)** To amend the Dominion Elections Act, by providing for the use of Macdonald voting machines.—(Mr. *Britton*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2035 (i).
- BILL (No. 82)** To determine the length of the working day for workmen and labourers.—(Mr. *Beattie*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2036 (i).
- BILL (No. 83)** Respecting the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company.—(Mr. *Rutherford*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2107; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2524 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 79.)

- BILL (No. 84)** Respecting the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company, and to change its name to "The Quebec Railway, Light and Power Company.—(Mr. *Carroll*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2108; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2524 (i); in Com., 5041, 5249; 3<sup>o</sup>, 5250 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 85.)
- BILL (No. 85)** Further to amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Blair*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2108 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>, and ref. to Sel. Com., 3503 (ii); in Com., 9731; 3<sup>o</sup>, 9749 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 37.)
- BILL (No. 86)** To further amend the Insurance Act.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2108 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>, and ref. to Sel. Com., 3504; in Com., 6391 (ii); 7001; 3<sup>o</sup>, 7001 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 13.)
- BILL (No. 87)** Respecting the Incorporation of Benevolent Societies.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2109 (i); withdn., 3748 (ii).
- BILL (No. 88, from the Senate)** For the relief of David Stock.—(Mr. *McCarthy*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2604; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2698 (i); in Com., 3489; 3<sup>o</sup>, 3491 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 134.)
- BILL (No. 89)** Relating to the Canada Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. *Wood*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2182; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2320 (i); withdn., 4477 (ii).
- BILL (No. 90)** Respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macpherson*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2182; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2320 (i); 3<sup>o</sup> m., 4189, 4524, 4771; agreed to (Y. 51; N. 21) 4786 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 69.)
- BILL (No. 91)** To amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2182 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 3914; in Com., 3915; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 3985; agreed to (Y. 80; N. 40) 3990; 3<sup>o</sup>, 3990; Sen. Amts., 6100 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 34.)
- BILL (No. 92)** Respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. *Landerkin*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2246; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2524 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 3996 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 89.)
- BILL (No. 93)** To incorporate the Edmonton and Saskatchewan Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2246; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2524 (i); in Com., 4302, 4847; 3<sup>o</sup>, 4857 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 65.)
- BILL (No. 94)** Respecting the Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company (Foreign).—(Mr. *Morrison*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2246; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2525 (i).
- BILL (No. 95)** Respecting the Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hughes*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2246; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2525 (i); in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 74.)
- BILL (No. 96)** Respecting the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—(Mr. *McCleary*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2247; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2525 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 97.)
- BILL (No. 97)** In further amendment of the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Cowan*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2247 (i).
- BILL (No. 98)** Respecting the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Guillet*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2318; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2650; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 61.)
- BILL (No. 99)** To incorporate the Canadian Mutual Benefit Advertising Company (Limited).—(Mr. *McAlister*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2318; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2525 (i).
- BILL (No. 100)** Respecting the Guarantee and Pension Fund Society of the Dominion Bank, and to change its name to the Pension Fund Society of the Dominion Bank.—(Mr. *Bertram*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2409; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2650 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 4302 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 112.)
- BILL (No. 101)** To incorporate the Glenora Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2409; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2650 (i).
- BILL (No. 102)** To incorporate the Yukon Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2409; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2650 (i).
- BILL (No. 103)** To incorporate the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—(Mr. *Maxwell*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2409; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2698 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 3996 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 72.)
- BILL (No. 104)** Respecting the Dominion Permanent Loan Company.—(Mr. *Clarke*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2409; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2525 (i); in Com., 6868; 3<sup>o</sup>, 6878 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 109.)
- BILL (No. 105, from the Senate)** For the Preservation of Health on Public Works.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2604 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>, 7645; in Com., 7667; 3<sup>o</sup>, 7675 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
- BILL (No. 106)** To incorporate the Canadian Birkbeck Investment and Savings Company.—(Mr. *Bertram*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2529; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2698 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 6326 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 103.)
- BILL (No. 107)** Respecting the Bedlington and Nelson Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bostock*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2529; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2650 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 3996 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 53.)
- BILL (No. 108)** Respecting the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Pontiac, and to change its name to The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Pembroke.—(Mr. *Poupore*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2529; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2698 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 3491 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 124.)
- BILL (No. 109)** To further amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *Flint*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2604 (i).
- BILL (No. 110)** Respecting the Hudson's Bay and Yukon Railways and Navigation Company.—(Mr. *Oliver*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2696; 2<sup>o</sup>, 3003 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 4857 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 70.)
- BILL (No. 111)** In further amendment of the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *McInnes*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 2696 (i).

- BILL (No. 112) Respecting the Montreal Island Belt Line Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lemieux.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2789; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3004 (i); on order for Com., 5897; M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 6091; in Com., 6327, 6404; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 6405 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 76.)
- BILL (No. 113) To incorporate the Canada Mining and Metallurgical Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Haley.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2790; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3004 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5792 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.* c. 100.)
- BILL (No. 114) To amend the Act respecting Joint Stock Companies.—(Mr. *Britton.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2790 (i).
- BILL (No. 115) To incorporate the Sudbury and Wahnapiatae Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2897; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3004 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4857 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 90.)
- BILL (No. 116) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, with respect to cruelty to animals.—(Mr. *Penny.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2963 (i).
- BILL (No. 117) To incorporate the Ottawa Suburban Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2966 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3492 (ii).
- BILL (No. 118) Respecting the Great Northern Railway Company, and to change its name to the Great Northern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Savard.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2966 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3492 (ii); in Com., 6970; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 6972 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
- BILL (No. 119) Respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Frost.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2966 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3492; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4189 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 86.)
- BILL (No. 120) To incorporate the Rutland and Noyan Railway Company.—(Mr. *Brodeur.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3149 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3492; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3996 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 88.)
- BILL (No. 121) Respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3150 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3492; in Com., 4302; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4524 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 80.)
- BILL (No. 122) In further amendment of the Weights and Measures Act.—(Mr. *McMillan.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 3254 (i).
- BILL (No. 123) Further to amend "The Adulteration Act."—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3334; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, and in Com., 3990, 3996; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3997 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 26.)
- BILL (No. 124) To amend "The Inland Revenue Act."—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3334; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, and in Com., 3759, 3881; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3884 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 24.)
- BILL (No. 125) To amend the Act respecting canned goods.—(Mr. *Ellis.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3334 (ii).
- BILL (No. 126) Respecting representation in the House of Commons.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)  
1<sup>o</sup> m., 3442, 3492; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 5207, 5262, 6464, 6596, 6606; agreed to (Y. 77; N. 41) 6722; in Com., 6758 (ii), 6904, 6940, 6972; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 7000 (iii).
- BILL (No. 127) To amend "The Bank Act."—(Mr. *Fielding.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 3497; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, and in Com., 3763; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3985 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 14.)
- BILL (No. 128) Further to amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 3544; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, and in Com., 3885 (ii); 9883; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 9893 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 28.)
- BILL (No. 129) Respecting "The General Trust Corporation of Canada."—(Mr. *McMullen.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3646; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3844; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5792 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 111.)
- BILL (No. 130) Respecting the "The London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Bain.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3647; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 5358; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 6327 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 117.)
- BILL (No. 131) Respecting the inspection of petroleum and naphtha.—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière.*)  
Prop. Res., 3647; 1<sup>o</sup>, 3749; 2<sup>o</sup>\* and in Com., 3884; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3990 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 27.)
- BILL (No. 132) To amend "The General Inspection Act."—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 3751; withdn., 5098 (ii).
- BILL (No. 133) To authorize the acquisition by the Dominion of the Drummond County Railway.—(Mr. *Blair.*)  
Prop. Res., 1949, 2792; in Com. on Res., 2843 (i), 3345, 3379, 3560, 3689; 1<sup>o</sup>, 3765; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 3907, 4152; in Com., 4165, 4733; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 4899; agreed to (Y. 91; N. 40) 4966 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9726 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 6.)
- BILL (No. 134) To amend the Temperance Act, 1864.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 3874 (ii).
- BILL (No. 135) In further amendment of the Militia Act.—(Mr. *Domville.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 4055 (ii).
- BILL (No. 136, from the Senate) For the relief of Annie Inkson Dowding.—(Mr. *Clarke.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4147; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 5359; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5792 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 133.)
- BILL (No. 137) Further to amend the Act respecting the Protection of Navigable Waters.—(Sir *Louis Davies.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 4150; 2<sup>o</sup>, 6118; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 6119 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9597 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 31.)
- BILL (No. 138) To confirm an agreement entered into by Her Majesty with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada for the purpose of securing the extension of the Intercolonial Railway system to the city of Montreal.—(Mr. *Blair.*)  
Prop. Res., 3946; in Com. on Res., 4062; 1<sup>o</sup>, 4170; 2<sup>o</sup>, 4171; in Com., 4353, 4554; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 4966 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9702 (iii) (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 5.)
- BILL (No. 139) Respecting the Nova Scotia Steel Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4259; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 5359; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 6606 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 121.)

- BILL (No. 140)** Respecting the Canadian Railway Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to the Dominion Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 4259; 2<sup>o</sup>, 5359; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 6879 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 107.)
- BILL (No. 141)** To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Penberthy Injector Company.—(Mr. *McGregor.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 4340; 2<sup>o</sup>, 5359 (ii); in Com., 6878; 3<sup>o</sup>, 6879 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 122.)
- BILL (No. 142)** In further amendment of the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. *Ingram.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 4341 (iii).
- BILL (No. 143)** To amend the Weights and Measures Act as respects the sale of Fish.—(Mr. *Ganong.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 4477 (ii).
- BILL (No. 144, from the Senate)** For the relief of Abraham Aronsberg.—(Mr. *Landerkin.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 4730; 2<sup>o</sup>, 5359 (ii); in Com., 7480, 7575; 3<sup>o</sup>, 7809 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 132.)
- BILL (No. 145)** To amalgamate the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company and the Canada Atlantic Railway Company under the name of the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 4804; 2<sup>o</sup>, 5359 (ii); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 7577 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 81.)
- BILL (No. 146)** Further to amend the Act respecting the Department of the Geological Survey.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 4891; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 6396; 3<sup>o</sup>, 6459 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 21.)
- BILL (No. 147)** Further to amend the Act respecting the Department of the Interior.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 4892; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 6397; 3<sup>o</sup>, 6459 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 15.)
- BILL (No. 148)** Further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 4894; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 6400, 6405; 3<sup>o</sup>, 6459 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 16.)
- BILL (No. 149)** Further to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 4895; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 6442; 3<sup>o</sup>, 6459 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 17.)
- BILL (No. 150, from the Senate)** To incorporate the Imperial Loan Investment Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 5096; 2<sup>o</sup>, 5536; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 6326 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 116.)
- BILL (No. 151, from the Senate)** Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 5096; 2<sup>o</sup>, 5536; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 6100 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 57.)
- BILL (No. 152, from the Senate)** Respecting the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Morrison.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 5096; 2<sup>o</sup>, 5536; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 5897 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 120.)
- BILL (No. 153)** To amend the Unorganized Territories Game Preservation Act, 1894.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 4991; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 6442 (ii); 3<sup>o</sup>, 6459 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 20.)
- BILL (No. 154)** Further to amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. *Paterson.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 4991; 2<sup>o</sup>, and in Com., 6443 (ii); 3<sup>o</sup>, 6939 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 22.)
- BILL (No. 155)** Further to amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 5096; 2<sup>o</sup>, 6102; in Com., 6104; 3<sup>o</sup>, 6118 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 29.)
- BILL (No. 156)** Further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 5099 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup>, and in Com., 9636; 3<sup>o</sup>, 9660 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 25.)
- BILL (No. 157)** Respecting the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hughes.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 5205; 2<sup>o</sup>, 5536; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 6405 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 75.)
- BILL (No. 158)** Respecting the Edmonton District Railway Company, and to change its name to the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 5384; 2<sup>o</sup>, 5536 (ii); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 6879 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
- BILL (No. 159)** Respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to railway debts.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 5385; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 6101 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 44.)
- BILL (No. 160, from the Senate)** An Act to amend the Companies Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 5744 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup>, 7645; in Com., 8774; 3<sup>o</sup>, 8779 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 40.)
- BILL (No. 161)** Respecting steel and iron made in Canada.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)  
Prop. Res., 4150, 4967; in Com. on Res., 4989; 1<sup>o</sup>, 5744 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup>, and in Com., 7638; 3<sup>o</sup>, 7644 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 8.)
- BILL (No. 162)** To incorporate the Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Hurley.*)  
M. to introduce, 5384; 1<sup>o</sup>, 5945; 2<sup>o</sup>, 6338 (ii); in Com., 7479; 3<sup>o</sup>, 7480 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 95.)
- BILL (No. 163, from the Senate)** Further to amend the Winding-Up Act.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 6120 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup>, 7001; in Com., 8780; 3<sup>o</sup>, 8781 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 43.)
- BILL (No. 164, from the Senate)** Respecting Loan Companies.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 6120; 2<sup>o</sup> and ref. to Sel. Com., 6391 (ii); in Com., 8475; 3<sup>o</sup>, 8477 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- BILL (No. 165)** To incorporate the Yukon River and Atlin Lake Improvement Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 6120; 2<sup>o</sup>, 6405 (ii); withdn., 8947 (iii).
- BILL (No. 166)** Respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. *McAlister.*)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 6120; 2<sup>o</sup>, 6338 (ii); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 6879 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 91.)

- BILL (No. 167, from the Senate) To provide for the administration of Criminal Justice in the Territory East of Manitoba and Keewatin and North of Ontario and Quebec.—(Mr. Sifton.)**  
1°\*, 6279 (ii); 2°, 8171; in Com. and 3°\*, 8172 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 47.)
- BILL (No. 168, from the Senate) Further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Sir Louis Davies.)**  
1°\*, 6397 (ii).
- BILL (No. 169) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1899, and the 30th June, 1900, and for other purposes relating to the public service.—(Mr. Fielding.)**  
1°, 6464; 2°\* in Com. and 3°\*, 6596 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 1.)
- BILL (No. 170) Respecting the Safety of Ships.—(Sir Louis Davies.)**  
1°, 6929; 2°, 9598; in Com. and 3°, 9599 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 33.)
- BILL (No. 171, from the Senate) To provide for the Conditional Liberation of Penitentiary Convicts.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)**  
1°\*, 7000; 2° and in Com., 9599, 9726; 3°\*, 9731 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 49.)
- BILL (No. 172) To incorporate the British America Pulp and Paper Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)**  
1°\*, 7441; 2°\*, 7809; in Com. and 3°\*, 9250 (iii).
- BILL (No. 173, from the Senate) Further to amend the Penitentiary Act.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)**  
1°\*, 7873; 2° and in Com., 8762; 3°\*, 8774 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 48.)
- BILL (No. 174, from the Senate) Respecting Usury.—(Mr. Rinfret.)**  
1°\*, 8217 (iii).
- BILL (No. 175) Further to amend the Act respecting Roads and Road Allowances in the Province of Manitoba.—(Mr. Sifton.)**  
1°, 8151; 2° and in Com., 8470; 3°\*, 9597 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 19.)
- BILL (No. 176) To provide for the establishment of direct submarine telegraphic communication between Canada and Australasia.—(Mr. Mulock.)**  
Prop. Res., 1950 (i) 8348; in Com. on Res., 8383; 1°\*, 8386; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 8475 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 3.)
- BILL (No. 177) To encourage the Construction of Dry Docks.—(Mr. Fielding.)**  
Prop. Res., 6123 (ii); in Com. on Res., 8472; 1°\*, 8474; 2° and in Com., 8757; 3°\*, 8762 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 9.)
- BILL (No. 178) Respecting the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.—(Mr. Fielding.)**  
1°, 8751; 2°, 9683; in Com., 9861; 3°\*, 9880 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 35.)
- BILL (No. 179) Respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Fielding.)**  
1°, 8752; 2° and in Com., 9880; 3°\*, 9963 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 36.)
- BILL (No. 180, from the Senate) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act.**  
This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.
- BILL (No. 181, from the Senate) For the relief of Isaac Stephen Gerow Van Wart.—(Mr. Landerkin.)**  
1°\*, 8913; 2°\*, 9056; in Com., and 3°\*, 9532 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 135.)
- BILL (No. 182) Respecting the Departments of Customs and Inland Revenue.—(Mr. Fielding.)**  
Prop. Res., 8753; in Com. on Res., 8923; 1°\*, 8947; 2° and in Com., 9661; 3°, 9683 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 23.)
- BILL (No. 183) To authorize the Government of Canada to construct a branch line of Railway from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour, in the Province of Prince Edward Island, as a public work.—(Mr. Blair.)**  
1°\*, 8989; 2°\* and in Com., 9750; 3°\*, 9758 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 4.)
- BILL (No. 184, from the Senate) Further to amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)**  
1°\*, 9178.
- BILL (No. 185, from the Senate) To amend the Expropriation Act.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)**  
1°\*, 9178; 2° in Com., and 3°\*, 10220 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 39.)
- BILL (No. 186, from the Senate) To amend the Yukon Territory Act.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)**  
1°\*, 9178; 2° and in Com., 9849; 3°\*, 9861 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 11.)
- BILL (No. 187) Respecting the City of Ottawa.—(Mr. Fielding.)**  
Prop. Res., 5098 (ii); in Com. on Res., 9186; 1°\*, 9197; 2°, 9609; in Com., 9626; 3°\*, 9636 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 10.)
- BILL (No. 188, from the Senate) To amend the Act passed at the present Session of Parliament, intitled: "An Act respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to Railway Debts."—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)**  
1°\*, 9309; 2°, 9835; in Com. and 3°\*, 9835 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 45.)
- BILL (No. 189) Respecting securities for Seed Grain indebtedness.—(Mr. Sifton.)**  
1°, 9464; 2° and in Com., 9847; 3°, 9849 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 18.)
- BILL (No. 190) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. Blair.)**  
Prop. Res., 8914; in Com. on Res., 9197, 9310, 9466, 9532; 1°\*, 9597; 2°, 9758; in Com., 9759; 3°, 9893 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 7.)
- BILL (No. 191) Further to amend the Acts respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. Fielding.)**  
1°, 9696; 2° and in Com., 9846; 3°\*, 9847 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 12.)

- BILL (No. 192)** An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1900, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.  
1<sup>o</sup>\* ; 2<sup>o</sup>\* ; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 10246 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 2.)
- BINDER TWINE IMPORTED IN 1899**: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 8218, 8990 (iii).
- **OUTPUT OF KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, TENDERS, PRICE, &c.**: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1825 (i), 3944 (ii), 6934 (iii).
- Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1837 (i).
- **M.** (Mr. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 9898 (iii).
- BLAIS, MR. J. C., AMOUNT PAID BY GOVERNMENT**: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3545 (ii).
- BLANCHETTE, MR. EUGENE, REINSTATEMENT BY GOVT.**: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 5859 (ii).
- BLISS, MAJ. D. C. F., POSITION UNDER GOVT., SALARY, &c.**: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3261 (i), 3335, 3552 (ii).
- BOIVIN, GIDÉON, CONTRACT FOR STONE AT RIVIÈRE LA PIPE WHARF**: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4061 (ii).
- BOLDUC, MR. A., SALARY**: in Com. of Sup., 5798; Conc., 6387 (ii).
- BONDS GIVEN BY OFFICIALS, RECORD OR LIST FOR NAMES**: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5310 (ii).
- **REGISTERED UNDER R.S.C., PREPARATION FOR PARLT. re YUKON DISTRICT**: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4804 (ii).
- BOSTON AND ALASKAN TRANSPORTATION CO., CONTRACT WITH CAN. GOVT.**: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1828 (i).
- BOTHWELL ELECTION, SPEECH OF THE HON. MR. MILLS IN THE SENATE**: Remarks (Mr. Clancy) 9896 (iii).
- BOUNTIES ON IRON AND STEEL**: prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 4150 (ii).
- BOUNTIES.** See "Iron and Steel."
- BOURASSA, MR., EMPLOYMT. IN YUKON POST OFFICE**: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1833, 1958 (ii).
- BOURGET, P. A., POSTMASTER AT LÉVIS, INCREASE OF SALARY**: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4059 (ii).
- BOWMANVILLE HARBOUR**: in Com. of Sup., 7966 (iii).
- Brandon and South-western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 47** (Mr. Morrison) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1165; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1389; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2290 (i). (62-63 Vic., c. 54.)
- BRANTFORD POSTMASTER, APPOINT. BY GOVT., &c.**: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 1968 (i), 8464 (iii).
- BREMNER, CHAS., INDEMNITY, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 10113, 10167 (iii).
- BREVET PROMOTIONS, PERMANENT FORCE, REGULATIONS, &c.**: Ques. (Mr. Ross Robertson) 3550 (ii).
- BRIDGES, OTTAWA CITY**: in Com. of Sup., 8147 (iii).
- BRITISH AMERICAN BANK NOTE CO. vs. THE QUEEN, ACTION BY GOVT.**: Ques. (Mr. Fraser, Lambton) 6050 (ii).
- BRITISH AMERICAN BANK NOTE CO., CLAIMS FOR BALANCE DUE**: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Foster) 2180 (i).
- British American Pulp and Paper Co. incorp. B. No. 172** (Mr. Belcourt) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 7441; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 7809; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 9250 (iii).
- BRITISH CANADIAN GOLDFIELDS CO.**: Ret. laid on Table, 3959 (ii).
- BRITISH COLUMBIA**:
- ABENAKIS INDIANS, LEGAL EXPENSES**: in Com. of Sup., 10110 (iii).
- ALASKA BOUNDARY AND CUSTOMS OFFICIALS, DIFFICULTIES WITH MOUNTED POLICE**: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 2193 (i).
- **AND PACIFIC CABLE, ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGREEMENT**: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 5386 (ii).
- **MODUS VIVENDI, RUMOURED ARRANGEMENTS**: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 2535 (i).
- **M.** (Sir Charles Tupper) to adjn., 8152 (iii).
- **PROTOCOLS**: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4259 (ii).
- ALIEN ACT, B. C., COR. WITH B. C. GOVT.**: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 8220, 8466, 8757 (iii).
- **DISALLOWANCE BY DOM. GOVT.**: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 7768 (iii).
- ASHCROFT, B. C., RY. LANDS PURCHASED BY ASHCROFT WATER AND ELECTRIC CO., COR. WITH DOM. GOVT.**: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Prior) 2408 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1855 (i).
- ATLIN DISTRICT, BREWERY LICENSES ISSUED**: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 5484 (ii).
- BAUER, DOM. LAND SURVEYOR, B. C., EXAMINATION OF PAPERS, &c.**: Remarks (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4061, 4313, 4713, 4898 (ii).
- BEAUMONT, Wm., CLAIMS FOR DISTRIBUTING MAIL AT MAPLE BAY PRIOR TO CONFEDERATION**: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 3820 (ii).
- BRITISH CANADIAN GOLDFIELDS CO.**: Ret. laid on Table, 3959 (ii).
- BRITISH COLUMBIA LT.-GOVERNOR AND TURNER ADMINISTRATION, AND CAN. GOVT.**: M. for Cor. (Mr. Prior) 2362 (i).
- **Papers laid on Table**, 3950 (ii).
- **SUPREME AND COUNTY COURT JUDGES, COR. BETWEEN B. C. AND DOM. GOVT., re ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN B. C.**: M. for Cor. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2362 (i).
- BROTCHIES LEDGE, B. C., LIGHTHOUSE, COMPLETION AND OPERATION**: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 2331 (i).
- BUILDINGS, B. C.**: in Com. of Sup., 9988 (iii).
- BURREARD, MEMBER FOR, SPEECH re AMOUNTS PAID TO VANCOUVER LIBERALS BY DOM. GOVT.**: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1838 (i).
- **USE OF REVEREND IN QUESTION**: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1838 (i).
- CHEMAINUS, B. C., PILOTAGE LIMITS**: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 5312 (ii).
- CHIEF JUSTICE McCOLL (B. C.), JUDICIAL RESIDENCE**: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3546 (ii).
- CHINESE ANTI-LEGISLATION IN B. C., AND GOVT. ACTION**: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1837 (i).
- CIRCUIT ALLOWANCE, B. C.**: in Com. of Sup., 5471 (ii).
- COAL MINING UNDER NANAIMO HARBOUR, LEASES, &c.**: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8991 (iii).
- COLUMBIA RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 8085 (iii).
- COMMERCIAL TELEGRAPH COMPANY, COR. WITH MANAGERS, INCOMPLETE RETURN**: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 5409 (ii).
- **CONSTRUCTION SYNDICATE**: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Prior) 3752 (ii).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*

- CROWN TIMBER OFFICE, NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C., COMPLAINTS, INSTRUCTIONS AND REP. OF MR. ARCHER MARTIN: M. for Copies\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3149 (i).
- DEADMAN'S ISLAND, COR. BETWEEN DOM. GOVT. AND B. HAIGH & SON (1880) *re* APPLICATION FOR USE: &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Prior) 2788 (i).
- FORFEITURE OF LEASE BY MR. LUDGATE: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 4739 (ii).
- LEASES, VALUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1815 (i).
- *par.* in Montreal *Witness re* Lease (Mr. Prior) 1353, 1640 (i).
- Ret. Laid on Table, 3959 (ii).
- DRILL HALL, VANCOUVER, B.C., CONTRACT, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 5487, 6122 (ii), 7765 (iii).
- in Com. of Sup., 9988 (iii).
- DRY DOCK, VICTORIA, B.C., PETS. *re* REDUCTION OF CHARGES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 7766 (iii).
- ESQUIMALT (B. C.) DRY DOCK, REDUCTION OF RATES, PETS., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 6122 (ii).
- DEFENCE: in Com. of Sup., 7151 (iii).
- FISHERMEN, SEIZURE OF NETS BY AMERICANS, *PAR.* IN VICTORIA *Daily Colonist*: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 8633 (iii).
- FRASER AND SKEENA RIVER FISH HATCHERIES, ERECTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 4058 (ii).
- FRASER RIVER, B.C., MILLER'S LANDING, IMPROVEMENTS, EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. 2701 (i).
- CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 8088 (iii).
- GOVT. PROPERTY (B.C.), LEASE, &c., COR. RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 8465 (iii).
- RENTAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 8991 (iii).
- GREY, ROBERT, LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER AT ENTRANCE ISLAND, RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 7319 (iii).
- HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 8085 (iii).
- INDIANS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5703, 5725 (ii).
- HOSPITALS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5726 (ii).
- RESERVES (B.C.) AND MINING RIGHTS: in Com. of Sup., 5703 (ii).
- YALE AND CARIBOO, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 8630, 8989 (iii).
- JAPANESE LABOUR EXCLUSION BILL, B.C., LEGISLATION, DISALLOWANCE BY DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. McInnes) 4343 (ii).
- M. to print Cor. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4477 (ii).
- COR. BETWEEN B.C. GOVT. AND DOM.: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 5206 (ii).
- DISALLOWANCE, INCOMPLETE RETURN: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 5408, 5491 (ii).
- GOVT. POLICY *re* FOURTEEN STATUTES ALREADY IN FORCE: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 5859 (ii).
- DISALLOWANCE OF BILL: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 2536 (i).
- LEGISLATION: Motion Dropped (Mr. Prior) 5313 (ii).
- JUDGESHIPS, APPOINTMENT, MINUTES OF COUNCIL, COMMISSIONS, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 1879 (i).
- KOOTENAY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 8090 (iii).
- LEGISLATION *re* CHINESE AND FOREIGN IMMIGRATION, DISALLOWANCE, &c.: M. to adjn. (Mr. Prior) 6823, 6902 (iii).
- LETTER CARRIERS, B.C., NUMBER, SALARIES, &c., FROM 1895 TO 1899: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Prior) 2789 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*

- LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE, B.C., ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 3821 (ii).
- MACAULAY POINT FORTIFICATIONS, CLAIMS FOR COMPENSATION, &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Prior) 3874, 5489 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 9133 (iii).
- MACAULAY POINT, B.C.: Inquiry for Return (Mr. Prior) 5489 (ii).
- MAIL SERVICE PACIFIC COAST, FACILITIES BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3254 (i).
- MARTIN, MR. JUSTICE, JUDICIAL RESIDENCE, B.C.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3545 (ii).
- NORTH AMERICAN TRANSPORTATION COMPANY AND GOVT. SUBSIDIES, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 5666 (ii).
- NORTHERN COMMERCIAL TELEGRAPH CO. AND DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Maxwell) 3873 (ii).
- COR. WITH MINISTERS OF THE CROWN: M. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Prior) 5510 (ii).
- NON-PRODUCTION OF HIGH COMMISSIONER'S TELEGRAM: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 5747 (ii).
- OYSTER BED, B.C., CLAIMS OF ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RY. CO.: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 3821 (ii).
- PACIFIC CABLE AND GOVT. OF B. C., OFFERS RESPECTING: M. for Cor.\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3873 (ii).
- COMMUNICATION FROM B. C. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. Morrison) 2697 (i).
- PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 5479 (ii).
- POACHING ON THE PACIFIC COAST: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 8347 (iii).
- PUBLIC WORKS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 8085 (iii).
- AGENCIES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 8190 (ii).
- "QUADRA," STR., PAYMENT OF CREW AND OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3076 (ii).
- QUARANTINE STATION, WILLIAM'S HEAD: in Com. of Sup., 8090 (iii).
- RIFLE RANGES, B.C., APPLICATIONS, PETS., &c.: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 5484 (ii).
- ROTHWELL'S REPORT *re* SETTLERS CLAIMS, TRANSMISSION TO B.C. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 2530 (i).
- RUSSELL, MR., DISMISSAL AS STEAMBOAT INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 4713 (ii).
- SONGHEES INDIAN RESERVE, B.C., COR. BETWEEN DOM. AND PROV. GOVTS.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Prior) 3873 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 5704 (ii).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Prior) 4713 (ii).
- REMOVAL FROM RESERVE, SETTLEMENT WITH B.C. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3797 (ii).
- SPINKS, COUNTY COURT JUDGE, B.C., CHARGES AGAINST: M. to Com. of Sup. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4172, 4201 (ii).
- STANLEY PARK AND DEADMAN'S ISLAND, O.C.'S, COR., &c., BETWEEN CAN. GOVT. AND B.C.: M. for Copies (Mr. Prior) 2334 (i).
- See "Deadman's Island."
- STATUTES FOR 1899, DATE OF RECEIVING BY SEC. OF STATE: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 5666 (ii).
- STEVESTON, B.C., TIDAL LANDS, APPLICATION FOR LEASES, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3822, 4058 (ii).
- O. C.'S, COR., PLANE, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3873 (ii).
- TRANSFER OF PROPERTY, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3544 (ii).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*

- "STRATHCONA," STE., AND RELIEF OF DESTITUTE MINERS, ARRANGEMENT WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 9179 (iii).
- TELEGRAPH LINES, ATLIN, B.C., AND TESLIN LAKE: in Com. of Sup., 10099 (iii).
- B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 8184 (iii).
- TURNER ADMINISTRATION, B.C., DISMISSAL BY LT.-GOV.: Papers laid on Table, 3950 (ii).
- M. for Cor. (Mr. *Prior*) 2362 (i).
- VANCOUVER ISLAND SS. SERVICE, SUBSIDY BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3797 (ii).
- VICTORIA AND MONTREAL HARBOURS, GRANTS BY DOM. GOVT.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Prior*) 1877 (i).
- VICTORIA HARBOUR, REP. OF RESIDENT ENGINEER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3828 (ii).
- LETTER CARRIERS, NUMBER, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1960 (i).
- POST OFFICE, OLD SITE, OWNERSHIP: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 4269 (ii).
- SAFES, ELEVATORS, &c., TENDER FOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1887 (i).
- PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., conc., 6335 (ii).
- British Columbia and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 28** (Mr. *Prior*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 895; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1113; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2644 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
- BRITISH YUKON MINING, TRADING AND TRANSPORTATION COMPANY, CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 2905 (i).
- British Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. No. 57** (Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1431; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1862 (i).
- BROCKVILLE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9960 (iii).
- BROCKVILLE ELECTION, BALLOT PAPERS, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3074 (ii).
- MAILING OF VOTERS' LISTS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2482 (i).
- NAME OF DEP. RETURNING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 2322 (i).
- AND WEST HURON ELECTIONS, ATTENDANCE OF CLERK OF THE CROWN IN CHANCERY WITH PAPERS, &c.: (Mr. *Speaker*) 6821 (iii).
- M. to place Documents on Table (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 6723 (ii); 6821 (iii).
- Notice of Motion (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 6595 (ii).
- Bronson and Weston Lumber Co.'s B. No. 70** (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1949; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2152; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3003 (i); Sen. Amts., 7577 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 96.)
- BRONTÉ HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 10069 (iii).
- BROOKFIELD AND EASTVILLE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8915; in Com., 8445 (iii).
- BROOKSIDE, P.E.I., POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1969 (i).
- BROTCHIES LEDGE, B.C., LIGHTHOUSE, COMPLETION AND OPERATION: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 2831 (i).
- BROWN, BARTH, CAMOBELLO, N.B., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4482 (ii).
- BROWN, MARION, COMMUTATION OF DEATH SENTENCE, PETS., COR.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wallace*) 6939 (iii).
- BRUCE MINES WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7966 (iii).

- BUBONIC PLAGUE AND QUARANTINE OF PACIFIC STEAMERS AT B.C.: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 5989 (ii).
- BUDGET, THE, FINANCIAL STMT. (Mr. *Fielding*) 2410 (i).
- REPLY (Mr. *Foster*) 2537 (i).
- Deb. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2571; (Mr. *Craig*) 2590; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2605; (Mr. *Paterson*) 2637, 2650; (Mr. *Pope*) 2672; (Mr. *Heyd*) 2682 (i).
- DATE OF DELIVERY: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2249 (i).
- AND ESTIMATES: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 1952 (i).
- BUFFALO AND CRYSTAL BEACH FERRY SERVICE, LICENSE AND PRIVILEGES GRANTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 4994 (ii).
- Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Co.'s B. No. 96** (Mr. *McCleary*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2247; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2525 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 97.)
- BUILDING, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 9988 (iii).
- N. B.: In Com. of Sup., 9954 (iii).
- N. S.: In Com. of Sup., 7613, 9943 (iii).
- ONT.: In Com. of Sup., 7621, 9938, 9956 (iii).
- OTTAWA: In Com. of Sup., 7689 (iii).
- QUEBEC: In Com. of Sup., 7619 (iii).
- BULLETINS, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8264 (iii).
- BURLINGTON CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 7998 (iii).
- BURRARD, MEMBER FOR, SPEECH *re* AMOUNTS PAID TO VANCOUVER LIBERALS BY DOM. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1838 (i).
- USE OF REVEREND IN QUESTION: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 1838 (i).
- BURNS, MR., PRIVATE SEC. TO MIN. OF FIN., APPNMT. TO PERMANENT FORCE: Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 8469 (iii).
- BUSBY, MR., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT SEAGWAY, DATE OF APPNMT. AND SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4805 (ii).
- BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—BUDGET SPEECH: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2318 (i).
- *re* ESTIMATES: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 2025 (i).
- Introduction of Bills (Mr. *Speaker*) 618 (i).
- MORNING SITTINGS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7768 (iii).
- PRECEDENCE ON THURSDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2409 (i).
- REDISTRIBUTION BILL: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2535 (i); 3844 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Beattie*) 8999 (iii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 9177 (iii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Huggart*) 3253 (i).
- Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2247 (i).
- Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 801 (i) 8216 (iii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Wallace*) 5744 (ii).
- AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7321, 7442 (iii).
- UNOPPOSED RETURNS: Remarks (Mr. *Wallace*) 6939 (iii).
- See "Govt. Business."
- CABINET MINISTERS, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1818 (i).

- CALGARY AND EDMONTON RY. CO. LAND SUBSIDY, AMOUNT SELECTED AND STILL DUE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2326 (i).
- Calvin Co. (Limited) B. No. 9 (Mr. *Rogers*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 618; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 934; withdn., 2897 (i).
- CAMPBELLTON WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10012 (iii).
- Can. Accident Assurance Co.'s B. No. 3 (Mr. *Hughes*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 617; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 933 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5042 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 98).
- CANADA AND GREAT BRITAIN, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 8661 (iii).
- AND SOUTH AFRICA, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 8692 (iii).
- Canada Atlantic and Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Ry. Co.'s B. No. 145 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 4804; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 5359 (ii); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 7577 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 81).
- CANADA EASTERN RAILWAY CO., PURCHASE BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3554, 3824 (ii).
- M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Foster*) 3873 (ii).
- Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1814 (i).
- (CROSS CREEK) RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8915; in Com., 9445 (iii).
- (NELSON BRANCH) SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8917; in Com., 9495 (iii).
- "CANADA GAZETTE" : in Com. of Sup., 8703 (iii).
- Can. Life Assurance Co.'s B. No. 62 (Mr. *Gibson*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1753; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1955 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3689 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 99.)
- B. No. 89 (Mr. *Wood*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2182; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2320 (i); withdn., 4477 (ii).
- Canada Mining and Metallurgical Co.'s incorp. B. No. 113 (Mr. *Haley*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2790; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3004 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5792 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 100.)
- Can. and Ont. Power Co.'s B. No. 77 (Mr. *Bertram*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2029; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2290 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3996 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 105.)
- Can. Permanent and Western Can. Mortgage Corporation Co.'s B. No. 75 (Mr. *Oster*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2029; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2320 (i); in Com., 4302, 4846; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4846 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 101.)
- Canada Plate Glass Assurance Co.'s B. No. 4 (Mr. *Hughes*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 617; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 933 (i); in Com., 5042; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5249 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 102.)
- Canada. See "Australasian."
- Can. Railway Accident and Insurance Co.'s B. No. 21 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 803; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1113; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2697 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 106.)
- Can. Railway Fire Insurance Co.'s B. No. 140 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 4259; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 5359 (ii); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 6879 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 107.)
- Can. Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 43 (Mr. *Ingram*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1165; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1389; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2152 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 56.)
- Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 109 (Mr. *Flint*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2604 (i).
- CAN. TEMPERANCE ACT ELECTIONS, COST : in Com. of Sup., 10111 (iii).
- Canadian Birkbeck Investment and Savings Co.'s B. No. 106 (Mr. *Bertram*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2529; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2698 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 6326 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 103.)
- CANADIAN COAST, SURVEYS OF CURRENTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1824 (i).
- CANADIAN EMIGRATION TO U. S., PAR. IN MONTREAL *Star* : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 1895 (i).
- CANADIAN FISHERIES AND AMERICAN FISH TRUSTS, COMPLAINTS *re* AND OFFICIAL REPORTS : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4993 (ii).
- Canadian Inland Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. No. 51 (Mr. *Richardson*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1352; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1585 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 104.)
- CANADIAN MINING INSTITUTE, DOCUMENTS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8702 (iii).
- Canadian Mutual Benefit Advertising Co.'s B. No. 99 (Mr. *McAlister*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2318; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2525 (i).
- Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 151 (Mr. *Davis*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 5096; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 5536; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 6100 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 57.)
- CANADIAN NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916; in Com., 9457, 9581 (iii).
- C. P. R. ACT (1881), POWER RESPECTING BRANCH LINES : Remarks (Mr. *McMillan*) 3315 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 9309 (iii).
- AND GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL, SURVEY OF BRANCH LINE : Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2532 (i).
- C. P. R. and Hull Electric Agreement B. No. 25 (Mr. *Poupart*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 895; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1113; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2320 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 59.)
- C. P. R. AND I. C. R., RUNNING PRIVILEGES BETWEEN ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX : Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2247 (i).
- AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916 (iii).
- Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 61 (Mr. *Gibson*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1753; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1955 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4189 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 58.)
- RY. COMMISSION, APPOINT. BY GOVT. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Richardson*) 2773 (i).
- CONTRACT WITH A. ONDERDONE, AWARDS BY ARBITRATORS *re* VALUE OF ROLLING STOCK, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *McMullen*) 5944 (ii).
- LAND DAMAGES : in Com. of Sup., 7153 (iii).
- MILEAGE TARIFF ON HAY, STRAW, &c., APPROVAL BY O. C. : Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4057 (ii).
- CANADIAN TROOPS FOR THE TRANSVAAL, PAR IN OTTAWA *Citizen* : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 7323 (iii).
- Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 52 (Mr. *Morrison*). 1<sup>st</sup>, 1352; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1862 (i).
- CANALS :
- ATWATER AVENUE, REBUILDING WALL : in Com. of Sup., 9173 (iii).
- BALSAM LAKE, REMOVAL OF STONE PILES : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2332 (i).
- BEAUCHAMNOIS CANAL : in Com. of Sup., conc., 10120 (iii).
- DAMAGE TO FARM LANDS BY OVERFLOW : Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4859 (ii).

CANALS—*Con.*

- BEAUBARNOIS CANAL, DISMISSALS: M. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Bergeron) 5411 (ii).  
 — LOCK LABOURERS, APPNT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3267 (i).  
 — STEEL BRIDGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7450 (iii).  
 BURLINGTON CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 7998 (iii).  
 CHAMBLY CANAL, SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iii).  
 — EMPLOYT. OF GEO. PEPPIN BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3821 (ii).  
 — INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3533 (ii).  
 — TELEPHONE LINES: in Com. of Sup., 5783 (ii).  
 CORNWALL CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 5784 (ii).  
 — AMTS. PAID TO MR. RUBIDGE, C.E., SINCE JAN. 1897, EXPENSES *re* STRS. "ALERT" AND "ALASKA," &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Taylor) 1878 (i).  
 — AWARD OF CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1853 (i).  
 — ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iii).  
 — PAYMENT TO MR. ROSS: in Com. of Sup., 9176 (iii).  
 FARRAN'S POINT: in Com. of Sup., 5779 (ii).  
 — AND IROQUOIS CANAL, LOCKS AT, REFS. OF MR. SHANLY AND MR. KEEFER, C.E.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Taylor) 1878 (i).  
 — TENDERS FOR 1897, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Clancy) 3873 (ii).  
 GALOPE CANAL, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7299, 7442 (iii).  
 GRENVILLE CANAL, COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4992 (ii).  
 — MAINTNEANCE OF ROADWAYS ON FARMS: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 6048 (ii).  
 — LETTER OF MR. G. S. CONWAY: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 6380 (ii).  
 — TOLL COLLECTOR, APPNT. AND DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2532 (i).  
 HENRY & BORTHWICK, CLAIMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9173, 10153 (iii).  
 LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 5781 (ii).  
 — ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7297 (iii).  
 — EVIDENCE TAKEN BEFORE ROYAL COMMISSION, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. McInerney) 5944 (ii).  
 — FINAL ESTIMATE OF SECTION 3, ENLARGEMENT OF 1875-80: M. for Copies\* (Mr. McInerney) 5944 (ii).  
 — REP. OF COMMISSION ON WELLINGTON AND G.T.R. BRIDGES: M. for Copy\* (Mr. McInerney) 5944 (ii).  
 — EXHIBITS, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. McInerney) 5944 (ii).  
 — PLANS, PROFILES, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. McInerney) 5944 (ii).  
 MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iii).  
 RAINY RIVER LOCK; in Com. of Sup., 10153 (iii).  
 RAPIDE PLAT CANAL, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7299 (iii).  
 REBATE OF CANAL TOLLS TO FORWARDING CO.: in Com. of Sup., 5794 (ii).  
 RIDEAU CANAL, KILMARNOCK: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iii).  
 — REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7463 (iii).  
 RYAN & CO.'S CLAIMS: *re* CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 10152 (iii).  
 ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AND CANALS, DEEPENING OF NAVIGATION, &c., CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 2783 (i).  
 — SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 7567 (iii).

CANALS—*Con.*

- ST. LOUIS LAKE CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iii).  
 ST. OURS LOCKS: in Com. of Sup., 7318 (iii).  
 — DISMISSAL OF SUPT. CODRRE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3552 (ii).  
 SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7296 (iii).  
 SECORD, MR. T. R., SUPT. ON WELAND CANAL, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 1833 (i).  
 SOULANGES CANAL, CONTRACTS: M. for Cor., Notices, &c. (Mr. Taylor) 1861 (i).  
 — SECS. 1 AND 2, CONTRACTS, ADVERTISEMENTS, &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Bergeron) 2028 (i), 9701 (iii).  
 — SECS. 4, 5, 6, 7, CONTRACTS, &c.: M. for Cor.\* O.C.'s, &c. (Mr. Bergeron) 2028 (i).  
 — AMOUNT EXPENDED IN CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2117 (i).  
 SIMCOE LAKE, LOWERING WATER, REQUESTS, &c., MADE TO DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2192 (i).  
 — Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 2248 (i).  
 SOULANGES CANAL ARBITRATION, LAND VALUATORS, APPNTS. AND DISMISSALS: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2333 (i).  
 SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL; in Com. of Sup., 10152 (iii).  
 SOULANGES CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7295 (iii).  
 — CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7296 (ii).  
 TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 5782 (ii).  
 — CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7299 (iii).  
 — JORDAN, MR. WM., CLAIMS FOR LAND DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1977 (i).  
 — LAND VALUATIONS, COMPLAINTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Graham) 5311 (ii).  
 — PAYMENT OF WORKMEN: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1977 (i).  
 — PAYMENTS TO MR. F. D. MOORE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Graham) 5311 (ii).  
 — PURCHASE OF LAND FOR DAM AT NASSAU: Ques. (Mr. Kendry) 1857 (i).  
 McLAUGHLIN, MR. R. J., AMOUNTS PAID AND DUE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1976, 2321 (i).  
 — AND FARMERS OF LINDSAY *re* DAMAGES BY FLOODS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 4485, 4486, 4499 (ii).  
 — Letter of Mr. McLaughlin read (Mr. Mulock) 4998, 5045 (ii).  
 WELAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iii).  
 — ENTRANCE AT PORT COLBORNE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: M. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Montague) 3997 (ii).  
 — "LAKESIDE," STR., INTEREST TO OWNERS: in Com. of Sup., 5792 (ii).  
 — WATER RENTAL: in Com. of Sup., 5790 (ii).  
**Canned Goods Inspection Act. Amt. B. No. 125** (Mr. Ellis) 1\*, 3334 (ii).  
 CANOE COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10007 (iii).  
 CAP SANTÉ: in Com. of Sup., 8105 (iii).  
 CARDIGAN BRIDGE, P.E.I., BONDED WAREHOUSE, PETS., COR., &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) 2961 (i).  
 CARS BUILT AND PURCHASED, NAME OF FIRM, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3945, 4479 (ii).  
 — Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 3553 (ii).

- CARS, EQUIPMENTS, STANDARD COUPLERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9171 (iii).
- LIGHTING SYSTEM: in Com. of Sup., 9172 (iii).
- OFFICIAL OR PRIVATE, NUMBER, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1835 (i).
- LOCOMOTIVES, NUMBER, COST, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Pope) 2028 (i).
- CARTRIDGE FACTORY, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 7151, 9124 (iii).
- CATTLE EMBARGO, COR. BETWEEN CAN. AND IMP. GOVTS.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Montague) 1877 (i).
- INQUIRY FOR RETURNS (Mr. Montague) 3253 (i).
- INSPECTION, &c., AT HEBERTVILLE, COR. *re* APPOINTMENT OF DR. HALL: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Casgrain) 5944 (ii).
- FOR TUBERCULOSIS, COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND DR. J. A. DUCHESNE, OF CHICOUTIMI, SINCE JUNE, 1896: M. for Copy\* (Mr. Casgrain) 5944 (ii).
- MONTREAL, REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques., 10115 (iii).
- QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5075 (ii) 8339 (iii).
- Central Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 58 (Mr. Edwards) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1540; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1862; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 60.)
- CENTRAL ONTARIO RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 8914; in Com., 9311, 9770 (iii).
- CENTRAL RY. CO., N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 5788 (ii).
- CENTRAL RY. OF N. B., AND DEPTS. OF RYS. AND CANALS, COR., &c., *re* SUBSIDIES: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Foster) 2788 (i).
- COR. IN DEPARTMENT: Inquiry for Ret. Mr. Foster) 5667 (ii).
- prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 8915, 8916; in Com., 9452, 9488, 9782, 9777 (iii).
- CHAMBERLAND, MR. F. F., CHARGES AGAINST, LETTER FROM ACHILLE LEBEL: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 2900 (i).
- CHAMBLY CANAL, SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iii).
- EMPLOYMENT OF GEO. PEPPIN BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3821 (ii).
- INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3553 (ii).
- TELEPHONE LINES: in Com. of Sup., 5783 (ii).
- CHAMBOURD CUSTOMS OFFICE, SALARIES, COLLECTION, EXPENSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1850 (i).
- CHAMP DE MARS, LEASE, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 2141 (i).
- CHARGES AGAINST YUKON ADMINISTRATION: M. to Com. of Sup. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5945; (amt.) 6022, 6053; neg. (Y. 32; N. 82) 6278 (ii).
- Proposal to adjn. Deb. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6100 (ii).
- PAR. IN LONDON *Times*: M. to adjn. (Mr. Davin) 6562, 6585 (ii).
- CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7001 (iii).
- CHARLESON, J. B., SURVEYS, &c., FOR TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 5604 (ii).
- O. C. APPOINTING, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9699 (iii).
- CHARLESON, J. B., TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 8106 (iii).
- CHEMAINUS, B. C., PILOTAGE LIMITS: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 5312 (ii).
- Chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord Co.'s incorp. B. No. 29 (Mr. Bourassa) 1<sup>o</sup>, 895; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1359; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 62.)
- CHEZZETCOOK WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10004 (iii).
- CHICAGO DEMONSTRATION, PRIME MINISTER'S REPLY TO INVITATION: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 9695 (iii).
- M. to adjn. 9837, 10220 (iii).
- LETTER OF PRIME MINISTER TO H. H. KOHL-SAAT: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 10220 (iii).
- CHICOUTIMI, POSTMASTER'S DISMISSAL, PETS., COR., &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Casgrain) 2408 (i).
- CHIEF JUSTICE, McCOLL (B.C.), JUDICIAL RESIDENCE: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3546 (ii).
- CHINA POINT, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7751 (iii).
- RECONSTRUCTION, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Martin) 3148 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2485 (i).
- CHINESE ANTI-LEGISLATION IN B.C. AND GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1837 (i).
- See "Anti-Japanese."
- Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. No. 49 (Mr. Maxwell) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1165 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m. 4323 (ii).
- CHINESE IMMIGRATION, ACT, ADMINISTRATION &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8697 (iii).
- CHOQUETTE, HON. MR. JUSTICE, PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND TRAVELLING EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5097 (ii).
- CHRISTIE, MR. W. J., DISMISSAL FROM INLAND REV. DEPT., O. C.'S, REPS., C.B.R., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Roche) 2393 (i).
- M. to ref. Papers to Public Accts. Com. (Mr. Roche) 3341 (ii).
- CIRCUIT ALLOWANCE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5471 (ii).
- CITADEL, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii).
- Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. No. 38 (Mr. Richardson) 1<sup>o</sup>, 974; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1923 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>, 5374; in Com., 5898 (ii).
- B. No. 50 (Mr. Monk) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1264; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 2204; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 m. h. agreed to (Y. 64; N. 39) 2245 (i).
- B. No. 63 (Mr. McMullen) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1753; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 3316 (i).
- CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMT. BILL: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1956 (i).
- ATTACHMENT OF SALARIES BILL: Ques. (Mr. Chauvin) 1852 (i).
- EMPLOYEES, NAMES OF THOSE NOT RECEIVING STATUTORY INCREASES SINCE 1896: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Hodgins) 5943 (ii).
- LIST: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 421 (i).
- CLAREAU, MR. J. A., CLAIMS FOR MATERIAL FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CHICOUTIMI OR STE. ANNE'S WHARF: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3335 (ii).
- CLARK, H. W., SERVICES AS ENGINEER ON DREDGE "CANADA," &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8630 (iii).

- CLARKE, JOS., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT. IN THE YUKON : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5485 (ii).
- CLARKE vs. THE QUEEN, CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT. : M. to Com. of Sup. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5750 (ii).
- CLEMENT, MR. W. H. P., RESTRICTIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS BY GOVT. AS LEGAL ADVISER TO YUKON COUNCIL : Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2322 (i).
- CLIFTON POSTMASTER, P.E.I., COR., PETS., &c., re APPNMT. : M. for Copies\* (Mr. Martin) 5377 (ii).
- CLASSIFICATION OF OLD RECORDS : in Com. of Sup., 8702 (iii).
- CLOTHING CONTRACTS re MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 9066, 9126 (iii).
- COAL MINING UNDER NANAIMO HARBOUR, LEASES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8991 (iii).
- COAL OIL AND FREE LIST : prop. Res. (Mr. Davis) ; Amt. (Mr. Fielding) agreed to (Y. 68 ; N. 30) 2014 (i).
- Deb. (Mr. Davis) 1982 ; (Mr. Fraser, Lambton) 1986 ; (Mr. Ellis) 1996 ; (Mr. Fielding) 1998 ; (Mr. Davin) 1999 ; (Mr. Beattie) 2005 ; (Mr. Johnston) 2006, 2013 ; (Mr. Oliver) 2008 ; (Mr. Richardson) 2009 ; (Mr. Monk) 2010 ; (Mr. Ratz) 2011 (ii).
- prop. Res. (Mr. Moore) 2118, 2130 (i).
- Deb. (Mr. Beattie) 2124 ; (Mr. Davin) 2125 ; (Mr. Rogers) 2125 ; (Mr. Oliver) 2126 ; (Mr. Richardson) 2126 ; (Mr. Fielding) 2126 ; (Sir Henri Jo'y) 2127 ; (Mr. Clancy) 2128 ; (Mr. Fortin) 2131 ; (Mr. Wallace) 2131 ; (Mr. Fraser, Lambton) 2134 ; (Mr. McMullen) 2135 ; (Mr. Flint) 2137 ; (Mr. Sproule) 2138 (i).
- COASTING LAWS, ENFORCEMENTS, COR. RESPECTING : (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3257 (i).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2696 (i).
- REPORT OF CAPT. JOHN IRVING, re ENFORCEMENT : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3258 (i).
- Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Ry. Co's B. No. 98 (Mr. Guillet) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2318 ; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2650 ; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3072 (i). (62-63 Vic., c. 61.)
- COLBORNE, PORT, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, CONTRACT, TENDERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. McNeill) 9310 (iii).
- AND MAITLAND PORTS, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, REPS., &c. : Remarks (Mr. Montague) 8633 (iii).
- REPORTS OF ENGINEERS, &c. : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Montague) 7771 (iii).
- COLD STORAGE FOR BAIT, DEEP SEA FISHERIES : in Com. of Sup., 10163 (iii).
- FOR FISH TRANSPORTATION FROM MAR. PROVS. : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1978 (i).
- FOR PRESERVATION OF BAIT FOR FISHERMEN : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1978 (i).
- COLD STORAGE ON STEAMSHIPS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8706 (iii).
- COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 8002 (iii).
- ASSIGNMENT OF CONTRACTORS : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1893 (i).
- COLONIAL SECURITIES AND IMPERIAL TAX : Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 1639 (i).
- COLPRON, MR. JOS. N., CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT. FOR SERVICES PERFORMED, AMOUNT PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2191 (i).
- COLUMBIA RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 808<sup>5</sup> (iii).
- Columbia and Western Ry. Co's B. 26 (Mr. Costigan) 1<sup>st</sup>, 895 ; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1389 ; in Com., 2645 ; 3<sup>rd</sup> m., 2934 ; agreed to (Y. 61 ; N. 14) 2949 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 63.)
- Combinations in Restraint of Trade B. No. 40 (Mr. Sproule) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1073 ; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1936 (i) ; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4859 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 46.)
- COMMERCIAL AGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 8698 (iii).
- TELEGRAPH CONSTRUCTION SYNDICATE : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Prior) 3752 (ii).
- COR. WITH MINISTERS, INCOMPLETE RETURN : Remarks (Mr. Prior) 5409 (ii).
- TREATIES WITH BRITISH W. INDIES, &c. : M. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Kaulbach) 8077, 8172 (iii).
- COMMISSIONS UNDER THE GREAT SEAL, REGULATIONS RESPECTING : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4483 (ii).
- re HALF-BREED CLAIMS : in Com. of Sup., 5832 (ii).
- OF INQUIRY, YUKON, REQUEST FROM MR. OGILVIE TO EXTEND HIS POWERS, &c. : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3080 (i).
- re INVESTIGATIONS AGAINST GOVT. EMPLOYEES, NAMES OF COMMISSIONERS, ALLOWANCES, &c., DISMISSALS, &c. : M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. Foster) 2180 (ii).
- OF STAMPS FOR CAN. TOBACCO : in Com. of Sup., 4790 (ii).
- COMMITTEE MEETINGS, ACCOMMODATION IN ROOMS : Remarks (Mr. Penny) 3314 (i).
- MEETINGS AT SAME HOUR : Remarks (Mr. La-Rivière) 2320 (i).
- COMMITTEES :
- AGRICULTURAL AND COLONIZATION COMMITTEE, 2<sup>ND</sup> REP. OF COM., PRINTING OF EVIDENCE : conc. (Mr. Bain) 3440 (ii).
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL, SEL. COM. : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 (i).
- 1<sup>ST</sup> REP. OF COM., CONC. : M. (Mr. Beausoleil) 337 (i).
- 2<sup>ND</sup> REP. OF COM. : conc. (Mr. Somerville) 1071, 1738 (i).
- 3<sup>RD</sup> REP. OF COM., CONC. : M. (Mr. Richardson) 2130 (i).
- 4<sup>TH</sup> REP. OF COM. CONC. : M. (Mr. Ellis) 2529 (i).
- 5<sup>TH</sup> REP. OF COM. CONC. : M. (Mr. Richardson) 5665 (ii).
- 6<sup>TH</sup> REP. OF COM. CONC. : M. (Mr. Richardson) 8913 (iii).
- LIBRARY COMMITTEE, JOINT : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 531 (i).
- PRINTING COMMITTEE, JOINT : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 531 (i).
- 3<sup>RD</sup> REP. OF COM. : Presented (Mr. Gibson) 5745 (ii).

## COMMITTEES—Con.

- PRINTING COMMITTEE, JOINT: 4TH AND 5TH REP. OF COM.: M. conc. (Mr. Gibson) 5378 (ii).  
 — 7TH REP. OF COM. CONC.: M. (Mr. Gibson) 8913 (iii).  
 PRIVATE BILLS, SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE, REDUCTION OF QUORUM: M. (Mr. Scriber) 4729 (ii).  
 — MEETING DURING SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE: M. (Mr. Scriber) 8751 (iii).  
 PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE, ABSENCE OF MINISTERS: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 9182 (iii).  
 — M. to Employ Stenographers (Mr. Fortin) 7193 (iii).  
 — Stenographer's Fees, 9462 (iii).  
 — M. to Print Evidence (Mr. Fortin) 7194 (iii).  
 — M. to sit concurrently with Sessions of the House (Mr. Fortin) 7771 (iii).  
 — 2ND REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. Fortin) 9461 (iii).  
 — REP. OF COM.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10115 (iii).  
 — M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10115 (iii).  
 PUBLIC ACCTS. COMMITTEE, DELAY IN MEETING: M. to adju. House (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3150 (i).  
 — DELAY IN MEETINGS: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7195 (iii).  
 — MEETINGS DURING SITTING OF THE HOUSE: M. (Mr. Fraser, Guysborough) 8730 (iii).  
 — MEETINGS: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2804 (i).  
 — Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 2964 (i).  
 — POSTPONEMENTS AND HOURS OF MEETING, &c.: Remarks (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4344 (ii).  
 — REDUCTION OF QUORUM: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 4347 (ii).  
 — 3RD REP. OF COM.: conc. (Mr. Fraser, Guysborough) 4147 (ii).  
 — 6TH REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. Fraser, Guysborough) 9836 (iii).  
 — REP. OF COM.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10116 (iii).  
 — M. to Print Evidence (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10116 (iii).  
 RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES, 22ND REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. Sutherland) 9209 (iii).  
 SELECT STANDING COMS., COM. TO PREPARE LISTS: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 (i).  
 — LISTS: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 525 (i).  
**Companies Act Amt. B No. 160** (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1<sup>st</sup>, 5744 (ii); 2<sup>nd</sup>, 7645; in Com., 8774; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 8779 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 40.)  
 COMPENSATION TO MRS. F. E. STEWART: in Com. of Sup., 9131 (iii).  
 — TO OCTAVE OUELLETTE: in Com. of Sup., 9127.  
**Conditional Liberation of Convicts B. No. 171** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1<sup>st</sup>, 7000; 2<sup>nd</sup> and in Com., 9599, 9726; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 9731 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 49.)  
 CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES OF CANADA: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4270 (ii).  
 CONSTANTIN, DR. JULES, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT., AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1847 (i).  
 CONTINGENCIES, PRINTING, &c., PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7554 (iii).  
 CONTRACTS LET WITHOUT TENDER SINCE JUNE, 1896: M. for O. C.'s (Mr. Davin) 5314, 5348 (ii).

- CONTRACTS FOR TIES, I. C. R., NAMES OF TENDERERS: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5308 (ii).  
 CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, JUDGES' REPS.: 1 (i).  
 — REGISTRAR'S FEES: Remarks (Mr. Calvert) 8348 (iii).  
**Convicts.** See "Conditional."  
 COPYRIGHT BILL AND GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. Ross-Robertson) 1981 (i).  
 CORNWALL CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 5784 (ii).  
 — ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iii).  
 — AMTS. PAID TO MR. RUBIDGE, C.E., SINCE JAN., 1897, EXPENSES *re* STRE. "ALERT" AND "ALASKA," &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Taylor) 1878 (i).  
 — AWARD OF CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1853 (i).  
 — PAYMENT TO MR. ROSS: in Com. of Sup., 9176 (iii).  
 COSTE, MR., EXPEDITION TO ENG., INSTRUCTIONS, COR., REPS., &c.: M. for Papers\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3334 (i).  
 — Remarks (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5360 (ii).  
 — YUKON EXPEDITION: M. to refer Papers to Pub. Accounts Com. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5489 (ii).  
 — REPORT *re* YUKON: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4997 (ii).  
 — AND LAFONTAINE'S INSTRUCTIONS, YUKON DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. Quinn) 1893 (i).  
 See "Yukon," &c.  
 COSTIGAN, HON. MR., ON PERSONAL EXPLANATION: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 3660 (ii).  
 — AND JOHN H. BARRETT, COR. BETWEEN DEPT., &c.: laid on the table, 3875 (ii).  
 COTEAU LANDING, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10030 (iii).  
 — CONTRACT FOR DREDGING, PAPERS, LETTERS, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Bergeron) 2026 (i).  
 COULOMBE *v.* THE QUEEN, TRIAL PROCEEDINGS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3916 (ii).  
 — ENFORCEMENT OF CONVICTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4479 (ii).  
 COUNCIL, YUKON, NAMES, APPOINT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Donville) 1832 (i).  
 See "Yukon," &c.  
 COUNTERFEIT BILLS, CIRCULATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 5206 (ii).  
 COUNTY COURT JUDGES, ONT., RETIREMENT, &c., LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Bennet) 1970 (i).  
 COWAN'S BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 9172 (iii).  
 COW BAY BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7704 (iii).  
**Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. No. 2** (Mr. Charlton) 1<sup>st</sup>, 421; 2<sup>nd</sup> m., 1898; in Com., 2525; 3<sup>rd</sup> m., 2911; agreed to (Y. 68; N. 29) 2930 (i).  
 — B. No. 36 (Mr. Britton). 1<sup>st</sup>, 974; 2<sup>nd</sup> m., 2160, 2527 (i).  
 — B. No. 80 (Mr. Ethier) 1<sup>st</sup> m., 2032 (i).  
 — B. No. 111 (Mr. McInnes) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2696 (i).  
 — B. No. 168 (Sir Louis Davies) 1<sup>st</sup>, 6397 (ii).

**Criminal Code.** See "Combinations."

CROWN TIMBER OFFICE, NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C., COMPLAINTS, INSTRUCTIONS AND REP. OF MR. ARCHER MARTIN: M. for Copies\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3149 (i).

CROW'S NEST PASS COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 5831 (ii).

CROW'S NEST PASS RY. AND C. P. R., RATES AND TOLLS, REVISION BY GOV. IN COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 2331 (i).

— DEATH OF MR. THORNBURY: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1976 (i).

— FRENCH TRANSLATION OF REP.: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 1852 (i).

— INVESTIGATION BY COMMISSIONER, REPS., &C.: M. for Copies,\* (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 1878 (i).

— REP. OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1967 (i).

**Cruelty to Animals Prevention Act Amt. B. No. 116** (Mr. Penny) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2963 (i).

**CUSTOMS:**

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS IMPORTED FROM U. S., BASES OF VALUATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 6047 (ii).

— REDUCTION OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 4861, 5933 (ii).

ALASKA BOUNDARY AND CUSTOMS OFFICIALS, DIFFICULTIES WITH MOUNTED POLICE: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 2193 (i).

BEEF ROOT SUGAR, BOUNTY FOR MANUFACTURE, &C.: prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 4823 (ii).

BUSBY, MR., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT SKAGWAY, DATE OF APPOINT. AND SALARY: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4895 (ii).

CHAMBERLAIN CUSTOMS OFFICE, SALARIES, COLLECTION, EXPENSES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1850 (i).

CHRISTIE, MR.: M. to ref. Papers to Public Accounts Com. (Mr. Roche) 3341 (ii).

COAL OIL AND FREE LIST: prop. Res. (Mr. Davis) 1982 (i); Amt. (Mr. Fielding) agreed to (Y. 68; N. 30) 2014 (i).

— prop. Res. (Mr. Moore) 2118, 2130 (i).

COSTIGAN, MR., AND JOHN H. BARRETT, COR. BETWEEN DEPT., &C.: laid on Table, 3875 (ii)

CURLISS, CHAS. H., PREVENTIVE OFFICER, GRAND FALLS, N.B., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4058 (ii).

CUSTOMS, BRITISH COLUMBIA: in Com. of Sup., 8453 (iii).

— MANITOBA: in Com. of Sup., 8453 (iii).

— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 8387 (iii).

— ONTARIO: in Com. of Sup., 8452 (iii); contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 5595, 5855 (ii).

CUSTOMS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2091 (i), 5588, 5855 (ii) 10207 (iii).

— TORONTO, EMPLOYEES, NAMES, DATE OF APPOINT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1849 (i).

— UNDERVALUATIONS AT TORONTO, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8387 (iii).

"DOROTHY," SEIZURE BY U. S. CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES AT SKAGWAY, PAR. IN OTTAWA CITIZEN: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 2367 (i).

GASPÉ CUSTOMS OFFICER, AND ELECTION, CHARGES AGAINST: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10222 (iii).

GERMAN DISCRIMINATING DUTIES ON CAN. IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1851 (i).

**CUSTOMS—Con.**

GRAIN EXPORTS FROM CAN. PORTS IN 1898: Ques (Mr. Bell, Addington) 3075, 3256 (i).

— TO GERMANY IN 1898-99, QUANTITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 8990 (iii).

HOGG, W. A., CUSTOMS OFFICER AT COLLINGWOOD, CHARGES AGAINST, COMMISSIONER'S REP., &C.: M. for Copy\* (Mr. McCarthy) 2788 (i).

INDIAN CORN IMPORTED FROM 1896-9: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 8217 (iii).

— FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 8632, 8990 (iii).

"JOHN C. BARR," AMERICAN STR., OWNERSHIP, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 8218, 8469 (iii).

— UNDERVALUATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3061 (i).

— VALUATION BY CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES: Ques.: (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2700 (i).

LEBEL, MR. WENCESLAS, CUSTOMS OFFICIAL, AND REVISION OF ELECTORAL LISTS, PAR. IN *Le Soleil*: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1888 (i).

LEPREAUX, N. B., CUSTOMS OFFICER, NAME, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5313 (ii).

LEVISON BROS., CUSTOMS UNDERVALUATION: in Com. of Sup., 8419 (iii).

LUMBER CUSTOMS DUTIES: in Com. of Sup., 5669 (ii).

MCCORMICK, MR. F. D., CUSTOMS OFFICER AT PELKE ISLAND, DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8438 (iii).

"PINGREE" AND "LOWE," STRS., UNDERVALUATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 8218 (iii).

P. E. I., CUSTOMS REFUND FOR DUTIES PAID ON FISH: in Com. of Sup., 10114, 10169 (iii).

PRINTING AND STATIONERY: in Com. of Sup., 5600 (ii).

PREVENTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4788 (ii).

SCHAFHEITLIN AND FITZGIBBON, CUSTOMS LAW INFRACTION: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1889, 2190 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 8387 (iii).

SCRIMGEOUR, J. G., GRANT OF BONDED WAREHOUSE, DATE OF LEASE, &C., &C.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, P. E. I.) 2113 (i).

SUGAR IMPORTS FROM BRITISH W. INDIES, QUANTITY AND VALUE: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2327 (i).

SUSPENSE ACCOUNT, MONTREAL: in Com. of Sup., 5588 (ii).

TORONTO CUSTOM HOUSE, EMPLOYEES, NAMES, DATE OF APPOINT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1849 (i).

U. S. CUSTOMS AND CANADIAN VESSELS, REGULATIONS, &C., re ENTERING AT AMERICAN PORTS: Remarks (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2528 (i).

VALLEYFIELD CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, CHARGES AGAINST, &C.: M. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Bergeron) 5501 (ii).

WHEAT EXPORTED FROM MONTREAL, ST. JOHN, FT. WILLIAM AND WINNIPEG, QUANTITY: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 2702 (i).

YUKON AND B. C., SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5596 (ii).

YUKON DISTRICT FRONTIER CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 8746 (iii).

— RUMOURS re CONFLICT BETWEEN U. S. AND CAN. CUSTOMS: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 975 (i).

— U. S. VESSELS AND CAN. REGISTRY, FRAUDULENT VALUATION, &C.: M. for Ret. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3296 (i).

— Ques. (Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3266 (i).

**Customs Act Amt. B. No. 154** (Mr. Paterson) 1<sup>o</sup>, 4991; 2<sup>o</sup>, and in Com., 6443 (ii); 3<sup>o</sup>, 6939 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 22.)

- Customs and Inland Revenue Dept. Act**  
**Amt. B. No. 182** (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 8753; in Com. on Res., 8923; 1<sup>o</sup>, 8947; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 9661; 3<sup>o</sup>, 9683 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 23.)  
 Deb. in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 8924; (Mr. *Charlton*) 8924; (Mr. *Foster*) 8924; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8925; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8926; (Mr. *McMullen*) 8930; (Mr. *Davin*) 8932; (Mr. *Talbot*) 8933; (Mr. *Marcotte*) 8934; (Mr. *Bennett*) 8936; (Mr. *Henderson*) 8938; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 8939; (Mr. *Craig*) 8940; (Mr. *McDougall*) 8944; (Mr. *Sproule*) 8945; (Mr. *Clancy*) 8946 (iii).
- DAIRYING AND AGRICULTURE**: in Com. of Sup., 8265 (ii).
- **ADVANCES &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 8337 (iii).
- DARGAVEL, MR. J. B.**, POSTMASTER AT ELGIN, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1955 (i).
- DAVIS, EDWARD**, SLIDEMASTER AT COULONGE, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 3946 (ii).
- DAWSON AND VANCOUVER MAIL SERVICE**, ARRIVAL, DESPATCH, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 2961.
- DEAD LETTER BRANCH**, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5068 (ii).
- DEADMAN'S ISLAND**, COR. BETWEEN DOM. GOVT. AND B. HAIG & SON (1880) *re* APPLICATION FOR USE, &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Prior*) 2788 (i).
- **LEASES, VALUE, &c.**: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1815.
- **FORFEITURE OF LEASE BY MR. LUDGATE**: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 4739 (ii).
- **PAR. IN MONTREAL Witness re LEASE** (Mr. *Prior*) 1353, 1640 (i).
- See "Stanley Park."
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL, SEL. COM.**: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 (i).
- **1ST REP. OF COM., CONC.**: M. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 337 (i).
- **2ND REP. OF COM., CONC.**: M. (Mr. *Somerville*) 1071, 1733 (i).
- **3RD REP. OF COM., CONC.**: M. (Mr. *Richardson*) 2180 (i).
- **4TH REP. OF COM.**: Presented (Mr. *Ellis*) 2529 (i).
- **5TH REP. OF COM., CONC.**: M. (Mr. *Richardson*) 5665 (ii).
- **6TH REP. OF COM.**: M. conc. (Mr. *Richardson*) 8913 (iii).
- **OFFICIAL**: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i).
- DEFENCE SCHEME**: in Com. of Sup., 5465 (ii).
- DELAY IN FURNISHING CARS, I. C. R., COMPLAINTS, &c.**: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1853 (i).
- DEMERS, DR.**, RAILWAY BICYCLE RIDING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 5308 (ii).
- DEMERS, MAJOR**, CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1833 (i).
- DEPTL. BUILDINGS, OTTAWA**, REFURNISHING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9937 (iii).
- DESCOUSSE WHARF, N.S.**, COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5486 (ii).
- DEVLIN, MR. JAMES**, PROSECUTION BY DEPT. OF JUSTICE: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 7218 (iii).
- DIBBLEE AND DUPONT, MESSRS.**, CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2114 (i).
- DICK, ISAAC**, FISHERY GUARDIAN, N.B., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 7765 (iii).
- DICKSON, MR. E.**, IMMIGRATION AGENT, APPMNT. BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 1855 (i).
- DIGBY POST OFFICE**: in Com. of Sup., 9947 (iii).
- DISTRESSED CANADIAN RELIEF FUND**: in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iii).
- DIVISIONS**:
- **ADDRESS**: Amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) agreed to (Y. 101; N. 48) 1811 (i).
- **APPEAL TO SPEAKER AGAINST A RULING OF DEP. SPEAKER** (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) Chairman's decision agreed to (Y. 65; N. 20) 4456 (ii).
- **APPEAL FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO SPEAKER** (Mr. *Foster*) Chairman's decision agreed to (Y. 39; N. 10) 5611 (ii).
- **BINDER TWINE, SALE OF BY GOVT.**: on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 20; N. 51) 9937 (iii).
- **CIVIL SERVICE (DISMISSAL OF OFFICIALS) B. 50** (Mr. *Monk*) Amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 m. h., agreed to (Y. 64; N. 39) 2244 (i).
- **COAL OIL AND FREE LIST**: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) Amt. (Mr. *Fielding*) agreed to (Y. 68; N. 30) 2014 (i).
- **COLUMBIA AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S B. 27** (Mr. *Costigan*) Amt. (Mr. *Oliver*) neg. (Y. 14; N. 61) 2948 (i).
- **CRIMINAL CODE (1892) B. 2** (Mr. *Charlton*) 3<sup>o</sup> agreed to (Y. 69; N. 29) 2330 (i).
- **DEBATES OFFICIAL, 2ND REP., DISMISSAL OF FRENCH TRANSLATOR**: on Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 1752 (i); neg. (Y. 40; N. 89).
- **FINANCIAL SITUATION, REVIEW OF**: Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Ways and Means, neg. (Y. 12; N. 30) 10244 (iii).
- **GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. CO.'S B. 90** (Mr. *Sutherland*) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>; Amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) neg. (Y. 21; N. 51) 4786 (ii).
- **IMMIGRATION AGENTS, SALARIES, &c.**: Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) to strike out W. T. R. Preston's salary neg. (Y. 13; N. 27) 10216 (iii).
- **I. C. R., DRUMMOND CO. B. 153** (Mr. *Blair*) M. for Com. on Res. agreed to (Y. 80; N. 38) 2841 (i).
- **INLAND REVENUE AND CUSTOMS DEPT. B. 182** (Mr. *Fielding*) Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) neg. (Y. 11; N. 27) 9683 (iii).
- **PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH G. B.**: Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) neg. (Y. 41; N. 77) 7965 (iii).
- **QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS B. 91** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 3<sup>o</sup> m., Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) neg. (Y. 40; N. 80) 3989 (ii).
- **RAILWAY SUBSIDIES B. 190**: Amt. (Mr. *Clancy*) neg. (Y. 12; N. 47) 9894 (ii).
- **REPRESENTATION IN THE H. OF C. B. 126** (Mr. *Mulock*) M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn. deb. on 2<sup>o</sup>, neg. (Y. 18; N. 23) 5336 (ii).
- M. for 2<sup>o</sup> agreed to (Y. 77; N. 41) 6720 (ii).
- **SABREVOIS WHARF**: Amt. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to strike out vote, neg. (Y. 25; N. 12) 10219 (iii).
- **SEED GRAIN IMPURITY B. 189** (Mr. *Sifton*) Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) neg. (Y. 17; N. 56) 9848 (iii).
- **VICTORIAVILLE POST OFFICE**: in Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) neg. (Y. 13; N. 27) 10218 (iii).
- **YUKON, ADMINISTRATION OF, CHARGES AGAINST**: Amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) neg. (Y. 32; N. 82) 6277 (ii).

- Divorce: Aronsberg, Abraham, B. No. 144** (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 4730; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 5359 (ii); in Com., 7480, 7575; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 7809 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 132.)
- **Dowding, Annie Inkson, B. No. 136** (Mr. *Clarke*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 4147; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 5359; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5792 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 133.)
- **Stock, David, B. No. 88** (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2604; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2698 (i); in Com., 3489; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3491 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 134.)
- **Van Wart, Stephen Gerow, B. No. 181** (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 8913; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 9056; in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 9532 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 135.)
- DOCKS, REDUCTION OF FEES, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 8178 (iii).
- DOCUMENTS, &c., YUKON DISTRICT: Inquiry for Ret.** (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3067 (i).
- "DOLPHIN," STR., SALE, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 4045 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1855 (i).
- Dom. of Can. Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.'s B. No. 76** (Mr. *Osler*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2029; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2290 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4302 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 108.)
- DOM. CENSUS AND B. N. A. ACT AMT.:** prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 2386 (i).
- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 81** (Mr. *Britton*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2035 (i).
- **B. No. 142** (Mr. *Ingram*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 4341 (ii).
- Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 148** (Mr. *Sifton*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 4894; 2<sup>nd</sup> and in Com., 6400, 6405; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 6459 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 16.)
- DOM. LANDS:** in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iii).
- **CHIEF INSPECTOR:** in Com. of Sup., 9006 (iii).
- **MAN., FRAUDULENT TRANSACTIONS BY OFFICIALS, PAR. IN WINNIPEG Telegram:** Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 4995 (ii).
- **SURVEY RETURNS, PRINTING, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 9053 (i.i).
- DOM. NOTES, NUMBER OF SHEETS, BACK AND TINT PLATES, DELIVERED TO GOVT.:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 1878 (i).
- **PRINTING:** in Com. of Sup., 5012 (ii), 7001 (iii).
- DOM. AND ONTARIO ACCOUNTS, INDEBTEDNESS BY DOM., 1898:** Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3544 (ii).
- Dom. Permanent Loan Co.'s B. No. 104** (Mr. *Clarke*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2409; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2525 (i); in Com., 6868; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 6878 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 109.)
- DOMINION POLICE FORCE:** in Com. of Sup., 10127 (iii).
- **YUKON DISTRICT, NUMBER, DISTRIBUTION, COST, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1965 (i).
- DOMINION PUBLIC BUILDINGS, LIGHTING, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 8136 (iii).
- **RIFLE ASSOCIATION, ANNUAL GRANT BY GOVT. OF TRANSPORT AND ENTRANCE FEES TO LIMITED NUMBER:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2358, 2361 (i).
- **STEAMERS, INSPECTION, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 4240 (ii).
- DOMVILLE, LT.-COL., LEAVE OF ABSENCE FROM COMMAND OF 8TH HUSSARS:** Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 2898 (i).
- **PAR. IN ST. JOHN Sun:** Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 2899 (i).
- **CHARGES AGAINST, EVIDENCE BEFORE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM.:** Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1845 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1839 (i).
- DONAHUE, W., CONTRACT FOR TIMBER FOR DREDGE AT ROBERVAL, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4069 (ii).
- DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY:** in Com. of Sup., 5477 (ii).
- "DOROTHY," SEIZURE BY U. S. CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES AT SKAGWAY, PAR. IN OTTAWA Citizen:** Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2367 (i).
- DOUKHOBORS, QUARANTINED AT GROSSE ISLE:** Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4550 (ii).
- DOWDING.** See "Divorce."
- Drainage across Railway Co's. Lands B. No. 24** (Mr. *Casey*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 803; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1917; M. for Sel. Com., 2153, 2930, 2949 (i); ref. to Sel. Com., 3849 (ii).
- DRAWBACKS ON FREIGHT CHARGES ON N. S. PORTION I. C. R. SINCE 1898:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Bell*, *Pictou*) 5945 (ii).
- **PAYMENTS ON FREIGHT CHARGES, AMOUNT PAID FOR JAN. AND FEB., 1899:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 3149 (i).
- DREDGING:** in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).
- **FOR MINERALS, YUKON, NUMBER OF LEASES (1897) RENTALS, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3079 (i).
- **PLANT, MAR. PROVS. AND B. C.:** in Com. of Sup., 10070 (iii).
- **new plant,** in Com. of Sup., 8137 (iii).
- **RICHMOND, N.S., AMOUNT EXPENDED FROM 1891 TO 1896:** Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5485 (ii).
- **SALARIES, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 5203 (ii).
- DRILL HALL, VANCOUVER, CONTRACT FOR CONSTRUCTION, TENDERS, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 6122 (ii), 7765 (iii).
- DRUMMOND COUNTY RAILWAY: Inquiry for Ret.** (Mr. *Foster*) 2972 (i).
- **Inquiry for Papers** (Mr. *Haggart*) 2249 (i).
- **Inquiry for Papers** (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2697 (i).
- DRUMMOND COUNTY.** See "I. C. R."
- Dry Docks Construction B. No. 177** (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 6123 (ii); in Com. on Res., 8472; 1<sup>st</sup>, 8474; 2<sup>nd</sup> and in Com., 8757; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 8762 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 9.)
- DRY DOCKS SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6123 (ii).
- DRY DOCK, VICTORIA, B.C., PETS. re REDUCTION OF CHARGES, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 7766 (iii).
- DUBE, APPOINT. OF SUPT., LOCATION OF HEAD-QUARTERS:** Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2533 (i).
- DUCIS INDIAN RESERVE, NEGOTIATIONS re SALE OF TIMBER LIMITS, REMOVAL OF INDIANS:** Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 2700 (i).

- DUCHESNE, DR. J. A., COMPLAINTS *re* APPNMT. OF DR. HALL: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3336 (ii).  
 ——— EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1887 (i).
- DUNN AVENUE, RY. CROSSING, TOPONTO, PROTECTION TO: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1857 (i).
- DUPUIS, P. C., PROSECUTION FOR SELLING LIQUOR TO INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4060 (ii).
- EARNINGS (GROSS) AND WORKING EXPENSES FROM 1898 TO 1899, I.C.R.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 2027 (i).
- EASTER ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 531 (i).  
 See "Adjournments."
- EASTERN EXTENSION RAILWAY, CLAIMS OF N. S. GOVT: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 3551 (ii).
- Eastern Trust Co.'s B. No. 54 (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1352; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1585 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3489 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 110.)
- EDGAR, LADY, BALANCE OF SALARY OF LATE SPEAKER: in Com. of Sup., 10196 (iii).  
 ——— SIR JAMES, LATE SPEAKER, DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9060 (iii).
- EDMONTON BRIDGE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 8196 (iii).
- Edmonton and Saskatchewan incorp. B. No. 93 (Mr. Oliver) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2246; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2524 (i); in Com., 4302, 4847; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4857 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 65.)
- Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s B. No. 35 (Mr. Poupore) 1<sup>st</sup>, 974; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1339; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3072 (i). (62-63 Vic., c. 66.)
- EDMONTON TRAIL TO YUKON DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 10109 (iii).
- Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 158 (Mr. Oliver) 1<sup>st</sup>, 5384; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 5536 (ii); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 6879 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 64.)
- EDMONTON, YUKON AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 8916; in Com., 9489, 9495, 9581, 9809 (iii).
- EDMONTON AND YUKON ROUTE, INSTRUCTIONS TO MESSRS. DIBBLEE AND DUPONT: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2114 (i).
- ELECTION ACT AMT. BILL: Request to have placed on Govt. Orders (Mr. Ingram) 7218, 7322 (iii).
- ELECTIONS, CERTIFICATES RECEIVED DURING RECESS (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- ELECTORAL LISTS, N.S., PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 1979 (i).
- ELECTRIC LIGHTING INSPECTION, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4804, 5518 (ii).  
 ——— OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5183 (ii), 9939, 9989 (iii); conc., 6386 (ii).  
 ——— Ques. (Mr. Prior) 5308 (ii).
- ELEVATOR AT HALIFAX, CONSTRUCTION AND COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2332 (i).
- ELEVATOR RESTRICTIONS AND C.P.R., LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 2903 (i).
- ELKHORN INDIAN SCHOOL, PRINTING PLANT, LEASE TO W. J. THOMPSON, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3076 (i).
- EMIGRATION TO U.S., ANSWER TO QUESTION: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2117 (i).  
 ——— PAR IN NEWSPAPERS: Ques. (Mr. McAlister) 2115 (i).
- EMPLOYEES, I.C.R., AT LEVIS AND PROVINCIAL ELECTION, TRANSFER, &c., INSTRUCTIONS TO MR. DESJARDINS: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 3260 (i).  
 ——— NUMBER, WAGES PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McLellan) 1860, 2332 (i).  
 ——— INCREASE OF STAFF AT RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1974 (i).
- Erie and Huron and Lake Erie and Detroit Amalgamation Co.'s B. No. 60 (Mr. McGregor) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1540; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1862 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3492 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 67).
- ESTATE DUTY, COR. INCOMPLETE: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 8220 (iii).
- ESQUIMALT DEFENCE: in Com. of Sup., 7151 (iii).  
 ——— DRY DOCK, REDUCTION OF RATES, PETS., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 6122 (ii).
- ESTIMATES, THE YEAR ENDING 1900: Presented Mr. Fielding) 2026 (i).  
 ——— SUPPL. ENDING 1899: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 4857 (iii).  
 ——— ENDING 1900: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7638.  
 ——— FURTHER SUPPL.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 9835 (iii).  
 ——— SUPPL., Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4147, 6458 (ii).  
 ——— Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 7242, 7442 (iii).
- Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. No. 159 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1<sup>st</sup>, 5385; 2<sup>nd</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 6101 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 44).  
 ——— B. No. 184 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1<sup>st</sup>, 9178 (iii).  
 ——— B. No. 188 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1<sup>st</sup>, 9309; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 9835; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 9835 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 45).
- EXCHEQUER COURT OF CAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5472 (ii).
- EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).  
 ——— INSPECTION OF SEALED FOOD PACKAGES, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Ellis) 2705 (i).
- EXPENDITURE ON CAPITAL AND REVENUE, I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Powell) 2531 (i).
- EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 7688, 8237 (iii).  
 ——— BALANCE DUE ON PROPERTY: in Com. of Sup., 5073 (ii).  
 ——— ESTABLISHMENT IN ST. JACQUES: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 2110 (i).  
 ——— FARM REP.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 3070 (i).
- Expropriation Act Amt. B. No. 185 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1<sup>st</sup>, 9178; 2<sup>nd</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 10220 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 39).
- EXTENSION TO MONTREAL, AMOUNT ACCRUED AND PAID TO G.T.RY. CO. SINCE JULY, 1898: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4478 (ii).  
 ——— CAR MILEAGE FOR VICTORIA BRIDGE, INCOMPLETE RETURN (Mr. Foster) 4658 (ii).  
 ——— PAPERS RESPECTING CAR MILEAGE: Presented (Mr. Blair) 4891 (ii).

FAIRLIE, MR., DISMISSAL FROM RUPERT'S LAND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL: Ques. (Mr. Bourassa) 2532 (i).  
 — M. for Reprs., Cor.\* (Mr. Bourassa) 2788 (i).  
 FARRAN'S POINT AND IROQUOIS CANAL, LOCKS AT, REPS. OF MR. SHANLY AND MR. KEEFER, C.E.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Taylor) 1878 (i).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 5779 (ii).  
 — TENDERS FOR 1897, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Clancy) 3873 (ii).  
 FAWCETT, MR., ADVICE *re* RECORDING MINING CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3822 (ii).  
 — DISMISSAL AS GOLD COMMISSIONER: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Davin) 1878 (i).  
 FENELON FALLS, CONSTRUCTION OF SLIDE: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1978 (i).  
**FINANCE:**  
 AMERICAN BANK NOTE COMPANY, DIES, PLATES, &c., DUTIES COLLECTED, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Paterson) 3828 (ii).  
 ARBITRATION, DOM. AND ONT., COST OF: in Com. of Sup., 8702 (iii).  
 AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup. 2086, 2269 (i).  
 BRITISH AMERICAN BANK NOTE Co. *vs.* THE QUEEN, ACTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser, Lambton) 6050 (ii).  
 — CLAIMS FOR BALANCE DUE: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Foster) 2180 (i).  
 BOUNTIES ON IRON AND STEEL: prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 4150 (ii).  
 BURNS, MR., PRIVATE SEC. TO MIN. OF FIN. APPOINT. TO PERMANENT FORCE: Ques. (Mr. Tyrwhitt) 8469 (ii).  
 CAN. TEMPERANCE ACT ELECTIONS, COST: in Com. of Sup., 10111 (iii).  
 CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7001 (iii).  
 COLONIAL SECURITIES AND IMPERIAL TAX: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 1639 (i).  
 COUNTERFEIT BILLS, CIRCULATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 5206 (ii).  
 DOMINION AND ONTARIO ACCOUNTS, INDEBTEDNESS BY DOM., 1898: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3544 (ii).  
 DOM. NOTES, NUMBER OF SHEETS, BACK AND TINT PLATES, DELIVERED TO GOVT.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 1878 (i).  
 — PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 5012 (ii); 7001 (iii).  
 ESTATE DUTY, COR., INCOMPLETE: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 8220 (iii).  
 FINANCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2090, 2973 (i).  
 — CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 5016 (ii).  
 FINANCIAL SITUATION, REVIEW, &c.: 10228; Amt. (Mr. Foster) neg. (Y. 12; N. 30) 10244 (iii).  
 HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, CONTINGENCIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8748 (iii).  
 INSOLVENCY LEGISLATION AND BOARDS OF TRADE: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Bergeron) 5944 (ii).  
 — M. for Copies\* (Mr. Monk) 5377 (ii).  
 — M. for Copies\* (Mr. Quinn) 5945 (ii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 4997 (ii).  
 — LEGISLATION: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3253 (i).  
 INSURANCE, SUPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7463 (iii).  
 IRON BOUNTIES, QUANTITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 1827 (i).  
 LETTERS OF CREDIT: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (iii).

**FINANCE—Con.**

LIQUOR COMMISSION REPORT, TRANSLATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5851 (ii).  
 LOBSTER FISHERY COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Remarks (Mr. McInerney) 2909 (i).  
 MINT, ESTABLISHMENT BY GOVT. IN CANADA: prop. Res. (Mr. McInnes) 3106 (i).  
 — GOVT., ESTABLISHMENT IN CAN.: Ques. (Mr. Caruallan) 2190 (i).  
 ONTARIO PROVINCIAL DEBT, REDUCTION OF INTEREST: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3074 (i).  
 P. E. I. AND DOM. GOVT., DELEGATION *re* QUESTIONS AT ISSUE, CLAIMS, SENTENTS, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Martin) 1879 (i).  
 PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE, AMOUNT PAID AND BALANCE DUE: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5859 (ii).  
 — COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 1814 (i).  
 — EXPENSES IN MONTREAL CITY, AMOUNTS UNPAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Quinn) 5312 (ii).  
 PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS, ROYAL COMMISSION, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sutherland) 1835 (i).  
 TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &c., OF FIN. MINISTER AND PRIVATE SECRETARY: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 1880 (i).  
 VILLE MARIE BANK, SUSPENSION INSPECTION BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) 8755 (iii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. Monk) 9065 (iii).  
 VANLOUVEN, PETER, *vs.* DOMINION BANK, ACTION OF GOVT. COR., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bell, Addington) 9178 (iii).  
 FIREWORKS, &c., *re* DEMONSTRATION ON PREMIER'S RETURN: in Com. of Sup., 8111 (iii).  
**FISHERIES:**  
 BEHRING SEA ARBITRATION, COST TO GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. McIsaac) 2186 (i).  
 — EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5180 (ii).  
 BELLE RIVER, P.E.I., SEIZURE OF FISH TRAPS, &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Martin) 2787 (i).  
 CANADIAN FISHERIES AND AMERICAN FISH TRUSTS, COMPLAINTS *re* AND OFFICIAL REPORTS: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4993 (ii).  
 COLD STORAGE FOR BAIT, DEEP SEA FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 10163 (iii).  
 — FOR FISH TRANSPORTATION, FROM MAR. PROVS.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1978 (i).  
 — FOR PRESERVATION OF BAIT FOR FISHERMEN: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1978 (i).  
 DICK, ISAAC, FISHERY GUARDIAN N.B., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 7765 (iii).  
 FISHERY INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4013 (ii).  
 — OFFICERS, LEEDS CO., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1818 (i).  
 — PROTECTION SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5180.  
 — Report presented (Sir Louis Davies) 700 (i).  
 — WEIRS, CHARLOTTE CO., LICENSES ISSUED, DATES, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Ganong) 2962 (i).  
 FRASER AND SEENA RIVER FISH HATCHERIES, ERECTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 4058 (ii).  
 GLAES, JAMES, FISHERY GUARDIAN AT CHARLOTTE, N.B., APPOINT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4482 (ii).  
 GRATUITY TO COMMANDER WAKEHAM: in Com. of Sup., 5183 (ii).  
 — TO R. N. VENNING: in Com. of Sup., 5183 (ii).  
 GRAY, ROBERT, LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER AT ENTRANCE ISLAND, RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 7319 (ii).

FISHERIES--*Con.*

- INLAND FISHERIES, ISSUE OF LICENSES BY LOCAL GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 2910 (i).
- LENOIR, FISHERY OVERSEER: Ret. laid on Table, 4268 (ii).
- LICENSES FOR FISHING TRAPS, ISSUE OF: Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) 2046 (ii).
- LOBSTER FISHERY COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Remarks (Mr. McInerney) 2909 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. McInerney) 2319 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. Russell, 2249 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. McDougall) 3960 (ii).
- LOBSTER FISHERY, P. E. I., INFRACTION OF REGULATIONS, FINES IMPOSED, COST OF PROSECUTIONS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Martin) 5377 (ii).
- M. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Martin) 5504 (ii).
- FISHING, EXTENSION OF SEASON IN P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 6561 (iii).
- PROTECTION, REGULATIONS *re*: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. McLennan, Inverness) 7675 (iii).
- MILTOWN, N. S., APPOINT. OF FISHERY GUARDIAN: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4482 (ii).
- NEWFOUNDLAND AND CANADIAN FISHERMEN, SUPPLY OF BAIT, COR., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) 9465 (iii).
- REGULATIONS *re* EXPORT OF BAIT: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 6938 (iii).
- FISHERIES AND FRENCH SHORE, REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Gillies) 3070 (i).
- REGULATIONS *re* LIVE BAIT: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2194 (i).
- REGULATIONS *re* PURCHASE OF BAIT: Inquiry for Return (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2696 (i).
- NOBLE BROS.: in Com. of Sup., 4214 (ii).
- AMOUNTS PAID TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2184 (i).
- OYSTER BED, B. C., CLAIMS OF ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RY. CO.: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 3821 (ii).
- OYSTER CULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 4241 (ii).
- PETERS, MR. F., AND E. V. BODWELL, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5181 (ii).
- POACHING ON THE PACIFIC COAST: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 8347 (iii).
- P. E. I. FISHING BOUNTIES, NAMES OF PERSONS, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Macdonald, P. E. I.) 5861 (ii).
- LOBSTER FISHING, PETS. *re* EXTENSION OF SEASON: Ques. (Mr. McLellan, P. E. I.) 6122 (ii).
- QUICK, MR. JAMES, DISMISSAL AS LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: par. in *Windsor World* (Mr. Cowan) 7219 (iii).
- U. S. FISHING VESSELS AND MODUS VIVENDI, LICENSES, CONCESSIONS GRANTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McAlister) 2330 (i).
- M. for Ret.\* (Mr. McAlister) 2788 (i).
- FITZGIBBON, &C., CUSTOMS UNDERVALUATION: in Com. of Sup., 3387 (iii).
- FLOUR RATES AND CAR MILEAGE, &c., I. C. R.: Papers laid on Table (Mr. Blair) 4730 (ii).
- FLUHMAN, DR., MEDICAL OFFICER TO INDIANS AT POINTE BLEUE, PETS. *re* DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4060 (ii).
- FORT FRANCIS AND RAINY RIVER RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 8916; in Com., 9550 (ii).
- FOSTER, HON. GEO. E., EX-MIN., TRAVELLING AND LIVING EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1834 (i).
- FOURCHIE HARBOUR, N. S., DREDGING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 2904 (i).
- FRANCHISE ELECTORAL ACT, AMENDMENTS BY N. B. GOVERNMENT: Ques. (Mr. McInerney) 2530 (i).
- FRANCHISE ACT AMT. BILL (P. E. I.), NOT ON ORDER PAPER: Remarks (Mr. Montague) 9308 (iii).
- FRANCHISE ACT SCHEDULES: Remarks (Mr. Powell) 1073 (i).
- FRANKING PRIVILEGES TO LEGISLATIVE REPORTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3823 (ii).
- FRASER RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 8088 (iii).
- MILLER'S LANDING, IMPROVEMENTS, EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques., 2701 (i).
- AND SKEENA RIVER FISH HATCHERIES, ERECTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 4058 (ii).
- FRASERVILLE HARBOUR AND BOARD OF TRADE RESOLUTIONS: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1968 (i).
- STATION ACCOMMODATION, PETS. FROM BOARD OF TRADE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1972 (i).
- PETS. *re* DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 2899 (i).
- FRECHETTE, L. A., TRANSLATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4803 (ii).
- FREDERICTON MILITARY SCHOOL, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADMISSION AND INSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 3795 (ii).
- FREIGHT CARRIED FROM 1897-9, I. C. R., NUMBER OF TONS AND RECEIPTS: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 3257 (i).
- RATES, &c., I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7457.
- RATES ON FLOUR, 1897-8, I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 3549 (ii).
- TRANSPORTATION, YUKON, GUARANTEE BY CONTRACTORS, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2902 (i).
- FRENCH CANADIAN REPATRIATION FROM U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1844 (i).
- FRIENDLY SOCIETY INSURANCE, GOVT.'S POLICY *re* LEGISLATION: Remarks (Mr. Montague) 3342 (ii).
- FRONTIER CUSTOMS, YUKON DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 8746 (iii).
- Fruit Packages Definition of Size B. No. 56 (Mr. Penny) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1352; on Order for 2<sup>d</sup>, 3316 (i); 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3872; withdn., 5360 (ii).
- FUNERAL WREATH, LATE SIR JOHN THOMPSON: QUESTION DROPPED (Mr. McMullen) 1849 (i).
- GABARUS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 5201 (ii), 9991 (iii).
- INSPECTION, &c., BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 2698 (i).
- GAGNE, HON. MR. JUSTICE, AND CONNECTION WITH LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO., DELAY TO LITIGANTS: Ques. (Mr. Savard) 2189 (i).
- GALICIAN IMMIGRANTS AT SALTCOATS, OUTBREAK OF SCARLET FEVER: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 4895 (ii).
- SETTLEMENT AT SALTCOATS, COMMISSIONER'S INVESTIGATION: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 6935 (iii).
- AND DOUKHOBORS, NUMBER BROUGHT INTO CAN., NAMES OF AGENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8466 (iii).

- GALLANT, W. A., ENGINEER POINT LEPREAUX FOG ALARM, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4806 (ii).
- GALLERIES OF THE HOUSE, DEMONSTRATION CHECKED (Mr. Speaker) 2897 (i).
- GALNA, MR., DISMISSAL, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8446.
- GALOPS CANAL, ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 7299, 7442 (iii).
- GALT POSTMASTER, SALARY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3824 (ii).
- Game Preservation Unorganized Territories Act (1894) Amt. B. No. 153** (Mr. Sifton) 1°, 4991; 2° and in Com., 6442; 3°, 6459 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 20.)
- GANANOQUE PUBLIC BUILDING, HEATING, TENDERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1881 (i).
- GASPE BASIN AND DALHOUSIE MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 8685 (iii).
- GASPE CUSTOMS OFFICER AND ELECTION, CHARGES AGAINST : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10222 (iii).
- GAUTHIER, JEAN, POSTMASTER AT METABETCHOUAN, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4059 (ii).
- General Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 55** (Mr. Penny) 1°, 1352 (i); 2°, 3871; withdn., 5360.  
See "Fruit Packages."  
— B. No. 132 (Sir Henri Joly) 1°, 3751; withdn., 5098 (ii).  
— B. No. 156 (Sir Henri Joly) 1°, 5099 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 9636; 3°, 9660 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 25.)
- General Trusts Corporation of Canada B. No. 129** (Mr. McMullen) 1°, 3646; 2°, 3844; in Com. and 3°, 5792 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 111.)
- GEOFFRION, HON. MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7630 (iii).
- Geological Survey Act Amt. B. No. 146** (Mr. Sifton) 1°, 4891; 2° and in Com., 6396; 3°, 6459 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 21.)
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY : in Com. of Sup., 2104 (i); 5668 (ii); 7467 (iii).
- GEORGIAN BAY AND TORONTO SHIP CANAL, PETS., APPLICATIONS, COR., &c. : M. for Copies (Mr. Wallace) 4819 (ii).
- GERMAN DISCRIMINATING DUTIES ON CAN. IMPORTS : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1851 (i).
- GIANT'S TOOMB, LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, SALARY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1834 (i).
- GILLIS, FRANK, I.C.R. STATION AGENT AT TRACADIE, N.S., DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 4056 (ii).
- GLADSTONE, RT. HON. W. E., RES. OF CONDOLENCE : Reply (Mr. Speaker) 3 (i).
- GLASS, JAMES, FISHERY GUARDIAN AT CHARLOTTE, N.B., APPNMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4482 (ii).
- Glenora Ry. Co's. B. No. 101** (Mr. Morrison) 1°, 2409; 2°, 2650 (i).
- GODERICH HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 8010 (iii).  
— DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 8012 (ii).  
— IMPROVEMENTS, CONTRACTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1881 (i).
- GOLD COMMISSIONER YUKON, APPNMT. : Ques. (Mr. Morrison) 1823 (i).
- GOSSELIN, MR. F., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Stenson) 3827 (ii).
- GOUIN, MR. LOMER, SPEECH *re* SUBSIDIES TO PROVS. : Ques. (Mr. Chauvin) 1981 (i).
- GOVERNMENT BUSINESS, DELAY IN BRINGING DOWN : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8221 (iii).  
— PRECEDENCE ON MONDAYS : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6279 (ii).  
— WEDNESDAYS : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3555 (ii).  
— CONTRACT, PROHIBITION OF SWEATING : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1975 (i).  
— NUMBER OF CONTRACTS AWARDED, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Clarke) 2961 (i).
- GOVERNMENT OF KEEWATIN : in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iii).
- GOVERNMENT LANDS, MAN., SALE OF, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1856 (i).  
— STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5101 (ii).  
— REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2990, 3004 (i); 3532, 4719 (ii).
- GOVERNMENT OF THE N. W. TERRITORIES : in Com. of Sup., 7499 (iii).  
— PROPERTY (B.C.) LEASE, &c., COR. RESPECTING : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 8465 (iii).  
— RENTAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 8991 (iii).  
— RYS., TENDERS FOR OIL, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Bergeron) 2028 (i).  
— WORKING EXPENSES FOR MAY AND JUNE, 1898, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4810 (ii).
- GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SECRETARY'S OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 2047 (i).  
— CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).  
— LETTER *re* PROROGATION : Read (Mr. Speaker) 10246 (iii).
- "GOVERNOR PINCBEE" AND "J. B. LOWE," STRS., REGISTRY IN CAN. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1856 (i).
- GRAIN ELEVATORS IN N.W.T., PAR. IN WINNIPEG *Tribune* : M. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Davin) 5494 (ii).  
— EXPORTED FROM CAN. PORTS, NUMBER OF BUSHELS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bell, Addington) 3256 (i).  
— EXPORTS FROM CAN. HARBOURS IN 1898 : Ques. (Mr. Bell, Addington) 3075 (i).  
— EXPORTS TO GERMANY IN 1898-99, QUANTITY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 8990 (iii).  
— N. W. T., LEGISLATION *re* INSPECTION, &c. : Prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 3829 (ii).  
— STANDARDS, BOARD, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5586 (ii).
- Grain Transit Man. and N. W. T. Regulation B. 15** (Mr. Douglas) 1°, 618; 2°, 1901 (i).
- GRAND MANAN AND MAINLAND, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 8634 (iii).
- GRAND NARROWS, LEASE OF PROPERTY : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. McDougall) 4997 (ii).

- GRAND RIVER FLOODS, GOVT. REPORTS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 2536 (i).
- G. T. R. and I. C. R., ENGINE AND CAR MILEAGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 4811 (ii).
- M. for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 5313 (ii).
- TRACKMENS' STRIKE: (Mr. *Clarke*) to Com. of Sup., 3774 (ii).
- AND ALIEN LABOUR LAW ENFORCEMENT: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3960, 3984 (ii).
- SETTLEMENT, &c.: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4501 (ii).
- Deb. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4503, 4512; (Mr. *Casey*) 4505; (Mr. *Blair*) 4506; (Mr. *Ives*) 4508; (Mr. *McNeill*) 4509; (Mr. *Wallace*) 4512; (Mr. *Powell*) 4514; (Mr. *Ingram*) 4519, 4544; (Mr. *Taylor*) 4520; (Mr. *Henderson*) 4523; (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 4534; (Mr. *Davin*) 4536; (Mr. *McMullen*) 4538; (Mr. *Clarke*) 4539; (Mr. *Bell, P. E. I.*) 4540; (Mr. *Hughes*) 4541, 4547; (Mr. *Reid*) 4541; (Mr. *Kendry*) 4543; (Mr. *McHugh*) 4549 (ii).
- COR. RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4730 (ii).
- LETTER FROM MR. DEANE: Read (Mr. *Taylor*) 4786 (ii).
- Inquiry for Papers *re* Settlement (Mr. *Clarke*) 4858 (ii).
- RUMOURED SETTLEMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 5206 (ii).
- GRAND TRUNK. See "I. C. R."
- GRATUITY TO COMMANDER WAKEHAM: in Com. of Sup., 5183 (ii).
- TO INDIANS, N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 5694 (ii).
- TO MRS. MUIRHEAD: in Com. of Sup., 5179.
- TO R. N. VENNING: in Com. of Sup., 5183 (ii).
- GREATER BRITAIN EXHIBITION, CANADIAN REPRESENTATION OF MINERAL EXHIBIT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1959 (i).
- G. B. AND RUSSIA, TREATY OF 1825, PROTOCOLS, &c.: M. for Copy\* (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6939 (iii).
- Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 118 (Mr. *Savard*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2966 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3492 (ii); in Com., 6970, 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 6972 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
- GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8914, 8918; in Com., 9435, 9770 (iii).
- Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 90 (Mr. *Macpherson*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2182; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2320 (i); 3<sup>o</sup> m., 4189, 4524, 4771; agreed to (Y. 51; N. 21) 4786 (ii) (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 69.)
- GREEN SAND CASINGS, I. C. R., TENDERS, PRICE, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 5360 (ii).
- GRENVILLE CANAL, COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4992 (ii).
- MAINTENANCE OF ROADWAYS ON FARMS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 6048 (ii).
- LETTER OF MR. G. S. CONWAY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 6380 (ii).
- TOLL COLLECTOR, APPOINTMENT AND DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2532 (i).
- GREY, ROBERT, LIGHT-HOUSE KEEPER AT ENTRANCE ISLAND, RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 7319 (iii).
- GROSS EARNINGS AND EXPENSES, I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1849 (i).
- GROSS, MR. BOAZ, HARBOUR MASTER AT HILLSBORO, PAPER RESPECTING: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *McInerney*) 4732 (ii).
- GUAY POST OFFICE, REVENUE, SALARY PAID TO POSTMASTER VERRAULT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3260 (i).
- HALF-BREEDS COMMISSION, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9056, 10110 (iii).
- N. W. T., COR. BETWEEN MR. McDOWALL AND GOVT. *re* RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2486 (i).
- HALIBURTON AND MATTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916 (iii).
- HALIFAX DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iii).
- HARBOUR LIGHTSHIP AND RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 8920 (iii).
- NPLD. AND LIVERPOOL, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8672 (iii).
- AND PORTO RICO, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 10158 (iii).
- PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 9943 (iii).
- QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 9945 (iii).
- HALL, DR., APPOINTMENT AS INSPECTOR OF CATTLE AT CHICOUTIMI: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3336 (ii).
- Hamilton Powder Co.'s B. No. 78 (Mr. *Penny*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2029; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2290 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 113.)
- HAMILTON RIFLE RANGE: in Com. of Sup., 5465 (ii).
- HANTSPORT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5198 (ii).
- HARBOUR AND RIVER WORKS, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5201 (ii); 8102, 8105 (iii).
- HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 8085 (iii).
- MANITOBA: in Com. of Sup., 8077 (iii).
- N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 10010 (iii).
- N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 8084 (iii).
- N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 5198 (ii); 7693, 9990; conc., 10218 (iii).
- ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 7966, 10065 (iii).
- P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 10006 (iii).
- QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 7557, 8103, 10014.
- HARPER, MR. F., POSTMASTER AT DAWSON CITY, ISSUE OF NOTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1961 (i).
- HARRIS, MR., AGREEMENT WITH, AS TRAFFIC MANAGER I. C. R.: Ques.: (Mr. *Pope*) 1975, 1980 (i).
- M. for Cor. (Mr. *McDougal*) 2905 (i).
- M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Pope*) 2961 (i).
- HAVELOCK AND OAK LAKE MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 3824 (ii).
- HAWKESBURY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916; in Com., 9456 (iii).
- HEADQUARTERS AT LEVIS, I. C. R., TRANSFER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 3551 (ii).
- HENEY & BORTHWICK, CLAIMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9173, 10153 (iii).
- HERNES, JOHN, CABETAKER NAPANEE PUBLIC BUILDING COR. *re* DISMISSAL, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. *Wilson*) 5377 (ii).

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, CONTINGENCIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8748 (iii).

HILLSBORO, N. B., HARBOUR MASTER, CHARGES AGAINST, EVIDENCE AND COMMISSIONERS' REP., &c., M. for Copy\* (Mr. *McInerney*) 2027 (i).

HOG CHOLERA, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5085 (ii).

HOGG, W. A., CUSTOMS OFFICER AT COLLINGWOOD, CHARGES AGAINST, COMMISSIONER'S REP., &c.: M. for Copy\* (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2788 (i).

Home Life Association of Canada, B. No. 13 (Mr. *McGregor*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 618; 2<sup>o</sup>, 934; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 2698 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 114.)

HOMESTEAD LAW IN N. W. T., INTEREST ON PRE-EMPTIONS, MEMORIAL FROM SETTLERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3080 (i).

HOPE ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, NAME, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1834 (i), 5486 (ii).

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS:

ADDRESS TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: Consdn., M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 (i).

— REPLY, MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 2963 (i).

— CLOSING OF DEBATE: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 975, 1016 (i).

— OMISSION OF NAMES FROM DIVISION LIST: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 1861 (i).

— GLADSTONE, RT. HON. W. E., RES. OF CONDOLENCE: Reply (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

— TO HER MAJ. *re* TRANSVAAL QUESTION: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8992 (iii).

ADJOURNMENT FOR ASCENSION DAY AND FRIDAY'S SITTING: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2706 (i).

— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2790 (i).

— EASTER: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 581 (i).

— MEMBERS DECEASED: M. to adjn. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 (i).

— OF THE HOUSE, MOTIONS: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3816, 3817 (ii).

— QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 3340 (ii).

— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3340.

— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3440 (ii).

APPEALS FROM RULING OF CHAIRMAN TO SPEAKER IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE, STMT. AND AUTHORITY QUOTED (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 4553 (ii).

BAIN, HON. THOS., ELECTION AS SPEAKER: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9062 (iii).

BAENETT, C., ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 10137 (iii).

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 6928 (iii).

BUDGET, THE, FINANCIAL STMT. (Mr. *Fielding*) 2410 (i).

— Reply (Mr. *Foster*) 2537 (i).

BURBARD, MEMBER FOR, USE OF REVEREND IN QUESTION: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 1838 (i).

BROCKVILLE AND WEST HURON ELECTIONS, ATTENDANCE OF CLERK OF THE CROWN IN CHANCERY WITH PAPERS, &c. (Mr. *Speaker*) 6821 (iii).

— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 6595 (ii).

— M. to place Documents on Table (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 57.3 (ii), 6821 (iii).

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—BUDGET SPEECH: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2318 (i).

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE *re* ESTIMATES: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 2025 (i).

— Introduction of Bills (Mr. *Speaker*) 618 (i).

— MORNING SITTING: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7768 (iii).

— UNOPPOSED RETURNS: Remarks (Mr. *Wallace*) 6938 (iii).

— SENATE RESOLUTIONS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7321, 7442 (iii).

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE. See "Govt. Business."

COMMITTEE MEETINGS, ACCOMMODATION IN ROOMS: Remarks (Mr. *Penny*) 3314 (i).

CONVERTED ELECTIONS: Judges' Reps., 1 (i).

EDGAR, LADY, BALANCE OF SALARY OF LATE SPEAKER: in Com. of Sup., 10196 (iii).

— SIR JAMES, LATE SPEAKER, DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9060 (iii).

ELECTIONS, CERTIFICATES RECEIVED DURING RECESS (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

ELECTORAL LISTS, N.S., PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1979 (i).

FRANKING PRIVILEGE TO LEGISLATIVE REPORTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3823 (ii).

FUNERAL WREATH, LATE SIR JOHN THOMPSON: Question dropped (Mr. *McMullen*) 1849 (i).

GALLERIES OF THE HOUSE: Demonstration checked (Mr. *Speaker*) 2897 (i).

GEOFFRION, HON. MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7630 (iii).

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS, DELAY IN BRINGING DOWN: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8221 (iii).

— PRECEDENCE ON MONDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6279 (ii).

— PRECEDENCE ON WEDNESDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3555 (ii).

— PRECEDENCE ON THURSDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2409 (i).

HURON, W., ELECTORAL DISTRICT, REPRESENTATION, VACANCY: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 9597 (iii).

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION, ALASKAN BOUNDARY PROTOCOLS: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 4264 (ii).

IRREGULARITY OF DEBATE: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 6741 (ii), 7635 (iii).

IVES, HON. MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7532 (iii).

LEGISLATION—SENATE: in Com. of Sup., 5730 (ii).

LIBRARY COMMITTEE, JOINT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 531 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, DISTURBANCE BY MESSENGERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 10221 (iii).

— MESSENGERS: in Com. of Sup., 10140 (iii).

MEMBERS ADDRESSING CHAIR: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7214 (iii).

— ASKED TO FORMULATE THEIR QUESTIONS SO AS NOT TO MAKE STATEMENTS OF FACTS (Mr. *Speaker*) 4483 (ii).

— ASKED TO KEEP TO MOTION BEFORE HOUSE (Mr. *Speaker*) 4816 (ii).

— ASKED NOT TO INTERRUPT SPEAKERS (Mr. *Speaker*) 1175 (i).

— ASKED TO RETRACT STATEMENT (Mr. *Speaker*) 4006 (ii).

— ASKED TO SPEAK TO MOTION BEFORE HOUSE (Mr. *Speaker*) 1565, 1573 (i).

— ASKED TO WITHDRAW STMT. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1177, 1555 (i).

— ATTENTION CALLED TO PROCEDURES FOR WEDNESDAYE (Mr. *Speaker*) 8269 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

- MEMBERS BREAKING RULES ON CALLING ORDERS OF THE DAY (Mr. *Speaker*) 3558 (ii).
- CANNOT INTERRUPT, WITHOUT CONSENT OF MEMBER MAKING SPEECH (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 3226 (i).
- CANNOT MOVE ADJNMT TWICE ON ORDER OF THE DAY BEING CALLED (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 4551 (ii).
- CANNOT REFER TO PREVIOUS DEBATE IN ASKING QUESTIONS: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3262 (i).
- CANNOT SPEAK BUT ONCE ON A MOTION (Mr. *Speaker*) 3777 (ii).
- CANNOT SPEAK TWICE ON SAME SUBJECT (Mr. *Speaker*) 5375, 5376 (ii).
- CHECKED IN REFERRING TO PREVIOUS DEBATE (Mr. *Speaker*) 3193 (i).
- IN ORDER TO SPEAK TO MOTION TO GO INTO SUPPLY (Mr. *Speaker*) 8644 (iii).
- INTRODUCED, 4, 421, 2897 (i).
- MILEAGE ALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Maxwell*) 6722 (ii).
- MOTION NOT IN ORDER (Mr. *Speaker*) 3342 (ii).
- MOVING READING OF BILL: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2918 (i).
- MUST ADDRESS THE CHAIR (Mr. *Chairman*) 9647 (iii).
- MUST CONCLUDE WITH A MOTION (Mr. *Speaker*) 3754 (ii).
- MUST CONCLUDE WITH A MOTION (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 3499 (ii).
- MUST CONFINE REMARKS TO BILL BEFORE HSE. (Mr. *Speaker*) 4780 (ii).
- MUST CONFINE HIS REMARKS TO MOTION BEFORE HSE. (Mr. *Speaker*) 5402 (ii).
- MUST NOT INTERRUPT WITHOUT PERMISSION OF SPEAKER (Mr. *Speaker*) 6170 (ii).
- MUST NOT QUOTE FROM PREVIOUS DEBATE (Mr. *Speaker*) 7196 (iii).
- MUST NOT REFER TO PAST DEBATE (Mr. *Speaker*) 3328 (i).
- NEW, CERTIFICATES OF RET.: Notification, 1 (i).
- RESIGNATION: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3.
- SPEECHES OUT OF ORDER, MUST MAKE A MOTION (Mr. *Speaker*) 2846 (ii).
- REMARKS CHECKED (Mr. *Speaker*) 1871, 1953, 1954, 2733, 2734, 2742, 2794, 2805, 3193, 3224, 3225 (i); 3557, 5493, 6315 (ii).
- MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 158 (i).
- INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 158 (i).
- Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 2963 (i), 4858 (ii).
- Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 7638 (iii).
- read (Mr. *Speaker*) 9835 (iii).
- MESS. BY BLACK ROD, 6930 (iii).
- MORNING SITTINGS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7768 (iii).
- ORDER, QUES. OF, ABUSING THE PRIVILEGES OF MOTIONS TO ADJN.: Authorities Quoted (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6591; (Mr. *Speaker*) 6594 (ii).
- IRREGULARITY OF DEBATE (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 8921 (iii).
- MEMBER ASKED TO WITHDRW. WORD "BEAST" (Mr. *Speaker*) 6225 (ii).
- MEMBER ASKED TO WITHDRW. WORD "COWARDLY" (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 6157 (ii).
- MEMBER (SIR CHARLES TUPPER) ASKED TO WITHDR. STATEMENT (Mr. *Speaker*) 5394 (ii).
- MEMBER IMPUTING MOTIVES: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 5882, 6239 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

- ORDER, QUES. OF, MEMBERS REQUESTED NOT TO INTERRUPT (Mr. *Speaker*) 427 (i).
- MUST WITHDRW. THE WORD "DEMAGOGUE," 9655 (ii).
- REFERENCE TO DEBATE IN ANOTHER HOUSE, 9897 (iii).
- REFERENCE TO DEBATE IN COM.: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 6826 (iii).
- REFERENCE TO PAST DEBATE: Ruling (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 6753 (ii).
- ON STATEMENTS MADE GENERALLY: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7213 (iii).
- Ruling (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 6778 (ii).
- PARLIAMENT, OPENING: Mess. by Black Rod, 1 (i).
- PROROGATION: Com. from Gov. Gen's Sec. (read) 10246 (iii).
- PERSONAL EXPLANATION, CHANGE OF ATTITUDE TOWARDS HIS PARTY (Mr. *Costigan*) 3555, 3648 (ii).
- re QUESTION AS TO MR. MARK WORKMAN (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4990 (ii).
- re VOTE ON KETTLE RIVER RY. BILL (Mr. *Prior*) 9595 (iii).
- PETITIONS, IRREGULARITY OF: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 421 (i).
- RULE OF PROCEDURE (Mr. *Speaker*) 1737 (i).
- PRIVATE BILLS PETITIONS, EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. *Scriven*) 894 (i).
- EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2182 (i).
- M. to Suspend Rule (Mr. *Landerkin*) 5378 (ii).
- PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF: Insertion of Remarks in HANSARD by Min. of Public Works (Mr. *Davin*) 421 (i).
- PROCEDURE FOR RETURNS, MOTION re: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3560 (ii).
- ON CALLING ORDERS OF THE DAY: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2118 (i).
- PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE, POLL BOOKS, VOTERS' LISTS, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Moore*) 2906 (i).
- RET. OF VOTES POLLED, PAPERS, &c.: Request that they be laid on the Table (Mr. *Foster*) 1894, 1895 (i).
- M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2037 (i).
- Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2041, 2045 (i).
- PROROGATION, COM. FROM GOV. GEN'S. SEC.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 10246 (iii).
- QUESTIONS, FORM OF ASKING: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 2322 (i).
- MEMBER ASKED TO WITHDRW. OBJECTIONABLE WORD (Mr. *Speaker*) 2484 (i).
- READING ROOM, VENTILATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 974 (i).
- RESTAURANT, H. OF C.; in Com. of Sup., 10137 (iii).
- SERGEANT-AT-ARMS, H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup. 2280 (i).
- SESSIONAL CLERKS, COMMITTEES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2278, 2280 (i).
- SESSIONAL INDEMNITIES OF DECEASED SENATORS AND MEMBERS; in Com. of Sup., 10196 (iii).
- SPEAKER'S ATTENTION CALLED TO MEMBER'S SPEECH OUT OF ORDER: (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3754 (ii).
- ELECTION OF: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9062 (iii).
- DEP. DELEGATION OF POWERS: Ruling asked from Mr. *Speaker* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5491 (ii).
- SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
- LATE SIR JAMES EDGAR, DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9060 (iii).
- SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 4 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

- SPEECHES OF MEMBERS, LIMITATION, &c. : M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Charlton) 2755, 2770 (i).
- STATIONERY, H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 5730 (ii) ; 10139 (iii).
- SUPPLIED TO MEMBERS : on M. (Mr. Gibson) to Conc. in 3rd, 4th and 5th Rep. of Printing Com. 5378 (ii).
- SUPPLIES, HOUSE OF COMMONS : in Com. of Sup. 2278 (i).
- UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE ; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 5406 (ii) ; 9208 (iii).
- VACANCIES : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- VENTILATION OF READING ROOM : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 974 (i).
- VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6120 (ii).
- VOTERS LISTS : in Com. of Sup., 8750, 10127 (iii).
- CONTINGENT EXPENSES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2281, 2290 (i).
- N. B., DELAY IN SENDING IN REVISION : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2530, 2693 (i).
- PRINTING, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 6827 (ii).
- REVISED COPIES, &c. : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 1819 (i).
- WINNIPEG ELECTORAL DISTRICT AND REPRESENTATION : Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1830 (i).
- ISSUE OF WRIT : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 804 (i).
- VACANCY : Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 619, 804 (i).
- LISTS, PREPARATION, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Wallace) 2908 (i).
- YUKON TERRITORY, REPRESENTATION IN PARLIAMENT : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2301 (i).
- HUBERT, MISS ANNABELLA, CLAIMS AND PETS. : Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 2534, 3256 (i).
- Hudson's Bay and Yukon Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. No. 110 (Mr. Oliver) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2696 ; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3003 (i) ; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup> 4357 (ii). (62-63 Vic. c. 70.)
- HUDSON BAY AND YUKON RY. AND NAV. COMPANY : M. to Receive Pet. (Mr. Flint) 2132 (i).
- HUDSON'S STRAITS, NAVIGABILITY, COST OF EXPEDITION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3337 (ii).
- HUMBERSTONE POST OFFICE, CHARGES AGAINST POSTMASTER : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6594 (ii).
- &c. : Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 6562 (ii).
- HUNKER CREEK, YUKON, KLONDIKE MINING, APPLICATION AND GRANTS FOR HYDRAULICING : M. for Copies\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2962 (i).
- Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Co's B. No. 74 (Mr. Beattie) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2029 ; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2290 (i) ; in Com., 4302, 4846 ; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4846 (ii). (62-63 Vic. c. 115.)
- HURON, W. ELECTORAL DISTRICT, REPRESENTATION, VACANCY : Remarks (Mr. Maclean) 9597 (iii).
- ILLUSTRATION STATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 8279, 8745 (iii).
- "ILLUSTRATION STATIONS," FRUIT, CEREALS, &c., GOVTL. ACTION : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2119 (i).
- IMMIGRATION :
- AGENTS, APPOINT. SINCE AUG., 1893, NAMES, SALARIES, &c. : M. for List\* (Mr. Foster) 1377 (i).
- BONUS TO : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1975, 2191 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

- AGENTS, SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8477, 8648 ; conc., 10214 (iii).
- BONUS, AMOUNTS PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1975, 2191 (i).
- CANADIAN EMIGRATION TO U.S. : par in Montreal Star : Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 1895 (i).
- DICKSON, MR. R., IMMIGRATION AGENT, APPOINT. BY GOVT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1855 (i).
- DOUKHOBOR, FINLAND, &c., NUMBER, COST, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 2481 (i).
- QUARANTINED AT GROSSE ISLE : Remarks (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4550 (ii).
- EMIGRATION TO U.S. ANSWER TO QUESTION : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2117 (i).
- PAR. IN NEWSPAPERS : Ques. (Mr. McAlister) 2115 (i).
- EUROPEAN, NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION OF IMMIGRANTS : Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 1980 (i).
- FINLAND, DOUKHOBOR, &c., NUMBER, COST, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 2481 (i).
- FRENCH CANADIAN REPATRIATION FROM U.S. : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1844 (i).
- GALICIANS AND DOUKHOBORS, NUMBER BROUGHT INTO CAN., NAMES OF AGENTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3466 (iii).
- IMMIGRANTS AT SALTCOATS. OUTBREAK OF SCARLET FEVER : Remarks (Mr. Davin), 4895 (ii).
- COMMISSIONER'S INVESTIGATION : Remarks (Mr. Davin) 6935 (iii).
- IMMIGRATION : in Com. of Sup., 8477, 9027 (iii).
- INDUCEMENTS TO SETTLERS (G. B.) IN CAN. &c. : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 3076 (i).
- NUMBER OF IMMIGRANTS SENT OUT BY AGENTS IN G.B. AND U.S. : Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 2192 (i).
- ARRIVAL IN 1898, NUMBER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 3553 (ii).
- JURY, MR. A. F., SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iii).
- ONTARIO SETTLERS IN N.W.T., PRIVILEGES GRANTED BY GOVT. : Remarks (Mr. Rosemond) 6051 (ii).
- PARIS AGENCY, SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8704 (iii).
- PRESTON, W. T. R., SALARY, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8569 ; amt. (Mr. Bennett) 8578 ; conc., 10214 (iii).
- Ques. (Mr. Davin) 6938 (iii).
- QUARANTINE : par. in Ottawa Citizen (Mr. Sproule) 2192 (i).
- REPATRIATION OF CANADIANS FROM U.S., NUMBER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 3078 (i).
- SETTLERS FROM EASTERN CANADA TO N.W.T., AID BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Gilmour) 2634 (i).
- FROM U.S., NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION : Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 1979 (i).
- Immigration Restriction B. No. 48 (Mr. McInnes) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1165 (i).
- IMMORALITY, PROFESSIONAL, YUKON DISTRICT, TAXES IMPOSED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1842 (i).
- Imperial Loan Investment Co.'s incorp. B. No. 150 (Mr. McCarthy) 1<sup>st</sup>, 5096 ; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 5536 ; in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 6326 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 116.)
- IMPERIAL SERVICE AND CANADIAN BRIGADE AND CAN. SEAMEN : prop. Res. (Mr. Hughes) 2335, 2352 (i).
- INCREASED STATION ACCOMMODATION I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 9163 (iii).

INDIANS:

- ABENAKIS INDIANS, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 10110 (iii).
- DUCHES INDIAN RESERVE, NEGOTIATIONS *re* SALE OF TIMBER LIMITS, REMOVAL OF INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. McCormack) 2700 (i).
- DUPUIS, P. C., PROSECUTION FOR SELLING LIQUOR TO INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4060 (ii).
- ELKHORN INDIAN SCHOOL, PRINTING PLANT, LEASE TO W. J. THOMPSON, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3076.
- ELCHMAN, DR., MEDICAL OFFICER TO INDIANS AT POINTE BLEUE, PETS. *re* DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4060 (ii).
- GRATUITIES TO INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 5694 (ii).
- INDIAN AFFAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2083 (i), 5669 (ii).
  - AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 5730 (ii).
  - GENERAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5722 (ii).
  - HOSPITALS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5726 (ii).
  - IMPLEMENTS, TOOLS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5712 (ii).
  - MAN, N.W.T., ANNUITIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5711 (ii).
  - SEED GRAIN, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 5691 (ii).
  - N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 5691 (ii).
  - B.C. RESERVES AND MINING RIGHTS: in Com. of Sup., 5703, 5725 (ii).
  - RESERVE SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 5710, 5721 (ii).
- INDUSTRIAL AND BOARDING SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 10110 (iii).
  - N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iii).
- LIQUOR SOLD TO INDIANS, PROSECUTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1850 (i).
  - TRAFFIC OF INDIAN RESERVES: in Com. of Sup., 5710 (ii).
- MEDICAL ATTENDANCE QUEBEC INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 5669 (ii).
- MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 10112 (iii).
- OJA INDIANS, REMOVAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5709 (ii).
- RAMA INDIANS AND STATUTE LABOUR, GOVT. AID TO MAINTENANCE OF ROADS AND BRIDGES: Ques. (Mr. McCormack) 2700 (i).
  - CHARGES AGAINST AGENT, COST OF INQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1976 (i).
  - WITNESSES FEES *re* INQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2114 (ii).
- ST. REGIS INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 5699 (ii).
- SAUGHER INDIANS RESERVE, MEDICAL SUPPLY, PATRICK SCOTT, DISMISSAL, &c.: Remarks (Mr. McNeill) 9699 (ii).
- SAW LOGS, EXPORTATION, PREVENTION BY GOVT. ON INDIAN RESERVES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1834 (i).
- SCOGOG INDIANS, LIQUOR SOLD, COR., BETWEEN DEPT. AND MR. A. SOPER: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Foster) 3149 (i).
- SEED GRAIN, MAN. AND N.W.T. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 5691 (ii).
- SIoux INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 5721 (ii).
- SONGHEES INDIAN RESERVE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5704 (ii).
  - COR. BETWEEN DOM. AND PROVL. GOVT.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Prior) 3873 (ii).
  - REMOVAL FROM RESERVE, SETTLEMENT WITH B.C. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3797 (ii).
  - Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Prior) 4713 (ii).

INDIANS—*Con.*

- STEEL BOXES FOR INDIAN DEPT., NUMBER SUPPLIED, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hodgins) 4995 (ii).
- VENNER, DR., INDIAN AGENT COMMISSIONER'S EXPENSES *re* INVESTIGATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McAllister) 1858 (i).
- YALE AND CARIBOO, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 8630, 8989 (iii).
- INDIAN CORN IMPORTED FROM 1896-99: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 8217 (iii).
  - IMPORTED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 8632, 8990 (iii).
- INDIAN GARDEN AND SHELburne RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 8915; in Com., 9454, 9780 (iii).
- INDIANTOWN BRANCH, AWARDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9165 (iii).
- INDIAN TREATY WITH N. W. T. INDIANS AND HALF-BREEDS: in Com. of Sup., 5694 (ii).
- INLAND FISHERIES, ISSUE OF LICENSES BY LOCAL GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 2910 (i).
- INLAND REVENUE:
  - APPLES, FRAUDULENT PACKING: par. in Toronto World, M. to adjn. (Mr. McMillan) 3753 (ii).
  - CHRISTIE, MR. W. J., DISMISSAL FROM INLAND REV. DEPT., O. C.'s, REP., COR., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Roche) 2393 (i).
  - COMMISSION ON STAMPS FOR CAN. TOBACCO: in Com. of Sup., 4790 (ii).
  - ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 5578 (ii).
    - EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4804 (ii).
  - ELEVATOR RESTRICTIONS AND C. P. R., LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 2903 (i).
  - EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).
    - INSPECTION OF SEALED FOOD PACKAGES, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Ellis) 2705 (i).
  - GRAIN STANDARDS BOARD: in Com. of Sup., 5583 (ii).
    - N. W. T., LEGISLATION *re* INSPECTION, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. Davis) 3829 (ii).
  - INLAND REVENUE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2100, 2270 (i).
    - CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 5013 (ii).
    - INSPECTION ACT, &c.; Remarks on M. for Ways and Means (Mr. Davis) 10225 (iii).
    - EXCISE, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4770, 4787 (ii).
    - WHEAT, DEPUTATIONS, &c.: Remarks (Sir Henry Joly de Lotbinière) 1540 (i).
    - WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4803 (ii).
  - POTASH INSPECTION AND MONTREAL BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. Pessay) 1858 (i).
    - M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Préfontaine) 1878 (i).
  - PREVENTIVE SERVICE, EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 5578 (ii).
  - SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 8173 (iii).
  - TOBACCO, CANADIAN AND FOREIGN, EXCISE DUTY PAID SINCE 1898, NUMBER OF EMPLOYERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 3075 (i).
    - (CAN.) MANUFACTURE, NUMBER OF FACTORIES, MEMORIALS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Gauthier) 2027 (i).
    - COMMISSION ON STAMPS: in Com. of Sup., 4790 (ii).

INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*

- TOBACCO, DUTIES COLLECTED : Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1818 (i).
- FOREIGN LEAF, PERCENTAGE REQUIRED UNDER REGULATIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Cowan*) 2486 (i).
- GROWN IN ESSEX CO., EXCISE DUTIES, &c.: par. in *Ottawa Citizen* (Mr. *Cowan*) 2117 (i).
- REDUCTION OF DUTIES : prop. Res. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4813 (ii).
- VIOLATION *re* SEIZURE OF TOBACCO : Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 10227 (iii).
- VIRDEN, MAN., INLAND REVENUE OFFICE : M. for Cor., dropped (Mr. *Roche*) 5313 (ii).
- WHEAT INSPECTION, DEPUTATION, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) 1540 (i).
- WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, INSPECTION : in Com. of Sup., 5578 (ii).
- SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4803 (ii).
- Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 124** (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3334 ; 2<sup>o</sup>\* and in Com., 3759, 3881 ; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3884 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 24.)
- INLAND REVENUE ACT, VIOLATION *re* SEIZURE OF TOBACCO : Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 10227 (iii).
- INSOLVENCY LEGISLATION AND BOARDS OF TRADE, COR. WITH GOVT. : M. for Copies\* (Mr. *Monk*) 5377 (ii).
- M. for Copies\* (Mr. *Quinn*) 5945 (ii).
- M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5944 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4597 (ii).
- Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3253 (i).
- INSPECTION ACT, &c.: Remarks on M. for Ways and Means (Mr. *Davin*) 10225 (iii).
- OF WHEAT, DEPUTATION, &c. : Remarks (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) 1540 (i).
- INSPECTORS OF EXCISE, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4770, 4787 (ii).
- OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4803 (ii).
- Inspection.** See "General."
- INSTRUCTIONS AND COR. BETWEEN DOM. GOVT. AND YUKON COUNCIL : M. for Copies\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2787 (i).
- Insurance Act Amt. B. No. 86** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2108 (i) ; 2<sup>o</sup> and ref. to Sel. Com., 3504 ; in Com., 6391 (ii), 7001 ; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 7001 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 13.)
- INSURANCE, SUPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7463 (iii).
- INTERIOR :**
- ARTESIAN BORING, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7468, 9055 (iii).
- ASHCROFT, B.C., RY. LANDS PURCHASED BY ASHCROFT WATER AND ELECTRIC CO., COR. WITH DOM. GOVT. : M. for Copies\* (Mr. *Prior*) 2408 (i).
- ATLIN DISTRICT, BREWERY LICENSES ISSUED : Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 5484 (ii).
- BAUER, DOM. LAND SURVEYOR, B.C., EXAMINATION OF PAPERS, &c. : Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4061, 4313, 4898 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 4713 (ii).
- BLISS, MAJ. D. C. F., POSITIONS HELD UNDER GOVT., DATE OF APPT., SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3261 (i) 3552 (ii).
- BREMNER, CHAS., INDEMNITY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10113, 10167 (iii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

- BRITISH CANADIAN GOLDFIELDS COMPANY : Ret. laid on Table, 39<sup>o</sup>9 (ii).
- CANADIAN MINING INSTITUTE, DOCUMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8702 (iii).
- CLARKE, JOS., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. IN THE YUKON : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5486 (ii).
- COAL MINING UNDER NANAIMO HARBOUR, LEASES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 8991 (iii).
- COULOMBE *vs.* THE QUEEN, TRIAL PROCEEDINGS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3916 (ii).
- CROWN TIMBER OFFICE, NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C., COMPLAINTS, INSTRUCTIONS AND REP. OF MR. ARCHER MARTIN : M. for Copies\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3149 (i).
- CROW'S NEST PASS RY., AND C. P. R., RATES AND TOLLS, REVISION BY GOV. IN COUNCIL : Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 2331 (i).
- COMMISSION : in Com. of Sup., 5831 (ii).
- DEADMAN'S ISLAND, COR. BETWEEN DOM. GOVT. AND B. HAIGH & SON (1880) *re* APPLICATION FOR USE, &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Prior*) 2788 (i).
- FORFEITURE OF LEASE BY MR. LUDGATE : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 4739 (ii).
- LEASES, VALUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1815. See "STANLEY PARK," &c.
- DOMINION LANDS : in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iii).
- CHIEF INSPECTOR : in Com. of Sup., 9006 (iii).
- MAN., FRAUDULENT TRANSACTIONS BY OFFICIALS, PAR. IN WINNIPEG TELEGRAM : Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 4995 (ii).
- SURVEY RETURNS, PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9053 (iii).
- FAIRLIE, MR., DISMISSAL AS PRINCIPAL OF INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL : M. for Repts., Cor.\* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 2788 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 2532 (i).
- FAWCETT, MR., ADVICE *re* RECORDING MINING CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3822 (ii).
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY : in Com. of Sup., 2104 (i) 5668 (ii) 7467 (iii).
- GOVT. LANDS, MAN., SALE OF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 1856 (i).
- HALF-BREEDS COMMISSION, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5832 (ii) 9056 (iii).
- TRAVELLING : 10110 (iii).
- N. W. T., COR. BETWEEN MR. McDOWALL AND GOVT., *re* RESERVES : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2486 (i).
- HOMESTEAD LAW IN N. W. T., INTEREST ON PRE-EMPTIONS, MEMORIAL FROM SETTLERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3080 (i).
- INTERIOR : in Com. of Sup., 2077 (i), 7466 (iii).
- CLERICAL ASSISTANCE : in Com. of Sup., 5021 (ii).
- EXPENDITURE YUKON DISTRICT : in Com. of Sup., 6366 (ii).
- JEROME, MR. MARTIN, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 6723 (ii), 7194 (iii).
- KLONDIKE OFFICIAL GUIDE, PREPARATION BY MR. OGILVIE : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1827 (i).
- LAND TRANSFERS IN MAN., AND GOVT. AGENTS SPECULATIONS : Remarks (Mr. *Roche*) 4735 (ii).
- LYECH, MR. W. H., REP. REFERRED TO BY MIN. OF INT. : M. for Copy\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3874 (ii).
- MCKAY, THOS., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., SALARY PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2487 (i).
- INDEBTEDNESS TO GOVT. FOR TIMBER DUES, COLLECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2486 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

- McKEOWN, E., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: QUES. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5487 (ii).
- MARTIN, MR. A. F., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: QUES. (Mr. Roche) 7534 (iii).
- MINING CLAIMS AND HOMESTEAD ENTRIES BY GOVT. OFFICIALS, O.C.'S, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Davin) 1877 (i).
- MINISTER OF INTERIOR'S TRAVELLING AND LIVING EXPENSES: QUES. (Mr. Carscallen) 1818 (i).
- MOODY, INSPECTOR OF N.-W. MOUNTED POLICE, CHARGES AGAINST: QUES. (Mr. Davis) 8219 (iii).
- NORTH AMERICAN TRANSPORTATION COMPANY AND GOVT. SUBSIDIES, &c.: REMARKS (Mr. Lemieux) 5666 (ii).
- NORTHERN COMMERCIAL TELEGRAPH COMPANY NON-PRODUCTION OF HIGH COMMISSIONER'S TELEGRAM: REMARKS (Mr. Prior) 5747 (ii).
- N.-W. MOUNTED POLICE BARRACKS AT BATOCHE, SUPPLIES FOR CONSTRUCTION, &c.: QUES. (Mr. Davis) 2487 (i).
- FORCE *re* YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 5834 (ii).
- POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 8746 (iii).
- ISSUE OF SCRIP, PETS., &c.: QUES. (Mr. Oliver) 2484 (i).
- VETERINARY SURGEONS: in Com. of Sup., 10111 (iii).
- N. W. T., ABANDONED HOMESTEADS, DEWDNEY DISTRICT, CANCELLATION BY GOVT.: QUES. (Mr. Davin) 3074 (i).
- SEED GRAIN INDEBTEDNESS, CANCELLATION, &c.: M. (Mr. Davin) 2015 (i).
- SETTLERS FROM ONT., PRIVILEGES GRANTED BY GOVT.: QUES. (Mr. Rosamond) 2902 (i).
- TERRITORIAL EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 5073 (ii).
- OGILVIE, MR., CONNECTION WITH GOLDFIELDS CO.: M. to adjn. (Mr. Foster) 3801 (ii).
- RELATIONSHIP TO MINISTER OF INTERIOR: QUES. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2703 (i).
- QUES. (Mr. Taylor) 1841 (i).
- PARIS AGENCY, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8704.
- PRINCE ALBERT MOUNTED POLICE BARRACKS, DATE OF ERECTION, &c.: QUES. (Mr. Davis) 8467 (iii).
- REGISTRY OFFICE, DATE OF ERECTION, COST, &c.: QUES. (Mr. Davis) 8468 (iii).
- ROTHWELL'S REPORT *re* SETTLERS CLAIMS, TRANSMISSION TO B.C. GOVT.: QUES. (Mr. McInnes) 2530 (i).
- ROYALTIES ON MINING LICENSES: in Com. of Sup., 8947, 9002 (iii).
- ST. PAUL DES METIS COLONY: in Com. of Sup., 9027 (iii).
- SCHOOL LANDS, MAX., STMT. OF SALE: READ (Mr. Sifton) 6461 (ii).
- SCRIP ISSUED TO THE HALF-BREEDS: in Com. of Sup., 5694 (ii), 7501 (iii).
- SEED GRAIN, &c., TO SETTLERS IN N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 9027 (iii).
- LIENS, CANCELLATION, LEGISLATION, *RE* RES. FROM N. W. COUNCIL: QUES. (Mr. Davin) 2903 (i).
- STANLEY PARK AND DEADMAN'S ISLAND, O. C., COR., &c., BETWEEN CAN. GOVT. AND B.C.: M. for Copies (Mr. Prior) 2334 (i).
- *ret.* Laid on Table, 3959 (ii).
- See "Deadman's Island," &c.
- STERL BOXES, INTERIOR AND INDIAN DEPTS., PURCHASED BY GOVT., TENDERS, &c.: QUES. (Mr. Hodgins) 4982 (ii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

- "STRATHCONA," STR., RELIEF OF DESTITUTE MINERS, ARRANGEMENT WITH GOVT.: QUES. (Mr. Prior) 9179 (iii).
- SURVEYS BRANCH, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5849 (ii).
- INSPECTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 8149 (iii).
- TREATY WITH N. W. T. INDIANS AND HALF-BREEDS; in Com. of Sup., 5694 (ii).
- WADE, MR. F. C., EMPLOYT., AMOUNTS, &c., PAID BY GOVT.: QUES. (Mr. Prior) 1830 (i).
- REMARKS (Mr. Davin) 7442 (iii).
- REMARKS (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 7242, 7320, 7442 (iii).
- WALSH, MAJ., AUTHORITY FOR COMMISSION ISSUED, &c.: QUES. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4269 (ii).
- INSTRUCTIONS BY GOVT. AS COMMISSIONER, REP. OF INTERVIEW AT SEAGWAY, &c.: QUES. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3078, 3258 (i).
- WALSH, PHILIP, RELATIONSHIP TO MAJOR WALSH: QUES. (Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3823 (ii).
- WILLISON, MR. J. W., CROWN TIMBER AGENT, YUKON DISTRICT: QUES. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3823, 4270 (ii).
- WINNIPEG HOSPITALS: in Com. of Sup., 8338 (iii).
- WRIGHT, WM., OFFICIAL IN RECORDING OFFICE AT DAWSON, RELATIONSHIP TO EDITOR OF GLOBE: QUES. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4270 (ii).
- YUKON DISTRICT, ADMINISTRATOR AND OFFICIALS, INSTRUCTIONS, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Foster) 1877 (i).
- APPNMT. OF MESSRS. WADE, MCGREGOR AND NORWOOD, DATE OF ARRIVAL AT DAWSON, &c.: QUES. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3081 (i).
- "BENCH" AND "CREEK" CLAIMS, DISPUTES PENDING, &c.: QUES. (Mr. Hughes) 3077 (i).
- BENNETT HOSPITAL, MATRON AND MEDICAL SUPT., NAMES, &c.: QUES. (Mr. Davin) 1979 (i).
- BRITISH YUKON MINING TRADING AND TRANSPORTATION COMPANY, CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT.: QUES. (Mr. Morrison) 2905 (i).
- BLISS, MAJ., PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: QUES. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3261 (i) 3552 (ii).
- COMMISSIONER, MAJ. WALSH, ALTERATIONS IN REP.: QUES. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2704.
- INSTRUCTIONS AND COR. FROM GOVT. OF CAN.: M. for Copies\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2787 (i).
- COMMISSIONER OGILVIE, INSTRUCTIONS AND COR. WITH DOM. GOVT.: M. for Copies\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2787 (i).
- COMMISSION OF INQUIRY, REQUEST FROM MR. OGILVIE TO EXTEND HIS POWERS, &c.: QUES. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3080 (i).
- DREDGING FOR MINERALS, NUMBER OF LEASES (1897) RENTALS, &c.: QUES. (Mr. Foster) 3079 (i).
- FAWCETT, MR., DISMISSAL AS GOLD COMMISSIONER; M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Davin) 1878 (i).
- FREIGHT, TRANSPORTATION, GUARANTEE BY CONTRACTORS, &c.: QUES. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2902 (i).
- GOLD COMMISSIONER, APPNMT.: QUES. (Mr. Morrison) 1823 (i).
- HUNKER CREEK, KLONDIKE MINING, APPLICATION AND GRANTS FOR HYDRAULICING: M. for Copies\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2962 (i).
- INSTRUCTIONS AND COR., BETWEEN DOM. GOVT. AND YUKON COUNCIL: M. for Copies\* (Sir Charles Tupper) 2787 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

- YUKON DISTRICT INSTRUCTIONS TO MAJ. WALSH : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3258 (ii).
- INVESTIGATION, MR. OGILVIE'S REP. AND PAPERS RE: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2410 (i).
- laid on Table, 3876 (ii).
- PRINTING, &c.: Remarks (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5359 (ii).
- PURPORT, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3820 (ii).
- PROTEST FROM MINERS' COMMITTEE, COR., &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2329 (i).
- KLONDIKE RIVER BRIDGE, OWNER, TOLLS, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2902 (i).
- LAFONTAINE, MR. E., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT. Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1958 (i).
- LIQUOR PERMITS AND SANCTION OF MIN. OF INT.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1859 (i).
- COR. BETWEEN MR. MARTIN AND MIN. OF INT.: M. for Papers,\* (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2027 (i).
- COR. BETWEEN N. W. T. GOVT. AND INT. DEPT.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Clarke) 1878 (i).
- inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 5667 (ii).
- ISSUED BY ARCHER MARTIN: Remarks (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3875 (ii).
- ISSUED BY MAJ. WALSH: M. for Copies\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2789 (i).
- Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2481, 2704.
- ISSUED BY MR. OGILVIE AND CANCELLED BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 2903 (i); 3789 (ii).
- NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3077 (i).
- NAMES OF Co.'s, &c.: M. for Return\* (Mr. Foster) 1877 (i).
- NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Douglas) 1843 (i).
- QUANTITY, &c.: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. Foster) 1876.
- TO MR. PETERS; M. for Cor\* (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2027 (i).
- LYNCH, MR. W. H., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT. REPS., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Powell) 1847 (i).
- MAGUIRE, MR. L., JUSTICE, APPNMT. AND ARRIVAL AT DAWSON. &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3258 (i).
- MINERS GRIEVANCES AGAINST COMPANIES BUYING WATER GRANTS: Remarks (Mr. Marcotte) 3315 (i).
- AND MR. OGILVIE'S REPORT: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2531 (i).
- RIGHT TO CUT TIMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 1836 (i).
- MINING REGULATIONS: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2248 (i).
- REGULATIONS, PUBLICATION, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 1841 (i).
- N.W. MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup. conc. 6388 (ii).
- OFFICIALS, APPNMT. BY GOVT., NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 1832 (i).
- BONDS, SECURITIES REGISTERED: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4991 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 5022 (ii).
- GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, NATIONALITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morrison) 1823 (i).
- SALARIES, COST OF LIVING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morrison) 1824 (i).
- OGILVIE, MR., CONNECTION WITH BRITISH CANADIAN GOLDFIELDS Co.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3799 (ii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

- YUKON DISTRICT, REP. *re* INVESTIGATION, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3548 (ii).
- O.C.'s REGULATING MINING CLAIMS BY OFFICIALS: Ques. (Mr. Morrioon) 1824 (i).
- STEAMBOAT OWNERS, PERMITS TO CUT TIMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 1836 (i).
- SURVEY OF LANDS, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3547 (ii).
- TEELIN LAKE ROUTE, REPS.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Davin) 2026 (i).
- TIMBER INSPECTOR, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: (Mr. Morrison) 1823 (i).
- REGULATIONS, ISSUE OF PERMITS, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 1836 (i).
- TRANSPORTATION Co., EMPLOYED BY GOVT., AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1958 (i).
- WADE, MR. F. C., DATE OF ARRIVAL AT DAWSON: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3546 (ii).
- INSTRUCTIONS OR PERMISSION TO STAKE CLAIMS, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Davin) 1877 (i).
- WALSH, MAJOR, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Morrison) 1823 (i).
- REPORTS, NUMBER SENT IN AND LAID ON TABLE: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3798 (ii).
- WATER FRONT, DAWSON, LEASE, &c. TO MORRISON AND McDONALD: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3547 (ii).

Interior Department Act Amt. B. No. 147 (Mr. Sifton) 1°, 4892; 2° and in Com., 6397; 3°, 6459 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 15.)

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond County Ry. Acquisition B. No. 133 (Mr. Blair) prop. Res., 1949, 2792; in Com. on Res., 2843 (i); 3345, 3379, 3560, 3689; 1°, 3765; 2°m. 3907, 4152 in Com., 4165, 4733, 3°m., 4899, agreed to (Y. 91; N. 40) 4966 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9726 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 6.)

Deb. on prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 2792, 2809; (Mr. Foster) 2793, 2811; (Sir Charles Tupper) 2793, 2795; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2794, 2823; (Mr. Wallace) 2795, 2828; (Mr. Taylor) M. to Adjn. House, 2795; (Mr. McMullen) 2816; (Mr. Sproule) 2817; (Mr. Haggart) 2821; (Mr. Powell) 2825; (Mr. McNeill) 2839 (i).

Deb. in Com. on Res.: (Mr. Blair) 2843 (i), 3351, 3700 (ii); (Mr. Haggart) 3345; (Sir Charles Tupper) 3377, 3703; (Mr. Morrison) 3383; (Sir Louis Davies) 3408; (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 3408, 3425, 3560, 3747; (Mr. Ross-Robertson) 3423; (Mr. Powell) 3413, 3600; (Mr. McIsaac) 3577; (Mr. Russell) 3633, 3669, 3707; (Mr. McLennan, Glenarry) 3689; (Mr. Fielding) 3734; (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 3739; (Mr. McDougall) 3743; (Mr. Moris) 3744 (ii).

1° m. (Mr. Blair) 3765.

Deb. on 1°, (Mr. McDougall) 3765; (Mr. Fielding) 3769; (Mr. Haggart) 3771; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3773.

2° m. (Mr. Blair) 3907, 4152.

Deb. on 2° (Sir Charles Tupper) 3907, 4164; (Mr. Foster) 4152; (Mr. Kaulbach) 4152; (Mr. Pope) 4153; (Mr. McMullen) 4163.

In Com. on B.

Deb. (Mr. Foster) 4165; (Sir Charles Tupper) 4165; (Mr. Blair) 4165.

**I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—Con.**

3° m. (Mr. Blair) 4733, 4899, 4920, 4925.

Deb. on 3°, (Mr. Foster) 4733, 4899 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4733; (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 4951; (Mr. McMullen) 4961; (Sir Charles Tupper) 4961 (ii).

3°, Agreed to (Y. 91; N. 40) 4967 (ii).

**Grand Trunk Agreement B. No. 138**

(Mr. Blair) prop. Res., 3946; in Com. on Res., 4062; 1°, 4170, 2°, 4171; in Com., 4353, 4554; 3° m., 4966 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9702 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 5.)

Deb. in Com. on Res. (Mr. Blair) 4062; conc., 4170; (Mr. Haggart) 4113, 4164, 4069; (Mr. Powell) 4077, 4123; (Mr. Fielding) 4125; (Mr. McMullen) 4128; (Mr. Gibson) 4135; (Mr. Foster) 4067, 4144; (Sir Charles Tupper) 4065 (ii).

2° m. (Mr. Blair) 4171 (ii).

Deb. on 2° (Sir Charles Tupper) 4171 (ii).

In Com. (Mr. Blair) 4353-4476.

Deb. in Com. (Mr. Foster) 4354-4476; 4554-4711; (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 4356, 4380, 4399, 4435, 4445, 4562, 4571, 4601, 4689, 4710; (Mr. Haggart) 4357, 4372, 4418, 4685, 4712; (Mr. McLennan, Glengarry) 4357, 4372, 4418, 4589; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4369, 4432, 4470, 4575, 4687; (Mr. Bergeron) 4367, 4374, 4405, 4434, 4472, 4622, 4647; (Mr. Sproule) 4378, 4390, 4670; (Mr. Powell) 4392, 4636, 4707; (Mr. Wallace) 4401, 4584, 4602, 4636, 4687; (Mr. Talbot) 4403, 4405; (Mr. Marcell) 4409; (Mr. McDougall) 4415, 4692, 4710; (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 4419, 4641, 4668; (Mr. Henderson) 4439, 4628; (Mr. Clancy) 4448, 4452, 4561, 4600; (Mr. Bennett) 4458, 4590, 4607; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 4567; (Mr. Britton) 4568; (Mr. Montague) 4573, 4579, 4643, 4669; (Mr. McMullen) 4582, 4620; (Mr. Fielding) 4597, 4635, 4649, 4705, 4711; (Sir Louis Davies) 4597, 4639; (Mr. Macdonald, P.-E.-I.) 4611, 4633; (Mr. Ives) 4612, 4699; (Mr. Clarke) 4612, 4639; (Mr. Ingram) 4616; (Mr. Osler) 4619; (Mr. Sutherland) 4643; (Mr. Marcotte) 4646; (Mr. Dugas) 4649; (Mr. Mulock) 4649; (Mr. Bourassa) 4651; (Mr. Harwood) 4653; (Mr. Monet) 4654; (Mr. Mignault) 4663; (Mr. Savard) 4664; (Mr. Ethier) 4665; (Mr. Morin) 4666; (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4673; (Mr. Davin) 4677; (Mr. Mills) 4678; (Mr. Gillies) 4680; (Sir Charles Tupper) 4685 (ii).

3° (Amt.) (Mr. Foster) 4966 (ii).

Deb. on Sen. Amts. (Mr. Blair) 9702; (Mr. Haggart) 9710; (Mr. McMullen) 9712; (Mr. Sproule) 9715; (Mr. Foster) 9716; (Mr. Wilson) 9722; (Mr. Clancy) 9723 (iii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY: See "Railways"—I.C.R.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 158 (i).

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION, WASHINGTON: in Com. of Sup., 5852 (ii).

— AND BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE: Proposal to Expedite (Sir Charles Tupper) 3779 (ii).

— BETWEEN CAN. AND U.S., COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kloepper) 1815 (i).

— CANCELLATION OF MEETINGS AT QUEBEC: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 2908 (i).

— PAR. IN LONDON *Times* re SETTLEMENT OF QUESTIONS (Mr. Ross Robertson) 3668 (ii).

— PAR. IN MONTREAL *Gazette* re NEGOTIATIONS (Mr. Wallace) 3340 (ii).

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION, PAR. IN MONTREAL *Gazette* (Sir Charles Tupper) 4738 (ii).

— M. (Sir Charles Tupper) to Adjn., 8152 (iii).

— PAR. IN MONTREAL *Star* (Sir Charles Tupper) 4169 (ii).

— Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (Mr. Prior) 6936 (ii).

— PERSONS CONNECTED THEREWITH, NAMES AND EXPENSES, &c.: M. for Stmtt.\* (Mr. Foster) 2180 (i).

— PROTOCOLS, MINISTER MAY MOVE TO LAY COMMUNICATION ON TABLE ACCORDING TO ENGLISH PRACTICE (Mr. Speaker) 4264 (ii).

— PROTOCOLS: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4259 (ii).

INVERNESS POST OFFICES. CHANGE OF LOCATIONS, APPOINTMENTS AND DISMISSALS: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3825 (ii).

IONA WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5198 (ii).

IRREGULARITY OF DEBATE: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 6741, 7635 (iii).

See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."

Iron and Steel Bounties B. No. 161 (Mr. Fielding) Prop. Res., 4150, 4967, in Com. on Res., 4989; 1°, 5744 (ii); 2° and in Com., 7638; 3°, 7644 (iii.) (62-63 Vic., c. 8.)

IRON BOUNTIES, QUANTITIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 1827 (i).

IRON DOORS FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS, PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Hodgins) 4273 (ii).

ISLEAUX NOIX, FORTIFICATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9154 (iii).

— LEASE, RENTAL, &c.: M. for Stmtt.\* (Mr. Quinn) 2961 (i).

IVES, HON. MR., LATE M. P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 7532 (iii).

JACQUES CARTIER COUNTY MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6934, 6933 (iii).

James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 73 (Mr. Hughes) 1°, 2029; 2°, 2290 (i); in Com. and 3°, 3842 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 71.)

JAPANESE LABOUR EXCLUSION BILL, B.C. LEGISLATION, DISALLOWANCE BY DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. McInnes) 4343 (ii).

— M. to print Cor. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4477 (ii).

— Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 2536 (i).

See "ANTI-JAPANESE," &c., "JUSTICE."

JEROME, MR. MARTIN, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 6723 (ii); 7194 (iii).

JÉSUS RIVER, CONSTRUCTION OF FISHWAY, PLANS, PAPERS, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Fortin) 3269 (i).

"JOHN C. BARR," AMERICAN STR., OWNERSHIP, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 8469 (iii).

— UNDERVALUATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 8218 (iii).

— VALUATION BY CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2700 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 3061 (i).

Joint Stock Companies Act Amt. B. No. 114 (Mr. Britton) 1°, 2790 (i).

JUDGES AND POLITICAL PREFERMENTS: Quer. (Mr. Bennett) 4484 (ii).

JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5470 (ii).

JURY, MR. A. F., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 8620 (iii).

JUSTICE:

ADDITIONAL JUDGE, YUKON TERRITORY: in Com. of Sup., 10191 (iii).

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: conc., 10217 (iii).

— YUKON TERRITORY: in Com. of Sup., 5468 (ii); 10191 (iii).

— LIVING EXPENSES OF JUDGES DUGAS AND MAGUIRE, INSTRUCTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5489 (ii).

— N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 10122 (iii).

— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 10122 (iii).

ALIEN ACT, B. C., COR. WITH B. C. GOVERNMENT: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 8220, 8466, 8757 (iii).

— DISALLOWANCE BY DOM. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 7768 (iii).

— APPOINTMENT OF AGENT AT WALLACEBURG: Remarks (Mr. Clancy) 5492 (ii).

— ENFORCEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 5471 (ii); 10123 (iii).

— AT HAMILTON: Remarks (Mr. McCleary) 3879 (ii).

— TORONTO, INSTRUCTION TO AGENT: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 3084 (i).

— PAR. IN TORONTO Star: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 2907 (i).

ANTI-CHINESE AND JAPANESE B. C. LEGISLATION, GOVT. POLICY re FOURTEEN STATUTES ALREADY IN FORCE: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 5859 (ii).

— DISALLOWANCE OF BILL: Remarks (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2536 (i).

— COR. BETWEEN B. C. GOVT. AND DOM.: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 5206 (ii).

— DISALLOWANCE, INCOMPLETE RETURN: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 5408, 5491 (ii).

— GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1837 (i).

BETHUNE, MR. C. J. R., PROFESSIONAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 5471 (ii).

BINDER TWINE CONTRACTS. ADVERTISEMENTS FOR TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 6934 (iii).

— IMPORTED IN 1899: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 8218, 8990 (iii).

— KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, SALE OF, NAMES OF TENDERERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3944 (ii).

— OUTPUT OF KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, TENDERS, PRICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1825 (i).

— SALE OF: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Taylor) 9898 (iii).

— TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1837 (i).

B. C. JUDGESHIPS, APPOINTMENT, MINUTES OF COUNCIL, COMMISSIONS, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 1879 (i).

— LEGISLATION re CHINESE AND FOREIGN IMMIGRATION, DISALLOWANCE, &c.: M. to adjn. (Mr. Prior) 6838, 6902 (iii).

— LT. GOVERNOR AND TURNER ADMINISTRATION, AND CAN. GOVT.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Prior) 2362 (i).

— PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 5479 (ii).

— SUPREME AND COUNTY COURT JUDGES, COR. BETWEEN B. C. AND DOM. GOVT. re ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN B.C.: M. for Cor. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2362 (i).

BROWN, MARION, COMMUTATION OF DEATH SENTENCE, PRIS., COR.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Wallace) 6939 (iii).

## JUSTICE—Con.

CHIEF JUSTICE McCOLL (B. C.) JUDICIAL RESIDENCE: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3546 (ii).

CHOQUETTE, HON. MR. JUSTICE, PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND TRAVELLING EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5097 (ii).

CIRCUIT ALLOWANCE, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 5471 (ii).

CLARKE vs. THE QUEEN, CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5750 (ii).

CLEMENT, MR. W. H. P., RESTRICTIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS BY GOVT. AS LEGAL ADVISER TO YUKON COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2332 (i).

COMMISSIONS re INVESTIGATIONS AGAINST GOVT. EMPLOYEES, NAMES OF COMMISSIONERS, ALLOWANCES, &c., DISMISSALS, &c.: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. Foster) 2180 (i).

CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES OF CANADA: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4270 (ii).

COULOMBE vs. THE QUEEN, ENFORCEMENT OF CONVICTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4479 (ii).

— TRIAL PROCEEDINGS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3946 (ii).

COUNTY COURT JUDGES, ONT., RETIREMENT, &c., LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1970 (i).

COPYRIGHT BILL AND GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. Robertson) 1981 (i).

CROW'S NEST PASS COMMISSION, FRENCH TRANSLATION OF REP.: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 1852 (i).

— ACTION OF GOVT. ON REP.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1967 (i).

— COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 5831 (ii).

— INVESTIGATION BY COMMISSIONER, REPS., &c.: M. for Copies\* 1878 (i).

— OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1967 (i).

— DEATH OF MR. THORNBURY: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1976 (i).

DEVLIN, MR. JAMES, PROSECUTION BY DEPT. OF JUSTICE: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7218 (iii).

DOMINION POLICE FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 10127 (iii).

DOECHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 5477 (ii).

EXCHEQUER COURT OF CAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5472 (ii).

GAGNE, HON. MR. JUSTICE, AND CONNECTION WITH LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO., DELAY TO LITIGANTS: Ques. (Mr. Savard) 2189 (i).

GOVERNMENT OF THE N. W. TERRITORIES: in Com. of Sup., 7499 (iii).

JAPANESE LABOUR EXCLUSION BILL, B. C. LEGISLATION, DISALLOWANCE BY DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. McInnes) 4343 (ii).

— M. to print Cor. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4477 (ii).

JUDGES AND POLITICAL PREFERMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4484 (ii).

JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5470 (ii).

JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 2063 (i); 10119 (iii).

— REPORT: Inquiry for (Mr. Clancy) 4899 (ii).

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, SUPERANNUATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6379 (ii).

LAW LIBRARY, ENGLAND: in Com. of Sup., 5470 (ii).

— FOR YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 5469 (ii).

LOTTERIES (ART UNION) IN MONTREAL, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2323 (i).

MAINTENANCE OF PRISONERS, YUKON TERRITORY: in Com. of Sup., 10195 (iii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

- MANITOBA ELECTION FRAUDS, FURTHER CONSIDERATION IN PUB. ACCOUNTS COM.: M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2479 (i).
- LEGISLATION, DISALLOWANCE BY DOM. GOVT., PETS., MEMORIALS, &C., FROM EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, PROTESTING, &C.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. *La Rivière*) 288 (i).
- PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 5479 (ii).
- MANITOULIN ISLAND JUDGESHIP: in Com. of Sup., 10122 (iii).
- MARTIN, MR. JUSTICE, JUDICIAL RESIDENCE, B.C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3545 (ii).
- MEAGHER, THOS., CLAIMS ON U. S. GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 5474 (ii), 10194 (iii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 5492 (ii).
- M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cowan*) 2742, 2754 (i).
- MONTREAL JUDICIAL DISTRICT, ADDITIONAL JUDGES, &C.: Personal Explanation *re par.* in *Montreal Gazette* (Mr. *Fortin*) 7632 (iii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Madore*) 7224 (iii).
- N. W. T., DUAL LANGUAGE, OPINION OF MIN. OF JUS.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2188 (i).
- O'CONNOR & HOGG, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5801 (ii).
- ONTARIO COUNTY COURT JUDGE, NAME, APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1848 (i).
- PENITENTIARY COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 5477 (ii).
- PENITENTIARIES, PRINTING BY CONVICTS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1832 (i).
- PETERS, MR. F., AND E. V. BODWELL, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5181 (ii).
- QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS BILL, INJURIOUS LEGISLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 9596 (iii).
- OPINION OF MINISTER OF JUSTICE: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 9700 (iii).
- SUPERIOR COURT, ADDITIONAL JUDGES, SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1845 (i).
- QUEEN'S COUNTY (P.E.I.) APPNMT. OF JUDGE: Remarks (Mr. *Marrin*) 9000 (iii).
- REVISION OF THE STATUTES, APPNMT. OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Britton*) 1851 (i).
- ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 5477 (ii).
- TOTAL COST, CLAIMS UNPAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 5484 (ii).
- REP. OF COMMISSION, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION: M. for Copy\* (Mr. *Fortin*) 1879 (i).
- SKELTON *vs.* THE QUEEN: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Davin*) 7770 (iii).
- REP. OF MIN. OF JUS. *re* RELEASE: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 7441 (iii).
- REP. OF MIN. OF JUS.: M. for Copy (Mr. *Davin*) 8171, 8217, 8346 (iii).
- SPINKS, COUNTY COURT JUDGE, B. C., CHARGES AGAINST: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4172, 4201 (ii).
- STONY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY, COMMISSIONERS REPORT: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 9837 (iii).
- STRONG, HON. CHIEF JUSTICE, EXPENSES *re* JUDICIAL COMMITTEE: in Com. of Sup., 5470 (ii).
- SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, QUEBEC, SUMS PAID FOR TRAVELLING EXPENSES: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Monk*) 2145 (i).
- TANNER, JOHN, CLAIMS AGAINST SPANISH GOVT. FOR DETENTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Russell*) 4805 (ii).
- TURNER ADMINISTRATION. B. C., DISMISSAL BY Lt. GOV.: Papers laid on Table, 3950 (ii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

- VELDT, RABBI, DISMISSAL AS CHAPLAIN, ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 10246 (iii).
- WENTWORTH *vs.* MATHIEU: in Com. of Sup., 10112 (iii).
- YUKON TERRITORIES ACT, REPS. FROM YUKON COUNCIL: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2536 (i).
- DISTRICT, ADMINISTRATION BY MR. OGILVIE, INSTRUCTIONS, &C.: M. for Rep.\* (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2027 (i).
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 5468 (ii), 8947, 9002 (iii).
- APPELLATE COURT, ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5308 (ii).
- APPNMT. OF SHERIFF, BONDS, COMMISSION, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4268 (ii).
- APPNMT. OF SHERIFF, CLERK OF COURT, O. C.'S, BOND CERTIFICATES, &C.: M. for Copies\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3149 (i).
- APPNMT. OF SHERIFF, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3943, 4268 (ii).
- APPNMT. OF SECOND JUDGE, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3081 (i).
- ALIEN LABOURERS AT LAKE BENNETT, AND GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1859 (i).
- BONDS, SECURITIES, &C., REGISTERED UNDER R. S. C., PREPARATION OF PARLT. *re* YUKON DISTRICT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4804 (ii).
- COUNCIL, NAMES, APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1832 (i).
- LEGAL ADVISER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).
- LETTERS FROM AMERICANS *re* ADMINISTRATION: (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3822 (ii).
- LIQUOR IMPORTATIONS, DISALLOWANCE OF ORDINANCE: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1638 (i).
- MAGUIRE, MR. JUSTICE, ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE FROM DAWSON: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3959 (ii).
- ORDINANCES RECEIVED, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2703 (i).
- REGISTRAR OF TITLES, INSTRUCTIONS AND RESTRICTIONS BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2324 (i).
- SALARIES, &C., *re* ADMINISTRATION: in Com. of Sup., 8658 (iii).
- KAMINISTQUIA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 7611 (iii).
- Keewatin. *See* "Administration of Justice."
- KENTVILLE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iii).
- KINCARDINE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 5203 (ii).
- KINGSTON HARBOUR, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 8014 (iii).
- KINGSTON AND PEMBROKE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8917; in Com., 9493 (iii).
- PENITENTIARY, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6379 (ii).
- KLONDIKE RIVER BRIDGE, YUKON, TOOLS, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2902, 3073 (i).
- RAILWAY SURVEY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8700 (iii).
- Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B No. 103 (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2409; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2698 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3996 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 72.)

- KLONDIKE OFFICIAL GUIDE, PREPARATION BY MR. OGILVIE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1827 (i).
- KNIGHTS OF LABOUR AND MECHANICS ASSEMBLY, COR., &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. *Ingram*) 3149 (i).
- KNOWLTON LANDING WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10020 (iii).
- KOOTENAY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 8090 (iii).
- LABELLE, MR. L. V., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT., AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1887 (i).
- LABELLE AND NOMININGUE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916 (iii).
- Labourers Working Day, Length B. No. 82 (Mr. *Beattie*) 1°, 2036 (i).
- LABRECQUE, MR. C. O., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT., AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1846 (i).
- LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 5781 (ii) 7297 (iii).
- EVIDENCE TAKEN BEFORE ROYAL COMMISSION, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. *McInerney*) 5944 (ii).
- FINAL ESTIMATE OF SECTION 3, ENLARGEMENT OF 1875-80: M. for Copies\* (Mr. *McInerney*) 5944 (ii).
- REP. OF COMMISSION ON WELLINGTON AND G.T.R. BRIDGES: M. for Copies\* (Mr. *McInerney*) 5944 (ii).
- ROYAL COMMISSION OF INVESTIGATION, EXHIBITS, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. *McInerney*) 5944 (ii).
- ROYAL COMMISSION, &c., PLANS, PROFILES, &c.: M. for Copies\*, (Mr. *McInerney*) 5944 (ii).
- LACHUTE AND ST. ANDREWS RAILWAY, COR., CONTRACTS, REPS., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Christie*) 4808 (ii).
- LAC RIVER BRIDGE CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8918 (iii).
- LAFONTAINE, MR. E., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1958 (i).
- LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT RIVER RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8917; in Com., 9490, 9819 (iii).
- LAKE ST. JOHN, PIERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8116 (iii).
- LAKE ST. LOUIS, REMOVAL OF SHOAL, REPRESENTATIONS FROM SHIPPERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2331 (i).
- LAND DAMAGES, OXFORD DIVISION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7154 (iii).
- Land Titles Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1°, 4895; 2° and in Com., 6442; 3°, 6459 (ii). (62-63 *Vic. c. 17.*)
- LAND TRANSFERS IN MAN., AND GOVT. AGENTS' SPECULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Roche*) 4735 (ii).
- LANGEVIN, AUGUST, PURCHASE OF LAND FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6561 (ii).
- LANGEVIN BLOCK, STEEL SHELVING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7625, 9938 (iii).
- LANG POST OFFICE AND RY. STATION, CARRIAGE OF MAILS, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 3823 (ii).
- L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, AMOUNT EXPENDED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1886 (i).
- CHAPEL GROVE BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2904 (i).
- LAROCHE, MR. WM., POSTMASTER AT LAKE BOUCHETTE, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1962 (i).
- LAW LIBRARY, ENGLAND: in Com. of Sup., 5470 (ii).
- FOR YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 5469 (ii).
- LEAKE, MR. J. R., POSTMASTER AT MORTON, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1963 (i).
- LEBEL, MR. WENCESLAS CUSTOMS OFFICIAL AND REVISION OF ELECTORAL LISTS, PAR. IN *Le Soleil*: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1888 (i).
- LEBLANC, MR. A. T., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1964 (i).
- LEGAL ADVISER, YUKON, APPOINT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).
- LEGISLATION, SENATE: in Com. of Sup., 5730 (ii).
- LEGRIS, MR., POSTMASTER AT STE. EULALIE, INVESTIGATION, REP., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4272 (ii).
- LENOIR, FISHERY OVERSEER: Ret. laid on Table, 4268 (ii).
- LEPREAUX, N. B., CUSTOMS OFFICER, NAME, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 5313 (ii).
- LETTERS FROM AMERICANS *re* ADMINISTRATION, YUKON DISTRICT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3822 (ii).
- LETTER CARRIERS, B.C., NUMBER, SALARIES, &c., FROM 1895 TO 1899: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Prior*) 2789 (i).
- LETTERS OF CREDIT: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (iii).
- LÉVIS FORTS, CONTRACT FOR CORDWOOD, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3082 (i).
- GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 8178, 9987.
- LÉVIS MAIL SERVICE, NAMES OF CARRIERS, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3554 (ii).
- MILITARY CAMP, QUALIFICATION OF OFFICERS, PERCENTAGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 9309 (iii).
- PURCHASE OF PROPERTY, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 8468 (iii).
- STATION IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 8220 (iii).
- LEVISON BROS., CUSTOMS UNDERVALUATION: in Com. of Sup., 8419 (iii).
- LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 8192 (iii).
- LIBERATION *See* "Conditional."
- LIBRARY OF PARLT., JOINT REP.: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).
- COMMITTEE, JOINT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 531 (i).
- DISTURBANCE BY MESSENGERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 10221 (iii).
- MESSENGERS: in Com. of Sup., 10140 (iii).
- LICENSE FEES FOR FISHING TRAPS, ISSUE OF: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 2046 (i).
- LT.-GOV.'S RESIDENCE, REGINA: in Com. of Sup., 9988 (iii).
- LIFE SAVING REWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 3064 (i).
- LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3523, 5116 (ii).
- SERVICE, B.C., ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3821 (ii).

- LIGHT-KEEPERS' SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3523 (ii).
- Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s B. No. 66 (Mr. *McHugh*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1949; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2290; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 73.)
- Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 95 (Mr. *Hughes*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2246; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2525 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 74.)
- LINDSAY, HALIBURTON AND MATTAWA RY. CO.'S PET. : M. to ref. to Sel. Com. on Standing Orders (Mr. *Henderson*) 1948 (i).
- LIQUOR COMMISSION REPORT, TRANSLATION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5851 (ii).
- LIQUOR PERMITS, COR. BETWEEN MR. MARTIN AND MIN. OF INT. : M. for Papers\* (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2027 (i).
- COR. BETWEEN N.W.T. GOVT. AND INT. DEPT. : M. for Copies\* (Mr. *Clarke*) 1878 (i).
- inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 5667 (ii).
- IMPORTATIONS, DISALLOWANCE OF ORDINANCE : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1638 (i).
- ISSUED BY ARCHER MARTIN : Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3875 (ii).
- ISSUED BY MR. OGILVIE, DISALLOWANCE BY GOVT. : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 2908 (i); 3789 (ii).
- NUMBER, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3077 (i).
- ISSUED BY MAJ. WALSH : M. for Copies\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2789 (i).
- Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2481, 2704 (i).
- NUMBER, NAMES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 1843 (i).
- NAMES OF CO.'S, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 1877 (i).
- TO MR. PETERS : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2027 (i).
- QUANTITY, &c. : M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 1876 (i).
- AND SANCTION OF MIN. OF INT. : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1859 (i).
- LIQUOR SOLD TO INDIANS, PROSECUTIONS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1850 (i).
- TRAFFIC ON INDIAN RESERVES : in Com. of Sup., 5710 (ii).
- LITTLE BEAR CREEK, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 8014 (iii).
- LITTLE RIVER, N.S., BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3944 (ii).
- Loan Companies B. No. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 6120; 2<sup>o</sup>, and ref. to Sel. Com., 6391 (ii); in Com., 8475; 3<sup>o</sup>, 8477 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.* c. 41.)
- LOBSTER COMMISSIONERS' REP. : Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 2319 (i).
- REGULATIONS : Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 3960 (ii).
- COMMISSIONERS' REP. : Remarks (Mr. *McInerney*) 2909 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 2249 (i).
- LOBSTER FISHING, EXTENSION OF SEASON IN P.E.I. : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 6561 (ii).
- P.E.I., SEIZURE OF TRAPS, &c. : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Martin*) 5504 (ii).
- FISHERIES, PROTECTION, REGULATIONS *re* : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) 7675 (iii).
- LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS, I.C.R., NUMBER EMPLOYED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Stenson*) 9697 (iii).
- London and Canadian Loan and Agency Co.'s B. No. 130 (Mr. *Bain*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 3647; 2<sup>o</sup>, 5358; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 6327 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 117.)
- LONDON DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 9961 (iii).
- LETTER CARRIERS AND STREET RY. TRANSPORTATION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Beattie*) 4483, 4995 (ii).
- London Mutual Fire Ins. Co. of Canada B. No. 68 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1949; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2152 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 4189 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 118.)
- LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN : in Com. of Sup., 7155, 7242, 7401 (iii).
- LOTTERIES (ART UNION) IN MONTREAL, LEGISLATION RESPECTING : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2323 (i).
- LUMBER CUSTOMS DUTIES : in Com. of Sup., 5669 (ii).
- IMPORTED INTO U. S. FROM CAN., *par.* in *Toronto Globe* : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1638 (i).
- LYNCH, MR. W. H., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT., REFS., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1847 (i).
- REP. REFERRED TO BY MIN. OF INT. : M. for Copy\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3874 (ii).
- MACKENZIE, LATE ALEX., MONUMENT : in Com. of Sup., 8150 (iii).
- MCCORMICK, MR. F. D., CUSTOMS OFFICER AT PELEE ISLAND, DISMISSAL, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8438 (iii).
- MCDONALD, A. R., DISMISSAL, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7276 (iii).
- INVESTIGATION INTO CHARGES AGAINST, COST, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1971 (i); 4812 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4811, 5098 (ii).
- inquiry for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 8757 (iii).
- MCDUGALL, MR. BRUCE, APPOINT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 7194 (iii).
- MCKAY, THOS., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT., SALARY PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2487 (i).
- INDEBTEDNESS TO GOVT. FOR TIMBER DUES, COLLECTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2486 (i).
- MCKEEN'S POINT, CONSTRUCTION OF STORM SIGNALS, COST, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3083 (i).
- MCKENZIE, F., DISMISSAL FROM FREDERICTON MILITARY SCHOOL : in Com. of Sup., 5056 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2485, 2699, 2899 (i).
- MCKENZIE POST OFFICE, MAN., PETS. *re*, &c., NAME OF POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2185 (i).
- MCKEOWN, E., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5487 (ii).
- MCLAREN'S CREEK, CONSTRUCTION OF A ROADWAY : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 3257 (i).

- McLAUGHLIN, R. J., AND FARMERS OF LINDSAY *re* DAMAGES BY FLOODS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1976, 2321 (i); 4485, 4486, 4499 (ii).  
 — LETTER OF MR. McLAUGHLIN READ (Mr. *Mulock*) 4998, 5005 (ii).
- McMILLAN, MR. W. D., DISMISSAL AS LIGHTKEEPER FROM WOOD ISLAND, P.E.I. : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2327 (i).
- McNEIL, STEPHEN, BEAVER COVE, RENTAL CHARGED BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3944 (ii).  
 — LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER AT RICHMOND, PAPERS RESPECTING : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4732 (ii).
- MACAULAY POINT CLAIMS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9133 (iii).  
 — FORTIFICATIONS, CLAIMS FOR COMPENSATION, &c. : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Prior*) 3874 (ii).  
 — INQUIRY FOR RETURN (Mr. *Prior*) 5489 (ii).
- MACHINERY AT RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, APPLICATION BY SUPT. FOR ADDITIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4481 (ii).
- MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 8133 (iii).  
 — MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTOR'S NAME, TERMS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 2113 (i).  
 — TERMS OF CONTRACT, &c. : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Pope*) 2789 (i).  
 — AND MAINLAND, MAIL SUBSIDIES : in Com. of Sup., 8678 (iii).
- MAGUIRE, MR. JUSTICE, APPNMT. AND ARRIVAL AT DAWSON, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3258 (i).  
 — Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3959 (ii).
- MAIL BAGS, CONTRACTS BETWEEN GOVT. AND OTTAWA SUPPLY CO. : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2185 (i).  
 — CLERKS : in Com. of Sup., 7331 (iii).  
 — YUKON : in Com. of Sup., 6360 (ii).  
 — SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 7366, 8661 (iii).  
 — YUKON : in Com. of Sup., 7350 (iii); conc., 6390 (ii); 10202 (iii).  
 — JACQUES CARTIER COUNTY : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6933, 6934 (iii).  
 — PACIFIC COAST, FACILITIES BY GOVT. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3254 (i).  
 — YUKON DISTRICT (1898-8) EFFICIENCY OF CONTRACTORS, REPS., &c. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2705 (i).  
 — BETWEEN DAWSON AND VANCOUVER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1965 (i).  
 — REGISTERED LETTERS, &c., POLICY OF GOVT. : Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 3792 (ii).  
 — RETURNED FROM DEAD LETTER OFFICE : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 4351 (ii).
- MAINTENANCE OF PRISONERS, YUKON TERRITORY : in Com. of Sup., 10195 (iii).
- MAITLAND HARBOUR : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Montague*) 9185 (iii).  
 See "Colborne, &c."
- MANITOBA :
- ALLAIRE, J. P. O., ST. BONIFACE, MAN., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1894 (i).
- MANITOBA—*Con.*
- C.P.R. AND GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL, SURVEY OF BRANCH LINE : Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2532 (i).
- C.P.R. COMMISSION, APPNMT. BY GOVT. : Prop. Res. (Mr. *Richardson*) 2773 (i).
- CHRISTIE, MR. W. J., DISMISSAL FROM INLAND REV. DEPT., O. C.'S, REPS., COR., &c. : M. for Copies (Mr. *Roche*) 2393 (i).  
 — M. TO REF. PAPERS TO PUBLIC ACCTS. COM. (Mr. *Roche*) 3341 (ii).
- COSTIGAN, MR. H. A., AND JOHN R. BARRETT, COR. BETWEEN DEPT., &c. : laid on Table, 3875 (ii).
- DOMINION LANDS, MAN., FRAUDULENT TRANSACTIONS BY OFFICIALS, PAR. IN WINNIPEG *Telegram* : Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 4995 (ii).
- FAIRLIE, MR., DISMISSAL AS PRINCIPAL OF INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL : M. for Repls., Cor.\* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 2788 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 2532 (i).
- GOVT. LANDS, MAN., SALE OF, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 1856 (i).
- HARBOURS AND RIVERS, MAN. : in Com. of Sup., 8077 (iii).
- JEROME, MR. MARTIN, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 6723 (ii), 7194 (iii).
- LAND TRANSFERS IN MAN., AND GOVT. AGENTS SPECULATIONS : Remarks (Mr. *Roche*) 4735 (ii).
- McKENZIE POST OFFICE, MAN., PETS. *re*, &c., NAME OF POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2185 (i).
- MANITOBA AND NORTH-WESTERN RY., MILES CONSTRUCTED, LAND SUBSIDIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2900 (i).
- MANITOBA ELECTION FRAUDS, DELAY IN MEETING OF PUB. ACCTS. COM. : M. to Adjn. Hse. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3150 (i).  
 — FURTHER CONSIDERATION IN PUB. ACCTS. COM. : M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2479 (i).  
 — Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3876 (ii).  
 — M. that Papers be referred to Pub. Accts. Com. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4654 (ii).
- MANITOBA LAKE, ADDITIONAL OUTLETS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8077 (iii).  
 — DRAINAGE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1965 (i).
- MANITOBA LEGISLATION, DISALLOWANCE BY DOM. GOVT., PETS., MEMORIALS, &c., FROM EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, PROTESTING, &c. : M. for Copies\* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2788 (i).  
 — PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 5479 (ii).  
 — SCHOOL QUESTION, COR. WITH THE HOLY FATHER, SETTLEMENT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1822 (i).
- MARTIN, MR. A. F., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 7534 (iii).
- RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS, ESTABLISHMENT OF BOARD : Prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 2488 (i).
- ST. ANDREWS RAPIDS : in Com. of Sup., 9173, 10155 (iii).
- ST. NORBERT, INUNDATIONS OF RED RIVER, CLAIMS OF OWNERS : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1894 (i).
- SCHOOL LANDS, MAN., STMT. OF SALE : Read (Mr. *Sifton*) 6461 (ii).
- SHANNON, THOS., DISMISSAL : M. for Papers\* (Mr. *Richardson*) 3333 (i).
- STONY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY, COMMISSIONER'S REPORT : Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 9837 (iii).
- VIERDEN, MAN., INLAND REVENUE OFFICE : M. for Cor. dropped (Mr. *Roche*) 5313 (ii).

MANITOBA—*Con.*

- WINNIPEG ELECTORAL DISTRICT AND REPRESENTATION: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1830 (i).  
 — ISSUE OF WRIT: Remarks (Mr. Roche) 8469 (iii).  
 — GRAIN EXCHANGE AND FORT WILLIAM HARBOUR, COR. WITH PUB. WORKS DEPT.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Roche) 1879 (i).  
 — HOSPITALS: in Com. of Sup., 8338 (iii).  
 — LAKE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 8079 (iii).

Manitoba and South-eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 157 (Mr. Hughes) 1<sup>st</sup>, 5205; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 5536; in Com.; and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 6405 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 75).

MANITOULIN ISLAND JUDGESHIP: in Com. of Sup., 10122 (iii).

MARGAREE AND ORANGEDALE MAIL SERVICE, CHANGES, &c., *re* CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 3261 (i).

MARIA WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 8133 (iii).

## MARINE:

- ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY BASIN, REPORTS, *re* BUOYS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 4993 (ii).  
 — BUOY SERVICE, EXPIRATION OF MR. MCCARTHY'S CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 4056 (ii).  
 "ACADIA," STR., REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5180 (ii).  
 BUFFALO AND CRYSTAL BEACH FERRY SERVICE, LICENSE AND PRIVILEGES GRANTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 4994 (ii).  
 BROTCHEES LEDGE, B. C., LIGHTHOUSE, COMPLETION AND OPERATION: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 2331 (i).  
 CANADIAN COAST, SURVEYS OF CURRENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1824 (i).  
 CHEMAINUS, B. C., PILOTAGE LIMITS: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 5312 (ii).  
 CLARK, H. W., SERVICES AS ENGINEER ON DREDGE "CANADA," &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8630 (iii).  
 COASTING LAWS, ENFORCEMENTS, COR. RESPECTING: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3257 (i).  
 — REPORT OF CAPT. JOHN IRVING, *re* ENFORCEMENT: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3258 (i).  
 "DOLPHIN," STR., SALE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4045 (ii).  
 — PURCHASER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1855 (i).  
 DOM. STEAMERS, INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4240 (ii).  
 GALLANT, W. A., ENGINEER POINT LEPREAUX, FOG ALARM, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganog) 4806 (ii).  
 GIANT'S TOMB LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1834 (i).  
 GOVT. STEAMERS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2990, 3004 (i); 4719, 5101 (ii).  
 "GOVERNOR PINGREE" AND "J. B. LOWE," STRS., REGISTRY IN CAN.; Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1856 (i).  
 GRATUITY TO COMMANDER WAKEHAM: in Com. of Sup., 5183 (ii).  
 HALIFAX HARBOUR LIGHTSHIP AND RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. Borden), Halifax) 8920 (iii).  
 HILLSBORO, N. B., HARBOUR MASTER, CHARGES AGAINST, EVIDENCE AND COMMISSIONER'S REP., &c.: M. for Copy\* (Mr. McInerney) 2027 (i).  
 HOPE ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, NAME, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1834 (i); 5486 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*

- HUDSON'S STRAITS, NAVIGABILITY, COST OF EXPEDITION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3337 (ii).  
 I. C. R., REYNOLDS, CAPT., STR. "MULGRAVE" COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. McLennan, Inverness) 5309 (ii).  
 "JOHN C. BARR" AMERICAN STR., OWNERSHIP, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 8469 (iii).  
 — UNDERVALUATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 8218 (iii).  
 — UNDERVALUATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3061.  
 — VALUATION BY CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2700 (i).  
 LIFE SAVING REWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 3064 (i).  
 LIGHT-KEEPERS SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3523 (ii).  
 LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3523, 5116 (ii).  
 LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE, B. C., ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 3821 (ii).  
 MCKEEN'S POINT, CONSTRUCTION OF STORM SIGNALS, COR., &c.: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 3033 (i).  
 McMILLAN, MR. W. D., DISMISSAL AS LIGHTKEEPER FROM WOOD ISLAND, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2327 (i).  
 McNEILL, MR., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER AT RICHMOND, PAPERS RESPECTING: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Gillies) 4732 (ii).  
 MARINE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2102, 2276 (i).  
 — HOSPITALS: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).  
 — INSURANCE RATES, MAR. PROVS, ADVANCEMENT IN PRICE: Remarks (Mr. McDougall) 8922 (iii).  
 — REP.: Presented (Sir Louis Davies) 1165 (i).  
 MASTERS AND MATES EXAMINATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3058 (i).  
 MIDLAND HARBOUR, AMOUNT OF DUES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1834 (i).  
 "MINTO," STR.: in Com. of Sup., 10159 (iii).  
 OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE WATERS, REMOVAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3065 (i).  
 OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2990, 3004 (i); 4719, 5100; *conc.*, 6363 (ii).  
 "PINGREE" AND "LOWE" STRS., UNDERVALUATION, &c.: Ques. Mr. Prior) 8218 (iii).  
 POINT JEROME LIGHT-KEEPER: Inquiry for Ret., (Mr. Gillies) 3668 (ii).  
 REGISTRATION OF SHIPPING: in Com. of Sup., 3065 (i).  
 REVENUE CRUISERS, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5602 (ii).  
 RICHELIEU RIVER, PLACING OF BUOYS, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3796 (ii).  
 RUSSELL, MR., DISMISSAL AS STEAMBOAT INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 4713 (ii).  
 SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 5170 (ii).  
 "SHAMROCK," TUG, AMOUNT PAID JOHN C. KAINE, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5666 (ii).  
 SICK AND DISTRESSED SEAMEN: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (i).  
 STEAMBOAT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4013, 4713 (ii).  
 STEVESTON, B. C., TIDAL LANDS, APPLICATION FOR LEASES, &c.: Ques.: (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3822, 4058 (ii).  
 — M. for Copies\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3873 (ii).  
 SUPPLIES FOR GOVT. DREDGES: in Com. of Sup., 7571 (iii).

MARINE—*Con.*

- TIDAL SURVEYS IN CANADIAN WATERS, PETS., &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3795 (ii).
- SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 3050 (i).
- on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3505 (ii).
- STMT. OF MINISTER AS TO REMARKS OF ALLAN SS. CAPTAINS, REP. OF CAPT. SPAIN., &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3262 (i).
- TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 5116 (ii), 10162 (iii).
- See "SUPPLY."
- U.S. BOATS REGISTERED AT DAWSON, NAMES, VALUATION, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2699 (i).
- CUSTOMS AND CANADIAN VESSELS, REGULATIONS, &c., re ENTERING AT AMERICAN PORTS: Remarks (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2528 (i).
- "VIGILANT" STR., B. C. COAST SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 5729 (ii).
- WOOD ISLAND, P.E.I., LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL AND CHARGES AGAINST, REP. OF COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2328 (i).
- DISMISSAL OF D. McMILLAN, COR., PETS., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Martin) 4613 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. Martin) 10117 (iii).
- WRECKS, INVESTIGATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 3064 (i).
- YUEON, RUSSELL, MR., INSPECTOR OF STEAMBOATS, DISMISSAL, REPS., &c.: M. for Copies (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3334 (i).
- MARTEL, MR. P., POSTMASTER AT ST. PRIME, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1964 (i).
- MARTIN, MR. A. F., EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 7534 (iii).
- MARTIN, MR. JUSTICE, JUDICIAL RESIDENCE, B.C.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3545 (ii).
- MARYSVILLE, N.B., POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7616 (iii).
- MASSAWIPPI VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop Res. (Mr. Blair) 8916 (iii).
- MASTERS AND MATES EXAMINATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3058 (i).
- MEAGHER, THOS., CLAIMS ON U.S. GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 5474 (ii) 10194 (iii).
- M. for Ret. (Mr. Cowan) 2742, 2754 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5492 (ii).
- MEDALS, GENERAL SERVICE, CLAIMS ALLOWED BY COMMISSION, DISTRIBUTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 5860 (ii).
- DATE OF ROYAL WARRANTS, GOVTL. ACTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 8630 (iii).
- DELAY IN ISSUE, BOARD OF CLAIMS, REMUNERATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 2699 (i).
- DESIGN APPROVED BY CAN. OR IMPERIAL AUTHORITIES: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 3266 (i).
- NOTICE IN CAN. Gazette re CLASPS, RIBBONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 3083 (i).
- RECOMMENDATIONS BY MILITIA DEPT., TERMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 3945 (ii).
- FOR LONG SERVICE, REGULATIONS RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Kloepper) 7320 (iii).
- See CAN. SERVICE, GEN. SERVICE, &c.

- MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, QUEBEC INDIANS; in Com. of Sup., 5669 (ii).
- MEMBERS ADDRESSING CHAIR: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 7214 (iii).
- APPOINTED TO OFFICE: par. in Victoria Colonist (Mr. Prior) 6381 (ii).
- ASKED TO FORMULATE THEIR QUESTIONS SO AS NOT TO MAKE STATEMENTS OF FACTS (Mr. Speaker) 4483 (ii).
- ASKED NOT TO INTERRUPT SPEAKERS (Mr. Speaker) 1175 (i).
- ASKED TO SPEAK TO MOTION BEFORE HOUSE (Mr. Speaker) 1565, 1573 (i), 4816 (ii).
- ASKED TO WITHDRW. STATEMENT (Mr. Speaker) 1177, 1555 (i), 4006 (ii).
- ATTENTION CALLED TO PROCEDURE FOR WEDNESDAYS (Mr. Speaker) 3269 (i).
- BREAKING RULES ON CALLING ORDERS OF THE DAY (Mr. Speaker) 3558 (ii).
- CANNOT INTERRUPT WITHOUT CONSENT OF HON. MEM. MAKING SPEECH (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 3226 (i).
- CANNOT MOVE ADJNMT. TWICE ON ORDER OF THE DAY BEING CALLED (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 4551 (ii).
- CANNOT REFER TO PREVIOUS DEBATE IN ASKING QUESTIONS: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3262 (i).
- CANNOT SPEAK TWICE ON SAME SUBJECT: (Mr. Speaker) 3777, 5375, 5376 (ii).
- DECEASED: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 (i).
- OF THE GOVT., ABSENCE FROM OTTAWA: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1819 (i).
- INTRODUCED, 4, 421, 2897 (i).
- MUST ADDRESS THE CHAIR: (Mr. Chairman) 9647 (iii).
- MUST CONCLUDE WITH A MOTION, 3499 (ii), 3754 (ii).
- MUST CONFINE HIS REMARKS TO MOTION BEFORE HSE. (Mr. Speaker) 5402 (ii).
- MOTION NOT IN ORDER (Mr. Speaker) 3342 (ii).
- MOVING READING OF BILL: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2918 (i).
- MUST CONFINE REMARKS TO BILL BEFORE HSE.: (Mr. Speaker) 4780 (ii).
- MUST NOT INTERRUPT WITHOUT PERMISSION OF SPEAKER: (Mr. Speaker) 6170 (ii).
- MUST NOT QUOTE FROM PREVIOUS DEBATE: (Mr. Speaker) 7196 (iii).
- MUST NOT REFER TO PAST DEBATE: (Mr. Speaker) 3328 (i).
- NEW, CERTIFICATES OF RET.: Notification, 1, 338 (i).
- IN ORDER, TO SPEAK TO MOTION TO GO INTO SUPPLY (Mr. Speaker) 8644 (iii).
- MILEAGE ALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. Maxwell) 6722 (ii).
- REMARKS CHECKED, 1871, 1953, 1954, 2733, 2734, 2742, 2794, 2805, 3193, 3224, 3225 (i), 3557, 5493, 6315 (ii).
- RESIGNATION: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 3 (i).
- SPEECHES OUT OF ORDER, MUST MAKE A MOTION (Mr. Speaker) 3846 (ii).

## MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY :

- MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 158 (i).  
 — Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 2025 (i).  
 — Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 2963 (i), 4358 (ii), 9335 (iii).  
 — Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 7638 (iii).  
 MESS. BY BLACK ROD, 1 (i); 6930 (iii).  
 MICHAUD, MR. EUGENE, GRANTING OF RAILWAY PASSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2904 (i).  
 MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 10112 (iii).  
 MIDLAND HARBOUR, AMOUNT OF DUES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1834 (i).  
 MIDLAND RY. CO.'S BRIDGE SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8918 (iii).

## MILITIA :

- ACTIVE FORCE, RESIGNATION OF MAJORS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 5487 (ii).  
 AGE LIMITS, SERVICE OF LT.-COLS., REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1852 (i).  
 ALLOWANCES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7002 (iii).  
 AMMUNITION, AMOUNT ISSUED TO 7TH BATTALION, LONDON: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 1956 (i).  
 ANNUAL DRILL: in Com. of Sup., 5055, 5414 (ii); 7002 (iii).  
 ARMS, AMMUNITION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5465 (ii); 9141 (iii).  
 ARMOURIES, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9125 (iii).  
 ARMY AND NAVY IMPORTATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 8704 (iii).  
 ARMY SERVICE CORPS, RECOMMENDATIONS OF REPS. OF MAJ. GENERAL: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 9697 (iii).  
 ARTILLERY, FORTRESS ARMAMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7152 (iii).  
 — INSTRUCTION IN ENGLAND, EXAMINATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 2330 (i).  
 BATE & CO.'S CONTRACT *re* YUKON SUPPLIES: in Com. of Sup., 6339 (ii) 7036, 7124 (iii).  
 BATTALION, 94TH, INCREASE OF FORCE: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 2111 (i).  
 BIGGAR, J. L., APPTMT. BY GOVT., QUALIFICATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3549 (ii).  
 BLISS, MAJ. D. C. F., POSITIONS HELD UNDER GOVT., DATE OF APPTMT., SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3261 (i); 3335 (ii).  
 BOSTON AND ALASKAN TRANSPORTATION CO., CONTRACT WITH CAN. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1823 (i).  
 BREVET PROMOTIONS, PERMANENT FORCE, REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3550 (ii).  
 CANTEENS AND SALE OF LIQUOR, PAR. IN OTTAWA *Citizen re* Dom. Alliance in Ont.: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Borden*, King's) 7322 (iii).  
 CARTRIDGE FACTORY: in Com. of Sup., 7151, 9124 (iii).  
 CHAMP DE MARS, LEASE, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Monk*) 2141 (i).  
 CITADEL, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii).  
 CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 5012 (ii).  
 CLOTHING CONTRACT, &c., AND COR. WITH MR WORKMAN: M. for Copies\* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 5377 (ii).  
 — NAME OF CONTRACTOR, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4806 (ii).  
 — TENDERS, &c.: M. for Copies to be Ref. to Pub. Accounts Com. (Mr. *Fraser*, Guysboro) 3874 (ii).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 5443 (ii); 7099, 9066, 9126 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

- COMPENSATION TO MRS. F. E. STEWART: in Com. of Sup. 9131 (iii).  
 DEFENCE SCHEME: in Com. of Sup., 5465 (ii).  
 DOM. RIFLE ASSOCIATION, ANNUAL GRANT BY GOVT. OF TRANSPORT AND ENTRANCE FEES TO LIMITED NUMBER: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2358, 2361 (i).  
 DOMVILLE, LT.-COL., CHARGES AGAINST, EVIDENCE BEFORE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1839 (i); 1845 (i).  
 — LEAVE OF ABSENCE FROM COMMAND OF 8TH HUSSARS: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 2898 (i).  
 — PAR. IN ST. JOHN SUR Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 2899 (i).  
 EMPLOYEES, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5420 (ii).  
 ESQUIMAULT DEFENCE: in Com. of Sup., 7151 (iii).  
 FORCE, ARTILLERY INSTRUCTION IN ENGLAND, EXAMINATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 2330 (i).  
 — OFFICER APPOINTED IN 1893, REQUIREMENTS AS TO QUALIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 2329 (i).  
 FREDERICTON SCHOOL, N.B., ADMISSION FOR INSTRUCTION, RECOMMENDATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3335 (ii).  
 — RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADMISSION AND INSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3795 (ii).  
 GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS AND SWEATING CLAUSE, NUMBER OF CONTRACTS AWARDED, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Clarke*) 2961 (i).  
 — PROHIBITION OF SWEATING: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1975 (i).  
 HAMILTON RIFLE RANGE: in Com. of Sup., 5465 (ii).  
 HUSSARS, 8TH, N.B., ANNUAL ALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 3072 (i).  
 IMPERIAL SERVICE AND CANADIAN BRIGADE AND CAN. SEAMEN: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2336, 2352 (i).  
 ISLE AU NOIX, FORTIFICATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9154 (iii).  
 — MILITIA PROPERTY, LEASE, RENTAL, &c.: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Quinn*) 2961 (i).  
 LÉVIS FORTS, CONTRACT FOR CORDWOOD, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3082 (i).  
 — MILITARY CAMP, QUALIFICATION OF OFFICERS' PERCENTAGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Thyrollet*) 9309 (iii).  
 LISTS AND CERTIFICATES OF QUALIFICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 2329 (i).  
 MCKENZIE, F., DISMISSAL FROM FREDERICTON MILITARY SCHOOL: in Com. of Sup., 5056 (ii).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2485, 2699, 2899 (i).  
 MACAULAY POINT FORTIFICATIONS, CLAIMS FOR COMPENSATION, &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Prior*) 3874 (ii).  
 — CLAIMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9133 (iii).  
 MEDALS, CAN. SERVICE, DELAY IN ISSUE, BOARD OF CLAIMS, REMUNERATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2699 (i).  
 — DESIGN APPROVED BY CAN. OR IMP. AUTHORITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3266 (i).  
 — NOTICE IN *Canada Gazette re* CLASPS, RIBBONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3083 (i).  
 — RECOMMENDATION BY MILITIA DEPT., TERMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3945 (ii).  
 — LONG SERVICE, REGULATIONS RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Kloepfer*) 7820 (iii).  
 — DATE OF ROYAL WARRANTS, GOVT. ACTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8629 (iii).  
 See "Can. Service, Gen. Service, &c."  
 MILITIA ACT AMENDMENTS, INTENTION OF GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3551 (ii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

- MILITIA AND DEFENCE: in Com. of Sup., 2070, 2266 (i) 5055; 5357 (ii) 9066; (iii); conc., 6339 (ii).  
 — Rep. presented (Mr. Borden, King's) 421 (i).  
 MISCELLANEOUS AND UNFORESEEN EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 5451 (ii).  
 MONUMENTS ON BATTLE FIELDS: in Com. of Sup., 7152 (iii).  
 NAVAL BRIGADE RESERVE, &c., ORGANIZED BY CAN. GOVT. COR. WITH IMP. GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Britton) 6048 (ii).  
 N. W. T. REBELLION (1885), CLAIMS COMMISSION: M. for Ret. (Mr. Davis) 3084, 3102 (i).  
 OFFICERS APPOINTED IN 1898, REQUIREMENTS AS TO QUALIFICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Ross-Robertson) 2329 (i).  
 REGULATIONS *re* FRENCH AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE, ENFORCEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Tyrwhitt) 8631 (iii).  
 PENSIONS *re* FENIAN RAID: in Com. of Sup., 8750 (iii).  
 — *re* REBELLION, 1885: in Com. of Sup., 8750 (iii).  
 PERMANENT CORPS, PENSION SYSTEM: Prop. Res. (Mr. Hughes) 2706 (i).  
 — PENSION SYSTEM: on Order being called for Prop. Res. (Mr. Hughes) 2487 (i).  
 — QUALIFICATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ross-Robertson) 3550 (ii).  
 PETITION, DUFFERIN COUNTY *re* INCREASE OF MILITIA GRANT: Ruled out of Order (Mr. Speaker) 1071 (i).  
 — ESSEX COUNTY *re* INCREASE OF MILITIA GRANT: Ruled out of Order (Mr. Speaker) 803 (i).  
 — LANARK COUNTY *re* INCREASE OF MILITIA GRANT: Ruled out of Order (Mr. Speaker) 1639 (i).  
 PLAINS OF ABRAHAM, LEASE, MEMORIALS, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Casgrain) 2026 (i).  
 PROPERTIES: in Com. of Sup., 5421 (ii).  
 RIFLE RANGES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7088 (iii).  
 QUEBEC CARTRIDGE FACTORY, DISMISSAL OF LABOURERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 2186 (i).  
 — EMPLOYEES, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 9699, 9843 (iii).  
 REGIMENTAL ESTABLISHMENTS, LISTS SUBMITTED TO PARLT.: Ques. (Mr. Ross-Robertson) 3550 (ii).  
 — MEETINGS OF 8TH HUSSARS, ANNUAL REP. M. for Copy\* (Mr. Sproule) 3873 (ii).  
 REGULATIONS AS TO AGE LIMIT FOR LT. COLS., RETIREMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2183 (i).  
 — PRESENTED TO PARLT: Ques. (Mr. Ross-Robertson) 3550 (ii).  
 RIFLE ASSOCIATION GRANTS: in Com. of Sup., 7147 (iii).  
 — RANGES, B.C., APPLICATIONS, PETS., &c.: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 5484 (ii).  
 — SALE BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 1817 (i).  
 ST. JOHN BATTALION, 8TH HUSSARS, CHARGES AGAINST COMMANDING OFFICER, REP. *re* INVESTIGATION, &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Domville) 2026 (i).  
 SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7074 (iii).  
 STORES, 8TH HUSSARS, SALE OF BY I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 1858 (i).  
 — TRANSFER. ORDERS FROM DEPT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 2897 (i).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 5423 (ii).  
 — OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 9942 (iii).  
 ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, CLOTHING CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6722 (ii); 6932 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

- ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, EXPENDITURE SINCE FOUNDATION, REGULATIONS, NUMBER OF GRADUATES, &c.: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. Casey) 1879 (i).  
 — INSPECTION, REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ross-Robertson) 3796 (ii).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 5464 (ii) 7022, 7140, 9960 (iii).  
 — MILITIA STAFF, AMOUNT EXPENDED FROM 1867 TO 1889: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Domville) 2029 (i).  
 STRATHY, MR. J. A. L., REINSTATEMENT AS LT. COL.: Ques. (Mr. Ross-Robertson) 2329 (i).  
 SUSSEX, N.B., ERECTION OF DRILL SHED: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 1857 (i).  
 TRANSPORT AND FREIGHT: in Com. of Sup., 7120 (iii).  
 TRANSPORTATION OF MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 5451 (ii).  
 VETERANS OF 1864-5, ISSUE OF MEDALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1853 (i).  
 — 1885 AT EDMONTON, ISSUE OF SCRIP AND MEDALS, APPLICATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 2701 (i).  
 — 1866, GRANTING OF MEDALS: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2114 (i).  
 — 1866 AND 1870, ISSUE OF MEDALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1848 (i).  
 — 1866, VOLUNTEERS ORGANIZED IN CHICAGO, ELIGIBILITY FOR MEDALS: Ques. (Mr. Ross-Robertson) 2704 (i).  
 WARLIKE STORES: in Com. of Sup., 7091 (iii).  
 WOLSELEY BARRACKS, LONDON, LAND PURCHASED, PRICE, &c.: (Mr. Calvert) 1840 (i).  
 YUKON DISTRICT, DOM. POLICE, NUMBER, DISTRIBUTION, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1965 (i).  
 — FORCE, PROVISIONS AND SUPPLIES: in Com. of Sup., 7126 (iii).  
 — CHARGES AGAINST FOR MISCONDUCT: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Hughes) 9963 (iii).  
 — MR. JUSTICE DUGAS' REPRESENTATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1842 (i).  
 — STRENGTH OF FORCE, COST OF SUPPLIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1831, 1841 (i).  
 — TRANSPORTATION, SUPPLIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6321, 6339, 7030 (iii).  
 — PERMANENT MILITIA, NUMBER, COST OF TRANSPORTATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1892 (i).  
 — PERMANENT FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 7005 (iii).  
 Militia Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Domville) 1<sup>o</sup>, 4055 (ii).  
 MILLER, MR. R. C., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: (Mr. Bennett) 1974 (i).  
 MILLTOWN, N. B., APPOINT. OF FISHERY GUARDIAN: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4482 (ii).  
 MINERS' COMMITTEE, PROTEST FROM, YUKON INVESTIGATION, COR., &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2329 (i).  
 — YUKON, AGAINST COMPANIES BUYING WATER GRANTS: Remarks (Mr. Marcotte) 3315 (i).  
 — YUKON, RIGHT TO CUT TIMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 1836 (i).  
 MINING CLAIMS AND HOMESTEAD ENTRIES BY GOVT. OFFICIALS, O.C.'s, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Davin) 1877 (i).  
 — REGULATIONS, YUKON, PUBLICATION, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 1841 (i).  
 — Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2248 (i).

- MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY re TRANSACTION OF OFFICIAL ADMINISTRATION:** on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4002 (ii).
- RETURNS ORDERED BY HOUSE: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5410 (ii).
- MINT, GOVT., ESTABLISHMENT IN CAN.:** Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 2190 (i).
- Prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3106 (i).
- “MINTO,” STR.: in Com. of Sup., 10159 (iii).
- MISTASSINI AND STE. METHODE STOREHOUSES, CONSTRUCTION, &c., NAME OF CONTRACTOR, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1888 (i).
- MONCTON SHOPS, MACHINERY, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 5753 (ii).
- Montreal Harbour Commissioners’ B. No. 179** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°, 8752; 2°, and in Com., 9880; 3°, 9963 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 36.)
- Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.’s B. No. 112** (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1°, 2789; 2°, 3004 (i); on Order for Com., 5897; M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 6091; in Com., 6327, 6404; 3°, 6405 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 76.)
- MONTREAL EXTENSION, EXPENDITURE, REVENUE FROM 1898 TO 1899:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Powell*) 2789 (i). See “Railways, &c.”
- MONTREAL HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS:** in Com. of Sup., 9964 (iii).
- IMPROVEMENTS, PLANS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2187 (i).
- JUDICIAL DISTRICT, ADDITIONAL JUDGES: Remarks (Mr. *Madorc*) 7224 (iii).
- personal Explanation re Par. in Montreal *Gazette* (Mr. *Fortin*) 7632 (iii).
- AND LABELLE SERVICE, APPNMT. OF MAIL CONDUCTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Chaurin*) 1966 (i).
- OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Poupore*) 4273 (ii).
- resmd. adjd. Deb. (Mr. *Belcourt*) 4300, 4859 (ii).
- resmd. adjd. Deb. (Mr. *Casey*) 5360 (ii).
- POSTMASTERSHIP, VACANCY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 5859 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1827 (i).
- DISMISSALS AND APPNMTS., NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 6047 (ii).
- POST OFFICE, REPAIRS, ADVERTISEMENTS re TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2112 (i).
- REPAIRS, &c., NAME OF CONTRACTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1974 (i).
- PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii).
- MONUMENTS ON BATTLEFIELDS:** in Com. of Sup., 7152 (iii).
- MOODY, INSPECTOR, OF N. W. MOUNTED POLICE, CHARGES AGAINST:** Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 8219 (iii).
- MOONSTONE, ONT., POSTMASTER, NAME, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1957 (i).
- MORNING SITTINGS:** M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7768. See “Business of the House.”
- MORRIS, DR., POSTMASTER AT DUNDAS, P.E.I., RESIGNATION, &c.:** M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 3873 (ii).
- MORRISON, HUGH, RIVERSIDE, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES:** Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) 5310 (ii).
- MORTON, POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF MR. J. R. LEAKE, REP. OF INSPECTOR, COR., &c.:** M. for Copies\* (Mr. *Taylor*) 2962 (i).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3150 (i).
- MOUNT ALBION, P.E.I., MAIL SERVICE, PETS. re &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1969 (i).
- Mounted Police Pensions Act Amt. B. No. 79** (Mr. *Davin*) 1<sup>m.</sup>, 2029 (i).
- MOUNT STEWART WHARF, P.E.I.:** in Com. of Sup., 5754; conc., 6387 (ii).
- MUNGOVAN, P., TEMPORARY CLERK:** in Com. of Sup., 5019 (ii).
- See “Supply,” &c.
- MURRAY BAY AND OUELLE RIVER, MAIL SUBSIDY:** in Com. of Sup., 10158 (iii).
- AND QUEBEC MAIL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS OF DELAY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1960 (i).
- MURRAY CANAL:** in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iii).
- NATIONAL ART GALLERY:** in Com. of Sup., 8149 (iii).
- Naturalization Act Amt. B. No. 37** (Mr. *McLanes*) 1°, 974; 2<sup>m.</sup>, 2176, 2527 (i).
- NAVAL BRIGADE RESERVE, &c., ORGANIZED BY CAN. GOVT., COR. WITH IMP. GOVT., &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Britton*) 6048 (ii).
- Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. No. 19** (Mr. *Britton*) 1°, 700; 2°, 1862; in Com., 1896; 3°, 2153 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 32.)
- B. No. 137 (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1°, 4150; 2°, 6118; in Com. and 3°, 6119 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9597 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 31.)
- NEUFRAGE POND, P.E.I., SURVEY, REPS., &c.:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 3873 (ii).
- NEW BRUNSWICK:**
- BROWN, BARTH., CAMPOBELLO, N.B., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.:** Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4482 (ii).
- BUILDINGS:** in Com. of Sup., 9954 (iii).
- CAMPBELLTON WHARF:** in Com. of Sup., 10012 (iii).
- CANADA EASTERN RAILWAY, N.B., PURCHASE BY GOVT.:** Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3554, 3824 (ii).
- M. for Cor., &c.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 3873 (ii).
- SALE, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1814 (ii).
- CENTRAL RAILWAY OF N.B. AND DEPTS. OF RYS. AND CANALS, COR., &c., re SUBSIDIES:** M. for Copies\* (Mr. *Foster*) 2788 (i).
- CENTRAL RAILWAY CO., N.B.:** in Com. of Sup., 5788 (ii).
- CHEZZETCOOK WHARF:** in Com. of Sup., 10004 (iii).
- CURLESS, CHAS. H., PREVENTIVE OFFICER, GRAND FALLS, N.B., DISMISSAL, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4056 (ii).
- DICK, ISAAC, FISHERY GUARDIAN, N.B., DISMISSAL, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 7765 (iii).
- DOMVILLE, LT.-COL., CHARGES AGAINST:** Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1839 (i).
- EVIDENCE BEFORE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1845 (i).
- LEAVE OF ABSENCE FROM COMMAND OF 8TH HUSSARS: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 2898 (i).
- PAR. IN ST. JOHN *Sun*: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 2899 (i).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Con.*

- DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in *Com. of Sup.*, 5477 (ii).
- FISHING WEIRS, CHARLOTTE CO., LICENSES ISSUED, DATES, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Ganong*) 2962 (i).
- FRANCHISE ELECTORAL ACT, AMENDMENTS BY N. B. GOVERNMENT: Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 2530 (i).
- FREDERICTON MILITARY SCHOOL, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADMISSION AND INSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3795 (ii).
- GALLANT, W. A., ENGINEER POINT LEPREAU FOG ALARM, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4806 (ii).
- GLASS, JAMES, FISHERY GUARDIAN AT CHARLOTTE, N.B., APPOINT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4482 (ii).
- HARBOURS AND RIVERS, N.B.: in *Com. of Sup.*, 10010 (iii).
- HILLSBORO, N.B., HARBOUR MASTER, CHARGES AGAINST, EVIDENCE AND COMMISSIONER'S REP., &c.: M. for Copy\* (Mr. *McInerney*) 2027 (i).  
— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *McInerney*) 4732 (ii).
- LEPREAUX, N. B., CUSTOMS OFFICER, NAME, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 5313 (ii).
- LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN: in *Com. of Sup.*, 7155, 7242, 7401 (iii).
- MILITARY SCHOOL, FREDERICTON, N.B., ADMISSION FOR INSTRUCTION, RECOMMENDATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2485, 2699, 2899 (i) 3335 (ii).  
— in *Com. of Sup.*, 5056 (ii).
- MILITIA, 8TH HUSSARS, N. B., ANNUAL ALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 3072 (i).  
— STORES, 8TH HUSSARS, SALE OF BY I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1858 (i).  
— TRANSFER, ORDERS FROM DEPT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 2897 (i).
- MILLTOWN, APPOINTMENT OF FISHERY GUARDIAN, Ques.: (Mr. *Ganong*) 4482 (ii).
- MONCTON SHOPS, MACHINERY, &c.: in *Com. of Sup.*, 5753 (ii).
- PARKER, CHARLES H., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1972 (i).
- PORT MULGRAVE, &c., STEAM COMMUNICATION: in *Com. of Sup.*, 10156 (iii).
- REGIMENTAL MEETINGS OF 8TH HUSSARS, ANNUAL REP.: M. for Copy\* (Mr. *Sproule*) 3873 (ii).
- ST. JOHN BATTALION, 8TH HUSSARS, CHARGES AGAINST COMMANDING OFFICER, REP. re INVESTIGATION, &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Domville*) 2025 (iii).
- ST. JOHN ACCOMMODATION: in *Com. of Sup.*, 7155, 7242, 7401 (iii).  
— DEEP WATER TERMINAL FACILITIES: M. for Specifications, Plans, &c. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1876 (i).  
— ELEVATOR: in *Com. of Sup.*, 9163 (iii).
- SUBSIDIES BETWEEN ST. JOHN, HALIFAX AND LONDON, AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 2900 (i).
- SUSSEX, ERECTION OF DRILL SHED: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1857 (i).
- TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE: in *Com. of Sup.*, 5116 (ii); 10162 (iii).
- TELEGRAPH LINES, CHETICAMP AND MEAT COVE: in *Com. of Sup.*, 10072 (iii).
- VOTERS' LISTS, N. B., PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2530 (i).
- NEWFOUNDLAND FISHERIES AND FRENCH SHORE, REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3770 (i).

NEWFOUNDLAND REGULATIONS re PURCHASE OF BAIT: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2696 (i).— LIVE BAIT: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2194 (i); 6938 (iii).— SUPPLY OF BAIT, COR., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 9465 (iii).NEWPORT BREAKWATER: in *Com. of Sup.*, 10014 (iii).NEWSPAPER AGENCIES, LESSEES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 1971 (i).

## NEWSPAPER CRITICISMS:

ALIEN LABOUR LAW, ENFORCEMENT, PAR. IN TORONTO *Star*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 2907 (i).APPLES, FRAUDULENT PACKING, PAR. IN TORONTO *World*: M. to Adjn. (Mr. *McMillan*) 3753 (ii).B.C. FISHERMEN, SEIZURE OF NETS BY AMERICANS, PAR. IN VICTORIA *Daily Colonist*: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 8633 (iii).CANADIAN EMIGRATION TO U.S., PAR. IN MONTREAL *Star*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 1895 (i).CANADIAN TROOPS FOR THE TRANSVAAL, PAR. IN OTTAWA *Citizen*: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 7328 (iii).DEADMAN'S ISLAND, PAR. IN MONTREAL *Witness* re LEASE (Mr. *Prior*) 1353, 1640 (i)."DOROTHY," SEIZURE BY U.S. CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES AT SKAGWAY, PAR. IN OTTAWA *Citizen*: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2367 (i).EMIGRATION TO U.S., PAR. IN NEWSPAPERS: Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 2115 (i).GRAIN ELEVATORS N.W.T., PAR. IN WINNIPEG *Tribune*: on M. for *Com. of Sup.* (Mr. *Davin*) 5494 (ii).IMMIGRANTS IN QUARANTINE, PAR. IN OTTAWA *Citizen* (Mr. *Sproule*) 2192 (i).I.C.R. AND SUNDAY TRAFFIC, PAR. IN NEWSPAPER: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 3877 (ii).— ROLLING STOCK, ADDITION TO, PAR. IN MONCTON *Star* (Mr. *Davin*) 6319 (ii).INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION, ALASKAN BOUNDARY AND RUMOURED COMPROMISE, PAR. IN MONTREAL *Gazette* (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4735 (ii).— PAR. IN MONTREAL *Star* (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4169 (ii).— PAR. IN OTTAWA *Citizen* (Mr. *Prior*) 6936 (iii).— PAR. IN LONDON *Times* re SETTLEMENT OF QUESTIONS (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3668 (ii).— PAR. IN MONTREAL *Gazette* re NEGOTIATIONS (Mr. *Wallace*) 3340 (ii).NORTHERN COMMERCIAL TELEGRAPH CO., &c., PAR. IN *Daily Times*: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Prior*) 6051 (ii).LEBEL, MR. WENCESLAS, CUSTOMS OFFICIAL AND REVISION OF ELECTORAL LISTS, PAR. IN *Le Soleil*: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1888 (i).LUMBER IMPORTED INTO U.S. FROM CAN., PAR. IN TORONTO *Globe*: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1638 (i).MEMBERS APPOINTED TO OFFICE, PAR. IN VICTORIA *Colonist* (Mr. *Prior*) 6381 (ii).MILITARY CANTEENS AND SALE OF LIQUOR, PAR. IN OTTAWA *Citizen* re DOM. ALLIANCE IN ONT.: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Borden*, King's) 7322 (iii).MONTREAL JUDICIAL DISTRICT, ADDITIONAL JUDGES, &c.: Personal Explanation re par. in *Montreal Gazette* (Mr. *Fortin*) 7632 (iii).OUELLET, MR. AGAPIT, PAR. IN *Le Soleil*, EMPLOYED BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3259 (i).

NEWSPAPER CRITICISMS—*Con.*

- PACIFIC CABLE AND PAR. IN *Citizen* re CONFERENCE BETWEEN SEC. OF STATE FOR COLONIES AND HIGH COMMISSIONER: Remarks (Mr. Fraser, Guysborough) 3268 (i).
- PERSONAL EXPLANATION IN REF. TO REMARKS ON COAL OIL PRICES (Mr. Wallace) 2247 (i).
- PAR. IN *La Patrie* (Mr. Bergeron) 1953 (i).
- PAR. IN *Mail and Empire* re SPEECH AT PICTON, ONT. (Mr. Richardson) 5375 (ii).
- PAR. IN *Mail and Empire* re YUKON CHARGES (Mr. Domville) 1167 (i).
- PAR. IN *Globe* re MR. FRED PETERS AND YUKON CHARGES (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3337 (ii).
- PAR. IN *MAN. Free Press* (Mr. Davin) 1952 (i).
- PAR. IN *MONTREAL Gazette* (Mr. Fraser, Guysborough) 2036 (i).
- PAR. IN *MONTREAL Star* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 701 (i).
- PAR. IN *MONTREAL Star* (Sir Louis Davies) 618, 701 (i).
- PAR. IN *MONTREAL Star* re WHARF AT ST. JOHN (Mr. Blair) 7326 (iii).
- re BINDER TWINE CONTRACT: par. in *Ottawa Journal*, 7197; M. to Adjn., 7205 (iii).
- PAR. IN *TORONTO World* (Mr. Sproule) 6825 (iii).
- PAR. IN *United Canada* re APPLICATION FOR MR. COSTIGAN'S SEAT (Mr. Davin) 3845 (ii).
- PRIME MINISTER'S REPLY TO INVITATION TO CHICAGO DEMONSTRATION, PAR. IN NEWSPAPER: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 9695; M. to Adjn., 9837 (iii).
- LETTER OF PRIME MINISTER TO H. H. KOHL-SAAT: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 10220 (iii).
- PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF, PAR. IN *Daily Patriot*, P.E.I., re SWEATING CLAUSE (Mr. Davin) 9594 (iii).
- PAR. IN *WINNIPEG Free Press* re APPNMT. OF MCGREGOR AND NORWOOD (Sir Charles Tupper) 9180 (iii).
- QUICK, MR. JAMES, DISMISSAL AS LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: par. in *Windsor World* (Mr. Cowan) 7219 (iii).
- SCRIP ISSUED TO THE HALF-BREEDS: par. in *Calgary Herald* (Mr. Davin) 7196 (iii).
- STEAMSHIP SERVICE BETWEEN P.E.I. AND LIVERPOOL: par. in *Examiner* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3543 (ii).
- YUKON ADMINISTRATION, CHARGES AGAINST, PAR. IN *LONDON Times*: M. to Adjn. (Mr. Davin) 6562, 6563 (ii) 6585.
- PAR. IN *LONDON Times* (Mr. Davin) 7535 (iii).
- PAR. IN *North British Daily Mail*: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Davin) 8020 (iii).
- NEWSPAPERS ISSUED AND MAILED IN TORONTO AND MONTREAL, WEIGHTS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Quinn) 2787 (i).
- NEW TIME TABLE, I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4481 (ii).
- Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 69 (Mr. Calvert) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1949, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2152 (i); M. for Com., 5042, 5250; in Com., 5262, 5351; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5535 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 77.)
- NICOLET RIVER BRIDGE Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 8918 (iii).
- PUBLIC WORKS, EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leyris) 3549 (ii).

- Nipissing and James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 33 (Mr. Bertram) 1<sup>st</sup>, 974; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1389 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3842 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 78.)
- Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert B. No. 10 (Mr. Rutherford) 1<sup>st</sup>, 618; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 934 (i); in Com., 3842; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3996 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 119.)
- NOBLE BROS.: in Com. of Sup., 4244 (ii).
- AMOUNTS PAID TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2184 (i).
- NORTH AMERICAN TRANSPORTATION COMPANY AND GOVT. SUBSIDIES, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 5666 (ii).
- NORTH CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 5779 (ii).
- Northern Commercial Telegraph Co.'s B. No. 152 (Mr. Morrison) 1<sup>st</sup>, 5096; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 5536; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5897 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 120.)
- NORTHERN COMMERCIAL TELEGRAPH COMPANY AND COR. WITH MINISTERS OF THE CROWN: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Prior) 5510 (ii).
- M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Maxwell) 3873 (ii).
- NON-PRODUCTION OF HIGH COMMISSIONER'S TELEGRAM: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 5747 (ii).
- PAR. IN *DAILY Times*: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Prior) 6051 (ii).
- Northern Pacific and Man. Ry. Co.'s B. No. 83 (Mr. Rutherford) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2107; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2524 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3489 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 79.)
- Northern Telegraph Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 7 (Mr. Bostock) 1<sup>st</sup>, 618; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 934; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3003 (i); Sen. Amts., 8822 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 131.)
- NORTH SHORE RAILWAY, PAYMENT TO QUEBEC GOVT. BY LEGISLATION OF 1884: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3080 (i).
- NORTH SYDNEY POSTMASTER, RUMOURED DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. McDougall) 4899, 4996 (ii).
- N.-W. MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 5830, 5832, 5834 (ii); 8746 (iii); conc., 6388 (ii).
- FORCE IN YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 5834 (ii).
- BARRACKS AT BATOCHÉ, SUPPLIES FOR CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 2487 (i).
- ISSUE OF SCRIP, PETS., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 24<sup>th</sup> (i).
- POLICE REP.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4995 (ii).
- SPECIAL CONSTABLES, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1843 (i).
- VETERINARY SURGEONS: in Com. of Sup., 10111 (iii).
- N.-W. T., ABANDONED HOMESTEADS, DEWDNEY DISTRICT, CANCELLATION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 3074 (i).
- DUAL LANGUAGE, OPINION OF MIN. OF JUSTICE: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2188 (i).
- ENTRY GRANT TO W. C. MIDDLETON, BY AGENT AT YORKTON: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Davin) 1877 (i).
- EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 5073 (ii).
- EXPENDITURE ON CAPITAL ACCOUNT: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Douglas) 1878 (i).

- N. W. T. REBELLION (1885) CLAIMS COMMISSION : M.**  
 for Ret.\* (Mr. *Davis*) 3084, 3102 (i).  
 — SEED GRAIN INDEBTEDNESS, CANCELLATION :  
 M. (Mr. *Davin*) 2015 (i).  
 — SETTLERS FROM ONT., PRIVILEGES GRANTED BY  
 GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 2902 (i).  
 — USE OF FRENCH LANGUAGE : Ques. (Mr.  
*Monk*) 2188 (i).
- NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES :**  
 ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, N.W.T. : in Com. of  
 Sup., 10122 (iii).  
 AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, REDUCTION OF DUTY :  
 prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 5861, 5893 (ii).  
 ARTESIAN BORINGS, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 7468,  
 9055 (iii).  
 BANFF SPRINGS, ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of  
 Sup., 7530 (iii).  
 BELLEVUE RIVER BRIDGE, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup.,  
 10070 (iii).  
 BREMNER, CHAS., INDEMNITY, &c. : in Com. of Sup.,  
 10113 (ii).  
 — CLAIMS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 10167 (iii).  
 CALGARY AND EDMONTON RY. CO., LAND SUBSIDY,  
 AMOUNT SELECTED AND STILL DUE, &c. : Ques.  
 (Mr. *Oliver*) 2326 (i).  
 COMMISSION *re* HALF-BREED CLAIMS : in Com. of  
 Sup., 5832 (ii).  
 EDMONTON BRIDGE, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 8196.  
 — TRAIL TO YUKON DISTRICT : in Com. of Sup.,  
 10109 (iii).  
 ELEVATOR RESTRICTIONS AND C.P.R., LEGISLATION  
 RESPECTING : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2903 (i).  
 ELKHORN INDIAN SCHOOL, PRINTING PLANT, LEASE  
 TO W. J. THOMPSON, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Roche*)  
 3076 (i).  
 GALICIAN SETTLEMENT AT SALTCOATS, COMMISSIONERS  
 INVESTIGATION : Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6935 (iii).  
 GOVERNMENT OF THE N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup.,  
 7499 (iii).  
 GRAIN ELEVATORS IN N.W.T., *PAR* IN WINNIPEG  
*Tribune* : on M. for Com of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 5494  
 (ii).  
 — STANDARDS, N.W.T., LEGISLATION *re* INSPEC-  
 TION, &c. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3829 (ii).  
 GRATUITIES TO INDIANS, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup.,  
 5694 (ii).  
 HALF-BREED COMMISSION, TRAVELLING EXPENSES :  
 in Com. of Sup., 10110 (iii).  
 — N.W.T., COR., BETWEEN MR. McDOWALL AND  
 GOVT. *re* RESERVE : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2486 (i).  
 HARBOURS AND RIVERS, N. W. TERRITORIES : in Com.  
 of Sup., 8084 (iii).  
 HOMESTEAD LAW IN N. W. T., INTEREST ON PRE-  
 EMISSIONS, MEMORIAL FROM SETTLERS, &c. : Ques.  
 (Mr. *Davin*) 3080 (i).  
 INDIANS, MAN. AND N. W. T. SEED GRAIN : in Com.  
 of Sup., 5691 (ii).  
 — ANNUITIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5711 (ii).  
 — TREATY WITH N. W. T. INDIANS AND HALF-  
 BREEDS ; in Com. of Sup., 5694 (ii).  
 INDUSTRIAL AND BOARDING SCHOOLS : in Com. of  
 Sup., 10110 (iii).  
 — N. W. T. : in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iii).  
 LT. GOV'S RESIDENCE, REGINA : in Com. of Sup.,  
 9988 (iii).  
 MCKAY, THOS., INDEBTEDNESS TO GOVT. FOR TIMBER  
 DUES, COLLECTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*)  
 2486 (i).
- NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—Con.**  
 MINING CLAIMS AND HOMESTEAD ENTRIES BY GOVT.  
 OFFICIALS, O. Cs , &c. : M. for Copies\* (Mr.  
*Davin*) 1877 (i).  
 MOODY, INSPECTOR OF N. W. MOUNTED POLICE,  
 CHARGES AGAINST : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 8219 (iii).  
 N. W. MOUNTED POLICE, BARRACKS AT BATOCHE,  
 SUPPLIES FOR CONSTRUCTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr.  
*Davis*) 2487 (i).  
 — FORCE *re* YUKON : in Com. of Sup., 5834 (ii).  
 N. W. MOUNTED POLICE : in Com. of Sup., 5830,  
 5832, 5834 (ii) ; 8746 (iii).  
 — ISSUE OF SCRIP, PETS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*)  
 2484 (i).  
 — SPECIAL CONSTABLES, NUMBER, &c. : Ques.  
 (Mr. *Davin*) 1843 (i).  
 — VETERINARY SURGEONS : in Com. of Sup.,  
 10111 (iii).  
 N. W. T. ABANDONED HOMESTEADS, DEWDNEY  
 DISTRICT, CANCELLATION BY GOVT. ; Ques. (Mr.  
*Davin*) 3074 (i).  
 — DUAL LANGUAGE, OPINION OF MIN. OF JUS. :  
 Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2188 (i).  
 — ENTRY GRANT TO W. C. MIDDLETON, BY AGENT  
 AT YORKTON : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Davin*) 1877 (i).  
 — EXHIBITION : in Com. of Sup., 5073 (ii).  
 — EXPENDITURE ON CAPITAL ACCOUNT : M. for  
 Ret.\* (Mr. *Douglas*) 1878 (i).  
 — REBELLION (1885), CLAIMS COMMISSION : M. for  
 Ret. (Mr. *Davis*) 3084, 3102 (i).  
 — SEED GRAIN INDEBTEDNESS, CANCELLATION,  
 &c. : M. (Mr. *Davin*) 2015 (i).  
 — SETTLERS FROM ONT., PRIVILEGES GRANTED  
 BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 2902 (i).  
 — USE OF FRENCH LANGUAGE : Ques. (Mr.  
*Monk*) 2188 (i).  
 ONTARIO SETTLERS IN N. W. T., PRIVILEGES GRANTED  
 BY GOVT. : Remarks (Mr. *Rosamond*) 6051 (ii).  
 PRINCE ALBERT MOUNTED POLICE BARRACKS, DATE  
 OF ERECTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 8467 (iii).  
 — REGISTRY OFFICE, DATE OF ERECTION, COST,  
 &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 8468 (iii).  
 PUBLIC WORKS, N. W. T. : in Com. of Sup., 9988  
 (iii).  
 ROADS AND BRIDGES, N. W. T. : in Com. of Sup.,  
 7530, 10070 (iii).  
 ST. PAUL DES METIS COLONY : in Com. of Sup.,  
 9027 (iii).  
 SASKATCHEWAN VALLEY RAILWAY FACILITIES, *LES*.  
 OF N. W. T. ASSEMBLY : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*)  
 3255 (i).  
 SCRIP ISSUED TO HALF-BREEDS : in Com. of Sup.,  
 5694 (ii) ; 7501 (iii).  
 — *par* in *Calgary Herald* (Mr. *Davin*) 7196 (iii).  
 SEED GRAIN, &c., TO SETTLERS IN N. W. T. : in Com.  
 of Sup., 9027 (iii).  
 — LIENS, CANCELLATION, LEGISLATION, *re* RES.  
 FROM N. W. COUNCIL : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2903  
 (i).  
 — MAN. AND N. W. T. INDIANS : in Com. of  
 Sup., 5691 (ii).  
 SKELTON *vs.* THE QUEEN : Inquiry for Papers, (Mr.  
*Davin*) 7770 (iii).  
 — REP. OF MIN. OF JUS. : 8171 ; M., 8217, 8346  
 (iii).  
 — REP. OF MIN. OF JUS. *re* RELEASE : Remarks  
 (Mr. *Davin*) 7441 (iii).  
 TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 8183 (iii).

**Nova Scotia Steel Co's B. No. 139** (Mr. Fraser, Guysborough) 1<sup>st</sup>, 4659; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 5359, in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 6606 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 121.)

## NOVA SCOTIA :

- ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY BASIN, REPORTS *re* BUOYS, &c.: Ques. Mr. *Mills*) 4993 (ii).
- BUOY SERVICE, EXPIRATION OF MR. MCCARTHY'S CONTRACT, &c. Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 4056 (ii).
- CO., PORT GEORGE HARBOUR, PIER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 7532 (iii).
- POST OFFICE IRREGULARITIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 8989, 9179, 9697 (iii).
- PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &c.; Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 2701 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Mills*) 2410 (i).
- ARICHAT BREAKWATER, N. S., REPAIRS, &c., AMOUNT EXPENDED FROM 1891 TO 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5485 (ii).
- BABIN'S COVE WHARF, ARICHAT, N. S., COST OF CONSTRUCTION, Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5486 (ii).
- BADDECK, EAST BAY, &c., MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8692 (iii).
- ERECTION OF DRILL SHED: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 2111 (i).
- BUILDINGS, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 7613, 9943 (iii).
- CANOE COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10007 (iii).
- CENTRAL RAILWAY, COR. IN DEPARTMENT: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 5667 (ii).
- COW BAY BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7704 (iii).
- CUSTOMS, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 8387 (iii).
- DESCOUSSE WHARF, N. S., COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5486 (ii).
- DIGBY POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9947 (iii).
- DREDGING, RICHMOND, N. S., AMOUNT EXPENDED FROM 1891 TO 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5485 (ii).
- EASTERN EXTENSION RAILWAY, CLAIMS OF N. S. GOVERNMENT: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3551 (ii).
- ELEVATOR AT HALIFAX, CONSTRUCTION AND COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2332 (i).
- FOURCHIE HARBOUR, N. S., DREDGING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2904 (i).
- GABARUS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 5201 (ii) 9991 (iii).
- INSPECTION, &c., BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2698 (i).
- GRAND NARROWS, LEASE OF PROPERTY: Inquiry for Return (Mr. *McDougall*) 4997 (ii).
- HALF-BREED'S COMMISSION, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9056 (iii).
- HALIFAX AND PORTO RICO: Mail Subsidy in Com. of Sup., 10158 (iii).
- HALIFAX DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iii).
- HARBOUR LIGHTSHIP AND RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 8920 (iii).
- PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 9943 (iii).
- QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 9945 (iii).
- HANTSPOUT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5198 (ii).
- HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 5198 (ii) 7698, 9990 (iii).
- HUBERT, MISS ANNABELLA, CLAIMS AND PETS.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2534, 3256 (i).
- INDIANS, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 5691 (ii).
- I. C. R., MCDUGALL, MR. BRUCE, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 7194 (iii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

- I. C. R., MORRISON, HUGH, RIVERSIDE, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) 5310 (ii).
- RESTAURANT AT GRAND NARROWS, COR. *re* CONTRACT, &c.: M. for Copy\* (Mr. *McDougall*) 3149 (i).
- INVERNESS POST OFFICES, CHANGE OF LOCATIONS, APPNMTS. AND DISMISSALS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hubbert Tupper*) 3825 (ii).
- IONA WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5198 (ii).
- KENTVILLE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iii).
- L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, AMOUNT EXPENDED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1886 (i).
- CHAPL GROVE BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2904 (i).
- LENOIR, FISHERY OVERSEER: Ret. laid on Table 4268 (ii).
- LITTLE RIVER, BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3944 (ii).
- MCKEEN'S POINT, CONSTRUCTION OF STORM SIGNALS, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3083 (i).
- MCNEILL, MR., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER AT RICHMOND, PAPERS RESPECTING: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4732 (ii).
- MCNEIL, STEPHEN, BEAVER COVE, RENTAL CHARGED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3944 (ii).
- MARGAREE AND ORANGEDALE MAIL SERVICE, CHANGES, &c. *re* CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3261 (i).
- MARNSVILLE, N. S., POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7616 (iii).
- NORTH SYDNEY POSTMASTER, RUMOURED DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 4899, 4996 (ii).
- PARKER'S COVE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10001 (iii).
- PETIT DE GRAT BREAKWATER, AMOUNT EXPENDED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1886 (i).
- PICTOU AND CHETICAMP MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 10156 (iii).
- POINT JEROME LIGHT-KEEPER: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3068 (ii).
- POINT TUPPER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 9171 (iii).
- PORT MULGRAVE, &c., IRISH COVE, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8692 (iii).
- QUARANTINE STATION, HALIFAX: in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii).
- ROCKY POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10006 (iii).
- ST. PETERS CANAL, AMOUNT EXPENDED FROM 1891 TO 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3255 (i).
- SHAG HARBOUR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 9998 (iii).
- SPRINGHILL PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 9945 (ii).
- TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 8338 (iii).
- TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., conc. 6384 (ii).
- TRUEMAN, MR. W. H., APPNMT. TO RYS. AND CANALS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 4483 (ii).
- VICTORIA COUNTY, N. S., PATRONAGE, &c., PAR. IN NORTH SYDNEY *Herald*: M. to Adjn. (Mr. *McDougall*) 5388, 5398 (ii).
- VICTORIAVILLE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9954 (iii).
- WHARFS, &c., N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 7698 (iii).
- WINDSOR, ONT., DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9962 (iii).
- N. S., PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 7615 (iii).

OAKVILLE, PIERS AND DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 8015 (iii).

OATHS OF OFFICE. See "Administration."

OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE WATERS, REMOVAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3065 (i).

OCEAN FREIGHT RATES : M. for Cor., Reps., &c. (Mr. *Davin*) 1861 (i).

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 2990, 3004(i) ; 4719, 5100 (ii) ; conc., 6363 (ii).

O'CONNOR & HOGG, LEGAL EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 5861 (ii).

O'DONOHUE, MR. W. T., CARETAKER AT ROBERVAL, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3335 (ii).

OFFICIALS, YUKON : in Com. of Sup., 5022 (ii).

— APPNMT. BY GOVT., NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1832 (i).

— BONDS, SECURITIES REGISTERED : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4991 (ii).

— IN GOLD COMMISSIONERS OFFICE, NATIONALITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).

— INSTRUCTIONS, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. *Foster*) 1877 (i).

— SALARIES, COST OF LIVING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1824 (i).

OGILVIE, MR., ADMINISTRATION BY, INSTRUCTIONS, &c., M. for Rep.\* (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2027 (i).

— INSTRUCTION AND COR. WITH DOM. GOVT. : M. for Copies\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2787.

— REPS. re YUKON INVESTIGATION, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3548 (ii).

— Inq. for (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8387 (iii).

— PRINTING OF EVIDENCE : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5507 (ii).

— PRINTING, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5359, 5746 (ii).

— REPS., PURPORT, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3820 (ii).

— LAID ON TABLE, 3876 (ii).

— MINERS GRIEVANCES : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2531 (i).

— REP. RECEIVED BY GOVT.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3794, 3795 (ii).

— REP. AND PAPERS re YUKON INVESTIGATION : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*, 2410 (i).

— CONNECTION WITH BRITISH GOLDFIELD CO. : M. to adjn. (Mr. *Foster*) 3799, 3801 (ii).

— Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3799 (ii).

— RELATIONSHIP TO THE MINISTER OF THE INT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1841 (i).

— Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2703 (i).

OIL SPRINGS POSTMASTER, REFUND FOR STOLEN STAMPS : in Com. of Sup., 5800 (ii).

OKA INDIANS, REMOVAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5709.

OMAHA EXHIBITION : in Com. of Sup., 5074 (ii).

ONTARIO, BELMONT AND NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8917 (iii) ; in Com., 9490 (iii).

— COUNTY COURT JUDGE, NAME, APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1848 (i).

— PROVINCIAL DEBT, REDUCTION OF INTEREST : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3074 (i).

Ontario and Quebec Bridge Co.'s B. No. 22 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 803 ; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1113 (i).

Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 121 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3150 (i) ; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3492 ; in Com., 4302 ; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4524 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 80.)

ONTARIO AND RAINY RIVER RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8915, 8918 ; in Com., 9454, 9529, 9532, 9581, 9780 (iii).

— CORRECTION IN MIN. OF RYS. SPEECH : Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) 9699 (iii).

— SETTLERS IN N. W. T., PRIVILEGES GRANTED BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Rosamond*) 6051 (ii).

ONTARIO :

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE : in Com. of Sup., 10122 (iii).

ALEXANDRIA REFORMATORY : in Com. of Sup., 7622 (iii).

AMMUNITION, AMOUNT ISSUED TO 7TH BATTALION, LONDON : Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 1956 (i).

BALL, MR. W. D., POSTMASTER AT BATH, ONT., DISMISSAL, PAPERS, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Wilson*, 2390 (i).

BALSAM LAKE, REMOVAL OF STONE PILES : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2332 (i).

BATH POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : Inq. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 3877 (ii).

BOTHWELL ELECTION, SPEECH OF THE HON. MR. MILLS IN THE SENATE : Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 9896 (iii).

BOWMANVILLE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 7966 (iii).

BRANTFORD POSTMASTER, APPNMT. BY GOVT., &c.) Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 1968 (i) ; 8464 (iii).

BROCKVILLE DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 9960 (iii).

BROCKVILLE AND WEST HURON ELECTIONS, ATTENDANCE OF CLERK OF THE CROWN IN CHANCERY WITH PAPERS, &c.: (Mr. *Speaker*) 6821 (iii).

— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 6595 (ii).

— M. to place Documents on Table (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 6723 (ii) ; 6821 (iii).

— BALLOT PAPERS, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3074 (i).

— MAILING OF VOTERS' LISTS : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2482 (i).

— NAME OF DEP. RETURNING OFFICER : Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 2322 (i).

BRONTE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 10069 (iii).

BRUCE MINES WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 7966 (iii).

BUFFALO AND CRYSTAL BEACH FERRY SERVICE, LICENSE AND PRIVILEGES GRANTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 4994 (ii).

BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 9938, 9956 (iii).

BURLINGTON CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 7998 (iii).

COLBORNE AND MAITLAND PORTS, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, REPS., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 8633 (iii).

— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Montague*) 7771 (iii).

— CONTRACT, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 9310 (iii).

COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR, ASSIGNMENT OF CONTRACTORS : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1893 (i).

— IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 8002 (iii).

COUNTY COURT JUDGES, ONT., RETIREMENT, &c., LEGISLATION RESPECTING : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1970 (i).

COWAN'S BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 9172 (iii).

DARGAVEL, MR. J. B., POSTMASTER AT ELGIN, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1955 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

- DUCHE'S INDIAN RESERVE, NEGOTIATIONS *re* SALE OF  
TIMBER LIMITS, REMOVAL OF INDIANS: Ques.  
(Mr. McCormack) 2700 (i).
- FENELON FALLS, CONSTRUCTION OF SLIDE: Ques. (Mr.  
Hughes) 1978 (i).
- FISHERY OFFICERS, LEEDS CO., DISMISSAL, &c.:  
Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1818 (i).
- GALNA, MR., DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8446.
- GALT POSTMASTER, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett)  
3824 (ii).
- GANANOQUE PUBLIC BUILDING, HEATING, TENDERS,  
&c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1881 (i).
- GEORGIAN BAY AND TORONTO SHIP CANAL, PRTS.,  
APPLICATIONS, COR., &c.: M. for Cor., (Mr.  
Wallace) 4819 (ii).
- GIANT'S TOMB LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, SALARY, &c.:  
Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1834 (i).
- GOEDERICH HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 8010 (iii).
- DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8012 (ii).
- IMPROVEMENTS, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr.  
Henderson) 1881 (i).
- GRAND RIVER FLOODS, GOVT. REPORTS, &c.: Remarks  
(Mr. Montague) 2536 (i).
- HAMILTON RIFLE RANGE: in Com. of Sup., 5465 (ii).
- HARBOURS AND RIVERS; in Com. of Sup., 10063 (iii).
- HAVELOCK AND OAK LAKE MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS,  
&c.: Ques. (Mr. Lang) 3824 (ii).
- HUGG, W. A., CUSTOMS OFFICER AT COLLINGWOOD,  
CHARGES AGAINST, COMMISSIONER'S REP., &c.:  
M. for Copy\* (Mr. McCarthy) 2788 (i).
- HOPE ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, APPOINTMENT BY  
GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1834 (i); 5486 (ii).
- HUMBERSTONE POST OFFICE, CHARGES AGAINST POST-  
MASTER: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6594 (ii).
- INDIANTOWN BRANCH, AWARDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup.,  
9165 (iii).
- KAMINISTIGUIA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 7611 (iii).
- KINCARDINE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 5203 (ii).
- KINGSTON HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup.,  
8014 (iii).
- LANG POST OFFICE AND RY. STATION, CARRIAGE OF  
MAILS, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lang) 3823.
- LEAKE, MR. J. R., POSTMASTER AT MORTON, DISMISSAL,  
&c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1963 (i).
- INSPECTOR'S REP., &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr.  
Taylor) 2962 (i).
- LONDON DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9961 (iii).
- MAITLAND HARBOUR: Inquiry for Ret., (Mr. Montague)  
9185 (iii).
- MANITOULIN ISLAND JUDGESHIP: in Com. of Sup.,  
10122 (iii).
- MCCORMICK, MR. F. D., CUSTOMS OFFICER AT PELEE  
ISLAND, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8438  
(iii).
- MCLAREN'S CREEK, CONSTRUCTION OF A ROADWAY:  
Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3257 (i).
- MCLAUGHLIN, MR. R. J., AMOUNTS PAID AND DUE  
BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1976, 2321 (i).
- Letter from Mr. McLaughlin read (Mr.  
Mulock) 4998, 5005 (ii).
- AND FARMERS OF LINDSAY *re* DAMAGES BY  
FLOODS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 4485, 4486, 4499  
(ii).
- MEAGHER, CLAIMS AGAINST U. S. GOVT.: in Com. of  
Sup., 5474 (ii); 10194 (iii).
- M. for Ret., (Mr. Cowan) 2742, 2754 (i).
- CLAIMS ON U. S. GOVT. FOR FURTHER COMPEN-  
SATION: Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5492 (ii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

- MEDALS, GENERAL SERVICE, CLAIMS ALLOWED BY  
COMMISSION, DISTRIBUTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr.  
Clarke) 5860 (ii).
- MIDLAND HARBOUR, AMOUNT OF DUES COLLECTED:  
Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1834 (i).
- MILLER, MR. R. C., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr.  
Bennett) 1974 (i).
- MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL:  
Prop. Res. (Mr. Poupore) 4273 (ii).
- MOONSTONE, ONT., POSTMASTER, NAME, &c.: Ques.  
(Mr. Bennett) 1957 (i).
- NOBLE, MR., AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: Ques.  
(Mr. Hughes) 2184 (i).
- OAKVILLE, PIERS AND DREDGING: in Com. of Sup.,  
8015 (iii).
- OIL SPRINGS POSTMASTER, REFUND FOR STOLEN  
STAMPS: in Com. of Sup., 5800 (ii).
- ONTARIO AND RAINY RIVER RAILWAY CO., CORREC-  
TION IN MIN. OF RYS. SPEECH: Remarks (Mr.  
Richardson) 9609 (iii).
- ONTARIO COUNTY COURT JUDGE, NAME, &c.: Ques.  
(Mr. Hughes) 1848 (i).
- ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CARETAKER, NAME, &c.:  
Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1957 (i).
- OTTAWA AND CYRVILLE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT,  
&c.: Ques. (Mr. Hodgins) 8911 (iii).
- OTTAWA SUPPLY CO., AND CONTRACTS WITH GOVT.:  
Ques. (Mr. Davin) 2185 (i).
- OWEN SOUND, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8016 (iii).
- PIGEON RIVER, DREDGING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes)  
2191 (i).
- SWING BRIDGE, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques.  
(Mr. Hughes) 2480 (i).
- PETITION, DUFFERIN COUNTY, *re* INCREASE OF MILITIA  
GRANT: Ruled out of Order (Mr. Speaker) 1071  
(i).
- ESSEX COUNTY, *re* INCREASE OF MILITIA  
GRANT: Ruled out of Order (Mr. Speaker) 803 (i).
- LANARK COUNTY, *re* INCREASE OF MILITIA  
GRANT: Ruled out of Order (Mr. Speaker) 1639  
(i).
- PORT COLBORNE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 9250  
(iii).
- AND PORT DALHOUSIE, HARBOUR IMPROVE-  
MENT: Prop. Res. (Mr. McCleary) 3276 (i).
- PORTER'S LAKE, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup.,  
9993 (iii).
- PORTSMOUTH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10065 (iii).
- RAINY RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 8016 (iii).
- LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 10153 (iii).
- ROSDALE SWING BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7318 (iii).
- EXPENDITURE, AMOUNT CONTRIBUTED BY GOVT.,  
&c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2333 (i).
- RYAN & CO.'S CLAIMS *re* CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup.,  
10152 (iii).
- SARNIA POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9962 (iii).
- SAUGREEN INDIAN RESERVE, MEDICAL SUPT., PATRICK  
SCOTT, DISMISSAL, &c.: Remarks (Mr. McNeill)  
9699 (iii).
- SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 10152  
(iii).
- SCUGOG INDIANS, LIQUOR SOLD, COR. BETWEEN DEPT.  
AND MR. A. SOPER: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Foster)  
3149 (i).
- RIVER, DREDGING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes)  
2191 (i).
- SECORD, MR. T. R., SUPT. ON WELLAND CANAL,  
CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 1833.

ONTARIO—*Con.*

- SIMCOE LAKE, LOWERING WATER, REQUESTS, &c., MADE TO DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2192, 2248 (i).
- SINGLETON, MR. W. R., POSTMASTER AT DELTA, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1956 (i).
- SPROULE, R. J., POSTMASTER AT FLESHERTON, ONT., COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 9179 (iii).
- ST. CATHARINES DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9957 (iii).
- ST. THOMAS AND AYLMER MAIL SERVICE, ADVERTISEMENTS FOR TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 9698 (iii).
- SYDENHAM POSTMASTER, IRREGULARITY IN ACCOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, Addington) 6935 (iii).
- SYDENHAM RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 3018 (iii).
- AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 3820 (ii).
- TELEGRAPH LINES, PEELE ISLANDS: in Com. of Sup., 8188 (iii).
- TORACCO EXPERIMENTAL STATION, ESTABLISHMENT IN ESSEX CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Cowan*) 2486 (i).
- GROWN IN ESSEX CO., EXCISE DUTIES, &c.: Par. in *Ottawa Citizen* (Mr. *Cowan*) 2117 (i).
- TORONTO, EAST, POSTMASTER, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACANT POSITION: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4272 (ii).
- CUSTOM HOUSE, EMPLOYEES, NAMES, DATE OF APPOINTMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1849 (i).
- HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 10066 (iii).
- OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5179 (ii).
- P. O., APPOINTMENTS BY GOVT., NAMES, SALARIES, Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1981 (i).
- SINCE 1895: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2905 (i).
- TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 5782 (ii).
- JORDAN, MR. WM., CLAIMS FOR LAND DAMAGES; Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1977 (i).
- LAND VALUATION, COMPLAINTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Graham*) 5311 (ii).
- PAYMENT OF WORKMEN: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1977 (i).
- PURCHASE OF LAND FOR DAM AT NASSAU: Ques. (Mr. *Kendry*) 1857 (i).
- WALKER, POSTMASTER, AT AILSA CRAIG, CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3873 (ii).
- WELLAND CANAL, ENTRANCE AT PORT COLBORNE, HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENTS: ON M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Montague*) 3997 (ii).
- "LAKESIDE," STR., INTEREST TO OWNERS: in Com. of Sup., 5792 (ii).
- WOLSELEY BARRACKS, LONDON, LAND PURCHASED, PRICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 1840 (i).
- O. C.'S REGULATING MINING CLAIMS BY OFFICIALS, YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1824 (i).
- ORDER, QUES. OF: Ruling (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 6778.
- ABUSING THE PRIVILEGES OF MOTION TO ADJOURN: Authorities Quoted (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6591; (Mr. *Speaker*) 6594 (ii).
- IRREGULARITY OF DEBATE (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 8921 (iii).
- MEMBER ASKED TO WITHDRAW STATEMENT (Mr. *Speaker*) 5394 (ii).
- MEMBER ASKED TO WITHDRAW WORD "BEAST" (Mr. *Speaker*) 6225 (ii).
- MEMBER ASKED TO WITHDRAW WORD "COWARDLY" (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 6157 (ii).
- ORDER, QUES. OF, MEMBER ASKED TO WITHDRAW THE WORD "DEMAGOGUE" 9655 (iii).
- MEMBER ASKED TO WITHDRAW THE WORD "THIMBLE-RIGGER," 9655 (iii).
- MEMBER IMPUTING MOTIVES: Ruling (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*,) 5882, 6230 (ii).
- MEMBERS REQUESTED NOT TO INTERRUPT (Mr. *Speaker*) 427 (i).
- REFERENCE TO DEBATE IN ANOTHER HOUSE, 9897 (iii).
- REFERENCE TO DEBATE IN COM.: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 6826 (iii).
- REFERENCE TO PAST DEBATE: Ruling (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*,) 6753 (ii).
- ON STATEMENTS MADE GENERALLY: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7213 (iii).
- ORFORD MOUNTAIN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8915; in Com., 9450 (iii).
- ORDINANCES RECEIVED, YUKON COUNCIL, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2703 (i).
- ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7155 (iii).
- ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING, CARETAKER, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1957 (i).
- OTTAWA, ARNPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916; in Com., 9456 (iii).
- OTTAWA BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 8147 (iii).
- BUILDING, VENTILATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5183 (ii).
- Ottawa City B. No. 187 (Mr. *Fiddling*). Prop. Res., 5098 (ii); in Com. on Res., 9186; 1<sup>st</sup>\*, 9197; 2<sup>d</sup>\*, 9609; in Com., 9626; 3<sup>rd</sup>\*, 9636 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 10.)
- OTTAWA CITY INDEMNIFICATION, &c., AND GOVT. INTENTION TO OTHER CITIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6379 (ii).
- OTTAWA AND CYRVILLE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hodgins*) 8991 (iii).
- Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s B. No. 18 (Mr. *Champagne*). 1<sup>st</sup>\*, 700; 2<sup>nd</sup>\*, 934; in Com., 2150; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2284 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>\*, 3842 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 82.)
- OTTAWA ELECTRIC STREET RY. B. 18: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 2318 (i).
- Ottawa and Gatineau Ry. Co.'s B. No. 17 (Mr. *Champagne*). 1<sup>st</sup>\*, 700; 2<sup>nd</sup>\*, 934; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>\*, 2524 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 83.)
- OTTAWA AND GATINEAU RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916; in Com., 9489, 9809 (iii).
- NOON-DAY GUN, FIRING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2277 (i).
- RIVER, SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9176 (iii).
- WATER POWER, LEASES, TERMINATIONS, &c.: M. for Stmnt.\* (Mr. *Copp*) 2961 (i).
- OTTAWA SUPPLY CO., AND CONTRACTS WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2185 (i).
- Ottawa Suburban Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 117 (Mr. *Morrison*). 1<sup>st</sup>\*, 2966 (i); 2<sup>nd</sup>\*, 3492 (ii).

- OUELLET, MR. AGAPIT, PAR. IN *Le Soleil*, EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT., &C.:** Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3259 (i).  
 — **SUSPENSION, &C.:** Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1859 (i).  
**OWEN SOUND, DREDGING:** in Com. of Sup., 8016 (iii).  
**OWEN SOUND AND MEAFORD RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916; in Com., 9782 (iii).  
**OYSTER BED, B. C., CLAIMS OF ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RY. CO.:** Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3821 (ii).  
 — **CULTURE:** in Com. of Sup., 4241 (ii).  
**PACIFIC CABLE BETWEEN VANCOUVER AND AUSTRALIA:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1950 (i).  
 — **AGREEMENT B. 8383** (iii).  
*See AUSTRALASIAN.*  
**PACIFIC CABLE AND GOVT. OF B. C., OFFERS RESPECTING:** M. for Cor.\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3873 (ii).  
 — **COMMUNICATION FROM B. C. GOVT.:** Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 2697 (i).  
 — **M. to print Papers** (Mr. *Casey*) 2963 (i).  
 — **COR. BETWEEN IMP. AND COLONIAL GOVTS.:** M. for Copies\* (Mr. *Casey*) 1879 (i).  
 — **PAR. IN *Citizen* re CONFERENCE BETWEEN SEC. OF STATE FOR COLONIES AND HIGH COMMISSIONER.:** Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*, *Guysborough*) 3268 (i).  
 — **Remarks** (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1352 (i).  
**PAPERS, YUKON INVESTIGATION:** M. to print Papers (Mr. *Sifton*) 4730 (ii).  
**PAR. IN LONDON *Times*, ADMINISTRATION OF YUKON,** (Mr. *Davin*) 7535 (iii).  
 — **IN NORTH BRITISH *Daily Mail*, YUKON, CHARGES AGAINST:** on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 8020 (iii).  
**PARISEAU, MR. C. D., POSTMASTER AT ST. ESPRIT, DISMISSAL, &C.:** Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1962 (i).  
**PARIS AGENCY, SALARIES, &C.:** in Com. of Sup., 8704.  
 — **EXHIBITION:** in Com. of Sup., 10140 (iii).  
 — **EXPOSITION, CAN. COMMISSIONERS, SPACE, &C.:** Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1829 (i).  
**PARKER, CHARLES H., DISMISSAL, &C.:** Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1972 (i).  
**PARKER'S COVE WHARF:** in Com. of Sup., 10001 (iii).  
**PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY, REWIRING, &C.:** in Com. of Sup., 9956 (iii).  
 — **OPENING:** Mess. by Black Rod, 1 (i).  
 — **PROROGATION:** Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. read, 10246 (iii).  
**PARRY SOUND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8917; in Com., 9494 (iii).  
**PASPEBIAC AND GASPÉ RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8917; in Com., 9818 (iii).  
**PASSES ISSUED, I. C. R., SINCE AUGUST, 1896, NAMES, &C.:** Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1860 (i).  
**PATENT OFFICE LIBRARY:** in Com. of Sup., 5074 (ii).  
 — **PHOTOGRAPHIC ESTABLISHMENT:** in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii).  
**"PATENT RECORD" PRINTING, &C.:** in Com. of Sup., 5074 (ii).  
**Patents.** *See* Penberthy "Robertson," "Williams."
- PEDNAULT, MR. P., EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT., SALARY, &C.:** Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3337 (ii).  
**PEMBROKE SOUTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY:** prop. Res., (Mr. *Blair*) 8917 (iii).  
**Penberthy Injector Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 141** (Mr. *McGregor*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4340; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 5359 (ii); in Com., 6878; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 6879 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 122.)  
**Penitentiary Act Amt. B. No. 173** (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 7873; 2<sup>o</sup>, and in Com., 8762; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 8774 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 48.)  
**PENITENTIARIES, PRINTING BY CONVICTS:** Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1832 (i).  
 — **COMMISSION:** in Com. of Sup., 5477 (ii).  
**Pension Fund, Dom. Bank Society B. No. 100** (Mr. *Bertram*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2409; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2650 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4302 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 112.)  
**PENSIONS, re FENIAN RAID:** in Com. of Sup., 8750 (iii).  
 — **re REBELLION 1885:** in Com. of Sup., 8750 (iii).  
**Pensions.** *See* "Mounted Police."  
**PERMANENT FORCE, YUKON:** in Com. of Sup., 7005 (iii).  
**PERSONAL EXPLANATION re BINDER TWINE CONTRACT:** par. in *Ottawa Journal* (Mr. *Taylor*) 7197 (iii).  
 — **M. to Adjn.** (Mr. *Taylor*) 7205 (iii).  
 — **CHANGE OF ATTITUDE TOWARDS HIS PARTY** (Mr. *Costigan*) 3555, 3648 (ii).  
 — **IN REF. TO REMARKS ON COAL OIL PRICES** (Mr. *Wallace*) 2247 (i).  
 — **re COR. BETWEEN MINISTERS AND MR. F. PETERS** (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4896 (ii).  
 — **MILITIA EXPENDITURE** (Mr. *McNeill*) 1354 (i).  
 — **PAR. IN "GLOBE" re MR. FRED. PETERS AND YUKON CHARGES** (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3337 (ii).  
 — **PAR. IN "LA PATRIE"** (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1953 (i).  
 — **PAR. IN "MAIL" AND "EMPIRE" re SPEECH AT PICTON, ONT.** (Mr. *Richardson*) 5375 (ii).  
 — **PAR. IN "MAIL" AND "EMPIRE" re YUKON CHARGES** (Mr. *Domville*) 1167 (i).  
 — **PAR. IN MAN. "FREE PRESS"** (Mr. *Davin*) 1952 (i).  
 — **PAR. IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE"** (Mr. *Fraser*, *Guysborough*) 2036 (i).  
 — **PAR. IN MONTREAL "STAR"** (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 701 (i).  
 — **PAR. IN MONTREAL "STAR"** (Sir *Louis Davies*) 618, 701 (i).  
 — **PAR. IN MONTREAL "STAR" re WHARF AT ST. JOHN** (Mr. *Blair*) 7326 (iii).  
 — **re QUESTION AS TO MR. MARK WORKMAN** (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4990 (ii).  
 — **PAR. IN TORONTO "WORLD"** (Mr. *Sproule*) 6825 (iii).  
 — **PAR. IN "UNITED CANADA" re APPLICATION FOR MR. COSTIGAN'S SEAT** (Mr. *Davin*) 3845 (ii).  
 — **re VOTE ON KETTLE RIVER RY. BILL** (Mr. *Prior*) 9595 (iii).  
**PETERS, MR. F. AND E. V. BODWELL, LEGAL EXPENSES;** in Com. of Sup., 5181 (ii).  
**PETIT DE GRAT BREAKWATER, AMOUNT EXPENDED BY GOVT.:** Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1886 (i).

- PETITION, DUFFERIN COUNTY *re* INCREASE OF MILITIA GRANT : Ruled out of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 1071.
- ESSEX COUNTY *re* INCREASE OF MILITIA GRANT : Ruled out of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 803 (i).
- IRREGULARITY OF : Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 421.
- LANARK COUNTY *re* INCREASE OF MILITIA GRANT : Ruled out of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 1639 (i).
- RULE OF PROCEDURE (Mr. *Speaker*) 1737 (i).
- Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection B. No. 131** (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbiniere*) prop. Res., 3647 ; 1°, 3749 ; 2°, and in Com., 3884 ; 3°, 3990 (ii). (62-63 *Vic., c. 27.*)
- PHILIPSBURG RY. AND QUARRY CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res., (Mr. *Blair*) 8914 ; in Com., 9437 (iii).
- PICHETTE, MR., PRIVILEGES AT LEVIS STATION : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4992 (ii).
- PICTOU AND CHETICAMP MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 10156 (iii).
- PIGEON RIVER, Dredging, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2191 (i).
- SWING BRIDGE, Construction, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2480 (i).
- PINETTE HARBOUR, P.E.I., Pets. *re* DREDGING : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2112 (i).
- "PINGREE" AND "LOWE," STRS., UNDERVALUATION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8218 (iii).
- PLAINS OF ABRAHAM, EXPIRY OF LEASE, MEMORIALS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1835 (i).
- M. for Copies\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2026 (i).
- POACHING ON THE PACIFIC COAST : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8347 (iii).
- POINTE CLAIRE WHARF, ESTIMATED COST, TENDERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2111 (i), 4806 (ii).
- M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Monk*) 2962 (i).
- POINT JEROME LIGHT-KEEPER : Inquiry for Ret., (Mr. *Gillies*) 3668 (ii).
- POINT TUPPER, IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 9171 (iii).
- PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8915 ; in Com., 9448 (iii).
- Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 34** (Mr. *Poupore*). 1°, 974 ; 2°, 1389 ; in Com. and 3°, 2152 (i). (62-63 *Vic., c. 84.*)
- PONTIAC. See "Roman Catholic."
- PONTYPOOL AND BOBCAYGEON RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*), 8915 ; in Com., 9447 (iii).
- Portage du Fort and Bristol Ry. Co.'s B. No. 42** (Mr. *Poupore*). 1°, 1165 ; 2°, 1389 (i) ; in Com. and 3°, 4857 (ii).
- PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 10071 (iii).
- RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*), 8915 ; in Com., 9449 (iii).
- PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE POST OFFICE, CARETAKER, SALARY, NAME, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2485 (i).
- PORT CLYDE AND LOCKPORT RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*), 8916 ; in Com., 9781 (iii).
- PORT COLBORNE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 9250 (iii).
- AND PORT DALHOUSIE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : prop. Res. (Mr. *McCleary*), 3276 (i).
- PORTER'S LAKE, DREDGING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9993 (iii).
- PORT GEORGE, ANNAPOLIS CO., NAME OF POSTMASTER, CHARGE OF IRREGULARITIES : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*), 9697 (iii).
- PORT HAWKESBURY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*), 8916 ; in Com., 9457, 9781 (iii).
- PORT HAWKESBURY AND ST. PETER'S RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*), 8914 ; in Com., 9444, 9772 (iii).
- PORT MULGRAVE, &c., STEAM COMMUNICATION : in Com. of Sup., 10156 (iii).
- IRISH COVE, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 8692 (iii).
- PORTSMOUTH WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10065 (iii).
- POSTMASTERS, JACQUES CARTIER COUNTY, SALARIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 6933 (iii).
- POSTMASTERS' SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 5805 (ii).
- POST OFFICE DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 7330 ; conc., 10202 (iii).
- DEAD LETTER BRANCH : in Com. of Sup., 5032, 5052 (ii).
- DEPTL. EMPLOYEES, &c., NAMES OF THOSE NOT RECEIVING STATUTORY INCREASES SINCE 1896 : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Hodgins*), 5943 (ii).
- INSPECTOR'S SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 5798 (ii).
- MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 7388 (iii).
- POST CARDS ISSUED BY P. O. DEPT., QUALITY, &c. : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Foster*), 1879 (i).
- CARDS, &c., ISSUED SINCE JAN., 1897 : M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Foster*), 1877 (i).
- POSTAL NOTES, CONTRACT, COST, &c. : M. for Copy (Mr. *Foster*), 1982 (i).
- ENGRAVING, PRINTING, &c., TENDERS, &c. : M. for Cor., O.C.'s, &c.\* (Mr. *Foster*), 1877 (i).
- LOST THROUGH TRANSMISSION : Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*), 10226 (iii).
- STAMP DIES, NUMBER ORDERED BY GOVT., COST, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3943 (ii).
- REPRODUCTION OF FACSIMILES BY BANK NOTE CO. : Ques. (Mr. *McGregor*), 2901 (i).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. No. 155** (Mr. *Mulloch*). 1°, 5093 ; 2°, 6102 ; in Com., 6104 ; 3°, 6118 (ii). (62-63 *Vic., c. 29.*)
- POST OFFICE :
- ANNAPOLIS CO., PORT GEORGE POST OFFICE, IRREGULARITIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 8989, 9179 (iii).
- AUTOMOBILE CARS, TORONTO POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 9958 (iii).
- BALL, MR. W. D., POSTMASTER AT BATH, ONT., DISMISSAL, PAPERS, &c. : M. for Copies (Mr. *Wilson*) 2390 (i).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 3877 (ii).
- BATISCAN POST OFFICE, CHARGES AGAINST POSTMASTERS, COR., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 2320 (i).
- Rep. of Inspector : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1966 (i).
- SALARY OF POSTMISTRESS : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1970 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

- BEAUMONT, WM., CLAIMS FOR DISTRIBUTING MAIL AT MAPLE BAY PRIOR TO CONFEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3820 (ii).
- BERTHIER (*en haut*) POSTMASTER AND EMPLOYERS, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2702 (i).
- BILODEAU, MR. JOB., POSTMASTER AT CHAMBORD, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1962 (i).
- BRANTFORD POSTMASTER, APPOINTMENT, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 1968 (i), 8464 (iii).
- BOURGET, P. A., POSTMASTER AT LÉVIS, INCREASE OF SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4059 (ii).
- BROOKSIDE, P. E. I., POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1969 (i).
- CHICOUTIMI, POSTMASTER'S DISMISSAL, PETS., CORRS., &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2408 (i).
- CLIFTON POSTMASTER, P. E. I., COR., PETS., &c.: re APPOINTMENT: M. for Copies\* (Mr. *Martin*) 5377 (ii).
- DARGAVEL, MR. J. B., POSTMASTER AT ELGIN, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1955 (i).
- DAWSON AND VANCOUVER MAIL SERVICE, ARRIVAL DESPATCH, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 2961 (i).
- DEAD LETTER BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5032, 5052 (ii).
- CONTINGENCIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5068 (ii).
- FRANKING PRIVILEGE TO LEGISLATIVE REPORTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3823 (ii).
- GALT POSTMASTER, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3824 (ii).
- GAUTHIER, JEAN, POSTMASTER AT METABETCHOUAN, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4059 (ii).
- GUAY POST OFFICE, REVENUE, SALARY PAID TO POSTMASTER VERRAULT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3260 (i).
- HAVLOCK AND OAK LAKE MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 3824 (ii).
- HUMBERSTONE POST OFFICE, CHARGES AGAINST POSTMASTER DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 6562 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 6594 (ii).
- INSPECTOR'S SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (ii).
- INVERNESS POST OFFICES, CHANGE OF LOCATIONS, APPOINTMENTS AND DISMISSALS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3825 (ii).
- JACQUES CARTIER COUNTY MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6934, 6933 (iii).
- LANG POST OFFICE AND RAILWAY STATION, CARRIAGE OF MAILS, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 3823 (ii).
- LAROUCHE, MR. WM., POSTMASTER AT LAKE BUCHETTE, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1962 (i).
- LEGRIS, MR., POSTMASTER AT STE. EULALIE INVESTIGATION, REP., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4272 (ii).
- LETTER CARRIERS, B.C., NUMBER, SALARIES, &c., FROM 1895 TO 1899: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Prior*) 2789 (i).
- LÉVIS MAIL SERVICE, NAMES OF CARRIERS, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3554 (ii).
- LONDON LETTER CARRIERS AND STREET RY., TRANSPORTATION: Ques. (Mr. *Beattie*) 4483 (ii).
- RAILWAY TRANSPORTATION, SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Beattie*) 4995 (ii).
- MCKENZIE POST OFFICE, MAN., PETS. re &c., NAME OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2185 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

- MAGADALEN ISLANDS MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTOR'S NAME, TERMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 2113 (i).
- M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Pope*) 2789 (i).
- MAIL BAGS, CONTRACTS BETWEEN GOVT. AND OTTAWA SUPPLY CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2185 (i).
- MAIL CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 7331 (iii).
- SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 7366 (iii).
- JACQUES CARTIER COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6933, 6934 (iii).
- PACIFIC COAST, FACILITIES BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3254 (i).
- MARGAREE AND ORANGEDALE MAIL SERVICE, CHARGES, &c., re CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3261 (i).
- MARTEL, MR. P., POSTMASTER AT ST. PRIME, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1964 (ii).
- MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7388 (iii).
- MONTREAL AND LABELLE MAIL SERVICE, APPOINTMENT OF MAIL CONDUCTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1966.
- MONTREAL POSTMASTERSHIP, VACANCY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 5859, 6047 (ii).
- RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1827 (i).
- MOONSTONE, ONT., POSTMASTER, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1957 (i).
- MORRIS, DR., POSTMASTER AT DUNDAS P.E.I., RESIGNATION, &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 3873 (ii).
- MORTON POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF MR. J. R. LEAKE, REP. OF INSPECTOR, COR., &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. *Taylor*) 2962 (i).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3150 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1963 (i).
- MOUNT ALBION, P.E.I., MAIL SERVICE, PETS. re, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1969 (i).
- MURRAY BAY AND QUEBEC MAIL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS OF DELAY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1960 (i).
- NEWSPAPERS ISSUED AND MAILED IN TORONTO AND MONTREAL. WEIGHTS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Quinn*) 2787 (i).
- NORTH SYDNEY POSTMASTER, RUMOURED DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 4399, 4996 (ii).
- OIL SPRINGS POSTMASTER, REFUND FOR STOLEN STAMPS: in Com. of Sup., 5800 (ii).
- OTTAWA AND CYRVILLE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hodgins*) 8991 (iii).
- PARISEAU, MR. C. D., POSTMASTER AT ST. ESPIRIT, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugne*) 1962 (i).
- PORT GEORGE, ANNAPOLIS C., NAME OF POSTMASTER, CHARGE OF IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 9637 (iii).
- PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE POST OFFICE CARETAKER, SALARY, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2485 (i).
- POSTAGE STAMP DIES, NUMBER ORDERED BY GOVT., COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3943 (ii).
- REPRODUCTION OF FACSIMILIES BY BANK NOTE CO.: Ques. (Mr. *McGregor*) 2901 (i).
- NOTES, CONTRACT, COST, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. *Foster*) 1982 (i).
- ENGRAVING, PRINTING, &c., TENDERS, &c.: M. for Cor., O. C.'s. &c.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 1877 (i).
- STAMPS LOST THROUGH TRANSMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 10226 (iii).
- STAMPS, CARDS, &c., ISSUED SINCE JAN., 1897: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 1877 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

- POST CARDS ISSUED BY P. O. DEPT., QUALITY, &c.:  
M. for Cor. &c.\* (Mr. Foster) 1879 (i).
- POSTMASTERS SALARIES: in Com. of Sup. 5805 (ii).  
— JACQUES CARTIER CO., SALARIES, &c.: Ques.  
(Mr. Monk) 6933 (iii).
- POST OFFICE DEPT., DEAD LETTER BRANCH: in Com.  
of Sup., 5032, 5052 (ii).  
— DEPTL. EMPLOYERS, &c., NAMES OF THOSE NOT  
RECEIVING STATUTORY INCREASES SINCE 1896:  
M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Hodgins) 5943 (ii).  
— DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7330; conc., 10202 (iii).  
— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup.,  
7388 (iii).
- P. E. I. GRAND VIEW, CHANGES IN MAIL SERVICE,  
PETS. AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 4994 (ii).  
— M. for Copies\* (Mr. Martin) 5377 (ii).  
— MAIL SERVICE BETWEEN I. C. R. AND CAPE  
TORMENTINE, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2325  
(i).  
— AND MAINLAND MAIL SERVICE, ARRANGE-  
MENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1838 (i).  
— WINTER MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, &c.: M.  
for Copies (Mr. Martin) 3124 (i).
- PRINTING AND STATIONERY, P. O. DEPT.: in Com. of  
Sup., 7358 (iii).
- PURPLE STAMPED 2-CENT ENVELOPES, CIRCULATION,  
ERROR IN PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. Quinn) 3797 (ii).
- RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE, SUPERINTENDENT AND  
STAFF, SALARIES, TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &c.:  
M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Hodgins) 5944 (ii).
- REGISTERED LETTERS STOLEN OFF C. P. R. TRAIN:  
Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1829 (i).
- ST. JEROME POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, CHARGES  
AGAINST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 2182 (i).
- ST. JOSEPH D'ALMA, POSTMASTER, INCREASE IN SAL-  
ARY: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1847 (i).
- ST. THOMAS AND AYLMER MAIL SERVICE, ADVERTISE-  
MENTS FOR TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 9698  
(iii).
- SINGLETON, Mr. W. R., POSTMASTER AT DELTA, DIS-  
MISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1956 (i).
- SINTULATA POSTMISTRESS, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques.  
(Mr. Davin) 8468 (iii).  
— M. to Com. of Sup., Remarks (Mr. Davin)  
10118 (iii).
- SMITH, MR. ABNER, POSTMASTER AT RUSAGORNIS,  
DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3256 (i).
- SPOULE, R. J., POSTMASTER AT FLESHERTON, ONT.,  
COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 9179.
- STAMPED ENVELOPES, 2-CENT, GREEN, NUMBER PUR-  
CHASED IN TORONTO, ISSUE OF AND DISTRIBUTION:  
Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2189 (i).  
— 2-CENT, PURPLE, NUMBER ISSUED AND DISTRI-  
BUTED: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2187 (i).
- STAMPS, JUBILEE AND GREATER EMPIRE, STAMP  
PLATES, COST, NUMBER, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr.  
Foster) 2028 (i).
- SYDENHAM POSTMASTER, IRREGULARITY IN AC-  
COUNTS: Ques. (Mr. Bell, Addington) 6935 (iii).
- TORONTO EAST POSTMASTER, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR  
VACANT POSITION: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 4272 (ii).
- TORONTO P. O., APPTS. BY GOVT., NAMES, SAL-  
ARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1981 (i).  
— M. for Ret. (Mr. Clarke) 2905 (i).
- VICTORIA, B.C., LETTER CARRIERS, NUMBER, SALAR-  
IES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1960 (i).
- WALKER, POSTMASTER AT AILSA CRAIG, CHARGES  
AGAINST: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Haggart) 3873 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

- WALMSLEY, ALEX., SUPERANNUATION AS BRITISH  
MAIL CLERK: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3797 (ii).
- WALTHAM AND CHAPEAU MAIL SERVICE, PET. FROM  
PONTIAC CO. COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. Poupore) 2330  
(i).
- YUKON MAIL CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 6360 (ii) 7350  
(iii).  
— SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., conc., 6390 (ii)  
10202 (iii).  
— BETWEEN DAWSON AND VANCOUVER, &c.:  
Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1965 (i).  
— (1898-9) EFFICIENCY OF CONTRACTORS, REPS.,  
&c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2705 (i).  
— REGISTERED LETTERS, &c., POLICY OF GOVT.:  
Remarks (Mr. McDougall) 3792 (ii).  
— REGISTERED PARCELS, &c., RETURNED FROM  
DEAD LETTER OFFICE: Remarks (Mr. Taylor)  
4351 (ii).  
— POST OFFICE, EMPLOYT. OF MR. BOUBASSA:  
Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1833, 1958 (i).  
— HARPER, MR. F., POSTMASTER AT DAWSON  
CITY, ISSUE OF NOTICE: Ques. (Mr. Gillies)  
1961 (i).
- POTASH INSPECTION AND MONTREAL BOARD OF  
TRADE: Ques. (Mr. Penny) 1858 (i).  
— PETS, &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Préfontaine)  
1878 (i).
- POULTRY FEEDING EXPERIMENTS, GOVTL. ACTION:  
Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2110 (i).
- POWERS, MR. THOS., LEASE OF GOVT. LAND AT  
LÉVIS: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 3082, 3259 (ii).
- PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH G. B.: Amt. (Sir Charles  
Tupper) neg. (Y. 41; N. 77.) 7965 (iii).  
— amt. to Com. of Sup. (Sir Charles Tupper)  
7773, 7789, 7840, 7942, 7953 (iii).  
Deb. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7790; (Mr. McNeill) 7809;  
(Mr. Mulock) 7835; (Mr. Moore) 7846; (Mr.  
Sproule) 7852; (Mr. McMillan) 7861; (Mr. Davin)  
7874; (Mr. Bell, P. E. I.) 7894; (Mr. Wallace) 7905;  
(Mr. Henderson) 7915; (Mr. Rogers) 7931; (Mr.  
Osler) 7944; (Mr. McPherson) 7945; (Mr. Mon-  
tagne) 7946; (Mr. Bergeron) 7950; (Mr. Bell,  
Pictou) 7955; (Mr. Broder, Dundas) 7961 (iii).
- PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH G. B., GOVTL. INTEN-  
TION: Remarks (Mr. McNeill) 8469 (iii).  
— prop. Motion: Remarks (Mr. McNeill) 8221,  
8347 (iii).  
Deb. (Mr. McNeill) 8221, 8347, 8469; (Sir Wilfrid  
Laurier) 8222, 8347, 8469; (Sir Charles Tupper)  
8222 (iii).  
— Prop. Res. (Mr. McNeill) 8633 (iii).  
Deb. (Mr. McNeill) 8633, 8634, (withdn.) 8755; (Sir  
Wilfrid Laurier) 8638, 8755; (Sir Charles Tupper)  
8639, 8754; (Mr. Edwards) 8643; (Mr. Charlton)  
8754, 8755 (iii).
- Preservation of Health. See "Public Works."
- PRESTON, MR. W. T. R., SALARY, &c.: in Com. of  
Sup., 8569; Amt. (Mr. Bennett) 8578; conc.,  
10214 (iii).  
— EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 6938  
(iii).
- PREVENTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4788, 5578  
(ii).

## PRIME MINISTER'S REPLY TO INVITATION TO CHICAGO DEMONSTRATION :

— Par. in Newspaper: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 9695; M. to Adjn., 9837, 10220 (iii).

— LETTER OF PRIME MINISTER TO H. H. KOHL-SAAT: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 10220 (iii).

PRINCE ALBERT MOUNTED POLICE BARACKS, DATE OF ERECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 8467 (iii).

— REGISTRY OFFICE, DATE OF ERECTION, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 8468 (iii).

Prince Albert. See "Nisbet."

P. E. I. Ry. (Murray Harbour Branch) B. No. 183 (Mr. Blair) 1<sup>st</sup>, 8989; 2<sup>nd</sup> and in Com., 9750; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 9758 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 4.)

## PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND :

BEAR RIVER, REMOVAL OF OLD PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 10161 (iii).

BELLE RIVER, SEIZURE OF FISH TRAPS, &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Martin) 2787 (i).

BROOKSIDE, POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: &c; Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1969 (i).

CARDIGAN BRIDGE, BONDED WAREHOUSE, PETS., COR., &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) 2961 (i).

CHINA POINT: in Com. of Sup., 7751 (iii).

— CONSTRUCTION, &c.: M. (Mr. Martin) 2485 (i).

— M. for Ret\* (Mr. Martin) 3148 (i).

CLIFTON POSTMASTER, COR., PETS. &c., re APPNMT.; M. for Copies\* (Mr. Martin) 5377 (ii).

CUSTOMS REFUND FOR DUTIES PAID ON FISH: in Com. of Sup., 10114, 10169 (iii).

FISHING BOUNTIES, NAMES OF PERSONS, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) 5861 (ii).

FRANCHISE ACT AMT. BILL (P.E.I.) ABSENT FROM ORDER PAPER: Remarks (Mr. Montague) 9308 (iii).

GRAND VIEW, CHANGES IN MAIL SERVICE, PETS., AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 4994 (ii).

— M. for Copies\* (Mr. Martin) 5377 (ii).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 10006 (iii).

LITTLE BEAR CREEK, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8014 (iii).

LOBSTER FISHING, EXTENSION OF SEASON IN P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 6561 (ii).

— Ques. (Mr. McLellan, P.E.I.) 6122 (ii).

— SEIZURE OF TRAPS, &c.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Martin) 5504 (ii).

— INFRACTION OF REGULATIONS, FINES IMPOSED, COST OF PROSECUTIONS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Martin) 5377 (ii).

MORRIS, DR., POSTMASTER AT DUNDAS, RESIGNATION, &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) 3873 (ii).

MOUNT ALBION, MAIL SERVICE, PETS. re &c.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1969 (i).

MOUNT STEWART WHARF, : in Com. of Sup., 5754; conc., 6387 (ii).

NEUFRAPE POND, SURVEY, REPS. &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) 3873 (ii).

NEWS AGENTS: in Com. of Sup., 7462 (iii).

P.E.I. AND DOM. GOVT., DELEGATION re QUESTIONS AT ISSUE, CLAIMS, STMTS., &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Martin) 1879 (i).

— AND G.B., COLD STORAGE AND SS. COMMUNICATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Martin) 5493 (ii).

## PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—Con.

P. E. I. AND I. C. R., STEEL RAILS, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 1814 (i).

— M. for Copies\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 1876 (ii).

— MAIL SERVICE BETWEEN I.C.R. AND CAPE TOR-MENTINE, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2325 (i).

— ARRANGEMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1838 (i).

— MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8683, 8687 (iii).

— PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 7751 (iii).

— RY. AND BRANCH LINES, PETS., COR., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Martin) 2364, 2368 (i).

— MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 9211 (iii).

— STRAIGHTENING CURVES AT NORTH WILTSHIRE, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1854 (i).

PINETTE HARBOUR, P. E. I., PETS., re DREDGING, Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2112 (i).

QUEEN'S COUNTY (P.E.I.), APPNMT. OF JUDGE: Re-marks (Mr. Martin) 9000 (iii).

ROLLING STOCK, CURVES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7389 (iii).

SCRIMGEOUR, J. G., GRANT OF BONDED WAREHOUSE, DATE OF LEASE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) 2113 (i).

SOURIS BREAKWATER, P.E.I., CLAIM FOR DAMAGES, BY MESSRS. MRELLISH AND WRIGHTMAN: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 4270 (ii).

TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 8180 (iii).

WINTER MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Martin) 3124 (i).

WOOD ISLAND, P.E.I., LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DIS-MISSAL, AND CHARGES AGAINST, REP. OF COMMIS-SIONER: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2326 (i).

— M. for Copies (Mr. Martin) 4813 (ii).

— Remarks (Mr. Martin) 10117 (iii).

PRINTING BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 8703 (iii).

— AND SUNDAY LABOUR: Remarks (Mr. Guillet) 3879 (ii).

PRINTING, JOINT COM.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 531 (i).

— 3RD REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. Gibson) 5745 (ii).

— 4TH AND 5TH REP. OF COM.: M. Conc. (Mr. Gibson) 5378 (ii).

— 7TH REP. OF COM.: M. Conc. (Mr. Gibson) 8913 (iii).

— MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 5850 (ii).

— AND STATIONERY, P. O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7358 (iii).

PRIVATE BILLS, EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. Lan-derkin) 2182 (i), 5378 (ii).

— M. (Mr. Scriver) 894 (i).

— COMMITTEE, MEETING DURING SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE: M. (Mr. Scriver) 8751 (iii).

— SEL. COMMITTEE, REDUCTION OF QUORUM: M. (Mr. Scriver) 4729 (ii).

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE: M. to Em-ploy Stenographers (Mr. Fortin) 7193 (iii).

— M. to print Evidence (Mr. Fortin) 7194 (iii).

— M. to sit concurrently with Sessions of the House (Mr. Fortin) 7771 (iii).

— 2ND REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. Fortin) 9461 (iii).

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE, ABSENCE OF MINISTERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 9182 (iii).  
 — REP. OF COM.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10115; M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10115 (iii).  
 — Stenographer's Fees, 9462 (iii).  
 PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF: Insertion of Remarks in *Hansard* by Min. of Public Works (Mr. *Davin*) 421 (i).  
 — PAR. IN *Daily Patriot*, P.E.I., re SWEATING CLAUSE (Mr. *Davin*) 9594 (iii).  
 — PAR. IN WINNIPEG *Free Press* re APPOINTMENT OF MCGREGOR AND NORWOOD (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 9180 (iii).  
 PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2408, 2265.  
 PROCEDURE ON CALLING ORDERS OF THE DAY: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2118 (i).  
 — FOR RETURNS, MOTION re: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3560 (ii).  
 PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS, ROYAL COMMISSION, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1885.  
 PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS, DISCUSSION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 9466 (iii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *Flint*) 5359 (ii).  
 PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*).  
 Deb. (Mr. *Flint*) 8782; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8805; (Mr. *Charlton*) 8814; (Mr. *Christie*) 8822; (Mr. *Moore*) 8823; (Mr. *McClure*) 8840. (amt.) 8850; (Mr. *McNeill*) 8851; (Mr. *Parmalee*) 8852, (amt.) 8856; (Mr. *Broder*) 8856; (Mr. *Craig*) 8864; (Mr. *Bell*, P.E.I.) 8869; (Mr. *Sifton*) 8879; (Mr. *Wilson*) 8883; (Mr. *Richardson*) 8889; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 8891; (Mr. *Davin*) 8896; (Mr. *Roche*) 8901; (Mr. *Holmes*) 8905; (Mr. *Henderson*) 8906; (Mr. *Logan*) 8909 (iii).  
 — M. to adjn. (Mr. *Foster*) 2037 (i).  
 Deb. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2039, 2045; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2040; (Mr. *Haggart*) 2040; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 2041; (Mr. *Davin*) 2043; (Mr. *Mulock*) 2043; (Mr. *Clancy*) 2043; (Mr. *Casey*) 2044; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2044; (Mr. *Taylor*) 2045 (i).  
 PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE, AMOUNT PAID AND BALANCE DUE: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 5859 (ii).  
 — COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1814 (i).  
 — BAGOT CO., UNPAID CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1967 (i).  
 — EXPENSES IN MONTREAL CITY, AMOUNTS UNPAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 5312 (ii).  
 — POLL BOOKS, VOTERS' LISTS, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Moore*) 2906 (i).  
 — RET. OF VOTES POLLED, PAPERS, &c.: Request that they be laid on Table (Mr. *Foster*) 1894, 1895 (i).  
 — M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2037 (i).  
 — Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2041, 2045 (i).  
 — COSTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2321 (i).  
 — LEEDS CO., REP. OF RETURNING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1848 (i).  
 — AND QUEBEC COUNTIES: Reports asked for (Mr. *Moore*) 5748 (ii).  
 — QUEBEC PROV., POLL BOOKS, RET., &c., LAID ON TABLE (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7820 (iii).  
 — SPEECH OF MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AT OTTAWA CONVENTION: Ques. (Mr. *Moore*) 1826 (i).

PROROGATION, COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 10246 (iii).  
 PROVISIONS AND SUPPLIES, YUKON FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 7126 (iii).  
 PUBLIC ACTS. COMMITTEE, DELAY IN MEETING: M. to Adjn. House (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3150 (i).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 7195 (iii).  
 — MEETINGS DURING SITTING OF THE HOUSE: M. (Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough) 8780 (iii).  
 — MEETINGS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2604 (i).  
 — Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2964 (i).  
 — POSTPONEMENTS AND HOURS OF MEETING, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4344 (ii).  
 — REDUCTION OF QUORUM: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4347 (ii).  
 — REP. OF COMMITTEE: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10116 (iii).  
 — M. to Print Evidence (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10116 (iii).  
 — 3RD REP. OF COM.: Conc. (Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough) 4147 (ii).  
 — 6TH REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough) 9836 (iii).  
 PUBLIC BUILDINGS, YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 10107 (iii).  
 Public Works, Preservation of Health B. No. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2604 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>, 7645; in Com., 7667; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 7675 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 30.)  
 PUBLIC WORKS:  
 ALEXANDRIA REFORMATORY: in Com. of Sup., 7622 (iii).  
 ANNAPOLIS CO., PORT GEORGE HARBOUR, PIER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 7532 (iii).  
 — PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 2410, 2701 (i).  
 ANSE A BEAUFILS, HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 8103 (iii).  
 ANSE AUX GASCONS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 8103 (iii).  
 ANTICOSTI ISLAND, INSPECTION OF PUBLIC WORKS, 1886, COST OF TRIP: M. for Rep.\* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2789 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2188 (i).  
 — TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 10072 (iii).  
 ARICHAU BREAKWATER, N.S., REPAIRS, &c., AMOUNT EXPENDED FROM 1891 TO 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5485 (ii).  
 ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 9943 (iii).  
 BABIN'S COVE WHARF, ARICHAU, N.S., COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5486 (ii).  
 BADDECK, N.S., ERECTION OF DRILL SHED: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 2111 (i).  
 BAIE DES HONFLEUR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1001 (iii).  
 BAIE ST. PAUL: in Com. of Sup., 8104 (iii).  
 BANFF SPRING, ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii).  
 BATHURST RIVER, OBSTRUCTIONS TO NAVIGATION, PETS. re: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3552 (ii).  
 BEAR RIVER, REMOVAL OF OLD PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 10161 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

- BEAUHARNOIS WATER POWER, IMPROVEMENTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1883 (i).
- BELLEY RIVER BRIDGE, N. W. T. : in Com. of Sup., 10070 (iii).
- BELCIEL PUBLIC WORKS, TOTAL COST, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3827 (ii).
- BERNIER, MR. N., DISMISSAL : in Com. of Sup., conc., 10204 (iii).
- BERTHIER (*en haut*) PUBLIC WORKS, CONSTRUCTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1893, 2703 (i).
- POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 7619 (iii).
- BOIVIN, GEDÉON, CONTRACT FOR STONE AT RIVIÈRE LA PIPE WHARF : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4061 (ii).
- BOWMANVILLE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 7966 (iii).
- BRIDGES, OTTAWA CITY : in Com. of Sup., 8147 (iii).
- B. C., PUBLIC WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 8085, 8190 (iii).
- BROCKVILLE DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 9960 (iii).
- BRONTE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 10069 (iii).
- BRUCE MINES WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 7966 (iii).
- BUILDINGS, B. C. : in Com. of Sup., 9988 (iii).
- N. B. : in Com. of Sup., 9954 (iii).
- N. S. : in Com. of Sup., 7613, 9943 (iii).
- ONTARIO : in Com. of Sup., 7611, 7621, 9938, 9956 (ii).
- QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 7619 (iii).
- CAMPBELLTON WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10012 (iii).
- CANOE COVE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 10007 (iii).
- CAP SANTE : in Com., of Sup., 8105 (iii).
- CHARLESON, MR., J. B., O. C., APPOINTING, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9699 (iii).
- SURVYS, &c., FOR TELEGRAPH LINE : in Com. of Sup., 5604 (ii).
- TRAVELLING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 8106 (iii).
- CHEZZETCOOK WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10004 (iii).
- CHINA POINT, P. E. I. : in Com. of Sup., 7751 (ii).
- CONSTRUCTION, &c. : M. (Mr. Martin) 2485 (i).
- M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Martin) 3148 (i).
- CLAREAU, MR., J. A., CLAIMS FOR MATERIAL FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CHICOUTIMI OR STE. ANNE'S WHARF : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3335 (ii).
- COLBORNE, PORT, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, CONTRACT, TENDERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. McNeill) 9310 (iii).
- Remarks (Mr. Montague) 8633 (iii).
- REPORTS OF ENGINEERS, &c : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Montague) 7771 (iii)
- COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 8002 (iii).
- ASSIGNMENT OF CONTRACTORS : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1893 (i).
- COLUMBIA RIVER, IMPROVEMENT, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8085 (iii).
- COMMERCIAL TELEGRAPH CONSTRUCTION SYNDICATE : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Prior) 3752 (ii).
- CONTRACTS LET WITHOUT TENDER SINCE JUNE 1896 : M. for O. C.'s, (Mr. Davin) 5314, 5348 (ii).
- COSTE, MR., EXPEDITION TO ENG. INSTRUCTIONS, COR., REPS., &c. : M. for Papers\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3334 (i).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4937 (ii)
- COTEAU LANDING, DREDGING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 10030 (iii).
- CONTRACT FOR DREDGING, PAPERS, LETTERS, &c. : M. for Copy\* (Mr. Bergeron) 2026 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

- COW BAY BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 7704 (iii).
- COWAN'S BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 9172 (iii).
- DAVIS, EDWARD, SLIDE MASTER AT COULONGE, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Poupore) 3946 (ii).
- DIGBY POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 9947 (iii).
- DESCOUSSE WHARF, N. S., COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 5486 (ii).
- DOMINION PUBLIC BUILDINGS, LIGHTING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8136 (iii).
- DONAHUE, W., CONTRACT FOR TIMBER FOR DREDGE AT ROBERVAL, &c. : Ques (Mr. Casgrain) 4060 (ii).
- DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).
- PLANT, MAR. PROVS. AND B. C. : in Com. of Sup., 8137, 10070 (iii).
- RICHMOND, N. S., AMOUNT EXPENDED FROM 1891 TO 1896 : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 5485 (ii).
- SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5203 (ii).
- DRILL HALL, VANCOUVER, B. C., CONTRACT, COST, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 5487, 6122 (ii), 7765 (iii).
- DRY DOCK, VICTORIA, B. C., PETS., *re* REDUCTION OF CHARGES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 7766 (iii).
- EDMONTON AND YUKON ROUTE, INSTRUCTIONS TO MESSRS. DIBBLE AND DUPONT : Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2114 (i).
- EDMONTON BRIDGE, N. W. T. : in Com. of Sup., 8196 (iii).
- TRAIL TO YUKON DISTRICT : in Com. of Sup., 10109 (iii).
- ELECTRIC LIGHTING, GAS, &c., OTTAWA BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 9989 (iii).
- OTTAWA BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 5183, 5308, 6386 (ii), 9939 (iii).
- Ques. (Mr. Prior) 5308 (ii).
- ELEVATOR AT HALIFAX, CONSTRUCTION AND COMPLETION : Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2332 (i).
- ESQUIMALT (B. C.), DRY DOCK, REDUCTION OF RATES, PETS., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 6122 (ii).
- FENELON FALLS, CONSTRUCTION OF SLIDE : Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1978 (i).
- FIREWORKS, &c., *re* DEMONSTRATION ON PREMIER'S RETURN : in Com. of Sup., 8111 (iii).
- FRASER RIVER CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 8088 (iii).
- FOUCHEIE HARBOUR, N. S., DREDGING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 2904 (i).
- GABARUS BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 5201 (ii), 9991 (iii).
- INSPECTION, &c., BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 2696 (i).
- GANOQUE PUBLIC BUILDING, HEATING, TENDERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1881 (i).
- GODERICH HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 8010 (iii).
- DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 8012 (iii).
- IMPROVEMENTS, CONTRACTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1881 (i).
- GOVT. PROPERTY (B. C.) LEASE, &c., COR., RESPECTING : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 8465 (iii).
- RENTAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 8991 (iii).
- GROSS, MR. BOAZ, HARBOUR MASTER AT HILLSBORO', PAPER RESPECTING : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. McInerney) 4732 (ii).
- HALIFAX DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iii).
- PUBLIC BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 9943 (iii).
- QUARANTINE STATION : in Com. of Sup., 9945 (iii).
- HANTSPORT WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 5198 (ii).
- HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B. C. in Com. of Sup., 8085 (iii).
- GENERALLY : in Com. of Sup., 8102 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

- HARBOURS AND RIVERS, MANITOBA : in Com. of Sup., 8077 (iii).  
 — N. B. : in Com. of Sup., 10010 (iii).  
 — N. S. : in Com. of Sup., 5198 (ii) 7698, 9990 (iii).  
 — N. W. T. : in Com. of Sup., 8084 (iii).  
 — ONT. : in Com. of Sup., 7966, 10065 (iii).  
 — P. E. I. : in Com. of Sup., 10006 (iii).  
 — QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 7557, 8103, 10014 (iii).  
 — REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8105 (iii).  
 — WORKS, IMPROVEMENTS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5201 (ii).
- HERNS, JOHN, CARETAKER NAPANEE PUBLIC BUILDING, COR. *re* DISMISSAL, &c. : M. for Copies\* (Mr. Wilson) 5377 (ii).
- INSPECTION : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1880 (i).
- IONA WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 5198 (ii).
- IRON DOORS FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS, PURCHASE BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Hodgins) 4273 (ii).
- JÉSUS RIVER, CONSTRUCTION OF FISHWAY, PLANS, PAPERS., &c. : M. for Copies (Mr. Fortin) 3269 (i).
- KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 7611 (iii).
- KENTVILLE BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iii).
- KINGARDINE PIER : in Com. of Sup., 5203 (ii).
- KINGSTON HARBOUR, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 8014 (iii).
- KLONDIKE RAILWAY SURVEY, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8700 (iii).
- KNOWLTON LANDING WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10020 (iii).
- KOOTENAY RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 8090 (iii).
- LABREQUE, MR. C. O., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT., AMOUNTS PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1846 (i).
- LAKK ST. JOHN, PIERS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8116 (iii).
- LAKE ST. LOUIS, REMOVAL OF SHOAL, REPRESENTATIONS FROM SHIPPERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2331 (i).
- LANGEVIN BLOCK, BALANCE DUE CONTRACTOR : in Com. of Sup., 9938 (iii).  
 — STEEL SHLIVING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7625 (ii).
- L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, AMOUNT EXPENDED BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 1886 (i).  
 — CHAPEL GROVE BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 2904 (i).
- LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK : in Com. of Sup., 8178, 9987 (iii).  
 — PURCHASE OF PROPERTY, AMOUNT PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 8468 (iii).  
 — STATION IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 8220 (iii).
- LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 8192 (iii).
- LT.-GOV.'S RESIDENCE, REGINA : in Com. of Sup., 9988 (iii).
- LITTLE BEAR CREKE, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 8014 (iii).
- LITTLE RIVER, N. S., BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 3944 (ii).
- LONDON DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 9961 (iii).
- LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN : in Com. of Sup., 7155, 7242, 7401 (iii).
- MACKENZIE, LATE ALEX., MONUMENT : in Com. of Sup., 8150 (iii).
- MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 8133 (iii).
- MAITLAND HARBOUR: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Montague) 9185 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

- MANITOBA LAKE, ADDITIONAL OUTLETS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8077 (iii).  
 — DRAINAGE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1965 (i).
- MARIA WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 8133 (iii).
- MARYSVILLE, N. B., POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 7616 (iii).
- MISTASSINI AND STE. METHODE STOREHOUSES, CONSTRUCTION, &c., NAME OF CONTRACTOR, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1888 (i).  
 — M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Casgrain) 2028 (i).
- MONTREAL HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, PLANS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2187 (i); 9964 (iii).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii).  
 — POST OFFICE, REPAIRS, ADVERTISEMENTS *re* TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2112 (i).  
 — REPAIRS, &c., NAME OF CONTRACTOR : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1974 (i).
- MOUNT STEWART WHARF, P. E. I. : in Com. of Sup., 5754; conc., 6387 (ii).
- NEUFRAGE POND, P. E. I., SURVEY, REFS., &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Macdonald, P. E. I.) 3873 (ii).
- NEWPORT BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 10014 (iii).
- NICOLET RIVER PUBLIC WORKS, EXPENDITURE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Legris) 3549 (ii).
- NORTH CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 5779 (ii).
- NORTHERN COMMERCIAL TELEGRAPH CO., AND COR. WITH DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Maxwell) 3873 (ii).  
 — COR. WITH MINISTERS OF THE CROWN : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Prior) 5510 (ii).
- OAKVILLE, PIERS AND DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 8015 (iii).
- OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE WATERS, REMOVAL, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3965 (i).
- O'DONAHUE, MR. W. T., CARETAKER OF ROBERVAL, SALARY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3335 (ii).
- ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING, CARETAKER, NAME, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1957 (i).
- OTTAWA BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 8147 (iii).  
 — RIVER, SURVEYS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9176 (iii).  
 — RIVER WATER POWER, LEASES, TERMINATIONS, &c. : M. for Stimt.\* (Mr. Copp) 2961 (i).  
 — SUPPLY CO. AND CONTRACTS WITH GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 2155 (i).
- OWEN SOUND, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 8016 (iii).
- PARKER'S COVE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10001 (iii).
- PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY, REWIRING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9956 (iii).
- PETIT DE GRAT BREAKWATER, AMOUNT EXPENDED BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 1886 (i).
- PIGEON RIVER, DREDGING : Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2191 (i).  
 — SWING BRIDGE, CONSTRUCTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2480 (i).
- PINEITE HARBOUR, P. E. I., PETS. *re* DREDGING : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2112 (i).
- POINTE CLAIRE WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Monk) 2962.  
 — Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2111 (i), 4806 (ii).
- POINT TUPPER, IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 9171 (iii).
- PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 10071 (iii).
- PORT COLBORNE AND PORT DALHOUSIE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : Prop. Res. (Mr. McCleary) 3276 (ii).  
 — HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 9250 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

- PORTER'S LAKE, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 9993 (iii).
- PORTSMOUTH WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10065 (iii).
- POWERS, MR. THOS., LEASE OF GOVT. LAND AT LÉVIS : Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 3259 (ii).
- PUBLIC WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 5203 (ii), 7557, 7536 (iii).
- AGENCIES, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 8190 (iii).
- B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 8085, 8190 (iii).
- CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 7554 (iii).
- DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 5203 (ii), 7536, 7557 (iii).
- PRINTING, STATIONERY, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5072, 5085 (ii).
- INSPECTION, EXPENSES OF TOUR, NAMES OF STRS., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1880 (i).
- N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 9988 (iii).
- ONTARIO : in Com. of Sup., 7611 (iii).
- P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 7751 (iii).
- QUEBEC BRIDGE, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION, COST, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Haggart) 2112 (i).
- RAINY RIVER CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 8016 (iii).
- READING ROOM, VENTILATION, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Sproute) 974 (i).
- RECORDS AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS, SAFETY OF, REP. OF COMMISSION : M. for Copy\* (Mr. Belcourt) 1878 (i).
- RIDEAU HALL : in Com. of Sup., 7693 (iii).
- ADDITIONAL WING : in Com. of Sup., 9958 (iii).
- RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 8135 (iii).
- CHARGES AGAINST MR. CHAMBERLAND : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1884 (i).
- RIVIÈRE LA PIPE AND FERIBONKA WHARFS, EMPLOYMENT OF LABOURERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3337 (ii).
- WHARF, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8116 (iii).
- COST, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1891 (i).
- ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 5204 (ii).
- N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 7530, 10070 (iii).
- ROBERVAL HARBOUR, DREDGING, MR. DONAHUE'S CONTRACT FOR SCOWS : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Casgrain) 2028 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1888 (i).
- ROCHE FENDUE AND CALUMET DAMS, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Poupore) 2789 (i).
- ROCKY POINT BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 10006 (iii).
- ROSEDALE BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 7318 (iii).
- SWING BRIDGE, EXPENDITURE, AMOUNT CONTRIBUTED BY GOVT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2333 (i).
- ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS : in Com. of Sup., 9173, 10155 (iii).
- ST. CATHARINES DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 9957 (iii).
- ST. FRANCIS LAKE CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1852 (i).
- LAKE SURVEY AND SERVICES OF STRS. *Alert* and *Alaska* : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Taylor) 1878 (i).
- STE. GENEVIÈVE, LAND DAMAGES, REP. OF COMMISSIONER : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6934 (iii).
- ST. JOHN ELEVATOR : in Com. of Sup., 9163 (iii).
- DEEP WATER TERMINAL FACILITIES : M. for Specification, Plans, &c. : (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 1876 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

- ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK, LENGTHENING : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1882 (i).
- ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL PROTECTION TO NAVIGATION : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 3343 (ii).
- NORTH SHORE TELEGRAPH LINE, CONTRACT FOR POLES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3335 (ii).
- AND CANALS, DEEPING OF NAVIGATION, &c., CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 2788 (i).
- RIVER IMPROVEMENTS, NORTH CHANNEL, CONTRACTS, PLANS, &c. : M. for Copies\* (Mr. Taylor) 1877 (i).
- SHIP CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 5086 (ii), 9986 (iii).
- ST. LOUIS LAKE, DREDGING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8219 (iii).
- ST. MAURICE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 10070 (iii).
- ST. NORBERT, INUNDATIONS OF RED RIVER, CLAIMS OF OWNERS : Ques. (Mr. La Rivière) 1894 (i).
- ST. OURS' LOCK : in Com. of Sup., 7318 (iii).
- ST. PIERRE RIVER, ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 9173 (iii).
- SABREVOIS WHARF, CONC., 10026, 10219 (iii).
- SAPPER'S BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 5204 (ii).
- SARNIA POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 9962 (iii).
- SCUGOG RIVER, DREDGING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2191 (i).
- SHAG HARBOUR WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 9998 (iii).
- "SHANROCK," TUG, AMOUNT PAID JOHN KAINE, &c. : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5666 (ii).
- SLIDES AND BOOMS : in Com. of Sup., 8178 (iii).
- SOURIS BREAKWATER, P.E.I., CLAIM FOR DAMAGES BY MESSRS. MELLISH AND WIGHTMAN : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 4270 (ii).
- SPRINGHILL PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 9945 (iii).
- STEEL BOXES, INTERIOR AND INDIAN DEPTS., PURCHASED BY GOVT., TENDERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Hodgins) 4482 (ii).
- STEVESTON, B.C., TRANSFER OF PROPERTY, &c. : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3544 (ii).
- STIKINE-TESLIN ROUTE, SURVEY, REP. OF ENGINEER : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1835 (i).
- SUPPLIES FOR GOVT. DREDGES : in Com. of Sup., 7571 (iii).
- SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 8149 (iii).
- SYDENHAM RIVER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 8018 (ii).
- AMOUNT EXPENDED : Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 3320 (ii).
- TATE'S DRY DOCK, MONTREAL, RENT, LESSEES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1851 (i).
- TELEGRAPH LINES, ANTICOSTI, RENEWALS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 10072 (iii).
- ATLIN, B.C., AND TESLIN LAKE : in Com. of Sup., 10099 (iii).
- B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 8184 (iii).
- CABLES, &c., ST. LAWRENCE SHORES : in Com. of Sup., 8181 (iii).
- CHETICAMP AND MEAT COVE : in Com. of Sup., 10072 (iii).
- NORTH SHORE ST. LAWRENCE, CONSTRUCTION, AMOUNT PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1890, 1891, 1963 (i).
- N.W. TERRITORIES : in Com. of Sup., 8183 (iii).
- PEELE ISLANDS : in Com. of Sup., 8188 (iii).

**PUBLIC WORKS—Con.**

- TELEGRAPH LINES, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 8180 (iii).
- ST. LAWRENCE SHORE; in Com. of Sup., 8149 (iii).
- SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 9171 (iii).
- YUKON AND B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1093 (iii).
- TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 8338 (iii).
- TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES: in Com. of Sup., 9250 (iii).
- TRAVELLING EXPENSES OF MINISTER OF PUB. WORKS AND PRIVATE SECRETARY: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1880 (i).
- TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., conc., 6384 (ii).
- TOWER AND POST OFFICE CLOCKS, PARLT. BUILDINGS, CHANGE IN LIGHTING, INVENTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 6381 (ii).
- COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 6121 (ii).
- TORONTO HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 10066 (iii).
- OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup.: 5179 (ii).
- VALLEYFIELD PUBLIC BUILDINGS, ERECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1832 (i).
- WATER POWER, DEEPENING OF BAY: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1882 (i).
- VANCOUVER DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9988 (iii).
- CONTRACT, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 5487 (ii).
- VENTILATION READING ROOM: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 974 (i).
- VICTORIA AND MONTREAL HARBOURS, GRANTS BY DOM. GOVT.: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. Prior) 1877 (i).
- VICTORIA HARBOUR, REP. OF RESIDENT ENGINEER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3828 (ii).
- POST OFFICE, OLD SITE, OWNERSHIP: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 4269 (ii).
- SAFES, ELEVATORS, &c., TENDER FOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1887 (i).
- PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., conc., 6385 (ii).
- VICTORIAVILLE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9954 (iii).
- WESTERN DEPTL. BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 9350 (iii).
- RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 5089 (ii).
- WHARFS AND PIERS CONSTRUCTED BY DOM. GOVT. IN SEVERAL PROVINCES SINCE 1867: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Gillies) 6939 (iii).
- Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 5861 (ii).
- WHARVES, &c., N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 7698 (iii).
- REVENUE, &c., STMT. PROMISED: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10221 (iii).
- WINDSOR, ONT., DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9962 (iii).
- N. S., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 7615 (iii).
- WINNIPEG GRAIN EXCHANGE AND FORT WILLIAM HARBOUR, COR. WITH PUB. WORKS DEPT.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Roche) 1879 (i).
- LAKE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 8079 (iii).
- YAMASKA LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (iii).
- YUKON—KLONDIKE RIVER BRIDGE, TOOLS, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3073 (i).
- MESSRS. COSTE AND LAFONTAINE'S INSTRUCTIONS: Ques. (Mr. Quian) 1893 (i).
- M. to refer papers to Pub. Accounts Com. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5420 (ii).
- Remarks (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5360 (ii).

**PUBLIC WORKS—Con.**

- YUKON TELEGRAPH LINES, CONSTRUCTION BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6047, 6120 (ii).
- TELEGRAPH LINE FROM SKAGWAY AND DAWSON, COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN MINISTERS AND ENGLISH SYNDICATE, U. S. GOVT., &c. re CONSTRUCTION: M. for Copies\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3384 (i).
- SKAGWAY AND DAWSON TELEGRAPH LINE, CONSTRUCTION BY ENGLISH CO.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3073 (i).
- TELEGRAPH LINES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5604 (ii).
- PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 10107 (iii).
- "QUADRA," STR., PAYMENT OF CREW AND OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3076 (i).
- QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5075 (ii).
- STATION, HALIFAX: in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii), 8090 (iii).
- ORGANIZED DISTRICTS: in Com. of Sup., 8338 (iii).
- SERVICE, EMPLOYEES, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Montague) 3826 (ii).
- QUEBEC BRIDGE CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 8919; in Com., 9571 (iii).
- TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Haggart) 2112 (i).
- CARTRIDGE FACTORY, DISMISSAL OF LABOURERS, &c.: (Mr. Ingram) 2186 (i).
- EMPLOYEES, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 9699, 9843 (iii).
- CITY MAIL SERVICE AND I. C. R., MEMORIALS, &c., FROM BOARD OF TRADE AND CITY COUNCIL: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Casgrain) 1879 (i).
- AND GASPÉ BASIN, MAIL SUBSIDIES: in Com. of Sup., 8686, 10157 (iii).
- Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. No. 91 (Mr. Fitzpatrick). 1<sup>o</sup>, 2182 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 3914; in Com., 3915; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 3985; agreed to (Y. 80; N. 40) 3990; Sen. Amts. 6100 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 34.)
- B. No. 178 (Mr. Fielding) 1<sup>o</sup>, 8751; 2<sup>o</sup>, 9683; in Com., 9861; 3<sup>o</sup>, 9880 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 35).
- QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, AMOUNT EXPENDED AND LOANS ADVANCED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 5309 (ii).
- BILL, INJURIOUS LEGISLATION: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 9596 (iii).
- OPINION OF MINISTER OF JUSTICE: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 9700 (iii).
- QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY; prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 8915; in Com., 9456, 9780 (iii).
- QUEBEC AND MANCHESTER, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8695 (iii).
- Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Ry. Co's B. No. 84 (Mr. Carroll) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2108; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2524 (i); in Com., 5041, 5249; 3<sup>o</sup>, 5250 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 85).
- Quebec Steamship Co's B. No. 14 (Mr. Malouin) 1<sup>o</sup>, 618; 2<sup>o</sup>, 934; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 2697 (i). (62-63 Vic., c. 125).

QUEBEC SUPERIOR COURT, ADDITIONAL JUDGES, SALARIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1845 (i).

QUEEN'S COUNTY (P.E.I.) APPNMT. OF JUDGE: Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 9000 (iii).

QUESTIONS, FORM OF ASKING: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 2322, 2484 (i).

QUICK, MR. JAMES, DISMISSAL AS LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: par. in *Windsor World* (Mr. *Cowan*) 7219 (iii).

QUEBEC:

ANSE À BEAUFILS HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 8103 (iii).

ANSE AUX GASCONS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 8103 (iii).

ANTICOSTI ISLAND, COR. BETWEEN BRITISH GOVT. AND CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1841 (i).

— INSPECTION OF PUBLIC WORKS, 1898, COST OF TRIP, &c.: M. for Rep.\* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2789 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2188 (i).

— TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 10072 (iii).

ATWATER AVENUE, REBUILDING WALL: in Com. of Sup., 9173 (iii).

BAIE DES CHALEURS RY., AGREEMENT, CONTRACT, EXPENSES, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.\* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2028 (i).

— AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1843 (i).

BAIE DES HONFLEUR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10019 (iii).

BAIE ST. PAUL: in Com. of Sup., 8104 (iii).

BATISCAN POST OFFICE, CHARGES AGAINST POSTMASTER, COR., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1966, 2320 (i).

— SALARY OF POSTMISTRESS: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1970 (i).

BATISCAN RIVER, OBSTRUCTIONS TO NAVIGATION, PETS. re: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3552 (ii).

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., Conc., 10120 (iii).

— DAMAGE TO FARM LANDS BY OVERFLOW: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4859 (ii).

— DISMISSALS: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5411 (ii).

— LOCK LABOURERS, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3267 (i).

— STEEL BRIDGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7450 (iii).

— WATER POWER, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1883 (i).

BELOEIL PUBLIC WORKS, TOTAL COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3827 (ii).

BERNIEE, MR. N., DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., Conc., 10204 (iii).

BERTHIER (EN HAUT) POSTMASTER AND EMPLOYERS, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2702 (i).

— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7619 (iii).

— PUBLIC BUILDING, PURCHASE OF SITE, &c., POSTMASTER'S SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1893 (i).

— PUBLIC WORKS, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2703 (i).

BILODEAU, MR. JOB, POSTMASTER AT CHAMBORD, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1962 (i).

BILODEAU, MR. L. P., EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3336 (ii).

BLAIS, MR. J. C., AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3545 (ii).

## QUEBEC—Con.

BOIVIN, GEDRON, CONTRACT FOR STONE AT RIVIÈRE LA PIPE WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4061 (ii).

BOLDUC, MR. A.: in Com. of Sup., 5798: conc., 6387 (ii).

BOURGET, P. A., POSTMASTER AT LÉVIS, INCREASE OF SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4059 (ii).

BUILDINGS, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 7619 (iii).

CAP SANTE: in Com. of Sup., 8105 (iii).

CARTRIDGE FACTORY: in Com. of Sup., 7151, 9124 (ii).

CATTLE INSPECTION, &c., AT HEBERTVILLE, COR. re APPOINTMENT OF DR. HALL: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 5944 (ii).

CHAMBERLAND, MR. F. F., CHARGES AGAINST, LETTER FROM ACHILLE LEBEL: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2900 (i).

CHAMBLY CANAL, EMPLOYMT. OF GEO. PEPPIN BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3321 (ii).

— INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3553 (ii).

— TELEPHONE LINES: in Com. of Sup., 5732 (ii).

CHAMBORD CUSTOMS OFFICE, SALARIES, COLLECTIONS, EXPENSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1850 (i).

CHAMP DE MARS, LEASE, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Monk*) 2141 (i).

CHICOUTIMI, POSTMASTERS DISMISSAL, PETS., COR., &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2408 (i).

CITADEL, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii).

CLAREAU, MR. J. A., CLAIMS FOR MATERIAL FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CHICOUTIMI OR STE. ANNE'S WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3335 (ii).

COTEAU LANDING, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10030 (iii).

— CONTRACT FOR DREDGING; PAPERS, LETTERS, &c.: M. for Copy\* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2026 (i).

COLPRON, MR. JOS. N., CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT. FOR SERVICES PERFORMED, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2191 (i).

CONSTANTIN, DR. JULES, EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT., AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1847 (i).

DAVIS, EDWARD, SLIDEMASTER AT COULONGE, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 3946 (ii).

DEMERS, MAJOR, CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1833 (i).

DONAHUE, W., CONTRACT FOR TIMBER FOR DREDGE AT ROBERVAL, &c.: (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4060 (ii).

DUCHESNE, DR. J. A., EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1887 (i).

FLUHMAN, DR., MEDICAL OFFICER TO INDIANS AT POINTE BLEUE, PETS. re DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4060 (ii).

FRASERVILLE HARBOUR AND BOARD OF TRADE RESOLUTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1968 (i).

GASPÉ BASIN AND DALHOUSIE, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8685 (iii).

— CUSTOMS OFFICER AND ELECTIONS, CHARGES AGAINST: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10222 (iii).

GAUTHIER, JEAN, POSTMASTER AT METABETCHOUAN, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4059 (ii).

GOVIN, MR. LOMER, SPEECH re SUBSIDIES TO PROVS.: Ques. (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1981 (i).

GRENVILLE CANAL, COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4992 (ii).

GUAY POST OFFICE, REVENUE, SALARY PAID TO POSTMASTER VERREault, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3260 (i).

HUMBERSTONE POST OFFICE, CHARGES AGAINST JAMES C. ROSE, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 6562 (ii).

QUEBEC--*Con.*

HERNS, JOHN, CARETAKER NAPANEE PUBLIC BUILDING, COR. *re* DISMISSAL, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. *Wilson*) 5377 (ii).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 10014 (iii).

I. C. R., BLANCHETTE, MR. EUGENE, REINSTATEMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 5859 (ii).

— DEMERS, DR., RY. BICYCLE RIDING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 5308 (ii).

— MICHAUD, MR. EUGENE, GRANTING OF RY. PASSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2904 (i).

— TROIS PISTOLES, DISMISSAL OF PIERRE MICHAUD AND F. BELANGER, COR., &c.: M. for Copy\* (Mr. *Foster*) 5945 (ii).

— VALCOUER, OCTAVE, EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 5309 (ii).

ISLE AUX NOIX, FORTIFICATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9154 (iii).

— MILITIA PROPERTY, LEASE, RENTAL, &c.: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Quinn*) 2961 (i).

JACQUES CARTIER CO. MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6933, 6934 (iii).

JÉSUS RIVER, CONSTRUCTION OF FISHWAY, PLANS, PAPERS, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Fortin*) 3269 (i).

KNOWLTON LANDING WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10020 (iii).

LABELLE, MR. L. V., EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT., AMOUNTS PAID TO, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1837 (i).

LABREQUE, MR. C. O., EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT., AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1846 (i).

LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 5781 (ii) 7297 (iii).

LACHUTE AND ST. ANDREWS RY., COR., CONTRACTS, REPS., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Christie*) 4808 (ii).

LAKE ST. JOHN, PIERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8116.

LAKE ST. LOUIS, REMOVAL OF SHOAL, REPRESENTATIONS FROM SHIPPERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2331 (i).

LANGEVIN, AUGUST, PURCHASE OF LAND FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6561 (ii).

LAROCHE, MR. W., POSTMASTER AT LAKE BOUCHETTE, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1962 (i).

LEGRIS, MR., POSTMASTER AT STE. EULALIE, INVESTIGATION, REP., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4272 (ii).

LÉVIS FORTS, CONTRACT FOR CORDWOOD, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3082 (i).

— GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 8178, 9937 (iii).

— MAIL SERVICE, NAMES OF CARRIERS, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3554 (ii).

— MILITARY CAMP, QUALIFICATION OF OFFICERS, PERCENTAGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Tyrolitt*) 9309 (iii).

— PURCHASE OF PROPERTY, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 8468 (iii).

LONDON LETTER CARRIERS, RAILWAY TRANSPORTATION, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Beattie*) 4995 (ii).

MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 8133 (iii).

— MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTOR'S NAME, TERMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 2113 (i).

— TERMS OF CONTRACT, &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Pope*) 2789 (i).

MAIL SERVICE, JACQUES CARTIER COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6933, 6934 (iii).

MARIA WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 8133 (iii).

MARTEL, MR. P., POSTMASTER AT ST. PRIME, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1964 (i).

MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, QUEBEC INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 5669 (ii).

QUEBEC--*Con.*

MISTASSINI AND STE. METHODE STOREHOUSES, CONSTRUCTION, &c., NAME OF CONTRACTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1888 (i).

MONTREAL AND LABELLE MAIL SERVICE, APPOINT. OF MAIL CONDUCTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1966 (i).

MONTREAL HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 9964 (iii).

— PLANS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2187 (ii).

— POSTMASTERSHIP, VACANCY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 5859 (ii).

— POST OFFICE, DISMISSALS AND APPOINTMENTS, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 6047 (ii).

— REPAIRS, ADVERTISEMENTS *re* TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1974, 2112 (i).

— RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1827 (i).

— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii).

MURRAY BAY AND OUELLE RIVER, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 10158 (iii).

— AND QUEBEC MAIL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS OF DELAY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1960 (i).

NEWPORT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10014 (iii).

NICOLET RIVER PUBLIC WORKS, EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 3549 (ii).

NORTH SHORE RAILWAY, PAYMENT TO QUEBEC GOVT. BY LEGISLATION OF 1884: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3080 (i).

O'DONAHUE, MR. W. T., CARETAKER AT ROBERVAL, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3335 (ii).

PARISEAU, MR. C. D., POSTMASTER AT ESPRIT, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1962 (i).

PEDNAULT, MR. P., EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT., SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3337 (ii).

PLAINS OF ABRAHAM, EXPIRY OF LEASE, MEMORIALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1835 (i).

— M. for Copy\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2026 (i).

POINTE CLAIRE WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Monk*) 2962 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2111 (i); 4806 (ii).

PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 10071.

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE POST OFFICE CARETAKER, SALARY, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2485 (i).

POSTMASTER, JACQUES CARTIER COUNTY, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6933 (iii).

POWERS, MR. THOS., LEASE OF GOVT. LAND AT LÉVIS, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3082, 3259, 3299 (i).

QUEBEC BRIDGE, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2112 (i).

— CARTRIDGE FACTORY, DISMISSAL OF LABOURERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 2186 (i).

— EMPLOYEES, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 9699, 9843 (iii).

— HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, AMOUNT EXPENDED AND LOANS ADVANCED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5309 (ii).

— BILL, INJURIOUS LEGISLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 9596 (iii).

— OPINION OF MINISTER OF JUSTICE: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 9700 (iii).

— SUPERIOR COURT, ADDITIONAL JUDGES, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1845 (i).

RICHELIEU RIVER, PLACING OF BUOYS, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3796 (ii).

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, DRRDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8135.

— CHARGES AGAINST MR. CHAMBERLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1884 (i).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

- RIVIÈRE LA PIPE AND PERIBONKA WHARFS, EMPLOYMT. OF LABOURERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3337 (ii).
- RIVIÈRE À LA PIPE, WHARF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8116 (iii).
- COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1891 (i).
- ROBERVAL, DREDGING SCOWS, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1888 (i).
- MR. DONAGHUE'S CONTRACT FOR SCOWS: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Casgrain) 2028 (i).
- ROCHE FENDUE AND CALUMET DAMS, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. Poupore) 1854 (i).
- M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Poupore) 2789 (i).
- SABREVOIS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10026; Conc., 10219 (iii).
- STE. GENEVIÈVE, LAND DAMAGES, REP. OF COMMISSIONER, Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6924 (iii).
- ST. FRANCIS LAKE CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1852 (i).
- ST. JEROME POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, CHARGES AGAINST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 2182 (i).
- ST. JOSÉPH D'ALMA, POSTMASTER, INCREASE IN SALARY: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1847 (i).
- ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK, LENGTHENING: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1882 (i).
- ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL, PROTECTION TO NAVIGATION: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 3343 (ii).
- NORTH SHORE TELEGRAPH LINE, CONTRACT FOR POLES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3335 (ii).
- RIVER IMPROVEMENTS, NORTH CHANNEL, CONTRACTS, PLANS, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Taylor) 1877 (i).
- SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 5086 (ii); 7557, 9936 (iii).
- ST. LOUIS LAKE DREDGING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8219 (iii).
- CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iii).
- ST. MAURICE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 10070 (iii).
- ST. METHODE AND MISTASSINI, WHARFS, CONSTRUCTION OF SHEDS, &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Casgrain) 2028 (i).
- ST. OURS LOCK, DISMISSAL OF SUPT. CODERRE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3552 (ii).
- ST. PIERRE RIVER, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 9173 (iii).
- ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 5477 (ii).
- SAMSON, MR. PIERRE, CARETAKER AT ST. JOSEPH DE LEVIS FORT, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 3082 (i).
- SCOTT ACT REPEAL, BROME COUNTY, APPLICATIONS FOR: Ques. (Mr. Pope) 2187 (i).
- SOULANGES CANAL, AMOUNT EXPENDED IN CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2117 (i).
- ARBITRATION, LAND VALUATORS, APPOINTMENTS AND DISMISSALS: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2333 (i).
- CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7295 (iii).
- CONTRACTS: M. for Cor., Notices, &c. (Mr. Taylor) 1861 (i).
- SECS. 1 AND 2, CONTRACTS, ADVERTISEMENTS, &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Bergeron) 2028 (i); 9701 (iii).
- SECS. 4, 5, 6, 7, CONTRACTS, &c.: M. for Cor., O. Cs.,\* &c. (Mr. Bergeron) 2028 (i).
- SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, QUEBEC, SUMS PAID FOR TRAVELLING EXPENSES: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Monk) 2145 (i).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

- TATE'S DRY DOCK, MONTREAL, RENT, LESSEES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1831 (i).
- TELEGRAPH LINES, ANTICOSTI, RENEWAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10072 (iii).
- CABLES, &c., ST. LAWRENCE SHORES: in Com. of Sup., 8181 (iii).
- NORTH SHORE OF ST. LAWRENCE, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1890, 1891, 1963 (i).
- ST. LAWRENCE SHORE: in Com. of Sup., 8149 (iii).
- TOBACCO (CAN.) MANUFACTURE, NUMBER OF FACTORIES, MEMORIALS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Gauthier) 2027 (i).
- TRENT VALLEY CANAL, PAYMENTS TO MR. F. D. MOORE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Graham) 5311 (ii).
- VALLEYFIELD CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, CHARGES AGAINST, &c.: on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. Bergeron) 5501 (ii).
- LEASE OF LAND, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1815 (i).
- PUBLIC BUILDINGS, ERECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1882 (i).
- WATER POWER, DEEPENING OF BAY: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1882 (i).
- VERRAULT, JOS., EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT., SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3555 (ii).
- VILLE MARIE BANK SUSPENSION: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 9065 (iii).
- WALTHAM AND CHAPEAU MAIL SERVICE, PET. FROM PONTIAC CO. COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. Poupore) 2330 (i).
- WENTWORTH vs. MATHIEU: in Com. of Sup., 10112 (iii).
- YAMASKA LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (iii).
- YULE BRIDGE, RICHELIEU RIVER, ARBITRATOR'S AWARD, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3827 (ii).
- Railway Act Amt. B. No. 72** (Mr. Davin) 1°, 1952 (i).
- **B. No. 85** (Mr. Blair) 1°, 2108 (i); 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 3503 (ii); in Com., 9731; 3°, 9749 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 37.)
- **B. No. 97** (Mr. Cowan) 1°, 2247 (i).
- **Passes (Members and Senators) Issuing B. No. 39** (Mr. Bostock) 1°, 1073; 2°m., 2195 (i).
- **Subsidies Authorization B. No. 190** (Mr. Blair) Prop. Res., 8914; in Com. on Res., 9197, 9310, 9466, 9532; 1°, 9597; 2°, 9758; in Com., 9759; 3°, 9893 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 7.) Deb. in Com. on Res. (Mr. Blair) 9197, 9311-9459, 9467-9594; (Sir Charles Tupper) 9198; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9204, 9337, 9366, 9435, 9450, 9471, 9478, 9492, 9512, 9543, 9551; (Mr. Sproule) 9205, 9328, 9468, 9485, 9544; (Mr. Richardson) 9206, 9349, (amt.) 9363, 9425, (amt.) 9531; (Mr. Davin) 9208, 9337, 9429, 9468, 9486, 9518, 9530; (Mr. Foster) 9311, 9332, 9469, 9500, 9561; (Mr. Wallace) 9312, 9398, 9467, 9479, 9532, 9567; (Mr. Bergeron) 9315, 9423, 9470, 9494, 9517, 9553; (Mr. Montague) 9315; (Mr. Haggart) 9319-9458, 9468, 9472; (Mr. Cochran) 9321, 9470; (Mr. Maclean) 9323, 9362, 9382; (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 9330; (Mr. Wilson) 9330, 9578, 9585; (Mr. Mulock) 9337, 9356, 9431, 9480, 9587; (Mr. Ross-Robertson) 9343; (Mr. Wood) 9355, 9401; (Mr. Macdonell, Selkirk) 9355; (Mr. Sifton) 9357, 9467, 9473; (Mr. Osler) 9363; (Mr. Oliver)

**Railways Subsidies—Con.****Deb. in Com. on Res.—Con.**

9372, 9435, 9454, 9495, 9504, 9529, 9593; (Mr. *McMullen*) 9375, 9546; (Mr. *Rutherford*) 9383; (Mr. *Frost*) 9389; (Mr. *Davis*) 9393, 9586, 9588; (Mr. *Rogers*) 9395, 9583; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 9400; (Mr. *Prior*) 9406, 9499; (Mr. *Meigs*) 9437; (Mr. *Britton*) 9440, 9494, 9590; (Mr. *Calvert*) 9441; (Mr. *Ingram*) 9442, 9493, 9570, 9777; (Mr. *Monk*) 9442, 9544, 9555, 9577; (Mr. *Casey*) 9443; (Mr. *Campbell*) 9443; (Mr. *Fielding*) 9444; (Mr. *Monet*) 9446; (Mr. *McHugh*) 9447; (Mr. *Mackie*) 9449; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 9452, 9488, 9580; (Mr. *McLennan*, *Glengarry*) 9456; (Mr. *McCormick*) 9457, 9494; (Mr. *Hughes*) 9460, 9543, 9580; (Mr. *Clancy*) 9489; (Mr. *Beattie*) 9491; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 9500, 9518, 9539, 9583; (Mr. *Costigan*) 9507; (Mr. *Domville*) 9509; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 9544; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 9544; (Mr. *Henderson*) 9548; (Mr. *Charlton*) 9549; (Mr. *Morin*) 9569; (Mr. *Ellis*) 9591 (iii).

2<sup>o</sup>m. (Mr. *Blair*) 9758 (iii).

Deb. (Mr. *Clancy*) 9758; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9759 (iii).

In Com. on B. (Mr. *Blair*) 9815 (iii).

Deb. (Mr. *Clancy*) 9759, 9819; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9760, 9771, 9813; (Mr. *Maclean*) 9760; (Mr. *Richardson*) 9761; (Mr. *Wallace*) 9762, 9783; (Mr. *McMullen*) 9767, 9806; (Mr. *Huggart*) 9767; (Mr. *Henderson*) 9767; (Mr. *Foster*) 9770, 9786, 9810; (Mr. *Fielding*) 9768, 9778; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 9767; (Mr. *Paterson*) 9768, 9782; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 9771; (Mr. *Mills*) 9777; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 9781; (Mr. *Sproule*) 9785, 9807; (Mr. *Davin*) 9792; (Mr. *Mulock*) 9797; (Mr. *Costigan*) 9828; (Mr. *Campbell*) 9830; (Mr. *McGregor*) 9831; (Mr. *Beattie*) 9833; (Mr. *McLennan*, *Glengarry*) 9834 (iii).

3<sup>o</sup>m., 9893 (iii).

Deb. (Mr. *Clancy*) (Amt.) Neg. (Y. 12. N. 47) 9894 (iii); Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) to ref. back to Com., 9894 (iii).

**RAILWAYS:**

ASHCROFT, B.C., SALE OF RY. LANDS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1855 (i).

CANADA EASTERN RY. CO., SALE, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1814 (i).

CAR EQUIPMENTS, STANDARD COUPLERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9171 (iii).

— LIGHTING SYSTEM: in Com. of Sup., 9172 (iii).

— OFFICIAL OR PRIVATE, NUMBER, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1835 (i).

C.P.R. ACT (1881) POWER RESPECTING BRANCH LINES: Remarks (Mr. *McMillan*) 3315 (i).

— BRANCH LINES, &c., POWER RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 9309 (iii).

— CONTRACT WITH A. ONDERDONK, AWARDS BY ARBITRATORS, re VALUE OF ROLLING STOCK, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *McMullen*) 5944 (ii).

— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 7153 (iii).

— MILEAGE TARIFF ON HAY, STRAW, &c., APPROVAL BY O.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4057 (ii).

COMPENSATION TO OCTAVE OUELLETTE: in Com. of Sup., 9127 (iii).

CROW'S NEST PASS RY., DEATH OF MR. THORNBURY: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1976 (i).

— REP. OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1967 (i).

DRUMMOND COUNTY RAILWAY RES.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Huggart*) 2249 (i).

**RAILWAYS—Con.**

DUNN AVENUE, RY. CROSSING, TORONTO, PROTECTION TO: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1857 (i).

GOVERNMENT RYS., TENDERS FOR OIL, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2028 (i).

— WORKING EXPENSES FOR MAY AND JUNE, 1898, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 4810 (ii).

G. T. R. TRACKMENS' STRIKE: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3774 (ii).

— AND ALIEN LABOUR LAW ENFORCEMENT: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3960, 3964 (ii).

— SETTLEMENT, &c.: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4501 (ii).

— COR., RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4730 (ii).

— LETTER FROM MR. DEANE: Read (Mr. *Taylor*) 4786 (ii).

— PAPERS, INQUIRY FOR re SETTLEMENT (Mr. *Clarke*) 4858 (ii).

— RUMOURED SETTLEMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 5206 (ii).

INDIANTOWN BRANCH, AWARDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9165 (iii).

I. C. R. ACCOMMODATION AT LÉVIS: in Com. of Sup., 9163 (iii).

— ADDITION TO WORKSHOPS AT RIVIÈRE DU LOUP: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4480 (ii).

— ALBA SECTION, NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*, *Inverness*) 5310 (ii).

— APPNT. OF SUPT. W. A. DUBE, LOCATION OF HEADQUARTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2533 (i).

— CARS CONSTRUCTED AND PURCHASED BY GOVT., NAME OF FIRM, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3945, 4479 (ii).

— CARS PURCHASED, TENDERS, PRICES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3553 (ii).

— AND C.P.R., RUNNING PRIVILEGES BETWEEN ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2247 (i).

— CHAUDIÈRE TO MONTREAL, REVENUE COLLECTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1856 (i).

— CONTRACTS FOR TIES, NAMES OF TENDERERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 5308 (ii).

— DELAY IN FURNISHING CARS, COMPLAINTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1853 (i).

— DRAWBACK, PAYMENTS OF, ON FREIGHT CHARGES, AMOUNT PAID FOR JAN. AND FEB., 1899, M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 3149 (i).

— DRAWBACKS ON FREIGHT CHARGES ON N. S. PORTION SINCE 1898: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Bell*, *Pictou*) 5945 (ii).

— EARNINGS (GROSS) AND WORKING EXPENSES FROM 1898 TO 1899: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 2027 (i).

— EMPLOYEES AT LÉVIS AND PROVINCIAL ELECTION TRANSFER, &c., INSTRUCTIONS TO MR. DESJARDINS: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3260 (i).

— EMPLOYEES' WORKING HOURS, COMPLAINTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1974 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. *McLellan*) 1860 (i).

— EXPENDITURE ON CAPITAL AND REVENUE: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 2531 (i).

— EXTENSION TO MONTREAL, AMOUNT ACCRUED AND PAID TO G. T. RY. CO. SINCE JULY, 1898: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 4478 (ii).

— CAR MILEAGE FOR VICTORIA BRIDGE, INCOMPLETE RETURN (Mr. *Foster*) 4858 (ii).

— PAPERS RESPECTING CAR MILEAGE: Presented (Mr. *Blair*) 4891 (ii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

- I.C.R. FLOUR RATES AND CAR MILEAGE, &c. : Papers laid on Table (Mr. Blair) 4730 (ii).
- FRASERVILLE STATION ACCOMMODATION, PETS. FROM BOARD OF TRADE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1972 (i).
- PETS. *re* DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 2899 (i).
- FREIGHT CARRIED FROM 1897-99, NUMBER OF TONS AND RECEIPTS: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 3257 (i).
- FREIGHT RATES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7457 (iii).
- FREIGHT RATES ON FLOUR, 1897-98: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 3549 (ii).
- GILLIS, FRANK A., STATION AGENT AT TRACADIE, N.S., DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 4056 (ii).
- GOSSELIN, MR. F., EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT., QUES. (Mr. Stenson) 3827 (ii).
- AND GOVT. RYS., CARS, LOCOMOTIVES, NUMBER, COST, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Pope) 2028 (i).
- AND G.T.R., ENGINE AND CAR MILEAGE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4811 (ii).
- AND G. T. R., COMBINED ENGINE AND CAR MILEAGE, EXPENDITURE, &c. : M. for Ret., (Mr. Foster) 5313 (ii).
- GREEN SAND CASTINGS, TENDERS, PRICES, &c. : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5860 (ii).
- GROSS EARNINGS AND EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1849 (i).
- HARRIS, MR., AGREEMENT WITH AS TRAFFIC MANAGER: Ques. (Mr. Pope) 1975, 1980 (i).
- HARRIS, MR. A. H., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: M. for Cor. (Mr. McDougall) 2905 (i).
- M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Pope) 2961 (i).
- HEADQUARTERS AT LÉVIS, TRANSFER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3551 (ii).
- I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5753 (ii).
- INCREASED STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 9163 (iii).
- LAND DAMAGES, OXFORD DIVISION: in Com. of Sup., 7154 (iii).
- LEBLANC, MR. A. T., EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Powell) 1964 (i).
- LÉVIS STATION IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 8220 (iii).
- LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS, NUMBER EMPLOYED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Stenson) 9697 (iii).
- McDONALD, MR. A. R., DISMISSAL AS SUPT.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1971 (i); 4811, 4812, 5098 (ii); in Com. of Sup., 7276 (iii).
- Inquiry for Papers, &c. (Mr. Bergeron) 8757.
- MACHINERY AT RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, APPLICATION BY SUPT. FOR ADDITIONS: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4481 (ii).
- MONCTON SHOPS, MACHINERY, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5753 (ii).
- MONTREAL EXTENSION, EXPENDITURE, REVENUE FROM 1898 TO 1899: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Powell) 2789 (i).
- NEWSPAPER AGENCIES, LESSEES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 1971 (i).
- NEW TIME TABLE: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4481 (ii).
- NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, WAGES PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. McLellan) 2332 (i).
- ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7155 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

- I.C.R., OURLETTE, DISTRICT SUPT., SUSPENSION, &c. : Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1859 (i).
- PASSES ISSUED SINCE AUGUST, 1896, NAMES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1860 (i).
- PICHETTE, MR., PRIVILEGES AT LÉVIS STATION: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4992 (ii).
- AND P. E. I. RYS., STEEL RAILS, CONTRACTS, &c. : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 1814 (i).
- M. for Copies\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 1876 (i).
- AND QUEBEC CITY MAIL SERVICE, MEMORIALS, &c., FROM BOARD OF TRADE AND CITY COUNCIL: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Casgrain) 1879 (i).
- RATES ON FLOUR, CAR MILEAGE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 4731 (ii).
- RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES, STMT. OF ACCOUNTS: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 2791 (i).
- REMOVAL OF SHOPS FROM RIVIÈRE DU LOUP TO LÉVIS: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 2533 (i).
- RESTAURANT AT GRAND NARROWS, COR. *re* CONTRACT, &c. : M. for Copy\* (Mr. McDougall) 3149 (i).
- REVENUE COLLECTED BETWEEN CHAUDIÈRE AND MONTREAL: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Powell) 2027.
- REYNOLDS, CAPT., STR. "MULGRAVE," COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. McLennan, Inverness) 5309 (ii).
- ROBERGE, CYRILLE, DISMISSAL OF: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1857 (i).
- ROLLING STOCK: in Com. of Sup., 5754 (ii).
- ADDITION TO: *par.* in Moncton Star (Mr. Davin) 6319 (ii).
- EXPENDITURE: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 6562 (ii).
- ST CHARLES BRANCH, CLAIMS FOR EXPROPRIATION OR PURCHASE OF LAND, &c. : M. for Stmnt.\* (Mr. McMullen) 3873 (ii).
- ST. JOHN ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 7155, 7242, 7401 (iii).
- SALARIES AT RIVIÈRE DU LOUP WORKSHOPS: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4480 (ii).
- SIDING ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 9156 (iii).
- SNOW SHOVELLING, NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Powell) 1964 (i).
- STARR AND DEWOLFE'S CONTRACT, REP. OF MR. SHANLEY, C.E.: M. for Copy\* (Mr. Borden, Hali'ax) 2962 (i).
- STEEL RAILS, TENDERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. McInerney) 2328 (i).
- TARIFFS, SPECIAL RATES, REPS. OF MR. HARRIS: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Pope) 2961 (i).
- UNIFORMS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7456 (iii).
- OCEAN FREIGHT RATES: M. for Cor., Reps, &c. (Mr. Davin) 1861 (i).
- P. E. I. RY., MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 9211 (iii).
- NEWS AGENTS: in Com. of Sup., 7462 (iii).
- ROLLING STOCK, CURVES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7389 (iii).
- RAILWAYS AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 2250, 2276 (i), 7153, 7455 (iii); *conc.*, 6382 (ii); 10201 (iii).
- MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iii).
- RY. COMMISSION APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. McMillan) 1890 (i).
- ESTABLISHMENT OF A BOARD: Debate *resmd.*, (Mr. Bostock) 3849 (ii).
- COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL, EXPENSES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9175, 10156 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

- I. C. R., MAIL SERVICE, SUPERINTENDENT AND STAFF, SALARIES, TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Hodgins*) 5944 (ii).
- POLICY OF GOVERNMENT *re* YUKON RAILWAYS: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4736, 4740 4744 (ii).
- RULES AND REGULATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9175, 10155 (iii).
- LEGISLATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5748.
- REGULATIONS, AMERICAN STANDARD, ADOPTION BY CAN. RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1969 (i).
- SUBSIDIES IN PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, 1898, SUMS PAID TO PROV. OF QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3267 (i).
- SUBSIDIES, RESOLUTIONS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8633, 9064, 9185 (iii).
- SNOWBALL, HON. MR., CLAIMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9165 (iii).
- "VICTORIA," GOV. GEN.'S CAR: in Com. of Sup., 5785 (ii).
- RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES, 22ND REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*) 9209 (iii).
- RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS, ESTABLISHMENT OF BOARD: prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 2488 (i).
- Deb. Rsm'd. (Mr. *Bostock*) 3849 (ii).
- APPOINT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1890 (i).
- COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9175, 10156 (iii).
- RAILWAYS AND CANALS: Report presented (Mr. *Blair*) 249 (i).
- LEGISLATION *re* WORKING RULES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5748 (ii).
- MAIL SERVICE, SUPERINTENDENT AND STAFF, SALARIES TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Hodgins*) 5944 (ii).
- Railway Passenger Tickets, Sale Amt. Act B. No. 32** (Mr. *Beattie*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 895; 2<sup>m.</sup>, 1875 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 4323 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9461 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- RAILWAY POLICY OF GOVERNMENT *re* YUKON RAILWAYS: on M. for Com. of Sup., (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4738, 4740, 4744 (ii).
- RULES AND REGULATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9175, 10155 (iii).
- AMERICAN STANDARD, ADOPTION BY CAN. RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1969 (i).
- SUBSIDIES IN PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, 1898, SUMS PAID TO PROV. OF QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3267 (i).
- SUBSIDIES, RESOLUTIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 8921 (iii).
- SUBSIDIES, RESOLUTIONS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8633, 9064, 9185 (iii).
- RAILWAYS. *Sec* "Drainage," "Subsidies."
- RAINY RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 8016, 10153 (iii).
- RAMA, INDIAN AGENT, CHARGES AGAINST, COST OF INQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1976 (i).
- AND STATUTE LABOUR, GOVT. AID TO MAINTENANCE OF ROADS AND BRIDGES: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 2700 (i).
- RAPIDE PLAT CANAL, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7299 (iii).
- RATES ON FLOUR, CAR MILEAGE, &c., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 4731 (ii).
- READING ROOM, VENTILATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 974 (i).
- REBATE OF CANAL TOLLS TO FORWARDING CO.: in Com. of Sup., 5794 (ii).
- RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES, I. C. R., STMT. OF ACCOUNTS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2791 (i).
- RECIPROCITY BETWEEN U. S. AND B. W. INDIES, PAR IN CHICAGO *Record* (Mr. *Wallace*) 4550 (ii).
- RECORDS AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS, SAFETY OF, REP. OF COMMISSION: M. for Copy\* (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1878.
- Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co's B. No. 119** (Mr. *Frost*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2966 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3492; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4189 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 86.)
- REFRIGERATOR CARS: in Com. of Sup., 9172 (iii).
- REGIMENTAL ESTABLISHMENTS, LISTS SUBMITTED TO PARLIAMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3550.
- MEETINGS OF 8TH HUSSARS, ANNUAL REP.: M. for Copy\* (Mr. *Sproule*) 3873 (ii).
- REGISTERED LETTERS STOLEN OFF C. P. R. TRAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1829 (i).
- REGISTRATION OF SHIPPING: in Com. of Sup., 3065 (i).
- REGISTRAR OF TITLES, YUKON DISTRICT, INSTRUCTIONS AND RESTRICTIONS BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2324 (i).
- REPATRIATION OF CANADIANS FROM U. S., NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3078 (i).
- REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BILL: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2964 (i).
- Representation in the House of Commons B. No. 126** (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1<sup>o</sup>m., 3442, 3492; 2<sup>o</sup>m., 5207, 5262, 6464, 6596, 6606; agreed to, 6722; in Com., 6758 (ii); 6904, 6940, 6972, 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 7000 (iii).
- 1<sup>o</sup>m. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3442, 3456, 3466.
- Deb. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3449; (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 3449; (Mr. *Foster*) 3457; (Mr. *McNeill*) 3458; (Mr. *Clarke*) 3458, 3464; (Mr. *Wallace*) 3458; (Mr. *Lunderkin*) 3461; (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 3462; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3463; (Mr. *Henderson*) 3465; (Mr. *Montague*) 3466; (Mr. *Sproule*) 3468, 3496; (Mr. *Casey*) 3470; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3471; (Mr. *Taylor*) 3474; (Mr. *McGregor*) 3475; (Mr. *Bennett*) 3476; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3481 (i).
- M. for 2<sup>o</sup> (Mr. *Mulock*) 5207.
- Deb. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5207; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5262; (Mr. *Paterson*) 5280; on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn. deb., 5299; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5299; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5299; (Mr. *McNeill*) 5302; (Mr. *Bennett*) 5305; deb. on 2<sup>o</sup>, (Mr. *Wallace*) 6464; (Mr. *McMullen*) 6481; (Mr. *Clancy*) 6493; (Mr. *Bell*, P.E.I.) 6524; (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 6530; (Mr. *Heyd*) 6550; (Mr. *McNeill*) 6596; (Mr. *Macdonald*, Huron) 6615; (Mr. *Bennett*) 6629; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 6636; (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 6650; (Mr. *Russell*) 6660; (Mr. *Sproule*) 6673; (Mr. *Bostock*) 6681; (Mr. *Roche*) 6685; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6690; (Mr. *Powell*) 6695; (Mr. *Clarke*) 6708; (Mr. *Britton*) 6715; (Mr. *Tyrovitt*) 6717; (Mr. *Oaler*) 6718; (Mr. *Bertram*) 6718; agreed to (Y. 77, N. 41) 6720 (ii).

**Representation in the House of Commons—Con.**

In Com. (M.) 6758.

Deb. (Mr. *Sproule*) 6758, 6910; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6758, 6797, 6910, (amt.) 6927, (M.) to ref. back to Com. (amt.) 6940, 6943, 6966, 6984; (Sir *Charles Tupper*, 6759, 6981; (Mr. *Clancy*) 6760, 6777, 6906, 6913; (Mr. *Paterson*) 6762-6802; (Mr. *Mulock*) (amt.) 6763-6820, 6905, 6910; (Mr. *Bennett*) 6763, 6910; (Mr. *Clarke*) 6768, 6782, 6796; (Mr. *Gibson*) 6777, 6803; (Mr. *McCleary*) 6780, 6802; (Mr. *Rogers*) 6786; (Mr. *McNeill*) 6789, 6907, 6942, 6962; (Mr. *Beattie*) 6802; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6303, 6940, 6947, 6963, 6983; (Mr. *Wallace*) 6806, 6941, 6945, 6967; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6811; (Mr. *McMillan*) 6813; (Mr. *Martin*) 6913; (Mr. *Haggart*) 6904, 6941; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 6924, 6940, 6963; (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 6924; (Mr. *Fielding*) 6941, 6979; (Mr. *Blair*) 6941, 6956, 6979; (Mr. *Powell*) 6948, 6973; (Mr. *Ellis*) 6969; (Mr. *Tucker*) 6951; (Mr. *Costigan*) 6952; (Mr. *Hughes*) 6955; (Mr. *McAlister*) 6978; (Mr. *Marcel*) 6988; (Mr. *Henderson*) 6993; (Mr. *Gilmour*) 6999 (ii).

REPRESENTATION OF YUKON TERRITORY IN PARLIAMENT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2901 (i).

REPS. FROM YUKON COUNCIL, YUKON TERRITORIES ACT: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2536 (i).

**REPORTS PRESENTED:**

AGRICULTURE (Mr. *Fisher*) 1352 (i).  
 ARCHIVES, CANADIAN (Mr. *Fisher*) 4061 (ii).  
 AUDITOR GENERAL'S (Mr. *Fielding*) 1165, 2180 (i).  
 CIVIL SERVICE LIST (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 421 (i).  
 EXPERIMENTAL FARMS (Mr. *Fisher*) 3070 (i).  
 FISHERIES (Sir *Louis Davies*) 700 (i).  
 LIBRARY OF PARLT., JOINT REP. (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).  
 MARINE (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1165 (i).  
 MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. *Borden*, King's) 421 (i).  
 NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4995 (ii).  
 RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. *Blair*) 249 (i).  
 SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 421 (i).  
 TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1860 (i).

RESTAURANT AT GRAND NARROWS, I. C. R., COR. re CONTRACT, &c.: M. for Copy\* (Mr. *McDougall*) 3149 (i).

— H OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 10137 (iii).

**Restigouche Boom Co's. incorp. B. No. 65** (Mr. *McAlister*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1949; on Order for 2<sup>o</sup>, 2152, 2524, 2648; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2698 (i); ref. back to Sel. Com., 6824 (ii); withdn., 8989 (iii).

— ON ORDER FOR 2<sup>o</sup>: Remarks (Sir *Louis Davies*) 2152 (i).

RESTIGOUCHE AND WESTERN RY. CO'S. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8917 (iii).

RETURNS, INQUIRY FOR (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 3759 (ii).

— (Mr. *Bergeron*) 9700, 9845 (iii).

— (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2696 (i).

— (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1073, 3253 (i).

— (Mr. *Davin*) 8753, 9595, 9895, 10116 (iii).

— (Mr. *Foster*) 1432 (i); 4171, 5387, 6320, 6595 (ii); 8075, 8224, 8386, 8754, 9310, 9595, 9836, 9844, 9895 (iii).

— (Mr. *Gillies*) 4552 (ii).

RETURNS, INQUIRY FOR (Mr. *Haggart*) 8076 (iii).

— (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1753 (i).

— (Mr. *McCarthy*) 8076 (iii).

— (Mr. *McDougall*) 4151, 5410, 6595 (ii); 7771 (iii).

— (Mr. *Martin*) 1953 (i); 6319 (ii); 10225 (iii).

— (Mr. *Monk*) 5747 (ii).

— (Mr. *Montague*) 3253 (i).

— (Mr. *Prior*) 8387 (iii).

— (Mr. *Taylor*) 3150 (i).

— (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8753, 8920 (iii).

— (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2696 (i); 3498, 3555, 4151, 4313 (ii).

— (Mr. *Wallace*) 5410 (ii).

— CROW'S NEST PASS RY. (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 3314 (i).

— INCOMPLETE: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3313 (i).

— INCOMPLETE, TELEGRAMS FROM ARCHER MARTIN, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4731 (ii).

— ORDERED BY HOUSE, NON-COMPLIANCE BY GOVT.: on M. for Com. of Sup., (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2966, 3071 (i).

— PUBLIC WORKS, P. E. I. (Mr. *Martin*) 3878 (ii).

— YUKON INVESTIGATION, &c. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4340 (ii).

— YUKON EXPEDITION, MR. COSTE'S REP. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5407 (ii).

REVISION OF THE STATUTES, APPNMT. OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Britton*) 1881 (i).

REVENUE COLLECTED, &c., CHAUDIÈRE TO MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1856 (i).

— M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Powell*) 2027 (i).

See "Rys., I. C. R."

REVENUE CRUISERS, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5602 (ii).

REYNOLDS, CAPT., STR. "MULGRAVE," COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) 5309 (ii).

RIFLE ASSOCIATION GRANTS: in Com. of Sup., 7147 (iii).

**Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co's B. No. 27** (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 895; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1113; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3003 (i). (62-63 Vic., c. 126.)

RICHELIEU RIVER BRIDGE CO'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8918 (iii).

— PLACING OF BUOYS, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3796 (ii).

RIDEAU CANAL, KILMARNOCK: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (ii).

— HALL: in Com. of Sup., 7693, 9958 (iii).

See "Supply," &c.

RIFLE RANGES, B. C., APPLICATIONS, PETS., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 5484 (ii).

RIFLES, SALE BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Beattie*) 1817 (i).

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP BRIDGE CO'S SUBSIDY: prop Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8918 (iii).

- RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ADDITION TO WORKSHOPS AT: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4480 (ii).
- REMOVAL OF SHOPS TO LÉVIS: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 2533 (i).
- SALARIES AT WORKSHOPS: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4480 (ii).
- DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8135 (iii).
- WHARF, CHARGES AGAINST MR. CHAMBERLAND: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1884 (i).
- RIVIÈRE LA PIPE, WHARF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8116 (iii).
- COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1891 (i).
- AND PERIBONKA WHARFS, EMPLOYMENT OF LABOURERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3337 (ii)
- Roads and Road Allowances in Man. B. No. 175** (Mr. Sifton) 1°, 8151; 2° and in Com., 8470; 3°, 9597 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 19.)
- ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 5204 (ii).
- N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 7530, 10070 (iii).
- ROBERGE, CYRILLE, DISMISSAL OF: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1857 (i).
- Robertson Patent Relief B. No. 11** (Mr. McAlister) 1°, 618; 2°, 934; in Com. and 3°, 2644 (i). (62-63 Vic., c. 127.)
- ROBERVAL, DREDGING SCOWS, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1888 (i).
- HARBOUR, DREDGING, MR. DONAGHUE'S CONTRACT FOR SCOWS: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Casgrain) 2028 (i).
- See "Quebec," &c.
- ROCHE FENDUE AND CALUMET DAMS, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. Poupore) 1854 (i).
- M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Poupore) 2789 (i).
- ROCKY POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10066.
- ROLLING STOCK, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5754 (ii).
- ADDITION TO: par. in *Moncton Star* (Mr. Davin) 6319 (ii).
- EXPENDITURE: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 6562 (ii).
- Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Pontiac B. No. 108** (Mr. Poupore) 1°, 2529; 2°, 2698 (i); in Com. and 3°, 3491 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 124.)
- ROSEDALE BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7318 (iii).
- SWING BRIDGE, EXPENDITURE, AMOUNT CONTRIBUTED BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2333 (i).
- ROTHWELL'S REPORT *re* SETTLERS CLAIMS, TRANSMISSION TO B. C. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 2530 (i).
- ROWE, MRS. ELIZABETH, POSTMISTRESS AT SINTULATA, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 8468 (iii).
- ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6928 (iii).
- See "Bills."
- ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 5464 (ii) 7022, 7140, 9960 (iii).
- CLOTHING CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6722 (ii) 6932 (iii).
- EXPENDITURE SINCE FOUNDATION, REGULATIONS, NUMBER OF GRADUATES, &c.: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. Casey) 1879 (i).
- ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ross-Robertson) 3796 (ii).
- ROYAL SOCIETY, PUBLICATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8705 (iii).
- ROYALTIES ON MINING LICENSES: in Com. of Sup., 8947, 9002 (iii).
- RUMORS *re* CONFLICT BETWEEN U. S. AND CAN. CUSTOMS IN YUKON: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 975 (i).
- Russell, Dundas and Grenville Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 59** (Mr. Edwards) 1°, 1540; 2°, 1862; in Com. and 3°, 3072 (i). (62-63 Vic., c. 87.)
- RUSSELL, MR., DISMISSAL AS STEAMBOAT INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 4713 (ii).
- DISMISSAL, REPS., &c., *re*: M. for Copies\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3334 (i).
- Rutland and Noyan Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 120** (Mr. Brodeur) 1°, 3149 (i); 2°, 3492; in Com. and 3°, 3996 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 88.)
- RYAN & CO.'S CLAIMS *re* CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 10152 (iii).
- See "Supply," &c.
- ST. ANDREWS RAPIDS: in Com. of Sup., 9173, 10155 (iii).
- ST. CATHARINES DRILL HALL: in Com. of Stp. 9957 (iii).
- ST. CHARLES BRANGH I. C. R., CLAIMS FOR EXPROPRIATION OR PURCHASE OF LAND, &c.: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. McMullen) 3873 (ii).
- St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s incorp. B. No. 45** (Mr. Tisdale) 1°, 1165; 2°, 1389; in Com. and 3°, 3003 (i). (62-63 Vic., c. 128.)
- ST. FRANCIS BRIDGE CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 8918 (iii).
- LAKE CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1852 (i).
- LAKE SURVEY, AND SERVICES OF STRS. "ALERT" AND "ALASKA": M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Taylor) 1878 (i).
- STE. GENEVIÈVE, LAND DAMAGES, REP. OF COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6934 (iii).
- ST. JEROME POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, CHARGES AGAINST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 2182 (i).
- ST. JOHN ACCOMMODATION I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7155, 7242, 7401 (iii).
- DEEP WATER TERMINAL FACILITIES: M. for Specifications, Plans, &c.\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 1876 (i).
- BATTALION, 8TH HUSSARS, CHARGES AGAINST COMMANDING OFFICER, REP. *re* INVESTIGATION, &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Domville) 2026 (i).
- ST. JOHN AND BELFAST, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8672 (iii).
- AND DIGBY, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8673 (iii).
- ELEVATOR: in Com. of Sup., 9163 (iii).
- AND GLASGOW, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8672 (iii).
- AND HALIFAX, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8686 (iii).

- ST. JOHN AND LIVERPOOL, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 8671 (iii).
- AND MINAS BASIN, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 8686 (iii).
- VALLEY AND RIVIÈRE DU LOUP RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 8914; in Com., 9443, 9772 (iii).
- AND WEST INDIES, MAIL SUBSIDY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8675 (iii).
- ST. JOSEPH D'ALMA, POSTMASTER, INCREASE IN SALARY : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1847 (i).
- ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK, LENGTHENING : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1882 (i).
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER SHIP CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 5086 (ii); 7557, 9986 (iii).
- CANALS, DEEPENING OF NAVIGATION, &c., CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 2788 (i).
- IMPROVEMENTS, NORTH CHANNEL, CONTRACTS, PLANS, &c. : M. for Copies\* (Mr. Taylor) 1877 (i).
- PROTECTION TO NAVIGATION : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 3343 (ii).
- NORTH SHORE TELEGRAPH LINE, CONTRACT FOR POLES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3335 (ii).
- ST. LOUIS LAKE CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iii).
- DREDGING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8219 (iii).
- ST. MAURICE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 10070 (iii).
- ST. METHODE AND MISTASSINI, WHARFS, CONSTRUCTION OF SHEDS, &c. : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Casgrain) 2028 (i).
- See "Quebec," &c.
- ST. NORBERT, INUNDATIONS OF RED RIVER, CLAIMS OF OWNERS : Ques. (Mr. LaRivière) 1894 (i).
- ST. OURS LOCK : in Com. of Sup., 7318 (iii).
- DISMISSAL OF SUPT. CODERRE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3552 (ii).
- ST. PAUL DES MÉTIS COLONY : in Com. of Sup., 9027 (iii).
- ST. PETERS CANAL, AMOUNT EXPENDED FROM 1891 TO 1896, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 3255 (i).
- ST. PIERRE RIVER, ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 9173 (iii).
- ST. REGIS INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 5699 (ii).
- ST. RÉMI AND STOTTSVILLE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 8915; in Com., 9446, 9773 (iii).
- ST. THOMAS AND AYLMER MAIL SERVICE, ADVERTISEMENTS FOR TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 9658 (iii).
- ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 5477 (ii).
- REP. OF COMMISSION, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION : M. for Copy\* (Mr. Fortin) 1879 (i).
- TOTAL COST, CLAIMS UNPAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5484 (ii).
- SABREVOIS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10020; conc., 10219 (iii).
- SALARIES, &c., re ADMINISTRATION YUKON DISTRICT : in Com. of Sup., 8658 (iii).
- SAMSON, MR. PIERRE, CARETAKER AT ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS FORT, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 3082 (i).
- SAPPER'S BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 5204 (ii).
- SARNIA POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 9962 (iii).
- Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s B. No. 92 (Mr. Landerkin) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2246; 2<sup>nd</sup> 2524 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3996 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 89.)
- SASKATCHEWAN VALLEY RAILWAY FACILITIES, RES. OF N. W. T. ASSEMBLY : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 3255 (i).
- SAUGEEN INDIANS RESERVE, MEDICAL SUPT., PATRICK SCOTT, DISMISSAL, &c. : Remarks (Mr. McNeill) 9699 (iii).
- SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 7296, 10152 (ii).
- SAVINGS BANKS AGENTS, SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 5012 (ii).
- SAW LOGS, EXPORTATION. PREVENTION BY GOVT. ON INDIAN RESERVES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1834 (i).
- SCHAFHEITLIN AND FITZGIBBON, CUSTOMS LAW INFRACTION : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1889, 2190 (i).
- SCHOOL LANDS, MAN., STMT. OF SALE : Read (Mr. Sifton) 6461 (ii).
- SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 5170 (ii).
- SCOTT ACT REPEAL, BROME COUNTY, APPLICATIONS FOR : Ques. (Mr. Pope) 2187 (i).
- DELAY IN VOTING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Moore) 3547 (ii).
- SCRIMGEOUR, J. G., GRANT OF BONDED WAREHOUSE, DATE OF LEASE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.,) 2113 (i).
- SCRIP FOR HALF-BREEDS : in Com. of Sup., 5694 (ii) 7501 (iii).
- par. in Calgary Herald (Mr. Davin) 7196 (iii).
- SCUGOG INDIANS, LIQUOR SOLD, COR. BETWEEN DEPT. AND MR. A. SOPER : M. for Copies\* (Mr. Foster) 3149 (i).
- SCUGOG RIVER, DREDGING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2191 (i).
- SECORD, MR. T. R., SUPT. ON WELLAND CANAL, CHARGES AGAINST : Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 1833 (i).
- SECRETARY OF STATE :
- B. C. STATUTES FOR 1899, DATE OF RECEIVING BY SEC. OF STATE : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 5666 (ii).
- BROCKVILLE ELECTION, BALLOT PAPERS, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3074 (i).
- MAILING OF VOTERS' LISTS : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2482 (i).
- NAME OF DEP. RETURNING OFFICER : Ques. (Mr. Broder) 2322 (i).
- "CANADA GAZETTE" : in Com. of Sup., 8703 (iii).
- CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT ELECTIONS, COST : in Com. of Sup., 10111 (iii).
- COMMISSIONS UNDER THE GREAT SEAL, REGULATIONS RESPECTING : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4485 (ii).
- ELECTORAL LISTS, N. S., PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION : Ques. (Mr. Mills) 1979 (i).
- FRANCHISE ELECTORAL ACT, AMENDMENTS BY N. B. GOVERNMENT : Ques. (Mr. McInerney) 2530 (i).

SECRETARY OF STATE—*Con.*

- MUNGOVAN, P., TEMPORARY CLERK : in Com. of Sup., 5019 (ii).  
 See "Supply," &c.
- PLEBISCITE VOTERS, LEEDS CO.. REP. OF RETURNING OFFICER : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1848 (i).  
 — Reports asked for (Mr. Moore) 5748 (ii).  
 — Poll Books, &c. : laid on Table (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 7320 (iii).
- PRINTING BUREAU : in Com. of Sup., 2077 (i).  
 — PLANT, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8703 (iii).  
 — SUNDAY LABOUR : Remarks (Mr. Guillet) 3879 (ii).
- PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE, AMOUNT PAID AND BALANCE DUE : Ques (Mr. Foster) 5859 (ii).
- PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE, COST, &c. : Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 1814 (i).  
 — NUMBER OF VOTES POLLED, Cost, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 2321 (i),  
 — RET. OF VOTES POLLED, PAPERS RESPECTING : M. to adjn. (Mr. Foster) 2037 (i).  
 — Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2041, 2045 (i).  
 — EXPENSES IN MONTREAL CITY, AMOUNTS UNPAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Quinn) 5312 (ii).
- SECRETARY OF STATE REP. : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 421 (i).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 2076, 2269 (i).
- SCOTT ACT REPEAL, BROME COUNTY, APPLICATIONS FOR : Ques. (Mr. Pope) 2187 (i).  
 — DELAY IN VOTING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Moore) 3547 (ii).  
 — CONTINGENT EXPENSES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2281, 2290 (i).
- VOTERS' LISTS : in Com. of Sup., 8750, 10127 (iii).  
 — N. B., DELAY IN SENDING IN REVISION : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2530, 2698 (i).  
 — PRINTING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2530 (i).  
 — PRINTING, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 6827 (iii).  
 — REVISED COPIES, &c. : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 1819 (i).
- Seed Grain Indebtedness, Securities, Man. and N. W. T. B. No. 16** (Mr. Douglas) 1<sup>c</sup>, 618 (i) ; withdn., 9893 (iii).  
 — B. No. 189 (Mr. Sifton) 1<sup>c</sup>, 9464 ; 2<sup>c</sup>, and in Com., 9847 ; 3<sup>c</sup>, 9849 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 18.)
- SEED GRAIN, MAN. AND N. W. T. Indians : in Com. of Sup., 5691 (ii).  
 — TO SETTLERS IN N. W. T. : in Com. of Sup., 9027 (iii).  
 — LIENS, CANCELLATION, LEGISLATION, *re. RES.* FROM N. W. COUNCIL : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 2903 (i).
- SEL. STANDING COMS., COM. TO PREPARE LISTS : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6. 158 (i).  
 — LISTS : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 525 (i).
- Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. No. 191** (Mr. Fielding) 1<sup>c</sup>, 9696 ; 2<sup>c</sup>, and in Com., 9846 ; 3<sup>c</sup>, 9847 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 12.)
- SENATE REFORM AND THE PROVINCES : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1821 (i).  
 — RESOLUTIONS : Withdr. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8752 (iii).
- SERJEANT-AT-ARMS, H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i).
- SESSIONAL CLERKS, COMMITTEES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2278, 2280 (i).

- SESSIONAL INDEMNITIES OF DECEASED SENATORS AND MEMBERS : in Com. of Sup., 10196 (iii).
- SETTLERS FROM EASTERN CANADA TO N. W. T., AID BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Gilmour) 2534 (i).
- SHAG HARBOUR WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 9998 (iii).  
 "SHAMROCK," TUG, AMOUNT PAID JOHN C. KAINÉ, &c. : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5666 (ii).
- SHANNON, THOS., DISMISSAL : M. for Papers\* (Mr. Richardson) 3333 (i).
- Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. No. 170** (Sir Louis Davies) 1<sup>c</sup>, 6929 ; 2<sup>c</sup>, 9598 ; in Com. and 3<sup>c</sup>, 9599 (iii). (62-63 Vic. c. 33.)
- SICK AND DISTRESSED SEAMEN : in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).
- SIDING ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 9156 (iii).
- SIMCOE LAKE, LOWERING WATER, REQUESTS, &c., MADE TO DEPT. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2192 (i).  
 — Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 2248 (i).
- SINGLETON, MR. W. R., POSTMASTER AT DELTA, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1956 (i).
- SINTULATA POSTMISTRESS, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 8468 (iii).  
 — o1 M. for Com. of Sup., Remarks (Mr. Davin) 10118 (iii).
- SIOUX INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 5721 (ii).
- SKAGWAY AND DAWSON TELEGRAPH LINE, YUKON, CONSTRUCTION BY ENGLISH CO. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3073 (i).  
 See "Yukon," &c.
- SKELTON *vs.* THE QUEEN : Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Davin) 7770 (iii).  
 — REP. OF MIN. OF JUS., M. (Mr. Davin) 8171 ; 8217, 8346 (iii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. Davin) 7441 (i).
- SLIDES AND BOOMS : in Com. of Sup., 8178 (iii).
- SMITH, MR. ABNER, POSTMASTER AT RUSAGORNIS, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3256 (i).
- SNOWBALL, HON. MR., CLAIMS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9165 (iii).
- SNOW SHOVELLING, I.C.R., NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Powell) 1964 (i).
- SONGHEES, INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 5704 (ii).  
 — REMOVAL FROM RESERVE, SETTLEMENT WITH B.C. GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3797 (ii).  
 — COR. BETWEEN DOM. AND PROVL. GOVTS. : M. for Copies\* (Mr. Prior) 3873 (ii).  
 — Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Prior) 4713 (ii).
- SOULANGES CANAL, AMOUNT EXPENDED IN CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2117 (i).  
 — ARBITRATION, LAND VALUATORS, APPNMTS. AND DISMISSALS : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2333 (i).  
 — CONTRACTS : M. for Cor., Notices, &c. (Mr. Taylor) 1861 (i).  
 — CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 7295 (iii).  
 — SECS. 1 AND 2, CONTRACTS, ADVERTISEMENTS, &c. : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Bergeron) 2028 (i), 9701 (iii).  
 — SECS. 4, 5, 6, 7, CONTRACTS, &c. : M. for Cor., O. C.'s, &c.\* (Mr. Bergeron) 2028 (i).

- SOURIS BREAKWATER, P.E.I., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES BY MESSRS. MELLISH AND WIGHTMAN : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4270 (ii).
- SOUTH SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916 ; in Com., 9551 (iii).
- SPEAKER'S ATTENTION CALLED TO MEMBER'S SPEECH OUT OF ORDER (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3754 (ii).
- DEP., DELEGATION OF POWERS : Ruling asked from Mr. Speaker (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5491 (ii).
- DEP., SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
- ELECTION OF : M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9062 (iii).
- LATE SIR JAMES EDGAR, DECEASE OF : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9060 (iii),  
See "House of Commons."
- SPEECH FROM THE THRONE : Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 4 (i).
- SPEECHES OF MEMBERS, LIMITATION, &c. : M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2755, 2770 (i).
- SPINKS, COUNTY COURT JUDGE, B. C., CHARGES AGAINST : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4172, 4201 (ii).
- SPRAYING FRUIT TREES, GOVTL. ACTION : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2110 (i).
- SPRINGHILL PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 9945 (iii).
- SPOULE, R. J., POSTMASTER AT FLESHERTON, ONT., COMPLAINTS AGAINST : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 9179 (iii).
- STAMPED ENVELOPES, 2-CENT GREEN, NUMBER PURCHASED IN TORONTO, ISSUE OF, AND DISTRIBUTION : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2189 (i).
- 2-CENT PURPLE, NUMBER ISSUED AND DISTRIBUTED : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2187 (i).
- JUBILEE AND GREATER EMPIRE, STAMPED PLATES, COST, NUMBER, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 2028 (i).  
See "Post Office," &c.
- STANLEY PARK AND DEADMAN'S ISLAND, O.C.'S, COR., &c., BETWEEN CAN. GOVT. AND B.C. : M. for Copies (Mr. *Prior*) 2334 (i).
- Ret. Laid on Table, 3959 (ii).  
See "Deadman's Island, &c."
- STARR AND DE WOLFE'S CONTRACT, I.C.R., REP. OF MR. SHANLEY, C.E. : M. for Copy\* (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2962 (i).
- STATIONERY, H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i), 5730 (ii), 10139 (iii).
- STATIONERY SUPPLIED TO MEMBERS : on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) to conc. in 4th and 5th Reports of Printing Com., 5378 (ii).
- STATISTICS, GENERAL : in Com. of Sup., 8236 (iii).
- STATISTICAL YEAR BOOK : in Com. of Sup., 8226 (iii).
- STATUES AND MONUMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 8150 (iii).
- STATUTORY INCREASES : in Com. of Sup., 2048, 2256, (i), 7536 (iii).
- STEAMBOAT INSPECTION : in Com. of Sup., 4013, 4713 (ii).
- SERVICE BETWEEN P.E.I. AND LIVERPOOL : Par. in *Examiner* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3543 (ii).
- STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS. See "Mail Subsidies."
- STEEL BOXES, INTERIOR AND INDIAN DEPTS., PURCHASED BY GOVT., TENDERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hodgins*) 4482, 4995 (ii).
- STEEL RAILS, I.C.R., TENDERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 2328 (i).
- STEEL SHELVING, DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE : in Com. of Sup., 9989 (iii).
- STEVESTON, B.C., TIDAL LANDS, APPLICATION FOR LEASES, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3822, 4058 (ii).
- O. C.'s, COR., PLANS, &c. : M. for Copies\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3873 (ii).
- TRANSFER OF PROPERTY, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3544 (ii).
- STIKINE-TESLIN ROUTE, SURVEY, REP. OF ENGINEER : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1885 (i).
- Stock. See "Divorce."
- STONY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY, COMMISSIONER'S REPORT : Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 9837 (iii).
- "STRATHCONA," STR., AND RELIEF OF DESTITUTE MINERS, ARRANGEMENT WITH GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 9179 (iii).
- STRATHROY AND WESTERN COUNTIES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8914 ; in Com., 9440, 9771 (iii).
- STRATHY, MR. J. A. L., REINSTATEMENT AS LT.-COL. : Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 2329 (i).
- STRONG, HON. CHIEF JUSTICE, EXPENSES *re* JUDICIAL COMMITTEE : in Com. of Sup., 5470 (ii).
- SUBSIDIES BETWEEN ST. JOHN, HALIFAX AND LONDON, AMOUNT PAID : Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 2900 (i).
- SUBSIDIES : See
- Antler and Moose Mountain Ry. Co.
  - Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.
  - Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.
  - Brookfield and Eastville Ry. Co.
  - Canada Eastern (Cross Creek) Ry. Co.
  - (Nelson Branch) Ry. Co.
  - Canada Northern Ry. Co.
  - C.P.R. and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.
  - Central Ontario Ry. Co.
  - Central Ry. Co.
  - Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.
  - Fort Francis and Rainy River Ry. Co.
  - Great Northern Ry. Bridge Co.
  - Great Northern Ry. Co.
  - Halibarton and Mattawa Ry. Co.
  - Hawkebury Ry. Co.
  - Indian Garden and Shelburne Ry. Co.
  - I.C.R. and Central Ry. Co.
  - Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.
  - Labelle and Nominigue Ry. Co.
  - Lac River Bridge Co.
  - Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.
  - Massawippi Valley Ry. Co.
  - Midland Ry. Co.
  - Nicolet River Bridge Co.
  - Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.
  - (Stanley and Port Arthur Branch) Ry. Co.
  - Ontario, Belmont and Northern Ry. Co.
  - Orford Mountain Ry. Co.
  - Ottawa and Gatineau Ry. Co.
  - Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Ry. Co.
  - Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.

SUBSIDIES—*Con.*

Parry Sound Ry. Co.  
 Paspébiac and Gaspé Ry. Co.  
 Pembroke Southern Ry. Co.  
 Philipsburg Ry. and Quarry Co.  
 Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.  
 Pontypool and Bobcaygeon Ry. Co.  
 Portage du Fort Ry. Co.  
 Port Clyde and Lockport Ry. Co.  
 Port Hawkesbury Ry. Co.  
 Port Hawkesbury and St. Peter's Ry. Co.  
 Quebec Bridge Co.  
 Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.  
 Restigouche and Western Ry. Co.  
 Richelieu River Bridge Co.  
 Rivière du Loup Bridge Co.  
 St. Francis Bridge Co.  
 St. John Valley and Rivière du Loup Ry. Co.  
 St. Rémi and Stottsville Ry. Co.  
 South Shore Ry. Co.  
 Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Co.  
 Sunnybrae and Country Harbour Ry. Co.  
 Témiscouata (St. François Branch) Ry. Co.  
 Tilsonburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.  
 United Counties Ry. Co.  
 Western Alberta Ry. Co.  
 Windsor and Truro Ry. Co.  
 Yamaska Bridge Co.

**Sudbury and Wahnapiatae Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 115** (Mr. *Dyment*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2897; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3004 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4857 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 90.)

SUGAR IMPORTS FROM BRITISH WEST INDIES, QUANTITY AND VALUE: Queb. (Mr. *Foster*) 2327 (i).

SUNDAY TRAFFIC, I. C. R. AND PAR. IN NEWSPAPER: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 3877 (ii).

SUNNYBRAE AND COUNTRY HARBOUR RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916 (iii).

SUPERANNUATIONS IN AGRICULTURE DEPT., APPOINTMENTS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Montague*) 3873 (ii).

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, QUEBEC, SUMS PAID FOR TRAVELLING EXPENSES: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Monk*) 2145 (i).

SUPPLIES FOR GOVT. DREDGES: in Com. of Sup., 7571 (iii).

**Supply B. No. 169** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 6464; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 6596 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 1.)

— **No. 192** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 10246 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 2.)

## SUPPLY:

(Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.)

AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) Orders of the House not complied with, 2966; (Mr. *Foster*) Drummond County Ry., 2972; (Mr. *Prior*) Liquor Licenses in the Yukon, 2973 (i); (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) Tidal Survey, 3504; (Mr. *Montague*) Welland Canal, Lake Erie entrance, 3997; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Ministerial responsibility, 3997; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) Investigation into conduct of Judges in B. C., 4172; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) Bauer, Mr., Dom. Land Surveyor, Papers re examination, 4713; (Sir

SUPPLY—*Con.*AMTS. AND REMARKS—*Con.*

(*Charles Tupper*) Railway Communication with the Yukon, 4740; (Mr. *Bergeron*) Beauharnois Canal, dismissal of employees, 5411; (Mr. *Davin*) Elevators in the N. W. Terns., 5494; (Mr. *Bergeron*) Valleyfield Collector of Customs, 5501; (Mr. *Martin*) Seizure of Traps, &c., P.E.I., 5504; (Mr. *Prior*) Northern Commercial Telegraph Co., 5510; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) *Clarke vs. The Queen*, 5750; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) Administration of the Yukon, 5945, 6053, 6124; neg. (Y. 32; N. 82) 6278; (Mr. *Roddick*) Tuberculosis, prevention, &c., 6281; (Mr. *Davin*) I. C. R., Rolling Stock, par. in *Star*, 6319 (ii); (Mr. *Cowan*) Dismissal of Lighthouse-keeper Quick, 7219; (Mr. *Fortin*) Judicial District of Montreal, 7224; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Preservation of Health on Public Works, 7241; (Mr. *Borden*, King's) Liquor in Military Canteens, 7322; (Mr. *Blair*) Long Wharf, par. in *Star*, 7327; (Mr. *Hughes*) Canadian Troops for the Transvaal, 7328; (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) Lobster Fishing, 7675; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Preferential Trade with G. B., 7773; Amt., 7789, 7874; neg. (Y. 77; N. 41) 7965; (Mr. *Davin*) Administration of the Yukon, 8020; (Mr. *McNeill*) Preferential Trade with G. B., 8221, 8634; (Mr. *Taylor*) Binder Twine, Kingston Penitentiary, contract, 9898; (Mr. *Clancy*) Bothwell Election, Hon. Mr. Mills speech in the Senate, 9896; (Mr. *Hughes*) Conduct of Troops in the Yukon, 9963; (Mr. *Davin*) Sintulata Postmistress. dismissal, 10118 (iii).

MESS. FROM HIS EX: Transmitting Estimates for 1899-1900, 2026 (i); Suppl., 1900, 4857 (ii); further Suppl., 7638, 9835 (iii).

RES. (Mr. *Fielding*) FOR COM., 1813; Ms. for COM., 2047, 2250, 2966 (i), 3504, 3997, 4713, 4740, 5411, 5494, 5750, 6281 (ii), 7001, 7219, 7322, 7675, 7773, 8020, 8172, 8221, 8386, 8634, 9895, 9963, 10118 (iii).

IN COM., 2047, 2250, 2973 (i), 3504, 3523, 4009, 4240, 4713, 4770, 5011, 5100, 5414, 5578, 5668, 5753, 6321 (ii), 7001, 7242, 7330, 7442, 7536, 7966, 8077, 8178, 8224, 8387, 8477, 8648, 8947, 9002, 9066, 9211, 9938, 9964, 10119 (iii).

## COMMITTEE:

*Administration of Justice.* See "Justice."

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:*

Archives, 8224 (iii).

Aid to Agricultural Societies, 8237 (iii).

Bulletins and Reports, Distribution, 8264 (iii).

Cold Storage, 8706 (iii).

Commissioner's Branch, Agriculture and Dairying, 8265 (iii).

Dairying Interests, 8337 (iii).

Experimental Farms, 5073 (ii), 7688, 8237 (iii).

General Statistics, 8236 (iii).

Illustration Stations, 8279, 8745 (iii).

North-west Territorial Exhibition, 5073 (ii).

Omaha Exhibition, 5074 (ii).

Paris Exhibition, 10140 (iii).

Patent Record, 5074 (ii).

Purchase of Books for Library, 5074 (ii).

Statistical Year-book, 8226 (iii).

*Charges of Management*, 7001 (iii).

Dominion Notes, Printing, &c., 5012 (ii).

Salaries of Agents of Country Savings Banks, 5012 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Civil Government :*

Agriculture, 2256 (i).

Auditor General's Office, 2086 (i).

## Contingencies :

Agriculture, 2270 (i), 5028 (ii).

Auditor General, 2269 (i).

Finance, 5016 (ii).

Governor General's Office, 2265 (i).

High Commissioner's Office, 8748 (iii).

Inland Revenue, 2270 (i), 5013 (ii).

Interior, 5021 (ii), 7467 (iii).

Justice, 2266 (i).

Marine and Fisheries, 2276 (i), 5023 (ii).

Militia and Defence, 2266 (i), 5012 (ii).

Miscellaneous, 2277 (i).

Post Office Dept., 5032 (ii), 5052, 5068, 7330, 7358 (iii).

Printing and Stationery (P. Mungovan's Salary), 5019, 5853 (ii).

Privy Council Office, 2265 (i), 5012 (ii).

Public Works, 5072, 5035 (ii), 7554 (iii).

Railways and Canals, 2276 (i).

Secretary of State, 2269 (i).

Trade and Commerce, 2277 (i).

## Customs, 2091 (i).

Finance, 2090 (i), 5016 (ii).

Geological Survey, 2104 (i).

Governor General's Secretary's Office, 2047 (i).

Indian Dept., 2083 (i).

Inland Revenue, 2100 (i).

Interior, 2077 (i), 7466 (iii).

Justice, 2063 (i), 10119 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries, 2102 (i).

Militia and Defence, 2070 (i).

Mounted Police, 2083 (i), 10122 (iii).

Privy Council Office, 2048 (i).

Public Printing and Stationery, 2077 (i).

Public Works, 7536 (iii).

Railways and Canals, 2250 (i).

Secretary of State, 2076 (i).

Trade and Commerce, 2107, 2262 (i).

*Collection of Revenues :*

## Customs :

B. C., 8453 (iii).

B. C. and Yukon, Salaries, &amp;c., 5596 (ii).

Manitoba, 8453 (iii).

N. W. T., 8453 (iii).

Nova Scotia, 8387 (iii).

Old Suspense Account, Montreal, 5588 (ii).

Ontario, 8452 (iii).

Printing and Stationery, 5600 (ii).

Revenue Cruisers, Maintenance, 5602 (ii).

Salaries Contingencies, 5595, 5855 (ii).

## Excise :

Collectors' Allowance and Duties Collected, 4790 (ii).

Preventive Service, 4788, 5578 (ii).

Salaries, Officers, Inspectors, &amp;c., 4770, 4787 (ii).

Sale of Stamps for Can. Tobacco, Commission, 4790 (ii).

Special Translation, L. A. Frechette, 4803 (ii).

## Post Office, Outside Service :

Mail Service, 7386 (iii).

Miscellaneous, 5798 (ii), 7388 (iii).

O'Connor &amp; Hogg, Legal Services, 5801 (ii).

## Public Works :

B.C. Agency, 8190 (iii).

Harbours, Docks and Slides, 8178 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Collection of Revenues—Con.*Public Works—*Con.*

Land and Cable Lines, &amp;c., 8181 (iii).

Slides and Booms, Salaries, &amp;c., 8178 (iii).

Telegraph between P.E.I. and Mainland, 8180 (iii).

—— B. C., 8184 (iii).

—— N. W. T., 8183 (iii).

—— Signal Service, Generally, 8188 (iii).

## Weights and Measures, Gas, &amp;c. :

Rent, Fuel, Travelling Expenses, &amp;c., 4804 (ii).

Salaries of Officers, Inspectors, &amp;c., 4803, 5578 (ii).

*Dominion Lands—Capital :*

General Vote, 7501 (iii).

Surveys, &amp;c., 9053 (iii).

*Dominion Lands—Income :*

General Vote, 7528, 9006 (iii).

Gratuity to Mrs. Cadenhead, 5850 (ii).

*Dominion Police :*

Salaries, increases, 10127 (iii).

*Excise. See "Collection of Revenues."**Fisheries :*

Behring Sea Claims Commission, 5180 (ii).

Cold Storage for Bait, 10163 (iii).

Gratuity to R. N. Venning, 5183 (ii).

Oyster Culture, 4241 (ii).

Repairs to Fisheries Protection Steamers, 5180 (ii).

Salaries, Inspectors, &amp;c., 4013 (ii).

To pay John S. Hall, Q. C., 5183 (ii).

To pay F. Peters and E. V. Bodwell, 5181 (ii).

*Geological Survey :*

General Vote, 7468 (iii).

Salary, John McLeish, 5668 (ii).

*Govt. of North-west Territories, 7499 (iii).**Govt. of the Yukon Provisional District :*

Amount required for Mail Service, 7359 (iii).

Customs, 8746 (iii).

Lewes and Yukon, River Improvements, 8192 (iii).

Salaries and Expenses of Administration, 8658, 8947, 9002 (iii).

[See "Yukon Provisional District, &amp;c."]

*Immigration :*

Agents' Salaries, Can., G. B. and Foreign Countries, 8477 (iii).

General Expenses of Agencies, 8648 (iii).

Payment to St. Paul des Métis Colony, 9027 (iii).

Women's Protective Society, Montreal, 8628 (iii).

*Indians :*

British Columbia, 5725-5730 (ii).

General Vote, 5722 (ii).

Liquor Suppression, 5710 (ii).

Manitoba and N. W. T., 5691 (ii), 10110 (iii).

Annuities to Half-breeds, Peace River District, 5694, 5711 (ii).

Grist Mills, &amp;c., 5721 (ii).

Implements, &amp;c., 5712 (ii).

Sioux, 5721 (ii).

Nova Scotia, 5691 (ii), 7480 (iii).

Ontario and Quebec, 5669 (ii), 10110 (iii).

Oka Indians, Removal, 5709 (ii).

St. Régis, Lock-up, 5711 (ii).

Surveys, 5710, 5721 (ii).

*Inspection of Staples :*

Expenses of Winnipeg Grain Exchange Members, 5588 (ii).

*Insurance :*

General Vote, 7463 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Justice, Administration of :*

- Circuit Allowance, B. C., 5471 (ii).
- Enforcement of Alien Labour Law, 5471 (ii), 10123 (iii).
- Exchequer Court, 5472 (ii).
- N. W. T., 10122 (iii).
- Ontario, Additional Judge, 10122 (iii).

[See "Govt. of Yukon," "Yukon District," &c.]

*Legislation :*

## House of Commons :

- Balance of Salary, late Sir J. D. Edgar, 10196 (iii).
- Committees, Sessional Messengers, &c., 2278 (i).
- Dep. Speaker's Salary, 2278 (i).
- Estimate of Sergeant-at-Arms, 2280 (i).
- French Translation, 10139 (iii).
- Indemnity, late Hon. J. F. Wood, 10200 (iii).
- Publishing Debates, 2280 (i).
- Restaurant-keeper, Allowance, 10137 (iii).
- Stationery, 10139 (iii).
- Voters' Lists, 2280, 2290 (i), 8750, 10127 (iii).

## Library : Additional Messengers, 10140 (iii).

## Senate :

- Sessional Indemnity, late Senator Sanford, 10196 (iii).
- Stationery, &c., 5730 (ii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service :*

- Gratuities, 5179 (ii).
- Salaries and Allowances of Keepers, 3523 (ii).
- Upper Traverse Lighthouse, 5116 (ii), 10162 (iii).

*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions :*

- Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona, 8692 (iii).
- Canada and Great Britain, 8661 (iii).
- Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie, 8685 (iii).
- Grand Manan and Mainland, 8684 (ii).
- Great Britain and P. E. I., 8687 (iii).
- Halifax and Porto Rico, 10158 (iii).
- Halifax, St. John, Nfld. and Liverpool, 8672 (iii).
- Magdalen Islands and Mainland, 8678 (iii).
- Montreal and Manchester, 8695 (iii).
- Murray Bay and River Ouelle, 10158 (iii).
- Pictou and Cheticamp, 10156 (iii).
- Pictou, Murray Harbour, Georgetown and Montague Bridge, 8686 (iii).
- Port Mulgrave, Arichat and Canso, 10156 (iii).
- P. E. I. and Mainland, 8683 (iii).
- Quebec and Gaspé Basin, 8686, 10157 (iii).
- St. John and Digby, 8673 (iii).
- St. John, Dublin and Belfast, 8672 (iii).
- St. John and Glasgow, 8672 (iii).
- St. John and Halifax via Yarmouth, &c., 8686 (iii).
- St. John, Halifax and London, 8673 (iii).
- St. John and Liverpool, 8671 (iii).
- St. John and Minas Basin Ports, 8686 (iii).
- St. John, &c., West Indies and South America, 8675 (iii).
- St. Peters and Port Mulgrave, 8692 (iii).

*Marine Hospitals :*

- Marine Hospitals, &c., 4009 (ii).
- Shipwrecked Seamen, 4012 (ii).

*Militia :*

- Annual Drill, 5414 (ii), 7061 (iii).
- Arms and Accoutrements, 5466 (ii), 9141 (iii).
- Artillery, Fortress Armament, &c., 7152 (iii).
- Battlefield Monuments, 7152 (iii).
- Claim of F. X. Mathieu, 9127 (iii).
- Clothing, 5443 (ii), 7099, 9126 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Militia—Con.*

- Compensation to Octave Ouellette, 9127 (iii).
- to Mrs. F. E. Stewart, 9131 (iii).
- Construction of Small Armouries, 9125 (iii).
- Defence Scheme Committee, 5465 (ii).
- Esquimalt Defences, 7151 (iii).
- Gen. Service Medals, 9127 (iii).
- General Vote, 5055, 5857 (iii).
- Govt. Cartridge Factory, 7151 (iii).
- Hamilton Rifle Range, Purchase, 5465 (ii).
- Military College, 5464 (ii), 7140 (iii).
- Military Properties, 5421 (ii), 7088 (iii).
- Stores, 5423 (ii).
- Miscellaneous and Unforeseen, 5451 (ii), 7147 (iii).
- Pay, Allowances, &c., 7002 (iii).
- Provisions and Supplies, 7126 (iii).
- Salaries of Civil Employees, 5420 (ii), 7074 (iii).
- Transport, 5451 (ii), 7130 (iii).
- Warlike and other Stores, 7091 (iii).

*Miscellaneous :*

- Academy of Arts, 8705 (iii).
- Amount for Charles Bremner, 10113, 10167 (iii).
- Arbitration, Dom., and Ont. and Quebec Accounts, 8702 (iii).
- Canada Gazette, 8703 (iii).
- Canada Mining Institute, 8702 (iii).
- Canada Temperance Act, Cost of Elections, 10111 (iii).
- Classification of Privy Council Records, 8702 (iii).
- Commutation in Lieu of Remission of Duties, 8704 (ii).
- Contributions to Can. Law Library, London, Eng., 5470 (iii).
- Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Commissioner's Expenses, 5831 (ii).
- Distressed Canadians in Foreign Countries, 7529 (iii).
- Expenses of Chief Justice Strong, 5470 (ii).
- Gratuity to Wm. Wakeham, 5183 (ii).
- Half-breed Claims Commissioner, Salary, &c., 5832 (ii).
- Commission's Expenses, 9054 (iii).
- International Commission at Washington, 5852 (ii).
- Keewatin District, Expenses of Govt., 7529 (iii).
- Maintenance of Roads, &c., Banff, 7530 (iii).
- Manniwanka Lake, Wharf, 9055 (iii).
- Monument of late Mr. Mackenzie, 8150 (iii).
- Mounted Police, Assistance to Half-breeds, 5830 (ii).
- National Art Gallery, 8149 (iii).
- Paris Agency, Salaries and Contingencies of, 8704, (iii).
- Payments of Extra Clerks, 8705 (iii).
- P. E. I. Fish Oil Duties, 10114, 10169 (iii).
- Printing Bureau Plant, 8703 (ii).
- Printing Dr. Rand's Dictionary, 10112 (iii).
- Printing, Miscellaneous, 5850 (ii), 8703 (iii).
- Privy Council. Wentworth v. Mathieu, 10112 (iii).
- Professional Services to C. J. R. Bethune, 5471 (ii).
- Relief to People of West Indies, 5852 (ii).
- Repairs to Gov. Gen's Car "Victoria," 8751 (iii).
- Royal Society, Publication of Proceedings, 8705 (iii).
- Statute of Her Majesty, 8150 (iii).
- Surveys and Inspections, 8149 (iii).
- To pay A. M. Montpetit, for translation, 5851 (ii).
- Well-boring Machines in N. W. T., 9055 (iii).

*Mounted Police :*

- General Service, 5832 (ii), 8746 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Ocean and River Service :*

- Generally, 5100 (ii).
- Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Repairs, 3004 (i).
- Investigation into Wrecks, 3064 (i).
- Masters and Mates, Examination, 3058 (i).
- New Steamer, "Minto," 10160 (iii).
- Registration of Shipping, 3065 (i).
- Removal of Obstructions in Navigable Rivers, 3065 (i), 10161 (iii).
- Rewards for Saving Life, 3061 (i).

*Pensions :*

- Fenian Raid, 8750 (iii).
- Rebellion of 1835, 8750 (iii).

*Penitentiaries :*

- British Columbia, 5479 (ii).
- Dorchester, 5477 (ii).
- General, 8750 (iii).
- Kingston :
  - Expenses of Devlin Investigation, 5073 (ii).
- Manitoba, 5479 (ii).
- St. Vincent de Paul, 5477 (ii).

*Post Office. See "Collection of Revenues."**Public Works—Capital :*

## Buildings :

- Nova Scotia, Halifax Building, 9943 (iii).
- Digby Post Office, &c., 9947 (iii).
- Quarantine Station, 9945 (iii).
- Springhill Building, 9945 (iii).
- Ottawa, Western Deptl. Block, 5089 (ii) 9938, 9943 (iii).
- Electric lighting, &c., 9939 (iii).
- Military Buildings, New Store, 9942 (iii).
- Observatory, 9943, 9950 (iii).

## Harbours and Rivers :

- Lévis Graving Dock, enlargement, 9987 (iii).
- Montreal Harbour Improvements, 9964 (iii).
- River Kaministiquia, 7611 (iii)
- St. Andrew's Rapids, 10155 (iii).
- St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, 5086 (ii) 7557, 7579, 9986 (iii).

*Public Works—Income :*

## Buildings :

## British Columbia :

- Kamloops, Public Building, 9988 (iii).
- Nelson, Public Buildings, 9988 (iii).
- New Westminster, Public Buildings, 9988 (iii).
- Rossland, Public Building, 9988 (iii).
- Vancouver, Drill Hall, 9988 (iii).

## New Brunswick :

- Marysville, Public Building, 7616 (iii).
- St. John, Quarantine Station, 9954 (iii).

## North-west Territories :

- Lieut. Governor's residence, 9988 (iii).

## Nova Scotia :

- Halifax, Drill Hall, &c., 7613 (iii).
- Quarantine Station, 5089 (ii).
- Windsor, Public Building, 7615 (iii).

## Ontario :

- Alexandria, Reformatory, 9960 (iii).
- Brockville, Drill Hall, 9960 (iii).
- General Vote, 7621 (iii).
- Kingston, Military College, 9960 (iii).
- Library rewiring, 9956 (iii).
- London Drill Hall, &c., 9961 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Public Works—Income—Con.*Buildings—*Con.*Ontario—*Con.*

- Ottawa, photographic establishment, 5090 (ii).
- East block, elevator, 9960 (iii).
- Concrete floors, Deptl. Buildings, 9957 (iii).
- West block, 9959 (iii).
- Rideau Hall, 9958 (iii).
- Sarnia, Public Building, 9962 (iii).
- St. Catharines, Drill Hall, 9957 (iii).
- Toronto, Post Office, 9958 (iii).
- Windsor, Drill Hall, 9962 (iii).

## Quebec :

- General Vote, 7619 (iii).
- Montreal Public Buildings, 5090 (ii).
- Quebec Citadel, 5090 (ii).
- Victoriaville, Public Building, 9954 (iii).

## Rents, repairs, &amp;c.:

- Dom. Buildings, Ottawa, 5183 (ii).
- Lighting, &c., 8136, 9989.
- Steel shelving, Agriculture Dept., 9989 (iii).

## Dredging, 5203 (ii).

## New Dredging Plant, 8137, 10070 (iii).

## Harbours and Rivers, generally, 8102 (ii).

## British Columbia :

- Columbia River, Improvements, 8085-86 (iii).
- Fraser River, Improvements, 8088 (iii).
- Kootenay River, Improvements, 8090 (iii).
- William's Head Quarantine Station, 8090 (iii).

## Manitoba :

- Lake Manitoba, Outlets, 8077 (iii).
- Wharf on Lake Winnipeg, 8079 (iii).

## Maritime Provinces, Generally, 5201 (ii).

## New Brunswick :

- Campbellton, Wharf, 10012 (iii).
- Campobello, Breakwater, 10010 (iii).
- Cape Tormentine, Breakwater, 10011 (iii).
- Generally, 7763 (iii).
- Hopewell Cape, Wharf, 10010 (iii).
- Main River, Wharf, 10012 (iii).
- St. John River, Wharfs, 10011 (iii).
- St. Nicholas River, Wharf, 10010 (iii).
- Shippegan, Wharf, 10012 (iii).

## Nova Scotia :

- Arcadia, Removal of Obstructions, 9990 (iii).
- Belliveau, Breakwater, 10000 (iii).
- Black Rock and Meat Cove, Harbour, 9991 (ii i)
- Brooklyn, Wharf, 10003 (iii).
- Brule, Wharf Repairs, 10003 (iii).
- Chebogue River, Wharf, 9999 (iii).
- Cheggogin, Breakwater, 9990 (iii).
- Chezzetcook, Wharf, 10004 (iii).
- Clifton, Wharf Repairs, 9991 (iii).
- East Ragged Island, Wharf, 9991 (iii).
- Gabarus Bay, Breakwater, 9991 (iii).
- Generally, 5198 (ii) 7698; 8084 (iii).
- Gunning Cove, Wharf, 9991 (iii).
- Harbourville, Wharf, 10002 (iii).
- Jordan Bay East, Breakwater, 9998 (iii).
- L'Ardoise, Breakwater, 9991 (iii).
- Lockeport, Breakwater, 9991 (iii).
- Malignant Cove, Breakwater, 10003 (iii).
- Newellton, Wharf, 9998 (iii).
- North River, St. Anne's Wharf, 9991 (iii)
- Parker's Cove, Wharf, 10001 (iii)
- Parrsboro', Dredging, 10003 (iii)

**SUPPLY—Con.**

**COMMITTEE—Con.**

*Public Works—Income—Con.*

*Buildings—Con.*

*Nova Scotia—Con.*

- Porter's Lake, Dredging, &c , 9993 (iii).
- Salmon River, Freight Shed, 9996 (iii).
- Saw's Pit, Wharf, 9997 (iii).
- Shag Harbour, Wharf, 9998 (iii).
- Tatamagouche, Wharf Repairs, 10003 (iii).
- Trout Cove, Breakwater, 10000 (iii).
- West Berlin, Protection Works, 10000 (iii).
- Wolfville, Harbour Improvements, 10002 (iii).
- Yarmouth, Breakwater, 9990 (iii).
- Young's Landing, Wharf, 9997 (iii).

*Ontario :*

- Bowmanville, Harbour, 7966 (iii).
- Bruce Mines, Wharf, 7966 (iii).
- Burlington Channel, 7998 (iii).
- Collingwood 8002 (iii).
- Generally, 8013 (iii).
- Goderich, Breakwater, &c , Dredging, 8010-12 (iii).
- Kincardine, North Pier reconstruction, 5203 (iii).
- Kingston, Harbour Dredging, 8014 (iii).
- Little Bear Creek, Dredging, 8014 (iii).
- Oakville, Repairs to Piers, &c , 8015 (iii).
- Otonabee River, Dredging, 10065 (iii).
- Owen Sound, Dredging, &c , 8016 (iii).
- Pelee Island, Wharf, 10068 (iii).
- Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, 9250 (iii).
- Portsmouth, Wharf, 10065 (iii).
- Providence Bay, Wharf, 10068 (iii).
- Rainy River, Channel Improvements, 8016, 9173 (iii).
- Scugog, River Channel, 10065 (iii).
- Sheginandah, Pier, 10068 (iii).
- Sydenham River, Dredging, 8018 (iii).
- Toronto Harbour, Dredging, 10066 (iii).

*Prince Edward Island :*

- Canoe Cove, Breakwater, 10007 (iii).
- China Point, Pier, 7751 (iii).
- North Cardigan, Pier, 10010 (iii).
- Rocky Point, Breakwater, 10006 (iii).
- St. Peter's Bay, Pier, 7755 (iii).
- Souris, Breakwater, 7755 (iii).
- Summerside, Harbour, 7757 (iii).
- West Point, Pier, 10006 (iii).

*Harbours and Rivers :*

*Quebec :*

- Anse à Beaufile, Harbour Improvements 8103 (iii).
- Anse aux Gascons, Breakwater, 8103 (iii).
- Baie de Honfleur, Wharf, 10019 (iii).
- Baie St. Paul, Repairs to Wharf, 8104 (iii).
- Beauport, Wharf, 10039 (iii)
- Black Brook, Wharf, 10014 (iii).
- Cacouna, Wharf, 10016 (iii).
- Cap à L'Aigle, Wharf, 10017 (iii).
- Cap Santé, Removal of Boulders, 8105 (iii).
- Carleton, Pier, 10014 (iii).
- Coteau Landing, Dredging, 10039 (iii).
- General Repairs, 8105 (iii).
- Isle aux Grues, Wharf, 10018 (iii).
- Kamouraska, Wharf, 10018 (iii).
- Knowlton Landing, Wharf, 10020 (iii).
- Lake St. John, Piers, &c , 8116 (iii).
- Les Eboulements, Wharf, 10017 (iii).

**SUPPLY—Con.**

**COMMITTEE—Con.**

*Public Works—Income—Con.*

*Harbours and Rivers—Con.*

*Quebec—Con.*

- Lower St. Lawrence, Removal of Rocks, 8133 (iii).
- Magdalen Islands, Breakwater, 8133 (iii).
- Maria, Wharf, 8133 (iii).
- New Carlisle, Wharf, 10014 (iii).
- Newport, Breakwater, 10014 (iii).
- Richelieu River, Belœil Channel, 8138 (iii).
- Rivière du Lievre, Lock, 10039 (iii).
- Rivière du Loup, Dredging Channel, 8135 (iii).
- Rivière à la Pipe, Wharf, 8116 (iii).
- St. Alexis, Pier, 8136 (iii).
- St. Anne, Wharf, 10039 (iii).
- St. Gedeon, Wharf, 10019 (iii).
- St. Irénée, Wharf, 10018 (iii).
- St. Jerome, Wharf, 10018 (iii).
- Sabrevois, Wharf, 10020 (iii).
- Saguenay River, Dredging, 8136 (iii).
- Sillery Cove, Wharf, 8136 (iii).

*Roads and Bridges :*

- Belly River, Bridge, 10070 (iii).
- Edmonton Bridge, 8196 (iii).
- Generally, 8146 (iii).
- Ottawa, Bridge over River, 8147 (iii).
- Maria Street Bridge, 8147 (iii).
- Sappers Bridge, 5204 (ii), 8148 (iii)
- Portage du Fort, 10071 (iii).

*Slides and Booms :*

- St. Maurice River, 10070 (iii).

*Telegraph Lines :*

- Anticosti Island, 10072 (iii).
- Cheticamp and Meat Cove, 10072 (iii).
- North Shore St. Lawrence, 8149 (iii).

*Quarantine :*

- Amount Transferred to Public Works Dept., 5075 (ii).
- Cattle Quarantine, 5075 (ii), 8339 (iii).
- Hog Cholera and Sheep Scab, 5085 (ii).
- Salaries and Contingencies of Organized Districts, 8338 (iii).
- Tracadie Lazeretto, 8338 (iii).
- Tuberculosis, Prevention, 8344 (iii).
- Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals, 8338 (iii).

*Railways and Canals :*

*Canals :*

- Beauharnois, 7450 (iii).
- Chambly, Telephone Lines, 5783 (ii).
- Surveys, Planting Stones, &c , 7454 (iii).
- Cornwall, Enlargement, 7298 (iii).
- Repairs, New Locks, 5784 (ii).
- Farran's Point, Enlargement, 5779 (ii).
- Galops, Straightening, &c , 7299, 7442 (iii).
- Lachine, Atwater Ave., Wall, 9173 (iii).
- Deepening, St. Pierre River, 5781 (ii), 9173 (iii).
- Enlargement, 7297 (iii).
- To pay Heney & Borthwick, 9173, 10153 (iii).
- Lake St. Louis, Channel, 7298 (iii).
- Murray, Landing Stage, 7454 (iii).
- North Channel, Deepening, &c , 5779 (ii).
- Rainy River, Lock and Dam, 10153 (iii).
- Rapide Plat, Enlargement, 7299 (iii).
- Repairs, &c , Operating Expenses, 7463 (iii).
- Rideau, Kilmarnock Rock Cut, 7454 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Railways and Canals—Con.*Canals—*Con.*

- St. Ours Lock, New Scows, 7318 (iii).
- Sault Ste. Marie, 7296 (iii).
- H. Ryan & Co., Claims, 9235, 10152 (iii).
- Soulanges, 7295 (iii).
- Trent, Construction, 7299, 7318 (iii).
- Pigeon Creek Bridge, 9172 (iii).
- Salary of Concrete Inspector, 5782 (ii).
- Welland, 5790, 5792 (ii), 7454 (iii).
- Rebate to Forwarding Co., 5794 (ii).

## Railways :

- Canadian Pacific Railroad :
  - Land Damages, &c., 7153 (iii).
- Intercolonial Ry. :
  - Car Couplings, 9171 (iii).
  - Elevator at Halifax, 9172 (iii).
  - General Vote, 7456 (iii).
  - Increased Accommodation at Lévis 9163 (iii).
  - at Moncton, 5753 (ii).
  - at St. John, 7155, 7242, 7401, 9164 (iii).
  - Siding Accommodation, 9156 (iii).
  - Station Accommodation, 9163 (iii).
- Indiantown Branch, 9165 (iii).
- Land Damages, 7154 (iii).
- One First Class Coach, 9172 (iii).
- Pintsch Gas Apparatus, 9172 (iii).
- Point Tupper, Improvements, 9171.
- Refrigerator Cars, 9172 (iii).
- Rolling Stock, 5754 (ii).
- St. John, Elevator, 9163 (iii).
- Telegraph Service, 9171 (iii).

## Prince Edward Island :

- Construction of Murray Harbour Branch, 9211 (ii).
- General Vote, 7462 (iii).
- Purchase of Wharf at Mount Stewart, 5754 (iii).
- Straightening Curves, Rolling Stock, &c., 7389 (iii).

## Miscellaneous :

- General Vote, 7455 (iii).
- Payment to A. P. Ross, 9176 (iii).
- Ry. Com. of Privy Council, 9175, 10156 (iii).
- Ry. Regulations, 9175, 10155 (ii).
- Repairs to Gov. Gen.'s Car "Victoria," 5785 (ii), 8751 (iii).
- Survey of Ottawa River, 9176 (iii).

*Railway Subsidies.*

- Subsidy to Central Ry. of N.B., 5788 (ii).

*Scientific Institutions :*

- Toronto Observatory, Rebuilding Dwelling, 5179 (ii).
- Steamboat Inspection, 4013, 4240, 4713 (ii).

*Trade and Commerce :*

- Administration of Chinese Immigration Act, 8697 (iii).
- Commercial Agencies, &c., 8698 (iii).
- Weights and Measures, Gas, &c. See "Collection of Revenues."

*Yukon Provisional District :*

- Administration of Justice :
  - Additional Judge, 10191 (iii).
  - Clerk of the Court, Salary, 10193 (iii)
  - Law-books, &c., 5469 (ii).
  - Living Expenses of Judges, 5469 (ii), 10193 (iii).
  - Maintenance of Prisoners, 5468 (ii), 10195 (iii).
- Customs, 10109 (iii).
- Expenditure of Interior Dept., 6366 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Yukon Provisional District—Con.*

- Lewes and Yukon River Improvements, Telegraphs, &c., 5604 (ii).
- Maintenance of Mounted Police Force, 5834 (ii).
- of Troops, &c., 6321 (ii), 9066 (iii).
- Postal Service, 6350 (ii), 7359 (iii).
- Public Buildings, 10107 (iii).
- Survey of All-Canadian Route, 8700 (iii).
- Telegraph Lines, 10093, 10099 (iii).
- Trails, Roads and Bridges, 10087 (iii).
- Edmonton, 10109 (iii).
- [See "Govt. of Yukon," &c.]

## CONCURRENCE :

- Beauharnois Canal, 10201 (iii).
- Customs, 10206 (iii).
- Harbours and Rivers, Nova Scotia, 10218 (iii).
- Quebec, 10219 (iii).
- Justice, Administration of, 10217 (iii).
- Mail Service, 10202 (iii).
- Militia and Defence, 6389 (ii), 10218 (iii).
- Mount Stewart Public Wharf, 6387 (ii).
- Ocean and River Service, 6383 (ii).
- Post Office, 6387, 6390 (ii), 10202 (iii).
- Public Buildings, Ottawa, 6386 (ii).
- Railways and Canals Dept., Salaries, 6382 (ii).
- Income, 10204 (iii).
- Sabrevois Wharf, 10219 (iii).
- Salaries of Immigration Agents, 10214 (iii).
- Upper Traverse Lighthouse, 6384 (ii).
- Victoriaville Public Buildings, 6385 (ii), 10218 (iii).
- Yukon Provisional District :
  - Mounted Police Service, 6388 (ii).

SURVEYS BRANCH, SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup. 5849 (ii).

—— AND INSPECTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 8149 (iii).

SURVEY OF LANDS, YUKON, &c. : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3547 (ii).

SUSPENSE ACCOUNT, MONTREAL : in Com. of Sup. 5588 (ii).

SUSSEX, N.B., ERECTION OF DRILL SHED : Ques. (Mr. Domville) 1857 (i).

SYDENHAM POSTMASTER, IRREGULARITY IN ACCOUNTS Ques. (Mr. Bell, Addington) 6935 (iii).

—— DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 8018 (iii).

—— AMOUNT EXPENDED : Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 3820 (ii).

TANNER, JOHN, CLAIMS AGAINST SPANISH GOVT. FOR DETENTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Russell) 4805 (ii).

TARIFFS, SPECIAL RATES, I. C. R., REPS. OF MR. HARRIS : M. for Copies\* (Mr. Pope) 2961 (i).

TATE'S DRY DOCK, MONTREAL, RENT, LESSEES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1831 (i).

TELEGRAPH LINES, ANTICOSTI, RENEWAL, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 10072 (iii).

—— ATLIN, B.C., AND TESLIN LAKE : in Com. of Sup., 10099 (iii).

—— B. C. : in Com. of Sup., 8184 (iii).

—— CABLES, &c., ST. LAWRENCE SHORES : in Com. of Sup., 8181 (iii).

—— CHETICAMP AND MEAT COVE : in Com. of Sup., 10072 (iii).

- TELEGRAPH LINES, CONSTRUCTION BY GOVT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 6047, 6120 (ii).
- NORTH SHORE ST. LAWRENCE, CONSTRUCTION, AMOUNT PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1890, 1891, 1963 (i), 3335 (ii).
- N. W. TERRITORIES : in Com. of Sup., 8183 (iii).
- PELEE ISLANDS : in Com. of Sup., 8188 (iii).
- ST. LAWRENCE SHORE : in Com. of Sup., 8149 (iii).
- SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 9171 (iii).
- FROM SKAGWAY AND DAWSON, COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN MINISTERS AND ENGLISH SYNDICATE, U. S. GOVT., &c., *re* CONSTRUCTION : M. for Copies\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3334 (i).
- YUKON PROVISIONAL DISTRICT : in Com. of Sup., 5604 (ii).
- YUKON AND B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 10093 (iii).  
*See* "Yukon," &c.
- Temiscouata Railway Co's. B. No. 166** (Mr. *McAlister*) 1\*, 6120 ; 2\*, 6338 (ii) ; in Com. and 3\*, 6879 (iii). (62-63 *Vic., c.* 91.)
- TEMISCOTATA RAILWAY CO. : M. to present Pet. (Mr. *McAlister*) 5746 (ii).
- (ST. FRANCIS BRANCH) RY. CO'S. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8917 ; in Com., 9483, 9818 (iii).
- Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 134** (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°, 3874 (ii).
- TESLIN LAKE ROUTE, REPS. : M. for Copies\* (Mr. *Davin*) 2026 (i).
- TIDAL SURVEYS : in Com. of Sup., 3050 (i).
- on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3505 (ii).
- IN CANADIAN WATERS, PETS., &c. : (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3795 (ii).
- STMT. OF MINISTER AS TO REMARKS OF ALLAN SS. CAPTAINS, REP. OF CAPT. SPAIN, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3262 (i).
- TILSONBURG AND LAKE ERIE RY. CO'S. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916 ; in Com., 9570 (iii).
- TIMBER INSPECTOR, YUKON, APPNMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).
- TIMBER PERMITS, YUKON STEAMBOAT OWNERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1836 (i).
- TOBACCO, CANADIAN AND FOREIGN, EXCISE DUTY PAID SINCE 1898, NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 3075 (i).
- COMMISSION ON STAMPS : in Com. of Sup., 4790 (ii).
- DUTIES COLLECTED : Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1818 (i).
- EXPERIMENTAL STATION, ESTABLISHMENT IN ESSEX CO. : Ques. (Mr. *Cowan*) 2486 (i).
- FOREIGN LEAF, PERCENTAGE REQUIRED UNDER REGULATIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Cowan*) 2486 (i).
- GROWING IN ESSEX CO., EXCISE DUTIES, &c. : par. in *Ottawa Citizen* (Mr. *Cowan*) 2117 (i).
- MANUFACTURE. NUMBER OF FACTORIES, MEMORIALS ; M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Gauthier*) 2027 (i).
- TOBACCO, REDUCTION OF DUTIES : prop. Res. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4813 (ii).
- TORONTO CUSTOM HOUSE, EMPLOYEES, NAMES, DATE OF APPNMT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1849 (i).
- EAST, POSTMASTER, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACANT POSITION : Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4272 (ii).
- HARBOUR, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 10066 (iii).
- OBSERVATORY : in Com. of Sup., 5179 (ii).
- P. O., APPNMTS. BY GOVT., NAMES, SALARIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1981 (i).
- SINCE 1895 : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2905 (i).
- TOWER AND POST OFFICE CLOCKS, PART. BUILDINGS, CHANGE IN LIGHTING, INVENTOR, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 6381 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 6121 (ii).
- TRACADIE LAZARETTO : in Com. of Sup., 8338 (iii).
- TRADE AND COMMERCE :**
- ALASKAN BOUNDARY, AMERICAN RUMOURS *re* CANADA'S CONTENTION : M. to adjn. (Mr. *Prior*) 3846.
- PACIFIC CABLE, ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGREEMENT : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5386 (ii).
- MODUS VIVENDI : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1074, 1166 (i).
- ALLAN SS. SERVICE AND GOVT. CONTRACT, NAMES OF VESSELS SAILING FROM ST. JOHN, 1897-8 : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3258 (i).
- ATLANTIC EAST SS. SERVICE, PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S BOND, PAYMENT TO GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2481 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 1883 (i).
- GOVT.'L ACTION : Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 4740, 5411 (ii).
- BADDECK, EAST BAY, &c., MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 8692 (iii).
- CANADA AND GREAT BRITAIN, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 8661 (iii).
- AND SOUTH AFRICA, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 8692 (iii).
- CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT, ADMINISTRATION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8697 (iii).
- COMMERCIAL AGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 8698 (iii).
- TREATIES WITH BRITISH W. INDIES, &c. : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 8077, 8172 (iii).
- GASPÉ BASIN AND DALHOUSIE, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 8685 (iii).
- GRAND MANAN AND MAINLAND, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 8684 (iii).
- G. B. AND RUSSIA, TREATY OF 1825, PROTOCOLS, &c. : M. for Copy\* (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6939 (iii).
- HALIFAX, NFLD. AND LIVERPOOL, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 8672 (iii).
- HALIFAX AND PORTO RICO, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 10158 (iii).
- INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION AND BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE : Proposal to Expedite (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3779 (ii).
- MAGDALEN ISLANDS AND MAINLAND, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 8678 (iii).
- MAIL SUBSIDIES : in Com. of Sup., 8661 (iii).
- MURRAY BAY AND QUELLE RIVER, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 10158 (iii).
- PACIFIC CABLE BETWEEN VANCOUVER AND AUSTRALIA : Prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1950 (i).
- GOVT. OF B. C., OFFERS RESPECTING : M. for Cor.\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3873 (ii).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*

- COR. BETWEEN IMP. AND COLONIAL GOVTS.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Casey) 1879 (i).
- COMMUNICATION FROM B. C. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. Morrison) 2697 (i).
- M. to print Papers (Mr. Casey) 2963 (i).
- Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 1352 (i).
- PICTOU AND CHETICAMP MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 10156 (iii).
- PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH G. B.: Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Sir Charles Tupper) 7773-7789, 7840, 7942, 7953 (iii).
- GOVTL. INTENTION: Remarks (Mr. McNeill) 8469 (iii).
- PROP. MOTION: Remarks (Mr. McNeill) 8221, 8347 (iii).
- Prop. Res. (Mr. McNeill) 8633 (iii).
- P. E. I. AND GREAT BRITAIN, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8687 (iii).
- AND MAINLAND, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8683 (iii).
- PORT MULGRAVE, &C., IRISH COVE, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8692 (iii).
- STEAM COMMUNICATION: in Com. of Sup., 10156 (iii).
- QUEBEC AND GASPÉ BASIN, MAIL SUBSIDIES: in Com. of Sup., 8686 (iii).
- AND MANCHESTER, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8695 (iii).
- RECIPROCITY BETWEEN U. S. AND B. W. INDIES, PAR. IN CHICAGO *Record* (Mr. Wallace) 4550 (ii).
- TRADE AND COMMERCE: in Com. of Sup., 2107, 2262, 2277 (i).
- DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1860 (i).
- U. S. TRADE RELATIONS, TREATY OF 1874: M. for Copy (Mr. McCarthy) 6939 (iii).
- ST. JOHN AND BELFAST, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8672 (iii).
- AND DIGBY, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8673 (iii).
- AND GLASGOW, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8672 (iii).
- AND HALIFAX, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8686 (iii).
- AND LIVERPOOL, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8671 (iii).
- AND MINAS BASIN, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8686 (iii).
- AND W. INDIES, MAIL SUBSIDY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8675 (iii).
- STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS. See "Mail Subsidies."
- VANCOUVER ISLAND SS. SERVICE, SUBSIDY BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3797 (ii).
- Trade Mark and Design Act Amt. B. No. 41** (Mr. Bertram) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1073; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1947 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3849 (ii).
- TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES: in Com. of Sup., 9250 (iii).
- TRANSPORTATION OF MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 5451 (ii).
- COS., YUKON, EMPLOYED BY GOVT., AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1958 (i).
- SUPPLIES, &C., YUKON MILITIA FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 6321, 6339 (ii); 7030 (iii).
- TRANSVAAL QUESTION, ADDRESS TO HER MAJ.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8992 (iii).
- TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &C., OF FIN. MINISTER AND PRIVATE SECRETARY: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 1880 (i).
- HON. GEO. E. FOSTER, EX-FIN. MIN.: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1885 (i).
- MINISTER OF PUB. WORKS AND PRIVATE SECRETARY: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1880 (i).
- SIR CHARLES TUPPER, EX-MIN. AND HIGH COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. McMillan) 1835, 1885 (i).
- TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 5116 (ii) 10162 (iii) conc., 6384 (ii).
- TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 5782 (ii) 7299 (iii).
- JORDAN, MR. WM., CLAIMS FOR LAND DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1977.
- LAND VALUATIONS, COMPLAINTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Graham) 5311 (ii).
- PAYMENTS TO MR. F. D. MOORE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Graham) 5311 (ii).
- PAYMENT OF WORKMEN: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1977 (i).
- PURCHASE OF LAND FOR DAM AT NASSAU: Ques. (Mr. Kendry) 1857 (i).
- TRUEMAN, MR. W. H., APPNMT. TO RAILWAYS AND CANALS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 4483 (ii).
- TROIS PISTOLES, I. C. R., DISMISSAL OF PIERRE MICHAUD AND F. BELANGER, COR., &C.: M. for Copy\* (Mr. Foster) 5945 (ii).
- TUBERCULOSIS EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5075 (ii) 8344 (iii).
- PREVENTION OF: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Roddick) 6282 (ii).
- INSPECTION IN CHICOUTIMI COUNTY, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 5097 (ii).
- TUPPER, SIR CHARLES, BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6382 (ii).
- EXPENSES WHILST MIN. AND HIGH COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. McMillan) 1835, 1885 (i).
- TURNER ADMINISTRATION, B.C., DISMISSAL BY LT. GOV.: PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE, 3959 (ii).
- UNITED COUNTIES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 8915: in Com., 9451, 9550, 9773 (iii).
- UNIFORMS, &C., I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7456 (iii).
- U. S. VESSELS AND CANADIAN REGISTRY, FRAUDULENT VALUATION, &C.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3266 (i).
- M. for Ret. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3296 (i).
- *re* ENTERING AT AMERICAN PORTS: Remarks (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2528 (i).
- REGISTERED AT DAWSON, NAMES, VALUATION, &C.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2699 (i).
- FISHING VESSELS AND MODUS VIVENDI, LICENSES, CONCESSIONS GRANTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. McAlister) 2330 (i).
- M. for Ret.\* (Mr. McAlister) 2788 (i).
- TRADE RELATIONS TREATY OF 1874: M. for Copy (Mr. McCarthy) 6939 (iii).
- UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE: Ruling (Mr. Speaks) 5406 (ii) 9208 (iii).
- See "House of Commons."

- Usury B. No. 174** (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1\*, 8217 (iii).
- VACANCIES : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2, 617, 700 (i).
- VALCOEUR, OCTAVE, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 5309 (ii).
- VALLEYFIELD CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, CHARGES AGAINST, &c. : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5501 (ii).
- LEASE OF LAND, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1815 (i).
- PUBLIC BUILDINGS, ERECTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1882 (i).
- WATER POWER, DEEPENING OF BAY : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1882 (i).
- VANCOUVER DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 9988 (iii).
- CONTRACT, COST, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5487, 6122 (ii).
- VANCOUVER ISLAND S.S. SERVICE, SUBSIDY BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3797 (ii)
- VANLUVEN, PETER vs. DOMINION BANK, ACTION OF GOVERNMENT, COR. &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, *Addington*) 9178 (iii).
- Van Wart.** See "Divorce."
- VELDT, RABBI, DISMISSAL AS CHAPLAIN, ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY : Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 10246 (iii).
- VENNER, DR., INDIAN AGENT, COMMISSIONER'S EXPENSES, *re* INVESTIGATION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 1858 (i).
- VENTILATION READING ROOM : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 974 (i).
- VERRAULT, JOS., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT., SALARY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3555 (ii).
- VETERANS OF 1864-5, ISSUE OF MEDALS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1853 (i).
- OF 1866 AND 1870, ISSUE OF MEDALS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1848 (i).
- VOLUNTEERS ORGANIZED IN CHICAGO, ELIGIBILITY FOR MEDALS : Ques (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 2704 (i).
- 1885 AT EDMONTON, ISSUE OF SCRIP AND MEDALS, APPLICATIONS, &c : Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2701 (i).
- VICTORIA, B. C., LETTER CARRIERS, NUMBER, SALARIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1960 (i).
- VICTORIA, B.C., AND MONTREAL HARBOURS, GRANTS BY DOM. GOVT. : M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Prior*) 1877 (i).
- VICTORIA, B.C., POST OFFICE, OLD SITE, OWNERSHIP : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 4269 (ii).
- SAFES, ELEVATORS, &c., TENDER FOR, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1887 (i).
- VICTORIA HARBOUR, REP. OF RESIDENT ENGINEER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3828 (ii).
- PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., Conc., 6385 (ii).
- VICTORIA COUNTY, N.S., PATRONAGE, &c. : Par in North Sydney *Herald* : M. to Adjn. (Mr. *McDougall*) 5388, 5398 (ii).
- VICTORIA " GOV. GEN.'S CAR : in Com. of Sup., 5785 (ii).
- VICTORIAVILLE POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 9954 (iii).
- "VIGILANT," STR., N.W. COST SURVEY : in Com. of Sup., 5729 (ii).
- VILLE MARIE BANK, SUSPENSION, INSPECTION BY GOVT. : Remarks (Mr. *Bourassa*) 8755 (iii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 9065 (iii).
- VIRDEN, MAN., INLAND REVENUE OFFICE : M. for Cor. dropped (Mr. *Rocic*) 5313 (ii).
- VOLUNTEERS OF 1866, GRANTING OF MEDALS : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2114 (i).
- VOTERS' LIST : in Com. of Sup., 8750, 10129 (iii).
- CONTINGENT EXPENSES, &c. : in Com of Sup., 2281, 2290 (i).
- N.B., DELAY IN SENDING IN REVISION : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2530, 2698 (i).
- PRINTING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2530 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Bell*, *Pictou*) 6827 (ii).
- REVISED COPIES, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1819 (i).
- VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS : Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6120 (ii).
- WADE, MR. F. C., DATE OF ARRIVAL AT DAWSON : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3546 (ii).
- WADE, MR., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT. : Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 7442 (iii).
- &c., PAID BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1830 (i).
- Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 7242, 7320, 7442 (iii).
- INSTRUCTIONS OR PERMISSION TO STAKE CLAIMS YUKON DISTRICT, &c. : M. for Copies\* (Mr. *Davin*) 1877 (i).
- WALKER, POSTMASTER AT AILSA CRAIG, CHARGES AGAINST : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3873 (ii).
- WALMSLEY, ALEX., SUPERANNUATION AS BRITISH MAIL CLERK : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3797 (ii).
- WALSH, MAJOR, ALTERATIONS IN REP. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2704 (i).
- AUTHORITY FOR COMMISSION ISSUED, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4269 (ii).
- EMPLOYT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).
- INSTRUCTIONS AND COR. FROM GOVT. OF CAN. : M. for Copies\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2787 (i).
- INSTRUCTIONS BY GOVT. AS COMMISSIONER, REP. OF INTERVIEW AT SKAGWAY, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3078, 3258 (i).
- REPORTS, NUMBER RECEIVED AND LAID ON TABLE : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3798 (ii).
- WALSH, PHILIP, RELATIONSHIP TO MAJ. WALSH : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3823 (ii).
- WALTHAM AND CHAPEAU MAIL SERVICE, PET. FROM PONTIAC CO. COUNCIL : Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 2330 (i).
- WARLIKE STORES : in Com. of Sup., 7091 (iii).
- WATER FRONT, YUKON, DAWSON, LEASE, &c. TO MORRISON AND McDONALD : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3547 (ii).

## WAYS AND MEANS—The Tariff.

BUDGET, THE, FINANCIAL STMT. : (Mr. *Fielding*) 2410 (i).

— For deb., See Budget, The.

Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6463 (ii); 10225 (iii).

**Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. No. 122** : (Mr. *McMillan*) 1°, 3254 (i).

— **B. No. 128** : (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 1° 3544; 2°, and in Com., 3885 (ii); 9883; 3°\*. 9893 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 28).

— **B. No. 143** : (Mr. *Ganong*) 1°, 4477 (ii).

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, INSPECTION : in Com. of Sup., 5578 (ii).

WELLAND CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iii).

— ENTRANCE AT PORT COLBORNE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Montague*) 3997 (ii).

— "LAKESIDE," STR., INTEREST TO OWNERS : in Com. of Sup., 5792 (ii).

— WATER RENTAL : in Com. of Sup., 5790 (ii).

**Welland Canal Power and Supply Co.'s B. No. 67** (Mr. *Gibson*). 1°, 1949; 2°, 2290; in Com. and 3°, 3003 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 129.)

WESTERN ALBERTA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916 (iii).

WESTERN DEPTL. BLOCK : in Com. of Sup., 5089 (ii), 9950 (iii).

WEST INDIES RELIEF FUND : in Com. of Sup., 5852 (ii).

WENTWORTH vs. MATHIEU : in Com. of Sup., 10112 (iii).

WHARFS, &C., N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 7698 (iii).

WHARFS AND PIERS CONSTRUCTED IN DIFFERENT PROVINCES, NUMBER, MAINTENANCE, &C., FROM 1867 TO 1899 : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5861 (ii).

— M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Gillies*) 6939 (iii).

— REVENUE, &C., STMT. PROMISED : Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10221 (iii).

WHEAT EXPORTED FROM MONTREAL, ST. JOHN, FT.

WILLIAM AND WINNIPEG, QUANTITY : Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 2702 (i).

WILLIAM'S HEAD STATION : in Com. of Sup., 8090 (iii).

**Williams Patent Relief B. No. 12** (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 618; 2°, 934; in Com. and 3°, 3003 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 130.)

WILLISON, MR. J. W., CROWN TIMBER AGENT, RELATIONSHIP TO EDITOR OF *Globe* : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3823, 4270 (ii).

**Winding-Up Act Amt. B. No. 31** (Mr. *Fortin*). 1°, 895; 2° m., 1867 (i); in Com., 4314; 3°, 4859 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 42.)

— **B. No. 163** (Mr. *Fielding*). 1°, 6120 (ii); 2°, 7001; in Com., 8780; 3°, 8781 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 43.)

WINDSOR DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 9962 (iii).

— N.S., PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 7615 (iii).

— AND TRURO RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8915; in Com., 9444, 9772 (iii).

WINNIPEG ELECTORAL DISTRICT, ISSUE OF WRIT : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 804 (i).

— remarks (Mr. *Roche*) 8469 (iii).

WINNIPEG ELECTION LISTS, PREPARATION, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Wallace*) 2908 (i).

— REPRESENTATION : Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 1830 (i).

— VACANCY : Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 619, 804 (i).

— GRAIN EXCHANGE AND FORT WILLIAM HARBOUR, COR. WITH PUB. WORKS DEPT. : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Roche*) 1879 (i).

— HOSPITALS : in Com. of Sup., 8338 (iii).

— LAKE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 8079 (iii).

WOLSELEY BARRACKS, LONDON, LAND PURCHASED, PRICE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 1840 (i).

WOOD ISLAND, P.E.I., LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL AND CHARGES AGAINST, REP. OF COMMISSIONER : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2326 (i).

— M. for Copies (Mr. *Martin*) 4813 (iii).

— Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 10117 (iii).

**Working Day.** See "LABOURERS."

WRECKS, INVESTIGATIONS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3064 (i).

WRIGHT, WM., OFFICIAL IN RECORDING OFFICE AT DAWSON, RELATIONSHIP TO EDITOR OF *Globe* : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4270 (ii).

YAMASKA BRIDGE CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8919; in Com., 9580, 9834 (iii).

— LOCK : in Com. of Sup., 8178 (iii).

**Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co.'s B. No. 94** (Mr. *Morrison*). 1°, 2246; 2°, 2525 (i).

**Yukon Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 102** (Mr. *Morrison*). 1°, 2409; 2°, 2650 (i).

**Yukon River and Atlin Lake Improvement Co.'s B. No. 165** (Mr. *Belcourt*). 1°, 6120; 2°, 6405 (ii), withdn., 8947 (iii).

**Yukon Territory Act Amt. B. No. 64** (Mr. *McInnes*). 1°, 1813 (i).

— **B. No. 186** (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*). 1°, 9178; 2°, and in Com., 9849; 3°, 9861 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 11.)

## YUKON :

ADDITIONAL JUDGES, YUKON TERRITORY : in Com. of Sup., 10191 (iii).

ADMINISTRATION OF : in Com. of Sup., 8947, 9002 (iii).

ADMINISTRATION BY MR. OGILVIE, INSTRUCTIONS, &C. : M. for Rep.\* (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2027 (i).

ADMINISTRATION, CHARGES AGAINST : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5945 (Amt.) 6022, 6053 (ii).

— PROPOSAL TO ADJN. DEB. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6100 (ii).

— PAR. IN LONDON *Times* : M. to Adjn. (Mr. *Davin*) 6562, 6585 (ii).

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, YUKON TERRITORY : in Com. of Sup., 5468 (ii) 10191 (iii).

— LIVING EXPENSES OF JUDGES DUGAS AND MAUGUIRE, INSTRUCTIONS, &C. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5489 (ii).

ADMINISTRATOR AND OFFICIALS, INSTRUCTIONS; &C. : M. for Copies\* (Mr. *Foster*) 1877 (i).

ALASKAN BOUNDARY, AMERICAN RUMOURS re CANADA'S CONTENTION : M. to Adjn. (Mr. *Prior*) 3846 (ii).

— MODUS VIVENDI : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1074, 1166 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*

- ALIEN LABOURERS AT LAKE BENNETT, AND GOVTL. ACTION; Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1859 (i).
- APPELLATE COURT, ESTABLISHMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5308 (ii).
- APPNTS. BY GOVT. SINCE AUG. 1896, NAMES, SALARIES, &c.: M. for Stimt.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 1876 (i).
- APPNT. OF SHERIFF, BONDS, COMMISSION, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4268 (ii).
- CLEER OF COURT, O. C.'s, BOND CERTIFICATES, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3149 (i).
- Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3943, 4268 (ii).
- MESSRS. WADE MCGREGOR AND NORWOOD, DATE OF ARRIVAL AT DAWSON, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3081 (i).
- “ BENCH ” AND “ CREEK ” CLAIMS, DISPUTES PENDING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 3077 (i).
- BENNETT HOSPITAL, MATRON AND MEDICAL SUPT., NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1979 (i).
- BLISS, MAJ., PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3552 (ii).
- BONDS, SECURITIES, &c., REGISTERED UNDER R. S. C., PREPARATION OF PARLT. *re* YUKON DISTRICT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4804 (ii).
- BOSTON AND ALASKAN TRANSPORTATION CO., CONTRACT WITH CAN. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1823
- BOURASSA, MR., POSTMASTER AT DAWSON CITY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1958 (i).
- B. C. AND YUKON CUSTOMS OFFICERS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5596 (ii).
- BRITISH YUKON MINING, TRADING AND TRANSPORTATION CO., CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 2905 (i).
- BUSBY, MR., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT SKAGWAY, DATE OF APPNT. AND SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4805 (ii).
- CHARLESON, MR. J. B., O. C. APPOINTING, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 9699 (iii).
- SURVEYS, &c., FOR TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 5604 (ii).
- TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 8106 (iii)
- CLARKE, JOS, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT. IN THE YUKON: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5486 (ii).
- CLEMENT, MR. W. H. P., RESTRICTIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS BY GOVT. AS LEGAL ADVISER TO YUKON COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2322 (i).
- COMMISSIONER OGILVIE, INSTRUCTIONS AND COR. WITH DOM. GOVT.: M. for Copies\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2787 (i).
- REQUEST FROM MR. OGILVIE TO EXTEND HIS POWERS, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3080 (i).
- COMMISSIONER, MAJ. WALSH, ALTERATIONS IN REP.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2704 (i).
- INSTRUCTION AND COR. FROM GOVT. OF CAN.: M. for Copies\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2787 (i).
- COSTE, MR., EXPEDITION, REPORT, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5360 (ii).
- EXPENSES, &c.: M. to refer Papers to Pub. Accounts Com. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5489 (ii).
- REPORT *re* YUKON: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4997 (ii).
- COSTE AND LAFONTAINE, MESSRS., INSTRUCTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 1893 (i)

YUKON—*Con.*

- COUNCIL, NAMES, APPNT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1832 (i).
- ORDINANCES RECEIVED, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2703 (i).
- DAWSON AND VANCOUVER MAIL SERVICE, ARRIVAL, DESPATCH, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 2961 (i).
- DOCUMENTS, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3067 (i).
- DOM. POLICE, NUMBER, DISTRIBUTION, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1965 (i).
- DREDGING FOR MINERALS, NUMBER OF LEASES (1897), RENTALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3079 (i).
- EDMONTON AND YUKON ROUTE, INSTRUCTIONS TO MESSRS. DIBBLEE AND DUPONT: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2114 (i).
- FAWCETT, MR., ADVICE *re* RECORDING MINING CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3822 (ii).
- DISMISSAL AS GOLD COMMISSIONER: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Davin*) 1878 (i).
- FORCE, PROVISIONS AND SUPPLIES: in Com. of Sup., 7126 (iii).
- FREIGHT, TRANSPORTATION, GUARANTEE BY CONTRACTORS, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2902 (i).
- FRONTIER CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 8746 (iii).
- GOLD COMMISSIONER, APPNT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).
- HARPER, MR. F., POSTMASTER AT DAWSON CITY, ISSUE OF NOTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1961 (i).
- HUDSON BAY AND YUKON RY. AND NAV. COMPANY: M. to receive Pat. (Mr. *Flint*) 2182 (i).
- HUNKER CREEK, KLONDIKE MINING, APPLICATION AND GRANTS FOR HYDRAULICING: M. for Copies\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2962 (i).
- INSTRUCTIONS AND COR. BETWEEN DOM. GOVT. AND YUKON COUNCIL: M. for Copies\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2787 (i).
- INSTRUCTIONS TO MAJ. WALSH: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3258 (ii).
- INTERIOR EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 6366 (ii).
- INVESTIGATION, MR. OGILVIE'S REP. AND PAPERS *re*: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2410 (i).
- PRINTING, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5746 (ii).
- PUBPORT, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3820 (ii).
- Inquiry for Returns (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4340 (ii).
- Mr. Ogilvie's Report; laid on Table, 3876 (ii).
- M. to print Papers (Mr. *Sifton*) 4730 (ii).
- PROTEST FROM MINERS' COMMITTEE, COR., &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2329 (i).
- JUDICIAL DISTRICT, APPNT. OF SECOND JUDGE, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3081 (i)
- KLONDIKE OFFICIAL GUIDE, PREPARATION BY MR. OGILVIE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1827 (i).
- RAILWAY SURVEY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8700 (iii).
- RIVER BRIDGE, OWNER, TOLLS, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2902, 3073 (i).
- LAFONTAINE, MR. E., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1858 (i).
- LAW LIBRARY, &c., FOR YUKON; in Com. of Sup., 5469 (ii).
- LEGAL ADVISER, APPNT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*

- LETTERS FROM AMERICANS *re* ADMINISTRATION: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3822 (ii).
- LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 8192 (iii).
- LIQUOR IMPORTATIONS, DISALLOWANCE OF ORDINANCE: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1638 (i).
- PERMITS, AND SANCTION OF MIN. OF INT.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1859 (i).
- COR. BETWEEN MR. MARTIN AND MIN. OF INT.: M. for Papers\* (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2027 (i).
- COR. BETWEEN N. W. T. GOVT. AND INT. DEPT.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Clarke) 1878 (i).
- ISSUED BY ARCHER MARTIN: Remarks (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3875 (ii).
- ISSUED BY MAJ. WALSH: M. for Copies\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2789 (i).
- REFS. *re*: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2481, 2704 (i).
- ISSUED BY MR. L. OGILVIE AND CANCELLED BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 2908 (i), 3789 (ii).
- NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3077 (i).
- TO MR. PETERS: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2027 (i).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 5667 (ii).
- NAMES OF COS., &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 1877 (i).
- NUMBER, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Douglas) 1843 (i).
- QUANTITY, &c.: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. Foster) 1876 (i).
- LYNCH, MR. W. H., EMPLOYT BY GOVT., REPS., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Powell) 1847 (i).
- MAGUIRE, MR. JUSTICE, APPOINT. AND ARRIVAL AT DAWSON, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3258 (i).
- Remarks (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3959 (ii).
- MAIL CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 6360 (ii).
- MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 7350 (iii); conc., 6390 (ii), 10202 (iii).
- BETWEEN DAWSON AND VANCOUVER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1965 (i).
- (1898-99) EFFICIENCY OF CONTRACTORS, REFS., &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2705 (i).
- REGISTERED LETTERS, &c., POLICY OF GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. McDougall) 3792 (ii).
- RETURNED FROM DEAD LETTER OFFICE: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 4351 (ii).
- MAINTENANCE OF PRISONERS: in Com. of Sup., 10195 (iii).
- MILITIA FORCE, CHARGES AGAINST FOR MISCONDUCT: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Hughes) 9968 (iii).
- FORCE, STRENGTH, COST OF SUPPLIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1831 (i).
- COST OF TRANSPORTATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1841 (i).
- MR. JUSTICE DUGAS' REPRESENTATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1842 (i).
- TRANSPORTATION, SUPPLIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6321, 6330 (ii).
- MINERS' GRIEVANCES AGAINST COS. BUYING WATER GRANTS: Remarks (Mr. Marcotte) 3315 (i).
- AND MR. OGILVIE'S REPORT: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2531 (i).
- MINING REGULATIONS: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2248 (i).
- PUBLICATION, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 1841 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*

- MINER'S RIGHT TO CUT TIMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 1836 (i).
- N. W. MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., conc., 6388.
- O. CS., REGULATING MINING CLAIMS BY OFFICIALS: Ques. (Mr. Morrison) 1824 (i).
- OFFICIALS: in Com. of Sup., 5022 (ii).
- APPOINT. BY GOVT., NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 1832 (i).
- BONDS, SECURITIES REGISTERED: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4991 (ii).
- GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, NATIONALITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morrison) 1823 (i).
- SALARIES, COST OF LIVING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morrison) 1824 (i).
- OGILVIE, MR., CONNECTION WITH BRITISH CANADIAN GOLDFIELDS Co.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3799 (ii).
- M. to Adjn. (Mr. Foster) 3799, 3801 (ii).
- RELATIONSHIP TO MIN. OF THE INT.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1841 (i).
- Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2703 (i).
- REPORT AND EVIDENCE: Inquiry for (Sir Charles Tupper) 8387 (iii).
- REPORTS *re* INVESTIGATION, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3548 (ii).
- RECEIVED BY GOVT.: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 3794 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. Sifton) 3795 (ii).
- PRINTING OF EVIDENCE: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5307 (ii).
- PRINTING, &c.: Remarks (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5359 (ii).
- PERMANENT FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 7005 (iii).
- MILITIA, NUMBER, COST OF TRANSPORTATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1892 (ii).
- PROFESSIONAL IMMORALITY, TAXES IMPOSED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1842 (i).
- PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 10207 (iii).
- RAILWAY POLICY OF GOVERNMENT *re* YUKON RAILWAYS: on M. for Com. of Sup., (Sir Charles Tupper) 4738, 4740, 4744 (ii).
- REGISTRAR OF TITLES, INSTRUCTIONS AND RESTRICTIONS BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2324 (i).
- REPRESENTATION IN PARLIAMENT: Ques.: (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2901 (i).
- RUMOURS *re* CONFLICT BETWEEN U. S. AND CANADIAN CUSTOMS: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 975 (i).
- RUSSELL, MR., INSPECTOR OF STEAMBOATS, REFS., &c., *re* DISMISSAL: M. for Copies\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3334 (i).
- SEAGWAY AND DAWSON TELEGRAPH LINE, CONSTRUCTION BY ENGLISH Co.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3073 (i).
- STEAMBOAT OWNERS, PERMITS TO CUT TIMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 1836 (i).
- SPIKING-TESLIN ROUTE, SURVEY, REP. OF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1885 (i).
- SUPPLIES, TRANSPORTATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7030 (iii).
- SURVEY OF LANDS, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3547 (ii).
- TELEGRAPH LINES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5604 (i).
- CONSTRUCTION BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6047, 6120 (ii).
- FROM SEAGWAY AND DAWSON, COMMUNICATION BETWEEN MINISTERS AND ENGLISH SYN. U. S. GOVT., &c., *re* CONSTRUCTION\* Copies\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper)

YUKON—*Con.*

- TELEGRAPH LINES, YUKON AND B. C.: in Com. of Sup. 10093 (iii).
- TERRITORIES ACT. REPS. FROM YUKON COUNCIL: Remarks (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2536 (i).
- TESLIN LAKE ROUTE REPS.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Davin) 2026 (i).
- TIMBER INSPECTOR, APPOINT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Morrison) 1823 (i).
- REGULATIONS, ISSUE OF PERMITS, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 1836 (i).
- TRANSPORTATION CO'S., EMPLOYED BY GOVT., AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1958 (i).
- U.S. BOATS REGISTERED AT DAWSON, NAMES, VALUATION, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2699 (i).
- VESSELS AND CAN. REGISTRY, FRAUDULENT VALUATION, &c.: M. for Ret. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3296 (i).
- WADE, MR. F. C., DATE OF ARRIVAL AT DAWSON: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3546 (ii).
- AMOUNTS, &c., PAID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1830 (i).
- BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 7442 (iii).
- Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 7242, 7320 (iii).
- INSTRUCTIONS OR PERMISSION TO STAKE CLAIMS, &c.: M. for Copies\* (Mr. Davin) 1877 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*

- WALSH, MAJ., AUTHORITY FOR COMMISSION ISSUED, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4269 (ii).
- EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Morrison) 1823 (i).
- INSTRUCTIONS BY GOVT. AS COMMISSIONER, REP. OF INTERVIEW AT SKAGWAY, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3978, 3258 (i).
- REPORTS, NUMBER RECEIVED AND LAID ON TABLE: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3798 (ii).
- WALSH, PHILIP, RELATIONSHIP TO MAJ. WALSH: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3823 (ii).
- WATER FRONT, DAWSON, LEASE, &c. TO MORRISON AND McDONALD: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 3547 (ii).
- WILLISON, J. W., CROWN TIMBER AGENT, RELATIONSHIP TO EDITOR OF *Globe*: Ques., 3823, 4270 (ii).
- WRIGHT, WM., OFFICIAL IN RECORDING OFFICE AT DAWSON, RELATIONSHIP TO EDITOR OF *Globe*: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4270 (ii).
- YULE BRIDGE, RICHELIEU RIVER, ARBITRATORS' AWARD, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3827 (ii).
- Zenith Mining and Ry. Co's. B. No. 20 (Mr. Poupore) 1<sup>st</sup>, 803; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1113 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 7577 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 92).